

BEHOLD THE BEAST: VICTORIAN ANXIETIES AND MONSTROUS FORMS

By

Ben Pascoe

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Major Subject: English

West Texas A&M University

Canyon, Texas

May 2019

ABSTRACT

This paper seeks to analyze two examples of Victorian Gothic, the 1885 novella *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and the 1897 novel *Dracula* as texts dealing with anxieties of degeneration, medicine, and addiction on the personal scale and a wider societal scale respectively. Both *Dracula* and *Hyde* represent monsters constructed as representatives of these anxieties in a direct and actionable form so that the audience could address their concerns.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Author would like to thank: his major advisor and committee members for their patience, help, and guidance; the various other faculty members who have contributed advice and assistance in the research and formatting of this paper.

This thesis is dedicated to my family for their love and support through the attainment of my degree, the friends who have helped me along this journey, and the teachers who have helped me learn the skills to create it.

Approved:

[Chairman, Thesis Committee]

[Date]

[Member, Thesis Committee]

[Date]

[Member, Thesis Committee]

[Date]

[Department Head/Direct Supervisor]

[Date]

[Dean, Academic College]

[Date]

[Dean, Graduate School]

[Date]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|-------------|
| <i>CHAPTER 1: GOTHIC ANXIETIES</i> | 1 |
| <i>CHAPTER 2: THE BEAST AMONG FRIENDS</i> | 30 |
| Sex, Drugs, and Chemicals: The Vice Reading | 34 |
| Dr. Jekyll and Dr. Hyde: The Medical Reading | 44 |
| The Savage Gentleman: The Degenerative Reading | 49 |
| <i>CHAPTER 3: THE BEAST AT THE GATES</i> | 56 |
| Unseen Yet Not Unfelt: The Degeneration Reading | 59 |
| The Strange Case of London and Dracula: The Medical Reading | 68 |
| Dealing Dracula: The Addiction Reading | 77 |
| <i>CODA:</i> | 88 |

CHAPTER 1: GOTHIC ANXIETIES

In the Victorian period, the gothic represents the encoding of anxieties given monstrous form to better understand and reveal the threats haunting the author and their times. Anxiety functions as the basis of many forms of literature; chief amongst genres for these fearful texts, the gothic genre's whole stock in trade reflects the anxieties of their time. Gothic literature, as Andrew Smith's phenomenal work of the same name claims, reflects disquieting ideas personified to bringing forth fears, whether through medieval imagery raising up ideas of degeneration through aristocratic monsters or the supposed image of progress associated with a goodly doctor twisted by his inner vices forming the dual fears of medicine progressing too far and addiction ravaging society. The gothic, especially the most monstrous figures within it, draw from a variety of potential sources, specific to their time period, to examine cultural anxieties. For the Victorian Gothic, some of the most common anxieties stem from cultural degeneration, medicine, and addiction. This mutability of anxieties proves one of the greatest strengths of gothic literature in regard to both psychoanalytical and historicist criticism; gothic literature crystalizes the fears of the society at that time period in order to directly address it (Smith 18). Andrew Smith begins the chapter on gothic literature in the Late Victorian period (1865-1900) by pointing out that in gothic works, "it is difficult to isolate psychological factors from social issues" (Smith 87), due to the Victorians' focus on the "progressive internalization of 'evil'" (Smith 87) in society, to the point that

psychological threats to one individual Victorian snowball into fears for society. The same occurs in comparing *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, a story of one man's degeneration into addiction; and *Dracula*, a story of all of London falling into peril at the hands of an addicting addict, a cultural throwback who defies all manner of sciences.

At its core, gothic literature looks not just within the human mind, but through human eyes into the darkness within and without to gain an understanding of what scares its audience society and why it does so. Gothic literature achieves this because "it is an interrogative, rather than [an] intellectually or culturally passive form" (88), seeking out exactly what lurks in the night and determining why it poses a threat in order to lead the audience to recognize the threat. Rather than weaving a tale of a society overtaken by these threats, gothic texts actively seek them out, making the audience just as much "Mr. Seek" (Stevenson 15) as Utterson in *Jekyll and Hyde*; or as much a part of the "Crew of Light" as Harker, Morris, and the other protagonists in *Dracula*. The average person cannot go out into the night and hunt down a concept, but they can investigate a monster from the supposed safety of his/her own home and find a personification of the threatening concept, a representative of evil.

An understanding of how the Victorians defined "evil" aids the understanding of how they sought to keep it at bay. When Andrew Smith speaks of *Jekyll and Hyde*, he does so by looking at it as part of the *fin de siècle* works of the Victorians, and especially as part of their obsession with evil. Most Victorian Gothic texts define evil as a threat to

civilization, which given the Victorians' perception of civilization as best represented by themselves, meant a threat to the Victorians themselves. Later gothic texts suggest society's inability to keep monsters beyond the borders stems from the notion that society itself cannot protect itself from these threats, instead allowing the monsters in. Society possesses its own inherent perils should one look too deeply within its darker corners, and so the very existence of civilization allows for the possibility that evil can infiltrate it, cropping up suddenly amongst its best and brightest and seeking to bring it all crumbling down. This understanding of evil as an innate yet frightful concept allows *Jekyll and Hyde* a fascinating blend of the uncanny and the double with which the anxieties manifest.

Authors cannot simply describe a horde of foreign invaders, as that would imply they could succeed over the armed forces of the greatest empire of the time period; likewise, addicts cannot simply corrupt everybody: the Victorians considered themselves too moral and smart for that. Anything that would represent such anxieties in a believable way would, contrarily, need to take on a form that embodies these transgressive ideals indirectly through monsters that defy the progressive nature of the Victorians, resurrecting old symbols and creating new, terrible figures to stand as personifications of the anxieties. Smith and Cohen point out that “[m]onsters are not straightforwardly just monsters:... rather they illustrate the presence of certain cultural anxieties,” (58) creating figureheads with actual power for fears and concepts in hopes that they can expose these anxieties “indirectly expressed through apparently fantastical forms” (58) which, counter-intuitively, actually feel like creatures that could overthrow the society itself.

Monsters exist in uncertainty and possess the ability to convey these new and terrifying concepts in something with bite.

Understanding the role of monsters within the gothic text requires a more expansive investigation: not every monster makes its text gothic, but every monster does represent a cultural anxiety, the fears which motivated the development and continuation of the gothic style. Jeffrey Cohen's *Monster Theory; Reading Culture* presents seven theses that provide a basic understanding of the monster's function within literature from a cultural analysis and highlights just what purpose they serve. To begin with, he highlights in his preface that monsters often appear in "a society that has created and commodified 'ambient fear'—a kind of total fear that saturates day-to-day living" (Cohen). Such a society generates certain types of anxiety which exist constantly in the back of society's mind, unnamable unless given a less blatant, more monstrous form (Cohen). These monsters then consist of historical and cultural anxieties, some more than others, which blend together to form "an unassimilated hybrid, a monstrous body" (Cohen) in which all of these anxieties can combine.

Cohen begins with his first thesis, "The Monster's Body is a Cultural Body," citing that the monster's body "quite literally incorporates fear, desire, anxiety, and fantasy... giving [the monsters] life and an uncanny independence" (Cohen) to carve its place in the minds of the audience. He cites that these amalgamations of anxiety thrive in "that place that leads to many other places, that point of indecision" (Cohen) which marks a better or worse future; concerns over society tend to worry about what comes next, and monsters thus come from those worries about the choices made now affecting

the cultural future. Writers construct monsters out of these anxieties and use them as stand-ins for those concepts.

In Thesis II, “The Monster Always Escapes” Cohen highlights how these monsters can then transcend that culture and time period to haunt other cultures because even in embodying these concepts, monsters are merely more evidence of those concepts which could and have outlived the Victorians. The underlying anxieties can become less urgent for a time, but just as the monster always returns, they merely take new forms as long as a culture deals with the same concepts. The anxiety’s monster can change into a new, culturally relevant form as long as that society must cope with the underlying anxiety (Cohen). Gothic texts then served as the Victorian outlet for common cultural concerns, and the monster’s adaptability allowed future generations to carry them along even into current pop culture, albeit with changed significance. Understanding these monsters proves much like chasing shadows, “a work that must content itself with fragments... signifiers of monstrous passing that stand in” (Cohen) for the true underlying anxiety and present it in a universal way.

Monsters in Victorian Gothic texts especially personified rising tensions and concerns of degeneration, medicine, and addiction, issues Smith refers to when he introduces the time period as one of “new psychological tensions appear[ing] in literature” in the 1860’s, “tensions which were given clear prominence” (82) in the monsters that became popular towards the latter half of the 1800’s. Degeneration, the perils of progressive medicine, and addiction all blend together within these two Victorian texts, each representing an anxiety that the gothic texts examine and engage

with, even after the Victorian Era ended. Degeneration, especially, mattered as the *Fin de Siècle*, and, as the Victorians feared, the end of the Victorian era, drew nigh.

William Hughes' *Historical Dictionary of Gothic Literature* shows that the gothic, born in the years just before the end of the eighteenth Century, and developing some of its finest examples in its second *fin de siècle* period at the end of the nineteenth century, often incorporates anxieties that develop and grow as the end draws near. The gothic works coming from the *fin de siècle*, which Hughes defines as "both the declining years of one century and the earliest ones of its successor" (Hughes 101) represent, as Cohen mentions, something much like the traditional image of an evil waiting at a crossroads to waylay travelers, drawing on "their association in the popular mind with significant change and a mood of uncertainty" (101) occurring over the thirty years where one century ends and a new one begins. The monsters who haunted Victorian bookshelves especially concerned themselves with the destruction or devolution of Victorian culture by outside influences, referred to as degeneration (Hughes). As people devoted to progressing their society, the Victorians feared devolving as a civilization and as people, hence their choice of monsters: the atavistic Hyde and the foreign vampire turning their young women into creatures like himself.

Smith brings up degeneration quite often, marking it as a recurring source of anxiety within gothic texts. When speaking of Nelly in *Wuthering Heights*, Smith points out that Nelly "attempts to establish a 'norm' that demonises [sic] certain types of behavior by using the Gothic as a language to exclude those who threaten to disrupt her notion of domestic harmony" (Smith 69); this idea can be easily applied to cultural degradation by considering gothic texts which demonize their monsters by portraying

them as representations of the foreign acting to corrupt their society. Smith later adds that the Victorians of the 1860's through the 1890's often considered civilization itself, "here constituted as a kind of Englishness" (98), required protection to prevent its compromise "by anxieties concerning possible moral, social, and psychological degeneration" (Smith 98) by external cultural influences. New ideas within the fledgling field of psychology and the beginnings of the collapse of the empire clashed with the optimistic if anxious mindset of Victorian society, as they asked themselves how darkness could fall on the empire on which the sun never sets? Naturally this anxiety birthed monsters to represent itself within the Gothic literature of the time.

As stated above, the gothic represents a genre that interrogates rather than represents, hunting the thing in the dark rather than simply describing it. Cohen's Thesis VII, "The Monster Stands at the Threshold... of Becoming" highlights that the gothic uses monsters in order to determine (as much as one can extrapolate each anxiety) exactly what the culture fears; it does so with monsters who force us to examine "how we perceive the world, and how we have misrepresented what we have attempted to place" (Cohen) within it; defying rational attempts to understand and banish a recurring concept and forcing the audience "to reevaluate our cultural assumptions...our perception of difference, our tolerance towards its expression" (Cohen) and then forces the audience to comprehend why exactly these objects hold such dread. While in the case of many monsters the fear proves unfounded or internal rather than external, sometimes, the Gothic warns, these fears have basis in truth, and so the writers hope this forced examination will lead the audience to properly understand what peril awaits them.

The haunted house; the man who turns into a monster; the dead man walking: each a symbol of the normal suddenly becoming dangerous, abnormal, frightening. Each has its place in the gothic, but each also possesses a unifying factor: the familiar suddenly becoming unfamiliar, if ever it originally was familiar. The traditional name for this, “the uncanny” comes from a period after the Victorians but is still clearly influenced by them. Originating in Sigmund Freud’s 1919 essay of the same name, the uncanny examines the complex emotions brought about by the domestic setting’s dual nature as a place of safety and also a source of anxiety itself. Freud sets up the ideas of “the *Heimlich* (literally, ‘the homely,’ and, by implication, the familiar)” and contrasts (yet also melds it) with “the *Unheimlich* (literally, “ ‘the unhomely,’ and usually translated from the German as ‘the uncanny’)” (Hughes 249). The uncanny, Hughes explains, “is capable of inducing fear precisely because it is not known or familiar to the perceiver” (249). Hughes further notes that “Freud extends the range of fearfulness by suggesting that unknown (and thus fearful)” (249) things may lie concealed within the most familiar of environments, institutions, and individuals. The idea of known, safe, understood things suddenly becoming sources of peril, and the thought of the home becoming a place imperiled not only fuels both texts, but also serves as a touchstone between all three cultural anxieties in common between the two texts: degradation (or cultural degeneration), medicine, and addiction.

The uncanny in Freud’s own words will help to elaborate just how something can at once be familiar and yet unfamiliar. The uncanny, while closely related, is not just “what arouses dread and creeping horror” but also relates “all those properties of persons, things, sensations, experiences, and situations” (Freud 545) which creates this anxiety,

this uncanny feeling. He sums up the uncanny as a type of fearfulness “which leads back to something long known to us, once very familiar” (546) to the subject; that which makes one feel safe becomes a source of anxiety. Home effectively becomes a dangerous place, once certain ideas suddenly become nonsense or non-applicable. The local doctor known for charity and dedication suddenly goes out at night and tramples little girls. Perhaps one of the best examples of this: the dead walk amongst us again.

Freud does make a point of pointing out that the uncanny does not just represent the idea that newness causes fright; such a concept would make understanding medicine in gothic literature much simpler, but would also rob the cultural anxieties of their longevity and would mean that such monsters would lose their frightfulness the longer the anxiety hangs around, although the longevity of *Dracula* in print and how often filmmakers retell it makes this unlikely. Freud also points out that while “we are tempted to conclude that ‘what is uncanny’ is frightening precisely because it is *not* known and familiar” (Freud) to the subject, novelty itself does not always equate the right type of fear to the uncanny (Freud). Instead, the novel must at the same time meld and emerge from what supposedly came before, the familiar and known, to provide that correct blend of anxieties which make something uncanny. The domestic, the safe, and the good suddenly become “unhomely,” dangerous, and evil, and this special fear manifests in the Victorian Gothic in each of the anxieties this thesis examines.

The uncanny represents an interesting concept to the gothic; Smith points out that the differentiation between good and evil plays constantly in gothic texts, and the Victorians’ Gothic works deal particularly with evils internalized within them which create the promised threat of the uncanny and truly binds the uncanny to Victorian gothic

(Smith 87). Smith summarizes the uncanny domestically by establishing “[t]he home as a place of family, domesticity, and therefore safety” (88) which evil then invades; this represented by Freud in that the homely and the invasive evil, the “unhomely, or uncanny,” meld in both their linguistic naming and in how the unhomely exists within the homely. This renders the home “a dangerous place because it is the site where sexual secrets are harboured and propagated” (89). With regards to the threat of cultural degeneration mentioned above, the uncanny renders a supposedly safe domestic space a dangerous place, infiltrating and corrupting the society from within, and yet remaining undetected by society at large. The uncanny exists as part of the domestic, unseen, yet dangerous, and for the Victorian writers, the best way to bring this threat to public mind, and reveal the uncanny, requires a face to apply to the anxiety: a monster.

Cohen’s extends his argument by providing the needed understanding of how monsters apply to this uncanny anxiety. Humans’ “cultural fascination with monsters—a fixation that is born of the twin desires to name that which is difficult to apprehend” (Cohen) leads them to try and identify the unhomely lurking within the homely, “to domesticate (and therefore disempower) that which threatens” (Cohen) the sanctity of the home or homeland. By giving people a monster, the gothic writers also provide a way to recognize, hunt, and eliminate these concepts from the face of society, thus rendering them powerless. The gothic seeks to understand why society fears this, and then creates monsters so that they can understand, reveal, and then alleviate these anxiety-inducing concepts from society. The hunt for Dracula and Hyde, for example, reveals the secrets of these monsters, humanizes them, and ultimately leads to their revelation and destruction.

As the gothic creates monsters to personify their anxieties, so too does Freud's theory of the uncanny create a personification of the uncanny within the doppelganger, or double. Smith references it in connection with the "other" which brings to light truths which the audience has up to now ignored (Smith 94). This other serves as an inner voice which, while intended as "the emergence of [one's] adult conscience," instead "turns into a dangerously powerful form of censorship" (94) which Freud feared "stifles the development of the self" (94) even going so far as "psychologically kill[ing] (or repress[ing]) the self" (94). For each of the anxieties examined in this work, the monster serves as a double: something monstrous which seeks to slow, stop, or even reverse the Victorian's progressive advancement.

The concept of the double, which Smith declares especially important to *Jekyll and Hyde*, even merits its own entry into the *Historical Dictionary of Gothic Literature* under "Doppelganger." Whether through the "duplication or division of a character" to "emphasize polemically the moral dilemmas" (Hughes 86) which drive the plot; or, psychologically, referencing the "polarity of the unrestrained id against its ego and superego counterparts" (86), the double serves as the contrast, the shadow against which the forces of good must struggle and the embodiment of the anxieties which motivate that struggle. Hughes claims that the doubling may take one of two forms: division, in which "a character is split, physically or psychologically, into two alternating personalities" or duplication, wherein "two entities effectively parallel each other's actions" (86) and create conflict in their comparison. In a way, every monster represents a double of some element of the identity of the culture which spawned them.

One issue does arise between these three sources; not a conflict, but a knot which one must unravel to balance these ideas of the uncanny and the double, one Victorian, one Modernist. Smith raises the point that utilizing Freud on the Victorian Gothic seems “historically perverse” (Smith 88), but that it works well with the gothic’s interrogative nature. The earlier gothic apparently predicts many of Freud’s theories, often decades before he published them (88), while predating his published essays by decades. Hughes himself, in his *Dictionary’s* entry for “The Doppelganger” claims that “[w]ith the rise of Freudian theory, and a model of the mind that is fragmented beyond the binary” (Hughes 87), the old ideas of a single binary divide fell out of common use, with little use of the motif after the Victorians. This moment then leads one to wonder why Freud himself would use the double within his essay.

Yet use it he does, even though he admits that “none of [the double figure] helps us to understand the extraordinarily strong feeling of something uncanny” without actually discrediting it, instead implying that “‘the double’ being a creation dating back to a very early mental stage” (Freud) transforms for developed minds “a vision of terror, just as after the fall of their religion the gods took on daemonic shapes” (Freud) for other cultures. The double represents the earlier version of this anxiety, this feeling that safe and good has become dangerous and evil, and serves as a personification of the uncanny, a sign of its presence without actually embodying it fully, foot prints in the snow, as Cohen remarks of monsters; a signifier of the society’s own uncanny frights.

Cohen speaks of doubleness within his theses as well. In his preface, he cites that a monster “is that uncertain cultural body in which is condensed an intriguing simultaneity or doubleness” wherein it “introjects the disturbing, repressed, but formative

traumas” (Cohen) as it brings forth to present time that which society thought banished. The monster “does not simply bring past and present together, but destroys the boundary” (Cohen) between the two so that fears thought revealed and banished previously can return to haunt once more. This doubleness which allows each society to create personalized monsters then also allows these monsters to return even after society changes and becomes more familiar with the anxiety; as familiar as it becomes, it still remains an anxiety that can flare up as people become awakened to its existence.

Thesis V, “The Monster Polices the Borders of the Possible” reflects on how these monsters can act as these crippling uncertainties of society; Monsters stand not only at the gates of society, but also “at the limits of knowledge” where they serve “as a warning against exploration of its uncertain demesnes” (Cohen) and ward off further progress. How easily one can compare a breakthrough about cloning to stepping on God’s toes, or how often in pop culture a supposedly mad scientist has some breakthrough idea which others attempt to block, often correctly, for fear of what it may unleash; monsters then serve as the teeth of such warnings no matter the era, as examples of what might happen and why society should not go down this path. But at the same time, the Victorians prided themselves on their progress and advancement; how could continuing that advancement be bad and good at the same time?

Both monsters in the texts examined in this thesis include, as Cohen mentions, “a double narrative, two living stories: one that describes how the monster came to be” (Cohen) revealing how the anxiety or anxieties became apparent. Doubled with that origin story, each text also provides the monster’s testimony, “detailing what cultural use the monster serves” (Cohen) or why the society must seek, understand, and destroy the

monster. The monster exists as an attempt to “call horrid attention to the borders that cannot *-must not-* be crossed” (Cohen) by society lest all become lost. Their existence marks the potential for society to go astray and fall, be it falling to degeneration, giving in to addiction, or going too far in the pursuit of medicine.

To better understand how each cultural anxiety appears within both texts, Christopher Craft’s “‘Kiss Me with Those Red Lips’: Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker’s *Dracula*” provides a common element in several of the most popular gothic texts, including both *Jekyll and Hyde* and *Dracula*. The monster serves to call attention to itself and each text as a run-through of the process of affecting society, a dress rehearsal for society’s encounter with the conceptual anxiety. Craft delineates “a predictable, if variable, triple rhythm” wherein each text “first invites or admits a monster, then entertains and is entertained by monstrosity for some extended duration” (Craft 107), during which the monster’s tale and the tale of how it affects society dominates the narrative; before finally “in its closing pages it expels or repudiates the monster and all the disruption” (Craft 107) the monster inflicts on the society. This system of introduction, activity, and expulsion, when applied with Cohen’s model of the monster as a cultural anxiety, allows one to create a sort of prediction of how each anxiety functions within the texts.

The first anxiety, the one perhaps closest tied to the uncanny for the Victorians, also struck deepest at the heart of their society: Degeneration. Victorian society had built itself up to such high status that the thought of falling back into old ways, (or worse, descending further to something less than human) haunted much of their *fin de siècle* literature. As Smith points out, “civilization cannot quite be trusted because it harbours

discontents” (Smith 100) which threaten its stability. A culture so obsessed with evil naturally found its criteria for a threat “defined by the threat it poses to ‘civilization’” (Smith 100) even if that evil might actually originate within the culture itself. Of course, the evil obviously comes from outside the civilization; it could not possibly come from within... could it? The Victorians may not openly have admitted the possibility, but their monsters offer a different opinion.

The monsters of the Victorians especially sought to force the audience to examine what their empire had latched onto in its worldwide reach and exactly how tight the bonds of the empire actually held things, as well as to think carefully about what they brought into their homes. Cohen’s fourth Thesis, “The Monster Dwells at the Gates of Difference” examines how monsters represent a threat which, rather than lurking beyond the walls, comes from within one’s own attempt to determine the self. As the Victorians saw themselves as the very height of civilization, so too did many of them consider anything not purely English as different or Other. Cohen highlights that a monster “is difference made flesh, come to dwell among us” (Cohen) as a personification of that which the culture fears lies outside its borders and ideals. Monsters function as the antithesis of the ideal, a “dialectical Other” which at once comes from “all those loci that are rhetorically placed as distant and distinct” (Cohen) by a society. Their distinctions stem from the audience itself; ordinarily, this “monstrous difference tends to be cultural, political, racial, economic, [or] sexual” (Cohen) each of which ties into degeneration as a possible means of cultural attack against the society and a point of cultural progress which must be maintained. Both Hyde and Dracula attack multiple points as

representatives of multiple anxieties, each an outer attack upon the very basis of Victorian social identity.

Hughes devotes an entire entry within his *Dictionary to Degeneration*, representing as it does a popular theme of gothic works from the beginning to modern day, and more clearly examines the concept itself. He defines degeneration similarly to Smith, citing it as “the *perception* of the *apparent* decline of the human species” (Hughes 80, my emphasis) which the Victorians would read as the decline of Victorian ideals. Whether or not they actually represented a threat, a question which still echoes today, the very thought of this potential threat fueled nightmarish figures throughout their literature. The Victorians melded this anxiety with new criminal theories which suggested that “criminality was a form of atavism or of reversion to mental states more suited to primitive humanity” (80), actively endangering the Victorians’ progressive state of mind. Monsters which personify this anxiety in Victorian works appear as unhuman, actively imperil the morals wellbeing of society, and often embody “a displaced form of the racism usually displayed toward ethnic groups perceived as alien or invasive” (80); this anxiety manifests in Dracula’s infiltration of London or Hyde’s abhuman physique. It became easy to believe that the less advanced nations and peoples pouring into London from the edges of the empire could become an anchor around the neck of progress, and the idea of the peace of the domestic becoming corrupted by this made for a compelling infiltrator of its own.

The concept of an empire wherein the external territories bring in much-needed wealth and consumables, but where external sources also bring in disease and danger aptly connects to the ideas of the uncanny. Given the wide spread of cultures and ideas

available to the Victorians through their empire, the Victorians would have examples of unfamiliar cultures even in the supposed bastion of Englishness that London represented. Things that did not fall under the banner of traditional Englishness had also become household staples and cultural elements; for example, can anyone nowadays imagine the English without tea? England the empire thrived and England the culture grew off of things brought in from the edges of the empire, and one can easily see how this would create the anxiety later-day Victorians encountered.

Monsters in late Victorian Gothic texts stalk London to the beat of an anxious heart, or so Christopher Craft's "'Kiss Me with the Red Lips': Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*" argues. Craft suggests that within the gothic monster novel, a pattern emerges of society inviting a monster into its presence, learning the monster's story, and then exiling it with that knowledge. Craft's triple rhythm easily fits the anxiety of degeneration. English society literally "invites or admits the monster" (Craft 107) into their midst by bringing in the degenerating force from without. *Dracula* comes in aboard "The Demeter" and with Harker's unwitting help establishes himself within London. Hyde has always existed within Jekyll, and thus within every Englishman. Once the invading/infiltrating/reawakened force has reached the core of society, society within the text then unknowingly hosts the monster for a period of time in which the monster remains almost undetected and wreaks havoc upon the people, actively attempting to dig away at the moral, economic, and cultural base of the society (Craft 107). Finally, as the novel reaches its conclusion, the society becomes aware of and actively engages with the monster to drive it from society, ending its influence and preventing any further

decline... for now (Craft 107). Degeneration for the Victorians has inspired many critics, and one does not lack for discourse upon it in either text.

The anxiety raised by medicine requires a bit more investigating. None can look upon the gothic and not see in many of its texts the awe-inspiring power of science; when it appears, it either provides an attempt to answer the anxiety, or uncannily becomes powerless to stop it (sometimes in the very same text, as *Dracula* shows). Medicine in particular fascinated the Victorians, partially because of their anxiety over degeneration. Their fear of social collapse partially emerged from the fledgling study of psychology, and Smith highlights that many early psychological works examined criminality as a source of degeneration. New advances in medicine explored and guarded avenues for potential degenerations, but also opened up the way for new fears to become apparent (Smith 98). Just as the influx of culture offered a crossroads for monsters to haunt in how they would affect England's future, so too did medicine promise great advancements and also its own brand of perils. Disease, sexuality, and even the newly discovered concept of addiction, itself a separate anxiety in its own right, all came to public attention through medicine, and the field itself had its own uncanny sense of distrust to battle.

Science's awe-inspiring power spends as much time making monsters as it does in fighting against them. *Dracula*, of course defies not one, but two doctors in his claiming of Lucy, and his very nature stands in sharp opposition to our medical definitions of "alive" and "dead." Cohen's third thesis, "The Monster is the Harbinger of Category Crisis" describes the monster's innate ability to defy science. He cites that when the monster sets himself against the progress and advancement of a society "scientific inquiry and its ordered rationality crumble... [t]he monstrous is a genus too large to be

encapsulated in any conceptual system” (Cohen) which could classify and understand it. A monster stands against the science of reality: one cannot stitch together a bunch of dead bodies, hit it with chemicals and lightning, and create a new being; a man who died centuries ago has no business walking amongst the living and reproducing by the exchange of blood; a drug should not change a man’s morals, perspective, physical traits, and appearance. And yet it can happen: a dead man’s eyes can be transplanted; someone from outside the usual genetic stock of a culture can enter his blood and genes into the pool; and drugs can turn someone into a completely different person, often without the person realizing it. All of these changes occur not just in spite of medical advancement, but sometime because of it. In an uncanny combination of “can do” and “can’t stop,” medicine offers both miraculous hope and a potential for unlimited suffering.

Not only logical, proven medical science appears in Gothic texts: other stranger, less traditional methods appear as well in a “fire vs. fire” methodology. Hughes’ *Dictionary* includes an entry for the “Psychic Doctor” a figure “qualified in both conventional secular medicine and more occult studies” (Hughes 206) which they use to counter those threats their basic medical knowledge cannot overcome. Asimov’s quote about sufficiently advanced science appearing indistinguishable from magic applies here: what strange rites Van Helsing reveals to his more traditional student Seward, who himself stands on the cutting edge of psychology, have the trappings of religion; but he first presents them as a medicinal treatment, and they work until someone with a less traditional knowledge of medicine takes action. These strange pseudoscientific methods do follow a sort of uncanny illogical logic, however, and work because of this.

Applying Craft's triple rhythm to medicine offers not one, but two different possibilities. Option one treats the monster as a disease invading the body, while option two examines the entrance of an idea or medical theory such as Lombroso's theory on criminals. The portion of the text where the society allows a monster in would represent the point wherein a disease first enters the body; in option two, the idea would first come into popularity amidst both the public and the medical experts of society (Craft 107). In the second phase, where the monster has its day, the disease wreaks havoc upon the body and causes what destruction it will while the doctors study its symptoms and attempt to determine a course of treatment; so too does the theory make its way through the society, influencing and possibly misleading as the doctors attempt to verify its veracity. Finally, when the disease has run its course the doctors find some way to expel the disease, whether by keeping the body alive to fight it off, curing it with external drugs, or, in the worst case, disposing of the dead body and preventing the disease's spread. Likewise, the theory eventually falls out of favor when Doctors find something newer and better, some new theory or evidence which repudiates the theory; in both cases, medicine eventually finds a solution to the disruption upon the body of society. Medicine thus provides two different rhythms which can apply to both texts and their monsters in ways strangely similar despite the difference of their scale. The end result, the removal of the monster from public influence, remains the same.

The final anxiety discussed here, addiction, has ties to both medicine, as the source and measure, and degeneration, as the consequence on a personal and societal level. Something medically based, medically examined for the first time during the Victorian Era, and something which itself remains a critical, if less unfamiliar, issue even

today. The person walking beside you could act exactly as expected, until they consume a certain drug. The idea of a celebrity doctor behaving in secret like a monster barely phases modern audiences, but for the Victorians, this represented a newly discovered and very severe anxiety. In an analysis of the early Gothic text, *The Monk*, Smith references that the book “emphasises that passions cannot be controlled, even if they lead to damnation” (Smith 30); an interesting idea when applied to Romanticism, but one with surprising import when applied to the Victorian Gothic, especially *Dracula* and *Jekyll and Hyde*. Does not Jekyll’s desire to divide good from evil lead him into eventually becoming nothing but evil; does not Dracula chase the blood of the living and his desires for a twisted form of love all the way to London? The monsters of the Victorian Gothic, in their desire to claim what they want, makes monsters of the Victorians themselves, and brings them to public knowledge.

Freud’s Uncanny applies to addiction, and addiction to degeneration, in that it makes monsters of men, and suddenly things familiar and known become hazards. This becomes a bit clearer when applying Craft’s triple rhythm to how a drug affects one’s system, how one generally expects one to react to discovering one’s friend or loved one has become an addict and how addiction moves through society. To begin with the most personal level, the monster as the drug, one looks at its appearance within the text as the moment one introduces the drug into their system; the text must have an anxiety in order to deplete it, the addicted system must have the drug (Craft 107). The monster’s reign of terror serves as the cathartic build up, designed to create an uncanny frightful pleasure, “indeed a thrilling anxiety” during the time when “the gothic novel entertains its resident demon— is, indeed, entertained by it” (Craft 107) much like the body uses the drug and

the user feels its effects. Craft describes this period of the monster's reign as when the monster appears "ascendant in its strength... potent enough to invert the 'natural' order and overwhelm" (Craft 108) the natural progression of the narrative. Finally, the body uses up the drug, and processes the remainder until its expulsion through natural processes- so too does the monster go away and the text end as normal... until the monster needs to return, the audience and text both craving more of the cathartic release the monster's tale brings.

However, while both *Dracula* and *Jekyll and Hyde* follow this addiction reading fairly closely, it takes a bit of open-minded effort to fit it into that frame. Each text falls more easily into the second version of the pattern, which interestingly enough also fits into the scale-based comparison of the two. *Jekyll and Hyde*, the older, smaller novella, takes the more personal scale of one realizing that one's friend has become an addict, copes with this sudden uncanny fright by attempting to excise this friend of their addiction, and perhaps succeeds. In this reading of the rhythm, the first initial hint of the friend's condition serves as the inciting incident which frightens and spurs the friend on to investigate deeper. Whether it's Utterson's realization that Hyde has some relation to Jekyll, or the Crew of Light's first encounter with the vampiric Lucy, this moment reveals that addiction lurks far closer to their home lives than they ever imagined, and they immediately begin the actions that they must to remove the influence of addiction upon their friend. The middle phase then represents the inevitable battle for the soul of their friend, their attempt to cure the disease. Just as the focus shifts to finding solid proof of the addiction, the addiction becomes the primary lens through which the friends interact, the threat of addiction enough to threaten the existing natural order or their

relationship until this situation resolves itself (Craft 108). Suddenly determining Hyde's true nature becomes Utterson's focus, while twelve years later the heroes must save Lucy's soul and then begin the business of rooting out the cause. The fact that they must then start this phase over again with Mina simply reinforces why they must root out this addiction, as it spreads to the societal level.

In the final part of the triple rhythm, the two texts differ somewhat in the successfulness of their efforts. As the threat of addiction recedes from their personal circle, they follow the text's imperative that they drive the monster hence by removing the threat to their social circles permanently; however, this is not the happy "rehab story" a modern audience might think possible (108). While the vampire might nowadays become a likeable, relatable figure for modern audiences, and the split-personality scientist a hero, for the Victorians, this anxiety could only result in the loss of the addict completely from society; they have degenerated too far to remain, and both Jekyll and Lucy perish. This might seem harsh, but it ultimately seems a bit necessary when one considers that the Victorians had a limited understanding of addiction, and when melded with their degeneration anxiety, addiction does look much like the coffin of their society.

Addiction remains a controversial and terrifying concept today, and in part this comes from the fears of what could happen to society if enough of its members became addicts. The third way one can read addiction as the driving beat of the gothic text examines it in a larger, sociological way which suits both texts reasonably, but *Dracula* in particular. This reading marks the beginning of the triple with the realization of addiction as a credible and exigent threat to society; enough Uttersons have realized their respective Hydes represent a problem affecting many people, and rather than just one

man mobilizing to counter the threat at a personal level, now a whole legion of societal forces must come together to stop it. To begin with, the society must admit that it allowed a monster into its midst; that good Dr. Jekyll or Mr. Harker has endangered more than simply his personal assortment of friends with his actions, but has in fact unleashed a monster onto all of London. Now all of society knows that this uncanny being lurks amongst them, and it becomes not familiar but known, and thus actionable.

From that point on, the plot becomes a protracted campaign during “the gothic novel’s prolonged middle, during which the text affords its ambivalence” (107) towards the monster to steadily ebb, society taking small measures and minor steps until finally they realize the full threat of addiction and mobilize to remove it, just as the Crew of Light make can only irritate and hinder Dracula’s efforts to take Lucy and Mina, until they finally gather enough of an edge to eliminate his foothold on London. Only once all of society has begun making a constant effort to stamp out addiction does the author’s text model the final phase in “its need both to destroy the monster it has previously admitted and to end the narrative that houses the monster” (107); which *Dracula* does by chasing the monster all the way out of Britain to where it originated, and supposedly ending it once and for all. The text must end with the eradication of addiction and it must end quickly, lest the addiction become familiar enough to lose that uncanny frightfulness which helps motivate society to destroy it.

To summarize and meld these three rhythms into a more complete addiction reading of the texts, the introduction of the drug into the addict’s system mirrors the moment one experiences an uncanny fear as they realize addiction has struck closer to home than they ever thought, which mirror’s society’s realization that an addictive

substance has taken root and affected, perhaps even begun destabilizing their culture. The monsters in such addiction tales are thus the anxieties of the drug, the personal effect of addiction, and the sociological effects of addiction all melded into one single personification. By applying the deeper understanding of addiction to these textual monsters, it becomes apparent that the Victorian monster-makers were attempting to create an understanding of addiction in their audiences; they just lacked all of the pieces which have become apparent with modern research into addiction.

An examination of the very basics of addiction theory provide a surprising amount of insight into how Stoker and Stevenson crafted their respective addiction monsters and attempted to create an understanding of addiction which appears incomplete with modern understanding. Robert West's *Theory of Addiction* seeks to unify several different modern theories of addiction as a psychological illness; though some may conflict, they do unify and the work functions as an introduction to the modern understanding of addiction. In examining these models, West first establishes a baseline definition of addiction. His starting definition of addiction states the conventional definition of "impaired control over a reward-seeking (usually drug-taking) behavior from which harm ensues" (West 3); as good a definition as any, and one that provides a simple baseline from which both West and this paper can build a deeper understanding of addiction. Applying the definition to the actor, an addict gives up part of their self-control in exchange for the satisfying effects of a substance or activity that actively harms them. However, taking this as an ironclad meaning for addiction raises awkward questions: does this somehow make Jekyll a bad person? Does this mean that Lucy and Mina *chose* to become victims of Dracula? Even asking these questions, especially in the latter case,

opens up accusations of victim-blaming; and while certain authors have examined both Mina and Jekyll in similar ways,¹ the original texts' addiction-based readings do not on their own support these views; indeed, those endangered by addiction must represent the best of Victorian morals, or else there lies no danger of addiction to society.

West utilizes hard scientific models for the symptoms of addiction. He utilizes a table taken from the APA's 1995 Diagnostic and Statistical Manual-IV, with the first four (of seven) behaviors listed below:

Diagnostic and Statistical Manual-IV (APA 1995)

- (1) Substance is often taken in larger amounts or over longer period than intended
- (2) Persistent desire or unsuccessful efforts to cut down or control substance use
- (3) A great deal of time is spent in activities necessary to obtain the substance (e.g. visiting multiple doctors or driving long distances), use the substance (e.g. chain smoking), or recover from its effects
- (4) Important social, occupational or recreational activities given up or reduced because of substance abuse

Anyone who fulfils three of the criteria within the table "at any time within the same 12-month period" (15) becomes classified as an addict. West also closely examines the why of addiction, and two of his theories fit nicely into late Victorian Gothic texts.

¹ Daniel Levine's *Hyde* (2014) and Dacre Stoker/Ian Holt's *Dracula The Undead* (2009) both portray these characters in a much more complex, possibly downright villainous light than the original texts.

This search for understanding of addiction not only accounts for why most addicts require external aid for their addiction, but also why addiction fits so well with the Gothic. In two gothic texts, *Jekyll and Hyde* and Le Fanu's *Carmilla*, Smith points out that "[q]uestions about the ownership of the self are central" (Smith 97) to these two and other gothic texts. Addiction complicates the question of the ownership of one's self: one chose to consume the drug, knowing it could lead to addiction; but once the addiction sets in, breaking it becomes a literal battle for one's soul.

West utilizes these two different theories for addiction, which he attempts to synthesize. The first model, the Rational Choice Model, or addiction as a choice, makes several assumptions on why the addict uses the drug. West cites that addicts "do things because [they] expect them to confer benefits" (29), even when knowing they have adverse. It examines the addict's decision as coming "from a weighing up of the costs and benefits as the decision-maker sees them" (39) and choosing to consume the drug. West points out that this model does fall flat in that "many addicts choose to exercise restraint and, in many cases, go to great lengths and yet still fail" (46), eventually relapsing. Dr. Jekyll, the main addict of *Jekyll and Hyde* best fulfills this model, and *Dracula's* Renfield also fulfills the criteria, except that Jekyll never knew the risks and eventually loses control of the change, while Renfield as a self-admitted madman does not seem to have chosen his madness. As West admits, the model on its own has flaws, but as active choice remains involved in the beginning of the addiction, and as "a choice can be rational even if the preferences that determine it are ultimately self-destructive" (53), the model does retain merit. Ultimately, it requires an opposing theory to properly balance out and function: that of addiction as a disease.

What if something forces one to become addicted? While addiction's taking of a humanoid form in the model of a vampire converting the living into more vampires does seem a bit melodramatic, West's second model, addiction as compulsion, also referred to as Addiction as Disease, or the Disease Model, does tie in nicely to the fears that addiction could overtake any Victorian, no matter how moral. The Disease Model of addiction stems from the accounts of addicts who reported, just before a relapse, "a feeling of compulsion" or "an urge they are trying to resist" (75) which eventually overpowers them. Images of Dracula appearing before Mina spring easily to mind here, but West simply sums up the model as suggesting that "[t]his model proposes that the pathology underlying addiction involves changes to the brain that lead people to do things against their will" (75) and establishes the addiction as exerting its own influence over the addict. Hyde's growing control and corruption of Jekyll and Dracula's efforts to control Lucy and Mina suddenly become more fitting to the uncanny fright of addiction if the addiction becomes an active force. But like a vampire, the someone must first make the choice to let the addiction into the home before it can take root. West devotes his book to trying to unify these and other models into a single addiction theory using over a century of research; the Victorians lacked that research, and so each text prevents a chilling if incomplete examination of addiction.

Even with over a century of study, we do not know today whether to view addiction as a result of conscious human choice or uncontrollable human nature; for the Victorians first beginning to understand that addiction even existed, either idea would prove monstrous. For the purposes of this paper and acting from textual evidence rather than an actual psychology background, Dr. Jekyll appears to represent an addict of the

Rational Choice model who swiftly and unwittingly falls into addiction, while Mina and Lucy could fall under Addiction as Disease, as Dracula leaves them little choice in first encountering vampirism.

An in-depth reading of each text must now follow these basics, wherein each text and criticism devoted to each text provides an understanding of how the uncanny anxieties of degeneration, medicine, and addiction, with their own triple rhythms, infuse their monsters with power and hopefully their audiences with a healthy dose of fear; the guiding emotion of the Gothic genre.

CHAPTER 2: THE BEAST AMONG FRIENDS

We can learn much about the late Victorians from Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Published in 1886, the text provides an example of addiction, medicine, and degeneration in a smaller scale of a group of friends or single level of society, using a mostly personal narrative form. The text does not shout and declare "here is a monster imperiling society" so much as it whispers and warns "here lurks a monster amongst your friends, and you have only just realized it." *Jekyll and Hyde* shows how a source of anxiety over degeneration, addiction, and medicine could seem to suddenly appear from nowhere within a relatively close-knit, social group, revealing that they had lain hidden there unseen for quite some time, monsters of addiction, medicine, and degeneration lurking unnoticed amongst those best known and beloved to the members of the group.

With Jekyll and Hyde forming the primary double relationship of *Jekyll and Hyde*, Stevenson's characters also give voice to an interesting interpretation of Jekyll himself as a threat to society masquerading as a respectable gentleman. Doctors in the Victorian era had themselves become potential vectors for the downfall of civilization, as Debbie Harrison claims; by the end of the 1800's, iatrogenic addiction, "an addiction triggered by a doctor's prescriptions— had become a serious issue for the medical profession, while reactions to the self-experimenting doctor ranged from unease to outspoken criticism" (Harrison 53) towards real-life examples of Jekyll. In considering

the dangers Harrison highlights, Jekyll perhaps does not represent the exemplar English gentleman that he seems to, but instead personifies a hidden, less obvious threat, even more terrifying than Hyde's open aggression and the obvious reactionary dread he inspires. This idea that Jekyll does not represent the ideal gentleman allows us to examine him as the exemplar of another role: the addict. But while Jekyll's threat to society remains somewhat uncertain, Hyde openly endangers it.

Hyde represents a more obvious personification of a threat to society, because Jekyll, supposing he does represent a worthy example of society, defines himself as a representation of the Victorian idea of evil. Jekyll establishes that his Hyde persona stands "alone in the ranks of mankind, [as] pure evil" (Stevenson 51), whereas most every other human, including Jekyll himself, exists as a composite being "comingled out of good and evil" (51) or for the Victorians, civilized and savage. This divide between Hyde and humanity explains the other characters' reported innate anxiety at Hyde's presence; it also establishes Hyde, similarly to Dracula, as an anti-Victorian, the embodied antithesis of the opposites of their social values, or to put it into Cohen's terms, a composite of their social anxieties: a monster.

Jekyll's contrasts with Hyde portrays a contrast of good and evil in multiple ways, exploring a theme apparent in other works of Stevenson's as well as other Victorian writers. Katherine Kearney Maynard examines Jekyll and his social circle as the highest and most socially conscious members of Victorian society, and Hyde as their opposing force. *Jekyll and Hyde* carries this conflict "to its polarized extremes" (Maynard 370) by using "the dualistic opposition between the respectable and the disreputable" (370) to drive the conflict, the good doctor as an exemplar of Victorian good on one pole, while

his alter-ego stands at the other, inhuman in his danger to Victorian society (Maynard 370). Jekyll desires social propriety, while at the same time craving those pleasures he cannot claim and retain the standing, and his desire to do both eventually leads to the creation of a monstrous double in Hyde, someone who can pursue those vices and supposedly protects Jekyll from the downsides.

Understanding the double concept provides an insight into how Hyde represents a multi-faceted opposition to the Victorian respectability Maynard mentions. Hughes defines the double (which he also connects with the doppelganger) in two ways: symbolically and psychologically; whether the double exists as a complete opposition to a value, or as a dreadful mirror to a particular character determines a great deal about the double's role in the text. Smith also highlights that the novella can and has fit into a variety of interpretations; in the first symbolic sense, Hyde represents "the moral dilemmas or social disparities" (Hughes 86) which faced the Victorians, and under this reading many have examined the text as warning about addiction, degeneration, or whatever anxiety they seek to interpret. In the second sense, Hughes defines the double psychoanalytically as examining "the polarity of the unrestrained id against its ego and superego counterparts" (86) wherein the baser parts of man attempt to overcome the civilized. In *Jekyll and Hyde*, the double seeks out that which a civilized man should not according to society's standards. In doing so, the double ultimately becomes an evil force within society itself, hauntingly close and, perhaps most terrifyingly, innately linked to every person, yearning to act freely.

Hyde's most terrifying quality may stem not from his degenerate features, nor even his callous disregard and violence towards other humans; it may instead come from

the fact that he comes from and exists within Jekyll, and by extension, everybody. Stevenson especially makes it a point to ensure that, aside from those like Lanyon who directly interact with Hyde, none can recognize him. Those who attempt to describe Hyde find that their descriptions of him “differed widely, as common observers will” (Stevenson 24) and the only point by which they all agree to identify him “was the haunting sense of unexpressed deformity with which the fugitive impressed his beholders” (24) which one can easily reword as an uncanny sensation which every person feels when they encounter the monster who looks human, perhaps, is human. Those who do encounter Hyde and can recognize him reliably, interestingly enough, know and recognize Jekyll before they met Hyde, and perhaps these people (Utterson, Lanyon, and Poole) notice Hyde as monstrous because of the fact that deep down, they realize his uncanny connection to their beloved friend. This perhaps explains why Utterson, in Jekyll’s parlor, a room he refers to as “the pleasantest room in London” (18), cannot help but shudder with “a nausea and distaste of life” (18) as thoughts of Hyde fill his mind.

Hughes makes a special effort to connect the doppelganger and the uncanny together, and for good reason. Hyde’s monstrosity only increases when his true connection to Jekyll becomes clear, as made evident by Lanyon’s death by fright after learning the truth. Hughes points out that Freud increases “the range of fearfulness by suggesting that unknown (and thus fearful) things may” (Hughes 249) lurk at the core of the domestic space, just as Hyde lurks in the heart of Henry Jekyll and, by extension, all humans. Hughes also claims that the human body itself might be the most uncanny element within a text, ever present and presenting yet “concealing not merely its mechanisms but its projected disorders as well” (250); even the human standing closest to

you remains a mystery internally and, uncannily, a potential threat to you. The self becomes a source of anxiety, the selves of others a source of anxiety, and the surprising realization of such a disconnect may shatter those who dare to perceive it.

If the double then exists as an equal part of the self and others, then the relation between the double and the self must then be examined before one can begin placing Hyde as the doppelganger of the three anxieties. For this, Karl Miller's "The Modern Double" provides an interesting take. Miller argues that during the end of the eighteenth century, the double began to shed part of their pseudo-mystical origins and became an aspect of desire; the double gained "an element of individual psychology and a domestic feature" (Miller 125) which allowed it to connect with the uncanny anxieties people developed. These doubles became a way for Victorians to examine an anxiety indirectly, and they determined that the doubles "appear to come from outside, as a form of possession, or from inside, as a form of projection" (126); a thought that becomes all the more fascinating when one considers two popular, simple, and yet flawed models of addiction- addiction as a choice and addiction as a disease- perfectly follow this idea of the double as both an expression of the self and an exterior mirror dedicated to the destruction of the self. Jekyll's existence as a secret addict, and Hyde as his addiction personified, mark the anxiety the text deals with the closest, and so there we shall start.

Sex, Drugs, and Chemicals: The Vice Reading

By the end of his final confession, Jekyll has described how his Hyde persona eventually came to overtake his life and existence. Amidst the cycle of addiction- abstinence-withdrawal- relapse-overdose which takes place, one specific factor of Jekyll's and Hyde's interaction stands out. Jekyll admits, early on in his final confession,

just after defining himself as the ideal of proper Englishman, that Hyde himself was a part of this upper-class Englishman, and that “both sides of [him] were in dead earnest” (Stevenson 48); and that whether following restraint or giving in to temptation, both halves existed as part of the same self, neither any more or less Jekyll than the opposing voice. He then broadens and generalizes this division of the self, establishing that every “man is not truly one, but truly two” (48) and likely many more personas exist than just two. Here the truest horror of Hyde becomes apparent for the reader: Stevenson has established that the monstrous Hyde comes from Jekyll, and that every person has a Hyde lurking within. One of the most common methods of examining Jekyll and Hyde together, the double view of the two as diametrically opposed opposites, may actually prove less accurate and less terrifying than another interpretation. Jekyll is Hyde; Hyde is Jekyll. The potion allows Jekyll to freely act without the weight of society to prevent him from seeking what pleasure he wants; these desires for monstrous actions that go unnamed all come from Jekyll as much as they do from Hyde, and thus potentially from any person.

After his remorseful oath to quit Hyde, Jekyll attempts to reintegrate into his former life, claiming his problem gone forever, even as he tries to make amends for his actions as Hyde. Hyde’s “strange associates,” his monstrous actions, and “the hatred that seemed to have surrounded his career” (28) become public knowledge as society seeks the monster. One would think that the text could end here, the monster discovered and driven out of society, Jekyll supposedly penitent and eager to make amends. But just as addiction poses a much more serious condition than just a matter of moral choice, so too does Jekyll’s attempt to return prove problematic. With the peril of Hyde supposedly

drawn from Jekyll like poison from a wound (or a disease cured from a patient) Jekyll “came out of his seclusion, renewed relations with his friends, *became once more their familiar guest*” (28, emphasis my own). The theory of uncanny once more appears, as Jekyll becomes the familiar paragon of Victorian society once more, but all the while, Hyde, admitted as an equal and aware part of Jekyll, remains unseen but not absent, waiting for his chance to bring about more fright and danger. The addiction has not passed, merely become impossible to detect until it surfaces once more, even if Jekyll would rather pretend he had exorcised his demon.

In the language of addiction, every person, no matter how morally opposed to drugs or other addictives, possesses at least some physiological potential for addiction. West cites that “[a]ll addictive drugs act directly on the nervous system” (West 23) once introduced. That Hyde exists and endangers Jekyll drives Utterson to actively pursue Hyde, in hopes of permanently removing his influence from Jekyll’s social circle. But perhaps another reason exists for Utterson to chase after Hyde. If Jekyll can become an addict and destroy his life and others, what prevents it from occurring to Utterson? West mentions that while “[i]ndividuals differ... in their propensity to reinforcement and tolerance” (34) to drugs, from a scientific standpoint, the potential for addiction occurs within every person.

Patricia Comitini highlights this potential within *Jekyll and Hyde*, using Hyde and his seeker, Utterson as contrasting examples. Addiction represents an internal disjunction within Victorian society, with Hyde “the inexplicable entity that Utterson seeks to understand” as he, an incorruptible, “unaddictable” (Comitini 113) investigator seeks to “rationally explain [addiction’s] origin, its progression, and its dangers” (113) within the

text. Without understanding the idea of addiction, how can one protect against it? More terrifyingly, with the implication that the potential for addiction lurks within every person, the text suggests that anybody, no matter how morally upright, can fall to addiction in an instant, yet betray little outward sign even to those closest to them.

This perceived vulnerability of the social circle, despite their supposed moral sentiment, becomes more apparent from Jekyll's description, further on in his existence as Hyde, of how his actions to feed his vices necessarily make Hyde, the personification of his desires, larger and stronger. As he at first pursues the unnamed, socially ruinous vices that he declares "undignified," (Stevenson 52-3) soon enough Hyde's pursuits (and likewise Jekyll's) "began to turn towards the monstrous" (53) to the point that even Jekyll "stood at times aghast before the acts of Edward Hyde" (53) in the pursuit of these vices. While these vices remain undefined within the text, the escalating pursuit of them only adds to Hyde's credibility as a threat. Part of Hyde's role as a monster requires this vagueness of desires, so that he could reasonably personify any Victorian anxiety that lurked within the audience's mind², although the downfall effect lends itself especially well to addiction. Jekyll begins to indulge in minor vices, but soon becomes hooked on

² This idea of Jekyll's vices remaining undefined allows one to ascribe just about any type of anxiety reading onto *Jekyll and Hyde*, be it an addiction reading, a medical reading, a degeneration reading, or others. This undefined vice appears in another type of reading of the text: the homosexual reading. Antonio Sanna examines *Jekyll and Hyde* and *The Portrait of Dorian Gray* by examining the protagonists Jekyll and Dorian Gray as similar characters. Both men act "very concerned with the public opinion of their persons" while at the same time they "never cease to indulge in corrupting behaviors that are condemned by their society" (Sanna 26); neither text ever reveals exactly which sins these are, although Sanna argues that the "unspecified pleasures" (Sanna 26) the men seek take the form of illicit covert homosexual pursuits.

harder and harder things, to the point that even he pales before what he has done to himself and others, but he does not stop. He cannot stop.

Hyde begins physically smaller and deformed compared to Jekyll, but while his monstrousness remains intrinsic, he grows as Jekyll falls, and by the time the unconscious changes begin, Jekyll perceives that “the body of Edward Hyde had grown in stature” (55) over time, and this prompts Jekyll’s realization that the change has begun to overcome him. Soon after this moment Jekyll begins to lose control of the change, and eventually it becomes a matter of Jekyll surfacing “only under the immediate stimulation of the drug,” (60) and Hyde assuming the dominant role. The addict’s persona and actions outside of using the drug have become so changed and alien to him that only the actual consumption of the drug feels like something he himself would do; the addiction overrides the addict to become the dominant personality factor. Jekyll’s testimony further supports this when he mentions Hyde spontaneously emerging and having to evade notice. Jekyll here refers to Hyde as “[h]e, I say— I cannot say I” (59); Jekyll here admitting that Hyde no longer remains as an element of his own self, but some separate entity at work within him.

Interestingly enough, Stevenson provides another double to Hyde beyond Jekyll, and one who at the same time operates as a double to the addict. As Utterson takes on the mantle of “Mr. Seek” (15), he does not realize that he already represents an anti-addict, one who resists vice rather than pursue it. Utterson, “was austere with himself” (7), and while he might tolerate vices in others, he does not pursue them himself. Long before we fully realize the horrific connection between Hyde and Jekyll, we see Hyde’s evil deeds through a man who prides himself on representing “the last reputable acquaintance and

the last good influence” (7) to those who fall from society, and thus fall to evil. That this last (life)line of defense declares Hyde something that requires investigation and elimination also highlights just how necessary the removal of this anxiety, and how dire the threat appeared to Victorians of the time.

Jekyll’s actions, when compared to West’s listed addictive behaviors, firmly cements his role as an addict, especially by using the table referenced in chapter 1 that lists the following as symptoms of addiction: “[s]ubstance is often taken in larger amounts or over longer period than intended” (West 15); the addict experiences “(2) Persistent desire or unsuccessful efforts to cut down or control substance use” (15); and “(4) Important social, occupational or recreational activities [are] given up or reduced because of the substance” (15) in pursuit of the drug. Jekyll possesses many of the symptoms listed in the DSM table from Chapter 1: specifically, he fulfils the first and fourth symptoms, as he takes the drug with no physical need, thus every dose is above the intended, and even then, he must occasionally “double, and once, with infinite risk of death,... treble the amount” (Stevenson 55). Furthermore, although one can assume Hyde goes forth each night and fraternizes with social classes and people Jekyll and his social circle would frown upon, Jekyll himself spends less and less time with his own social circle, and in fact physically cannot spend time amongst them when he spends time as Hyde.

Harrison further points out that Jekyll’s trustworthiness remains in question throughout the text, and once his own personal narration begins, his credibility within society only falters. Jekyll’s research as well as his “scientific objectivity is impaired by the personal and emotional nature of self-experimentation” (Harrison 58), which raises

the question of whether his efforts remained scientific or not. Harrison analyzes Jekyll's actions first as signs of an addict. Specifically, she highlights that the transformation substance "shares characteristics in common with cocaine... acts as a stimulant and confers a youthful vigour and heightened sense of confidence" (58), both qualities which one could describe as pleasure and thus something one would pursue. As Jekyll pursues the pleasure the drug gives him, his actions soon become more of the addict than the scientist (58). Jekyll does not pursue knowledge in his actions but becomes overcome by the pursuit of pleasure.

Jekyll's reasoning for beginning the experiment—the idea of dividing good and evil so that man does not spend his life battling competing impulses sounds noble enough. But within even the apparent noble intentions, his reasoning begins to change. When Jekyll describes the drug's side effects beyond just releasing Hyde, he hopes that in dividing and freeing his evil self, "life would be relieved of all that was unbearable" (Stevenson 49) and the good portion (in theory, Jekyll) could freely pursue "the good things in which he found his pleasure" (49). The phrasing here becomes interesting when one considers that Jekyll's initial goal in taking the potion, allowing the good and evil halves to divide, is to bring the good persona pleasure. The "hidden life dedicated to vice" (Sanna 26) that Jekyll pursued even before he released Hyde to pursue them openly clearly motivated him before Jekyll writes his final statement after having existed as Hyde for some time—long enough that we must consider his testimony with the same level of skepticism one would use when listening to an addict claim they do not have a problem. Addiction does not mean the addict chooses addiction entirely on his own

Even West claims that addiction does not completely fall completely under the addict's control. West's examination of the Rational Informed Choice Model shows that the model fails because the addict can try to limit the choice, or reverse his choice entirely, and yet the addiction remains. Like Jekyll, "many addicts choose to exercise restraint" (West 46), even utilizing "time, effort, and money to achieve this, and yet still fail" (46) to permanently overcome the addiction. Jekyll made the choice to become Hyde, and then later after the Carew murder tries desperately to undo his choice, swearing off Hyde, telling Utterson "I am done with him in this world" (Stevenson 25) and that "[I]t is all at an end" (25); and yet the remainder of the text does indeed show that Hyde comes back, with a vengeance. One must remember that Jekyll cannot be trusted any longer, and his assurances that Hyde will not return rings hollow, as Hyde has never left. His attempt to return, supposedly cured, into London society merely allows the evil to lurk a bit longer, and so while London remains watchful for Hyde and his taint, Jekyll's attempt to reintegrate does not quite work out.

At the beginning of his statement, and during several of his more "controlled" moments within the text, Jekyll claims to have control of the situation and himself and that his transformations represent a conscious choice on his part. Going off of this statement that his addiction represents a rational choice on Jekyll's part, at least initially, this essay assigns the Rational Choice Model to Jekyll, even though, as West admits, the model has flaws. Jekyll claims that his relationship with Hyde, the external version of Jekyll's addiction observable by friends and outsiders, whom Jekyll later confesses represents Jekyll as much as Jekyll does, "is not so bad as" (20) his friend and lawyer supposes. Jekyll also claims that he "can be rid of Mr. Hyde" (50) and his addiction

whenever he wishes and begs Utterson to let the matter lie. This moment shows Jekyll's perception of his condition as both a willing choice, and yet something that will bring him to ruin if his actions and decisions come under outside social scrutiny. Jekyll knows that he cannot maintain his life as Hyde (his addiction) if too much attention comes his way. Here the willing choice façade begins to crack a bit; it will completely shatter once Jekyll tries to make another choice.

Jekyll may not willingly admit that he has a problem, but an observation of his interactions with his friends, and their more objective perception of Jekyll offers a bit more insight into how much freedom the good man actually has once he unleashes his addiction. After Jekyll's moment of relapse, his social circle appears to restore itself, allowing him to converse with Utterson and his companion. Then, suddenly Jekyll's addiction, the condition which he had claimed to his friends "will not last long, thank God" (32), returns with a vengeance, as "the smile was struck out of his face" and replaced with "abject terror and despair" (32), the sudden change startling his old social group and forcing Jekyll to shut himself off and his friends to immediately vacate Jekyll's domestic space, perceiving it as tainted and driving them to not thank God, but seek his forgiveness. More than the testament of Lanyon, more than Jekyll's unhappy fate, perhaps this scene represents the response to the concept of addiction the Victorians sought: cut off ties with the evil and seek to atone for ever allowing it purchase in society.

Jekyll attempts to undo a choice that he made at the beginning of the nightmare, consuming the drug and letting Hyde loose in the first place. Jekyll himself admits that his attempt cannot succeed, that the very attempt brings back the evil even stronger. As he states in the opening of his confession, when the attempt is made to remove the

struggle between good and evil, desire and denial, that “it but returns upon us with more unfamiliar and more awful pressure” (49); the cravings become worse, the danger to society grows, and the uncanny dread of the addicts existing unexposed within society only increases. Jekyll attempts to quit the disease without any type of support to reintegrate with society without acknowledging that which divided him from it in the first place, effectively pretending that the monster does not exist in hopes that it will remain gone. This fails, partially because the anxiety of the monster remains present yet intangible amongst society, and partially because Jekyll does not seek the open admittance of his addiction which would allow him and his fellow Victorians to confront it directly.

Comitini especially highlights this notion that the Victorians had not yet fully managed to examine addiction openly enough to truly begin dealing with it. She places *Jekyll and Hyde* within “a developing discourse on addiction that had begun to be constructed primarily in literary texts and then by medical treatises” (Comitini 115) in the first half of the eighteenth century. During the late Victorian Period, doctors and legislators began to understand addiction as “something that could be rationally explained and avoided if drug use were legislated” (116) and properly guarded against.

One more section from Lanyon’s final days fully showcases just how dire the threat of addiction must have seemed to the Victorian writers first examining it. Upon hearing Lanyon’s renouncement of Jekyll, Utterson counters that “We are three very old friends, Lanyon; we shall not live to make others” (Stevenson 29); this line provides several potential meanings, all undermined by the addiction that has invaded these bonds. In one way, addiction has ended a lifelong series of friendships, and the likelihood of

creating new, similar bonds seems remote. On a less personal, more dire interpretation, these “very old friends” function as a representation of Victorian society itself, and once it collapses, the world will not see its like again; the full threat of these anxieties to Victorian society appears, but the full danger to society does not become as obvious as Stoker and his vampire will after a decade and increasing *fin de siècle* dread grants them even more monstrous forms.

Dr. Jekyll and Dr. Hyde: The Medical Reading

Reading Hyde as a monstrous addict and Jekyll as the upright Victorian paragon becomes more complicated when one considers whether or not Jekyll actually does sit at a respected position within Victorian society. Mr. Hyde’s name brings about obvious fear and dread to modern readers, but what if the first name in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* included just as much dread? Public opinion of doctors and the study of medicine in general did not hold quite the same familiarity as they do nowadays, and in some ways raised as many concerns as they sought to resolve. Through ideas such as iatrogenic addiction, the doctors themselves represented a source of anxiety, partially because doctors “treated but also created new forms of addiction” (Harrison 55); but the anxiety of addiction did not represent the only anxiety doctors suggested. Doctors stood on a crossroads, safekeeping England’s purity and at the same time endangering it through their at times reckless pursuit of progress and knowledge³. More critically, these doctors

³ Simply look at Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*, predating both *Jekyll and Hyde* and *Dracula* and the Victorians themselves when published in 1818. The idea of a doctor going too far in the pursuit of knowledge hardly constituted a new fear.

hoarded this knowledge, as Katherine Kearney Maynard argues. With the rise of professionalism at the end of nineteenth-century, many advanced fields that “became established and powerful... were based on the control and monopolization of knowledge” (Maynard 365) into the hands of the few and wealthy. The traditional values of the society had begun a tremendous shift, and doctors stood at the crossroads of this change.

Cohen mentions in his first thesis that monsters come from that uncertain feeling which exists at the point where the present and past affect the future, a social crossroads. Doctors in the end of the Victorian era occupied a very similar state; on the one hand offering hope, on the other reaching into new and unexplored territory scientifically and socially. Harrison describes how “in many respects the doctor appeared to be the very essence of self-made, professional, middle-class male rationality” (Harrison 53) while “also regarded in a more sinister light” (53) both because of the new understanding of addiction and because the “growth of the medical professional’s influence in the mid-to late Victorian Period represented yet another shake-up to Victorian society” (54) one which seemed capable of revealing new horrific monsters hiding amidst them unseen. This uncanny figure, dedicated to curing his fellow man and advancing progress, also possessed “an intellectual detachment from the patient and also a monopoly of social and economic control” (54) as well as the ability to apparently create anxiety, either by supplying it (in the form of addiction) or revealing its presence already hidden within society.

Even Utterson, upon learning how much influence Hyde has upon Jekyll, determines that Hyde must come from something of Jekyll’s doing, although the true

horror only becomes apparent at the end of the novel. Long before then, Utterson recalls Jekyll as “wild when he was young” (Stevenson 18) and decides that Hyde must then represent “the ghost of some old sin, the cancer of some concealed disgrace” (18) originating from Jekyll. Victorian doctors seeking to advance scientific and medical knowledge in a similar way unwittingly created the very monsters they now sought to understand and cure. Just as Jekyll creates Hyde and unleashes him into the night, so too did doctors recognize supposed degeneration and faults within themselves and others, bringing the uncanny secrets into society’s perception and engendering that uncanny dread within them (Harrison 57). This quest for “an expansion of medical knowledge... is countered by the physician’s intellectual limitations” (61); just as Jekyll sets out to divide good from evil for noble purposes, he unintentionally creates Hyde, and, “undermined by his lack of vision... becomes a source of fear and danger to himself, his patients,” (61) and society in general. But Harrison’s admirable work misses one other dangerous aspect of the doctor’s efforts to uncover dangers amidst the population: the concept of doctor-patient privilege.

Jekyll and doctors like him have an obligation to investigate and examine diseases, and at the same time possesses an obligation not to reveal their patients’ personal information and medical conditions to the public; they become the ones who know who exactly in a community has what disease or disorder, yet cannot reveal it, allowing the monster to remain faceless, and thus maintain the uncanny anonymity of the monster. When Hyde speaks to Lanyon under the seal of doctor-patient confidentiality, he denies Lanyon the agency to reveal Hyde’s true nature and Jekyll’s secret to society, allowing Hyde to run free and ultimately killing Lanyon; for what good can a doctor do if

he knows the exact vector of a disease but cannot speak of it (Stevenson 62)? And Hyde does indeed move unseen and corrupting through London like a disease, killing the pure and good and reveling in his corruption but remains powerless to stop it. Jekyll and Lanyon both know what they could do to permanently stop Hyde: reveal the exact nature of his existence and remove him from London. The power to do so, however, becomes as much of a choice as Jekyll's choice to stop taking the potion; that is, no choice at all.

Maynard points out that even in Victorian times, doctor patient confidentiality protected both the patient's privacy and the doctor's possessive control over knowledge. She cites that Jekyll "makes sure that [Lanyon] cannot betray him by reminding him" (Maynard 372) of the confidentiality between doctor and patient, and the "*professional honour and faith*" (372) which bind Utterson from reading the will also binds Lanyon or any doctor from revealing the truth. With this seal in place, the doctor's "private lapses from respectability" (372) and their potential threat to society could remain hidden from open knowledge, but not completely forgotten by those they treated and studied.

This intellectual distance that the doctors possess might explain some of the mistrust in them; certainly Utterson's cousin Enfield, an equally austere and dedicated man, possesses some sort of method for determining good doctors from bad, although one questions how accurately Utterson's method of determining the same actually works, given that he missed all of the clues of Jekyll's condition until the monster himself, spells it out for him. Not every doctor meets the high approval Utterson reserves for Jekyll and Lanyon; in the beginning of the text, another doctor appears, the one the little girl sought until she encountered Hyde, himself a doctor, if his words to Lanyon later on apply; Enfield refers to this Apothecary as "Sawbones"(Stevenson 9) slang for a

doctor or surgeon. This Sawbones, despite his description as “the usual cut and dry apothecary” (9) recognizes the danger within Hyde, yet perhaps his moral compass points a bit truer (or his dedication to doctor-patient privilege does not have as much weight, according to his obvious physical reaction to Hyde: “he turn[ed] sick and white with the desire to kill” (9) Hyde the monster, the disease, the anxiety⁴.

The entire hunt for Hyde, from Utterson’s encounter with the back door to Jekyll’s accounting of the case, becomes a peculiar blend of gothic elements and a medical case study. Anne Stiles explores the strange relationship between Stevenson’s late Victorian Gothic works and medical case studies and observes that the text “embraces contemporary scientific theories with remarkable thoroughness containing an altogether more explicit address to medical inquiries” (Stiles 888) by its use of such a form. The gothic works especially well with mixing traditional gothic conventions, with their “emphasis on psychological interiority and emotion” (888) and the (supposed) logical methodology of medical case studies. These gothic elements create an uncanny contrast when combined with “the eminently rational aims of the scientific case study” (888). There lies another possibility as well; the case study of the Victorian Period, like its creators, gives causes for concern as to their reliability as well.

Stevenson evokes the questionability of the case study in the title and twice more in his naming of two chapters within the novella. The first instance, the fourth chapter, “The Carew Murder Case,” describes Hyde’s brutal killing of someone even higher up the social scale than Jekyll and his companions. The second instance proves even more

⁴ The editor Lineham points out that the term Apothecary represents an older, archaic meaning for doctor, and the character himself is older- an interesting connection to *Dracula*, perhaps an inspiration for Van Helsing, with Jekyll a very misguided Dr. Seward, perhaps.

horrifying: Jekyll's own personal testimony, wherein the full damning truth of his and Hyde's life becomes clear in "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of The Case." The novel itself becomes a medical case study on the degeneration of a doctor and fulfills the genre well. Stiles establishes that the Victorian case study "commences with an ostensibly objective third-person narrative...with anecdotal and numerical evidence" (889) towards the end and written by multiple educated authors. Yet this anecdotal basis raises concerns with "late-Victorian scientific objectivity" (889) when Stiles points out that in using these anecdotes, "scientific authors constructed narratives suspiciously akin to fictitious productions" (889). Viewed in this light, and with the discrepancies already mentioned within Jekyll's testimony, the concerns his role as a doctor raise become that much deeper and more potent.

The Savage Gentleman: The Degenerative Reading

While addiction and medicine represent the anxieties most thematically linked within *Jekyll and Hyde*, they both represent mere aspects or forms of the third *fin de siècle* anxiety: degeneration. Cultural degeneration also has a strong presence within the text, and perhaps represents the anxiety into which the other two feed. Perhaps in the new terror of addiction and the uncertain future of medicine, the Victorians saw instead a steep slide back into the ways of the past; that in striving for new progress, old revenants of degeneration would appear in their midst and drag them down.

Certainly, Stevenson's description of Hyde has provided fuel for many degeneration readings. He describes Hyde at various times as "deformed somewhere; he gives a strong feeling of deformity" or "pale and dwarfish" (Stevenson 11-17) in his appearance; he laughs "a savage laugh" (17); and even those who observe him see

“something troglodytic” (17) in him. No observer, not even Utterson, can quite name a specific physical deformity Hyde possesses that would prompt such a response, so one must look instead at some more esoteric quality. Utterson perhaps comes closest, out of all the observers, when he asks, “is it the mere radiance of a foul soul that thus transpires through, and transfigures, its clay continent?” (17), Does Hyde dismay and horrify every Victorian who encounters him because he personifies their deeper anxieties and yet walks amongst them relatively openly?

One struggles to determine just which atrocity constitutes Hyde’s most degenerative action: the trampling of an innocent girl and destruction of innocent youth; his corruption and eventual overtaking of Jekyll, sundering social bonds and ruining doctors and lawyers alike; but most certainly his most aggressive act against Victorian society occurs in his murder of Sir Danvers Carew. Carew possesses “an innocent and old-world kindness of disposition,” (21) and his first action towards Hyde, when he “bowed and accosted the other with a very pretty manner of politeness” (21) acts as one would expect a Victorian gentleman to. Hyde’s response reflects only savagery: he does not speak, but “broke out in a great flame of anger, stamping with his foot, brandishing the cane” (22) like a club. When Carew shows weakness in the face of this display of dominance, Hyde acts with “ape-like fury” and “clubbed him to the earth” (22). Ignoring the bloody outcome and the monstrous descriptions of the violence, it reads almost like some humorous account of a modern man attempting to converse with a caveman and getting clobbered for it. The reality of the situation highlights Hyde’s bestial nature and his danger to society, especially when one bears in mind the Victorians’ definition of evil as a threat to society.

Cohen asserts that the monster “is that uncertain cultural body” which “introjects the disturbing, repressed, but formative traumas of ‘pre-’ into the sensory moment of ‘post-,’ binding the one irrevocably to the other” (Cohen). The monster brings the dark past forwards and reminds the present of it, just as Hyde brings to the mind of Victorian readers of a loss of progress, a reversal back into dark old days and bad old ways. Hyde represents a loss of progress, opposing the Victorians from their midst; even the highest and most stalwart of their number can suddenly come under vicious attack.

Although Jekyll’s career does throw a bit of confusion on this, Jekyll defines himself as an ideal example of the upper-class English Victorian. The autobiographical opening statement of his “Full Statement of The Case” establishes that Jekyll began with wealth, and possesses “excellent parts, inclined by nature to industry, fond of the respect of the wise and good” (47) among society— to summarize, he’s a wealthy Englishman who enjoys (in multiple senses of the word) the respect of those within his social rank. He lists as his worst fault “a certain impatient gaiety of disposition” (47) which Katherine Lineham (editor of the Norton Critical Edition of the text, and herself referencing the OED) explains could mean a certain light-hearted nature or, more interestingly, an addiction to “social pleasures” (48) which Jekyll apparently decries in himself. While his confessed inner temptations and vaguely described pursuits as Hyde may bring this confession of faults into question, Jekyll makes it a point to establish himself (the first time the audience hears him speak firsthand) as a good person, and one few would ever expect to have any involvement with someone like Hyde, much less suspect of actually being Hyde.

Another possible interpretation of this “gaiety of disposition” helps to support this idea of Jekyll as a faulty narrator. Elaine Showalter’s *Hystories: Hysterical Epidemics and Modern Media* argues that the troubled medical misuse of hysterics during that time period catches Jekyll as well. Interestingly enough, she also brings in Max Nordau, whose theories on degeneration play a critical role in Stoker’s *Dracula* twelve years later. Nordau and other “writers and critics in the 1890’s” equated hysteria with the reactions to changing values, viewing “hysteria as a metaphor for the fin-de-siecle sensibility” (Showalter 83) which had begun to take hold around the time of *Jekyll and Hyde’s* publication. Jekyll’s untrustworthy narrative would then become a symptom of a disease rapidly invading Victorian society at the time, to the point that “the hysterical narrative had already acquired a negative meaning for its readers” (83) which would become apparent through Jekyll’s testimony.

Jekyll attempts to reintegrate with society, and yet his actions move him beyond society’s ability to perceive and affect. He has become the monster, and his uncanny presence thus prevents society from willingly realizing his presence to help him (or drive him out, which happens more frequently when society encounters the monster directly). Utterson, that dry, determined metaphor of Victorian stoicism, fears what might occur with Hyde able to creep up on the slumbering Jekyll, the unaware paragon of Victorian society and desperately wishes to set himself against the monster, “if Jekyll will but let [him]” help (Stevenson 19). Jekyll’s concealment of his choice and condition, his efforts to keep his shame secret and unspoken (as Victorian society tended to do to uncomfortable or improper concepts) thus prevent him from exposing the monsters; it keeps his social group from recognizing the threat clearly in their midst; and ultimately, it

prevents society itself from openly acting against the threat directly. However, once the social group discovers the monster in their midst, without active concealing effort on the monster's part to reduce the fear, the ties uniting the social group collapse, and the reasoning behind the anxiety of degeneration whether addictive or medicinal, its ability to destroy social ties on small and large scales, becomes the end of the social circle.

When the last mask finally falls away, and Jekyll's situation of being both a supposed pinnacle of society and the greatest threat to it all the same time, the shock of it dooms the social group. Lanyon, the first to learn the truth, declares "I have had a shock"(29) and that "if we all knew, we should be more glad to get away" (29) from the horror; while reading this particular paragraph without knowing what he has encountered, the reader might assume that he refers to happily doing without the experience. Once one examines his reaction to the mention of Jekyll, however, a startling change occurs. Lanyon declares "I wish to see or hear no more of Dr. Jekyll...I am quite done with that person" (29); Lanyon has seen beneath the mask and realized Jekyll's status as the interloper, the addict, the monster, and the knowledge destroys him; more importantly, it destroys the bonds of the social group.

Furthermore, the response of the civilized Victorians to Hyde's actions, their first method for dealing with his like, only worked on beings who care about their social standing. When Hyde tramples the child, Enfield and the other gentlemen threaten his social standing, that which allows him to commit his crimes, unaware that they cannot harm him as long as he can conceal himself as Jekyll. Unaware of this, Enfield pledges to "make such a scandal out of this, as should make his name stink from one end of London to the other" (9) hoping that driving the monster out of civilized land would remove its

threat. The Victorians' plans to ruin Hyde could not succeed: he already had access to money to pay off the family, and even keeps it in Coutts's, which Lineham's footnote marks as "the most elite bank in Great Britain" (10) even today. Even if they tried by force, however, they could not so easily drive out Hyde, for this monster did not crawl out from the woods, on dark nights like Grendel; Hyde prowled out of the darkest alley of the Victorian mind, and even if forced to hide as Jekyll for a time, he could return at a moment's notice. Furthermore, who besides Utterson, desiring to save a friend from the monster, would seek it? Revealing the anxiety as lurking present in society would simply give it more strength, and as Hyde points out, "No gentleman but wishes to avoid a scandal" (10) that could ruin his name and social power. To admit that these anxieties lurked amongst them and had access to the highest echelons of society would merely strengthen their grip on society, and make the monster stronger, just as the realization of the monster amongst friends destroys the social group.

To conclude this, an explanation of why the social group alone could not counter the threat comes from the fact that they could only set eyes on the signs of the monster at a distance; when they beheld the beast amongst their own social group, they lost the distance needed for a proper analysis. Utterson has the option to press Jekyll when he declares himself done with Hyde; another when after the fall of Lanyon he does not seek firmly to speak with Jekyll. Instead of investigating source of the anxiety, Utterson chooses to allow the mystery of Hyde to lurk amongst them unsought (Stevenson 20). Surprisingly enough, this leaves him level enough to pursue Hyde even into his lair, trusting that he can save Jekyll from Hyde, unaware that even he cannot save Jekyll from himself. Just as Jekyll cannot stop himself from becoming Hyde, and lacks the distance

needed to understand that his judgement has become compromised, so too did Utterson need that distance to engage the monster directly, and so too would the Victorians require more time and analysis to properly examine the anxieties behind the monsters and deal as a threat to their friends, not as some monster suddenly creeping upon them, but as a threat to and a part of society itself, that society as a whole had to confront and deal with.

CHAPTER 3: THE BEAST AT THE GATES

Dracula represents an escalation of the fear and response to degeneration when compared to *Jekyll and Hyde*. While those directly battling Dracula constitute a group of friends similar to Jekyll's, they represent a more varied collection of social levels, made from greater swathe of society as they chase a far greater and more terrifyingly powerful monster across London and beyond the borders of England. Hyde would likely debauch and ruin Jekyll, kill a few people, but could not on his own topple Victorian society. Dracula, on the other hand, does threaten Victorian society⁵ as a whole, and does so by attacking Victorian society through an element commonly attacked by disease, degeneracy, and of paramount import to the Victorians: blood. Medicine, addiction, and degeneration readings of *Dracula* all commonly draw upon this element within the text, and Smith also examines it closely in his analysis of gothic literature during that time.

Dracula's eponymous monster represents not only another collection of cultural anxieties personified, but also the direst embodiment of these three anxieties; everything about the count paints him as the antithesis to the established morals and ideals of Victorian society. Smith does an entire reading of *Dracula*, establishing Dracula as a double of multiple characters, but establishing "the clearest representation of doubling

⁵ The *Anno Dracula* series of books by Kim Newman, beginning with the novel *Anno Dracula* (Simon and Schuster, 1992) examines just what could have happened had Dracula not been stopped, with Dracula wedding Queen Victoria, taking over London, and raising the vampire race to the point where they threaten to overwhelm humanity.

exists between the Count and Van Helsing,” (Smith 114). Hughes agrees, citing that the novel “doubles the central figures of the count and Van Helsing through... physiognomic stigmata” (Hughes 87). Both characters come from foreign lands to England, act under strange, folkloric behaviors, and find themselves enthralled with the young women of England. While Van Helsing may represent the “clearest” (87) example of the double, other possibilities and pairings exist amongst the Victorian protagonists and their monstrous adversary. Where Dracula brags of noble blood, Arthur Holmwood becomes Lord Godalming reluctantly. Dracula corrupts and hinders the Victorian heroes, whereas Mina Harker uplifts and supports them. Both doctors attempt to heal and help, resisting the vampires who seek to corrupt. But more than just a double for any one character, Dracula stands as a doppelganger, in his pursuit of its destruction or corruption to the society which spawned him itself, as the Anti-Victorian.

Carol A. Senf examines the epistolary form of the novel and raises an interesting point: the narrators all agree almost without any doubt, once proof appears, that Dracula’s evil must be removed. Though the novel breaks itself into sections, wherein each main protagonist (Harker, Seward, and Mina, whom, Senf points out, “are perfectly ordinary nineteenth-century Englishmen” (Senf 423)) narrates his/her section in his/her own way, Senf also points out that “[t]he narrators appear to speak with one voice” and further claims that Stoker considers this “perfectly acceptable so long as they remain within their limited fields of expertise” (423). While Senf marks this unified hatred as a problem when these characters encounter Dracula, it also highlights that *Dracula* attempts to showcase Victorian society united against the threats Dracula poses. While their individual fields may limit them, together the protagonists represent multiple elements of

Victorian society and its allies (the nobleman, the lawyer, an allied foreign doctor, a pioneering local doctor, the lawyer's educated and loyal wife, and an American adventurer) all coming together to face this threat: society itself turning to engage the anxiety as a unified front, against a threat which itself threatens society itself.

Returning to society's most precious resource and most threatened element within the text, blood represents a critical element in just about any recent vampire text, and their primogenitor, the ur-text of today's vampires, uses it so as well. Critically, Stoker mentions the importance of blood strategically before Dracula's greatest threat becomes clear. Not for nothing is there talk of the blood transfusions and the social and moral implications of this new medical technology right before children, some of the most vulnerable members of any culture, are attacked.

After Lucy's funeral, in that liminal space between Lucy's death and undeath, Van Helsing morbidly jokes with Seward about how if "the transfusion of [Arthur Holmwood's] blood to [Lucy's] veins had made her truly his bride"(Stoker 158), then the fact that Lucy also imbibed the blood of Dr. Seward, Quincy Morris, and Van Helsing made her and Van Helsing bigamists. This bleak, uncanny kind of humor, also raises an interesting moral-medical quandary, surely, but also a critical degenerative image when one considers that the very next segment of the novel represents the appearance of Lucy as the vampiric "bloofer lady" (159) who imperils the children of society, leading them astray and feeding upon them. Whenever blood appears within the text, be it noted by its absence from Lucy's veins, dripping down Dracula's chest and splattered over Mina, or spurting from Quincy Morris' side as he attempts to kill the vampire once and for all, it flows throughout the novel. Blood represents an uncanny double to Victorian society in

its own right: the fluid represents not only unifying element common to every Englishman, but also the vector for disease to move through the body, the drug which Dracula addicts others to and himself craves.

Unseen Yet Not Unfelt: The Degeneration Reading

To examine these concerns, we first turn to degeneration, as the wellspring into which the other anxieties feed and also as one of the most critically examined fears present within *Dracula*. Interpreted as a degenerative monster, Dracula becomes the primitive foreign power, a savage king determined to drag England down into his dark world. Stephen D. Arata provides one of the more popular examinations of Dracula as a foreign agent, a beast from the east, and an invasive cultural threat. Arata states that “[l]ate-Victorian Gothic in general and *Dracula* in particular, continually calls our attention to the cultural context surrounding and informing the text” (Arata 622); *Dracula’s* specifically raises the idea of “the decline of Britain as a world power at the close of the nineteenth century” (622) and the text itself “is saturated with the sense that the entire nation- as a race of people,” and especially “as a social and cultural power- was in irretrievable decline” (622). Where Cohen claims a writer makes a society’s cultural fears manifest in a monster, here Arata argues that a culture uses the text “to articulate and account for its troubles” (622) but also to “defend against and even to assuage the anxiety” (623). For this reason, Dracula, as both a foreign nobleman with a rich ancestry of eastern warrior races and as an undead monster that makes a mockery of the laws of science and God, requires the attention of multiple representatives of Victorian society’s “best parts,” while simultaneously imperiling them.

Within the novel, Mina declares that she feels some small sympathy for Dracula, although this sympathy fades after reading the experiences of those who suffered under Dracula's assault, especially Lucy and Seward's accounts; she declares that "this Thing is not human— not even beast" (Stoker 202), and her words here provide an interesting insight combined with Arata's. Dracula does not simply represent a Victorian who degenerates, as Hyde does; he represents degeneration itself, an active force at a social level, obvious to those who have a familiarity with him, that Arata cites as "the fear that what has been represented as the 'civilized world is on the point of being colonized by 'primitive forces'" (Arata 623) and overthrown entirely. Dracula represents the actual possibility of a sudden and irrevocable decline that the best of Victorian society can, indeed, must resist; a face for the fear that, using the proper knowledge, they can actually defeat.

Dracula describes himself as hailing from bloodlines of savage warrior races, known for conquering other peoples and for primitive barbarity, much as this novel hails from a similar lineage comprising variety of *fin de siècle* narratives, such as invasion-scare novels, dynamite novels, and, most critically, reverse colonization novels (624). But while they might trace their lineage back to these invasion novels, the monsters of the late Victorian Gothic do not arrive obviously. Hyde and Dracula in their respective monster roles, do not arrive openly in full warrior array, as they do in invasion-scare novels. Instead, these agents infiltrate society discretely, appearing all of a sudden amidst them and other times passing unseen amongst the people. Arata ties in these atavistic agents to "the late-Victorian fascination with the occult and the paranormal, and by extension to the Gothic" (624) because these agents, the "primitive and the occultist alike

operated beyond or beneath the threshold of the ‘civilized’ rational mind” (624) appearing and worrying while at the same time thrilling and entertaining; and all the while “tapping into primal energies and unconscious resources as well as into deep-rooted anxieties and fears” (624). To put it simply, vampires represent secret agents of destruction at a societal level, sneaking in like spies and worrying away at the foundations of society, like drugs, like a disease in the blood of a body.

Just what potential source of degeneration Dracula could represent remains frighteningly unclear. Just as Hyde’s vices remain undefined, Stoker leaves Dracula’s actual race ambiguous, emphasizing the vampire aspect over any particular race or nationality. This break from invasion-scare texts with obvious enemies with a mixture which “underscores the impossibility of untangling the two aspects of Dracula’s essential nature, since his vampirism is interwoven with his status as conqueror and invader” (628), providing an interesting differentiation. Dracula’s history reflects a frontline approach, the traditional invasion England expected and expected to beat, but his vampiric nature changes the game. While the mortal Dracula might have been such a forward warrior, the vampire Dracula acts much more subtly, and with good reason. Dracula the monster, a composite of different anxieties, must remain ambiguous, untied to any particular race— because to identify a specific race would cost Dracula the “everyman” anonymity he requires as a double of Victorian society. A known race would have an obvious origin point; a known enemy that could be studied and prepared for.

Knowledge, won through experience, familiarity, and understanding strip the monster of his mystery, his power, and his ability to hide. Why else does Dracula go from hunter to hunted once Van Helsing explains his weaknesses and powers. Once the disease

becomes understood and treatable, the addict a known and controlled factor, the hypothetical foreign dissident a familiar part of society, a shift occurs, from the immediate terror of an unseen foe lurking out in the darkness, to a certain threat which one can react against, can fight and pursue, while still retaining that more ominous horror of something recognizably evil. Once his influence becomes obvious, Dracula's vampiric nature comes to the fore, allowing him to represent his composite anxieties without becoming too attachable to any particular known and obvious example.

Arata also provides some important explanations about political concerns inherent in the novel that further strengthens the degeneration reading. Transylvania's association with vampires in popular culture first began with Stoker's positioning of Castle Dracula within the region, but Victorian readers would already have known of the region's "political turbulence and racial strife," an "endemic cultural upheaval and its fostering a dizzying succession of empires" (627), all concerns which follow Johnathan Harker back to England in the form of Dracula. This historic cycle of "rise, decay, collapse, displacement" (628) of empires and imperial races especially would have drawn notice in those Victorian readers who already possessed fears that their empire limped its way into collapse. That Dracula claims descent from these races of broken empires who also likely broke empires themselves raises similar ideas of political concern within the nation, while isolating the obvious versions outside the boundaries of England, they also become personified within Dracula and given a more direct, potent form to act upon society.

Smith includes a close reading of *Dracula* unlike any other in his book; as scholars can approach the novel from multiple perspectives, so too does Smith read different scenes as representing multiple themes. Degeneration does come up amongst

readings for doubling, empire, and sexuality, and Smith highlights the degenerative reading as a possible answer to the question of “how was it possible that *Dracula* could convince a reader of the novel in the 1890’s that its terrors were plausible” (Smith 112). In the novel’s references to Victorian criminal theorists, brought up by Mina, and the adherence of Dracula’s and Van Helsing’s physical appearances to these theories, “through their embodiment of the physiognomic stigmata associated with” (Hughes 87) the theories. The Victorian audience would have seen brave heroes using the popular theories of the day to combat evil. Stoker even aligns his characters with the Victorian perceptions of criminal physiognomy and nascent psychology based upon these theories to help further emphasize the degeneration Dracula threatens to bring forth, making it easily recognizable to his fellow Victorians.

Here a deeper examination of Cesare Lombroso and Max Nordau’s theories on criminals and degeneration strengthens Dracula’s monstrous degenerative potential. When Mina assigns Dracula criminal status and possessing an “imperfectly formed mind” (Stoker 296), she invokes the names of Lombroso and Nordau and their ideas, well known and respected at the time. Lombroso described criminals as “atavistic, a relic of a vanished race” (Lombroso 469), created by a variety of negative stimuli, especially those “inherited from insane, criminal, or diseased progenitors, or the abuse of nerve poisons” (469) or addictive substances, all of which result in “a return to the characteristics”(469) of primitive races. Nordau likewise describes how “an organism becomes debilitated” when exposed to “noxious influences” and that in such instances, the organism’s “successors will not resemble the healthy, normal types of the species” (Nordau 471);

both ideas summed up in Dracula and his vampires efforts to corrupt and convert the Victorians.

Smith raises another interesting along these lines: Arthur Holmwood, Van Helsing, and Jonathan Harker all experience very un-Victorian, un-masculine “hysterical fits which would, certainly for Nordau have marked them out as emotionally degenerate types” (112-3) in this way. That two of the most educated members of the crew and the one with the purest Victorian blood could become affected by this suggests that “under certain circumstances the middle-class male could become infected with a deviant effeminacy” (113), a weakening of the traditional social values in one who should embody Victorian ideals of masculinity as fully as Dracula embodies Victorian fears. Dracula then imperils society at multiple levels, by weakening the males, and by turning young women and children into monsters.

Understanding how Dracula imperiled society’s security through its purity, ostensibly as represented by its women, also supports the degeneration reading. Kathleen L. Spencer argues that Urban Gothic (which includes both *Jekyll and Hyde* and *Dracula*) possesses “a concern for purity, for the reduction of ambiguity, and for the preservation of boundaries” (Spencer 203); all of which Dracula violates. Infiltrators like Dracula violate traditional distinctions which had begun to weaken in late Victorian Society. “Male and female, natural and unnatural, civilized and degenerate, human and nonhuman” (203): all of these boundaries, and the boundary between “good” and “evil” come under siege by Dracula. Spencer makes it a point that within Victorian society “what is inside is good, what is outside is bad” (207). Dracula imperils society because he infiltrates it and breaks this boundary, mimicking “good” well enough that only those

who have encountered him outside of his disguise can tell he does not belong, that he represents an “evil” outside force moving in undetected.

Dracula’s obvious effect on those who have personal experience and evidence of his inhuman nature resembles the uncanny effect Hyde has on the normal Victorians who encounter him. Just as Enfield and the Apothecary have a noticeable primal hatred of Hyde, so too do a lawyer and a doctor in *Dracula* have similar responses to both Dracula and his progeny. When Harker first meets the count, and the count touches him, Harker, completely unaware of Dracula’s nature, comments that “a horrible feeling of nausea came over [him]” (Stoker 24), which sounds much like the sort of revulsion Hyde engendered in those who met him. But Dracula does not engender this feeling alone; recalling the apothecary’s unconscious desire to kill Hyde, Dr. Seward, upon encountering Lucy newly-turned into a vampire, declares that “the remnant of my love passed into hate and loathing; had she then to be killed, I could have done it with savage delight” (188). Seward declares that he could easily kill the creature Lucy has become, not much different from how the apothecary could feel homicidal rage against Hyde; but that hatred could come from previously intense feelings of love towards a young lady, and that the doctor speaks of killing with “savage delight” shows that just as Dracula can turn others into vampires, he can spread this uncanny hatred into not only his vampiric victims. Dracula can infect even those who desire to heal and love his victims— the uncanny becomes a contagious disease within society.

Finally, we return to Dracula’s state as a vampire, not just a representative of warrior races, and to an inherent contradiction within his opening introduction and his actual behavior. While just as threatening as some expeditionary force of an invading

warrior race, Dracula does not wage his war on the Victorians openly like his warrior ancestors, but like a vampire. Arata raises the point that “Dracula’s twin status as vampire and Szekely warrior suggests that... the Count’s aggressions against the body are also aggressions against the body politic” (Arata 630) and that his efforts to corrupt and convert healthy Englishmen into vampires threatens on both the personal level *Jekyll and Hyde* engages and on the social level. While this idea ties quite nicely into the discourse below on *Dracula* and medical anxieties, it also provides an introduction into another important element of degenerative readings: Dracula’s war on England runs cold, not hot; that is, he fights like an infiltrator, moving into society undetected, subverting and sabotaging its structures, and then fading away as mist. Dracula’s efforts to invade begin with his studies with Harker on how Englishmen live, so that he can operate as a perfect infiltrator, unnoticed by society on a greater level until his threat becomes too great to stop.

Realistically, if Harker had not escaped Transylvania, how would Van Helsing, Mina, Seward, and the rest have ever known enough about Dracula to track him down and stop him? Dracula himself admits that his primary goal when arriving in England, is “to go through the crowded streets” (Stoker 26) teeming with humanity, and to avoid being detected as “a stranger in a strange land” (26); when Dracula moves, talks, and pretends “like the rest, so that no man stops if he see me, or pause in his speaking if he hear my words” (26) and detect him as a threat. Dracula seeks to infiltrate Victorian society so completely that his actions raise no initial suspicion, that he can do as he pleases amongst them without fear of any discovering his true nature. The dangerous lurking amongst the familiar, unseen and ignored. It should surprise no one that Dracula’s

goals sound much like an attempt to become the embodiment of the uncanny, the unknown masquerading as the known. He can move about, as mentioned above, appearing as a part of the respected and “good” society while spreading his degenerative vampirism undetected, raising the potential for all of England to fall to him.

Dracula proves successful in posing as an Englishman so much so that even Harker remarks “[f]or a man who was never in the country, and who did not evidently do much in the way of business, his knowledge and acumen” (37) made him nigh indistinguishable from the average Englishman. Arata points out that he can pass as an Englishman even amongst his own people. Whereas Harker finds himself obvious and at odds with the customs and ways of Transylvania, Dracula adopts the English ways perfectly, which “both promotes and masks the Count’s sinister plan to invade and exploit Britain and her people” (Arata 638); Dracula’s ability to double as Harker “becomes most pressing when Dracula twice dons Harker’s clothes to leave the castle” (638) and thus twice before even leaving his homeland travels under an Englishman disguise. On both occasions the count, in a manner eerily similar to Jekyll’s nightly excursions as Hyde, goes forth to harass his people. When compared to the death of the babe and the mother at the teeth of the wolves, this scene becomes one of the most overlooked scenes, but more than any shows that “[t]he truly disturbing notion is not that Dracula impersonates Harker, but that he does it so well” (638), that people who have likely lived in terror of him for years suddenly view the Englishman as their most dire threat. If even those wise to Dracula’s evils cannot discern him from a true Englishman, how can the unsuspecting protagonists hope to pick him out. When this evil monster

lurks in a form indistinguishable from any other Londoner the external threat becomes an internal peril.

Senf draws similar parallels between Dracula and his Victorian adversaries, pointing out that while Harker experiences an uncanny reaction to Dracula, the real terror does not start until he realizes that Dracula intends to go forth into England unseen. Once “Harker realizes that he is assisting to take this anachronism to England” (Senf 426) he and the readers finally begin to understand the threat that Dracula poses. *Dracula* introduces the threat outside of the boundaries, but uses this to showcase Dracula’s ability to blend in with English society; but the true terror hits home when one considers Dracula not posing amongst his own people, but blending in amongst them, and “Dracula’s behavior confirms that he is an internal, not an external threat” (427) when he first arrives to England and vanishes.

The Strange Case of London and Dracula: The Medical Reading

Like a vampire, the fear of degeneration by an unseen, unknown, yet terrible force running rampant within society can take many forms. The thought of somehow contracting from outside the body some sort of corrupting, degenerating influence conjures certain images in the mind; for the Victorians, degeneration likely felt much like some horrific disease, and the infection of society would seem much like an epidemic. Certainly, a medical reading of *Dracula* raises concerns of a disease moving through society, and just as those who treat the sick risk catching the contagions they battle, so

too do these doctors bring about the same potential for corruption. *Dracula* itself mimics in some ways a medical thriller.⁶

Not only does *Dracula* read like a medical thriller, but like *Jekyll and Hyde*, it poses elements of a medical case study blended with gothic elements. Stiles' argument that *Jekyll and Hyde* combines "Gothic conventions [such as] the nocturnal setting, the theme of monstrosity, and the embedded narratives" (Stiles 888) with a medical case file also applies to *Dracula* but scaled up. Now instead of Utterson the lawyer, Lanyon the doctor, and Jekyll the victim, the text provides the observations of two doctors, a lawyer, a nobleman, Dracula's first victim, and the lawyer's wife as a second victim. With this in mind, the first half of the medical reading, the identification of the disease by an analysis of the symptoms, begins with Lucy and the crew of the doomed ship *Demeter*.

Lucy, the first Englishwoman turned into a vampire on native soil, the first addict Dracula creates, constitutes the initial staging point for Dracula's invasion of London. Her part of the story, hidden beneath romantic entanglements and perhaps a bit overshadowed at first by Harker's experiences in Transylvania, reads as an examination of Dracula's disease-like effects. Firstly, contained within her tale, the fate of the *Demeter* and her crew experience symptoms, the sailors becoming "all worn out" (Stoker 82) to the point that there remains "no one fit to go on" (82) watch, and then slowly die off one by one. A crew of nine sailors drops quickly to zero within the closed environment of the ship, and the shared symptom does sound very much like a plague striking aboard the ship, but this case also offers up another important note. Every disease has a vector, its means of infiltrating and traveling through the body, and in this instance

⁶ A definite similarity, and possibly a legacy of Sheridan Le Fanu's *Carmilla*. This earlier vampire story, published in 1872, also takes the form of a medical case study

Dracula's vector takes the form of a ship coming ashore and releasing an animal (a large black dog in this instance) onto the shore. What is the difference, then, between Dracula and the rats which brought the plague to Europe? Dracula has mastery of multiple animal shapes besides the dog, including rats, which furthers the reading of Dracula as a plague coming to England's shores.

Dracula's arrival to England marks the beginning of his influence, which he attempts to spread like a disease, and like an actual disease the elderly and infirm perish first. Even as the healthy Lucy first begins manifesting symptoms similar to the crew, for although not mentioned immediately, the sleepwalking observed on August 8th (the day of the storm) by Mina does eventually suggest a reason for Lucy's exhaustion one has already perished: the elder sailor Mr. Swale "was found dead... a look of fear and horror on his face" (85) that inspires further horror in those who observe him. This horrific fear, similar again to that experienced on direct contact with Dracula, implies that the uncanny dread mentioned in the degeneration reading can in fact, spread like a disease. Dracula's next murder occurs when Lucy's mother dies of a heart condition exacerbated by Dracula's actions— exacerbating existing weaknesses in the body to maximize the damage.

Dracula's disease spells a swift doom to the elder members of society, namely the old sailor and Lucy's mother, although only the mother initially appears especially at risk due to her existing condition. Regardless of this, a sudden shock spells her end, and the shock comes directly from Dracula's open invasion of Lucy's room, after her mother "was uneasy about" (131) her besieged daughter and sought to "see that [she was] all right" (131). Dracula proves the cause of the deaths of mother and child, who represent

old Victorian social ideals and the imperiled status of the future respectively. The idea of elders dying of fright proves interesting to both the medical and degeneration readings if one but examines the idea of a severe shock, cultural or otherwise, spelling the end of the older, weaker, more traditional members of society, especially given that the doctors and other Victorians keep Lucy's condition secret and go to great efforts to prevent such an occurrence.

Lucy's symptoms differ from those which killed her mother, but still closely mirror those which affected the sailors. Throughout the month of August, Lucy becomes more and more exhausted, and her sleepwalking offers a potential explanation of this, but by the 17th of August, Mina notes that something more affects Lucy; for Lucy grows ever more tired, even though "she eats well and sleeps well, and enjoys the fresh air," (Stoker 92) all valid medical requirements by Victorian and modern medical views, still "the roses in her cheeks are fading" (92), as she slowly loses that precious blood which fuels the medical, addiction, and of course, degenerative readings. This decline makes her startling recovery the very next day a rather disquieting matter, especially as it follows a mention that the wounds upon her neck have yet to heal (the emphasis here will be further explained below); and this sudden laughing health Mina finds "a little uncanny" (94) that this recovery should bring about such a state. Lucy has apparently contracted whatever effect Dracula has on Harker, but in a much milder form, and from this point on, it becomes another symptom which grows as Lucy suffers from this vampiric disease, and fully manifests after her death and conversion.

From this point, Lucy's condition begins to worsen again, albeit at a slower rate, and by the end of August, it comes to the notice of doctors. As Arthur calls in Dr. Seward

to examine Lucy the disease comes to professional medical attention, and in modern narratives this would most likely mark the beginning of the end, or at least a temporary break in the tension, as doctors begin fighting to save Lucy's life by studying the disease. But doctors themselves provide a source of anxiety, especially in late Victorian times, and their arrival and characterizations only serve to introduce new forms of the medical anxiety into the text. Harrison, Maynard, and Stiles refer to the Victorian doctor's powerful and changing role in Victorian society, and those within *Dracula* reflect some of the same questions they raise about the doctor's professionalism.

The first doctor introduced, Dr. John Seward, while experienced in medicine, works in a controversial new field, and physical ailments seem a bit out of his wheelhouse. Debbie Harrison reads Seward as "the flawed 'mad doctor' (doctor to the insane) who...unable to see beyond narrow medical boundaries, fails to save the life of his patient (Harrison 54). Seward's portions of the narrative more than any other reflect *Dracula's* medical thriller nature; even the opening sections of his journal spare only a single paragraph for his personal emotions, and the rest of the entry serves as a sort of casefile for Renfield, echoing the clinical case file language of *Jekyll and Hyde* (Stoker 61). This narrowmindedness and his social circle-level connections to the chief patient of the text (Lucy) further hinder his ability to act.

Seward does not come across as the best doctor, and not just because every named patient under his care in the text perishes. Harrison specifically mentions Renfield, attributing his death to Seward's "stubborn refusal to accept facts that do not correspond to his knowledge and experience, despite the constant urging of his mentor, Van Helsing" (Harrison 58). This refusal to accept facts outside of his own limited experience could

also apply to his questioning of Van Helsing's methods, and his overall behavior in both instances reflect "a man struggling to maintain a detached, disciplined approach to his work" (59) while dealing with "confusion, uncertainty, and the fear of insanity" (59) which cloud his judgement. Seward mirrors Jekyll in both his inability to maintain detachment from his research, and his addiction; Seward "is in the habit of taking the sedative and hypnotic drug chloral" (59), and while no textual evidence appears which suggests that this habit occurs during the time of the novel, it raises the exact same questions about Seward's credibility as it does for Jekyll. Ultimately, Seward does seem an improvement on Jekyll, resisting the addiction and working against it in others, and most critically, he recognizes the peril of the addiction.

One other moment, more relevant to Lucy's case, easy to miss but noticed by the editors of the Norton Critical Edition (NCE) of the novel, further highlights that Seward may not represent the most trustworthy doctor. When Seward first meets with Lucy as his patient, not as a potential wife, he claims that "a doctor's confidence is sacred" (Stoker 105) invoking the same supposed protections which Hyde imposes on Lanyon. However, whereas this represented a peril to the social group, the doctor bound by oath to keep such personal information secret, Seward does not hold this oath quite as sacred; the editors of the NCE coyly attach a footnote to this line, pointing out that "Seward distributes his medical reports profligately" (105). Lucy's and Renfield's medical information makes up a decent chunk of Seward's journals, the bulk of his narrative; however, the novel's intention to warn and the doctor's relative freedom to use basic statistical information in research without giving away patients' personal information allows him to share what information he can to help deal with an anxiety at a social level.

Seward shares the pertinent information freely amongst his fellow vampire hunters and Mina's reproduction of it into multiple copies reflects the publishing process quite nicely.

As part of this social outreach effort, Seward brings in another doctor to consult on Lucy's case. Van Helsing represents an interesting character for degenerative and medical readings: as a foreigner, especially one who shows up with Catholic and folkloric solutions to what appears a medical problem, one could likely see him as a degenerator in his own right: just as Dracula becomes better known and sought as the novel goes on, so too does Van Helsing reveal a deeper understanding of the threat Dracula poses, and a less limited approach to dealing with them. Van Helsing first appears when Seward announces his plan to contact his "old friend and mentor," who "knows as much about obscure diseases as anyone in the world" (105); this line first establishes Van Helsing as a trustworthy source, experienced with the Victorians medical knowledge as he admits to an education in London on page 107. Interestingly enough, it also establishes that, for readings that examine Dracula as a disease, Van Helsing's arrival foreshadows Dracula's influence, just as the apothecary from *Jekyll and Hyde* offers the first medical opinion that Hyde needs to go.

Whereas Seward's methods come under a cloud of his emotions and somewhat reckless methods, Van Helsing represents the benefits of age and experience mixed with a reassuring, grandfatherly manner. When he first interviews Lucy, he speaks "of all things, except ourselves and diseases, and with such an infinite geniality" (107) that it sets the patient at ease; and when the time comes for an actual examination, connives to send Seward away so that he can examine his patient in privacy. But after the examination, whether his examination has revealed to him the degenerative taint of

Dracula and begun the thought process that leads him to vampirism as a diagnosis, or simply because he knows when and when not to adopt a bedside manner, he speaks with a doctor's professional voice about his "careful examination" (108) and the lack of a "functional cause" (108). Within the space of a paragraph Van Helsing reveals a deep and powerful mind, and a professional attitude similar to Seward's operating underneath his grandfatherly attitude, which makes his bizarre methods contrast all the more with Seward's. Even while putting on this grandfatherly attitude, and conversing with Lucy, he clearly has also conducted a clinical examination of Lucy, seeking a diagnosis. If Seward represents the type of reckless doctor the Victorians worried about, Van Helsing would represent the older, more traditional, more trustworthy doctor they wished for. Despite his more familiar bedside manner, Van Helsing's other methods, garlic and crucifixes, might explain Van Helsing's failure to save Lucy— not because of their ineffectiveness, but because no one in London understood how they would help.

This lack of understanding becomes apparent when Van Helsing's occult methods fail, not because of misdiagnosis, but because of an unaware mother's misunderstanding and close social ties overcoming the shaky societal belief in new methods and ideas like blood transfusions and psychology that lacked the backing of time and testing. Unpacking the exchange between Van Helsing and Lucy's mother over the garlic flowers best showcases this breakdown. Van Helsing brings his garlic, (a "big parcel from abroad," sent "all the way from Haarlem" (121) raising its own foreign and thus degenerative concerns) and despite Lucy and Seward's skepticism, uses it to ward the room. While garlic has a folkloric connection with good health, the use of garlic, not as some sort of consumable drug, but as some sort of arcane combination of window

treatment and fashion statement would hardly seem effective by common sense, and Van Helsing offers no actual medical reasoning for it to back it up. Mrs. Westenra's choice to remove it proves an understandable one, especially with an examination of her other, less obvious motivations.

Thus far Harrison has gently accused both Jekyll and Seward of practicing medicine under the influence, social or otherwise. Why not let Mrs. Westenra in on the fun, then; When Van Helsing rejoices that "[he] thought [he] had diagnosed the case...[his] treatment is working" (123) Mrs. Westenra quickly jumps in, claiming that "Lucy's state this morning is due in part to" her own actions, clearing away "those horrid strong-smelling flowers" (123) and opens a window for that vaunted medicinal fresh air, unaware that she exposes Lucy to Dracula's predations. Her reasons for doing this, a maternal fear that "the heavy odour would be too much for the dear child in her weak state" (123), and with Van Helsing unable to openly explain the danger of Dracula, it proves difficult to find fault in it. Just as Utterson's close social ties and affections for Jekyll perhaps blind him and hinder his actions, so too do Mrs. Westenra's maternal instincts lead her to unwittingly act against Van Helsing's efforts.

While at first Van Helsing's methodology does seem strange, by the time the vampire Lucy begins moving about London and feeding from people, clearly Van Helsing's methods were not meant to battle a normal disease, but a more spiritual epidemic. His more permanent methods for dealing with the vampire, once hard proof comes up, still requires a bit of convincing on the part of the Englishmen, but interestingly enough, they actually follow more obvious medical knowledge than the garlic. Van Helsing describes the methods for ending the vampire, and while they sound

barbaric and come from superstition, he has more than proved the validity of his words, and his matter-of-fact delivery adds its own credibility.⁷ Yet his statement of the methods does still meet with disbelief by Seward and his efforts to combat Dracula, too radical to the Victorian mindset, and even his brightest student doubts his methods. In the end, no matter how successful the doctor's methods, the anxiety and distrust still remain. Van Helsing's methods smack of barbarism, and while perfectly sound medically, as it turns out, still cannot soothe the Victorian anxiety inherent within the novel.

Dealing Dracula: The Addiction Reading

If medicine should seek to protect society, then what about its own troubling monster alter-ego, addiction? What if Lucy's case does not stem from a disease, but from some substance which she cannot help but crave and seek, even as it kills her. While Seward knows the danger of his use of chloral, addiction takes on a mind of its own within *Dracula*, with Dracula himself an addict who creates more addicts. The vampire pursues blood, "cannot flourish without this diet" (211) as a food source, but its ceaseless pursuit mirrors that of an addict; after all, cannot one become addicted to food? Vampirism as the unceasing, unnecessary consumption of food, an eating disorder, holds a powerful image in the addiction reading, and then carries it one step further. The vampire's pursuit of blood, its behaviors and the behavior of those under the control of its blood raise the concerns of society. The vampire feeds on the wholesome blood of

⁷ An interesting note: Van Helsing's depiction in films sometimes disagree with this calm, rational figure from the novel, but in Francis Ford Coppola's 1992 rendition, *Bram Stoker's Dracula*, Anthony Hopkins' calm, rational delivery of this explanation, in contrast to Mina and Harker's reactions proves an especially good portrayal of the uncanny feeling of this scene, describing quite calmly the methods used on Lucy amidst a crowded inn's dining area, cheerful and full of life, with a quick cut to an after-action scene of the tomb with a decapitated Lucy, silent and solemn.

society and its own represents a substance that prolongs the vampire's unlife and spreads the curse of addiction to others.

To begin with, Renfield proves the most obvious addict, and also the least threatening to society on a large scale; locked away within an asylum and studied closely, albeit by dubious, experimental methods, Renfield, although not fully vampiric also provides the first clear and cohesive example of addiction, in perhaps his most iconic line. Confronted about his consumption of animals alive, Renfield states that "it was life, strong life, and gave life to him" (69) to consume these, although he clearly has other means to sustain himself. He does not require the consumption of such lifeforms, but he pursues it to unhealthy levels anyway, and his actions in pursuit of blood, such as his escape attempts and his assault on Seward on page 129 represent his determination to get the blood he craves. In his behavior, Renfield differs little from his master, or the other vampires within the text, and his behavior as an addict represent the threat of addiction to society. To recall the medical reading for one more instance, Dracula spreads addiction to his victims, and their behavior in pursuit of the blood, the pains and costs that pursuit brings to others, showcases the threat of addiction to society which the protagonists rise to oppose.

Seward of course comes up with a name for this condition, and sets about attempting to study it, but misses quite a few clues as to the sudden amplification of Renfield's condition—his abandonment of these verminous feedings, claiming that suddenly he does not care about them now that his "master" has come and offered him something greater (Stoker 96). Stoker thus begins his establishment of Dracula's special brand of addiction in this way, overwhelming even Renfield's own madness and

amplifying his worse nature, to the point that he becomes a willing minion of the vampire.

Renfield's addiction only grows, and Seward notices within him that his addiction to consuming life proves a powerful motivation, but also engenders within him negative traits which begin to take over. When Seward resumes his description of Renfield on June 5th, he describes that, having acquired a better understanding of Renfield's personality, declares that Renfield "has certain qualities very largely developed: selfishness, secrecy, and purpose" (69) which he seems to cultivate as his service to Dracula begins; traits which could equally apply to Jekyll and other characters as well, long before Lucy begins showing these same signs. Stoker assigns the addict certain personality qualities which establish the addict as a negative force within society, one who works against society's efforts to help them. This uncontrollable desire, driving the addict to do whatever they must, regardless, of society's desires, to achieve their drug, becomes apparent when Renfield attacks Seward, whom he previously scoffed at the notion of hurting. Seward then describes horrific sight of Renfield "licking up, like a dog, the blood" (129) he has drawn from Seward, seeking the greatest life possible; and this occurs the same night that Dracula pays his final visit to Lucy, and completes her transformation into an addict. If Renfield's addiction story proves the most obvious and least dangerous, then Lucy's proves the most subtle; the truth of exactly what occurs to Lucy does not come out until Mina's narrative.

Returning to the early moments of Lucy's decline, the medical case can, in an addiction interpretation, provide a similar social circle-level addiction story as *Jekyll and Hyde*, with Lucy's fall mirroring Jekyll's, hidden in secrecy from Mina/ Utterson (or

perhaps Lanyon?) and others who care for her; and only after it becomes too late to help her does the truth of her condition come out. Before Renfield's feeding, Stoker makes the audience aware of Lucy's own burgeoning craving for blood with some interesting language: Lucy "will die for sheer want of blood to keep the heart's action as it should be" (113); medically sound, but on another level, Lucy's life become imperiled because she craves blood, and not the healthy blood of an Englishman, but the degenerative blood of Dracula. Combining the ideas of Lucy craving blood and of Renfield scheming dark actions to obtain his desire, cast against the narrative of the gradual discovery and self-destruction of the addict amidst the social group which *Jekyll and Hyde* showcased, Lucy's actions during her illness, while clearly not voluntary, mirror the actions and motivations Stoker establishes for addicts- secrecy, selfishness, and purpose.

Upon the 18th of August, when Mina points out the bizarre nature of her companion's actions, Lucy herself appears to feel better, but remains pale. As Stoker does not reveal the exact nature of Lucy's exchanges of blood with Dracula, and we base our understanding of it only off of Stoker's descriptions of Mina's own situation it becomes a bit of a guessing game, trying to determine when Dracula gifts Lucy with his blood and when he simply takes from her. But in Mina's conversation on the 18th with Lucy, she describes her perceptions of her sleepwalking the night she goes to the seaside graves and apparently encounters Dracula for the first time. She describes this moment "in a half-dreaming kind of way" that "[she] only wanted to be in this spot—[she] didn't know why" (94); her description then grows vague as she gets to the part where she encounters "something long and dark with red eyes,"(94). From this moment on her recounting sounds much like a dream, flying over the lighthouse or perhaps an out of

body experience (as she describes seeing Mina shaking her before she feels it); but an addiction interpretation would see this as Lucy recalling a “trip” on a strong hallucinogen. If this moment marks Lucy’s first time utilizing the drug, then her desire to return to that seat in her somnambular state suddenly makes a lot more sense; her dealer calls to her, and her addiction compels her to seek it out.

But Lucy never actively chose to become addicted: unlike Jekyll, her addiction comes not from a rational choice, but from a personification of addiction actively pursuing her. Even before we learn about Lucy’s midnight trip, Mina’s method of keeping the bedroom key on her wrist to prevent Lucy from leaving does not prevent Lucy’s dealer from coming to her; explaining why Mina awakens one night to find Lucy hanging out a window, unconscious, unresponsive, and laboring for breath, and when pressed as to why, “she shook her head and turned away” (92), offering no explanation, much like Jekyll when Utterson questions him about Hyde, as if ashamed of some dark action. This reading in no way seeks to claim Lucy willingly pursues Dracula and chooses addiction, but instead suggests that, in that strange way the Late-Victorian Gothic has of predicting Freud’s theories, they have also picked up on the second addiction theory Robert West seeks to unify: Addiction as a Disease.

West’s attempt to establish a comprehensive theory of addiction outlines two different models which, on their own cannot provide an accurate understanding, and attempts to combine the two (and a few other theories and ideas) into a single synthetic theory which accounts for all these theories as part of the same condition. Whereas Jekyll most easily falls under the Addiction as Rational Choice model, he also offers up evidence of the model’s faults. But *Dracula* externalizes the addiction into an active,

monstrous form, one which forces Lucy and Mina down the path of addiction. West examines another popular model, one which answers some of the issues of this model, with the Addiction as Disease, or Disease Model, which “states that addiction involves pathological changes in the brain that result in overpowering urges” (West 76) which inspires within the addict cravings, or feelings which drive the addict “to take whatever steps are necessary and feasible to achieve the object of the addiction” (77) which one can easily extrapolate to fit Renfield’s, Lucy’s, and Mina’s actions once under the effect of Dracula. Dracula actively forces upon his victims these cravings, and, like a drug dealer, manipulates their desires for the drug for his own gain, regardless of the damage he does to them.

Lucy’s case becomes especially critical to an addiction interpretation when one observes the nature of her degeneration: from a bit pale, to death’s door to well enough to feign health, and back again multiple times until her final decline. This decline offers multiple possible interpretations, whether as an addict destroying their body through use of their drug and then gaining ground again during abstinence, much like Jekyll, or perhaps the hamster-wheel of chasing a high only to deal with the crash and withdrawal until their next fix. Perhaps her return as a vampire represents the culmination of such a cycle, the ultimate high, perhaps even an overdose. These interpretations, plus the previously mentioned lack of textual evidence as to how Lucy and Dracula exchange blood during this month, make determining exactly how this relationship functions nigh-impossible. However, one other possible clue exists, and provides a deeper degenerative examination of blood as a drug. Stoker makes it a point to state that the source of the blood Lucy consumes matters.

Lucy's craving/illness becomes severe enough that she requires blood transfusions to survive, and one considers that blood in an addiction interpretation of the text represents in itself a drug, then the type of blood Lucy consumes represents the type of drug consumed. Obviously first-time readers remain unaware that Lucy has already consumed Dracula's foreign vampire blood, thus making just about any other type of blood consumption a lesser evil. They do, however, learn from Van Helsing's morbid joking that after Arthur donates to her his aristocratic blood, and in doing so, creates a socially acceptable spiritual marriage between the two, Lucy becomes a polyandrist (158). Lucy consumes, in order of worthiness, the blood of an English aristocrat and her betrothed; the blood of an English doctor who also pursued her hand; the blood of a young American, another suitor, and finally, an old foreign doctor, trained in England and supporting of its people. Stoker's apparent racial hierarchy here supports the idea of Lucy progressively degenerating as she consumes more blood, especially with the blood itself becoming more degenerate as she consumes it for scholars making degenerative readings such as Arata. But this idea holds another, darker meaning for addictive readings if one considers the idea of a gateway drug, with Lucy surpassing Jekyll's degeneration by consuming blood of lesser quality and purity the more desperate she becomes for it.

Kathleen Spencer also raises the concerns of this scene in support of her argument that Lucy's fate shows a warning and attempted solution to the social concerns over degeneration by corruption. Spencer claims that "[w]hat makes Lucy's sexuality threatening to the community" stems from that "she will not limit herself to one man," (Spencer 210) but I would instead argue that the threat implied within this particular blood-consumption lies in the decline of the quality of blood which Lucy intakes.

Lucy's case provides the reader with an addiction story similar to Jekyll's, and if *Dracula* contained only the sections relevant to Lucy, the stories would bear enough similarity in size, theme, and plot to render the novel more of an homage than an expansion. But the novel takes this addiction narrative one step further and provides a more horrifying first-hand account of addiction in Mina's portions of the narrative. Mina becomes the only addict in either *Jekyll and Hyde* or *Dracula* who gives voice to her own addiction beyond the motivations of it (Renfield holds that honor) and describes in her own words how she becomes an addict, how she hates it, and the first to take an active role in curing herself of the addiction, making use of her condition to aid in combatting the source. She also highlights some of the more advanced social concerns about addiction while giving it a more loving and beloved face than the monster Dracula.

Mina's addiction begins on the night Renfield, the addict who first speaks for addicts, dies. Dracula comes to her and, Seward makes quite a show of Mina's exposure to the addicting blood, describing how Mina's "white nightdress was smeared with blood," (Stoker 247) and in the very next sentence showing Dracula as it's source, his own "blood-dripping mouth" (Stoker 247) and "a thin stream" of his blood which "trickled down the man's bare breast" (247) becomes a horrific double for Mina with "blood which smeared her lips and cheek and chin" (247) and, like Dracula, "from her throat trickled a thin stream of blood" (247); the wording here matching a little too closely for coincidence. This coupled with the fact that there remains no way to know, from the description, whose blood belongs to whom, implies an equalization of the blood, Mina now becoming as corrupted as Lucy, on her way to becoming a vampire like Dracula. Harker seconds this when, after awakening from whatever stupor Dracula has

placed upon him⁸ cries out “What does that blood mean? My God, My God!” (248) and immediately sets about begging Van Helsing to save Mina while swearing to hunt down Dracula. This in and of itself marks an interesting moment with regards to both texts. Mina’s status as an addict becomes certain; all previous addicts before here have apparently deserved only death, but here the potential for redemption occurs.

All previous admitted addicts mentioned in this chapter, Jekyll/Hyde, Renfield, and the vampirized Lucy, (disregarding Seward, who apparently resists the addiction on his own, and the mortal Lucy, as her addiction remained a secret hinted at yet not openly acknowledged) have by their actions apparently merited only death. Only the absolute removal of the addict from society would suffice, and death has followed relatively swiftly once the addict has delivered their personal warning on the perils of addiction. But from familiarity with and understanding of the disease-like aspects of addiction, and the understanding that even a devoted, innocent lady such as Mina could succumb to it, the addict becomes more understandable and relatable- not a monster to remove from society, as addiction itself, but a member of society who, by her social ties to the rest of her circle, deserves the aid of society in freeing herself of her addiction. Stoker himself seems to perhaps suggest this, as rather than exile Mina away from them, Mina claims that “I am safer with you, and you shall be safer too” (284); Mina, left alone, would seek out Dracula and become just like him, but working amongst her fellows, she becomes a crucial key to defeating Dracula.

Their ability to actually kill Dracula remains in doubt, however. In their slaying of Dracula, they fail to use the actual methods Van Helsing so painstakingly insists they

⁸ Perhaps implying that Harker too has become exposed to Dracula’s blood, and thus raising the specter of Johnathan becoming addicted as well?

must use. A bowie knife through the heart and another knife to the throat (note that Stoker does not say decapitation occurs) do not meet the required methods for killing a vampire (325). But while the individual vampire brides of Dracula can perish with impunity, Dracula cannot, for as Cohen mentions, the monster never truly dies, indeed exists in a way beyond death, that he can return to menace the society for as long as the anxieties which compose him remain. As humans desire to drive away that which scares them, for the monster to remain “hidden away at the edges of the world and in the forbidden recesses of our mind” (Cohen), they come back eventually, with new forms or new stories. The novel does not suggest that society cannot overcome the anxiety; rather, taken with its precursor *Jekyll and Hyde*, the novel’s ending of a united social action against the anxiety shows a solution, and grants the audience a sense of progression towards understanding and dealing with the anxiety; but perhaps this understanding also opened a path to another option, one where the addict, the degenerate, the medical disquiet all gain some measure of sympathy, perhaps even acceptance.

None of Dracula’s victims have much of a say in their fates— Dracula forces addiction upon them, and none of them willingly continue taking the drug of vampire blood after exposure. Yet Dracula himself acts as both addict and addict, pursuing better hunting grounds from his native homeland to England. While the text does not describe in detail how Dracula became a vampire (the description of the Scholomance on page 212 of the NCE describes certain members of his bloodline attending and learning from the devil, but not Dracula specifically) it does describe how Dracula himself creates another vampire. Perhaps Dracula himself fell victim to another vampire, long ago, and his own thirst for blood repulses him. This thinking of the vampire as a tragic figure in

pop culture might find its origin (like many common vampire characteristics) in *Dracula*, as Mina expresses sympathy for the vampire, “[t]hat poor soul who has wrought all this misery is the saddest case of all” (269); disease and diseased, degenerate and degenerated, addict and addict- perhaps not quite as powerful a conglomeration of cultural anxieties as Cohen describes monsters.

CODA:

The greatest relief from anxiety often comes from familiarity with and understanding of the source, although this may never completely remove all negative emotion from the concept. As Cohen argues, the monster comes back eventually, never fully dead; but he does not always return in the same form. As our societal familiarity with these anxieties has grown and changed, they have taken new forms, leaving the old forms as remnants. As time has progressed, our views on these leftover monsters have altered, as have their roles. While Dracula and Hyde's archetypes, the vampire and the monstrous double, respectively, remain and can still provide a sense of horror, newer versions have appeared over the centuries, offering newer, deeper examinations of the anxieties, and more besides.

Dracula and Hyde do remain, however, and have even themselves developed new, more varied versions of themselves. While a full understanding of Jekyll's condition does not dispel the unease generated by his alter-ego, an understanding of his condition does go a ways towards making him less terrifying. As long as Jekyll has not taken his medicine, he poses little threat. Indeed, what more notable example of a man of science split between a doctor and a rampaging monster exists in modern pop culture than Dr. Bruce Banner and his hulking alter-ego, a larger than life superhero? Likewise, Dracula within his novel goes from a shadowy invader to a hunted beast, dangerous, but on the defensive, as soon as a cheerful old doctor shows up and explains exactly how to hunt

and kill him. Furthermore, he's now been depicted as a devoted father in a series of comedic family movies. While these original monsters endure, their successors have perhaps not just retained their precursor's influence but have perhaps expanded beyond it.

The idea of a vampire, a seductive yet terrifying monster remains just as, if not more popular than in Victorian times, but the priority placed upon the adjectives has shifted. Now authors like Anne Rice, Anne Bishop, and a veritable army of others have made Vampires something fascinatingly far from Dracula's predatory efforts: heroes. Writers have created heroic figures out of what originated as monstrous addicts, now battling against their thirst, while others who have simply embraced their nature. Rather than attempting to secretly infiltrate society, these monsters now live, with varying degrees of openness, alongside humans, or, in an expansion of Dracula's efforts, control it from the shadows.

Somehow, the dangerous invaders who defy science and represent horror have become beloved antiheroes. One possibility for this: the Victorians feared their monsters and their concepts as strange and new; doctors creating addicts, new cultures suddenly encroaching upon traditional English traditions, all of these new ideas imperiling their old perspectives. Now, while they have by no means vanished from society, the sources of these anxieties and their effects on society have become better understood, even if we still have yet to find the quirky old doctor who will show us how to completely remove the threat. Take the addict for example: as we have known about and acknowledged their presence in society as a society, they no longer prove as surprising on a societal level, and society level efforts have occurred to attempt to solve the problem. We have grown up with addicts, seen them become a common element in society, and now our better

understanding has removed some of the anxiety, enough to allow a deeper understanding of addiction, and perhaps a chance to find some redeemable aesthetic element within it. If such aesthetic must come from monstrous characters so that we can avoid feeling guilty for exploring and enjoying this aesthetic, then let the monsters have their voice. Included with the works cited of this thesis is a list of modern supernatural books that explore monstrous characters in newer, deeper ways, not always as horrifying creatures, but also as figures as heroic as those who opposed their precursor representatives.

Works Cited

- Arata, Stephen D. "THE OCCIDENTAL TOURIST: DRACULA AND THE ANXIETY OF REVERSE COLONIALISM." *Victorian Studies*, vol 33. No.4, 1990, pp. 621-645. *Ebscohost Academic Search Complete*, DOI:6888498.
- Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome, *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. University of Minnesota Press, 1996. Ebook
- Comitini, Patricia, "The Strange Case of Addiction in Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*" *Victorian Review*, vol 38, no.1, Spring 2012, pp.113-131. *Project Muse*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/vcr.2012.0052>
- Craft, Christopher, " 'Kiss Me with those Red Lips': Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*" *Representations*, no.8, Autumn, 1984, pp.107-133, University of California Press, *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2928560>.
- Freud, Sigmund, *The "Uncanny"* trans. Alix Strachey. 1919. Ebook.
- Freud, Sigmund, " 'The Uncany (1919)" *Gothic Evolutions: Poetry, Tales, Context, Theory*. Broadview Press, 2014.
- Harrison, Debbie, "Doctors, Drugs, and Addiction: Professional Integrity in Peril at the Fin de Siècle." *Gothic Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2, Nov. 2009, pp. 52-62. *Ebscohost Academic Search Complete*, DOI:20100930.
- Hughes, William, *Historical Dictionary of Gothic Literature*, Scarecrow Press, Inc. 2013.
- Lombroso, Cesare, "Criminal Man According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso (1911)." *Dracula*, ed. Glennis Byron. Broadview Press Ltd. pp. 468-469.

- Maynard, Katherine Kearney, "The Perils and Pleasures of Professionalism in Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and Doyle's *A Study in Scarlet* and Other Fictions" *The European Legacy* vol 5, issue 3, 2000, pp. 365-384. *Taylor and Francis Online*, DOI: 10.1080/713665493.
- Nordau, Max, "[Degeneration] (1892)" *Dracula*, ed. Glennis Byron. Broadview Press Ltd. pp. 468-469.
- Sanna, Antonio, "Silent Homosexuality in Oscar Wilde's *Teleny* and *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and Robert Louis Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*." *Law and Literature*, vol 24, iss. 1, pp. 21-39. *Taylor and Francis Online*, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/lal.1012.24.1.21>.
- Senf, Carol A. "*Dracula*: The Unseen Face in the Mirror." *Dracula: an authoritative text, contexts, reviews and reactions, dramatic and film variations, criticism*. W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1997, pp. 421-431.
- Showalter, Elaine. *Hystories: Hysterical Epidemics and Modern Myths*. Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Smith, Andrew, *Gothic Literature, Second Edition*, Edinburgh Critical Guides. *Edinburgh University Press*, 2007.
- Spencer, Kathleen L. "Purity and Danger: *Dracula*, the Urban Gothic, and the Late Victorian Degeneracy Crisis." *ELH- English Literary History*, vol. 59, no. 1, 1992, pp.197-225. *JSTOR Arts and Sciences*, DOI: 10.2307/2873424.
- Stevenson, Robert Louis, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: an authoritative text, backgrounds and contexts, performance adaptations, criticisms*. Ed. Katherine Lineham, W.W. Norton & Co., 2003.

Stiles, Anne, "Robert Louis Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde* and the Double Brain." *Studies in English Literature*, Vol 46, iss 4, Autumn 2006. Pp 879-900, *Project Muse*

DOI: 10/1353/se1.2006.0043

Stoker, Bram. *Dracula: an authoritative text, contexts, reviews and reactions, dramatic and film variations, criticism*. Edited by Nina Auerbach and David J. Skal, W.W. Norton & Co., 1997.

West, Robert,; Hardy, Ainsley, *Theory of Addiction* Addiction Press, Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Suggested Readings and Films

Films:

Coppola, Francis Ford. *Bram Stoker's Dracula*

As the title implies, this film version of *Dracula* attempts to recapture the horror of the original *Dracula*, while at the same time broadening *Dracula's* role, retaining his monstrous elements while also making him a sympathetic, almost tragic figure.

Tartakovsky, Genndy, *Hotel Transylvania* 2012.

This children's film series showcases the king of the monsters as a caring if overprotective father, who uses blood substitutes instead of the real deal, and seeks to protect, rather than to destroy.

Whedon, Joss. *Marvel's The Avengers* 2013. While not the characters' first appearance, the presence of scientist Bruce Banner and his monstrous alter-ego the Hulk and the conflict inherent in whether the monster can become a hero has perhaps received the most attention within this film and its sequels, as well as the conflict between the two characters.

Books:

Newman, Kim, *Anno Dracula* series

Returning to their monstrous past, the vampires within this series seek to control the world, replacing humans as the dominant species and even turning several of the protagonists from the original novel into vampires. Here it seems the true horror of Stoker's creation becomes realized, with England and, potentially, the entire world falling to vampirism.

Butcher, Jim, *The Dresden Files*

While the main protagonist of this series is a wizard, Butcher includes three "flavors" or courts of vampires: a "Black Court" of vampires right out of Stoker's work; a "Red Court" of vampires who possesses a disguise as humans but beneath appear as hideous bat monsters; and finally a "White Court" of human-like vampires who feed off of emotional energy through sexual intercourse and similar actions. Characters like Thomas Wraith, a white court vampire who over the course of several books strives to overcome his hunger, and ultimately fails, showcase the vampire as one who struggles against their nature as monsters.

Levine, Daniel. *Hyde: A Novel*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt 2014

This fascinating tale (which includes as an appendix the complete text of *Jekyll and Hyde*) tells the story from Hyde's perspective, rather than Utterson or Jekyll's, and casts Hyde in a much more human, more heroic light. Intended as a companion and expansion of the original novella, this work offers up a possible redemptive reading of Hyde as a heroic, or at the very least, antiheroic figure.

Rice, Anne *Interview with a Vampire*, Knopf, 1976

If Dracula represents the beginnings of pop culture's image of the vampire, then Anne Rice's Lestat and his fellow vampires represent a similar moment, with the vampires within depicted as tragic figures, some merely bloodthirsty beasts, or shrewd manipulators, others as monsters with souls, horrified by their existence yet willing to struggle against it.