



UiT The Arctic University of Norway

Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education

The Development of Villains in B. Stoker's *Dracula*, A.C. Doyle's "The Final Problem" and J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* saga.

Evgeny Kalinin

Master's Thesis in English Literature and Education ENG-3983 May 2020

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Dracula as a villain	10
3	Moriarty as a villain	20
4	Voldemort as a villain	28
5	Discussion	40
6	Conclusion.....	47
7	Bibliography.....	52

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to thank Ruben Moi for doing a great job as my supervisor. His wise feedback was always useful and constructive. He helped me tremendously to be productive and always encouraged me to improve the quality of my text throughout. His kind words of complimenting my effort were heart-warming and reassuring during the whole period of writing the thesis.

I would also like to thank my schoolteacher U. Alexandersen for always being an inspiring example of a great professional, for always making me remember that dreams come true if one works hard enough for it, and for his endless trust in me.

My gratitude goes to my dear parents for always being there for me on my long journey. They always brought me a sense of confidence and certainty, and I knew that I can always count on them. I know that all of this would never be possible without their help, love, and support.

Finally, I want to thank my significant other C. Pettersen for her eternal care and patience. Only with her encouragement, motivation, and her limitless ability to cheer me up was I able to work, continue working, and achieve what I strived for. She believed in me when I would start doubting myself, she always managed to give me the energy I needed and lift my spirits in the hard days. Thank you for your love and comfort.

Abstract

This Master's Thesis explores the phenomena of villains and their development in English literature in period from 1893 to 2016, based on the examples of Dracula from B. Stoker's *Dracula*, Moriarty from A. C. Doyle's "The Final Problem", and Voldemort from J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series. The analysis investigates the development of these villains and brings up the greater questions about evil and the essence of human nature. In order to do so, these villains are correlated to the philosophical, theological, and social ideas by Hobbes, Rousseau, Machiavelli, Augustine of Hippo, and Locke. This work is divided into six sections. First comes the introduction, then three sections for closer analysis of each villain where the philosophical ideas are used to suggest the possible interpretation of these characters. A close reading of the original texts is used to provide information about the villains, their characteristics, and specifics. A comparative discussion of the villains ensues from the philosophy-oriented character analysis. The conclusion finalizes the character analysis, comparisons and philosophical consideration. The argumentation declares that even though these villains represent different forms of evil, they at the same time, remain undoubtedly evil at their core. Their evil nature is the same, the representation of it is what differs them.

1 Introduction

The theme of villains and villainy appears as an imperative aspect in such literary works as *Dracula* by Bram Stoker, *Sherlock Holmes* series by Sir A. C. Doyle or *Harry Potter* by J.K. Rowling and these are only few examples from a diversity of works which discuss this theme. My intentions for this thesis are to find the connection between the villains of different times, to figure out in what ways they correlate and how the same concept changes with time. At the same time as analyzing the villains and their villainy, it is thought-provoking to see how the villains in mentioned works correlate with greater ideas of good and evil, and in order to do so, it is fruitful to refer to philosophy.

The never-ending debate whether humans are good or bad is still a topic for discussion and will perhaps remain so for the many years to come. Throughout history, the greatest minds of humanity have been busy with that question about human nature. Many opinions exist in regard to this question, some of them quite polar, from Machiavelli and Hobbes to Rousseau and Locke. Hobbes in his *Leviathan* refers to the state of nature idea, and in his view that the condition for humans has been solitary. It has been “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short”, meaning that people’s lives are solemnly driven by self-interest and egoism (Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 179). In similar fashion to Hobbes, Machiavelli also holds a pessimistic view about human qualities: “Men are so simple and so subject to present necessities, that he who seeks to deceive will always find someone who will allow himself be deceived” (Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 67). On the other hand, Locke and Rousseau hold a more optimistic view of humans. “Men being, as has been said, by nature, all free, equal and independent” (Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, 58). “Man is naturally good” (Rousseau, *The Social Contract & Discourses*, 239). Another relevant perspective about human nature is expressed by Augustine of Hippo. He recognizes the duality of human nature but rather builds his view on the Christian faith and belief in almighty, all-knowing and all forgiving God. Augustine suggests the theory of the original sin, the fact that Adam and Eve out of foolishness or pride disobeyed God and therefore, for Augustine, humans are born with original sin “for in Thy sight none is pure from sin” (Augustine of Hippo, *The Confessions*, 13), but since God granted humans free will, it is their choice to be cleansed of that sin, and live a good honest life, or to continue living as a sinner. The free will is the ability granted by God to the people to make choices. Poor choices such as the one by Adam and Eve which caused the original sin, are also the result of this granted free will. However, this is the byproduct of free will, the

corruption of free will which was given by God. The free will was granted to Adam and Eve by God and was restricted only by their need to obey him. After Adam and Eve's first sin, humans bear the original sin in them and are no longer completely free, they can be tempted and corrupted. The concept of original sin for Augustine bears in itself the understanding that disobedience to God and egoism, caring too much about yourself rather than about God, is sinful. For Augustine making the faith in God the main priority explores virtuous traits of a person. This contrast Augustine's ideas with Machiavelli's, for whom virtues are not always necessary. Machiavelli is particularly interested in rulers who succeeded even without being virtuous. Even more so, the Prince, the ideal leader according to Machiavelli, must care about the art of war and the state or city he is in charge of, everything else is secondary. Therefore, God and faith do not have the priority positions in Machiavellian philosophy of a great leader. For Hobbes, in the state of war, the main priority of a human is survival, due to nasty and brutal life conditions, which also leaves out Augustine's idea of God, making therefore the people of the pre-societal state sinners in Augustine's point of view by not in Hobbes's. According to Hobbes, the animals for instance, cannot be sinful even for the evil actions they do in order to survive. Therefore, for Hobbes in the state of war of all against all, the pre-societal state, humans are no different from animals due to the brutish conditions of life. Consequently, humans cannot be considered sinful either. The fact that these philosophers belong to different times, starting with Machiavelli from the 1500s and following the others through the 1700s, not even mentioning Augustine, who is older than all others, only proves the simple idea that the questions of human nature have been relevant through centuries and remain relevant today. The constant search for the answer to the mystery of the human soul still occupies the minds of people of different areas of occupation, from literary critics who try to sort out and categorize characters of novels to criminologists who attempt to find a key to figuring out the portrait of a criminal, and to answer what makes a villain a villain? This question is not only of philosophical significance but also of social, political and religious importance, since the field of research concerns the nature of the human being itself. Such a global issue obviously became a theme of inspiration for people of different arts. Of course, this includes such a large area of art as literature.

The duality of human nature, the mystery of good and evil in literature, has a long and quite complex history. *Dracula*, "The Final Problem" and *Harry Potter* saga all delve into the mystery of human evil, and the topic of villains and villainy. *Dracula* is a gothic horror novel by Bram Stoker, written in 1897. *Dracula* is considered a masterpiece and a very influential work in the vampire fantasy sub-genre. *Sherlock Holmes* is a series of works in the detective

novel genre, written by Sir Conan Doyle in the period from 1887 to 1927. These series of works heavily influenced the detective genre and the popular culture as a whole, with Sherlock Holmes being one of the most well-known fictional detectives and one of the most portrayed film characters in history, according to Guinness Record Book (Guinness World Records News, “Sherlock Holmes Awarded Title for Most Portrayed Literary Human Character in Film & TV”). The *Harry Potter* saga is a series of books in the fantasy genre. This saga consists of seven books, written by J. K. Rowling from 1997 to 2007. The books have won huge popularity and commercial success (Casserly, “J.K. Rowling, Founder of the Harry Potter Empire”). Rowling’s books have attracted a rather wide audience due to their large variety of themes, such as discussions about nature of death, fear, madness, friendship and others. Perhaps one of the largest and most interesting themes *Harry Potter* brings up is the question of evil and evil’s nature.

Since evil is not a one-dimensional aspect of defining the character, readers often need to analyze exactly the whole book in order to understand what is evil in that particular work. Is the nature of evil and villainy in that particular book the same as the regular human life standard? This idea brings it further to the question like what defines different characters like Dracula, Moriarty or Voldemort? Do they all have certain similar traits, are they represented in a certain way or described particularly by the author? Can readers always find out who is the villain in the story and what villainy even means? After all, are all of the villains somewhat the same or should we look at all of them differently? These questions take the discussion to the very nature of a human.

Human nature and human passion for categorizing everything, trying to make systems and sort out the ideas or phenomena that we struggle to understand, in literature has resulted in complex discussions and dilemmas about human psychology, and when it comes to more technical aspects, it affected the creation of archetypes. If the "good" one is, on the first sight, simply a hero, a virtuous protagonist, a character of a story who has the main role and holds the position of just and righteous, the readers normally see that character taking his struggles through the story, defeating his enemies and overcoming challenges for the sake of good and justice. The readers are supposed to feel sympathy for that character and take his/her side of the story. That correlates with Aristoteles ideas about a tragic hero, who is supposed to make readers feel pity and fear (Butcher et al. *Poetics*, 10-11) but also such a hero must remain a virtuous character, even though not eminently good, “not pre-eminently virtuous and just” (Reeves, “The Aristotelian Concept of the Tragic Hero”, 174). The classical examples can be Beowulf or Hercules, in more modern works Jay Gatsby or Eddard Stark. In the examples

chosen for this work, the archetype of a hero, not necessarily or not fully a tragic one, would be fulfilled by Sherlock Holmes in all series devoted to that character. Harry Potter in the *Harry Potter* saga provides another example, even though Harry Potter as a character possesses certain traits of a tragic hero, like evoking fear for himself and pity among readers, being a generally good but flawed person, who is often in difficult and rather tragic circumstances. In Stoker's *Dracula*, several characters, e.g. Jonathan Harker, Mina Harker, Van Helsing form a hero group. The second archetype, the "bad" one an anti-hero or a villain, is normally following the concept of an antagonist for a protagonist, although he or she can sometimes be the main character of the story too. An antihero, an antagonist in the book is supposed to be a representative of evil, the character who is supposed to cause readers' fear, antipathy, and rejection. Plenty of examples of anti-heroes present themselves in different works, such as for example the Devil in *Paradise Lost* and Iago in *Othello* to Patrick Bateman in *American Psycho*. In the works chosen, these villains are Dracula, Professor Moriarty, and Voldemort.

The three villains differ from each other in their attitudes, methods, and motivations, however, they have certain similar traits if one pursues to investigate their villain type. Dracula, Moriarty, and Voldemort are all presented as power-oriented, merciless and egoistic characters. Especially their egoism and self-interest above anything else, like morals or other people's needs, correlate with Hobbes' idea of the state of nature, where all human behavior would be based on such egoistic motivations. For Dracula, this egoism is his will to spread the vampire curse further, move to England to feed on new fresh people. For Moriarty, it is his criminal empire, the feeling of power and joy that crimes bring him, the realization of being invincible and escaping the law and order of human society. Voldemort's main motivation is to beat death and reach immortality, but with that comes his determination to achieve that goal by any cause, with no regard to how brutal are the methods. Therefore, the genocide of the non-magical population, the practice of forbidden magical rituals despised by the rest of the wizarding world and his absolute will to either enslave or destroy anyone opposing him are only few of the instruments he is willing to execute in order to reach his goal. All these three villains, despite their certain differences, share the same trait when it comes to realization of their villainy by actions. All of them are egoists, yet in different ways and for various reasons. The evil of Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort is unique in their methods but similar in their egoistic attitude towards life and other people. This attitude is the purest representation of Hobbes pre-societal state of chaos and brutality.

Looking at these villains' egoism as one of the main motivations for their actions, the majority of the readers will find it hard to sympathize with them. Both their aims and their methods are beyond the regular understanding of good morals and ethics of societal norms. Instead, they represent absolute evil in their stories, they are the embodiment of such evil. However, this aspect becomes questionable when discussing whether the villains chose to be bad or they were born bad. With some of them, like Moriarty or Dracula, the novels provide scant information about their background, which makes it difficult to theorize whether the society or other factors have pre-determined these characters to be deceiving and destructive. With Voldemort however, the situation is slightly different since in the books by Rowling the readers get a sufficient amount of information about his past. In terms of his nature, Voldemort is an ambiguous character, who truly questions the statement by Rousseau that "Man is naturally good" (Rousseau, *The Social Contract & Discourses*, 239). According to the novels, Voldemort demonstrates traits of villainous nature from his early childhood. Mrs. Cole in *Half-Blood Prince* for example tells that "He scares the other children", "There have been incidents... nasty things...", "Amy Benson and Dennis Bishop were never quite right afterwards, and all we ever got out of them was that they'd gone into a cave with Tom Riddle" (Rowling, *The Half-Blood Prince*, 250-251). He is no stranger to lying, deceiving and finally murdering people. On the other hand, he is the product of love, which was artificial, stimulated not by real feeling but a love potion according to Harry's and Dumbledore's guess Harry suggested. "Or a love potion? Very good. Personally, I am inclined to think that she used a love potion. I am sure it would have seemed more romantic to her..." (Rowling, *The Half-Blood Prince*, 201), therefore even the very fact of his existence is evidence of lie and deception. With his very birth being a product of deceit as his starting point, as well as both parents being dead, followed by life in the orphanage, growing up knowing no love or friendship, it is a question whether Voldemort is simply a bad person because of circumstances of his birth or because of the other factors which he was influenced by while growing up? The first point of view is supported by for instance Augustine of Hippo and his theory of original sin and free will. In his ideas, men are born with the sin from Adam and Eve, who were given a right to choose, the free will and they were corrupted to choose evil. "That free will was the cause of our doing ill" (Augustine of Hippo, *The Confessions*, 159). Therefore, all men are born bad "for in Thy sight none is pure from sin" (Augustine of Hippo, *The Confessions*, 13) and only through making a just choice of free will, by living a virtuous life, can one cleanse himself from it. From this perspective, society and living conditions do

not influence the nature of Voldemort's villainy. He was born evil, and it was his decision and choice to remain such and pursue evil throughout his life.

In order to answer or discuss some of the questions raised it can be smart to look at how Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort show the development of the concept of a villain throughout time. To do so, this thesis examines some of the very canonical villains in Stoker, Doyle and Rowling's literature. *Dracula*, "The Final Problem" and *Harry Potter* series belong to different times and even different genres, therefore they offer great opportunity to see whether villain as a concept undergoes certain changes. A close analysis of these works and their anti-heroes will help to see how these characters were created with attention to certain cultural and historical aspects. This paper will research how the philosophical theories by Hobbes, Machiavelli, Augustine, Rousseau and Locke, their views and ideas about evil and human nature can be used in analysis of these characters. Since all characters of analysis are villains, of course the main focus will be on how these characters contribute to the evolution of villains. The thesis also attends to the image of the villains, the way they are portrayed, and to compare them and try to see whether they have any similarities or how they have influenced each other.

A closer reading of the texts is the most appropriate method for this academic study in order to answer the questions and analyze the characters. After all, the primary texts constitute the main material, the writer's language and ideas which are the main interest of the discussion. Therefore, it is the most logical and preferable to work mainly with the texts in form of close reading, with special attention to details and language when it comes to the villains. The analysis will include support from certain historical and philosophical studies, such as Hobbes's ideas of the state of nature, Machiavellian thoughts on deceiving and being deceived and beliefs that men are naturally good expressed by Locke or Rousseau, as well as the theological ideas by Augustine. The goal is to see how these ideas correlate with the villains presented, what thoughts and tendencies in philosophical discussions can be found in the representations of Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort. Another important aspect of the thesis is the investigation of three villains, the comparison of them in order to explore whether their differences are fundamental or whether they are secondary. Do they all belong to the same sense and meaning of the villain character, having a common base or idea they represent or whether they differ from each other tremendously?

In order to speak about villains as a phenomenon, it is important to define what the villain is. The history of villains' representation is vast, and therefore villains have different types and archetypes. However, certain characteristics between different types of villains, and

their combinations allow to make a definition of a villain and what traits a villain must possess. A villain most importantly is a character, a character that is playing a particular role or roles in the story. Another important aspect of a villain is motivation (Fahraeus and Dikmen, *Villains and Villainy: Embodiments of Evil in Literature, Popular Culture and Media*, 7). A villain is a motivated character who exercises his/her will in order to reach their goals. A villain is a character that represents the evil in the story, that is the character that will oppose the hero. Many villains have in common the fact that they are evil characters with certain motivations, which oppose the hero. However, as for instance Patrick Bateman from *American Psycho*, a villain can sometimes be the main character of the story. Other aspects of villain's traits, besides being the competition to the hero, vary greatly depending on the story itself, on the author's intentions or on other factors. For instance, villains can be anthropomorphic or not, their motivation can be different as well as their powers and weaknesses. For example, in the works chosen, Professor Moriarty is a human, and Voldemort can only partially be considered one. Voldemort unlike Dracula, who is always a monster in the novel, undergoes a transition from a more human-like form of being to a more monstrous one, only resembling a human.

Some of the earlier representations of villains were often defined by a very transparent approach. It was meant to be easy for the readers of the story to understand who the villain is. This was quite often achieved by portraying the villain the certain way, including both the physical appearances and manners. To provide some examples which can demonstrate that, the monster from *Beowulf* is a clear villain of the story, due to evil intentions, monstrous looks and destructive motives. Monstrous villains from various works, often represent that approach. They are only there to be a challenge for the protagonist, or they simply represent all negative, feared and hated traits of humanity. Later examples, for instance, the Gothic villains are also defined by certain traits that indicate the villainy, such as gloomy looks, suspicious and mysterious behaviour, unclear motives for actions and a general feeling of uncanny. Especially the part about physical appearance is important since in the world of Gothic literature villains are usually clearly marked, their looks are supposed to give them away, their physical appearance is the indicator of their inner evil character (Marshall, "The face of Evil: Phrenology, Physiognomy, and the Gothic Villain.", 161).

Furthermore, as the concept of how to portray a villain progresses and changes, it becomes more popular to give the evil characters a sense of ambiguity. Such archetypes as a trickster villain or a traitor add to the variety of villains. Another big category here is so-called sympathetic villains. They often have the ambiguous motivation, and their goals might

not necessarily be initially evil, but their actions and methods of reaching those goals normally are. The complexity of such characters and their motivation often makes them more relatable to readers as they represent the real world and its complexity. Voldemort for instance, spikes the discussion whether men as Godly creatures are naturally good or are they affected by the original sin and therefore corrupted as Augustine of Hippo suggests. The readers are not supposed to sympathize with Voldemort because of his actions, but they are curious about whether his motivations and methods are innate or has been adapted throughout life. A similar question applies to Dracula. He despises God, he is presented as a monster and unhuman and ungodly creature, therefore not belonging to the range of humankind. Is he therefore doomed to be evil? A counterargument here can be that Dracula was once a human, and a defender of God's will and Christian faith. Does this complexity mean that after his death he no longer belongs to God and is cleansed from Adam and Eve's sin, but has chosen the evil as his new life? If yes, what made him do so? These examples demonstrate the ambiguity of these villains and raise questions whether they are so one-sided as they might seem. Therefore, Dracula's villainy is a question: is he a brute as Hobbes shows the pre-societal state, because that is the only way of surviving in such chaotic circumstances, the world has made him into one? Or is he a brute and a sinner because he chose to nourish his inner sin by his evil actions, according to Augustine's ideas about free will and freedom of choice?

When speaking of villains, it is impossible to leave out the very essence of them, the villainy itself. There is no one ultimate definition of what villainy is and how it can be categorized. The concept of villainy and villainous acts has existed as long as humans. The problematics of defining villainy lies within the number of aspects that need to be considered when trying to identify and explain villainy. What is to be considered villainous depends greatly on various factors, such as, a point in history or the taken perspective. Different approaches to the question also contribute to complexity, villainy can be looked upon from the religious view or philosophical, inside the philosophy itself there will be different opinions, depending on the philosophical school. Villainy's definition will also be different for people of different backgrounds, mentalities or cultures. Hobbes, for example finds the purest villainy in the state of human nature determined by chaos and human desires led by absolute egocentrism and self-interests. This brutal human condition leads individuals such as Dracula to achieving the goals by the very simplest and most despised by Hobbes means by violence.

Violence is closely associated with the concept of evil and villainy. This proximity also finds reflection in the portrayal of villains, since they are meant to take the evil side of the story. The correlation between villainy and evil makes these two concepts almost interchangeable. However, it is usually considered that evil is a stronger word than villainy. This would say that the villainous is not always evil, but evil is almost always villainous. After looking at how complex the concept of villainy is, one can only gather some aspects which will be more frequent than others when speaking about villainy. Certain crimes like murder, rape or other forms of abuse are considered evil and villainous by Hobbes who hated and feared violence in any form of it, deeply traumatised and affected by King Charles brutal execution or by any person with classical Christian beliefs where murder or theft are among the crimes against The Ten Commandments. While it is important to remember that almost every case of villainy or even evil acts can be looked at from a different perspective. Take, for instance, theft. It is and has been considered a crime in various cultures, countries and at different times. Stealing is generally considered to be a criminal offense. However, in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*, Harry, Ron and Hermione steal some ingredients from professor Snape in order to make a needed potion (Rowling, 140). Even after that act of crime they still remain good characters, due to the fact that they needed the potion to fulfil their quest which is a right and virtuous one. However, from a regular person's perspective this act appears like an example of end justifying the means principle, which is quite often abused. If theft is not villainous enough, murder is also a questionable moment. Taking the life of another person is punished by society in most situations, but normally is not when it comes to soldiers at work, or when "good" characters kill "bad" ones. One example of such a case is from *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* which can illustrate the same ambiguous situation is the duel between Molly Weasley and Bellatrix Lestrange. Molly kills Bellatrix, with a curse which is not mentioned but is doubtfully a Killing Curse, since the description of effect does not match the mentioned curse. "Molly's curse soared beneath Bellatrix's outstretched arm and hit her squarely in the chest, directly over her heart" (Rowling, *The Deathly Hallows*, 590). In this situation, murder does not seem so villainous to many people since Molly represents the just part of the wizarding world, she fights for the greater good, for her family and against Voldemort. She is a good character throughout the novels, a kind and loving mother and a great friend. On the contrary Bellatrix is one of the cruellest characters of the series who enjoys violence and is happy to use it anytime, as well as she is one of the most loyal Voldemort's followers. Therefore, this duel and Molly's victory is supposed to represent the victory of Good over Evil. However, this still does not deny the fact that a good character

took another person's life. Those are just two of the very many examples which can be demonstrated to prove one single point that villainy is, first of all, a question of perspective. As Hobbes states in his ideas about mankind's state of nature for instance, none of these actions, which nowadays in civilized world would be considered criminal, would be looked upon as such in the state of nature since "The desires and other passions of man are in themselves no sin. No more are the actions that proceed from those passions, till they know a law that forbids them" (Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 180).

In the world of *Harry Potter* most of evil revolves around one person, around Lord Voldemort. Despite the fact that the wizarding world has other manifestations of calamity such as regular crimes, corruption and so on, Voldemort is the ultimate representation of the most hated and feared matters of the *Harry Potter* universe. He is the taboo theme, he is the almost physical feeling of terror and horror for the regular wizards of the universe. This example illustrates the embodiment and representation of villainy. In similar fashion Dracula is the canonical example of a villain. Dracula is a monster, a vampire who stands for all fears of surreal, strange and foreign which humans might feel. Moriarty is an example of a criminal mastermind, an archnemesis for a great detective Sherlock Holmes. Moriarty represents the more down to earth fears, his villainy is criminal. Nevertheless, Moriarty is a character who in all of his features, motivations and methods represent the human understanding of evil. By analysing these villains, their motives, way of thinking and their acts it becomes possible to look into manifestations of villainy. Since villains in literature belong to genres in which they appear, they have their limitations and limits. They can also be limited by genre limits and philosophical ideas from which these villains can be analysed. These villains and their villainy is diverse and varied, however they all can be correlated to the philosophical ideas by Hobbes, Rousseau, Locke, Machiavelli and Augustine. This broad spectrum of philosophical theories applies to Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort to a different extent. However, certain ideas such as the origins of human nature by Hobbes and Rousseau, thoughts about an ideal leader and leadership by Machiavelli and his controversial pessimistic perspective of a human being and the ideas of the original sin and free will by Augustine, can be used for all three villains in order to understand them best and specify their type of evil and villainy.

2 Dracula as a villain

Dracula, the protagonist of Stoker's novel from 1897, is perhaps one of the most canonical villains in literary history.¹ Stoker's monster has undoubtedly influenced the gothic genre, has broadened the gothic villain horizons, and forever set a standard for the vampire fantasy. "For the most people, the word "vampire" and the name "Dracula" are synonymous" Elizabeth Miller states in *A Dracula Handbook* (11). Subsequent popular culture devoted to the representation of vampires, from Neil Jordan's gothic horror film *Interview with the Vampire* in 1994, to the romance fantasy *Twilight* series, directed by different film directors in between 2008-2012, demonstrates clear references or influence of *Dracula*.

The question therefore is: why is Dracula so influential, what is he like as a main antagonist of the story? Dracula, as the novel's villain, is somewhat ruined for the modern readers due to his popularity and influence. Modern readers of Stoker's original title have already seen Dracula in various other works, like films, theatre plays or video games. Therefore, his character's mystery, the secret of his vampiric nature, which in the book unfolds after a while, the modern readers already know before even opening the book. Nevertheless, Dracula as a villain still strikes the readers of the novel with his looks, manners and behavior.

The Count is described as having, "a very marked physiognomy" (Stoker, 19) including a mouth "fixed and rather cruel-looking, with peculiarly white teeth; these protruded over the lips" (Stoker, 19). About his face: "strong - a very strong - aquiline, with high bridge of the thin nose and peculiarly arched nostrils; with lofty domed forehead, and hair growing scantily round the temples, but profusely elsewhere. His eyebrows were very massive, almost meeting over the nose" (Stoker, 19) "ears [that] were pale and at the tops extremely pointed" (Stoker, 19). Mina describes Dracula as a "criminal type" (Stoker, 291) and his face as "his face was not a good face; it was hard, and cruel, and sensual" (Stoker, 150).

The Ancient Greek philosophers pursued the idea that a good, virtuous person must not only have clear thoughts and a bright mind, but also his physical features must be the

¹ Dracula can be considered both a protagonist and an antagonist of the novel. However, due to the fact that the novel bears his name, he is the main character in most of the actions and that the plot revolves around him, most logical assumption is to call him the protagonist of the story. Speaking of antagonists, it is most certainly Dracula himself, the evil vampire ladies, Lucy after becoming a vampire, and Mina to a certain extent as well. Some might argue that despite Mina being a good character, the fact that she for a while wears a vampire curse, makes her evil.

reflection of his inner state. Therefore, education of both body and mind were important in Ancient Greece. The concept of physiognomy has certain parallels to these ideas. The popular theory that the physiological look of a person can bring light upon this person's inner nature. So, speaking a criminal can be distinguished by the way he looks. If one follows this theory, Count Dracula possesses certain features, some listed above, which are meant to foreshadow his monstrous nature of a vampire and a villain. The animalistic traits like his teeth or hairy hands, do not combine well with the standard portrayal of a proper nobleman. Such features give away his villainous thoughts, manners and desires. These ideas correlate also with Augustine of Hippo theory about human being as a crown of God's creation. According to Christian philosophy, God has created humans by his own image, therefore the human looks are the physical representation of God. Based on this, Dracula's monstrosity emphasizes not only his otherness comparing to regular humans, but it also indicates his distance from God. Dracula in the novel is contrasted not only by one character, since the novel does not have one main virtuous protagonist, but a group of heroic "vampire hunters". Already on that level, the readers can see a lot of differences in between the evil and good sides. While all the representatives of the vampire hunters are devoted, just Christians and they find their power in God, Dracula, once a defender of the faith, has now been corrupted by his monstrosity and is closer to the Devil than God. As well as his un-Godly origins, Dracula counteracts the others by his looks. Even in the beginning of the novel, readers already see the animalistic traits of his, which allows them to be suspicious about his nature. His appearance sets him drastically apart from the fair and good vampire hunters. Count has cold skin, hairy body parts, even palms on the inside, carnivore-like looking face and sharp shaped nose, sharp inhumanly big teeth, more looking like some animal, like wolf.

Dracula's appearance works as a telling factor for his otherness and villainous nature, especially from a physiognomist perspective. In the Count's appearance the readers familiar with physiognomy and Lombroso's ideas will come to the conclusion that "it is easy to indicate parallels between Lombroso's degenerate and Stoker's count" (Tomaszeska, "Vampirism and the Degeneration of the Imperial Race: Stokers Dracula as the Invasive Degenerate Other", 2). However, he manages due to his knowledge, certain level of intelligence and manners, to deceive Jonathan Harker, to distract him from such openly visible traits as physical looks. As proposed by Machiavelli, men are too simple and they will be deceived as long as there is someone to deceive them, and Dracula does exactly that. He manages, without hiding his true nature of a vampire too hard, to keep Jonathan, a rather smart and analytical person, in captivity of his castle. If one relies on the Greek philosophers'

idea of indivisibility of body and mind, Dracula is a proof against Rousseau's thesis about a man being naturally good, since Dracula by his very looks is naturally cruel. On the other hand, since Dracula's appearance is so animalistic and his otherness is so obvious, can he even be considered a human? Therefore, is it right to judge his nature from the perspective of human beings and their views and belief systems? If Dracula is to be analyzed from the pre-societal Hobbes' state of nature, the state of war according to Hobbes, his looks are merely a reflection of his actions, egoistic and violent, which is a norm in the state of nature according to Hobbes. Dracula's deception of Harker is just a demonstration of the Darwinist approach of survival of the fittest, he lies and manipulates in order to achieve his goals. Since the morals, ethics or societal norms or laws do not exist in the state of nature, Dracula from this perspective is no more of a villain than Jonathan, who demonstrates his weakness by being tricked. These discussions, however, do not change the fact that in the novel, Dracula and both his appearance and actions are repulsive and inhuman. He is the monster and the villain of the book, and "Dracula is otherness itself, a distilled version of all others produced by and within fictional texts, sexual science, and psychopathology", as Judith Halberstam declares (*Technologies of Monstrosity: Bram Stoker's Dracula*, 334).

Dracula is entirely driven by personal motives, which are egoistic, and they bring no good to anyone but himself. All his actions and methods are egoistic and cruel, which again, when thinking about him as being un-Godly, go against the whole concept of the Christian morale. In Hobbes's state of nature God and morale do not exist, therefore from this point of view Dracula is only doing what he must to live his life. On the other hand, for Augustine of Hippo, all actions of Dracula would be acts of evil, egoism and nourishing the inner sin, which makes Dracula a person who freely chose to remain a sinner.

Another aspect which distinguishes Dracula from the hero group of the story is a cultural or even geographical factor. All of the vampire hunters represent England, and some of them have connections to the other countries, like Van Helsing. Dracula is a pure product of Eastern Europe, Transylvania in particular. The constant rivalry of West and East is portrayed here in the battle of vampire hunters and the main vampire. This geographical binarism is a reflection of the contrast between the civilized, scientific and at the same time Christian world against the superstitious, barbaric and naturalistic part of the world. Dracula is a strong Eastern nobleman, a powerful sovereign with a long and rich history, who opposes the people of the Western world. He is the Other to the vampire hunters, to the Western and Christian people, as in philosophical aspect, he is a matter which they do not recognize, understand and/or accept. He does not obey the same laws or rules as they do, as if he belongs

to Hobbes' state of nature, while they belong to the modern and civilized world. Moreover, due to his characteristics, they fear him and while the Count is in his full power, that fear demonstrates their weakness: "the Count saw his victory in my bow, and his mastery in the trouble of my face" (Stoker, 31). Dracula in this scene, demonstrating his dominance, is the brute from Hobbes' pre-societal state, he is nasty and full of pride because of his almost physical superiority. Dracula in this reading is the representation of everything a civilized Western person of the post-Enlightenment era can fear. That contrast of the Other, the naturalistic and physical against the rational and logical, is the reflection of the West versus East conflict. However, Stoker by having a character like Van Helsing shows the interdependence of the two worlds. Since Van Helsing takes the best from both East and West, he is a scientist, but he sees value in using legends, myths and folktales. He combines the two very different cultures and shows that they coexist and are equally important. Van Helsing is more balanced and just character which makes him a strong contrast to Dracula. Peaceful coexistence in Van Helsing is opposed by the brutality, the idea of superiority and the desire to dominate of Dracula. The Count represents a barbarian, who hides behind a mask of nobility to cover his true destructive and egoistic nature of a monster. He sees his position, strengths and powers only as an instrument to fulfill his goals and suppress any disagreement or resistance.

The readers barely get to see Dracula as a normal human being, only in the very beginning when he is introduced to Jonathan Harker. Even then though, the perspective turns quickly towards the fact that Dracula is anything but an ordinary wealthy landlord from Romania. Dracula's monstrous nature is only emphasized by all his actions and the ways he handles events in the book. His manipulations, aggressiveness, egoism and violence leave the readers with no choice but only consider him purely evil and destructive by his nature. Dracula's appearance, unhuman and un-Godly, his egoistic and evil plans and actions, together with his position as a Count and representative for the opposing part of Europe, present the readers with one particular perspective of Dracula, which is simply the fact that he is a monster. This perspective is presented early and does not change throughout the novel. Despite the philosophical discussion around his nature which may put a difference perspective on the character, Dracula remains a representation of absolute evil throughout the novel, a fact that is emphasized by his contrast to the vampire hunters protagonists, his portrayal is in fact quite dependent on that contrast. The readers can fully realize and feel the villainous and un-Godly nature of Dracula even better in comparison to the characters like Van Helsing or Mina Harker.

Dracula is indeed a very canonical example of a gothic villain – mysterious, suspicious and driven by egoistic, selfish motives. At the same time, he is also a perfect image of a monstrous villain. All of his features fit very well with the representation of metaphysical evil, the evil outside this world. These two aspects, gothic villain and monstrosity helped Stoker to create a character so strong and influential, that very few works about vampires and evil after *Dracula* can claim that they have not been affected by him. Dracula's appearance is not the only aspect which makes his character a villain. Evil acts and intentions play a vital role in defining the antagonist of the story. Therefore, it is essential to study what Dracula's intentions in the novel are, what are his goals and methods he chooses in order to reach these goals.

In best Gothic traditions, which among many features include mysterious and gloomy setting, quite typically a remote castle, an atmosphere of mystery and horror, the first encounters with Dracula are placed in a rather specific setting and under specific circumstances. As Miller suggests: "Dracula shares many of the conventions of the genre: mysterious aristocrats (usually foreign), old castles set in mountainous environments, stormy weather, heroic rescues and the like" (*A Dracula Handbook*, 35). Jonathan Harker experiences the different culture of Eastern Europe, superstitious and religious people who try to warn him about some horrors he is to meet. Stoker foreshadows some aspects of the further development of the plot and provides information for the readers to be suspicious about the nobleman which Harker is about to meet. These foreshadowings come in different forms as for instance locals talking about devilry, and even mentioning some words directly: "Ordog"—Satan, "pokol"—hell, "stregoica"—witch, "vrolok" and "vlkoslak"—both of which mean the same thing, one being Slovak and the other Servian for something that is either were-wolf or vampire" (Stoker, 9), the wolves which follow the carriage with Harker on his way to the castle. Of course, the castle itself, its facade and location also add to the atmosphere and the general mood of the early book chapters: "the courtyard of a vast ruined castle, from whose tall black windows came no ray of light, and whose broken battlements showed a jagged line against the sky" (Stoker, 14). This castle together with the landscape and some worrying comments of the local population create certain suspense and indicates that Count Dracula is no ordinary person.

With all the weirdness and otherness of Dracula, he manages to keep his true nature from Jonathan for a while, lying and deceiving him. In best Machiavellian traditions, Dracula does not even need force to keep Jonathan in the dark about his nature. Dracula combines well his power and intimidation with his ability to deceive: "he who overcomes the enemy

with fraud is praised as much as the one who overcomes it with force” (Machiavelli, *Discourses on Livy*, 299). After a while Jonathan starts to have even more suspicions, he encounters the locked doors everywhere: “doors, doors, doors everywhere, and all locked and bolted. In no place save from the windows in the castle walls is there an available exit” (Stoker, 26). The Count wants to keep him in longer than Jonathan thought, and he has no contact with the outer world, he simply realizes that Dracula keeps him as a hostage in his castle “The castle is a veritable prison, and I am a prisoner!” (Stoker, 26). This combines well with the Gothic genre, where the plot of imprisonment is quite popular and is often used, as for instance in *Mysteries of Udolpho* by Ann Radcliffe, or many other works. As Aguirre states “it is easy to enter the Gothic castle, hard to come out” (“Geometries of Terror: Numinous Spaces in Gothic, Horror and Science Fiction”, 6). The struggles which Jonathan has escaping the castle of Dracula later in the novel, only proves this statement. The desire of Dracula to imprison Jonathan demonstrates his villainous nature and his inner wish to not only reach his goals of getting to know everything about England and fixing all needed business he needs in order to move there, but it also shows his desire to get and maintain control over a person, over their life and freedom. Dracula enjoys Jonathan’s fear, he terrifies Jonathan when he cuts himself shaving when the Count almost loses his mask: “I startled”, “his eyes blazed with a sort of demoniac fury, and he suddenly made a grab at my throat. I drew away” (Stoker 26). One more time when Dracula loses his temper is when he protects Harker from the three vampire ladies, claiming Jonathan for himself: “This man belongs to me!” (Stoker, 36). Such behavior and manners correlate with Machiavelli’s ideas of a strong ruler. Even the very manner in which Dracula speaks, to Jonathan earlier in the novel or to the vampire ladies in this moment, emphasizes his strong character and a lot of willpower. These capabilities unite him even more with Machiavellian Prince because: “If one wishes to be obeyed, it is necessary to know how to command” (Machiavelli, *Discourses on Livy*, 265). Dracula is as well as a Machiavellian leader more feared than loved: “one should wish to be both [feared and loved], but, because it is difficult to unite them in one person, it is much safer to be feared than loved” (Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 63). One of the vampire ladies lends further credence to Dracula’s Machiavellian nature when she claims that Dracula is incapable of love: “You yourself never loved; you never love!” (Stoker, 36). Dracula shows a clear interest in power, his desire to control and possess, to manipulate people with fear and terror. Also, Dracula fits Machiavelli’s ideas about deceiving people Dracula is the one who wants to deceive, which is a part of his evil and destructive nature of a monster. Referring to Hobbes and his pre-societal state, Dracula’s desire to control and dominate Jonathan is a reflection of

this state's war, the stronger trying to gain benefits by defeating or humiliating the weaker. So, already in the first part of the book, Dracula is portrayed through his intentions and actions as a deceiving, manipulative, intimidating character who enjoys control and the feeling of superiority on different levels, from being proud of his noble and ancient origins – “the pride of his house and name is his own pride, that their glory is his glory, that their fate is his fate”, “We Szekelys have a right to be proud, for in our veins flows the blood of many brave races who fought as the lion fights, for lordship” (Stoker, 28) – to almost physically controlling another human's life and freedom.

Dracula stands behind several other acts of evil in the novel, besides imprisoning and technically leaving Jonathan as a prey to the vampire ladies. First, after the readers realize that Dracula is indeed a vampire, his goals become clearer. He intends to spread the vampirism curse to England, to find himself new blood to feed on. To do so, he must bring Transylvanian soil with him, which he does by transporting it in coffins, which will serve him as a place of rest and restoration. Dracula already does fit the profile of a classic Gothic villain, which Miller describes as “a tall, dark and mysterious nobleman who lived in a remote castle” (*A Dracula Handbook*, 18). The details about his supernatural origins and coffins serving him as beds only make that image even more terrifying. The image of an evil character, a monstrous vampire sleeping in a coffin, is a strong literary image, which Stoker uses to keep strengthening the Gothic atmosphere as well as to cause even more fear and revolt against Dracula from the readers. Also, by creating this image Stoker refers to an old folklore superstition about vampires, that they rest in their graves until they are strong enough to go hunting.

Later, Dracula continues with his felonies in England. One of the characters who is directly affected by this situation is Renfield, the patient of a psychiatric hospital led by Dr. Sewerd. Dracula manipulates his mind, spikes his bloodlust and causes troubles in Renfield's already troubled mind. Renfield is obsessed with his master because that is exactly how he sees Dracula. The count has managed to manipulate Renfield into believing that he is some sort of God-like creature, a higher mind:

I am here to do Your bidding, Master. I am Your slave, and You will reward me, for I shall be faithful. I have worshipped You long and afar off. Now that You are near, I await Your commands, and You will not pass me by, will You, dear Master, in Your distribution of good things? (Stoker, 90).

This act of Dracula's villainy once again corresponds with the possessive nature of a tyrant and a dictator. He shows in this situation, as well as in the one with Harker, his wish to control people and to be in charge of their lives, mind, and wishes. Dracula wants to own them and dominate them in all possible forms since he seems to strengthen from that domination as well as he enjoys it. These factors bring Machiavelli's ideas to the light. Dracula is the deceiving, cruel type of a ruler (dictator) which the Italian philosopher saw as the ideal. However, Machiavelli's ruler was violent, feared but still just, and did what he did for the best of his state. Here lies a fundamental difference with Dracula. The Count does everything out of his desires and wishes. He is not only not just, but also an egoist who is driven by his most base desires. In Freud's psychological theories, Dracula is pure Id, he is only driven by the lowest and most basic desires. These base drives also contribute to the idea of Dracula's animalistic nature as well as his appearance. He resembles an animal in his looks and he also behaves like one, his hunger and bloodlust are the most active mechanisms of his nature. This behavior correlates with Hobbes's idea about life being nasty, brutal and short. Dracula with his behavior and life values proves that idea and does his best to make the life even nastier and more brutal. In similar manner Dracula is also a sinner by Augustine's view. For Augustine one of the main aspects of the original sin and sin as a whole is disobedience to God and human egoism. Caring too much about yourself rather than caring about God is sinful. "For it was my sin, that not in Him, but in His creatures myself and others sought for pleasures, sublimities, truths, and so fell headlong into sorrows, confusions, errors" (Augustine, *The Confessions*, 32). Dracula, who is driven by his vampiric nature and most primitive desires and who is feeling empowered by fear of others, is an absolute egoist. Dracula's egoism distances him from God, and therefore makes him a sinner according to Augustine.

When speaking of his animalistic nature as a monster, Dracula demonstrates his brutalism more than once in the novel. He attacks and preys on Lucy, continuously drinking her blood and finally turning her into a vampire. Such an act of egoism and, once more, wish to own, possess and dominate is of animal nature. This animalistic nature is to even larger extent emphasized by the fact that "in his pursuit and seduction of Lucy, Count Dracula frequently disguises himself in the form of a large bat" (Miller, *A Dracula Handbook*, 46). The survival of the strongest beast is Dracula's behavior, exactly like in Hobbes's state of nature. Dracula tries to show everyone that he is the strongest and most influential one on Earth, but his methods of doing that are strictly physical. As of animals, he is incapable of realizing that physical dominance and possession are not only not victorious to regular

people, but instead are revolting and repulsive. It is, therefore, the infection of Lucy, the most free and independent person of all characters, who with these Rousseauistic traits would be a definition of a good person, is such a strong contrast to Dracula, who is consumed by his hunger and is anything but free or independent despite his strength, and therefore is not a good person.

Dracula culminates his villainy by spreading his curse to Mina. In another demonstration of a very animal-like, and even intimate event, Dracula feeds Mina his blood to turn her into a vampire. She is not transformed fully though, but that act of evil, the brutal and malicious attack on smart, good and kind Mina is a final drop in the quest to destroy Dracula. Dracula still wants to possess and own, to show his dominance, but Stoker shows that since Mina does not become a vampire fully, she is stronger than the Count. Even though she is terrified of the connection the blood exchange has caused, she manages to become a spy into Dracula's mind and consciousness. "She permits herself to be hypnotized so that Van Helsing can take advantage of her psychic links to Dracula" (Miller, *A Dracula Handbook*, 40). That helps the vampire hunters tremendously throughout their journey.

Dracula's actions and intentions in Stoker's novel, as well as his looks, constitute a pure reflection of his evil nature. He is a monster, driven by bloodlust. Dracula shows signs of megalomania, with his almost obsessive desires to dominate, to possess people and control them, which he tries to fulfill by spreading his vampirism curse. He is the Other, the different one, and is such a contrast to the rest of the characters in the novel. The original sin which according to Augustine of Hippo is present in everyone is not only present in Dracula but is flourishing since the Count is evil by default and only pursues his evil nature. He is not a good person in any state of mind or any view, his animalism is that of a pre-societal fight for resources in Hobbes's state of nature. There, only the strongest gets the profit in a chaotic state of existence. Therefore, Dracula does not belong to the modern or as the matter of fact any at all vision of good, his character is as far from the constructive ideas of Enlightenment as possible. Hobbes describes the state of nature with a certain level of revolt, he refuses to accept any form of violence, which for Dracula is a natural way of reaching his goals. Dracula's nature, his otherness, and monstrosity, together with the unforgettable Gothic atmosphere of the novel and the Count's physical appearance, make Dracula a very memorable and influential villain. Dracula does not belong to Locke's or Rousseau's ideas of people naturally being good. The fact that Dracula can only partially be considered a human does not play a vital role in this statement. His evil intentions, goals and methods are of more significant. The Count possesses certain Machiavellian traits, as a tendency to tyranny and a

desire to control. However, he is too egoistic, too animalistic and too much driven by natural instincts. Furthermore, he lacks higher skills of manipulation and planning to be fully considered a Machiavellian criminal. The best perspectives in which to analyze Dracula are Hobbes's ideas of natural human brutality and the original sin theory by Augustine. Dracula's villainy fits the nasty world of pre-societal state which Hobbes describes, and The Count is the brute of such a society. For Hobbes, primal instincts of survival in the pre-societal state of war are inevitable for a human being. Humans try to avoid pain as best as possible and gain as much benefit as they can. In these terms, Dracula does not do anything particularly sinful, since humans in these conditions are no more sinful than animals. The difference lies within the fact that Dracula does not live in the conditions of the war of all against all. He is a part of a bigger, more structured and law obedient society, a society with rules which Dracula willingly and knowingly chooses to ignore and break. Dracula is a brute. According to Hobbes, a brute is not to be punished in pre-societal conditions. However, in the conditions where the government, the law, the Leviathan already exist, such a brute must be persecuted. In this manner, Dracula's vampiric curse can be paralleled to the original sin, Dracula does not try to restrain or somehow control his bloodlust, he chooses to spread the curse and does it by most cruel methods.

3 Moriarty as a villain

Professor Moriarty, Sherlock Holmes' great antagonist in Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's "The Final Problem", presents an interesting type of a villain which relates to a few philosophical ideas. Firstly, based on his *modus operandi* and his personal traits, Moriarty represents a so-called Machiavellian criminal type. The Machiavellian type represents a cold planner, a smart strategist whose prototype is to be the infamous Prince of Niccolò Machiavelli and this prototype embodies ideas about the ideal leader of a state. Also, Moriarty, based on certain descriptions given by Holmes in the short story as well as with impact of the phrenological theories at the time, can be correlated to the ideas of Augustine and his theory of the original sin as a part of every human. This correlation is logically followed by the contrast of Moriarty to Holmes which can be illuminated by Augustine's free will and freedom of choice. This contrast of the two great minds, the rivalry between Holmes and Moriarty, has become canonical in the detective genre. The Detective genre or certain features of it are present in different works from Ancient texts like *Oedipus Rex* to modern detective stories. Works by

writers like E. A. Poe and Agatha Christie quickly gained popularity among readers. Therefore, the fact of popularity of Sherlock Holmes is not surprising. This British detective is one of the most recognizable fictional characters and is certainly one of the most well-known fictional detectives. Numerous stage and screen versions of Sherlock Holmes prove the popularity of the character and the audience's interest in the detective genre. This interest spiked tremendously after the release of commercially successful BBC series *Sherlock* (2010) created by M. Gatiss and S. Moffat, based on original works by Sir A. C. Doyle.

Sherlock Holmes is a genius detective, a brilliant investigator with sharp mind and deep knowledge of his areas of expertise. He fights crime with elegance using his famous deduction method. Such a bright protagonist as Holmes must have a worthy opponent. Conan Doyle puts Sherlock against many criminals in the series, but no one is nearly as smart as Sherlock. No one, except one modest professor of mathematics who at the same time is the criminal mastermind of Doyle's fictional universe- professor Moriarty.

In order to understand Moriarty's character and analyze what type of villain he is, the story by Conan Doyle where Sherlock Holmes himself introduces Watson and the readers to this "Napoleon of crime", is useful (Doyle, "The Final Problem", 284). First, Sherlock points out to the fact that Moriarty has good upbringing and is naturally gifted in mathematics (Doyle, 283). These details imply that Moriarty is very smart and unlike many other criminals, he does not come from a poor background, poverty or other hard life circumstances. However, as Sherlock states: "the man had hereditary tendencies of the most diabolical kind. A criminal strain ran in his blood, which, instead of being modified, was increased and rendered infinitely more dangerous by his extraordinary mental powers" (Doyle, 283). This characteristic is quite sinister for the person who had good upbringing and education. Moriarty is not put and never has been put in Hobbes's conditions of pre-societal state of war, he needs no crime to live life it would seem like. Nevertheless, he is the criminal mastermind, who "pervades London" and "That's what puts him on a pinnacle in the records of crime" (Doyle, 283). In Sherlock's description he uses words like "hereditary tendencies" and "criminal strain run in his blood", these words correlate well with Augustine's idea of the original sin. The crime is innate in Moriarty as it is with all evil in all people according to Augustine. However, every single person with their free will makes the choice to pursue that inner sin or reverse their life to the good. Clearly, Moriarty has chosen the path of the criminal.

In the part of "The Final Problem" when Sherlock continues informing Watson about Moriarty, Moriarty's influence as a villain unfolds. Sherlock describes his influence with a

metaphor, comparing Moriarty to some power which is responsible for all the crime in the city. “For years past I have continually been conscious of some power behind the malefactor, some deep organizing power which forever stands in the way of the law, and throws its shield over the wrong-doer” (Doyle, 284). The author shows through words of Holmes the complexity of the process, where the famous detective discovers that this “deep organizing power” was one specific person. “forgery cases, robberies, murders -- I have felt the presence of this force”, “I seized my thread and followed it, until it led me, after a thousand cunning windings, to ex-Professor Moriarty” (Doyle, 284). The difficulties of such a detective talent as Sherlock, in investigating this criminal force, only emphasize the intellectual level of Moriarty, his ability to act indirectly and remain uncovered. Moriarty is a great strategist. Therefore, he is compared to Napoleon, one of the brightest generals and rulers of his time (Doyle, 284). Sherlock recognizes Moriarty’s strengths and creates a feeling of Moriarty as a dangerous opponent by complimenting his skills “He is a genius, a philosopher, an abstract thinker. He has a brain of the first order” (Doyle, 284). Moriarty fulfills his role as a villain, he is responsible for many criminal acts “He is the organizer of half that is evil and of nearly all that is undetected in this great city” (Doyle, 284). Moriarty’s intellectual level, together with his well-established criminal network and him being responsible for numerous crimes make him into a rival worthy of Sherlock Holmes. The evidence that Moriarty is behind a broad network of crime of different kind is a proof that in Augustine of Hippo’s theory, Moriarty would remain a sinner. He is a villain because he chose to be one, despite his intellectual talent and good background. Moriarty nourishes his original sin with his criminal empire. The intellect level of Moriarty, his abilities to foresee and plan in advance, allows him to not only build and develop his criminal empire but also for a long time avoid law and persecution. He even manages to escape from Holmes for a long period of time. These facts confirm the Machiavellian talents of Moriarty, his perspicacity and ability for strategic thinking. Further in this part of the short story, the readers get to see how Moriarty operates his criminal organization. In description, Conan Doyle draws a parallel between Moriarty and a spider who “sits motionless in the center of its web, but that web has a thousand radiations, and he knows well every quiver of each of them. He does little himself. He only plans” (Doyle, 284). The many agents who work for the professor do all the actions for him “Is there a crime to be done, a paper to be abstracted, we will say, a house to be rifled, a man to be removed” (Doyle, 284). In case of some failures of agents, they rarely face consequences and most importantly Moriarty is never caught, he is always out of the picture. The way Moriarty operates his network demonstrates that he is involved into all kinds of different criminal

activities, he has interest in a lot of areas, which makes him even more influential. His methods are illegal, ruthless and unprincipled. At the same time, he always manages to remain unseen. He is the brain of the system, he manipulates, commands and give orders to reach his goals. The way Moriarty commits his crimes can be compared to the Machiavellian ideas of the good leader. Machiavelli believed that a good leader is a talented manipulator, someone who is authoritative enough to be feared and obeyed. Ideally though for Machiavelli a leader should be loved but he considers it difficult to be achieved and therefore makes a choice between love and fear in favor of the latter: “one should wish to be both [feared and loved], but, because it is difficult to unite them in one person, it is much safer to be feared than loved” (Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 63). Moriarty fits that profile, he is a manipulator of the highest order, he deceives people and plays his own game which only he knows and fully understands. For Machiavelli the main goal and motivation of a leader is the prosperity and greatness of the state, and if criminal organization can be compared to a state, Moriarty becomes even more characteristic Machiavellian ruler.

Moriarty, as a true Machiavellian ruler, does not belong to himself. He does not consider himself an independent element, but rather a part of a much bigger system which he though, has created. He tells Sherlock “You stand in the way not merely of an individual, but of a mighty organization” (Doyle, 287). Moriarty seems to be proud of his criminal network as a father who is proud of his child, and the fact that Sherlock stands in his way does not seem to make him furious but more annoyed. Professor even expresses his “pity” that Sherlock refuses to step aside after Moriarty’s visit “It seems a pity, but I have done what I could” (Doyle, 288). Moriarty with all of his mathematical accuracy takes notes of when exactly Sherlock crossed him and ruined his plans (Doyle, 287), also he compliments Holmes’ skills and efforts “It has been an intellectual treat to me to see the way in which you have grappled with this affair” (Doyle, 287). His calm manner of the dialogue with Sherlock demonstrates several things, first of all that Moriarty has good control over his emotions and words. He manipulates his language excellently, he politely but very persuasively threatens Holmes. Also, the fact that Moriarty is so calm and sure of his words, emphasizes how confident he is of his system. Indeed, Holmes has managed to create certain difficulties, but Moriarty believes that in a long run Holmes will lose, since the criminal network is too big and too powerful “You must stand clear, Mr. Holmes, or be trodden under foot” (Doyle 288). Conan Doyle portrays Moriarty as a powerful villain, an archnemesis of Holmes. He is calm, strategic, extremely smart, mathematically accurate and very polite. At the same time, he is intimidating, self-confident and absolutely free of any morale or principle. Unlike Dracula

who exists in other dimension in terms of morale and he does not recognize any human aspects such as laws or norms, Moriarty knows all of them, but he chooses not to follow any, for that interferes with his goals. Moriarty is a villain both for Augustine since he chooses to do evil and grow his inner sin, and for Hobbes because Moriarty acts like a pure egoist and brute in the world where Leviathan (the state of law, order and government) already exists. In this manner he is no less of a monster than Dracula, maybe even more considering the fact that almost nothing about his physical appearance is strange, repulsive or very special. While Dracula is in fact a monster, a vampire, Moriarty is a human, which makes him as a villain even more scary since he represents a monster within a normal human society.

The otherness of Dracula is emphasized by his looks. Certain physical characteristics of The Count indicate his difference from Jonathan Harker or any other regular humans in the novel. His animalistic traits foreshadow his monstrous nature of a vampire. On the contrary, Moriarty is a very ordinary looking person. Most of his physical traits do not bear in themselves anything revolting or odd. “He is extremely tall and thin”, “He is clean-shaven, pale, and ascetic-looking, retaining something of the professor in his features”, “His shoulders are rounded from much study” (Doyle, 286). These details of Moriarty’s looks do not create a mysterious or scary portrayal of him, they do not make an impression of him to be a criminal mastermind and an evil genius of the criminal empire. These characteristics instead create an image of Moriarty as a harmless, innocent person, a person who is just “one of us”. However, some aspects of Moriarty’s looks, as Holmes describes them, are suspicious or can be paralleled to certain features which indicate Moriarty’s villainous nature. One moment which is worth paying attention to is how metaphorically Sherlock compares Moriarty to a reptile: “his face protrudes forward and is forever slowly oscillating from side to side in a curiously reptilian fashion” (Doyle, 286). This metaphor parallels Moriarty to a reptile, perhaps a snake, who does the same movements before it attacks. This description of Holmes indicates the danger which comes from Moriarty. Unlike Dracula who is openly scary, Other and monstrous, Moriarty’s danger and threat are deeply hidden, and only such a bright detective and an experienced reader of body language and physical traits like Holmes can notice these little details. Another aspect of Moriarty’s looks is perhaps less intimidating or scary but no less curious and important, “his forehead domes out in a white curve” (Doyle, 286). This moment indicates Sherlock’s phrenological approach in his description. Phrenology was very popular at the beginning of the 1900s, around the time when Sherlock Holmes novels are set, and one of the very popular ideas in phrenology was that a big head indicates a big brain, which is the sign of great intelligence. Sherlock, according to James O’Brien expresses this

idea in for instance “The Blue Carbuncle” when speaking of Henry Baker (*The Scientific Sherlock Holmes: Cracking the Case with Science and Forensics*, 90). Holmes demonstrates the same approach in “The Final Problem” as well. His reference to Moriarty’s big forehead is an indicator of the professor’s bigger mental capacity. This detail supports the idea that not only Moriarty is dangerous because of his reptilian manners but also because he is extremely smart. This feature is emphasized even more when Moriarty himself mentions that “You [Sherlock] have less frontal development than I should have expected” (Doyle 286). Moriarty by mentioning this, in hidden form compares his own intelligence levels with Holmes’s, and in phrenological theory, this comparison is not in favor of Sherlock. Last, Moriarty’s eyes complete his physical portrait: “two eyes are deeply sunken in this head”, “his puckered eyes” (Doyle 286). These descriptions create an image of a smart, suspicious and unkind person.

Drawing a comparison between two villains and their looks, Dracula is an open threat. He comes out as a strange-looking person, too many of his features are animalistic and different from any human norm. This deviation indicates his otherness and points towards his true nature of a monster. Moriarty, on the other hand, has a more deceptive appearance. His looks do not scream otherness, on the first sight he might seem like an average person. Only through the experienced and very attentive eyes of Holmes, the readers can spot certain villainous details of Moriarty’s looks. This hidden danger correlates well with the type of villain Moriarty is. He is an *éminence grise*, a hidden leader and brain of the criminal empire. His big head² fits well with his Machiavellian criminal type. For Machiavelli, a great leader must be a great philosopher, a thinker, a person of a great mind. He must be capable of strategic decisions, long term planning and manipulations. Moriarty suits that profile. His looks must be the reflection of his nature, very ordinary on first sight and extremely dangerous and suspicious for one who is capable of looking deeper and more attentively. Moriarty represents an enemy within, his physique is so ordinary and not unique that together with the knowledge that he actually is a criminal mastermind, this contrast creates the fear of an ordinary person, a neighbor next door. Since such a contrast creates an understanding that a villain and a criminal are not visually easily distinguished, the monster can be any one of us, regular people. Even Holmes admits that Moriarty scares him. “My nerves are fairly proof, Watson, but I must confess to a start when I saw the very man who had been so much in my thoughts standing there on my thresh-hold” (Doyle, 286). Moriarty is always a human. Unlike Dracula, he does not possess almost any animalistic traits, therefore he is not a monster by his

² From the phrenological perspective a big head indicates a big brain

looks. Moriarty is a monster because of his goals, actions and motivations. On the contrary to Augustine, and his idea that not to be sinful one must focus on God rather than himself, Moriarty's goals and motivations revolve around the criminal empire he has created, making him after all an egoist and a sinner.

Several aspects of Moriarty, such as his above-average intelligence, ability to plan and manipulate on the highest level together with his determination to develop and keep running his criminal empire as well as absence of any morals or principles, demonstrate that he is a worthy and a dangerous opponent for Sherlock Holmes. Sherlock admits it himself: "I was forced to confess that I had at last met an antagonist who was my intellectual equal" (Doyle, 285). The rivalry of the two is a quintessential aspect of "The Final Problem" but is also crucial for Moriarty's character and the disclosure of him as a villain. The intensity of confrontation between the protagonist and the antagonist of the short story is described by Holmes himself: "if a detailed account of that silent contest could be written, it would take its place as the most brilliant bit of thrust-and-parry work in the history of detection", "Never have I risen to such a height, and never have I been so hard pressed by an opponent. He cut deep, and yet I just undercut him" (Doyle, 286).

Out of these short but very bright descriptions, the readers get the feeling of how fierce this battle of two great minds is. It resembles a chess game between two grandmasters, both making moves, trying to predict the next move of the opponent and waiting for him to make a mistake. The two opponents have so much in common, they both are incredibly smart and strategic. They both have won a tremendous amount of such battles before and both of them want to win this time as well. The defining difference between Holmes and Moriarty lies within the question of sides, which side of the law do they stand at? Their rivalry is built on these factors, on the similarities of their intellectual nature, mental abilities and skills in different areas of knowledge as well as on the contrast of their worldview. Sherlock Holmes is a detective, the character who helps people in need. Even more importantly, his main motivation for most cases is to find out the truth. He represents the societal need and desire for truth. Holmes is the embodiment of a lawful citizen's wish for truth and justice in case of crimes. On the contrary, Moriarty is an antagonist to Holmes in every aspect mentioned. Moriarty stands for everything Holmes rejects and despises. Professor does not have any morals and he puts his goals of the criminal empire above anything else. He does not stop before any actions or methods in order to reach the results he wants. The villain Moriarty mirrors Sherlock Holmes by his skills, abilities and intelligence level. However, he is on the other side of the law, his life ideology is the contrast to the one of Holmes. Metaphorically

speaking, Moriarty is Holmes's evil twin brother, who instead of pursuing the career of the detective decided to become a criminal. Here lies the factor which is crucial for Augustine's philosophy. The freedom of will, the freedom of making a choice is the aspect which Augustine points out to when he presents his theory of the original sin in all humans. This idea is well demonstrated by Holmes and Moriarty. Holmes as any other human is not flawless, however, he chooses to do good in his life. He becomes a detective and tries his best to help people get truth and justice. He helps the society to protect the victims and punish the criminals. Therefore, from Augustine's perspective Holmes is fighting his original sin, he tries to reverse his life for the better. Moriarty on the other hand, as Holmes' evil doppelganger, does exactly the opposite. With his great mind and abilities, he could have been a benefit to the society, but he chooses to be a criminal mastermind. The innate evil which runs in his veins Moriarty prefers to develop rather than destroy. He nourishes his original sin by his crimes, and he does so willingly with no remorse or second thoughts. Moriarty, therefore, is an absolute sinner by Augustine, no remorse and no attempts to change his life. He knows he is a criminal and he is satisfied with this knowledge. Moriarty is a sinner and he has no mental torment about that. This fact makes Moriarty a Machiavellian criminal type. Since for Machiavelli such aspects as morals or honesty are limiting factors to success when considering who is a successful ruler of a state, Moriarty from this perspective is an ideal archetype of a leader. What for Augustine is sinful, serves for Machiavelli as a method of success. Therefore, Moriarty's actions and motivations from the perspective of Hobbes's state of war are very curious. Moriarty is set in the society which has established rules, morals and official laws. However, he willingly chooses to break them in order to benefit from these crimes. Also, he commits his crimes with knowledge about the law system since he is able to escape being caught or punished rather successfully. Can it be so that Moriarty, despite the presence of the established law system in the society, despises this system and therefore does not recognize it as legal or even functioning? What if Moriarty sees the world as a pure pre-societal state where he needs to either "eat or be eaten" following the Darwinist idea of the survival of the fittest? He sees the world and people in it as chaos, as the lack of any structure. Therefore, he by organizing the world around him into a criminal network hits two goals with one shot. He brings his vision of a structure to the chaos of the society, as he is a Prince of crime this vision is a criminal one, but he sees no issue with that. Also, he takes maximum profit of the situation, he manipulates and uses people for his own benefit. Moriarty from this point of view only does what he considers necessary to survive.

Moriarty is not a developing character. He is presented as evil from the start and he remains such throughout the story. He is created to be a supervillain for Holmes, his complete opposite in ideology, but almost his clone in powers and skills. Moriarty's uniqueness is in something else. The professor is unique because he represents an enemy within, a monster who looks and behaves like any other human a reader might meet on the street. This factor of villain's commonness together with his undoubtedly Machiavellian criminal nature and his free will to nourish his inner sin makes Moriarty a hidden but yet, a very serious danger. He is perhaps one of the most canonic representatives of a criminal mastermind character type and therefore has a considerable impact on the genre of the detective novel, especially antiheroes in such narrative.

4 Voldemort as a villain

Voldemort belongs to a very different period than Dracula or Moriarty. He is the villain who, unlike Dracula or Moriarty, is created after World War II.³ Such a crucial and influential period of human history cannot have not affected several generations of artists and writers in particular. J. K. Rowling herself does not hide the fact that Voldemort as a character can easily be paralleled to such tyrants of the 20th century as Adolf Hitler or Joseph Stalin ("New Interview with J.K. Rowling for Release of Dutch Edition of *Deathly Hallows*"). The different time factor, a different genre to which the *Harry Potter* series belong, and a different target audience – all these aspects define Voldemort as the main antagonist of the story.⁴ He is definitely different from both Dracula and Moriarty. However, despite clear differences between these characters, they most definitely share a number of similar traits. Through the comparison of older villains to a newer one, it is possible to see the development of what a villain is. Some characteristics of Voldemort are different from ones of Dracula or Moriarty since Voldemort represents newer times. At the same time, there are features of villainy which many antagonists possess no matter what time or genre they belong to. If the information about Dracula or Moriarty's past is somewhat missing and incomplete and it is therefore difficult to claim absolutely that their characters were always purely evil as they are

³ The *Harry Potter* series, unlike the *Dracula* or *Sherlock Holmes* series, were written in the post-world war II period.

⁴ At least, in the beginning, *Harry Potter* was meant to be young adult literature, only later gathering a rather wide reader's audience of different ages.

presented throughout the stories, Voldemort's past and present are presented in detailed manner in the novels. Therefore, the readers have a chance to see Voldemort as an antagonist of Rousseau's ideas of humans as naturally good and peaceful creatures only corrupted by the emergence of state, society and private property. Voldemort as a villain is the representation of most concentrated evil. The nature of this evil however is yet to be determined. Even with all material about the character it is still unclear whether Voldemort is the classical sinner of Augustine, who decided to abuse the God-given free will and freedom of choice and preferred to nourish his inner sin by crimes, or he is a victim of his birth and early life circumstances. In terms of Voldemort's methods, behavior and relationships with other characters in the story, Voldemort is a contrast figure too. On the one hand he possesses a certain number of traits uniting him with the Machiavellian Prince, putting a parallel to a cold, rational thinker and planner like Moriarty. On the other hand, Voldemort's inability to control his rage and fear distances him from the ideal ruler and the Machiavellian type. It seems more like Voldemort is a tyrannical figure who has certain Machiavellian traits but because of his emotions and inability to restrain them, he cannot be fully associated with The Prince as a figure.

To find out what kind of villain Voldemort is and what unites or differs him from two other villains analyzed earlier, the closer analysis of him as a character is crucial. Voldemort, unlike both Dracula and Moriarty, is an unfolding character and perhaps even a developing one. That distinguishes him from them since neither Dracula nor Moriarty develop throughout the stories. They remain the same throughout the story, their behavior does not change. Voldemort is a changing character, partially due to the fact that throughout seven books of the series, the readers get a chance to investigate his past. The readers see his story of becoming what he is in the world of Harry Potter, the most dangerous and feared Dark wizard of all times. The progression of change of Voldemort can already be noticed with his looks. Voldemort in his outward appearance is somewhere in between Dracula and Moriarty. Yes, for the biggest part of the story the readers see Voldemort as a monster, but he is shown to have human features as well. His physical body degrades together with his soul, with the amount of evil and villainous actions he commits. If one refers to Christian philosophy, like for instance Augustine of Hippo, then a human is a God's creation in his image. For Voldemort, Augustine's image of man bears upon Voldemort's changing appearance: he becomes more monster-like as he removes himself from God. Voldemort's acts of violence demonstrate his disobedience to live right by the laws of God, and according to Augustine this is sinful. Therefore, Voldemort's degrading appearance is the reflection of his progressing original sin, and his estrangement from God and his virtues.

Young Tom Riddle is a person of stunning appearance.⁵ Already at the age of eleven, he is described as “his handsome father in miniature, tall for eleven years old, dark-haired, and pale” (Rowling, *The Half-Blood Prince*, 252). His outward appearance is same attractive later when he has already graduated from school: “his hair was a little longer than it had been at school and his cheeks were hollowed, but all of this suited him; he looked more handsome than ever” (Rowling, *The Half-Blood Prince*, 404). These looks together with his natural ability to charm other people with his speech and humble manners allowed Tom Riddle to succeed in many of his actions, especially when it involved human interaction. His success in getting the full trust of Hepzibah Smith in *The Half-Blood Prince* or the matter that a lot of Hogwarts professors who taught him adored him only prove this fact. Therefore, even more, interesting and terrifying is the contrast of Lord Voldemort’s looks compared to his younger version. The more his involvement in the Dark magic progresses the less human-like he becomes. His experiments, particularly the ones with Horcruxes⁶, which damage his soul (Rowling, *The Half-Blood Prince*, 465), also leave marks on his outward appearance.

They were not as snake-like, the eyes were not yet scarlet, the face not yet masklike, and yet he was no longer handsome Tom Riddle. It was as though his features had been burned and blurred; they were waxy and oddly distorted, and the whites of the eyes now had a permanently bloody look, though the pupils were not yet the slits. (Rowling, 413).

This is an in-between stage of his looks before he is reborn in *Goblet of Fire*, where he gets his most commonly known appearance:

tall and skeletally thin; (face) Whiter than a skull, with wide, livid scarlet eyes and a nose that was flat as a snakes with slits for nostrils; His hands were like large, pale spiders; his long white fingers, the red eyes, whose pupils were slits, like a cats, gleamed still more brightly through the darkness (Rowling, 558-559).

⁵ Tom Riddle is the Mother-given name of Lord Voldemort, which he renounces after a certain point in life, changing his name to Voldemort. “I am Lord Voldemort” is an anagram of “Tom Marvolo Riddle” (Rowling, *Chamber of Secrets*, 231)

⁶ Magical objects in which Voldemort conceals parts of his soul to secure himself immortality. One needs to commit a murder to split a soul and create a Horcrux.

A human is the crown of creation by God, according to Christian philosophy. Also, a human is created by God in his appearance and likeness. In her many descriptions of Voldemort, Rowling uses several comparisons to animals, e.g. cats, spiders and snakes. These comparisons play a role in the realization of Voldemort's animalism. They indicate that he looks less and less human, as a result of how Voldemort, according to Augustine, progressively distances himself from God. He does not look like God's creation anymore. Even more interesting is the reoccurring comparisons of Voldemort to exactly a snake, the very creature which was responsible for Adam and Eve's original sin. The parallel of Voldemort to such a creature indicates how strong evil and sin stand in him. He already has a ruined, corrupted soul to begin with, and he continues to enlarge his sin by his crimes. The curiosity of his transformation is in the fact that his outward appearance is the direct reflection of the degradation of his soul and personality. Comparing to Dracula who is always a monster, his animalistic traits are always visible, or Moriarty who bears certain sinister features but nevertheless still looks like a most ordinary person, Voldemort's looks change as well as he does. This change can be referred to the Ancient Greeks' theory about human's exterior as a reflection of their inner world. The more Voldemort loses connection with what little of a human he had in him, the more monstrous and unhuman his physical features become. The same way this tendency can be paralleled to ideas of physiognomy, that a revolting exterior is a sign of a criminal. Voldemort's change of outward appearance is the very obvious sign of him as a developing character. His looks degrade as his villainy progresses. He does not start nicely in his life, with his shady childhood in the orphanage and suspicious cases of violence. Neither is he any better in school years, manipulating people, already having developed his interest in the dark matters. This culminates with his first murder and starts his full transformation to the villain and a monster he is.

Voldemort's motivations throughout the whole story are quite clear. He has particular goals which he intends to achieve and in doing so he uses a whole variety of methods. The main motivation for Voldemort is to become immortal. "Tom Riddle was doing all he could to find out how to make himself immortal" (Rowling, *The Half-Blood Prince*, 467). Immortality is his biggest priority. His desire to become immortal does not come simply from his obsession with power and wishes to become the only person who beat death. Quite opposite his biggest life goal is the reflection of his biggest fear. Voldemort is terrified of the very idea that he can die, therefore he puts all of his efforts into finding a way to beat death. "Voldemort's fear is death, ignominious death. His worst fear is death" ("Accio Quote!", The

Largest Archive of J.K. Rowling Interviews on the Web”). His fear of death can be explained by the fact that Voldemort lacks normal human feelings. He knows no love, friendship or sympathy. “Voldemort has no friends or people who love him” (Mulholland, *The Psychology of Harry Potter*, 102). This friendlessness and lack of need for love emphasize Voldemort’s arrogance and egoism. His egoism, his obsession with the idea of immortality only support the idea that Voldemort is a sinner according to Augustine’s theory. For Augustine, exactly egoism, the self-centered rejection of God, is the greatest sin. Disobedience to God and ignorance of God are the key elements of further evil actions in human life. As Dumbledore says in *The Half-Blood Prince*: “He preferred to operate alone. Lord Voldemort has never had a friend, nor do I believe that he has ever wanted one” (Rowling, 260). Therefore, death for him is the ultimate end of his existence, while for people like Harry or his parents, they will live as long as the memory about them lives because this memory is filled with love. Voldemort is blinkered, he fails to understand that love is the strongest force in the world: “If there is one thing Voldemort cannot understand, it is love” (Rowling, *The Philosopher’s Stone*, 216). Voldemort is unable to understand that death is not the end. “There is nothing worse than death, Dumbledore!” snarled Voldemort” (Rowling, *Order of the Phoenix*, 718). On the one hand, according to Hobbes, Voldemort seems to simply be playing by the rules of the war of all against all conditions. *Homo homini lupus est*, this is the motto of life for Voldemort. He does not need friends because he does not believe in friendship. Also, he is afraid of death as any other human in the state of nature. “In such condition there is... continual fear, and danger of violent death” (Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 179). On the other hand, the readers see a well-established and lawful world in the wizarding society. Voldemort tries to ruin and change this society to his own standards, which are far away from Hobbes’s ideas of social justice and social contract. His fears and insecurities, which are common and normal for a human in a theoretical state of nature conditions, are unacceptable in the society of law and order making. Voldemort therefore a criminal and an undesirable element. Voldemort is a contrast character. On the one hand he is a powerful, manipulative control-type of a villain, that connects him with Machiavellian ideas. On the other hand, he is an unstable, paranoid tyrant whose motivations are based on his fears and most basic human instincts of survival, making him behave like a caveman of a Hobbes’s state of nature. These contrasted characteristics make Voldemort a complex and intriguing character.

Voldemort’s inability to understand and accept the power of love, as well as his fear of death make him weak and Dumbledore emphasizes this. “You are quite wrong,” said Dumbledore “Indeed your failure to understand that there are things much worse than death

has always been your greatest weakness” (Rowling, *The Order of the Phoenix*, 718). He is the vindicator of pure power, physical or in this manner magical force. That unites him with Hobbes’s brute of the pre-societal state of nature. He is also driven by most basic desires and quite often by fear of death or pain. Humans are brutes in Hobbes’s state of war, and for them the main goal is survival, by any means and methods, since laws are absent. Therefore, the idea of the one who is strong is also by definition right, applies. Voldemort has the same thinking. In his mind, the stronger one is always the right one, therefore he tries to establish his dominance in everything, become the strongest wizard, be the most intimidating and powerful person. Voldemort lacks the broader horizons of not evaluating the world and people in it by the level of their strength. He is too crude and power-obsessed to understand that some features can mean more than physical or magical power, and that certain moments are scarier than pain or even death. Voldemort’s limitations are his biggest weaknesses, they create his fear and make him vulnerable.

However, no matter the fact that Voldemort’s main goal is also the reason for his main fear and therefore his biggest weakness, no one denies that he is a very dangerous opponent to Harry and his friends. In some ways, Voldemort is similar to Moriarty. Certain Machiavellian traits are the key elements of this similarity. He is powerful, arrogant, confident and manipulative. Throughout the novels, Voldemort demonstrates his skills and abilities, both personal powers, like his magic level and his organizational and strategical talents. Voldemort is one of the or even perhaps the most powerful wizard in the world, only such a strong and experienced mage as Dumbledore manages to duel Voldemort as an equal “Dumbledore has been a great wizard — oh yes, he has, the Dark Lord acknowledges it” (Rowling, *The Half-Blood Prince*, 36). However, that duel comes with a lot of difficulty for Dumbledore which proves Voldemort’s magical strength. According to Snape: “Dumbledore is growing old. The duel with the Dark Lord last month shook him. He has since sustained a serious injury because his reactions are slower than they once were” (Rowling, 36). Voldemort always loves to emphasize his undoubtedly high level of magical power. He creates an image of himself as the strongest wizard of all time, making his followers and his enemies believe that he truly is what he wants to be seen as. This propagandist work is smart in a Machiavellian manner: “Everyone sees what you appear to be, few really know what you are, and those few dare not oppose themselves to the opinion of the many” (Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 67).

Voldemort’s magical skills are very high, for instance, he can fly without any equipment, as well as he is an expert in legilimency (Rowling, *The Order of the Phoenix*, 468), the ability to extract people’s feelings and memories. The latter helps him tremendously

to avoid being lied to and is useful for his manipulations and control mechanisms. Voldemort proves himself as a smart strategist and planner. In *Goblet of Fire*, for instance, he plans an operation of his rebirth and capturing of Harry Potter for a whole year. In a similar manner, his manipulator skills and planning talents help him to gather supporters. He creates an army of Death Eaters, all sorts of magical creatures and others, to reach his goals. Voldemort uses a variety of methods, he lies, manipulates, threatens, no methods are unacceptable to him. Voldemort builds his Dark state with fear, threats, and terror. He actively uses propaganda, espionage and sabotage work in order to gain control over magic society and the Ministry of Magic and later Hogwarts in particular. Voldemort is smart, manipulative and strategic. He aims to be the ultimate and absolute leader for the ones around him. In this manner the parallel to Machiavellian Prince is inevitable. Voldemort does not shy away from any methods, including violence and terror in order to reach his goals. For instance, one of the many examples can be that in *The Deathly Hallows*, Voldemort is behind the abduction and later murder of professor Charity Burbage (Rowling, 17-18). He, due to his inability to love and be loved, clearly chooses to be feared, and according to Machiavelli, it is safer to be feared than loved. Voldemort is capable of ruling with the iron hand and making anyone either obey him or be destroyed. Also, important to be mentioned that Voldemort willingly commits all of his crimes, like the abduction of people, murders, manipulations and many others. He does not have a single idea or thought of remorse or doubt. This truly makes it possible to contrast Voldemort to Rousseau's idea that "Man is naturally good" (Rousseau, *The Social Contract & Discourses*, 239). Throughout the whole series, Voldemort is never kind or sympathetic to anyone. He has never helped anyone in need or even showed mercy of any kind. On the contrary, he is cruel, vindictive and incapable of forgiving. Such a character is a clear representation of pure evil.

However, the clear parallel to Machiavellian ideal ruler ends for Voldemort with his main goals and motivations. For Machiavelli, the Prince must, first of all, prioritize the state, it's greatness and wellbeing. Voldemort is an egoist, he does not care for anything or anyone but himself. Any person he ever helped or sympathized he was willing to sacrifice or use in his own ways as soon as it was needed. He kills Snape with no sadness or remorse when he thinks that it will help him get control over the Elder Wand (Rowling, *The Deathly Hallows*, 527). Also, he gives a magic hand to Peter Pettigrew for his loyalty instead of the hand he has lost (Rowling, *The Goblet of Fire* 563). Although, the moment Peter for a second doubts his actions for The Dark Lord, the hand kills Peter (Rowling, *The Deathly Hallows*, 381). This death proves that a new hand was not a gesture of kind will of Voldemort or a reward to his

loyal servant, but another mechanism of control. This shows that Voldemort truly does not trust anyone and that he fears being betrayed. These actions, as well as the other moments of how Voldemort treats his followers, emphasize even more the fact that he is far away from the Machiavellian Prince. “The first opinion which one forms of a prince, and of his understanding, is by observing the men he has around him” (Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 84). This quote indicates that a good leader not only chooses his servants well, but that by these servants an image of the leader is formed. The followers of Voldemort, with the exception of Bellatrix perhaps, are terrified of Voldemort. And even though Machiavelli suggests that it is useful for a Prince to be feared if one cannot be loved and feared at the same time, the way Voldemort treats people around him shows that he does not value any of them. He is ruthless and rude by his nature, he lacks flexibility in his relationship with his followers, that makes him a bad leader in Machiavelli’s perspective. Voldemort appears even less Machiavellian when he is compared to Moriarty. As mentioned before, all agents who ever worked for Moriarty and got caught were rescued from the prison, they have been paid for, probably bribed the police or judges. These methods show that in order to stay in the shadow Moriarty truly takes care of his empire and his smallest members of it. He protects his servants, yes for his own benefit, but nevertheless he does it. On the contrary Voldemort does not care for any of his servants. Death Eaters die for him and his operations and plans, while he takes no interest in protecting them or even helping them. Even more, any flaw or any failure he considers a betrayal that needs to be punished. For Voldemort, all of his servants are pawns which he is willing to sacrifice without any guilt or remorse. For him they all are cannon fodder, for Voldemort no death is a tragedy, except his own death. Voldemort’s attitude towards people around him, both his foes and supporters, proves his egoistic and selfish nature. Like a Hobbesian human in the state of nature, Voldemort neglects the interests of others and puts his needs above all. Voldemort is a violent egoist, and his villainy therefore is the reflection of this characteristic of him.

Another part of the proof that Voldemort is not a fully Machiavellian type lies within some of his methods and behavior. In *The Half-Blood Prince* when Harry and Dumbledore try to find the Horcrux, one of the barriers Voldemort puts as a defensive mechanism is a stone that demands a blood sacrifice (Rowling, 523). This moment as Dumbledore emphasizes demonstrates how limited is Voldemort in his thinking “I said it was crude” (Rowling, 523). With all of his magical powers and evil yet bright mind, he comes up with the most brutal solution, to physically weaken the opponents, give them pain. His inability to understand that there are moments in life which are scarier than pain and physical death lets him down. “Once

again, Lord Voldemort fails to grasp that there are much more terrible things than physical injury” (Rowling, 523). He shows himself as a very straightforward character, almost an animal who is driven by most primal and primitive thinking. He is one more time a brute of Hobbes, his methods are violent and crude. The other aspect which demonstrates Voldemort’s brutal nature, which shows his weaknesses and which distances him from a cold, strategic Machiavellian ruler is his inability to control his temper and emotions. As for instance Adolph Hitler, with whom Voldemort can be associated, the Dark Lord also suffers from rage outbreaks and inability to restrain his anger and frustration. This trait of Voldemort points out that he indeed is a different, new type of villain if compared with for example Moriarty. Moriarty is a calm manipulative Machiavellian criminal, and he remains one throughout the whole story. Voldemort, on the other hand, is first a calm planner but later his madness and villainy progress and make him a psychopath and a paranoid maniac who loses his temper when for instance he finds out that Horcruxes were stolen from Gringotts. His rage and fear he takes out on goblins of the bank, demonstrating how animalistic and brutal his true nature is (Rowling, *The Deathly Hallows*, 443). He takes out his frustration and anger on the ones who are way weaker than him, humiliating and killing them. Voldemort does not even treat his followers and supporters nicely, to the ones who are just in his way he is merciless. His cruelty and incapability to love and forgive go against Augustine’s thinking of a good person and a good Christian. “All people should be loved equally. But you cannot do good to all people equally, so you should take particular thought for those who, as if by lot, happen to be particularly close to you” (Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*, 21). For Augustine as a Christian philosopher, ability to love and ability to forgive are crucial parts of a good person. These abilities make it possible for a person to live a just life and redeem his sins. Voldemort who lacks these abilities will remain a sinner. Voldemort here is like a school bully, whose fears and problems he tries to suppress by bringing pain and fear to the others who cannot fight him back. These contrasts of Voldemort, his rage outbreaks and inability to keep his emotions under control, together with his undoubted abilities to manipulate and plan create a very curious and complex picture of him as a villain. He is an ill-tempered maniac and tyrant whose fears and insecurities become visible in moments of danger. These contrasts make him a villain of a new type, a developing unfolding character who is also unpredictable due to his incredible abilities and progressing madness. These characteristics of Voldemort, his inability to control his negative emotions, his rage outbreaks and his way of turning his rage and negativity into aggression put him in the contrast to Rousseau’s idea of human as a peaceful and good creature whose biggest wish is to coexist with the others without violence and pain.

Voldemort's instability and unpredictability make him dangerous in any view of a pre-societal state. If according to Rousseau such a natural condition was peaceful, Voldemort would have corrupted it by his violence. If referring to Hobbes, where such a condition is already chaotic and violent, then Voldemort's unpredictability makes him incapable of adapting. This inadaptability would lead to him never being able to fit into the future forming of a state, of a social contract.

Voldemort is the main antagonist and the main rival of Harry Potter in the novels. Due to certain circumstances, Harry and Voldemort are bound together. Harry is a Horcrux that Voldemort has created unwillingly. Therefore, the two characters share a lot of similarities, such as both grow up without parents, both can talk to snakes, etc. The parallel of Harry to Voldemort is obvious in the story and is a big part of the plot. Therefore, in terms of philosophical theory more interesting seems to be the idea of comparing Voldemort to another character, a comparison with whom would not be so clear. The ideal candidate for such a comparison is Albus Dumbledore. Voldemort and Dumbledore have certain characteristics in common, such as their bright mind, their powerful position, and their magical skills. The main difference between them is the same as with Holmes and Moriarty, they stand on the different side of good and evil. Both Holmes and Dumbledore care about peace and justice. They make their choice to live life so that they help others. This choice puts them by Augustine, on the Godly side of the humanity. Their vision of life correlates with general Christian beliefs and with Augustine's vision of how one can attempt to be redeemed of the original sin, by the right use of free will. Voldemort and Moriarty on the other hand, by their egoism put themselves on the other side of this concept. Their destructive and corrupted nature is only getting nourished by the original sin and their crimes. For Augustine as a Christian philosopher, all sins can be forgiven if one seeks forgiveness. However, this is where the key element lies: Voldemort never seeks forgiveness throughout the whole story, he shows no guilt or remorse for his crimes, and he never forgives anyone himself. Curious enough is the fact that Dumbledore himself is not a fully good hero. He has a dark past and history of obsession with power, the desire to gather the Deathly Hallows and of course his friendship with Grindelwald, another great dark wizard. Here the concept of original sin by Augustine comes useful. Both Voldemort and Dumbledore are sinners according to Augustine's theory. However, Dumbledore after a certain point realizes that he lives life the wrong way. He chooses to fight Grindelwald and stop a former friend in a battle rather than join him. Dumbledore understands that power is taking over his mind, therefore he chooses to be a schoolteacher and a headmaster, and continuously rejects the position of the Minister of

Magic. On the contrary, he prefers to live a modest life, devotes himself to the school, the students. He throughout the years earns people's trust and love, with his kindness and smartness. Albus tries to make up for his earlier mistake and therefore for Augustine, he tries to clear himself of the sin. Especially valuable these attempts are since Dumbledore at the beginning of his life path made a lot of mistakes, but he paid the bitter price for them and remembered these lessons forever.

On contrast, Voldemort is the complete opposite. His life is full of sin. The Dark Lord kills, tortures, lies and manipulates people for his own profit and benefit. He is an egoist who knows no love, empathy or compassion. In light of modern liberal and democratic values, views of Machiavelli on the methods a Prince might use in order to reach his goals still leave room for love, virtues and understanding. A Prince, according to Machiavelli, can be violent and ruthless if the situation craves such behavior. The key moment here is the flexibility of a ruler, the ability to change and adapt according to the needs and circumstances. "It is necessary to be a fox to discover the snares and a lion to terrify the wolves" (Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 66). Voldemort on the contrary is violent all the time. Throughout the whole series, the readers will not find a single moment of remorse by Voldemort, not a single hint to him trying to change his life for better. Instead, he only goes deeper and deeper into the darkness of his original sin, nourishing this sin with his crimes.

The question of why Voldemort is a villain, the origins of his nature stands open even after reading of the whole series of novels. The circumstances of his birth which are mentioned in the introduction are not fully explained or confirmed. Taking for the starting point the theory that Voldemort as a child is not a product of true love of parents, but rather a result of charms, in particular, a love potion, the question is whether this fact of his parents' unnatural connection has caused Voldemort to be what he is? According to Augustine's philosophy, it would not matter whether Voldemort is a result of charms or a love potion. All people are born with original sin, it is only their later ability to use free will correctly that defines their fate and future life. Confirming this theory, Voldemort shows signs of a being villain from the early childhood, he has a tendency to be violent and criminal. These tendencies only develop with the growth of his power as a wizard. Voldemort clearly has a negative approach towards his mother, since he believes that she could not have been a witch, otherwise she would not have died and left him alone. In this idea of Voldemort, the readers can feel the sadness and bitterness of a child who was left by his parent. However, with Voldemort, this sadness becomes anger and disgust, since he is convinced that his mother was

a muggle⁷. That explains his later hate towards all muggles as a whole. Later on, when he finds out the truth that in fact, his father was a muggle, he does not change an attitude towards his mother but rather turns his hate and anger on his father too. He changes his name and is actively trying to connect himself with the pure-blood line of Salazar Slytherin, so nothing ever will remind him of his origins. The complicated relationships with his family origin and his attitudes towards parents partially do explain his personality and the evil he has inside. However, it still does not answer the question of whether he has always been a villain, or the life circumstances have made him into one? As Rousseau states “Man is naturally good” (Rousseau, *The Social Contract & Discourses*, 239), and Voldemort is the biggest contrast to this statement, but what if Voldemort is exactly not natural? Due to the love potion, the fact of his birth is proof of the artificially created love, which disappears with the effect of magic. Therefore, is it not Voldemort who is unnatural and based on that he cannot be considered a human? Another way of looking at the problematics of Voldemort as a villain and his evil nature is Augustine’s theory. From this perspective, Voldemort is a sinner as anyone else. He indeed has a very bad starting point and all of the life circumstances make it extremely difficult for him to change his life for the better. For Augustine though as a Christian philosopher, the challenges are sent by God to test you and make you stronger, and free will is the key instrument given to people by God to make the choices. Voldemort in this manner fails the challenges, he decides to take the easy way, he chooses to have the sin, the evil as his life path. Therefore, for Augustine, for instance, Dumbledore is a redeemed sinner, but Voldemort is not.

Voldemort is a complex character, a villain with Machiavellian traits, who at the same time shows signs of a Hobbesian brute, and who loses control over his anger as the famous megalomaniacs of the 20th century, Hitler or Stalin. Voldemort is a sinner with the horrible starting point who fails or does not even try to change his life for better. As well as at the same time he is an unnatural result of magically created attraction who cannot even be considered a human and therefore does not belong to the human ideas of good and evil. Voldemort is all of these. He is a strong contrast of different traits he possesses and a riddle for the ones who try to understand his nature. He is the new type of villain and the stereotypical fantasy genre antagonist at the same time. Certainly, his complexity and absence of the answer to the origins of his villain nature, together with his memorable outward

⁷ A person with no magical skills.

appearance and the image of the greatest dark wizard of all time have contributed to the fact that Voldemort has become a very recognizable and influential character.

5 Discussion

Dracula, Moriarty, and Voldemort are three characters from different times, styles and genres. They all, however, represent evil in their stories, therefore all of them are undoubtedly the villains. In this part of the text, in order to look closer at the evolution of villains, the main focus becomes the comparison of these villains in light of the philosophical ideas presented throughout the thesis. These villains stem from different times and genres. Therefore, the question is what do these villains have in common, and how do they differ from each other? Are there certain traits that unite them, specific characteristics that go through the concept of literary villainy like a connecting thread through the times and genres? At the same time, what are the particular differences which make the villains unique and different from one another? The philosophical framework remains the same for all of them, the question is here how the different philosophical approaches and ideas correlate with every particular villain analyzed.

One of the aspects which unite the three presented villains is the influence of the Machiavellian ideas and theories on these villains. All three of them, to a larger or lesser extent, fit the profile of a Machiavellian criminal. The closest one of the three is without doubt Moriarty. His personal traits and methods fit quite well with the Machiavellian ideas of a decent leader. He is smart, manipulative and willing to use different methods, adapt to the situation in the very manner Machiavelli wants the Prince to be: “It is necessary to be a fox to discover the snares and a lion to terrify the wolves” (Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 66). In the same fashion as Machiavelli’s Prince cares about the art of war and the state which he controls, Moriarty cares about the criminal empire he has designed. This care includes both the fact that he managed to create such a system, to develop it and keep it running, so he is capable of being a leader, a person in charge. The way Moriarty takes care of his criminal system’s smallest mechanisms, such as his agents, also demonstrates his shrewd sympathy. The two other villains, Dracula and Voldemort only partially belong to the Machiavellian philosophy of a great ruler. Dracula has specific traits that a Prince must have. Dracula has a strong will, he can use both deception and force when necessary and he is undoubtedly feared by others. However, he lacks intelligence according to Van Helsing: “In some faculties of mind he has been, and is, only a child” (Stoker, *Dracula*, 258). His plans are also far away

from Machiavellian shrewdness and elegance. Dracula's monstrous nature frequently takes control of his emotions and feelings, which is unacceptable for Machiavelli's tenets for the Prince. Dracula is a vampire, a monster driven by his bloodlust and desire to spread the vampire curse. This fact allows his animalistic nature to take over, and the reasoning and calm planning or decision making will be difficult or impossible for Dracula since his vampire instincts control him and therefore restrict him. Due to his nature, Dracula needs to obey his curse and drives, such as the need to rest in the coffin or the need for Transylvanian soil, compulsions that also limit his flexibility:

Thus, whereas he can do as he will within his limit, when he have his earth-home, his coffin-home, his hell-home, the place unhallowed, as we saw when he went to the grave of the suicide at Whitby; still at other time he can only change when the time come (Stoker, *Dracula*, 206).

Flexibility is a crucial aspect for a great leader according to Machiavelli, a capability Dracula clearly does not possess. Voldemort, however, is more of a Machiavellian type than Dracula. Indeed, the Dark Lord is talented, a careful planner and a bright strategist. His problems lie within the fact that Voldemort is an egoist, who cares only about himself. That results in him being merciless, not only to the enemies but also to his supporters. He does not value them and is ruthless and unforgiving to their flaws and mistakes, showing his inability to adapt and be more flexible. Also, Voldemort suffers from his inability to control emotions, especially when it comes to negativity. He is known for his rage, which absolutely affects his thinking process and decision making. Summarized, Dracula, Moriarty, and Voldemort possess certain Machiavellian traits. However, only Moriarty stands close to the Machiavellian vision of the leader. Dracula and Voldemort only partially subscribe to Machiavellian ideas of scrupulous leadership.

Augustine's theory of original sin and free will can be used to analyze all three characters. Due to the fact that Augustine is a Christian theologian and philosopher, this perspective is closely associated with Christian faith, beliefs, and morals. According to Augustine, all people are born with the original sin as a part of them, because of Adam and Eve's first sin. sin "for in Thy sight none is pure from sin" (Augustine of Hippo, *The Confessions*, 13). However, despite this fact God granted humans free will. Free will in this theory is the ability of people to decide themselves how they are going to live their life, whether they will clear themselves off the original sin or if they will choose to nourish their

flaw in it. Free will was meant to be used right, and by right, Augustine means a life devoted to God, his virtues and faith in him. According to this theory, all three characters have the original sin as part of them, like any other person on Earth. Only their own vision of the world and their life in it determines whether this sin is going to grow, or if they will be redeemed. For all three of them, the answer to this dilemma is certain: Dracula, Moriarty, and Voldemort remain sinners. For Augustine, the nature of the human being is secondary in the concept of the original sin, whether humans are good or evil. The choice of how the gift from God, the free will, is going to be used becomes the most crucial aspect. In this aspect all the characters presented in this analysis willingly choose to remain in original sin. Dracula is already ungodly since he is a vampire, a monster who goes against the sacred idea of humans created in God's image. He is driven by bloodlust because of his vampirism curse, that perhaps limits his opportunities to live a better life. However, the important part here is that Dracula does not feel the need to clear his sins. He perhaps does not even recognize his actions as such. Dracula is corrupted by his vampiric nature and he only wants to become stronger, greater and bigger. He even has Renfield who adores him and who sees a Master in him, which puts Dracula dangerously close to becoming a god. His obsession with not only blood, which is inhuman and animalistic, but also with his pride, arrogance, and superiority takes him deeper into the sin and further away from God, which is the biggest sin for Augustine. "For it was my sin, that not in Him, but in His creatures myself and others sought for pleasures, sublimities, truths, and so fell headlong into sorrows, confusions, errors" (Augustine of Hippo, *The Confessions*, 32). Dracula remains a remorseless and unredeemed sinner according to Augustine's philosophy of sin and free will.

Moriarty is similar to Dracula in this philosophical perspective. As stated in the text, Moriarty has criminal tendencies "criminal strain ran in his blood" (Doyle, "The Final Problem", 284). This tendency connects him directly to the idea of the original sin. The fact that the professor chose to become a criminal mastermind makes clear that Moriarty willingly chose to be a criminal mastermind. He could have remained a professor, he is a talented mathematician: "endowed by nature with a phenomenal mathematical faculty" (Doyle, "The Final Problem", 283). Instead, he chooses to build and to run a criminal empire. He does so willingly, this decision is his use of free will and, according to Augustine, a wrong use of his freedom to choose. Moriarty is less restricted than Dracula. After all, he is always a human. In his desire to remain unpunished and keep his criminal network running, however, he is determined to get rid of anyone who stands in his way, including Sherlock Holmes.

Moriarty's evil nature and his immorality prove that he abused the free will and chose to live the life of a sinner.

Voldemort's birth is already an act of corrupt nature. The forced attraction of Voldemort's father and mother as the result of the love potion has most likely affected his early childhood. However, his starting point might be terrible but so it is for many others, and for Augustine, the starting point makes no difference, since all are born with original sin. Voldemort makes his choice from the very beginning. He starts demonstrating villainous inclinations already as a child and does so with awareness and knowledge of his actions. His evil nature only progresses, and his choices become only more terrifying and evil. As Voldemort gets older his powers grow as well and even more than Harry Potter's main antagonist uses the God-given free will for reaching his goals, which are cruel, egoistic and evil at their core. His main wish, to become immortal, manifests clear defiance against God, the wish to live forever goes against God's ideas for humans. Voldemort disobeys God in this sense, therefore committing a grave sin according to Augustine.

The possibility of redemption is one more element of Augustine's theory which all three villains choose to ignore. None of the three villains ever demonstrates any sign of guilt, remorse or regret for their actions. Instead, all of them continue to commit their crimes with absolute certainty that this is the way to go, leaving them no chance to be redeemed. In Augustine's Christian belief, the realization of one's sins and mistakes is the first step to becoming better. The sins can be forgiven if the sinner repents sincerely, but neither Dracula, Moriarty nor Voldemort seek forgiveness. Therefore, choosing the path of original sin and sinful life makes all three of them the villains with full awareness. They all understand the evil nature of their choices, and they willingly and knowingly choose to commit crimes. For Augustine, this would mean that the three villains choose the way with no return: not only do they chose to nourish their original, innate sin but they also reject the very possibility of remorse and redemption.

The three villains have particular aspects in common when it comes to their outward appearance. Darker colors, sinister traits and animalistic features dominate all of them. Animalism is a part of all three villains, with the difference that all three of them are on different levels of this animalism. The connection between the physical appearance of a person and his inner world can be traced back to the Ancient Greeks and Romans and their idea of "Mens sana in corpore sano" ("a healthy mind in a healthy body"). Of course, this Latin expression does not directly correlate the mind to the body, the phrase speaks more about the health factor. However, the idea that a good, virtuous person will also look good

and attractive takes its roots from these very past times. This classical idea developed in alter stages, especially in such pseudosciences like physiognomy and phrenology. The idea of wholesome virtue and appearance in these two pseudosciences designates that an evil person, a criminal, can be distinguished by the way this person looks. These pseudosciences claimed that criminals and other unsocial elements possess specific physiological traits that indicate their evil inner nature. These ideas were popularized and became famously associated with for instance Cesare Lombroso, the Italian criminologist. Among many aspects of these theories, the degenerative, asymmetric and animal-like features were considered indicators of a criminal.

These theoretical discussions correlate with Augustine's Christian theology. In Christianity, God has created humans in his own image, making them therefore the crowns of creation. Assuming that a human's outward appearance is supposed to represent Godlikeness and demonstrate closeness of a human being to God, degraded appearance, like animalistic non-human traits, indicate distancing from God. Dracula is a monster villain. He is a vampire and he has a great number of animalistic traits such as: "strong - a very strong - aquiline, with high bridge of the thin nose and peculiarly arched nostrils; with lofty domed forehead, and hair growing scantily round the temples, but profusely elsewhere. His eyebrows were very massive, almost meeting over the nose" (Stoker, 19). Due to his nature, he is more an animal than a human, he also has a supernatural connection with animals and certain abilities to control them. Dracula's villain type is very animalistic, and the readers encounter his animalism early in the novel. Dracula's animalism fits well into the Augustinian theory of human outward appearance. Dracula as a character rejects God, and represents the non-Christian side of the world, his fear of religious symbols proves it. His looks, therefore, demonstrate his rejection of God and emphasize the contrast of him to other good Christian characters.

Moriarty, on the other hand, is the opposite to Dracula in this manner, since the professor is a human and remains such throughout the series. Holmes uses certain animal-like comparisons like: "his face protrudes forward and is forever slowly oscillating from side to side in a curiously reptilian fashion" (Doyle, "The Final Problem", 286). However, this comparison serves more as an emphasis of the strong image of Moriarty. These lines strengthen the feeling of the danger of Moriarty. On the contrary, in the phrenological theory, a big head indicates a big brain and therefore outstanding mental capacity. So, Moriarty as a person with such physiological trait as a big head, in fact, should be on the opposite side of the phrenological spectrum if only being judged by the size of the head.

The situation with Voldemort is more complicated than with the other two villains. The Dark Lord is an unfolding character. The readers get to see him in his younger days, when he has stunning looks, as well as they see him after rebirth when he looks more monstrous. His animalism progresses with his villainy. He becomes more monster-like as he degrades as a person with the commitment to his violent crimes, such as murder. Degradation of Voldemort's appearance correlates with the degradation of his soul, which culminates in creation of Horcruxes. His changing appearance demonstrate his distancing from the God, according to Augustine. Voldemort willingly splits his soul into parts, which he knows will demand such a horrible crime as a murder. He commits these crimes, as well as he divides his soul, the very crucial element of belonging to God in Christianity. The way Voldemort looks functions as the reflection of his crimes and rejection of God. Therefore, the three villains demonstrate three different scales of animalism, Moriarty is always a human, Dracula is always a monster and Voldemort who started as a human but degraded to a monster.

These differences in appearance are due to the fact that Dracula, Moriarty, and Voldemort belong to different genres and in specifics of the genres, they need to be portrayed a certain way in order to best represent the particular villainy or a particularly chosen evil. Dracula is the Other, his otherness is what distinguishes him from other characters and serves as an indicator of his danger and power. Moriarty's looks develop the idea of an enemy within, a human who looks like a human but due to his intentions and deeds is, in fact, worse than a monster. Voldemort's degrading outward appearance demonstrates the degradation of his soul and it represents his internal fall and destruction. In Augustine's point of view, the outward appearance of a human must be the reflection of a God-given soul and the divine creation. The degrading, animalistic looks or some descriptive non-human physical traits indicate that the three villains are distanced from God. Perhaps this refers more to Dracula and Voldemort, than Moriarty since the professor remains a human in his appearance, however some aspects of his physical appearance are still disturbing and therefore can be read as ungodly.

The big part of the philosophical framework for this text is derived from the discussions about human nature and in particular the theory of a pre-societal state, so-called the state of nature. The state of nature is a theoretical condition in which humans are not organized in society, the laws or governments are not established. Several views upon the state of nature exist in philosophy, one of them is expressed by Thomas Hobbes. In Hobbes's theory, the state of nature is a cruel, chaotic and violent condition. Humans are living in constant fear of death and pain, and their primary concern biggest need is survival, to avoid

pain and to achieve pleasure Life is a condition of constant war of all against all, all methods are allowed since laws are absent, therefore humans are ruthless, brutal and merciless in the fight for resources. Life of a human is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short" (Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 179). Therefore, Hobbes sees government, law, and society as a restricting factor which will bring order to this chaos and will put the brutal, survival-oriented human desires under control. Rousseau has another opinion on the state of nature. For him, this condition is a peaceful coexistence. For Rousseau, humans are naturally good. They seek no conflict, fight or confrontation. Therefore, such incidents will be absent in the state of nature. According to Rousseau, humans were corrupted only with the emergence of society, laws and private property, leading them to be oriented by materialism and possession of goods. Hobbes's and Rousseau's views of human nature confront each other. Humans are naturally good but corrupted in Rousseau's philosophy, the romanticist view upon the social contract and the state of nature. In Hobbes's philosophy, which in comparison to Rousseau is a classical realism understanding of the social contract and the state of nature, humans are naturally bad, selfish and egoistic, natural human flaws which the organized society and laws are able to restrict, contain and order.

Dracula, Moriarty, and Voldemort seem to inhabit Hobbes's world, where humans are naturally not good. All three villains represent evil in the story. They are driven by their most egoistic and selfish desires. None of the villains demonstrate any signs of good nature in them. They are from the start, corrupted, manipulative, deceiving and violent. Perhaps only Moriarty can be partially correlated to Rousseau's theory about humans being corrupted. Moriarty is the only villain of the three who is not supernatural. He is a human criminal who has very understandable goals, methods, and actions. Most criminals are tempted by materialistic goods in most cases. Therefore, perhaps Moriarty is corrupted by the ability to make fortunes by his crimes? Certain aspects within his character though demonstrate that his nature is not corrupted by materialistic goods but is evil from the beginning. Moriarty is a gifted, talented man with a wealthy background, who holds a prestigious position of a professor and reaches high levels in his area of expertise. This indicates that he does not struggle financially, he is a worthy and respectable member of society. However, with all the positive points mentioned, he pursues the career of a criminal. Even more, he does not simply commit local crimes or empties pockets on the streets, as a person of extraordinary mind abilities he builds his own criminal empire to fulfill his goals, and he seems to be proud of his creation. To some extent, perhaps the maintenance of the created empire and the complications and challenges it provides interests him more than the crime itself. Therefore,

based on their evil indications and purely egoistic goals together with ruthless, merciless and moral absent methods, all three of the villains belong to Hobbes's idea of a human being as a naturally brutal and bad creature, who needs control and restrictions.

All three villains relate to the philosophical ideas of Hobbes, about men being naturally bad. In similar fashion, Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort all belong to the theory of the original sin and abuse of free will by Augustine. The villains choose by their criminal deeds to nourish their innate sin and misuse the God-given free will. Such crimes make them all sinners according to Augustine. All villains analyzed possess certain Machiavellian traits, therefore partially belong to his ideology of a Prince. However, the villains' destructive and cruel nature distinguishes them from Machiavellian ruler in terms of nature against necessity. Machiavelli does not completely reject violence, lie or manipulations, but he emphasizes the correct use of them, only when such methods are necessary. While all the villains subject to the matters mentioned simply not only due to situations they are in, but also because of their natural tendencies to violence, all three of them find certain level of satisfaction in the ways of how they commit their crimes.

Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort are related to all philosophical ideas and theories mentioned to a varied degree. Most fully, they can all be connected to Hobbes's vision of human nature and Augustine's philosophy of sin and free will. In contrast to theories of Rousseau or Locke, who claim that human nature is naturally good, these villains serve as a counterargument to this statement. Their correlation to Machiavellian leader ideals is for most of them limited and selective. The connection of Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort to Hobbes's pessimistic view upon human nature and Augustine's theological theory is more universal, since they all can be related to both of these ideas equally strong.

6 Conclusion

Stoker's Dracula, Doyle's Moriarty and Rowling's Voldemort are three very different villains. They are from different times and genres: Dracula is a gothic horror story villain, Moriarty is a detective genre criminal mastermind, Voldemort is a fantasy antagonist. Dracula and Moriarty belong to the pre-WW2 period, and they reflect certain aspects of life of these times, such as the growing and developing interest for criminology in the society in times of Moriarty and the first signs of globalization. Europe meets Dracula, and the West meets the East in Stoker's novel. Voldemort is a progressive, post-WW2 villain who is influenced by

Hitler, Stalin and other tyrants of the 20th century history. The villains differ in their outward appearance as well where Dracula and Voldemort are more monstrous, while Moriarty with his ordinary human-like appearance represents the concept of an enemy among regular people. All the three villains are different, but they serve the same purpose. They are all representations of what human evil and fear can look like. Therefore, despite the fact that these villains can differ in some aspects, for instance, Voldemort is an intriguing character and Dracula or Moriarty are more stereotypical villains. However, Voldemort and Dracula are more animalistic than Moriarty, who is, unlike the other two, a pure Machiavellian criminal. Nevertheless, they all represent the worst fears and horrors about human nature.

Hobbes's or Rousseau's philosophies about the state of nature or Augustine's theory of original sin and free will relate the three villains to the ideas about human nature and dilemmas about greater good and evil. In this philosophical framework Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort are inevitably evil by their nature, and they represent this evil. Human nature is not ultimately agreed upon to be good or evil. According to Rousseau for instance, human nature is originally good but corrupted by society and materialistic goods, while Augustine and Hobbes express the opinion that human nature is sinful and vicious. For Augustine, original sin has corrupted human nature and for Hobbes humans are brutal, selfish and chaotic without the controlling, restricting power of the Leviathan state. Human nature is more ambiguous, humans have both sides. These villains represent the worse part of a human being. Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort possess all what Hobbes, Rousseau or Augustine saw as imperfections, sins and degenerative human traits. Therefore, they portray how a human being could be if it was almost artificially separated into good and bad, like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in the famous work by Stevenson. As villains, they develop, and they adapt to genres and to reader expectation. They can behave differently, look differently, have completely unique backgrounds and use varied methods. Still, the common denominator of past and present villains is their purpose. Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort all represent human fear and the destructive part of human nature. The villains are there to be the understandable evil, for the evil which is in the nature of every human is yet to be understood.

While the question of human nature is open, the question of Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort's villainy can possibly be answered. In order to do so, Hobbes's realism-oriented vision of the human nature in the pre-societal state here seems to fit best. Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort are evil, this evil lies within their nature and they do not change in this manner. However, these canonical villains without doubt present a possibility to reflect upon the great dilemmas of good and evil as significant concepts as well as upon the essence of

human nature. These villains, in the wider perspective of philosophical doctrines by Augustine, Machiavelli, Hobbes and Rousseau, allow us to see the complexity and variety of human fear and evil. Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort are the embodiment of human fear, these villains present the concentration of evil in the form of literary characters. All three of them are brutal and driven by fear and basic desires of profiting and surviving, like the human in the Hobbesian state of nature. As well as that, all of them ignore the laws and rules of the societies they are in, like these laws do simply not exist for them, which again refers them to the state of nature. The villains are different in their archetypes, where Voldemort is a fantasy villain and Moriarty is a criminal mastermind. They also differ in their appearance and methods to a certain extent, but their evil core remains the same. This core element of their evil correlates to Augustine's original sin and free will theory. The villains are evil and sinful as they have the innate sin in them, as do all humans according to Augustine. However, it is their decision to abuse the free will by committing to the world of crime and villainy, that makes them irreversible sinners and villains according to Augustine. None of the villains are developing in this perspective. They are created evil, they serve their purpose of being evil's embodiment and they reject the possibility of redemption. Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort function as a contrast to the very many characters like Hamlet or Raskolnikov, who struggle through their stories with their flaws, sins and dilemmas about them being good or evil. These villains do not question their identity or their nature, because they have no interest in this. They do not reflect on their existence, they only see their goals and methods to achieve them. Reflection and ideas of redemption only come with understanding of one's wrongdoing, and the villains presented do not possess such self-reflection.

The development of these villains in terms of villainy as a broader literary term lies mainly within the form of their villainy but not its meaning. Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort are evil characters, their affiliation to villainy is unquestionable, the way they represent evil and villainy is what differs them. They look and act differently but their absolutistic evil nature and their villainous predisposition are the same. They demonstrate with their specific traits and characteristics the diversity and versatility of villain characters. At the same time, they preserve the very meaning of the villain character: the representation of evil, the embodiment of human fear and disgust, and the portrayal of the terrifying idea of a person who is completely free of any social or religious morals. The evolution of villains resides in details such as the complexity of their literary image, the amount of specific traits in outward appearance, methods of operation and their motivations and the circumstances of their stories. In this regard, Dracula is an un-Godly monster who changed sides from good to evil after his

vampiric rebirth, Moriarty is a mastermind criminal whose most important goal is the thriving empire of crime and Voldemort is a dark wizard tyrant whose past is carefully revealed in the *Harry Potter* series. All these factors are important but not defining for the types of characters Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort are. The mentioned characteristics and details only emphasize the differences between certain traits of these villains, but they do not change the essence of these characters. The aspect of villains which does not change throughout the times is their main purpose, and, because of that, their predisposition. The villains are evil, they are the embodiment of human perception of evil, and they are the embodiment of the brutal, nasty and scary part of a human nature. Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort are in *Dracula*, “The Final Problem” and *Harry Potter* to fulfil the function, to serve as the representation and embodiment of villainy, to be the understandable evil, to concentrate fear and to exude evil. Such focus on villainy, in form of concentrated representation of it in form of specific villains, allows the human comprehension of evil to be more visible and understandable. Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort, when correlated with the global ideas about human nature and the origin of good and evil in the philosophies by Hobbes, Augustine, Machiavelli and Rousseau, connect the ephemeral human understanding of evil and the imperfect human reasoning about human nature to a phenomena of these three particular villains. This connection makes the human understanding of evil more certain and specific, due to the fact that the evil is portrayed through very concrete examples, through the three villains which are described in detail with precision. The analysis of Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort brings up the metaphysical dilemma of good and evil, the religious philosophies and social systems and ideas. These villains and the focus on their version of villainy and evil make evil more tangible and therefore more understandable. The very idea of a villain, the essence of evil, for instance, based on examples of Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort, has not changed with the time, while the representation of evil has. The three villains show the diversity and variety of forms of evil while emphasizing the unified villainous core of these forms. The villains have both differences and similarities in smaller aspects, details, methods, outward appearance and the way they correlate with certain philosophical ideas. Indeed, Dracula is unique due to his monstrous appearance, the beast-like physical traits as well as his vampiric specifics, like the need for blood or dependence on the Transylvanian soil. Moriarty is uncommon in his criminal but yet brilliant mind and his ability to plan, manipulate and remain invisible for justice. Voldemort is the most feared dark wizard. He possesses incredible, magical powers at the same time as he is completely immoral, ruthless and unforgiving. He is a cold planner and a strategist but also a paranoid, unstable tyrant who suffers from uncontrollable rage. These

two very contrasted characteristics make him a very nuanced character. Still, even with all of these specifics, Dracula, Moriarty and Voldemort remain villains due to their evil nature, desire to kill, harm and abuse, and due to their complete rejection of the possibility of remorse. In B. Stoker's *Dracula*, A. C. Doyle's "The Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes" and J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series these villains enact and invite the reader to speculate upon evil in relation to Hobbes's and Rousseau's ideas about state and human nature, Machiavelli's philosophies about an ideal ruler and human traits and Augustine's religious theories about the original sin and free will.

7 Bibliography

- “Accio Quote!”: The Largest Archive of J.K. Rowling Interviews on the Web, 2005, *Accio-Quote.Org*, http://www.accio-quote.org/articles/2005/0705-tlc_mugglenet-anelli-2.htm Accessed 1st April 2020.
- Aguirre, Manuel: “Geometries of Terror: Numinous Spaces in Gothic, Horror and Science Fiction”, *Gothic Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2008, pp. 1–17.
- Augustine, Saint and Edward Bouverie Pusey: *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. The Floating Press, 1921.
- Butcher, S. H., et al.: *Poetics*. Infomotions, Inc.; Virginia Tech., 2001.
- Casserly, Meghan: “J.K. Rowling, Founder of the Harry Potter Empire”, *Forbes*, <https://www.forbes.com/pictures/lml45effkg/j-k-rowling-founder-of-the-harry-potter-empire/#76062e3258cd> Accessed 1 Apr. 2020.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan: *The Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes*. Electric Book Co., 2001.
- Fahraeus, Anna, and Yakalı-Çamoğlu Dikmen: *Villains and Villainy Embodiments of Evil in Literature, Popular Culture and Media*. Editions Rodopi, 2011.
- Green, R. P. H.: *Saint Augustine: On Christian Teaching*. Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Guinness World Records News: “Sherlock Holmes Awarded Title for Most Portrayed Literary Human Character in Film & TV”, *Guinness World Records*, 14 May 2012, www.guinnessworldrecords.com/news/2012/5/sherlock-holmes-awarded-title-for-most-portrayed-literary-human-character-in-film-tv-41743 Accessed 4th May 2020.
- Halberstam, Judith: “Technologies of Monstrosity: Bram Stoker's Dracula”, *Victorian Studies*, vol. 36, no. 3, 1993, pp. 333–352. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3828327. Accessed 11 May 2020.
- Hobbes, Thomas: *Leviathan: The Matter, Forme, & Power of a Common-Wealth Ecclesiastical and Civill*. The Floating Press, 2009.
- Locke, John: *Second Treatise of Government: An Essay Concerning the True Original, Extent and End of Civil Government*. 1st ed., John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 1982.

Machiavelli, Niccolo: *Discourses on Livy*. Translated by Harvey C. Mansfield; Nathan Tarcov. University of Chicago Press, 2009.

---. *The Prince*., Lerner Publishing Group, 1987.

Marshall, Bridget M.: “Phrenology, Physiognomy, and The Gothic Villain”, *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS)*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2000, 161–172. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/41274102, Accessed 4th May 2020.

Miller, Elizabeth Russell: *A Dracula Handbook*. Xlibris, 2005.

Mulholland, Neil: *The Psychology of Harry Potter: An Unauthorized Examination Of The Boy Who Lived*, BenBella Books, Inc., 2007.

“New Interview with J.K. Rowling for Release of Dutch Edition of *Deathly Hallows*”, *The-Leaky-Cauldron.Org*, 19 Nov. 2007, www.the-leaky-cauldron.org/2007/11/19/new-interview-with-j-k-rowling-for-release-of-dutch-edition-of-deathly-hallows, Accessed 4th May 2020.

O’Brien, James: *The Scientific Sherlock Holmes: Cracking the Case with Science and Forensics*, Oxford University Press, 2013.

Reeves, Charles H.: “The Aristotelian Concept of the Tragic Hero” *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. 73, no. 2, 1952, pp. 172–188. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/291812. Accessed 11 May 2020.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, and G.D.H. Cole: *The Social Contract & Discourses*. J.M. Dent & Sons, 2013.

Rowling, J.K.: *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*, Bloomsbury, 2013

---. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*, Bloomsbury, 2013.

---. *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*, Bloomsbury, 2013

---. *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*, Bloomsbury, 2013

---. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, Bloomsbury, 2013.

---. *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone*, Bloomsbury, 2013.

.

Stoker, Bram: *Dracula*. First Avenue Editions, a Division of Lerner Publishing Group, 2015.

Tomaszewska, Monika: "Vampirism and the Degeneration of the Imperial Race: Stokers Dracula as the Invasive Degenerate Other." In: *Journal of Dracula Studies*, No.6, 2004, pp 1-7, Web. 01. Mar. 2014. <https://research.library.kutztown.edu/dracula-studies/vol6/iss1/1/> Accessed 4th May 2020.

