Rodrigo Silva Guedes

Secular Readings of Good and Evil in R. L. Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

Faculdade de Letras
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais
Belo Horizonte
2007

Secular Readings of Good and Evil in R. L. Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

by

Rodrigo Silva Guedes

Submitted to the Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras: Estudos Literários in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Mestre em Letras: Estudos Literários.

Area: Literatures in English

Thesis Advisor: Prof. Julio Cesar Jeha, PhD

Faculdade de Letras
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais
Belo Horizonte
2007

To my family

Acknowledgements

This work is the result of the encouragement and support of many people. First, I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor, Julio Jeha, whose excellence and guidance were fundamental from beginning to end in the Masters programme. I would also like to thank Professor Sandra Goulart Almeida, with whom I have had the privilege of learning. My appreciation also goes to my classmates and colleagues, whose comments helped me enormously – Fátima, Eliza, Newton, and Erika.

I would like to say many thanks to my parents, Lucia and Kleber, as well as to my brother Thiago. Their participation in this process could not have been better. I hope I have made them proud. Thanks to my grannies, Ina (in memoriam) and Lília, for the inspiration and the example to be truthful and hardworking; to my grandpas Raul (in memoriam) and Walter; my uncle Walter and my cousin Thaísa; thanks are due to Édil and Flávia, for the friendship and assistance; to Kate for caring and motivating me; to Myla, Lidiane, and Soha for believing in me, too; and finally to all my friends whose wisdom helped me come out of this endeavour with a feeling of accomplishment and an ever greater passion for art.

My devil had been long caged, he came out roaring. I was conscious, even when I too the draught, of a more unbridled, a more furious propensity to ill. It must have been this, I suppose, that stirred in my soul that tempest of impatience with which I listened to the civilities of an unhappy victim.

R. L. Stevenson

Abstract

Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* dramatizes philosophical debates over good and evil throwing light into the analysis of these concepts. By depicting opposite personalities in one character who, at times, behaves strictly morally and, at others, utterly amorally the novel raises questions, first, as to how good and evil are represented, especially evil, in the figure of the double and the monster; second, the origins of good and evil actions; and finally, the parameters used to define or categorize such actions. Both personalities mark the conflict of reason and nature in guiding, motivating, and leading men's actions. The juxtaposition of the Kantian categorical imperative and the Nietzschean *Übermensch* to Jekyll and Hyde allows an examination of how good actions are identified with reason, translated by morality; and how evil actions are identified with nature, disclosed in impulses and instinctive drives in the story. The Darwinian notion of natural selection is also used in the analysis, providing an alternative and complementary way to look into good and evil actions. This approach shows not only the way the literary piece discusses the problems of defining actions from purely rational, natural, and circumstantial perspectives, by laying bare criteria used here to define good and evil actions, but also how Stevenson's book relates to the historical context of Victorian culture.

Resumo

A obra *O Estranho Caso de Dr. Jekyll e Mr. Hyde*, de Robert Louis Stevenson, dramatiza debates filosóficos sobre o bem e o mal, iluminando a analise desses conceitos. Mostrando personalidades contrastantes em um personagem, que ora se comporta com uma moral rigorosa, ora sem qualquer moral, levanta questões relativas, primeiro, a como o bem e o mal são representados, especialmente o mal, na figura do duplo e do monstro; segundo, à origem de ações boas e más; e finalmente, aos parâmetros usados para definir ou categorizar tais ações. As personalidades marcam o conflito entre razão e natureza ao guiar e motivar ações humanas. A justaposição do imperativo categórico kantiano e do *Übermensch* nietzschiano a Jekyll e Hyde permite analisar como ações boas são identificadas com a razão, traduzida pela moralidade; e como ações más são identificadas com a natureza, revelada em impulsos e instintos no romance. A noção darwinista de seleção natural tambem é usada na análise, oferecendo uma visão alternativa e complementar no estudo de ações boas ou más. Essa abordagem mostra não apenas como a obra de Stevenson discute o problema de definir ações como boas ou más a partir de perspectivas puramente racionais, naturais e circunstanciais, expondo os critérios levados em conta nas definições, mas também como o livro de Stevenson está relacionado ao contexto histórico da cultura vitoriana.

Contents

1. Introduction

Robert Louis Stevenson's literary history is that of popularity amongst readers and critics. In a study of the critical reception, Richard Dury compiles the criticism in a series of quotes that address several aspects of Stevenson's works, especially his popularity. Although he begins as a modest essay writer, notoriety soon comes after the publication of *Treasure Island* (1883), reaching its peak with the release of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) and other well received works such as *Kidnapped* (1886) and *The Master of Ballantrae* (1889) and *Catriona* (1889).[1] His popularity increased considerably after *Jekyll and Hyde*, which quickly entered pop culture in cartoons, psychological tag lines, and film adaptations that followed his period (Linehan xi). In a headline of *The Illustrated London News* Dec. 221894: 769, his death was announced: "He is gone, our Prince of storytellers – such a Prince, indeed, as his own Florizel of Bohemia, with the insatiable taste for weird adventure, for *diablerie*, for a strange mixture of metaphysics and romance" (Dury). His reputation in the world of fiction is remarkable and the genres to which he is associated also suggest that: mystery, bogey story, detective, and shilling shockers.

His popularity was associated to a growing literary market from which he benefited. Stevenson lived off his writings and therefore had financial motivations to write. The market at the time privileged the production of fictional texts in ways that kept readers interest. Long works were often divided in instalments that were printed and released gradually. This practice often required a style that was alluring enough to recapture the audience promptly. It demanded that fiction was able to renew the great public excitement. This culminated in a sensationalism that drove several writers at the time. Stevenson is thought to have been one of them as he wrote Jekyll and Hyde. Although the book was short to follow the gradual printing and releasing system, it was efficient in arresting attention.

[1] From here onwards, *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is referred to as *Jekyll and Hyde.*

The context involving this book's production also contributed to this sensationalist effect. Stevenson says that the idea for the story come to him in a dream. In "A Chapter on Dreams" for *Scribner's Magazine* (January 1888), he writes, "I went on racking my brains for a plot of any sort; and on the second night I dreamt the scene at the window, and a scene afterward split in two, in which Hyde, pursued for some crime, took the powder and underwent the change in the presence of his pursuers" (Linehan 91). This association rendered Stevenson with an aura of ingeniousness and mastery that influenced his readership. The book was said to have been written in three days, although it actually took weeks until its final version came out and it soon reached a popularity that outlived Stevenson.

Critics were of two minds about Stevenson's style, according to Dury. Some frowned at it, arguing that it was forced and artificial, referring to the absurdity and eerie situations Stevenson describes in his books. E. M. Forster claimed he is full of mannerisms, self-consciousness, sentimentality, and quaintness. George Orwell believed he was dull and did not deserve the merit some authors attributed him. Others praised his techniques. His language skills were acclaimed by the first two holders of chairs of English Literature at Oxford and Cambridge universities, Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch. Rudyard Kipling praised his talent for fine descriptions. Graham Green writes, "I think it was Stevenson's method of describing action without adjectives or adverbs which taught me a good deal." Ítalo Clavino and Jorge Luis Borges include themselves in the long list of Stevenson's admirers. Vladimir Nabokov refers to *Jekyll and Hyde* as a phenomenon of style and uses Stephen Gwynn's words to explain his enchantment: the story "is a fable that lies nearer to poetry than to ordinary prose fiction" (qtd in Stevenson 185).

Stevenson was outmoded and critics questioned his skills. This is reflected in his exclusion from several books that dealt with English Literature, the Victorian era, and the novel. Norton and Oxford anthologies kept him out for years. Only after William Veeder and Gordon Hirsch edited a collection of essays in *Dr Jekyll and Mr. Hyde after One Hundred Years* in 1988 critical interest was renewed. The establishment of biennial conferences in 2000

and the implementation of the *Journal of Stevenson Studies* in 2002 reinforced Stevenson's return to the critical arena. As a result, the criticism of Stevenson's works is now vast. A series of articles, essays and books, many of which listed in a website dedicated to Stevenson, started reviewing his works, including *Jekyll and Hyde*. Carol Christ and Catherine Robson's eighth edition of the *Norton Anthology of English Literature* welcomes him back entering *Jekyll and Hyde*'s full text with a two-page introduction.

The search for critical material on *Jekyll and Hyde* for the present thesis was comprehensive though unsatisfactory. The sources included the Internet Public Library (IPL) and Voice of the Shuttle (VoS) websites, both specialized in literary criticism.[2] Capes's Portal Periódicos, the Muse Project, and Jstor were also consulted, in addition to the Scotland National Library on-line and Google Scholar. The Victorian Web, the best reference for Victorian matters on (and perhaps off) the Internet, and the Stevenson's official website were also checked. Most of them, especially the last one, provided information on the author of *Jekyll and Hyde*, but little on the book. Most of the texts listed there were inaccessible. *The Journal of Stevenson Studies* was also an alternative but it was also restricted.

Based on the titles the search aforementioned revealed, on a detailed critical edition by Katherine Linehan and on acquired sources, it is possible to see that the approaches to *Jekyll and Hyde* tend to concentrate on the use of the double. The double and the dichotomy of good and evil in the narrative are explored as an allegory for man's dual identity. Hyde is analysed as a manifestation the unconscious or the ego in psychoanalytical studies.[3] Critics analyse the book as an expression of the Gothic style, either in Hyde as a monster or the setting of story as excessive and fearful. [4] The double is also explored as a metaphor for reli-

[2] To make up for the scarcity of printed material in Brazilian libraries, an online search was done on the websites mentioned, all of them recognized for their academic excellence. They can be found here: <www.ipl.org>, <www.nls.uk/rlstevenson>, <vos.ucsb.edu>, <www.jstor.org>, <scholar.google.com.br>, <www.periodicos.capes.gov.br>, <www.bartleby.com>, and <muse.jhu.edu>.
[3] For insights into the question of the double in literature, in general, and in *Jekyll and Hyde*, in particular, see Miller's *Doubles: Studies in Literary History*, Massey's *The Gaping Pig: Literature and Metamorphosis*.

[4] Refer to Dryden's *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles*.

gious divergence and moral instability. Recent approaches have associated *Jekyll and Hyde* with evolutionary theories, exploring the topic of illicit behaviour as part of a natural process.[5] Stevenson's fascination for the figure of the double is undeniable and indeed renders fertile readings of story within historical approaches. However, the topic of good and evil remains an uncharted territory.

Although good and evil are easily recognized, they are hardly ever defined. In the first place, leaders everywhere on the globe have brought these words back to common use since the latest terrorist attacks, the war in Iraq and the conflicts in Palestine. It has been spread all over to refer not only to terrorist attacks but also to gigantic catastrophes such as the tsunami and the sweeping hurricanes in North America. In a smaller scale, they have been applied to modes of behaviour in different cultures, places, and times. As a result, the meaning of good and evil became quite blurred, varying from place to place according to religious, political, natural, and cultural viewpoints. Moreover, if understanding good and evil turned out to be a difficult task, setting the criteria to define it have become even more so. Some critics claim we lack of vocabulary to discuss it.[6] Others still go on doing research on the topic. Philosophy did its part in attempting to define evil. Nevertheless, philosophy was not and should not be alone in this endeavour.

Although good and evil has been widely investigated in religion and philosophy, literary criticism is still legging behind. It has barely given any critical attention to their representation in fiction. This thesis is an attempt to remedy that. Julio Jeha states that some might not promptly see the relevance of studying good and evil in literature, once philosophy and theology have apparently exhausted the topic. He argues that neither philosophers nor

---

[5] Authors who have written about Stevenson's works refer to evolutionary theories, but this could only be verified in the majority of cases on book titles, table of contents, and abstracts. The texts whose access was not restricted related evolution and Stevenson's stories rather briefly. Some articles such as Julia Reid's "Stevenson, Romance, and Evolutionary Psychology" and Olena M. Turnbull's "Robert Louis Stevenson and Nineteenth-Century Theories of Evolution: Crossing the Boundaries between Ideas and Art" seem to be more extensive on the debate, although this could not be verified. Miller's *Doubles*, on the other hand, is available but does not go deep into the topic.

[6] See Neiman for a discussion on the lack of vocabulary to describe evil.

theologians believe that they have said the last word on the issue. "From Alain Badiou and Jean Baudrillard, to John Keke and Susan Neiman, from Terry Eagleton to John Feinberg, from Adi Ophir to Russ Shafer-Landau, the list of contemporary scholars interested in evil seems endless" (Jeha).[7] An on-line search at MLA database and Amazon limited to the period of 2001 and 2005, says Jeha, will list over a thousand texts, including articles, magazines, and books. Therefore, the topic is far from being exhausted, "certainly not for philosophers, theologians, or literary scholars," and dismissing it would have to be at one's own risk.

Philosophy and fiction promote a prolific debate on good and evil. To be more specific, an interdisciplinary approach in the case of Stevenson's work is coherent both because *Jekyll and Hyde* reflects to some degree the philosophical issues of the time of its production, and because it adds to these issues in its own artistic terms. It does not merely repeat what philosophy has claimed about the topic but expands on it, including scientific issues that enable other readings of the literary piece that have not been done yet.

Jekyll and Hyde tells the story of a doctor who attempts to separate his good side from his evil side by means of a drug that he manipulates. The double character Jekyll-Hyde presents notions related to natural and moral behaviour that inform the understanding of the story. This interpretation points to a long-standing concern with the origins of good and evil and the attempts that have been made to categorize it as either natural or moral. In Stevenson's book, I claim, each personality of the protagonist represents either a Kantian or a Nietzschean concept. Jekyll personifies Kant's categorical imperative, the idea that a man must act in such a way that his will can become a universal law; whereas Hyde embodies Nietzsche's *Übermensch*, the belief that a man must act according to his own will, regardless of laws. In one case, morals distinguish good from evil actions and, in the other, nature does. The contrast between Kant's and Nietzsche's views can illuminate the discussion on good and evil as being natural or moral in its literary expression. Darwin can also be used to ana-

[7] The arguments quoted here come from an e-mail by Julio Jeha, as he replied to questions relative to the relevance of studying evil in literature when the project for the present thesis was evaluated.

lyse how good and evil acquired different innuendos when contrasted with evolutionary principles of natural selection.

The approximation suggested here between Jekyll and Kant as well as Hyde and Nietzsche together with an evolutionist or a naturalist perspective, which begins with Darwin and ends with Lyall Watson, was yet to be attempted. Parallels between Kant and Jekyll, Nietzsche and Hyde and Darwin and Jekyll-Hyde remain an epistemological gap. This exploration is valid inasmuch as it attempts to present another perspective from which to look at and analyse good and evil in their literary expression the same way philosophy does it in and outside religion. Thus, literary criticism can only benefit from this interaction with philosophy. Besides bridging a gap between both fields of study, the present thesis may reveal a new apparatus for critical thinking on good and evil in *Jekyll and Hyde* and possibly in other literary works.

Some historical elements are relevant to this approach because they indicate possible sources of philosophical debates that helped in the understanding of good and evil actions. They are organized in ways that indicate the connections between economic, political, and social history and philosophical tendencies at the time. They are arranged in ways that put religion and morality side by side with secular modes of thought that can be used to assess good and evil actions in *Jekyll and Hyde*.

Economic, political, and social agendas introduce the discussion for showing, on the one hand, the ideas of power, development, and superiority that the British Empire enjoyed; on the other, they start the thesis because they reveal one of the main points symbolized in the Jekyll-Hyde character, that of tension and conflict, generated by all the rapid changes taking place in the Victorian period.

Religion and morality follow this historical contextualization because of their intricate relationship with each other, the way thinkers questions them, and most importantly, because they are parameters from which good and evil actions are defined. Then, the analysis of doubles and monsters are added in the same line of inquiry. These metaphors are analysed

as forms of evil representations and, as such, help identify how evil, and by contrast, good, can be not only identified but defined by a set of criteria.

2. Historical Context of Morality

2.1. Economic History and Its Consequences

The Victorian Age was marked by an outstanding scenario of change in all instances of life, be they economic, technological, political, social, religious, scientific, philosophical, or literary. The Industrial Revolution and its impact allowed England to become the fastest growing country on the globe. The country, under the reign of Queen Victoria, which lasted from 1832 to 1901, is said to have made more progress than any other nation has ever achieved in so little time. The consequences of so much change were various, but some of them epitomize this period.

Economically, England reached an unquestionable hegemony with its industrialization. It switched from an agriculture-based life and property ownership to trade and manufacturing. The cities rather than rural areas were the centre of the economy. The urban areas became the site of commerce and growth. Having been the first to achieve such feat, England saw its wealth increase enormously, especially with the development of the colonies and the conquest of markets.

Technological improvement emphasized economic prosperity. One of the most striking technological feats was the train, which "transformed England's landscape, supported the growth of its commerce and shrank the distance between its cities" (Christ 1046). The opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway in 1830 had a tremendous impact on the transport of commodities and services due to the speed and efficiency it provided. Technology also signalled development in architecture. The opening of the Great Exhibition in 1851 displayed the power of industry in the "gigantic glass greenhouse, the Crystal Palace" (1049), the size and style of which were meant to symbolize the unbelievable proportions of England's economic ventures. The economy, however, was not always constant in its course.

The economical development showed signs of decline and weakness towards the end of the century. The long-lasting turn down that went from 1873 to 1896 caused disquieting

effects, especially to the middle-class, which was challenged by a market that made a portion of its products unaffordable. In addition, the competition of the Germans and Americans for military supremacy contributed to this period of decay and frailty. Britain's so far unthreatened power came under dispute and the country entered the other side of its economic history, the side that revealed its maladies and tensions.

Industrialization defined not only economy and technology but also politics. Parliament redefined political structures with Reform Bills in 1832 and 1867. Conservative landowners participated in the political life of the country but manufacturers claimed for their own participation too. In an attempt to avoid conflicts of interests and accommodate the manufacturers, the Bill initially gave the lower middle class the right to vote. Later the working class was granted the same right, although women were excluded. The political power of the middle-class in the Parliament increased in detriment of old power monopolies. Diversification of political forces governing the country consequently led to the capital of the empire lacking a clear political identity. This political disorder was signalled by the vulnerability to terrorist attacks on the part of the Continental anarchists and Irish Fenians. Government Board offices, underground railways, Victoria Station were blown up, causing major political crises. Therefore, on a political level, tension and incoherence were visible.

The fast-paced expansion of the British Empire also had enormous social consequences. While the expansion of the empire seemed socially positive to rich citizens, bringing wealth and pomposity to certain parts of the city with various palaces and luxurious buildings on the one hand, on the other it proved negative. The population that was spread throughout the countryside concentrated in the cities to work in factories and this movement from the rural to urban areas happened too fast and caused problems. The unprecedented inflow of people was too much for cities and towns to manage sustainable growth. As a result, working conditions were a matter of concern. The long hours workers spent in their activities were extenuating. The low salaries were an obstacle to the high living costs and pushed entire families to work, including children. The living conditions in the cities became ex-

tremely poor. No sanitation system took care of animal, human, and industrial waste; therefore pollution was a constant problem. Health care became a serious issue. The filth in the streets started a series of diseases that health care could not handle satisfactorily. Poverty added up to dissatisfaction and agitation. The disparity between the lifestyle of the well off and the impoverished became evident.

The Jekyll-Hyde character reflects this divide. Stevenson employs this metaphor to illustrate tension, disorder, and conflict in economical, political, and social areas. It can be argued that the conflicts seen in all these areas are analogous to Jekyll's sense of self-division. His character incorporates on several layers of interpretation the anxieties of an oscillating economy, the political lack of control in the Empire and the social contrasts. Katherine Linehan suggests that Jekyll mirrors the dissimilarities in "practice and preaching" (141) of the Victorian morality, that is, the lack of correspondence between the way a man acts and the way he is told to act on behalf of virtue, an argument defended by Judith R. Walkowitz and Walter Houghton (qtd in Stevenson 141-49).

The Victorian man is commonly charged with a hypocritical moral behaviour. Accused of having "sacrificed sincerity to propriety" (146), in the words of Walter Houghton, they feigned decency, passing off as incorruptible, while often living lewdly and licentiously. This duplicity in character is said to be revealed in the public and private spheres of life in which decorum belongs to the public and depravity to the private. Victorians hid their desires and wishes to themselves and displayed correctness and respectability. The pressure of morality was so excessive that escapism almost became justified. Despite having questionable moral standards, these same standards were exported throughout the Empire.

The expansion of the Empire is also seen from a moral and religious perspective. Morality is intrinsically interwoven with religious belief at the time. According to Carol T. Christ, "many English people saw the expansion of the empire as a moral responsibility, what Kipling termed 'The White Man's burden'" (1050). The belief that expansion is a moral responsibility is related to an idea of bringing civilization. The Victorian's sense of superiority

somewhat blurred the definition of civilization. They put themselves in a superior position in relation to those not as economically developed and saw them as uncivilized, savage and primitive. Moreover, they believed it was a moral obligation to spread civilization. This is when religion played its role. Missionaries were responsible for the dissemination of Christianity in India, Asia, and Africa. Nonetheless, at the same time spread Christianity outside of England, at home religious belief was increasingly debated.

2.2. Religion and Philosophy

Although this thesis aims to discuss the topic of evil from a non-religious perspective, one cannot help avoiding the historical role religion, more specifically Christianity, played in defining it. Religious belief has had great influence over what was considered evil and was involved in various degrees in major debates over the understanding of evil. Christianity played its part in the nineteenth century and in the centuries before. This religious perspective is also beneficial because it help the reader to recognize the religious from the non-religious.

The problem of evil, as it is commonly referred to, concerns evil's own existence in a world that God, the ultimate symbol of goodness, has created. [8] Evil is omnipresent though not absolute and this makes little or no sense when one thinks of its origin. According to religious belief, God is behind creation, and, as the sum of goodness and righteousness, He cannot be the source of evil. Thus the question of where evil comes from raised other questions, the first being relative to why He allows evil to exist. Attempted answers range from faithful to atheist ones. On the one hand, God is either evil, too, or not powerful enough to eliminate it. On the other, God's purpose in allowing evil in the world reflects His willingness to let men follow their own path, and, as imperfect creatures, they chose evil.

Philosophy of religion presents a way out of this dilemma that supposedly preserves the integrity of God's image. Crudely, the philosophical explanation excuses Him from being

[8] Refer to Mark's *The Problem of Evil: A Reader*.

evil or powerless and is intended to justify the origin of evil in men's choice. Philosophy of religion advocates that free will, the right to choose, solves this dilemma by placing the origin of evil in men's turning away from God. The fact that evil stems from the choice of not to do good implies that evil has no nature or essence, but is merely absence of goodness or God. In this sense, the problem of evil is clarified in the Christian tradition. An example of this idea appears in Augustine of Hippo, one of the Church Fathers.

Augustine supports the claim that evil is attached to reason rather than nature because evil is a choice and does not lie in one's nature. In *City of God,* he defines evil as a perversion. For him, evil does not exist as an entity or in essence but is rather the absence of goodness, "good may exist on its own but evil cannot" (474). Wherever good is not, there is evil. Because God, the supreme good, created men, their nature could not be evil. "No nature is contrary to God; but a perversion, being evil, is contrary to good" (474). Perversion or evil actions only appear whenever one consciously chooses not to do good. Evil results from the choice not to aspire to the supreme good, that is, God. Evil is the turning away from Him. If the cause of evil lied in human nature, God would be to blame for such failure in men as their creator. Nonetheless, God, as the supreme good, is blameless. Thus, the only source for men's wickedness is the turning towards themselves, away from Him. When men prefer themselves to God, perversion takes place. Thus, for Augustine, reason determines an evil action and not any type of nature.

Religious belief undergoes deep questioning from the mid-Victorian period onwards. At this time, the Church of England was already divided into Low, Broad, and High Church. The Low Church, also known as the Evangelicals, defended strict Christian morality and a Puritanical code. Powerful in the beginning of the century, it shares this view with several groups that do not belong to the Church of England, such as the Nonconformists, or Dissenters, which include Baptists, Methodists, Congregationalists, and other Protestant denominations. The High Church, like the Catholic Church, teaches the importance of tradition, ritual, and authority. Some members of the High Church propagated their arguments in

pamphlets or tracts, for which they were called "tractarians." "Tractarians argued that the church could maintain its power and authority only by resisting liberal tendencies and holding to its original traditions" (Christ 1050). These arguments consisted of a conservative attempt to keep a superior ecclesiastical position before society. Unlike the previous sections of the Church of England, the Broad Church takes the Bible not as a text to read literally but metaphorically, that is, it should be interpreted in a sort of analogy between the empirical facts of the world and God's plans in which the first are signs or revelations of His divinity. In this sense, this group is said to have a more liberal and inclusive character than the Low and High churches.

One of the questions posed to religious belief arises from a philosophical rationalist thought that had a long lasting effect in Victorian times. Rooted before the nineteenth century in the philosophy of Jeremy Bentham and his disciple James Mill father of John Stuart Mill, Utilitarianism undermines religion with the principle of utility. Utilitarianism says that actions should be considered in their practical use; right and wrongdoing should be distinguished whether it promote happiness to others or not. If they do not bring happiness to the greatest number, they cannot be considered effectively good. The objective is to examine how effective actions are in promoting happiness to the majority. This is the utilitarian test and "such test, when applied to long-established institutions like the Church of England, or to religious belief in general, had disruptive effects Was religious belief useful for the needs of a reasonable person?" (Abrams 923). Testing the institution of the church against such principles brings controversy instead of harmony since a great number of people start to think that the church does not pass this test.

The Church fails the utilitarian test for not proving its usefulness in promoting happiness. To the Benthamites the answer to the question "was religious belief useful?" was evidently no. One of the ideas associated to happiness at the time consisted of the fulfilment of bodily pleasures, instinctive drives, natural impulses, and corporeal needs. This happiness amounted to the response of sensorial perceptions, which many linked to an animal-like be-

haviour. This sense of happiness was not encouraged by religion. In fact, it was – and is – denied and condemned as sin. Thus, religion distanced itself from a practical reality in a sense, at least for those who hold this notion of happiness.

John Stuart Mill strived to reintroduce the utilitarian principle as fundamental to morality. Resuming Bentham and the influence of his father, Mill states, "[A]ctions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness is intended pleasure, and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain, and the privation of pleasure" (118). Believing that setting a principle of morality is necessary and attainable by observing an individual's actions and their connection with happiness, he reinforces Utilitarianism or the Happiness Theory. Yet, he points out two major misconceptions concerning its relation with pleasure. The first common misunderstanding is to oppose the principle of utility to pleasure, as if the aim of this principle was not to achieve pleasure, but practicality or usefulness. The second and more current misunderstanding is to assume that pleasure is not worth an end to be pursued, as if it were not noble enough to be an ultimate goal.

Mill emphasizes that utility is not opposed to pleasure; in fact, they commingle. For him, "pleasure, and freedom from pain, are the only things desirable as ends; and all desirable things […] are desirable either for the pleasure inherent in themselves, or as a means to the promotion of pleasure and the prevention of pain" (118). Pleasure exists in things themselves and in their use as a tool to promote pleasure. Things are pleasurable not only for their own sake but also for the sake of others as much as these things can be used to spread pleasure. Pleasure is an end, an ultimate goal. Nevertheless, whether pleasure is a noble goal depends on the understanding of pleasure, or happiness, as merely sensorial or animal-like, according to Mill. For him, the human idea of happiness goes beyond nature to a higher level: "few human creatures would consent to be changed into any of the lower animals, for a promise of the fullest allowance of a beast's pleasures, […] a being of higher faculty requires more to make him happy" (120). Against the conception of pleasure or happiness as simply condi-

tioned to impulse satisfaction or bodily urges, which he calls content, he attributes to pleasure a meaning that includes the enjoyment of the intellect, feelings, imagination, and moral sentiments, which are higher in the sense that they are not shared by irrational creatures.

The concern with the necessity to establish a moral principle is enduring in Mill's work and it has strong roots in Kantian philosophy. Although Mill disagrees with Kant's later developments on the categorical imperative, he says that the Kantian "system of thought will remain one of the landmarks in the history of philosophical speculation […]" (115). Such adherence to moral values, or at least an attempt to adhere to moral values, is a noticeable Victorian trace and Kant is still a reference when it comes to the debate of good and evil.

Kant is partly a product of the Enlightenment's defence of reason or rationality in that he privileges this faculty in men over others. Reason and rationality are prior to the lesser parts of men, namely the natural. This rationalism, per se, enters the Victorian era to be exercised as far as possible in detriment of the supposedly opposing issues regarding human nature. As morality is more connected to reason rather than to nature, one can understand why morality receives so much attention at the time. Kant remains pivotal either for those who call themselves Kantian for following the same line of thought or as a starting point for discussing moral principles or even as a counter point for reassessing morality from an opposite perspective, as Friedrich Nietzsche does.

Nietzsche refreshes the debate on morality with a reasoning that directly conflicts with Kantian ideas. If religion is intrinsically tied up with morality and religion has already been suffering from utilitarian criticism, Nietzsche contributes even more drastically to this sufferance. His controversial view of religion, morality and especially the concepts of good and evil shake the long-standing parameters to understand these elements. The seeds for his discomforting ideas are planted in *The Birth of Tragedy,* released in 1872, in which he attacks morality as Christianity defines it. He says,

> [F]or in the eyes of morality (and particularly Christian morality, that is, absolute morality) life must be seen as constantly and inevitably wicked, be-

> cause life is something essentially amoral. Hence, pressed down under this weight of contempt and eternal No's, life must finally be experienced as something not worth desiring, as something worthless. And what about morality itself? Isn't morality a 'desire for the denial of life'? (Nietzsche section 5)

Nietzsche ideally conceives life as an expression of one's instincts, as the manifestation of one's nature and therefore, good. Contrary to this, Christianity sees life as evil exactly because it is natural or amoral. Under such light, nature and morality are contrasted to the point of becoming almost mutually exclusive.

The Apollonian and Dionysian elements of the Greek tragedy incorporate such ideas of nature and morality as opposing forces. On the one hand, there is the allusion to an ethical divinity Apollo, which is civilized, moderate, and self-conscientious. On the other, there are the barbaric, excessive, and reckless characteristics attached to Dionysius. Both forces are antithetical and are often in dispute. Zarathustra, a Dionysian, as Nietzsche says, elaborates on these notions in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra,* and defines the *Übermensch*. Through the figure of the Persian prophet Zarathustra, Nietzsche claims that God is dead, especially as a symbol of goodness, lending such an attribute to the *Übermensch*. Having defined Nietzsche's prospective of good, the questions of evil is the next obvious observation.

Nietzsche's *Beyond Good and Evil* suggests an answer to the question of evil. Expanding on the idea of morality and the purpose it serves, that is, power or the need to impose control, he concludes that, roughly speaking, evil becomes the repression of one's will. Because both *Beyond Good and Evil* and *Jekyll and Hyde* were published in the same year, the idea that they can be paralleled in some aspects is not too far-fetched. Other connecting points appear in *On the Genealogy of Morals*, where the origin of the terms good and evil is sought and presented in relation to power. Nietzsche attacks Christianity in *The Anti-Christ* by claiming its ideology is an attempt of self-empowerment and a disguise for exercising control. Therefore, good and evil are no longer, in Nietzsche's view, relative to following God, giving Him

power. On the contrary, good and evil are relative to following one's own self-created principles and values, and holding the power for one's self.

2.3. Science and Morality

Scientifically, the impact of the discoveries in the natural sciences on religion and morality appear even greater then the ones provoked by utilitarian and Nietzschean philosophies. With *The Origin of Species,* Charles Darwin also causes controversy with his ideas on natural selection or survival of the fittest and evolution. Darwin claims that through a struggle for existence, creatures undergo a process he calls "natural selection," which consists of preserving favourable individual differences and variations that help them survive (63). This means that any natural characteristic that improves the living conditions of a being is kept, whereas any characteristic that does not contribute or mars better living conditions is eliminated. The stages creatures go through during the process of natural selection define evolution.

Evolution in the Darwinian application of the term refers to the phenomenon marked by biological variation that represents the development of a being, the passing from one biological stage to the other. In *The Descent of Man* (1887), Darwin applies these principles directly to man and concludes that men descend from lower animals, the monkeys, especially given the structural similarities between them, and such association "raised more explicitly the haunting question of our identification with the animal kingdom" (Christ 1052). Just the fact that Darwin's theory differed from religious accounts of evolution already caused great discomfort. To admit the notions contained in the principle of natural selection or the survival of the fittest seemed contradictory, to say the least, to biblical teachings on the origins of man. The fact man does not come into the world according to the literal biblical view of creation but rather from primitive animal forms startled society, especially the pious. "Although many English scientists were themselves men of strong religious convictions, the impact of their scientific discoveries seemed consistently damaging to established faiths"

(Abrams 924). People received the new findings with astonishment and soon recognized the danger they represent to religion and morality.

The English philosopher Herbert Spencer applied the idea of evolution to ethics. He disseminated the concept of "social evolution," which compares the development of organisms to the development of societies; he also discussed morality from an evolutionary perspective. Spencer anticipated the theory of natural selection in his work before the publication of *The Origin of Species* and coined the term "survival of the fittest." In general, good for Spencer consists in what contributes to the survival of an organism and allows its development. He makes complex elaborations on this moral philosophy based on freedom and on an innate moral sense. To put it simply, good or happiness, he says, is what comes from the adaptation of an individual to its environment.

The application of the evolution theory to human thought had ramifications that restore the role of nature in the constitution of men's identity. Stephen Jay Gould remarks that evolutionary rationales, for instance, began to justify criminal behaviour (132). Based on the morphology of human skulls, Cesare Lombroso's theory of the delinquent man suggested that crime is hereditary and that anatomical similarity to apes and lower animals stands as evidence of that. Another example of the influence of the evolutionary thought in the ideas developed at the time is the differentiation of social groups based on the analysis of brain size. According to the characteristics of the brain, individuals were classed as belonging to one group or another. Social Darwinism was also used to explain the inevitability of poverty, since there would always be those who are less fit to survive in an economically driven world. Thus, the evolution theory foregrounds nature, once overlooked by excessive rationalism, in its role to characterize men's behaviour and identity.

The questioning of religious belief by philosophy and science in the nineteenth century is most conducive to a debate of new ways to understand morality. With the weakening of the connection between religious and moral values, one is led to find alternative modes of thinking to assess social behaviour, right, and wrongdoing, as well as good and evil actions.

Conflicts between philosophical and scientific views and religion lead some people to associate science with evil because it distances individuals from God. Conversely, these same philosophical and scientific views allow people to associate them to good because it brought progress.

Literature reflected the debate on morality. The deep questioning of principles and values practiced by Christianity is echoed in fiction. Fiction engaged in this discussion, amongst others, in its own artistic terms. It readdressed philosophical issues as well as scientific ones in detriment of the morality in vogue. It contributed to these issues in literary forms, offered alternative and critical perspectives. Among the most famous nineteenth-century stories that show these reworking of issues relative to morality are, for instance, Shelley's *Frankenstein*, which approaches the topic of evil by exploring the relations of religion, science, and morality in the opposition between creator and creatures, allowing for a plethora of readings. Along the same line, Wells's *Island of Dr. Moreau* addresses evil by showing the clash of nature and reason in experiments with human beasts. Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde* renders philosophical interpretations as to whether evil is natural or moral in the figures of the dutiful doctor and his other dark, monstrous side.

Overall, the conflicts seen in economy and social and political upheaval during this era, as well as the philosophical debates between nature and reason, are reflected in *Jekyll and Hyde* by references in the duality of man's character. The impact of the scientific discoveries and the consequences of philosophical debates shook the foundations of society, generating fear of change. This fear is represented as a metaphor in fictional monsters, which incorporate society's anxiety of new concepts and beliefs.

3. Doubles and Monsters

3.1. Doubles

The fictional context of *Jekyll and Hyde* involves the influences of the doppelganger literature and the Scottish devil folklore. According to Karl Miller, there was a European literary trend to search for new means to understand the self and its inherent duality, especially during the 1880s. Elicited by ambiguous social practices and psychological duplicity, the double re-enters the literary milieu as a metaphor for the distinction between public and private lives of Victorians, in addition to the contrast of opposing personalities.

Although the term double was translated into English from Jean Paul Richter's late eighteenth century novel *Doppelgänger*, its use goes a long way back in the history of literature, without a specific work in which it first appeared. This difficulty to specify when the double first appeared certainly has to do with the struggle that authors have to define it. Examples come from Greek, French, German, American, and English literature in the classical milieu, not to mention the many other literatures such as the Indian, African, Canadian, Latin-American, which have been overlooked. The list of literary titles would be endless if the idea here was to present them. Additionally, the variations in the use of the double were too complex to pin down into one single application. Nonetheless, more important for this work than making a list of titles or analysing the variations of the double is to show how widespread this figure has become in the contexts of Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde*. The point of this section is not to go deep into the study of the double but to provide an overview of the topic in literature to be able to work on one of the uses of the double in Stevenson's work.

The word *double* suggests a few associations that illuminate its understanding. According to Carl Francis Keppler in *The Second Self*, one of the first ideas it brings into the readers mind is that of duplication. The double can manifest itself either physically or psychologically. Physically, the dualism may well be represented in double organs, mirror images, photographs, statues, busts, and twinship in likeness, for instance, a twin sibling, or contrast-

ingly as a monster, among other forms. According to Keppler, these are more recognizable ones since they are more visible, revealing an immediate connection to their other half.

Psychologically, the twofoldness of the double might be slightly less obvious. One identifiable clue is language. The expressions one uses in moments of distress are quite suggestive. For instance, when a person says he was "out of his mind" or that "he was not himself," that he was "possessed" or "beside himself," he implies that someone else was there, some other but himself. The singularity or wholeness of the individual is broken. Although some consider these expressions a simple figure of speech used offhandedly, they carry the notion of a double or a second-self and might be interpreted as a sign of such notion. Other types of clue to the dual nature of men are, still according to Keppler, somnambulism, hypnotism, subconscious or projection of the unconscious, because they reveal, at least partly, uncharted territory in one's character and hidden parts of one's personality (5). Therefore, these two types of manifestation of the double, namely, physical and psychological, help to identify it.

Major works on this topic include Sigmund Freud's "The Uncanny" and Otto Rank's "The Double as Immortal Self," which still stand among the most influential discussions on this figure. Karl Miller also brings insights to the topic in his book entitled *Doubles: A Study In Literary History*. From a psychoanalytical view, Freud addresses the double by explaining in detail his definition of the uncanny and its origin. Initially Freud draws on the meaning of the German root word *heimlich* and its opposite *unheimlich* to clarify where the uncanny comes from. Among the several dictionary entries and examples that he lists, *familiar* and *homely* are the recurrent descriptions that incorporate the main ideas of *heimlich*. Thus, it often signifies what one is able to recognize and relate to on a close level. On the contrary, *unheimlich* contains a negative connotation and is translated as *strange* and usually *uncomfortable*, *uneasy* or even *repulsive*. Therefore, it often characterizes what is new and unpleasant. Uncanny appears to encompass both German words to pass on the notion of something strangely familiar, that is, something that is simultaneously new and unpleasant but intimately recognizable.

The source of the uncanny remains arguable. Freud claims that the feeling of uncanniness has a different source from the one Jentsch believes it does. Jentsch advocates that it is the intellectual uncertainty that causes the impression of uncanniness. He describes intellectual uncertainty as the lack of orientation one has about his own environment: "the better oriented in his environment a person is, the less readily will he get the impression of something uncanny" (154). This means that the more one knows where one is and becomes aware of one's context; the less likely it is for this person to consider something as uncanny.

The ego ignites the feeling of uncanniness. Freud postulates that, in its attempt to deal with the external world and mediate internal affairs, the ego represses emotions. He claims that the repression of emotions provokes a morbid anxiety, as he calls it. The double relates to the uncanny inasmuch as the double represents this anxiety, this repressed content inside, which the individual has chosen to hide from himself. In other words, the double becomes this outward manifestation of the unconscious. It projects the latent content outside to a conscious level where it become intimately recognizable and at the same time new, or strangely familiar – uncanny.

The use of the double in Stevenson's work echoes Freud's elaborations. Hyde can be associated to the uncanny. Hiding is a form of repression and Jekyll admits that he has concealed his pleasures; he confesses to having repressed an "imperious desire" to let pleasure take over. The anxiety, caused by such extreme repression, acquires shape in the figure of Hyde with the help of the potion Jekyll develops. Regarding the drug he has developed to consummate the separation, he says, "It but shook the doors of the prisonhouse of my disposition; […] and the thing that was projected was Edward Hyde" (52). Hyde is the result of Jekyll's inability to avoid his will. Jekyll's repression of his pleasure seeking nature is so strong that he wants to separate it from reason.

The feeling of estrangement and familiarity typical of the uncanny is present when Hyde is referred to. While Jekyll becomes Hyde, he feels "something in [his] sensations, something incredibly new" (50). He is amazed at the result of the transformations he under-

goes. About these transformations or "excursions" as he calls them, he avows, "When I would come back from these excursions, I was often plunged into a kind of wonder at my vicarious depravity" (53). Alternatively, "Henry Jekyll stood at times aghast before the acts of Edward Hyde." Jekyll's feelings of estrangement towards Hyde could not be more intense.

Strangely enough and despite his astonishment, he also shows a sense of familiarity. As he looks in the mirror, Jekyll recognizes Hyde as part of himself: a part for which he felt "no repugnance, a lead of welcome." For, as he eventually acknowledges, "This too, was myself" (51). He recognizes the other part of his as "being inherently malign and villainous" (53). At that point, Jekyll unveils Hyde for what he is: his double, his dark side better left repressed.

Freud directly refers to Otto Rank's ideas of the double. Rank claims, "Civilized man does not act only upon the rational guidance of his intellectual ego nor is he driven blindly by the mere elemental forces of his instinctual self" (62). Human actions conjure up both nature and reason to form a worldview Rank called supernatural. Supernatural for him implies a worldview that goes beyond the natural world to encompass the cultural world as well. Rank identifies his concept of the supernatural with culture, which he defines as all that is non-natural, or not belonging to nature, to put it simply.

To illustrate the notion of the supernatural, Rank compares primitive with modern men. He points out that not only the primitive are governed by superstitious beliefs called irrational life forces. In fact, both primitive and modern men share a spiritual self that is revealed in superstitious beliefs. Modern men, however, attempt to deny superstitious belief due to their pride on being rational. Nonetheless, they cannot escape it. This spiritual self of modern men or civilized men is manifested in the spiritual values represented by religion, philosophy, and psychology.

The cultivation of a spiritual side reveals an effort to overcome death. Rank believes that men deny the biological self and create a magical worldview. They do so because this worldview allows them not to avoid death but, more importantly, to fulfil their need to im-

mortalize themselves (64). There must be a way for the individual to endure time and outdo nature. By valuing the spiritual rather than the natural self, the individual should be able to achieve such an ambition.

The fear of death and this attachment to the spirit lays the foundation of culture (64). "Culture is derived from 'cult', not only linguistically, that is, as a continuous translation of supernatural conceptions into rational terms" (84). Culture is understood as an ever-changing process that rationalizes this supernatural worldview, demystifying the irrational terms of this magical perspective and bringing them to the light of reason.

The double appears in this context because of a preoccupation with the self. The double holds two interpretations, says Rank. The first interpretation is positive and associates the double with the immortal soul. This association was recurrent throughout the ages and usually evoked by the symbolism of a shadow or a reflection. The second interpretation is negative and shows the double as a symbol of death.

Influenced by the Christian doctrine, the double came to represent immortality or death. Rank postulates, "Originally conceived of as a guardian angel, assuring immortal survival to the self, the double eventually appears as precisely the opposite, a reminder of the individual's mortality" (76). He explains that the double is initially an identical self and a promise of personal future survival, of eternal life. Later, the double becomes a symbol of death. The double comes as an obstacle toward immortality, thus interpreted as something bad, according to the author. It becomes an opponent and starts to appear "in the form of evil" (82). Rank believes that these opposing interpretations of the double come from the Christian assumption that the good ones deserve immortality whereas the bad do not.

Hyde represents the deathly. He embodies what takes Jekyll away from eternal life, which is his pleasure-seeking side, his irrational self and his instincts and impulses. He personifies nature and its imperatives. As he wants to fulfil immediate needs more than to follow reason, he cannot be granted immortality and is portrayed as a bad creature. The religious influence on this portrait is verifiable in the several references made to the Devil; for

example: "if I ever read Satan's signature upon a face" (17) and "my devil had long been caged" (56). This accounts as the pivotal motivation for Jekyll to engage in the experiment to separate himself from Hyde.

Separation is a form of denial. This attempt to exclude part of man's identity symbolizes refusal. Karl Miller notices this fact in his investigations of the double. He refers to Stevenson's work as "a project of separation" (209). He claims, "Jekyll is seen to use chemistry to expel an animal nature" (211). Indeed, Hyde is referred to as an ape-like figure, a primitive animal in some of his descriptions. Jekyll himself states his purpose in the will: "if each, I told myself, could be housed in separate identities, […] the unjust might go his way, […] and the just could walk steadfastly and securely on his upward path […] no longer exposed to disgrace and penitence by the hands of this extraneous evil" (49). Jekyll longs to end the struggle within him between his two conflictive parts by setting them apart, drawing a clear line between good and evil.

The double and the issue of separation were in vogue in the nineteenth century fiction. "Dualistic productions were becoming and established genre, indeed a mine of activity, in the literatures of Scotland, England, and France, and in that of Russia, […] with Edinburgh and St. Petersburg the twin capital cities of the subject – the axis of international duality" (Miller 130). Rank's examples of the double, then, do not strike as a surprise. He believes that Dostoyevsky's works seem of great use to illustrate the topic given the lengths to which the Russian writer goes to explore the topic, especially in *The Double: A Petersburg Poem* (1946). Poe's "William Wilson," and Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* are illustrative too, according to Rank. Although he does not go into a detailed analysis, he refers to these works as remarkable concerning the double and separation.

Stevenson's idea to use the double motif in the story raised questions as to the influence of other works over his own. As far as reception is concerned at the time, the writer, reviewer and mythologist Andrew Lang suggested that the closest reference to *Jekyll and Hyde* was Edgar Allan Poe's "William Wilson" and Gautier's "Le Chevalier Double." Stevenson

acknowledged his acquaintance with Poe's "William Wilson" but was sorry to hear for the first time about Gautier's tale (Linehan 81). He probably learnt from the use Poe made of the double to add later to the idea. According to Lang, Stevenson's originality lies in adding a moral sense to the story. Being authentic because it discusses morality may be a bold assertion. Nevertheless, the impact that the discussion of morality has in the nineteen hundreds does break ground. In one of Lang's reviews, he writes that Stevenson's story is a tragedy of a body and a soul. The words body and soul should remind readers of the biological and spiritual self that Rank discusses.

Other texts that also use the idea of the double in the plot are said to have had an effect on Stevenson's writing. Katherine Linehan mentions Romans 7:20, "Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me" (49), to point out the relation between religious belief and the double. She also mentions the Edinburgh legend of Deacon Brodie (1741-88), who was a master artisan during the day and, at night, became a burglar. In addition, James Hogg's *The Private Memoir and Confessions of a Justified Sinner,* which tells the story of a man who is convinced to have been saved by Christ but is deceived by his double, the devil himself, may have influenced Stevenson.

Scottish folklore alludes to the idea of the double in the figure of the Devil. Stevenson's own tales show how much of the devil figure can be seen in folk stories. Jenni Calder believes that the recurrent appearance of the devil is relative to the author's intention to show how susceptible men are to him. According to her, Stevenson suggests that men are naturally more vulnerable to the devil. Stories such as "Thrawn Janet" (1881), "The Body Snatcher" (1884), "The Merry Men" (1882), and "Markheim" (1886) depict this inborn susceptibility or vulnerability to the devil. The last story seems the closest in meaning to *Jekyll and Hyde* for pointing out the triumph of evil during a struggle with goodness, in the life of a man possessed by an uncontrollable urge to kill. Calder says that Stevenson is addressing what he called "the war in the members" (Linehan 127), referring to the conflicting parts that constitute humans.

The double can also be seen in Well's *The Island of Dr. Moreau*. Dr Moreau's experiments involve the ethical issues of submitting animals to a treatment that educates them in order to turn them into man-creatures, a mixture of human beings with animals. The unsuccessful result of such experiments, with the animal's side prevailing over the human, shows the constant battles of men's opposing sides, the natural, represented by the animals, and the human, represented by the rational part in the animals.

Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* depicts the double in an ever-changing image of the protagonist Dorian. This image is a reflection of Dorian's actions, which are committed to pleasure and sin, all the impulses and desires commanded by his nature. Dorian acts as he pleases regardless of a moral code that tells him to do otherwise. His image gets more and more terrifying with his every misdeed, as if it were becoming a monster. Dorian yields to temptation; he cannot resist it and manifests the passions within himself. This painting reveals the inner self of Dorian, the side that morality attempts to keep hidden. Thus, the battle of nature and morality discloses the double in this story.

German Romanticism is remarkable for reviving the double. Goethe's *Faust* stands out as one of the most popular stories concerning the divide between body and soul, as well as happiness and immortality in men. Russian literature, especially the writings of Dostoyevsky, also recaptured the topic of the double in literature.

Overall, the double seems to be a strategy some nineteenth century writers, especially Stevenson, find useful to address questions of the soul and immortality and, by consequence, of matters relative to the body and death. Apparently, it helps to clarify deep psychoanalytic issues, such as the expression of one's most repressed feelings. In a more general sense, it also serves as a tool that shapes and brings to the limelight the secrets and spoils of a second life. Hyde's manifestation provokes an introspection that makes one look back at one's own identity and analyse it from a more fragmented perspective, since the unity is broken. Its actions contribute to raise questions in a critical reader as to the foundations of moral standards at the time and the origin of concepts such as good and evil in the life of the protagonist.

3.2. Monsters

From Greek myths to contemporary stories, monsters keep on reappearing, often in different shapes. They include aberrations, maniacs, vampires, animal-like characters, deformed images of humans and Satan as the utmost icon of evil. Monsters notably re-enter the literary imagery of nineteenth century Britain. Although they have been portrayed numerous times before then, they stand in the limelight of major works such as Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde*. Furthermore, their figures not only become recurrent but also ignite philosophical and scientific debates within literature. The monster serves as a tool that brings forth key issues concerning moral and natural behaviour, along with good and evil in Victorian society. In fact, their popularity derives from the notorious topics they allude to.

The term "monster" renders some illuminating ideas as to its application. Leslie Fielder, in *Freaks: Myths and Images of the Secret Self*, argues that the monster has been used to describe "creations of artistic fantasy like Dracula, Mr. Hyde, the Wolf Man, King Kong […] and Mary Shelley's Frankenstein [sic]" (22). He associates monsters to literary characters and reinforces that the term is "as old as English itself and remained the preferred name […] from the time of Chaucer to that of Shakespeare and beyond" (20). Beyond Shakespeare up until the time Stevenson at least, since both literary and theoretical texts still refer to such entities as monsters.

The origin of the term "monster" suggests several possibilities of interpretation. Charles T. Wolfe writes in *Monsters and Philosophy* that the Latin root of the word is "'monstrum', meaning a "divine portent, prodigy, i.e., something deemed as a premonition" (190). Here monster signifies a warning from God. Yet, he quotes Fortunio Licet, who believes that it is wrong to understand "monster" etymologically as a sign from God. Licet thinks that the term "monster" comes from the fact that one points at it or "shows" it.

Monsters are qualified by the feelings they raise in an individual. Noël Carroll's elaborations on art-horror give a clearer view of monsters, especially the Jekyll-Hyde character. These fictional beings are characterized by the emotion they give vent to, namely horror,

as their names suggest. "Indeed, the genres of suspense, mystery and horror derive their very names from the affects they are intended to promote […] the genre of horror takes its title from the emotion it characteristically or rather ideally promotes; this emotion constitutes the identifying mark of horror" (14). He defines art-horror as a genre of monster stories, monsters that uncover nothing but horror, although not every monster in a story is bound to be horrific.

Monsters often appear outside the horror genre. They raise other emotions such as laughter, pity, sadness, empathy, for instance, and are often present in the children and travel literature of fairy tales, epics, and odysseys. In such context, "the monster is an ordinary creature in an extraordinary world" (Carroll 16). The monster is taken for granted; it is a part of the story that does not attempt to horrify. Horrific monsters must represent two key elements, namely, menace and impurity simultaneously. They cannot be only threatening because they would simply ignite fear. Likewise, if they are only impure, the emotion is more like disgust (10).

Monsters are a menace when they challenge pre-existing orders. Monsters of the horror genre violate cultural codes of behaviour and, for that reason, are often seen as entities that obliterate morality. This makes it possible to understand why monsters are "extraordinary character[s] in our ordinary world" (16). They represent a clash of two realities, the monstrous and the normal one. They constitute a disturbance of established ways of thinking and acting, defying common knowledge and symbolizing danger in any social context. Monsters not only constitute a physical threat for the strength they usually have but also cognitive since they offhandedly break cultural rules.

Monsters are impure due to a difficulty to classify them. According to Carroll, "an object or being is impure if it is categorically interstitial, categorically contradictory, incomplete, or formless" (32). Assuming that categorization is a way to bring the unknown to an intelligible reality, the author states that monsters do not fit appropriately any categorization. They remain inconceivable and unknown and are often ambiguous in the way they show

themselves. Their impurity is also shown in their incompleteness or formlessness indicated by the various disturbing shapes, texture, constitution, and smell they possess.

Monsters show this impurity in two ways. They shock one by mingling characteristics of animate and inanimate things into their figure. Zombies, mummies, and humanoids illustrate this combination of dead and alive. They also startle by mixing animalistic with human traits. Human-beasts, werewolves and the Jekyll-Hyde character foreground this mixture. The Jekyll side symbolizes the human and Hyde symbolizes the animal side, acting without the limits of reason.

The characteristics associated to monsters may well be seen in Hyde. In a conversation with Mr. Utterson, Enfield recalls his witnessing of the encounter of Hyde and the little girl: "I saw two figures, one little man who was stumping along eastward at a good walk, and the other a girl of maybe eight or ten who was running as hard as she was able down a cross street" (9). Gradually leading the imagination to cause some anxiety and agitation, Mr Enfield continues: "the two ran into one another naturally enough at the corner, and then came the horrible part of the thing." The element of fear, required in Carroll's definition of the monster, plays a major role in the report: "he was perfectly cool […], but gave me one look, so ugly that it brought out the sweat on me like running." The suspense created in the narration heightens the fearful and threatening feelings as the event unfolds.

Interstitiality characterizes Hyde, as he apparently is neither human nor non-human. Categorical difficulties like that hinder the speech, making it difficult to find words to describe the interstitial. Enfield has trouble ascribing Hyde to any given category and resorts to the neuter pronoun: "It wasn't like a man, it was like some damned juggernaut" (9). Enfield's unsuccessful attempt to categorize Hyde appears again: "he is not easy to describe. There is something wrong with his appearance." Thus, Enfield's perplexity as to what he sees indicates interstitiality in Hyde.

Enfield also hints at impurity, formlessness, and incompleteness. "Something displeasing, something downright detestable. I never saw a man I so disliked, and yet I scarce

know why. He must be deformed somewhere; he gives a strong feeling of deformity, although I couldn't specify the point" (11). "Displeasing" and "detestable" suggest repulsiveness, which is a reaction to impurity. The repetition of "deformed" and Enfield's inability to locate it or "specify the point" show the uncertainty about shape, size, or form: "He is an extraordinary looking man, and yet I really can name nothing out of the way. No, Sir; I can make no hand of it; I can't describe him. And it's not want of memory, for I declare I can see him this moment" (12). Enfield's insistence on trying to identify Hyde accurately shows how unknown and inconceivable Hyde seems to him.

Utterson's reactions also show the elements aforementioned, namely impurity and threat. Impurity is evinced by the difficulty to conceive of Hyde's figure and a strong physical response from Utterson. He says, "there must be something else […] there is something more if I could find a name for it […] the man seems hardy human! Something troglodytic […] if I ever read Satan's signature upon a face, it is on that of your new friend" (17). The repetition of "something" reveals this doubt regarding the looks of Hyde. The narrator says:

> Mr. Hyde was pale and dwarfish, he gave an impression of deformity without any nameable malformation, he had a displeasing smile, he had borne himself to the lawyer with a sort of murderous mixture of timidity and boldness […] but not all of these together could explain the hitherto unknown disgust, loathing and fear with which Mr. Utterson regarded him. (17)

A sense of repulsiveness and disgust comes from Hyde's impressions. Threat is signalled by the fear Utterson feels in the room while he waits for Poole to fetch Jekyll: "he seemed to read a menace in the flickering of the firelight on the polished cabinets and the uneasy starting of the shadow on the roof" (18). The elements of impurity and threat follow one another in the reactions of characters almost simultaneously.

The settings that remind readers of Hyde also translate impurity and threat. . The space monsters occupy resembles the impact they cause. In one of Utterson's searches for Hyde, the narrator points out the mystery and fear the scenery invokes, "a great chocolate-

coloured pall lowered over heaven, but the wind was continually charging and routing these embattled vapours […] for a moment, the fog would be quite broken up, and a haggard shaft of daylight would glance in between the swirling wreaths" (23). The dark and misty environment elicits the sense of danger and unfamiliarity. He goes on, "the dismal quarter of Soho seen under these changing glimpses, with its muddy ways, ad slatternly passengers, and its lamps […] seemed in the lawyer's eyes, like the district of some city in a nightmare" (23). Besides the impression of filth indicated by "muddy" and "slatternly," the setting is described as nightmarish, scary, and unreal to some extent. It is as if the place looked too frightening and strange to be real. In this sense, the impurity associated to the monster contaminates his surroundings.

Monsters can be associated to nature. Carroll refers to an animal side in monsters, and Wolfe, in a historical overview of the topic, corroborates that by recalling the relation monsters have with body malformations. Analysing Francis Bacon's elaborations in *Novum Organum*, Wolfe points out that, instead of omens as the Latin root *monstrare* implies, according to Bacon, they are "an event which allows the naturalist to glimpse existing natural structures" (Wolfe 191). Monsters are anomalies, errors of nature being revealed. They represent genetic malformation of foetuses, mysterious natural impediments to normal growth, variations, or deviations of an evolutionary pattern. According to Bacon, Wolfe says, they offer an opportunity to look into one's own natural constitution. However, monsters go beyond this association with nature.

Monsters consist of symbolic representations created with a purpose. Leslie Fielder argues that human malformations precede the creation of monsters: "men have always hewn out of rock and painted on the walls of caves freaklike figures ever since art began, and these have usually been considered idols or icons based on the human form but distorted for symbolic purposes" (26). He thinks that freaks, or abnormal human bodies, generate the concept of monsters, but do not constitute monsters by themselves. As he says, these natural varia-

tions suffer symbolic distortions so as they can be considered monsters. Monsters are a later development of anomalies, created or defined as such with a purpose.

The purposes monsters serve vary, but they are often connected to three main ideas: freedom, pleasure, and power. This idea of freedom is based on acting naturally or following one's own nature, unafraid of remorse or punishment. Indeed, they usually behave indifferently to such feelings since they show no concern for others. Pity or the law does not restrain them. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen says, "The monster is continually linked to forbidden practices" (16). Any action limited by morality the monsters breaks: "Through the body of the monster fantasies of aggression, domination, and inversion are allowed safe expression" (17). He remarks that monsters act as they please, regardless of rules. In this sense, the monster is free and often represents pleasure.

Pleasure arises from the lack of limitations. There is no sense of denial when it comes to bodily satisfaction. The monster is above the rules, willing to fulfil its needs. It evokes "potent escapist fantasies" because they serve as an "egress from constraint" (Cohen 17). Through the monster, one is able to forget morality or any other cultural inhibitor. The author believes that the monster unravels the pleasure of the body.

Like freedom and pleasure, power is a typical attribute of monsters. Carroll believes that monsters in the horror genre are usually invested with some kind of intimidating power or strength to subjugate or control the other. The political connotation attributed to them is relative to the control they enjoy. "A tettering [sic] zombie or a severed hand would appear incapable of mustering enough force to overpower a co-ordinated six-year-old. Nevertheless, they are presented as unstoppable" (34). This depiction of power is remarkable of horrific creatures and revealed in moments that barely make sense if one does not see them as mysteriously powerful.

The notions of freedom, pleasure, and power involve Hyde more than Jekyll. Jekyll's maid recounts the murder of Sir Danvers Carew: Hyde suddenly "broke out in a great flame of anger, stamping with his foot, brandishing the cane, and carrying on […] like a madman

[…] Mr. Hyde broke out of all bounds and clubbed him to the earth" (22). Hyde sees no limits to his actions and kills a person despite any moral code that forbids him to do so. He acts freely and apparently with pleasure, the pleasure of doing it for no reason and no bounds. Power is shown in his physical strength to destroy his victim without giving him the slightest chance to fight back: "with ape-like fury, he was trampling his victim under foot, and hailing down a storm of blows, under which the bones were audibly shattered and the body jumped upon the roadway" (22). His fury is unmotivated and his violence is gratuitous, as he purges his anger, unlike the proper and honourable Jekyll, who, as pillar of the Victorian community, cannot vent his feelings freely.

Monsters also carry a deeper meaning relative to identity. They are linked to either their natural side aforementioned or the cultural one. They can be "representations of other cultures, generalized and demonized" (Cohen 15). The monster is a horrific stereotyped image of others. It identifies and stigmatizes them with monstrous characteristics because one of the purposes of the monster figure is to impose differences. They identify the other, either negatively or positively, setting the boundaries between *us* and *them*. "[M]onsters symbolize alterity and difference in extremis" (Carroll 19). They are an attempt to define the other and consequently to define oneself, separating both radically. He goes further to assert that the act of calling something a monster comes from strong feelings such as fear of contamination, impurity, and loss of identity. Such fear must come from an assumption of purity or from an unconvincing Victorian Puritanism.

Identity is a key issue in *Jekyll and Hyde*. The "Hyde" monster exits only until Jekyll explains who Hyde is. From that moment on it ceases to exist because, according to Carroll, he is no longer a complete stranger. In fact, he is part of someone who is rather well-know. Monsters do not inspire any type of identification from the audience; they lack human characteristics and resist explanation. The moment Jekyll tells the truth about Hyde in the will, the monster is naturalized; it is brought into an acceptable frame of mind; it is made somewhat familiar and acknowledgeable, and allowed identification from readers.

In this light, the monster cannot be seen as a double in Freudian terms. The monster must be a complete stranger in Carroll's view; there is no sense of familiarity towards it as Freud's notion of uncanny implies. The monster is totally unknown whereas the uncanny is not; hence, the incompatibility of these concepts of the monsters and the double in this context. Therefore, Hyde can only be a monster until his identity is disclosed. Authors such as Jeffrey Cohen, however, disagree by saying that the monster figure may work as a counterpart of humans. Cohen hypothesizes that "the monster can function as an alter ego, as an alluring projection of (an Other) self" (17). It becomes the exact opposite of the self.

Hyde's monstrous image has religious, scientific, and artistic implications. This religious connotation comes from the thought that they have no soul. Katherine Linehan remarks that such image of Hyde might have led readers at the time to associate him with the "Christian lore about the Devil, said to be cunning in his concealment of his bestialized horns, tail, or cleft foot when he appeared in human form" (11). Linehan also observes that depravity hinted on the surface image of villains and monster-men as well as the animal-like appearance of Hyde could be interpreted a sign of "grotesque criminality or under-evolution, according to neo-Darwinist theories" (12).

The Gothic style contributes to the portrayal of Hyde. Judith Halberstam defines the Gothic as "the rhetorical style and narrative structure designed to produce fear and desire within the reader" (128). She claims that artists, including writers, use the Gothic to evoke the feelings of fear and desire. In her view, these feelings are usually ignited by an excess of meaning, often comprised in the figure of the monster.

Later readings of the Gothic, such as that of Eve Sedgwick in *The Coherence of Gothic Conventions* (1986), and Jeffrey Cohen in *Monster Theory*: *Reading Culture* (1996) based on the Freudian *unheimlich*, understand the monster as the return of the repressed, the revival of what has been buried inside human beings and considered foreign. These latter readings also offer ways into the construction of the Hyde monster, whose traits and manifestation suggest a resemblance with the Gothic. Other characteristics of the Gothic novel can be seen in Ste-

venson's book, according to Halberstam. She mentions, for instance, the typical exhibition of a sinister mistrust of the not-said, the unspoken, the hidden and the silent. She also points out that Gothic novels do not show the monster's viewpoint and this is true in *Jekyll and Hyde*, but not in others such as *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*.

This Gothic monstrous image of Hyde and its association with evil can also be corroborated in philosophy, especially in that of Immanuel Kant, as is demonstrated in the following chapters. Julio Jeha remarks that monsters show the variety and the power of imaginary evil creatures. He adds that they stand as a cultural metaphor and a literary artifice. Thus, based on this line of thought, this work departs from this literary artifice to explore the cultural metaphors Hyde incorporates, revealing their power and form.

Overall, monsters raise questions relative to fixed or established concepts and notions such as that of identity in Victorian literature, especially in Stevenson's work. Cohen suggests that they "ask us how we perceive the world and how we have misrepresented what we have attempted to place […] they ask us to re-evaluate our cultural assumptions […] they ask us why we have created them" (20). He reminds the critical reader the risk of using crystallized concepts, for example, unity in identity to perceive the world. This is one of the reasons the monster comes in to existence in *Jekyll and Hyde*.[9] It points out to the reader the human capacity to misunderstand and misjudge others with this practise of fitting the unknown into fixed categories.

[9] For further studies on the topic of monsters, refer to Jeha's "Monsters and Monstrosities in Literature"; Gilmore's *Monsters: Evil Beings Mythical Beasts, and All Manners of Imaginary Terrors*; Kearney's *Strangers, Gods and Monsters: Interpreting Otherness*; Kreuter's *Monsters and the Monstrous*: *Myths and Metaphors of Enduring Evil.*

4. Evil in Kant and Nietzsche

4.1. The Categorical Imperative and Jekyll

Kant formulated the "categorical imperative" as he tried to define moral behaviour in terms of nature and reason. According to him, two natures constitute men. The first, sensitive, is responsive to physical stimuli and allows one to know the world through one's senses; the second, intelligible, is associated with thinking and allows one to know the world through reason. Likewise, two principles govern human actions, namely the principles of self-love and morality. The former concerns all individuals' search for happiness and the latter concerns all individuals' commitment to duty.

Happiness results from the fulfilment of biological needs. Whenever people follow their natural inclinations and their impulses, they enjoy happiness. Pleasure is commonly associated to it due to its sensorial connotation. Pleasure is a positive response to the human senses of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, and feeling. It is the contentment derived from perception. Happiness is inferior to what the philosopher calls true satisfaction, which acquires a transcendental meaning involving more than the satisfaction of biological needs. The reason for this inferiority is explained in the way he sees human nature and the action stemming from it.

Kant understands natural actions as based on causality. He believes that nature engenders people in an inescapable cause and consequence relationship in which all their actions are conditioned, that is to say, their actions are caused by a previous event, which in turn is caused by another previous event *ad infinitum*. In this sense, actions turn out to be irrational. Irrational beings are unable to break with this cause-and-consequence chain. However, as rational beings, men should be able to break this chain rather than being confined to the impositions of nature. The happiness such actions bring are merely immediate needs of the flesh, pure longings for sensorial experience. According to him, men should go after higher satisfaction that originates in the breaking of such causal connection and takes a sub-

ject to a transcendent state that is more rewarding for the soul. This happens only when one is able to act from duty.

Duty defines an action based on reason and is the way to accomplish freedom. Kant claims, "[A]n action from duty is to put aside entirely the influence of inclination and with it every object of the will" (*Practical* 55). Acting from duty means to avoid nature and recognize in reason the sole inspiration for one's action. "[T]here is left for the will nothing that could determine it except objectively by the law and subjectively pure respect for this practical law" (*Practical* 56). Nature cannot have any influence on the decision to act. Reason only should have such power to motivate an action. Acting from duty is to act for law out of pure choice and not by any kind of imposition. Duty is the necessity to act from reason and respect for the law (*Practical* 55), "for only law brings with it the concept of unconditional" (69). The law frees men in the sense that it allows them to break with the conditioning inherent to natural behaviour and with the relation of causality that binds one to the satisfaction of mere instinctive urges.

Kant reiterates that one may act from duty but also in conformity with it. The first entails respect and a passion for the law whereas the latter involves the use of the law as a means to an end. On the one hand, the law is an end in itself and represents reason, duty, and morality, which is governed by the universally applicable principle, selflessness, and common welfare. On the other, the law is a tool and is often misused. One misuses the law by taking advantage of it for one's own benefit, or more precisely, when following it is merely convenient to fulfil a personal inclination. These are the foundations for the categorical imperative.

The categorical imperative tells you to act for the sake of the law, without consideration for the consequences. In other words, people must respect rules of behaviour and not follow their own natural inclinations. Thus, the common well-being is privileged over the happiness of the individual. It is not enough to act in conformity with the law because one might as well use it as a means to an end; one might possibly use it for one's own benefit. The categorical imperative says that an individual "ought never to act except in such a way that [he] could also will that [his] maxim should become a universal law" (*Practical* 57). Good

actions are "unegoistic," in the sense that they aspire to promote common welfare instead of the prosperity of the individual. For you to be good, you have to act in a way that makes the principle that guided your action an absolute law. This is the core of the categorical imperative.

Overall, Kant not only points out a direct connection between nature and evil but also establishes another direct connection between morality and goodness. Natural actions, defined as the ones that follow one's own inclinations, are evil in the way they disregard their consequences to others as sociable beings and bring a lower type of happiness. Moral actions, defined as the ones that come from duty, are good in the way they, first, free man from irrationality and conditioning; second, show concern for others and their lives in society, and finally, bring true satisfaction. Although Kant recognizes that men have both sides, the natural and the rational, the categorical imperative leaves no room for the first and privileges the latter entirely.

Kant is criticized for holding an essentialist view of evil. Yet evil is absolute in the sense that it reveals itself in all cultures; it is manifested, almost without exception, in all social practices and interactions. Nevertheless, evil may be characterized in many ways according to the moral principles of each culture and social group (Jeha). One cannot deny that it exists everywhere. However, it takes many forms and shapes depending on specific moral codes, which in turn vary according to different times and places. Some critics distrust Kant's effort to blame human nature for causing evil; others attack the extreme moral attitude enforced by the categorical imperative as well as the attempt to universalize it.

Kant's ideas on morality, good, and evil in light of the categorical imperative can be used to analyze *Jekyll and Hyde*. Two major characters, Utterson and Jekyll, represent morality. Utterson epitomises the law. His looks suggest the way people may see the law: a "man of a rugged countenance that was never lighted by a smile; cold, scanty and embarrassed in discourse; backward in sentiment; lean, long, dusty, dreary, and yet somehow lovable" (7). Sturdiness and endurance speak of Utterson's lack of emotion and warmth as if he was unaffected by it and suggest that he is detached from emotion but admired for this quality.

Utterson enforces the moral perspective on the story. As an attorney, he represents law and virtue: "In this character it was frequently his fortune to be the last reputable acquaintance and the last good influence in the lives of down-going men" (7). He is highly esteemed, honourable, and respectable – an exemplary figure. He stands for moral and almost religious correctness. His nature is unassuming: "It is the mark of a modest man to accept his friendly circle ready made from the hands of opportunity; and that was the lawyer's way" (7). Self-contained, conscientious, moral, helpful, tolerant, and amicable are adjectives that translate the ideas conveyed by Utterson's description. Hence, the morally oriented analysis he makes of the actions taking place.

Jekyll's image is also that of a morally driven citizen. His association to morality begins with the narrator's description of his appearance. Like Utterson's, his physical traits suggest that he is a good man, "a large, well-made, smooth-faced man of fifty, with something of a slyish cast perhaps, but every mark of capacity and kindness" (19). Outlining his fine looks in a favourable light makes his morality visible or at least indicated. Other elements such as Jekyll's titles reinforce this association between this character and morality. When Utterson checks his friend's will, he lists the several titles granted Jekyll: Doctor of Medicine, Doctor of Civil Law, Doctor of Laws, and Fellow of the Royal Society (13). The first two titles show his training in medicine and law, the third is an honorary degree, and the last shows how distinguished he was in his contributions to science. The reader is introduced to a man of science and law whose profession and civil duty are beyond question and therefore worthy of respect. Jekyll's image vouches for moral principles and values. His actions also strengthen his ethical qualities. He incorporates the qualities of a good man of the law; "he was busy, he was much in the open air, he did good; his face seemed open and brighten, as if with an inward consciousness of service" (29). Besides, there is an almost religious sense of duty revealed in the satisfaction Jekyll apparently has in doing good to others.

Jekyll's image is made even more convincing when one notices Utterson's surprise to see all the assets that belonged to Jekyll passing to Hyde in the will. Privileging an alleged

murderer with one's inheritance makes no sense at all to Utterson, unless he believes his friend is being coerced in some inescapable way. The lawyer believes that, given his friend's moral concerns, Jekyll would not freely support a monster such as Hyde. Therefore, this close connection between Jekyll and Hyde seems absurd, even appalling taking into account Jekyll's credentials. "I thought it was madness," Utterson says (13). Fearing the circumstances in which his friend Jekyll may be involved, he thinks about the bond between Jekyll and Hyde and concludes, "Ay, it must be that; the ghost of some old sin, the cancer of some concealed disgrace: punishment coming [. . .] years after memory has forgotten and self-love condoned the fault" (19). The guilt of some irreparable mistake is perhaps being used against his friend for evil purposes. The language he uses to describe the situation he imagines elicits his religious values. He even checks himself for some wrongdoing in his past that he would regret and suffer the consequences later. Yet he finds nothing and is reluctant to accept that his friend may have done wrong and, filled with compassion, quickly blames Hyde. Utterson wants to believe in the image of Jekyll, his friend, an ethical man. Hence, the image of an honourable man stays unblemished.

Jekyll's image is again linked to duty. Duty is, among other aspects, relative to doing one's work, acting on what is ethical or having moral and legal obligations. In the portrait he paints of himself in the will, he refers to this commitment to duty. Jekyll starts his testament by making a historical background of himself and is quick in highlighting duty to mark his self-portrait: "I was born in the year 18 __ to a large fortune, endowed besides with excellent parts, inclined by nature to industry and fond of the respect of the wise and good among my fellow men, and thus, [. . .] with every guarantee of an honourable and distinguished future" (47). This is the image of an admirable dutiful man. He even claims to have denied, concealed an "imperious desire" (48) or pleasure on behalf of duty. Jekyll avoids acting on his impulses and hides them for the sake of the law. He represses his natural inclinations to serve a moral code as he alleges.

This image of Jekyll seems coherent with Kant's categorical imperative. In the figure of Jekyll, duty plays a fundamental role in its construction as it does in the categorical imperative. Ethics is pivotal in his characterization inasmuch as the well-known Jekyll is presented as someone who privileges the law, the social bond, and the concern for others above all. Dr. Jekyll epitomizes reason in his exercise of morality. His image is very close to the Kantian ideal formulation. Nonetheless, Jekyll's image is deceiving and its ethical hallmark is unsustainable.

Jekyll provides several motives that testify to a doubtful personality. A careful investigation of his appearance unearths some hints that corrode his supposedly moral perfection. Later in the story, "the rosy man [grows] pale; his flesh [falls] away; he [is] visibly balder and older" (29). The gracious appearance that once educed his moral attitude now gives way to a decadent phenotype that arouses suspicion of foul play, doubt, and fear. Jekyll's servant Poole corroborates this view: "[T]he man's appearance amply bore out his words; his manner was altered for the worse" (33). His external features reflect his moral corruption to the eyes of characters and readers. In fact, early in the story, some descriptions signal a hidden corruption for example when he is described as having "something of a slyish cast perhaps." His attitude also endorses his crookedness.

The secrecy of his life as Jekyll is a hint to pretence. He is increasingly less accessible to the public, to his friends and even to his assistants. Although he makes some appearances that supposedly give evidence to his openness in the investigation Utterson carries out about Hyde, he cannot keep them long enough to ensure his contribution. He swiftly surrenders to the isolation of his laboratory, becoming a recluse. Whenever he is found and confronted with questions about the murder case, he is evasive, keeping from Utterson any clue that would involve him. Jekyll hides in the darkness of the night and more often in his other self, who is aptly named Hyde. Another name would not make the existence of a secret more obvious.

Jekyll's will is the most substantial piece of evidence of his unlawful behaviour. He confesses to having done wrong, tempted by ambition, in carrying forth the idea to separate

men's two sides, "the temptation of a discovery so singular and profound, at last overcame the suggestions of alarm" (50). He develops the drug that would eventually give vent to his impulses, natural inclinations, or desires, but not as Jekyll, which would blemish the reputation behind this name. Jekyll cannot bear the guilt and sorrow that comes with it. He is not prepared to take responsibility for unlawful, amoral, and egotistic deeds. Then, he becomes the very self-centred Hyde, who pays no heed to feelings of guilt and sorrow or any sort of pain for others.

Always unapologetic, Jekyll reports to a man of the law all that takes place, but does not go to the police to unravel the crimes he has committed as Hyde. Although he may have felt guilty for the consequences of Hyde's actions, he does not excuse himself for carrying out the research leading up to the commotion around him. Despite being aware of the undignified actions Hyde would still be able to perform, he allows himself to take pleasure in them. A dutiful man would feel obliged to turn himself in, but he goes unnoticed for as long as possible and tries to ensure Hyde's economic wellbeing through his testament.

Jekyll admits to having not found happiness being himself, as he confesses in the last sentence of his will: "I bring the life of that unhappy Jekyll to an end" (62). His motivation is the happiness Hyde grants him. "[T]here was something strange in my sensations," Jekyll says, "something incredibly new and, from its very novelty, incredibly sweet. I felt younger, lighter, happier" (50). He enjoys the pleasures only Hyde can bring him through unbounded physical experience. "[He] was conscious of a heedy recklessness, a current of disordered sensual images running like a mill race in [his] fancy" (50). Hyde's excess is Jekyll's happiness.

Jekyll convinces himself of his dual character and the impossibility to rebuff it. He also hopes to persuade Utterson to believe him and follow the terms in the testament. Speaking of his other half, he claims, "This, too, was myself" (51). He accepts that he cannot be a purely good man who has a passion for following the law. He is a mixture of such a man and Hyde, who is pure evil. Conceding that "all human beings, as we meet them, are commingled out of good and evil" (51), he explains that the duplicity in him and others is inexorable and

not susceptible to resolution. Overall, Jekyll is inconsistent with the Kantian moral principle, based on the evidence presented here. The ambiguity of his character elicited by his image, attitude, and actions disagree with the categorical imperative.

To think of Jekyll in terms of the categorical imperative would be possible if one believed in a sincere attempt on his part to follow reason and morality for respect of the law. It would be convincing to associate Jekyll's actions to such concept if they were thoroughly coherent and left no room for doubt that he solely behaves from duty. Some could consider Jekyll's behaviour innocent because they might see him as someone unable to realize in advance that denying his nature is pointless. Alternatively, some could perceive him as a hypocrite for betraying the laws in the most secretive way possible. No matter how well meaning he may have been, his actions do not show honesty and candour. What the reader learns is that he conforms to duty. He does not find the true satisfaction Kant refers to, as he does not act for the sake of, or the pure respect for the law. Although Jekyll's reputation speaks of a reasonable person whose morals stand out and define him, eventually his nature overpowers him. Jekyll relishes the happiness brought by the liberating effect of Hyde's inclinations. Moreover, both interpretations touch on a relatively bigger issue. More important than to notice Jekyll's hypocrisy or naiveté is to realize the hypocrisy of Victorian morality, which is most conducive to Jekyll's behaviour.

As many have pointed out, hypocrisy characterizes the Victorian era. Behind the strong image of an ethical society lie the facts that contradict the image. Stevenson does not refer to the hypocrisy of a "double-dealer" such as Jekyll, someone who is torn in two and who at certain times behaves morally and, at other times, amorally. He is not concerned with this rather evident trace of Jekyll. He refers to the view of men that ignores and denies human nature as if it were possible or desirable, but that begets a creature such as Hyde. This view, of which the categorical imperative is an example, unravels an extreme emphasis on rationality and morality that minimizes the role of nature in defining human identity and

behaviour. It is based mostly on religious cultural belief, which often tries to abnegate the biological constitution of human beings and its influence on human actions.

The pressure induced by society to be rational and moral motivates Jekyll to purify himself from his nature, leading to his self-destruction. Feeling compelled to separate his two sides, he attempts to get rid of his bad half so that the burden of sin or wrongdoing does not fall on him. He is forbidden to show duplicity in character, although social practices bring forth this duplicity. Morality becomes too constrictive to him: "I was the first who could plod in the public eye with a load of genial respectability, and in a moment, like a schoolboy, strip off these lending and spring headlong into the sea of liberty" (52). Feeling too inhibited by laws, Jekyll craves for freedom from the social rule.

The result of this oppression is summarized in Hyde, an extreme opposite of rationalization and morality. Seen through the lenses of Kantian morality, Hyde is evil. He is the consequence of Jekyll's utmost fear to accept himself as a two-fold person. Hyde is everything Jekyll tries to kill inside him, as the sound of his own name suggests. "Je" kill, means "I kill," or "kill" might also refer to what he wishes to do with himself, as in "kill me." He is the sum of all that is repressed by Jekyll and is never let show, as the name Hyde suggests, which, in turn, hints at all that Victorian society would force its member to keep out of sight for the common good.

The Victorian uneasiness over reason, nature, and identity foreshadows the existentialist philosophy. Existentialism asks what "to be" means. This philosophy reassesses the key concepts of essence and existence. José Ferrater Mora says that the term "existentialism" has been overused to refer to many philosophical tendencies in which the premise "existence precedes essence" appears.[10] For instance, Thomas Aquinas is thought to have been an existentialist because he understood essence as the intelligibility of existence; essence was existence made conceivable. However, to avoid the misconceptions of the various approaches

[10] Although primary works of philosophy have been used so far in this thesis, existentialism is too broad a topic and its main practitioners are too many to be covered here. Thus, for the sake of brevity, an encyclopedia of philosophy will have to suffice.

that have been made to existentialism, Mora advises to limit its applicability to a specific period and philosophical trend. Hence, given the publication date of *Jekyll and Hyde* and the philosophical trends that permeate it, the work of Søren Kierkegaard, the precursor of existentialist thought, becomes pertinent.

Kierkegaard, a religious nineteenth-century Danish philosopher, introduced existential philosophy – influenced by Socrates, Stoics, and the Augustinians – as a counterpoint to Hegel's speculative philosophy or dialectics. The foundation of existentialism, Mora says, lies in the idea that no man is substance susceptible to objective determination; in fact, his being is the process of his self-constitution (962). No external reality defines the self; such reality does not impose an identity on man. Rather, to the existential way of thinking, a man is his own reality and constitutes his own identity. Reality does not exist by itself or outside man. Kierkegaard rejects the idea of determinism, which does not allow either change or choice. The existentialist subject is not an object that merely reflects a reality outside him, but thinks for himself and has the capacity to make his own choices.

Kierkegaard's existentialism can illuminate Kant's categorical imperative. The categorical imperative rejects the definition that nature imprints on the self; it resists this natural objective determination of the self to embrace subjectivity. Subjectivity is an attempt at self-determination and self-constitution. It presupposes that men can build their identity based on reason and choice, that they can become themselves rationally and freely, independent from an external reality that supposedly identifies them. In this manner, the categorical imperative makes sense existentially. Existentialism denies that objective truths determine identity. If one thinks of nature, or genetic heritage, as an objective truth, one cannot accept it as a constitutive element of one's identity. This denial exists within the concept of the categorical imperative, which defines men through pure reason and excludes nature.

In *Jekyll and Hyde*, Jekyll's initial motivation to split his good and evil sides, namely, reason and nature, carries the existentialist view of man. Jekyll struggles to be someone who defines and at times is defined by law and morality, without the interference of the irrational

forces of his instincts and impulses. He endeavours to become the one to whom the categorical imperative can be applied, the supreme moral man and an existential subject. Nevertheless, his failure to do so culminates with the realization that objective truths may not determine one's identity but nor can they go unnoticed. Hyde may stand as evidence of such realization.

4.2. The *Übermensch* and Hyde

Nietzsche writes about good and evil in direct response to Kant. Approaching the same topic from opposite standpoints, they offer some insights that contribute to the analysis of *Jekyll and Hyde*. These insights are relative to how good and evil can be discussed from mainly two perspectives, one moral, the other amoral. Furthermore, Nietzsche's perspective brings to light other elements inherent to such debate: the ideas of freedom and the importance of power in understanding good and evil.

Human nature for Nietzsche is twofold; there are those who are strong and those who are weak, and goodness is associated to the former, whereas evil is linked to the latter. To be good, a man must be able to act freely, regardless of any restraint imposed by duty. These are the qualities of a strong man. Evil actions are unnatural for Nietzsche; they go against a strong man's natural inclination. They characterize a weak man.

Nietzsche traces back the origins of the terms good and evil in an attempt to show that the former reflects the assumptions of people in a powerful position in society whereas the latter, by consequence, is associated with the less fortunate. According to him,

> the judgment 'good' did not originate with those to whom goodness was shown! Rather it was 'the good' themselves, that is to say, the noble, the powerful, the high-stationed and high-minded, who felt and established themselves and their actions as good, that is, of the first rank, in contradistinction to all the low, low-minded, common and plebeian. (*Genealogy* 26)

Both concepts exist relative to power relations and are established from the top down with the purpose of maintaining power structures.

In Nietzsche's reasoning, the term good was etymologically associated with the powerful, the privileged, thus, with the strong. Conversely, the term "evil" was connected to the plebeian, the ordinary, or else the weak. The main issue he addresses is that different moralities and not *a* morality identify good actions and evil actions. Contrary to Kant, he believes that there is no absolute morality, but at least two. The judgment of actions vary according to the morality one inserts oneself in, since "one should ask rather precisely who is evil in the sense of the morality of *ressentiment*. The answer, in all strictness, is: precisely the 'good man' of the other morality" (*Genealogy* 40). The morality of *ressentiment* represents the feelings of the oppressed against the morality of the powerful. In this way, depending on the perspective from which one judges an action, it may be simultaneously good and evil.

His view that the strong rules and the weak submit is present in the concepts of master and slave moralities developed in *Beyond Good and Evil*. "The moral value-distinctions have arisen either among a ruling order which was pleasurably conscious of its distinction from the ruled – or among the ruled, the slaves and dependents of every degree" (195). Power underlies the establishment of ideologies, a will to power being present in every individual. "Where I found a living creature," Nietzsche claims in *Thus Spake Zarathustra,* "there I found the will to power" (137). Everyone nurtures a desire to exercise power over the other, "and even in the will of the servant I found the will to be master. The will of the weaker persuades it to serve the stronger; its will wants to be master over those weaker still" (138). There are levels to power for individuals and they enjoy it according to their position in the social hierarchies of power. Furthermore, this power relation is inescapable: "he who cannot obey himself will be commanded" (137). Those who cannot follow their own will, follow the will of others. One will assume either the position of the strong or that of the weak.

In the *Antichrist*, Nietzsche answers the same key questions as to the concept of good and evil in a very straightforward manner. To the question "What is good?" he replies,

"Whatever augments the feeling of power, the will to power, power itself, in man" (22). Strength is the ultimate motivation to one's behaviour. He continues, "What is evil? – Whatever springs from weakness" (22). He postulates that weakness can only lead to evil deeds and goes as far as to connect this issue with happiness and poses "what is happiness? – The feeling that power *increases* – that resistance is overcome" (22). This connection with happiness is also fundamental in Kant's reasoning on good and evil. Nietzsche cares to explain what he means by happiness as much as Kant does. Nietzsche says it is "not contentment, but more power" (22). Happiness for him is to relish power that comes following one's instincts without moral restraints, or else, free.

Freedom consists of being in a higher position where limitations cannot reach one. Indeed, the freedom Nietzsche discusses amounts to not only being above limitations such as morality, but also creating and implementing them at will. The strong are free because they go beyond any assessment of values; they define them, they tell right from wrong and thus submit the weak, those without freedom.

Culture is an obstacle to freedom: "the meaning of all culture is the reduction of the beast of prey 'man' to a tame and civilized animal, a domestic animal" (*Genealogy* 42). It maintains order by repressing human instincts and desires and forcing them to live by codes, such the religious. In his view, Christianity is an ideology set to make the weak seem strong, to make evil seem good, to submit the disempowered to those with power. Interpreting Christian morality, he points out how some signs of weakness come disguised as strengths. For instance, "impotence" is mistaken for "goodness of heart," according to him; "anxious loneliness" is confounded with "humility"; "subjection" to God is taken for "obedience." The "inoffensiveness of the weak man," or "cowardice," as Nietzsche names it, is softened but words such as "patience" are passed as virtue, and some men's inability for revenge is transformed into "forgiveness" (*Genealogy* 47). Not all these changes of terminology masquerade the truth for Nietzsche, which is that the strong can be made weak; neither can the weak be made strong by ideologies such as the Christian. Christianity, he says, stands as a remarkable

example of "how ideals are made on earth" (46), how they are fabricated. He claims the same goes for both concepts of good and evil.

Morality and religion are fabricated and contradict men's nature. Appealing to ideas of reality, Nietzsche proposes that these cultural ideologies are "purely fictitious" and have no bearing on actuality. Concepts such as God, soul, ego, spirit, and free will, as well as sin, salvation, grace, punishment, and forgiveness of sins are imaginary and go against the reality that is men's nature (*Antichrist* 31). Nature is real in the sense that it is not a result of creation or invention. According to him, morality and religion falsify, cheapen, and deny nature. Hence, the evil denomination attributed to nature. "Once the concept of 'nature' had been opposed to the concept of 'God,' the word 'natural' necessarily took on the meaning of 'abominable' – the whole of that fictitious world has its sources in hatred of the natural (– the real! –)" (31). The instinctive and impulsive characteristics that constitute human nature acquired the sense of vice. Acting amorally, that is, naturally, becomes evil from a Christian moral perspective.

Nietzsche believes that every man has an innocent side, that of the beast of prey. This beast of prey must occasionally be freed in order to compensate for the repression that culture and morality cause. He remarks, "once they ['the good men'] go outside, where *Strange*, *Strange*r is found, they are not much better than uncaged beasts of prey" (*Genealogy* 40). He compares the other personality that is manifested to a creature, a non-human entity. He proceeds: "they savour a freedom from all social constraints," that is, they ignore the culture of morality; "they compensate themselves in the wilderness for the tension engendered by protracted confinement and enclosure within the peace of society" (40). This creature's actions represent liberation not only from social laws but also from the tension caused by repression; "they go back to the innocent conscience of the beast of prey, as triumphant monsters." This personality is equalled to that of a monster, which could not care less about moral bonds. "One cannot fail to see at the bottom of all these noble races the beast of prey, […] this hidden core needs to erupt from time to time, the animal has to get out again and

go back to the wilderness." This creature is described as an animal that must behave instinctively, per se, naturally. He claims that men have inherent to their nature this uncontained and reckless side that must be unleashed so that they vent their torments and channel the anger. Only by giving way to this beast of prey or this "blond beast" does this torment in a sense become bearable. These are the foundations for his concept of the *Übermensch.*

The *Übermensch* is an ideal man supposed to rise above morals and act on his own terms, regardless of laws. As Mora remarks, he is not a historical celebrity, a hero, nor a biologically superior man (747).The *Übermensch* is an ideal man and as such he leaves behind the notions of respect for duty and acts above any morals. As Nietzsche requires in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra,* "Overcome, you Higher Men, the petty virtues, the petty prudences, the sand-grain discretion, the ant-swarm inanity, miserable ease, the 'happiness of the greatest number'!" (298). Good actions are self-centred, uncontained, and carefree. For that reason, the *Übermensch*, or the Higher Man, is mistaken for an evil man. Nietzsche says, "Man must grow better and more 'evil' – thus do I teach. The most evil is necessary for the Superman's best" (*Zarathustra* 299). He points out that what the common man qualifies as evil is actually good in the *Übermensch* reality.

Hyde typifies the *Übermensch*: monstrous, amoral, and strong. The first element refers to his monstrous image. A friend of Mr. Utterson's, Mr. Enfield, telling him about the episode with the girl who was trampled by Hyde, describes him: "There is something wrong with his appearance; something displeasing, something downright detestable […] He must be deformed somewhere; he gives a strong feeling of deformity, although I couldn't specify the point" (11). Hyde is presented as animal-like, a frightening creature. Indeed, the slight suggestions of character but mostly physical deformity at the time were enough to cause great impact in the imaginary of Stevenson's readers, according to Linehan. She notes (as aforementioned) that they might have raised associations such as the "Christian lore about the Devil, said to be cunning in his concealment of his bestialized horns, tail or cleft foot when he appeared in human form; […] neo-Darwinist theories interpreting animal-like features in

humans as signs of grotesque criminality or under-evolution" (11). The beastly shape that Hyde's body conceals also resembles Nietzsche's image of the best of prey, *Strange* monster he claims to live inside human beings imprisoned by social rules and practices. This association is reinforced by a second element in Hyde's personality, or to be more precise, his actions.

The second element that characterizes the *Übermensch* is acting naturally. In this case, acting naturally does not mean following a habit or doing as usual, but rather following one's own nature. Instead of following reason the way the reputable Dr. Jekyll does, Hyde lets out his nature, instincts, or impulses. This is suggested in the letter Jekyll addresses to his friend Lanyon, asking him a favour, and saying that if he fails to do it, that will be the shipwreck of his reason. Reason here is endangered because Hyde, the natural side, is taking over Jekyll. Jekyll confesses what Hyde embodies. From the memories of his transformations and experiences through which he, as Hyde, undergoes, he concludes that to be Jekyll "was to die to those appetites which I had long secretly indulged" (55). These appetites amount to bodily pleasures. Hyde cannot be dissociated from the earthly and mundane. Purely material, all that appeals to the flesh and to the senses characterize Hyde. He lives under nature's command and is devoid of unnatural qualities such as spirit or morals.

Hyde acts amorally and regardless of laws. Similarly to Nietzschean *Übermensch*, Hyde behaves as if an innocent creature, showing no knowledge or care for rules and the consequences that breaking them may bring. The case of Sir Danvers Carew shows Hyde following his impulses and beating a man to death gratuitously: "[Hyde] clubbed him [Carew] to the earth, […] with ape-like fury, he was trampling his victim under foot, and hailing down a storm of blows, under which the bones were audibly shattered and the body jumped upon the roadway" (22). He has no reason to kill but still he goes on merciless as a reckless murderer. These strong impulses that cause him to act on his will with no respect for laws have to do with another element that constitutes the notion of the *Übermensch*: power.

Power or strength is the ultimate element that defines the *Übermensch*. It characterizes him, according to Nietzsche, and is related to a sense of control over others and a sense freedom from any kind of moral imposition. In a passage where Utterson is about to find out the secret Jekyll hides in a letter by Lanyon, Hyde says, "If you [Lanyon] shall prefer a new province of knowledge and new avenues to fame and power shall be laid open to you, here, in this room, upon the instant; and your sight shall be blasted by a prodigy to stagger the unbelief of Satan" (46). The "will to power," as Nietzsche writes, motivates the character's actions. In this sense, Hyde is the personification of the overman because he enjoys power as a strong and good creature.

Although Hyde is depicted as an evil creature in the story, he can be understood as a good man in Nietzschean terms. Good is not connected to justice or pity in the philosopher's view. Contrary to what some may argue, good is relative to being powerful and strong, to being superior, or above the laws as Hyde is. Moreover, it is not even a question of being, because for Nietzsche there is no being, but only doing: "popular morality also separates strength from expressions of strength, as if there were a neutral substratum behind the strong man, which was free to express strength or not to do so. But there is no such substratum; there is no 'being' behind doing, […] the deed is everything" (*Genealogy* 45). Actions, then, define a man. Thus, Hyde's actions define him as good in Nietzschean terms. He incorporates the three main elements that identify the ideal man Nietzsche creates, namely, the monstrous appeal, the amoral behaviour, and the urge for power. In those three elements, Hyde can be said to resemble the *Übermensch*.

A rather extreme individualistic idea hides behind the concept of the *Übermensch*. As aforementioned, the *Übermensch* is idiosyncratically self-centred and his relationship with the other is that of indifference. He concentrates on the self, unlike what Kant dictates in the categorical imperative that teaches selflessness and collectivism. This individualistic trace is evident in Hyde. The narrator says, "Jekyll had more than a father's interest," whereas "Hyde had more than a son's indifference" (55). Jekyll is portrayed as someone who has company, a

sociable figure as he preferred [to be] the elderly and the discontented doctor, surrounded by friends" (55). However, Hyde is friendless and most often despised by those who see him, as Jekyll observes. This individualism is built on the image of a man who isolates himself and keeps no unnecessary connections.

Other parallels with Kant can be drawn in the debate of moral and amoral actions. Nietzsche attacks Kant by claiming that morality is destructive rather than protective. The selflessness and collectivism Kant defends does not preserve men. On the contrary, it endangers life: "What destroys a man more quickly than to work, think and feel without inner necessity, without any deep personal desire, without pleasure – as a mere automaton of duty? That is the recipe for *decadence,* and no less for idiocy" (*Antichrist* 28). Nietzsche points out how Kant empties the idea of the self, the person, the man, in favour of social homogeneity, equality, and universality. Nietzsche says that this impersonation can only make unattainable the concepts Kant refers to, namely "virtue," "duty," and "good for its own"; "goodness grounded upon impersonality or a notion of universal validity – these are all chimeras, and in them one finds only an expression of the decay, the last collapse of life […] Quite the contrary is demanded [. . .] that every man find his *own* virtue, his *own* categorical imperative" (28). Nietzsche believes that the self, for its own sake, must protect itself and lead its own life so that goodness, as he understands it, becomes real and possible, not only a dream.

This conflict permeates Jekyll and Hyde's existence. Jekyll's commitment to duty and the others around him is often counterbalanced by Hyde's commitment to his nature and himself. While the first attempts to cling to this moral bonds that turn men into equals, the latter carelessly overlooks them to indulge in egoistic deeds. Consequently, one loses reference to understand vices and virtues, good and evil; one either has society as a whole to judge one's actions or the self to do so; one departs from either morality or nature to assess one's actions. As the story suggests with the supposed death of Henry Jekyll, the self's point of reference, the natural is established more strongly, gaining more attention and acceptability.

Although Nietzsche seems thoroughly coherent, he presents a contradictory view of men. While he claims that there is no essence to a strong man, no being behind the deed, he introduces a determinist perspective to discuss men and their relation with power. "Mankind surely does *not* represent an evolution toward a better or stronger or higher level, as progress is now understood. This 'progress' is merely a modern idea, which is to say, a false idea [. . .] the process of evolution does *not* necessarily mean elevation, enhancement, strengthening" (23). He believes that the strong man or the higher man appears by accident when uncovered by the heavy layers of the Christian religious ideology. One is born strong or weak and there is no becoming. As he says, "[W]e weak ones are, after all, weak; it would be good if we did nothing for which we are not strong enough" (*Genealogy* 46). Men cannot choose to be strong and therefore powerful. He explains that life appears to man "as an instinct of growth, for survival, for the accumulation of forces, for power" (*Antichrist* 24). Recalling Darwin's theory of evolution and natural selection, Nietzsche argues that men cannot deny their instinct to self-preservation by having moral values govern their lives.

5. Evolutionist Views on Evil

The theory of evolution renders interpretations of the principles of natural selection in the literary field that add to the view of good and evil in *Jekyll and Hyde*. Patricia Cohen remarks in an article for the *New York Times*, "Darwin's scientific theories about the evolution of species can be applied to today's patterns of human behaviour" She analyses the influence of Darwinism in a political sphere, pointing out how it is used to by conservative thinkers. She quotes Karl Marx, who wrote that "Darwin's book is very important and serves me as a basis in natural science for the class struggle in history." Darwinism crosses the boundaries of biology and the natural sciences to enter political and economical grounds.

The significance of the theory of evolution is noticeable in other fields of study such as sociology and philosophy. Herbert Spencer, for instance, was one of the authors that initiated this practice by introducing the analogous "social evolution." He explained that members of a group occupy powerful positions in stratified society because they are more fit than others. They fill the requirements of their rank in a social hierarchy. In this case, poverty and social inequality are justified in evolutionary terms by lack of adjustment or appropriate characteristics. Francis Galton promoted the eugenic social philosophy that supports the improvement of hereditary characteristics through selective breeding. According to him, superior or fit members of society instead of inferior and unfit should be used to enhance human constitution. The social implications of this line of thought include racism and segregation.

Darwin's *Origin of Species* consolidates the principles of natural selection, which are extended to apply to human beings in *The Descent of Men*. The theory of evolution based on these principles affected the way Victorians understood men's origin, their relationship with each other and with their environment. It interfered in traditional views and shook long-standing beliefs mainly attached to religion, touching upon the question of moral actions and natural behaviour. Darwinism has been retaken as a parameter for criticism in other fields of knowledge. Likewise, it can be used as a parameter in literature, especially in *Jekyll and Hyde*.

In an approach that brings together literature and Darwinism, the key elements of the theory of evolution can be juxtaposed to the analysis of the Jekyll-Hyde character in order to expand it on a more socio-philosophical level.[11]

Evolution is based on the principles of natural selection. The term evolution derives from the Latin word *evolvere* and literally means to roll out, roll open, or unfold. In the Darwinian view, evolution refers to stages of development that all species go through. It defines the process of transformation that plants and animals endure every generation, moving them from lower and simpler biological systems to higher and more complex ones. It describes the natural advancements taking place in organisms, which increases their fitness for survival. According to Darwin, this process is essentially fortuitous.

Evolution is based on chance. This aspect must be clear so that one can understand in which way the environment participates in the process and avoid the Lamarckian belief that the environment actually changes organisms. Darwin postulated that the individual of any given species will adapt or not to the situations found in the environment. The environment in turn has no direct interference in the inheritance of their biological make up, that is, it does not modify structures in animals and plants to make them more adjusted. Simply, those less fit to survive are slowly but inexorably replaced by those more better- adapted.

Evolution implies that these characteristics are not simply given, but attained by struggle and competition amongst other living creatures. "As more individuals are born than can possibly survive, there must in every case be a struggle for existence, either one individual with another of the same species, or with the individuals of distinct species, or with the physical conditions of life" (Darwin 50). Self-preservation depends on the ability to compete for survival.

The evolution of a species is considered not only on its own, but in relation to others. Darwin discusses evolution from a collective standpoint that takes into account species living together in community instead of individually. This accounts for the way one should

[11] For more information on Darwin and literature, refer to Joseph Carroll's *Literary Darwinism.*

analyse a case from an evolutionary standpoint. It tells one not to overlook the aspects that only a collective perspective allows one to see. These aspects are relative to understanding creatures and men, not in isolation, but in the relationship established between themselves and their surroundings.

Three main criteria can be observed in the evolutionary process. The first describes a struggle for survival, and the attempt to guarantee the preservation and continuity of legacy. The second entails men's adaptation to the environment and the capacity to adjust to their surroundings. Finally, the third comprises the development towards more complex biological structures; the passage from lower to higher forms. Darwin reiterates that not only natural features are passed on every generation, but also the ability to use moral faculties.

These criteria can be used to analyze the Jekyll-Hyde character on a social level. Jekyll then would be a figure struggling for survival. He can be seen as someone who does not adapt to his environment. Belonging to a high rank in the social hierarchy, he fails to comply with the obligations ascribed to someone in such position: impeccable moral conduct and flawless character. He is part of a group, the noble and supposedly decent citizens, that imposes on him a highly strict ethical posture. Although he strives to maintain such posture for the sake of status and merit, he fails. His public life elicits his compatibility with a morally geared up environment. However, his private life dramatically contrasts his public one. Jekyll's preference for his private life endorses his inability to cope with his surroundings, background, and rank.

Although Jekyll apparently survives, he strives to keep his other side, Hyde, from perishing. Before he suspects losing control of his experiments, he is careful enough to ensure his continuing existence through Hyde by means of a will. Although he initially does not make it clear that Hyde and him are the same person, he makes sure that if anything goes wrong in the course of events, Hyde will be endowed with economic conditions to support himself. Hyde "should step into the said Henry Jekyll's shoes without further delay and free from any burden or obligation" (13). His efforts are towards continuity. Later, when he is

sure of his end but unsure of his existence as Hyde, he restates his case justifying the terms in the will. By explaining what he had previously kept from Utterson, he expects to persuade his friend to execute his requests out of sympathy. In this way, he convinces himself that Hyde will continue to exist. Jekyll's testament is compelling evidence of his attempt to survive.

The last Darwinian criterion refers to Jekyll's development. Instead of reaching a more complex level of social life, Jekyll degenerates. He undergoes a process of involution that unravels his most animal-like characteristics in the figure of Hyde. These animalistic characteristics can be seen both physically and psychologically. While Hyde victimizes the child, his fury is referred to as "ape-like" (22). Like the narrator, Poole has the impression that Hyde looks like a monkey by the way he jumps and makes noises in the laboratory (37-38). Hyde is often framed as a raging beast trapped inside Jekyll (61). These characteristics are usually referred to as a sign of lower life forms and primitiveness, given their irrational and sensorial peculiarities. Being Hyde means to regress from complexity and fitness. Hyde is shown as unfit, inept, and ineligible for life in society.

A socio-evolutionist view of *Jekyll and Hyde* generates a circumstantial understanding of what Kant and Nietzsche proposed as good and evil. From such perspective, good and evil lose their moral meanings and turn into better or worse adaptation to the environment. Good actions can be correlated with the environmental adaptive effort, according to which a person (in fact, any living being) is better if he adjusts to his milieu. A person is worse off if he is unfit for the environment. Jekyll then would be seen as struggling for survival in his attempt to escape the stifling stricture of his social environment, whereas Hyde would be seen as a rugged individual, ill adapted to existence in society and more fit for survival in wild nature.

This view slightly redirects the focus of attention from reason and nature as the sources of good and evil to include the importance of the environment. Although it does not exclude either reason, reflected by morality and laws, or nature, codified in one's genes, from being determinant, it attributes to the environment a fundamental part in the motivation of

human actions. This view makes one's actions dependent less on reason or nature and more on the circumstances leading to an action.

The environment becomes as important a parameter as nature and reason in influencing human behaviour. Once the conflict of nature and reason cannot be denied nor can their coexistence, the environment presents itself as a compelling force in the configuration of good and evil actions. A sense of causality lies outside the individual. The conditions to which one is submitted lead one to take a course of action. These conditions, whether they are right or wrong, influence one to do good or evil.

This approach seems coherent inasmuch as it does not consider the environment as the only influence on human actions. Otherwise, it would justify the atrocities committed by "good" men and excuse them from their moral responsibilities. Men would simply be victims of an oppressive and hostile context that forces them to act offhandedly and wrongly. They would merely react to an unfriendly setting, indifferent to the consequences of their actions. Thus, attributing solely to the environment the cause of one's actions is to corroborate the view that men cannot be blamed for their acts. This mistake stems from a view that allows one to think of good and evil as purely circumstantial.

Although modern thinkers, who also draw from Darwin's ideas, return to the role of nature in determining good and evil actions, they introduce novel apparatuses for critical thinking. The biologist and naturalist Lyall Watson puts forward a natural history of good and evil without the filter of religion and moral philosophy. Unlike Nietzsche's approach in *On the Genealogy of Morals*, he explains the topic based on the tenets of evolutionary biology, anthropology, and psychology. Watson says that understanding evil from a cultural view does not grasp its real character, although in fiction Robert Louis Stevenson comes close to it (xi). His studies concentrate on the analysis of the gene.

Watson claims that what people term evil is in fact biological. To ascribe evil to nature is still a current practice and Watson is not alone in this line of thought. Roy W. Perret also attributes evil to human nature, "a character-based notion" (305). He believes that evil

actions stem from a corrupt natural disposition and a flawed personality. Watson claims that from a natural perspective, good and evil do not exist except to the eyes of culture. He says that if good does exist, it cannot be natural. Nature can only be evil as a rule of thumb, because genes can only be selfish.[12]

Watson uses genes as a metaphor to explain natural behaviour. Following the steps of the evolutionary biologists Richard Dawkins, William Donald Hamilton, and Edward Osborne Wilson, he describes genes as structures present in every complex living creature. He uses the term gene for all the imperative instinctive forces of an individual to explain human natural behaviour as selfish (*Dark* 57). He affirms that the gene is devoid of direction and intelligence, and selfishness is the main characteristic that makes evil possible from a cultural perspective. "Genes are simple-minded and mean-spirited. They have no vision and cannot be expected to have the welfare of the whole species at heart [. . .] Generosity and unselfishness are not part of biological nature. Where such things exist, they have had to be learnt or cultured by working against the trend. The sad fact is that we are born selfish" (54). Watson believes that genes leave no room for altruism, which can only be unnatural. He shows that, from a natural perspective, the gene can only act in ways that it can benefit in order to survive. Selfishness is the gene's sole character and guiding force. Watson supports his claim based on the study of animal behaviour, which shows selfishness according to three basic genetic rules.

The first rule is "be nasty to outsiders." According to this principle, a gene behaves in such a way to benefit from the action of others that have no kinship to them, which are total strangers to them, that is, that are out of their gene pool. Watson illustrates this point by telling how non-related penguins act when they feel threatened. On their way to the sea full of leopard seals, which are their major predators, some penguins make way for more anxious penguins to take the plunge into the water. They do it as if out of politeness, when in fact all they want is to check the risk of becoming prey. These penguins make guinea pigs out of

[12] The theory of the selfish gene is expounded in Richard Dawkins's *The Selfish Gene*.

others in order to preserve themselves. From a cultural viewpoint, this behaviour is an example of cowardice and selfishness. Had any of the penguins been related, the story might have been otherwise.

The second principle is "be nice to insiders." Being kind to strangers seems unnatural, and it means wasted energy and unnecessary risk, according to Watson. Nonetheless, being kind or "nice" to insiders makes biological sense, although "nice" may not be the most appropriate word to describe this attitude. Genes do not worry about anything except how well their gene pool is represented; they worry about preserving and strengthening their own biological inheritance. Thus, they do not protect a brother for the sake of kindness or because they are nice. Rather genes protect a brother because otherwise half of their representatives are dismissed if the brother dies. Genes only start to murder their own family if there is a higher gain.

The third principle is "cheat whenever possible." Watson outlines that genes will do anything possible to benefit from a situation regardless of the other. Studying wild hyenas in Kenya, Laurence Frank found the reason for the fatal fight between siblings. Female hyenas play the dominant role in their social life and they usually have twins. If one of the siblings is a female, the fight is justified because it means that this female winner will eliminate the competition and will be the top ranked hyena in a group, being able to spread its gene pool more effectively. However, if the sibling is male, he is spared as he is not in direct competition to the female sibling. Any gene, Frank says, will take advantage of another less cautious gene if he is given the chance: "No chick, no pup, no body ever passes up an opportunity to deceive. They pretend to be younger, hungrier, and more at risk than they really are in the hope of getting more time, more food, or more attention" (65). No one escapes the talent to lie; deceit and pretence are key words for the third principle. Another compelling evidence that cheating occurs more often than one imagines is camouflage. Watson claims that camouflage can be defined as "the communication of misinformation" (70). He also points out that "no system of communication in any species is designed to convey the truth, the whole

truth and nothing but the truth" (72). From such a lawful perspective, this particular flair for deception or even the ability to hide reveals itself as a form of cheating.

Hyde is the embodiment of Jekyll's nature. Hyde is moved by selfishness and individualism, which is illustrated in the way he is always callous with others, much like how genes behave in order to survive. In a natural world, his conduct is not out of place but in a cultural setting, it acquires the main characteristic that seems to define evil actions. Neither altruism nor social attachment concern Hyde at any time; he shows no sign of guilt or remorse because such feelings do not belong to the natural realm.

Overall, the theory of evolution applied to *Jekyll and Hyde* amplifies one of the ways good and evil can be understood in literature. It shows the relevance that the environment acquires in imposing on men certain types of conduct that at times are considered good and at other times are classed evil. Nonetheless, to think that this environment exists independently as an external reality imposing its own terms on men would make matters too simple. The environment must be considered, along with nature and reason, that is, genetic and cultural codes, to assess men's actions as good or evil.

6. Conclusion

Although Stevenson does not present a solution to the case of Jekyll and Hyde, he puts at issue the problem of good and evil actions in ways that go beyond the apparent contradistinctions found in the text. Outstripping the noticeable dichotomies that riddle the story, such as those of nature and reason, God and Devil or human and animal, he allows one to make a substantial analysis of human behaviour, posing questions on how good and evil are discriminated. These questions bring out elements that make up for a more comprehensive outlook of the topic.

Stevenson's use of the double permits a confrontation of Kantian and Nietzschean formulations on morality. The approximation of the categorical imperative to Jekyll is hindered by his ambiguity and his incoherence, possibly suggesting the corrosion of premises that supported the morality proposed by Kant, or else, a resistance to their application in an extreme way. These premises are that morality must be rational and that, as such, they must be the same for all rational beings independent of circumstances and conditions, as Alasdair MacIntyre puts it. Such emphasis on reason becomes an obstacle to Jekyll since he cannot epitomize pure reason.

The approximation of the second formulation to Hyde is less of an obstacle due to the similarities found between the *Übermensch* and Hyde. However, the assumptions imbued with Nietzsche's *Übermensch* are not shown as an alternative to a Kantian moral philosophy but rather as an effect of the boundless effort to privilege reason. They are presented as the spoils of an over-rationalizing tendency in society; they are introduced as a reaction to the abandoning of nature; they are rescued in a radical attempt to give human nature the attention it had lost. Hence, the monstrosity imputed to Hyde.

Nietzsche's acute focus on human nature allows an approach to Darwin's theory of evolution, although Nietzsche does not discuss nature in biological terms as Darwin does. In Kant and Nietzsche, there is the idea that morality comes from the individual. In Kant, this

morality will privilege the collectivity, whereas in Nietzsche, it will focus on the self. In both cases, the source of moral actions is internal and independent from external elements. In Darwin, external factors are taken into account.

From an evolutionary viewpoint, Darwin offers an understanding of society that puts chance and the environment as key elements because they also determine human actions. The social boundaries and moral values within a society do not always originate from every individual. As much as individuals define them, they also define individuals. These social boundaries and moral values are also inherited by and enforced on men. They are often imposed by the law and other cultural institutions in ways that determine human actions, in ways that encourage some types of actions and halt others; in ways that stimulate the use of reason and reduce the role of nature so that life in a community becomes possible. Thus, social development makes evolutionary sense.

Based on these analyses, three propositions can be used to assess good and evil actions. The first, based on Kant, entails the emphasis on reason as the foundation of an absolute morality, which has freedom and collectivity as its main tenets. Morality's ultimate goal is true satisfaction. Within this view, altruism becomes the parameter from which to evaluate human actions, rendering them as good if they represent selflessness and evil if they convey the opposite. Nature is set aside.

The second proposition, predicated by Nietzsche, puts nature in the place of importance that reason occupied. It dismisses morality and the way it is understood by Kant to focus on nature and the self. It privileges individualism and freedom from rules, making power the sole criterion against which human actions are measured. Good actions turn out to be those that engender one's nature whereas evil actions become those that demur nature.

The third proposition includes an element that does not exempt reason and nature from determining human behaviour but accentuates the role of the environment in shaping it. Rooted in Darwin, these notions take into account the forces that compel individuals to adapt to their surroundings in a natural process that will allow life in society to continue.

Therefore, good actions differ from evil ones according to the extent they lead an individual to adjust to his environment.

Lyall Watson offers a modern approach to good and evil that distinguishes a cultural from a natural perspective, claiming that if actions based on nature must be categorized by culture in those terms, they will be classed as evil because nature can only be selfish. By contrast, his view endorses the part reason plays in making life in society possible through the creation of a set of morals that is shared by men. According to MacIntyre, "the goods, and with them the only grounds for authority of laws and virtues, can only be discovered by entering into those relationships which constitute communities whose central bond is a shared vision of an understanding of goods" (258). Good actions become attainable only when a group shares them. Otherwise, if they were personal as Nietzsche attempts to make them in the *Übermensch*, the assessment of human actions would turn out to be a matter of perspective. "[T]o isolate oneself from the communities," MacIntyre states, is "to debar oneself from finding any good outside of oneself. [It is] to condemn oneself to that moral solipsism which constitutes Nietzschean greatness" (258). In this case, good actions can only be judged against individual criteria, having no external reference. Therefore, a shared morality must exist that provides the external reference with which actions may be evaluated.

MacIntyre also criticizes Kant for proposing a notion of duty in the categorical imperative that does not consider the consequences of one's actions. MacIntyre believes that the notion of duty Kant proposes suggests that "given a proposed course of action, [one] may only ask whether, in doing it, one can consistently will that it shall be universally done, and not ask what ends or purposes it serves" (198). This line of thought only leads to conformism to authority because this type of behaviour does not question the law or tries to understand why the law requires such and such. He thinks that Kant fails in attempting to prove that duty is independent from circumstances. Thus, Kantian and Nietzschean perspectives do not succeed in presenting an encompassing set of criteria to evaluate human actions by

themselves because the role of circumstance is neglected. Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde* allows a close analysis of these criteria and shows positive and negative aspects of Victorian morality.

Overall, on the positive side is morality's power to make life in society possible by means of rules. Men can live socially only when they are limited by laws that keep them from harming each other and that bond them together. On the negative side, Stevenson observes how the strict application of extreme rules of behaviour eventually fails. Within the highly moral standards Jekyll must live, there is no space for the expression of nature or no mechanism that allows room for its manifestation. Jekyll cannot cope with the demanding environment he finds himself in. Stevenson depicts reason and nature as inseparable with Jekyll's failure attempt to purify himself from his nature. Men cannot bear the burden of total control. Since reason and nature coexist, nature must occasionally be granted safe leave. Society must create mechanisms through which this unmediated side of men can be purged from time to time so that a balance is found. It is on the balance of these conflicting parts in men that morality should rest.

Further research could investigate authors that take into account other parameters to define good and evil actions and apply them to *Jekyll and Hyde* and other literary pieces. Future works could not only explore how the representation of this topic has changed in literature after Stevenson, revealing literary goods and evils, but also lay bare the underlying structure on which the concepts of good and evil are built and sustained.

7. Works Cited

Abrams, M. H. et al., eds. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. London: Norton, 1986.

Ambrosini, Richard & Richard Dury, eds. *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries*. Madison: The U of Wisconsin P, 2006.

Augustine. *The City of God*. Trans. Henry Bettenson. London: Penguin, 1984.

Calder, Jenni. Literary Contexts: Doubles, Devils and Monsters. Stevenson 126 -128.

Carroll, Joseph. *Literary Darwinism: Evolution, Human Nature and Literature*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Carroll, Noël. *The Philosophy of Horror or Paradoxes of the Heart*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome, ed. *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996.

Cohen, Patricia. "A Split Emerges as Conservatives Discuss Darwin." *The New York Times*. 5 May 2007. 6 May 2007. <www.nytimes.com/2007/05/05/us/politics/05darwin.html>

Christ, Carol, ed. *The Victorian Age*. New York: Norton, 1999. Vol. 2B of *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 7th ed. 2 vols. 1043-1896.

Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. 6th ed. London: John Murray, 1872.

Dawkins, Richard. *The Selfish Gene*. New York: Oxford UP, 2006.

Dryden, Linda . *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004.

Dury, Richard. "Critical Reception". *The Robert Louis Stevenson Website*. 30 Abr. 2007 <dinamico.unibg.it/rls/critrec.htm>

Fielder, Leslie. *Freaks: Myths and Images of the Secret Self*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978.

Freud, Sigmund. "The Uncanny." *Literary Theory: an Anthology*. Ed. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan. Malden: Blackwell, 1998. 154-67.

Gilmore, David D. *Monsters: Evil Beings Mythical Beasts, and All Manners of Imaginary Terrors*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2003.

Gould, Stephen Jay. "Post Darwinian Theories of the Ape within." Stevenson 132-34.

Halberstam, Judith. "An Introduction to Gothic Monstrosity." Stevenson 128-31.

Jeha, Julio. "Evil and Suffering in Auster, DeLillo, Doctorow and Vonnegut." www.juliojeha.pro.br. 6 Mar. 2003 Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. 7 Aug. 2005. <www.juliojeha.pro.br/research_pgs/evil/evil_00201.htm >

Kant, Immanuel. *Practical Philosophy*. Ed. and trans. Mary J. Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Kearney, Richard. *Strangers, Gods and Monsters: Interpreting Otherness*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Kreuter, Peter Mario, ed. *Monsters and the Monstrous: Myths and Metaphors of Enduring Evil*. Oxford, UK: Interdisciplinary-Press, 2004. 215-29.

Landow, George P. *The Victorian Web*. 20 Nov. 2006 <www.victorianweb.org>

Larrimore, Mark, ed. *The Problem of Evil: A Reader*. Padstow: Blackwell, 2001.

Linehan, Katherine. Preface. Stevenson xi–xv.

MacIntyre, Alsdair. *A Short History of Ethics: A History of Moral Philosophy from the Homeric Age to the Twentieth Century*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

---. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Indiana: U of Notre Dame P, 1984.

Massey, Irving. *The Gaping Pig: Literature and Metamorphosis*. Berkley: U of California P, 1976.

Mill, John Stuart. "Utilitarianism." *On Liberty and Utilitarianism*. New York: Knopf, 1992. 113-72. (Everyman's Library 81)

Miller, Karl. *Doubles: Studies in Literary History*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985.

Mora, José Ferrater. *Dicionário de Filosofia*. Trans. Maria Stela Gonçalves et al. São Paulo: Loyola, 2001.

Neiman, Susan. *Evil in Modern Thought: An Alternative History of Philosophy*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2002. 203-335.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Trans. R. J. Hollingdale. London: Penguin, 1990.

---. *The Birth of Tragedy*. 1871. Trans. Ian Johnstone. June 2003. Malaspina University College. 7 Aug. 2006. <www.mala.bc.ca/~Johnstoi/Nietzsche/tragedy_all.htm>

---. *Genealogy of Morals*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage, 1989.

---. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. London: Penguin, 2003.

---. *The Anti-Christ*. Trans. H. L. Mencken. Tucson: See Sharp Press, 1999.

Perret, Roy W. "Evil and Human Nature." *The Monist* 85.2 (2002): 304-19.

Rank, Otto. "The Double as Immortal Self.". *Beyond Psychology*. Philadelphia: E. Hauser, 1941. New York: Dover, 1958. 62-101.

Reid, Julia. "Stevenson, Romance, and Evolutionary Psychology." Ambrosini & Dury 215-27.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *The Coherence of Gothic Conventions*. New York: Routledge, 1986.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. 1886 .Ed. Katherine Linehan. New York: Norton, 2002.

Turnbull, Olena M. "Robert Louis Stevenson and Nineteenth-Century Theories of Evolution: Crossing the Boundaries between Ideas and Art." Ambrosini & Dury 228-36.

Walkowitz, Judith R. and Walter Houghton. "Sociohistorical Contexts: Political Disnudity and Moral Conformity." Stevenson 141-49.

Watson, Lyall. *Dark Nature: A Natural History of Evil*. New York: Harper Collins, 1997.

Wolfe. Charles T. *Monsters and Philosophy*. London: College Publications, 2005.

Wynne-Davies, Marion, ed. *The Bloomsbury Guide to English Literature*. London: Prentice Hall, 1990.