



WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

---

The Sedulous Ape: Atavism, Professionalism, and Stevenson's "Jekyll and Hyde"

Author(s): STEPHEN D. ARATA

Source: *Criticism*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (Spring, 1995), pp. 233-259

Published by: [Wayne State University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23116549>

Accessed: 17/05/2013 11:56

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Wayne State University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Criticism*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## The Sedulous Ape: Atavism, Professionalism, and Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde*

In an early review of *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886), Andrew Lang noted the most striking feature of Robert Louis Stevenson's tale. "His heroes (surely *this* is original) are all successful middle-aged professional men," he wrote.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, one could hardly miss the novel's foregrounding of the stature enjoyed by "Henry Jekyll, M.D., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S., etc."<sup>2</sup> In Lang's view this interest in professional men defined Stevenson's novel at least as much as its portrayal of the grotesque Edward Hyde. If *Jekyll and Hyde* articulates in Gothic fiction's exaggerated tones late-Victorian anxieties concerning degeneration, devolution, and "criminal man," it invariably situates those concerns in relation to the practices and discourses of lawyers like Gabriel Utterson, doctors like Henry Jekyll and Hastie Lanyon, or even "well-known men about town" (29) like Richard Enfield. The novel in fact asks us to do more than simply register the all-too-apparent marks of Edward Hyde's "degeneracy." It compels us also to examine how those marks come to signify in the first place. As Stevenson understood, one thing professional men tend to be good at is close reading. Another is seeing to it that their interpretations have consequences in the real world. *Jekyll and Hyde* proves to be an uncannily self-conscious exploration of the relation between professional interpretation and the construction of criminal deviance. The novel is also, I will argue, a displaced meditation on what Stevenson considered the decline of authorship into "professionalism."

### The Atavist and the Professional

In Edward Hyde, Stevenson's first readers could easily discern the lineaments of Cesare Lombroso's atavistic criminal. Lombroso, in one of degeneration theory's defining moments, had "discovered" that criminals were throwbacks to humanity's savage past. While contemplating the skull of the notorious Italian bandit Vilella, Lombroso suddenly saw history open up before him, illumined as if by lightning.

*Criticism*, Spring 1995, Vol. XXXVII, No. 2, pp. 233-259  
Copyright © 1995 Wayne State University Press, Detroit, Michigan 48201

This was not merely an idea [he wrote later], but a revelation. At the sight of that skull, I seemed to see all of a sudden, lighted up as a vast plain under a flaming sky, the problem of the nature of the criminal—an atavistic being who reproduces in his person the ferocious instincts of primitive humanity and the inferior animals.<sup>3</sup>

“Thus were explained anatomically,” Lombroso continues, such diverse attributes as the “enormous jaws, high cheek bones, prominent superciliary arches, solitary lines in the palms, extreme size of the orbits, [and] handle-shaped ears” of the criminal, as well as various moral deformities like the propensity for “excessive idleness, love of orgies, and the irresponsible craving of evil for its own sake.” These features were all signs of a form of primitive existence which normal men and women had transcended but which the criminal was condemned to relive. In his physiognomy as in his psyche, the criminal bore the traces of humanity’s history and development.

From the first publication of Stevenson’s novel, readers have noted the similarities between Lombroso’s criminal and the atavistic Mr. Hyde.<sup>4</sup> Less often noted is how snugly descriptions of criminal deviance fit with longstanding discourses of class in Great Britain. Lombroso’s work first reached a wide audience in England thanks to Havelock Ellis’s *The Criminal* (1891); the combined influence of Ellis and Lombroso was in part due to the ease with which the new “scientific” categories mapped onto older, more familiar accounts of the urban poor from Mayhew onward. Lombroso’s theory was in part a discourse on class, and much of its “legitimacy” derived from the way it reproduced the class ideologies of the bourgeoisie. Equating the criminal with atavism, and both with the lower classes, was a familiar gesture by the 1880s, as was the claim that deviance expressed itself most markedly through physical deformity.<sup>5</sup> Stevenson’s middle-class readers would have had as little trouble deciphering the features of the “abnormal and misbegotten” Hyde, his “body an imprint of deformity and decay,” as Stevenson’s middle-class characters do (78, 84). “God bless me,” exclaims Utterson, “the man seems hardly human. Something troglodytic, shall we say? . . . or is it the mere radiance of a foul soul that thus transpires through, and transfigures, its clay continent?” (40). Utterson’s remark, moreover, nicely demonstrates how old and new paradigms can overlap. He at once draws on familiar Christian imagery—Hyde’s foul soul transfiguring its clay continent—and a Lombrosan vocabulary of atavism,

with Hyde-as-troglodyte reproducing in his person the infancy of the human species.

In considering degenerationism as a class discourse, however, we need to look up as well as down. Late-Victorian pathologists routinely argued that degeneration was as endemic to a decadent aristocracy as to a troglodytic proletariat. And, indeed, Hyde can be read as a figure of leisured dissipation. While his impulsiveness and savagery, his violent temper, and his appearance all mark Hyde as lower class and atavistic, his vices are clearly those of a monied gentleman. This aspect of Hyde's portrayal has gone largely unnoticed by later critics, but for Stevenson's contemporaries the conflation of upper and lower classes into a single figure of degeneracy would not have seemed unusual. Lombroso's criminal may have been primitive in appearance, but his moral shortcomings—"excessive idleness, love of orgies, the irresponsible craving of evil"—make him a companion of Jean Floressas des Esseintes and Dorian Gray, not Vilella. In his highly influential *Degeneration* (1895), Max Nordau took pains to insist that the degenerate population "consists chiefly of rich educated people" who, with too much time and means at their disposal, succumb to decadence and depravity.<sup>6</sup>

Lombroso and Nordau have in mind not only the titled aristocracy but also a stratum of cultured aesthetes considered dangerously subversive of conventional morality. That Stevenson meant us to place Hyde among their number is suggested by the description of his surprisingly well-appointed Soho rooms, "furnished with luxury and good taste" (49). Hyde's palate for wine is discriminating, his plate is of silver, his "napery elegant." Art adorns his walls, while carpets "of many plies and agreeable in colour" cover his floors. This is not a savage's den but the retreat of a cultivated gentleman. Utterson supposes that Jekyll bought the art for Hyde (49), but Stevenson in a letter went out of his way to say that the lawyer is mistaken. The purchases were Hyde's alone.<sup>7</sup>

In Edward Hyde, then, Stevenson created a figure who embodies a bourgeois readership's worst fears about both a marauding and immoral underclass and a dissipated and immoral leisure class. Yet Stevenson also shows how such figures are not so much "recognized" as created by middle-class discourse. He does this by foregrounding the interpretive acts by means of which his characters situate and define Hyde. Despite the confident assertions of the novel's professional men that Hyde is "degenerate," his "stigmata" turn out to be troublingly difficult to specify. In fact, no one can accurately describe

him. "He must be deformed somewhere," asserts Enfield. "He gives a strong feeling of deformity, though I couldn't specify the point. He's an extraordinary-looking man, and yet I really can name nothing out of the way. No, sir . . . I can't describe him" (34). Enfield's puzzled response finds its counterparts in the nearly identical statements of Utterson (40), Poole (68), and Lanyon (77–78). In Utterson's dream Hyde "had no face, or one that baffled him and melted before his eyes" (36–37). "The few who could describe him differed widely," agreeing only that some "unexpressed deformity" lurked in his countenance (50). That last, nearly oxymoronic formulation—unexpressed deformity—nicely captures the troubled relation between the "text" of Hyde's body and the interpretive practices used to decipher it. Hyde's stigmata are everywhere asserted and nowhere named. In this way Stevenson underscores how the act of interpretation is grounded less in empirical data (the shape of Hyde's face, the hue of his skin) than in the categories brought to bear upon him. The novel continually turns the question of Hyde back on his interlocutors so that their interpretive procedures become the object of our attention. "There is my explanation," Utterson claims. "It is plain and natural, hangs well together and delivers us from all exorbitant alarms" (66). It is also, we are immediately given to understand, wrong, though its delusions differ only in degree from other "plain and natural" explanations brought forward in the tale.<sup>8</sup>

Indeed, what makes *Jekyll and Hyde* compelling is the way it turns the class discourses of atavism and criminality back on the bourgeoisie itself. As Lang recognized, Stevenson's novel is finally more concerned with its middle-class professional "heroes" than it is with the figure of Edward Hyde. Among the story's first readers, F. W. H. Myers felt this aspect acutely, and it prompted him to protest in a remarkable series of letters to Stevenson. Since the letters suggest that Hyde can be read as a figure not of degenerate depravity but of bourgeois "virtue," they are worth pausing over.<sup>9</sup>

Shortly after its publication Myers wrote to Stevenson, whom he did not know, enthusiastically praising *Jekyll and Hyde* but suggesting that certain minor revisions would improve the novel. After noting some infelicities of phrasing and gaps in plotting, Myers came to what he considered the story's "weakest point," the murder of Sir Danvers Carew. Hyde's mauling of Carew's "unresisting body" offended the decorous Myers ("no, not an elderly MP's!"), but his primary objection was that such an act was untrue to Hyde's nature. Because "Jekyll was thoroughly civilized . . . his degeneration must

needs take certain lines only." Hyde should be portrayed as "not a generalized but a specialized fiend," whose cruelty would never take the form Stevenson gave it. At most "Hyde would, I think, have brushed the baronet aside with a curse."

Stevenson's reply was polite, passing over the bulk of Myers's suggestions in silence. He did pause to correct him on one subject, though, that of a painting in Hyde's lodgings. Myers had questioned whether the doctor would have acquired artwork for his alter ego. Stevenson answered that Hyde purchased the painting, not Jekyll. Myers's response was disproportionately vehement. "Would Hyde have bought a picture? I think—and friends of weight support my view—that such an act would have been altogether unworthy of him." Unworthy? Myers and his weighty friends appear to feel that Hyde's character is being impugned, that his good name must be defended against some implied insult. Asking "what are the motives which would prompt a person in [Hyde's] situation" to buy artwork, Myers suggests three, none of which, he argues, applies to Hyde's case.

1. There are jaded voluptuaries who seek in a special class of art a substitute or reinforcement for the default of primary stimuli. Mr. Hyde's whole career forbids us to insult him by classing him with these men.

2. There are those who wish for elegant surroundings to allure or overawe the minds of certain persons unaccustomed to luxury or splendour. But does not all we know of Hyde teach us that he disdained those modes of adventitious attractions? . . .

3. There are those, again, who surround their more concentrated enjoyments with a halo of mixed estheticism. . . . Such, no doubt, was Dr. Jekyll; such, no doubt, he *expected* that Mr. Hyde would be. But was he not deceived? Was there not something unlooked for, something Napoleonic, in Hyde's way of pushing aside the aesthetic as well as the moral superfluities of life? . . . We do not imagine the young Napoleon as going to concerts or taking a walk in a garden. . . . I cannot fancy Hyde looking in at picture shops. I cannot think he ever left his rooms, except on business.

This is a most unfamiliar Hyde! On the evidence of Myers's letter we would have to pronounce him an upstanding citizen. Myers clearly perceives how easily Stevenson's Hyde could be taken not for a brute but for a dandy. At no point is Myers worried that Hyde

might be considered atavistic. Instead, he is concerned that Hyde's reputation not be smeared by association with "jaded voluptuaries" and aesthetes. In attempting to clear him of such charges, Myers presents Jekyll's alter ego as the very image of bourgeois sobriety and industry, manfully disdainful of the shop window, the art gallery, the concert hall—of anything that might savor of the aesthetic or the frivolous. Myers praises Hyde's simplicity of dress: he's not a fop but a "man aiming only at simple convenience, direct sufficiency." Unconcerned with personal adornment, he is "not anxious to present himself as personally attractive, but [relies] frankly on the cash nexus, and on that decision of character that would startle" those less forceful than himself.

We might dismiss Myers's reading as eccentric, especially given the absence of any irony in his references to Hyde's "business," freedom from personal vanity, or reliance on the cash nexus (blackmail and prostitution appear to be the primary drags on his resources). Yet Myers's admittedly exaggerated response illuminates an important aspect of Stevenson's novel. Edward Hyde may not be an image of the *upright* bourgeois male, but he is decidedly an image of the bourgeois male. While Hyde can be read as the embodiment of the degenerate prole, the decadent aristocrat, or the dissipated aesthete, it is also the case that his violence is largely directed *at* those same classes. Of the three acts of violence we see Hyde commit, two—his trampling of the little girl and his striking of the prostitute—involve lower-class women. Hyde's third victim is the novel's only titled character, Sir Danvers Carew. That Hyde shares Myers's disdain for aesthetes is made plainer in Stevenson's manuscript draft of the novel. There, Hyde murders not Sir Danvers but a character who appears to be a caricature of the aesthetic stereotype, the "anoemically pale" Mr. Lemsome. Constantly "shielding a pair of suffering eyes under blue spectacles," Lemsome is considered by the respectable Utterson as both "a bad fellow" and "an incurable cad."<sup>10</sup> The substitution of Carew for Lemsome suggests that the two characters were connected in Stevenson's mind, just as for Nordau aesthetes like Oscar Wilde are grouped with troubling aristocrats like Lord Byron as disruptive of middle-class mores.

Mr. Hyde thus acts not just as a magnet for middle-class fears of various "Others" but also as an agent of vengeance. He is the scourge of (a bourgeois) God, punishing those who threaten patriarchal code and custom. Indeed, the noun used most often in the story to describe Hyde is not "monster" or "villain" but—"gentleman." This

novel portrays a world peopled almost exclusively by middle-class professional men, yet instead of attacking Hyde, these gentlemen more often close ranks around him.<sup>11</sup> Enfield's "Story of the Door," though it begins with Hyde trampling a little girl until she is left "screaming on the ground" (31), concludes with Enfield, the doctor, and the girl's father breakfasting with Hyde in his chambers (32). Recognizing him as one of their own, the men literally encircle Hyde to protect him from harm. "And all the time . . . we were keeping the women off him as best we could, for they were as wild as harpies. I never saw a circle of such hateful faces; and there was the man in the middle, . . . frightened too, I could see that" (32). The homosocial bonding that occurs in this scene is only intensified by its overt misogyny. Though both he and the doctor profess to feel a profound loathing for Hyde, Enfield refers to him with the politeness due a social equal, consistently calling him "my gentleman" or "my man." Indeed, Enfield derives vicarious pleasure from watching Hyde maul the girl.<sup>12</sup> Though he could easily have prevented their collision, Enfield allows them to run into one another "naturally enough" (31). Neglecting to intervene until Hyde has finished his assault, Enfield describes the incident with some relish, nonchalantly admitting to Utterson that the beating "sounds nothing to hear" (31). (Though he goes on to say that it "was hellish to see," that does not unring the bell.) That Hyde acts out the aggressions of timid bourgeois gentlemen is emphasized once again in the beating of Sir Danvers. That gesture of "insensate cruelty" is performed with a cane "of some rare and very tough and heavy wood" (47), which was originally in the possession of Gabriel Utterson. The stick breaks in two, and Stevenson takes care to let us know that both halves make their way back into the lawyer's hands after the murder (47, 49).

It is Edward Hyde's covert affinities with professional men that prompted Myers to describe him as a kind of bourgeois Napoleon. Myers recognized that Stevenson had created a figure whose rage is the rage of a threatened patriarchy. It is only a seeming paradox to say that Hyde is most like himself when he behaves like a gentleman. Yet to leave matters here would do an injustice to the complexity of Stevenson's vision, an injustice Myers himself is guilty of. While *Jekyll and Hyde* is a compelling expression of middle-class anger directed at various forms of the Other, the novel also turns that anger back on the burgesses themselves, Stevenson included.

It does this in part by taking as one of its themes the education of a gentleman, in this case Mr. Hyde. Most critical accounts of the novel



have with good reason focussed on the social and psychological pressures that lead Jekyll to become Hyde. Yet Stevenson is also concerned with the reverse transformation. That is, the novel details the pressures which move Hyde closer to Jekyll.<sup>13</sup> It is one thing to say that Hyde "acts out" the aggressive fantasies of repressed Victorian men, another altogether to say that he comes eventually to embody the very repressions Jekyll struggles to throw off. Yet this is in fact a prime source of horror in the tale: not that the professional man is transformed into an atavistic criminal, but that the atavist learns to pass as a gentleman. Hyde unquestionably develops over the course of the novel, which is to say he becomes more like the "respectable" Jekyll, which in turn is to say he "degenerates." Degeneration becomes a function not of lower-class depravity or aristocratic dissipation but of middle-class "virtue."

Needless to say, then, Mr. Hyde's education into gentlemanliness exacts a considerable cost. The Hyde who ends his life weeping and crying for mercy (69) is not the same man whose original "raging energies" and "love of life" Jekyll found "wonderful" (95–96). By the time he is confined to the doctor's laboratory, Hyde is no longer Jekyll's opposite but his mirror image. Where earlier the transitions between Jekyll and Hyde were clean and sharp (and painful), later the two personalities develop a mutual fluidity. By the end the doctor's body metamorphoses continually from Jekyll to Hyde and back again, as if to indicate that we need no longer distinguish between them.

How does one become a gentleman? If born into a good family, by imitating one's father. That Jekyll and Hyde stand in a father-son relationship is suggested by Jekyll himself (89) as well as by Utterson (37, 41–42), who suspects that Hyde is the doctor's illegitimate offspring. After "gentleman," the words used most often to describe Hyde are "little" and "young." As William Veeder notes, when Hyde appears at Lanyon's door ludicrously engulfed in Jekyll's oversized clothes we are likely to be reminded of a little boy dressing up as daddy.<sup>14</sup> The idea that Hyde is being groomed, as Utterson says, "to step into the said Henry Jekyll's shoes" (35) is reinforced by the doctor's will naming him sole heir, as well as by the lawyer's description of this "small gentleman" (46) as Jekyll's "protege" (37). Indeed, when Jekyll assures Utterson that "I do sincerely take a great, a very great interest in that young man" (44) he sounds like a mentor sheltering a promising disciple. "Bear with him," he urges the lawyer, "and get his rights for him. I think you would, if you knew all" (44).

If Hyde is to assume his mentor-father's position, he must be indoctrinated in the codes of his class. As Jekyll repeatedly insists, Hyde indulges no vices that Jekyll himself did not enjoy. What differs is the manner in which they enjoy them: Hyde openly and vulgarly, Jekyll discretely and with an eye to maintaining his good name. Gentlemen may sin so long as appearances are preserved. This is the lesson Hyde learns from his encounter with Enfield. Having collared Hyde after his trampling of the little girl, Enfield and the doctor are "sick . . . with the desire to kill him" (thus replicating Hyde's own homicidal rage), but "killing being out of the question" they do "the next best": they threaten to "make such a scandal . . . as should make his name stink" (31–32). They extort money as the price of their silence, in the process teaching Hyde the value of a good reputation. "No gentleman but wishes to avoid a scene," Hyde acknowledges. "Name your figure" (32). When Enfield winds up his narration of this incident by telling Utterson that "my man was a fellow that nobody could have to do with" (33) he seems to be describing not a violent criminal but a man who cannot be trusted to respect club rules. Enfield underscores this point when he says that, in contrast to Hyde, Jekyll "is the very pink of the proprieties" (33).

A commitment to protecting the good names of oneself and one's colleagues binds professional men together. Utterson, remarkably unconcerned with the fates of Hyde's victims, directs all his energies toward shielding Jekyll from "the cancer of some concealed disgrace" (41). Sir Danvers' death awakens fears that the doctor's "good name . . . [will] be sucked down in the eddy of the scandal" (53). After the murder Jekyll himself admits, "I was thinking of my own character, which this hateful business has rather exposed" (52). As Enfield's actions indicate, blackmail is an acceptable way to prevent such exposure. Utterson mistakenly believes that Hyde is blackmailing Jekyll, but rather than going to the police he hits on the happier and more gentlemanly idea of blackmailing Hyde in turn (42). By far the most potent weapon these men possess, however, is silence. Closing ranks, they protect their own by stifling the spread not of crime or sin but of indecorous talk. "Here is another lesson to say nothing" (34). "Let us make a bargain never to refer to this again" (34). "This is a private matter, and I beg of you to let it sleep" (44). "I wouldn't speak of this" (55). "I cannot tell you" (57). "You can do but one thing . . . and that is to respect my silence" (58). "I daren't say, sir" (63). "I would say nothing of this" (73).<sup>15</sup> In turn, the commitment to silence ultimately extends to self-censorship, a pledge not to know. Respectable

men like Utterson and Enfield invert the Biblical injunction to seek a truth that will set them free. For them, a careful ignorance works better. Utterson's motto—"I let my brother go to the devil in his own way" (29)—finds its counterpart in Enfield's unvarying rule of thumb: "The more it looks like Queer Street, the less I ask" (33). ("A very good rule, too," Utterson agrees.) Enfield explicitly equates knowledge with scandal when he says that asking a question is like rolling a stone down a hill: "presently some bland old bird . . . is knocked on the head . . . and the family have to change their name" (33). Knowledge's harm is suffered most acutely by Dr. Lanyon, whose Christian name of Hastie nicely indicates his fatal character flaw. Warned by Hyde that it is always wiser not to know, Lanyon nevertheless succumbs to that "greed of curiosity" (79) which leads directly deathward.

By means of Mr. Hyde, Jekyll seeks of course to slough off these same burdens of respectability, reticence, decorum, self-censorship—of gentlemanliness—and "spring headlong into the sea of liberty" (86). In tracing the arc of Hyde's brief career, however, Stevenson shows how quickly he becomes simply one of the boys. Over the last half of the novel Stevenson links Hyde, through a series of verbal echoes and structural rhymes, to various bourgeois "virtues" and practices. Not only do we discover Hyde beginning to exercise remarkable self-control—that most middle-class of virtues and seemingly the furthest from his nature—but we hear him speaking confidently in Jekyll's tones to Lanyon concerning the benefits of science and the sanctity of "the seal of *our* profession" (80; my emphasis).<sup>16</sup>

The kind of structural rhyming I refer to is most noticeable during Hyde's death-scene, when Utterson and Poole, having violently burst in the door of the rooms above Jekyll's laboratory, are startled by what they find.

The besiegers, appalled by their own riot and the stillness that had succeeded, stood back a little and peered in. There lay the cabinet before their eyes in the quiet lamplight, a good fire glowing and chattering on the hearth, the kettle singing its strain, a drawer or two open, papers neatly set forth on the business table, and nearer the fire, the things laid out for tea; the quietest room, you would have said, and except for the glazed presses full of chemicals, the most commonplace that night in London. (69–70)

We are apt to share their bewilderment at first, since this is the last

tableau we might expect Stevenson to offer us at this juncture in the story.<sup>17</sup> Yet it has been carefully prepared for. The novel is full of similar domestic tableaux, invariably occupied by solitary gentlemen. When they are not walking or dining, it seems, these men sit at their hearths, usually alone. It is Utterson's "custom of a Sunday . . . to sit close by the fire, a volume of some dry divinity on his reading-desk" (35). When the lawyer visits Lanyon, he finds the doctor sitting alone over his wine after dinner (36). Later he finds Jekyll in nearly the same position (51). Utterson shares a friendly fireside bottle of wine with Mr. Guest, though their conversation leaves him singularly unhappy (54–55). It is one of Stevenson's triumphs that he transforms the hearth—that too-familiar image of cozy Victorian domesticity—into a symbol of these men's isolation and repression. In turn, the most notable thing about the scene Utterson and Poole stumble upon is that it is empty of life. The lamplight soothes, the kettle sings, the chairs beckon—but no one is home. Recognizing this, we recognize too the subtle irony of calling it "the most commonplace" sight to be seen in London. The outward forms remain in place, but the indwelling spirit has fled.

We next discover that the lifeless Hyde's "contorted and still twitching" body lay "right in the midst" of this scene (70). On the one hand, it is a fit setting for Hyde's last agony and suicide. The terrors suffered by Hyde during his final days arise in part from his surroundings: the very symbols of bourgeois respectability that he exists to repudiate do him in. On the other hand, he seems to feel bizarrely at home in these surroundings. If for instance we ask who set the table for tea on this final night, the answer has to be Hyde and not Jekyll, since Utterson and Poole, prior to breaking in the door, agree that they have heard only Hyde's voice and Hyde's "patient" footsteps from within the room that evening (69). (Poole insists that his master "was made away with eight days ago" [65].) Beside the tea things is "a copy of a pious work for which Jekyll had . . . expressed a great esteem, annotated, in his own hand, with startling blasphemies" (71). Generations of readers have assumed that Hyde is responsible for those annotations, but that is not what the sentence says.<sup>18</sup> These are not fussy or pedantic quibbles, but rather indicate how carefully Stevenson has blurred the boundary between the two identities. It is Jekyll who is now blasphemous and who violently berates the man at Maw's (66), Hyde who sets a quiet tea table and cries to heaven for mercy.<sup>19</sup> On adjacent tables Utterson and Poole discover two cups, one containing the white salt used in Jekyll's po-

tion, the other containing the white sugar used in Hyde's tea (71). Both are magic elixirs: the first transforms a gentleman into a savage while the second performs the reverse operation. Having found his place by the hearth, Mr. Hyde also knows what posture to assume: "Thenceforward, he sat all day over the fire in the private room, gnawing his nails; there he dined, sitting alone with his fears" (94). If this sounds more like Utterson or Lanyon than the Hyde we first met, it is meant to. Bitter, lonely, frightened, nervous, chewing his nails (we recall that Utterson bites his finger when agitated [65]), and contemplating violence; Edward Hyde is now a gentleman.

### The Sedulous Ape

*The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is an angry book, its venom directed against what Stevenson contemptuously referred to as that "fatuous rabble of burgesses called the public."<sup>20</sup> The novel turns the discourses centering on degeneration, atavism, and criminality back on the professional classes that produced them, linking gentlemanliness and bourgeois virtue to various forms of depravity. At the same time the novel plumbs deep pools of patriarchal anxiety about its continued viability. Indeed, *Jekyll and Hyde* can be read as a meditation on the pathology of late-Victorian masculinity. Jekyll's case is "strange," Stevenson suggests, only in the sense that it is so common among men of the doctor's standing and beliefs.

Yet if *Jekyll and Hyde* is a consummate critique of the professional men who formed the bulk of its readership, the novel was also self-consciously written to please, which it did. In no respect is Stevenson more of his age than in the tortuous acts of self-definition and self-positioning that allowed him at once to dismiss and to court the "fatuous rabble."<sup>21</sup> Ironically, the publication of *Jekyll and Hyde* marked the emergence of Robert Louis Stevenson as a "professional" author in the narrow sense of being able, for the first time, to support himself solely by means of his trade. No longer a coterie writer relying on his father for financial help, Stevenson now enjoyed a popular acclaim that would last until his death. He professed to find such acclaim distressing, a mark of artistic failure and an indication that he had become, in his stepson's words, "the 'burgess' of his former jeers."<sup>22</sup> "I am now a salaried party," Stevenson wrote to William Archer after the success of *Jekyll and Hyde* led to a lucrative commission from an American magazine. "I am a *bourgeois* now; I am to write a weekly paper for *Scribners'*, at a scale of payment which

makes my teeth ache for shame and diffidence. . . . I am like to be . . . publicly hanged at the social revolution."<sup>23</sup> "There must be something wrong in me," he confided to Edmund Gosse, "or I would not be popular."<sup>24</sup>

Stevenson's critique of professional discourses in *Jekyll and Hyde* turns out also to be a displaced critique of his own profession. As literary historians like N. N. Feltes have shown, the 1880s and '90s, like the 1830s and '40s, constitute a key moment in the professionalization of authorship over the course of the nineteenth century.<sup>25</sup> The founding of The Society of Authors in 1883 was only the most visible among many signs of this process. Stevenson ambivalently resisted the idea that imaginative writing constituted a professional discourse. His resistance was based on two factors. First, he saw professionalism as inseparable from the middle classes, that fatuous rabble he preferred to jest at rather than join. Second, he associated professional writing with a functionalist "realism" which he in theory opposed.

In Stevenson's view, to be professional was to be bourgeois, and to be bourgeois was to embrace the very blindnesses, evasions, and immoralities delineated in *Jekyll and Hyde*. Indeed, the salient biographical fact to recall here is that the novel was composed during Stevenson's three-year "imprisonment" at Skerryvore, the Bournemouth house purchased by Thomas Stevenson for his son and daughter-in-law.<sup>26</sup> This was a period of personal crisis and transition for the writer. Prior to it were years of self-styled bohemianism, fashionable dabblings in socialism, and occasionally self-indulgent nose-thumbings at "the fathers," his own included. Until he took possession of Skerryvore, Stevenson had never had a permanent address. In his letters he repeatedly refers to his occupancy of the house as a capitulation to bourgeois convention, a "revolt into respectability."<sup>27</sup> To Gosse he complained: "I am now a beastly householder," and when Archer came to visit he found his friend ensconced in the heart of "British Philistinism."<sup>28</sup> Stevenson's always-fragile health was never worse than during these years, nor were his always-difficult relations with Thomas ever pricklier. When Thomas died in mid-1887 Stevenson immediately fled house and country, not returning to England during the seven remaining years of his life.

The biographical context throws some light on the motivations underlying *Jekyll and Hyde*. Writing it was in part an expression of self-loathing for what Stevenson perceived as his betrayal of former ideals.<sup>29</sup> Yet, as his letters and essays indicate, Stevenson was also in-

tensely engaged at this time with the question of what it meant to be a professional author. For him, the operative definition of professionalism came from Walter Besant, whose lecture "The Art of Fiction," delivered in April 1884 to the Royal Institution, prompted lengthy replies first from Henry James and then from Stevenson. Besant, having recently helped organize The Society of Authors, was explicitly interested in redefining fiction-writing as a profession analogous to the law, medicine, certain sciences, and other of the arts. If the "fine arts" like painting or sculpture enjoy a status denied to writers, he contends in the lecture, that is because they are organized into culturally-sanctioned professional institutions. Besant correctly perceived that the painter who was permitted to append "R.A." to his name was accorded a respect no novelist could win.<sup>30</sup>

Throughout the essay, however, Besant's implicit model for the fiction-writer is not the painter or sculptor but the professional scientist.<sup>31</sup> Wedded to the twin gods of positivism and empiricism, the Besantian novelist recognizes that fiction is "of this world, wholly of this world" and therefore seeks to reproduce the surfaces of life exactly as he finds them. Like the scientist too, the novelist reports his findings in a "transparent" prose, one that refuses to call attention to itself as writing. For Besant such transparency is the mark of professional writing in all disciplines. It at once vouches for the truth of the information conveyed while also ensuring that the professional's "products" will find the widest possible market. In the view of his detractors, however, Besant had succeeded primarily in degrading fiction-writing from a sacrament into a trade. He urges novelists to look after their self-interest by considering their products first as marketable commodities and only secondarily as "art." For many writers Besant's position was scandalous, akin to the mercenary views confessed by Anthony Trollope in his recently published autobiography (1882). James eloquently objected to Besant's rules for successful novel-writing, rules which Besant offered as analogs to the procedural protocols that governed professional activity in other disciplines but which James considered as forming a risible do-it-yourself manual.<sup>32</sup>

In their replies James and Stevenson self-consciously distance themselves from Besant's professional author. They reject his implicit claim that the novel's function is to reproduce middle-class ideology by means of a facile mimesis. Both men were uncomfortable with the idea that the interests of the professional author ought to be at one with what Stevenson refers to elsewhere as "that well-known charac-

ter, the general reader."<sup>33</sup> Of the two men, Stevenson took the more radical position by embracing a non-functional "style" as a kind of anti-mimesis. He argues that literature has nothing to do with reproducing reality but "pursues instead an independent and creative aim." Fiction, "like arithmetic and geometry" (two sciences, significantly, whose practitioners were not considered professionals in the nineteenth century), looks away from "the gross, coloured, and mobile nature at our feet, and regard[s] instead a certain figmentary abstraction." The novel in particular lives "by its immeasurable difference from life."<sup>34</sup> That difference is achieved only through a painstaking attention to craft, or what Stevenson termed the "technical elements of style." According to him, this craft so long to learn, unlike Besant's easily-mastered rules, is precisely what separates true writers from the general public, making the former unpopular with all but the blessed few who cultivate "the gift of reading."<sup>35</sup> Affirming that "the subject makes but a trifling part of any piece of literature" and that "the motive and end of any art whatever is to make a pattern" and not to reproduce "life," Stevenson situates himself in opposition to dominant notions of realism, and thus also in opposition to the model of professional authorship proposed by Besant.<sup>36</sup>

It can be argued that, in rejecting Besant, Stevenson simply embraces a different model of professionalism, one that would become increasingly familiar in the modernist period. Certainly, in his hauteur regarding the reading public, as well as in his commitment to the values of craft, of style, of culture and taste, Stevenson participates in that reshaping of authorial self-presentation that Jonathan Freedman has identified most notably in James, Pater, and Wilde. As Freedman suggests, rejecting the middle-class marketplace could be a highly marketable strategy, just as distancing oneself from both the Besantian professional and the "general reader" could be a way of asserting one's own more authentic professionalism.<sup>37</sup>

Yet while James, Pater, and Wilde—all consummate modernist professionals by Freedman's standards—have been assimilated into the modernist canon, Stevenson has not. There are doubtless many reasons for this exclusion, but one has to do with Stevenson's conspicuously split allegiances, his dual commitment to aestheticism and "style" on the one hand and to what George Saintsbury called "the pure romance of adventure" on the other.<sup>38</sup> A feuilletonist who wrote pirate stories, Stevenson combined a Paterian attention to the intricacies of style and form with blood-and-thunder celebrations of male adventure. While aestheticism in turn became a key component of



much Modernist writing, adventure did not. Stevenson's champions in the twentieth century have almost always been those who, like Proust and Nabokov, recognize in him a fellow dandy. Critical considerations of his adventure stories have, by contrast, tended to thrust him firmly back into the nineteenth century. Late-Victorian adventure stories were themselves rejections of both realism and professionalism. Unlike aestheticism, however, adventure rejected them in the name of a reimagined male bourgeois identity. It was thus a form of critique—occluded, self-interested, contradictory—arising from within the patriarchy itself. Stevenson's simultaneous embrace of aestheticism and adventure thus possesses a certain coherence, yet it was also the source of significant incoherences. Like Oscar Wilde, Stevenson cultivated a "style" both aesthetic and personal that carried within it an implicit critique of conventional middle-class mores. Yet like Andrew Lang, Rider Haggard, Arthur Conan Doyle, and other votaries of the "male romance," Stevenson used the conventions of "adventure" (and again, those conventions could be said to structure both his work and, especially after the move to Vailima, his life) in an attempt to reshape his male middle-class readership and ultimately to affirm his ties to them.

That Stevenson felt this split in his allegiances with special acuteness while writing *Jekyll and Hyde* is suggested by his account of the story's genesis offered in "A Chapter on Dreams" (1892). In this essay Stevenson writes that *Jekyll and Hyde*, like many of his tales, originated in a dream which he simply transcribed and elaborated. Indeed "I am sometimes tempted to suppose . . . [that] the whole of my published fiction . . . [is] the single-handed product of some Brownie, some Familiar, some unseen collaborator, whom I keep locked in a back garret" of the mind "while I get all the praise."<sup>39</sup> Stevenson's conscious self—"what I call I, my conscience ego, the denizen of the pineal gland"—is left merely to bring some order to the Brownies' ideas and then to "dress the whole in the best words and sentences that I can find and make" (16:187). For post-Freudian readers this account of creativity's sources in the unconscious will sound familiar. Like Freud, Stevenson is deeply indebted to Romantic paradigms of the artist: "A Chapter on Dreams" in effect reimagines Shelley's Cave of Prometheus in proto-psychoanalytic language. Like Freud, too, Stevenson distinguishes between dream and waking world in terms of a series of productive contrasts: energy and order, licentiousness and morality ("my Brownies have not a rudiment of what we call a conscience" [16:188]), spontaneity and craft, and so on. It

seems especially appropriate that Edward Hyde should spring from a dream, since like the Brownies he is so easily identified with the raging energies of the id.

Yet Stevenson's unconscious is distinctly un-Freudian in one respect, for it has developed what can only be called a business sense. Over the years, Stevenson writes, he has come to dream only *marketable* stories, for the denizen of the pineal gland has no use for any other. Where once the Brownies told tales that, though powerful, were "almost formless" (16:178), now "they have plainly learned . . . to build the scheme of a considerate story and to arrange emotion in progressive order" (16:186–87). They now "dream in sequence" and "tell . . . a story piece by piece, like a serial" (16:187). This new-found restraint arises not from any intrinsic love of aesthetic form but because the Brownies "have an eye to the bankbook" and "share in [Stevenson's] financial worries" (16:186). "When the bank begins to send letters and the butcher to linger at the back gate . . . at once the little people begin to stir themselves" (16:183).<sup>40</sup>

Despite its comic tone, the essay's point is a radical one: in what Stevenson called "the days of professional literature"<sup>41</sup> even the ostensibly unbridled play of the unconscious has come to be determined by the exigencies of the pocketbook. Stevenson has become a "professional" author whether he would or no. In "A Chapter on Dreams" the creative unconscious is not, as it sometimes was for the Romantics or for Freud, a place "elsewhere," freed from the disabling pressures of history. Instead it is decisively shaped by those pressures. To survive, an author must not only write to order but also dream to order. So well trained have the Brownies become, the essay ironically concludes, that they have begun to fantasize potentially marketable stories in styles entirely unlike Stevenson's own. "Who would have supposed that a Brownie of mine should invent a tale for Mr. Howells?" (16:189). In learning to write like William Dean Howells, that champion of sturdy realist prose, the Brownies demonstrate that they know better than Stevenson himself what goes down best with the reading public. Increasingly severed from any individual ego, the Brownies place themselves in willing bondage to the demands of the marketplace. Stevenson, thought by the world to be the "author" of his tales, is only an amanuensis—"I hold the pen . . . and I do the sitting at the table . . . and when all is done, I make up the manuscript and pay for the registration" (16:187–88)—transcribing tales he can claim no credit for, since they come not from some deep authentic self but from the culture itself. If Stevenson succeeds in

giving his middle-class readers what they want, the essay concludes, that is because they have manufactured his stories for him.<sup>42</sup> "A Chapter on Dreams" is in essence an elegy for Romantic paradigms of creativity. The Romantic visionary genius has become the Besantian purveyor of goods, a kind of literary shopkeeper.

"A Chapter on Dreams" also gives further weight to my earlier claim that *Jekyll and Hyde* traces the gradual taming of Edward Hyde into a parody of bourgeois respectability. Like Hyde, the Brownies find that lawlessness and licentiousness simply do not pay, and that they must adjust accordingly. As in the novel, Stevenson concludes that there is no place elsewhere, no human activity not already saturated with ideology. The creative unconscious is shown to be wholly acculturated: not in opposition to bourgeois morality but unavoidably pledging fealty to it.<sup>43</sup> In a striking and bitter letter to Gosse, Stevenson called this servicing of the public a form of prostitution. "We are whores," he wrote, "some of us pretty whores, some of us not: whores of the mind, selling to the public the amusements of our fireside as the whore sells the pleasures of her bed."<sup>44</sup> His further point is that under modern conditions "whoredom is the writer's only option. In another letter he returned to this same metaphor: "like prostitutes" professional authors "live by a pleasure. We should be paid if we give the pleasure we pretend to give; but why should we be honoured?"<sup>45</sup>

What begins to emerge is a cluster of veiled equivalences, with threads linking Stevenson, his creative Brownies, Edward Hyde, and the prostitute-writer within a larger web comprising middle-class ideology, commerce, and the ethics of professionalism. *Jekyll and Hyde*, I would argue, is in part a symbolic working through of these linkages. We recall for instance that bourgeois commerce is implicitly associated with whoring in Stevenson's description of the "thriving" commercial street which Jekyll's house backs on to, its "florid charms," "freshly painted shutters," and "well polished brasses" giving luster to goods displayed "in coquetry; so that the shop fronts stood along that thoroughfare with an air of invitation" (30). The doctor's house fronts on to "a square of ancient, handsome houses, now for the most part decayed from their high estate" and given over to vaguely disreputable trades, "shady lawyers, and the agents of obscure enterprises": the once-fine homes are "let in flats and chambers to all sorts and conditions of men" (40). Readers who hear in this last passage a covert reference to Besant's popular 1882 novel, *All Sorts and Conditions of Men*, might speculate that Stevenson is indirectly in-

cluding professional authorship among the shady and obscure trades of modern life. Even without the specific connection to Besant, we note that Jekyll's house is surrounded front and back by the trappings of bourgeois life, a life described in terms of the seedy, the disreputable, the garish, the decayed. These linkages—commerce and prostitution, prostitution and authorship, authorship and professionalism, professionalism and bourgeois ideology, and so on—suggest that we might usefully approach *Jekyll and Hyde* as an indirect attempt by Stevenson to size up his situation as a professional writer at the close of the nineteenth century.

The novel in fact turns out to be obsessively concerned with writing of various kinds: wills, letters, chemical formulae, bank drafts, "full statements," and the like. Like "A Chapter on Dreams," *Jekyll and Hyde* worries over the question of authenticity. Just as in the essay Stevenson feared that his writing originates not in some genuine self but in a market-driven unconscious, so in the novel he continually links writing with forgery and other kinds of "inauthentic" production. Enfield first discovers Hyde's identity when he reads his name written on a cheque that Enfield "had every reason to believe . . . was a forgery." That in fact "the cheque was genuine" only convinces Enfield that the deception runs deeper than he had imagined (32). Hyde was known even earlier to Utterson through Jekyll's will, which the lawyer considers an affront to "the sane and customary sides of life" (35) and whose irregularities he "never approved of" (43). Even before he makes his first appearance in the present of the novel, then, Hyde is associated with writing that is at once "professional"—bank drafts and legal testaments—and yet also somehow irregular and thus troubling. In both instances, moreover, Hyde stands to benefit financially, just as in "A Chapter on Dreams" Stevenson says his own "irregular" writings proved to be the most lucrative.

Jekyll too is implicated in the production of questionable writing. Utterson, after hearing Mr. Guest's analysis of Jekyll's letters, is driven to conclude that the doctor has begun to "forge for a murderer" (55). We also recall that Jekyll's downfall results from the "impurity" of his original chemical formulae, and that it is precisely out of that impurity that Hyde originally springs (96).<sup>46</sup> We cannot finally separate Jekyll's writing from Hyde's, however, since a central conceit of the story is that they write identical hands. "Of my original character," the doctor notes, "one part remained to me: I could write my own hand" (93). Hyde can sign Jekyll's cheques and Jekyll can write Hyde's letters because their "characters" (in both senses of that

word) are the same. Ever vigilant, F. W. H. Myers objected to this conceit, saying that it showed a “want of familiarity on Stevenson’s part “with recent psycho-physical discussions” concerning the individuality of handwriting.<sup>47</sup> Once again fingering a pressure point in the novel, Myers argued that no two hands could be identical, since each individual’s unique and authentic character is reproduced via the characters on the page. In a parallel vein, both Rider Haggard and E. T. Cook took exception to Jekyll’s will, claiming that the law would never recognize such a document because it could not be securely attributed to Jekyll himself.<sup>48</sup>

*Jekyll and Hyde* of course takes as its explicit theme the possibility that the self is not unique and inviolable. Yet Myers, Haggard, and Cook seem relatively untroubled by the novel’s “revelation” that two distinct subjectivities inhabit the same “self.” All three men instead attest to the anxiety that arises from the suspicion that writing itself might be entangled in this same indeterminacy. As their appeals to science and the law further suggest, vast realms of social discourse operate on the assumption that writing and selfhood are interchangeable. Yet it is precisely this faith that both “A Chapter on Dreams” and *Jekyll and Hyde* undermine. In this context it is worth noting that Stevenson himself has often been criticized for not being sufficiently “present” in his own writings. In 1926, at the nadir of Stevenson’s reputation, Leonard Woolf dismissed him as having “no style of his own.” His writing is “false,” Woolf contended; at best he was a mimic, “a good imitator.”<sup>49</sup> The “no style” argument is common in Stevenson criticism, and interestingly finds its complement in the equally common claim that Stevenson is merely a stylist. During his lifetime both William Archer and George Moore criticized Stevenson for being all style and no substance.<sup>50</sup> What links these seemingly contradictory assessments is their shared suspicion that there may be no “self” visible in Stevenson’s writing, no discernable subjectivity expressed there. Rather than style being the man, it seems that in Stevenson’s case style—whether his own or borrowed—replaces the man. Stevenson occasionally critiqued himself along these same lines, claiming that as a writer he was merely “a sedulous ape” who did no more than mimic the styles of the writers who came before him.<sup>51</sup> This self-characterization links Stevenson back to Edward Hyde, himself a “sedulous ape” who learns to his great cost how to mimic his “betters.”

Given this context, we can readily agree with Ronald Thomas’s claim that *Jekyll and Hyde* enacts the modernist “disappearance of the

author." Thomas notes, for instance, how often in the story writing is tied to vanishing.<sup>52</sup> "When this shall fall into your hands," Jekyll predicts in his last letter to Utterson, "I shall have disappeared" (72). Earlier, the lawyer's apprehensions concerning Jekyll's will centered on the provision that it come into effect upon the doctor's "disappearance or unexplained absence" (35). Hastie Lanyon likewise pens his narrative (also "not to be opened until the death or disappearance of Dr. Henry Jekyll" [58]) knowing that it will not be read until after his decease. It is thus only fitting that the novel concludes by foregrounding this link between the act of writing and the death of selfhood: "as I lay down my pen," reads the book's final sentence, "I bring the life of that unhappy Henry Jekyll to an end" (97).

That last sentence points the problem with particular sharpness, since it leaves unclear to whom "I" refers. Though the document is labelled "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of the Case," within the statement the first person shifts referents with notorious frequency. The final paragraphs alone, for instance, contain sentences in which "I" means Jekyll, sentences in which "I" means Hyde, and sentences in which both Jekyll and Hyde are referred to in the third person, leaving an authorial "I" unattached to any self. The oft-cited confession of ontological anxiety—"He, I say—I cannot say, I" (84)—is in one sense misleading, since the "Full Statement" says "I" all the time. We merely do not always know who "I" is. Like the conscious self posited in "A Chapter on Dreams," the "I" of the "Full Statement" holds the pen and sits at the desk yet cannot unequivocally claim to be author of the document.

This dissociation of writing from selfhood is especially conspicuous in what is after all meant to be an autobiographical narrative. When Jekyll begins his confession in properly Victorian fashion ("I was born in the year 18—to a large fortune, endowed besides with excellent parts, inclined by nature to industry," and so on [81]), we might expect him to at last write himself into the kind of coherence ostensibly promised by the autobiographical form.<sup>53</sup> What he finds instead is a self increasingly fragmented and estranged from "his" own writing. "Think of it—I did not even exist!" (86).

*Jekyll and Hyde* covertly enacts, then, a crisis in realist writing alongside its more overt thematizing of a crisis in bourgeois subjectivity. That these crises find expression in a story "about" criminal degeneracy should not surprise us, since traditional humanist notions of both realism and identity were deeply embedded in the normative categories deployed by degenerationists. *Jekyll and Hyde* self-con-

sciously dismantles those categories, though it does not offer any to replace them, since Stevenson too felt himself estranged both from his "professional" self and from his writing. In this context it is easy to see his subsequent flight to Samoa as a finally futile attempt to reclaim the possibility of pure Romantic expression. The irony, of course, is that exile made him more popular than ever with the middle-class reading public in Britain.

*The University of Virginia*

### Notes

1. See Paul Maixner, ed., *Robert Louis Stevenson: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), 200–201.

2. Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886; reprint, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979), 35. Further references to this novel are given parenthetically in the text.

3. *Criminal Man According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso*, briefly summarized by his daughter Gina Lombroso Ferrero, with an introduction by Cesare Lombroso (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911), xiv. The quotations in the next paragraph can be found on xiv–xv.

4. John Addington Symonds, for instance, read the story as a parable of atavistic man. See his March 1886 letter to Stevenson, reprinted in *Critical Heritage*, 210–11. Recent critics who have studied the tale's indebtedness to theories of criminality, atavism, and devolution include Ed Block, Jr., "James Sully, Evolutionist Psychology, and Late Victorian Gothic Fiction," *Victorian Studies* 25 (Summer 1982): 443–67; Donald Lawler, "Reframing Jekyll and Hyde: Robert Louis Stevenson and the Strange Case of Gothic Science Fiction," in William Veeder and Gordon Hirsch, eds., *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde After One Hundred Years* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 247–61; Daniel Pick, *Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder, c. 1848–1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 65–67; Martin Tropp, "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, Schopenhauer, and the Power of the Will," *The Midwest Quarterly* 32 (Winter 1991): 141–55; and Marie-Christine Lepps, *Apprehending the Criminal: The Production of Deviance in Nineteenth-Century Discourse* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1992), 205–20. Elaine Showalter persuasively argues that we should read the novel's class interests in terms of "the late-nineteenth-century upper-middle-class eroticization of working-class men as the ideal homosexual objects." Hyde's proletarian status makes him a figure both of fear and desire for Stevenson's professional gentlemen (*Sexual Anarchy: Gender and Culture at the Fin-de-Siecle* [Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990], 111).

5. See Gertrude Himmelfarb, *The Idea of Poverty: England in the Early Industrial Age* (London: Faber and Faber, 1984), esp. 312–400, and Gareth Stedman-Jones, *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship Between Classes in Victorian Society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), esp. 127–51, 281–313.

6. Max Nordau, *Degeneration* (New York: D. Appleton, 1895), 7.

7. See Stevenson's letter of 1 March 1886 to F. W. H. Myers in *The Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson*, 4 vols., ed. Sidney Colvin (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), 3:326: "About the picture, I rather meant that Hyde had bought it himself; and Utterson's hypothesis of the gift an error."

8. Referring to the proliferation of interpretations of Hyde within the novel, Veeder and Hirsch argue that "*Jekyll and Hyde* engages ineptly in self-analysis in order to call into question the very possibility of such analysis and to complicate comparable analytic moves by the reader" ("Introduction" to Veeder and Hirsch, xii). By arguing for such awareness, they usefully reverse a longstanding tradition of seeing Stevenson as the most innocent of writers, one whose value was separate from his intentions. The most powerful articulation of this latter position is still G. K. Chesterton's in his *Robert Louis Stevenson* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1928): "I am by no means certain that the thing which he preached was the same as the thing which he taught. Or, to put it another way, the thing which he could teach was not quite so large as the thing which we could learn. . . . [Stevenson] had the splendid and ringing sincerity to testify . . . to a truth which he did not understand" (22–23). In other words, as the professional reader whose learning is needed to make sense of an unself-conscious text, Chesterton plays Jekyll to Stevenson's Hyde.

9. Myers wrote four letters to Stevenson on the subject of *Jekyll and Hyde* (21 February, 28 February, and 17 March 1886, and 17 April 1887), which are reprinted in *Critical Heritage*, 213–22.

10. See "Collated Fractions of the Manuscript Drafts of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*," in Veeder and Hirsch, 24. For a general discussion of Stevenson's alterations from manuscript to printer's copy to first edition, see William Veeder, "The Texts in Question," in Veeder and Hirsch, 3–13.

11. My reading makes few distinctions among Enfield, Utterson, Lanyon, and Jekyll, whom I take as types of the bourgeois professional rather than as individuals, and thus largely interchangeable. For readings that do make such distinctions, see Block, 448; Mark M. Hennelly, Jr., "Stevenson's 'Silent Symbols' of the 'Fatal Cross Roads' in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*," *Gothic* 1 (1979): 10–16; Irving Saposnik, *Robert Louis Stevenson* (New York: Twayne, 1974), 10; and Stephen Heath, "Psychopathia Sexualis: Stevenson's *Strange Case*," *Critical Quarterly* 28 (1986): 104. Block, Hennelly, and Saposnik single out Utterson as the novel's only "healthy" character, while Heath nominates both Utterson and Enfield for that honor. Closer to the position I take is that of Masao Miyoshi, *The Divided Self: A Perspective on the Literature of the Victorians* (New York: New York University Press, 1969), who also stresses the interchangeability of the primary male characters, noting that the "important men of the book . . . are all unmarried, intellectually barren, emotionally joyless, stifling" (297).

12. In "Children of the Night: Stevenson and Patriarchy," William Veeder argues for Enfield's vicarious participation in this scene and notes that "exculpation of Hyde has marked Enfield's narrative from the start" (Veeder and Hirsch, 117–18).

13. I owe this idea to a suggestion made by William McKelvy in an unpublished essay (1993) on *Jekyll and Hyde*.



14. "Children of the Night," 126.

15. As Lepps points out regarding the opening conversation between Enfield and Utterson, "the novel begins with the silent recognition of an unsayable relation between an unnameable high personage and an indescribable creature" (210).

16. In recounting how Hyde negotiated for Lanyon's help to retrieve the chemical, Jekyll emphasizes how Hyde on this occasion "rose to the importance of the moment" and mastered himself "with a great effort of the will" (93–94). Regarding Hyde's subsequent conversation with Lanyon, both Veeder and Peter K. Garrett have noted that Hyde now speaks in the professional tones of Jekyll ("Children of the Night," 131, and Peter K. Garrett, "Cries and Voices: Reading Jekyll and Hyde," in Veeder and Hirsch, 66).

17. Among previous critics of the novel, only Veeder has discussed this scene, coming to conclusions quite different from mine. He reads the tableau as a projection of Utterson's unconscious, a "kind of parlor primal scene," with "Jekyll/Hyde as father/mother in cozy domesticity" ("Children of the Night," 136). Veeder's reading is richly suggestive, though it neglects what I take to be an important facet of Stevenson's description, namely that the tableau is an empty one: no one is there to enjoy the cozy domesticity.

18. Later of course Jekyll accuses Hyde of "scrawling in my own hand blasphemies on the pages of my books" (96), though even this leaves room for doubt as to ultimate responsibility. Jekyll, had he wished to be conclusive, could have said "scrawled in *his* own hand," since the two men share the same handwriting.

19. For readings that place Hyde's weeping in the context of late-Victorian discourses on femininity, see William Patrick Day, *In the Circles of Fire and Desire: A Study of Gothic Fantasy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), esp. 91–92; and Janice Doane and Devon Hodges, "Demonic Disturbances of Sexual Identity: The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr/s Hyde," *Novel* 23 (Fall 1989): 63–74.

20. Letter to Edmund Gosse dated 2 January 1886. See *Letters*, 2:313.

21. For a reading of *Jekyll and Hyde* as "an unconscious 'allegory' about the commercialization of literature and the emergence of a mass consumer society in the late-Victorian period," see Patrick Brantlinger and Richard Boyle, "The Education of Edward Hyde: Stevenson's 'Gothic Gnome' and the Mass Readership of Late-Victorian England," in Veeder and Hirsch, 265–82.

22. Lloyd Osbourne, *An Intimate Portrait of R. L. S.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), 59.

23. Letter to Archer dated October 1887 (*Letters*, 3:19).

24. Letter to Gosse dated 2 January 1886 (*Letters*, 2:313).

25. See N. N. Feltes, *Literary Capital and the Late Victorian Novel* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993).

26. Thomas Stevenson bought the house as a wedding present for Fanny Stevenson. She and Louis lived there between January 1885 and August 1887. Thomas died in May 1887, and Louis almost immediately insisted on moving, though Fanny by all accounts was happy at Skerryvore. Ian Bell writes that "in Samoa, Stevenson never spoke of the place. It was as though he had expunged the memory of imprisonment, despite having written some of his most famous works while living—like a 'weevil in a biscuit'—at the

house" (*Robert Louis Stevenson: Dreams of Exile* [Edinburgh: Mainstream, 1992], 179).

27. Quoted in Frank McLynn, *Robert Louis Stevenson: A Biography* (London: Hutchinson, 1993), 240.

28. Letter to Gosse dated 12 March 1885 (*Letters*, 2:271). Archer is quoted in J. A. Hammerton, ed., *Stevensoniana: an Anecdotal Life and Appreciation of Robert Louis Stevenson* (Edinburgh: John Grant, 1907), 75. Jenni Calder quotes an unpublished letter of Fanny's: "The tramp days are over, and this poor boy is now, for the rest of his life, to be dressed like a gentleman" (*Robert Louis Stevenson: A Life Study* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1980], 152).

29. Stevenson was clearly uneasy at this time about his loss of faith in socialism. Joking to Gosse that "the social revolution will probably cast me back upon my dung heap" at Skerryvore, Stevenson said his political change of heart was sure to bring upon him the wrath of H. M. Hyndman, the socialist politician. "There is a person Hyndman whose eye is upon me; his step is beHynd me as I go" (Letter dated 12 March 1885; *Letters*, 2:271.) Readers who feel Edward Hyde lurking in that "beHynd" might also recall the emphasis given in the tale to Hyde's sinister footsteps and disconcerting gaze. Equating Hyde with Hyndman (and thus with socialism) gives additional weight to readings that focus on the class issues raised in the novel. For an opposing view, see Christopher Harvie's persuasive argument for Stevenson's lifelong, thoroughgoing Toryism in "The Politics of Stevenson," in *Stevenson and Victorian Scotland*, ed. Jenni Calder (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1981), 107–25.

30. See Walter Besant, *The Art of Fiction* (Boston: Cupples, Upham, 1884), 4–6.

31. Useful discussions of the Besant-James-Stevenson debate can be found in Feltes, 65–102; John Goode, "The Art of Fiction: Walter Besant and Henry James," in *Tradition and Tolerance in Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, ed. D. Howard, J. Lucas, and J. Goode (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966); and Mark Spilka, "Henry James and Walter Besant: 'The Art of Fiction' Controversy," *Novel* 6 (Winter 1973): 101–19.

32. See Henry James, "The Art of Fiction," in *Essays on Literature; American Writers; English Writers*, ed. Leon Edel and Mark Wilson (New York: Library of America, 1984), esp. 49–53.

33. "On Some Technical Elements of Style in Literature" (1885), in *The Works of Robert Louis Stevenson*, 25 vols., ed. Sidney Colvin (London: Chatto and Windus, 1911), 16:242.

34. "A Humble Remonstrance" (1885), *Works*, 9:152–53.

35. "Books Which Have Influenced Me" (1887), *Works*, 16:274.

36. The first quotation is from "The Morality of the Profession of Letters" (1881), *Works*, 16:266, the second from "On Some Technical Elements of Style in Literature," *Works*, 16:243.

37. Jonathan Freedman, *Professions of Taste: Henry James, British Aestheticism, and Commodity Culture* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).

38. George Saintsbury, "The Present State of the English Novel" (1888), in *The Collected Essays and Papers of George Saintsbury 1874–1920*, 4 vols. (London: Dent, 1923), 3:126. On Stevenson and adventure, see Edwin M. Eigner, *Robert Louis Stevenson and Romantic Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University

Press, 1966). On Stevenson as an aesthete and consummate stylist, see Vladimir Nabokov, *Lectures on Literature*, ed. Fredson Bowers (New York: HBJ, 1980), 179–205.

39. *Works*, 16:187. Further page references to this essay are given parenthetically in the text.

40. Stevenson wrote to Myers that *Jekyll and Hyde* was written to ward off “Byles the Butcher.” Letter to Myers dated 1 March 1886 (*Letters*, 2:325).

41. Letter to T Watts-Dunton dated September 1886 (*Letters*, 2:348).

42. Stevenson’s version of the novel’s genesis agrees in outline with the stories told by Fanny Stevenson and Lloyd Osbourne while significantly altering the emotional and moral valences of their accounts. According to both Fanny and Lloyd, Fanny found Louis’s first, dream-inspired draft of the novel unsuitable. Louis, she said, “had treated it simply as a story, whereas it was in reality an allegory.” After a heated argument, Louis burned the manuscript and started over to produce a version more in keeping with Fanny’s “moral” vision of the story. Both Fanny and Lloyd report that Louis agreed that his second, Fanny-inspired draft of the tale was more marketable. In “A Chapter on Dreams” the two stages are collapsed together: the Brownies both produce the original tale and simultaneously revise it into a marketable story. The censor, rather than being outside the author (in this case in the person of Fanny), is instead thoroughly internalized. For Lloyd’s account of *Jekyll and Hyde*’s writing, see *Intimate Portrait*, 62–67; for Fanny’s, see Nellie van de Griff Sanchez, *The Life of Mrs. Robert Louis Stevenson* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1920), 118–19.

43. It can of course be argued with some justice that “A Chapter on Dreams” simply rationalizes Stevenson’s failure to be the subversive he sometimes claimed he was. As Veeder points out, the successive drafts of *Jekyll and Hyde* show him toning down and in some cases deleting potentially objectionable material (“The Texts in Question,” in Veeder and Hirsch, 11–12).

44. Unpublished letter quoted in Calder, 291. We might in turn connect the letter’s invocation of the “amusements of the fireside” to *Jekyll and Hyde*’s portrayal of the hearth as the site of bourgeois isolation and solipsism.

45. Letter to Gosse dated 2 January 1886 (*Letters*, 2:313).

46. Ronald Thomas convincingly argues that Hyde is “the product of Jekyll’s pen” (“The Strange Voices in the Strange Case: Dr. Jekyll, Mr. Hyde, and the Voices of Modern Fiction,” in Veeder and Hirsch, 78).

47. *Critical Heritage*, 215.

48. The objections of Haggard and Cook are reprinted in *Critical Heritage*, 202–203.

49. Leonard Woolf, “The Fall of Stevenson,” in *Essays on Literature, History, Politics, Etc.* (London: Hogarth, 1927), 41.

50. See William Archer, “Robert Louis Stevenson: His Style and Thought” (1885), reprinted in *Critical Heritage*, 160–69; and George Moore, *Confessions of a Young Man* (1886; reprint, Swan Sonnenschein, 1892), 284–87.

51. “A College Magazine,” *Works*, 9:37.

52. Thomas, 79.

53. Most recent studies of the novel have stressed what can be called the heteroglossia of the “Full Statement,” its deployment of a multitude of con-

flicting voices and perspectives. A notable exception to this critical trend is Garrett, who argues for the formal and ideological conservatism of Jekyll's narrative while acknowledging the "factors that resist" the novel's drive toward monovocality (Garrett, 59–61).