*Katarina Labudova*

# Angela Carter's Parody of Romance and Gothic Conventions in the Bristol Trilogy

## Introduction

Angela Carter's early writing presents passive characters who struggle to accommodate themselves to numerous versions of stereotypical feminine ideals, only to discover that they cannot satisfy the demands of others. In this respect, Carter uses the genres of the romance and the Gothic romance to re-write and parody the predetermined roles and stereotypical assertions which these traditional genres contain.[1]

Angela Carter does not tell romances: she slices them open, seasons them with irony, and serves them raw. In *Shadow Dance* (1966) and *Love* (1971), she steps inside the familiar machinery of romance and Gothic romance, only to rewrite the genres with irony, grotesque imagery, and acts of destruction. Her heroines do not walk hand-in-hand into a sunset; they stalk away through the ruins, set fire to the house, or stage their own annihilation. These early novels dismantle the ideological architecture of the love plot, its faith in male redemption, its fetishisation of female submission, its promise of renewal through marriage or rescue, and replace it with entropic narratives where obsession, violence, and decay are the true constants. Reading the volumes that comprise The Bristol Trilogy, that is, *Shadow Dance*, *Several Perceptions* (1968) and *Love*, together, reveals Carter's sustained political act: she uses the conventions of the genres that have scripted women's lives for centuries not to uphold their myths, but to show the wreckage they leave behind.

Angela Carter's early novels inhabit and disrupt the structures of popular narrative forms, particularly romance and its Gothic variant. In *The Secular Scripture*, Northrop Frye identifies the archetypal romance as a cyclical form, descending "through the threatening complications and up again through the escape from them" (131). Within this trajectory, the descent into danger is only a temporary stage; the plot moves inexorably towards reconciliation, stability, and renewal, often embodied in the union of hero and heroine. This structural arc, which for centuries has defined the romance, not only shapes the reader's expectations but also reflects deeply ingrained cultural narratives about gender. Women in romance, as Tania Modleski has observed in *Loving with a Vengeance*, achieve fulfilment "only by undergoing a complex process of self-subversion" (37), learning to

[1] In 2014, together with Nóra Séllei, I was a convenor of a panel on Food in Literature Written by Women. Professor Séllei presented on the theme of food in Carter's *The Magic Toyshop*. Our joint panel sparked my interest in the topic of food in literature. This article of mine, to celebrate Nóra's birthday, returns to Carter's early texts, to her perception of conventional femininity and happy endings.

renounce independence and submit to the needs of the hero. Marriage, domesticity, and motherhood are the inevitable and desirable rewards.

Carter's fiction rewrites this framework from within. In *Shadow Dance*, *Several Perceptions*, and *Love*, she constructs narratives that initially seem to draw on the love plot and the Gothic romance but then warp their trajectories, replacing the consolatory ending with destruction, disillusionment, or deliberate ambiguity. Her settings are not the lush landscapes of pastoral romance or the exoticised castles of Gothic fiction but decaying urban environments where desire is tangled with violence, obsession, and ironic detachment. The ruins in these novels are more than atmosphere: they are metaphors for the collapse of the ideological structures that romance has traditionally sustained–patriarchal authority, female passivity, and the conflation of sexual union with personal fulfilment.

Although Angela Carter does not write romances and Gothic romances in the conventional sense, her early novels clearly engage with and subvert elements of the genre. In Shadow Dance, Carter draws on the conventions of traditional popular romances, yet refuses to produce a text designed "to read as an escape" (Radway 52). Rather than offering the romance as a "reversal of the oppression and emotional abandonment suffered by women in real life" (Radway 55), Carter uses the form to expose those very realities. She rewrites the genre's happy endings, adopts at times a masculine narrative perspective, and incorporates violence–both metaphorical and actual–to dismantle the fantasy of romantic rescue. *Shadow Dance* negotiates and inverts the genre's prescribed unequal power relations between women and men: instead of culminating in the heroine's marriage to a saviour figure, Carter's narrative reveals how such endings reinforce female subordination.

**Passive Dolls and Practical Girls in Shadow Dance**

In *Shadow Dance*, the lovers "moaned and writhed in the rhododendron bushes among the fag ends and dogshit" (SD 13), a scene that grotesquely parodies the conventional image of passion in an idyllic setting.[2] The description refuses the idealising gaze, situating romantic encounter amid waste and decay. As Aidan Day has argued, the novel's ruined landscapes are "symbolic of old, outdated cultural values" (15), including the assumption that heterosexual love can redeem suffering and restore order. Carter's world is not cyclical but entropic: relationships do not emerge from danger purified; they

[2] Peach labels the novel as "Euro-American Gothic" (27), in "'Mutability Is Having a Field Day': The Sixties Aura of Angela Carter's Bristol Trilogy," Marc O'Day says that the novel, together with *Several Perceptions* and *Love*, "invite[s] readings in terms of quite traditional literary realism" (24), while Aidan Day sees the novel as an "allegory of the nature of sexual identity in a manner comparable to Carter's other fiction" (22). The obvious ambiguity of the genre allows for a more open characterization, and that is why it is possible to read this novel, as I do, as an anti-romance.

collapse further into obsession, cruelty, or apathy. The novel, in its ironic treatment of the romance genre, breaks all the typical taboos.[3]

The narrative centres on Morris and Honeybuzzard and three women, Ghislaine, Edna, and Emily. The novel begins with Ghislaine, who has been sexually involved with both men, returning from hospital after being stabbed by Honeybuzzard. Violence, in Carter's vision, is not the barrier to romance but its underlying logic, the latent threat that traditional narratives domesticate or disguise.

Edna, Morris's wife, is perhaps the closest the novel comes to a conventional romance heroine. She is described as "a Victorian girl" (SD 45), engaged in knitting, jam-making, and dreaming of "his children" (SD 22). Her understanding of marriage is explicitly one that conceives it in terms of "submission and procreation" (SD 45), and Carter's irony here is devastating: Edna's wedding-day glow is likened to the radiance of altar chrysanthemums, a simile that mocks the solemnity of vows while revealing the passivity expected of a bride. In Modleski's terms, Edna exemplifies the heroine who achieves happiness through self-erasure, sacrificing desire and agency to fit the mould of devoted wifehood.[4] Yet, Carter refuses her the romance's reward. Edna's obedience yields neither security nor transformation; she remains static, a figure of muted endurance: "Husbands were a force of nature or an act of God; like an earthquake or the dreaded consumption, to be borne with, to be meekly acquiesced to, to be impregnated by as frequently as Nature would allow." (SD 45)

Emily offers a contrast, beginning as a doll-like figure with "a dolly patch of bright pink in the centre of each round cheek" (SD 54), but revealing herself to be a "practical girl" (SD 104) who recognises Honeybuzzard's predatory nature.[5] Discovering Ghislaine's

[3] Janice Radway points out the significance of taboos in the romance genre, which include rape, violence, and 'bed-hopping' of the female protagonist: there are "things that 'should never appear in a romance [...] promiscuous sex, a sad ending, rape, physical torture and weak heroes have no place in the romance" (73).

[4] The novel is narrated from the third person point of view, but, mostly, it presents the male perspective ("male focus," Peach 29). However, the male perspective is only one of many and it is "challenged and undermined by the wider interaction of voices within the text which also encourages the reader to regard it sceptically" (Peach 29). Linden Peach's observation enables the possibility to concentrate on other voices (e.g. Edna's) to parody the male focus. Thus, Edna can be seen as a cliché heroine of a romance and the male characters as comic versions of the Gothic villains – Honeybuzzard enjoys wearing false noses and false vampire teeth.

[5] In "Convulsive Beauty and Compulsive Desire: The Surrealist Pattern in *Shadow Dance*," Anna Watz Fruchart suggests that Ghislaine is "a doll-like child woman" (23). She compares Ghislaine to surrealist automata and concludes that "[t]he dolls, patched up like Ghislaine, confuse and conflate categories such as sexiness and innocence, childhood and adulthood, beauty and its destruction, eroticism, mutilation and death in a manner characteristic of surrealism" (24). I add that this is exactly how Carter crosses the conventions of the genre. By presenting the character in contradictory terms, she liberates her from the passive/active, male/female dichotomies which are typical for traditional romances.

murder, she compares him to Bluebeard, invoking the folkloric archetype of the dangerous husband who hides dead wives behind a locked door. Emily's response is active and destructive: she tears off the corset advertisements and Victorian knick-knacks in Honeybuzzard's room, smashing a bust of Queen Victoria (SD 164). These objects, relics of an oppressive past, are physically destroyed in a gesture that combines personal rage with symbolic iconoclasm. In leaving Honeybuzzard while pregnant, she asserts that her child "had nothing to do with him" (SD 179), rejecting the central romance equation between sexual union, motherhood, and male ownership.

If Emily figures a resistant reimagining of the romance heroine, Ghislaine embodies the most extreme form of its passivity. In the closing scenes, she returns to Honeybuzzard declaring, "I can't live without you, you are my master, do what you like with me" (SD 166). The scene is chillingly familiar from the declarations of surrender in conventional love stories, but Carter strips it of romantic gloss. Ghislaine is killed by Honeybuzzard. This collapse of the "happy ending" exposes the violence implicit in fantasies of complete submission, while also revealing the danger that Frye's cyclical model conceals.

Carter aligns bodily states with narrative disruption. Emily's pregnancy sickness, initially unrecognised, functions as a visceral metaphor for the breakdown of the romance plot; her body refuses to "digest" the trajectory laid out for her. Her final act, burning down Honeybuzzard's house, destroys not only his property but also the symbolic architecture of the romance's conclusion. The "decaying old house" of Frye's tradition is here reduced to ash.

**Blind and Blank Dolls: Inscribing Resistance in Several Perceptions**

In *Several Perceptions*, Carter similarly inscribes resistance into the body: she uses physical symptoms to signal a refusal, which may be partial, conflicted, or unconscious, of prescribed narrative and social roles. The simultaneous "acceptance and refusal of sexuality" (Mitchell 289) and motherhood result in the symptoms of Anne Blossom's hysteria. In this novel, Anne Blossom, herself an orphan, decides to give away her newborn baby boy, because, as a single mother, she would not be able to earn enough to support herself and her child. This seems to be a reasonable solution to her economic as well as her social status. However, her hysterical limping exposes the unresolved contradictions of her situation: she relinquishes the baby yet remains caught in the bodily aftershocks of maternal and sexual deprivation.

In her hatred towards Mrs Boulder,[6] a prostitute, she expresses her anger with herself as well as with her own mother, who had given her away in a similar fashion. Mrs Boulder,

[6] Mrs Boulder is the mother of Joseph's friend, Viv. In "Nothing Sacred," Sarah Gamble offers a particularly interesting reading of the figure of the *femme fatale* through Mrs Boulder. She is presented as an active woman, even though she is "worn out by the constant battle to resist the aging process" (57). Gamble suggests that Mrs Boulder is a survivor and, viewed through Joseph's eyes, "she embodies a kind of masochistic heroism" (57). I only add that Mrs Boulder is one of the first

the "white queen," was able to keep her son, Viv, and is able to get her man, "a black king" (SP 131). Anne's body signals her frustrated desire for the baby. She unconsciously punishes herself for this act by developing somatic symptoms: limping and pain in her leg. Her hysterical paralysis is cured by Kay, who tells her in a firm voice that she does not really limp.[7] "She turned and ran towards him. She was laughing exultantly. Then she ran right back to the fireplace and spun round and back to Kay, racing her mirror image. 'I'm all right again,' she said. 'It wasn't a punishment for what I did'" (SP 144). Kay helps Anne to overcome her hysterical paralysis from the outside, parodying psychotherapy.

In *Several Perceptions*, women characters (Miss Blossom, Mrs Boulder) are portrayed as dolls, although the connotations are slightly different. Miss Blossom's face "was perfectly expressionless" (SP 43), "her eyes were blind and blank" (SP 43) and she "was the quietest of women" (SP 43) who "looked like a Dutch doll" (SP 44). Miss Blossom, in her old-fashioned clothes, is portrayed as a victim: "It was an anonymous face in the crowd, face of a girl with a paper carrier bag of groceries waiting at a rainy bus stop or the blurred newspaper face of a girl raped and murdered by a perfect stranger while walking by herself in a wood; it was a plain brick in the wall of the world" (SP 37). Miss Blossom can be seen as a victim of patriarchy, because it is impossible for her to be economically independent as a single mother, and she is thus forced to give her baby away.

On the other hand, Mrs Boulder "was fat, white and painted like a holy statue" (SP 48), she "did not speak often although her voice was beautifully dark and cool" (SP 48) and despite the fact that she worked as a prostitute, "she was, as always, immaculate" (SP 48). The image of a silent 'holy statue', I suggest, is the strategic masquerade Mrs Boulder uses to earn her money. By presenting Mrs Boulder as a single mother who cares for her illegitimate son with all her love, Carter destroys the conventional image of a prostitute.

Several Perceptions ignores traditional happy endings, however, they seem to bring positive promises: they challenge the objectification and paralysis of women in traditional romantic plots. Anne Blossom frees herself from the repressed guilt and learns to walk straight again.

**Painted Dolls: Gothic Traps in Love**

If *Shadow Dance* and *Several Perceptions* parody and reject the restorative arc of romance, Love extends this critique into the Gothic, a genre traditionally associated with danger,

among Carter's prostitutes. They are not seen as pitiable fallen women, but, with Carter's legendary pinch of optimistic grotesque, as women striving to survive the stereotypical representations of the *femme fatale*. Carter presents this type of prostitute most memorably in *Nights at the Circus*.

[7] For a psychoanalytical analysis of 'the sense of lack' in *Several Perceptions*, see Linden Peach's *Angela Carter* (48–50) and Aidan Day's *Angela Carter*: *The Rational Glass* (36–40). The psychological link between sexual and oral appetite in *Several Perceptions* is explored by Sarah Sceats (52–3).

confinement, and eventual escape.[8] As Elaine Showalter notes, the Gothic has often articulated "women's dark protests, fantasies, and fear" (127). Its heroines face tyrannical men, mysterious houses, and ambiguous threats, but in the classic form, these dangers are resolved: the villain is unmasked, the heroine rescued, and moral order restored. Carter retains the danger, but resists resolution. Her Gothic worlds remain morally ambiguous, their endings unresolved or destructive.

David Punter remarks that Carter "ironically suggests that the Gothic vision is in fact an accurate account of life, of the ways we project our fantasies onto the world and then stand back in horror when we see them come to life" (398). For Carter, the Gothic's excess and theatricality are not escapist ornamentation but a means of confronting the fantasies and fears embedded in everyday relationships.[9] In Love, she stages a love triangle between Lee, his half-brother Buzz, and Lee's wife Annabel. From the outset, Annabel is "confronted by ambiguities" (L 1), signalling her unstable sense of self. She inhabits an imaginary world "populated with fearful shapes" (L 3) and projects her fantasies onto Lee, seeing him in grotesque, contradictory images: as "a herbivorous lion" and "a unicorn devouring raw meat" (L 34). The idealising gaze common in romance heroines is here distorted through predatory and violent imagery, collapsing the boundary between desire and destruction.[10]

---

[8] The term Gothic has been used in a broader context than that of classical Gothic fiction, and some of the new varieties of the genre are quite different from its original practice. In *The Literature of the Terror*, David Punter observes that "one central meaning, however, it has retained: Gothic writing is not realist writing. And as non-realistic and broadly expressionist forms of fiction multiply in England and America, so has the term 'Gothic' become more prevalent" (373).

[9] In "'The Desecration of the Temple'; Or, 'Sexuality as Terrorism'? Angela Carter's (Post-)feminist Gothic Heroines," Rebecca Munford explores Carter's fiction within the framework of postfeminism. Like Munford, I try to show that Carter's protagonists ought not to be understood within the framework of "victim feminism" (63). Further, I concentrate on the chronological development of the characters' positions from protofeminism to postfeminism. In *Femicidal Fears: Narratives of the Female Gothic Experience*, Helene Meyers emphasizes "the use of [the] contemporary female Gothics for the development and critique of feminist thought on female victimization" (19).

[10] Aidan Day in *Angela Carter: The Rational Glass* observes that *Love* explores "a traditional pattern of understanding the nature of gender identity and the relations between the sexes, which is characterized in terms of unreason" (55). Linden Peach in *Angela Carter* suggests reading Carter's Bristol Trilogy (the term suggested by Marc O'Day in "Mutability is Having a Field Day") in similar terms, an idea also supported in Lorna Sage's "Introduction" to her edited volume *Flesh and the Mirror*: she reads it as "a combination of Gothic and psychological fantasy" (27). However, nearly all of Carter's novels are indebted to the Gothic. According to Linden Peach, the pervasive Gothic tone of her early writing "subverts the close relationship between word and referent which characterizes realism" (28). The Gothic mode gives Carter's writing openness and ambiguity. In "Reconfiguring the Gothic Body in Postmodern Times: Angela Carter's Exposure of Flesh-Inscribed Stereotypes," Mariaconcetta Constantini discusses the frequency of Gothic plots in Carter's writing, evident already in Bristol Trilogy: "[…] *Shadow Dance* or *Love* are still characterized by a project of 'domestification' of danger typical of female Gothic romances (from eighteenth-century to contemporary ones) […]" (16). She observes that "in traditional Gothic, the various

Annabel and Lee's relationship incorporates ritualised violence. After she loses a chess game, she strikes him; he responds by tying her wrists, forcing her to kneel, and beating her until she collapses. The scene is narrated with Carter's characteristic detachment: the narrator refuses to moralise while making the choreography of harm disturbingly intimate. The dynamic exemplifies her inversion of the romance: passion becomes performance, intimacy is inseparable from cruelty, and mutual objectification replaces mutual devotion.

Annabel's acts of possession are equally distorted. She tattoos her name on Lee's chest, an inscription that, as Sarah Gamble argues, is "not the symbol of romance it seems, but a visible sign of his tie to Annabel, which is compounded not of love, but of mutual pain, manipulation and delusion" (*Angela Carter* 87). The tattoo literalises ownership but does not prevent Lee's infidelities. Instead, it turns his body into another object in Annabel's 'collection,' reducing the beloved to a possession rather than elevating him into a romantic ideal.

Her suicide attempts are staged with an eye for spectacle, blurring the line between performance and reality. Before spying on Lee and his lover, she borrows Buzz's ring to pretend she is invisible; after witnessing them together, she retreats to the bathroom to kill herself, irritated that she must "make do with an undignified razor blade" rather than a more theatrically appropriate knife (L 44–5). Even her final act, killing herself after Lee spends the night with another woman, is presented as a tableau: "now she was a painted doll, bluish at the extremities" (L 109). The romanticised image of the tragic heroine is here undercut by its artificiality, its doll-like stillness an emblem of lifelessness rather than beauty.[11]

Buzz, while ostensibly Lee's foil, is equally implicated in Annabel's objectification. During sex, he imagines her as she appeared after a suicide attempt, "on a tiled floor with her blood welling out through the silk pores of her embroidered shawl," and finds the image erotically stimulating. The eroticisation of her inert body reinforces Carter's critique of

manifestations of the uncanny (physical violence and pain, sadistic practices, female victimization, forbidden sexual fantasies, and unrestrained terrors) are rendered with a language of excess that encourages a dual reading: on one side, it promotes a reactionary ethic by stressing the frightening effects of uncontrolled desires; on the other, it gives evidence of the artificiality of culture and identity, which are obtained through the rigidification of a polarized system" (15). I add that Carter plays upon these notions in their parodies of the Gothic genre. For a detailed study of Carter's postmodern Gothic, see Botting's "Aftergothic," where he suggests that "Carter powerfully, and often critically, demonstrates the reversal of values and identifications that occurs via the Gothic genre" (186).

[11] It is not only Annabel who is unable to become an autonomous subject: the brothers also feel "incomplete without her presence; without any conscious volition of her own, by a species of osmosis, perhaps, since she was so insubstantial, somehow she had entered the circle of their self-containment" (*L* 29).

the link between desire and possession. This collapse of Annabel's subjectivity into a fetishised image previews her dehumanisation within the narrative.

Annabel is repeatedly described in monstrous terms, as possibly "not fully human" (L 33). Aidan Day observes that she "ends up as literally nothing" because she cannot form "a coherent, autonomous being" (62).[12] Carter's Afterword underlines this, noting that "even the women's movement would have been no help to her" (L 111). Annabel's tragedy is not only that she is destroyed by male desire but also that she cannot imagine herself outside the fantasies that consume her. Unlike Emily, who destroys the symbols of her oppression and leaves, Annabel destroys only herself.

**Conclusion**

Across these early novels, Carter dismantles both the romance's promise of renewal and the Gothic's moral resolution. Her heroines may resist, self-destruct, or take revenge, but they never arrive at the harmonious closure Frye identifies. By inhabiting these genres closely enough to evoke their pleasures, she is able to distort them from within, exposing the patriarchal ideologies they encode. The ruins, dilapidated houses, and broken objects that litter her narratives are not mere decoration; they are structural metaphors for the collapse of narratives that have bound women's lives to submission, sacrifice, and the eroticisation of harm.

Carter's refusal to offer alternative "happy endings" is not a failure of hope but a political choice. As Linden Peach notes, her work "refuses to collude with the reader's desire for closure" because such closure often requires the reinstatement of the very structures she seeks to dismantle (66). By leaving her narratives fractured and her endings unresolved, or, in the case of *Shadow Dance*, resolved only through death and fire, Carter challenges readers to imagine other scripts for desire and agency.

In *Shadow Dance*, the cycle of romance collapses into murder and arson; in Several Perceptions, Carter subverts the conventions of the traditional happy ending. While the conclusions offer a sense of hope, they actively resist the objectification and passivity imposed on women in conventional romantic narratives. Anne Blossom overcomes her internalized guilt and regains the ability to walk with confidence. In Love, the Gothic entrapment ends not with rescue but with the heroine's annihilation. These are not aberrations but deliberate revisions of the genres' fundamental promises. Carter stages the descent into "threatening complications" (Frye 131), but refuses the ascent back into safety, substituting endings that confront the reader with the cost of believing in such ascents at all.

[12] David Punter also comments on Annabel's and other characters' inefficient attempts to survive: "the characters do not struggle for self-realisation, or indeed for survival" (399).

In doing so, she enacts a sustained political act: that of dismantling the myths that bind female experience to the consolations of romance and revealing the dangers of stories that promise escape only to return women to the arms of domination. Her heroines may not always survive, but their fates expose the violence embedded in the very idea of the 'happy ending,' leaving the reader to contemplate what other endings might be possible once the old houses have burned to the ground.

**Works Cited**

Botting, Fred. "Aftergothic: Consumption, Machines, and Black Holes." Ed. Jerold E. Hogle, *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*. Cambridge UP, 2002, 277–300.

Carter, Angela. *Love*. Vintage, 2006.

Carter, Angela. *Several Perceptions*. Virago Press, 1997.

Carter, Angela. *Shadow Dance*. Virago Press, 1997.

Constantini, Mariaconcetta. "Reconfiguring the Gothic Body in Postmodern Times: Angela Carter's Exposure of Flesh-Inscribed Stereotypes." *Gothic Studies* 4.1 (2002): 14–27. Academic Search Premier. DOI:10.7227/GS.4.1.2 Accessed 2 Feb. 2011.

Day, Aidan. *Angela Carter: The Rational Glass*. Manchester UP, 1998.

Fruchart, Anna Watz. "Convulsive Beauty and Compulsive Desire: The Surrealist Pattern of Shadow Dance." Ed. Rebecca Munford, *Re-visiting Angela Carter: Texts, Contexts, Intertexts*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, 21–42.

Frye, Northrop. *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance*. Harvard UP, 1976.

Gamble, Sarah. *Angela Carter: Writing from the Front Line*. Edinburgh UP, 1997.

Gamble, Sarah. "Something Sacred: Angela Carter, Jean-Luc Godard, and the Sixties." *Re-visiting Angela Carter: Texts, Contexts, Intertexts*. Ed. Rebecca Munford. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, 42–63.

Hogle, Jerrold E. *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*. Cambridge UP, 2002.

Meyers, Helene. *Femicidal Fears: Narratives of the Female Gothic Experience*. State U of New York P, 2001.

Mitchell, Juliet. *Psychoanalysis and Feminism: Freud, Reich, Laing and Women*. New York: Vintage, 1975.

Modleski, Tania. *Loving with a Vengeance: Mass-Produced Fantasies for Women*. London: Routledge, 1982.

Munford, Rebecca. "'The Desecration of the Temple': Or, 'Sexuality as Terrorism'? Angela Carter's (Post-)Feminist Gothic Heroines." *Gothic Studies* 9.2 (2007): 58–70. Academic Search Premier. DOI:10.7227/GS.9.2.7. Accessed 3 Apr. 2011.

Munford, Rebecca, ed. *Re-visiting Angela Carter: Texts, Contexts, Intertexts*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

O'Day, Marc. "'Mutability is Having a Field Day': The Sixties Aura of Angela Carter's Bristol Trilogy." Sage ed. 24–59.

Peach, Linden. *Angela Carter*. 2nd ed. Macmillan, 2009.

Punter, David. *The Literature of Terror: A History of Gothic Fictions from 1765 to the Present Day*. Longman, 1980.

Radway, Janice A. *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature*. U of North Carolina P, 1984.

Sage, Lorna. "Introduction." Lorna Sage, ed. *Flesh and the Mirror: Essays on the Art of Angela Carter*. Virago Press, 1994, 1–23.

Sage, Lorna, ed. *Flesh and the Mirror: Essays on the Art of Angela Carter*. Virago Press, 1994.

Sceats, Sarah. *Food, Consumption, and the Body in Cotemporary Women's Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Showalter, Elaine. *Sister's Choice: Tradition and Change in American Women's Writing*. Clarendon Press, 1991.