

INTRODUCTION

Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886) is one of the most famous works of horror fiction of all time. Like Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) and Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897), *Jekyll and Hyde*, or at least a version of its central idea, resides in the collective consciousness. It has been the subject of many films, featured in countless sketches, cartoons and parodies, and the term 'Jekyll-and-Hyde personality' has entered our language, describing someone who lives a double-life of outward sanctity and secret iniquity. If the popular press discovers that the latest serial killer, homicidal maniac or even petty fraudster did not spend all his daylight hours pursuing these activities, and occasionally acted like his neighbours, chances are it will suggest that X is displaying 'Jekyll-and-Hyde' tendencies, a useful shorthand for sensationalist reportage, and perhaps a way of making us scrutinize our neighbours more closely. It is testimony to Stevenson's inventiveness as a writer that his creation has this independent existence over a hundred years after his tale was first published. And yet, despite this almost universal familiarity with the *idea* of Jekyll and Hyde, it is also true that Stevenson's story is more known about than actually known, and that many of those who believe they know what it is about, have not actually *read* the hundred pages that comprise the tale. They would find there something different from what they imagined: a more complex, rewarding and disturbing story than the version that has been handed down in popular cultural form. Those who are about to read the *Strange Case* and the other tales collected here for the first time, would do best to return to this Introduction after they have read them, as it is necessary to reveal specific plot

details for the purposes of discussion. New readers will also find the experience more rewarding if they forget all their preconceptions, and put themselves in the position of Stevenson's first readers who knew nothing about 'Jekyll and Hyde'.

Christmas Crawlers

Robert Louis Stevenson wrote his most famous story in October 1885 when he was thirty-five. He was living in Bournemouth with his wife Fanny and Lloyd Osbourne, her son from an earlier marriage. Stevenson's letters along with some observations in 'A Chapter on Dreams' (abridged in this volume), reveal that he was finding himself under financial constraint at the time. He had been a professional writer since the age of twenty-one, but was still dependent on his father, a matter of some embarrassment. The tale was written for a commercial market, so that he could pay the likes of 'Byles the butcher'.¹ It was his first really successful work, enabling him to be financially independent for the first time.

To ensure its success, Stevenson turned his fertile imagination to creating a 'fine bogey tale' to satisfy a large market for such literature. Stevenson's editor at Longmans asked him to write a 'shilling shocker' for Christmas 1885, a season traditionally associated with supernatural and creepy tales. Charles Dickens's most famous ghost story 'A Christmas Carol', was just one of many he produced in this tradition, whilst Stevenson himself wrote 'The Body Snatcher' and 'Olalla' for publication for Christmas 1884 and 1885. As it turned out, the Christmas 1885 book market was crowded, so publication was delayed until January; but from the start the *Strange Case* was conceived as a 'crawler', a sensational tale of supernatural incident designed to produce a pleasurable chill in its readers. It is worth considering this tradition, as it helps us understand how his tale conforms to, but also departs from and innovates within, a mode upon which it would have enormous influence.

Horror fiction really started with Horace Walpole's Gothic novel *The Castle of Otranto* published on Christmas Eve 1764. His tale of

spectres, portents, family curses and bizarre supernatural occurrences was written partly as a joke, being presented as a medieval manuscript that had been 'discovered' by an eighteenth-century antiquarian and presented as a curiosity for a modern enlightened readership. Many were taken in by Walpole's ruse, and many enjoyed the new experience of reading material associated with folk legends and chivalric romances in the pages of a novel, a form hitherto concerned with the modern and the everyday, the probable and the realistic. Others followed, and by the turn of the nineteenth century critics were complaining that fiction was inundated with stories of diabolical revenges and family curses, set in ancient castles or monasteries deep in gloomy forests, and involving proud Italian or Spanish nobles and the machinations of corrupt ecclesiastics. Most early Gothic stories, even the best by Ann Radcliffe, Matthew Lewis or Charles Maturin, were set in distant times, and/or (usually Catholic) countries. There was an understanding, held by author and reader alike, that such horrors were far removed from those who avidly consumed such fictions (middle-class Protestants in London, Edinburgh or Bath), that they could only take place in 'less civilized' ages or places.

Stevenson himself writes within this tradition in his short story 'Olalla', which he published a few weeks before *Jekyll and Hyde*. This story of atavism and a form of pathological 'vampirism' set in an ancient aristocratic mansion in a remote part of Spain is a typical Gothic tale. Its opening conforms to what Victor Sage has called 'the paradigm of the horror-plot: the journey from the capital . . . to the provinces'.² Its long description of the journey from the city to the remote mountainous domicile creates atmosphere and builds expectations of suspense and the supernatural through a technique that would serve horror fiction from Ann Radcliffe's *Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794) to Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897) and beyond: 'The country through which we went was wild and rocky, partially covered with rough woods, now of the cork-tree, and now of the great Spanish chestnut, and frequently intersected by the beds of mountain torrents . . .' The narrator travels to the residencia in this remote region to recover from his war wounds, and (ironically, given the outcome) to 'renew [his] blood'. He finds there a typically labyrinthine,

ruinous and picturesque old edifice, which he compares with the 'sleeping palace of the legend', home to an aristocratic family as decayed as their ancestral mansion. As with Poe's 'House of Usher' (1839), and Nathaniel Hawthorne's *House of the Seven Gables* (1851), 'house' (building) is the physical expression of 'House' (family or lineage). Chris Baldick, in a very useful introduction to the Gothic, observes that this 'fiction is characteristically obsessed with old buildings as the sites of human decay. The Gothic castle or house is not just an old and sinister building; it is a house of degeneration, even of decomposition . . .'³ Geography and environment thus go beyond providing atmospheric effects, and offer a suitable location to explore the themes of the tale. These also conform to Gothic type according to Baldick's definition. For, 'typically a Gothic tale will invoke the tyranny of the past (a family curse, the survival of archaic forms of despotism and of superstition) with such weight as to stifle the hopes of the present . . .' (p. xix). This is the defining property of the Gothic mode, which is characterized by its attitude to the past, its tyrannies, legacies and unwelcome survivals or returns. In 'Olalla' the unwelcome legacy takes a very precise form, and provides a modern and materialist application of this central concern. On meeting his strange hostess and her simpleton son, the narrator makes the connection between architecture and ancestry: 'The family blood had been impoverished, perhaps by long inbreeding, which I knew to be a common error among the proud and the exclusive.' The ancestral 'curse' was a staple theme of Gothic fiction from *The Castle of Otranto* onwards. But whilst Walpole depicts a supernatural mechanism avenging ancestral crime through a number of generations, Stevenson's emphasis is biological. The burden of the past is carried in the bodies of descendants. 'Evil' becomes a reproductive issue, which blights the happiness of the innocent girl Olalla, compelled to renounce her romantic attachment to the gallant soldier who intrudes upon her secluded detachment from the modern world, through a fear that the hereditary taint will afflict their offspring. Pointing to a portrait of a distant ancestor of evil reputation whom both she and her mother resemble, Olalla reasons with the besotted protagonist:

. . . Others, ages dead, have wooed other men with my eyes; other men have heard the pleading of the same voice that now sounds in your ears. The hands of the dead are in my bosom; they move me, they pluck me, they guide me; I am a puppet at their command; and I but reinform features and attributes that have long been laid aside from evil in the quiet of the grave. Is it me you love, friend? or the race that made me? . . . individual succeeds to individual, mocked with a semblance of self-control, but they are nothing. We speak of the soul, but the soul is in the race . . .

Here Stevenson provides a modern twist to the conventional Gothic theme of aristocratic family curses and ancestral returns, adapting it to the concerns of mental pathology or what was termed 'social hygiene' at the time, making Olalla's mother a biological revenant and perhaps even the first post-Darwinian 'vampire'.⁴ For this emphasis on lineal repetition as a form of extended generational life provides a chilling hint of the 'vampirism' displayed by the hostess of this remote castle. The soldier has cut himself, and seeks help from the usually lethargic mother:

Her great eyes opened wide, the pupils shrank into points; a veil seemed to fall from her face, and leave it sharply expressive and yet inscrutable. And as I still stood, marvelling a little at her disturbance, she came swiftly up to me, and stooped and caught me by the hand; and the next moment my hand was at her mouth, and she had bitten me to the bone. The pang of the bite, the sudden spurting of blood, and the monstrous horror of the act, flashed through me all in one, and I beat her back; and she sprang at me again and again, with bestial cries . . .

There is no evidence beyond the superstitions of the local peasantry that the mother actually belongs to the Undead. Here, 'vampirism', like the suggestion of extended life through lineal repetition figured in the portrait, is largely metaphorical, supposedly a manifestation of her pathological inheritance. The 'blood' is impoverished, so it seeks renewal from healthy stock. In this way Stevenson cleverly adapts, and innovates within, the conventional framework of Gothic fiction. He uses the stock features of the mode to explore contemporary concerns and emphases, something he would take even further in the

Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, which is also concerned with forms of atavistic return, but which dispenses altogether with the remote geographical setting of the conventional Gothic tale.

However, before examining what made *Jekyll and Hyde* so original, it is worth briefly considering one further horror story, which offers a contrast to, but also anticipates aspects of, that more famous tale published two years later. Stevenson's 'The Body Snatcher' (1884) was also written for the Christmas ghost story market, and is in many ways an even more traditional example of that form. Its opening conforms to the narrative convention of grisly deeds recounted in hushed voices around the fireside on a winter's night. Fettes, the local drunk, is roused from his habitual stupor by the reference to a name he has not heard spoken for many years, but which has evidently haunted his memory in the intervening decades: 'Fettes became instantly sober; his eyes awoke, his voice became clear, loud, and steady, his language forcible and earnest; we were all startled by this transformation, as if a man had risen from the dead.' This analogy (which is also partly a pun) is ironic in a number of ways, for the transformation of this 'deadbeat' into lively sobriety is triggered by an association with exactly that: the ghostly return of a 'long-dead and long-dissected' corpse. This actual supernatural occurrence is saved for the chilling denouement of the story, but is pre-figured by the subject matter of the tale which Fettes relates to the anonymous narrator. This final, literal haunting finds its metaphorical counterpart in the return of the man who was Fettes's fellow witness to the resurrection of Gray, and the way both of them have obviously been haunted by its horrible memory ever since: 'Fettes clutched him by the arm, and these words came in a whisper, and yet painfully distinct, "Have you seen it again?"' 'It' is the ghost of Gray, the man Macfarlane murdered, who returns in the place of a body the two students had disinterred from a lonely rural grave for the purposes of dissection for surgical instruction. Fettes 'rising from the dead' at the start, and the return of Gray at the shocking conclusion, provide literal and metaphorical frames to a narrative about the exploits of what were called 'resurrection men', traders in human corpses.

It is in these central incidents, recalling dark deeds from the annals

of true crime from the 'bad old days' of the early part of the century, that we find prefigurations of the concerns which Stevenson would develop fully in *Jekyll and Hyde*, but in a contemporary context. 'The Body Snatcher' is a fictionalized account of events that occurred in Edinburgh in the 1820s, but which were still notorious in the popular imagination. Burke and Hare posed as body snatchers, supposedly supplying resurrected corpses to the anatomical schools, but turned out to be murderers, selling bodies that had never been buried. (For full details of the historical background to this tale see note 6 to 'The Body Snatcher'). Robert Knox, a famous, and then infamous, surgeon whom these two supplied with 'subjects', was publicly implicated in this scandal and appears in the sidelines of Stevenson's tale. His representative, the fictional 'Dr Wolfe Macfarlane', takes a more central role, and is shown to be actually guilty of murder like the notorious grave robbers with whom he deals. Through this shift in emphasis from the avowedly criminal Burke and Hare (portrayed fleetingly), to the guilty secrets of the young medical students, Stevenson appears to be more interested in exploring the theme of a double life that he would make his own in his most famous tale. For Macfarlane (and to an extent Fettes) can be considered in part ancestors of Jekyll. The narrator describes Fettes when a student at the medical school:

Cold, light, and selfish in the last resort, he had that modicum of prudence, miscalled morality, which keeps a man from inconvenient drunkenness or punishable theft. He coveted besides a measure of consideration from his masters and his fellow-pupils, and he had no desire to fail conspicuously in the external parts of life. Thus he made it his pleasure to gain some distinction in his studies, and day after day rendered unimpeachable service to his employer, Mr K—. For his day of work he indemnified himself by nights of roaring blackguardly enjoyment; and, when the balance had been struck, the organ that he called his conscience declared itself content.

Fettes is a profound 'double-dealer': seeking 'consideration' from his professional peers in the light of day, but offsetting this with what would be considered the exact opposite behaviour – blackguardly enjoyment – in the hours of darkness (sounding very much like Jekyll,

who believes that he is personally absolved from all of Hyde's crimes). This inverted logic ironically infers that his dishonourable behaviour 'indemnified' him for his daylight industry and sobriety, achieving a form of ethical balance. But this is undermined by the knowledge that part of his 'service' to his employer involves supplying the corpses upon which the anatomy school depended. This detail disrupts the neat dichotomy between daylight and nocturnal behaviour, and decidedly tips the moral equilibrium Fettes believes he maintains. It is tipped further when he is encouraged by Macfarlane to turn a blind eye to the murder of Gray, who Fettes receives as another 'subject' for dissection, full-knowing its provenance. The final return of Gray's ghostly corpse on a body-snatching expedition finally overturns Fettes's contrived compact with his conscience, and accounts for the ruined state he presents at the start of the tale, having abandoned all claims to respectability. Not so his fellow witness, the man who actually murdered Gray, and offered him up to surgical dissection. Wolfe Macfarlane, 'the great London Doctor', who visits the George Inn many years after that terrible night

... was richly dressed in the finest of broadcloth and the whitest of linen, with a great gold watch chain and studs and spectacles of the same precious material; ... and he carried on his arm a comfortable driving-coat of fur. There was no doubt but he became his years, breathing, as he did, of wealth and consideration; and it was a surprising contrast to see our parlour sot [drunk], bald, dirty, pimpled, and robed in an old camlet cloak, confront him at the bottom of the stairs.

'Macfarlane,' he said, somewhat loudly, more like a herald than a friend.

This contrasts the two parts of duplicitous personality – roaring blackguardly excess; and sober and respectable industry – that the narrative dissects and explores. This confrontation between the representatives of the daylight and the nocturnal hours could be seen as a prefiguration of Jekyll seeing the features of Hyde for the first time. For what Macfarlane beholds is his exact counterpart in the ruined features of Fettes, who acts as his suppressed conscience. The true 'haunting' is this bringing to account of a long-buried crime of a respectable and successful man.

This pattern of suppressed guilt, of a double life of daylight respectability and nocturnal transgression, of the 'ghost' of old crimes overtaking their perpetrators, contained here within a fairly conventional supernatural tale, would be developed in a far more subtle and disturbing way in the next story Stevenson wrote for the Christmas Crawler market. Written exactly a year later, *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* dispenses entirely with the distancing devices of the traditional Gothic – set 'over there' in southern Spain, or 'back then' in the near or distant past. It is set in London in the present day, and situates horror *within* a respectable individual, with its vision of evil reflecting on a much broader section of society than had perhaps been hitherto suggested in popular fiction. While the 'supernatural' element is given a degree of plausibility, coming close to the techniques of 'Science Fiction' in the inference that Jekyll's experiment might be repeated if he had only supplied the formula. Finally, its narrative method of collected contemporaneous testimony gives it a greater sensational immediacy, and authenticity than the fireside recollections of the traditional ghost story form. The following pages will explore what makes this story one of the most important and influential horror stories since *The Castle of Otranto*; starting with its narrative technique.

Testimony

Horror fiction has a tradition of narrative complexity. From Charles Robert Maturin's *Melmoth the Wanderer* (1820) and James Hogg's *Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824) to *Dracula* (1897) the tale of terror has rarely been presented 'straight'. Narratives often purport to be assembled from a number of discreet manuscripts, letters or testimonies, which combined provide a (more or less) coherent account of events. This technique became the trade mark of the so-called 'Sensation' school of fiction (a form of suburban Gothic) which emerged in the 1860s when writers like Wilkie Collins constructed thrilling narratives out of letters, diaries and individual testimonies and confessions. Stevenson's tale in part conforms to this pattern, where two of the most important revelatory chapters (the ninth and

tenth) are discreet documents written by protagonists, while a third (the fourth) is partly presented as a newspaper report of a grisly crime. Such a technique serves the interests of veracity, as the various documents are supposedly more 'real' than the overtly artificial observations of an omniscient narrator who has no existence within the world of the fiction. It serves suspense, as the individual contributors do not know the full outcome of events, delaying complete explanation until the final pages. And it helps to heighten the emotional impact of the narration, as Dr Lanyon's own account of the shocking spectacle of Hyde turning into Jekyll, or Jekyll's terrors of Hyde's usurpation of his identity are more immediate and thrilling than would be possible if they were reported second hand.

The supposed veracity of the testimonies is further endorsed by the fact that they are produced by, or concern the interests of, highly reliable witnesses: two physicians and one lawyer, who use their professional expertise to investigate the mystery that confronts them. This heightens the shock when their investigations fail, but it also determines their preoccupations and expectations. Stevenson's tale is presented as a 'Case', evoking the procedures of both legal and medical knowledge and testimony; but it is a *strange* case, its strangeness deriving from its disruption of the very expectations associated with these procedures and forms of writing.

Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde is constructed as a mystery in many ways resembling a detective story. Eight of its ten chapters are concerned with getting to the bottom of the mysterious circumstances surrounding Jekyll's will, and his dealings with a most unlikely individual, Mr Edward Hyde. We should remember that until the ninth chapter, when Dr Lanyon witnesses the transformation of Hyde into his friend Jekyll, the story involves two individuals, Jekyll and Hyde. The characters within the story, and its very first readers, believed this to be the case, and this should influence our reading, especially our understanding of the suspicions and expectations of those who investigate the mystery. Let us consider appearances, for they are all the first readers had to go on. The respectable bachelor Dr Jekyll and the 'damnable' young man Edward Hyde are the most unlikely companions. When pressed by Utterson the lawyer to 'make a clean

breast of' the trouble he imagines him in, Jekyll confesses to taking 'a great, a very great interest' in a 'young man' who is not his son, and is a total stranger to his oldest friends. Hyde is allowed full range of Jekyll's house, has his own special back door and has his cheques honoured by the older man. As Utterson declares: 'It turns me cold to think of this creature stealing like a thief to Harry's bedside.' It is later learned that Hyde hangs around by the river at night, and that Jekyll has set him up with his own house in Soho, a place that appears to be appointed more for Jekyll's own refined tastes than Hyde's. It is supposed throughout that Hyde is blackmailing Jekyll. 'It isn't what you fancy; it is not so bad as that,' Jekyll assures Utterson. But what *was* this unspoken bad fancy tacitly understood by both Utterson and his client? These circumstances appear to be carefully plotted to point to, without actually specifying, a suspicion that some erotic attachment is at the bottom of Jekyll's relationship with Hyde. Blackmail and homosexuality have a long history of association. According to Rictor Norton; 'Before the passing of the 1967 Sexual Offences Act the law prohibiting homosexual intercourse was described as a "Blackmailers' Charter", for very many – perhaps even "most" – blackmail attempts involved a threat to expose a man as a homosexual, whether or not he were in fact gay (*sic*).'⁵ The 'Blackmailers' Charter' was the law passed in 1885 (the year Stevenson wrote his tale), outlawing all erotic acts between males whether in public or private, and was responsible for Oscar Wilde's imprisonment in 1895.⁶ But even before this new legal definition of outlawed sexuality, the much older offence of 'sodomy' had made blackmail a highly lucrative enterprise. As Norton suggests: 'Professional blackmail rings were . . . common, especially in the 1810s–1820s, and gay men who blackmailed their partners were not unknown. The threat of exposure as a sodomite is the basis of more than half of the prosecutions throughout the eighteenth century . . .' Oscar Wilde had himself been subject to a number of blackmail attempts, most of them by rent boys with whom he, or his lover Alfred Douglas, had consorted. Given this association it is likely that suspicions of some form of erotic connection between Dr Jekyll and Edward Hyde might have been entertained by Stevenson's first readers, who also wondered about Jekyll's 'very great interest' in Hyde.

A suggestion of homosexuality provides a plausible hypothesis until the truth is revealed that two men are actually one.⁷ Of course, Stevenson could not describe or directly refer to what was called 'unnatural' and deemed unspeakable in the pages of prose fiction designed for a popular readership; but he could, and perhaps did, manipulate the expectations and suppositions of his readers who could not complain if their own imaginations had supplied what Stevenson had refused to actually state.⁸ An 'unspeakable vice' provides a particularly effective sub-text for a sensational plot about secrets, where what looks like an 'unnatural' relationship eventually turns out to be a supernatural or preternatural one. This is an effect of the framework of expectations upon which the narrative is built: the use of legal and medical procedures and forms of knowledge (which, apart from pornography, constituted almost the sole place where homosexuality was discussed in print), and their corresponding adherence to the rationalist principles which the supernatural explanation brilliantly overturns.

This overturning of expectations has its greatest effect in Dr Lanyon's Narrative, when the fantastic explanation that two people are in fact one is first revealed. If Utterson's investigations evoke the expectations and procedures of legal inquiry, then Lanyon's narrative is even more self-consciously structured according to the methods of his profession. Lanyon has responded to Jekyll's plea to assist him in an urgent matter, to collect his chemicals and to admit a stranger (Hyde) to his house late at night. When Hyde arrives, he receives him in his consulting room as if he were one of his patients, and attempts to turn Hyde into a 'case':

as there was something abnormal and misbegotten in the very essence of the creature that now faced me – something seizing, surprising and revolting . . . to my interest in the man's nature and character there was added a curiosity as to his origin, his life, his fortune and status in the world . . . [Therefore I] sat down myself in my customary seat and with as fair an imitation of my ordinary manner to a patient, as the lateness of the hour, the nature of my preoccupations, and the horror I had of my visitor, would suffer me to muster.

Lanyon's preoccupations and procedures are characteristic of medical writing at the time. The origin, life, fortune and status of 'abnormal' subjects contributed important information to clinical case-studies.⁹ Lanyon believes he has an insane patient before him, 'wrestling against the approaches of hysteria'. But before he has time to compile his notes, this monstrosity turns into his friend Henry Jekyll, a fellow member of his profession, who has, at least to appearances, impeccable 'life, origin and status'; and yet contained within him the misbegotten, abnormal, revolting murderer, Hyde. The transformation of 'patient' into physician; abnormal hysteric into respectable member of the middle classes; two people into one, stages a narrative and 'epistemological' revolution also. For as medical, legal, or rational forms of understanding collapse, the *case* of Jekyll and Hyde becomes the *Strange Case* of one of the most original horror tales ever written.

The horror of my other self

That Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* is something more than just a shilling shocker, a creepy tale for Christmas 1885, was noticed immediately. Reviewers stated that 'the story has a much larger and deeper interest than that belonging to mere skilful narrative. It is a marvellous exploration into the recesses of human nature', and referred to it as a 'parable' with a 'profound allegory', while a Christian paper stated that it was an 'allegory based on the two-fold nature of man, a truth taught us by the Apostle Paul in Romans 7'.¹⁰ Indeed, his tale provided the text for a sermon that was preached from the pulpit of St Paul's Cathedral. Pared down to its essentials it is about the fight between good and evil, duty and temptation, in the human 'soul': a story as old as Genesis. Jekyll considers his dilemma in these terms, referring to 'the perennial war among my members', and the fact that 'the terms of this debate are as old and commonplace as man'. Stevenson's own upbringing inculcated in him a strong sense of sin, which emerges in the moral foundation of his tale. As he wrote to Edward Purcell in February 1886: 'I have the old Scotch Presbyterian preoccupation with these [moral] problems . . . The Scotch side came

out plain in *Dr Jekyll*¹¹. However, this 'moral' extrapolation from his tale is one of the first simplifications it has undergone, and needs to be put into context.

When Adam and Eve clothed themselves in shame they did not immediately don frock coats and crinoline. In other words, Stevenson's tale, despite its 'perennial' moral framework, is very much a product of its time, and if it is an allegory it is constructed out of historical circumstances and class relations. Edward Hyde is the embodiment of what Jekyll refers to as his 'lower elements', but he also makes clear that this hierarchical relationship is formed by Jekyll's excessive conformity to the codes of respectability and public opinion. As he explains, 'the worst of my faults was a certain impatient gaiety of disposition, such as has made the happiness of many, but such as I found it hard to reconcile with my imperious desire to carry my head high, and wear a more than commonly grave countenance before the public'. The simple opposition between good and evil breaks down at this point. He continues: 'Many a man would have blazoned such irregularities as I was guilty of; but from the high views that I had set before me, I regarded and hid them with an almost morbid sense of shame.' It is his overdeveloped sense of sinfulness that constructs Hyde. The more Jekyll sought to do *and appear to be* 'good', the more 'evil' he made Hyde. His Hyde is imaginary and potential until Jekyll discovers a potion that will *embody* these divisions. It is here that the moral allegory starts to wear the vestments of class and history:

If each, I told myself, could but be housed in separate identities, life would be relieved of all that was unbearable; the unjust might go his way, delivered from the aspirations and remorse of his more upright twin; and the just could walk steadfastly and securely on his upward path, doing the good things in which he found his pleasure, and no longer exposed to disgrace and penitence by the hands of this extraneous evil.

Jekyll appears to be observing the behaviour of two distinct individuals that happen to coexist in his consciousness. The potion makes this idea a reality. On 'releasing' his Hyde, Jekyll starts to characterize him, clothe him, classify him, and to moralize on him, appalled but also thrilled by his behaviour. Hyde is the bodily expression of his

relationship to Jekyll's more exalted principles – lower in stature and uglier in aspect than his 'more upright twin' Jekyll, who we are told is a fine figure of a man, with a 'handsome face'. Once his imagined divisions are externalized and made concrete, Jekyll could give his righteousness full rein:

The pleasures which I made haste to seek in my disguise were, as I have said, undignified; I would scarce use a harder term. But in the hands of Edward Hyde, they soon began to turn towards the monstrous. When I would come back from these excursions, I was often plunged into a kind of wonder at my vicarious depravity . . . Henry Jekyll stood at times aghast before the acts of Edward Hyde; but the situation was apart from ordinary laws, and insidiously relaxed the grasp of conscience.

Thus even when we are told that two people are one, Jekyll's testimony still divides them, denying responsibility for Hyde's actions. Such distinctions allow Henry Jekyll to act with all propriety as a member of his class, and castigate the behaviour of Hyde, his social, and what could be termed his 'anthropological', opposite and inferior. For Jekyll, as much as his friends, views Hyde the monstrous criminal in distinctive terms, fashioned according to the theories of crime and immorality at the time.

Apes and Angels

Jekyll conceives of Hyde as his 'lower element'. Whilst this is principally a moral or even metaphysical designation, it is also strongly suggested that Hyde is also lower on the evolutionary scale (as it was perceived) than his more upright twin Henry Jekyll. Jekyll's reference to treading the 'upward path' also refers to his perceived position on what was considered the 'ladder' of cultural and biological development. A less upright individual evokes suggestions of the simian, and Hyde is certainly that. Utterson found him both dwarfish and 'troglodytic', whilst another remarks upon the 'ape-like' fury of his attack on Carew, and Jekyll himself refers to Hyde's 'ape-like spite', his 'bestial' nature, and remarks how hairy his opposite is. This inference eventually

culminates in a frightening vision of primordial immorality: 'This was the shocking thing; that the slime of the pit seemed to utter cries and voices; and that the amorphous dust gesticulated and sinned; and what was dead, and had no shape, would usurp the offices of life.' This emphasis on criminality or sinfulness being a *primitive* condition or impulse corresponds with that found in a number of writings from the period which employed evolutionary models to understand criminality and mental disorder. The idea of 'reversion', which helped explain immoral behaviour in scientific terms, also provided possibilities for Gothic representation, which could now figure unwelcome ancestral legacies on a greatly extended scale, reaching back to the origins of human life itself. This can be seen by comparing the psychiatrist Henry Maudsley's 'Remarks on Crime and Criminals' from 1888 with Stevenson's depiction of Jekyll and Hyde:

The sense of moral relations, or so-called moral feeling . . . are the latest and the highest products of mental evolution; being the least stable, therefore, they are the first to disappear in mental degeneration, which is in the literal sense an *unkinding* or undoing of mind; and when they are stripped off the primitive and more stable passions are exposed – naked and not ashamed, just as they were in the premoral ages of animal and human life on earth.¹²

Maudsley's reasoning sounds very like Jekyll's, who thinks of Hyde as 'lower', and as the 'animal within' him, who allows him to 'strip off these lendings [of moral sense] and spring headlong into the sea of liberty'. Jekyll's potion effects the 'unkinding' to which the psychiatrist refers; a release from the bonds of acquired civilized behaviour, and thus a return to 'primitive' pre-moral indulgence. When embodied, Hyde naturally resembles the simian and 'degenerate', hardly human form of the criminal type described by medico-legal experts. In short, Hyde is the physical expression of moral lowness according to post-Darwinian thought.¹³ (A much fuller discussion of these aspects of Stevenson's story is offered in the essay 'Diagnosing Jekyll' at the end of this volume.)

A world of ordinary secret sinners

In Mr Hyde Stevenson created a new fictional monster; a Frankenstein's creature, fabricated from the beliefs of evolutionary anthropology and scientific criminology, whom he releases into contemporary London. Jekyll marvelling at the 'monstrous' depravity of Hyde, and the witness of the Carew murder commenting on the 'ape-like' fury of his assault, sound very like the classic descriptions of the atavistic criminal type; who, according to Lombroso: 'desire[s] not only to extinguish life in the victim, but to mutilate the corpse, tear its flesh and drink its blood'.¹⁴ But Stevenson's tale is actually more complex and disturbing than that, for he used this picture of criminal monstrosity to reflect on that which had actually defined it: the world of respectable physicians and legislators. Hyde is *within* Jekyll, and perhaps within others too. Stevenson's story strips away all the distancing devices of the traditional Gothic, locating the horror of atavistic returns in central London, in the present and in the body and mind of a representative of the professional classes. It is this world that his tale reflects on and probes with its central concern with respectability and its discontents. Jekyll attempts to make an absolute division between the respectable and the disreputable, the righteous and the libertine, the social and the sensual/sexual. But he fails. Ostensibly because of a mistake with his chemicals; but the experiment also fails because the divisions Jekyll imagines and attempts to solidify were impossible to sustain. It is not only the chemicals that are 'impure', the differences he considers to be absolute are also decidedly mixed and confused.

Jekyll claims that he is 'a composite', like 'all human beings, as we meet them . . . commingled out of good and evil'; whereas 'Edward Hyde, alone, in the ranks of mankind, was pure evil.' And yet Hyde appears to have some elements of Jekyll in him. Jekyll's original plan is that Hyde would act as an 'alibi'. Like a contract killer or 'bravo' he would conduct the business Jekyll was ashamed of, and if there were any reprisals, Jekyll would not be implicated:

Let me but escape into my laboratory door, give me but a second or two to mix and swallow the draught . . . and whatever he had done, Edward Hyde would pass away like the stain of breath upon a mirror; and there in his stead, quietly at home, trimming the midnight lamp in his study, a man who could afford to laugh at suspicion, would be Henry Jekyll.

If Jekyll 'hired' Hyde for this peace of mind and security, then he was short changed. For if Hyde is pure evil, and Jekyll believed he could laugh at suspicion, Hyde himself does not share this view. Indeed, the very first words we hear him speak, recounted by Enfield in his anecdote about Hyde trampling on the child, show Hyde acting in a very Jekyll-like way. As Enfield recalls:

. . . and there was the man in the middle, with a kind of black, sneering coolness – frightened too, I could see that – but carrying it off, sir, really like Satan. 'If you choose to make capital out of this accident,' said he, 'I am naturally helpless. No gentleman but wishes to avoid a scene,' says he. 'Name your figure.'

Hyde's 'Satanic' sneering scarcely disguises an overriding concern with his reputation. Would Satan truly attempt to convince the witnesses that the incident with the child was an 'accident'? Why should he care what they think if he was pure evil? Hyde appears to be performing no useful function here. For he costs Jekyll a hundred pounds (a very considerable sum at the time), and the necessity of drawing the cheque which implicates his own name in the business, the very thing he wished to avoid. Enfield told Hyde: 'If he had any friends of credit . . . he should lose them' unless he pays up. But it is Jekyll's 'credit' (meaning reputation) that he should preserve here by *not* drawing on his funds. Far from laughing at suspicion, Jekyll's 'bravo' leads him into an inquiry that eventually spells his ruin. On hearing this anecdote, Utterson, already unhappy about the will, resolves to discover what hold Hyde has over Jekyll.

Indeed, the will that alerted Utterson's suspicions in the first place also contributes to the failure of Jekyll's plans. Jekyll draws up a will 'so that if anything befell me in the person of Dr Jekyll, I could enter on that of Edward Hyde without pecuniary loss'. It is significant that

Jekyll uses the first person when he refers to Hyde continuing without pecuniary loss. Jekyll wishes to enjoy all the comforts and privileges of the position he has gained in the world *as himself*, even if he has to do so in the person of Hyde, supposedly pure evil and disassociated from, and indifferent to, the interests of Jekyll. By drawing up a will Jekyll clings to the financial support systems and observes the sanctioned procedures of the class whose moral codes and values he attempts to escape with his experiment. This wanting to have it both ways, renouncing and preserving bourgeois values, is in effect a hypocritical continuation of the duplicity Jekyll originally sought to evade, and entangles him in the very network of secret sins and their reprisals that he attempted to escape. Jekyll is never really free as Hyde because Hyde is never really free of Jekyll and all he represents.¹⁵ In short, perhaps the strangest (and certainly the most disturbing) thing about the case of Jekyll and Hyde, is that it turns out not to be so strange at all. Appearances would suggest that if we read the confessions of others in his circle we would appreciate how ordinary his case is.

Secrets everywhere

Following the Carew murder Jekyll renounces Hyde, and attempts to settle back into a life of respectability once more. After a while the temptations return and he becomes an 'ordinary secret sinner' again, without the help of Hyde. This phrase captures something that is glimpsed repeatedly in the narrative: that the 'ordinary' condition of his society is for individuals to sin in secret, but also to hold, hide or attempt to discover or reveal secrets. There are a good many secrets that are never revealed. Enfield (a well-known man about town) returns home from 'some place at the end of the world, about three o'clock of a black winter morning', but neglects to mention exactly where or what he was doing. Both he and Utterson have a policy that 'the more it looks like Queer Street, the less I ask'. Enfield predicts what happens when this rule is broken: 'You start a question, and it's like starting a stone. You sit quietly on the top of a hill; and away the stone goes, starting others; and presently some bland old bird (the last

you would have thought of) is knocked on the head in his own back garden, and the family have to change their name.' One such 'bland old bird' might be the elderly MP Sir Danvers Carew, whose death down by the river late at night is rather suspicious. The maid:

became aware of an aged and beautiful gentleman with white hair, drawing near along the lane; and advancing to meet him, another and very small gentleman, to whom at first she paid less attention. When they had come within speech . . . the older man bowed and accosted the other with a very pretty manner of politeness. It did not *seem* as if the subject of his address were of great importance; indeed, from his pointing, it *sometimes appeared* as if he were only inquiring his way; but the moon shone on his face as he spoke . . . [and] it *seemed* to breathe such an *innocent* and old-world kindness of disposition, yet with something high too, as of a well-founded self-content. [my italics]

If we look at what the maid says we find that it is qualified and highly speculative. Why mention that he *seemed* innocent? And what is he doing 'accosting' young men in a 'pretty' manner down by the river late at night? Surely when directions are asked it is the knowledgeable addressee who does the pointing. When the police officer learns that the victim of this crime is Sir Danvers Carew, his response: "Good God, sir!" exclaimed the officer, 'is it possible?'" appears somewhat excessive. Why is he so amazed? What are the circumstances that trouble him about the identity of such a victim in such a crime – 'some bland old bird (*the last you would have thought of*)' as Enfield puts it? What was in the letter he was carrying addressed to Utterson, seeking his professional help? We will never know. But are we right to be so suspicious?¹⁶ According to the text we are. We are actively encouraged to imagine secrets where there might be none, and be suspicious perhaps without cause. Stevenson's story actively demonstrates that you can never trust appearances.

Seek and hide

This lack of trust also affects our belief in the testimony of others, and undermines our faith in the veracity of what we read. From the very first page we are introduced to a world governed by public opinion, and by a fear of revelation and blackmail. In fact, it could be argued that the real 'monster' in *Jekyll and Hyde* is opinion. It casts an ominous shadow across the entire narrative and is responsible for stunted lives, and two, or even three deaths. The fear of exposure is so powerful it even scares Hyde, who pays a hundred pounds to keep a good name he doesn't even have. Enfield and the doctor blackmail Hyde: 'killing being out of the question, we did the next best. We told the man we could and would make such a scandal out of this, as should make his name stink from one end of London to the other.'¹⁷ When Hyde produces the cheque in another's name Enfield assumes Hyde is blackmailing Jekyll; on hearing this Utterson resolves to have a go himself and see what Hyde has to hide. They are all motivated by the need to maintain appearances and to protect the system that works on 'credit', however bankrupt this appears to be. It is this that encourages Utterson to turn amateur detective and investigate the mystery of Jekyll and Hyde. However, whilst most detectives investigate secrets in order to solve crimes and bring the details to light, Utterson is driven by the opposite motives.¹⁸ He is a questor who doesn't actually want to know, whose ruling passion is to preserve his friend from scandal, to save his 'credit'. If he can find out what Hyde's secrets are he can trade them for Jekyll's being forgotten. Or so he thinks. When Hyde commits a murder Utterson accompanies the police officer, whose job it is to make a thorough investigation and publicize all facts if necessary. Utterson assists the investigation, but only up to a point. He technically obstructs the course of justice, for he fails to mention someone who is intimately connected with the murderer, and has supposedly received a communication from him subsequent to the crime. Indeed, the murder weapon actually belongs to Jekyll, having been given to him many years before by Utterson. Jekyll confesses to Utterson that he is only 'thinking of [his] own character, which this

hateful business has rather exposed'. His friend shares this concern; fearing that 'the good name of [Jekyll] should be sucked down in the eddy of a scandal'. To the very end this is his objective. When all is lost, Hyde is dead, Jekyll has been murdered, or has disappeared, Utterson still hopes that 'we may at least save his credit'. Even Lanyon, who has been killed by the shock of Jekyll's 'moral turpitude', puts restrictions on his disclosures, stipulating that if Utterson predeceases him the document which we eventually read should be 'destroyed unread'.

How near we came to not having the full facts of the case, from Lanyon or from Jekyll. As the latter observes in his final paragraph: 'if my narrative has hitherto escaped destruction, it has been by a combination of great prudence and great good luck'. But do we have the full facts? Lanyon recalls 'What [Jekyll] told me in the next hour, I cannot bring my mind to set on paper.' We have no way of knowing whether this actually corresponds with Jekyll's final confession. And even this encourages doubt. For if Utterson has spent the whole time attempting to hide or withhold information – 'can we venture to declare this suicide? O, we must be careful. I foresee that we may yet involve your master in some dire catastrophe' – why does he release these documents? Can we be sure they are presented unaltered or unedited? There appears to be a conflict of interests between content and form. The narrative attempts full revelation, the agents of its publication concealment. At the core of the text are silences, evasions, suppressions. Stevenson's tale is effective as horror fiction because it creates more questions than it answers. As a result it lives and grows in the imaginations of those who read and reread it over a hundred years after Dr Jekyll first concocted his potion.

Unreal City

Stevenson's tale put the modern city, and specifically London, firmly on the map of Gothic horror. In this it had an immediate influence on writers like Oscar Wilde, Arthur Conan Doyle and Arthur Machen, and is perhaps largely responsible for creating the late-Victorian

London of our cinematic imaginations; a foggy, gaslit labyrinth where Mr Hyde easily metamorphoses into Jack the Ripper, and Sherlock Holmes hails a hansom in pursuit of them both. There had been examples of 'Urban Gothic' fiction earlier in the century, when writers like Charles Dickens and the popular novelist G. W. M. Reynolds depicted scenes of crime and horror in the rookeries of outcast London in narratives as sprawling and labyrinthine as the districts which they haunt.¹⁹ However, Stevenson's hundred pages, which draw on the imagery of these earlier writers, convey in a more intense and succinct form a cityscape transformed by what could be termed the psychological focus of the narrative. He was perhaps the first 'psychogeographer', laying the foundations of an imaginative topography that would be explored by writers from Arthur Machen to Iain Sinclair. Consider Stevenson's representation of a specific London locale, Soho:

It was by this time about nine in the morning, and the first fog of the season. A great chocolate-coloured pall lowered over heaven, but the wind was continually charging and routing these assembled vapours; so that as the cab crawled from street to street, Mr Utterson beheld a marvellous number of degrees and hues of twilight . . . The dismal quarter of Soho seen under these changing glimpses, with its muddy ways, and slatternly passengers, and its lamps, which had never been extinguished or had been kindled afresh to combat this mournful reinvasion of darkness, seemed, in the lawyer's eyes, like a district of some city in a nightmare. The thoughts on his mind, besides, were of the gloomiest dye . . .

As the cab drew up before the address indicated, the fog lifted a little and showed him a dingy street, a gin palace, a low French eating house, a shop for the retail of penny numbers and twopenny salads, many ragged children huddled in the doorways, and many women of many different nationalities passing out, key in hand, to have a morning glass; and the next moment the fog settled down again on that part, as brown as umber, and cut him off from his blackguardly surroundings. This was the home of Henry Jekyll's favourite; of a man who was heir to a quarter of a million sterling.

This passage (in both senses), invites comparison with the famous opening of Charles Dickens's consummate Urban Gothic novel, *Bleak House* (1853), where the whole of London is enveloped in fog, mud and

mire. But whilst Dickens uses fog to comment on the obfuscation of political and legal procedure (a reflection of the muddled state of Britain at the time), Stevenson's use of a similar setting can be characterized as more directly 'psychological'. And whilst Dickens's description manages to convey a recognizable and identifiable London floating in his sea of fog, Stevenson's cityscape is conspicuous for its unreality. It is truly a district from a 'nightmare', no more real than the city figured in Utterson's earlier dream of a lamplit labyrinth crawling with murderous Hydes. The use of 'pall' to describe the fog manages to suggest both a theatrical scene, the lowering of a stage curtain, and (with its funeral associations) the metaphysical implication that 'heaven' and its influences are being blotted out as they descend into an infernal region. The descent into this abyss is for Utterson a confrontation with the heart of darkness that we later learn resides within Jekyll himself. For him location reinforces the supposed dichotomy between the 'blackguardly' Hyde, and the prosperous and respectable Jekyll; but in truth it provides an allegorical reflection of Jekyll's true relationship with Hyde. Soho was an enclave of poverty and criminality (which was by then principally associated with the East End), residing within the more salubrious Western end of London. It thus provides a suitable location for Hyde's dwelling, but also a geographical expression of the Hyde within Jekyll.

This 'allegorical' approach to London geography is typical of a text that specifies very few identifiable locations, and is reinforced by the description of Jekyll's own house:

Round the corner from the bystreet, there was a square of ancient, handsome houses, now for the most part decayed from their high estate and let in flats and chambers to all sorts and conditions of men: map-engravers, architects, shady lawyers and the agents of obscure enterprises. One house, however, second from the corner, was still occupied entire . . . [and] wore a great air of wealth and comfort . . .

In other words, this is the architectural equivalent of Jekyll's character and relationship with his fellow men. The other houses are fragmented, openly proclaiming that they are made up of many parts, and many conditions. Jekyll's, however, must 'wear' (with an emphasis on seem-

ing and disguise) a great air of integrity as well as respectability. But, as we know, Jekyll has his back door, tucked away in obscurity and seemingly unconnected with his 'stately' official residence. Hyde's special door is the architectural equivalent of Jekyll's condition: he can only preserve his house 'entire' on the square because he has Hyde, his backdoor man, to do his dirty work for him. So landscape is transformed, serving allegorical and psychological more than strictly geographical purposes, and creating an Urban Gothic stageset for late-Victorian horror.

The return of Mr Hyde

Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde was an enormous success for Stevenson. It sold 40,000 copies in six months in Britain alone, and appears to have been read by everyone including the prime minister and Queen Victoria herself. It struck a chord with the late-Victorian public, and very soon entered the collective imagination. *Punch* parodied it, preachers pontificated on it, and Oscar Wilde has Vivian in 'The Decay of Lying' (1889) recount an anecdote about an unfortunate individual who happens to be called Mr Hyde finding himself reproducing all the incidents of the first chapter of Stevenson's tale. This Hyde is horrified at what is happening, takes to his heels, and finally finds refuge from the child's family in a doctor's surgery: 'the name on the brass door-plate of the surgery caught his eye. It was "Jekyll"'. At least it should have been.²⁰

Stevenson's tale was also very influential on writers of imaginative and supernatural fiction. Wilde's own novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890-91) bears some points of resemblance. Also set in a foggy London, with excursions into low-life neighbourhoods, it too is about appearances and reputations, and involves an individual who lives a double life of outward purity and secret corruption. As Jekyll uses the ugly deformed Hyde as his body double, so Dorian Gray has a magic portrait that bears all the consequences of a sinful life. As Stevenson refused to specify what Jekyll's or Hyde's 'monstrous' crimes were, so Wilde keeps Dorian's sins similarly vague, allowing him to be

surrounded by 'hideous' rumours that are never fully disclosed. Wilde describes a similar world of secrets, rumours and speculations:

Curious stories became current about him . . . It was rumoured that he had been seen brawling with foreign sailors in a low den in the distant parts of Whitechapel . . . His extraordinary absences became notorious, and, when he used to reappear again in society, men would whisper to each other in corners, or pass him with a sneer, or look at him with cold searching eyes, as though they were determined to discover his secret.²¹

As a character tells Dorian, 'Every gentleman is interested in his reputation' (p. 143), a circumstance that necessitates the supernatural stratagems employed by both Wilde's and Stevenson's characters.

But perhaps the main thing that both stories have in common, and where Stevenson's influence on horror fiction can be felt most, is the focus on the body and brain of the individual as the location for horror. Jekyll's metamorphosis into the grotesque, misshapen Hyde (who bears the physical 'stamp' of his evil impulses) finds its counterpart in the description of Dorian's portrait: 'Through some strange quickening of inner life the leprosy of sin were slowly eating the thing away. The rotting of a corpse in a watery grave was not so fearful' (p. 150). If the first generation of Gothic novelists located fictional terror in the forests and castles of Italy and Spain, then the tradition that developed after Stevenson betrayed a distinct physiological interest, demonstrating that the body and mind of individuals could provide horrors of their own, the site for unwelcome legacies and returns. Bram Stoker's five-hundred-year-old Count Dracula is, like Hyde, partly an atavistic 'criminal type', conspicuous for his grotesque features, who is also glimpsed through the collected testimonies of the lawyers and physicians who track him down. H. G. Wells's Doctor Moreau conducts experiments in accelerated evolution, attempting to extract the man out of beasts as Jekyll had released the beast out of a man (*The Island of Doctor Moreau* (1896)). Arthur Machen's *The Great God Pan* (1894) and *The Three Impostors* (1895), involve strange experiments, and fragmented testimonies recalling hideous bodily transformations, unspeakable sins and indescribable individuals. Jekyll, a pioneer in 'transcendental medicine', had prophesied that 'Others will follow,

others will outstrip me on the same lines.' This turns out to be true, for Machen's own Dr Raymond in *The Great God Pan*, also described as a practitioner in 'transcendental medicine', uses surgery on a certain group of nerve-cells in the brain to explore 'the unknowable gulf that yawns profound between two worlds, the world of matter and the world of spirit',²² and releases from these experiments primitive horrors far exceeding Stevenson's in their grotesque hyperbole. After Stevenson, horror fiction repeatedly explored these worlds, devising fanciful, but still plausible, pseudo-scientific theories about the horrors that lurked within seemingly ordinary individuals, in their bodies, brains or memories. This domain has proven to be extremely fertile; from H. P. Lovecraft to *Psycho*, *Nightmare on Elm Street* and *The Silence of the Lambs*, versions of Mr Hyde have leaped forth from the pages and screens of the horror industry.

Notes

1. Stevenson, letter to F. W. H. Myers, 1 March 1886, in *Collected Letters*, vol. 5, edited by Bradford A. Booth and Ernest Mehw (1995), p. 216. Byles stands for a generic creditor, and was not actually the name of his butcher.
2. Victor Sage, *Horror Fiction in the Protestant Tradition* (1988), p. 8.
3. Baldick, 'Introduction' to *The Oxford Book of Gothic Tales* (1993), p. xx.
4. She is 'atavistic' in as far as her character and condition appear to derive from her distant ancestors (*atavus* means ancestor), and therefore like a vampire she, or her ancestors, has lived and died many times. There is an echo here of Walter Pater's famous description of Da Vinci's 'La Gioconda' (known as the Mona Lisa), which offered a template for prose stylists and a model for femmes fatales at the end of the nineteenth century: 'She is older than the rocks among which she sits; like the vampire, she has been dead many times, and learned the secrets of the grave; and been a diver in deep seas, and keeps their fallen day about her . . . ; and as Leda, was the mother of Helen of Troy, and, as Saint Anne, the mother of Mary; and all this has been