

Journal of
Stevenson Studies
Volume 3

Editors

Dr Linda Dryden
 Reader in Cultural Studies
 Faculty of Arts and Social
 Sciences
 Craighouse
 Napier University
 Edinburgh
 EH10 5LG
 Scotland
 Tel: 0131 455 6128
 Email: l.dryden@napier.ac.uk

Professor Roderick Watson
 English Studies
 University of Stirling
 Stirling
 FK9 4LA
 Scotland

Tel: 01786 467500
 Email: r.b.watson@stir.ac.uk

Contributions are warmly invited and should be sent to either of the editors listed above. The text should be submitted in MS WORD files in MHRA format. All contributions are subject to review by members of the Editorial Board.

Published by
 The Centre for Scottish Studies
 University of Stirling

© The contributors 2006

ISSN: 1744-3857
 Printed and bound in the UK by
 Antony Rowe Ltd.
 Chippenhan, Wiltshire.

Editorial Board

Professor Richard Ambrosini
Universita' di Roma Tre
Rome

Professor Stephen Arata
School of English
University of Virginia

Professor Oliver Buckton
School of English
Florida Atlantic University

Dr Jenni Calder
National Museum of Scotland

Dr Linda Dryden
Faculty of Arts and Social
Science
Napier University

Professor Richard Dury
University of Bergamo
(Consultant Editor)

Professor Gordon Hirsch
Department of English
University of Minnesota

Professor Katherine Linehan
Department of English
Oberlin College
Ohio

Professor Barry Menikoff
Department of English
University of Hawaii at
Manoa

Professor Glenda Norquay
Department of English and
Cultural History
Liverpool John Moores
University

Professor Marshall Walker
Department of English
The University of Waikato

Professor Roderick Watson
Department of English
Studies
University of Stirling

Contents

Editorial	1
Jim C Wilson	
RLS.....	4
Katherine Linehan	
The devil can cite scripture: intertextual hauntings in <i>Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde</i>	5
Isaac Yue	
Metaphors and the discourse of the late-Victorian divided self: the cultural implications of <i>Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde</i> and its Chinese translations	33
Wendy R. Katz	
Stevenson, Conrad and the idea of the gentleman: Long John Silver and Gentleman Brown	51
Laavanyan Ratnapalan	
Stevenson and cultural survivals in the South Seas	69
Saverio Tomaiuolo	
Under Mackellar's eyes: metanarrative strategies in <i>The Master of Ballantrae</i>	85
Roger Swearingen	
Stevenson's final text of <i>Kidnapped</i>	111
Giuseppe Albano	
'Stand sicker in oor auncient ways': Stevenson's Scots drinking verse and the fulfilment of a pastoral fantasy	116
Benjamin A. Brabon	
Richard Ambrosini and Richard Dury (eds), <i>Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries</i>	136
Richard Dury	
Renata Kobetts Miller, <i>Recent Reinterpretations of Stevenson's Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde Why and How This Novel Continues to Affect Us</i>	141

Editorial

This issue is released after the fourth international Stevenson conference at Saranac Lake. ‘Transatlantic Stevenson’ was a great success, and we are sure that we speak for everyone who was there in thanking Ann Colley and Martin Danahay who planned and organised the event. The local community —proud of the Stevenson cottage— took an active part in the social aspects of the conference in a way that may be difficult to match at any other venue. The next number of the *Journal of Stevenson Studies* will be a special issue based on papers from the Saranac conference, guest edited by Professors Colley and Danahay, while this present number contains a review of Robert *Louis Stevenson, Writer of Boundaries*, edited by Richard Ambrosini and Richard Dury, based on papers from the third Stevenson conference at Gargano in 2002. Clearly these biennial conferences are doing much to bring Stevenson into contemporary contexts and new critical debates. And from the contributors to this issue of the *Journal*, it is equally clear that we are providing a forum for informed discussion and analysis of Stevenson’s work by academics from a wide range of disciplines and countries.

In this issue, Katherine Linehan pursues several fascinatingly intertextual hauntings in *Jekyll and Hyde* and the critical and practical questions these raise for an editor, while Isaac Yue ponders hauntings of another kind in reflecting on some of the cultural echoes that have proved so elusive for Chinese translators of Stevenson’s best-known novel. Richard Dury’s essay in *JSS2* (‘Strange Language of *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*’) showed how Stevenson’s English prose style depends on finely nuanced and ever so slightly disruptive variations on what might be assumed to be normative expression and familiar English idiom, and such ‘strangeness’ must make any translator’s difficult job still more taxing. A similar complexity —along structural and narratological lines— is the focus of Saverio Tomaiuolo’s essay

on ‘metanarrative strategies’ in *The Master of Ballantrae*, in which he identifies a struggle for textual mastery by which ‘page after page of the novel will deal with the *process* of narration – as a permanent revision of pre-inscribed texts.’

Laavanyan Ratnapalan brings a specifically anthropological context to Stevenson’s South Seas stories, arguing that ‘Stevenson approaches cultural phenomena from a standpoint of contradiction and doubt, where the appearance of these phenomena is itself regarded as paradoxical and presents a problem for the observer to take in.’ Wendy Katz’s essay on the ‘gentleman’ takes on the sociology of class and changing mid-Victorian mores as it is reflected and further complicated in the fiction of Stevenson and Conrad. It is a pleasant coincidence that Stevenson’s essay on ‘Gentlemen’ was one of the series that he wrote for *Scribner’s* while staying at Saranac Lake –in touch with a freer and more bracingly open American society. Giuseppe Albano’s article on Stevenson’s poetry concentrates on the drinking poems where he finds a curious mixture of bohemian swagger and an ambivalent pastoralism of longing, parody, retreat and return –the complex work of a man separated from the city about which he had such mixed feelings in his youth and the language of its streets.

The editors are now commissioning special essays for issue 5 of the *Journal* in 2008, which will focus on Stevenson’s legacy and his influence on later writers. A number of contemporary authors will contribute essays to this issue reflecting on how Stevenson influences their writing, or on the wider impact of Stevenson on the modern world of literature. These essays will be complemented by articles from leading scholars who will offer an assessment of Stevenson’s current reputation and the state of Stevenson studies in academe. In this way we hope that the *Journal* will make a significant contribution to the current revival of interest in Robert Louis Stevenson and his work.

We are grateful to Roger G. Swearingen for permission to reproduce his notes on the text of *Kidnapped* and to Jim C.

Wilson for permission to use his poem 'RLS'. Our thanks also go to Scott Russell who has designed this issue.

We hope you like the new cover for the Journal. It has been developed from one of the Studio portraits of RLS, made by W. Notman of New York, probably in September 1887.

Linda Dryden

Roderick Watson

RLS

The garden was unending to the child
but Mr Hyde was there behind each tree.
A high bright sun smiled down; the breeze was mild;
the garden was unending. To the child
the trees were masts. He sailed across the wild
South Seas until he reached his final quay.
His Eden seemed unending; he was beguiled;
and Mr Hyde was there, behind each tree.

Jim C Wilson

The devil can cite scripture: intertextual hauntings in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*¹

Katherine Linehan

Intertextual allusions typically operate as a ghostlike presence in the fiction of Robert Louis Stevenson. This deeply well-read author so strongly favored page-turning intensity over any show of erudition that he habitually left echoes of predecessor texts to be recognized—or not—through such trace effects as an association-laden proper name, a foreign phrase, a teasingly familiar-sounding turn of phrase, or a déjà vu sensation recalling an important scene in a well-known work.

I doubt that any work of Stevenson's, however, can match his most famous spook story, *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886), for suitability and subtlety of function involved in just such shadowiness of allusion. The haunting effects of intertextuality in this tale of mystery and horror depend upon a combination of, on the one hand, lightly disquieting surface atmospherics emanating from the elusiveness of intertextual echoes and, on the other, more deeply disquieting conceptual depths emanating from the implications of those echoes when tracked and considered.

The tracking and considering are not likely to be part of an ordinary reading experience. I came to a series of intriguing conjectures about the patterned implications of the tale's intertextual references only as a result of researching footnotes for my Norton Critical Edition of the text.² The marvel of the subtle patterning involved is all the greater in light of the fact that, as Stevenson himself reported it, the tale was composed in 'white-hot haste,' being 'conceived, written, rewritten, re-written and printed inside ten weeks' in the fall of 1885 (NCE, 84). My sup-

position in the argument which follows is that while Stevenson worked at top speed to produce a piece of sensation fiction geared to popular accessibility, he laid up an additional store of mind-teasing, shock-inducing reading pleasure through knowing his intertextual sources so intimately that he could draw on them with ease to create what amounts to a coded layer of signification for readers who share a knowledge of those sources. At his most masterful, he manages to refresh our sense of both source text and his own tale in the process.

As a basis for developing my case, let me explain more concretely what I have in mind when I propose that the tale uses intertextual echoes to promote a haunting sense of disturbance at the level of both surface atmosphere and conceptual depths.

At the surface level, by which I mean the tale as we absorb it in a fast-paced, sensation-oriented reading, phrases that are candidates for intertextual allusion tend to assimilate so inconspicuously to context that readers equipped to recognize the reference are liable to have their attention merely ruffled by a sense of familiarity. As it turns out, some uncertainties are not even fully resolvable through research. Beyond agreeing on the footnoting of a few concretely allusive noun clauses, annotators over the past few decades have varied in their speculations on possibilities for literary echoes ranging from classical literature and the Bible to Shakespeare and 19th century Euro-American fiction.³ I would urge that tenuousness of reference is the point here. The effect of peripheral possibilities for allusion is one of a hovering uncertainty that well serves the tale's uneasy mood of being gripped by mysteriously unanswerable questions and by things vaguely recognizable and yet uncannily hard to place.

At a more cerebral and more recondite level of the text, echoes of predecessor texts prove upon scrutiny to conform to patterns of signification that bespeak yet further powers of disturbance. The best-developed and least appreciated set of orchestrated references revolves around the many biblical echoes in the tale.

Exploration of Jekyll's adaptations of lines from the King James Bible reveals the frequency with which, under cover of piety, he subverts what Judeo-Christianity takes as the Word of God, reworking biblical injunctions to reverence or humility so that they unobtrusively but blasphemously serve his own self-glorification or self-exoneration. The disruptive effect of this realization goes beyond an undercutting of Jekyll's narrative reliability. It startlingly closes the gap between Jekyll's polished hypocrisy and the devil-dimension of his abjected inner self, Hyde. Meanwhile, attention to biblical echoes in the tale as a whole (i.e., going beyond Jekyll's adaptations) illuminates Stevenson's thrust towards a discomforting critique of Victorian society's liability towards rote uses of Scripture which lay the groundwork for the hypocrisies and repressions of religious cant.

Another unsettling aspect of intertextual echoes derives from the clustering of allusions around various genre types carrying competing implications for interpretation. Echoes of the Bible may encourage viewing the tale as moral allegory or religiously based social criticism, but attention to allusions belonging to other genres can sponsor rival constructions of artistic means and ends. Critics of the tale have, for example, proposed direct or indirect allusions to Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, Hogg's *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*, Poe's 'William Wilson,' or W. H. Stead's 1885 newspaper expose', 'Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon'⁴ (all of which we know Stevenson read). These critics logically tend to take such echoes as cues to explaining the central nature of the tale in terms of the typology of science fiction, Gothic novel, literature of the double, or topical social criticism. Or, to cite an example of genre-oriented interpretive tensions I'll be working with in this essay, a thought-provoking choice for our judgment of Jekyll's and of the tale's larger meanings comes into focus when we recognize a tension between the tale's generic leanings in one direction towards Jekyll-damning moral allegory, and leanings in another direc-

tion towards Jekyll-compassionating tragedy. The multiplicity of genres evoked through intertextual echoes thus reinforces a dimension of the tale familiar to anyone who studies it seriously: the work refuses to let us rest easy in any single reading.

My scheme for discussing these matters will fold the issue of the surface-layer elusiveness of literary echoes into an exploration of the in-depth implications of the clustering of intertextual echoes around three genre categories. First, I'll first look at the way that several fragile cases for intertextual echoes of Shakespearean or Greek tragedy gain credibility when considered collectively in relation to elements in the tale that invite a reading of Jekyll as tragic hero.⁵ Second, I'll examine the contrasting implications for interpretation and judgment we get when Jekyll's misappropriations of biblical phrases are considered as cues for a reading of the tale as moral allegory featuring Jekyll as negative exemplum. There is a way, I'll suggest, to reconcile interpretive tensions between views of Jekyll as tragic hero or allegorical villain, but the tension itself remains an effective factor in the tale's marvelous ability to get under our skins and keep us thinking. Third and last, I'll take up the question of how direct or indirect allusions to the Bible throughout the story speak for a muted yet stinging authorial criticism of hypocrisy in Victorian society.

Intimations of Shakespearean and Greek Tragedy

The five short phrases I'll examine as candidates for allusions to Shakespearean or Greek tragedy offer a good example of the haunting effect of intertextual echoes at the level of surface atmospherics. If certain fleeting word combinations or images encountered in these phrases are even dimly discerned as familiar, they can unsettle the reading experience by nagging at us with questions about whether that familiarity is imagined or real, and if real, traceable to what source and employed with what degree of conscious intention on Stevenson's part. My own standard of proof as an editor was in fact conservative enough that I footnoted only one of three possible Shakespeare allusions suggested

by previous commentators, and only one of two possible classical allusions I spotted afresh.

Yet one can see why even the weaker cases for Shakespeare allusions have attracted the attention of Stevenson scholars familiar with the plays involved and with Stevenson's affection for the Bard.⁶ When we put Utterson's horrified, 'God forgive us, God forgive us' (NCE, 32) alongside the exclamation of Lady Macbeth's doctor, 'God, God forgive us all!' (*Macbeth*, 5.1.83), our first impression may be of nothing more than the accidental recurrence of an expression of dread-inspired religious humility. However, the parallel in mood (both speakers have just witnessed a lost soul in torment) and the parallel stylistic trick of intensification through internal repetition make the connection a suggestive one. Similarly, when Jekyll's reference to 'the mist-like transience, of this seemingly so solid body' (NCE, 49) is compared to Hamlet's parallel fascination with bodily insubstantiality, 'O, that this too solid flesh would melt, / Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew!' (*Hamlet*, 1.2.129-30), rich thematic resonance accompanies a modest word match. The one case for a Shakespeare allusion that got my vote as an annotator is anchored in an unusually striking linguistic overlap centering around the archaism 'lendings,' in the sense of 'clothes,' or more broadly, the borrowed outward apparel of the self. The infirm King Lear commands, 'Off, off, you lendings!' as he tears off his royal robes in order to align himself with the naked madman he has met on the heath (*King Lear*, 3.4.114). Jekyll uses the word in reference to his Jekyll-body when boasting that with the transformative potion in hand, 'I [. . .] could [. . .] in a moment [. . .] strip off these lendings' (NCE, 52). In either case, the protagonist's characterization of a key part of personal identity through the quirky word 'lendings' bespeaks an unsettling degree of self-alienation. Noting that fact points to the further observation, worth bearing in mind for possible relevance to Jekyll, that all three of these proposed Shakespearean echoes revolve around

a tragic protagonist of stature and intellect tormented by a self-alienation related to madness and sometimes murder.

A sceptic could of course still justifiably question any of these attributions. Does concrete textual evidence really merit categorizing such small-scale resonances as authorially orchestrated and directed, rather than hasty, essentially accidental recyclings of tiny word combinations that Stevenson might have carried with him from his encounters with Shakespeare? My argument is that while we'll never know for sure (which is part of the intrigue these passages pose), nevertheless, evidence for a patterned design at some level of creative consciousness mounts as the recurrence of examples, all from tragedies, accumulates, and as these possibilities on consideration tie in fruitfully with other intimations of tragedy in the text likewise grounded in Stevenson's reading enthusiasms.

Among those other elements are the two brief phrases I will here venture to propose, as I did not in my NCE footnotes, as connections to Greek tragedy generally and to *Oedipus Rex* in particular: '*pede claudo*' (Latin: 'on limping foot') and 'the fatal cross roads.'

I did indeed footnote '*pede claudo*' but only to identify its Latin source: an ode on male virtue by the Roman poet, Horace, an early favorite of Stevenson's.⁷ The lawyer Utterson draws on his classics education when he conjectures about Hyde's relationship to Jekyll: 'it must be [. . .] the ghost of some old sin, [. . .] punishment coming, *pede claudo*, years after memory has forgotten and self-love condoned the fault' (NCE, 18-19). His quotation elides the conclusion of 3.2.32 in Horace's *Odes*: '*raro antecedentem scelestum / deseruit pede Poena claudo*'; 'seldom has Vengeance abandoned a wicked man through lameness of foot though he has got a start on her.' Utterson's line 'punishment coming, *pede claudo*' raised for me a consideration I judged too speculative to be included in a fact-oriented footnote. Would not Stevenson have been alert to the suggestiveness of Utterson's phrase in rela-

tion to Greek tragedy's notion of nemesis and more particularly Sophocles' tragic hero Oedipus Rex? The story of Oedipus, whose name, due to his childhood history, translates as 'swollen foot,' is after all western culture's most famous reference point for the Greek concept of a fated retribution which surely if sometimes slowly (i.e., limpingly) overtakes the doer of any hubristically blind act of arrogance that gives offense to the gods.

This possibility for '*pede claudo*' invites a partnering question about the phrase 'fatal cross roads,' which comes from Jekyll. Recalling in his 'Full Statement' the test of disposition involved in his first experiment with the transformative potion, Jekyll writes: 'That night I had come to the fatal cross roads' (NCE, 51). Crossroads of course may be merely an elemental image of decision-making. Yet when we put Jekyll's 'fatal' character-revealing crossroads together with a scene which eventually unfolds from that transformation, namely, Jekyll's alter ego Hyde clubbing a white-haired old man to death in a sudden access of rage, might we not be justified in proposing a connection with Oedipus's act of murderous rage against his unrecognized father, famously occurring at a place where three roads met?

Two forms of evidence outside the realm of verbal echoes bolster the case for supposing that an element of Sophoclean tragedy hovers behind Stevenson's tale. An extratextual ground of evidence is found in what Stevenson's letters show of his interest in the Oedipus story. He uses the Oedipus myth as a touchstone for life's most urgent tests of character when he writes to Arthur Patchett Martin in September 1878: 'there are pinches [. . .] and a man finds himself face to face with the Sphinx, and has to answer within the hour' (LRLS, 2.270). Six years later —hence twelve months before the composition of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*— Stevenson immersed himself in a school primer on Sophocles authored by his friend Lewis Campbell, and singled out Campbell's treatment of *Oedipus Rex* for commendation, writing him: 'You are very right to express your admiration for

the technical resource displayed in *Oedipus King*; it is a miracle' (LRLS, 5.18)

An additional ground of supporting evidence lies within the text: Stevenson's choice of time frame. Like Sophocles, Stevenson brings his readers into the final downward curve of the life of his protagonist just as a delayed price is about to be paid for a fateful deed done years earlier. The fact that the eminent scientist and philanthropist Jekyll, 'growing towards the elderly man' (NCE, 52), has gone unscathed in his role as Hyde not just for months, but 'a period of many years' (NCE, 44) is a quiet element in Stevenson's text (we have to pick it up from Lanyon's report on Jekyll's laboratory book). When recognized, however, it adds force to Jekyll's own mounting horror as his long-successful gambit crumbles under Hyde's growing power. It also adds to the dramatic intensity of our entry onto the scene at a moment when Hyde's recent child-trampling, as described by Enfield, heralds the coming spiral into murder and high-speed involuntary transformations that will bring about the destruction of Carew, Lanyon, and Jekyll himself.

Ultimately, there remains ample room for debate about any of the five individual cases for Shakespearean and Sophoclean echoes I've just reviewed. Ultimately too, individual cases may matter less than the big picture. In a large-scale framework, we know that Stevenson lived in close imaginative contact with the tragedies of Shakespeare and Sophocles and that annotators have agreed on the persuasiveness of at least some of the candidate examples. We also know that Stevenson when writing to his friend Will Low termed *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* 'a gothic gnome' that 'came out of a deep mine, where he guards the fountain of tears' (NCE, 82) and that Stevenson's fellow-writer Andrew Lang in reviewing the tale dubbed it a 'Tragedy of a Body and a Soul' (NCE, 93). In any case, the most fruitful question for us to ask, finally, is the following: if the case for overtones of tragedy rings true from the only angle that really

matters —the angle of reading experience—what might it mean for our judgment of Jekyll?

I'd suggest that intimations of tragedy in the tale subtly invite us to align Jekyll with the profile of western tragedy's classic hero. It's centrally a sympathetic profile: a man whose birth and outstanding talents have taken him to a place of high social standing succumbs to pride and ambition in taking a fatally flawed action, harmful to others. A selfish blindness to his own wrongdoing gives way to agonized understanding, as the consequences of his action catch up with him, too late to be remedied. As his life approaches its end, his noblest potential emerges in the insights wrung out of him by suffering.

I'm not denying that there are counter-constructions to be made of Jekyll; I'll investigate a very different alternative in a minute. I propose only that 'tragic hero' is a plausible paradigm serving several sources of the story's power. One is the horrified but fascinated identification readers are likely to feel with Jekyll in the harrowingly intense 'full statement' as they follow his account of his life ticking down to its final, trapped moments. Another is respect for the desperate struggle he is putting up at the end —to stay awake in order to avoid transformation, to divorce himself from the now-hated 'insurgent horror' (NCE, 61) that lodges in his flesh. Presumably it is this struggle that Stevenson has in mind when he says in a letter to Andrew Lang that what differentiates *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* from Poe's tale of imploded dual identity, 'William Wilson,' is that 'my point is the identity with difficulty preserved' (NCE 81).

Intimations of Moral Allegory

If allusive echoes of tragedy cue us to the genre-appropriateness of viewing Jekyll as a tragic hero whose eyes are belatedly opened to his misdeeds, another set of allusions —more unambiguously identifiable this time— coheres around the framework of moral allegory, with Jekyll at the center of a reverse *Pilgrim's Progress*. This interpretive possibility rests on seeing Jekyll as a man whose

loss of accountability to his conscience takes him on a one-way street to spiritual deterioration. The result is that to the moment of his death, his professions of insight into his own wrongdoing are riddled with signs of his irredeemably blind, prideful self-deception. From this angle the script is one of incorrigible misperception and moral unreliability rather than emerging vision and nobility.

So grim a morality-tale construction may seem heavy stuff to attribute to a writer who shrank from didacticism, enjoyed his own periodic escapes from stuffy middle-class proprieties, and had a genius for thrilling readers with such lawlessly hedonistic villains as Long John Silver and indeed Edward Hyde. Yet it was Stevenson himself who affirmed that his 'Scotch side' (in his words, 'the old Scotch Presbyterian preoccupation [. . .] itself morbid') 'came out plain in *Dr. Jekyll*' (NCE 83-84). As I have argued elsewhere,⁸ the aspect of Scotch Presbyterian anxiety about damnation that emerges as especially relevant for a reading of Jekyll as a negative moral exemplum is the conviction that without constant vigilance, one's small sins will grow into large ones. Operating under cover of a self-blinding hypocrisy, the powers of evil, when given an inch, will take a mile. The 'appalling vitality, and terrible power of growth and increase' that Andrew Lang celebrates as the essence of Hyde (NCE, 93) can thus be read as a visible projection of the evil that results from Jekyll's creation of a wall between his consciousness and conscience.

The twist that is delivered by the allusions supporting this dimension of the tale is a subtle but powerful reminder to the reader of something that Jekyll cannot allow about himself: he is inhabited by evil whether he is in the skin of hideous Hyde or gentlemanly Jekyll. The allusions in question are gentle echoes of the Bible, unobtrusively altered, truncated, or recontextualized in ways that blasphemously subvert the original message of piety. All come from Jekyll's pen, whether in the darkly desperate letters he writes to Utterson and Lanyon in the chapters entitled

‘Remarkable Incident of Dr. Lanyon’ and ‘Dr. Lanyon’s Narrative,’ or in the lengthy, confessional suicide note, ‘Henry Jekyll’s Full Statement of the Case,’ which closes out the tale.

Let me pause to say here that the number of biblical echoes contained in the tale as a whole was the biggest surprise I had in researching footnote material. I ended up with a list of eighteen echoes of the Bible and one from the Book of Common Prayer. Not all seemed significant enough to footnote and only about half of them (ten of eighteen) come from Jekyll. A number of the non-Jekyll items will be touched on in the final section of this essay.

Of the ten biblical allusions emanating from Jekyll, seven especially well fit the term ‘haunting.’ That’s partly because they command (judging by my own first reading) Stevenson’s typical allusive effect of fleeting, half-recognizable familiarity. More unusually and more eerily, they haunt because of the way they allow selfishness, cowardice, and arrogance to disguise themselves in the garb of sanctity.

To see how subtly this subversive force operates, we need first to appreciate how easily Jekyll’s biblically-inflected expressions can be construed as reflections of a *genuine* Pilgrim’s Progress. At first glance, they can seem testimonials to the struggle of a soul caught between the call of flesh and spirit, doomed to cycles of sin, remorse, relapse, and despair and hence finding sanctuary only in God’s serene compassion. Even Victorian readers, far better versed in the Bible than most of us now, might well have registered the soothing, elevating effect of the smoothly-integrated biblical cadences employed in Jekyll’s version of the Pilgrim’s Progress scenario without pausing to consider or critique the phrases in relation to their sources. After all, what flags are there to be raised on biblical echoes so apparently normal in Victorian common speech as: ‘If I am the chief of sinners, I am the chief of sufferers also,’ or ‘This inexplicable incident seemed, like the Babylonian finger on the wall, to be spelling out the letters of my judgment’? Why should we question Jekyll’s calling upon the

story of God's miraculous shaking open of the prison doors at Philippi when speaking about the effect of the transformative portion on his repressed desires? And what reader faculty other than empathy should be called into play when Jekyll, grasping for solutions to his desperate plight, anticipates his salvation in such biblically resonant lines as 'my troubles will roll away like a story that is told,' or, 'Jekyll was now my city of refuge'?

We do well to remember, however, how deceptive the 'first glance' approach generally is in this tale, where investigation of smooth surfaces repeatedly leads to a double-take and a new set of questions. If we take the trouble to trace and study the source passages for Jekyll's biblical allusions, we repeatedly find in Jekyll's version a self-serving fiddling of scriptural reference. The trend is surely not an accidental pattern on the part of an author who fumed over inept word changes in modernized versions of the Bible (LRLS 3:186),⁹ sought an easily-legible, annotated copy of the Bible when living abroad in 1884 (LRLS 4:301), and gave the New Testament a prominent place in his 1887 essay, 'Books Which Have Influenced Me.'

One weakness brought to light in Jekyll through examination of his biblical allusions in relation to their source texts is moral self-indulgence. Here are five examples for comparison, with Jekyll's statements to the left and King James Version Bible source texts to the right.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. I have brought on myself a punishment and a danger that I cannot name. If I am the chief of sinners, I am the chief of sufferers also. (NCE, 30)</p> | <p>Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief. (I Timothy 1:15)</p> |
| <p>2. if you will but punctually serve me, my troubles will roll away like a story that is told. (NCE, 43)</p> | <p>Thou has set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance. For all our days are passed away in thy wrath: we spend our years as a tale that is told. (Psalms 90:8-9)</p> |

3. The drug [...] but shook the doors of the prison-house of my disposition; and like the captives of Philippi, that which stood within ran forth. (NCE, 51-52)
- And from thence to Philippi [. . .] And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God: and the prisoners heard them. And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken; and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one's bands were loosed. And the keeper of the prison [. . .] would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had been fled. But Paul cried with a loud voice, saying, Do thyself no harm: for we are all here. (Acts 16: 12, 25-28)
4. The pangs of transformation had not done tearing him, before Henry Jekyll, with streaming tears of gratitude and remorse, had fallen upon his knees and lifted his clasped hands to God. The veil of self-indulgence was rent from head to foot (NCE, 57)
- Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake (Matthew 27:50-51; cf. Mark 15:38, Luke 23:45)
5. the guilt of Hyde was patent to the world [. . .] Jekyll was now my city of refuge (NCE, 57)
- Then shall ye appoint you cities to be cities of refuge for you; that the slayer may flee thither, which killeth any person at unawares [. . .] until he stand before the congregation in judgment (Numbers 35: 11-12)

The hints by which Jekyll's moral self-indulgence can be discerned, when these comparisons are carefully considered, take shape subtly and incrementally. In example number 1, Jekyll's line to Utterson, 'If I am the chief of sinner, I am the chief of sufferers also,' differs from the source phrase, 'sinner of whom I am chief' merely though a small mitigating addendum calling pity onto himself. Yet to begin with, let's note that in I Timothy,

it is *unmitigated* moral self-abasement that signals a ripeness for salvation.

In example 2, consultation of Psalm 90's contextualized use of 'as a tale that is told' takes us back to Jekyll's version of the phrase with a slight shock. The biblical original speaks for humanity's inability to hide any sins from God's omniscience. Jekyll, writing to Lanyon for help in reversing the involuntary transformation that has put him in Hyde's body, uses the 'tale that is told' phrase to anticipate his relief at escaping from prosecution for murder.

In example 3, a review of the biblical account of the miracle by which the prisoners at Philippi are given a chance to escape calls profoundly into question the sanctifying aura that Jekyll's allusion to this incident imparts. Paul and Silas are unjustly imprisoned apostles who, when God shakes open the doors to their jail, set the honourable example of remaining in prison. As a result, none of the prisoners even chooses to escape, and the life of the prison-keeper is saved. Jekyll conveniently reverses the plot of honorable restraint in order to lend an air of validation to the bolting forth of his inner man to lawless hedonism and ultimately the taking of a life.

The biblical passage alluded to in number 4 commemorates the sacred moment of Christ's death, accompanied by such wondrous portents as the spontaneous sundering of the veil which separated the Holy of Holies from all else in the Temple. Jekyll appropriates the elevated image of the torn Temple veil to characterize a moment of supposedly life-changing new piety and moral responsibility when he regains his Jekyll-body immediately after the murder of Carew. His retrospective claim for the destruction of 'the veil of self-indulgence,' however, proves exaggerated at the least: he re-immerses himself in philanthropy for several months, but does not take responsibility for the murder of Carew (it is instructive on this point to compare the outcome of Stevenson's short story 'Markheim'), and he further reports that the old impulses reassert themselves 'as the first edge of my penitence wore off' (NCE, 57).

The comparison in example 5 yields the realization that the biblical ‘cities of refuge’ do not represent the prosecution-free safe haven suggested by Jekyll’s use of the phrase. They give safe haven only to those who have killed someone unawares, and far from granting immunity, they merely protect against immediate retaliatory murder while allowing the local congregation to stand in judgment.

If these five textual comparisons highlight the evasion of moral responsibility that is one key element lurking beneath the surface of Jekyll’s mellifluous invocations of the Bible, several other comparisons point up another, more egregious liability: Jekyll’s taking upon himself godlike powers, or, what comes to the same thing, conferring them upon Hyde. Consider the following juxtapositions, based on three passages encountered in Jekyll’s ‘Full Statement’:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. And yet, when I looked upon that ugly idol in the glass, I was conscious of no repugnance, rather of a leap of welcome. (NCE, 51) | Thou shalt have none other gods before me [. . .] And ye have seen their abominations, and their idols (Deuteronomy 5:7, 29:17) |
| 2. This familiar that I called out of my own soul, and sent forth alone to do his good pleasure, was a being inherently malign and villainous (NCE, 53) | it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom (Luke 12:32) For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure (Philippians 2:13) |
| 3. This inexplicable incident, this reversal of my previous experience [i.e., the first involuntary transformation], seemed, like, the Babylonian finger on the wall, to be spelling out the letters of my judgment (NCE, 54) | In the same hour came forth fingers of a man’s hand, and wrote [. . .] upon the plaister of the wall of the king’s palace [. . .] Then Daniel answered and said before the king [. . .] [thou] hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of Heaven (Daniel 5:5, 5:17, 5:23) |

The verbal overlap in example 1 is tiny, resting only on the word ‘idol’ —which indeed according to the Oxford English Dictionary, Stevenson here used in the specialized sense of ‘an image caused

by reflexion as in a mirror'. I advance this juxtaposition, nonetheless, on the theory that Stevenson at the same time deliberately engaged the familiar connotation of 'idol' as an object of worship, putting it in the context of Jekyll gazing admiringly on his ugly Hyde-image in order to evoke what to Victorian readers would surely have been the well-known biblical prohibition against a reverencing of images representing illegitimate substitutes for God. Example 2 shows Jekyll, even while reporting his developing repugnance to Hyde, applying to him a phrase, 'good pleasure,' that the Bible uses to represent the will of God. In example 3, despite Jekyll's apparently sincere apprehension about divine judgment, his allusion to the 'Babylonian finger' takes on a weight presumably beyond his ken when we note that the particular transgression which provoked the prophetic handwriting on the wall was the arrogant King Belshazzar's having 'lifted [him]self up against' God.

That Stevenson saw allegory as a viable category for the tale is supported by his reference to the story as 'my allegory' in a letter of 25 February 1886 to J. R. Vernon (NCE, 83). That he wanted to hint a moral about usurpation of godlike powers gains plausibility when we consider that the kinship-affirming line with which he opens the prefatory dedication to his cousin, 'It's ill to loose the bands that God decreed to bind,' may double as an epigraphic moral caution, echoing as it does God's message of human limitations to Job: 'Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?' (Job 38:31). And that he sought to produce resonances, finally, with Judeo-Christianity's central allegory of human overstepping of God-given bounds is consistent with the tale's evocation of Genesis through Jekyll's comment about his final 'fall' (NCE, 58).

Stevenson of course turns his version of this allegory towards the horror story by creating a relentlessly powerful incubus within his over-reaching protagonist, a distillation of the protagonist's own hedonistic, duplicitous drive towards power run amok. This

well-known horror aspect of the tale stands to yield two under-appreciated further spooky realizations when we size up Jekyll's subtle manipulations of the Bible. One unsettling realization is that even as Jekyll moves towards moral self-recognition, bitterly reviling Hyde as the acknowledged colonizer of his transformable flesh, his writings betray the ominous and ghostly role Hyde plays as the *unacknowledged* colonizer of Jekyll's *mind*.

A second unsettling realization unfolds from the tale's hints—all effectively left in the realm of suggestion— that Hyde is the devil himself. The leading clue is Hyde's uncannily disturbing effect on people. As the narrator puts it, the one point of description on which everyone who meets Hyde agrees is a 'haunting sense of unexpressed deformity' (NCE, 24). Poole and Lanyon experience it as an icy chill at the core of their being (NCE, 37 and 44). Enfield and Utterson invoke Satan explicitly, Enfield describing Hyde, when facing down his accusers, 'carrying it off, sir, really like Satan' (NCE, 10) and Utterson musing that his first sight of Hyde has shown him 'Satan's signature upon a face' (NCE, 17).¹⁰ The Hyde-as-devil possibility takes on a spine-tingling expansion of meaning when we connect it with Jekyll's smooth-tongued, self-serving distortion of the Bible, of all books —the Word of God, in the eyes of believers. We begin to see Jekyll in his *Jekyll*-persona representing something of the devil at his worst: as powerful and ominous as Hyde, but all the more dangerous for the fact that he skilfully conceals his identity under a mask of normalcy.

To carry this notion back to the Scotch Presbyterian thinking discussed earlier, we might say that the devil of selfishness fattened so richly on Jekyll's successful non-accountability for his actions that when Jekyll at the disastrous end of his life attempts to fend off Hyde, he proves spiritually corrupted to the point that his Secret Sharer irrepressibly blasphemes through him by perverting the Word of God. It's this idea which prompted me to include an intertextual allusion of my own in the title of this essay, based on Antonio's line in *The Merchant of Venice*

(1.3.99): ‘The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose.’¹¹

To see Jekyll, especially in his writing, as in some measure a ventriloquist’s dummy for Hyde-as-devil adds extra meaning to the fact that Jekyll and Hyde write in the same hand. It also gives us a way to see an enjoyable play of interpretive possibility in the narrator’s description of the book Utterson and Poole find lying open in Jekyll’s cabinet: ‘Utterson was amazed to find it a copy of a pious work, for which Jekyll had several times expressed a great esteem, annotated, in his own hand, with startling blasphemies’ (NCE, 40). The ventriloquist’s dummy idea not only supports the logic of this description, it also lets us contemplate the incongruously annotated text as a coded anticipatory characterization of the manuscript Utterson and the tale’s reader are about to encounter under the title ‘Henry Jekyll’s Full Statement of the Case’—a manuscript which, metaphorically speaking, similarly presents a decorous main text harboring blasphemies in the margin.

It might be argued that I go to an unwarranted extreme in suggesting that Stevenson allows a place in the tale for the devil as a literal being, a supernatural bogeyman who stalks the world looking for souls to snatch. After all, despite Stevenson’s childhood immersion in Scottish devil-lore, he did by adulthood move to a secular psychologically oriented scheme of morality. My response is twofold. One point to be made is that Stevenson in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, as in such tales as ‘Thrawn Janet’ and ‘The Body-Snatcher,’ enjoys *flirting* with the devil, evoking him as a hair-raising *possible* presence in order to stoke a haunting effect of fearful uncertainty about a superhuman power of evil. The other point I’d make is that Stevenson’s psychologically oriented scheme of morality recognized a folk-wisdom in the idea of the devil as an autonomous, non-human, frighteningly powerful incarnation of evil. ‘Autonomous’ corresponds with the fact that the evil we see in the world often seems to have a mysterious life of its own. ‘Non-human’ fits with the phenomenon

that at one level of thinking, we have difficulty bringing ourselves to accept evil as part of normal human nature, resorting instead to such phrases as ‘acts of inhumanity.’ ‘Frighteningly powerful’ matches the reality that at another level of thinking, we recognize evil as a potential in all humans, one which makes life a perpetual call upon free will to resist evil. In this sense, the term ‘the devil’ speaks for a persistent self-destructive and socially destructive capacity within the human psyche to stray ever farther from conscience and humility.

Stevenson’s endorsement of this view speaks in such visions of the human condition as he proposes in his 1888 essay, ‘Pulvis et Umbra,’ when he describes humankind as ‘savagely surrounded, savagely descended’ and yet ‘still obscurely fighting the lost fight of virtue’ —or in his 1891 letter to Adeline Boodle excoriating ‘prettified religion that would pretend the world is not a tragic battlefield.’¹²

Stevenson’s notion of life as a moral battlefield suggests why readings of Jekyll’s character as either redemption-worthy tragic hero or irredeemably corrupted negative moral example need not be seen as mutually exclusive. The tension in genres supported by the two different sets of intertextual allusions we’ve been examining becomes a particularly productive interplay if we view it as speaking for an authorial vision of humanity at its horrible, pitiable, moving, worst and best. This bridging of genres gives us a vision of Jekyll as a man whose huge moral blindness has turned into an ineradicable parasite on the best part of himself, moving in a vicious circle to increase its stranglehold; while at the same time, a better element of identity still extant within, now with its back to the wall, more fiercely than ever wills *its* own continued existence.

Broader Uses of the Bible: Intimations of Social Criticism

I turn finally to a speculation about how uses of the Bible generally in the tale (including but not limited to Jekyll’s self-

serving manipulations of Scripture) support another direction of interpretation encouraged by the text: criticism of Victorian hypocrisy. Commentators have proposed many possible targets of social criticism in the tale, and many possible variations on the theme of hypocrisy. The dimension of implicit social critique that interests me here is Stevenson's concern over the liability to hypocrisy fostered when a conspicuously Bible-minded society allows casual and sometimes self-sanctifying personal constructions of the Bible to substitute for the challenge of grappling with the text's difficult, morally demanding content.

In this concern, Stevenson is no stranger to the now-popular notion that texts do cultural work. In *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, he portrays his educated professional men with an elite access to the classics that both shapes their thinking (Utterson's *pede claudo* reflection) and gives them a medium of privately shared communication (Lanyon's Damon and Pythias line to Utterson). The Bible, on the other hand, stands in the social world of the tale as the great common denominator text, a uniquely sacred, communally honored channel of expression for what was taken to be God's immutable Word, and a touchstone thereby of morality, wisdom, and integrity. One reflection of this is the conclusiveness with which Jekyll's butler Poole says to Utterson, 'I give you my bible-word it was Mr. Hyde!' (NCE, 37). Another reflection is the sincerity with which Utterson's mind turns to biblical locutions at moments in his night-time envisionings of Hyde as 'a figure to whom power was given' (NCE, 15; cf. Revelations 13:5-7) and 'a man who was without bowels of mercy' (NCE, 15; cf. Colossians 3:12).¹³

Such sincere allusions to the Bible as these are far from Jekyll's shadowy distortions of Scriptural injunctions to humility. Yet to frame an accurate picture of the author's perspective on the cultural work that the Bible *actually* performs in the social world of the novel, as against its idealized place in Victorian thinking, we need to recognize that Jekyll's self-serving distor-

tions and Utterson's honest invocations of the Bible are part of a spectrum of character uses of Scripture that recycle fairly well-worn phrases to meet the needs of the moment, whether anxiety (Utterson), moral camouflage (Jekyll), or chatty humor.¹⁴ No in-depth consideration of content or context seems to be present in these instances.

Indeed only in turning to the narrator's and author's echoes of the Bible do we feel a largeness of vision and energy of imagination at work. Such scope and vitality are most evident in the morally weighty echo of Job contained in the earlier-quoted opening line of the author's dedication, 'It's ill to loose the bands that God decreed to bind.' A sense of breaking through to something larger hovers also, if more obscurely, in various biblically inflected bits of narratorial description. A reference to Jekyll late in the tale immured in his 'house of voluntary bondage' (NCE, 31) poignantly reverses the phrase in Exodus (13:2) which speaks of the Jewish people being led with God's help 'out of the house of bondage' in Egypt. An earlier description of London street noises 'still rolling in through the great arteries with a sound as of a mighty wind' (NCE, 27), as Utterson and his clerk Guest cozily meet over a glass of wine to scrutinize Hyde's handwriting, creates sweeping atmospheric effect, while it also teases the biblically literate reader to account for a possible further logic of connection to the 'sound [. . .] as of a rushing mighty wind' which in Acts 2:2 announces the descent of the Holy Spirit for Pentecost.¹⁵

Setting the author's and narrator's thought-provoking uses of the Bible against the characters' subjectively variable and relatively shallow or even opportunistic recourse to commonly-used phrases helps underscore the author's implicit awareness that in social reality, the words of the Bible are not fixed, transcendent, and powerful of their own accord. Those words are shaped to unreflective if well-intended habitual uses from the tale's most trustworthy characters and are adapted to self-serving pieties by its worst.

When we add to this a reminder of Stevenson's and the tale's sensitivity to the way that the society Jekyll and Utterson inhabit encourages pleasing surface appearances at all costs and prescribes impossible standards of supposed virtue, it is not a big step to seeing a role for biblical allusions generally in the tale as helping to illustrate how easily an unexamined crediting of the biblical buzzwords of piety can reduce people's motivation for taking serious counsel with actual Scriptural text and with their consciences, as well as allow them to overlook gaps between preaching and practice. In this context, the selfish extreme of hypocrisy in Jekyll, which Stevenson put at the moral heart of the tale,¹⁶ is not an isolated phenomenon. Rooted as it is in his imperious desire to [. . .] wear a more than commonly grave countenance before the public' (NCE, 48), Jekyll's verbal façade, along with his conspicuous acts of charity, can be seen as largely a reflection and extreme outgrowth of the Victorian liability to respond to a puritanical ambition for virtue with publicly sanctifying moral formulas. The fact that Jekyll is not alone in this regard is reflected in Enfield's sardonic comment that the 'celebrated' person (i.e. Jekyll) who bought off Hyde's pursuers 'is [. . .] one of your fellows who do what they call good' (NCE, 10).

Stevenson's frustration with rote uses of the Bible finds further expression a little over a year after the composition of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* in a formulation which may serve as a clue to yet another intertextual echo in the tale. Responding to *The British Weekly's* invitation to contribute to their 'Books Which Have Influenced Me' series in the spring of 1887, Stevenson chooses a roundabout way to pay tribute to the 'truths' to be found in the Book of Matthew: with drily polite humor, he focuses on the frequency and cost of people's *missing* those truths by falling short of *genuine* reading:

The next book, in order of time, to influence me, was the New Testament, and in particular the Gospel according to St. Matthew. I believe it would startle and move any one if

they could make a certain effort of imagination and read it freshly like a book, not droningly and dully like a portion of the Bible. Any one would then be able to see in it those truths which we are all courteously supposed to know and all modestly refrain from applying. But on this subject it is perhaps better to be silent.¹⁷

For our purposes this paragraph is most obviously of interest as a non-fiction testimonial to Stevenson's edgy conviction that the moral blindness sponsored by paying lip service to biblical sound bites has a very real prevalence in his society.

A further interest lies in the way that the resonance thus set up between the tale and the essay paragraph is triangulated by the Book of Matthew itself. Read with the content of that essay paragraph in mind, something leaps into prominence in Matthew that touches central aspects of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Matthew's account of Christ's life emphasizes his preaching against hypocrisy; his visiting 'woe' upon the posturing 'scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! [. . .] like unto whited sepulchres [. . .] beautiful outward, but [. . .] within full of dead men's bones' (23:27), and his warning the multitudes to 'take heed' not to make a parade of virtue 'as the hypocrites do' when giving alms, praying, or fasting (6:1-18). Moreover, Matthew's Christ vividly honors the dual potential of the *word* to deaden *or* revivify spiritual imagination. The hypocrites worship 'in vain,' he says, because while they 'draweth nigh unto me with their mouth and honoureth me with their lips [. . .] their heart is far from me' (15:8-9). The multitudes face a similar danger, 'For this people's heart is waxed gross and their ears are dull of hearing' (13:15). The challenge of moral communication, accordingly, pivots around the question of how language can be used to save the multitudes from the fate of the hypocrites: how words can be marshalled to penetrate the shell of spiritual complacency liable to blind pride to its imminent hypocrisy in mouthing professions of virtue.

Several answers are given in Matthew, including Christ's setting out of the Lord's Prayer as a model for simple, humble, private communication with God (6:5-13). The answer surely closest to Stevenson's story-telling heart, though, lies in Christ's choice of teaching through parables. After telling the multitudes of the sower whose seed throve or failed according to the richness or barrenness of the ground on which it fell, Christ comments in an aside to the disciples: 'Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand' (Matthew 13:13).

The brevity and simplicity of biblical parables —short, earthy fictitious narratives which work by similitude to set forth a spiritual truth— stands at a substantial distance from the length, complexity, and sensation-story excitement of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Yet an important part of the tale's moral and artistic impetus inheres in an affinity with what Matthew's Christ proposes as the value of using an attention-getting, mind-teasing story to inspire reflection about spiritual truths to which people have become dangerously tone deaf. When we put that affinity on Stevenson's part together with the range of uses made of the Bible in the tale, from Jekyll's self-seeking perversions of Scripture, through other characters' relatively rote uses, to the author's powerfully evocative allusions, we can see all the better why the plot of Jekyll's suicidal self-division deserves to be viewed not just as one man's reverse Pilgrim's Progress, but an extreme outcome of a besetting social liability to moral deafness and budding hypocrisy. Our list of genre impulses in the tale reinforced by intertextual references and influences accordingly warrants expansion. If Jekyll's story is (among other things) part tragedy and part religious allegory, it also broadly qualifies to be seen as in part a parable for its times.

This 'parable for the times' dimension of the tale returns us to one last aspect of the work's intertextually related spook effects: its capacity to insinuate to its reading audience that Jekyll's

example holds a mirror not merely to individual moral fallibility, but to the actual social reality of the world which those readers inhabit.

One moment in the tale which especially effectively promotes this dismaying insinuation revolves around a literal mirror. The mood is one of confused horror: Utterson and Poole, searching for signs of an imprisoned or murdered Jekyll after bursting in on the still-twitching suicidal corpse of Hyde, have turned away mystified from the blasphemously-annotated pious book mentioned earlier in this essay as a reference point for Jekyll's life of hypocrisy. 'Next,' the narration continues, 'the searchers came to the cheval glass, into whose depths they looked with an involuntary horror.' What they see is 'nothing but' reflections of the fire-lit room 'and their own pale and fearful countenances stooping to look in' (NCE 40). The passage is a favorite of critics generally for its metafictional richness, and of deconstructive critics in particular for its insight into the subjectively generated aspects of interpretation (as well as fear). Without disagreeing, I would suggest that Stevenson, with typical flair for a cunning multiplicity of meaning, builds in another possibility consonant with the tale's many versions of intertextual haunting. By planting in the immediately preceding paragraph the image of the religious book representing a life led with sanctifyingly pious words as the public main text and deeply impious realities as the private marginalia, Stevenson offers a disquieting reminder, meaningful beyond the Victorian context, about what there is to be frightened of, collectively as well as individually, when we look at ourselves in the mirror.

NOTES

1 Adapted from my plenary talk of the same title at the 'Robert Louis Stevenson and Joseph Conrad: Writers of Land and Sea' convention which took place in Edinburgh, July 7-9, 2004; prepared with assistance on

classical texts from my colleague Thomas Van Nortwick and on biblical texts from my colleague Robert Longworth.

2 *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: A Norton Critical Edition*, edited by Katherine Linehan (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2003); hereafter cited as NCE.

3 Conservative annotators like Jenni Calder (1979 Penguin) and Martin Danahay (1999 Broadview Press) indeed do not press the case for allusion beyond a few straightforward noun clauses such as 'Cain's heresy,' 'Damon and Pythias,' 'Dr. Fell,' 'the captives of Philippi,' and 'the Babylonian finger on the wall.' Annotators taking a more speculative approach include Richard Dury (1993 Guerini Studio and 2004 Edinburgh University Press), Leonard Wolf (1995 Plume) and the team of Barry Qualls and Susan Wolfson (1995, Washington Square Press).

4 Stead's series of reports on child prostitution in London included attention to the hidden consumer role of high-placed gentlemen with money to spend and a reputation to protect.

5 Tragedy at a certain level is the emphasis favored by the many stage and film versions of the tale that reshape Jekyll as a Byronic young lover and researcher victimized by some combination of Victorian prudery, an irrepressible drive for knowledge, and the swift-acting, unforeseeable results of a bad day in the lab. The greater challenge is to reckon with the tragic dimension of the elderly, essentially loveless, and long-duplicious protagonist Stevenson gives us in his text.

6 One of Stevenson's liveliest testimonials to his admiration for Shakespeare occurs in a 9 October 1883 letter to his cousin Bob Stevenson: 'In my art of course, there is one summity: Shakespeare: the only realist who ever succeeded: that is who reached the clear design and force of the ideal, and yet carried along with him the bulk and lineament, freshness, colour and brute imprint, of actual detail. And of course the result is simply staggering. It doesn't seem like art: all is moved into clearer air and puts on beauty: the ugly becomes the terrible, the maudlin rises into the pathetic; and every fact, placed where it belong, shines many-coloured like a gem' (*Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson*, ed. Bradford A. Booth and Ernest Mehew [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994], 4:181; hereafter cited as LRLS).

7 Volume 3 of Stevenson's letters (LRLS, August 1879-September 1882), for example, is thick with quotations from Horace: three from *Ars Poetica* (see pp. 160, 165, 191), one from the *Odes* (see p. 232), and one from *Epistles* (see p. 243).

8 First in “Closer Than a Wife”: The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll’s Significant Other,’ in *Robert Louis Stevenson Reconsidered: New Critical Perspectives*, ed. William B. Jones, Jr. (Jefferson, NC: MacFarland & Company, 2003), 85-100; then in revised form in ‘Sex, Secrecy, and Self-Alienation in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*’ (NCE 204-13).

9 Stevenson wrote with vindictive panache to Edmund Gosse shortly after the May, 1881 publication of *The Revised Version of the New Testament*: ‘The swollen, childish and pedantic vanity that moved the said revisers to put “bring” for “lead” [in the Lord’s Prayer, Matthew 6:13] is a sort of literary fault that calls for an eternal hell; it may be quite a small place, a star of the least magnitude and shabbily furnished’ (LRLS 3:186).

10 Further hints of Hyde as the devil amplify the tale’s stock of biblical references. Satan’s temptation of Eve in Genesis 3:1-6, for example, finds an echo in Hyde’s goading, predictably disaster-producing question to Lanyon about whether Lanyon will be ‘wise’ and ‘guided’ enough to avoid witnessing the darkly miraculous spectacle of Hyde’s imminent chemical transformation, or whether he will instead act upon ‘the greed of curiosity’ and thereby ‘be blasted by a prodigy’ (NCE, 46). Another invocation of the Bible relating Hyde to Satan is transmitted through Utterson early in the tale when he thinks of Hyde as ‘a figure to whom power was given’ (NCE, 15), a phrase lifted from the passage in Revelation 13:4-5 where it is said of the grotesque beast who blasphemes against God that ‘power was given unto him’ by ‘the dragon,’ i.e., the devil. Richard Dury in the explanatory notes for his Edinburgh University Press edition of the tale sees two additional devil allusions insinuated through esoteric word-play. The phrase ‘*pede claudo*’ (through which Utterson frames his notion of Hyde as the fruit of Jekyll’s past sin, now catching up ‘on limping foot’ with the sinner, NCE, 19) invokes antecedents not only in classical literature, Dury proposes, but also European folk-literature representing the Devil limping—even as he tries to pass as human—because of the hoofs hidden in his boots. Dury also points out that when the narrator describes Utterson contemplating his own possible harboring of ‘some Jack-in-the-Box of an old iniquity’ (NCE, 19), Stevenson (a fluent French-speaker) references a toy known in France as ‘*le Diable*.’

11 Stevenson doubtless knew not only that line in Shakespeare, but also the antecedent passage in Matthew in which the devil cites Scripture to Christ during the temptation in the wilderness (‘If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee’ [Matthew 4:5-6]).

12 See, respectively, [Works] (New York: Charles Scriber's Sons, 1924), v. 15: *The Travels and Essays of Robert Louis Stevenson*, pp. 293 and 296; and LRLS 7:74.

13 These two phrases occur in a passage that descriptively narrates Utterson's mental processes without use of quote marks. Technically speaking the words are the narrator's, but as befits the free indirect technique of narration involved, the imagery seems clearly to originate with Utterson.

14 Enfield tosses out breezy references to 'the day of judgment' (NCE, 11) and to his 3 a.m. return from 'some place at the end of the world' (NCE, 9; cf. Psalms 19:4 and Romans 10:18); Utterson in a relaxed mood observes, 'I incline to Cain's heresy [. . .] I let my brother go to the devil in his own way' (NCE 7).

15 For the sake of completing the list, here are the two other narratorial echoes of central religious texts I found: (1) there is a derivation from The Book of Common Prayer in the description of the flats in Jekyll's square rented to 'all sorts and conditions of men' (NCE, 17-18); cf. the eleventh item in The Book of Common Prayer's 'Prayers and Thanksgivings' section: 'O God [. . .] we humbly beseech thee for all sorts and conditions of men; (2) the narrator uses a formulaic biblical line describing lamentation when he mentions the terrified maid in Jekyll's house who 'lifted up her voice and now wept loudly' (NCE, 34; cf. for example Genesis 29:11).

16 'The harm was in Jekyll, because he was a hypocrite —not because he was fond of women [. . .] The Hypocrite let out the beast Hyde— who is no more sexual than another, but who is the essence of cruelty and malice, and selfishness and cowardice: and these are the diabolic in man' (Stevenson to John Paul Boccock, November 1887; see LRLS 6:56 or NCE, 84).

17 In *Robert Louis Stevenson on Fiction*, ed. Glenda Norquay (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999), p. 112.

Metaphors and the discourse of the late-Victorian divided self: the cultural implications of *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* and its Chinese translations

Isaac Yue

The literature of the late-Victorian period offers an interesting perspective on the social and cultural sentiment of the time, in its reflection of the surfacing materialization of a public tension between society's conventional middle-class 'puritan' moral ideals and the changing values of a rapidly industrializing nation. The year 1851 arguably marks the emerging point of this conflict, when the jubilant celebration of the achievement of the Victorian age, which Prince Albert hailed in the opening of the Great Exhibition as 'a period of most wonderful transition',¹ was confronted by the Condition of England debate which prominently brought to light the previously 'hidden' elements of poverty and chaos in Albert's utopian society. It is a conflict of cultural ideology that Arthur Hugh Clough would later capture in his poem 'The Latest Decalogue', which aims to satirize the simultaneous existence of both the elements of good and evil in one society:

Thou shalt not steal; an empty feat
 When it's so lucrative to cheat:
 Bear not false witness; let the lie
 Have time on its own wings to fly:
 Thou shalt not covet, but tradition
 Approves all forms of competition. (15-20)

According to middle-class perceptions of the time, the concept of Victorian cultural identity was based upon the notion of Christian virtue, which traditionally lays heavy emphasis on the moral integrity of both the individual and society. However, aside from the obvious perception of the poet, the fact that Clough

was able to openly make a mockery of the public's conventional code of behavior goes to illustrate the extent of the rift between this conventional code of practice and the contemporary world, which regards previously sacred statements such as "Thou shalt not steal" as nothing but 'empty feat'. The motif of the divided self in late-Victorian culture thus effectively becomes a literary institution as society embarks on the quest to redefine itself in respect to its identity. As J. Hillis Miller points out:

[W]hen the elements that defines [Victorian cultural] conformity, such as religion, their sense of domesticity, and the belief in their cultural superiority were realised as faulty, the identity collapses and the search must begin again.²

In late-nineteenth century English literature, the theme of the divided self offers a unique perspective on the cultural sentiment of the time, in the sense that it summarises the feeling of society in its problematic dichotomy of good and evil, which mimics the tension between the decadent movement and conventional Victorian society. Works such as *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891) and *Dracula* (1897), which appeared towards the end of the century, reaffirm the cultural anxiety of the time in that they employ a central idea of the co-existence of good and evil within one entity to illustrate the contemporary dilemma of being unable either to strengthen and enforce the conventionally 'good' elements of society, or to dispel completely their 'evil' counterparts. An important forerunner of such late-Victorian novels of the Double is *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886), which utilizes this depiction of the opposed-yet-inseparable relationship between good and evil to reflect the decadent attitude towards the fragmentation of both self and society.

While the re-presentation of the tale as a straightforward story of good versus evil is relatively easy for a Chinese translator, conveying to a Chinese reader the cultural significance that

is embedded within this dichotomy can be extremely difficult. This is because the cultural connotations of the theme of *Jekyll and Hyde* are mainly achieved by the author's intentional and methodical usage of various metaphors and symbolical devices which, as Richard Scholar points out, are often difficult to translate because of their highly cultural-specific implications.³ Sun Yifeng, in support of this view, further cites a number of linguistic features that Stevenson utilizes to insinuate and reinforce the ambiguous nature between Jekyll and Hyde, and interprets them as precarious hurdles that translators must attempt to navigate when translating the text into Chinese.⁴

Thus, using the text of *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* as well as a selection of its many Chinese translations as examples, this paper aims to examine the significance of the various metaphors in the story in relation to the ideas and cultural atmosphere of the time as depicted by Stevenson, and our interpretation and understanding of the social, historical and literary importance of the text. It will then explore how different translators have been able to employ dissimilar methods to re-create equivalent literary effects in their Chinese translations, and we will discuss their relative success in representing to the Chinese reader the metaphorical significance of the original text.

As Stevenson himself professes, the main inspiration behind the story of *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* comes from his perception of the 'strong sense of man's double being which must at times come in upon and overwhelm the mind of every thinking creature'.⁵ Its very title, for instance, bears evidence to this in the double meaning of the word 'case', as well as in the name of Hyde, which suggests both a character and a hidden identity. There are numerous other more subtle examples throughout the text, which employs this same literary technique to enrich the metaphorical social impact of the story, as well as to communicate to its contemporary readers the author's social critique of the late-Victorian public order. The mention of Utterson's volume of 'dry divinity' ⁶ in the beginning

of Chapter Two, for example, serves as a reminder of Protestant theology, or perhaps the post-Oxford Movement and Darwinian religious debate of the time. However, due to the grammatical and linguistic difference between Chinese and English, as well as the lack of a similar religious background in China, most translators had to settle for the equivalent of a 'boring religious text', which unquestionably fails to re-create the same cultural response as the original. For this reason, one translator even felt he had to 'cheat' by altering the supposedly 'original' parallel text to 'religious book'⁷ in order to better convey part of the original meaning of the story, if not its cultural implication.⁸

To take another example, the initial description of Hyde as a 'damned Juggernaut' (31) involves another popular nineteenth century cultural manifestation —Orientalism born out of British imperial experience in India, which Stevenson deliberately evokes to reinforce the image of Hyde as a fundamentally alien entity. The significance of this word lies in the fact that it contains a double negative charge from its Oriental, non-Christian associations, in addition to its obvious association with monstrosity. Therefore, its allusion is a powerful reinforcement of the image of Hyde as an evil entity, which in turn sets a foundation for the development of the central theme of the story. However, a Chinese reader who lacks the same cultural perception as the Victorian reader is obviously not going to deduce as much from this description of Hyde. By translating it into a 'Hindu Chariot god' (Zhao)⁹ or other similar terms, not only does a Chinese reader experience difficulties in registering a distinctly Orientalistic implication, but the original text's intended effect of causing immediate revulsion is also lost in translation.

Aside from the usage of individual words in such allusive contexts, Stevenson is also the master of the embedding of allegorical features within the prose itself. In his essay 'A Humble Remonstrance', he sums up his idea concerning the art of fiction as the careful construction of the 'plot so that every incident is

an illustration of the motive, and every property employed shall bear to it a near relation of congruity or contrast¹⁰ Thus, in other words, a translator of *Jekyll and Hyde* must pay close attention to the usage of each word as well as the structure of each sentence because, in the eyes of Stevenson, both are considered 'properties' of the story which the author, on every possible occasion, endeavors to manipulate in order to further reinforce the central theme of the work. An example of this can be found in the parallel development of the events in the story and the description of the fog of London. For instance, in the beginning of the story when the connection between Jekyll and Hyde has yet to reveal itself to Utterson, the fog seems to follow his every move as 'Mr Seek', and on one occasion even to the extent of obscuring a night that was originally stated to be 'cloudless' (46). However, towards the end of the story when Jekyll reaches the point of no return and Utterson is urged by Poole to come to the Doctor's house to uncover the secret, the previously mystifying fog suddenly lifts. In its dispersal, the following scene is presented:

It was a wild, cold, seasonable night of March, with a pale moon, lying on her back as though the wind had tilted her, and a flying wrack of the most diaphanous and lawny texture. The wind made talking difficult, and flecked blood into the face. (63)

By suddenly replacing the fog of London with clear, windy weather, Stevenson utilizes the atmosphere of the city to match and further reflect Utterson's journey of discovery of the nature of good and evil. If the fog in the beginning of the story represents the sense of uncertainty and confusion regarding the Jekyll and Hyde affiliation, then the later depiction of a cold and windy London suggests a sudden revelation of the ugly side of society. This is evident in the sense of revelation created by the deliberately juxtaposed words of 'wild', which insinuates the lack of civilized restraint, and 'cold', which conjures the feeling of a repressive

Victorian society, that parallels society's new interpretation of itself as being suppressed by a falsely prescribed moralistic protocol. It is, however, a point that most translators discussed in this study failed to recognize, as most of them left out the word 'wild' in their translations. The result of this is that not only does the intended contrast between foggy and cold London become less prominent in the translations, but the cultural connotation in its subtle assessment of the Victorian divided self also pales by a significant degree.

The portrayal of the image of the 'door', meanwhile, represents one of the more powerful motifs that create a symbolical social parallel to the ambiguity of good and evil, which can be seen as an important message of Stevenson's story. From a translator's perspective, it deserves extra attention because each description related to it can be metaphorically important and effect a reader's interpretation and perception of the text. For instance, the first chapter of the story is fittingly titled the 'Story of the Door', and in it readers are introduced to the door of 'a certain sinister block of building' that 'bore in every feature the marks of prolonged and sordid negligence' (30). This door, with its prominently decadent and disagreeable features, is unmistakably reflective of the wickedness of its user—Mr. Hyde. By reserving the symbolical association of this sinful door to Hyde and Hyde only, Stevenson is able to establish early on Hyde's connection to corruption and decadence.

Meanwhile, if readers were to contrast Hyde's door to the one that Jekyll uses regularly, the parallels between Jekyll and Hyde and the elements of good and evil become even more evident. In the chapter that follows, when readers are finally introduced to Jekyll, they find that his door boasts 'a great air of wealth and comfort, though it was now plunged in darkness except for the fanlight' (40). This bears obvious reminiscence to Jekyll's situation, in the sense that not only do the qualities of 'wealth and comfort' reinforce the doctor's positive impression on the read-

ers' mind, but the looming 'darkness' of the door also foretells his inner struggle with the containment of his less respectable persona. However, while most translators reviewed in this paper are successful in conveying to their Chinese readers the sense of decay that is associated with the door of Mr Hyde, most seem to have missed the significance of the word 'darkness' as an insinuation of Jekyll's divided self, and translated it simply according to its literal meaning of 'nighttime'. The important metaphor that the author employs to further reflect the ambiguity of the Victorian divided self, as a result, is once again obscured in the process of translation.

The most interesting thing about this metaphor of the 'door' in *Jekyll and Hyde*, however, lies not in its suggestion of the separate and opposed presence of good and evil, but in the gradual development of the discrepancy between the distinction of good and evil, as perceived by society, and their ambiguity as experienced in reality. This works because, by emphasizing the fact that Jekyll and Hyde use separate doors that reflect their respective representation of lawfulness and evilness, a discourse is created to mimic the conventional Victorian belief of good and evil being two separate and non-overlapping entities, along a new suggestion that the manifestation of one or the other is simply a matter of personal choice. The questioning of this Victorian belief, however, soon reveals itself as readers are introduced to the scenes behind the previously closed doors. In chapter Four, after the murder of Sir Danvers Carew, although the scene of the evil door shifts from the back entrance of Jekyll's laboratory to Hyde's apartment in Soho, they nonetheless share a reminiscent connection in the elements of evil found in the 'dingy street', 'gin palace' and 'ragged children' (48) surrounding the Soho location, which the narrator further emphasizes when he remarks on the 'evil face' (49) of its landlady. But as readers are brought inside this apartment, although at first the sight of the rooms 'having been recently and hurriedly ransacked' seems to suggest a

consistency with its outward decadence, they learn unexpectedly that it is 'furnished with luxury and good taste' (49). And almost immediately after this, when the scene changes to Utterson's confrontation with Jekyll, a parallel and reversed contrast is encountered as readers discover the existence of chaos behind Jekyll's orderly façade, as Utterson 'eyed the dingy, windowless structure with curiosity, and gazed round with a distasteful sense of strangeness as he crossed the theatre' (51). By intentionally disclosing to the readers this kind of discrepant detail in front of and behind both doors, the story is able to unleash its most powerful critique of society's experience of the divided self phenomenon, which is the cohabitation of good and evil behind a misleading disguise. In order to be able to re-convey this to a different audience, a translator must be vigilant when translating any passage with possible cultural connotations, and try his/her best in re-wording the phrases in a different language in ways that does not jeopardize this reading. For example, although by translating the line 'a distasteful sense of strangeness' into something like 'a strange and boring feeling', (Wang)¹¹ a translator may succeed in accurately conveying to his readers the feeling of the protagonist, it does so only at the expense of the cultural elucidation of the original text because the distastefulness of Utterson is intended as both a description of his feeling as well as a critique on the falsehood of Jekyll's outward respectability, which applies also to late-Victorian society as a whole. Similarly, the use of the Chinese term *zi wei* in another translation (Zhao 34) although it seemingly captures the correct mood of the original description, the phrase is likely to be interpreted in the Chinese language as something similar to 'unenjoyable', which does not quite match up to the affirmative/authoritative tone of 'distasteful' of the English text. This means that the metaphorical significance of the contrast between the interiors and exteriors of the doors, which relies heavily on the provision of distinctive references to good and evil, is once again weakened due to the need to choose

between translating a text as a story and as a cultural critique.

Stevenson, meanwhile, does not intend his assessment of the *fin de siècle* manifestation of the divided self to stop there. In fact, in order to further prompt the question of the nature of morality within oneself, readers soon realize that the metaphorical implication of the two doors as representation of good and evil has only been set up as a decoy. The story's ultimate critique on society's failure to comprehend and understand the elements of immorality that surrounds them, and the illusion that such things are external to their cultural identity instead of internal, does not come until those entrances (which previously suggests a clear pathway to either good or evil) are respectively disabled to insinuate the confinement of both law and chaos within one single entity. This begins shortly after the incident of the murder when Dr. Jekyll, out of fear and guilt, damages the key that is associated with Hyde's door, leaving it 'as if a man had stamped on it' (71), which metaphorically suggests his determination to forsake his evil identity and re-align himself to his conventional Victorian sense of high morality. However, what takes place afterward turns out to be the opposite of what Jekyll has in mind, for at that stage the ambiguity between the good of Jekyll and the vileness of Hyde has already become inseparable, to the extent that by damaging the key, what has been successfully prevented is not the transformation from the lawful Jekyll to the evil Hyde, but the back-transformation from Hyde to Jekyll, which leaves him with no choice but to seek the help of Dr. Lanyon and ask him to retrieve his medicine for him. This, in essence, marks the shift of the metaphor of the door from being representative of a passage to either good or evil, to simply a surface that *hides* the nature of good and evil which has always existed within oneself. In other words, the conventional Victorian belief that the path of good or evil is simply a matter of personal choice, along with the concept of the existence of a certain system of morality that guides society toward goodness and prevents evil, is being thoroughly criticized

here as a fabricated lie. The purpose of the previous interpretation of the doors as a metaphorical choice between morality and immorality, thus, now fully reveals itself to be a Conradian 'whited sepulcher' in its criticism of society's hypocrisy of believing in the false façade of conventional Victorian morality, which in actuality only masks its own ambiguous malignancy.

In order to fully illustrate to readers the cultural connotation of the story as a critique of this sense of disorder, and achieve its aim of making society aware of its own erroneous ways, Stevenson is careful to structure his metaphorical transformation of the symbolical meaning of the door as an apparent parallel to what the late Victorian society was experiencing regarding the mounting revelation of 'immoral' elements in their midst. He achieved this by utilizing in the story texts or dialogues that bear obvious resemblance to the public attitudes that are being expressed at the time towards society's internal chaos. For example, upon reading Henry Mayhew's reports in the *Morning Chronicle* (1849-50, later serialized as *London Labour and the London Poor*, 1861), which revealed to the middle-class the abhorrent living condition of the poor, and made them question the existence of morality in their society, William Makepeace Thackeray writes:

But what I note, what I marvel at, what I acknowledge, what I am ashamed of, what is contrary to Christian morals, manly modesty and honesty, and to the national well-being, is that there should be that immense social distinction between the well-dressed classes (as, if you will permit me, we will call ourselves) and our brethren and sisters in the fustian jackets and pattens [...] the griefs, struggles, strange adventures here depicted exceed anything that any of us could imagine. Yes; and these wonders and terrors have been lying by your door and mine ever since we had a door of our own. We had but to go to a hundred yards off and see for ourselves, but we never did.¹²

The sentiments of shame, grief and disbelief which Thackeray laments here, after realising, on reading Mayhew's report, the nature of duality in his society, is one that is interestingly echoed by Dr. Lanyon in the story after his discovery of the dual identity of Jekyll and Hyde:

My life is shaken to its roots; sleep has left me; the deadliest terror sits by me at all hours of the day and night; and I feel that my days are numbered, and that I must die; and yet I shall die incredulous. As for the moral turpitude that man unveiled to me, even with tears of penitence, I can not, even in memory, dwell on it without a start of horror.
(80)

Indeed, as Lanyon discloses in his letter his feeling of shock and horror over the revelation of Jekyll's secret, a sharp parallel can be traced between this emotion and the public sentiment at the time towards the exposure of chaos in society. Not only does Lanyon's distinctive choice of words of 'incredulous' and 'penitence' echo Thackeray's disbelief at what he perceives as the violation of his 'Christian morals, manly modesty and honesty', but Stevenson was also able to craftily set up the plot so that the revelation of the dialecticism of Jekyll and Hyde becomes simultaneously a corresponding picture of the late-Victorian cultural duality, in the sense that Lanyon's realization of the existence of evil within what had been conventionally perceived as the pillar of morality, as reflected in the identity of Jekyll as the ideal Victorian gentleman with 'every mark of capacity and kindness' (43), is comparable to the discoveries made by Mayhew regarding the buried social problem of Victorian England's most celebrated city.

For a translator, this is once more a difficult task to tackle because an understanding of the cultural paradigm of the time is needed to bring to readers a sense of awareness of the cultural implication of the divided self phenomenon. And when the culture

of the translated text lacks this same shared knowledge to allow it to accurately decipher the metaphors, it is up to the translator to convey the message in such words that would enable readers to grasp its full meaning. In Jekyll's confession afterwards, for instance, the sufferer of the divided self states that:

Though so profound a double-dealer, I was in no sense a hypocrite; both sides of me were in dead earnest; I was no more myself when I laid aside restraint and plunged in shame, than when I laboured, in the eye of day, at the furtherance of knowledge or the relief of sorrow and suffering. (81)

Jekyll's profession of his innocence here, in his insistence on his earnestness and the conviction that he is 'in no sense a hypocrite', importantly underlines the fundamental correspondence between the story's duality and cultural dilemma of the age, which is the realization of the unsettling complication of personal and cultural identity, as manifested in the no-longer deniable existence of 'evil' under a moralistic façade. The term 'hypocrite', thus, should not be interpreted simply as a person who deliberately masks a conscious evil, as suggested in its being translated into the term *weishan* by Zhao, but instead must be regarded as involving the problem of Jekyll's personal identity interconnected with the overall cultural ambivalence of Victorian decadence. Similarly, the subject-focus of the phrase 'both sides of me were in dead earnest' is significant because its social implication is that it accepts the uncompromising co-existence of good and evil. Therefore to interpret 'in dead earnest' as 'extreme sincerity' (Zhao 75) or 'determination' (Chen 128) with regard to both sides, would be to miss the connotations of active conflict in the dilemma of Victorian identity concerning the divided self.

Of all the translators analysed in this study, only Wu seems to have been able to grasp the metaphorical implication of this passage. His translation of the sentence as 'both faces are absolutely

real' (Wu)⁴³ not only captures the intended tone adequately, but also enables his Chinese readers to better comprehend the cultural reference intended by the original text. However, when faced with other cultural-specific allusions that carry highly deliberate metaphorical connotations, even the best translations must accept defeat. For example, Dr. Lanyon's comparison of his early relationship with Jekyll to that of 'Damon and Pythias' (36), besides demonstrating his lamentation of the deteriorated friendship between himself and Jekyll, also utilizes the insinuation of this mythological reference of two close friends linked in life and death to foreshadow Jekyll's situation. Although Chinese culture does not lack mythological icons capable of recreating the same intensity of the friendship between Damon and Pythias, it would be difficult to come up with one that contains the corresponding motif of life and death as well. As a result, in spite of the fact of the lack of metaphorical equivalence in Chinese society, such translations as 'the best of friends' (Chen 20) must nonetheless be regarded as inadequate because they are unable to convey the full literary and cultural significance of the original text.

Similarly, towards the end of the book, when Jekyll compares his feeling of helplessness to contemplating the terrible omen of a 'Babylonian finger on the wall' (88), it symbolically suggests not only the imminent destruction of the self by divine judgement, but evokes once again the connotations of Orientalism in the decadent biblical city of Babylon, to invoke the fear of and the fascination with anarchy and discontent in late Victorian society. In this regard, the problem of translation of this metaphor incorporates more than just the textual and linguistic feature of the original story, because the literal translation of 'Babylonian finger' demands from its Chinese readers the same level of biblical knowledge possessed by a Victorian reader, which is not something that a translator can guarantee.

A similar but more subtle usage of such biblical allusion can be found in Poole's description of the sound he hears originating from

Jekyll's locked laboratory, which he perceives to be '[w]eeping like a woman or a lost soul' (69). Here, the terminology of 'lost soul' is a significant one because it deliberately reinforces the conventional Victorian idea of morality, which popularly regards its middle-class code of behavior as the foundation of society's salvation. By equating the emergence of Hyde to the damnation of Jekyll (as implied in the perdition of the doctor's soul), the cultural implication of the scene is clearly one that seeks to mimic the experience of society, during its transition from Victorian conventionality to decadence and its struggle to comprehend its own cultural identity. The translation of the word 'lost', therefore, becomes a complicated problem because it can be interpreted in several different ways, and not all of them convey this sense of cultural connotation. Wu and Wang, for example, coincidentally deduced from it the meaning of physical disorientation, and translated the phrase as 'a soul that got lost' (Wu 65; Wang 115), which clearly fails to relate the issue of Victorian morality and its cultural complication. Chen, meanwhile, interprets the word in association with the psychological status of the mind, and translates the expression into 'a soul that has become confused' (Chen 98). This, likewise, fails to convey to its Chinese readers the biblical and highly Victorian middle-class implication of the phrasing of 'lost soul', which refers more to the notion of moral perdition than the physical and mental status of an individual. Finally, aside from the word 'lost', the translation of the word 'soul' also merits thorough consideration because it is likewise possible to interpret this term in several different contexts in Chinese. Unfortunately, the choice of the Chinese word *guihun* by Zhao (8), which more often invokes the negative image of a ghost or an apparition than the inner essence of men, has clearly missed the metaphorical meaning of the original text.

In many ways, the literary obsession with the theme of the divided self of the late nineteenth century can be seen as a moment of self-recognition of the demise of conventional Victorian cul-

tural identity, which prompted the exploration as well as gradual acceptance of the possibility of the co-existence of good and evil within a single entity. In *Jekyll and Hyde*, Dr. Jekyll's dilemma in attempting to hide his 'almost morbid sense of shame' behind an 'imperious desire to [...] wear a more than commonly grave countenance before the public' and his 'impatient gaiety of disposition' (81), essentially summarizes this late-Victorian identity crisis as a taxing conflict between society's desires for the maintenance of its conventional 'respectability' in face of the gradual revelation of its many problems. For an entire generation that grew up under a strict Arnoldian system of pedagogy that stressed moral respectability yet found it nearly impossible to admit to such serious flaws in identity, to deliberately lie to oneself and overlook such flaws meant jeopardizing one's integrity, which posed another difficulty. The late-Victorian notion of cultural identity, therefore, represents a complicating struggle of alliance and association between two polarizing positions. As R. K. R. Thornton observes, the late Victorian sentiment denotes:

[A] man caught between two opposite and apparently incompatible pulls: on the one hand he is drawn by the world, its necessities, and the attractive impressions he receives from it, while on the other hand he yearns towards the eternal, the ideal, and the unworldly.¹⁴

Indeed, as this study has demonstrated, throughout the text of *Jekyll and Hyde*, Stevenson both consciously and conscientiously applied various meticulously crafted metaphors and allusions to create not only a simple story, but a cultural critique that summarizes this precise cultural sentiment and identity crisis that preoccupied his society. The unmistakable parallel which operates between the development of the text's divided self motif and the cultural dilemmas of society at the time, is keenly observed in Jekyll's awareness, before the manifestation of Hyde, of his 'profound duplicity' (81), which insinuates the recognition of an

existing duality in society where good and evil are inseparable. The eventual emergence of Hyde, thus, is never once alluded to in the text as the creation of something new (i.e. Frankenstein's monster), but rather as the manifestation of a *previously existing* part of the self which, in the end, 'shook the very fortress of identity' (83) because of its revelation of the flawed makeup of the popular Arnoldian image of a stoically moralistic Victorian subject.

As Masao Miyoshi points out, the greatest contribution of *Jekyll and Hyde* to our understanding of the cultural dilemma of Victorian society lies in the successful 'vision it conjures of the late Victorian wasteland, truly a de-Hyde-rated land unfit to sustain a human being simultaneously in an honorable public life and a joyful private one'.¹⁵ Indeed, given the fact that the text contains such an obvious intention to examine and explore the relationship between identity and the late-Victorian awareness of both the moral and immoral aspects of its own society, a translation that does not convey this element properly would seem to be missing out on one of the most important features of the original text. As this article has shown, translating such notions and ideas in the same metaphorical mode as the original is not easy, and in places may even be downright impossible. Nevertheless, because the literary prestige of the work happens to lie in this unique technique utilized by the author, a responsible translator must seek to recognize and understand the metaphorical tone as a key feature of the text, and try to come up with ways to re-create this *modus operandi* in another language. It is only by being willing to discover the cultural relevance of a text and to tackle the impossible, can a translator guarantee equal literary significance in his/her translation. Otherwise, the translation process commits the fundamental fault of rendering an important literary masterpiece of social, moral and psychological criticism into a simple and mundane story, thus missing the very purpose and goal of literary translation.

NOTES

1. J. M. Golby, ed., *Culture and Society in Britain: 1850-1890 A Sourcebook of Contemporary Writings*. London: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 1.
2. J. Hillis Miller, *Victorian Subjects* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990), p. 51.
3. Richard Scholar, 'Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde: A Case-Study in Translation?', *Translation and Literature* 8, 1998, 42-55.
4. Sun Yifeng, 'Fanyi Xuyao Jingti di Xianjing' / 'Pitfalls in Translation', *Chinese Translators Journal*, 1, 1999, 48-50.
5. Robert Louis Stevenson, 'A Chapter on Dreams' (1888) in *R. L. Stevenson on Fiction*, ed. by Glenda Norquay (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999), p. 136.
6. Robert Louis Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde and Other Stories* (1886) ed. by Jenni Calder (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1997), p. 35, henceforth cited in text.
7. Shuangjun Chen (trans.), *Hua Shen Bo Shi / The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (Taipei: Zhengwen Press: 1973), p. 17.
8. Among the translations surveyed in this study, this strategy of making similar subtle alterations to the original text in a parallel presentation is more frequently employed than one might expect. This not only attests to the difficulties of translating a text such as *Jekyll and Hyde*, but also, to a certain extent, demonstrates the translator's recognition of the story's rich cultural implication and the complexity of re-rendering them in a foreign language in an unaltered state.
9. Yiheng Zhao (trans.), *Hua Shen Bo Shi* (Kunming: Yunnan People's Press, 1981), p. 6.
10. 'A Humble Remonstrance' (1884) in *R. L. Stevenson on Fiction*, p. 90.
11. Pengyan Wang (trans.), *Hua Shen Bo Shi* (Beijing: Foreign Language Press, 2000), p. 61.
12. William Makepeace Thackeray, 'Waiting at the Station', *Punch* 18, 1850, 93.
13. Hong Wu (trans.), *Hua Shen Bo Shi* (Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press, 2003), p. 81.
14. R. K. R. Thornton, "Decadence" in *Later Nineteenth-Century*

England', in *Decadence and the 1890s*, ed. by Ian Fletcher (London: Edward Arnold, 1979), p. 26.

15. Masao Miyoshi, *The Divided Self: A Perspective on the Literature of the Victorians* (New York: New York University Press, 1969), p. 301.

Stevenson, Conrad and the idea of the gentleman: Long John Silver and Gentleman Brown

Wendy R. Katz

'Gentlemen' (May 1888), the fifth of twelve essays Stevenson wrote for *Scribner's Magazine* while staying at Baker Cottage, Saranac Lake, New York from October 1887 to April 1888, considers the nature of that elusive and quintessentially British term of approval for the ideal man.¹ Addressed to an American audience during Stevenson's second trip to the United States, the essay seems designed as something of a cross-cultural exercise, one made possible by his acquaintance with a nominally classless society in America. This is not to say that Stevenson hadn't considered questions of class before, as a young man in Edinburgh, or that he hadn't contemplated the matter further, during his first trip to America in 1879 when he voluntarily housed himself alongside the steerage passengers aboard the *Devonia*, assuring himself of his status only when the brass plate of the second cabin confirmed that he was still a 'gentleman' rather than a steerage-class 'male'.² Still, the years since that initial journey had afforded Stevenson ample time to assimilate his earlier American experience and perhaps to use it as a filter through which to view his own culture. 'Gentlemen,' the result of what might be called a process of transatlantic deliberations, reveals a sharp awareness and understanding of the crucial transformation in social class taking place on both sides of the Atlantic. More than that, it also helps to illuminate what I see as a noteworthy connection between Stevenson and Joseph Conrad, which I will explore in what follows by looking at two parodic figures of gentlemen in their fiction, Long John Silver in *Treasure Island* and Gentleman Brown in *Lord Jim*.

Stevenson maintains from the start of his essay that the concept of the gentleman is hard to pin down. Any discussion of the term, he allows, will involve matters of class and privilege, but he wants to lessen, if not eliminate altogether, this emphasis on birth and breeding, or the 'social' rather than 'moral' dimension of the issue. This reduced emphasis on ancestry notwithstanding, he has by no means converted to the American ideology of equal rights. Although Dr. Edward Trudeau, who treated Stevenson during his Baker Cottage days, says in his autobiography that 'Mr. Stevenson was very democratic in his ideas',³ Stevenson himself claims that he 'was hurried into no democratic theories',⁴ declaring that we are born 'unequal', inheriting different gifts and tendencies. But 'descent' is so complicated, he argues, that the gentleman can come from any class. His essay advances no political endorsement of social change, which is well underway in any case, but offers instead recognition of the 'classlessness' of the gentleman, an acknowledgment of its more important moral character. As such, the gentleman can appear in the descendants of 'clowns or counts' ('Gentlemen', p. 347). Specific notions of the gentleman vary with one's class, he explains good-humouredly in a passage offered in 'the love of fun' that brings to mind Herbert Pocket's gentle tutoring of Pip, the aspiring gentleman in *Great Expectations*:

In one class, and not long ago, he was regarded as a gentleman who kept a gig. He is a gentleman in one house who does not eat peas with his knife; in another, who is not to be discountenanced by any created form of butler. ('Gentlemen', pp. 347-8)

Such fun aside, Stevenson is aware throughout that the definition of the gentleman not only varies with class but changes with time: the most elegant gentlemen of the future, he predicts, will be those who can wait upon themselves.

In what develops into a discussion of masters and servants,

Stevenson describes an encounter with his personal idea of a 'gentleman' in the form of a hotel waiter. In a hotel where he and his mother were the only guests, Stevenson and the dining room waiter spent the afternoons together 'on a perfect equality in the smoking-room' and then the waiter served them at night with what Stevenson describes as 'a masterpiece of social dexterity'. Being a gentleman is no easy feat, especially not in a culture of masters and servants that Stevenson prophesies 'will exist nowhere long' ('Gentlemen', pp. 348-9). The social force of the term has manifestly ceded power to its moral force.

The relation between master and servant, Stevenson contends, is essentially 'corrupt and vulgar'. The effect of balancing this relation between people who are socially unequal is that one person is invariably degraded, a phenomenon that differs from one side of the Atlantic to the other. Conscious of his American audience in *Scribner's Magazine*, Stevenson explains his view that the idea of service is so inimical to the independent American, born in a world where 'all men are created equal,' that the servant is forced to be ashamed of his position:

At home in England it is the master who is degraded; here in the States, by a triumph of inverted tact, the servant often so contrives that he degrades himself. He must be above his place; and it is the mark of a gentleman to be at home. He thinks perpetually of his own dignity; it is the proof of a gentleman to be jealous of the dignity of others. He is ashamed of his trade, which is the essence of vulgarity. He is paid to do certain services, yet he does them so gruffly that any man of spirit would resent them if they were gratuitous favours. ('Gentlemen', p. 349)

Class envy, shame and resentment swirl around each other in this view of Americans in service, but the phenomenon is not uniquely American as will be clear later, in the comparison of the Stevenson and Conrad texts.

This being 'at home' with oneself, the mark of a gentleman just noted, along with another characteristic of the gentleman, a sense of decency, is compromised quite literally by being away from home. The person who moves beyond the margins of familiar territory or recognizable social settings, which was increasingly common in a world of improved transportation and travel, confronts a difficult challenge. It's easy to behave decently, he says, among people and in places we know, but trickier when we are faced with the unfamiliar. A new terrain offers few readable markers. His 1879 journey to the United States, for example, was made more difficult because he was passing as a mason on board ship, and he was never sure that his masquerade was a success: 'The workmen were at home,' he observes, 'I was abroad' ('Gentlemen', p. 351). He was chiefly concerned not to offend, to be 'decent', unlike the three unpleasant saloon passengers visiting the steerage area whose condescending treatment of Stevenson's fellow passengers could not have been more carefully calculated to expose the boorish arrogance of his class: '[A]s I was by that time pretty well accustomed to the workman's standard, I had a chance to see my own class from below' ('Gentlemen', p. 352). The 'gentlefolk', coming into contact with another class, behave badly, leaving behind whatever sense of decency they might have had.

The nub of Stevenson's argument seems to be that social change creates confusion about class, manners, character, and gentlemanly behavior. Abandoning his attempts at a definition, he characteristically agrees instead to explain his elusive signifier by means of 'a story', focusing on a vivid metaphor of ordered social ceremony, the dance. In the past, during what Stevenson calls the 'life of our fathers', formal rules fixed behavior in the 'dance' of life; social conduct was consequently 'highly ceremonial'. Convention and rule governed even 'the simplest necessary movements [. . .] Life was a rehearsed piece; and only those who had been drilled in the rehearsals could appear with decency in

the performance'. A man's birth and education allowed him to be 'versed in this symbolic etiquette' ('Gentlemen', p. 358). The less ceremonial the society, the more difficult to follow the fixed rules that guided the gentleman:

With the decay of the ceremonial element in life, the gentleman has lost some of his prestige, I had nearly said some of his importance; and yet his part is the more difficult to play. It is hard to preserve the figures of a dance when many of our partners dance at random. It is easy to be a gentleman in a very stiff society, where much of our action is prescribed; it is hard indeed in a very free society where (as it seems) almost any word or act must come by inspiration. The rehearsed piece is at an end; we are now floundering through an impromptu charade. [. . .] [M]uch of life comes up for the first time, unrehearsed. ('Gentlemen', p. 359)

The gentleman is the one who can improvise with tact and 'fitness' in these unrehearsed moments accompanying shifting notions of class.

Victorians writing both before and after Stevenson's essay struggled with the concept of the gentleman, and Victorian scholars do the same. Cardinal Newman's attempt to define the gentleman, in *The Idea of a University* (1852), calls to mind Stevenson's later discussion of the effects of familiar territory on behavior:

The true gentleman [. . .] carefully avoids whatever may cause a jar or a jolt in the minds of those with whom he is cast; -- all clashing of opinion, or collision of feeling, all restraint or suspicion, or gloom, or resentment; his great concern being to make every one at their ease and at home.⁵

In the evolving definition of this crucial norm of Victorian masculinity, Newman's mid-century contribution to the shifting

emphasis from the aristocratic to the moral ground underscores the growing democratization of the term. But the increasing numbers of men who believed they were gentlemen of character and principle rather than gentleman by birth were not oblivious to the status attached to their attained distinction. Almost one hundred and thirty years after Newman's work, Robin Gilmour, in *The Idea of the Gentleman in the Victorian Novel* (1981), observes that the position of the gentleman offered a 'not too exacting route to social prestige for new social groups'.⁶ Including Stevenson's 'Gentlemen' among other works, Victorianist Shirley Robin Letwin, in *The Gentleman in Trollope* (1982), provides an historical survey of the definitions of the term that likewise traces its changing social significance. Letwin concedes that a definition remains disappointingly elusive, although the 'large literature devoted to the subject shows that it has been something of a national hobby'.⁷ Tony Tanner, perhaps even more to the purpose, discusses the use of the word 'gentleman' in his 1986 *Critical Quarterly* article 'Joseph Conrad and the Last Gentleman'. Tanner's article, which examines the concept in *Victory* (1915), includes as an epigraph an entertaining passage from *The Nigger of the Narcissus* (1897) in which some sailors discuss 'the characteristics of the gentleman', disputing endlessly as if to illustrate Letwin's point but ignoring any question of moral worth:

One said: - 'It's money as does it.' Another maintained: - 'No, it's the way they speak.' Lame Knowles [. . .] explained craftily that he 'had seen some of their pants'. The back-sides of them —he had observed— were thinner than paper from constant sitting down in offices, yet otherwise they looked first-rate and would last for years. It was all appearance. 'It was,' he said, 'bloomin' easy to be a gentleman when you had a clean job for life.'⁸

For those on the outside looking in, being a gentleman often

meant living a life of leisure. By way of background, Tanner offers several efforts to grapple with the concept and touches on Victorian definitions of the gentleman attempted by Mill, Ruskin, Macaulay, Newman, Emerson, and of course Stevenson (Tanner, p. 111). He goes on to say that "Trollope, for whom the idea of "the gentleman" was absolutely central [. . .] admits quite explicitly [. . .] "A perfect gentleman is a thing which I cannot define" (Tanner, p.113). In other words, finding attempts to tackle the concept is fairly easy, but uncovering a precise formulation impossible.

More recent scholarly work on the Victorian concept of the gentleman has focused on the issue of masculinity. Of particular interest and relevance is James Eli Adams' *Dandies and Desert Saints* (1995), in which the gentleman figures as a type of masculine identity (along with the prophet, the dandy, the priest, and the soldier), that was achievable through self-discipline, an ethos of restraint that was expected to effect a way around the problem of one's birth. As a gendered term, the notion of the 'gentleman' was largely supported by a rhetoric of manliness and virility (often employed by Stevenson in his essays) invoked to strengthen the borders of masculinity and render them less porous to the perilous bleeding through of effeminacy. (In this regard, what is one to make of Stevenson's insistence on putting Silver in the cook's galley of the *Hispaniola*?) More important here is Adams' theorizing about masculinity and social class. 'Egalitarian understandings of the gentleman,' he explains, 'developed in the eighteenth century in resistance to aristocratic hegemony, turned it into a norm that could be realised by deliberate moral striving.'⁹ The route of the gentleman was thrown open in particular to the middle-class intellectual: 'Increasingly, middle-class professionals [...] legitimated their masculinity by identifying it with that of the gentleman—a norm that was the subject of protracted contention throughout Victorian culture, because the concept served so effectively to regulate social mobility and its attendant privileges' (Adams, p. 6). Stevenson's Doctor Livesey, gentleman, medical

man and lawyer, seems a striking example of Adams' point. He is surely the epitome of self-discipline in *Treasure Island*, firmly challenging the boisterous, drunken, and decidedly undisciplined reveller Billy Bones. Social inferiors, in both *Treasure Island* and *Lord Jim*, have little control over themselves. In still another place, Adams comments on the disorienting instability of structures of masculinity for early Victorians such as Carlyle: "The traditional "scripts" of masculinity no longer obtained" (Adams, p. 24). Stevenson's late-Victorian metaphor in 'Gentlemen' is 'dance' rather than 'scripts', but surely the dilemma expressed in these tropes is similar. It was a predicament that continued to command concern throughout the century. Yet another point that Adams makes, that the Victorians eschewed the self-conscious aspirant to the rank of gentleman, seems to find an echo in Stevenson's insistence that the gentleman be 'at home' with himself. Ironically, unselfconsciousness becomes a new form of the 'gentleman born' and a cause of anxiety. Groping for a definition of the gentleman that would temper social forces in an unsettled society, the Victorians sought a definition that continued to elude them. Adams notes that the gentleman is 'the most pivotal and contested norm of mid-Victorian masculinity' (Adams, p. 152). Stevenson's essay would suggest that it was a pivotal norm of late-Victorian masculinity as well.

What does this discussion of the gentleman have to do with a comparison of Stevenson and Conrad? Let me begin by making the more obvious connections between the two texts I propose to compare. As a regular teacher of *Lord Jim*, I use Conrad's turn of the century text as a way to end my course on the nineteenth century novel by offering the story of the enigmatic Jim as the narrative undermining of Victorian certitude, itself a flawed but helpful key to the fiction of the century. The period of sureness and certainty, I suggest, was at last over (if it ever existed) and this novel of indeterminacy usually suffices to make the point. But each time I re-read *Lord Jim* in preparation for a farewell

to the Victorians, I am struck by the narrative echoes of an earlier Jim —Stevenson's Jim Hawkins, whose tale carries its own uncertainties. *Treasure Island* and *Lord Jim* have striking affinities. Both are romances of heroism. Indeed, I imagine that if Conrad had allowed the readers of *Lord Jim* to peek over the young sailor's shoulder as he was reading those stories of adventure, perhaps they would have seen *Treasure Island*, a book that would not have been out of place among the adventure romances that inspire the heroic idealism of Conrad's character and cause him to dream of 'quell[ing] mutinies on the high seas'.¹⁰ There are other links to be made between the texts. If *Lord Jim* persists in baffling readers with its chronological puzzle, *Treasure Island*, it should be remembered, begins at the end, although Jim Hawkins claims to be telling the story as a conventional sequential narrative. No longer a youth, Jim offers a narrative that is complicated by the adult's retrospective account of the boy's point of view. Like Conrad's text, *Treasure Island* also contains a narrative shift to which its readers have to adjust. And both books leave their readers with figures of evil who are allowed to escape punishment, Gentleman Brown and Long John Silver. It is not too much of a stretch to say that the observant reader of *Treasure Island* is left with a narrative puzzle that resembles the one Conrad's readers attempt to work out. Readers of both texts may also ask themselves why the 'bad guy' gets away.

Both texts consider the competing claims of loyalty, the issue of moral responsibility, and the problem of desertion. Conrad's Jim deserts the pilgrim ship, while Stevenson's Jim Hawkins leaves the captain and his men. And both fall in with the enemy, Conrad's Jim after his jump from the *Patna* and Jim Hawkins after his French leave, blundering into the enemy camp and compromising his own integrity and the safety of his allies. Jim Hawkins manages to get back to his friends and is forgiven whereas Conrad's Jim must have his day in court and at last punishes himself. Both texts involve elements of the law: Conrad

submits his Jim to the rigors of the enquiry whereas Jim Hawkins is accompanied throughout by that staunch figure of both the law and medicine, Dr. Livesey.

Perhaps the most compelling affinity between the two books is the claim on both characters by others. In the case of Jim Hawkins, the claim of evil is the piratical hold that must be rejected. For Conrad's Jim, the claim comes despite his repeated efforts to separate himself from others. It appears as the claim of the German skipper, as dirty and dishevelled as Billy Bones, and the skipper's drunken allies, figures of disorder that resemble Stevenson's disorderly pirates. Unlike these disgraceful men is the reputable Marlow, who wants to lay claim to Jim as 'one of us'. Catastrophically for Conrad's Jim, an especially obnoxious and predatory claim comes from Gentleman Brown, a 'latter-day buccaneer' (*LJ*, p. 303) with a bagful of silver dollars and a fear of imprisonment or punishment that rivals that of Long John Silver. Gentleman Brown, who 'became talked about as the terror of this or that group of islands' (*LJ*, p. 303), could well have been an older Silver, a Silver who, having never made it into the gentlemanly stratum of society for which he so longed, was contented with his self-called title. For Jim Hawkins, the unwelcome claim comes from Silver, who is at his persuasive best when he says he sees the boy as 'the picter of my own self when I was young and handsome'.¹¹ Jim Hawkins, the son of a publican who pointedly meets Silver in the latter's own public house, must resist the pirate's appeal to a shared identity. Similarly, Conrad's Jim is addressed by Gentleman Brown as an alter ego figure. Both Jim Hawkins and 'Lord' Jim are deceived by men who are false doubles, egomaniacs out for themselves and for loot.

Significantly, both Long John Silver and Gentleman Brown want more than simple loot; they both aspire to the status of gentleman. The word 'gentleman' occurs throughout both texts, as do questions of respectability; there are roughly twenty-five references in *Treasure Island* and twenty in *Lord Jim*. In *Treasure*

Island, dedicated to ‘an American gentleman’, Lloyd Osbourne, Trelawney and Livesey are referred to as gentlemen as a matter of course, foils to those parodic anti-gentlemen, the ‘gentlemen of fortune’ (*TI*, pp.68-9), who are out for treasure. Jim, who assures Ben Gunn that the ‘Squire’s a gentleman’ (*TI*, p. 94) whose word is good, overhears Silver say that he wants to be ‘a gentleman’ (*TI*, p. 68). Far more complex than his fellow pirates, Silver carefully distinguishes his own ways and habits from those of the other pirates:

‘Now, the most goes for rum and a good fling, and to sea again in their shirts. But that’s not the course I lay. I puts it all away, some here, some there, and none too much anywheres, by reason of suspicion. I’m fifty, mark you; once back from this cruise, I set up gentleman in earnest.’
(*TI*, p. 68)

Silver vainly agrees with Israel Hands’ estimation that he is ‘quite the gentleman’ (*TI*, p. 71), but clearly decency has nothing to do with notions of the gentleman for this murderer, who wants to kill his enemies, Smollett, Trelawney, and Livesey, rather than maroon them: ‘When I’m in Parlyment, and riding in my coach, I don’t want none of these sea-lawyers in the cabin a-coming home, unlooked for, like the devil at prayers’ (*TI*, p. 71). Silver knows enough about the gentleman’s honor to assure Smollett that he believes the captain is trustworthy: ‘A word from you’s enough’, he says, ‘I know a gentleman’ (*TI*, p. 119). Later, when Livesey comes to speak to Jim, and Silver allows the boy to speak to the doctor alone, consent is granted on the grounds of Jim’s being a gentleman. Silver appeals to Jim’s word of honour in these terms: ‘Hawkins, will you give me your word of honour as a young gentleman—for a young gentleman you are, although poor born—your word of honour not to slip your cable?’ (*TI*, p.182). And Jim is as good as his word. But Silver also believes that money will transform him into the gentleman he wants to be, and he links wealth

and the rank of gentleman in his attempted seduction of Jim: 'I always wanted you to jine and take your share', he says to Jim, 'and die a gentleman' (TI, p. 168).

Doctor Livesey can't bear the idea of leaving Jim with Silver and insists on Jim's making an effort to escape. His advice curiously anticipates the urging of Conrad's despicable deserters in the later *Lord Jim*: 'Jump!' the doctor advises Jim. 'One jump, and you're out, and we'll run for it like antelopes' (TI, p. 184). But Jim Hawkins, who had given his word, refuses to jump.

Conrad's Jim, the Jim who 'jumps', is described as 'gentlemanly' (*LJ*, 50) in the second chapter of the novel, when still an untested sailor. Brierly refers to him as a gentleman in his discussion with Marlow, when the tortured Captain presses Marlow to bribe Jim to run away from the shame of the enquiry: 'The fellow's a gentleman if he ain't fit to be touched—he will understand' (*LJ*, 92). Brierly's suicide, the result of his encounter with Jim, may be viewed as a consequence of Jim's having subjected himself to public scrutiny at the enquiry and having thereby crossed a border a gentleman cannot safely traverse. Such an interpretation is suggested by Adams' observation that when, in the rhetoric of masculinity, the disciplined will 'crosses an elusive boundary that demarcates a realm of ostentation, or theatricality, or calculated social role—when, that is, discipline is manifested as public ritual—contemporary observers typically attack it as a form of effeminacy' (Adams, p. 209). Perversely, Jim is abused by the name when his fellow deserters in the boat call him 'Too much of a bloomin' gentleman' (*LJ*, 129). To them, Jim's status as a gentleman is to be despised and equated with cowardice and unmistakable effeminacy. Speaking to Marlow, Jim says that he is confiding in Marlow because both are gentlemen: 'I wouldn't have talked to you about all this if you had not been a gentleman. I ought to have known . . . I am —I am —a gentleman too . . .' (*LJ*, 139). The second engineer on the *Patna* refers to Jim as a gentleman twice, once to rebuke him and the next time when the

second engineer runs into Jim by chance and promises to safeguard his secret: 'I know a gentleman when I see one, and I know how a gentleman feels' (*LJ*, 182).

Gentleman Brown comes in at the end of *Lord Jim* as the mocking figure who undoes Jim, condemning him to Marlow as a 'stuck-up beggar' (*LJ*, 297) and a 'hollow sham' (*LJ*, p. 297). Like the deserting seamen of the *Patna*, Brown reviles Jim as a figure of questionable masculinity: 'As if he couldn't have said straight out, "Hands off my plunder!" blast him! That would have been like a man! Rot his superior soul!' (*LJ*, 297). At the same time, according to Marlow's narration, he paradoxically blames Jim for not thinking Brown worth the trouble of fighting:

'A thing like that letting me off as if I wasn't worth a kick! [. . .] Fraud . . . Letting me off . . . And so I did make an end of him after all [. . .] I would give you a five-pound note if—if I had it—for the news—or my name's not Brown....' He grinned horribly.... 'Gentleman Brown.' (*LJ*, 297)

During his confrontation with Jim, Gentleman Brown manages to say just the right thing to remind Jim of the younger man's own fallibility, telling him that Patusan is 'as good a jumping-off place for me as another. I am sick of my infernal luck. But it would be too easy. There are my men in the same boat —and, by God, I am not the sort to jump out of trouble and leave them in a d—d lurch.' (*LJ*, 326)

He reminds Jim of the past he has run from, asking

'whether he had nothing fishy in his life to remember that he was so damnedly hard upon a man trying to get out of a deadly hole by the first means that came to hand —[. . .] And there ran through the rough talk a vein of subtle reference to their common blood, an assumption of common experience; a sickening suggestion of common guilt.' (*LJ*, 329)

Brown, as I suggested earlier, is a version of Silver, and very much like Silver in his complexity:

Brown was a latter-day buccaneer, sorry enough, like his more celebrated prototypes; but what distinguished him from his contemporary brother ruffians [...] was the arrogant temper of his misdeeds and a vehement scorn for mankind at large and for his victims in particular. The others were merely vulgar and greedy brutes, but he seemed moved by some complex intention. (LJ, 303)

During their meeting, Brown tells Marlow that he was down on his luck and was left with 'nothing in the way of material advantage except a small bag of silver dollars' (LJ, 305). It's hard to resist thinking of the bag Silver escaped with at the end of *Treasure Island*.¹²

As indicated earlier, it remains something of a puzzle that Stevenson and Conrad allow their villains to escape punishment. Silver and Brown are, as was also suggested above, corrupt versions of the two Jims, false doubles to be resisted. Resistance, however, is not followed by defeat. One way of understanding their escape comes by means of an intertextual commentary offered by yet another criminal character whose narrative life is consumed by the idea of the gentleman and the purposive activity of revenge. Dickens's Magwitch, who has his own false double in the renegade gentleman Compeyson, from whom Magwitch can extricate himself only in death, is sadly forbidden his long-planned escape. Although no real threat to anyone in his reformed condition at the end of *Great Expectations*, Magwitch succumbs to capture, containment, and state execution. His fate helps to work out the puzzle of the unequivocally more offensive Silver and Brown, who escape punishment.

Negotiating the pieces of the puzzle requires further assistance from Frederic Jameson's chapter on Conrad in *The Political Unconscious* (1981), in which Jameson sees Brown as a figure of

nihilism, 'that formidable combination of energy and, more than utter lack of scruple, a passion for nothingness'.¹³ Jameson's schema of the character system of *Lord Jim* interestingly puts Brown in a category of 'The Buccaneers' in opposition to 'The Pilgrims'. Like the ruthless buccaneer-adventurer Silver, who serves as Jim Hawkins' adversary, Brown functions as the necessary adversary against whom the older Jim can prove himself. In the Patusan section of the novel, Jameson maintains, 'the malevolent agency of Nature is replaced by that of man, in the person of Gentleman Brown' (Jameson, p. 267). Jameson construes the motivation for Brown's 'gratuitous malevolence' (Jameson, p. 268) in ideological terms, using the idea of *ressentiment*:

[. . .] such a motivation is available everywhere in late nineteenth-century ideology, devised initially as a psychological explanation of the revolt of mobs, but also for the revolutionary vocation of disaffected intellectuals, and then more largely applied to the presentation of daily life, and to the discrediting of the political impulse in particular: this is, of course, the concept of *ressentiment*. (Jameson, pp. 267-8)

Jameson explains that Brown, and by analogy Silver, offer a "glimpse of [...] sullen resistance, and the sense of the nascent political dangers of [...] potential unification of the laboring population' (Jameson, p. 289). This Marxian class interpretation offers to see beyond the individual envy of these would-be gentlemen to the political power of the under-class. As figures in what are arguably politically conservative narratives, the escapees Silver and Brown seem to warn, at the level of Jameson's 'political unconscious', of the enduring and uncontainable threat of such social forces. More than dangerous simply to the two Jims, their fictional antagonists, Silver and Brown are dangers to the prevailing social order and, altogether unlike Magwitch, to the hegemonic ruling class. To function adequately at the level

of political allegory, the subversive power of their threatening nature requires their escape.

Tony Tanner, discussing the word 'gentleman' in Conrad's *Victory*, writes that 'As a word, a concept, a referent, a signal in social discourse, a recognizable hierarchical marker, it is completely destabilized; blurred by multiple recontextualisations; and semantically depleted, if not emptied by repeated and vague usage' (Tanner, p. 108). Tanner concedes that 'in England itself, the word was becoming ever harder to define' (Tanner, p. 108). In *Treasure Island* and *Lord Jim*, the men who despise their own status and want to grin triumphantly at the top of the social heap, are men, as Marlow describes Brown, of 'inconceivable egotism' (*LJ*, p. 334) who want that 'recognizable hierarchical marker' of the gentleman. Fuelled by envy, shame and resentment, these characters are enticed by a notion of the gentleman that corrupts and debases, one that is unrelated to merit and achieved by connivance. Stevenson's essay doesn't make the word 'gentleman' easier to define. But it does help readers to understand such characters by reminding those on both sides of the Atlantic of the difficulties involved in the notion, dangers even.¹⁴ As Stevenson warns, the inevitable changes in class structure mean that the unrehearsed life was now to be expected; and those who struggled to succeed through some species of corrupt improvisation, possibly the most complex of men, might be, depending on one's politics, a predictable source of trouble.

NOTES

1. 'Gentlemen' is one of Stevenson's twelve monthly articles written for Scribner's Magazine. See Robert Louis Stevenson, 'Gentlemen', *Scribner's Magazine*, 3 (1888), 635-40. It was followed by 'Some Gentlemen in Fiction' (June 1888) and 'Popular Authors' (July 1888). These three of the twelve essays written for Scribner's were not published along with the others included in *Across the Plains* in 1892. Roger Swearingen notes that they were 'first collected in the Scribner's counterpart of the Edinburgh Edition, the Thistle Edition, vol. 14 (1896)'. See Roger Swearingen, *The Prose Writings of Robert Louis Stevenson, A Guide* (London: Macmillan, 1980), p. 117.
2. Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Amateur Emigrant*, in *From the Clyde to California, Robert Louis Stevenson's Emigrant Journey*, ed. by Andrew Noble (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1985), p. 39.
3. *Edward Livingston Trudeau, an Autobiography* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1961; i.e., 1916), p. 226.
4. Robert Louis Stevenson, 'Gentlemen' in *The Novels and Tales of Robert Louis Stevenson*, XIV (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), pp. 346-360 (p. 348). Further references to this essay are given after quotations in the text.
5. Geoffrey Tillotson, *Newman, Prose and Poetry* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 544. 'The Victorian Web' has a useful section on 'The Victorian Gentleman' including notes on 'The Gentleman', 'The Political Function of the Gentleman', and 'Newman on the Gentleman', this last by George P. Landow.
6. Robin Gilmour, *The Idea of the Gentleman in the Victorian Novel* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1981), p. 5.
7. Shirley Robin Letwin, *The Gentleman in Trollope: Individuality and Moral Conduct* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), p. 11. See also the 2004 thread on 'the gentleman' on the 'Victoria' listserv initiated by Martin Danahay with a question on Newman's ideal gentleman.
8. Joseph Conrad, *The Nigger of the 'Narcissus'*, ed. by Robert Kimbrough (New York: W. W. Norton, 1979; i.e., 1900), pp. 19-20. See also Tony Tanner, 'Joseph Conrad and the Last Gentleman', *Critical Quarterly*, 28 (1986), 109-142. This article was kindly brought to my attention by Richard Ambrosini.
- 9 James Eli Adams, *Dandies and Desert Saints: Styles of Victorian*

Masculinity (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), p. 152. Further references to *Dandies and Desert Saints* are given after quotations in the text. See also Joseph Bristow, *Effeminate England: Homoerotic Writing After 1885* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995).

10. Joseph Conrad, *Lord Jim* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1986), p. 47. Further references to *Lord Jim* are given after quotations in the text.

11. Robert Louis Stevenson, *Treasure Island*, ed. by Wendy R. Katz (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998; i.e., 1883), p. 168. Further references to *Treasure Island* are given after quotations in the text.

12. The entry for Gentleman Brown in the *Oxford Reader's Companion to Conrad* sums up the 'malevolent buccaneer' and 'gloating pirate' as 'a resonantly symbolic emissary of evil'. Owen Knowles and Gene M. Moore, *Oxford Reader's Companion to Conrad* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 49.

13. Frederic Jameson, *The Political Unconscious* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), p. 255. Further references to *The Political Unconscious* are given after quotations in the text.

14. Cedric Watts, who sees the roots of *Victory* in Stevenson's *The Ebb-Tide*, recalls that Edgar, in *King Lear*, says to Gloucester, 'The Prince of Darkness is a gentleman.' See Cedric Watts, 'The Ebb-Tide and *Victory*', *Conradiana*, 28 (1996), pp. 133-7, 137 n.

Stevenson and cultural survivals in the South Seas

Laavanyan Ratnapalan

The present essay argues that in his South Seas travel writing, Robert Louis Stevenson's concern is not to reveal things 'as they are' but rather to question what it is that he is witnessing, for what is striking about this writing is how it is almost at every step marked by a theoretical understanding of the complexity of cultural narration. Stevenson approaches cultural phenomena from a standpoint of contradiction and doubt, where the appearance of these phenomena is itself regarded as paradoxical and presents a problem for the observer to take in. One of the ways in which he reaches this position is through a critical encounter with the work of a contemporary writer whose influence is evident but hardly acknowledged in Stevenson's work: the anthropologist E. B. Tylor. Here this critical encounter is explored with reference to Tylor's concept of the *survival*.

E. B. Tylor and cultural survivals

Edward Burnett Tylor (1832–1917) is regarded as the foremost British anthropologist¹ of his day. A self-taught scholar for much of his life, he is nevertheless able to produce numerous books and articles across a range of subjects, many of which are widely discussed beyond the relatively small cultural milieu of Victorian ethnology. Tylor's appointment in 1896 as the first professor of anthropology at the University of Oxford is seen as a significant moment in the professionalisation of that discipline. His method of research is synthetic, bringing together masses of information about different human cultures from correspondents —mainly European and American missionaries and colonial officials— who are stationed around the world, and ordering this information according to an evolutionary scheme.²

Tylor's great work is *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art and Custom* (1871), which is revised and reprinted several times in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Despite the revisions, however, the organisation of the book does not vary. Tylor begins by writing about the science of culture and his view of its development, which leads on to his concept of cultural survivals (see below). The definition Tylor gives of 'culture' in the first edition of his book also remains the same throughout:

Culture, or civilization, taken in its broad, ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.³

As his definition shows, Tylor is interested in what he regards as the totality of human activity within a multilayered society. Culture is this totality expressed as a 'complex whole', and consists of things such as 'knowledge, belief, art' and so on. Furthermore, the broad evolutionary paradigm that his work follows is evident in the interchangeability of the terms 'culture' and 'civilization'. Without reference to civilization, the term culture could refer to any group of 'capabilities and habits' that are abstracted from the observable materials of a given society. Whereas, granting such an abstraction the title of 'civilization' places it in moral juxtaposition with things which it is *not*. Culture *as* civilization, therefore, implies a hierarchical relationship between human societies, which may be measured and compared by anthropologists in practical ways according to their particular field of research. After this theoretical exposition on culture he devotes the remainder of his study to explaining the inner coherence of his idea through categorical examples in the following fields: emotional and imitative language; the art of counting; mythology; animism; rites and ceremonies.⁴

Tylor never strays from the belief that anthropology, or 'the

science of culture', 'is essentially a reformer's science.'⁵ The aim of human society is gradual enlightenment through scientific discovery and greater knowledge of the world, and this increase in knowledge and understanding will at the same time improve human society. Within this view, he adopts a controversial measure to explain the appearance in 'civilized' societies such as those of Western Europe and North America of supposedly outdated beliefs and irrational or barbaric practices. Such modern-day occurrences as children's sports, popular sayings, and 'absurd customs', all of which he acknowledges are 'not philosophically insignificant'⁶, are described as *survivals*. These are, in his words

processes, customs, opinions, and so forth, which have been carried on by force of habit into a new state of society different from that in which they had their original home, and they thus remain as proofs and examples of an older condition of culture out of which a newer has been evolved.⁷

The function of cultural survivals, according to Tylor, is strictly academic, since their modern-day existence in advanced societies has been brought about by 'force of habit' rather than by necessity. Tylor emphasises this point by stating that 'for the ethnographer's purpose, at any rate, it is desirable to introduce such a term as "survival", simply to denote the historical fact which the word "superstition" is now spoiled for expressing.'⁸ Wherever he identifies a superstition, or something that does not fit his idea of modernity, he terms it a survival, rendering it archaic and the site of irrational activity. In this way, the concept of survivals is used to maintain his evolutionary model of cultural change, from 'savagery' towards 'civilization'. The rare instances of savagery *in* civilization which he discovers are defined as exceptional cases—survivals, traces of human prehistory, which deserve a rational explanation as 'proofs and examples of an older condition of

culture out of which a newer has been evolved.’

The smoothness of the application of the theory of survivals in Western society makes Tylor a significant figure in both anthropological science and in the wider circulation of ideas during the later nineteenth century.⁹ As many other writers have noted, cultural evolution is an idea that is used to buttress opportunistic foreign policies during the Victorian era.¹⁰ The march of civilization is deemed to bring light to the dark corners of the earth. This is a widespread contemporary notion that Tylor’s theory generally affirms. But the theory of survivals is not seen as being uniformly applicable to all human cultures, according to critics such as the Scottish folklorist Andrew Lang, who is in correspondence with Stevenson about anthropological matters relating to the South Seas.¹¹ Lang is also a keen follower of Tylor’s work, at least since the time of the publication of *Primitive Culture*, and owes his adoption of the anthropological—rather than the dominant philological—method of comparative analysis in folklore and mythological studies to Tylor’s pioneering studies.¹² He begins, therefore, as a student of Tylor’s work.

Lang’s reading of Tylor becomes steadily critical as, in his opinion, the empirical evidence begins to weigh against the anthropologist’s theories. He observes in a dedication to Tylor written in 1907:

The doctrine of survivals, though incontestable in general, has its difficulties. We meet phenomena in savage culture which one set of students recognizes as ‘survivals’; while, in the same facts, other inquirers see novelties, freaks, or ‘sports’. An example is familiar; several of the customs and beliefs of the tribes of Central Australia are, on one side, explained as survivals of *primitive*, on the other as recent modifications of *decadent* totemism.¹³

Lang contests Tylor’s theory, at least in its universal application across the cultures of the world. According to Lang, ‘the

doctrine of survivals' faces difficulty in trying to explain certain tendencies of 'savage' culture. The doctrine is shown to have geographical limitations. Using the example of the beliefs and customs of the tribes of central Australia, which he researches in pursuance of his own theory about the origins of religion, Lang points to the confusion of interpreting these either as relics of a more 'primitive' stage, or as the contortions of 'decadent totemism'. In its application to some non-Western cultures the concept of survivals is therefore in a precarious position, unable to mediate between differing interpretations of cultural change. It is here that Stevenson situates his own examination of Tylor's theory.

Cultural survivals in the South Seas

Although Stevenson nowhere states that he has read Tylor's work it is difficult to imagine from his wide reading of anthropological literature prior to setting out and during his travels in the South Seas, not to mention his correspondence with Andrew Lang, that he has not come into contact with Tylor's ideas. Even more indicative of the fact is his use of the word 'survival' in its Tylorian, anthropological sense several times in his South Seas writing. For example, in his discussion of cannibalism he writes:

Cannibalism is traced from end to end of the Pacific, from the Marquesas to New Guinea, from New Zealand to Hawaii, here in the lively haunt of its exercise, there by scanty but significant survivals.¹⁴

The statement is typical of many of the author's anthropological reflections in *In the South Seas*, and does not attempt to overturn conventional beliefs of the time. Stevenson notes that the nature and practice of cannibalism varies across the Pacific Islands, flourishing in some places, in others existing as 'scanty but significant survivals.' An example of the latter is Tahiti, where 'in historic times, when human oblation was made in the marae¹⁵, the eyes of the victim were formally offered to the chief: a delicacy to the leading guest.' However, he believes that this 'single

circumstance' 'appears conclusive,'¹⁶ adding that 'the higher Polynesian races' of which he includes Tahitians, 'had one and all outgrown, and some of them had in part forgot, the practice [of cannibalism].'¹⁷ The historical example of 'human oblation' in Tahiti is therefore presented as a survival. This reading closely corresponds to Tylor's theory that the more advanced societies shed their barbaric traditions in the course of evolutionary progress up the ladder of civilization.

In the writing on Hawaii Stevenson mentions another survival but in a different formulation:

One residual trait of savage incompetence I have already referred to; they cannot administer a trust —I was told there had never yet been a case known. Even a judge, skilled in the administration, was found insusceptible of those duties and distinctions which appear so natural and come so easy to the European. But the disability stands alone, a single survival in the midst of change; and the faults of the modern Hawaiian incline to the other side.¹⁸

In this example, Stevenson shows how closely he reads culture in the South Seas according to the prevailing European anthropological theories of the time. He describes as a 'residual trait of savage incompetence' the Hawaiian inability to 'administer a trust'. Furthermore, he claims that even a Hawaiian judge 'was found insusceptible of those duties and distinctions which appear so natural and come so easy to the European.'¹⁹ Tylor would approve of this reading of 'a single survival in the midst of change', where the Hawaiians' inherent savagery is cannily exposed in the midst of widespread, Western-influenced, progress. However, the final line of the narrative turns the thought on its head: 'the faults of the modern Hawaiian incline to the other side.' Stevenson claims that despite the 'savage incompetence' manifested by this cultural survival, the majority of the problems that face Hawaiian society have been a product of modernity, that is to say, with

European colonization of the islands. The idea is consistent with his statements in respect of the decline in the native population of Hawaii, where he states that each change, no matter how small, that is imposed on the culture of the islands disadvantages the Hawaiian people, and that the smallest changes can often produce the most adverse results.²⁰

A more emphatic criticism of the concept of survivals is made by Stevenson in his discussion of the ascendancy to power of the Gilbertese King Tembinok'. In the opening passage of the last part of *In the South Seas*, Stevenson describes this individual as 'the last tyrant, the last erect vestige of a dead society.'²¹ Tembinok' is the monarch of three Gilbertese Islands, and his method of governance does not involve advisors. The vigilant ruler who keeps his Kingdom of Apemama in terrified and perpetual silence is also known for his military forays into neighbouring islands —acts for which Stevenson claims that he 'figures in the patriotic war-songs of the Gilberts like Napoleon in those of our grandfathers.'²² Here is a person who appears to be an authentic South Seas survival: a despot, intense and unpredictable, capable of the most terrifying assertions of his power and authority —nothing is more remote to the thought of the placid constitutional monarchy of Great Britain, which would represent modern values in this instance. Yet, towards the end of the section on Apemama, Stevenson produces an extraordinary reversal:

It would be natural to suppose this monarchy intact through generations. And so far from that, it is a thing of yesterday. I was already a boy at school when Apemama was yet republican, ruled by a noisy council of Old Men, and torn with incurable feuds. And Tembinok' is no Bourbon; rather the son of a Napoleon.²³

He proceeds to describe the convoluted recent history of Apemama that leads Tembinok's family, and eventually the present ruler, to gain control over the island. From its recent

republican form it has gradually been transformed into despotism. Tembinok', the despot, is not a battered remnant or a mere survival: instead, he is thoroughly the product of modern conditions, as demonstrated by his stringent restrictions on European and American trade in the port of Apemama.²⁴ In the recounting of the history of the King of Apemama, the concept of the cultural survival is therefore treated with grave irony. Tylor's comforting description of the same as 'proofs and examples of an older condition out of which a newer has been evolved' is made problematic by this 'last erect vestige of a dead society' who owes his existence to modern transformations.

The complicating and paradoxical representation of culture is everywhere in the writing of the South Seas. The historical phenomenon of the Tahitian brotherhood of Oro, a group noted for the members' conditional sacrifice of their own children, is explained in the light of famine in those islands. According to Stevenson, the problem had been so menacing to the future of the people, and 'the needful remedy repulsive, it was recommended to the native mind by these trappings of mystery, pleasure, and parade.'²⁵ For Tylor, the progress of culture often comes at a cost, and advancement cannot be measured uniformly along all its lines. He claims that, 'To have learnt to give poison secretly and effectually, to have raised a corrupt literature to pestilent perfection, to have organised a successful scheme to arrest free enquiry and proscribe free expression, are works of knowledge and skill whose progress toward their goal has hardly conduced to the general good.'²⁶ Certain types of action, while being individual 'progressive', cannot be deemed to advance the culture as a whole.

Stevenson shifts the emphasis on the consequences of immoral actions from the general to the specific, arguing in terms of the violence that is done to South Seas cultures even by the imposition of what from a Tylorian perspective would be regarded as more peaceful conditions. Writing about how the arrival of

European ethics and bureaucracy has led to the absence of war on many Pacific Islands, Stevenson explains how this modern development has not been conducive to the general good:

We have been so long used to the dreary business of war on the great scale, trailing epidemics and leaving pestilential corpses in its train, that we have almost forgotten its original, the most healthful, if not the most humane, of all field sports —hedge-warfare. From this, the islander, upon a hundred islands, has been recently cut off.²⁷

The European separation of civilian and military life has removed the practicalities, even the benefits, of war at an individual level. What some Western observers might regard as barbarous behaviour among Pacific Islanders is for Stevenson essential to the moral identity of such cultures, enshrined in practices such as hedge-warfare, a forgotten form of battle, which is ‘the most healthful, if not the most humane, of all field sports.’

Stevenson uses irony time and again to highlight the productive uses of ‘barbarity’ in the South Seas. In the Marquesas, the French government depends on the criminality of some of the indigenous population for labour: ‘With a people incurably idle, dispirited by what can only be called endemic pestilence, and inflamed with ill-feeling against their new masters, crime and convict labour are a godsend to the government.’²⁸ The presumably civilised colonial government of the Marquesas Islands looks to crime to continue to supply it with an indigenous workforce.

Death and the Marquesans

A further ironic use of the term ‘survival’ occurs in the section on the Marquesas, in which Stevenson describes the appearance of deserted native houses along the roadside in Hatiheu. The local population has either fled or died of European-born disease. ‘Only the stones of the terrace endure’, he writes, and ‘the forest on either hand must be equally filled with these survivals: the gravestones of whole families.’²⁹ In this poignant

example, the ruins of the extinction of an entire culture are collectively described as survivals. The counter-historical reading of Western progress is unmistakable: according to Stevenson, Tylor's proof of an older condition of culture out of which a newer has been evolved is to be found in the mortuary symbols of the former. In discussing death and depopulation in the context of Western colonial activity, Stevenson takes on a subject that many Victorian anthropologists avoid. In *In the South Seas*, the chapter on 'Death' follows a similar course to the one that is projected in Stevenson's earliest plans for 'The South Seas'.³⁰ Therefore it is reasonable to assume that his idea to write this chapter has been germinating for some time. It offers the most intense and critical examination of Marquesan culture of all the chapters that are devoted to those islands.

The literary context for the production of this chapter is Tylor, but also and more generally the 'reformer's science' that is Victorian cultural studies. Tylor's definition of culture is concerned with the broad totality of human 'capabilities and habits'. Taken in its bare outlines it represents a list of achievements that are made in the name of evolutionary advancement. This can be usefully compared with the definition of culture that is given by Stevenson in his earlier travel narrative, *The Amateur Emigrant*: 'Culture is not measured by the greatness of the field which is covered by our knowledge, but by the nicety with which we can perceive relations in that field, whether great or small.'³¹ The contrast with Tylor's views is striking. Stevenson is concerned with 'relations' in the field of knowledge and the 'nicety' with which these relations can be perceived, as the proper study of culture. He does not believe that wide knowledge in itself can guarantee a true understanding, and in this sense Tylor's sweeping evocation of a 'complex whole' would seem to be completely at odds with Stevenson's perspective. This microcosmic and problematising view of culture is supported by his meditation on death and the Marquesans.

Throughout the chapter on death, Stevenson follows the line of many Victorian anthropologists and travel writers, that a melancholy disposition is a native trait or 'survival'. As numerous examples will show, this perspective is adopted by those documenters of non-Western cultures who do not wish to confront the problem of contextualising native population decline within the colonial activity of which they form an essential part.³² Conversely, Stevenson begins by pointing to the statistical fall in the Marquesan population since the first half of the nineteenth century. He claims that the population of the bay of Tai-o-hae has dropped from 'many thousands' to 'eight residual natives.'³³ Such a drastic fall cannot have been the outcome of random fluctuation, since it is simply too great. In the district of Hatiheu, the population has 'declined in forty years from six thousand to less than four hundred.'³⁴ Stevenson mentions various causes of population decline: smallpox, tuberculosis, phthisis, and lower birth rates. Traces of depopulation are everywhere in Hatiheu, as can be seen from the example of the ruins of former habitations that dot the roadside.

The author proceeds to show how the deadly transformation brought with the arrival of the Europeans has paradoxically led the Marquesans to respond in kind. Faced with 'the approaching extinction of his race', Stevenson reports that 'hanging is now the fashion.'³⁵ In the Marquesas, the death of a man is a thing to be greeted with envy, and 'the coffin, though of late introduction, strangely engages their attention. It is to the mature Marquesan what a watch is to the European schoolboy.'³⁶ An even more striking example is later given:

In the time of the small-pox in Hapaa [a Marquesan valley], an old man was seized with the disease; he had no thought of recovery; had his grave dug by a wayside, and lived in it for near a fortnight, eating, drinking, and smoking with the passers-by, talking mostly of his end, and equally unconcerned for himself and careless of the

friends whom he infected.³⁷

Whether this story is true or not, Stevenson believes that 'this proneness to suicide, and loose seat in life, is not peculiar to the Marquesan', but that what makes them unique among the Polynesian people 'is the widespread depression and acceptance of the national end.'³⁸ Marquesan self-destruction precedes the arrival of the Europeans and is a long-established feature of life on many islands which does not, however, achieve status as a historical problem until the Marquesans become objects of Western history. Thereafter, Stevenson's examination of the contemporary population decline reveals how the 'culture' that is represented by the Marquesan people makes no attempt to survive. Although he admits that some Marquesan songs and dances have been forbidden by the French government on the islands, 'many remain, if there were spirit to support or to revive them.'³⁹ Instead, he laments, 'the whole body of Marquesan poetry and music was being suffered to die out with a single dispirited generation.'⁴⁰ No interest remains in cultural preservation against the rapid fall in numbers, since no collective future is anticipated. The response of the Marquesans to their own destruction is to take a stance that is antithetical to the one that is inflicted by changed circumstances: they improvise by seeking, and finding, a space of their own—in death.

Stevenson's meditation on the decline of the Marquesan people complicates E B Tylor's concept of culture without offering any consolatory truths. Tylor's assertion that 'the tendency of modern enquiry is more and more towards the conclusion that if law is anywhere, it is everywhere'⁴¹ is damaged by Stevenson's findings in the South Seas, where each island appears to be 'a law unto itself'.⁴² Tylor's evolutionary perspective on cultural development is disturbed by Stevenson's description of the creative methods of self-annihilation of the Marquesans. Without putting forward a sustained counter-argument, for reasons which probably include the causes of the breakdown of the book that he had intended to

write as ‘The South Seas’, Stevenson nevertheless offers enough examples to make his readers reconsider some of the theoretical investments of Victorian anthropological science.

NOTES

1. Although, this particular term only achieves wide currency during the latter years of the nineteenth century.
2. Tylor’s only excursion to the object of one of his anthropological studies is Mexico, a journey that he subsequently narrates in his study *Anahuac; or Mexico and the Mexicans: Ancient and Modern* (London: Longman, 1861). See also George Stocking’s *Victorian Anthropology* (London: Collier Macmillan, 1987) and *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology* (London: Athlone Press, 1996); and Thomas Hylland Eriksen and Finn Sivert Nielsen, *A History of Anthropology* (London: Pluto Press, 2001).
3. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, p. 1.
4. Tylor believes that a theory is only validated as a category by the volume of factual examples given in its favour. In the preface, he claims that: ‘The statement of the facts must form the staple of the argument, and the limit of needful detail is only reached when each group so displays its general law, that fresh cases come to range themselves in their proper niches as new instances of an already established rule.’ *Primitive Culture*, vol. 1 (5th ed., London: John Murray, 1929), p. vi.
5. *Primitive Culture*, vol. 2, p. 453.
6. *Primitive Culture*, vol. 1, p. 111.
7. *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 16.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 72. Tylor also introduces the supplementary concept of the ‘revival’ to explain the modern manifestations of former superstitions. For example, the ‘group of beliefs and practices which have their roots deep in the very stratum of early philosophy where witchcraft makes its first appearance...constitutes what is now more commonly known as Spiritualism.’ (*Ibid.*, p. 141.)
9. The influence of Tylor’s theory of survivals has even been traced in the work of the early twentieth century art historian Aby Warburg, who writes on the historical ‘afterlife’, or *nachleben*, of works of art. See G. Didi-Huberman, ‘The Surviving Image: Aby Warburg and Tylorian Anthropology’, *Oxford Art Journal*, 2002 25(1): 59-70.

10. For example, Bernard Smith writes: 'In the Pacific it was not only trade and commerce that followed the flag but also "scientific" theory. In this regard it is worth noting that whereas in Europe evolutionary theory was strongly opposed by organised religion, in the Pacific it combined with social Darwinism, in the business of destroying traditional Pacific societies.' Bernard Smith, *European Vision and the South Pacific*, 2nd edn. (London: Yale University Press, 1985), p. x.

11. See Bradford A. Booth and Ernest Meheew (eds.), *The Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson*, vol. 6, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994-6), p. 416.

12. According to his biographer, Lang takes *Primitive Culture* out of the library at Merton College, Oxford in March 1872. cf. Roger Lancelyn Green, *Andrew Lang: A Critical Biography* (Leicester: Edmund Ward, 1946), pp. 69-70.

13. Andrew Lang, 'Edward Burnett Tylor', in H. Balfour et al., *Anthropological Essays Presented to Edward Burnett Tylor in Honour of his 75th Birthday*, Oct. 2, 1907 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), p. 7.

14. *In the South Seas*, p. 92-93.

15. A sacred meeting-place.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 93.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 94.

18. Robert Louis Stevenson, *In the South Seas*, ed. Andrew Lang (London: Chatto & Windus, 1912) p. 194.

19. He adds in *In the South Seas* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1900): 'honest and upright Hawaiians —one in particular, who was admired even by the whites as an inflexible magistrate— have stumbled in the narrow path of the trustee.' (p. 161.)

20. In Stevenson's words: 'Experience begins to show us that change of habit is bloodier than a bombardment.' *In the South Seas*, p. 42.

21. *In the South Seas*, p. 275.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 276.

23. *In the South Seas*, p. 337.

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 283-4. Such restrictions are designed to protect his people from what he perceives to be the harmful effects of European and American trade, such as the unfair exploitation of island resources. It is the perception of his forbidding his subjects from legitimate tradewith foreigners that contributes to the notion of the ruler as a tyrant.

25. Ibid., p. 37.
26. *Primitive Culture*, p. 27-28
27. *In the South Seas*, p. 41.
28. Ibid., p. 68.
29. Ibid., p. 29.
30. See Huntington Library MS 2421 for the author's handwritten plans for 'The South Seas'.
31. *The Amateur Emigrant* (London: Hogarth Press, 1984), pp. 70-71.
32. For more on this subject see Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992) and Neil Rennie, *Far-Fetched Facts: the Literature of Travel and the Idea of the South Seas* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995).
33. *In the South Seas*, p. 26. According to Nicholas Thomas, around 20,200 Marquesans die between 1840 and 1880, for various reasons including internal fighting and famine as well as disease. By the 1880s the population falls to 5,000 and it is to fall even lower, to less than 2,000, in the 1920s. Thomas, *Marquesan Societies: Inequality and Political Transformation in Eastern Polynesia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 4-5.
34. Ibid., p. 27.
35. Ibid., pp. 29-30.
36. Ibid., p. 30.
37. Ibid., p. 31.
38. Ibid., p. 31. Greg Dening has written of the Marquesan (or Enata, as they called themselves) preoccupation with death: 'In the last years of their cultural existence, Enata became preoccupied not with rebellion or resistance, but with themselves. They cannot be said to have had a nativistic revival or to have sought some return to a golden age. They did not indulge, as many other Pacific island groups did, in any millenarian religious movement. They did not extract one element of the culture that came to them across the beach and enlarge it and embellish it. Instead they embarked on a course of suicidal violence. They extracted from their own past its quality of division and hatred. In conditions in which the savagery of their violence was unsoftened by any limitations of tapu or religious and secular morality, they killed one another. Uprooted by the violence done to them by disease, by invasion, by cultural destruction, they raged at one another.' Dening, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on*

a Silent Land: Marquesas, 1774-1880 (Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1980), p. 240.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

40. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

41. *Primitive Culture*, p. 24.

42. MS Vault Stevenson 525, Beinecke Library, Yale University.

Under Mackellar's eyes: metanarrative strategies in *The Master of Ballantrae*

Saverio Tomaiuolo

1. Story, Discourse and Heteroglossia

The choice of the narrative angle and of any special style in a novel is not simply a peripheral element but is, in itself, part of the content of this fictional form. For Robert Louis Stevenson capturing his readers' interests and scrupulously developing his own stylistic technique were integral parts of the same narrative strategy.¹ *Romance* was conceived by him neither as a specific literary genre (with its own unchanging rules and stereotypes), nor as a vague leap into an inconsistent fictional heterocosm; rather, it took the shape of an articulate and deliberate narrative process, which he constantly revised in his essays and translated into his fictional works. In this sense, *The Master of Ballantrae* (1889, from now on *MB*) represents a fundamental achievement in Stevenson's career, summing up many of the thematic and stylistic features he had already introduced in his essays and novels, endowed with a mature metanarrative awareness of all the limits and incongruities of literary writing. Moreover, the force and novelty of *MB* consists in its being an elegy on the impossibility of *romance*, as a narrative choice and even as a concept, in an age of increasing scepticism and sordid individual interests.

In its title, as well as in its semantic implications, Stevenson's novel deals with themes of 'mastery' and 'disinheritance', referring not simply to James and Henry's desire to acquire absolute control over the Durrisdeer estate, but also to literary *mastery* and *authority*. There is a strict connection between these two concepts, as both point to questions related to the notion of *power* in the narrative economy of the text. Significantly, most of the story of the two brothers and the house of Durrisdeer

is recounted by the most pervasive narrative *auctoritas* in Stevenson's text: Ephraim Mackellar, the land steward and administrator of the Durrisdeer estate who collects all the documents related to the events. But his tale—which includes some interpolations, selected by Mackellar himself, such as Chevalier Burke's memoirs and Mr Mountain's version of James Durie's quest for the treasure—is enclosed in another peritextual frame, represented by the *author's* own narration (who calls himself 'the editor' and signs 'R. L. S.'), based on a parcel containing Mackellar's 'book' and received from his friend the lawyer Mr Johnstone Thomson.

The editor's, or better the *ur-editor's*, (to distinguish him from the other 'editor' of the story, namely Mackellar) first form of 'mastery' over the collected texts is a paradoxical one. In fact, his only reliable source (Mr Thomson) makes two mistakes, the first connected to the dates of the events that are narrated and the second to the name of the last lord Durrisdeer:

'The Durrisdeer', cried I. 'My dear fellow, these may be of the greatest interest. One of them was out in the '45; one had some strange passages with the devil—you will find a note in Law's *Memorials*, I think; and there was an unexplained tragedy, I know not what, much later, about a hundred years ago—'

'More than a hundred years ago,' said Mr Thomson. 'In 1783.' [*On the contrary, the final scenes are set in 1764.*] [...]

'Yes,' said Mr Thomson. 'Henry Graeme Durie, the last lord, died in 1820; [*in the course of MB we find out, instead, that his name is Alexander*] his sister, the Honourable Miss Katharine Durie, in 'Twenty-seven;'²

From the first pages of this 'Preface' the reader is confronted

with a series of statements connected with the textual reliability of the documents, doubly questioned because of the novel's inaccurate introduction (on a *narrative* level), and because of its condition of purely fictional product (on a *metanarrative* level). If Mr Thomson suggests that the *ur-editor* should 'work up the scenery, develop the characters, and improve the style', the latter ironically resolves to publish it 'as it stands' (p. 8). So, in these opening pages Stevenson plays a metaliterary game based on the limits and presumptions of novel writing, implicitly aware of the impossibility of being totally objective and detached in any kind of fictional narration. Though Thomson and 'R. L. S.' are dealing with historical events (the Jacobite risings, the reference to Law's *Memorial*), Stevenson subtly indicates that each 'history' is also a 'story', and that there cannot be a totally faithful rendering of any event. In this, as well as in other novels (*Kidnapped*, *Catriona*, or the future *Weir of Hermiston*) even Scottish history will be given a fictional value, as if to illustrate its own status as literary creation written to satisfy the reader's necessities and needs.³ Stevenson here seems to suggest — as he already suggested in 'A Humble Remonstrance' — that the only truth is that of the written text and its words, and that art 'cannot compete with life' because they pertain to two irreconcilable universes. From its beginning *MB* tells a story which is not in search of any connection with everyday events and situations (even though it pretends to be so), but only with a *coherent plot* everybody tries to 'master',⁴ from Mackellar to the *ur-editor*, from Thomson to the Durie brothers, from Chevalier Burke and Mr Mountain to the novel's implied readers (who are given the opportunity to detect and deduce their own truths). As a consequence, page after page of the novel will deal with the *process* of narration — as a permanent revision of pre-inscribed texts — rather than with the actual *story* of the 'Master of Ballantrae'.

Many critics have associated Mackellar with Wayne Booth's 'unreliable narrator' and in a certain sense he appears to be so.

Not only does he offer his personal homodiegetic perspective on events, but comments on, cuts, revises and gives order to the other texts (letters, scraps of dialogues, commercial documents, Chevalier Burke's memoirs and Mr Mountain's narration), which he deliberately uses and misuses as 'evidence' to demonstrate the superiority of Henry's goodness to James' 'devilish' nature.⁵ Mackellar pretends to be objective and detached, but the more he relates the events of the Durrisdeer estate the more he reveals his true intentions. Though there could be some comparisons with Joseph Conrad's homodiegetic narrator Marlow, seduced and at the same time terrified by Kurtz's 'history' in *Heart of Darkness* (1899),⁶ a more useful comparison with Mackellar's peculiar visual angle can be represented by the anonymous 'teacher of languages' in *Under Western Eyes* (1911). Conrad's narrator is more controversial than Mackellar, as his attempts to distort the truth are motivated by his love for Victor Haldin's sister Natalia and by his jealousy for Razumov. At the beginning of the novel (as Mackellar himself does) he immediately tries to justify his own linguistic limits:

To begin with I wish to disclaim the possession of those gifts of imagination and expression which would have enabled my pen to create for the reader the personality of a man who called himself, after the Russian custom, Cyril son of Isidor — Kirylo Sidorovitch — Razumov.⁷

Even though Stevenson's novel is a 'heteroglossia' of points of view, documents and narrations, characterized by different conflicting languages which compose a 'dialogic' text (at least in its general narrative organisation),⁸ Mackellar attempts to turn the *story* and the *history* of the Durie brothers into a 'monological' one-sided relation of events, subjected to his own 'editorial' point of view and to his peculiar visual and moral perspectives. Mackellar's axiological stance as an unreliable narrator (which can be defined not only in terms of an ideological investment, as

in Wayne Booth's view, but also as an optical-geometric visual angle) offers a world-picture that determines and conditions *MB*. But despite Mackellar's aims, the novel finally resists the steward's partisan attempts to impose his exclusive point of view on the readers, not least because of the problematic status of the 'Master of Ballantrae' himself.

So who 'masters' who, and who is the real 'master' in *MB*? From its very title Stevenson's novel questions and debates the idea of power and control on reality and on the auctoritas of the events reported. Stevenson's 'winter's tale'⁹ has the down-to-earth land steward Ephraim Mackellar as its narrator, who dramatizes the contrast between theme (the Master's 'myth', his heroic enterprises and exotic adventures, and the final quest for the treasure) and style (Mackellar's 'ordinary' language), enacting a complex textual antithesis between content and form, or in narratological terms between story and discourse. *MB* thus reveals its value both as a literary masterpiece and as a metaliterary reflection on the way texts are written, 'manipulated' (as in Mackellar's case) and rewritten. As a consequence, James Durrissdeer often takes the form of a Scottish Quixotic hero, the embodiment of a 'winter's myth' on the anachronistic nature of old ideals and values.¹⁰ *MB* illustrates on a stylistic, narrative and semantic level the crisis of the romance, conceived not only as a peculiar literary genre but also as the expression of a cultural system belonging to the past. Despite the 'historical' context of the narration, Mackellar represents the typically pragmatic Victorian man whose aim is to demonstrate the inadequacy and the failure of the hero of the Durrissdeer 'legend' in contemporary society. In this sense, *MB* is an elegy to Romance literature in an un-romantic age. Thus Stevenson leaves the story in Mackellar's hands, with the narratorial power to control, to edit and finally to try and reinscribe the Master of Ballantrae's romance according to his own personal perception and narrative style.¹¹ Rather than the problem of the contrast between Henry and James (the supposed 'good' against

the supposed 'evil') and the mystery related to James's 'devilish' nature, the most puzzling question in *MB* is connected to the choice of Mackellar as narrative mediator and as the prevailing narrative voice of the novel. Even though the textual surface in *MB* presents a melodramatic construction of characters and events (based on apparently Manichean antitheses), Stevenson's own narrative choices act to complicate the meaning of the tale.¹² The very notion of 'truth', which the Victorians constantly and seriously aimed at, is dispersed and put under question because of the presence of the 'partisan' editor Mackellar, who dominates the whole text and determines (or tries to determine) its world picture.¹³

2. Trials of Truth: Witnesses and Duels

After having briefly narrated the story of the Master's decision to join the Scottish rebels and of Henry's permanence at home (followed by his marriage with Miss Alison), Mackellar adds: 'It was December of the same year that first saw me alighting at the doors of the great house; and from there I take up the history of events as they befell under my own observation, *like a witness in a court*' (pp. 18-19, italics mine). This sentence acquires an ironic tinge because of Mackellar's evident preference for Henry's pragmatic way of looking at things, rather than for the romance-like attitude of the Master. Mackellar's reference to the court as the *locus* of 'truth' parodically recalls the incipit of Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White* (1860):

Thus, the story here presented will be told by more than one pen, as the story of an offence against the laws *is told in Court by more than one witness* –with the same object, in both cases, to present the truth always in its most direct and most intelligible aspect; and to trace the course of one complete series of events, by making the persons who have been most closely connected with them, at each successive stage, relate their own experience, word for word.¹⁴

In Stevenson's novel, Mackellar is the only 'witness' of the events who is given the opportunity to narrate them, if unreliably. Wilkie Collins, on the other hand, will try and guarantee, through the use of a multiple narrative perspective, the indisputable truth of Laura Fairlie's 'case'. Finally, while in Collins's novel there is a triumph of justice followed by the resolution of its complex plot (in accordance with that Victorian need for 'solvable plots' that Peter Brooks has studied in detail),¹⁵ in *MB* the narrative texture of the novel will be left unresolved.

Even the adventurous enterprise of the Master is given only an 'unromantic' brief reference by Mackellar, whose aim is to discredit it. The Jacobite heroes are indeed depicted by the steward as a disorganized group of scoundrels:

Altogether it was in pretty ill blood with his family that the Master rode to the North; which was the more sorrowful for others to remember when it seemed too late. By fear and favour he had scraped together near upon a dozen men, principally tenants' sons; they were all pretty full when they set forth, and rode up the hill by the old abbey, roaring and singing, the white cockade in every hat. It was a desperate venture for so small a company to cross the most of Scotland unsupported [...]
(p. 13)

Here the clash is between the content and the style chosen, between the topic of the narration and the narrative technique that Mackellar 'masters'. Thus the 'what' (the 'epic' of Jacobitism) acquires a totally different meaning because of the 'how' (Mackellar's language). Choosing Mackellar's peculiar register, Stevenson gives credit to a theory he had repeatedly alluded to in many of his previous essays: the literary categories of realism and *romance* can be a question of technical choices rather than of subjects and themes.

MB offers many examples of Mackellar's documentary manipu-

lation and of his deliberate intrusions, seeking to de-legitimize James's 'mastery' over the history of Durrisdeer. In some cases he even admits his narrative deficiencies and limits:

My pen is clear enough to tell a plain tale; but to render the effect of an infinity of small things, not one so great enough in itself to be narrated; and to translate the story of looks, and the message of voices when they are saying no great matter; and to put in half a page the essence of near eighteen months –that is what I despair to accomplish. (p. 26)

In other occasions Mackellar comments over and censures other 'texts' dealing with James, in order to 'master' the latter's 'character' in the best way possible. For instance, as far as Chevalier Burke's memoirs are concerned ('The Master's Wanderings. *From the Memoirs of Chevalier de Burke*'), Mackellar abruptly interrupts his 'adventurous' narration –in which James figures as a hero– to point to its textual incongruities:

I drop the Chevalier's narration at this point because the couple quarrelled and separated the same day; and the Chevalier's account seems to me (I must confess) quite incompatible with the nature of either of the men [...]. I have refrained from comments on any of his extraordinary and (in my eyes) immoral opinions, for I know him to be jealous of respect [...]. I regret this oversight of the Chevalier's, all the more because the tenor of his narrative (set aside a few flourishes) strikes me as highly ingenuous. (pp. 59-60)

This brief 'editorial' intrusion contains many lexical allusions to the paradigm of *perception* –a textual occurrence that pervades Stevenson's novel– which in this case points to the absolute partiality of Mackellar's visual and narrative angle ('to an eye more worldly-wise'; 'in my eyes'; and 'oversight'). At the same

time the terms ‘comments’ and ‘version’ refer to the metanarrative strategy that both Mackellar and (implicitly) Stevenson are using in the text.¹⁶

Some pages later (‘Persecutions endured by Mr Henry’) the attempts to discredit James multiply with reference to the Master’s presumed ‘secret’, connected to his ‘Government connivance’ (p. 87) and to the possibility that he acted as a spy for the English monarchy. But Mackellar’s wish to demonstrate Henry’s moral superiority to James does not succeed completely, as his accusations are not supported by reliable evidence and material proofs. The mere fact that the Master’s most ‘devilish’ acts happen when he is alone with Mackellar demonstrates that the latter remains the only witness to a parodic turning of the Jekyll/James into the Hyde/Master:

When I was alone with him, he pursued me with sneers; before the family he used me with the extreme friendly condescension. This was not only painful in itself; not only did it put me continually in the wrong; but there was in it *an element of insult indescribable*. (pp. 77-78)

Anyway, he now practices one of his *transitions*; and as soon as the door closed behind him, and without the smallest change of voice, *shifted from ordinary civil talk into a stream of insult*. (p. 93, italics mine)

In one of his most relevant dramatic asides, Mackellar labels James not just as an anti-Henry but, significantly, as the ideal adversary to *his own* ideological and cultural perspective:

My lord, in his heart of hearts, now knew his favourite to be a Government spy; and Mrs Henry (however she explained the tale) was notably cold in her behaviour to *the discredited hero of a romance*. Thus in the best fabric of duplicity there is some weak point, if you can strike it, which will loosen all; and if, by this fortunate stroke, we

had not shaken the idol, who can say how it might have gone with us at the catastrophe? (p. 89, italics mine)

The 'discredited hero of a romance' is humiliated and 'killed' for the second time (the first was in the course of the Scottish defeat at Culloden) during the famous duel, which represents a sort of anticlimax summarizing many of the novel's hermeneutic codes. Apart from the romantically captivating setting (the shrubbery at the Durrisdeer estate, by candlelight, during a cold winter night on February the 27th 1757), the narration of the duel between the two brothers is only fragmentarily related by Mackellar in his colourless style, in the course of a comic scene that clashes with the tragic context, featuring the terrorized land steward on his knees, crying for fear. The 'what' (the epic duel between the opaque Henry and the wicked 'Master') again contrasts with the 'how' (Mackellar's relation), in a parodic version of a *romance*. As a consequence, the readers will never know what really happened in the course of the duel:

And now here is a blot upon my life. At these words of mine [*because Mackellar has attempted to prevent the duel*] the Master turned his blade against my bosom; I saw the light run along the steel; and I threw up my arms and fell to my knees before him on the floor. 'No, no', I cried, like a baby [...].

I am no judge of the play; my head, besides, was gone with cold and fear and horror; but *it seems* that Mr Henry took and kept the upper hand from the engagement, crowding in upon his foe with a contained and glowing fury [...]. *I cannot say I followed it, my untrained eye was never quick enough to seize details, but it appears* [James] caught his brother's blade with his left hand, a practice not permitted. Certainly Mr Henry only saved himself by leaping on one side; as certainly the Master, lunging in

the air, stumbled on his knee, and before he could move, the sword was through his body. (pp. 94-95; p. 96, italics mine)

What is to be noted here is the presence of a series of isotopic references¹⁷ to *visual limitation* ('to see clearly', 'it seems', 'I cannot say I followed it', 'my untrained eye', 'it appears'), which point to a relevant cultural trait in Mackellar's narration. The only reliable event is its epilogue (James is defeated and, at least momentarily, 'killed'), followed by Mackellar's final remark, in the course of his own re-telling of the duel to old Lord Durrisdeer: 'A partisan I am; partisans we have all been; it is as a partisan that I am here in the middle of the night to plea before you. Hear me; before I go, I will tell you why.' (p. 101)

Mackellar's 'partisan' attempts to acquire a role in the family—and a master-role in the narration of the story—are energetically checked by Alison Graeme/Mrs Henry, during another 'verbal' duel with the land steward, in which she humiliates him by comparing him to 'an old maid':

Presently the door flew open, and my lady swept in with flashing eyes. 'What is all this?' she cried. 'What have you done to my husband? Will nothing teach you your position in this house? Will you never cease from making and meddling?' [...]. She paused, looking at me; then suddenly smiled a little, and said a singular thing: 'Do you know what you are, Mr Mackellar? You are an old maid.' (pp. 127-128)

Interestingly, Alison's allusion to the fact that Mackellar is a 'weaver of stories' ('making and meddling') introduces a metaphor for (textual) 'weaving', which had already occurred and will be used in the novel, as the following examples illustrate:

'Did ever ye hear tell, Mr Mackellar, o' Wully White the wabster?' (p. 22)

'I followed [James] behind, loaded almost to the dust, though I profess I was not conscious of the burthen; being swallowed up in the monstrosity of this return, and my mind flying like a weaver's shuttle.' (p. 73)

Moreover, the moment James Durie starts working as a tailor with Secundra Dass, his weaving activity is compared with Penelope's: 'Underneath this [placard], when he had a job, my gentleman sat withinside tailor-wise and busily stitching. I say, when he had a job; but such customers as came were rather for Secundra, and the Master's sewing would be more in the manner of Penelope's.' (p. 174) Stevenson here seems to suggest that even the Master himself is trying to 'weave' his own *story* as well as his own *history* against Mackellar's attempts at 'making and meddling' it.¹⁸

But there are many other 'duels' in the text as well. The coin tossed, for instance, exemplifies the idea of a contest against any providential view of reality, because everything is entirely demitted to the hands of chance.¹⁹ It is by a coin that the first decision to go and fight for Scotland (or to stay at Durrissdeer) is taken, and it is the Master himself who proposes it:

'I say this, Harry', returned the Master, 'that when very obstinate folk are met, there are only two ways out: Blows—and I think none of us could care to go so far; or the arbitrament of chance— and here is a guinea piece. Will you stand by the toss of a coin?'

'I will stand and fall by it', said Mr Henry. 'Heads, I go; shield, I stay.'

The coin was spun, and it fell shield. So there is a lesson for Jacob', says the Master.

'We shall live to repent of this', says Mr Henry, and flung out of the hall. (pp. 12-13)

If the real diegetic process in *MB* could be said to begin with a repressed and delayed ‘duel’ replaced by the casual toss of a guinea, the second ‘duel by coin’ features the Master and Chevalier Burke, even though its result this time guarantees the alliance between the two and paves the way for their future adventures. Against any theological and teleological approach to existence, James once more contrasts his chance-oriented (and adventurous) ‘vertical’ view of life to a (dull) ‘linear’ existence.

[...] ‘Fight or make friends?’

‘Why, says [James], ‘I think it will be the best manner to spin a coin for it’.

This proposition was too highly chivalrous not to take my fancy; and, strange as it may seem of two well-born gentlemen of today, we span a half-crown (like a pair of ancient paladins) whether we were to cut each other’s throats or be sworn friends. [...] The coin fell for peace, and we shook hands upon our bargain. (pp. 34-35)²⁰

Another important ‘duel’ is the verbal encounter between Mackellar and James during their journey to America. On board the *Nonesuch* the two characters read totally different books, which reveal their divergent attitudes toward reality: Samuel Richardson’s *Clarissa* (read by the Master), and the Bible (by Mackellar). While for Mackellar the sacred scriptures are a moral guide to existence, for the Master they remain another ‘fictional’ document to be read alongside Lovelace and Clarissa’s love story. The Master gives both texts only a literary importance, juxtaposed to the ‘realistically’ aimed teachings of the Bible Mackellar supports:

The book he had on board with him was Mr Richardson’s famous *Clarissa*, and among other small attentions he would read me passages aloud; nor could any elocutionist

have given with greater potency their pathetic portions of that work. I would retort upon him with passages out of the Bible, which was all my library [...]. But it was singular how little he applied his reading to himself; it passed high above his head like summer thunder; Lovelace and Clarissa, the tales of David's generosity, the psalms of his penitence, the solemn questions of the Book of Job, the touching poetry of Isaiah –they were to him a source of entertainment only, like the scraping of a fiddle in a change-house. (p. 156)

This scene offers Stevenson another occasion to insist on the relationship between the inherent literary quality of any written text and to enhance the metafictional nature of his own novel, in which imaginary characters (James and Mackellar) 'read' about other imaginary characters (Clarissa, Lovelace, and the 'characters' in the Bible) in an endless sequence of literary allusions. As a final *coda* to their verbal and literary duel, Mackellar's comic attempt to kill the Master is marked by significant understatement. Though Mackellar remains the 'master' of the narration, he is ultimately 'mastered' by the fictional destiny he will have in Stevenson's text and by the book's prefigured ending, already written and inscribed in the author's intentions:

I called my energies together, and (the ship then heeling downward toward my enemy) thrust at him swiftly with my foot. *It was written* I should have the guilt of this attempt without the profit. Whether from my own uncertainty or his incredible quickness, he escaped the thrust, leaping to his feet and catching hold at the same moment of a stay. (p. 164, italics mine)

At the end of Mackellar and James's journey Stevenson introduces (through the mediation of James's own words) another reflection on the absolute fictionality of their existence as literary characters, though the Master points to the moral necessity to

cultivate an 'idea':

'Oh! There are double words for everything: the word that swells; the word that belittles; you cannot fight me with a word!' said he. 'You said the other day that I relied on your conscience: were I in your humour of detraction, I might say I built upon your vanity. It is your pretension to be *un homme de parole*; 'tis mine not to accept defeat. Call it vanity, call it virtue, call it greatness of soul –what signifies the expression? But recognize in each of us a common strain: that we both live for an idea.' (pp. 167-168)

Playing on the double meaning of the expression *homme de parole* –because Mackellar, being a literary creation, is also a 'man of words'— James (and behind him Stevenson the critic, the novelist and the man) asserts that beyond the arbitrary and changing nature of *paroles* ('O! There are double words for everything') there must always be a vital impulse ('an idea') which should encourage human actions.²¹

The 'duel plot' in *MB* is given a more complex articulation that is not limited to the contrast (either physical or moral) between the two brothers but has a wider textual and cultural relevance. Stevenson's 'antithetical' construction of the novel is in fact tightly connected to Scottish culture and its literary tradition, whose recurrent features are dissociation and ambivalence. The private tragedy of the Durrisdeer estate echoes the public tragedy of Scotland as a land dissociated from the inside; Scotland provided, in David Daiches's own words, 'topographically, psychologically and socially, the "objective correlative" for those moral problems and ambiguities that disturbed [Stevenson] all his life.'²² Notwithstanding the fact that *MB* is a tale which 'travels into many countries' and whose narration is set in Scotland, France, America, India and the Canadian Border, it is in Scottish history, culture and tradition that Stevenson finds many keys to give form to the 'dualistic' and 'duellistic' structure of the novel,

although this antithetical construction is (ironically and deliberately) due to Mackellar's partisan perspective on the events.

3. Intertextuality, Grave Endings and (Grave) Beginnings

In *MB* Stevenson does not only refer to Scottish literature and history but to his own previous novels, enacting a parodic revision of many themes and narrative strategies he had already adopted. His remains a meditation on the impossibility of 'epic' narrations in an implacably 'realistic' world, inserted in a novel which becomes an intertextual 'duel' with himself as a writer and as a literary theorist. First of all, the use of a series of different 'documents' produced by different people (memoirs, letters, written statements etc.), adopted to complicate and to give semantic opacity to the events, is indebted to the narrative strategy of *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886), in which for example Utterson's point of view is mixed with Dr Lanyon's narrative and, finally, with Henry Jekyll's own 'statement of the case'. Henry and James Durie appear to be an ironic evolution of the *doppelgänger* theme, which *Jekyll and Hyde* so evidently embodies. This Calvinistic notion of the 'double self' is complicated in *MB* because of Mackellar's control of all the documents included in the text (framed in turn by the *ur-editor* 'R. L. S'). However, even though James (just like Jekyll) is described as a 'devil' and as an infernal creature, there is in his case no commonly shared opinion on his behaviour.²³

Kidnapped (1886) is also concerned with the characters' interaction with history and their mixing of their private lives with important public events; moreover, the contrast between members of the same family reminds the readers of the relation between the two brothers Alexander and Ebenezer Balfour. Even the adventures on board the *Covenant* and the 'conquest' of the ship, which featured Alan Breck (the Jacobite highlander) and David Balfour (the moderate lowlander), anticipate those of James Durie and Chevalier de Burke on the *Sarah* and parodi-

cally recall the experience on the *Nonesuch*. In a sense, Stevenson parodically rewrites the fictional character of Alan Breck in *MB* to demonstrate how his previous narrations evolved in the elegiac mood of this 'winter's tale'. At the beginning of 'The Master's Wanderings', Chevalier Burke describes a 'duel' between Alan Breck (whom he misnames 'Black') and James Durie, turning this legendary fight into a comic episode: the romance of the past (*Kidnapped*) is thus revised through the implacably parodic eyes of the present:

This was on the second day of our flight, after we had slept one night in the rain upon the inclination of a mountain. There was an Appin man, Alan Black Stewart (or some such name, but I have seen him since in France), who chanced to be passing the same way, and had a jealousy of my companion. Very uncivil expressions were exchanged; and Stewart calls upon the Master to alight and have it out.

'Why, Mr Stewart', says the Master, 'I think at the present time I would prefer to run a race with you'. And with the word claps spurs to his horse.

Stewart ran after us, *a childish thing to do*, for more than a mile; and *I could not help laughing, as I looked back at last and saw him on a hill*, holding his hand to his side, and nearly *burst with running*. (pp. 33-34, italics mine)

The most important adventures of David and Alan (two sides of a 'dissociated' Scotland, torn between the acceptance of a British rule and the desire to be independent), as well as the first meeting between the Master and Chevalier de Burke, take place on the road, a setting that possesses an important chronotopic value. According to Mikhail Bakhtin, the road in fact represents a semantically and textually pregnant site in which irreconcilable

cultures and ideologies are associated:²⁴

Sometimes we walked, sometimes ran; and as it drew on to morning, walked even the less and ran the more. Though, upon its face, that country appeared to be a desert, yet there were huts and houses of the people, of which we must have passed more than twenty, hidden in quiet places of the hills [...]. But for the details of our itinerary, I am all to seek; our way lying now by short cuts, now by great detours; our pace being so hurried; our time of journeying usually by night; and the names of such places as I asked and heard, being in the Gaelic tongue and the more easily forgotten.²⁵

As far as *Kidnapped's* follow-up *Catriona* (1893) is concerned, *MB* anticipates in many respects its interest in Scottish 'duality' stories and narrative textures, as for instance in the case of 'Black Audie's Tale of Tod Lapraik' (Ch. XV), told by Black Audie to David while he is imprisoned in the Bass Rock (anxiously hoping to escape in time for James of the Glen's trial at Inverary). The eponymous hero of this tale is in fact an ambiguous creature, and significantly 'a wabster to his trade'.²⁶

Another novel, which echoes throughout *MB*, is *Treasure Island* (1883), Stevenson's first experiment with romance and with adventure tales. As in Stevenson's literary debut, there are pirates (see 'The Master's Wanderings'), conquered ships, fascinating villains (the character of James owes a lot to Long John Silver) and buried treasures.²⁷ But the most relevant and significant thing is that in *MB* the 'quest' is totally abortive, as the novel ends with no allusion to the destiny of James's phantasmal Adirondack treasure. In Stevenson's later novel the buried treasure will turn into a winter tomb lost in a desolate foreign land, as if the dreams of the past corrupt and disappear in a frozen present which seems to offer no 'treasures' anymore. Stevenson here describes the clash between the hero's aspirations and the

narrative structure of *MB* as an epic in an anti-epic world. Like Don Quixote, James witnesses the doom of idealism, since his inability to cope with the present leads to a tragic epilogue.

The last 'document' included by Mackellar—which follows Mountain's narrative on the death of James's crew—is the inscription chiselled on the grave where the two brothers lie together:

J. D.
 HEIR TO A SCOTTISH TITLE
 A MASTER OF THE ARTS AND GRACES,
 ADMIRED IN EUROPE, ASIA, AMERICA,
 IN WAR AND PEACE,
 IN THE TENTS OF SAVAGE HUNTERS AND THE
 CITADELS OF KINGS, AFTER SO MUCH
 ACQUIRED, ACCOMPLISHED, AND
 ENDURED, LIES HERE FOR-
 GOTTEN.

H. D.
 HIS BROTHER,
 AFTER A LIFE OF UNMERITED DISTRESS,
 BRAVELY SUPPORTED,
 DIED ALMOST IN THE SAME HOUR,
 AND SLEEPS IN THE SAME GRAVE
 WITH HIS FRATERNAL ENEMY

(p. 219).

Even in this case, Mackellar's desire to re-write the story justifies the different tone, which he uses to summarize James's and Henry's lives (and deaths). But, despite his efforts to support Henry Durie, his description appears pallid and colourless, while the one he gives of James's adventures seems richer. Even though he adds a final 'lies here forgotten' to try and erase (at least in his intentions) the memory of the 'Master', the only one who will be probably forgotten seems to be Mackellar himself, who signs the tomb's inscription with the anonymous 'one old servant', in a

sort of scriptural suicide.²⁸

James and Henry's tombstone inscription can be juxtaposed to another one, included in 'Passages at New York', which ironically anticipates it. This 'text' (a placard hung above a hutch) alludes to another kind of 'death': James's momentary transition from romance hero to ordinary man, as well as his social 'descent' from aristocracy to middle-class life. With a typical *mise en abyme* technique, Stevenson here parodically frames his own epilogue in another mock-epilogue, thus making his novel mirror its own textual strategies. In the light of this 'inscription' even the tragic epilogue of *MB* is charged with an ironic vein:

JAMES DURIE,
FORMERLY MASTER OF BALLANTRAE
CLOTHES NEATLY CLOUDED

SECUNDR A DASS
DECAYED GENTLEMAN OF INDIA
FINE GOLDSMITH WORK

(p. 174)²⁹

If *Kidnapped* ended with an explicit reference to its sequel *Catriona*, the epilogue to *MB* can be textually and semantically connected with *Weir of Hermiston* (1894), the novelist's unfinished masterpiece. The image of the tomb with which the curtain falls on the two brothers will in fact reappear at the beginning of Stevenson's last novel:

In the wild end of a moorland parish, far out of the sight of any house, there stands a cairn among the heather, and a little by east of it, in the going down of the braeside, a monument with some verses half defaced. It was here that the Claverhouse shot with his own hand the Praying Weaver of Balweary, and the chisel of Old Mortality has clinked on that lonely gravestone. Public and domestic history have thus marked with a bloody finger this hollow among the hills; and since the Cameronian gave his life there, two hundred years ago, in a glorious folly, and without

comprehension or regret, the moss has been broken once again by the report of firearms and the cry of the dying.³⁰

Among the other connections between the two novels, the most relevant ones are related mainly with the ambiguity of both titles (along with the epistemological consequences of such a peritextual choice), which do not deliberately refer to a specific 'Weir' (Adam or Archie) and to a specific 'Master' (James or Henry), along with the recurrent image of the 'weaver' (see the recurrent textual presence of the 'Praying Weaver of Balweary') as an allusion to the fictional construction of both the 'history' and the 'story' narrated in the two texts. Finally, the contrast between Adam's brutal 'realism' and Archie's dreaming 'idealism' often resembles that between the two brothers in *MB*.

Emblematically, Stevenson's most intimate narrative reflections on Scottish history —*MB* and *Weir of Hermiston*— were composed far from Scotland, as if to enhance the fact that the farther he travelled from his motherland, the more he found himself connected to it. But while *MB* points to the impossibility of an 'epic' literary form in an anti-heroic society, *Weir of Hermiston* seems to suggest (at least from the fragment Stevenson left his readers) the urgency of a new romance. If in *MB* the tomb surrounded by the cold winter landscape becomes the metaphor for the paralysis of old values, that same image will become in Stevenson's last novel the central *chronotope* where the most important events of the narration will take place. Significantly, the cold gravestone that condemned James and Henry to an eternal exile in the distant American wilderness, will be brought back in *Weir of Hermiston* to the author's native Scotland, where everything began, as if to demonstrate —in Stevenson's own words— that 'though these dreams of youth fall by their own baselessness, others succeed, graver and more substantial; the symptoms change, the amiable malady endures.'³¹

NOTES

1. In Robert Kiely's words, 'Stevenson's concept of adventure was also part of a highly serious and carefully developed theory of fiction.' —Kiely, *Stevenson and the Fiction of Adventure* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965), p. 21.
2. Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Master of Ballantrae*, ed. with Introduction and Notes by Adrian Poole, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1996), pp. 6-7. From now on, page references will be from this edition.
3. Hayden White has repeatedly asserted the implicit fictional quality of historical narrations; for him '[the] meaning of real human lives, whether of individuals or collectives, is the meaning of plots, quasiplots, parplots, or failed plots by which the events that those lives comprise are endowed with the aspect of stories having a discernible beginning, middle, and end. A meaningful life is one that aspires to the coherency of a story with a plot.' —White, *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), p. 173.
4. To quote from Alan Sandison whose detailed analysis of Stevenson has deeply influenced my own approach, '[the] fragmentation of authorial responsibility at the very start of the book is of crucial significance: a character then takes over as a writer of the book who turns out to be less the creator than the creature of a certain sort of discourse through whose forms alone can the realm of the moral occult be approached.' —Sandison, *Robert Louis Stevenson and the Appearance of Modernism. A Future Feeling*, (London: Macmillan, 1986), p. 307.
5. In describing James Durie to Sidney Colvin, Stevenson says, 'The Master is all I know of the devil' —letter from Saranac Lake dated 24 December 1887, quoted in Robert Louis Stevenson, *Selected Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson*, ed. Ernest Mehew (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997), p. 356. A 'homodiegetic narrator' in narratological terms, is a narrative perspective which corresponds to that of a character involved in the narration— see Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse* (London: Cornell University Press, 1978) and, on a more general level, the already quoted Wayne Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1961).
6. According to Roderick Watson's analysis, *MB* thematically prefigures the themes related to 'existential wilderness' which will be typical of Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, and which will lead 'directly to Stevenson's finest novel of modernity, *The Ebb-Tide*.' —"You cannot fight me with a word": *The Master of Ballantrae* and the Wilderness beyond Dualism',

Journal of Stevenson Studies, 1 (2004), 2.

7. Joseph Conrad, *Under Western Eyes*, ed. and introduced by Jeremy Hawthorn (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 3. Both Stevenson and Conrad's novels include a series of documents which, rather than revealing the 'truth' about what has happened, tend to complicate it.

8. According to Mikhail Bakhtin, the novel as a literary form is marked by the presence of a 'heteroglot' stratification of languages; as a result '[it] is a phenomenon multiform in style [...]. In it the investigator is confronted with several heterogeneous stylistic unities, often located on different linguistic levels and subject to different stylistic controls.' —'Discourse in the Novel', in *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), p. 261.

9. As far as 'A Winter's Tale' is concerned, there is an explicit intertextual dialogue with William Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale* (1611), first of all because of the presence of two kings—Leonte from Sicily and Polixenes from Bohemia—who usually refer to each other with the term 'brother'. *The Winter's Tale* deals with disinheritance and exile, with reference to the destinies of Perdita (a semantically meaningful name) and Florizel; moreover, the final resurrection of the queen Hermione—turned to perfect stone—with the mysteriously magical help of Paulina, wife of Antigonus (a courtesan at Leonte's court) will be re-configured in the Master's third and final 'resurrection'. For a discussion on the connections between *The Winter's Tale* and *MB*, see Jean-Claude Almaric, 'The Master of Ballantrae: Une conte d'hiver? Note sur un sous-titre', *Cahiers Victoriens & Edouardiens*, 40 (October 1994), 119-125.

10. In Northrop Frye's view, the 'mythos of winter' is characterized by irony and, in some other cases, by satire. —*Anatomy of Criticism. Four Essays*, first ed. 1957 (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990), p. 223.

11. Stevenson had to face problems related to the novel's textual coherence; for instance, as far as the final narrative set in the wilderness is concerned, he repeatedly reflected on the best style and the most suitable narrator, choosing in the end Mr Mountain to relate part of 'The Journey in the Wilderness'. 'How, with a narrator like Mackellar, should I transact the melodrama in the wilderness? How, with his style, so full of disabilities, attach a passage which must be either altogether seizing or altogether silly and absurd?' —'Stevenson's 'Note to the Master of Ballantrae. Appendix II'', in *The Master of Ballantrae*, cit., p. 226.

12. Roderick Watson acutely suggests that in this novel Stevenson 'moves away' from a traditional dualistic approach to reality 'to confront a fully modern world view (or even perhaps a postmodern one) where such easy distinctions do not and cannot apply' (Watson, p. 14). In Alan Sandison's words 'while on the surface adopting the mode of melodrama [MB] significantly transcends it, though 'subverts' might be a better word. When the moral axis turns out to be so unstable, then authority and authorship are both dealt with so deprecatingly, when an insistent textual reflexivity exposes nothing but the texts' impotence.' (Sandison, p. 309.) For James F. Kilroy 'ultimately, the complex narrative technique has a greater effect: it conveys, quite realistically, the complexity of the author's own task: the process of narrating.' 'Narrative Techniques in *The Master of Ballantrae*', *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 5, 2 (October 1967), 106.
13. Although I agree with Edwin M. Eigner's reading of *MB* as 'elegiac romance' – a literary genre that includes *Heart of Darkness*, *Caleb Williams*, *Guy Livingstone* and *She*—I partially disagree with the fact that this novel 'like elegiac romances in general, is ultimately more concerned with rebirth.' —Edwin M. Eigner, 'The Master of Ballantrae as Elegiac Romance', *Cahiers Victoriens & Edouardiens*, 40 (October 1994), 105. As we will see, *MB* ends with no allusions to moral or physical rebirth but, on the contrary, with an ironically sad double death.
14. Wilkie Collins, *The Woman in White* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994), p. 1 (*italics mine*).
15. Peter Brooks, *Reading for the Plot. Design and Intention in Narrative* (London, England, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), p. 6.
16. Mackellar's desire to textually 'dispossess' the Master as legitimate heir to the 'story' and the 'history' of Durrisdeer is suggested by Richard Ambrosini: 'being unable to become a father, he becomes an author.' —R. L. Stevenson. *La poetica del romanzo* (Roma: Bulzoni, 2001), p. 307, translation mine.
17. Algirdas Julien Greimas defines an isotopy as a series of words or expressions that can be connected with the same pervasive image or theme. —*Du sens* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1970).
18. In 'On Some Technical Elements of Style in Literature' (1884) Stevenson considers the pattern, or as he calls it the 'web', as one of the most important stylistic features in artistic writing: 'The web, then, or the pattern: a web at once sensuous and logical, an elegant and pregnant

texture: that is style, that is the foundation of the art of literature.’ —Quoted in *R. L. Stevenson on Fiction. An Anthology of Literary and Critical Essays*, ed. Glenda Norquay (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999), p. 97. In the essay he uses expressions such as ‘weaving’, ‘texture’ and ‘knit and knot the logical texture of the style’ as metaphors for the construction of the literary text.

19. Douglas Gifford comments on the pervasive presence of the themes of ‘Providence’ and ‘Chance’ in *MB*, connecting them with Stevenson’s biography. —‘Stevenson and Scottish Fiction. The Importance of *The Master of Ballantrae*’, in *Stevenson and Victorian Scotland*, ed. Jenni Calder (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1981).

20. For Alexander B. Clunas ‘[the] coin tossing does two things: it conflates the narrative principle of Burke’s tale [...] in a gesture of contempt for Providence and for the teleology of lives and narratives; and it alludes to the origin of the brother’s quarrel.’ —“A Double Word”: Writing and Justice in *The Master of Ballantrae*’, *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 23 (1993), 63.

21. ‘Mackellar is a man of his word, but also a man of words, of language (Not only a user of language; also, as the reader will remember, a creature whose only existence is in the text we are reading, a fiction which has temporarily seduced us into forgetting his unreality.)’ —Clunas, p. 70. Mackellar as *homme de parole* can be seen as a parodic version of Stevenson himself as a ‘man of words’, an expression which often recurs in his own letters. For example, in comparing literature and visual arts, Stevenson juxtaposes the painter —who is interested in the ‘study of nature’—to the ‘man of words’, who studies ‘man’s business and passions.’ —Letter to Bob Stevenson dated 30 September 1993, in *Selected Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson*, p. 235.

22. David Daiches, ‘Stevenson and Scotland’, in *Stevenson and Victorian Scotland*, p. 24.

23. If in many occasions wicked actions and powers are attributed to James, in other cases he paradoxically resembles a figure modelled on Christ. For instance, the people with whom the Master begins his ‘holy war’ against English government are ‘a dozen men’ (p. 13), like the Apostles. Later on Henry is insultingly called ‘Judas’ (p. 18), because he has betrayed James, who Jessie in turn calls ‘the bonnie lad’ (p. 24). But the most interesting recurrence is that of the number three (in itself a sacred number) associated with the Master’s ‘resurrections’: the first after the Jacobite defeat, the second after the duel with Henry, the third

thanks to Secundra Dass's intervention.

24. 'Encounters in a novel usually take place "on the road". The road is a particularly good place for random encounters. On the road ("the high road"), the spatial and temporal paths of the most varied people [...] intersect at the spatial and temporal point.' —Bakhtin, 'Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel', *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 243.

25. Robert Louis Stevenson, *Kidnapped and Catriona*, edited with an Introduction and Notes by Emma Letley (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 126-127.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 330.

27. Robert Kiely suggests that 'Henry Durie is Jim Hawkins and David Balfour turned middle-aged and set in stone.' —Kiely, p. 228.

28. In the course of his narrations Chevalier de Burke never remembers Mackellar's name, while others usually invent comic nicknames for him, such as 'square-toes'.

29. For Alexander Clunas, '[like] the several discourses which constitute *Master*, even in their sincere effect to do justice, [the epitaphs] speak also of what they do not intend to speak. In modestly presenting Mackellar's memoir 'as it stands' Stevenson has constructed an astute fable on the nature of fiction itself' —Clunas, p. 74.

30. Robert Louis Stevenson, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde / Weir of Hermiston*, ed. with an introduction and notes by Emma Letley (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 83.

31. Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Works of Robert Louis Stevenson*, Swanston edition, 25 vols., ed. Andrew Lang (London: Chatto & Windus, 1912), vol. 15, pp. 184-185.

Stevenson's final text of *Kidnapped*

Roger G. Swearingen

Toward the end of 1893, the sequel having at last been completed, RLS went through the text of *Kidnapped* and marked a copy of the first edition for a planned two-volume edition bringing *Kidnapped* and *Catriona* together for the first time as two parts of the same story. In December 1893 he sent this marked copy of *Kidnapped* to Harriet Baker, a Braille writer in London who was then preparing an edition for the blind, asking her to note the changes and then to pass the book along to Cassell and Company for the new edition. This two-volume Cassell edition appeared in April 1895, four months after RLS's death on 3 December 1894, and between it and the first edition there are more than 150 differences. They occur throughout the book, from the Dedication to the very last page, and they are of all kinds: deletions, changes, and additions in wording; changes in punctuation, the hyphenation of compound words, capitalization, spelling, and the correction of typographical errors. —In the Dedication, 'like the tale' is changed to 'like this tale'; in Chapter III, David's age is changed from sixteen to seventeen, a change followed up in Chapter XXVII, in which the year of his birth is changed from 1734 to 1733. From Chapter XXV, a paragraph is deleted telling the eventual fate of Robin Oig; also deleted is a paragraph at the very end of the book taking leave of David and Alan but leaving open the possibility of a sequel. And there are dozens of changes in punctuation.

Kidnapped appeared next in Volume XII of the Edinburgh Edition, in October 1895, where again it is identified, as in the 2-volume Casell's edition, as Part I of the *Adventures of David Balfour*. *Catriona* appeared in November 1895 and is Volume XIII of the edition, Part II of the *Adventures of David Balfour*.

Together, they comprise Volumes IV and V of *Romances*. The version of *Kidnapped* that appears in the Edinburgh Edition resembles the Cassell edition closely. Of the 150 changes made in the Cassell edition, more than 80 per cent of them are also made in the Edinburgh Edition, including all of the deletions, changes, and additions of wording. Of the changes that are not the same in both versions, almost always the Edinburgh Edition follows the first edition, in effect undoing changes made in the Cassell edition. Many additional changes appear only in the Edinburgh Edition, however, the most notable of these being a consistent change in how spoken dialect is represented. In the Edinburgh Edition, words that in the first edition and the manuscript are represented as *didnae*, *cannae*, *shouldnae*, and the like, appear instead as *didna*, *canna*, *shouldna*; *no*, meaning 'not', appears in the Edinburgh Edition as *no'* - with an apostrophe; *wha*, meaning 'who', replaces *whae*. There are also many additions - and deletions - of commas and other punctuation and minor changes in wording, all of these changes seemingly designed to improve clarity or readability. For example, in the Edinburgh Edition version of the eighth paragraph from the last in Chapter III, the word 'to' replaces the first edition reading 'into' to yield the sentence, 'The blood came to my face', and the word 'you'll' replaces the first edition reading 'you' to produce the phrase 'it'll be the last you'll see of me in friendship.'

In my opinion, the best choice of text for any new edition of *Kidnapped* is the 1895 Cassell edition, all the more so if emendations can bring in a few corrections of capitalization, spelling, and the like, that Colvin was able to make in the Edinburgh Edition that seem to have been overlooked or not made earlier. The Edinburgh Edition shows in its variants that it was prepared with great care and with a desire for at least a certain kind of readability, correctness, and consistency. Stevenson died just as the Edinburgh Edition was getting under way, however, and as he never saw proofs even of the first volumes of that edition, we have

no idea what he would have wished as to styling, consistency, and emendations in a collection of all of his works. He might have loved – or hated – the approach that was taken. And whatever its virtues, the Edinburgh Edition is one step farther away than is the Cassell edition from Stevenson’s marked copy of *Kidnapped*. The rendering of dialect in the Edinburgh Edition is certainly not what RLS saw (and did not change) in the copy that he marked and sent home. Nor do we know that he would have approved the many small changes (in punctuation especially) that appear for the first time in the Edinburgh Edition. His opinion might have been that help of the sort that is being provided might better have been withheld, perhaps in order to preserve other effects such as period and rusticity. For all of these reasons, the Cassell edition seems to me the better choice. It is surely closer to what Stevenson sent home, whatever may have been his to-us-unknown expectations (or intentions) for the text thereafter. And RLS never lived to see, either to commend or to condemn –and he did not himself make– the changes that appear for the first time in the Edinburgh Edition.

In his editions of the manuscript versions of ‘The Beach of Falesá’ (1984) and *Kidnapped* (1999), Barry Menikoff has urged the superiority of the manuscript versions over anything printed, chiefly for two reasons. The manuscripts capture emphases and nuances of speech and dialect that are conveyed by Stevenson’s own punctuation and spelling but are lost in standardized print. Stevenson also accepted from his friends, editors, and printers many changes from the words and the spellings that he himself used, of which the change in the marriage-paper in ‘The Beach of Falesá’ is only the best known. Even though he himself never un-did these changes, it is arguable that he never really had a chance to do so; that it is only in the manuscripts that we have access to Stevenson’s intentions alone and purely, un-merged with an indeterminate number of unknown additional changes by others; and that the manuscript versions are aesthetically

superior to all of the later ones and ought to be restored on these grounds alone.

Against all of this, of course, is the undeniable fact that intentions that belong to Stevenson do exist in versions later than the manuscripts. The history of *Kidnapped*, once it reaches print, is not only one of decline, nor only one of the imposition by others onto Stevenson's creative intentions (represented by his manuscript) of their own ideas of what should be put before the public. Even before marking a copy of the book in 1893, Stevenson mentioned in his letters changes that he himself wanted to see; and even earlier he had a chance to give expression and tangible form to his own intentions as he corrected the proofs both of the Young Folks version, published serially, and the first book-form edition – and no doubt he did so, in both iterations.

Stevenson's work marking a copy of *Kidnapped* seven years later, in 1893, is significant because it shows that when finally he had written and published the always-intended sequel he lost no time preparing the earlier book for publication jointly with the later one, as two parts of the same whole. So for *Kidnapped* as Stevenson left it, with the sequel at last in place, rather than as he had first written it, seven years earlier, we must look to the 1895 Cassell edition. It is true that – as in all versions of the book later than the manuscript – the work of persons other than Stevenson is present, and at all levels from the spelling of words such as niether correctly, all the way up to changing them, even though this occurs infrequently and only in small ways such as the changes of singular to plural (or vice versa) when the context or geography demands it. But Stevenson's intentions are present also: as the author, making changes of his own, and as a privileged collaborator in the production of the book, interacting with, and no doubt at times undoing, the work of others as he corrected proofs and then, later, marked a copy of the book for a new edition. Some or all of these intentions – of Stevenson's – are necessarily lost to us if we do not choose the 1895 Cassell

edition as our copy-text.

That we cannot tell whether any change really is due to Stevenson, rather than being put there by someone else, is, in my opinion, a small price to pay for being able to say that none of the intentions that Stevenson expressed in marking a copy of *Kidnapped* in 1893 and sending it home for publication has knowingly or categorically been ignored by deciding to use only the manuscript or only the earlier printed editions. By the same line of reasoning, the additional changes in the Edinburgh Edition should, in my opinion, be ignored except where it seems likely that they bring the text in the Cassell edition closer to what appeared in the copy that RLS marked.

NOTES

1 RLS to Harriet Baker, [? 5 December 1893], Letter 2661; RLS to Cassell and Company, 5 December 1893, Letter 2662. I am indebted to Ernest J. Mehew for sharing with me, many years ago, his own collations of the 1893 and Edinburgh Edition texts of *Kidnapped* with the first edition. Readings from the manuscript now in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California, are now available in Barry Menikoff's edition (1999).

2 For a detailed discussion of the various texts, including Menikoff's edition of the manuscript, see my review of research, 'Recent Studies in Robert Louis Stevenson: Letters, Reference Works, Texts—1970–2005,' *Dickens Studies Annual*, 37 (2006), 393–99. Menikoff's edition of the manuscript is used in the Modern Library edition (Random House, 2001) and in the Canongate edition (Edinburgh, 2006) for the UNESCO celebration of Edinburgh as World City of the Book. The version that RLS sent home in 1893 and that Cassell published in 1895 is used—for the first time since its original appearance—in the Barnes and Noble 'Library of Essential Reading' series, with an introduction by Caroline McCracken-Flesher (New York, 2006).

‘Stand sicker in oor auncient ways’:
Stevenson’s Scots drinking verse and the
fulfilment of a pastoral fantasy

Giuseppe Albano

Stevenson began composing poems with drinking themes as an undergraduate when he frequented the public houses of Edinburgh’s working and under-classes. The mordacious ‘Hail! childish slaves of social rules’, scribbled in a notebook during a lecture in the spring of 1873, belongs to this period of his life and includes the lines:

O fine, religious, decent folk
In Virtue’s flaunting gold and scarlet,
I sneer between two puffs of smoke,
Give me the publican and harlot.¹

The ‘publican and harlot’ are biblical figures imbued with contemporary resonances. In the New Testament, prostitutes are placed alongside ‘publicans’, a translation of the Latin *publicani*, or tax-collectors, as belonging to the lowest class in social and moral terms (specifically, Matthew, 21:31-32; Luke, 15-30). Stevenson also plays on the modern British use of the term, dating from the early eighteenth century, and referring to owners or managers of public houses, in whose hospitable company he spent much time. For Edinburgh’s ‘fine, religious, decent folk’, such people become contemporary social pariahs, but for Stevenson, they signify something quite different, as the opening lines make clear:

I see, and pity you; and then
Go, casting off the idle pity,
In search of braver, better men,
My own way freely through the city.

The poet rejects all forms of social artifice and opts instead to spend time amidst the city's apparently 'braver, better men'. He sets himself apart from the hypocrites he pities and, in the following stanza, goes off to 'Seek real friendship that endures'. This dualism is embedded in centuries of pastoral writing, often nesting itself in authors' quests for a superior (because simpler) peasant life. But while Stevenson came to celebrate the supposedly purer, freer lifestyles of Edinburgh's beggars and thieves, drunkards and whores, the present-day peasantry who usurp the shepherds of pastoral convention, his success in doing so was, at least initially, limited. In 'Hail! childish slaves' he uses the act of writing not so much to critique, as to uncritically denounce, the society in which he lives and, above all, to evaluate his position as an outsider in that environment. The poem's speaker seeks to escape Edinburgh society, something which is assisted by drinking and spending time in public houses. However, that the 'I' of the poem is clearly Stevenson himself lessens its richness and complexity as pastoral. There is none of the distance between the real life of the poet and the imagined, dramatic persona of the poems that sophisticated pastoral demands. Instead, Stevenson allows political invective to become his prime literary motive, and makes no attempt to hide doing so.

This essay starts from the premise that Stevenson enjoyed another, and arguably more successful, poetical awakening in the early seventies: he started writing poems in Lowland Scots. Lallans provided ample opportunity to play with the themes and subjects that excited him —of which drinking culture figures prominently— and brought forth a means to experiment with dramatic personae which were obviously distanced from that of his own, while still allowing him to explore aspects of his own personality. In his early song 'Sit doon by me, my canty freend' (pp. 277-278) the reader finds 'fire an' life', 'blythesomeness an' cheer', 'love and laughter', and all in a glass of whisky. The song draws on the escapist possibilities of communal drinking, spe-

cifically in cheering drinkers, rescuing them from the backdrop of night which threatens to engulf them, as presented in the third stanza: 'O mirk an' black the lee-lang gate / That we maun gang the nicht'. Drinking together in the safe haven of the public house counters this darkness and brings light to those involved: 'But aye we'll pass the brimmin' glass / An' aye we'll snuff the licht'. The use of the Scots word 'aye' is particularly reassuring for it means both *yes* and *always*: the former sense affirms the comforting situation, the latter stresses its longevity. Yet even something as apparently simple as this assertion contains a degree of intricacy. Drinking allows those involved to escape the 'mirk an' black [...] nicht' and, instead, 'snuff the licht' but there are two possible meanings to be taken from this. The 'mirk' (*murk*) intimates that the night is filled with gloom and danger outside the drinking place while, inside, the 'licht' (*light*) staves off this gloom: hence 'snuff' can mean take in, inhale, consume. But 'snuff' also suggests extinguishing, stamping out. In this respect 'snuff the licht' implies forgetting the inevitability of dawn which, in turn, means that the night is something to be both feared and enjoyed.

The simple, even sentimental, escapist aspects of drinking advocated here are, moreover, enriched by the song's complex poetics of persona. These lines still contain something of Stevenson himself, given his self-confessed rebellious love of public houses at this time in his life, but the use of Scots immediately distances the identities of the poem's speaker from the aspiring middle-class writer who composed it. This distancing is bolstered by the first person plural, which not only adds authenticity to the poem as an imitation traditional drinking song, but makes it harder to ascertain a single speaker in the first place. The song's plurality is reflected in both the identities of its speaker(s) and of those to whom it is addressed. Unlike standard English, and in common with other European tongues, Scots allows a clear distinction to be made between the second person singular and plural, as shown in the opening stanza:

Sit doon by me, my canty freend,
 Sit doon, an' snuff the licht!
 A boll o' bear's in ilka glass
 Ye'se drink wi' me the nicht!

If the first two lines suggest intimacy between the speaker and one addressed person, the last line's 'Ye'se' contains the suggestion that it might be addressed to more than one such 'freend'. (While the address 'Ye'se' technically means *you shall* in Lallans, it seems likely that given the poem's claims to drinking-song status, Stevenson is also playing on the second person plural.) The song thus becomes explicitly homosocial while avoiding any ambiguity which may arise regarding the nature of the scene depicted, as happens purposefully in the *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám*, the greatest Victorian literary appropriation of the drinking song, in which Edward FitzGerald plays on the potentially erotic relationship between speaker and addressed. In Stevenson's poem, it is not only the boundaries between the identities of speaker and poet which are blurred, but the respective identities of speaker and addressee, as both are pluralised to the point where those speaking (or singing) the poem are those same persons to whom it is addressed, and vice versa.

The date of this song's composition has caused discord between two of Stevenson's editors. Roger Lewis notes that George Hellman 'dates this poem 1874 [...] but gives no source; written on the *verso* of the ode *To Sydney*, which is dated 1872, it more likely belongs to that year'.² The difference between these dates might not seem worth losing sleep over, but it does present a quandary about the chronology of Stevenson's poetic development. If, as Hellman believes, the song dates from 1874, it would have been written after 'Hail! childish slaves of social rules'. Language aside, the difference between these pieces is that while 'Sit doon by me' purports to be a communal drinking poem or song, 'Hail! childish slaves' is essentially an essay in verse which uses drinking as a backdrop to the author's political concerns.

The former is dramatic; the latter, declamatory. The drinking song still allows Stevenson to voice some of his youthful political opinions, as in its anti-temperance chorus:

Let preachers prate o' soberness
 An' brand us ripe for doom,
 Yet still we'll lo'e the brimmin' glass,
 And still we'll hate the toom.

The last line here draws on an aural pun for the closing 'toom' may be heard as *tomb* which, preceded by the definite article, refers generally to the state of death. Read in this light, the chorus advocates communal drinking as a means of battling and forgetting the inevitability of death. In Scots, of course, the word means *empty*, and thus refers specifically to an empty glass, as opposed to a full, or 'brimmin', one. This sense of the term is often used by Burns, as in, for example, 'The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer' which contains the lines 'Paint Scotland greetin' owre her thrissle; / Her mutchkin stowp as toom's a whissle'.³

Burns's influence lingers profusely in Stevenson's song, particularly its chorus which invites comparison with that of Burns's 'Willie Brew'd a Peck o' Maut':

We are na fou, we're nae that fou,
 But just a drappie in our e'e;
 The cock may crawl, the day may daw,
 And ay we'll taste the barley bree.⁴

Here communal drinkers pronounce their sobriety despite their continual drinking so that they can deceive themselves into thinking that the fun is not about to end, despite the inevitability of dawn. This is a staple feature of traditional drinking songs and Burns has fun with it. The adamant 'We are na fou' (*We are not drunk*) quickly becomes 'we're nae that fou,' (*We're not that drunk*) which concedes that they may be a little drunk but are still in the initial stages of drunkenness. This aspect of tradition is gently mocked by Yeats's 'A Drunken Man's Praise for Sobriety',

whose speaker, a bon vivant, wants to have his ale and drink it, to 'keep me dancing still / That I may stay a sober man / Although I drink my fill'.⁵ The similarities between 'Willie Brew'd a Peck o' Maut' and 'Sit doon by me my canty freend' in terms of rhythm and rhyme scheme, mood and subject, are striking, not to mention the use of the first person plural. Above all, the core pastoral ideas about drinking are the same in both, in which potential threats to the idyll (in Burns's chorus, the coming of day, in Stevenson's, this, coupled with the whining of pro-temperance preachers) are staved off by communal drinking, of friends and acquaintances staying strong together.

The difference between the defiance expressed in the chorus of 'Sit doon by me my canty freend' and that in the English pieces above, then, is that Stevenson's own personality is dissolved, becoming at one with, and speaking collectively as, those 'better, braver men' with whom he drinks. In the comparatively childish 'Hail! childish slaves of social rules', on the other hand, Stevenson clearly reveals himself to be the poem's speaker by means of a clumsy rhetorical question: 'I'll choose my friends myself, you hear?'. The tone of this line — part defensive, part accusational — remains throughout a poem filled with snarling second person addresses, placed alongside self-references in the first person singular — 'How could I shake your faith, ye fools'; 'And as I scorn your social laws'; 'I swim, from your dishonest haven', among others — but never any such references in the first person plural. Stevenson casts himself outside the flawed ideology he criticises but there is no evidence that he is accepted into the circles he seeks to penetrate and his poem ultimately, inevitably slides into selfish introspection ('Far from the friends I hoped to cherish — / It may be I shall sink').

Even when Stevenson's Scots drinking poems do not directly imitate communal drinking songs, their colourful use of Scots places a smoke screen between the personality of Stevenson himself, and the persona of his speaker. 'To Charles Baxter' (pp.

274-275), composed in autumn 1875, is an early example of many verse epistles written in Scots to his close friend and former fellow law student. That this is very much Stevenson writing as himself, though hidden under a sheen of sturdy Lallans vocabulary and accent, is attested by the poem's theme: the dreaded coming change of seasons, a subject ever close to his consumptive heart. Over the first seven stanzas the prospect of winter becomes increasingly dreadful as abominable winters past are recalled. Such punishing weather would be Stevenson's eventual reason for leaving Edinburgh for good. In this instance, though, it forms a formidable part of the city's experience and, while not quite celebrated, is ultimately evoked in order to bind the two friends closer together, providing a challenge to be faced in the company of one another, as revealed in the penultimate stanza:

But, freend, ye ken how me an' you,
 The ling-lang lanely winter through,
 Keep'd a guid speerit up, an' true
 To lore Horatian,
 We aye the ither bottle drew—
 To inclination.

The 'guid speerit' referred to here implies both the human spirit and the liquid sort which comes in a bottle. The double meaning of this word is something Stevenson would play on in 'The Counterblast —1886' (pp. 109-111), another call to drink to counter adversity:

An' since at life ye've taen the grue,
 An' winnae blithely hirsle through,
 Ye've fund the very thing to do—
 That's to drink speerit;

In an alternative manuscript version of the above Stevenson has 'Just tak' to speerit' for the last line, thus leaving it less clear whether 'speerit' refers to drinking whisky, or to gathering strength and courage, qualities which can indeed also be taken

from a bottle.⁶ Similarly, in ‘To Charles Baxter’, the ‘ither bottle’ implies simultaneously drawing on, or taking to, both the metaphorical bottle of personal spirit, and the literal bottle of whisky which provides courage to those in need. And that the act of keeping ‘a guid speerit up’ (again playing on the relationship between the literal act of drinking and drinkers’ moods) derives from mutual ‘inclination’ shows that it is a vital part of human instinct from Horace down through the ages. Taking strength from the templates provided by previous winters, the speaker draws to conclusion by facing the winter to come with the eager anticipation of repeated drinking/bonding sessions:

Sae let us in the comin’ days
 Stand sicker in oor auncient ways, —
 The strauchtest road in a’ the maze
 Since Eve ate apples;

An’ let the winter weet oor cla’es—
 We’ll weet oor thrapples.

The rhyming of ‘apples’ with ‘thrapples’ (*throats*) takes advantage of the luxurious range of Scots —there being nothing from standard English that would fit here — and the staunch Scots monophthongal vowels accentuate the poem’s ultimate theme, namely, the ‘sicker’ (*secure*) bonds encouraged by friends drinking together to stave off the cold, wind and rain.

The relentlessness of Edinburgh winters is a recurring motif in Stevenson’s verse and is inseparable from his various depictions of the city’s sounds, sights and smells. Images of communal drinking often serve to counter Edinburgh’s meteorological severity, as shown in the closing stanza of ‘Sit doon by me my canty freend’:

We’ll draw the closer roond the fire
 And aye the closer get.
 Without the ways may thaw or freeze,
 Within we’re ravin’ wet!

Like the last lines of ‘To Charles Baxter’, this uses a pun on ‘wet’ in order to contrast the scenes inside and out, and thus implies a connection between Edinburgh’s weather and the behaviour of those residents who must suffer it, and have an excuse to drink because of it. This is a trick Stevenson uses in ‘Ille Terrarum’ (pp. 101-102), another early Scots piece which depicts an Edinburgh street scene:

An noo’ the winter winds complain;
 Cauld lies the glaur in ilka lane;
 On draigled hizzie, tautit wean
 An’ drucken lads,
 In the mirk nicht, the winter rain
 Dribbles an’ blads.

The image of those ‘drucken lads’ might be a play on another Scots word: *druckit*. These words may look similar in Scots but in English, they are represented by quite different words: *drunken* and *drenched* respectively. Scots words for drinking and being drunk often have correlations with words to describe the weather. *Drouthy*, for example, can mean *dry*, with regards to the weather, but also *thirsty*, and *given to drink*. In the above lines, wetness, represented in ‘To Charles Baxter’ by the more Scottish-sounding ‘weet’, is used to describe drinkers’ clothes and throats. The lads here are having fun in spite of, and because of, the weather: suffering rain-soaked clothes may be a miserable experience to endure alone but becomes something else to share in the communal drinking experience and ultimately brings people all the closer together, and inevitably to drink more. Like the ‘mirk an’ black [...] nicht’ the weather becomes a cause for celebration as much as dread. In pastoral terms, it is both a threat to, and a means of sustaining, the drinking idyll.

The piece from which the above lines are drawn was composed a short while after ‘To Charles Baxter’ in the midst of winter of the same year, and recalls gentle summers past against a furious wintry present. Its speaker once again resembles Stevenson

himself, this time alone and contemplative, 'wi' sober heart, / For meditation sat apairt,' as his mind wanders back and forth from the freezing city outside to a childhood memory of a 'kintry hame' in the summertime: 'An' Fancy traivels far afield / To gaitther a' that gardens yield / O' sun an' Simmer'. The place of retreat in question is unnamed in the poem but is authoritatively revealed by Graham Balfour to be Swanston Cottage, a summer residence leased by Stevenson's family on Edinburgh's Pentland Hills. Balfour points out that this proved an important place in Stevenson's early life and development as a writer, for 'here he saw something of the country folk, and enriched his vocabulary of Lallan; here made the acquaintance of John Todd the shepherd, and Robert Young the gardener [...] This was to him *ille terrarum angulus* of *Underwoods*; on the hill above Swanston there lies the tiny pool, overhung by a rock, where he "loved to sit and make bad verses"'.⁷ Balfour's quotation is taken from Stevenson's own essay 'Pastoral', which sings the praises of John Todd, shepherd of Swanston. In this essay Stevenson warmly recalls that Todd 'spoke the richest dialect of Scots I ever heard', a fact which leads him to observe that 'talking Scots and talking English seem incomparable acts'.⁸ The sounds of Todd's Scots tongue thus blended in Stevenson's mind with memories of summers spent composing lines of verse, these distinct multi-sensory experiences combining to create his own conception of pastoral as both spatial and linguistic retreat and return. This means that the cottage, garden and surrounding fields which provided Stevenson with a place of literal retreat from the noisy city as a child becomes, for the adult writer, a place of mental return to be summoned up by recreating in verse the language he recalls having heard around him. It is for these reasons that Stevenson's Scots is as much a personal, commemorative language as a literary one.

However, the particular relations between drinking and Scots culture and language gripped his poetical imagination. Stevenson

became fascinated by the place of alcohol in the minds and hearts of Scots and he enjoyed delving into its history and mythology, as seen in his ballad, 'Heather Ale: A Galloway Legend', based on a traditional Scots ballad but written in Standard English. Transcending the realm of Scottishness, Stevenson's interest in drinking as a subject matter owes much to its very universality. And his love of 'lore Horatian', as he phrases it in 'To Charles Baxter', shows his belief that Latin provides a true example of a pan-western tradition to which all European literatures, including Scots, owe a debt. Yet words to describe drink, drinkers and being drunk are, alongside those for sex and money, the most profuse in languages and dialects the world over and Scots is flooded with them. (One Scots wordbook lists over three hundred such terms relating to alcohol and its cultural accoutrements.⁹) Stevenson's Scots drinking poetry is thus highly resourceful, not only in its use of language, but in its adaptability of language to suit various purposes. Shortly after writing 'To Charles Baxter', Stevenson drafted another poem to his friend on the death of John Adam who, known to them in their student days, is remembered and celebrated for always having a 'drouthy glint in his e'e'. The poem (pp. 275-277) was probably meant as a companion piece to the epistle which calls on drinking to overcome the bleakness of winter. It is dated the same month, appears on the same manuscript, and has the title 'To the same, on the death of their common friend, Mr John Adam, Clerk of Court', there being no need to repeat Baxter's name.¹⁰ The resultant elegy corrupts some of the first poem's core ideas about drinking to become subjects of ridicule. Specifically, it shows Stevenson's awareness of, and willingness to address, the downside of the hearty drinking previously advocated, and to whip up some humour along the way. So, communal drinking may make friends 'stand sicker' in the closing stanza of 'To Charles Baxter', but John, in contrast, was 'aye unsicker on his feet / Wi' whusky toddy'. And there is a wicked, black irony in the fact that John is

'deid o' Aqua-vitae', killed by the so-called water of life so revered elsewhere. Furthermore, the idealised 'aye' which occurs in many of Stevenson's drinking poems to express security and longevity, here becomes the realistic 'aye' of simply being constantly drunk. The first poem's 'We aye the ither bottle drew— / To inclination' thus mutates into the following tribute:

Whusky an' he were pack thegether
 Whate'er the hour, whate'er the weather...
 Wi' him, there was nae askin' whether—
 John was aye drunk.

There seems to be a reference here to Burns's 'The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer', and its penultimate line 'Freedom an' whisky gang thegither!'¹¹ But the change in vowel from Burns's 'whisky' to Stevenson's more robustly Scotticised 'whusky' shows the extent to which the later poet sought to get as close as possible to representing a naturalistic Scots phonology.

Moreover, the games Stevenson plays with the speaker and subject of his poem suggests that he is respectful of Burns but brazenly so, even daring to cheekily name-drop him in the penultimate stanza alongside John Adam as a fellow great man killed by drink. That this comparison, as with the rest of the poem, contains a certain amount of dramatic irony, though, is confirmed by Stevenson's essay on Burns, in which he argues that 'It is the fashion to say he died of drink; many a man has drunk more and yet lived with reputation, and reached a good age [...] He died of being Robert Burns, and there is no levity in such a statement of the case'.¹² Stevenson may venerate the Scots Bard and the long shadow he casts over Scottish culture, but also clears the way for MacDiarmid's dissection of the shoddy clichés of drinking and Scottishness which, in turn, owe much to Burns. (MacDiarmid's *A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle* has a twisted behest to Burns, 'The whisky that aince moved your lyre's become / A laxative for a' loquacity'.¹³) Stevenson never questions the connections

between drinking and Scottish character to the extent that MacDiarmid would do, but it is something he hints at through exaggeration and irony. In a letter to Baxter dated 11th December 1873, he writes of John Adam, 'How my heart would melt within me and the tears of patriotism spring to my eyes, if I could but see him reel towards me, in his dress clo' like a moon at midday and smiling his vulgar, Scotch grin from ear to ear!'¹⁴

As for John Adam, that a man who was 'aye drunk' could incite 'tears of patriotism' in Stevenson is, of course, farcical, and the joke is intentional. By the tenth stanza, however, his speaker proceeds to seemingly deeper contemplations about the nature of drinking and frivolity:

What's merely humorous or bonny
 The warl' regards wi' cauld astony.
 Drunk men tak' aye mair place than ony;
 An' sae, ye see,
 The gate was aye ower thrang for Johnie —
 Or you an' me.

John Adam is clearly not supposed to be seen as an alcoholic, but simply as a drunk man. He belongs, not to contemporary medical discourses about alcoholism, but to an older tradition of what William Empson would call 'mock-pastoral'; a source of gentle humour rather than something to be viewed with 'cauld astony' (*cold astonishment*). As Empson points out, though, mock-pastoral is not the same thing as anti-pastoral, but belongs to the (proletarian) pastoral tradition in which "The simple man becomes a clumsy fool who yet has better "sense" than his betters and can say things more fundamentally true'.¹⁵ The last line suggests that the speaker counts himself, and the persona to whom his words are addressed, as fellow drinkers, thereby allowing him to speak on this subject with authority.

From this point, the poem's tone moves from gentle mockery to (mock) genuine affection, the speaker clearly being someone who knew John Adam as someone to laugh with, and not just

someone to laugh at, as Stevenson and Baxter did. In particular, lines like 'O — I wadnae had him naething else / But Johnie Adam', and the self-reproaching 'We leuch, an' Johnie's deid' create an illusory air of intimacy for a man Stevenson and Baxter only knew as an occasional source of amusement during their student days. Stevenson thus uses an unnamed persona to relate a facet of his shared past with a friend, but told from a slant different to their own, and one tinged with irony. Stevenson does not fully disclose the identity of this persona but he is presumably around the same age as the recently deceased who, it is discovered in the final stanza, died at fifty. Read in this light, the poem challenges the nature of epistolary verse (this is persona to persona, not poet to friend as the title claims). That it appears alongside the more obviously literal 'To Charles Baxter', though, casts aspersions about even that piece's reliability to become, in turn, yet another source of inspiration for Stevenson's burgeoning poetic mind.

Baxter appreciated the poem and thus began a tradition of correspondence between them in which they adopted the personae of Johnstone and Thomson, two opinionated Scottish church elders. The first of a series of pieces using these guises is titled 'The Scotsman's Return from Abroad: In a letter from Mr Thomson to Mr Johnstone' (pp. 115-118) and was written at Strathpeffer in autumn 1880. It begins with Thomson's first person account of his travels through far-off lands and his encounters with strange peoples, all of which and whom are in lamentable states — 'And still in ilka age an' station / Saw naething but abomination'— brought about largely by their 'cauld religious destitution'. In the second stanza the speaker rejoices in his return to a land of beautiful scenery, fine ecclesiastical architecture and (best of all) single malt whisky. Just as the cliché of Brits abroad typically has them bemoaning the lack of decent tea available, here Stevenson's archetypal Scot complains about the quality of foreign whisky, a fact made clear in the third stanza, 'Of a' their foreign tricks an' pliskies, / I maist abominate their whiskies'.

(A *plisky*, or *pliskie*, is a practical joke which shows Thomson's belief that whisky made outside Scotland is a travesty.)

Stevenson has long been praised for his ability to use dramatic personae to explore personal thoughts. On the Scots pieces published during and after his lifetime, B. Ifor Evans points out that 'Stevenson is more outspoken here than in the English poems; it is as if the satirical tradition of Scottish poetry allowed him to speak his mind'.¹⁶ However, it is sometimes difficult to know where the satire begins and ends and Stevenson's own description of 'The Scotsman's Return from Abroad' as 'a bleeding assault on beastly elders, clergymen and others' also has a whiff of satire about it because the claim is palpably overstated.¹⁷ Although this poem is quite clearly, and quite cleverly, satirical, it also contains fragments of Stevenson's personal experience at the time of writing. The fact that it was written after Stevenson's own return from a period spent in California in which he married Fanny Osbourne, sheds new light on some of his speaker's grumbles, not least the complaint about whisky which thus becomes a jibe at American blends. Its opening lines also contain a remarkable parallel with occurrences in the poet's life:

In mony a foreign pairt I've been,
An' mony an unco ferlie seen,
Since, Mr. Johnstone, you and I
Last walkit upon Cocklerye.

In an editorial note on this poem, Roger Lewis points out that Stevenson had stayed with Baxter and his family at Cocklerye (near Bathgate) in the summer of the previous year. As happens in many of Stevenson's subsequent poems in the Johnstone-Thomson canon, pointers to incidents in the poet's life are placed alongside more obviously fictive references but the boundaries between the real and the imaginary are twisted beyond readers' immediate recognition. Reading 'The Scotsman's Return from Abroad' as outright satire, then, contains an element of presump-

tion as anyone who intrudes on the joke is not quite in on the joke. Taken to the extreme, this presumption extends to any reader who is not Charles Baxter.

For Stevenson, writing these pseudo-epistles under the guises of Johnstone to Thomson, or vice versa, supplied a much needed source of amusement through times of illness. In another piece (pp. 280-281), their beliefs are summarised as follows:

O dinnae mind the drams ye drink
 Nor whatten things beside.
 There's naething matters noo or syne:
 The Lord'll can provide!

That Stevenson apparently shows fondness for these lazily hypocritical characters is surprising given his early invectives against such types, but less so given the dramatic nature of the poems concerned. Any tenderness on display in this and other pieces shows less a surefire change in Stevenson's attitudes *per se*, than a maturing of his means of exploring such attitudes in verse. Under their knowing irony, though, some of the resultant pieces have a warm-hearted feel to them, assisted by the poet's personal recollection of his Edinburgh days fused into his speaker's words:

When I was young and drouthy
 I kent a public hoose
 Where a' was cosh an' couthy,
 It's there that I was crouse!

These are the opening lines from a poem (pp. 279-280) composed at Hyères, France in May 1883, a decade after Stevenson first wrote to Baxter in Scots, and some five years since he had spent any length of time in Edinburgh. The public house here becomes a representation, not of literal escape as in the likes of 'Hail! childish slaves of social rules', but of mental return. It is transformed into a figment of the poet's imagination, a symbolic landscape of the past no more current to his real life than the

fields and sounds of Swanston.

Once again, though, Stevenson's tone is ambiguous in being part nostalgic, part satirical. There is nothing scathing in the use of 'cosh an' couthy' to describe the speaker's mood in the public house. These words are fairly interchangeable and are taken by Lewis to mean *snug* and *comfortable* respectively, although they can also mean *friendly* and *sociable* with regards to character.¹⁸ Both words may have different meanings in English originating from the latter part of the nineteenth century (*couth* being a curious back-formation from *uncouth*, although neither word is directly related to the older Scots word *save*, perhaps, from the old English 'cuth', for *known*), but it is clear that Stevenson refers solely to their Scots uses.

Stevenson's underlying motives in the final adjective 'crouse' is less certain, however. Lewis's glossary rightly defines this word as *cheerful* but it can also mean *courageous* and *spirited*, or, more negatively, *self-satisfied* and *arrogant*.¹⁹ (This latter sense comes across in MacDiarmid's vitriolic stanza on 'Croose London Scotties' in *A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle*.)²⁰ The difference between these uses is a subtle but critical one for it has direct bearings on both the poem's tone and the poet's intention. Specifically, if taken to represent *cheerful*, or *spirited*, the tone remains nostalgic; if taken to imply any of the negative emotions, though, it becomes a comment on the speaker's smugness, and possibly an admission on Stevenson's part to his own youthful belligerence. The public house is further distanced from the poet's life by the subsequent revelation that this is Stevenson speaking, not directly as himself about his own past with Baxter, but as Johnstone on his imagined past experiences with Thomson:

It's there that me an' Thamson
 In days I weep to mind,
 Drank Wullywauchts like Samson
 An' sang like Jenny Lind.
 We cracked o' serious maitters

We quarrelt and we grat;
 Like kindly disputators
 Our whustles weel we wat.

The scenes described here (presumably) contain grains of truth about the drinking sessions which took place between Stevenson and Baxter in various public houses across Edinburgh in the early seventies. The fact that they are ultimately distortions becomes apparent when the poem suddenly breaks into a tribute to friends past and lost. This reminds readers that Johnstone and Thomson are not, in fact, men in their early thirties, still less middle-class law graduates, but two middle-aged bibulous fools who still sit in the same taverns in the same town, but without some of their former drinking companions.

At the same time as Stevenson began writing poems lamenting lost youth (and stable health), he also began to eulogise the city which, in the early seventies, had been a place from which he used poetry as a means of escape, whether from its smug society or its weather. As Stevenson's verse-writing changes direction, Edinburgh moves from being a place which the poet seeks retreat from, to becoming a place returned to in verse, a fact which accords with his complex notion of pastoral as both retreat and return, rather than his earlier simpler notion of pastoral in 'Hail! childish slaves' as mere escapism. One need only contrast those Johnstone-Thomson pieces sent to Baxter with an earlier English epistle titled 'To Charles Baxter' (pp. 287-289) and composed in February 1872, to detect this modification in thought. While the later poems, composed in southern places, use Scots to express longing for Edinburgh, the early epistle does quite the reverse: as a poem written in standard English it ends with a call to escape to the warmer south: 'Drown care in jovial bouts —and yet / Sigh for the South!'

Stevenson's essay 'Pastoral' confirms and clarifies this change of heart. At the start he contemplates that 'To leave home in early life is to be stunned and quickened with novelties; but to leave it

when years have come only casts a more endearing light upon the past'.²¹ Although this shift in sensibilities, in which the passing of time softens the harshness of experience, is reflected across Stevenson's writing —his essays and letters as well as his verse in general— it is vividly encapsulated by his drinking poems, which often have a pastoral tone in their idealised models of social relations. The act of writing was a cathartic process for Stevenson; in step with the rest of his work, the drinking poems allowed him to work through and resolve his troubled attitudes to his once-censured city of Edinburgh but such pieces, specifically, opened avenues for exploring healthier, happier personae in verse. As Stevenson grew older he became increasingly troubled by illness and unable to lead the life he lived in youth, which means that his drinking poems (many of which profess the merits of excess) become more metaphorical than literal, and their claims to pastoral status thus enriched. Stevenson's motives for writing drinking verse may have been as multifarious as the range of models and traditions he attempted: classical-inspired imitation drinking songs in both English and Scots, as well as real drinking songs commemorating specific occasions, such as school reunions, or the dissolution of his Society of Liberty, Justice and Reverence. But it is the linguistically melic, and dramatically rich, Scots pieces, particularly the pseudo-epistles imagined as one drunken persona addressing another, which arguably provided their author with the fullest range of tools to probe, query and occasionally mock human behaviour, to explore, and come to terms with, his own social and physical condition, and to develop his talent for sly poetic guises in the process.

NOTES

1. *The Collected Poems of Robert Louis Stevenson*, edited by Roger C. Lewis (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993), p. 319. All page numbers given in the main text refer to this edition.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 568. Hellman published Stevenson volumes in 1916 and 1921

titled *Poems Hitherto Unpublished*. His methods are strongly criticised by Lewis in his introduction, pp. 17-18.

3. *Poetical Works of Robert Burns* (London and Glasgow: Collins, 1908), p. 158.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 374.
5. *Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats* (London: Macmillan, 1961), pp. 359-360.
6. Beinecke, B6472 (p. 2 of 'Notebook A.154'). Noted by Lewis, p. 442.
7. Graham Balfour, *The Life of Robert Louis Stevenson* (London: Methuen, 1901), p. 75.
8. 'Pentland edition' of *The Collected Works of Robert Louis Stevenson*, vol. IX (London: Cassell and Co., 1907), p. 63.
9. *The Scots Thesaurus*, edited by Iseabail MacLeod, Pauline Cairns, Caroline MacAfee, Ruth Martin (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1990), pp. 161-169.
10. The MS, which contains both poems, is at the Scottish Writers Museum, Edinburgh (MS LSH 136/91). Noted by Lewis, p. 568.
11. Burns, p. 163.
12. 'Pentland' edition, vol.III, pp. 74-75.
13. Hugh MacDiarmid, *Complete Poems 1920-1976*, vol. I edited by Michael Grieve and W. R. Aitken (London: Martin Brian & O'Keeffe, 1978), p. 85.
14. *The Letters of RLS*, vol. I, p. 397.
15. William Empson, *Some Versions of Pastoral* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966), p. 18.
16. B. Ifor Evans, *English Poetry in the Later Nineteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1933), p. 273.
17. *The Letters of RLS*, vol. III, p. 101.
18. Lewis, p. 617; MacLeod et. al., p. 497.
19. Lewis, p. 617; MacLeod et. al., p. 395. This latter source also defines 'crouse' elsewhere as touchy (p. 393); conceited, arrogant, proud (p. 372); bold, courageous, spirited (p. 402); cheerful, merry (p. 422).
20. MacDiarmid, p. 84.
21. 'Pentland Edition', vol. IX, p. 61.

Reviews

Richard Ambrosini and Richard Dury (eds),
Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries
(Madison, Wisconsin: The University of
Wisconsin Press, 2006).

Robert Louis Stevenson's ability to cross boundaries and transcend the divisions of high and low culture is excellently attested to by the essays in this edited collection. From London to the South Seas, male hysteria to popular entertainment, evolutionary psychology to pirates, 'writing as en-graving' to 'writing as cruising' (p. xxi), the eclectic nature of Stevenson's interests and influences is explored in the thirty essays. The paradox of Stevenson's status within the literary establishment (or lack of it) —as his boundary crossing became both the source of criticism of his style in the early twentieth century and the root of his popularity— is indirectly the inspiration behind the collection's approach to the multifarious aspects of his work. The blurb on the back cover confirms this desire, signalling that 'the contributors [...] look, with different critical approaches, at the whole range of his literary production and unite to confer scholarly legitimacy on this enormously influential writer'. *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries* certainly goes a long way to achieving this impressive intention. The essays expose that Stevenson's 'liminal' quality as a writer positions him on a number of thresholds between the literary, political, psychological, geographical and historical —confirming his influence in numerous areas (p. xiv). In fact, as Ambrosini and Dury elucidate in their introduction, Stevenson is best described as a 'writer of boundaries' (p. xiv).

Ambrosini's and Dury's collection —the cream of the papers delivered at an international conference on Stevenson in Gargnano, hosted by the University of Milan in August 2001—

bring together a renowned group of Stevenson scholars. The range of the material is matched by its quality as the collection maintains a critical cohesion and strength even through its diversity. By dividing the collection into four parts ('The Pleasures of Reading, Writing, and Popular Culture', 'Scotland and the South Seas', 'Evolutionary Psychology, Masculinity, and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*', and 'Textual and Cultural Crossings'), Ambrosini and Dury marshal the essays effectively, creating critical foci for the reader while acknowledging that many of the essays intersect and overlap. This said, my only criticism of the collection resides in the structure as the limits of imposing artificial 'boundaries' for the reader are exposed in the short fourth part—which reads like the four that did not fit—and by Oliver Buckton's essay on Stevenson's South Sea yarns in part two, which might have been better placed at the end of part one. Once again for Stevenson, boundaries and categorisation are a point of contention. Yet unlike Stevenson's work, there is no disputing the significance or quality of these essays.

In the first part, 'The Pleasures of Reading, Writing, and Popular Culture', the essays consider Stevenson's approach to fiction, essay writing, biography, reading and popular entertainment. Two essays that deserve particular attention are Richard Ambrosini's 'The Four Boundary-Crossings of R. L. Stevenson, Novelist and Anthropologist' and Stephen Donovan's 'Stevenson and Popular Entertainment'. Ambrosini analyses the connections between Stevenson's writing and anthropological theories of his time. He argues that Stevenson's anthropological approach and his 'ethnographic imagination' strongly influenced and shaped his novels (p. 23). In particular, Stevenson's resistance to fiction and his refusal to pen a novel during the first ten years of his career underline the importance of his essays and travel writings in developing his literary style. Ambrosini compellingly concludes that Stevenson intended to create what amounts to a 'modern version of epic' by combining conflicting forms and

styles of writing (p. 25). In so doing, Ambrosini brings to the fore Stevenson's importance as the writer of the first colonial fictions in English.

In 'Stevenson and Popular Entertainment', Stephen Donovan approaches Stevenson through a different lens, arguing that he 'is implicitly making for popular entertainment as a meaningful and valuable activity' (p. 70). According to Donovan, Stevenson relishes the challenge of breaking down the boundaries between low and high culture, childhood and maturity —finding value in the childishness of the popular when others of his generation considered it infantile. For Stevenson, popular entertainment provided inspirational paths of enquiry —'the realisation and the apotheosis of the day-dreams of common men'.¹

From writing, reading and popular culture in part one, the collection moves to a section entitled 'Scotland and the South Seas'. Although Ambrosini and Dury point out that this 'section traces a trajectory between Scotland and the South Seas linking not places but forms of writing' (p. xxi) —the connections between place, location and identity are nevertheless of paramount importance to the essays in this section. For example, Caroline McCracken-Flesher in her essay on 'The Body Snatcher' (1884) explores anxieties over Scottish identity and its 'social obsession with the corpse in inappropriate circulation' (p. 134). Highlighting the connections between 'The Body Snatcher' and the Burke and Hare scandal, McCracken-Flesher contends that the way to locate the Scottish within Britain as a whole is through an understanding of 'buried' Scottish identities. As she argues, the 'circulation of Scots in the British body politic is possible only by the suppression of otherness. But suppression deadens the circulating Scot, and thus paradoxically resurrects his affinity with the other' (p. 142). In conclusion, McCracken-Flesher notes that Stevenson disliked 'The Body Snatcher', as it was '[t]oo horrid' for a man that was trying to advance his work within the British literary establishment while considering a return to his

native land (p. 143).

In the following section on 'Evolutionary Psychology, Masculinity, and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*', the view that Stevenson's writing does not engage with the psychological thinking of his time is debunked and his interest in evolutionary psychology is shown to extend well beyond *Jekyll and Hyde* into his other writings. Julia Reid in her essay 'Stevenson, Romance, and Evolutionary Psychology' makes this point clear through her consideration of a number of Stevenson's essays from the 1880s. Reid argues that Stevenson, while deploying evolutionist rhetoric, 'destabilized many of its assumptions —assumptions about the nature and direction of the evolutionary process, and about the relations between "primitive" and "civilized" life' (p. 216). In this way, through his forays into evolutionary psychology, Stevenson managed to unsettle the boundaries between the civilized and the savage.

In the final part, entitled 'Textual and Cultural Crossings', four diverse and eclectic essays highlight the range of Stevenson's influence and the influences on him. For instance, Wendy Katz in her essay 'Whitman and Thoreau as Literary Stowaways in Stevenson's American Writing' exposes the inspiration Stevenson took from the American literary tradition. As Katz argues, from 'Whitman and Thoreau, Stevenson learned much about how to "write" America. From them he encountered a forward-looking optimism, an appreciative regard for the variegated spirit of democracy [...] in short, a nation and its ideology' (p. 335). Katz reminds us that Stevenson drew strongly on the work of Whitman and Thoreau in *The Amateur Emigrant* and *The Silverado Squatters*, mimicking their style in order to develop specific aspects of his works.

Above all, *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries* provides a diversity of approaches and perspectives that make an excellent contribution to the ongoing rehabilitation of Stevenson as a writer. The collection underlines the magnificent range of

Stevenson's interests and abilities on display in his writings. Numerous critical lights are shone on Stevenson who is illuminated as an essayist, anthropologist, ethnographer, travel writer, novelist, and a 'writer of boundaries' (p. xiv). As the essays in this collection reveal, the contradictions and conflicts within his work—the unsettling and breaking down of boundaries—are points of strength, not weakness.

Benjamin A. Brabon

NOTES

1. Robert Louis Stevenson, 'A Gossip on Romance', p. 136 quoted in Stephen Donovan 'Stevenson and Popular Entertainment' in *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries*, ed. Richard Ambrosini and Richard Dury (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), p. 81.

Renata Kobetts Miller, *Recent Reinterpretations of Stevenson's Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde. Why and How This Novel Continues to Affect Us*

(Lewiston, NY: The Edward Mellen Press, 2005), £69.95 / \$109.95. ISBN: 077345991X

Whether Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* is the most adapted and parodied literary text is a question that eludes a definitive answer, but it is certainly among the most adapted and has all characteristics of a 'modern myth': a narrative repeatedly used by adapters and retellers to explain worrying or puzzling aspects of the human condition. So many derivative versions, or rather 'reinterpretations', of the narrative have been produced that it is useful to have a book like this as a guide to some of them. It starts with an analysis of Stevenson's *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (Ch. 1), followed by a survey of many of its adaptations (Ch. 2), and by then the main part of the book (Ch. 3-5, pp. 63-224): a study of three recent adaptations (Emma Tennant's *Two Women of London. The Strange Case of Ms Jekyll and Mrs Hyde* (1989), Valerie Martins' *Mary Reilly* (1990) and David Edgar's stage adaptation (1992)), accompanied by long interviews with their authors.

The first chapter ('Hyde's Silence') is an interesting and perceptive analysis of Stevenson's text, emphasizing how descriptions of both of people and actions are indeterminate or lacking, so that within 'a richly textual framework' we find 'a silence at the novel's core' (p. 8). Hyde is indeed essentially undefined, hence uncontrollable, and pervades the whole society of ageing patriarchs: all the other characters are similar or complicit with him (pp. 14-19). In particular, Hyde's silence is contagious, and all the other main characters repress speech at some time or another.

The convincing thesis here is that '[t]he silence, the fundamental unspeakability of Hyde, produced the horror of Stevenson's story and allowed so many interpretative voices to fill the void'. (20). The fragments of narrative in the original have stimulated others to make Hyde visible and specific, in most cases perhaps in order to be able to name and control what he represents.

Chapter 2 (pp. 21-62), titled 'Spectacular Transformations: A Survey', consists of a commentary on adaptations of Stevenson's text (pp. 21-43), followed by a partly annotated listing (pp. 44-62). The information for the latter comes from previously-published studies and listings 'supplemented by original archival research in the British Theatre Museum (for play reviews and programmes), the British Film Institute (for film synopses and production details), the Princeton University Library Theater Collection (for details of performances), and the British Library (Lord Chamberlain's Plays and Correspondence index). She has also found information on both books and theatre programmes in 'WorldCat' (a subscription union catalogue of world libraries with 71 million entries, presently growing at about 1 million records a month!).

For the early stage adaptations Miller unfortunately did not see the invaluable study by Danahay & Chisholm.² So the first London theatrical parody of Stevenson's story, *Hyde and Seekyl* is listed here as performed in May 1886 (following Geduld), though Danahay & Chapman (who also identify the author as George Grossmith) cite newspaper reports of its postponement from that date and first performance in September 1888. At the same time, however, Miller gives a useful reference for the play to the Lord Chamberlain's Play Index.

This combination of incomplete or inaccurate information with the new and valuable is typical of the list. The Sullivan stage adaptation for Richard Mansfield is listed under 1888, the year of its London performances: it had, however, been performed in Boston and New York in 1887. But here, too, Miller has a

contribution to make: her research in the Theater Collection of Princeton University Library and reference to Odell's 15-volume *Annals of the New York Stage* allows her to list places and dates of US performances (which Danahay & Chisholm do not do): Boston, New York, Washington, D.C. in 1887 and 1888 and here and elsewhere up to 1906; she also gives a reference to the Lord Chamberlain's licence to perform the play in London.³ The story is similar for the 1888 Bandmann adaptation. The first performance is listed as 19 March at the Amphion Academy in New York (from *Geduld*), while Danahay and Chapman have located the première to 12 March at Niblo's Garden. Yet Miller's research has found the name of the author of the adaptation: John McKinney.

Though my remarks may sound like the nerdish precision of the trainspotter, fascinated by mere data, the aim of mentioning them here is to make the point that, like *Geduld*, Miller's listing of derivative works is not totally reliable,⁴ yet at the same time is an indispensable source of new information —a book necessary for any collection of works on the afterlife of nineteenth-century gothic and horror texts (in particular Stevenson's novella), with the warning that chapter 2 should be used in combination with other sources. The task of surveying these texts is particularly difficult, since right from the beginning, adaptations of Stevenson's work seems to have spread through non-institutionalized channels —the cheap press, the variety theatre, the small-scale early film company, the comic book— that have left incomplete records. Despite the errors, however, Miller has done an invaluable job in collecting information on many works for the first time: the stage adaptations of 1888 (with Marlande Clarke), 1893 (with Charles T. Fletcher), 1904 (by Stratton), 1910 (by Law), 1933 (Akrill), 1947 (Percy), 1957 (Maxwell), 1973 (Thompson), 1979 (Morrison; Smith), 1983 (Corris), 1984 (Martin), 1985 (Campbell), 1989 (Poskitt), 1991 (Brooks), 1996 (Reece & Young), 2002 (ballets by Logunov and King & Guerin). Films listed here for the first

time are from 1950 (BBC, with Alan Judd), 1956 (BBC, with Dennis Price) and interesting experimental shorts from 1980 (Saunders) and 2001 (Bush), together with episodes of cartoon and TV fantasy/adventure series loosely based on Stevenson's story.⁵ Another interesting work inspired by 'Jekyll and Hyde' that is listed here for the first time is a short prose work by the avant-garde Japanese writer Taruho Inakagi (1925).

Miller notes that most adaptations give significantly more definition to Hyde and his vices (hence, the adjective 'spectacular' in her chapter-title: 'viewable', especially in the important theatrical and cinematographic tradition of this modern myth). This general tendency towards specifying the indefinite can be seen as motivated by the desire to 'narrow the threat posed by Hyde' (p. 26) and bring it under society's control. The appearance of a fiancée (in the 1888 Sullivan and later versions) eliminates the stasis of patriarchy and removes the suggestion of homosexuality and the presentation of a noble, altruistic Jekyll creates a simple and understandable opposition with Hyde. The portrayal of Carew as a kindly patriarch (a vicar in some versions) removes Stevenson's idea that Jekyll and Hyde dualism pervades patriarchal society. The early theatrical tradition (Sullivan 1888, Bandmann 1888, Forepaugh & Fish 1897,⁶ Carr 1910) shaped a kind of consensus variant narrative (the common conception of the story of 'Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde'), which was taken up by Hollywood, whose classic versions of 1920, 1931 and 1941 'further diminished the social criticism of Stevenson's tale' (p. 30).

Towards the end of the twentieth century, however, 'serious reinterpretations of Stevenson's novel began to shift away from the tradition of limiting Hyde and securing social controls' (p. 43). The three works examined in the second part of the book (Ch. 3-5) all see Hyde as a pervasive phenomenon in patriarchal society and all three introduce women but in different roles from the opposed fiancée and prostitute roles familiar from the film tradition.

The interviews with Emma Tennant, Valerie Martin and David Edgar will be of interest to students of these three adaptations or of derivative works based on Victorian narratives and on *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* in particular. Each interview is preceded by a useful introductory analysis of the work with references to the author's answers during the interview.

The conversations go here and there, as conversations do, but they are basically structured around a list of questions prepared beforehand. In the case of Emma Tennant, questions centre on the feminist point-of view: the way that *Two Women of London* shows how even today women are often powerless and how powerful professional women merely imitate patriarchal culture. There are also questions about the complex narrative structure that imitates Stevenson, about new conservative 'Victorian values' (promoted by Mrs Thatcher) and the myth of 'freedom of choice'. Miller ends by asking whether *Bad Sister* (1978), Tennant's adaptation of Hogg's *Justified Sinner*, influenced *Two Women of London*, to which Tennant replies with a long answer about the importance of the double in Scottish literature and its relation to a divided Scottish identity.

This interview is raw data for future researchers, so the present review is unable to cover all its points. I will just limit myself to one small interesting observation. Speculation about the name of Jekyll's butler, Poole, has ranged from seeing it as a mere loan from the town of Poole, not far from Bournemouth, to Naugrette's suggestion of a link with the frightening connotations of water in the text, to the present writer's speculation on the name's invitation and resistance to interpretation or on its being in the tradition of one-syllable servants' names in fiction, to Veeder's rather over-the-top comment that in the name: 'Watery depths belie the apparent taut face of patriarchy'.⁷ Miller however sees a possible link with Grace Poole, Bertha Rochester's nurse in *Jane Eyre* and Tennant agrees that Stevenson may well have taken this 'odd name' from there to name his own 'servant in an impos-

sible household'. In her *Two Women of London*, she in fact has a character with the name Grace Poole, who, she says, 'stands for the patient witness' (p. 95).

Valerie Martin, on the other hand, thinks that Stevenson was probably not alluding to Grace Poole in the choice of his butler's name, but admits that *Jane Eyre* was a model for herself as an 'honest way of telling a story' by a subordinate female narrator (p. 143). This interview with Valerie Martin (pp. 125-175) will probably be the most consulted in the book, thanks to interest in the novel and film of *Mary Reilly*. In her presentation, Miller emphasizes the 'self-conscious textuality' that we find in Stevenson and Martin (and in the other two versions too). The first-person narrative of the servant (missing, of course, in the film version) 'provides insights into the struggle between Victorian values and *fin de siècle* rebellion' (p. 123) and is a means to exploring 'the psychological effects of gender and class' (p. 110).

Subjects that are discussed in the following interview include the motivation for Jekyll's 'desire to do good', the use of the maid as narrator to allow us get behind Jekyll's social façade, Mary as a more 'whole' and 'natural' than Jekyll, her gradual understanding of social injustice, her use of the journal as a way to justify her own actions ('why she's in that room at the end', p. 144), the victimization of women by patriarchal society, the affinities between Mary and Jekyll and their relationship, the way Mary is not a masochist or a martyr but 'about as sane as she can be given the world she lives in' (p. 168). Interestingly, Martin identifies Jekyll with a 'liberal' (i.e. American Democrat) and Hyde with a Darwinian conservative, and current political divides can be seen, for example, in the debate of Jekyll and Lanyon over education for the working class.

We also learn some interesting gossip such as the fact that Valerie Martin has a dog called Louis, after RLS, and the fact that she based the character of Mary Reilly on a photo in Michael Hiley's *Victorian Working Women* (Boston: David R. Godine,

1980), a blown-up copy of which hung near her desk as she was writing the novel. We also learn that the first screenplay, written by Roman Polanski and judged 'horrible' by Martin, increases Mary's plight by making her illiterate and motherless.

The interview with Edgar focuses on Jekyll's relationship with his father and Stevenson's difficult relationship with his and the father-son relationship between Jekyll and Hyde. It was principally to bring this out that Edgar divided the title roles between an older and a younger actor.⁸ As he says, 'the relationship between age and youth and fatherhood and sonship is crucial to the novel, and one which many the adaptations usually ignore by virtue of having to have Jekyll and Hyde be roughly the same age' (p. 215). In contrast, Edgar assigns one actor to the parts of Carew and Lanyon so that 'Jekyll's causing Lanyon's death mirrors Hyde's murder of Carew' (Miller's comment, p. 184). Jekyll's 'new woman' sister, Katherine, is partly introduced to strengthen this family drama situation: she has suffered a violent act from her brother as a child, related to the father's preference for her. She is also there partly 'to draw attention to the male nature of Jekyll's London life by contrast' (p. 193).⁹ All the three authors show that they know Stevenson's text very well, but of the three Edgar is the one who makes most reference to literary critical works, while Martin makes more references to primary and secondary works that deal with social conditions of the period.

Miller's study will be a valuable addition to university and college libraries, where it will be of use to students and scholars interested in the comparative study of two texts and studies of the translation of a narrative from one medium to another. There is also much of interest to the scholar in the interviews and the introductions to them as well as in the first two chapters. The basic thesis of the first chapter explaining the great number of adaptations is clearly put and convincing. The second chapter, despite the inaccuracies, contains many new indications of adaptations Stevenson's story which I'm sure will be the starting

point for further explorations of the mythical force of this most adapted of texts.

Richard Dury

NOTES

1. Harry M. Geduld, *The Definitive 'Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde' Companion* (New York/London: Garland, 1983); William Veeder & Gordon Hirsch (eds.), *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde after One Hundred Years* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Brian A. Rose, *Jekyll and Hyde Adapted: Dramatizations of Cultural Anxiety* (London: Greenwood, 1996); Charles King, 'Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde. A Filmography', *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 25i (1997): 9-20; Raymond T. McNally & Radu R. Florescu, *In Search of Dr. Jekyll & Mr. Hyde* (Los Angeles: Renaissance Books, 2000).

2. Martin A. Danahay & Alex Chisholm (eds.), *Jekyll and Hyde Dramatized* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2004); a work that came too late for consultation for unravelling the history of 'Jekyll and Hyde' derivative works is Richard Dury (ed.), *The Annotated Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, Second edition (Genova: ECIG, 2005).

3. However, the listing of later performances in a note on p. 230 contains, without town names, Chestnut Street Opera House, Col. Sinn's Montauk Theatre and 'Garden Theater, Colonial Theatre' (two juxtaposed theatre names with only one date of performance).

4. For example: *Jekyll Meets Hyde, Overheard in Arcady* (p. 46) should be 'Jekyll Meets Hyde', in *Overheard in Arcady*; *The American Century Magazine* (p. 230n) should be *The American Magazine*; an item listed as a story by Borges (p. 50) is actually a film review; a short story by John Rackham, listed by Geduld under 1963 is here listed under 1973 (p. 54); a poem (p. 61) by John Kessel is listed as a short story; a ballet choreographed by Ralf Rossa is given the title *Und Mr Hyde* (p. 62) instead of *Dr Jekyll und Mr Hyde*. In defence of Miller, the works listed are never collected in one place, in one catalogue, and have often disappeared; in such conditions, errors are inevitable (though many of the above seem to be errors of transcription); in addition her new information is useful: thanks to Miller, I have not only be able to add items to the listings of derivative works on the RLS Website (www.unibg.it).

it/rls) but also to correct several errors there.

5. Miller also includes some irrelevant items, such as Brian de Palma's *Raising Cain* (a thriller involving Multiple Personality Disorder), film documentaries and TV series episodes that just happen to have the names Jekyll and Hyde in the title (1950, 1986, 1986). Separating adaptations of Stevenson's novella from works that it more or less inspired is, however, an impossible task.

6. This is the date given by Miller; Geduld does not list this version; Rose, however, dates it to 1904.

7. Jean-Pierre Naugrette, 'The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde: Essai d'onomastique', *Cahiers Victoriens et Edouardiens* 40 (1994), p. 83 and note; Richard Dury, *The Annotated Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, Second edition (Genova: ECI, 2005), p. 50; Richard Dury (ed.), *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004), p. 91; William Veeder, 'Children of the Night: Stevenson and Patriarchy', in William Veeder & Gordon Hirsch, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde After One Hundred Years* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press), p. 120.

8. The interview took place in 1992, before Edgar's 1996 revision of the play, which Miller does not note (published by Hern Books, 1996), in which the two title roles were given (as in most performance adaptations) to one actor. In an interview in 2006 Edgar says that the use of two actors 'was a mistake. [...] It didn't do what I intended to do, which was to dramatise two sides of society. There's something very corporeal about the theatre, and it looked like what it was, which was a tall thin man and a short fat man having an argument' (*The Herald*, November 7, 2006, web issue 2672 <http://www.theherald.co.uk/features/73791.html>).

9. Another opposition of Edgar's play, which does not come out in the interview, is that of divided Scottish identity: 'Jekyll had a light Edinburgh accent while Hyde was plainly from the mean streets of Glasgow' (<http://www.rogerallam.co.uk/jekyll.html>). This characterization is also found in the BBC radio dramatization by Robert Forest (1997) in which Alexander Morton plays the title roles with opposed accents (genteel Edinburgh Scottish standard English versus demotic Glaswegian Scots).

Contributors

Giuseppe Albano completed his doctoral thesis at Cambridge in 2005. Since then he has held fellowships at Queen's University (Canada) International Study Centre and Edinburgh University's Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities. He currently teaches English Literature at Edinburgh University.

Benjamin Brabon is a Lecturer in Literature and Culture at Napier University, Edinburgh. His primary area of research is Gothic fiction from the late eighteenth and nineteenth century. He is the co-editor of *Postfeminist Gothic: Critical Interventions in Contemporary Culture* (Palgrave 2007) and he is currently working on a book entitled *Darkness and Distance: Gothic Cartography and the Mapping of Great Britain*.

Richard Dury was born in Bristol in 1947. After finishing University (at Manchester, where he studied Medieval and Modern History) he moved to Italy. He has taught English language and linguistics and occasionally English literature at Bergamo University since 1977.

Wendy R. Katz is Professor of English at Saint Mary's University in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada. She has taught and published in the area of Victorian literature. She has written articles on Stevenson and is the editor of *Treasure Island* for Edinburgh University Press.

Katherine Linehan is Professor of English at Oberlin College in Ohio. She edited the Norton Critical Edition of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and has published articles on Stevenson, Gissing, and George Eliot.

Laavanyan Ratnapalan is studying for a PhD in history at Goldsmiths College, University of London, researching Stevenson's Pacific travel writing. He has taught modern history at Goldsmiths College and Middlesex University.

Roger G. Swearingen is best known for his authoritative guide to the writing and publication of Stevenson's many prose works, *The Prose Writings of Robert Louis Stevenson: A Guide* (1980). But he is also the author of *Robert Louis Stevenson's Edinburgh: A Concise Guide for Visitors and Residents* (2001) and the review of research, 'Recent Studies in Robert Louis Stevenson: Letters, Reference Works, Texts 1970–2005' in *Dickens Studies Annual*, 37 (2006). This review will be followed, in 2007, by sections on Biography and Criticism. He is currently the website architect for a major electronics firm in Santa Rosa, California, and is still at work on a full-length biography of RLS for Faber and Faber Publishers, London, titled *Robert Louis Stevenson: Spirit of Adventure*.

Saverio Tomaiuolo is Lecturer in English Literature and Language at Cassino University, Italy. He has published on Victorian literature (Tennyson, Dickens, Hopkins, and especially Braddon and the sensation novel) and postmodern literature (Robert Pirsig, Antonia Byatt) on Italian and international journals. He has published a monograph on Tennyson's narrative poems ('Tennyson e il senso del narrare', 2003).

Isaac Yue recently received his PhD in English Literature from King's College, University of London. He has written and published articles in refereed journals in both Chinese and English, and is presently engaged in various research projects that concern the Western representation of China throughout the nineteenth century. He is currently teaching at Lingnan University in Hong Kong.

The Journal of Stevenson Studies

Committed to the study and wider implications of the work of Robert Louis Stevenson as a modern writer, *The Journal of Stevenson Studies* offers an original and unique insight into the moral, psychological and cultural ambiguities of his vision.

**The Journal is available annually
by subscription only.**

Subscription rates 2007 (all rates inclusive of postage)

	Personal		Institutional	
	UK	Overseas	UK	Overseas
1 Year	£15	£17	£25	£27

I wish to subscribe to *The Journal of Stevenson Studies* as a
Personal UK/Overseas* subscriber
Institutional UK/Overseas* subscriber

*please delete as applicable

I enclose a cheque for £ made payable to
The University of Stirling

Please return orders to: Journal of Stevenson Studies
English Studies
University of Stirling
Stirling
FK9 4LA
Scotland

Name _____

Address _____

About The Journal of Stevenson Studies

Volume One of The Journal, published in July 2004, contains articles by Richard Ambrosini, Steven Arata, Oliver S. Buckton, Liam Connell, Richard Dury, Vincent Giroud, Douglas S. Mack, Sudesh Mishra, Glenda Norquay, Olena M. Turnbull, Richard J. Walker, and Roderick Watson.

Volume Two was published in the summer of 2005 with the following contents:

Hilary Beattie: ‘Dreaming, doubling and gender in the work of Robert Louis Stevenson: The strange case of “Olalla”’

Sara Clayson: “Steadfastly and Securely on His Upward Path”: Dr. Jekyll’s Spiritualist Experiment’

Richard Dury: ‘Strange Language of *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*’

Liz Farr: ‘Surpassing the Love of Women: Robert Louis Stevenson and the Pleasures of Boy-loving’

William Gray: ‘The Incomplete Fairy Tales of Robert Louis Stevenson’

Gordon Hirsch: ‘The Commercial World of *The Wrecker*’

Juergen Kramer: ‘Unity in Difference – A Comparative Reading of Robert Louis Stevenson’s “The Beach of Falesá” and Joseph Conrad’s “Heart of Darkness”’

Book Reviews:

Richard Dury on Ann C. Colley, *Robert Louis Stevenson and the Colonial Imagination* (Ashgate, 2004)

Eric Massie on Claire Harman, *Robert Louis Stevenson: A Biography* (Harper Collins, 2005)

Volume Four (guest editors Ann Colley and Martin Danahay) will appear in 2007 with essays from *Transatlantic Stevenson*, the 4th Biennial International Robert Louis Stevenson Conference held at Saranac Lake in July 2006.

To subscribe to the Journal please use the form overleaf. If you wish to order an earlier volume or volumes as well, please make this clear.