MONSTERS

Fictional Representations of Cultural Anxieties

Monsters
Fictional Representations of Cultural Anxieties

Thesis
Aalborg University
May, 2011

Written by:

_____

Brian Holm Sørensen

Supervisor:
Robert Rix

Keystrokes: 183,571
Pages: 76.5

Table of Contents

I
Introduction

Monsters have always been a part of our world. They are the ghosts of humanity, and wherever we leave a trail, monsters are able to follow us. This is how it has always been, and how it will probably always be. Even so, we do not seem to understand these terrifying and fascinating creatures. We believe to know what a monster is, and what a monster is not, and we know that they are threatening. But the actual reason for their existence, their cultural function, seems beyond our grasp, and it is this element of the monster that will be of immense interest in this study.

In short, the monster represents, or becomes, the embodiment of certain anxieties existing within a society, and the ousting of the monster will help us exclude these anxieties. It is realising such functions that ensures a proper understanding of the value of the monster. And this is exactly what this study is attempting to reach: a proper understanding of the monster. Not so much the term "monster", for this has, as shall come to be seen, been thoroughly examined, but more the function of the monster. For it is exactly when realising the function of the monster that we will find the proper understanding of the creature and its cultural importance. In fact, even though we might think that we know what a monster is, the monster is at times so similar to human beings that it can be difficult to discover the real difference. If we cannot discover the monster due to its appearance, it must be due to its function within a given context, and as a consequence, this study will investigate the function of the monster. It is evident that I must also investigate what a monster is, since this must be an initial point of departure in understanding the creature. Said in other words, the aim of this study is not to discover what a monster is, but to discover why it is what it is. Hence, why the monster is here, why it is evoked so often and why we are so interested in the monster. In order to reach a sufficient answer, I wish to examine the following question:

> **How does the literary monster function as an _uncanny_ double of society and of the fears and anxieties embedded within this society, and how does it function, due to its status as a double, as a sacrificial victim?**

In this thesis, one will find certain terms of interest: "uncanny", "double" and

"sacrificial victim". Being uncanny will be one of my entrance points in the examination of the monster. As we will see in this study, "uncanniness", as made known by Freud, is, in my view, linked to the monster being recognisable as an anxiety that we have repressed. This is linked to the notion of the double, for the monster becomes a projection (and thereby a double) of this repressed anxiety. This will be elaborated further in chapter one, but for now I shall merely say that the monster becomes a defence-mechanism insofar as it is exactly a projection of our deepest anxieties. Another term of interest, concerning victimisation in a social perspective, is that of the sacrificial victim. This is a term applied by, among others, René Girard, who defines the sacrificial victim as a creature that comes to represent the very concept of evil and impurity, and by eliminating the offending object, we can regain purity, peace and social order.

I will, as a point of departure, and as the most useful theorists for this study, use Freud and Girard. Freud is extremely interesting in relation to a psychoanalytical study in the context of this thesis, since he emerged at practically the same time as the literary texts used in this study was written, i.e. at the fin-de-siècle. Secondly, he applies the psychoanalytical tools of interest here, namely the terms "projection", "repression" and "uncanny", and explains them in an excellent manner. Girard is of interest since he has written about the sacrificial victim in his influential study *Violence and the Sacred* (1986), which will be a core text in this study. In *Violence and the Sacred*, Girard comments that "[...] the rites of sacrifice serve to polarize the community's aggressive impulses and redirect them towards victims that may be actual or figurative [...]" (1986; 18). As such, he is saying that the sacrificial victim is not necessarily a real creature but might just as well be a figurative or imagined object, like the fictional monstrous creations of the fin-de-siècle. Hence, his studies concern both fictional and non-fictional creatures in the shape of a sacrificial victim.

Girard comments that he does not wish to psychoanalyse on the sacrificial victim, but as shall come to be seen, it is highly interesting to use the two theorists together. Additionally, whilst examining monsters and theories of monsters, a psychoanalytical reading is essential, and in this context it must be noted, as does Andrew Smith when discussing the use of the term "uncanny", that the psychological realm "[…] should not be separated form social issues." (2007; 90). What he means by this is that even though uncanniness might be seen as a psychological phenomenon, it must still be seen in connection with the social context that gives rise to such anxieties. Hence, we cannot choose to look at one without the other. We must accept that a

psychological phenomenon is based on a social anxiety and vice versa, one might add. So, in that context it is necessary to explore monsters from both angles, since it will always work with and within them both.

Given mankind's timeless fascination of monsters, numerous books and articles have been devoted to exploring this field. Some have looked at the monster from medieval times, some have looked at the history of monstrosity and yet others have looked at the monster in horror films, and so on. The common denominator in all investigations within the field is the creation of a definition. Some definitions can be seen as a mirror of already established definitions, others try to bring something new to the field. Some stand out as more or less singular and others echo already established definitions. It is evident that I, too, shall look into the field of monstrosity and try to arrive at a definition. More precisely, I shall make a survey of the definitions within this vast field in order to arrive at a deeper understanding of monstrosity, and from the immense corpus of texts I shall create a definition of the term "monster" that should help me answer my thesis-question. This definition will highlight the function of the monster, as discussed above.

When defining the monster, I will take the investigation one step further than merely defining it: I shall also create a taxonomy of monstrosity. This will be done in order to find easily recognisable common denominators, which should enable me to examine the monster as being precisely a double of our society and of our inner fears. Hence, in the taxonomy as well, the psychoanalytical aspect will play an important role in my perception of the monster. Furthermore, using a taxonomy should ensure a thorough reading of those aspects of monsters that I find as being the most important. And this is essential to stress: even though the taxonomy will show some general tendencies regarding monsters, it is still highly subjective – it simply cannot avoid being so. It is subjective because it must emphasise some important aspects of monsters within this study. Had I chosen another point of departure, some other overall theories, I might have highlighted other aspects of monsters.

In my examination of the monster as a double of our society, I will use Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) (henceforth abbreviated *JH*). This text is of interest for several reasons: 1) It was written during a time in which the human mind was becoming of interest as a science and as a literary topic. 2) It was written at a time in which the British Empire experienced massive national and international challenges. 3) It was written by an author who seemed to have

an immense interest in the Gothic novel and the human psyche. These three points are all reasons why I should chose this particular text; yet, one will find a further element of interest: alongside *Dracula* (1897) and *Frankenstein* (1818), *JH* contains one of the most famous monsters of all time. Even today, we know the metaphor that Jekyll/Hyde represents. Hence, the double character Jekyll/Hyde has been of interest to readers and literary critics for the last 125 years. Thus, *JH* is of interest here simply because the monster, Mr. Hyde, is very fruitful to examine in connection with my taxonomy and my thesis-question.

This study will be constructed as follows:

1) **An investigation of monsters from a theoretical point of view.** Since I wish to investigate the thesis-question, and show that monsters are literary doubles of our society, I must initiate my examination by investigating the critical consensus within the field. Hence, the ground work will be to examine various points of view within this vast field. I wish to direct my investigation to novels published at the fin-de-siècle, and my discussion will, consequently, be limited by this.

2) **Creating a taxonomy of monstrosity.** A taxonomy is valuable because it highlights the common denominators of monsters that I shall find during the investigation of the point above. This will also ensure a uniform reading of the tales of interest and a foundation on which to anchor my findings. Points 1 and 2 will make up *Chapter 1*.

3) **Engage in a reading of *JH*.** I shall aim at finding an answer to the thesis-question and validate the taxonomy. In this context, it is obvious that I must also examine notable readings of the tale in order to discuss it within its critical context. Yet, the taxonomy will be one of the cornerstones in the reading. This will be *Chapter 2*.

4) **Readings of other notable monster tales of the fin-de-siècle.** In order to thoroughly answer the thesis-question and prove the validity the taxonomy, I find it of importance to read other notable texts from the fin-de-siècle that can be seen as tales concerning monstrous entities. Here, I shall read Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891), Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897) and Henry James' "The Turn of the Screw" (1898). This will be the content of *Chapter 3*.

These four points constitute the overall layout of this study – framed, of course, by this introduction and a conclusion. Having now introduced my main field of interest and the objective of this study, I will move on to examine monsters from a theoretical point of view.

Chapter 1:

The Monster

This chapter shall deal with monsters and how they are represented in fiction. But more than that, monsters shall be viewed as sacrificial victims and as entities created by our minds as projections of our inner fears and anxieties. It must, therefore, be clarified that the investigations into the field of monstrosity will, to a large extent, be based on two theorists: René Girard and Sigmund Freud. The importance of these should become obvious as I move into my investigation of the field. It must be noted that I also intend to use other theorists, but Girard and Freud will be the overall theoretical points of departure. However, it is important to start the investigation from another point of interest, namely by narrowing the field of research. For it is evident that I cannot make an investigation of the entire field of monsters in literature as this is an extremely vast area to cover. I shall limit my investigation to the late-Victorian, or fin-de-siècle, Gothic, which, in this study, will be framed by the publication of Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* in 1886 and the publication of Henry James' "The Turn of the Screw" in 1898. The reason for such a limitation will be explained in the following.

1.1. Narrowing the Field of Research

There are many reasons to be interested in monsters, and one of the most fascinating and, in this study, most important reasons is that monsters are to be seen as expressions of our cultural or personal fears. But in having this as a starting point, and in finding monsters interesting from a psychological and cultural point of view, I find the Gothic monster of the fin-de-siècle to be of severe interest.

It would definitely be interesting to investigate how the monster has developed from its origins until the present day, for both the "original" monster and the modern monster are fascinating entities. However, there are some very clear reasons why I find the monsters of the fin-de-siècle immensely interesting. One reason is that these creatures exhibit clear and discernable traits linked to the historical period into which they were written. In relation to this, Andrew Smith notes about *JH* that it is "[...] ostensibly about doubled selves, but it never loses sight of the social conflict that Jekyll

and Hyde represents." (2007; 101). This is a tendency that can be observed in several late C19 monster tales, and it is exactly this tendency that has triggered my interest in this period and its monsters: the tales of what Girard has termed monstrosities (1986; 64) might on the surface concern doubled selves and heroes courageously defending the Motherland or the cradle of civilisation, but it is also about something deeper, namely the human psyche and the social conflicts that monsters represent. Donna Heiland argues that "[...] what is threatening changes from one society to another, and from one historical moment to another." (2004; 100), and as such the monster must also change in the course of time, according to the era into which it was written. It must, in other words, correspond to its context. The monster is never just a monster meant to keep us from entering the dark forest; it is a creature that is, at its very core, a distorted mirror image of ourselves, showcasing our weaknesses in a body that we can defeat and thereby eliminate the threat that our internal (i.e. personal and mental) and external (i.e. public and cultural) problems constitute.

The 1880's and the 1890's saw psychology developing into a scientific discipline as, for instance, Freud began his research around this time. This scientific and cultural interest in the human psyche must have had an influence on literature as well. As shall come to be seen in chapter two, others besides Freud made investigations into the human mind, and *JH* was presumably inspired by one such investigation. So, there are some tendencies that cannot be ignored and since, as commented in the introduction, Andrew Smith argues that one should not separate the psychological elements of a reading from the cultural readings of any given text, I find it to be a natural consequence to initiate my investigation from a time in history in which the perspective, both in fiction and in science, was turned towards the human psyche and social concerns at the same time.

1.2. Defining the Monster

I want to divide this section into two sub-sections: 1) an investigation of the general definitions of the monster; 2) an investigation of the more specific categorisations of the monster. This should result in a thorough understanding of the monster as a cultural entity, and it will be valuable to have examined both the general tendencies and the specific categorisations before turning to the creation of a taxonomy.

1.2.1. General Tendencies

There are many differentiated definitions of monsters, so in order for me to give a definition that can lead into a reasonable taxonomy that should help me answer my thesis-question, I want to look further into a few of these. Following Noël Carroll, it is important to note as an initial comment that in the works of horror, which forms the basis of his examinations, "[...] the humans regard the monster they meet as abnormal, as disturbances of the natural order." (1990; 16). Or, said in other words, the monster is an outsider in the society into which it has been positioned. Following this point of view, we can learn much by including René Girard and his notion of the sacrificial victim, which he defines as being a replacement for another creature that has committed a deed that excited fury. The original creature can, for various reasons, not be punished, and therefore society must find someone or something to punish (1986; 2). Or, as Tom Douglas points out, "[...] some individuals were so important and necessary that it was deemed quite legitimate and indeed desirable that others should be punished in their stead for any wrongdoing." (1995; 33). Hence, the actual sinner cannot be punished, therefore a replacement is needed onto whom the guilt can be positioned and this replacement can thus be punished, since it is seen as a sinful or impure creature. In the context of the monster, this punishment is often a death-sentence, but this need not always be he case. In fact, as a result of scapegoating, we can frequently observe that scapegoats "[...] are pushed to the periphery of a group or a community but not driven completely away because their function as a focus of blame may need to be repeated." (Douglas, 1995; 29). Much the same can be seen with the monster, which is excluded but constantly brought back (or re-read) because our focus of blame must be repeated. The sacrificial victim is thus "[...] chosen only because it is vulnerable and close at hand." (Girard, 1986; 2).

Taking the discussion into the context of Carroll's notion above, Girard comments that the sacrificial victim "[...] must bear a sharp resemblance to the *human* categories excluded from the ranks of the 'sacrificeable', while still maintaining a degree of difference that forbids all possible confusion."[1] (1986; 12). How and why the monster is to be seen as a sacrificial victim (or a scapegoat) will become obvious in the following sections. For now, however, I merely wish to state that the monster is seen both as abnormal, as Carroll says, but also as a being that must be somewhat familiar to that which it is meant to represent. This can be further highlighted by Douglas, who

---

[1]   Unless otherwise noted, all italics are in the original text.

states that "[...] the search for someone or something to blame usually finds what it seeks in available people who may be already disliked but who are inevitably seen as different." (1995; 39). I will take Douglas' argument a bit further and comment that we can find the scapegoat in animate and inanimate beings and things that we may or may not already dislike but which we inevitably see as different. That the scapegoat must be both similar and dissimilar might seem somewhat paradoxical, but the importance and accuracy of this shall become known in the course of this study.

As we shall see later in this chapter, the monster is positioned opposite a hero who wants to destroy it. Or, using the terms of Freud's psychoanalysis, the hero can be observed as a creature trying to repress a monstrous uprising. The action of repression can be defined as follows: "[...] *the function of rejecting and keeping something out of consciousness.*" (Freud, 1971a; 86). Hence, the hero is trying to keep the monster from entering the public conscious mind by repressing it – which in the case of the hero/monster symbiosis more often than not means killing it. Being *positioned* opposite a hero must, in this respect, also infer that the monster will *be* the opposite of the hero or the monster hunter, who can be defined as follows:

> The original monster hunter is a brave man with noble intentions who is admired and respected for his choice to face the dangerous monster. […] the monster hunter's chosen job is to restore some semblance of order to the lives of those around him. (Duda, 2008; 13)

Following this argument, and following my argument above, the monster should be identifiable as being *a create (not human) with evil intentions and a creature that is hated and feared by those around it because the basic occupation of the monster is to produce chaos in its environment.* This fits reasonably well into the definitions to come, even though this definition neglects certain elements that I shall comment upon shortly.

Observing the monster as something directly opposite its hunter seems quite fair, although one must look at the nuances. Briefly disregarding the time-frame, one can use Blade (from the movie *Blade* (1998)) as an example. Here the monster (vampire) becomes the hero and one will notice that the monster hunter is equal to, or the same species as, the monster he is hunting. This is not at all a unique case, for the hunter is often "[...] an outsider of some type" (Duda, 2008; 13), and therefore the hero has an understanding of the monster that will help him defeat it. Thus, even though the hunter and the monster are opposites, they also share the fact that they are outsiders (one an

admired outsider, the other a loathed outsider).

However, even though the monster and the hero are in some instances alike, one must always remember that they are positioned as categorical opposites for a reason. Despite the fact that they are interdependent, one can find a very reasonable explanation to the hero's status by once more observing the monster as a sacrificial victim:

> All our sacrificial victims, whether chosen from one of the human categories […] [or] from the animal realm, are invariably distinguishable from the nonsacrificeable beings by one essential characteristic: between these victims and the community a crucial social link is missing, so they can be exposed to violence without fear of reprisal. Their death does not automatically entail an act of vengeance. (1986; 13)

Therefore, the explanation can be found in the following way: the hero has been accepted by the community as being a saviour; the monster, on the other hand, has not. Or, said in other words, the hero has been accepted as part of the ingroup and the monster has been rejected, being a part of the outgroup, two terms that I shall explain later. Hence, the hero can kill the monster without fearing public vengeance, but the monster cannot kill the hero without living with such a fear. Reading this aspect into the monster/hunter symbiosis, one will find it to be rather accurate in connection with, for instance, *Dracula* (Dracula/Van Helsing) and *JH* (Hyde/Utterson). I shall pursue this aspect further in my analysis of the monstrosity in *JH* in chapter two.

Even though one can observe some reasonable and interesting aspects of the monster by defining it as being opposite the hero, one must also define it from different positions. One rather good definition is offered by David D. Gilmore, who comments the following in a definition that is partially based on what a monster is not:

> […] by *monster* I will confine usage to supernatural, mythical, or magical products of the imagination. I will not include heinous criminals or mass murderers like Hitler of Stalin […] nor will I include physical abnormalities, freaks and birth defects, or other real anomalies or deformities […] Additionally, for purposes of cultural comparison, I will exclude witches and sorcerers, because, like our serial murderers, they are only human beings who have gone bad rather than fantasies. For the same reason I exclude revenants like ghosts and zombies, which are, once again, only dead (or half-dead) people come back to haunt. (2003; 6)

This definition is interesting because it emphasises that the monster is a creature of the imagination. Hence, defining monsters as being "supernatural, mythical, or magical products of the imagination"[2] seems like a reasonable point of departure, and

---

[2]   When presented like this, i.e. with no marker of origin or page, the quote has been used previously.

emphasising the imaginary aspect also accentuates that the monster is exactly a projection of our anxieties. This basically infers, using Freud, that insofar as the monster is a projection, it can be used to "[...] transfer outwards, all that becomes trouble […] from within." (1971a; 148). For now I shall not comment any further on the monster as a projection, but I shall return to this aspect later. Moving on, noting that human beings cannot be monsters is also interesting, and I agree with Gilmore here as well. Using the term "monster" for every person who commits some deed of perceived evil would be to distort the term altogether. Only by defining and limiting the use can the term be aptly applied to monsters in fiction. Hence, the above definition is useful given two very important insights: the focus on the imaginary and the exclusion of human beings from the realm of monsters.

However, I find some of Gilmore's limitations worth discussing. First and foremost, witches and sorcerers can be monsters, even when engaging in a cultural comparison. Since I observe monsters as being uncanny (I shall elaborate on this term shortly), and since magic is included in the realm of uncanniness (Freud, 1971a; 396), I do not agree with Gilmore. Furthermore, again jumping out of the time-frame, Voldemort from *Harry Potter* (1997-2007) is very likely to be seen as a monster. Naturally, he is positioned in a world in which magic is part of the everyday furniture, as Noël Carroll terms it (1990; 16), but even so, there are numerous aspects to speak in favour of his inclusion in the monster category: he is brought back to life by the blood of his ultimate enemy (Harry Potter), he can only be killed by the hero (cf the discussion above), and, finally, he lives for huge parts of the story in the intersection between dead and alive. Additionally, Voldemort is very likely to be a sacrificial victim, inhabiting all that is apparently evil and merciless and which can therefore be extinguished without fear of reprisal – not even his followers seem to seek vengeance. Hence, even though magicians in fiction can be hard to position as either or, I believe a categorical exclusion to be problematic. One might argue that Gilmore is referring to actual witches, those who were executed for being so. However, insofar as he has stated that monsters are products of the imagination, one might very well argue that the witches he refers to must be fictional witches, those that cannot be found and executed in real life. For I agree that real witches cannot be monsters, since the monster can only be found in the imagination.

Secondly, the exclusion of ghosts and zombies because they are "only dead (or half-dead) people come back to hunt" seems problematic as well. Following this

reasoning, one might also want to rule out vampires such as Dracula and the ghosts of Miss Jessel and Peter Quint in *The Turn of the Screw*. If these entities cannot be positioned as monstrous, some difficulty would certainly arise when trying to position them within the fictional world altogether. In this respect I wish to follow Carroll, who lists mummies, vampires, ghosts and zombies as monsters in the fusion category (1990; 43). I shall return to this later. In conclusion: even though the definition offered by Gilmore offers certain useful insights that can, and will, be used throughout this study, it does seem to have its limitations and its problems, and some of Gilmore's observations will not be used or commented further.

Moving on, one can observe a definition proposed by Robert and Karin Olsen. Their focus is primarily on the medieval monster, and thus rather far from the focus in this study. Even so, their view of monsters might still bring some valuable insights into the field, as they state the following:

> Monsters are, in effect, the tangible representations of this past of persistent otherness, and they are, therefore imaginary, strange or marvellous creatures in combinations that seem almost limitless. (Olsen & Houwen (ed.), 2001; 6).

Once more we will find our attention drawn towards the imaginary aspect of the monster, and this quote is closely linked to a statement put forth by Gilmore saying: "Monsters embody all that is dangerous and horrible in human imagination." (2003; 1). This exactly directs our attention towards the monster's function as a double of our minds and the monster's function as a projection.

Now, what seems especially interesting in the above definition is the word "otherness", which the definition by Gilmore did not present to us. The word "otherness" precisely implies that human beings cannot be monsters. It could also be argued that the word "otherness" is directly linked to the term "uncanny", as put forth by Freud, and which can be defined as follows: "the 'uncanny' is that class of terrifying which leads back to something long known to us, once very familiar." (1971a; 369-70). What I mean by this is that if the monster is in fact a double of our society and of our inner fears then it would as a consequence be known to us to some degree – at the very least it was "once very familiar". So, no matter how "other" the monster might seem to be, thus no matter how unknown it must seem, it will always be based on something known or recognisable. The term "otherness", to return to this discussion, therefore

emphasises that the monster is different from human beings. When combining this term with the term "uncanny", we realise that the monster is a projection of the "other" side our society, as we shall see with *JH* in chapter two. Hence, the otherness of the monster also embodies the uncanniness of the monster. This is linked to the second aspect of interest in the definition above, an aspect that lets us understand how the monster can always be "other": the believe that monsters are to be found "in combinations that seem almost limitless." As shall come to be known later, being a combination or a hybrid is another core element of being a monster. This is the very reason why I shall pay particular attention to this in a section to come, for every monster is seen as a combination of two, and possibly more, entities and therefore the monster must necessarily always be other.

Noël Carroll offers yet another explanation that will become valuable in our understanding of monsters. Carroll states that "[...] in examples of horror, it would appear that the monster is an extraordinary character in our ordinary world [...]" (1990; 16). Hence, interestingly, the monster is a monster because it is an outsider, which is accurate not only regarding works of horror but also regarding fin-de-siècle Gothic. Carroll furthermore sees the reactions of both the fictional characters and the spectators as a core element of monstrosity, which leads him to state the following: "[...] the monster is regarded as threatening *and* impure." (1990; 28). It is thus important that the monster plays with both the feeling of fear and of disgust. That they are dangerous can, as Carroll states "[...] be satisfied simply by making the monster lethal." (1990; 43).

I agree with Carroll regarding the remark that the monster must be dangerous, but I would like to return to his notion of impurity and investigate this a bit further. For I do not believe that a monster must necessarily be impure in order to be a monster – at least not in the sense that Carroll seems to refer to it, namely as evoking the feeling of disgust. In fact, some monsters are seen as beautiful and seductive as, to some extent, Dracula and the ghosts Jessel/Quint. They would thus not qualify as monsters if impurity in the meaning "disgusting" was a key element. In this context one can include Dani Cavallaro, who states that the monster is a "[...] creature whose intellect and moral aberrations are mirrored by its physical deformities or, in some cases, concealed beneath a seductive and charismatic façade [...]" (2002; 171). Following her, the monster might be deformed and ugly and therefore also (following Carroll) impure, but it might also be seductive and charismatic and thus not necessarily impure. The monster might, I agree, be surrounded by impure elements but the monster is not necessarily impure itself. This

is what Carroll terms "horrific metonymy":

> Often the horror of horrific creatures is not something that can be perceived by the naked eye or that comes through a description of the look of the monster. Frequently, in such cases, the horrific being is *surrounded* by objects that we antecedently take to be objects of disgust and/or phobia (1990; 51)

To be surrounded by certain impure objects is central in what I would term "outsider creation" (which I will apply to Mr. Hyde later). Hence, even though I do not believe it to be essential for the monster to be impure or disgusting, it is evident that it is frequently surrounded by impure or disgusting elements. So, impurity is *part of* the monster alongside the fact that the monster must be threatening.

      To conclude on the discussion of impurity, and in order to bridge Carroll's view of the monster with my own view, I can use Girard who states that the cause of (ritual) impurity is violence (1986; 28). Hence, Girard comments that *violence* is seen as impure or as the cause of impurity, which would in the end confirm Carroll's statement that the monster must be both threatening *and* impure. However, Girard emphasises that impurity comes about when violence is used – and it is, in the end, primarily the blood-shed of the violence that brings forth the impurity. Moving away from my time-frame once more, Girard notes, in the context of the ancient Greeks, that "[...] when a man hanged himself, his body becomes impure. So does the rope from which he dangles, the tree to which the rope is attached, and the field where the tree stands." (1986; 29). Hence, one might state that the impurity is linked to death and thus not to violence. Yet, in the context of Girard's investigations I would rather note that it is the knowledge of the self-inflicted violence that ensures the impurity of the body and its surroundings, not the presence of death itself. Furthermore, Girard frequently refers to the term impurity as meaning polluting or contaminating (1986; 95). In this context, the sacrificial victim must be excluded in order for it not to infect the community. This threatening pollution is seen as impure, but the victim is not necessarily disgusting. Therefore, I will follow Girard regarding impurity and state that impurity comes about through violence and through the threat of contamination and not through the monster's appearance.

      As can be seen from this section, a simple definition of the monster is not necessarily as easily gained as one might suspect. For the purpose of this study, I find it proper to sum up the discussion made hitherto before turning my scope towards some more specific definitions. I intend to do so by offering a definition that will employ the

most significant and, for my purpose, most interesting aspects of the discussion above: *A monster is a creature of the imagination which has been created so as to be a projection of a specific social, cultural or psychological threat. This threat is eliminated through the symbolic destruction of this monster.*

1.2.2. Specific Definitions of the Monster

Having now offered a general definition of monsters, and having looked into the general tendencies regarding the view of monsters in fiction, I want to go into some more specific definitions of particular types of monsters. The specific definitions of monsters are interesting to observe since various types of monsters must infer different connotations, and various types of monsters will represent cultural anxieties differently. For instance, the shape-shifter will be of interest in chapter two, since it is the nature of the shape-shifter to be a projection, and it is therefore interesting to examine how it works as such on different levels.

As a first step in this examination, I want to return to Olsen and Olsen and their particular monster distinctions. In short, they state that there are four types of monsters: human monsters (monsters that are close to being human), demonic monsters (superhuman), animal monsters (like a werewolf) and inanimate monsters (like the zombie) (2001; 6). It is very important, I believe, to note that Olsen/Olsen term the close-to-human monster as a "human monster", which constitutes a problem. One would benefit from using the term *humanoid*, indicating certain human features and similarities but still also including a, I would argue, necessary separation from actual human beings. This might very well be the meaning that Olsen and Olsen wanted to generate, but the word "human" could cause some confusion, which could easily be avoided.

Thus, the distinctions proposed by Olsen and Olsen are interesting because they show some very fascinating characteristics of the monster. Basically, they investigate what I would term the *hierarchical function* of the monster, which would in the end work to discover how monsters work in our minds given the threat that they impose. The humanoid monster (Mr. Hyde for instance) and the demonic monster (as Dracula) can be said to be more terrifying to us as social and personal metaphors because they are equal to or stronger than us – both physically and mentally. However, in that they are exactly like us in so many ways, and since they can therefore be seen as distorted mirror images of the human species, they work very well as sacrificial victims, as defined by

Girard. The animal monster (the wolf-side of the werewolf) and the inanimate monster (the zombie) are often not as threatening, metaphorically, as the humanoid and demonic monsters. This simply because they possess only limited mental processes (2001, 6) meaning that we find ourselves superior to them. Hence, we can see that the different types of monsters must infer different types of anxieties to be projected, and we might state that in being a projection of human-created anxieties (like human degeneration or homosexuality to name a few) the humanoid and the demonic monster work better, whereas the fear of, for instance, the unknown could be better portrayed in the animal or the inanimate monster.

Even though this hierarchical function of the monster is a valid and very interesting way to approach the monster, I do not believe it to be completely sufficient. Therefore I want to turn my scope towards Noël Carroll, who offers three distinctions: fusion, fission and magnification (a subcategory of this being the massification). On fusion Carroll explains that "[...] this often entails the construction of creatures that transgress categorical distinctions such as inside/outside, living/dead, insect/human, flesh/machine, and so on." (1990; 43). Hence, the monster in the fusion category is a creature that is stuck between being something and being something else. In other words, the creature is not a monster in the fusion category if it is only one thing, i.e. human *or* animal, dead *or* alive, flesh *or* machine. However, as soon as the creature breaks down the boundaries between these very distinct categories and thus defies conclusive categorisation, it becomes dangerous and monstrous. Thus, following Girard's discussion of the similarity between the sacrificial victim and the thing it is meant to represent, the fusion monster is both separable from and equal to all the categories of which it is a fusion.

Carroll continues with his explanation of the fission, which he divides into two sub-categories:

> Temporal fission – which the split between Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde exemplifies – *divides the characters in time* – while spatial fission – for instance, the case of doppelgangers – *multiplies characters in space*. (1990; 47)

So, the temporal fission, which will be of the greatest interest in chapter two, is for instance Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, a creature that can be either Dr. Jekyll *or* Mr. Hyde but never both at the same time. Spatial fission could be exemplified by twins, entities of which Girard notes the following: "In some primitive societies twins inspire a

particular terror." (1986; 56). This can be linked to the notion of the "uncanny", in which Freud includes the double, which he defines as characters "[...] who are to be considered identical by reason of looking alike." (1971a; 386). And in much the same way, Girard comments upon the uncanniness (he, however, never uses this term himself) of the twin: "Two individuals suddenly appear, where only one had been expected" (1986; 56). Hence, even though Girard does not vote in favour of applying psychoanalysis, he handles terms that correspond very well with Freud's terms. Nonetheless, in that Girard deals with the sacrificial victim, he also adds the following to the notion of twins:

> In the case of twins, symmetry and identity are represented in extraordinarily explicit terms; nondifference is present in concrete, literal form, but this form is itself so exceptional as to constitute a new difference. Thus the *representation* of nondifference ultimately becomes the very exemplar of difference, a classic monstrosity that plays a vital role in sacred ritual. (1986; 64)

What Girard is basically saying here is that the complete similarity between twins can be used in connection with the sacrificial rite, since we have seen earlier that there must be some resemblance between the thing we wish to repress and the victim we use to represent this thing. This can definitely be found in twins, who are so much alike that they become uncanny, constituting what Girard terms "a new difference" that separates them from the rest of the community in which they exist. They, thus, become outsiders.

The last of Carroll's terms of interest here is magnification which he defines as increasing the size of "[...] beings already typically adjudged impure or disgusting within the culture." (1990; 49). Moving temporarily away from the time-frame and into a contemporary context, we can observe an example of magnification in the spiders from the movie *Eight Legged Freaks* (2002), in which huge spiders attack in hordes. The use of this film proves that magnification is commonly seen in connection with massification, of which Carroll states that "[...] it is not the case that any kind of entity can be grouped into horrific hordes. It must be the sort of thing that we already prone to find repellent [...]" (1990; 50), as for instance spiders. One might, mistakenly, find that massification and spatial fission are equal, but this is not the case. The difference between the two is that with massification the entities must be both horrific and disgusting whereas the spatial monster need not be disgusting but must only be multiplied – as the evil twin for instance.

I will suggest that Carroll's way of separating the monster is based on a *spectatoral function* meaning the following: Carroll emphasises the effects of the monster on the spectator. He comments the following:

> Horrific monsters are threatening. […] They must be dangerous. This can be satisfied simply by making the monster lethal. […] The monster may also be threatening psychologically, morally, or socially. (1990; 43)

Hence, as can be seen, Carroll works with the effects of the monster on its audience: it must cause fear or else it is not a monster. Therefore, the monster's appearance to the audience is what makes it monstrous.

Combining Carroll and Olsen/Olsen in a reading of monsters is very interesting, I believe, since they grasp something of the monster that is noteworthy, but they simultaneously seem to neglect something as well. This "something" can be emphasised and investigated by combining them. In doing so, one might use a quote by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen who states the following:

> [Monsters] are disturbing hybrids whose externally incoherent bodies resist attempts to include them in any systematic structuration. And so the monster is dangerous, a form suspended between forms that threatens to smash distinctions. (1996; 6)

This quote is one that I believe Carroll and Olsen/Olsen would agree on, simply because is captures the very essence of their respective theories and definitions by stating that the monster goes beyond our regular categorisations.

Having now discovered the specifics of monstrous entities, I believe to have shed light on some very interesting aspects of monstrosities. The specifics draw attention towards the fact that there are several different types of monsters and in an analysis, such as the analysis of Mr. Hyde in chapter two, it is very significant to observe what type of monster one is dealing with and from this discuss its relevance. For there can hardly be any doubt that the specifics of the monster is as important to observe as is the fact that it is a monster. Having thus discussed some specific categories of monsters, I find it fitting to move into my taxonomy, which can also, in some respects, be seen as a summary of the discussion up until this point.

1.3. Creating a Taxonomy of Monstrosity

I have created five taxonomical steps which will, with certain monsters, seem inexhaustible, but the point of these taxonomical steps must be seen as creating and locating the common denominators present in all monsters. This is definitely an overwhelming task in many ways, and as such this taxonomy shall be my attempt to create a taxonomy of common denominators. In the end, the taxonomy will help answer the thesis-question and therefore it is immensely important in connection with my investigations in the following chapters.

1) The Monster is a Creature of the Imagination

Heinz Mode comments, quite reasonably, that it is "[...] characteristic of the 'monster' that is does not occur in nature, but belongs to the realm of the human imagination […]" (Mode in Gilmore, 2003; 8). Hence, one of the key elements of a creature being a monster is that it cannot be found in nature, but must be found only in the imagination. Additionally, what is essentially threatening about the monster is that it is an embodiment of our unconscious anxieties. Everything that we fear and have tried to repress is represented in the monster, which then functions as a scapegoat that can be re-repressed.

Moving towards Girard and Freud once more, we can note that the destruction of the threat that the sacrificial victim or the monster projects must be a defence mechanism constructed by the imagination. This can be explained as follows (although here Girard uses the term *surrogate victim*):

> In destroying the surrogate victim, men believe that they are ridding themselves of some present ill. And indeed they *are*, for they are effectively doing away with those forms of violence that beguile the imagination and provoke emulation. (1986; 82)

In this context it should be noted that the threat of the sacrificial victim must be imaginary, for surely no singular entity can rid a society of all its problems, but Girard says that there is a reason behind believing in such a relief: "any community that has fallen prey to violence or has been stricken by some overwhelming catastrophe hurls itself blindly into the search for a scapegoat." (1986; 79). Hence, even though it might seem irrational to do so there is definitely some rationale behind such an act, and it must thus be viewed as a defence mechanism – a safety valve used to rid our mind of the

anxieties that can be eliminated with the destruction of the monster.

So, one must always remember that the monster is a creature of the imagination, but insofar as it is a scapegoat, one must also remember that it is the embodiment of some very real anxieties. This imaginary creature encompasses these anxieties, which we can only exclude by the elimination of the monster.

2) The Monster is an Outsider

In order to understand the monster as an outsider, we must turn our focus towards Girard's notion of the sacrificial crisis, which is basically "[...] a crisis of distinctions – that is, a crisis affecting the cultural order." (1986; 49). Hence, if there is no distinction between the pure and the impure or the inside and the outside, the people hitherto defined as belonging to the inside will turn on each other. Girard uses the example of the Kaingang Indians in the aftermath of their relocation to a reservation:

> As soon as they are installed on a reservation, members of a group tend to turn against one another. They can no longer polarize their aggressions against outside enemies, the 'others,' the 'different men' (1986; 53)

It is when dealing with such a crisis, i.e. aggressions wanting out, that the members of the tribe need a sacrificial victim, an outsider onto whom they can project all of their aggressions. In this case it becomes valuable once more to turn towards how Freud defines projection: "to transfer outwards, all that becomes trouble […] from within." This shows how the scapegoat or the sacrificial victim works: all the anger that lives within a person or a community must find a way to escape. As such, the community projects these anxieties onto someone or something else, i.e. a scapegoat. It becomes evident through this that a community not only needs a sacrificial victim (in this study a monster) but the community also needs this victim to be an outsider or a possible outsider. If the victim is an insider, following Girard, "[...] the moment arrives when the inner group is contaminated." (1986; 53) and the community will be corrupted.

I stated earlier that the monster was rejected within society since it is seen as a member of the outgroup. Following this argument it is interesting to investigate the term *Linguistic Intergroup Bias* or LIB and specifically the terms *ingroup* and *outgroup*. These notions are fairly simple to understand: the ingroup is a group of people who have accepted each other (for instance the band of hunters in *Dracula*) and the outgroup is constituted by those people who are not accepted into the ingroup (for instance

Dracula and his brides). Now, the really interesting aspect here, especially when combined with Girard, is that the basic hypothesis of LIB is the following: undesirable behaviour of an outgroup member and desirable behaviour of an ingroup member is described with a higher level of linguistic abstraction than is desirable behaviour of an outgroup member and undesirable behaviour of an ingroup member. (Wigboldus & Douglas in Fiedler (ed.), 2007; 83). Therefore, when Dracula bites (and kills) Lucy, this is described with a higher level of loathing than is the elimination of Dracula by the band of hunters. Both groups commit a murder, the difference is that one is part of the ingroup, the other of the outgroup. Hence, the monster is a member of the outgroup and thereby an outsider.

The element of outsiderism can, of course, also be found on a much more concrete level, which can also be observed in *Dracula*. Here, Count Dracula is literally an outsider, coming from Transylvania in the underdeveloped East to London in the highly developed West. He is thus, in more than one way, an outsider. However, in accordance with Stephen D. Arata one must note that even though Dracula might be an outsider, "[...] his invasion of London in order to 'batten on the helpless' natives there mirrors British imperial activities abroad." (1990; 633). He, in other words, is the perfect scapegoat, since "[...] Victorian readers could recognize their culture's imperial ideology mirrored back as a kind of monstrosity." (1990; 634). Hence, Dracula becomes the embodiment of the fin-de-siècle imperial ideology of the declining British Empire and thus a scapegoat for the anxieties related to this imperial ideology, which will be examined further in chapter three.

Being an outsider can be linked to several things, but the most important notion of the above discussion is that the monster will always be an outsider in the world in which it exists. One can, nonetheless, also argue that it is inevitably an insider as well, since it stems from the culture by which it has been repressed. It is both similar and dissimilar; or, it stems from the inside but is positioned at the outside.

3) The Monster is Threatening

That the monster necessarily must be threatening is linked to the monster's function in literature and to its function as a double. Regarding the monster's function in literature, it must be noted that the monster is meant to be the bringer of darkness and chaos, opposed to the hero who will bring light and order. This function in literature cannot, of course, be separated from its function as a sacrificial victim. For if the monster was not

threatening, it would hardly function as a scapegoat. Even though the sacrificial victim is, according to Girard, "[...] chosen only because it is vulnerable and close at hand.", one must still remember that it is, as mentioned earlier, meant to bear some resemblance to the thing it is replacing and simultaneously be sharply distinguishable from it. Since the monster is exactly a projection of the anxieties of the particular society and culture into which it is written it could be inferred that it is intended to "[...] protect the community from *its own* violence" (Girard, 1986; 8); or rather, the monster *becomes* the violence that must be repressed, and as such it cannot avoid being dangerous insofar as it is a double of this danger.

As can be seen from the above, the threat of the monster cannot be separated from its function as a scapegoat. However, that it is threatening and (therefore) a scapegoat cannot, either, be separated from its being a psychological mirror of our minds. In many ways, the monster can bee seen as a repressable projection, which must infer that the monster is threatening because we recognise the monster as a projection of something familiar which we have repressed (the very definition of the uncanny), and as something which we wish to re-repress. If the monster is not threatening, it would hardly corresponded to our anxieties, and if the monster is not threatening, we would not fear it, and, lastly, if the monster is not threatening, we would probably not use it as a scapegoat. This is why, as Girard puts it, "[...] the victim is considered a polluted object, whose living presence contaminates everything that comes in contact with it and whose death purges the community of its ills." (1986; 95). Hence, the monster is threatening because it represents a projected societal anxiety and only by extinguishing, or repressing, the monster can society be rid of said anxiety and live a life in order.

4) The monster is a Hybrid

The monster is a hybrid in the sense that it always incorporates more than one category or cultural distinction. For instance (moving away from my initial time frame), one can observe Frankenstein's monster which is both animate and inanimate, young (in mind) and old (in body); one can also observe Jekyll/Hyde, who is both Jekyll and Hyde or the vampire that is both living and dead. Hence, the only way to categorise these creatures with an overall term is to call them *monsters*. As such, at the very core of its existence, the monster must be something that is not definable within one culturally embedded category: thus a hybrid.

Dani Cavallaro states that "[...] monstrosity eludes conclusive categorization

[...]" (2002; 174), which follows the definitions above. It eludes categorisation exactly because it is meant as "[...] a metaphor for all that must be repudiated by the human spirit." (Gilmore, 2003; 12). Moving this into the realm of Freud and Girard once more, it makes sense to say that since the monster works as a projection of our fears (cultural and personal), the creature quite simply cannot be altogether human or, for that matter, completely known, for is must be sharply distinguishable from us, or from the "nonsacrificeable beings" as Girard terms it. However, the monster must still seem somewhat similar in order for us to grasp it, and in order for us to use it as a scapegoat. Hence, the hybridity not only works to prove the argument that the monster is a sacrificial victim but also that it is an *uncanny* double of our society because it is something we at least partially recognise.

5) The Monster is Opposed to a Hero

Gilmore states that "[...] the existence of monsters call forth heroes who must perform the same function the world over, that of clearing the field for humanity." (2003; 11). Since the literary monster functions as a projection of a cultural anxiety, it is always opposed to a hero who will try to extinguish said fear and thus free society and bring order. Hence, the monster projects a cultural fear growing within a particular society and the hero functions as the bringer of salvation, who will rescue the community and the world of the great evil and bring back the idealised society.

Additionally, Gilmore offers another very useful comment, as he states that "[...] the horrible monster is always killed off, usually in the most gruesome manner imaginable, by humans." (2003; 5). This exactly because the monster functions as a literary double of the threats and dangers that we wish to destroy, and in order to destroy the monster, we need a hero. However, there must be a reason why the hero (or humans in general) would want to kill off the monster "in the most gruesome manner imaginable". This can once more be explained by use of Girard who states that "[...] the Dinka sacrificial execution often takes the form of a stampede of young men, who trample the beast down and crush him by their sheer mass." (1986; 100). Hence, in some societies, the execution of the sacrificial victim is extremely brutal, which can be linked to the fact that the monster is a projection of the mind and in order to thoroughly eliminate it, it must be completely repressed. The hero is thus the executor of the necessary sacrificial action meant to kill the monster in order to uphold the sacrificial distinction ("[...] the distinction between the pure and the impure [...]" (Girard, 1986;

49)) and thus avoid a sacrificial crisis.

14. Conclusion Disguised as a Minor Discussion

As can be seen in the above, I have focused on the monster as a sacrificial victim and on the monster as being a psychological entity. It might seem somewhat paradoxical to combine Girard and Freud in this study, since Girard tries very hard to be cleared "[...] of any suspicion of 'psychologizing'" (1986; 102). However, in my opinion, which would then be the opposite of Girard's in this respect, it is impossible to look at sacrificial rites without also discussing the catalyst of such actions. I mean by this that the sacrificial victim (i.e. the monster) must represent something, a fact that all the theorists in the above seem to agree on. Girard, in fact, frequently comments that the ousting of the sacrificial victim is a procedure meant to rid society of all its ills. This obvious projection, always followed by a repression (or re-repression), cannot be caused by anything but a psychological rationale, and therefore one cannot separate the realm of psychoanalysis from the realm of sacrificial rites.

I believe that the monster is to be seen as a sacrificial victim *and* a projection/repression symbiosis. It is therefore evident that the monster will become an uncanny double of our society – that is, the parts of society which we want to exclude. It is furthermore obvious that I cannot merely state that the monster is to function as thus without anchoring this statement in a concrete example. Therefore, it is necessary for me to move into an analysis of a case-study, which will, as mentioned earlier, be *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. The study of this particular text will be based on several aspects: first and foremost I intend to contextualise the text – both in the context of the literary field into which it writes itself and in the context of the culture into which it was written – in order to establish the ground-work. Said in other words, if I want to prove that the monster is a double, I must initiate my investigation by locating the doubled – the anxiety or threat that the monster is a projection of. Secondly, I wish to observe Mr. Hyde as (a) a separate entity, i.e. not as a double of Dr. Jekyll, since this is how he is initially perceived, and (b) as a monster, i.e. as a double of Dr. Jekyll, as he is viewed in the last part of the text. Thirdly, and lastly, I wish to prove the validity of the taxonomy above by showing how Mr. Hyde fits into the five taxonomical steps. These three overall steps should, in the end, lead to a complete picture of Mr. Hyde as a monster and, naturally, his status as a literary double.

Chapter 2:

Reading *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and. Mr. Hyde*

In this chapter I shall make a reading of *JH*. More specifically, I shall look at Mr. Hyde in the context of the terms used in chapter one: as a sacrificial victim and as a psychological entity. When reading *JH*, I find it valuable to establish connections to other notable fin-de-siécle texts (some of which will be examined more extensively in chapter three). This simply because *JH* writes itself into a vast field of literature that one cannot neglect to take into consideration. The context into which *JH* writes itself is interesting, and therefore I will initiate my examination by contextualising the text before moving into an actual reading of *JH*.

2.1. Contextualising the Text

In this section, I want to look at specifically two areas of interest: the textual context and the sociocultural context. That is, the genre into which *JH* was written and the social context to which it refers.

2.1.1. The Textual Context

Looking at the textual context as the initial point of departure, it becomes evident that *JH* was written within the Gothic genre. The Gothic genre is rooted in the so called *Graveyard Poetry* of the 1740s and 1750s (Smith, 2007; 52), but in prose form the genre finds its origins in Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* (1764). Moving into the contemporary context of Robert Louis Stevenson, *JH* belongs to the late Victorian Gothic – or the fin-de-siècle Gothic – as it was published in 1886, and within this sub-genre one can find several famous stories such as Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891), Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897), Henry James' *The Turn of the Screw* (1898) and Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1898-99), just to name a few. *JH* also writes itself into yet another Gothic tradition that I will term the *monster Gothic*. Here as well, *JH* is written into a tradition in which one will find several famous (and semi-famous) pieces, such as Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818), George W. M. Reynolds' *Wagner the Wehr-Wolf* (1846-47), Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu's "Carmilla" (1872) – and

the list could go on, including some of the fin-de-siècle Gothic texts listed above. This genre works with many of the elements observable in *JH* and in general one can say that the monster Gothic uses the monster as a scapegoat and as a way to project certain anxieties onto a defenceless entity that must consequently be extinguished. So, as can be seen, *JH* is definitely written within a textual context that is interesting to observe and a literary field that is extremely diverse.

JH must surely be seen in connection with the texts mentioned above, as it writes itself into a vast and very important tradition. Yet, *JH* stands out as being of particular interest here since it deals explicitly with the double and the doubled on many different levels, and in this context it is in fact unique. Roger Luckhurst comments that shortly after its publication, *JH* became "[...] an instantly available metaphor [...]" for the criminal reality of London at the fin-de-siècle (Luckhurst (ed.), 2008; xxx). In connection with this, it is interesting to mention the 1888 adaptation of *JH* at the Lyceum Theatre in London, which was cancelled due to similarities between the play and what came to be known as the 'Jack the Ripper' murders (Luckhurst (ed.), 2008; xxix-xxx). And one can, in fact, observe similar instances today, as Jekyll and Hyde are frequently used as a metaphor for the split-personality of any given person. This ensures a fame that no other story can, or probably ever will, achieve in the same degree.

Since the origins of the Gothic genre can be traced to the 1740s, and since I will argue that the Gothic genre is still in full bloom today, the genre is definitely filled with differentiated tales that can seem difficult to grasp in a single definition. Nonetheless, one definition that can be said to combine the texts, and thus one that plays with all the common denominators, is the following:

> On the one hand, it conjured up the barbarism and savagery of unlawful invading forces, and was understood as all that threatens civilized life. On the other hand, it took one back to the 'dark ages' of the English medieval period, viewing it as a purer expression of English national identity than the neo-classical present. Thus the gothic represents a return to a national ideal […]. (Heiland, 2004; 4)

So, observing the essences of this quote, "Gothic" refers to savagery, barbarism and all that threatens civilized life; however, it is also a reference to the good old days, or a national ideal. This definition seems to fit neatly into the essence of the monster/hero symbiosis as described in chapter one. The monster is the embodiment of all that threatens civilised life, conjuring up barbarism and savagery – or, the monster is the projection of the cultural and personal threats; the hero, on the other hand, is the

personification of the national ideal. *JH* can thus definitely – and not surprisingly – be seen as Gothic.

Finishing this section, it must be noted that Stevenson himself wrote several Gothic novels besides *JH*. In 1884 he published "The Body Snatcher", in 1885 he published "Markheim" and "Olalla" and in the aftermath of the publication of *JH* he published "Thrawn Janet" (1887). All of these texts are Gothic for several reasons: firstly they all conjure up the savagery and barbarism that Heiland mentioned above. Examples of this can be found in the murders and the robbing of corpses from cemeteries in the "The Body Snatcher" and the murder in "Markheim". Secondly, they all deal with the mysterious and the supernatural, which can be observed with the mysterious family in "Olalla" and with the supernatural resurrection of the dead Janet in "Thrawn Janet". Lastly, they all grasp aspects of the uncanny, which is a common denominator in Gothic literature and, particularly, monster Gothic tales. Hence, all of these tales write themselves into the Gothic tradition and one can therefore see that Stevenson was in fact very well acquainted with the genre.

2.1.2. The Sociocultural Context

Having now discussed the context of *JH* regarding genre, I will turn my focus towards the sociocultural context. There can be little doubt that the sociocultural context had a severe impact on the writing of *JH*, and there can be little doubt that there is something within this particular context that has been projected into Mr. Hyde.

Several scholars have argued for a reading of *JH* that presupposes certain homosexual tendencies. This is a natural consequence of the fact that no women of importance are to be found in the text. In fact, the references to female characters "[...] remain brief, keeping women very much in the story's margins" (Heath in Pykett, 1996; 66). It is fair to read the anxieties concerning homosexuality into the text since homosexuality was "[...] a topic of considerable scientific and legal interest in 1886." (Showalter, 1991; 106). As Showalter furthermore argues, by the 1880s, homosexuals formed a secret but very active subculture. Hence, it is only natural that Stevenson should have a particular interest in this field, especially since one of his friends, John Addington Symonds, was "[...] a fairly open and vocal homosexual." (Cornes, 2008; 132). Additionally, even though "[...] the sexual threat of the exotic villain is hinted at only through Hyde's unspecified villainies." (Dryden, 2003; 29), Linehan states that those who observe homoerotic tendencies in *JH* "[...] obviously have a particularly

strong argument for the exclusion of women [...]" (Linehan in Jones, Jr. (ed.), 2003; 89). Hence, even though we are not explicitly informed that Jekyll or Hyde should be sexually active, some would argue that there are certain more or less implied factors to support a homosexual reading. In this respect, Showalter argues that *JH* can be seen as expressing male hysteria and as such, *JH* "[...] can most persuasively be read as a fable of fin-de-siècle homosexual panic, the discovery and resistance of the homosexual self." (1991; 107). Following this, one can argue that "[...] Hyde may be the physical manifestation of Jekyll's homosexuality." (Dryden, 2003; 99). Using Freud's terms, all the theorists above argue that Mr. Hyde is the projection of homosexual anxieties; *JH* thus becomes a tale of the repression of homosexuality (both internally and externally), in which the projection dies in the end, completing the repression.

Above I stated that *JH* became an instantly available metaphor for the contemporary crimes in London at the fin-de-siècle. One of these crimes can be found in another matter of sexual interest, namely the exposé of child prostitution brought forth by W. T. Stead who "[...] exposed how members of the upper classes regularly 'bought' child virgins for sexual enjoyment." (Dryden, 2003; 52). His findings led to a trial that unfolded in September and October 1885 – as Stevenson was composing *JH* (Luckhurst (ed.), 2008; xxiv). Some argue that this trial and the matter of child prostitution can, alongside matters of homosexuality, be found in *JH*. The fact that these crimes took place as Stevensons composed *JH* must, according to certain critics, be significant to our reading of the story, and as Dryden states, these coincidences are "[...] too compelling to ignore." (2003; 82). I understand how a sexual reading of *JH* can be observed as plausible, but one must at all times remember that there is no conclusive evidence voting in favour of a directly sexual reading. There are definitely elements pointing towards such a reading, and it is indeed interesting to look into these. According to Heath, however, Stevenson himself seemed annoyed by the fact that people presumably thought of nothing but sexuality (Heath in Pykett (ed.), 1996; 85). Naturally, one cannot deny a sexual interpretation merely because Stevenson did not like it, for since sexuality at the fin-de-siècle was indeed repressed, Stevenson might simply have been unaware that he wrote such elements into the tale, certain critics might argue. But it is striking that I have not been able to find one theorist who could present conclusive evidence that Jekyll or Hyde should be sexually active in any way.

There are, however, other things of interest at the fin-de-siècle. Lingering a bit at Mr. Hyde's criminal tendencies, it is interesting to observe that in the late-Victorian

mind, crime was linked to the lower classes. However, "[...] *Jekyll and Hyde* problematizes that notion." (Dryden, 2003; 78). It does so by letting Dr. Jekyll, a highly respected and somewhat wealthy doctor, be the actual criminal, since he states that Mr. Hyde did not actually exist. So, as with men from the upper classes buying young girls for sexual entertainment, the actions committed by Mr. Hyde questions and problematises the common idea that criminals and crime were confined to East-End London, according to Dryden.

Another aspect that must be taken into consideration is the observation of a psychological case-study that is very similar to the story of *JH*. The case dates back to 1876 in which Félida X, a patient of Dr. Eugène Azam, was observed shifting personalities from her dysfunctional primary or "ordinary" self to a more outward, socially oriented and feminine self. Likewise, we might observe Hyde as being the more outward and masculine compared to Jekyll. The two personalities of Félida X, contrary to Jekyll/Hyde, did not seem to share memory or even to be conscious of each other, but similar in these two cases one can find that in the course of time (15 years), the secondary state of Félida X became the dominant, as one will see (in a shorter time-span) with Mr. Hyde (Luckhurst (ed.), 2008; xviii). This case-study is interesting for several reasons: first and foremost, it brings forth the very reason why it is valuable to look into psychoanalysis in connection with the fin-de-siècle: psychoanalysis was a science of severe interest at the time. Secondly, this case-study shows that identity is fluid and unstable, as Stevenson tried to portray it (Dryden, 2003; 108). Furthermore, as Luckhurst shows, there are numerable cases similar to this in fin-de-siècle psychological science (Luckhurst (ed.), 2008; xviii-xix). This is interesting, since Fanny Osborne, Stevenson's wife, explained that Stevenson had been inspired by "a paper he had read in a French scientific journal on subconsciousness" (Luckhurst (ed.), 2008; xix). It is very likely that Stevenson was inspired and fascinated by the investigation of the psyche, and perhaps Mr. Hyde is a projection of the threat that the mentally ill was believed to encompass – as such, the destruction of the mentally ill could be perceived as an attempt to rid society of such an illness. Reading *JH* in such a manner might be a bit too simplistic, and therefore I will not spend any further time following this explanation. It is, however, interesting to observe the similarities between the actual case-study, which Stevenson might have been inspired by, and the fictitious case-study of *JH*.

There is one further theme that I must examine, namely that of the threatening decline of the British Empire at the fin-de-siècle. The British Empire had experienced

what came to be known as the "great Victorian boom" during the third quarter of the C19 (Clarke, 2004; 7). In fact, the British Empire had grown so massive that its territories covered huge parts of the globe. Interestingly, as Natalie Regensburg comments, "England regarded the countries it colonized with a strange mixture of affection, fascination, and repulsion, often depicting the rebellious colonies as naughty children." (WebA). This can for instance be seen in the illustration "The Irish 'Frankenstein'" in which the Irish are portrayed as being Frankenstein's monster (WebA). Hence, they are portrayed as being a creation of the British Empire that is trying to break the master that created it. This representation of the mob might have influenced Stevenson into portraying the mob, with which Hyde is frequently associated, through a monstrous creature. In this context, one can, very interestingly, find a picture in which *JH* is used in connection with the Irish. Here, the picture shows an image of corruption, which once more links Hyde to crime: "[...] this cartoon reflects British suspicions that Irish Home Rule representatives in the British Parliament [...] secretly supported the Irish Fenian terrorist activities [...]" and this was, allegedly "[...] a source of anxiety for middle-class Londoners in the 1880s." (Linehan (ed.), 2003; 145).

The British Empire was not constituted without problems, and Regensburg comments that England experienced "[...] rebellions all over its empire [...]" (WebA). To make matters worse, the British Empire was, at the fin-de-siècle, threatened by a decline, partially due to the fact that France, Germany and the US in particular grew increasingly strong (Clarke, 2004; 14). Furthermore, Barry S. Godfrey notes that "[t]he public consciousness at that time was agitated [...] by the degeneration of the species; by unrestrained science [...] and by the uncontrollable poor." (2001; 24). Hence, it was not exclusively external matters that threatened England. In fact, the very backbone of the British Empire was threatened, and as such, Judith R. Walkowitz states that "[...] London epitomized the power of the empire but also its vulnerability.", and in fact, "[...] London lacked a clear political identity." (Walkowitz in Linehan (ed.), 2003; 142). Hence, even though London had been established as "[...] an immense world city, culturally and economically important [...]" it was in fact "[...] socially and geographically divided and politically incoherent." (Walkowitz in Linehan (ed.), 2003; 141).

One last aspect of interest in connection with this decline is the fear of terrorist attacks at the fin-de-siècle for "London was, in fact, a prime target of terrorist attacks." (Walkowitz in Linehan (ed.), 2003; 143). For instance, from March 1883 to May 1884,

London experienced several terrorist attacks, including an attack on the Victoria Station in February 1884. Perhaps Hyde is to be observed as such a terrorist, as he also places his attacks at the very heart of the British Empire. Hence, it must be argued that these anxieties of the perceived decline of the British Empire must have influenced Stevenson and as such, it is reasonable to argue that these anxieties must be observable in *JH*. I shall comment further upon this during my reading of *JH*, as I find this of severe importance in this context.

Having thus examined and established the textual and sociocultural context of *JH*, I wish to move further into an actual analysis of the text.

2.2. Reading *JH*

In order to understand *JH* in a satisfying manner, I want to make a reading in three overall stages which should lead me through the story and let me examine Mr. Hyde as a monster. The three stages of this section shall include, firstly, a reading a Mr. Hyde as an other, in which I will observe Mr. Hyde as being separable from Dr. Jekyll, as this is the way in which he is portrayed in the initial chapters of the tale. Secondly, I wish to investigate Mr. Hyde as a double of Dr. Jekyll. In this section, I shall not look at Hyde as a double of a cultural anxiety but strictly as a double of Dr. Jekyll. Lastly, I shall read Mr. Hyde as being a monster, and in doing so, I shall follow the five taxonomical steps from chapter one. These three stages should ensure a thorough reading of Mr. Hyde as a monster.

2.2.1. Mr. Hyde as the Other

There are two ways to understand the otherness of Mr. Hyde. Firstly, in the beginning of the tale, the reader is supposed to believe that Mr. Hyde is a character separate from Dr. Jekyll. Secondly, one can observe Hyde as the other insofar as he is the evil side of the shape-shifting. I will return to this second understanding later, but in this section I want to focus on Mr. Hyde as being physically separable from Dr. Jekyll. I will more specifically examine two points: Mr. Hyde as an outsider and Mr. Hyde as a sacrificer.

It is evident that Mr. Hyde is positioned as an outsider. In fact, Mr. Hyde is the victim of what I have previously termed *outsider creation*, which is definable as being any action committed in order to ensure the outsiderism of any given character. With Hyde it is obvious that he quickly becomes an outsider or a member of the outgroup as

Mr. Enfield narrates the following incident:

> I was coming home from some place at the end of the world, about three o'clock of a black winter morning […] All at once, I saw two figures: one a little man who was stumping along eastward at a good walk, and the other a girl of maybe eight or ten who was running as hard as she was able down a cross street. Well, sir, the two ran into one another naturally enough at the corner; and then came the horrible part of the thing; for the man trampled calmly over the child's body and left her screaming on the ground. It sound nothing to hear but it was hellish to see. It wasn't like a man; it was like some damned Juggernaut. (9)[3]

Hence, the actions of Mr. Hyde are narrated so as to ensure his outsiderism. First of all, Hyde is walking about on a "black winter morning" making him a creature of the night. Secondly, Hyde is walking East, which might suggest that he is heading for the East End, the place of social outsiders. As Dryden comments, "[...] the East End was an area where wealthy men came to indulge is nefarious pleasures, notably sexual pleasures." (2003; 49). Finally, Hyde is linked to the "hellish" and the "damned" and designated "Juggernaut", taken from Hindu religion. Here, the Juggernaut is, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*:

> A title of Krishna, the eighth avatar of Vishnu; *spec.*, the uncouth idol of this deity at Puri in Orissa, annually dragged in procession on an enormous car, under the wheels of which many devotees are said to have formerly thrown themselves to be crushed. (WebB)

Hyde would in this respect be linked to mad religious fanatics. A further explanation from the *Oxford English Dictionary* is the following: "An institution, practice, or notion to which persons blindly devote themselves, or are ruthlessly sacrificed". Thus, these two entries explain that being a Juggernaut is to be a fanatic who sacrifices himself ruthlessly, which might indicate that even here he is seen as sacrificeable, thus, by definition, an outsider. These designations definitely suggest an obvious status as an outsider and they work as elements of outsider creation.

Moving further into the tale, one can observe Mr. Utterson's first encounter with Hyde. Besides the fact that Utterson sees him as "other" (16), he explains that "Mr. Hyde was pale and dwarfish, he gave an impression of deformity without any nameable malformation, he had a displeasing smile […]" (17). Yet, this is not as such what establishes the feeling of "[...] hitherto unknown disgust, loathing and fear with which

---

[3] All references to *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* are to the Norton Critical Edition, 2003, edited by Katherine Linehan. If nothing else noted, page references will refer to this edition.

Mr. Utterson regarded him." (17). This feeling it rather brought forth by the impression that "[...] the man seems hardly human!" (17). In fact, even though Hyde is by and large human, everything about his appearance ensures the outsider creation. Regarding this, Jekyll explains the following:

> [...] when I wore the semblance of Edward Hyde, none could come near to me at first without a visible misgiving of the flesh. This, as I take it, was because all human beings, as we meet them, are commingled out of good and evil: and Edward Hyde, alone in the ranks of mankind, was pure evil. (51)

Hence, even though the threat of Hyde is not one that can be identified by appearance, every person can feel the evil of Hyde since "[t]hat child of Hell had nothing human" (59). This furthermore denotes that the true identity of Hyde (as being Jekyll's evil twin) is not acknowledged by anyone simply because Jekyll and Hyde share nothing regarding appearance. Jekyll is "a large, well-made, smooth-faced man of fifty, with something of a slyish cast perhaps, but every mark of capacity and kindness" (19) whereas Hyde is ugly and "[...] younger, lighter, happier in body" (50). So, there is not much of a resemblance between the two, even though they are in fact one and the same. The difference in appearance and the linguistic abstraction with which this difference is staged must of course also be linked to the fact that Jekyll is the admired insider and Hyde is the hated outsider. Hyde therefore becomes the ultimate scapegoat, which I shall return to later.

This notion of the scapegoat is not only interesting insofar as Hyde is the sacrificial victim himself. It is also interesting to observe how Hyde acts as the executor of the sacrificial rite, which can be observed twice in *JH*: with the little girl and the Carew murder. It must be noted, however, that the violence directed towards the little girl seems to be an accident, but even so it has been noted that there appears to be an underlying current of sexual pleasure in this assault. Joyce Carol Oates, for instance, states that the screaming and the payment offered to the girl's parents are to be extrapolated as evidences of indecent sexual behaviour (1988; 605). I find this argument highly unlikely. One might rather suggest that the little girl symbolises complete virginity and purity and since Hyde tramples "[...] calmly over the child's body and [leaves] her screaming on the ground." (9) the reader instantly realises the complete impurity of Hyde. Hence, Hyde is from the very beginning portrayed as an unsympathetic and impure creature.

A much more interesting case-study, and a case that functions better as evidence of the sacrificial rite performed by Hyde, is the Carew murder case. Carew is "[...] an aged and beautiful gentleman with white hair [...]" (21) and thus very likeable and, once more, an image of purity. He is, however, one of Hyde's victims, and the murder is described as thus:

> [...] then all of a sudden [Hyde] broke out in a great flame of anger, stamping with his foot, brandishing the cane, and carrying on (as the maid described it) like a madman. The old gentleman took a step back, with the air of one very much surprised and a trifle hurt; and at that Mr. Hyde broke out of all bounds and clubbed him to the earth. And the next moment, with ape-like fury, he was trampling his victim under foot, and hailing down a storm of blows, under which the bones were audibly shattered and the body jumped upon the roadway. (22)

This is extremely brutal but given its status as a sacrificial rite this brutality is not at all surprising, for, as we saw in chapter one, the sacrifice is often bestial. So, I would argue, Hyde is using his victims in rites of sacrifice, but the question is, of course, who Hyde's anger is directed towards, i.e. who is the actual hate-object? I find two explanations to this question: one assuming that Hyde's anger is directed towards Jekyll, another seeing Hyde as a metaphor for the mob. Both will discover an alternative explanation for the exclusion of women, which has primarily been linked to homosexual tendencies.

In this first alternative explanation, I will assume, as a point of departure, that Hyde's anger is directed towards Jekyll, since it is evident that Hyde wishes to be rid of Jekyll. However, in order to be so he must eliminate Jekyll which is impossible without risking his own life – and as it turns out, Hyde has a wonderful love for life (61), so he would not risk committing irreversible[4] suicide. If Hyde's anger is indeed directed towards Jekyll, we find a possible explanation as to why the violent act directed towards the girl seems to be an accident opposed to the murder of Carew. The explanation is thus: if Hyde's anger is directed towards Jekyll we will find that an aged gentleman is the best possible scapegoat due to the fact that an aged gentleman has more in common with Jekyll, the actual hate-object, than does any female character. Carew is, however, distinguishable from Jekyll insofar as he is a politician (an MP), differentiable in appearance and so on. Therefore, we would find that Stevenson has excluded women because Hyde's anger is directed towards someone or something that is better projected into a male character rather than a female character. Hence, following this argument, the

---

[4]   I write irreversible because it is stated that Hyde commits temporary suicide as his fear for the gallows forces him to "[...] return to his subordinate station of a part instead of a person" (61).

story evolves around men because Hyde is a man trying to find a sufficient scapegoat onto whom he can project his anger, and this anger is more accurately projected into a male character than a female character. This does not negate the possibility that Stevenson might be homosexual himself or that he could have portrayed homosexuality in *JH*, but it certainly provides an alternative way to examine the exclusion of women.

The second alternative explanation evolves around Mr. Hyde as a metaphor or personification of the mob. The mob is frequently portrayed as a monster and an illustration of the degeneration of the human species. This can for instance be observed in the illustration "The Irish 'Frankenstein'" (WebC), in which it can be seen that the mob (the Irish) is portrayed as being monstrous and the master (the British Empire) is the victim being threatened by this vicious monster. As Regensburg states, one will find implicitly in the cartoon "[...] a criticism of England which, like Victor Frankenstein, is at least partly to blame for its hubristic aspirations." (WebA). Hence, if we observe Hyde in this context we will see that he is a metaphor for the mob, or the uncontrollable poor, or even the degenerate human species, fighting the aristocracy that made him who he is. Therefore, Danvers Carew is an obvious candidate to become a scapegoat in that he is a Member of Parliament. If we follow this a bit further, we will find that a "fully human" identity at this time was seen as a European (white) male (Hurley, 1996; 142), and therefore one might infer that the only correct way to show the complete degeneration of the human species and the uncontrollability of the poor would be to have Hyde attack a white European male who is, as it turns out, a member of the aristocracy and who has therefore ensured the existence of this degeneration, as Victor Frankenstein has ensured the life of his monster. And, returning to the little girl, who is also relevant in this context, what can show the impurity and degeneration of the uncontrollable poor better than an attack on a little, innocent (presumably) virgin girl? By attacking both an MP and a little, innocent girl we will find that the degeneration is complete, and it is therefore no wonder that we must kill this ruthless and unscrupulous low-class member of society in order to secure the survival of the human species – and in this case the survival of the British Empire as well. I shall return to this in my taxonomical analysis of Hyde as a monster.

The above discussion proves the fact that Hyde is eternally an outsider. For even though Hyde does indeed engage in sacrificial rites, he must still be denoted a monster. Insofar as he engages in acts of sacrifice, one might believe him to be human, as sacrificial rites are very (ancient) human "tricks". However, as is also commented upon

by Girard, the difference between the original or intended sacrificial victim and actual hate-object is that the sacrificial victim can be killed by the executor of the sacrificial rite, the hero, without the fear of vengeance. But the sacrificial victim cannot kill anyone without living with such a fear. And in both cases of sacrifice committed by Hyde, the act is followed by revenge either as blackmail or as a persecution. Hence, even when trying to observe Hyde as something besides a monster, one will discover that Hyde is indeed the embodiment of the very idea of the sacrificial victim, which we saw in chapter one is the very essence of being a monster. It must also be noted that it is not atypical of the monster to be a sacrificer. We can observe a similar case in *Dracula*, in which the monster is also pursued and must die in the end.

So, it is evident that even though one might initially wish to investigate Mr. Hyde as being not-monstrous, one will have to face the fact that nothing is done to ensure such a reading. Hyde is overtly monstrous, and he is in fact nothing but evil. Hence, the outsider creation is the essence of every description of Hyde and every action committed by Hyde. The monstrosity of Hyde is explicitly portrayed as the reader recognises that Hyde is not just a friend of Jekyll's but actually an uncanny double of the evil within Jekyll. In other words, the reader realises that Mr. Hyde is in fact a double of Dr. Jekyll, and therefore, it will be of interest to continue my examination of *JH* by looking at this element of the tale.

2.2.2. Mr. Hyde as a Double

In this section I shall look at Hyde as the double of Jekyll, and in doing so I shall also investigate the possibility that Jekyll ends up being a double of Hyde. I will not, in this section, look Mr. Hyde as being a double of some cultural anxiety. I shall strictly look at Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde as being one person, and the implications of this.

The fact that Hyde is a double of Jekyll is something of which we are not explicitly informed until we read Lanyon's letter. However, we are given certain hints. One hint that might give away the true identity of Mr. Hyde before Lanyon's letter, is the following answer provided by Mr. Guest, as he has compared the handwriting of Jekyll and Hyde: "there's a rather singular resemblance; the two hands are in many ways identical: only differently sloped." (28). Hence, this is offered as a clue, but only the reader already familiar with the story (or the extremely clever reader) would recognise this as being a clue. Cornes explains as another clue that "[...] we never see Jekyll and Hyde occupying the same space." (2008; 130). This is noteworthy since Jekyll has a

"[...] very great interest in poor Hyde." (20). After having read the story we know that Hyde is a (mostly) humanoid temporal fission monster, and as such this fact is no longer confusing. However, before having read Lanyon's letter we cannot feel certain that Hyde is indeed a double of Jekyll. In fact, we might actually observe Mr. Hyde as a fusion monster up until this point, since he is a man of "ape-like fury" (22) who tends to "cry out like a rat" (36) and weep "like a woman or a lost soul" (38), and who in fact "wasn't like a man" (9). Hence, Mr. Hyde is a fusion of many entities: most notably he is a fusion of human and ape (including a fusion between the humanoid and animal monster), but he also incorporates rat, woman, man, Juggernaut and the hellish. Interestingly one can thus add that Hyde initiates the story by being a fusion but ends the story as a fission.

We are without a doubt certain of Hyde's status as a double as Lanyon narrates the following incident:

> He put the glass to his lips and drank at one gulp. A cry followed; he reeled, staggered, clutched at the table and held on, staring with injected eyes, gasping with open mouth; and as I looked there came, I thought, a change – he seemed to swell – his face became suddenly black and the features seemed to melt and alter – and the next moment, I had sprung to my feet and leaped back against the wall, my arm raised to shield me from that prodigy, my mind submerged in terror […] there before my eyes – pale and shaken, and half-fainting, and groping before him with his hands, like a man restored from death – there stood Henry Jekyll! (47)

As can be seen here, it becomes painfully real to Lanyon that Hyde is actually Jekyll, and vice versa. Such a transformation is, of course, a common denominator with all shape-shifters, but what makes this transformation of particular interest is the fact that it is Hyde who transforms into Jekyll. Or, in order to specify the interest in this, the first time we are given an opportunity to observe a transformation it is the monster that transforms into the human and not the other way around. This transformation takes place as Hyde has become the stronger of the two and the fact that Hyde has become the stronger is exactly mirrored in this reversed transformation. If we wish to observe the transformation as we might expect it to be, we have to wait for Jekyll's own statement of the case, after he has swallowed the draught:

> The most racking pangs succeeded: a grinding in the bones, deadly nausea, and a horror of the spirit that cannot be exceeded at the hour of birth or death. Then these agonies began swiftly to subside, and I came to myself as if out of a great sickness. (50)

As we observe this transformation, we are taken back to the time in which Jekyll is still the stronger in the Jekyll/Hyde relationship. However, as time goes by, Hyde grows stronger: "it had seemed to me of late as though the body of Edward Hyde had grown in stature [...]" (55). This growth in stature once more becomes a mirror image of the growth in power. As can be observed in the story, Hyde is the projection of the evil within Jekyll, and since he is a projection, Jekyll can repress him as long as Hyde is weaker. However, as soon as Hyde grows in strength, Jekyll cannot merely repress his own projection. Furthermore, one can observe how the Jekyll/Hyde power struggle is reversed in the course of time, meaning that although Jekyll is initially the stronger power, projecting his anxieties into the shape of Hyde, Hyde becomes the stronger in the end, projecting *his* desires and anxieties into the shape of Jekyll (the desire to survive and the anxiety of dying). Hence, whilst Hyde is the projection to be repressed in the beginning, Jekyll becomes the repressable projection in the end, which can be observed in the following quote: "Jekyll was now my city of refuge; let but Hyde peep out an instant, and the hands of all men would be raised to take and slay him." (57). Shortly after this sentence is uttered, we observe the involuntary transformation in the park:

> My reason wavered, but it did not fail me utterly. I have more than once observed that, in my second character, my faculties seemed sharpened to a point and my spirits more tensely elastic; thus it came about that, where Jekyll perhaps might have succumbed, Hyde rose to the importance of the moment. [...] Hyde in danger of his life was a creature new to me [...] Yet the creature was astute; mastered his fury with a great effort of the will [...] He, I say – I cannot say, I. That child of Hell had nothing human [...]" (58-9)

Here we can observe that Jekyll has become the projection that Hyde can easily repress. The fact is, however, that Hyde rarely wishes to do so, for Jekyll is exactly the city of refuge in which Hyde can live safely. This quote also proves that Jekyll and Hyde are interdependent and that they cannot completely repress one another. Jekyll is not strong enough to hold Hyde back, and he is thus easily repressed, and Hyde knows that in order to be safe, he cannot kill Jekyll.

Now, in this involuntary transformation above, we can find one other thing of severe interest that underlines the fact that Jekyll and Hyde are one and the same: the voices. The narration of the above starts with the first person pronoun "I". As the rage grows inside and as Hyde becomes increasingly evil, the narration shifts to a "he". Yet, interestingly, we also find an outside narrator, as if Jekyll has not only created Hyde but

also an over-Jekyll: "thus is came about that, where Jekyll perhaps might have succumbed, Hyde rose to the importance of the moment." Here we can observe a narrator standing outside both Jekyll and Hyde, referring to both personalities, evidently not being either. Hence, we can observe that there must be at least three voices in the narration of Jekyll's "Full Statement of the Case". This might indicate that over-Jekyll is the conscious mind shared by Jekyll and Hyde, which is then divided into the good mind of Jekyll and the evil mind of Hyde. The narration of this over-Jekyll validates the argument that Jekyll has turned into a double of Hyde, since he narrates how Jekyll, almost without noticing it, turns into Hyde, which must infer that Hyde can repress Jekyll without trouble. Yet, the over-Jekyll also shows that Jekyll is the ideal and Hyde is the monster, exactly due to this shift between "I" and "he". One can furthermore argue in favour of Jekyll being the double of Hyde since it is Hyde who takes the draught in front of Lanyon, in order to transform into Jekyll, and not the other way around. Hence, if this scenario has become reality, Jekyll has taken the place that would usually be occupied by the monster, meaning that he has corrupted the sacrificial distinction. As Girard comments, this infers a sacrificial crisis, which must in the end lead to the death of Jekyll and Hyde. Thus, even on the narratological level of *JH*, one can observe how the role of sacrifice plays an important part, and as soon as the regular distinctions are corrupted, a crisis emerges that must either be dealt with or will lead to the destruction of the parties involved.

To end this section, we can observe that *JH*, and especially "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of the Case", is a story divided into three parts: 1) the part in which Jekyll loves Hyde and finds it thrilling to be Hyde; 2) the part in which Jekyll despises Hyde and tries to get rid of him completely; 3) the part in which Jekyll discovers that he cannot get rid of Hyde and thus commits suicide. In part two, Jekyll is sure that he can get rid of Hyde any time he so wishes – Hyde is, after all, merely a repressable projection. But in part three, Jekyll is painfully aware that suicide might be the only option if he wishes to rid society of this pain. In parts one and two, Jekyll has the power but in part three, Hyde takes control and becomes the dominant force in the Jekyll/Hyde symbiosis. It could very well be stated that the murder of Danvers Carew happens as parts two and three intersect. At this moment, as he kills one of the (more or less important) rulers of the British empire, Hyde becomes an external threat rather than a purely internal threat. Or, said in other words, prior to his murder of Sir Danvers Carew, Hyde is merely a double of Jekyll – though no one is aware of this fact. As Hyde kills

Carew, he becomes the personification (or the projection) of the threat against the British empire, thereby a scapegoat, and he is consequently regarded as a monster. This is very interesting and must be investigated further, which will be the focus in the following section.

2.2.3. Mr. Hyde as a Monster

For huge parts of *JH*, the monstrosity of Hyde remains unclear to the reader. Hyde certainly shows evil tendencies and monstrous facets of his existence, but the complete picture of his monstrosity persists to be rather opaque. In fact, the realisation of his absolute monstrosity comes to the reader at the same time as the realisation that Hyde is a double of Jekyll. In order to show how the monstrosity of Hyde is portrayed, I wish to observe Hyde through the taxonomy created in chapter one.

1) The Monster is a Creature of the Imagination

Stating that Hyde is a creature of the imagination, leads me to follow Girard as he states that the monstrous double is a "hypothetical creation" (1986; 164). Even so, Girard still acknowledges that these hypothetical or fictitious entities must be adopted into the family of sacrificial victims. This also infers that Hyde is rightfully positioned as a sacrificial victim, in being a monstrous double, and he must thus be the embodiment of some cultural fear that is projected into an imaginary entity. The question is, of course, which fear he is the embodiment of. I have already stated that I do not find homosexuality to be an explicit theme in *JH*, and as such I will use this section to discover the anxiety of which Mr. Hyde is an uncanny double.

Concluding on a very brief study of anxieties at the fin-de-siècle, Barry S. Godfrey states that we must not "[...] be too keen to grasp at the ephemeral and intangible emotions for our explanations whilst overlooking more concrete historical realities." (2001; 26). What I mean by including this is basically that I believe it to be a mistake to look for elements in a text that exists only through circumstantial evidence. It is evident that sexual anxieties were of the essence at the fin-de-siècle, but there might be some more concrete incidents that must be taken into consideration when dealing with *JH*. These incidents would, in my opinion, be harbingers of a better and more concrete reading of *JH*. My argument can basically be summed up by the following quote, parts of which I have used previously:

In England […] the period between 1880 and 1914 was possibly the high watershed of anxiety […] The public consciousness at that time was agitated [...] by the degeneration of the species; by unrestrained science;[...] and by the uncontrollable poor. Again, popular and scientific literature will testify to this widespread unease. (Godfrey, 2001; 24)

Even though Godfrey goes beyond my time frame, his insights are valuable and can be easily traced in *JH*. For instance, Hyde is an excellent example of this "degeneration of the species" that Godfrey mentions, and since Hyde is often seen as belonging to the East End, he furthermore becomes a great example of the "uncontrollable poor.". Lastly, Jekyll is an excellent example of the unrestrained science, since he, much like Victor Frankenstein, tampers with human lives, trying to defy natural and God-given laws. Interestingly, it can also be noted of Hyde that "[...] he committed his crimes in London, the national capital, and symbol of the Great British Empire." (Godfrey, 2001; 26). The *he* that Godfrey refers to here is Jack the Ripper, but we will find it equally suitable to Hyde. So, since Hyde is capable of attacking England from the inside, he becomes a great example of the "[...] perceived decline of [England] – racial, moral, spiritual – which makes the nation vulnerable to attack from more vigorous, 'primitive' people." (Arata, 1990; 623). The primitive people in *JH* are personified through Hyde who can, as mentioned before, be seen as the embodiment of the mob and the degenerate human species. Hence, Hyde is the primitive people attacking high-society ensuring a sacrificial crisis, which I shall return to later.

That Hyde is a degeneration of the species can be found in the fact that Hyde is "[...] less robust and less developed […]" (51) than is Jekyll and in the fact that Hyde is perceived as being somewhat like a monkey (37) with a hand that is "[...] lean, corded, knuckly, of a dusky pallor and thickly shaded with a swart growth of hair." (54). Hence, one will find that the appearance of Hyde is closer to that of a Neanderthal than a Homo sapiens. Or, as Maeve Tynan writes regarding the construction of racial otherness, "[t]hese ape-like features clearly indicate a 'primitive' nature." (2010; 5). She is describing racial stereotyping and how specific characteristics, frequently linked to apes or Neanderthals, were believed to be present in the Celtic and specifically the Irish population. However, this is equally suitable to Hyde, and might portray Hyde as being exactly a fear of degenerate outsiders. That he is to be seen as the uncontrollable poor can for instance be observed in that he attacks the aristocracy that created him (or the mob of which he is a representation). It is therefore evident that Hyde is a primitive

member of society attacking high society, which indisputably constitutes his status as the uncontrollable poor. Lastly, Jekyll becomes the scientific threat that the technological advances involuntarily constituted to the British Empire at the fin-de-siècle, since it is indeed he who creates the enemy.

Following the above argument it therefore seems reasonable to suggest that Hyde personifies the anxiety and fear of the decline of the British Empire and the decline of the human species in general. Therefore, Hyde is a fictitious creature emanating from a deep-rooted sociocultural fear of this decline, which the reader might recognise but would wish to re-repress. Unconsciously, such a decline can be dealt with by the creation of a scapegoat, who can be excluded as soon as the threat of the embedded degeneration and decline grows too strong. Hence, even though Hyde is attacking the very heart of the British Empire (London), *JH* tells the tale of the enduring empire that will always rule the waves, so to speak, but an empire that is fragile to both external and internal threats. As a last comment regarding this, I want to quote Girard who states the following:

> In a universe where the slightest dispute can lead to disaster […] the rites of sacrifice serve to polarize the community's aggressive impulses and redirect them towards victims that may be actual or figurative, animate or inanimate […] (1986; 18)

This is exactly what happens with the use of Hyde as a sacrificial victim: the British Empire is declining and any sort of uproar can lead to disaster. Therefore, the creation of Hyde, a figurative creature, serves to polarise the aggressions onto an outsider. And this will exactly be of interest in the following section.

2) The Monster is an Outsider

I have already mentioned that Mr. Hyde is the victim of outsider creation and therefore, this taxonomical step will not be dealing with this particular aspect of outsiderism. I will consequently pay attention to the other elements of the monster being an outsider.

As a conclusion to this taxonomical step in chapter one, I mentioned that the monster is inevitably an insider as well as an outsider, since it stems from the culture by which it has been repressed. Or, as I said, it stems from the inside but is positioned at the outside. I wish to investigate this a bit further. In general it can be said that the shape-shifter, alone in the ranks of monsters, literally stems from the inside. Other

monsters naturally function as uncanny doubles of our society, being always a distorted mirror image of a given culture, but no other monster actually stems from the inside. Therefore it is evident that Hyde, and the shape-shifter in general, is extremely useful in order to represent this internal threat and the fragility of a certain society, such as the British Empire, as has been discussed above. Hence, Hyde is exactly an insider, or a terrorist wanting to blow up the Empire from within, showcasing the fragility of the British Empire.

Thus, I find it reasonable once more to argue that at the fin-de-siècle, the monster was as much an insider as an outsider. Further examples from the fin-de-siècle can be found with *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, *Dracula* and "The Turn of the Screw" - these three tales will be of particular interest in chapter three. However, even though the monster is *positioned* inside the community and/or *stems* from within it, it is evident that the monster will also always be an outsider, or an other, as is of course the case with Hyde, even though nobody can evidently say what initiates this feeling of otherness. It is, nonetheless, evident that Hyde is inhuman, an outsider, who is similar to those surrounding him but also inevitably very different from them. Hence, Hyde becomes the perfect scapegoat.

An interesting comment in relation to Hyde being an outsider and a scapegoat is that Hyde literally comes about through impurity. This is proved to be the case as Jekyll states that "[...] I am now persuaded that my first supply was impure, and that it was that unknown impurity which lent efficacy to the draught." (61). Hence, the fact that Jekyll (a more or less pure and righteous human being) drinks the impure salt ensures that he will always be Hyde. For, as Girard says, "[a]s long as purity and impurity remain distinct, even the worst pollution can be washed away; but once they are allowed to mingle, purification is no longer possible." (1986; 38). Thus, as soon as Jekyll unknowingly mixes the pure with the impure he is doomed and will remain an outsider.

Moving further into Hyde's status as a sacrificial victim, it can be noted that since he is the personification of the evil side of Jekyll, and since he is new to the world, he has not had time to build a community of his own that would be able to revenge his death. Therefore it is evident that Hyde is "[...] incapable of propagating further vengeance." (Girard, 1986; 18), and he becomes the perfect scapegoat. Said in other words, since Hyde is a representation of the decline of the British Empire, the anxieties and fears connected to this are projected into Hyde. He is then killed off as a means of redirecting the aggressive impulses of the community towards a victim that is somewhat

similar to but still easily distinguishable from the community in which he has been positioned. Hyde does not have an ingroup since be does not belong in any community and therefore it will not provoke any kind of vengeance to kill or sacrifice Hyde.

I can end this discussion by following Girard's observations on monsters and the fact that they are both insiders and outsider: "[...] how can one defend oneself against an enemy who blithely ignores all barriers between inside and outside?" (1986; 165). This is a core element in the above discussion, for the monster is both an insider and an outsider, and this is partially what makes the monster threatening.

3) The Monster is Threatening

Hyde is a threat on several levels. As I commented in chapter 1 during this taxonomical step, the monster brings chaos and darkness. This becomes relevant in connection with Hyde as well, since he brings complete chaos as a consequence of his acts of evil against the girl and Danvers Carew. But these murders not only constitute the threat that Hyde is to society but also his status as a scapegoat. For, as I also commented in chapter one, a creature would probably not be seen as a scapegoat if it was not a threat of some sort. Or, said in other words, if the monster was not perceived to be a threat, one could hardly justify killing it. I am fully aware that Girard states that the sacrificial victim is vulnerable and close at hand, but this vulnerability must be seen in connection with the following statement:

> When a community succeeds in convincing itself that one alone of its number is responsible for the violent mimesis besetting it; when it is able to view this member as the single 'polluted' enemy who is contaminating the rest; and when the citizens are truly unanimous in this conviction – then the belief becomes a reality, for there will no longer exist elsewhere in the community a form of violence to be followed or opposed, which is to say, imitated or propagated. In destroying the surrogate victim, men believe that they are ridding themselves of some present ill. And indeed they *are*, for they are effectively doing away with those forms of violence that beguile the imagination and provoke emulation. (1986; 81-82).

This rather extensive quote from Girard is valuable to present as a whole because it states precisely that the monster, or the scapegoat, must be *perceived* as being threatening without necessarily being so. Not thereby said that Hyde is not a threat, but one must recognise that the sacrificial victim might not be the only threat to society. Yet, since the inhabitants of said society have decided that the scapegoat is the soul threat, the creature must be sacrificed for being a polluted object. In this context, one can

follow Tom Douglas and argue that scapegoating is a communal ritual "[...] in the sense that every member of the community agreed with the procedure [...]" (1995; 29). Hence, the community in which the creature is positioned agrees that said creature is dangerous and must be excluded – this does not infer that the creature *is* indeed threatening, but insofar as the community has agreed that it is, the scapegoat is excluded for being the harbinger of evil and a polluted object. In this context, we must recognise that Hyde is in fact that which Girard calls a polluted enemy, proven by the fact that after having seen Hyde, Dr. Lanyon suddenly has "[...] his death-warrant written legibly upon his face." (29). Furthermore, Utterson states the following of Lanyon:

> The rosy man had grown pale; his flesh had fallen away; he was visibly balder and older; and yet it was not so much these tokens of a swift physical decay that arrested the lawyer's notice, as a look in the eye and quality of manner that seemed to testify to some deep-seated terror of the mind. (29)

Now, two things are of interest here: firstly, it so happens that Lanyon has "had a shock" (29) from which he will never recover. This shock, and the consequent disease, is implemented by Jekyll and Hyde as Lanyon is allowed to see the transformation. Hence, Hyde is definitely contaminating his surroundings. Secondly, it is interesting to observe the similarities in how Utterson narrates the uncanny appearance of Lanyon above and the appearance of Hyde. I have mentioned the appearance of Hyde before, but in order to properly compare these two instances, I want to bring the scene in an extended quote:

> Mr. Hyde was pale and dwarfish, he gave an impression of deformity without any nameable malformation, he had a displeasing smile, he had borne himself to the lawyer with a sort of murderous mixture of timidity and boldness, and he spoke with a husky, whispering and somewhat broken voice; all these were points against him, but not all of these together could explain the hitherto unknown disgust, loathing and fear with which Mr. Utterson regarding him. (17)

Similarly in both cases one will find that Utterson is not capable of defining the one thing that ensures the uncanniness of their appearances. I mean by this that they look like something one would recognise, but they are so distorted that one must observe them as being completely different, or monstrous. Hyde looks human, but something in his appearance makes Utterson cry "the man seems hardly human!" (17); Lanyon looks like himself but he has grown old in a undefined, but presumably short, period of time. Therefore, one might suggest, Hyde has infected Lanyon, turning him into something

well-known but utterly different. Seen in this light it is reasonable to conclude that Hyde is indeed the polluted object that must be destroyed in order to avoid further contamination, and since a reward has been offered for the imprisonment of Hyde, the entire society seems to be unanimous in this believe.

I stated in the beginning of this section that Hyde is threatening on several levels. In light of the above discussion, I can now thoroughly explain this statement: Hyde is explicitly threatening to the community since he commits a murder; he is implicitly dangerous to Jekyll because Jekyll neglects to face this danger and therefore Hyde can become the dominant part; lastly, he is a threat because he is the polluted object that can infect others, causing an epidemic which must be stopped. Hence, Hyde is dangerous on several levels, which must of course infer that he must be excluded. It might be argued that Hyde is a hybrid-threat, since he is both an internal and an external threat. And, as we learned in chapter one, being a hybrid is yet another core element of being a monster.

4) The Monster is a Hybrid

That Mr. Hyde is a hybrid is fairly evident given the fact that he is a temporal fission monster, which by definition involves hybridity. Mr. Hyde is a hybrid insofar as he is both Jekyll *and* Hyde though never both at the same time. Furthermore, Hyde is a hybrid given the fact that the he is both fission and fusion; basically, Hyde initiates the tale by being a fusion, insofar as he is a combination of several entities, but he ends the tale by being unmistakably a fission. Hence, it might be noted that the spectatoral function alters in the course the of story. However, even though Hyde is a fission given the Jekyll/Hyde symbiosis, one must also see that he is a fusion in his Hyde-shape, simply because he encompasses several cultural distinctions, like human/monkey and masculine/feminine (he is a man, but he is "[w]eeping like a woman [...]" (38) as his life comes to a close). In this context, one might suggest that Hyde is exactly an uncanny double of our society, since he becomes an image of the degenerate human species and the degeneration of sexuality, which might, as shall be seen in chapter three, be equal to a degeneration of identity altogether.

If we move this discussion into the realm of Girard and Freud, we would argue that Hyde is, as it turns out, essentially uncanny since he seems somewhat recognisable though strangely different in being that which we would like to keep repressed, as Utterson states the first time he encounters Hyde. He cannot say what it is about Hyde

that brings to him a sense of discomfort, but we know that it is the fact that Hyde represents the part of the self, and in the end the part of society, which we would want to repress – namely the fully evil part. Hyde is the manifestation of the failure to keep the degenerate human species and the uncontrollable poor in awe and as such Hyde represents a possible degeneration of the entire population, insofar as he is a polluted and contaminating object, as stated above. He is therefore the very essence of the decline of the British Empire. Hence, Hyde is an uncanny hybrid, encompassing something that we essentially recognise as that which we would want to keep repressed. In fiction, the person who must do the repressing is the hero, and as a last step in the taxonomy, I shall look closer at this hero.

5) The Monster is Opposed to a Hero

As Gilmore stated in chapter one, it is evident that the presence of a monster must infer the presence of a hero as well. This simply due to the fact that if Hyde represents the degeneration of the human species *and* the uncontrollable poor, there must be a counter-weight, someone to represent the evolution of man and the dream of the ideal society. Someone like this is always found in the vicinity of the monster, and as such we must locate this hero in *JH*.

The hero is, as I commented in chapter one, the executor of the necessary sacrificial action. The hero must, in other words, kill the monster in order to uphold the sacrificial distinction and avoid a sacrificial crisis. The interesting thing is that if the hero must kill the monster, and often in a very brutal manner, we will find that there is in fact no hero in *JH*. However, as Gilmore states, the monster is *usually* killed off in a gruesome manner, but *JH* is a case in which we are dealing with a "self-destroyer" (39). Since this is the case, it is evident that we must pursue some other role of the hero. The hero is still the projection of the righteous human species, and he is still willing to sacrifice the monster in order to restore order, but unfortunately the monster does the deed himself. Hence, the hero in *JH* is a man that is *willing* to commit the sacrificial action. The hero will, in this light, be found in Mr. Utterson.

Utterson is not like the heroes we know today in the shape of Blade or Van Helsing from movie *Van Helsing* (2004). He is, so to speak, not an action figure but a man of thought. This is not at all unlike heroes in other pieces of fiction from the fin-de-siècle. We can find an equal example in *Dracula*, in which Van Helsing is a scientist; we can discover an example in *Dorian Gray*, in which one will hardly find an action hero;

and, lastly, one will find a famous example in Sherlock Holmes, the well-known detective who solves crimes by use of his extraordinary mind. Hence, at the fin-de-siècle, monster hunters were generally men of thought, not of violence. However, we must recognise that Utterson is willing to use violence if it should come to that, which can be seen in the fact that he brings a poker and Poole an axe (37) as they wish to confront Hyde. Nonetheless, there is no real danger to the hero, since Hyde commits suicide. Even so, it becomes evident that Utterson is the hero of the tale.

Thus, even though Hyde is not as such opposed to a hero who will destroy him in the most brutal manner, he is opposed to a hero all the same. There can hardly be any doubt that it is Utterson who is the hero of the tale, and it is indeed Utterson who Hyde is opposed to.

2.3. Concluding Remarks

As can be seen from the discussions above, it is hard to see Hyde as being anything but a monster. It becomes evident that he is a scapegoat, and even when trying to see him as being something else than a monster – in fact attempting a reading in which he is almost human – it becomes impossible to observe him as being anything but monstrous.

In the course of my investigation, I have concluded several times that Hyde is a scapegoat, and I have concluded that he is an uncanny double of the anxieties following the perceived decline of the British Empire or, more specifically, the degeneration or the human species and the uncontrollable poor. Hence, I believe that my reading of *JH* provides an answer to the thesis-question. By initiating the investigation by examining Hyde as an outsider and a sacrificer, I believe to have shown that he might seem human, but he is in fact a monster and a scapegoat, since his acts of sacrifice are revenged, whereas his death is not. Hyde is, therefore, from the very beginning the victim of outsider creation and thereby an outsider and a likely scapegoat. Investigating the Jekyll/Hyde symbiosis and Hyde as a double emphasised the monstrosity of Hyde and his explicit function as a scapegoat and a polluted object. Finally, by using the taxonomy I believe to have shown even more explicitly that Hyde is a monster, that he is a projection of certain sociocultural anxieties, that he is an outsider and a sacrificial victim that must be excluded by the hero. Hence, I believe that my reading answered the thesis-question from a variety of angles.

There are, of course, numerous other ways in which one can read *JH*, and I do

not wish to negate any of the other possible readings, some of which I have scrutinised in this chapter. However, I do believe that my observations are valid, since I have attempted a reading in which every argument was anchored in the text without me having to read too much into it. What I have discovered is, as said, that no matter how one wishes to look at Hyde, one cannot escape the fact that he is indeed a monster. There is, so to speak, not much about him to ensure any other reading: he is pure evil and has nothing good about him. This is quite simply the premiss by which he has been created.

Having now read *JH* in a manner that I believe to have shed light upon several very important aspects of the text, I now wish to move into some readings of other notable monster-tales of the fin-de-siècle. These readings will be made in order to 1) find an even more extensive answer to the thesis-question, and 2) prove the validity of the taxonomy. Since this chapter has dealt, more or less, strictly with *JH*, I have only shown how the thesis-question can be answered in relation to this text and how the taxonomy works within this context. It is important, in order to show a more wide-ranging validity, to look into other notable texts from the fin-de-siècle in order to discover the validity of my arguments. This will be the purpose of the following chapter.

Chapter 3

Monsters of the Fin-de-siècle

In this chapter I wish to investigate other notable monster tales of the fin-de-siècle. More specifically, I will read Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891), Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897) and Henry James' "The Turn of the Screw" (1898). These are of particular interest given the fact that they represent three famous types of monsters. The readings will follow the taxonomical steps as seen with my reading of *JH*, and having established that the character is indeed a monster, I shall examine the anxieties of which the monster is a repressable projection. It must be noted that the readings in this chapter will be short and rather generalised, but they will work to show the validity of the taxonomy and, through this, answer the thesis-question.

3.1. The Double: The Picture of Dorian Gray

It has often been said of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (henceforth abbreviated *DG*) that it is very similar to *JH*. They are both about double lives, they concern a young, monstrous double and a older doubled and it evolves around a homosocial environment. Yet, despite these similarities, there are certain aspects that makes an investigation of *DG* worthwhile in the context of this study, for it is indeed a story that highlights some interesting difficulties regarding my taxonomy. Furthermore, there is one important difference between *JH* and *DG* that must be accentuated: the importance of sexuality. In chapter two, I argued against the importance of sexuality in *JH*, but one cannot ignore the importance of sexuality in *DG*. Dorian can be read as a homosexual or a heterosexual character, but no matter which reading one might prefer, sexuality is important, and an aspect that cannot be negated. Having now established the importance of *DG*, I wish to move into the taxonomy.

3.1.1. Dorian and the Taxonomy

1) The Monster is a Creature of the Imagination

It is evident that Dorian Gray is a creature of the imagination, which can be observed on different levels. We can, for instance, observe Dorian as an "extreme character". John G. Peters explains this as follows: "[...] Wilde's characters are types and extremes that he

chose for artistic effect rather than realistic representation." (1999; 3). This basically means that the characters portrayed by Wilde are meant to be unrealistic, and as such it is emphasised that Dorian is a fictional character meant to be only so. Hence, Dorian might be said to be an extreme or unrealistic character representing the corruption of the ideal society or the degeneration of the human species. Or, as Peters furthermore notes, "[...] Dorian sells his soul to become the perfection of art and the portrait to become the imperfection of reality." (1999; 10). Therefore, Dorian is both art and artist since he *is* the picture and he *creates* the picture. In this context it is interesting to follow Houston A. Baker, Jr., who states that Wilde's "[...] view of the role that the artist and the critic could play in molding society was extremely sanguine." (1969; 351). This role of the artist is basically the foundation on which *DG* is created: Basil and Lord Henry construct Dorian, a representation of the ideal society, and corrupt him, creating a degenerate society, as I argued above. Hence, there can be little doubt that Dorian fulfils the first taxonomical step in a very explicit manner, since Dorian is constantly referred to as art.

2) The Monster is an Outsider

Here, we have to face a minor problem since Dorian is initially the personification of an insider at the fin-de-siècle. He belongs to a class in which social mingling is the norm, as is frequently portrayed in *DG*. However, there are certain parameters to ensure his outsiderism. For instance, Dorian, in a Hyde-like manner, wanders about town, and one night he "[...] passed by an absurd little theatre, with great flaring gas-jets and gaudy play-bills." (2009; 49). Here, Dorian observes "[a] hideous Jew [...]" (2009; 49) guarding the door. This most likely infers that Dorian has gone to the East End, for the East End was "[...] at the beginning of the 20th Century, home to an estimated 300,000 Jews [...]" (WebD). Hence, Dorian moves away from his home in the wealthy part of London to visit a theatre in the East End, in which he falls in love with (the characters played by) an actress from the lower classes. Hence, Dorian portrays the movement towards degeneration, and one might state that he becomes an image of this anxiety of the degeneration of the human species at the fin-de-siècle, as we saw with Hyde. Later in the tale, Dorian once more seeks the lower classes, as he looks for "[...] opium-dens, where one could buy oblivion, dens of horror where the memory of old sins could be destroyed by the madness of the sins that were new." (2009; 176). Here, one can observe that Dorian moves closer to the uncontrollable mob and thereby he emphasises

his degeneration and consequently the degeneration of the human species. Hence, Dorian moves from being the ideal into being monstrous. Lastly, as a further proof of this developing outsiderism, we learn from Basil that "[...] the most dreadful things are being said against you [Dorian] [...]" (2009; 143). Hence, people are engaging in acts of outsider creation. We also learn that every relationship (whether homo or hetero) that Dorian engages in, ends in misery for practically everyone but Dorian. One can therefore argue, as was stated concerning Hyde, that Dorian is a polluted object that must be killed in order to avoid further contamination. So, Dorian can definitely be seen as becoming an outsider as the tale progresses.

3) The Monsters is Threatening

That Dorian is threatening is linked to him being a polluted object, and it becomes very notable as Dorian's kills Basil:

> Hallward stirred in his chair as if he was going to rise. [Dorian] rushed at him, and dug the knife into the great vein that is behind the ear, crushing the man's head down on the table, and stabbing again and again. (2009; 151)

Here, one finds an echo of Hyde's murder of Danvers Carew, as the same bestial action is repeated. Dorian thus becomes completely impure since he destroys his "Good Angel" (Baker, Jr., 1969; 354). In this, one can see that Dorian moves away from the good path and into the path of evil, and one can see that the murder of Basil and the fact that Dorian pollutes everyone around him definitely accentuate his status as a threat. And this threat is indeed the very basis for his exclusion from the ingroup.

4) The Monster is a Hybrid

In the context of being a hybrid, Dorian is a combination of several things: humanoid and inanimate (human and portrait), young and old (young in life and old in portrait) and "Heaven and Hell" (2009; 150). Yet, even though being a fusion of several distinctive categories, one must acknowledge that Dorian is a spatial fission. Much like we saw with Hyde in the final stages of his life, Dorian's evil self becomes the dominant one, and the good self is only confronted whenever Dorian so desires. Unlike Hyde, Dorian cannot project this good self or the actual self (meaning the ageing man) but is stuck with being a projection of the corrupted ideal society. The portrait is, however,

always disturbing Dorian by its presence, even though Dorian has tried to repress it. Yet, Dorian fears that people should discover the truth, and it is this fear that leads him to destroy the painting, and as a consequence kill himself.

5) The Monster is Opposed to a Hero

The fifth step is very interesting since it shows a potential problem regarding the taxonomy. I have already mentioned that Basil is the Good Angel in the story, and we can thus observe Lord Henry as the Bad Angel. Therefore, we can exclude Lord Henry as being the hero and we might consequently observe Basil as the hero, insofar as he confronts Dorian with his impurity. However, Basil seems far to enthralled by Dorian to sacrifice him. We might also observe James Vane as being the hero, but I do not find this argument valid, since he is merely a minor character in the tale. He might, however, be seen as a co-hero, insofar as his death seems to call forth Dorian's good conscience, and it is obvious to Dorian that James wanted to kill him, which is emphasised after Dorian has seen James' dead body: "As he rode home, his eyes were fill of tears, for he knew he was safe." (2009; 1999). Yet, neither James nor Basil is capable of performing the necessary sacrificial rite for different reasons, and therefore we are faced with two choices: either there is no hero or the hero is Dorian himself. I will argue that there is a hero in the tale, namely Dorian Gray. I anchor this statement in the fact that only Dorian is willing to and capable of engaging in the necessary sacrifice as he, ignorant of the consequent suicide, "[...] seized the [knife], and stabbed the picture with it." (2009; 212). Dorian is, thus, both protagonist and antagonist, hero and monster. Said in other words, Dorian enters a monster/hero symbiosis, in which he, very interestingly, becomes both. This does not at all negate my taxonomy, but it does show that the monster/hero relation is not necessarily as straight-forward as I might have indicated in the taxonomy in chapter one.

3.1.2. Reading Anxieties

Having now discovered that Dorian Gray fulfils every step of the taxonomy, I shall turn to a brief examination of the sexuality of Dorian, since this is very important in understanding the anxieties embedded in *DG*. In this context it is frequently noted that Dorian lives in "[...] a male homosocial environment." (Dellamora in Pykett, 1996; 90), meaning that no women of importance are to be found in the tale. This might appear to

be a strange statement, for Dorian does indeed fall in love with an actress, Sibyl Vane; yet he does not love *her*, but the characters which she portrays. In this context, Ed Cohen states that Sibyl's "[...] appearance merely shows how much an overtly heterosexual discourse depends on male-defined representations of female experience." (Cohen in Pykett, 1996; 119). It can, therefore, be seen that Dorian does not, and cannot, love those who perform art (male or female, painter or actress), but only that which they perform. Following this line of thought, Cohen accentuates that the picture of Dorian foregrounds "[...] the male body as the source of both aesthetic and erotic pleasure." (Cohen in Pykett, 1996; 113). This erotic pleasure is represented as homosexual desire which is observable as Basil narrates the following: "I turned half-way round, and saw Dorian Gray for the first time. When our eyes met, I felt that I was growing pale." (2009; 9). And this first meeting grows even more intense: "Suddenly I found myself face to face with the young man whose personality had so strangely stirred me. We were quite close, almost touching. Our eyes met again." (2009; 10). This shows a homosexual tendency, or at least a homosocial preference. However, as Christopher Craft suggests, no matter whether Dorian is "[...] 'homo' or 'hetero' in relation to its presumed external objects (and the text authorizes both), Dorian's eroticism remains fundamentally self-motivated and self-directed." (2005; 116). Following this, I would argue that Dorian might be in love with himself, but he is equally in love with the *idea* of himself constituted by the portrait of his own perceived purity.

The possibility that Dorian is neither homo- nor heterosexual emphasises the importance of discussing his sexuality, for in this self-sexuality, one might find that Dorian is to project a fear of the degenerate human species. Thereby meant that Dorian is meant to be a projection of the outwardly idealised society hiding its inwardly dark and immoral tendencies; an image of a nation experiencing degeneration but projecting success. In this light, one might argue that *DG* becomes the tale of how internal degeneration of the human species will in the end destroy even the most perfect external projection of success and purity. As such, *DG* becomes a projection of the fall of the British Empire at the fin-de-siècle. Hence, *DG* must indeed be read as a tale of degeneration. It is obvious that sexuality plays a huge part in the tale, but this is not, I would argue alongside Craft, based in Dorian as homosexual or heterosexual, but more on his self-sexuality as he, in a narcissistic manner, desires no one but himself. As such, one can see that *DG* becomes a double of the society into which it was written, a society which projected wealth and experienced fall.

However, one might also engage in another reading of the tale. The first reading must be seen as coloured by Wilde's sexuality. The other reading can be seen as coloured by his nationality. Wilde was an Irishman living in London. According to Curtis Marez, Wilde argued that he lived in London because of the artistic opportunities it gave him: "There is no lack of culture in Ireland but it is nearly all absorbed in politics. Had I remained there my career would have been a political one." (Wilde in Marez, 1997; 261). Marez furthermore notes that Wilde was, in some sense, an Irish Nationalist, but he still enjoyed the artistic freedom that London allowed. Hence:

> this double position allowed him to criticize the current state of English rule in Ireland while maintaining his devotion to a uniquely British heritage encapsulated in a canon of beauty. (Marez, 1997; 262)

Therefore, it is plausible that we, in *DG*, can observe how the criticism of the English rule in Ireland is portrayed alongside Wilde's devotion the the scene of art. For *DG* evolves around art and the artist but one will also see that *DG* accentuates the battle between the pure and the impure. As we can see with the image "The Irish 'Vampire'" (WebE), which I shall examine closer in relation to *Dracula*, Ireland was portrayed as a young, beautiful lady, drained by the monstrous freedom fighters. In *DG*, one can reverse this argument and state that Dorian becomes the beautiful representation of the perfect Ireland as seen through Wilde, and the creators of this perfect projection (Basil and Lord Henry) become the monstrous vampires, draining Dorian of his purity. Hence, it is a possibility to not only read Dorian as a projection of the anxieties of the degenerate human species but also as a criticism of the colonisation of Ireland by the British Empire and the anxieties following this, thus becoming an uncanny double of society and the anxieties that must be repressed. Therefore one can observe that the thesis-question of this study has found an answer by following two lines of thought: *DG* as a tale of human degeneration and as a tale of impure colonisation.

Having now engaged in a brief reading of *DG*, I will move on to reading another noteworthy and famous fin-de-siècle Gothic text written by one of Wilde's fellow Irishmen, namely Bram Stoker's *Dracula*.

3.2. The Vampire: Dracula

When dealing with Dracula, we can observe, as we saw with *DG*, that a sexual reading

is more or less impossible to avoid. Therefore, in order to investigate *Dracula* as an uncanny double of society, I wish to investigate Dracula's overt sexuality and his actions as being yet again the threat of the decline of the British Empire *and* the threat of human degeneration. First, however, I will investigate Dracula as a monster, using the taxonomy.

3.2.1. Dracula and the Taxonomy

1) The Monster is a Creature of the Imagination

Even though Dracula is supposedly based on a real, historical character, we must also realise that he is a fictitious character existing only in the text and in our imagination. Furthermore, Dracula is, as shall come to be known in the following, a projection of the repressed anxieties at the fin-de-siècle. Since this will be of interest shortly, I will not elaborate this here, but I can say that Dracula is a projection of corrupted sexual borders and following this sexual degeneration, one can find a complete degeneration of the human species. Additionally, as also noted before, and as will be further accentuated later, Dracula comes to represent a reversed colonisation and, in this context, the anxieties following the Irish Problem, as we saw with *DG*. So, Dracula is indeed a creature of the imagination, both insofar as he is an imaginary entity, and because he is a projection of certain cultural anxieties.

2) The Monster is an Outsider

Moving along, we can discover that Dracula is indeed an outsider, on several levels. He is an outsider insofar as he is a foreigner and he is an outsider since he is of another species, which Jonathan Harker soon learns as he sees Dracula "[...] slowly emerge from the window and begin to crawl down the castle wall over that dreadful abyss, *face down* with his cloak spreading out around him like great wings." (2000; 30). The realisation that Dracula might not be a human being is further accentuated as Harker asks "[w]hat manner of man is this, or what manner of creature is it in the semblance of man?" (2000; 30). And this is the core of Dracula, for he looks like a man, but it is evident, as Harker says, that he is not a human being, but a creature looking like a human being, hence humanoid. However, even though he is an outsider, he is trying to buy estates in London, which might suggest that he is attempting to move from the outgroup into the ingroup. Yet, this initial attempt to become an insider proves quickly

to be merely an attempt to colonise the heart of the British Empire, which I will comment upon shortly. Furthermore, as Tynan states, "[...] while the Count's otherness is discernible to the naked eye, he is also adept at blending into his surroundings." (2010; 1). We can therefore observe that Dracula is indeed an outsider, but even so he is able to blend into his surroundings, inferring some similarity between Dracula and those he wants to imitate. We can therefore conclude, following Girard, that Dracula is a likely scapegoat, and as such there can be little doubt that Dracula is in fact an outsider.

3) The Monsters is Threatening

It is evident that Dracula is indeed a threat to the community. This threat becomes evident even before we experience Dracula in his vampire shape; Jonathan Harker, for instance, states that "[...] he could control the wolves, as he did, by only holding up his hand in silence [...]" (2000; 25). Later, Harker is faced with the danger of Dracula and his alliance with the wolves for, as he states, "[w]ith such allies as these at his command, I could do nothing." (2000; 43). Yet, even though Dracula is dangerous before we learn that he is a vampire, he is even more threatening as he exercises his vampireous tendencies. In this context, he presumably kills the sailors on his way to England. I say *presumably*, for there is "[...] no evidence to adduce; and whether or not the man himself committed the murders there is now none to say." (2000; 73). It can, nonetheless, be proved that he violently rapes and seduces Lucy and Mina, and he tries to pollute the British Empire by colonising London, and impregnating its fairest ladies. In fact, the only character to explicitly penetrate these two women is Dracula, who sucks the blood from them as is his way of seduction. However, Lucy is the only one completely seduces, and not even the pure blood of the band of hunters can rescue her. Only Mina, who incidentally "[...] has man's brain [...]" (2000; 194), can partially resist Dracula's seduction, only to be seduced equally by Van Helsing, who might not rape her body, but who rapes her brain in his desperate search for information. Mina is, nonetheless, rescued which can be based on her having the brain of a man and not, like Lucy, the brain of a woman. Yet, even though Mina is saved, the threat of Dracula remains potent until he is killed.

4) The Monster is a Hybrid

It is rather obvious that Dracula is a hybrid, insofar as he is a fusion of living/dead; but we must also recognise that he is a fission as well, insofar as he can transform between

his humanoid appearance and wolf, dog, bat and fog. Furthermore, even when appearing in his humanoid shape, he becomes a fusion of human and winged creature, according to Harker as he observes Dracula crawl down the walls of the castle. Dracula does, in fact, consist of many different animal figures, all ensuring that the reader understands that Dracula is inhuman, an outsider and threatening. Hence, Dracula probably encompasses more categories than any other monster of the fin-de-siècle and one therefore has no trouble in stating that he is a hybrid. Interestingly, as a final comment, one will note that Hyde and Dorian also ensured a mingling of fission and fusion, altering the spectatoral function temporarily. However, with Dracula we will find that he also violates the hierarchical function, since he moves between humanoid, demonic, animal and inanimate as well as between fusion and fission. This is interesting and proves the complete monstrosity of Dracula.

5) The Monster is Opposed to a Hero

There can be little doubt that Dracula is opposed to a hero, namely Van Helsing (and the band of hunters), who is continuously trying to eliminate Dracula and his attempts so pollute and destroy the British Empire. This monster/hero symbiosis is enhanced by the outsider creation connected to Dracula, since his violent acts are linguistically portrayed as being threatening and impure, even though he merely seduces Lucy and Mina. This seduction is, in fact, nothing more than a violent proposal, for he merely wishes for them to become his brides. Contrary to this, the murder of Dracula committed by the band of hunters is described as being desirable. Furthermore, we are asked to believe the story of the band of hunters blindly since, as Jonathan states, "[...] there is hardly one authentic document" (2000; 315), meaning that everything that the reader has read must be taken at face-value, for we have no evidence that it ever happened. And, even more important, we have no statement from Dracula, which means that it is rather easy for us to see him as the outgroup, since we hear the story from the threatened ingroup. This, naturally, merely emphasises the ease with which we can construct and constitute the roles of hero and monster. So, as we can see here, the monstrosity of Dracula is relatively easily established. An interesting aspect of *Dracula* could therefore be to see how this text projects the anxieties of the fin-de-siècle, which will be of interest, as I move into a closer reading of the anxieties of *Dracula*.

3.2.2. Reading Anxieties

Starting with a sexual reading of the text, it has been inferred that there are certain homosexual tendencies in *Dracula*. As Christopher Crafts states, "Dracula's desire to fuse with a male, most explicitly evoked when Harker cuts himself shaving, subtly and dangerously suffuses he text." (1984; 110). However, we must recognise that Dracula "[...] seems to be the world's last surviving male vampire." (Auerbach in Pykett, 1996; 28). As such, one will also notice that as Dracula attacks the sailors, there is no indication whatsoever that these sailors transform. In fact, only the female victims transform into vampires, which might suggest a 'heterosexual' relation between vampire and victim. Relating to this, there is another element that we must take into consideration: the main quest for Dracula is to move to England and be "[...] the father or furtherer of a new order of beings […]" (2000; 252), which would infer that his quest is to contaminate the purity of the British Empire. In creating this "new order of beings" he must impregnate others with his seed, and the only beings that he truly impregnates are, as Auerbach comments, the three brides, Lucy and Mina (Auerbach in Pykett, 1996; 28). Interestingly, the brides do apparently not transform anyone. This might indicate that only male vampires can transform their victims, even though the women are equally capable of penetrating their victims. This could furthermore indicate that, even though a discussion of homo- or heterosexuality of Dracula is very interesting, it is more accurate to follow Catherine Belsey, who states that the vampire deconstructs sexuality since "both male and female vampires penetrate their victims, but only after they have been penetrated by another vampire" (1994; 174). Hence, vampires are androgynous, as they penetrate their victim, receiving the vital fluid, and they are penetrated, giving the vital fluid, in order to become vampires. This receiving/giving-relation reverses the natural order of sexual intercourse, insofar as penetration usually entails giving the fluid and being penetrated infers receiving the vital fluid. Hence, vampires on a very basic level deconstruct the natural order, emphasised by their androgynous behaviour. This androgyny is further accentuated as Dracula allows Mina to drink his blood in the following sequence:

> With that he pulled open his shirt, and with his long sharp nails opened a vein in his breast. When the blood began to spurt out, he took my hands in one of his, holding them tight, and with the other seized my neck and pressed my mouth to the wound, so that I must either suffocate or swallow […] (2000; 240)

In this context, Craft states that this image of breastfeeding "[...] entails a confusion of Dracula's sexual identity [...] as Dracula here becomes a lurid mother [...]" (1984; 125). Hence, it is more accurate to state that the vampire is a picture of the deconstruction of sexual identity. One could in this context state that a deconstruction of sexual identity is followed by a deconstruction of identity altogether, which is the case with Lucy, who, after having been raped by Dracula, moves between vampire at night and human by day, and as she becomes a vampire she engages in yet another crisis of identity: "I call the thing that was before us Lucy because it bore her shape" (2000; 175). Hence, it looks like Lucy but it is not Lucy, meaning that her identity has been completely corrupted. We are, therefore, not only observing a degeneration of sexual identity at the fin-de-siècle, but a complete degeneration of the human species caused by the impurity of the dangerous outsider.

Another reading of *Dracula*, more or less following the above, addresses the matter of the decline of the British Empire. I have mentioned this earlier, but I wish to investigate it further here. In this context, we will observe Dracula as a colonial power, trying to colonise the very heart of the British Empire, London. In light of the argument that Dracula's "[...] invasion of London in order to 'batten on the helpless' natives there mirrors British imperial activities abroad." (Arata, 1990; 633) and since "[...] Victorian readers could recognize their culture's imperial ideology mirrored back as a kind of monstrosity." (Arata, 1990; 634), Dracula becomes an uncanny double of this society, and thereby a scapegoat. One could thus, following Arata, state that Dracula is a representation of the the contaminated British Empire, trying to pollute other nations with its impurity. In fact, Tynan describes Dracula as follows:

> [...] a figure that represents an otherness that can infect, corrupt and ultimately destroy. His parasitic appetite seeks its own growth by gorging on the healthy and pure, ultimately destroying the host body. (2010; 1).

This description is very accurate in this context if we remember that the Irish mob was frequently portrayed as monstrous in, for instance, the cartoon "The Irish 'Vampire'". This cartoon portrays the Irish revolutionary Charles Parnell as a vampire attacking a female figure, presumably a personification of Ireland. In connection with this cartoon, it can be noted that "[a]ttempts to liberate Ireland from English rule are depicted […] as monstrous and predatory, draining Ireland of her strength and ultimately, her humanity."

(WebE). Therefore it is not at all mysterious that Bram Stoker, himself an Irishman, should create a monster in the shape of a vampire to represent an uncanny double of the British Empire. In this manner, Dracula represents the monstrous colonisation that the British Empire has continuously engaged in, and the attempt to liberate the country is portrayed as heroic. The colonial power (Dracula) is seen as monstrous and the freedom-fighters (the hunters) are seen as heroes. This is very unlike the image of "The Irish 'Vampire'", in which the freedom-fighters are seen as monsters and the colonial power is thus implicitly seen as being the hero, who will ensure the humanity of Ireland. By positioning the monster in the heart of the British Empire, Stoker manages to redirect the attention and reverse the colonising process, as he has reversed the regular sexual gender roles. *Dracula* thus becomes a metaphor for the unjust British Empire and the justification for fighting for freedom.

Hence, as can be seen, *Dracula* indeed becomes an uncanny double of society. As Arata states, Dracula represents the British Empire in various ways, and the Victorian reader would be able to recognise this. Having now briefly read *Dracula*, I wish to turn my focus to the last text of interest in this study, namely "The Turn of the Screw".

3.3. The Ghost: The Turn of the Screw

Henry James' tale "The Turn of the Screw" (henceforth abbreviated *Screw*) is singular within this study for several reasons. Firstly, James was American but became a British subject (Baym (ed.), 2003; 468) and lived in England from 1876 – meaning at least the last forty years of his life. So, I can without trouble justify including him in this study, which has focused strictly on authors asscoictaed with the British literary scene. Secondly, the tale is primarily told from the point of view of a woman – the structure of the tale is, however, more complex than that, for the frame is actually narrated by both an "I" and Douglas. Hence, it is the story told by the governess as read by Douglas and experienced through the "I". So, we will actually find a rather complex and interesting narrative pattern very similar to that of Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*, in which "[t]he reader (R) thus moves through Lockwood's narration (L) and then through Nelly's (N) […] until he/she arrives at the core of the novel (C)." (Brontë, 2000; xv). We are, therefore, dealing with a narrative pattern that relies on the credibility of the narrator of each tale.

This credibility of the narrator leads to the third element of interest, namely the sanity of the governess. Regarding this aspect, the ghosts of the tale have been read in two ways: either as imaginary creatures of the governess' mind, which would render her insane, or as actual ghosts haunting the house, the kids or the governess herself. Hence, as Thomas J. Bontly states, one major issue in the reading of *Screw* "[...] has concerned, of course, the reality of the ghosts and the sanity of the governess." (1969; 721). Or, basically the story either concerns an insane woman *or* supernatural events. Either way, the story can, according to Nathan B. Fagin, be read simply as "[...] an allegory which dramatizes the conflict between Good and Evil." (1941; 200). However, in this study, I will take as a point of departure that the story concerns actual ghosts and not, initially, an insane woman. Moving on to an closer analysis of the text, we must move into the taxonomy in order to define the ghosts as monsters.

3.3.1. The Ghosts and the Taxonomy

<u>1) The Monster is a Creature of the Imagination</u>

It is evident that the ghosts are imaginary creatures, and we cannot, in fact, be sure that anyone, besides the governess, ever observes the ghosts. Furthermore, the first taxonomical step requires that the monster must represent some cultural fear or anxiety. Even though the tale can, as mentioned before, be seen as a struggle between good and evil, I believe it to be more accurate to state that it is basically a struggle between the pure and the impure. The governess fights hard to maintain some degree of purity within the children, and she suspects that the ghosts are trying to corrupt them: "Heaven forbid! The man. He wants to appear to *them*." (1980; 323). However, even though one can observe *Screw* as a tale of the possible corruption of the children, James is indeed highly ambiguous regarding this aspect, allowing several possible readings. I shall return to the ambiguity later but for now I merely wish to state that the ghosts are creatures of the imagination since they are explicitly highlighted as being fictional characters. In fact, it is made clear to the readers from the beginning that it is merely a tale, insofar as the last lines in the frame-tale goes: "But Douglas, without heeding me, had begun to read with a fine clearness that was like a rendering to the ear of the beauty of his author's hand." (1980; 298). Hence, there are two aspects within this step ensuring that we see the ghosts as creatures of the imagination: a) we are being told a story in which the ghosts function as an uncanny element of suspense and terror, and b) we are

not certain whether the ghosts actually exist, for no one but the governess is proven to have sees them.

2) The Monster is an Outsider

We can very clearly state that the ghosts are outsiders. This can be seen through the fact that the ghosts primarily inhabit the outer rims: Quint is initially observed "[...] at the very top of the tower [...]" (1980; 310). The second encounter with Quint happens as he stands outside the house looking in (1980; 316). As the governess sees Jessel for the first time, Jessel is standing at the other side of the lake, inhabiting the outer rims of the ground (1980; 327). And it is in such ways that the governess chiefly encounters the ghosts: either at night or as ensuring the outer rims. Furthermore, as the governess intends to leave Bly, she finds Jessel inside the house "Dark as midnight in her black dress [...]" (1980; 365). Having thus seen Jessel inside the house, the governess, in an act of apparent heroism, decides not to leave the children, and as such the ghosts inhabit the outer rims *and* secures the borders. Hence, the ghosts definitely fulfils the second taxonomical step.

3) The Monster is Threatening

This step is very interesting to observe as well, for it is obvious that the governess believes the ghosts to be threatening: "He was absolutely, on this occasion, a living, detestable, dangerous presence." (1980; 342). The fact of the matter is, as I have mentioned above, that no one but the governess sees the ghosts. Mrs. Grose does, however, claim that Flora has told her certain things that could indicate that she has seen the ghosts (1980; 388), but we do not know precisely what Flora has said, so we must rely on the credibility of the housekeeper. We must also remember that it is the governess who states that "[...] it was not for me he had come there. He had come for someone else." (1980; 316). In fact, the ghosts do not seem to do any harm to the children – at least not any harm that we can be sure of. Even though the governess is certain that the ghosts will harm those around her, we must acknowledge that those around her are only frightened as the governess mirrors the ghosts by, for instance, going to the tower (1980; 347) or looking in through the window (1980; 317). We must therefore state the the ghosts are "[...] obliged to act through *human* agents." (Bontly, 1969; 733), and the human agent through which they act can be found in the governess. Yet, one must also observe that the ghosts do not physically hurt the governess or

anyone else, but they disturb her mentally so that she turns somewhat hysterical. Hence, the ghosts are in fact dangerous, though not physically.

4) The Monster is a Hybrid

The fourth taxonomical step states that the monster must be a hybrid. This should be fairly easy to accept, insofar as the ghost is among those creatures that Noël Carroll terms as fusion figures. Quint and Jessel are thus fusions of dead and alive and inside and outside. Insofar as they walk in our world we could indicate that they are both alive and insiders, but they do in fact not belong in our world, since they are dead and thereby, by definition, outsiders. So, we can easily observe the ghosts as hybrids. It might be worth noting that the ghosts play with the hierarchical function, meaning that they might appear to be humanoid fusions, but they are essentially inanimate, insofar as they are dead people come back to hunt. This might be mirrored in their threat-level, for even though they appear to be threatening, they cannot hurt anyone physically but must use humans agents. However, they do not change their appearance in the course of the text, which further accentuates the importance of including *Screw* within this study, for it is necessary to emphasise that not all monsters change their appearance, even though they are hybrids.

5) The Monster is Opposed to a Hero

In *Screw* we can only find the hero in the governess who, according to her own testimony, finds "[...] a joy in the extraordinary flight of heroism the occasion demanded of me." (1980; 325). And one might indeed state that there is no one better to fight the impurity of the ghosts than a parson's daughter (1980; 339). However, as stated above, it might in fact be the governess who corrupts the children, but insofar as I started my investigation by stating that I will take the governess' explanation at face-value, there can be no other hero in the tale than the governess herself. And she does whatever she can to keep the children safe and pure, as she states that "[t]he more I saw, the less they would." (1980; 326). Hence, she is willing to sacrifice her own purity for the children. Furthermore, she might not exclude the ghosts by killing them, but as we saw in chapter one, the sacrificial victim is not necessarily killed but might merely be extinguished to the periphery. And this is the case with the ghosts, for the governess keeps them from the children, hence at the periphery of the community. One difficulty might arise when having to look at the governess as the picture of the ideal society, as is a key element in

being a hero. Yet, one might suggest that the governess portrays the matriarchal society, and insofar as this is the case, we can state that she embodies the ideal society of the fin-de-siècle, or the late-Victorian era, in which the British Empire was indeed a matriarchal society. Therefore it is possible to view it as a valid argument that the governess is the hero and that she represents the ideal society, since she represents and mirrors the society surrounding the context of *Screw* at the fin-de-siècle.

3.3.2. Reading Anxieties

One anxiety that I wish to emphasise follows the argument in step five above, namely the corruptive matriarchal society due to the lack of masculine involvement or masculine authority. I mentioned above that James is highly ambiguous regarding certain aspects of the tale, which is highlighted in the ambiguity surrounding the the relationship between the governess and Miles. This ambiguity can be seen in the following: "[...] he bent forward and kissed me. […] I met his kiss and I had to make, while I folded him for a minute in my arms, the most stupendous effort not to cry." (1980; 350). In this context, Bontly states that the governess' "[...] treatment of the boy paradoxically combines her desire to keep him sexually ignorant and innocent and her impulse to act as if he were a mature and knowledgeable adult." (1969; 731). As Bontly furthermore notes, her desire to keep the children safe "[...] becomes an implement of evil, a destructive force more potent than the ghosts themselves." (1969; 733). Hence, even though the governess tries to protect the children, she becomes the corruptive force. This corruptive nature is brought about by her believing that the children can see the ghosts. Her desperate desire to be proven right leads Flora to beg of Mrs. Grose to "[...] take me away from *her!*" (1980; 383). Insofar as we have no evidence that the children have seen the ghosts, we must assume that their corruption happens not, as the governess suspects, because Quint and Jessel have "[...] made them […] still cleverer even than nature did" (1980; 386) but because she has herself been polluted by the ghosts. As Bontly states, Quint and Jessel "[...] are *her* ghosts, seen only by her, meaningful only to her, and hostile only to her – at least in so far as the events of the tale give us definite and concrete evidence." (1969; 729). Hence, the governess has been polluted by the impurity of Quint and Jessel, which in the end also pollutes Flora and kills Miles. This impurity might exactly be brought about through the lack of a male, authoritative voice, which could be seen as a criticism of the British Empire at the fin-de-siècle.

One might also state that *Screw* is a classical example of women being inferior, as we saw in *Dracula* with the seduction of Lucy and Mina. The governess herself states of Miles that "[...] there was a little boy in the world who could have for the inferior age, sex, and intelligence so fine a consideration." (1980; 340). It is significant that the main character is a woman, and her being "[...] rather easily carried away." (1980; 300) might indicate that James viewed women as being easily corrupted. In *Screw*, this corruption happens as a consequence of the lack of masculine authority, as discussed. As Bontly says, "[...] it is this absence of masculine authority and strength which accentuates the governess's weaknesses and makes it possible for the ghosts to haunt her [...]" (1969; 733). Hence, one might observe a sociocultural criticism in *Screw* suggesting that every society needs male influence in order to survive and in order to avoid corruption, because women are evidently easily corrupted and easily carried away. Nonetheless, Gothic novels are regularly [...] all about patriarchies, about how they function, what threatens them, what keeps them going [...]" (Heiland, 2004; 10) which is interesting in this context because it might suggest that any given society needs both masculine and feminine forces, and a lack of either will lead to social degeneration.

As the above discussion has shown, the ghosts are monsters and their presence sheds light on certain cultural anxieties, making them doubles of some cultural fear. At the very least, they are the catalysts emphasising the need for masculine authority embodying in this context the uncanny outsider that can break the Empire, like we saw in *Dracula*. Having now read *Screw* as the last text in this chapter and in this study as a whole, I shall conclude on my findings in this chapter in the following.

3.4. Concluding Remarks

Several interesting things have appeared in the course of reading these notable monster tales. Most noteworthy is that we will find instances like *DG* in which the monster and the hero become one and the same. This is interesting and indeed the reason for including *DG* in this study. This, of course, also entails certain difficulties regarding my taxonomy, and especially step five. But this also infers a deeper understanding of the taxonomy which is very valuable. Much the same can be found in *Screw* in which we found that we must either see the hero(ine) as an insane woman or fierce protector of purity. What makes *Screw* so immensely interesting to investigate is that it does not rule out any of the readings due to its high level of ambiguity. It must also be noted, in this

context, that I have not found any other reading linking the fall of a matriarchal society at the fin-de-siècle to *Screw,* but I believe such a reading to be valid and definitely a reading to be considered alongside other readings.

One can note that Dracula is the most overtly and explicitly monstrous creature examined in this chapter. In its aftermath, certain nuances have been added to *Dracula*, and in the 1992 adaptation *Bram Stoker's Dracula*, Dracula is portrayed as less monstrous, since he merely hungers for love. As could be seen in all three readings, I chose to follow the taxonomy step-by-step. This was done simply to ensure a uniform reading of the texts, emphasising the elements that I found to be important in order to validate the taxonomy and, consequently, answer the thesis-question. Furthermore, it must be noticed that I, unlike my reading of *JH*, chose to separate the reading of the sociocultural anxieties from the taxonomy. A complete separation was, naturally, impossible, but I believed it interesting to first completely validate my taxonomy, which would also validate the monstrous creature's status as a monstrous scapegoat before investigating the anxieties of which the monster was a projection. But I believe that this chapter has exactly proven the validity of my taxonomy and provided a further answer to my thesis-question by firstly emphasising the monstrosity of the creature and secondly reading the anxieties embedded within the tales. Therefore, I believe these tales to show how the monster works as an uncanny double of our anxieties and, as a consequence, as a scapegoat. I therefore wish to move into a conclusion of this study in the following chapter.

II

Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to explore how monsters function as uncanny literary doubles of a given society and the fears and anxieties embedded within this society. Likewise, it has been an aim to explore how these monstrous doubles act as sacrificial victims due to their status as literary doubles. In other words, the aim of this thesis has been to answer the following thesis-question:

How does the literary monster function as an *uncanny* double of society and of the fears and anxieties embedded within this society, and how does it function, due to its status as a double, as a sacrificial victim?

In order to answer this thesis-question, I have applied René Girard's concept "sacrificial victim" and Freud's notions of "uncanny", "projection" and "repression". These terms are shown to be interesting to examine together, even though Girard denies a psychoanalytical reading of the process of scapegoating. However, I believe the psychological terms applied by Freud to be highly valuable in connection with a reading of scapegoating, and in particular when investigating literary monsters, or monstrous creatures, as scapegoats, for these are in fact creatures projected by the author, meant to be repressed by the hero and the reader. Hence, the psychological realm and the realm of scapegoating are interesting and useful to apply together.

Reversing the thesis-question, temporarily disregarding the monster, I will briefly discuss sacrificial victims as uncanny doubles in order to answer how they can be seen as thus. The sacrificial victim is, according to Girard, a creature that has been singled out as being an impure creature within a contaminated society. Or, in other words, it is seen as a creature that is to blame for every evil and misery befalling the community within which the sacrificial victim exists. In order to rid society of this pressing evil, the impure, contaminating creature must be ousted in order for the community to be purified. Hence, the sacrificial victim is a projection of the anxieties following some misery within a given society, and by excluding or repressing this one, impure creature, the community believes to be rid of this evil. Therefore, the sacrificial victim must be seen as a double of these anxieties, and insofar as the community sees in

the sacrificial victim that which they have tried to keep repressed, it becomes an uncanny double.

Observing the first part of the thesis-question, namely that the monster is an uncanny double, it can be argued that the monster functions as a projection of society and the fears within this society. This can, for instance, be seen on a cultural level, in which the fear of human degeneration or the unjust imperial strategy of the British Empire against Ireland at the fin-de-siècle can be projected into certain monstrous entities, like Dracula or, as argued, Dorian Gray. Said in other words, these fictitious characters represent the anxieties connected to certain cultural events, and as such they work within a social frame. Therefore, the monster becomes an uncanny double of the anxieties within a given society.

Finally, linking these two sections and thus justifying the thesis-question, since the monster can be seen as an uncanny double of the anxieties embedded within a particular society, and since scapegoats can be seen as playing an equal role, it is fair to argue that the monster also becomes a scapegoat or a sacrificial victim. Furthermore, the function that is imposed upon the sacrificial victim is one which can also be discovered with the monster. Here as well, one will find a person who has to exclude the creature that has been deemed impure by a unanimous community, and insofar as the creature is impure it must be eliminated. Hence, following these arguments, it becomes obvious that one can observe the monster as being an uncanny double of society and of the anxieties embedded within this society and as a sacrificial victim.

In order to answer the thesis-question, three things were emphasised: 1) some very general observations on the monster and 2) some more specific categorisations of the monster. These two were lastly summarised by 3) a taxonomy highlighting the most general aspects of the investigations into the field of monstrosity. One might also state that step one emphasised the general tendencies whereas step two emphasised the more specific tendencies regarding the different points of view highlighted by the writers within the field. The taxonomy then boiled down the investigations of steps one and two, turning the entire field of monstrosity into five generalised steps that should help me answer my thesis-question.

Using the very generalised taxonomy on four specific texts and types of monsters was fruitful and I believe the taxonomy helped emphasise those elements of particular interest in relation to answering the thesis-question, namely that monsters do project certain anxieties and that monsters are sacrificial victims that must be excluded

in order for a given society to reach some degree of cleansing. Furthermore, the taxonomy ensured a uniform reading, and the taxonomy has definitely been proven as valid, since I have been able to apply it to four particular types of monsters of the fin-de-siècle. The question remains whether the taxonomy is valid in a contemporary context.

Given the fact that I limited the research to the fin-de-siècle, it is obvious that the specific findings in relation to the thesis-question and the taxonomy is limited to this context. However, I believe that one can investigate the thesis-question in any cultural context and within any time-frame and discover that contemporary monsters within that given time-frame do in fact work as uncanny doubles and as scapegoats. I furthermore believe that one will find that the taxonomy will be applicable within any time-frame, insofar as it does not emphasise any aspect that is culturally specific nor specific to any given time-frame. Had I emphasised matters of specific sociocultural interest, it would be hard to apply the taxonomy to a contemporary monster, but given the generalised nature of the taxonomy, I believe it to be applicable to any specific monster, regardless of time or sociocultural context.

One last and highly interesting observation regarding the monster as an outsider includes the authors behind the stories. For it is indeed interesting to observe that the authors, whose novels have been examined in the course of this study, are all outsiders themselves. I have, in the course of this study, been dealing with anxieties of importance regarding the British Empire and England in particular, but none of the authors are in fact from England. Robert Louis Stevenson was born in Edinburgh, Scotland, Oscar Wilde was born in Dublin, Ireland, as was Bram Stoker, and Henry James was born in New York, USA. Hence, none of the authors were English at birth. In this light, we might very well see the authors as outsiders trying to break the natural order of things by criticising the British Empire. Thereby one must also note that the monsters are as much outsiders as are their authors, and it might therefore be relevant to state that the sociocultural criticism that I have argued for in the readings of the texts can be seen as guided by the anxieties of an outsider rather than the fears of an insider. Even more interesting is the fact that Oscar Wilde was a homosexual, hence as much a social outcast as the monstrous creatures examined here. One must therefore not neglect this element of the textual context, for it might very well be so that the texts are coloured by the context of the author.

In light of the above discussion, and the discussions throughout this thesis, I

believe the thesis-question to be answered in a satisfying manner. I believe that monsters are uncanny doubles of the society into which they are written, and I do believe that monsters, due to this status as uncanny doubles, function as scapegoats. In the context of the limitations of this particular study, I believe to have shown how the monsters of the fin-de-siècle functioned as uncanny doubles of the anxieties embedded within the British Empire. But despite the very specific nature of these conclusions, I believe that the findings can be seen as somewhat more generalised, and I believe that the thesis-question could have been asked in connection with any time-frame, and one would have come to the same conclusion. And this is exactly the beauty of monsters, both at the fin-de-siècle and today: their destruction can clear the path for the survival of humanity. We are not naïve, of course. We know that the monster cannot completely rid our society of all its evils, and we know that as soon as we put down the book, we have to face reality. But while reading the book, we do not have to worry about such matters. In the course of reading, we can believe whatever we want to believe and in the course of reading, the destruction of the monster becomes a testament of how the good and the pure will always defeat the evil and impure. We should, in fact, be thankful to have such monsters, for they allow us to believe in humanity. Monsters never die – as soon as we have anxieties to repress and threats to be projected, we will resurrect the monster, and the monster is willing to be killed over and over again.

Monsters are indeed the true heroes.

Dansk resumé

Dette speciale vil omhandle spørgsmålet om, hvorvidt man kan se monstre som værende "uncanny doubles" af et givent samfund og dettes bekymringer, og hvorvidt de i denne rolle som kulturelle dobbeltgængere kan ses som syndebukke. Specialet vil være begrænset til at omhandle tiden omkring *fin-de-siècle* i England, altså århundredeskiftet mellem det nittende og det tyvende århundrede. Denne tidsbegrænsning er valgt, fordi mange af de bekymringer, som kan anskues i det Britiske Imperium på dette tidspunkt, også er at finde i samtidens skønlitterære kontekst. I denne forbindelse vil jeg primært analysere fire tekster indenfor tidsrammen: Robert Louis Stevensons *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886), som vil være mit primære analyseobjekt, Oscar Wildes *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891), Bram Stokers *Dracula (*1897) og Henry James' "The Turn of the Screw" (1898). I disse fire tekster kan man finde en vis fokus på bekymringer omkring fin-de-siècle, som gør det særdeles interessant at undersøge deres monstrøse karakterer nærmere.

I forbindelse med læsningen af forskellige teorier omhandlende monstrøsitet, og i forbindelse med min analyse af ovennævnte tekster, vil jeg konstruere en taksonomi, der vil forsøge at inkorporere de fællesnævnere, man kan finde i de mange forskellige typer monstre, der findes. Dette er en svær opgave, og de fem taksonomiske skridt er da også højst selektivt valgt, således at taksonomien vil være behjælpelig med at besvare min problemformulering.

For at se monsteret som dobbeltgænger og syndebuk, vil specialet være fokuseret på især to teoretikere: René Girard, der har skrevet om syndebukbegrebet (hvad han kalder "the sacrificial victim" eller "the scapegoat"), og Sigmund Freud, hvis begreber "the uncanny", "projection" og "repression" vil være særdeles brugbare i forbindelse med besvarelsen af problemformuleringen. I denne sammenhæng må jeg sige, at Girard selv nægter at psykoanalysere brugen af syndebukke, men netop grundet at jeg anser monsteret som en syndebuk og som en projektion af vores bekymringer og vores dybeste frygt, vil jeg argumentere imod Girard på dette punkt.

Sagt ganske kort omhandler nærværende speciale monsterets funktion som literær dobbeltgænger for de bekymringer, der til enhver tid er at finde i et samfund i en given historisk periode – her specificeret omkring fin-de-siècle – og som en syndebuk, der kan udryddes for at slippe af med disse bekymringer.

Bibliography

Books and Articles

<u>Theory</u>

Arata, Stephen D.”The Occidental Tourist: "Dracula" and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization” in *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 4 (1990), pp. 621-645

Baker, Jr., Houston A.; “The Tragedy of the Artist: The Picture of Dorian Gray” in *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, Vol. 24, No. 3 (1969), pp. 349-355.

Baym, Nina (ed.); *The Norton Anthology of American Literature, Sixth Edition, Volume C*, New York, London: W.W. Norton and Company (2003)

Belsey, Catherine; *Desire – Love Stories in Western Culture*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers (1994)

Bontly, Thomas J.; “Henry James's 'General Vision of Evil' in The Turn of the Screw”, in *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (1969), pp. 721-735.

Carroll, Noël; *The Philosophy of Horror – Or Paradoxes of the Heart*, New York: Routledge. (1990)

Cavallaro, Dani; *The Gothic Vision – Three Centuries of Horror, Terror and Fear*, London: Continuum. (2002)

Clarke, Peter; *Hope and Glory – Britain 1900-2000,* London: Penguin Books (2004)

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome (ed.); *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (1996)

Cornes, Judy; *Madness and the Loss of Identity in Nineteenth Century Fiction*, Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers (2008)

Craft, Christopher; “Come See About Me: Enchantment of the Double in The Picture of Dorian Gray” in *Representations*, Vol. 91, No. 1 (1995), pp. 109-136)

Craft, Christopher; “'Kiss Me with those Red Lips': Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker's Dracula” in *Representations*, No. 8. (1984), pp. 107-133

Douglas, Tom; *Scapegoats – Transferring Blame*, London and New York: Routledge (1995)

Duda, Heather L.; *The Monster Hunter in Modern Popular Culture*, Jefferson, North Caroline: McFarland & Company, Ind., Publishers (2003)

Dryden, Linda; *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles – Stevenson, Wilde and Wells*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan (2003)

Fagin, Nathan B.; "Another Reading of the Turn of the Screw", in *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 56, No. 3 (1941), pp. 196-202.

Freud, Sigmund (Riviere, Joan (trans.)); *Collected Papers Volume IV – Papers on Metapsychology – Papers on Applied Psycho-Analysis*, London: The Hogarth Press Ltd. (1971a)

Freud, Sigmund (Strachey, James (ed)); *Collected Papers Volume V – Miscellaneuous Paper, 1888-1938*, London: The Hogarth Press Ltd. (1971b)

Gilmore, David D.; *Monsters – Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (2003)

Girard, René (Gregory, Patrick (trans.); *Violence and the Sacred*, Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press (1986)

Godfrey, Barry S.; "Jack the Ripper and fin de siècle anxieties: Relocating Historical Specificities" in *newsletter Moderne,* Vol. 4, No. 1 (2001). pp. 24-26

Heiland, Donna; *Gothic & Gender – An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. (2004)

Hurley, Kelly; *The Gothic Body – Sexuality, materialism, and degeneration at the* fin de siècle*,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1996)

Linehan, Katherine Bailey; "'Closer Than a Wife'": The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll's Significant Other" in Jones, Jr., William B. (ed.); *Robert Louis Stevenson Reconsidered: New Critical Perspectives*, Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers. (2003)

Marez, Curtis; "The Other Addict: Reflections on Colonialism and Oscar Wilde's Opium Smoke Screen" in *ELH*, Vol. 64, No. 1 (1997), pp. 257-287

Oates, Joyce Carol; "Jekyll/Hyde" in *The Hudson Review*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (1988). pp. 603-608

Olsen, Robert & Olsen, Karin; "Introduction: On the Embodiment of Monstrosity in Northwest Medieval Europe" in Olsen, K.E. & Houwen, L.A.J.R. (ed.); *Monsters and the Monstrous in Medieval Northwest Europe*, Leuven: Peeters. (2001)

Peters, John G.; "Style and Art in Wilde's The Picture of Dorian Gray: Form as Content" in *Victorian Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (1999), pp. 1-13.

Pykett, Lyn (ed.); *Reading* Fin de Siècle *Fictions*, London: Longman (1996)

Showalter, Elaine; *Sexual Anarchy – Gender and Culture at the* Fin de Siécle, London: Bloomsbury Publishing Ltd. (1991)

Smith, Andrew; *Gothic Literature*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. (2007)

Tynan, Maeve; "Fin-de-siècle Gaelic Gothic: Reflections on the Irish Question" in Beville, Maria & Stephan, Matthias (ed.); *Otherness: Essays & Studies*, Vol. 1. No. 1., Aarhus: Aarhus University (2010)

Wigboldus, Daniël & Douglas, Karen; "Language, Stereotypes, and Intergroup Relations" in Fiedler, Klaus (ed.); *Social Communication*, New York: Psychology Press (2007)

Fiction:

Primary:
Stevenson, Robert Louis (Linehan, Katherine (ed.)); *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. (2003)

Stevenson, Robert Louis (Luckhurst, Roger (ed.)); *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and Other Tales*, Oxford: Oxford University Press (2008)

Secondary:
Brontë, Emily (Whitley, John S. (ed.)); *Wuthering Heights*, Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics (2000)

Conrad, Joseph (Moore, Gene M. (ed.)); *Heart of Darkness & Other Stories*, Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics (1999)

James, Henry (Thorp, Willard (ed.)); *The Turn of the Screw and Other Short Novels*, New York: Signet Classic (1980)

Le Fanu, Joseph Sheridan; "Carmilla".
http://www.horrormasters.com/Text/a0335.pdf (2011)

Shelley, Mary; *Frankenstein – or, The Modern Prometheus*, London: Penguin Books. (1994)

Stoker, Bram (Rogers, David (ed.)); *Dracula*, Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics (2000)

Reynolds, George W. M. (Collins, Dick (ed.)); *Wagner The Werewolf* (originally: *Wagner the Wehr-Wolf*), Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Ltd. (2009)

Rowling, J.K.; *Harry Potter and ...*, London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. (1997-2007)

Tolkien, J.R.R.; *The Lord of the Rings*, London: George Allen & Unwin. (1954-55)

Walpole, Horace (Cleery E.J. (ed.)); *The Castle of Otranto – A Gothic Story*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. (1996)

Wilde, Oscar; *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, London: Penguin Book Ltd. (2009)

Films:

Coppola, Francis Ford (Dir.); *Bram Stoker's Dracula*, United States: Columbia Pictures. (1992)

Elkayem, Ellory (Dir.); *Eight Legged Freaks*, United States: Warner Bros. (2002)

Norrington, Stephen (Dir.); *Blade*, United States: New Line Cinema. (1998)

Sommers, Stephen (Dir.); *Van Helsing*, United States: Universal Pictures. (2004)

Web:

WebA:
http://www2.lib.virginia.edu/exhibits/gothic/imperial.html, Web. 6. Apr. 2011

WebB:
"juggernaut." *Oxford English Dictionary.* Web. 1 Apr. 2011
http://www.oed.com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/view/Entry/101949?
rskey=PmR7JX&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid

WebC
http://www2.lib.virginia.edu/exhibits/gothic/images/punch82.jpg, Web. 6. Apr. 2011

WebD:
http://www.timetravel-britain.com/articles/london/jewish.shtml, Web. 21. Apr. 2011

WebE:
http://www2.lib.virginia.edu/exhibits/gothic/vampire.html, Web. 12. Apr. 2011

WebF:
http://www.parliament.uk/education/online-resources/parliament-explained/women-in-politics/, Web. 16. May 2011