

5-2019

Monstrous Mobility in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and Dracula

Autumn Danielle Weese
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>

Part of the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Weese, Autumn Danielle, "Monstrous Mobility in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and Dracula" (2019). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3142.
<https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/3142>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact ccmiddle@uark.edu.

Monstrous Mobility in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *Dracula*

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in English

by

Autumn Weese
John Brown University
Bachelor of Arts in English, 2012

May 2019
University of Arkansas

This thesis is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

Lissette Lopez Szwydki-Davis, Ph.D.
Thesis Director

William Quinn, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Sean Dempsey, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Abstract

This thesis explores Late Victorian Gothic texts that are central to theories on monstrosity in terms of mobility by examining *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *Dracula*. The goal of this project is to survey the ways in which two exemplary monsters, Mr. Hyde and Count Dracula, promote mobility for others and themselves as an inherent part of their monstrosity. The variety of this mobility is demonstrated by examples showing how monsters move and encourage movement in ways that are social and transformative as well as physical. Because social mobility is essential to these movements, this study also considers the societies these monsters enter and interrupt. The gentleman bachelors of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *Dracula's* Crew of Light and the women they seek to protect are presented as monolithic groups that the monster joins, transforms, and spurs into movement. By identifying mobility as one of the main attributes of monstrosity, this argument seeks to not only add to the copious amount of scholarship already done on these works but also to reconcile some of them since many of the most critically controversial aspects of these texts are rooted in the monster's mobility. A study focused on movement not only adds something that is missing from the existing discussion on these seminal monsters but also provides a new framework through which to discuss constantly evolving theories of monstrosity.

©2019 by Autumn Weese
All Right Reserved

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Dr. Jekyll's Good Name and His Illegitimate Heir: Social Mobility in <i>Dr Jekyll and Mr. Hyde</i>	12
The Monstrous Mr. Hyde and the Newly-Mobile Gentlemen Bachelors: Transformative Mobility in <i>Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde</i>	24
The Professional District, the Slums of Soho, and “Mixed Spaces:” Physical Mobility in <i>Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde</i>	34
The Monstrous New Woman and Masculinity at Stake: Social Mobility in <i>Dracula</i>	44
Monstrous Heroes and Up-to-Date Medievalism: Transformative Mobility in <i>Dracula</i>	61
“Reverse Colonization” and <i>Dracula's</i> Travel War: Physical Mobility in <i>Dracula</i>	71
Conclusion	84
Works Cited	88

Introduction

In the shadow of the Carpathians, an elderly woman wrings her hands and pleads to an Englishman, a solicitor, to stay at her inn a while longer. She knows, or at least suspects, the monster that waits at the end of his journey. Worried for his safety, she asks, “Do you know where you are going, and what you are going to?” (Stoker 9). The Englishman, very simply, does not know, but this does not stop him. He has received an important, if eccentric, invitation to conduct business with a certain Count in the area and cannot ignore it. His business is “imperative,” and he insists, “I must go” (Stoker 9). Back in London, a respectable lawyer from the West End is also impelled towards movement when the police question him about the violent death of one of his clients. An upstanding gentleman has been clubbed to death in the street, and surely only a monster could do such a thing. The lawyer has his own suspicions and seems to steel himself before agreeing to begin his journey. “If you will come with me in my cab,” he explains, “I think I can take you to his house” (Stevenson 27). The lawyer, an officer at his side, approaches the suspect streets of Soho through a thick fog because, like the solicitor traveling in a foreign land, he too “must go.” Both are impelled to go and meet their monsters as the monster, whether or not he is yet recognized as such, makes a call that cannot be ignored.

One of the “Seven Theses” on monstrosity that Jeffrey Jerome Cohen offers in his introduction to *Monster Theory* is that “the monster polices the borders of the possible” (12). He argues that “the monster stands as a warning against exploration” and shows “that one is better off safely contained within one’s own domestic sphere than abroad” (J. Cohen 12). Cohen deduces from this that “the monster prevents mobility (intellectual, geographic, or sexual)” since to move under these circumstances “is to risk attack by some monstrous border patrol” (12). This reasoning holds that monsters, despite moving through border spaces themselves, cause their

human counterparts to freeze in fear. The following project, however, argues the opposite: monsters actually promote human mobility. While the fear of crossing borders may remain, monstrous threats tend to promote movement rather than stillness as humans either run away from or towards the monster.

The present argument examines Mr. Hyde and Count Dracula as exemplars of this monstrous mobility. Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) and Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897) have been selected, in part, because of their similarities since both share a place in the canon of Late Victorian Gothic novels, are set primarily in England, and have shared a similar afterlife in copious reiterations. Because these are foundational, seminal monsters, it may later be concluded that their shared mobility is an attribute of monstrosity in general, but it is at least clear that Hyde and Dracula are monsters who promote mobility for themselves and others. This mobility is depicted as the ability to cross borders that are social (demarcating boundaries between parts of social constructs), transformative (demarcating boundaries between changing identities), and physical (demarcating boundaries between actual spaces).

Whether it is to run away from in fear or to chase as part of a hunt, monsters provide a reason for physical mobility. Because they move and tend to move quickly, monsters are often recognizable by their own mobility. In general terms, the physical fear of the monster is that it will, indeed, move as it threatens to sneak up, chase, or attack. In addition to exceptional strength and speed, Hyde and Dracula are both depicted with the supernatural ability to move in ways that humans cannot like Dracula's riding into rooms on motes of dust and Hyde's movements that are often described as demonic or animalistic. However, the monster's physical mobility is not limited to itself because, as the monster chases or attacks, it prompts its potential victims to run.

As the following chapters will show, Hyde forces the gentlemen of London to cross the border into the slums of Soho to investigate him, and the humans of *Dracula* end by traveling all the way to Transylvania in order to execute their nemesis. In order to respond to the exceptional mobility of the monster, others must move as well.

Transformative mobility occurs as, in addition to encouraging movement, monsters change people. Because they are Other, different in as many ways as possible, monsters tend to inhabit a network of colliding identities. In the identity of the monster, “one kind of difference becomes another as the normative categories of gender, sexuality, national identity, and ethnicity slide together like the imbricated circles of a Venn diagram” (J. Cohen 11). The layering of difference evident in the monster explains, in part, the variety of interpretations they can produce. Dracula's monstrosity, for example, has been attributed at times to his racial difference, sexual difference, and national difference among other things. This argument can be expanded, however, since the monsters not only exist in this space of “slippage” but also bring the humans they hunt there with them (J. Cohen 10). Both Hyde and Dracula produce changes in the seemingly homogenous communities that they terrorize as they transform them, arguably, into something like the monster they fear and, certainly, into something different than they once were. By transforming the humans into something Other themselves, “monsters serve both to mark the fault-lines but also, subversively, to signal the fragility of such boundaries” (Graham 12). The monster shows not only what the humans are *not*, but also what they are so close to *becoming*.

Monsters also promote social mobility because the strange positions that they place people in tend to allow space for movement in the existing social structure. Because of the layering of difference mentioned earlier, the monster itself often inhabits the borders between

existing structures of class, gender, and race. As the following argument will show, for example, Hyde is depicted as a rough member of the lower class at the same time that his position as Jekyll's heir gives him potential as an up-and-coming gentleman. Similarly, even a cursory study of *Dracula* can uncover the various readings of the vampire as both a supremely feminine and masculine monster. In addition to crossing these social borders themselves, monsters bring their victims across these borders with them as the crises they create allow people to do more (or less) than norms would usually dictate. Hyde brings mobility to an otherwise rigid class structure as Jekyll's association with the monster causes him to lose his social status and Utterson must travel to the slums of Soho to investigate. *Dracula* allows for a blurring of the strict borders limiting gender and sex in Victorian England as the men of *Dracula* become weak and impotent in the face of the vampire while the women are spurred onto action as a response to his threat. The monster, then, is able to question boundaries and grant freedom from the norms that rule the protagonists before his introduction.

The complexities of gender and sex and class structure have been well documented in both *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *Dracula*, but the goal of the present argument is different in that these subjects are being considered in terms of mobility instead of as ends unto themselves. The social anxieties latent in monster texts as popular as these have already been studied at great length, but the present argument seeks to explore the underlying cause of these already well-examined themes. The movement that the monster makes possible is the source of these topics that have drawn so much critical attention, but the movement itself has often been ignored. This lack of attention to movement is likely why there is so much scholarly indecision about the interpretation of these texts. Scholars often diverge on just what these concepts mean because they ignore that the meaning is moving or changing. Because the monster is constantly in flux, it

is difficult to provide a definite interpretation of him. That is why, instead of trying to pin down just what the monster means, this project focuses on examining that fluctuating movement. The crossing of the borders between class identities and normative gender roles that has drawn so much attention in these works is considered here as a symptom of monstrous mobility.

In *Monsters, Gods, and Strangers*, Richard Kearney posits that monsters “are, deep down, tokens of fracture within the human psyche” (4). “They speak to us,” he says, “of how we are split between conscious and unconscious, familiar and unfamiliar, same and other” (Kearney 4). No monster, perhaps, can speak as eloquently on this split as Mr. Hyde, whose own body is shared with that of his creator. That scholars have read Hyde in a variety of ways is not surprising since his mysteriously fluid appearance and half hidden nature is bound to produce a wide range of interpretations. Among other things, Hyde stands in most often as a manifestation of “the perverse violence of male sexuality, the necessarily preterited pleasures of homoeroticism, or the frightful blurring of conventional gender categories linked in the late-nineteenth century imagination to such figures as the New Woman” (Williams 413). These interpretations tend to be primarily efforts to uncover the nature of the secret sin that Jekyll hides behind his monster. The present argument is instead an effort to read Hyde more generally in terms of his mobility without necessarily ruling out any of these readings that are focused on solving the mystery of Hyde. Not only is Hyde worthy of examination in this study of monstrous mobility because of his position among the most recognized, researched, and reiterated monsters in the genre but also because he presents a unique opportunity to explore a movement that is based firmly in socio-economic class.

In the *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Hyde’s monstrosity produces movement for himself and others. Hyde offers several kinds of social mobility to explore, but the best lens

to view this work through continues to be that of class. Of the various concerns that were abundant in the “increasingly conflict-ridden social and political context” of Victorian England, it is “the vexed relations between the middle-class Englishman and his many ‘others’” that are apparent in Utterson and his peer’s interactions with and fear of Hyde (E. Cohen 183). Hyde allows for social mobility as he moves himself up and Jekyll down in the social status that is so important to the gentlemen bachelors. As he becomes Hyde, Jekyll experiences downward mobility as he descends from a respected *Doctor* to an ignominious *Mister*. Hyde, on the other hand, embodies the threat of an upwardly mobile lower class with his potential to enter the ranks of the gentlemen as Jekyll’s heir. In addition to this pure social mobility, Hyde also causes transformative movement as he moves into the lives of these gentlemen and undermines the social norms they hold most dear. As he transforms their social hierarchy, Hyde embodies how the “Other is perceived as antisocial, breaking society's rules, or nonsocial, going beyond society's norms” (Waterhouse 29). Finally, although Hyde never prompts Jekyll to go any further than the other side of London, the symbolic importance of this relatively small distance is especially important since these areas are divided decisively by class. Hyde’s ability to move both himself and others to different sides of town (not far physically, but socially distant) complements his ability to blur the borders between those apparently distinct places.

Hyde, then, is a disruptive social force, poised to disrupt the society of the well-to-do gentlemen¹ bachelors of Jekyll's circle. Jennifer Beauvais describes this “exclusively male community” as exclusive in other ways as well since they are “professional men separated from the vacuous public by their class status, intelligence, and morality” (173). Despite Utterson's claims that “it is the mark of a modest man to accept his friendly circle ready made from the

¹ Although “gentleman” is often a loaded term, it is used in this argument for the sake of ease to describe this group because it is how the men in the novella choose to refer to themselves.

hands of opportunity,” his social group is defined by its exclusivity (Stevenson 4). “Opportunity” here keeps very closely with the existing social order, and these friendships are “ready made” in such a way that men of good means are kept alongside other men of good means so that, in the end, this group is defined by the wealth of the men in it. While the philosophy of this society of gentlemen is never explicitly explained in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, it is possible to point out some of the more recognizable characteristics by which they can be identified. An ability to exhibit class, though largely performative, forms the main distinction between man and gentleman. Martin Danahay explains that, for the Victorian gentleman, “class is exhibited both through taste (for fine wines, sterling silver, and Turkish carpets for example) but also through norms of behavior that are exhibited through the body” (36). Their combination of social position and class make these men identifiable as gentlemen and set them noticeably apart from men like Hyde.

Like Hyde, *Dracula's* titular monster proves to be dangerously mobile. In *At Stake*, Edward J. Ingebretsen claims that monsters enjoy a certain freedom in that “they transgress, cross over, do not stay put where—for the convenience of our categories of sex, race, class or creed—we would like them to stay” (4). This ability to cross over accepted lines of demarcation is evident as Count Dracula monstrously moves primarily by crossing borders. Surrounded by a wealth of scholarship, adaptations, and imitations, Dracula joins Hyde as one of literature's most recognizable monsters with the same variety of interpretations. *Dracula* has been touted as both a celebration of the New Woman and a diatribe against her, a near-pornographic embodiment of lust and homosexuality and a warning against such behavior. The great variety of interpretations that *Dracula* produces is again tied to the constant movement that the monster makes possible. Dracula is not only especially mobile himself but also allows others to experience mobility as

they cross borders that are physical and social. Kearney's argument that “monsters terrify and intrigue” because “they defy borders” is apparent in *Dracula* as the antagonism between monster and man becomes a battle of movement versus restriction as Dracula crosses borders while the men try to reestablish them (118). Dracula, “a border being” who “abrogates demarcation,” is opposed by the Crew of Light² whose “largest purpose is to re-inscribe the dualities that Dracula would muddle and confuse” by reinstating “inexorable and ineradicable lines of separation” (Craft 117). However, despite the Crew of Light's varied attempts to counter his movements, Dracula's mobility and ability to mobilize—whether it is social, transformative, or physical—is continually apparent.

Dracula's own mobility prompts the movement of the story's protagonists. Although scholars have found a variety of ways to examine social movement in *Dracula*, the present study will focus on social mobility through gender as Dracula's own androgyny complicates the apparently strict classification between and expectations of men and women. The social borders that separate normative concepts of gender and sexuality are crossed as the female vampires develop aggressive agency and the human men are emasculated. The borders that separate monster and man are also blurred as *Dracula* depicts its heroes transforming into something eerily similar to its monster. Transformative movement occurs as Dracula mirrors the Crew of Light's modernity while the men become monstrous themselves as they begin to exchange blood and commit gruesome murders. Finally, national borders are challenged as Dracula's imperial aspirations cause him to cross the line, both symbolic and physical, that separates Transylvania from England. In addition to moving himself, Dracula's attacks on England start a Travel War in

² A useful term coined by Christopher Craft that will be used here to refer to the men who oppose Dracula. While Mina does play a role in this group, it will be shown that her membership in the Crew of Light is never completely accepted by any of its male members.

which the Crew of Light are spurred into movement as they must follow him.

The social climate that the monster is poised to interrupt is similar at the opening of both of the works being examined here, though the world of *Dracula* seems more rigid in terms of gender than class. The men of *Dracula* begin by adhering to a similar standard to those of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. The main difference is that Hyde questions the social position of the gentlemen bachelors while *Dracula* questions the Crew of Light's potency. Because the Crew of Light are primarily gentleman of Utterson's type, most of the identifying characteristics of this class remain the same between these two texts. The main differentiation between these groups of men is that Stoker tends to lean on the strength or vigor of his protagonists. To begin with, the men of the Crew of Light are referred to "almost formulaically" as "*good, brave, and strong*" (J. Stevenson 142). Although they are adventurous, they are not at all wild or uncouth. With the exception of Lord Godalming, a member of the aristocracy, they are associated with respectable professions much like Utterson's gentlemen. The Crew of Light, then, begin as the epitome of idealized Victorian masculinity.

Mina and Lucy, the primary women featured in *Dracula*, depict well the apparently normative Victorian woman who was expected to be *good*, like her male counterparts, but also weak and ornamental. They are also provided with the foil of their apparent opposite: the New Woman. For the present argument, increased mobility will be discussed in terms of the New Woman because these are the terms in which so many scholars have already broached this subject. They do so with good reason since Stoker seems to go out of his way to bring this figure to the reader's attention. For *Dracula*'s contemporary audience, the New Woman was a burgeoning figure who "desired a more valuable role in society's workforce" along with a "more disturbing" call for "sexual freedom" (Lancaster 1). The fear that this movement would lead to

“the moral decay of society” was rooted in the concern that a woman's “thoughts had now [been] divided between work, sexuality, and the home life to which she formerly devoted herself completely” (Lancaster 1). This controversial figure is brought up solely by Mina in the text and is brought up solely for the sake of mockery as she positions both Lucy and herself as outsiders to this radical group of women. Indeed, Mina “is often a mouthpiece for the Victorian ideology of ‘stalwart manhood’ and nurturing, admiring femininity” and Lucy “is characterized as an ideal of Victorian, upper-class, innocent femininity” (Pikula 289). Thus, the social setting at the opening of *Dracula* provides an apparent split between ideals of masculinity and femininity that Dracula will challenge with his presence.

To return to the problem posed at the beginning of this introduction, these conclusions about monstrous mobility do stand opposed to other arguments that monsters serve to immobilize instead. There is some logic to these theories since the presence of a monster may well cause people to lock their doors and stay inside. The issue with arguments like those cited at the beginning of this paper is that they only address the monster as a limiting presence and not as a call to action which is, ultimately, how most protagonists see the monster. For example, if *Dracula* had ended in the foothills of the Carpathians with the terrified locals who warn Jonathan Harker against his visit to the castle, this argument would be enough. However, because the protagonists must react to the monster's threat, this concept of an immobilizing monster needs to be amended. The monster becomes a catalyst for mobility because the hero must leave safety—both physically and metaphorically—to confront them. In *Monster Theory*, Cohen does go on to explain that this theory of immobility applies to “monster of prohibition” who “exists to demarcate the bonds that hold together that system of relations we call culture, to call horrid attention to the borders that cannot—must not—be crossed” (13). However, through their

crossing of lines that can only be crossed to the detriment of “culture,” Hyde and Dracula both fit this mold of prohibitive monster while still proving to be mobile and mobilizing.

Dr. Jekyll's Good Name and His Illegitimate Heir:

Social Mobility in *Dr Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

The gentlemen of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* exist in an apparently rigid social structure that will continue to be examined as part of this argument as Jekyll's association with Hyde and even the science needed to create him divide the doctor from this society he was once a standard member of. One of the most notable characteristics of this group is the importance that they place on public opinion. As gentlemen, they cannot accept anyone thinking they do not act like gentlemen, so they would not do anything publicly that may make them vulnerable to popular censure and would be upset about any rumors concerning them. In their efforts to make and retain a good name, these gentlemen share a “clear understanding” on issues of “scandal and disgrace” (Beauvais 183). When Enfield describes trying to punish Hyde for trampling a young girl in the street, he tells Utterson,

Killing being out of the question, we did the next best. We told the man we could and would make such a scandal out of this, as should make his name stink from one end of London to the other. If he had any friends or credit, we undertook that he should lose them. (Stevenson 7)

Positioning this punishment as one of the most severe available reveals the importance that these gentlemen place on maintaining their good names and, ultimately, the disregard Hyde has for the same. When Jekyll's signature is found on the check Hyde offers in reparation, the social weight Jekyll's name carries is highlighted by Enfield's belief that the check is a forgery and his hesitancy, even in retelling the story, to mention Jekyll as he says only that his name is “very well known and often printed” (Stevenson 7). Scenes like these simultaneously foreground the importance these men place on their good names and the potential risk they face by associating with Hyde.

Through their repeated concern that an association with Hyde might spoil Jekyll's

reputation, Utterson and his fellow gentlemen make it clear that a man's good name is crucial to securing his place in this social hierarchy. Furthermore, these men are put forward as the defenders of Jekyll's good name. What Catherine Frank calls "Utterson's membership" in this group "means that he will protect Jekyll from a public world of outsiders" (221). Although Utterson had never approved of Jekyll's will being written in Hyde's interest, his disapproval shifts to fear of "disgrace" once he learns more about Hyde (Stevenson 12). In the world of these men, "what one owns and how one disposes of it says something about one's character," and Jekyll's will signals a shortcoming in his character that Utterson cannot or will not accept (Frank 218). Utterson does not fear for Jekyll's money or future but, instead, for his name and the potential disgrace Hyde may bring to it. Utterson's concern deepens during the Carew murder investigation when he worries that Jekyll's "good name" could be "sucked down in the eddy of the scandal" (Stevenson 33). The interest that Utterson and his peers share in preserving the credit or good name of Jekyll reveals that the underlying hierarchy of this gentlemanly social group relies, at least in part, on good public opinion.

In this system of understanding that stresses the importance of public opinion, the individual's actual morality means less than his perceived morality. In *Victorian Babylon*, Lynda Nead outlines different modes of morality from Victorian London with terms that help express how Stevenson's social elite approach public opinion and moral actions. Jekyll's peers are not interested in what Nead calls "private morality" since, to them, morality is a public act (157). Immorality is only important in that it may harm a man's good name or public persona. Thus, a gentleman's code of morality is not concerned with right and wrong so much as with what society permits and how well a sin can be kept secret. In *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, morality is configured as a "public matter" and so becomes "an issue of social stability" (Nead 158). For

these men, social standing is everything and, therefore, morality is everything. Consequently, a moral threat, like Hyde, can become a social threat as well. When Jekyll becomes Hyde, he experiences a moral change that results in a social change as he moves away from this group of gentlemen, downward in social class, and lower in public and professional opinion. By becoming Hyde, Jekyll distances himself from his friends and also his place in the social hierarchy that he once shared with those friends in a movement not only *away from* them but also *downward into* a lower social class.

Hyde's ability to move by creating space between these gentlemen begins even before his creation. Early in his investigations, Utterson finds that Jekyll has already been rejected by his associates in the scientific community because of his questionable experiments. Dr. Lanyon verifies that Jekyll has already made a significant split from his peer group when he admits it has been "more than ten years since Henry Jekyll became too fanciful for [him]" (Stevenson 13). Although not stated specifically, the scientific interests that Lanyon deems "fanciful" likely have something to do with the creation of Hyde or some similar experiment. Lanyon explains only that Jekyll "began to go wrong, wrong in mind" because of his "unscientific balderdash" (Stevenson 13). Even before his birth as a product of Jekyll's questionable experiments, Hyde creates space between these men. Because his good name as a respected scientist and doctor is called into question, Jekyll is moved away from his social position within this group because of his connection even with the science required to create Hyde. When Jekyll mentions this split between Lanyon and himself over his "scientific heresies," he underlines the fact that this professional distance has wrought social distance when he says in the same breath, "I always mean to see more of [Lanyon]" (Stevenson 22). This implies that their disagreement has caused a distance in the form of discontinued social visits, events that are extremely important to these

gentlemen. By causing his peers to question his mental stability, the very science necessary to create Hyde distances Jekyll from his colleagues.

In addition to his scientific studies drawing the ire of his friends, Jekyll is moved away from his social group by Hyde's mere existence. Hyde is every part of Jekyll that he has sought to reject and—yes—hide. Because no explanation of him can be shared, the nature of Hyde's threat must separate and cause division. Jekyll himself implies that his problem is inherently lonely since it is “one of those affairs that cannot be mended by talking” (Stevenson 22). Because of its root in his secret sins, the burden of Hyde is one that must be borne alone. Later, when Jekyll explains his final break with Lanyon, he seems to understand how Hyde must distance him from his previous circle of friends. He says, “I mean from henceforth to lead a life of extreme seclusion; you must not be surprised, nor must you doubt my friendship, if my door is often shut even to you” (Stevenson 39). Indeed, Jekyll's closing of his physical door to visitors signals a metaphorical move away from the social group that he had once been a part of. Hyde is a monster born of the secret interior life of his creator, and he is forced to remain a secret for that creator's safety. By his very nature, Hyde moves Jekyll away from his peers because it is impossible for the secret to be kept without the space between them that he creates. Hyde's presence dissolves many of the social bonds in this group as Jekyll sequesters himself and others (either instinctively or through special knowledge like Lanyon's) distance themselves from him.

Hyde's distancing power also ripples out to affect smaller social issues as he pervasively forces distance in a group that requires hegemony and close ties. This is evident as the conventions of the gentlemanly visit become twisted as what was once a moment of mannerly, regulated interaction between gentlemen is subverted by the presence of the monster. In his first meeting with Hyde, Lanyon's strict adherence to the conventions of a social call in his circle

highlights Hyde's inability to comply with those conventions. Instead of being introduced by a servant, Hyde arrives so late at night that Lanyon must answer the door himself. Without introduction, he begs Lanyon for the item he is there to retrieve with such "lively" "impatience that he even laid his hand upon" and "sought to shake" his host (Stevenson 66). Hyde's inability to conform to the norms of these meetings that serve to bring men together underlines his natural ability to create distance and move people away from one another. Similarly, when Poole seeks Utterson's aid after Jekyll has locked himself in his lab, the butler makes a request that flips Utterson's understanding of what a social visit should be. He says, "I want you to hear, and I don't want you to be heard. And see here, sir, if by any chance he was to ask you in, don't go" (Stevenson 48). This request, so odd to Utterson that it "nearly threw him from his balance," shows that Hyde's presence has changed the way both Jekyll and the other gentlemen move in social settings (Stevenson 48). The theme here is a repeating one of distance that Hyde sows in relationships both on a large scale in the seclusion of Jekyll or small with the confusion of these social conventions that were once so important.

Hyde is certainly the cause of this movement in the form of creating distance because Jekyll can freely approach this group and, therefore, his original place in society once Hyde is seemingly gone. Utterson describes how "a new life began for Jekyll" once "the evil influence [Hyde] had been withdrawn" (Stevenson 36). Jekyll is apparently *right* again, and Utterson and his peers understand this *rightness* in the terms that are important to their society as Jekyll "came out of his seclusion, renewed relations with his friends, became once more their familiar guest and entertainer" (Stevenson 36). Apparently restored to his previous state, Jekyll is "much in the open air," part of their routine dinners, and "busy" or profitable (Stevenson 37). During this time, Utterson sees "his friend almost daily," implying that regular social interactions are a necessary

part of Jekyll's return to his place in the social hierarchy (Stevenson 37). This reconnection to society is possible only through Hyde's banishment. At this point in the narrative, that banishment seems final, and the near immediate result is a shrinking of the space Hyde created between them all. It is important for these men to have a good name that must be reinforced by close social ties and interactions, and Hyde's presence among them interrupts those ties and forces Jekyll away from that society. The distance that Hyde introduces to this group can be attributed solely to his monstrous movement among them since it disappears when he does.

In addition to creating distance between people, however, Hyde also allows Jekyll to move downward in the social hierarchy, movement that is most apparent when viewed in regard to the former security of Jekyll's position. Jekyll's claim in his own introduction that he was born "to a large fortune" and "inclined by nature to industry" places him in a higher economic bracket at the same time that it gestures towards the professionalism the men in this novella hold dear (Stevenson 70). He is, at once, seemingly separated from men like Hyde by economics and grouped with men like Utterson by profession. Jekyll goes on to describe himself as always "fond of the respect of the wise and the good among [his] fellow-men" (Stevenson 70). By choosing to depict himself as naturally interested in social status and craving the esteem of his peers, Jekyll situates himself in this group of gentlemen who are so concerned with position and public opinion. Ed Cohen observes how this opening sets the reader up to expect a very specific type of writer because of its "rhetorical structure and its enumerated attributes" that "might seem to provide a model opening to an ideal autobiography of a bourgeois Victorian man" (192). The reader is led to expect the story of another sedate English gentleman, like Utterson or Lanyon, much the same way they are led to expect Jekyll to fit in with that group. However, Cohen points out that "even as the text so explicitly evokes this class-determined, masculine ideal, it

immediately swerves away from it” with the creation of Hyde (192). Jekyll’s description of himself and the expectation it creates for the audience serves as a marker for the position Hyde will allow or force him to abandon.

Jekyll’s apparent inability to share the good name of his peers and his subsequent escape to a lower class body form the crux of this story as he struggles to reconcile his impure interests with his desire to “hold [his] head high” (Stevenson 70). Unlike the other gentlemen who seem to be happy with their somber life of routine, Jekyll admits, “I had not yet conquered my aversion to the dryness of a life of study” (Stevenson 76). Despite his desire to be in the good opinion of good men, Jekyll has certain desires that are not permissible amongst that group. Although his position as a gentleman requires him to value his good name, his unspecified desires make retaining that name impossible. Antonio Sanna argues that Jekyll and Dorian Gray both fail as gentlemen because of an inability to repress desire since both men are “very concerned with the public opinion of their persons” and yet they “never cease to indulge in corrupting behaviors that are condemned by their society” (26). Jekyll’s interests do not align with his position and, if discovered, would put that position at risk. As the outlet for all of Jekyll’s improper cravings, Hyde provides a way for Jekyll to escape his social standing. Jekyll admits that the only thing he gains from Hyde’s existence is the ability to “indulge his desires as if wearing a mask or costume” (Danahay 30). The body he leaves is that of a “noted professor” and Hyde is like a “thick cloak” to conceal him, but the mask of Hyde is clearly intended to disguise class (Stevenson 76).

When Jekyll becomes Hyde, he undergoes physical changes that depict the downward social mobility he experiences. In accordance with a contemporary logic that social status is imprinted on the body, the physical differences between upper and lower class individuals is

shown clearly in the bodily changes of Jekyll as he becomes Hyde. A gentleman's appearance must satisfy certain expectations about clothing, grooming, and posture. The gentlemanly body of Jekyll cannot be an adequate house for the criminal Hyde because, allegedly, those two classes are so disparate that their physical reality must be as well. It is evident that these class differences are inscribed on the body when Jekyll unintentionally awakes as Hyde one morning and recognizes the change by his hands. He specifies that “the hand of Henry Jekyll” is “professional in shape and size,” a description that underlines how important occupation is to defining character among this group of gentlemen (Stevenson 79). When Jekyll opens his eyes to see a hand that is “lean, corded, knuckly, of a dusky pallor, and thickly shaded with a swart growth of hair,” the change is clear and alarming (Stevenson 79). Instead of being neat, lithe, and professional, this hand is a bulky, rude instrument. Jekyll's body undergoes many changes in height, posture, and appearance when becoming Hyde, but the physical reality of this movement to a lower class body is written clearly here upon the hand of Jekyll-as-Hyde.

In addition to these physical attributes that indicate class difference, Jekyll takes on a new frame of mind when he becomes Hyde. Hyde's emotions and ideologies are comprised exclusively of the aspects of Jekyll's own personality that he has chosen to reject; however, because it is untempered by Jekyll's gentlemanly reserve, Hyde's mindset is distinct and also distinctly lower class. It will be discussed later how thoroughly Hyde's character contrasts with the gentlemen, but for now it is sufficient to say that, with few exceptions, Hyde is not concerned about the things that Jekyll and his peers would be concerned about. When Jekyll becomes Hyde, he says, “I began to be aware of a change in the temper of my thoughts, a greater boldness, a contempt of danger, a solution of the bonds of obligation” (Stevenson 85). Hyde's mind is not one that comprehends the social dangers of boldness or neglecting these bonds of obligation.

Because Jekyll perceives Hyde's mindset as distinct from his own, he can experience "liberty, the comparative youth, the light step, leaping pulses and secret pleasures" of Hyde instead of a gentleman's concern (Stevenson 82). Similarly, because Hyde does not share a gentleman's interest in discretion, Jekyll is less safe as Hyde. As Hyde he is "the common quarry of mankind, hunted, houseless, a known murderer, thrall to the gallows" when just a moment before Jekyll was "safe of all men's respect, wealthy, beloved" (Stevenson 85-86). Jekyll's position as a gentleman provides him with a buffer of safety that Hyde, who does not share Jekyll's good name, does not have access to. As Jekyll puts on the mantle of Hyde, he discards his upper class mindset and safety and exchanges it for that of a criminal.

Becoming Hyde allows Jekyll to act on desires he could not otherwise, many of which are intimately tied to class. Utterson and his fellow gentlemen are identifiable by their ability to repress desire, but when Jekyll becomes Hyde, he is able to cast off that characteristic part of his identity. The regulation of desire and expression that Utterson and his peers exhibit position them as products of the "'Great Masculine Renunciation' of the early nineteenth century" who are "more like a piece of domestic furniture than an active, desiring body" (Danahay 27-28). This can be easily contrasted with Hyde who is recognizable as sensual body, prone to excess. Hyde is identifiable as "working class" not only by his physical appearance but also because "he expresses overtly desires that are repressed in respectable society" (Danahay 30). Whereas the public position of Utterson and his peers requires them to repress their desires, Hyde is able to readily act on his. By depicting Hyde this way, Danahay argues that "Stevenson is drawing upon images here of the working classes as closer to the 'animal' and as lower down the social scale, and thus able to express desires that were off limits to the respectable man" (30). The ability to act on these desires is depicted as a uniquely lower class characteristic, but the desires

themselves are lower class as well. Jekyll's downward mobility is apparent in Hyde's actions as he “enacts the violence commonly associated with the working classes” (Danahay 30). As he transitions to a lower class body, mindset, and desire, Jekyll moves inexorably downward in the social hierarchy by becoming Hyde.

While Jekyll moves downward, Hyde proves capable of upward social mobility as his role as Jekyll's successor positions him to join the society of these gentlemen. The action of this story begins with Utterson's concern about Jekyll's will in which he has named Hyde his main inheritor. “The problem of Hyde,” as Jane Rago calls it, “originates for us...in the sealed and enclosed will of Jekyll that so bothers Utterson” (277). For all of the many threats Hyde presents, they begin with the threat of him inheriting Jekyll's wealth and, therefore, his place in society. The social importance of this inheritance is evident in its apparent impossibility to Utterson and his peers. The belongings of Jekyll, a gentleman, cannot pass with ease to Hyde, a scoundrel. One of Jekyll's first fears upon becoming Hyde is that he has lost access to his property and will have to “flee before daylight from a house that was no longer [his]” (Stevenson 75). The concern that Hyde will not be considered an adequate heir for Jekyll is a recurring one and prompts Jekyll to make Utterson promise to “get his rights for him” (Stevenson 23). Hyde has no invitation to this exclusive society, but his position as Jekyll's monstrous other half grants him social mobility as he is put in line for an inheritance he is apparently unworthy of.

By inheriting Jekyll's wealth, Hyde is also poised to accept his place in this social hierarchy. What separates these gentlemen from men like Hyde is predominately their economic class, so it follows that Hyde will fill Jekyll's place as a gentleman when he inherits Jekyll's wealth. As if to remove all doubt, Jekyll specifically dictates in his will that after his death or disappearance “the said Edward Hyde should step into the said Henry Jekyll's shoes without

further delay” (Stevenson 12). The near impossibility of this social mobility can be gauged by the surprise and discomfort with which others, like Utterson, greet it. The level of potential mobility that Hyde wields here is so foreign and threatening to Utterson that he believes Jekyll’s connection with Hyde must be false or the product of blackmail. From Utterson’s point of view, the gulf that lies between Hyde and a legitimate heir for Jekyll is insurmountable at least in part because of the gap between the social positions those two individuals should inhabit. These gentlemen are depicted throughout as “the antithesis of Mr. Hyde,” so it is understandable that they cannot imagine that Hyde would be chosen as Jekyll’s replacement in their society (Danahay 28). Utterson’s fears exemplify the anxieties of the Victorian British class system in which the rise of a newly mobile middle class threatened to allow new, lower class people to join the ranks of the upper class elite. Indeed, Hyde’s threat is not that he will prey on these respectable gentlemen, as any criminal could, but that he will join them by replacing his victim.

In addition to being able to move upward into a different socio-economic class, Hyde’s movement is perpetual in that he continues to move between and embody social classes that are allegedly distinct. One example of Hyde’s mobility and the gentlemen’s inability to comprehend it can be found in his appearance. Danahay discusses in great detail how Hyde’s “working-class, muscular body” is at odds with the upper class clothing he wears (24). Because Jekyll’s money buys Hyde’s clothes, there is a blending of class visible in Hyde that creates “cognitive dissonance for all those who look at him as they register the contrast” (Danahay 24). Because he wears familiar clothes on an unfamiliar body, the visual effect of Hyde is uncanny. Some argue that Hyde embodies Freud’s *unheimlich* instead because he is “an insider of the society he threatens” (Schneider 5). Rago reads Hyde as “a gentleman, a part of this very same masculine order of the text,” and interprets the fear the men feel as “the threat of self-implication” if they

acknowledge him as one of their own (277). Hyde is unfamiliar, perhaps, because the gentlemen cannot risk recognizing him. Although this reading must complicate the preceding interpretation of Hyde as an infiltrating outsider, it is not problematic for the main argument of mobility regardless of direction. Even if Hyde begins, as Rago argues, as a gentleman, he still never ceases to cross and recross the line between classes. The only effect is that his initial social movement is downward, like Jekyll's. Movement between classes is visible in Hyde as he is marked as both upper and lower class with the mobility to move between them.

While there is some room to argue which socio-economic class Hyde begins in, he proves to be a mobile monster who can invade and thrive in any group. As she examines Hyde's ability to move in the public realm (where good names are valued) and the private realm (where secret transgressions are acted upon), Beauvais argues that, contrary to some popular interpretations, "the suggestion here is not that Jekyll represents the public persona, and Hyde the private" (175). This story lends itself to strict dichotomies, but this is not one of those since "Hyde is simultaneously both" (Beauvais 175). Unlike his creator, "Hyde can penetrate both the public and private spheres without changing identities" (Beauvais 175). The essence of Hyde's monstrous movement is his ability to enter and operate in these disparate social groups where he is unexpected and unfamiliar as he weakens the hegemony of the gentlemen elite, harms Jekyll's good name, and threatens to inherit his position.

The Monstrous Mr. Hyde and the Newly-Mobile Gentlemen Bachelors:

Transformative Mobility in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

The gentlemen who Hyde antagonizes have already been thoroughly examined here, but a closer examination of Hyde's monstrosity is necessary to understand just how he transforms this group. To begin, part of Hyde's monstrosity clearly comes from his appearance. Enfield sets the tone for how all other characters will view Hyde when he says Hyde is "downright detestable" and gives off a "strong feeling of deformity" without being visibly deformed (Stevenson 10). This general sense of deformity pervades the portrayal of Hyde to such an extent that, even without any particularly monstrous descriptors, Hyde is recognizable as monstrous. The only constant in Hyde's ever-changing appearance is that "every major protagonist in the text chooses signifiers that point to the deformity and evil that fit Hyde into the monster paradigm" (Waterhouse 29). This inability to describe Hyde clearly could be rooted in his role as "the consummate outsider in Victorian society" since a gentleman's vocabulary cannot adequately depict him (Conolly-Smith 79). It could also indicate that Hyde carries the sublimity of the Gothic as he is, apparently, beyond the understanding of the men who are horrified to view him. Although his mark of evil continues to be indescribable, Hyde's monstrosity is written on his face and body in such a way that it cannot be ignored.

There is an initial and natural reaction to read Hyde's appearance as a metric for morality. It is a common trope in any kind of story since, in fiction, bad people tend to be ugly people. This concept that physical deformities can signal a psychological or moral deformity would have been familiar to contemporary readers. Especially in the "context of its Victorian times," Peter Conolly-Smith argues, "Hyde's repulsive appearance would suggest, to a readership accustomed to equating external appearance with internal, moral value, that there is indeed something

criminal about him” (81). Nineteenth century science and medicine tended to correlate outward appearance (in various forms) to physically and mental wellness as “anatomy, physiology, and phrenology were the methods by which Victorians categorized criminals, the insane, and the sexually deviant” (Beauvais 183). The use of external sciences, like the study of the body or even the shape of the head, to diagnose primarily internal problems, like lunacy, highlights the reliance at this time on often misleading physical indices. It was, and in many ways still is, an easy assumption that a person’s exterior appearance accurately reflects their interior morality. Thus, Hyde, the embodiment of Jekyll's evil supposedly cast off, looks evil; however, the disgust that Hyde elicits is so atypical and indescribable that it merits further investigation.

Hyde is monstrous not only because he is ugly, but because he is indescribably so. The lack of concrete descriptors for Hyde lends him an aura of mystery and sublimity that make him appear even more monstrous. Part of Hyde’s monstrosity is that he is partially hidden, either invisible or obscured. In “Literary Invisibility,” Evan Horowitz calls it “essential” to this story that “the great ugliness at its heart be ultimately invisible,” a “felt foulness” instead of a “picturable creature” (470). Hyde's propensity to conceal is juxtaposed with popular realist tales from the nineteenth century as Utterson depicts the realist “fantasy of surveillance” when he believes (fanatically even) that he could solve the mystery if only he could see Hyde in person (Williams 418). Because this realist surveillance “hinges on a penetrating gaze and a legible body,” Hyde's incomprehensible, inexplicable body necessarily frustrates Utterson's hopes (Williams 418). This unsettled, changing description is, in itself, an example of Hyde’s mobility as his “sheer narrative intractability” evokes mobility and horror that a clear and gruesome description could not (Williams 413). The Gothic ideal of the sublime, that man will experience both horror and pleasure when viewing something beyond the scope of human understanding, is

present in Hyde indescribable yet horrific depiction. He is incomprehensible and, therefore, sublimely frightening. Because they lack concrete details, the stories told about Hyde become “as mobile, febrile, and perverse as Hyde himself” (Williams 416). In accordance with his name, Hyde is hidden from being properly seen or described and appears most monstrous in that he never clearly appears at all.

That Hyde is a monster and not, for example, just a very bad man is made evident as the narrators continually refer to him as a monstrous threat. When Utterson first meets Hyde, he is quick to claim that “the man seems hardly human” (Stevenson 18). Utterson’s statement here is one of many that position Hyde as, if not explicitly monstrous, at least not quite human. This type of language repeats as the gentlemen continue to describe Hyde as something categorically different or Other. Even Jekyll, who can look at Hyde’s face with a loving familiarity, strives to distance himself from Hyde’s monstrosity. Jekyll indulged in what he calls, at worst, “undignified” “pleasures,” but he says, “in the hands of Edward Hyde they soon began to turn towards the monstrous” (Stevenson 77). Despite the reality that all of Hyde’s actions belong to some part of Jekyll, the narrators strive to draw the line between monster and man much like Jekyll himself has tried to separate his dual natures. Hyde’s monstrous proclivities are underlined by a thematic insistence on his mysterious Otherness through supernatural language. Jekyll, for example, calls Hyde a “familiar” that he calls “out of [his] own soul,” a “being inherently malign and villainous” (Stevenson 77). Likewise, many turn to the description of Hyde as he kills Carew as an example of his monstrosity as his “transformation from swift invisibility to ‘ape like’ fury and deformity is the essence of Hyde as Other” (Beauvais 185). Hyde, then, is depicted in various ways as being not only evil but decidedly monstrous.

In addition to Hyde’s “haunting sense of unexpressed deformity” that categorizes him as a

monster, Hyde is depicted as being active and, therefore, dangerous (Stevenson 9). Hyde's physical strength and speed are exhibited first when he tramples the young girl and Enfield describes him as not “like a man” but “like some damned Juggernaut” (Stevenson 6). When Utterson imagines the crimes Hyde could be committing, he imagines Hyde growing faster and faster with each thought. In Utterson's nightmares, he sees the monster “glide more stealthily through sleeping houses, or move the more swiftly, and still the more swiftly, even to dizziness” (Stevenson 14). The still image of Hyde does not frighten Utterson. It is the actions of Hyde moving and moving quickly that form the basis of his fears, and these fears are not unfounded. When Jekyll describes the transition between his bodies, he says that becoming Hyde is like leaping into “a body that seemed not strong enough to contain the raging energies of life” (Stevenson 89). Beauvais also claims that the “fluidity and elasticity of Hyde as he moves through the streets of London” is at center stage here as his “movements form the primary tension of the novella” (185). Repeatedly, Hyde’s threat is posed in terms of his active energy and ability to move. In the present attempt to track the mobility that Hyde creates in this story, it would be remiss to ignore the importance of his mobility being one of his most frightening or monstrous attributes.

This topic of physical speed sets a precedent for the next major way that movement is featured in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* as the characteristics of the upper class gentlemen are compared to those of the lower class Hyde before Hyde, despite their differences, effects change. Hyde promotes a transformative mobility as he forces others to move by bringing about change. For example, although Hyde is depicted as a highly active monster, the gentlemen appear to be stationary. When Utterson is concerned about Hyde’s influence over Jekyll, he is slow to act in spite of his belief that the threat is immediate since Hyde may “grow impatient to inherit”

(Stevenson 20). He does not act on his concerns until he simply speaks to Jekyll about the relationship “a fortnight later” before he drops into inactivity again (Stevenson 21). Utterson's inaction is perhaps rooted in Hyde not being a constantly present threat from his point of view, but it is “nearly a year later” when the murder of Carew spurs him into action again. Here a defining characteristic of Hyde, his speed, is placed in opposition to a defining characteristic of the gentlemen, their immobility. Despite his initial slowness, however, Utterson becomes more mobile because of Hyde's influence. Utterson's movement as it is spurred on by Hyde will be explored later in this argument, but for now it is important to note that in order to solve this mystery Utterson must travel. Hyde's ability to move by bringing about change in this group of gentlemen is apparent as he becomes the catalyst for the movement of others.

This pattern is revisited as Hyde changes the regulated schedule by which Utterson and his peers live. At the opening of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, the gentlemen are depicted as creatures of habit who live their lives according to an unspoken but understood routine or schedule. These schedules may differ in specifics, but each man has a routine that he follows, and the following of that routine sets him apart as a gentleman. The novella begins with this routine as it opens on one of Utterson and Enfield's “Sunday walks” (Stevenson 4). Since the day is predetermined and both men plan their work around them, the regularity of these social walks is emphasized even above the enjoyment they offer. Their “Sunday walks” are of the utmost importance to them even though “those who encountered them” report that “they said nothing, looked singularly dull, and would hail with obvious relief the appearance of a friend” (Stevenson 4). Since they are, after all, moving, the gentlemen do experience a kind of mobility during these walks; however, the strict adherence to routine makes this mobility seem forced. It can be inferred, then, that even their apparently leisurely movement is strictly controlled.

The routine that holds this group together is also evident in the importance they place on their dining rituals. Although only a few of these dinners occur within the scope of the novella, it is repeatedly reinforced that these are routine events whose regularity underlines their regulatory function in this group³. As they gather, they distinguish who is worthy of invitation; as they dine, they determine who can properly enjoy their luxury; and as they discuss over an emptied table, they discover who has the language and mind of a gentleman. Along with dining, especially the way these gentlemen participate in that ritual, comes many social implications. Dining signals that these men have the money to purchase good food and wine, the leisure to have others prepare it for them, and, since they rarely dine alone, dining provides a system by which they reinforce the social group. During “one of his pleasant dinners,” Jekyll equates the social position of his guests with their ability to enjoy these dinners when he describes them as “all intelligent, reputable men, and all judges of good wine” (Stevenson 21). Fine dinners and good wine are part of routine communal interactions, and friendship can be understood in terms of meals shared. Through their participation in ritualistic social interactions, like walks and dinners, these men are consistently depicted as enacting a routine that, while not strict in its specifics, is pervasive nonetheless.

Hyde, however, does not seem to care for routine, and whatever routine he may have is not likely to include those things the gentlemen hold dear. The most direct description given of Hyde’s schedule comes from the woman with an “evil face” who informs a curious Utterson that Hyde is not at home (Stevenson 28). She says, “There was nothing strange in that; his habits were very irregular” (Stevenson 28). In addition to his general irregularity of routine, Hyde’s dining routine (or lack thereof) can be referenced as a specific counter to that of Utterson and his

³ For example, when Utterson receives a note from Jekyll and mentions that it is “only an invitation to dinner,” his wording indicates that this is a regular occurrence (Stevenson 35).

peers. When questioned about Hyde's intimacy with Jekyll's household, Poole says Hyde has full run of the house but clarifies that "he never *dines* here" (Stevenson 19). Hyde's exclusion from these gatherings could show that it is understood that he is not a socially acceptable guest; however, it also marks Hyde as the type of man who does not dine as regularly as the rest of the men in Jekyll's circle. Less directly, Poole later explains that the monster hiding in his master's laboratory is recognizable as monstrous because of its abnormal habits. The door remains locked, Poole complains, and "the very meals left there to be smuggled in when nobody was looking" (Stevenson 49). Here, the denial of regular dining habits signals monstrosity, and these monstrous dining habits are then ascribed to Hyde. Hyde's habits can only be described as irregular, and this idea of irregularity is foreign to Utterson and his friends who live a life of routine.

Beyond the threat of Hyde invading Utterson's social circle while having no routine of his own is the danger that Hyde can change the habits of those who are already a part of this group. Hyde moves and causes others to move as he disrupts the routine schedule of this homosocial society. This interruption of routine is most clear in Utterson's life and begins directly after he learns about Hyde from Enfield. He returns that night to his "bachelor house" and sits down to his dinner as usual, but his "custom" of reading some "dry divinity" before settling down to sleep is changed (Stevenson 11). "On this night, however," he goes to the safe in his office to look over Jekyll's will (Stevenson 12). After this explicit mention that his strict evening ritual has been disrupted by the presence of Hyde, Utterson then disturbs another gentleman's evening as he shares his concerns with Lanyon. Although the text does not supply many specifics, Lanyon's schedule seems to mirror Utterson's as he is found "alone over his wine" after dinner (Stevenson 12). As Utterson decides to "set forth" at an hour that would

usually have him in bed, his mobility has already been increased by the influence of Hyde as he leaves not only his home but also his routine schedule behind (Stevenson 12). Utterson's routine continues to deteriorate after this first night as he begins to "haunt" the alley where Hyde was seen, an obsession that predicates being in an unusual place "by all lights and at all hours" and prevents any kind of regular schedule that he may be accustomed to (Stevenson 15). The presence of Hyde and the urge to find out more about him upsets the schedules of the men in this circle and causes them to transform their normal routine to confront him.

Another important aspect of this society that Hyde denies and manages to subvert is that of profession. This society of gentlemen places importance on a man's profession; however, in addition to having none of his own, Hyde undermines those professions that are valued in the novella. A gentleman's vocation defines him in this society, and this is emphasized by the repetition of the esteemed careers of the main characters. Because they hold positions that are largely respected, Charles Campbell explains that these "lawyers, doctors, and scientists" are the "city incorporated" (316). Because they study, work, and even see patients in their homes, the personal and professional lives of these men are inseparable. Indeed, they are so fused that, as mentioned earlier, occupation is expected to be apparent in the body. When Danahay compares the descriptions of Hyde and Jekyll's hands, he points out that "one of the adjectives used to describe Jekyll's hand is 'professional,' as if his work, and thus his social status, were legible on his body" (37). This stress on professionalism is so ubiquitous that even secondary characters, like the cops working the Carew murder case, are imbued with "professional ambition" (Stevenson 26). Even Enfield has some meaningful occupation, though it is unclear what it is, since he must resist "the calls of business" to attend his weekly walk with Utterson (Stevenson 4). Through the repetition of and reverence given these gentlemanly careers, it becomes evident

that occupation is an essential part of how these gentlemen define themselves before the introduction of Hyde.

Unlike the lawyers and doctors in Utterson's circle, Hyde is never given a vocation and would likely not need one since he can freely spend Jekyll's wealth. Indeed, profession is so absent from Hyde's environment that even the nameless low class characters that are associated with him are also usually seen sulking around and doing nothing profitable. The marketplace scams or prostitution they are accused of are, if profitable, at least not likely to engender respect from men like Utterson. Hyde "unsettles" the gentlemen, who define themselves by their work, with "his *lack of profession*" (Frank 220). The absence of a career through which to interpret him may be why these gentlemen spend so much time trying to ascribe a disreputable vocation to Hyde. Conolly-Smith argues that readers participate in this exercise as well because Hyde serves as a "blank slate upon whom the collective consciousness of the novel's middle class readership projects its own fantasies of aberrance and otherness" (79). The readers and the gentlemen both try to make sense of Hyde's lack of profession by attributing an imagined, criminal career to him. It is posited that "Hyde may be a drug dealer, a pimp, or worse, as Stevenson suggests at various points" (Conolly-Smith 79). However, the narrative will reveal that, while it is not impossible that he does some of these things recreationally, Hyde's presence is not continual enough to sustain any as a profession. Even if the gentlemen could satisfactorily explain that Hyde is, for example, a pimp, his work would still be set up in opposition to the proper, respected careers that they prize. These gentlemen are ambitious, and Jekyll clearly states that to be Hyde is "to die to a thousand interests and aspirations" (Stevenson 81). Throughout, Hyde is viewed as the antithesis of the professionalism and subsequent social elevation that the gentlemen hold as central to their character.

In addition to having no profession himself, Hyde targets and undermines the professions that Utterson and his peers belong to. Jekyll's work and ability to be productive in society are ruined as his obsessive focus on the creation and then suppression of Hyde occludes him from making any other useful discoveries and his medical practice is interrupted as his anxiety eventually leaves him locked away from society—patients and friends alike. This transformation is perhaps most apparent in that, by becoming Hyde, Jekyll experiences a “loss of status” when he loses “the title ‘Dr.’ as he becomes a mere ‘Mr.’” (Danahay 23). To a lesser degree, the vocations of others are belittled as well. As Ed Cohen observes, “The book works within and against the two most pre-eminent modes of male professional knowledge in the period, law and medicine, in order to demonstrate their inability” (196). Utterson is foiled in his capacities as both lawyer and investigator since he is unable to protect the legal interests of his client and unable to unravel the mystery of Hyde before it is too late. Throughout the text, Hyde “stymies professional acumen” as he negates the work these men once esteemed (Frank 222). Lanyon is forced to confront his professional misjudgment of the science his friend has been active in, a shock that brings him to the brink of his death. Although not mentioned in the text, the ambitious policemen were also likely thwarted in their attempts to explain the Carew case.

Hyde's mobility is evident here in his ability to cause change. As described earlier, these gentlemen are part of a culture that is monolithic, stagnant, and strict. As he moves into this society, Hyde not only embodies their opposite but also forces them to change. The transformations that Hyde make possible target the characteristics most central to these men. Where there was once routine, there is now chaos. Where there was once respect of profession and ambition, those professions are undermined by a monster who has none at all. Hyde's ability to move into and transform this society depicts the magnitude of his monstrous movement.

The Professional District, the Slums of Soho, and “Mixed Spaces:”

Physical Mobility in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

Finally, and perhaps most noticeably, Hyde allows for physical mobility as he moves freely throughout London and forces or allows others to accompany him. Hyde only ever moves from one side of town to the other; however, while the geographical distance between these two places is fairly small, the social implications of that distance are extreme. Throughout, Stevenson stresses the distinctions between the upper and lower classes, distinctions that are imprinted on the places these people inhabit as well. The gentlemen bachelors, like Utterson and Lanyon, have more respectable homes in the professional part of town; more questionable men, like Hyde, live in slums like Soho. Conolly-Smith argues that *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde's* ending is so surprising because of the “apparent differences” between the titular characters, differences that have as much to do with where they are as who they are (80). Among other things, “Jekyll enters through the front door; Hyde, the back; Jekyll lives in a handsome building; Hyde, in a slum” (Conolly-Smith 80). Mobility, even when it is in the physical realm, is inextricably tied to social class because the locations Hyde visits are defined by the economic status of those who live there. While the actual mileage traveled may be small, the ability to move between the professional and flourishing West End to the slums of Soho should impress. In addition to going there himself, Hyde also allows for the physical movement of others. Because they share a physical body, Hyde requires Jekyll to accompany him, but he also causes others to follow as they must investigate his crimes. Despite the social divide that splits these physical places, Hyde can move between them and bring the gentlemen along with him.

Although the domestic sphere is typically cast as an effeminate space, the home is where the gentlemen of this story thrive, and they can be identified by their role as protectors and

regulators of the domestic. Utterson and his peers are often found at home, sitting at their dining table, fireside, or desk. In accordance with their socio-economic position, these men are expected to inhabit homes that are high quality, well-staffed, sedately but finely decorated, and in the right neighborhood. Like profession, the location of their homes helps define the social hierarchy for Utterson and men like him. When Utterson first meets Hyde, he gives his name along with his address as “Mr. Utterson, of Gaunt Street” because, to him and his peers, the place his house is located provides important information about who he is (Stevenson 16). Their addresses demonstrate capital, both monetary and social, that distances them from the slums of Soho. Unlike those slums and destitute alleys, these men inhabit neighborhoods that are depicted as safe, quiet, and comfortable. That is until, of course, the creation of Hyde allows for movement into and out of this supposedly closed society.

In *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, the home of a proper gentleman is depicted only in broad strokes as an aura of comfort, finery, and safety are provided instead of minute descriptions of them. One image of the ideal home life occurs when Utterson returns from his investigations one evening. The text recounts:

He sat on one side of his own hearth, with Mr. Guest, his head clerk, upon the other, and midway between, at a nicely calculated distance from the fire, a bottle of a particularly old wine that had long dwelt unshined in the foundations of his house. (Stevenson 33)

This scene emanates a gentlemanly domesticity that depicts the essence, if not the particulars, of Utterson’s home. Beauvais comments that, when Utterson and Guest commune at the hearth, they “engage in a completely domestic scene while exercising every aspect of Victorian masculinity” (181). The visual effect created by this domestic harmony is hinted at in this passage. The reference to the “foundations of the house” and presence of a wine cellar gesture towards a sizable home, and the presence of this “particularly old wine” and the assumption that similar bottles remain in the cellar signals wealth and a tendency towards finery. Their location

near the fire and the wine's "calculated" distance from it denote a studied comfort. Even without exact details, the ideal home of a gentleman is depicted clearly as a place of comfort and safety in which wealth can be exhibited and enjoyed.

In addition to being comfortable and fit for entertaining, these are also professional spaces since these men tend to work from their homes. Because they are located in the professional district, the domestic spaces that are most important to these men "double as sites for their professional work as well" (Frank 219). Utterson, for example, keeps Jekyll's will locked in the safe in his "business room," and Lanyon also describes meeting with patients in his home (Stevenson 11). In this depiction of "an in-between zone of professional work within the home," the professional and domestic are blended as their homes, like the gentlemen themselves, are inescapably defined by their social position, profession, and class (Frank 219). In her side-by-side reading of *The Right to Privacy* (1890) and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Frank references the "familiar notion of the house as middle-class man's equivalent to the castle" (216). This concept of the home as a castle rings true for men like Utterson who seek not only comfort and safety but also exhibitions of professionalism and wealth in the fortitude of their homes.

Much like their society as a whole, the gentlemen's homes are depicted as insular and presumably safe until Hyde's monstrous mobility challenges that safety. Because of the wealth and profession required to move into a home like Utterson or Lanyon's, their exclusive neighborhood presumably protects them from outside influence. There is an expectation that the luxuries of a nice home can protect these men from the potentially unsavory people in the public at large. The social distance between classes is translated into a geographical distance between their habitations with an assumed border somewhere in the middle. By crossing this border and causing others to do the same, Hyde threatens the safety of these homes. Hyde's presence

encourages Utterson to leave the comfort of his home and neighborhood in his role as investigator, and Lanyon is also asked to leave his home on an errand for Hyde posing as Jekyll. Hyde's physical mobility is significant because of the socio-economic borders he crosses as well as the geographic ones. Theresa Adams describes this novel as "deeply concerned with spaces and places," and she argues that Hyde's movement into and around London "articulate the threats posed by Hyde's crossing, re-crossing, and potentially infecting, the West End" (40). As Hyde moves into and around this part of the city that tries, and fails, to reject him, it is evident that his ability to enter "the West End marks Hyde as dangerously (even uncannily) mobile" (Adams 40).

Hyde's home in Soho is a stark contrast to the homes of men like Utterson and Lanyon and serves as an example of his ability to move himself and others through yet another space. When Utterson's investigations eventually lead him to Hyde's home, he describes the neighborhood as "the dismal quarter of Soho" with its "muddy ways, and slatternly passengers" where lamps try to thwart the fog's "mournful reinvasion of darkness" (Stevenson 27). Far from the warmth and comfort of Utterson's neighborhood, Soho is depicted as a mysterious, dirty, and dangerous place. To Utterson, Soho seems like "a district of some city in a nightmare" (Stevenson 27). In addition to registering his fear, Utterson's first impressions of Soho juxtapose that setting with his own home. He reports that there is a "gin palace, a low French eating house, a shop for the retail of penny numbers" (Stevenson 27). Here are people who drink cheap alcohol (not his fine wines), eat cheap food (not his nice dinners at home), and read cheap books (not his dry divinity before bed). It is "a dingy street" where he sees "many women of many different nationalities passing out, key in hand, to have a morning glass" (Stevenson 27). Utterson likely imagines these are poor women committing lewd acts⁴, but just the fact that there are women

⁴ Since women of different nationalities is "one of several Victorian euphemisms for 'prostitutes'" (Conolly-Smith 81).

here at all sets Soho apart from his own androcentric home. It is clear, then, that Soho is depicted as the habitat of a low class, even criminal, people and is strongly contrasted with the neighborhood of Utterson and his peers.

Much like Utterson's professional neighborhood, Soho is defined by the class of the people who live there. The concept that living in a questionable neighborhood can imply a lower position in the social hierarchy is by no means a new one. Nead explains that, historically, criminal behavior like Hyde's was considered "a spatial problem" that originated in "particular locations within the city, which were most resistant to the economic, social, and aesthetic ideals of the modernisers" (149). In addition to housing one criminal, Hyde, Soho is given an aura of criminality by the rest of its inhabitants. Connolly-Smith points out that "in keeping with the Victorian belief that we rise or descend to the level of those whose company we keep," Hyde resides "in a slum populated by shady subalterns of various sorts" (81). In this same vein, Adams relates this discussion to Charles Booth's *Life and Labour of the People in London* (1886), a work that attempts to map the social setting of London. Booth marked "criminal spaces with the color black" on his maps, "suggesting a link between spaces and criminality" (Adams 36). Soho is a bad neighborhood filled with, at least in Utterson's mind, bad people. Utterson's description of Soho exemplifies a nineteenth century assumption "that a correlation existed between criminal activity, geographical residence, and social conditions" (Joyce 7). Soho is poised as a setting that is distinct because it is populated by lower class individuals who Utterson at least is willing to assume are criminals.

After trudging through the slums of Soho, Utterson is confounded by what he finds as Hyde's apartment presents a jarring conundrum that is specifically class based. The interior of the apartment embodies Hyde's ability to blur the distinctions between classes. Because it

reflects the chaos of blending societies in its decorations, Hyde's home provides what Adams refers to as a "mixed space" (36). Much like the uncanny effect of Hyde's incongruent clothing, this mixed space confuses Utterson because "the flat and the clothes bespeak capital, whereas the body and location are lower class" (Danahay 36). Only a few of Hyde's rooms are used, but those are "furnished with luxury and good taste" (Stevenson 28). Not only is there a closet "filled with good wine" but also "the plate was silver, the napery elegant" (Stevenson 28). The details of this mixed space are shocking to Utterson because Hyde, a common blackguard, should not own these things. Another facet of Hyde's monstrous mobility is apparent in his ability to create this mixed space in Soho. Hyde alone is capable of bringing the luxuries the social elite enjoy to the slums of Soho where they do not belong. Whether it is a gentleman coming to visit Soho or a fine wine hidden in a dilapidated apartment, Hyde's ability to move things where they are not expected to be because of allegedly impenetrable class divides is made incarnate in his apartment in Soho.

Despite its depiction as a monstrous environment, Soho itself is also a mixed space. Some scholars, especially Theresa Adams and Simon Joyce, are wise to turn their attention to Stevenson's depiction of this neighborhood as it "gestures towards Soho's complicated history" (Adams 36). Having been in waves a "respectable residential area," abandoned during a cholera outbreak, "rebuilt as a commercial center," and "a haven in the late nineteenth century for successive waves of immigrants," Soho would have been a diverse collection of the wealthy and the poor (Joyce 9). By locating Hyde in Soho instead of the East End, the more obvious home for him in the mind of contemporary readers, Stevenson uses a "finer-grained sense of the interrelation of class and geography" that draws the reader's attention to the existence of these in-between spaces that Hyde both creates and thrives in (Adams 32). Hyde's presence in "an

equally schizophrenic area like Soho” underlines his ability to exist in these mixed or liminal spaces that the gentlemen seem uncomfortable in (Joyce 10). The blurring of class distinctions indicated in these mixed spaces are the result of Hyde’s social mobility as he physically crosses the borders between two neighborhoods that are defined primarily by socio-economic status. Despite the differences, if not distance, that separate these two neighborhoods, Hyde proves capable of moving between them and bringing others along.

This theme of mixed spaces is continued and fully realized in Jekyll’s home and Hyde’s adjoining door. While the homes of the gentlemen and the neighborhood of Soho seem to provide mostly complete images of opposing socio-economic realities, Jekyll’s home provides a more complicated image. While he does live a small distance from the other gentlemen, Jekyll still lives in a professional neighborhood with large, established houses that, unlike Soho, men like Utterson would not be nervous to visit. On this side, Jekyll’s door greets visitors with a “great air of wealth and comfort” (Stevenson 18). However, Jekyll’s home is not quite like those of the other gentlemen either since it is in a “square of ancient houses, now for the most part decayed from their high estate, and let in flats and chambers to all sorts and conditions of men” (Stevenson 18). This is a neighborhood that should be prosperous but is now worn down and peppered with questionable people. “The area,” Joyce recognizes, “seems to be going down, not up, and to be filled with residents whose professional lives are taking them in the same direction” (167). This space is home to seemingly opposing elements as it is simultaneously “characterized by wealth and poverty, cleanliness and dirt, repair and disrepair” (Adams 34). The depiction of the mixed space of Jekyll’s neighborhood, then, seems “entirely appropriate when we remember that Jekyll is already partly Hyde even before he effects his first transformation” (Joyce 167). Just as Jekyll and Hyde are not neatly split halves of a whole, the spaces they inhabit are mixed.

In addition to moving through spaces that are meant to be distinct, like Soho and the West End, Hyde also moves by creating and thriving in these mixed spaces where those lines of distinction have been blurred, like Jekyll's home.

Similarly, the first image in Enfield's story introducing Hyde depicts another mixed space: the door through which he enters Jekyll's laboratory. This door is introduced as a "sinister block of building thrust[ing] forth its gable on the street" (Stevenson 5). On par with Soho, this door and adjoining alley seem like a natural home for Hyde as well as other disreputable characters who have nothing to do but trespass all day⁵. One of the only descriptions of this door is that it "was equipped with neither bell nor knocker" indicating either how little effort has gone into enhancing this space or how little the inhabitant wants to interact with the outside world, both things that are necessary for a gentleman (Stevenson 5). Because an alley provides anonymity and darkness, Sanna argues that "such places are ideal for Hyde's existence: they are the proper settings for vices to be enjoyed and consumed, and for avoiding any public discussion and repercussion that might ensue upon their discovery" (30). Nead also argues that the geography of the city, specifically the feature of the alley, makes the growth of this bad neighborhood possible since an alley "is the spatial and conceptual antithesis of the boulevard" and, therefore, opposed to the more proper neighborhoods in that it "obeys the logic of the labyrinth; it is illegible and multifarious, as opposed to homogenous and purposeful" (163). Hyde's door and the alley that leads to it are, then, depicted as part of a bad neighborhood not unlike Soho.

Despite its depiction as a low class environment frequented by criminals, however, this

⁵ "Tramps slouched into the recess and struck matches on the panels; children kept shop upon the steps...and for close on a generation no one had appeared to drive away these random visitors or to repair their ravages" (Stevenson 5).

setting is a mixed space because it is located in the wrong part of town. The confusion and even fear that this alley creates is because “the East End suddenly appears out of place, having moved from its assigned geographical and social margin to the heart of the city” (Joyce 37). In the alleyway, it becomes clear that the threat of Hyde has traveled outside of its expected, and even accepted, home. While the gentlemen of this story do visit the alley that leads to Hyde’s door, theirs is not the most important movement that occurs in this space. The major movement found in this alleyway is Hyde’s ability to not only move into but to create a mixed space that exists just outside a gentleman’s home. In addition to coming there himself, Hyde has brought the obscenity of his bad neighborhood far enough to abut Jekyll’s own home. He can move himself to the good side of town despite his illegitimacy there, and he can move the men to his Soho slum as they investigate him. However, this ability to create and move through mixed spaces sets Hyde apart as an especially mobile monster.

As Hyde physically moves around London, he clearly cannot be “confined to specific spaces on the map” but can and will “travel freely” (Adams 30). The slums of Soho and the homes of the West End depict two opposing neighborhoods, distant in the social classes they house more than they are geographically, but Hyde can move between these two distinct spaces and force or allow others to move between them as well. Hyde brings Jekyll to Soho with him because they share a body, and this creates an unnatural connection that Utterson must follow to investigate. In addition to moving between two socially distinct places, Hyde is able to blur the lines between these places by creating and thriving in mixed spaces that “are more difficult to map, name, and understand” (Adams 34). Indeed, part of the horror for men like Utterson is the realization that these people and places are not distinct as Hyde complicates the borders that the gentlemen believe to be so absolute. Through Hyde, the alley can sneak up to the back door of a

gentleman's home and the Soho apartment can be furnished with finery. Thus, while the actual distance of travel here may be minimal, the social differences between these spaces put them worlds apart in the view of Utterson and his peers and forces a recognition that the power to travel and especially blur the distinctions between them must be immense and socially mobile as well as physically mobile.

In a variety of ways, Stevenson presents Hyde as an exceptionally mobile monster whose movements are best understood as they relate to class. Indeed, the main threat of Hyde's monstrosity is his disregard of social norms and class distinctions that are so important to the gentlemen of this story. The monster's ability to effect movement in social classes is apparent in the downward mobility that Jekyll experiences as well as the upward mobility Hyde threatens. Hyde also expresses a transformative mobility in his habit for countering and undermining the traits that the gentlemen at the center of this novella hold dear. Finally, Hyde's mobility is made most clear in his physical movement around London, a city that is depicted as being split into neighborhoods primarily based on the class of the people who live there. Hyde not only freely roams through and allows others to travel between these allegedly discrete neighborhoods but also creates a blurring of the borders that once made them distinct. The gentlemen who serve as the standard for normality against Hyde's monstrosity depend upon borders (be they social, normative, or physical), and part of the fear that Hyde instills is his ability to take meaning away from these borders.

The Monstrous New Woman and Masculinity at Stake:

Social Mobility in *Dracula*

In Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, Count Dracula provides social mobility by reversing normative gender roles as his presence causes the women to become sexually aggressive and professionally capable while the men become weak and helpless. First, the women are taken over these borders by the presence and influence of the monster as he permits and promotes sexual desire and increased activity. As mentioned earlier, female agency in *Dracula* is often thought of in terms of the New Woman despite disagreements on just how that term applies to these characters. Perhaps the startling variety of ways that scholars have interpreted the relationship between *Dracula*'s female characters and the New Woman is the result of their relationship to this figure fluctuating throughout the text. How these women are interpreted is dependent upon what portion of the text is considered since they begin by poking fun at this social figure but eventually become and, later, unbecome her. Mina and Lucy are not New Women until the entrance of the vampire allows them room to move. While both women begin with some sort of latent desire that is non-normative, their desires grow to fruition only because of Dracula's presence until these women embody the most extreme attributes of the New Woman with their interest in sexual and professional liberation. While Lucy comes to embody the "sexual example of womanhood and vampirism," Mina "becomes an example of how females have begun to blur the roles commonly associated with males and females, by working hard and completely giving herself to the task at hand" (Lancaster 4). However, by the end, neither Mina nor Lucy are recognizable as New Women because the Crew of Light have successfully immobilized what Dracula had set in motion.

While Lucy is initially depicted as the ideal of a good, pure woman, she does betray an

initial desire that does not fit what society would expect of her. To begin with, “Lucy displays all the features of the sweetly languid Victorian lady, thus exhibiting the conventional image of femininity required of her” (Dominguez-Rue 302). Taking this characterization into account, Susan Parlour admits that “we might at first be tempted to view Lucy as the antithesis to the New Woman figure” (3). Although she has no apparent interest in entering the workplace, however, her sexual desires “make it increasingly clear that Lucy is indeed reflective of a new social order” (Parlour 3). The initial idealized image of Lucy is complicated by her flirtations and desire since, even before she encounters Dracula at Whitby, Lucy has an “excessive appetite and the associated deviant sexuality it implies” that can “anticipate her descent (or her rise) into the Undead” (Dominguez-Rue 302). Lucy acknowledges that being admired by so many men could cause her to be perceived as a “horrid flirt,” but it is her passing comment that she wishes she could marry all three of the men who have proposed to her that draws the most attention to her desire (Stoker 66). Parlour argues that as she “demonstrates her voracious sexual appetite” and “endorses the merits of polyandry” Lucy “embraces some of the more radical ideals of the New Woman’s challenge to accepted sexual values” (3). However, this may be too strong of a statement to apply to Lucy at this point in the narrative since, although she seems to enjoy the idea of entertaining all of her suitors, she does select Holmwood early and summarily rejects the other men. While her latent desire may make her an easier target for Dracula, she does not actually cross this line before his entrance.

Because of Dracula’s presence, Lucy’s appetites increase and result in a polyandrous union that flouts traditional marriage. After her meeting with Dracula in Whitby, Lucy shows several signs of increased power and hunger. She reports that she has been “quite restored” by their vacation and speaks of this restoration in terms of appetite (Stoker 119). She says, “I have

an appetite like a cormorant, am full of life, and sleep well...Arthur says I am getting fat” (Stoker 119). This hunger is translated into sexual desire as Dracula's continued attacks allow Lucy freedoms that were formerly impossible. As part of her treatments, Lucy receives emergency blood transfusions from all four of the men in the Crew of Light who are in England at the time. That these transfusions are configured as polyandry is clear in Holmwood's assertion that, after the first transfusion, he felt “as if they two had been really married and that she was his wife in the sight of God” (Stoker 188). Van Helsing, aside with Seward, jokes that “this so sweet maid [Lucy] is a polyandrist” because of the similar transfusions that have taken place with Seward, Morris, and Van Helsing himself (Stoker 190). In addition to the text equating transfusion with consummation, there is a general consensus that Lucy “not only loves multiple men” but has also “symbolically (through blood transfusions) had sexual relations with each man” (Lancaster 1). Dracula’s attacks make these transfusions necessary and allow Lucy to cross the border of normative sexuality as her apparent foreshadowing of a polyandrous union is made reality as she is transfused with blood from all three of her suitors, Van Helsing, and (the reader must assume) Dracula himself.

Once Lucy is turned into a vampire, she epitomizes the sexual fears this society has about the New Woman. As part of her change, Lucy's “sweetness was turned to adamantine, heartless cruelty, and the purity to voluptuous wantonness” (Stoker 226). The repeated use of words like “voluptuous” here “clearly gestures towards scripts of sexual arousal” that foreground Lucy’s deviant sexuality (Pikula 293). Because her desire and hunger are clearly displayed, Lucy no longer meets nineteenth century “male standards of femininity that regarded women as angels of purity and innocence” (Dominguez-Rue 297). In addition to being a sexual threat because of her desire, Lucy is specifically imagined as a Bad Mother: an archetype that also embodies the

anxieties produced by the New Woman. An unexplained rash of disappearing children is attributed to Lucy's new feeding habits when the Crew of Light find her feeding on a small child who gives "a sharp little cry" before she flings it away "with a careless motion" (Stoker 226). Her exclusive preying on children and her rough handling of them depicts the concern that the New Woman would neglect her children to fulfill her own, especially sexual, desires. Dracula's influence allows these women to move outside of the social categories they are normally in, including their role as mothers. The Good English Mother, the term both Marilyn Brock and Ardel Haefele-Thomas use to refer to this idealization, "is the most critical component of the stabilized definition of the Victorian home" and as such is "the site at which the British feel most vulnerable" (Haefele-Thomas 113). Thus, for these female vampires "their rejection of the nurturing mother role" is configured as the "pinnacle of their monstrosity" (Pikula 291). When she is changed into a vampire, Lucy crosses the border of monstrosity to become the "phallic woman" and "the novel's gender reversals are complete" in her "voracious sexual appetite and rejection of the accepted maternal role" (Parlour 4).

Because of her excessive desire and rejection of the role of nurturing mother, Lucy can be read as a character with "aggressive mobility" who "flaunts the encasements of gender norms;" however, she is eventually forced into submission by the Crew of Light as normality is reinscribed in her execution (Craft 121). When Holmwood is tasked with executing Lucy, he is depicted as godlike as "like a figure of Thor" he hammers home the "mercy-bearing stake" (Stoker 231). Despite the heroic tone here, Lucy's death is violent and uncomfortable. "The Thing," Seward says of Lucy, "writhed" and emitted "a hideous, blood-curdling screech" before she "quivered and twisted in wild contortions" and her "sharp white teeth champed together till the lips were cut" (Stoker 231). Eric Kwan-Wai Yu says that it is this "vivid, meticulous

depiction of the brutal murder” of Lucy that calls the “sanity” of these men into question (154). Likewise, Christopher Craft argues that “the murderous phallicism of this passage clearly punishes Lucy for her transgression of Van Helsing's gender code” (122). That her death is a return to her alleged *correct* place in society is stressed by the pointed description of her face, returned in death to its “unequalled sweetness and purity” (Stoker 233). After the violence of her execution, “Lucy is seen to no longer be a threat to symbolic or social order and is restored to her benign femininity” (Parlour 5). While the men do succeed in subduing Lucy and thus reestablishing the border between accepted sexuality and gender roles, the way they do it is disturbing and violently sexual in a way that makes the reader question just what it has cost them to rebuild this border.

The monstrous female sexuality that Dracula’s bite makes possible is evident in Lucy but is fully realized in the Weird Sisters⁶ who live at Castle Dracula. The Weird Sisters hunger and desire in a way that women are not expected to or are, at least, expected to demurely deny, and that hunger, although it is for blood, is staged in a uniquely aggressive and sexual way. The Weird Sisters have the power to evoke as well as feel desire that is due, in part, to their often-referenced “voluptuously plump figures” (Dominguez-Rue 301). When they approach Van Helsing, he recognizes them by their visible sexuality. He says, “I knew the swaying round forms, the bright hard eyes, the white teeth, the ruddy colour, the voluptuous lips” (Stoker 388). The Weird Sisters “display an aggressive sexuality” as their teeth provide “an aggressive instrument that subverts the masculine prerogative of penetration” (Dominguez-Rue 301). Much like Lucy, they epitomize the fear of the sexualized New Woman especially because they are

⁶ These three vampires are often referred to either as Dracula’s wives or daughters. However, since their exact relationship to Dracula is unclear, they are referred to here by the term Harker uses for them in the text: “Those weird sisters” (Stoker 55).

characterized as Bad Mothers with a “perverse antimaternal delight in feeding upon babies instead of nurturing them” (Dominguez-Rue 301). In the end, norms are reinscribed on the bodies of these women as well when Van Helsing executes them. Like Lucy's, these executions are depicted as salvation since Van Helsing reports that he “could not have gone further with [his] butchery” had not there been the “repose” and the “gladness” on the faces of the Weird Sisters before their “final dissolution” (Stoker 392). Despite the peace that Van Helsing depicts here, he also describes their “horrid screeching” as well as the “plunging” of their “writhing form[s]” and their “lips bloody with foam” (Stoker 392-393). In the Weird Sister's execution, again, the reinscribing of norms is a horrific, painful event as those mobilized by Dracula are immobilized by the Crew of Light.

The movement that occurs as the women of *Dracula* are brought to the brink of New Womanhood and then brought back by the Crew of Light can also be seen in Mina's professionalism. The various idyllic descriptions of Mina are perhaps best evinced by Van Helsing when he says she is “so true, so sweet, so noble, so little an egoist” (Stoker 203). Throughout *Dracula*, Mina is portrayed as “the nearest thing to a saint that Stoker can conceive of” (Leatherdale 137). She is recognizable as pure and good, in part, because of her attention to propriety that stems from her role as a teacher of etiquette. Her eagerness “to be dressed adequately and behave properly at all times” positions Mina as a *safe* and *good* woman as opposed to the more troublesome New Woman (Mewald 2). However, Mina does show a propensity for work that connects her with this complicated figure even before the introduction of Dracula. Although she tells Lucy that she has been “simply overwhelmed with work,” she explains that her efforts are primarily for the good of her future husband (Stoker 61). Through her practice in shorthand and typing, she hopes that she “shall be able to be useful to Jonathan”

(Stoker 61). Although she is defined by her industrious nature, Mina's work is repeatedly phrased in terms of her being an able wife instead of a budding professional. Many read Mina as the “prototype of the ideal Victorian woman” because “almost her whole existence is devoted to her future husband and she aspires to become a good wife and mother, the ‘angel of the house’” (Mewald 1). In the beginning, at least, Nicholas Daly is correct to claim that Mina “resembles the New Woman in her skills, but she is a New Woman with no desire for equality” (40). However, his subsequent claim that she is happy, instead, “to leave professionalism to the men” is called into question by the changes she experiences due to Dracula's presence (Daly 40).

Because of Dracula's presence as a monstrous threat, Mina's work is not only permitted but instrumental as she becomes an essential part of the effort to track him. When she finally reads Harker's account of his experiences at Castle Dracula, Mina thinks of the problem in terms of work that needs to be done. She says, “I shall get my typewriter this very hour and begin transcribing” so that “we shall be ready for other eyes if required” (Stoker 193). Her work, primarily secretarial in nature, is essential to getting the Crew of Light on the same page (literally and figuratively) as she combines their various narratives into a coherent whole. Mina's ability to and interest in work allies her more closely with a masculine work ethic than with, what may be expected of her, a feminine damsel as she repeatedly proves herself to be a capable worker through her knowledge, reasoning skills, and ability to memorize and organize. Tanya Pikula points out that Mina's unbridled excitement over new technology, like Seward's phonograph, also points to “a lack of mannered, feminine restraint” (289). Mina may have a natural tendency towards organization and cutting-edge technology, but it is the imminent threat of the monster that allows Mina the right to work in this context. That her work causes her to cross the border of what is generally accepted is evident in that, despite their acknowledgment

that Mina has been helpful, the Crew of Light come to deny Mina's place in their group. When Van Helsing dictates that she must have nothing else to do with "this so terrible affair," his reasons for excluding her are explicitly based on gender (Stoker 251). He says, "We men are determined...to destroy this monster; but it is no part for a woman" (Stoker 251). Although the Crew of Light try to reject her in order to reify gender norms, the monstrous threat of Dracula allows Mina to enter this professional group.

Despite the gender-based boundary that these men are working so hard to rebuild, Mina is able to move back into this professional group and continue her work because of Dracula's continued influence. After she is bitten by the vampire, Harker reports, "The very first thing we decided was that Mina should be in full confidence; that nothing of any sort—no matter how painful—should be kept from her" (Stoker 308). The renewed influence of the monster brings Mina back across this border and closer to the figure of the feared New Woman as she goes back to work. Unlike Lucy, whose transition presented in heightened sexuality, Mina's vampirism takes the other path supposed of the New Woman as she becomes increasingly professional. Kwan-Wai Yu argues that while Van Helsing and the other men "make their due contributions" to the efforts against Dracula, "it is in fact Mina who has most laboriously conducted the research and led to the final victory" (156). Indeed, it is Mina's theorizing on how contemporary medicine and psychology would classify Dracula and her logical conclusions about his plan of travel that help unravel how to counter him while "demonstrating Mina's systematic approach and compelling deduction" that "would impress any reader" (Kwan-Wai Yu 157). As her vampirism progresses, she works harder and with even more skill so that she "is able to perfect her ascetic hard labor only *after* she has been 'polluted' by the count" (Kwan-Wai Yu 157). Her increased efforts eventually make the men anxious to exclude her again. Although Mina is

pleased to “try to be of use in all ways,” the Crew of Light show concern that this renewed ability signals that Mina's (now monstrous) work ethic is taking her too far across the border they are trying to rebuild (Stoker 359). After she is attacked by Dracula, Mina's already impressive work ethic and intelligence are increased, and the Crew of Light's repeated attempts to exclude her underline the fact that her abilities are considered unexpected or even monstrous, especially in a woman.

In the end, Mina is brought to submission as the men seem to achieve their goal of reestablishing the borders that the vampire has called into question. Stephen Arata reminds the reader that while ‘the violence of Lucy's demise is grisly enough,’ they “should not miss” that her and Mina’s “final fate parallel one another” (632). “They differ in degree,” he says, “not kind” (Arata 632). In the end, the genders norms that Mina's movement into the professional realm have challenged are reinscribed by the Crew of Light as Mina fades into the background as a “Good English Mother,” a finale that Parlour claims “heralds the death knell for the New Woman within the text” (7). The two things that were most important to Mina, her voice as a narrator and her work as a transcriber, are silenced and undermined in the post-script. This ending is written and signed (as if it applies to the whole text) by Harker, and he says that in looking over the collection he finds “there is hardly one authentic document; nothing but a mass of typewriting” (Stoker 400). This dismissive reference to Mina’s transcriptions, once deemed so instrumental, certainly undermines her efforts. Harker also alludes to the fact that Mina does not continue her work after Dracula's death since he claims that the only pieces of their narrative not in typewriting are “the later note-books of Mina and Seward and myself, and Van Helsing’s memorandum” (Stoker 400). These later documents, available only after the monster's demise, have not even been reproduced by the once-meticulous Mina. In the end, the Crew of Light

successfully position Mina in the role of a silent mother with any professional interests far in the background. Despite the social mobility Mina experiences because of Dracula, this ending reflects “the Victorian aversion to the New Woman” by rendering her voice and her work obsolete (Parlour 7). Although much less violent than the execution of Lucy or the Weird Sisters, Mina's end is similar in that it makes the reader, who has been trained to listen and trust her voice, uneasy.

The Crew of Light, the men at the center of *Dracula*, experience a similar cycle of gender role reversal because of the vampire's movement. Whereas the women tend to experience an empowering mobility (monstrous as that power may be), the men experience a loss of power as they begin to cross the border into femininity (generally imagined to be weaker). Although they are initially depicted as the epitome of masculinity, they are emasculated by Dracula's presence, and their actions in the text are primarily attempts to win back that masculinity by reifying the borders between men and women that Dracula has called into question. As mentioned earlier, they are referred to “almost formulaically” as “*good, brave, and strong*” (J. Stevenson 142). In their opposition to Dracula, their goodness and manliness are stressed often, as when Mina surveys them and claims that “the world seems full of good men—even if there *are* monsters in it” (Stoker 240). The egos of these men seem inflated, in part, because their purpose as a group is configured as a holy crusade against the mobility of the monster. Their “task is not only motivated by the men's desire to save their beloved woman” but also as “a crusade to save all mankind” (Kwan-Wai Yu 154). Van Helsing compares them to the crusaders as they go out like “the old knights of the Cross” to ensure “that the world...will not be given over to monsters” (Stoker 340). Thus, because of their characterization and purpose, these men begin in a position of the utmost masculinity. They are thrown across the border of masculinity, though, by their

fear of the vampire, their impotence against Dracula, and the presence of a penetrative threat and desire.

Dracula's emasculation of these men begins with the fear he instills in them. Their depiction as traditional masculine figures is foiled by their weakness as they are repeatedly thwarted and shown to be emotionally unsound as they become subject to fainting spells, weeping, and breakdowns that display emotion not befitting a masculine hero. When Holmwood has fits of emotion after Lucy's death, Mina describes him as "he suddenly broke down" and cries while she holds him (Stoker 182). While it is not unusual for Holmwood to be emotional after the death of his fiancée, the text ties his emotion directly to a lack of masculinity. Seward says that he looks "desperately sad and broken" and "even his stalwart manhood seemed to have shrunk somewhat under the strain of his much-tried emotions" (Stoker 182). The mental or emotional weakness these men betray can be contrasted with Mina who, despite being a woman, is depicted as decidedly "not of a fainting disposition" (Stoker 239). When she finally reads Harker's journal, she does not shrink the way that Harker himself is described as doing. Instead, she immediately begins her transcription work which protects her husband by allowing her to "speak for him" and "never let him be troubled or worried with it at all" (Stoker 194). Though the Crew of Light may still be *good* and *strong*, they are not nearly so *brave* as the reader is lead to believe. Their emotional distress, generally typified as a female response, signals a loss in masculinity that is caused by the monster's presence.

Because they are depicted as largely unable to counter his attacks, the Crew of Light are further emasculated by their impotence against Dracula. Dracula chooses to focus primarily on female victims for reasons that will be discussed later, but for now it is clear that his choice serves to illuminate the inadequacy of the men who are trying to protect these women. When

Lucy is vamped, it begins a Blood War in which the men convene to give her transfusions of their own blood to replace what Dracula has taken. Before the first transfusion, Van Helsing explains “a strict hierarchy among the potential donors” (Arata 632). In this hierarchy, which serves to reinforce the apparent strength these men have to offer Lucy, Seward's blood is better than Van Helsing's because he is “more young and strong,” but Holmwood's is better still because neither of the scholarly gentlemen have nerves “so calm” nor “blood so bright” as his (Stoker 135). Despite the alleged strength of their blood, however, they all prove insufficient against Dracula as, despite repeated transfusions, Lucy clearly needs more than they can offer. With Lucy still in desperate need, Van Helsing laments that all the available donors are “exhausted” (Stoker 162). Their exhaustion coupled with Lucy's continuing need indicate that these men are inadequate, unable to provide for or protect her. The ineffective transfusions that take place show “the Western male characters' impotence in comparison to Dracula—their very life blood is useless to stop him” (Brock 125). Despite Van Helsing's claim that “a brave man's blood is the best thing on this earth when a woman is in trouble,” the Crew of Light's efforts are ultimately useless and their failures exemplify their insufficiency against Dracula's threats (Stoker 163).

In addition to emasculation through fear and impotence, vampires are able to emasculate these men because they allow them the potential to become passive recipients of a sexual threat. In the same way that the female vampires have a masculine, aggressive desire to penetrate, the men reveal a passive potential (and even desire) to receive. Since stories tend to portray men as the sexual aggressor, the advent of monstrous women who can threaten them with a sexual attack provides a reversal of Victorian expectations. In addition to being emasculated by being overpowered by monstrous women, a man's desire to be penetrated is considered a homosexual

desire and, thus, positioned in *Dracula* as a feminine trait. Craft explains that, to *Dracula's* first readers, desire “is always already constituted under the regime of gender—to want a male cannot not be a feminine desire, and vice versa” (114). The interest these men betray, then, in being seduced by these penetrative women points to their own femininity. It is when the men approach Lucy outside of her tomb that the sexual threat to the Crew of Light is most clear as their passivity is contrasted with the aggressive sexuality they are subject to. Instead of the heroics expected of them, the men respond to Lucy's attack the way the reader may expect a Gothic damsel to since they “[shudder] with horror,” Van Helsing's “iron nerve” fails him, and Holmwood nearly falls down (Stoker 226). Lucy's seduction of Holmwood here is a reversal because “she is cast in the role of the sexual aggressor, a role exclusively reserved for the Victorian male” (Parlour 4). These men experience social mobility as their passive position in these sexual attacks is indicative both of a weakness and a homosexual desire that do not fit the normative masculine gender roles of their time.

While this series of emasculations occurs for the Crew of Light as a whole, the changes that Harker undergoes in particular serve as the best example. Before the change that *Dracula* causes, Harker is best described in the words of Mr. Hawkins, his mentor, who describes him as “a young man, full of energy and talent in his own way, and of a very faithful disposition” (Stoker 22). Harker is also gentlemanly in that he is “discreet and silent” and respectful since Hawkins promises *Dracula* that Harker “shall be ready to attend on [him]” and “shall take [his] instructions in all matters” (Stoker 22). This description sets Harker forth as a professional, capable young man. He begins his travels to Transylvania as a curious adventurer and, as Sebastian Dümpling argues, “encounters the castle as a discoverer” (190). In his meeting with the Weird Sisters, however, Harker becomes the passive recipient of a penetrative sexual threat that

reverses the gender norms he seems to ascribe to so well. As he anticipates and even desires the Weird Sisters, normative gender codes that attribute “to the more active male the right and responsibility of vigorous appetite” are flipped “as virile Jonathan Harker enjoys a ‘feminine’ passivity and awaits a delicious penetration from a woman whose demonism is figured as the power to penetrate” (Craft 108-109). Even though the Weird Sisters are interrupted and Harker is rescued, “a sense of passive helplessness lingers on” (Kwan-Wai Yu 147). When he admits he would rather fall to his death trying to escape than be the victim of the Weird Sisters, Harker directly associates an attack by these women to an attack on his masculinity. “The precipice is steep and high,” he reasons, “at its foot a man may sleep—as a man” (Stoker 60). The threat he is subject to in the castle, the reader assumes, gives no such promise. Despite his initial claims to masculinity, Harker’s passivity when attacked by the Weird Sisters signals his move across the border of traditional gender expectations.

Harker's impotence is further cemented when his wife is attacked by Dracula while he lays “in a stupor” in bed beside them (Stoker 301). When he finally awakes, long after the vampire has retreated and the damage has been done, he is prepared to jump into action with “all the man in him awake at the need for instant exertion” (Stoker 301-302). Despite his apparent desire to face the vampire, he is too late, a truth that saps whatever strength he has left. Harker becomes so “overwhelmed in a misery that is appalling to see” that it takes a physical toll on him almost immediately as overnight he becomes, in Seward's words, “a drawn, haggard old man, whose white hair matches well with the hollow burning eyes and grief-written lines of his face” (Stoker 320). When he fails to heroically protect his wife, Harker's recognition of his own weakness causes sudden aging that makes him even more dramatically and obviously weak. Despite this apparent physical and mental weakness, however, Seward claims that Harker's

“energy is still intact; in fact, he is like a living flame” (Stoker 320). Instead, the reality seems closer to what Brock describes as, after Dracula's attack, “Harker continues to be an impotent husband” (126). This “living flame” that Seward describes seems absent from most of Harker's actions over the next few chapters as he grieves and laments Mina's situation and turns to others (including Mina) for guidance.

Similar to Seward's “living flame,” the emasculation of Harker is simultaneously occluded and highlighted by the narrators of *Dracula* as they attempt to conceal it. When Mina arrives in Budapest to nurse Harker back to health, she finds him “oh, so thin and pale and weak-looking” with “all the resolution” and “quiet dignity” he once held “vanished” (Stoker 116). “He is,” she says, “only a wreck of himself” (Stoker 116). While Harker is convalescing, he admits that he is actively refusing to remember what happened to him at Castle Dracula which displays a weakness in will that is not masculine as he is too sensitive (a traditionally feminine attribute) to confront it. At the same time that Harker is clearly in a weak or passive position, however, the narration attempts to draw the reader's attention to his strength instead. This theme is repeated but is perhaps most obvious in the poignant weakness Harker betrays in their wedding scene. Although Mina reports that he “answered his ‘I will’ firmly and strongly,” this tone is at odds with his position as “he sat up in bed, propped up with pillows” throughout the ceremony (Stoker 117). Likewise, although their kiss is “like a very solemn pledge” it is with “poor weak hands” that Harker draws her near (Stoker 118). Although some forgiveness must be given since he is, after all, ill, Harker's weakness is at the forefront of their wedding despite the apparent attempts to undercut it through Mina's rose-colored description.

This same phenomenon occurs throughout *Dracula* as the men's impotence is obvious while the narrators collectively try to draw attention away from it. Indeed, one of the

complications of the present argument, that Dracula allows the men to cross borders by emasculating them, is that when Harker does finally learn the truth of the monster it seems to galvanize him. Once he knows about Dracula he says, “It seems to have made a new man of me. It was the doubt as to the reality of the whole thing that knocked me over” (Stoker 202). He now admits openly, though in the past tense, “I felt impotent, and in the dark, and distrustful” (Stoker 202). However, Harker should be viewed with skepticism when he claims, “But, now that I *know*, I am not afraid, even of the Count” (Stoker 202). Despite this apparent surge of heroic masculinity, Harker continues in varying states of impotence and uncertainty throughout most of the narrative. Harker’s weakness, both physical and mental, displays a departure from the traditional model of masculinity even as the text tries to reassign it to him. This continued weakness is the result of Dracula’s continued presence while the denial of that same weakness signals the Crew of Light’s attempts to resurrect the borders Harker has been pulled across.

Although Dracula allows for social mobility as these men are brought from the apparent pinnacle of masculinity to categorical emasculation, *Dracula* ostensibly ends with norms being reinforced. The Crew of Light’s attempts to reify borders can be seen in their continued insistence (even in the face of opposition) that these men are strong and these women are virtuous. Pikula argues that Van Helsing’s efforts to “solidify the men’s masculinity...and to erase the stain of impurity from the women’s foreheads” are, in the end, successful as “Harker is the epic hero who decapitates the monster, while Mina is busy nurturing the stalwart future of Victorian masculinity in the shape of her young son” (291). While Dracula’s death indicates a return to traditional norms, it could also serve to further emasculate the men with its homoerotic subtext since the men are required for the first time to stake another man. Perhaps because the staking of Dracula may have seemed “too reminiscent of the sexual innuendo which besets the

disposal of Lucy,” a knife becomes the weapon of execution, however, even with this substitution the ending is arguably guilty of “conceding to Dracula even as he is vanquished a chance to cast a slur on British manhood” (Rance 448).

Furthermore, the birth of Quincey Harker also hints at an uneasy ending since, according to Craft, the “heterosexual mediation” present throughout the text is repeated in Harker's son as “Stoker's prose quietly suggests an alternative paternity” (129). In an equation that Renfield could be proud of, Mina, who has consumed Dracula's blood, has in her Lucy's blood from Dracula. Lucy's blood, in turn, has been transfused with that of Holmwood, Seward, Morris, and Van Helsing. Thus, in addition to sharing their “bundle of names,” Quincey Harker serves as the “fantasy child of those sexualized transfusions” (Stoker 399; Craft 129). This suspicious paternity problematizes Harker's potency as it subtly asks the question: “How secure is any racial line when five fathers are needed to produce one son?” (Arata 631). This uncertainty of reproduction also points out the weaknesses of the British class system and its dependence upon paternal lines to transfer inheritance. By embodying the difficulty of producing an heir, Quincey Harker is, if not an attack on masculinity, at least a jab toward the patriarchal system that the Crew of Light is a part of. The monster still emasculates, as a patriarchal system is undermined, and requires movement, as a change out of that stagnant system is required. Trapped in a stagnant social order, reproduction and inheritance is uncertain or impossible since, alone, none of these men have the strength to protect or continue family lines. Brought together through monstrous intervention, however, they may. Dracula's presence brings this community together, gives them a vessel in which to combine their blood, and allows them to reproduce successfully, if monstrously.

**Monstrous Heroes and Up-to-Date Medievalism:
Transformative Mobility in *Dracula***

In *Dracula*, movement can also be tracked in the changes the monster brings about in both himself and others as Dracula blurs the borders between old and new and, most importantly, between himself and the Crew of Light. The meaningful boundaries between man and monster are questioned as the vampire crosses over into the modern world and the Crew of Light must cross borders in order to reestablish them as they are forced to use some of Dracula's own tools, like superstition and magic, to defeat him. Thus, Dracula's transformative mobility as he adapts himself and converts the Crew of Light to his own ways is most noticeable as they cross the border between old and new. Arata argues that authors of the Late-Victorian Gothic tend to "root their action firmly in the modern world," so it is no surprise that "*Dracula*, in particular, continually calls our attention to the cultural context surrounding and informing the text" (621-622). Indeed, it is generally well accepted that *Dracula* is firmly set in the modern world of its characters. Dümling expands this argument by adding that, in addition to depicting it, authors of the Late-Victorian Gothic pit the modern world against the monsters of the past as they "narrate otherness" in relation to the "imagined border between the Middle Ages and modernity" (182). Because Dracula is a medieval figure and the Crew of Light are beacons of modernity, he claims that "Stoker's *Dracula* kills the anxiety that the modern system of knowledge could be damaged by alien, medieval knowledge" (Dümling 192). However, this reading does not account for the fact that there is a movement, rather than a dichotomy, between past and present within the text as Dracula, a relic of times gone by, comes to the future while the men, peers of the modern realm, must regress into the pseudo-religious superstition of the past in order to defeat the vampire.

It is not exactly difficult to argue that Dracula is allied with the past, magic, or superstition since his existence as a historical figure from preceding centuries is an important part of his characterization in the novel. Since it is so central to this argument, however, it is worth exploring how *Dracula* “focuses on a nightmare emanating from the distant past” (Brantlinger 196). Because these monsters are undying, persistence through time is an essential part of vampirism. Nicholas Rance argues, “The essence of the idea of a vampire is to signify a more or less remote past declining to recede” (444). Because vampires are necessarily supernatural and “magical knowledge” itself is “geared toward the past because it provides insight into a primordial age when the laws of nature were written,” the supernatural element of vampirism cements Dracula's connection with the past (Dümling 189). With all this in mind, it seems easy to argue that “Dracula belongs to a superstitious age that is on the way out” (Alder 19). The vampire's alliance with the past is underlined by the fact that the spaces he is associated with are primarily medieval and suffused with superstitious energy. When Harker enters Transylvania, “he leaves modernity behind” because “everything about Dracula's castle is medieval, and vampirism itself is a relic or a revenant of medieval superstitions” (Brantlinger 198). Whitby, Dracula's first stop in his travels West, is also depicted as medieval with its ruin of an abbey and decaying graveyard. Carfax, the home Dracula purchases in London, is described by Harker as “of all periods back...to mediæval times” (Stoker 28). These places and Dracula's relationship to them position him as a medieval figure himself who is perhaps more comfortable in the past.

Although Dracula is associated with the past through his history, supernatural influences, and medieval spaces, he is still capable of functioning in and even threatening the modern world. Dracula is from the past, but he does not stay there. This is, perhaps, an unpopular opinion since

many scholars have noted the juxtaposition between the Crew of Light's modernity and the vampire's antiquity as an inherent and constant part of their characterizations⁷. However, these opinions do not take into account Dracula's ability to adapt to modernity that is made evident in the text. Although he may be designated "as dated, as last year's model," Dracula is able to cross the border into modernity, and he seems perfectly capable of adapting once he does (Daly 43). Dracula is apparently camouflaged in modernity, and his only apparent failure occurs when some sailors describe him as wearing a "hat of straw" that "suit not him or the time" (Stoker 337). His readiness and ability to adapt depict Dracula as an "*au courant* monster" who is "certainly in the swim of modern mass culture" once he arrives in London (Brantlinger 198). Similarly, Kwan-Wai Yu argues that Dracula is able to "modernize himself" as he learns about "modern-day legal and commercial transactions" but especially as he is able to move around London "without attracting public attention" (147). Dracula, then, is a relic of the past that is able to transform himself in order to cross the border into modernity.

Because they are depicted as doctors, scientists, and people who can use technology seamlessly, *Dracula's* protagonists are firmly allied with modernity and science. This is underlined as they are put forward as part of a new generation by the pointed death of many of their parental figures a fraction of the way through the novel. This movement from old to new occurs as Mrs. Westenra, Lord Godalming, and Mr. Hawkins⁸ all leave their children (within days of each other) to inherit their positions. Their relative youth along with this inheritance places these characters as members of a newer, younger order that are detached from the past. The members of the Crew of Light and Mina also have a connection with "cutting-edge

⁷ Rance argues that the "new technology" in *Dracula* is there "to underscore the Count's degeneracy" (444). Others, like Martin, argue that scenes like those in *Castle Dracula* "construct a dichotomy between the Count's ancient powers and the modernity of the novel's typewriters, phonographs, telegraphs, and telephones" (529).

⁸ The primary parent or parent-figure for Lucy, Holmwood, and Harker respectively.

Victorian science and technology” that allows their work to take on a “distinctly *modern* form” (Kwan-Wai Yu 155). The Crew of Light’s efforts are “premised on the assumption that the latest gadgetry of nineteenth-century information culture can trace, manage, and eliminate the vampire from London” (Martin 540). Technology, especially as it relates to communication and travel, is constantly weaved into their lives as they journey by train and boat and coordinate with a now-familiar exchange of telegram and telegraph. Among other Victorian technological advances mentioned in the novel are “Winchester repeating rifles, telegrams, trains, blood transfusions, Kodak cameras, steam-powered boats, electric lamps, and the London Underground” (qtd. In Kwan-Wai Yu 155). Through their alliance with science and technology, then, *Dracula's* heroes begin by being thoroughly aligned with modernity and the present.

When their scientific attempts fail to contain the vampire, however, the Crew of Light must transform and resort to ancient remedies that are supernatural. As the men arm themselves, they do so with primarily superstitious weapons⁹ as when, before entering Dracula's Carfax home, they are given “a little silver crucifix” and “a wreath of withered garlic blossoms” along with a revolver and “a portion of Sacred Wafer” (Stoker 266). Daniel Martin argues that there is “an almost seamless fusion of the scientific and the occult” as “the occult powers of crucifixes, holy water, and garlic supplement the limited capabilities of the materialist method” (540). By accepting, though hesitantly, these occult tools that deny explanation, these modern men accept that the “scientific, sceptical, matter-of-fact nineteenth century” is unlikely to provide any solution for their monstrous problem (Stoker 255). Instead of being a battle of the Crew of

⁹ The concepts of religion, superstition, and magic have been conflated for the purposes of this argument primarily because Stoker readily allows for it by depicting these religious items as weapons. In religion, Leatherdale explains, the “powers” of the crucifix and Communion Host (when it is not specifically employed during the Eucharist) are symbolic only,” so “when they are used as ‘weapons’, as if they possessed divine energy in themselves,” as they are in *Dracula*, they “become objects of magic rather than religion” (181).

Light's modern technology versus the vampire's ancient magics, "in *Dracula* magic tends to exist side-by-side with science in an uneasy relationship" as both sides must change to use tools from both the past and present (Frost 5). Although the Crew of Light are put forward as modern heroes, in their pursuit of Dracula they "gradually leave behind them all their modern technological trappings and ultimately defeat him with the weapons of his own time: knives and crucifixes" (qtd. in Alder 19). Instead of Dracula being a figure of the distant past, it is the Crew of Light who end by appearing as "relics of the dark ages" (Moretti 75). Despite their apparent allegiance to modernity, Dracula requires the Crew to cross the border into antiquity as they must use magic and superstition instead of science and technology in order to beat him.

As Dracula causes these men to cross the border between past and present, it becomes clear that Van Helsing fills a special role as mediator between science and magic. Despite the fact that "Stoker insists on presenting Van Helsing as a scientist," he ends up playing "the role of white magician to counter the black magic of Dracula" (Frost 6). His "shamanic-science" is the gateway through which the Crew of Light move between the use of modern and ancient weapons (Frost 7). Van Helsing fulfills the role of the "wise man" who appears "only when ordinary 'medicine' has failed to cure the patient and it is necessary to seek recourse in the 'witch doctor' who has access to less orthodox remedies" (Leatherdale 118). Unlike the rest of the Crew of Light, then, Van Helsing himself never seems fully aligned with modernity as he straddles the boundary between the science the Crew of Light are associated with and the magic or superstition needed to kill the monster. Clive Leatherdale agrees that "Van Helsing takes science across the frontiers of witchcraft," and his apparent comfort with crossing this border seems, at first, at odds with his role as a protector of those borders (121). However, while he does use the modern tools of science and the ancient tools of superstition, Van Helsing, unlike Dracula, does

so only to render others motionless. He may cross this border himself, but he does so only to reestablish that same border. Van Helsing's presence as a character who is comfortable on the edge between science and magic draws attention to the uncomfortable similarities he and the rest of the Crew of Light share with the vampire.

Despite the expectation that the line between good and evil should be well defined, that line is complicated in *Dracula* as the vampire blurs the borders between his own actions and those of the Crew of Light. Dracula is transformative in that he makes himself into the image of the men while, in turn, forcing them to become monstrous. This reversal is foreshadowed in the thematic switch the two groups experience between past and present, but it is apparent in other parts of the text as well. First, Dracula is not so different as the readers, nor the men in the story, expect. Arata argues that, "by Harker's own criteria, Dracula is the most 'Western' character in the novel" because it is repeatedly made clear that "no one is more rational, more intelligent, more organized, or even more punctual than the Count" (637). When Dracula leaves his castle in Harker's clothes, his ability to "pass" as an Englishman, as Arata calls it, is "the truly disturbing notion" (638). Especially in his professionalism, Dracula bears marked similarities to these men. Kwan-Wai Yu points out that, "like Stoker himself, Van Helsing, Seward, Harker, and even Mina are all bourgeois working people" while Holmwood and Morris "both work laboriously as equals...in their mission to destroy Dracula" despite their lack of occupation (150). Because this work ethic is so central to the Crew of Light, there is an expectation that it will not be shared by Dracula. Indeed, as a *bona fide* member of the aristocracy, Dracula's wealth has been passed down for generations and he could easily avoid any great amount of work. At Castle Dracula, however, Harker "observes with astonishment that Dracula lacks precisely what makes a man 'noble': servants" (Moretti 72). Instead, the vampire does everything himself as "Dracula stoops

to driving the carriage, cooking the meals, making the beds, cleaning the castle” (Moretti 72). It would be easy to contrast Dracula's work ethic with those in the Crew of Light if he fit their expectations of a man with his wealth and position, but he is instead put forward as “an upholder of the Protestant ethic” (Moretti 73). By depicting the pointed similarities the monster shares with the men, *Dracula* blurs the borders between those allegedly inviolable categories.

Dracula is not who the reader expects him to be, but the Crew of Light are not either since, despite their commitment to an apparently holy cause, many of their actions are questionable. When he and Van Helsing go to visit Lucy's tomb in the night, Seward finds himself thinking of the awkwardness of their position. He says, “I realised distinctly the perils of the law which we were incurring in our unhallowed work” (Stoker 215). Seward's concerns here draw attention to the fact that, “put most bluntly,” the primary action of these men “is breaking into private properties and trying to murder the occupants” (Kwan-Wai Yu 155). In the end, Rance's argument that “at least the semblance of murderousness attaches not only to Dracula but to Van Helsing's party” is more than fair (444). In addition to a propensity for criminal actions, the members of the Crew of Light begin to betray a kind of vampiric logic. Their preoccupation with the quality of blood given to Lucy in her transfusions seems uniquely vampiric as Van Helsing evinces a hierarchy of blood in which Holmwood's is best and Lucy's maids are not even worth consideration. This monstrous mindset is also highlighted as Van Helsing discusses who has the *right* to first blood in several forms. As her fiancé, Holmwood is given the first right to give Lucy blood through transfusions and later to draw her blood through staking. This focus on *right* echoes the logic of the Weird Sisters who tell their fair sister that she has the “right to begin” as they attack Harker (Stoker 43). The result is that, by the end, Stoker's “heroes have stooped to imitate Dracula” as his presence causes them to commit monstrous acts that confuse

the border that once seemed so clear between monster and man (Leatherdale 212).

Van Helsing, already somewhat monstrous in his willingness to cross the border between science and magic, exemplifies the way *Dracula's* heroes come to resemble its monster. When Van Helsing is introduced, Seward positions him as an almost omniscient person. He is a well-informed man who is a “philosopher and a metaphysician” as well as “one of the most advanced scientists of his day” who knows “as much about obscure diseases as any one in the world” (Stoker 124). It is perhaps because of this beatific description that “many readers see Van Helsing as the hero of *Dracula*,” which Leatherdale argues “was probably Stoker’s intention” (118). However, Van Helsing is depicted as a near mirror to the monster he hunts. Craft argues that, in the end, “*Dracula* certainly problematizes, if it does not quite erase, the line of separation signifying a meaningful difference between Van Helsing and the Count” (126). The first clue to the similarities between Van Helsing and Dracula is given by Seward as he explains his history with Van Helsing and the vampiric exchange that has cemented the relationship between master and student. If the mere connotations of the title “master” being applied to Van Helsing does not liken him to Dracula, the way that this relationship was forged does since Van Helsing, accidentally cut with an unsterilized knife, was saved by Seward sucking the poison out of the wound (Stoker 131). This connection between Seward and Van Helsing is a “parody of vampiric bonding” that R.J. Frost argues leaves the reader with “a feeling of discomfort” (6). Thus, a pointed correlation is drawn between the way that Dracula and Van Helsing forge new followers.

In his ministrations on Mina and Lucy, Van Helsing turns towards penetrative and mesmeric solutions that are not unlike the vampire’s own. Emma Dominguez-Rue describes the surprisingly similar marks the attacks of both man and monster leave as, during Lucy’s illness, “while the Count bites her throat, Van Helsing uses his hypodermic needles to subdue her”

(305). Dracula, who makes twin marks with his pointed canines on Lucy's neck, is mirrored by Van Helsing as he pierces her once to sedate her and once for a transfusion of blood. "A perverse mirroring occurs" in what Craft calls "the war of penetrations" between Dracula and Van Helsing as "puncture for puncture the Doctor equals the Count" (126). The morphine injections and hypnosis that Van Helsing use serve another purpose as they also "mirror Dracula's hypnotic power" (Dominguez-Rue 305). The soothing, coaxing words of Van Helsing as he medicates Lucy resonate with the words of Dracula to Mina while she is mesmerized and submissive. He says, "Now, little miss, here is your medicine. Drink it off, like a good child. See, I lift you so that to swallow is easy. Yes." (Stoker 135). This type of coddling talk to a half-sleeping woman is characteristic of the mesmerism of both man and monster. Similarly, after her vamping, Mina is reported as being "very wakeful and alert" both before sunrise and sunset, but it is during this wakefulness that she is forcibly returned to sleep by Van Helsing's attempts to hypnotize her and gain some information on Dracula (Stoker 353). Although the reader is told "at first, some effort was needed" to hypnotize her, she eventually "seems to yield at once" (Stoker 353). In his ability to pierce and sedate, Van Helsing's manipulations of Mina and Lucy's bodies become conspicuously similar to Dracula's own attacks on these women.

When Mina first meets Van Helsing, she describes his physical appearance in a way that stresses his direct relationship to the vampire. Mina reports,

The face, clean-shaven, shows a hard, square chin, a large, resolute, mobile mouth, a good-sized nose, rather straight, but with quick, sensitive nostrils, that seem to broaden as the big, bushy brows come down. (Stoker 196)

Dracula, similarly, is a "tall old man" who is "clean shaven save for a long white moustache"

(Stoker 20). The vampire's chin also is "broad and strong," and Harker stresses Dracula's

"peculiarly arched nostrils" as well as his "very massive" and "bushy" eyebrows (Stoker 22-23).

Although "physiognomy is not something we accept today," Frost argues that from the

perspective of the characters of *Dracula* and its original audience “Dracula and Van Helsing are uncomfortably matched” (7). The description that Mina offers paints Van Helsing first as similar to Dracula and second as a foreigner since the nose, forehead, and eyebrows of both are often pointed to as markers of racial difference. Although Brock argues that this depiction demonstrates “Stoker's intention for Dracula's race to represent a combination of non-English racial categories,” the fact that Van Helsing shares many of these traits identifies him as foreign as well (125). In addition to appearance, he and Dracula share similar foreign speech patterns and accents that also serve to mark them as outsiders. Van Helsing's control (or lack thereof) of English is evident throughout the narration, and Harker reports that Dracula speaks “excellent English” but with a “strange intonation” (Stoker 20). Because the Crew of Light, especially Van Helsing, develop a striking resemblance to the monster while Dracula mimics some of the men's most identifiable characteristics, Dracula's presence produces a transformative mobility as he causes them to betray similarities despite their antagonism.

“Reverse Colonization” and *Dracula's* Travel War:

Physical Mobility in *Dracula*

The physical differences that Dracula and Van Helsing share become an instrumental part of the physical mobility that the vampire prompts as his foreign identity makes it clear that Dracula crosses borders not as a tourist but as a colonizer seeking to propagate his race in a new land. The reader may expect monsters to be banished to the outer rim of civilization, but Dracula is instead “a rational entrepreneur who invests his gold to expand his dominion: to conquer the City of London” (Moretti 68). Playing upon the anxieties of an England spread out in various imperial attempts, *Dracula* portrays the fear of invasion by monstrous Others as the vampire commits what Arata calls “reverse colonization” (623). In this “terrifying reversal,” the imperial aspirations of Britain are turned on them as “the colonizer finds himself in the position of the colonized, the exploiter becomes exploited, the victimizer victimized” (Arata 623). Along with the concern that they may have overextended their reach, events like “the Indian rebellion of 1857” manifested “the growing unrest in England's colonies” and “caused panic in England's political consciousness” (Brock 122). The presence of this theme in fiction is indicative of guilt as well as fear because “in the marauding, invasive Other, British culture sees its own imperial practices mirrored back in monstrous forms” (Arata 623). In reverse colonization, the monster again blurs the line between himself and the humans he torments as his most monstrous act, to conquer them and their homes, is a crime they are also guilty of. The threat of Dracula’s physical mobility is primarily that he will cross the border between colonized and colonizer as he strives to populate England with members of his own race.

A necessary part of Dracula’s identity as reverse colonizer is his racial difference, made doubly clear by his depiction as both an Outsider (Szelky) and Other (vampire). The fear that

Dracula may seek to overpower the native Englishmen is evident as Dracula's race is described as one that is distinctly focused on supremacy. He says, "We Szekelys have a right to be proud, for in our veins flows the blood of many brave races who fought as the lion fights, for lordship" (Stoker 35). Stoker's choice to make Dracula a Székler instead of a Romanian¹⁰ is considered by Duncan Light as a calculated choice, made because of the "the nineteenth-century assumption...that the Széklers were the descendants of Attila the Hun" ("The People" 42). In addition to connecting Dracula with this famous conqueror, Stoker's choice to place Castle Dracula in Transylvania instead of Styria¹¹ also heightens his imperial threat since "Victorian readers knew the Carpathians largely for its endemic cultural upheaval and its fostering of a dizzying succession of empires" ensuring that the vampire myth is "intimately linked to military conquest and the rise and fall of empires" (Arata 627). Because Dracula is a vampire as well as a Székler, the threat of his colonization is that, in addition to being Other himself, he can change English citizens to be like him. When Harker is struck with the danger of the monster that he is "helping to transfer to London," he thinks of it in terms of victims but also conversions since Dracula will "create a new and ever-widening circle of semi-demons to batten on the helpless" (Stoker 58). Much like his Szekely ancestors who were prone to conquest, Dracula is "impelled towards a continuous growth, an unlimited expansion of his domain" because, as a vampire, "accumulation is inherent in his nature" (Moretti 73). Dracula's ability to conquer by creating vampires serves as evidence that "vampirism designates a kind of colonization of the body" as Dracula "appropriates and transforms" his victims (Arata 630). Dracula's identity as both Szekler and vampire, both races prone to colonize and conquer, highlights the imperial nature of his

¹⁰ According to Light's "The People of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*," Romanians were the more prominent people group living in Transylvania at the time.

¹¹ Stoker's first choice of locale and home to other literary vampires like Le Fanu's *Carmilla* (1872).

threat to London.

Because the underlying concern of Dracula's attack is his potential colonization and the resulting fear that his vampiric race will spread, Dracula's primary victims are women and his primary threat is sexual. The imperial anxieties of Victorian England are on display here as well because "these women symbolize the site at which the British feel most vulnerable" (Brock 120). Dracula's choice of female victims paired with his attacks that are configured as sexual in nature indicate his interest in colonizing through reproduction. Although Dracula is interested in colonizing other women as well¹², Mina and Lucy are his primary targets. After Dracula's first attack on Lucy, her subsequent "little shudder" and continued "moaning and sighing" are often referenced as signs of an awakening sexuality; however, the sexual overtones of Lucy's attack are muted compared to Mina's which provides an overtly sexual tableau (Stoker 102-103). When the Crew of Light come upon this scene, they find Harker, with "his face flushed and breathing heavily," in a position that underlines his impotence as well as his potential voyeuristic interest as Dracula forces Mina to drink from a gash in his chest in a position that many scholars have read as both a "symbolic act of enforced fellation and a lurid nursing" (Stoker 300; Craft 125). Dracula's promise to Mina that she is now "flesh of [his] flesh; blood of [his] blood; kin of [his] kin" establishes this sensual attack as a consummation by echoing traditional wedding vows (Stoker 306). The imperial concern that Britain had overextended itself is underlined as Dracula says triumphantly that the men, who have failed to protect Mina, "should have kept their energies for use closer to home" (Stoker 306). By colonizing the bodies of young women through primarily sexual attacks, Dracula propagates his own race while making reproduction

¹² The third Weird Sister is described as "fair" with "golden hair" and "eyes like pale sapphires" (Stoker 43). Harker's comment that he seems "somehow to know her face," helps cement the idea that this Fair Sister may well be English and indicates a trend in the Dracula's tastes (Stoker 43). Dracula's attacks on other Englishwomen are alluded to when Mina sees him stalking (we assume to vamp) a woman in Piccadilly (Stoker 186-187).

impossible for the Englishmen.

Dracula's identity as Other is crucial to his role as an imperial threat, so the physical border between East and West is presented in *Dracula* as a line that helps define the vampire's difference. As Harker travels to Transylvania, he says, "The impression I had was that we were leaving the West and entering the East" (Stoker 5). In *Dracula and the Eastern Question*, Matthew Gibson explains how "the idea of the South Eastern European countries of the Balkans as being not merely Eastern...but 'Oriental'...is a common one throughout the nineteenth century," and it continues to be important in *Dracula* despite the country's actual location in Europe (1). Transylvania is likewise "associated with the supernatural and with beliefs and practices that had all but disappeared from Western Europe," so Dracula's Eastern identity serves as a contrast to the Western ideals of the Crew of Light (Light, "Imaginative Geographies" 9). Transylvania, whose name means "the land beyond the forest," is poetic in that it "immediately evokes somewhere remote, strange and timeless" (Light, "Imaginative Geographies" 11). Indeed, Dracula warns Harker of this inherent difference when he says, "We are in Transylvania; and Transylvania is not England. Our ways are not your ways, and there shall be to you many strange things" (Stoker 26). Light argues that *Dracula* depicts Transylvania as "menacing, sinister and dangerous" enough to be "an entirely plausible home for a monster intent on invading and colonising the civilised West" ("Imaginative Geographies" 12). This focus on distance as well as difference across the border between East and West renders Dracula as thoroughly Other and also highlights his role as a colonizer as he pointedly enters a new land. Here, the border lends importance to his travel since to cross over into other lands is, after all, a necessary part of colonization.

This border is crossed by both monster and man because Dracula's imperial threat

requires the Crew of Light to pursue him back to Transylvania. Even when he retreats, the men continue to fear Dracula because, from what they know of his history, he will return to conquer. Van Helsing explains that when Dracula was once in “what Mr. Morris would call a ‘tight place’” he retreated to his home “and thence, without losing purpose, prepared himself for a new effort” in which “he came again better equipped for his work; and won” (Stoker 362). Because of the nature of this threat, the men are forced to follow Dracula in order to stop him. If the war for Lucy was a Blood War that pitted the bodily strength of the men against Dracula through transfusions, this Travel War for Mina’s soul devolves into the men pitting their ability to move through the physical world against Dracula’s ability to do the same. When Dracula retreats to his homeland, the men immediately begin their plans to track and follow him by theorizing what path he has chosen, investigating what boat he has bought passage on, and deciding how best to pursue him. From the beginning, then, the resulting Travel War is retold as the Crew of Light countering Dracula’s attempts at travel with their own. Dracula promotes physical mobility as his influence and his threat produce travel because, in order to reify borders and prevent the colonial threat of the vampire, the men must follow him.

Although Dracula appears to be the main source of mobility in the text, not all movement can be assigned to his agency since the Crew of Light do travel before Dracula’s entrance. When Morris describes their history together, he poses their relationship in terms of adventures already shared. He refers to Seward as “our old pal at the Korea” and says, “We’ve told yarns by the camp-fire in the prairies; and dressed one another’s wounds after trying a landing at the Marquesas; and drunk healths on the shore of Titicaca” (Stoker 69). Morris is an American by birth, and Van Helsing is also required to cross the border between England and his homeland repeatedly. The Crew of Light, then, are no strangers to adventure or travel, and they have

crossed national borders already as tourists or immigrants. Patricia McKee refers to these men as being “characterized by unsettled behavior” and “experienced travelers” who can “capitalize on mobility” (42). In this, the Crew of Light are not like the once-stagnant gentlemen of Utterson's circle. They do not move from immobility to mobility but rather are given a new cause for mobility as Dracula requires them to move but with none of their old reasons. They do not travel as tourists, but as crusaders against the monster. They move, now, not entirely of their own will because their destination is determined by the monster they chase.

Once Dracula appears, he becomes the reason for travel; however, the ability the Crew of Light and Mina have to travel well continues to be stressed. Harker's trip to Transylvania “constitutes a travel narrative in miniature” which depicts him as a capable and happy traveler (Arata 635). Harker studies his destination extensively before he leaves and, while there, expresses his appreciation of the “national dish[es]” prepared for him as well as his old-fashioned hotel (Stoker 5). Harker's preparation for and interest in travel foreshadows that of the rest of the Crew of Light who are depicted as traveling well for several reasons. First, their available funds make travel simple since it takes money to pay for their various tickets and hotel rooms. In addition to bribing locals when necessary¹³, their money allows them to outfit themselves for travel¹⁴. The Crew of Light also possess travel knowledge that aids them. Mina's knowledge of the train timetables (a knowledge that perseveres no matter what country she is in) is only the most obvious example of this as the men regularly exhibit knowledge on what conveyance is best for them to take at certain times or what Dracula is likely to have done given

¹³ Once they reach Transylvania, Harker admits they are lucky to be “well supplied with money” since “this is the country where bribery can do anything” (Stoker 354).

¹⁴ Mina reports, awe-struck, that “in three hours” they are able to secure “a lovely steam launch,” “half a dozen good horses,” all the maps and appliances of various kinds that can be had,” along with “a good deal of ready money” so they can “buy a carriage and horses” (Stoker 377).

modern transportation options. Finally, their money and their apparent knowledge of travel make it possible for them to plan travel well. When plotting their trip versus the *Czarina Catherine* that carries Dracula, the Crew of Light reason that it will take the ship “at the quickest speed she has ever made at least three weeks to reach Varna,” but on land they can make it “to the same place in three days” (Stoker 344). Despite their head start, they wisely plan to leave immediately in order to account for any possible delays and to get familiar with their destination. Likewise, when they must change their plan because Dracula has evaded them, they show a great ability to adapt as they split up to continue pursuit by land and boat. Thus, the Crew of Light are put forward as well-versed travelers who are equipped to hold their own against Dracula in this Travel War.

Despite their apparent ability and resources, the Crew of Light do experience some issues as they travel. As they hunt Dracula, their initial plan is made with confidence upon the idea that Dracula will travel slower than they will. Van Helsing assures Mina that they have to “rest for a time” (Stoker 338). He says, “For our enemy is on the sea” and “to sail a ship takes time, go she never so quick; and when we start we go on land more quick, and we meet him there” (Stoker 338). Despite this assertion, however, the Crew of Light remain a few steps behind Dracula for the majority of their journey. Dracula fools them, causing them to wait for him in Varna when he has routed his travel through Galatz instead. Once they split up in Galatz, Seward reports that Holmwood and Harker have had a traveling mishap of their own while navigating the river. He says, “To-day we heard of the launch having been detained by an accident when trying to force a way up the rapids...I fear that the boat is not any better for the accident” (Stoker 380). Despite their great ability, the Crew of Light and Mina do experience problems during their travel that position the vampire as at least more skilled than they are. Dracula does not, however, actually

inhibit their movements as they hunt him. Although he travels wiser and better than they do, he does not try to detain them and, thus, continues to be a source of mobility. These men are adept travelers, but, in the scope of *Dracula's* Travel War, the vampire is always at least one step ahead of them. Whatever the Crew of Light may do to travel successfully, Dracula does better. He has more money, greater knowledge, better plans, and—at least until their final turn—he is winning.

Dracula prompts the Crew of Light and Mina to cross national borders in order to respond to his threat. When Dracula invites Harker to Transylvania, “the telegram is eerie because it indicates how easily the border between Harker’s world and Dracula’s world can be crossed” (Dümling 182). However, Harker's foray across this border is only the first in *Dracula* as Mina travels to Budapest and back to nurse Harker, and Van Helsing must traipse back and forth between Amsterdam and England to monitor Lucy’s illness. While they study and track him from their base at Seward’s asylum, the Crew of Light and Mina move around London to do the legwork required to investigate the vampire. Finally, they follow him as he retreats to Transylvania. In general terms, the action of *Dracula* is primarily a series of movements by the vampire that are followed by the humans. As Dracula beckons them across borders, daring them to chase him, the threat of the vampire ensures the movement of these heroes. Kwan-Wai Yu echoes this sentiment with focus on the monster causing a call to action more generally instead of movement when he says that “fear...is *productive* rather than paralyzing” as it produces “an imperative to work assiduously together” (149). Dracula's threat as a colonizer spurs on movement as The Crew of Light take up the crusade against the monster as a moral responsibility, one that does not allow them to stay safe at home. Although the Crew of Light are veteran travelers and seems to travel well, they travel now at the monster’s behest.

In addition to causing the movement of others, Dracula displays great personal mobility and physical strength. Even as Dracula anonymously drives Harker toward his castle, the first thing Harker notices is “his prodigious strength” as “his hand actually seemed like a steel vice that could have crushed mine” (Stoker 19). His physical strength is only one of Dracula's supernatural powers that help him move effortlessly through the physical world. Van Helsing says Dracula is as “strong in person as twenty men” and “can, within limitations, appear at will when, and where, and in any of the forms that are to him” (Stoker 253). He has the ability to control some elements and animals as well as the ability to “grow and become small” and “vanish and come unknown” (Stoker 253). Emily Alder points out how Dracula’s abilities to change his physical form “subvert conventional physical boundaries and also social ones” as he moves through spaces he should not be able to (15). In addition to general quickness and a monstrous ability to change the way he looks, Dracula is also characterized by an animalistic mobility that marks him as Other as well as highly mobile. This is evident first when Harker sees him scale the walls of Castle Dracula “with considerable speed, just as a lizard moves along a wall” (Stoker 40). These descriptions of Dracula’s movements support Kwan-Wai Yu’s assertion that “most frightening in the story is the extreme mobility and power of the ‘King-vampire’” (148). Dracula, then, is able to cross physical borders because his monstrous abilities make him exceptionally mobile.

In the present discussion of monstrous mobility, however, it cannot be ignored that the vampire’s movement is seemingly restricted in several ways. When Van Helsing itemizes the various transportations that Dracula has at his disposal¹⁵, he concludes that “he can, when once

¹⁵ “He can transform himself to wolf...he can be as bat...he can come in mist which he create...he come on moonlight rays as elemental dust,” and he can “become so small” that he can “slip through a hairbreadth space at the tomb door” (Stoker 256).

he find his way, come out from anything or into anything” (Stoker 256). However, the vampire is subject to the laws of his supernatural race and must obey certain precepts that specifically hinder his movement. Van Helsing says, “He cannot go where he lists” since he cannot enter a home unless “there be some one of the household who bid him to come,” in the daytime his powers cease so “only at certain times can he have limited freedom,” and “he can only pass running water at the slack or the flood of the tide” (Stoker 256). Mina also theorizes that Dracula’s weakness can be found in his restricted mobility when she says that “Count Dracula’s problem is to get back to his own place” and that “he must be *brought back* by some one” (Stoker 371). The restrictions the vampire must follow have caused some scholars to agree that Dracula really has limited mobility. Stoyan Tchapravov points to Dracula’s dependence on the Slovaks and Gypsies he hires to transport him as a sign that “his freedom to move in space is quite limited” (523). Likewise, Christine Ferguson argues that Dracula is less, not more, mobile because of his vampirism. She argues that although “vampirism has given him supernatural strength and transformative powers,” it “has also subjected him to a series of prohibitions which often curtail these powers when they are most needed” (Ferguson 230). Although Dracula and other vampires are depicted as especially mobile, their mobility is theoretically hindered by the supernatural laws their race must follow.

However, Dracula’s ability to flout these rules and move despite them shows an even more increased mobility. Claims like those by Tchapravov and Ferguson focus on the restrictions to Dracula’s mobility but fail to account for all the evidence in the narrative. They stop short when they find an obstacle; the monster does not. Dracula’s movement is theoretically impeded by the supernatural laws he must abide by, but he proves adept at bypassing those impediments. For example, to circumvent a vampiric injunction that he may not enter Lucy’s home without an

invitation, Dracula uses his influence over wolves to get one from the zoo to bust through Lucy's window. When Dracula requires an invitation into Seward's asylum, he approaches Renfield (a zoophagous patient who already worships the vampire) but has no apparent difficulty crossing the threshold because of his mesmeric abilities. When Renfield describes the "red cloud" settling over his eyes as Dracula approaches him, he says, "Before I knew what I was doing, I found myself opening the sash and saying to Him: 'Come in, Lord and Master!'" (Stoker 297-298). Dracula's manipulation of his supernatural powers seems to undermine his need for an invitation since he can seemingly convince anyone to invite him in at any time. Despite Van Helsing's reassurance that the vampire is made weaker by his need to follow these rules, Dracula continues to flout them. "Confined" as he is by daylight, Van Helsing promises, "he cannot melt into thin air nor disappear through cracks or chinks or crannies" (Stoker 310). However, when Dracula finds the Crew of Light waiting to ambush him at his Piccadilly home in the daytime, he is still exceptionally strong and quick and, ultimately, able to evade them. He is "panther-like" in his movement as he "leap[s]" into the room and "win[s] a way" past them before they can even "raise a hand to stay him" (Stoker 324). While some aspects of vampirism may seem like apparent impediments on Dracula's mobility, they instead serve to highlight his mobility as he finds ways to move around these obstacles.

In addition to his simple, physical mobility, Dracula is put forward as an adept traveler. He is depicted as doing everything the Crew of Light and Mina do well as they travel, and his resources, knowledge, and ability to plan far exceed those of the humans he opposes. Dracula, like Harker on his way to Transylvania, has studied the land he travels towards and, like the Crew of Light, has amassed money for his travels, but his unnaturally long life has given him more time to study and save than his human counterparts could ever have. Dracula's success in

travel is begrudgingly lauded by Harker as the result of his expert planning.

Everything had been carefully thought out, and done systematically and with precision. He seemed to have been prepared for every obstacle which might be placed by accident in the way of his intentions being carried out. To use an Americanism, he had “taken no chances,” and the absolute accuracy with which his instructions were fulfilled, was simply the logical result of his care. (Stoker 242)

Indeed, Dracula is so prepared that his trip goes according to plan even as he remains locked in a box of dirt. Dracula’s astute plans that require no additional effort on his part appear as a foil to those of the Crew of Light as they must continually work and plan, running around Varna and Galatz to bribe officials and secure tickets or information. Dracula’s supernatural abilities that control elements, like wind and fog, also impute to him a natural ability to travel, especially by sea. Dracula’s ability to travel well, even better than those in the Crew of Light, is evidenced by his continued success throughout most of *Dracula's Travel War*.

Although Dracula is ahead of them for the majority of their travels, the Crew of Light does end by defeating him¹⁶. In the end, Dracula's movement West as a colonizer is thwarted as are his attempts to propagate his monstrous race, since Mina is apparently healed upon his death. The borders are reestablished, but it seems that something has managed to slip through. The travel that Dracula promotes does not end after his death but continues with a trip to Transylvania that the Crew of Light take seven years after the main action of the novel. McKee reads this trip as a sign that the Crew of Light have succeeded, and Eastern Europe is now “a place they have made safe for tourism” (48). Harker’s assertion that “every trace of all that had been was blotted out” seems to support this argument (Stoker 399). However, as with most of the endings in *Dracula*, there is a hint of dissatisfaction with this apparent defeat of the monster.

¹⁶ Some argue that *Dracula* ends with the false-death of the titular vampire, providing the possibility for Stoker to write a sequel. Since this potential sequel is not available for study, however, this theory has been disregarded for the sake of this argument.

Their return to Transylvania could signal that the Crew of Light are now able to travel as they did before, as tourists and adventurers. However, since they return only to confront the trauma of facing the monster, this final trip also appears to be spurred on by Dracula. Although the threat of Dracula has been removed, there is an insistence on his continued influence over the Crew of Light and the land they have traveled to. This land, Harker says, “was, and is, to us so full of vivid and terrible memories” (Stoker 399). The memories, despite their assertions otherwise, still haunt them, and the castle “stood as before...above a waste of desolation” (Stoker 399). In their return to Transylvania, the vampire's continued power to necessitate and direct their movement is evident.

Through promoting movement that is social, transformative, and physical, Dracula's monstrosity is defined by his mobility. Dracula's monstrosity ignores normative sexual boundaries as the women are remade in the image of the empowered New Woman while the men are emasculated. Dracula transforms so that the ancient relic of the past can cross over to dwell in modern London while the up-to-date Crew of Light must deign to use the instruments of antiquated superstition. Dracula's colonizing threat beckons the Crew of Light across national borders to the foothills of the Carpathians and back again seven years later. At all points, Dracula is a creature who questions existing borders. He flouts them by crossing them himself, and he allows others to cross them as well. Whereas Dracula permits movement, the Crew of Light attempt to restrict it as they try to reinscribe the norms of sexuality, the duality of good and evil, and the importance of national borders. The Crew of Light succeed in reinscribing norms in the text; however, the reader is left with a sense that their triumphs are tainted by the borders that have already been crossed, and their successes are not exactly convincing.

Conclusion

Authorial intent has been neglected throughout this argument in favor of close reading in part because these monsters have grown into more than either Stevenson or Stoker could have expected. Both men considered these works to be largely sensational pieces that they wrote to make some quick money in a time of need. The afterlife of these stories has been so remarkable and varied that they have, indeed, taken on a life of their own beyond what their authors would have intended. Before closing, however, we turn to the lives of these authors to help shed a final, different light on their monsters.

If Utterson and the gentlemen bachelors who Robert Louis Stevenson (1850-1894) wrote about are—as argued earlier—identifiable as a type, Stevenson himself would have been their opposite. History remembers him as a “bohemian” with a tendency towards outlandish dress and long hair. His favorite velvet jacket “was totemic, marking perfectly his difference from the waistcoated and tailed bourgeois of Edinburgh” (Harman 56). Stevenson spent his life anxious that his profession was not as respectable or sustainable as others—specifically his family trade of lighthouse engineering. His family seemed to agree since his father, though encouraging his writing as a hobby, forced him to train as an engineer and then a lawyer. His parents had wealth, but Stevenson spent most of his life struggling to produce income. Although Stevenson respected the more stable professions, like those of his gentlemen bachelors, he never achieved that stability himself. Indeed, much like Jekyll, Stevenson continually struggled to reconcile his personal desires with his ideals. He was also deeply, if misguidedly, moral and, like Jekyll, punished himself for things no one else likely would have. He felt guilt for rejecting the religion of his parents and also for, what he considered, the indulgence of his writing career.

Stevenson also shows a greater ability for movement than is present among his gentlemen

elite as he traveled widely and often, predominately for his own health. His travel narratives like *An Inland Voyage* (1878) and *Travels with a Donkey in the Cévennes* (1879) depict him as adventurous and migratory, unlike the gentlemanly archetype Utterson and his peers ascribe to before Hyde's entrance. In *The Amateur Emigrant* (1895), Stevenson even explicitly uses his trip to America as an experiment in class mobility as he attempts to "pass" as someone from the working class travelling in steerage. Unlike the gentlemen and, notably, like Hyde, Stevenson himself did not consider physical borders to be stopping posts.

Indeed, Stevenson likely would have identified more with Hyde than the apparent heroes of his story. Like Hyde, he had a penchant for frequenting seedy neighborhoods. The Soho depicted in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is not unlike Stevenson's own haunts while in college where he drank alcohol, smoked opium, and befriended prostitutes. While Stevenson had access to good neighborhoods because of his family's wealth, he did not seem to have ever fit there. His understanding of the rigid class structure of this society is likely learned, in part, from himself being excluded from it, an exclusion that must have informed his creation of Hyde. Stevenson, a bohemian outsider among gentlemen, may have felt like Hyde as he hid in their midst.

Unlike Stevenson, Bram Stoker (1847-1912) would likely have fit in well with the men in his Crew of Light. He was a notoriously hard worker, physically strong, and conventionally masculine, but, like much of *Dracula*, this characterization is also complicated. Stoker's work ethic can be used as an example of this complication. He wrote creatively, worked full time as a civil servant (like his father), attended university (though sporadically), and wrote theater reviews multiple times a week before he ever even started his more famous theater work with Henry Irving. Given Stoker's defining work ethic, it is no surprise that his heroes are also hard workers. However, Stoker's choice to depict *Dracula* with this same work ethic forces a

realization that, if Stoker is like his heroes, he must also be like his villain.

Biographers have often attributed homosexual desire to Stoker because of the homosocial relationships that defined his personal life—far beyond the influence of his apparently frosty marriage. His ties to Hall Caine (the Hommy-Beg from *Dracula*'s dedication), Henry Irving, and Walt Whitman along with comparisons to Oscar Wilde, his contemporary if not friend, are often referenced as evidence of Stoker's own non-normative desire. Although this can only be speculation, it is worthy of note that *Dracula* is exactly the kind of monster who can make looser definitions of sexuality possible. If not sexual interest, it is at least clear that Stoker was deeply invested in these friendships much like the homosocial community in the Crew of Light, brought together by *Dracula*'s monstrous influence.

Although Stoker would likely have identified with the Crew of Light, it cannot be ignored how strongly those same men identify with the monster. He, too, would likely have benefitted from the bringing together of men and the questioning of gender norms that *Dracula* makes possible. Stoker, like the Crew of Light, seems to embody a simultaneous urge to defy norms and desire to reinstate them. His own desires are unclear, but the challenge to norms is apparent in his own, often feminine,¹⁷ perspective and his emotions, sometimes hysterical, at the theater. However, Stoker does not lean into this border crossing. Late in life, he became a vehement proponent of censorship¹⁸ and his unease about the New Woman would continue throughout his writing career, ending in *Lair of the White Worm* (1911), which is widely accepted as misogynistic. Perhaps the complicated implications of *Dracula*'s ending are rooted in Stoker's own confused relationship to issues concerning normative behavior.

¹⁷ In one of his letters to Whitman, "Stoker's description of himself as having 'a woman's eyes' is curious" and "suggests a strongly transgender perspective" (Skal 99)

¹⁸ Stoker's "The Censorship of Fiction" was published in 1908 and argued that "censorship must be continuous and rigid" (qtd. in Skal 465).

The implication here is not that either author intended to create a monster who was more relatable than their heroes. Neither likely venerated their own monster since both were moral, if not religious, men who strived to be well-liked by their contemporaries. Despite intent, however, both depict their monsters with a mobility that is complicated and complicating and, therefore, attractive. Because their personal lives reflect the complicated interrelations of class and gender that are evident in their monsters, both men likely identified with their monster instead of, or at least as well as, their heroes. This experience is, arguably, shared by readers.

To their original audience, the movement that these monstrous border crossings made possible was frightening. This is, however, an audience known to enjoy things that frighten them. Indeed, it is the essence of Gothic literature to amuse with terror. The fear these monsters invoke is, in part, one that is based in conservatism since the concern is that a monster will challenge or change the society he attacks. Perhaps the interest in these monsters, historical and abiding, is rooted in their liberating mobility. The same movement that frightens with its potential for change is welcome because it signals growth. Evident in *Dracula's* interest in the New Woman, the movement these Gothic monsters offer their victims is often indicative of the beginning of a new social order. The interest that the authors of these monsters share with their original and modern audiences is that they and we simultaneously both crave and fear movement and so are entranced by the mobility of the monster.

Works Cited

- Adams, Theresa. "The Strangely Mobile Mr. Hyde." *Victorians: A Journal of Culture and Literature* 129 (Spring 2016): 30-43. *Literature Resource Center*. Web. 08 Jan. 2018.
- Alder, Emily. "Dracula's Gothic Ship." *The Irish Journal of Gothic and Horror Studies*, vol. 15, no. 15, 2016, pp. 4-19. Web. 19. Mar. 2018.
- Arata, Stephen D. "The Occidental Tourist: Dracula and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 33, no. 4, 1990, pp. 621. Web. 24 Mar. 2018.
- Beauvais, Jennifer. "In the Company of Men: Masculinity Gone Wild in Robert Louis Stevenson's the Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde." *From Wollstonecraft to Stoker: Essays on Gothic and Victorian Sensation Fiction*. 172-192. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2009. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 08 Feb. 2018.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. *Taming Cannibals : Race and the Victorians*, Cornell University Press, 2011. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, Web. 23 Feb. 2018.
- Brock, Marilyn. "The Vamp and the Good English Mother: Female Roles in Le Fanu's *Carmilla* and Stoker's *Dracula*." *From Wollstonecraft to Stoker: Essays on Gothic and Victorian Sensation Fiction*. 120-131. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2009. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 23 Feb. 2018.
- Campbell, Charles. "Women and Sadism in Strange Case Of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde: "City In A Nightmare." *English Literature In Transition, 1880-1920* 57.3 (2014): 309-323. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 6 Feb. 2018.
- Cohen, Ed. "Hyding the Subject?: The Antinomies of Masculinity in the Strange Case Of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde." *Novel: A Forum On Fiction* 37.1/2 (2003): 181-199. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 18 Feb. 2018
- Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome, ed. *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996. Print.
- Conolly-Smith, Peter. "The Outsider Within: The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde." *The Image of the Outsider*. Ed. Will Wright and Steven Kaplan. Pueblo, CO: Colorado State University-Pueblo, 2008. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 20 Feb. 2018.
- Craft, Christopher. "'Kiss Me with those Red Lips': Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Representations*. 8.1 (1984): 107-133. Web. 19 Feb. 2018.
- Daly, Nicholas. *Modernism, Romance and the Fin De Siecle: Popular Fiction and British Culture, 1880-1914*. Cambridge University Press, 2000. Web. 15 Mar. 2018.
- Danahay, Martin. "Dr. Jekyll's Two Bodies." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 35.1 (2013): 23-40. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 20 Jan. 2018.

- Domínguez-Rue, Emma. "Sins Of The Flesh: Anorexia, Eroticism and the Female Vampire in Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Journal Of Gender Studies* 19.3 (2010): 297-308. *Academic Search Elite*. Web. 19 Feb. 2018.
- Dümling, Sebastian. "Killing Fear by Killing Time: Stoker's Dracula as an Epochal Conflict Narrative." *Narrative Culture*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2016, pp. 180.
- Ferguson, Christine. "Nonstandard Language and the Cultural Stakes of Stoker's Dracula." *Elh*, vol. 71, no. 1, 2004, pp. 229-249. Web. 15 Mar. 2018.
- Frank, Catherine O. "Privacy, Character, and the Jurisdiction of the Self: A "Story of the Door" in "The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.." *English Language Notes* 48.2 (2010): 215-224. *Academic Search Alumni Edition*. Web. 22 Jan. 2018.
- Frost, RJ. "'A Race of Devils': Frankenstein, Dracula, and Science Fiction." *Journal Of Dracula Studies* 5.1 (2003): 1-10. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 18 Feb. 2018.
- Gibson, Matthew. *Dracula and the Eastern Question*. Springer Nature, GB, 2006. Print.
- Graham, Elaine L. *Representations of the Post/Human: Monsters, Aliens and Others in Popular Culture*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2002. Print.
- Haefele-Thomas, Ardel. *Queer Others in Victorian Gothic : Transgressing Monstrosity*. University of Wales Press, 2012. ProQuest Ebook Central. Web. 25 Jan. 2018
- Harman, Claire. *Myself and the Other Fellow: A Life of Robert Louis Stevenson*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2005. Print.
- Horowitz, Evan. "Literary Invisibility." *New Literary History: A Journal Of Theory And Interpretation* 45.3 (2014): 463-482. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 21 Feb. 2018.
- Ingebretsen, E. J. *At Stake: Monsters & The Rhetoric Of Fear In Public Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 2001. Print.
- Joyce, Simon. *Capital Offenses: Geographies of Class and Crime in Victorian London*. University of Virginia Press, 2003. Charlottesville. Print.
- Kearney, Richard. *Strangers, Gods, and Monsters: Interpreting Otherness*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Kwan-Wai Yu, Eric. "Productive Fear: Labor, Sexuality, and Mimicry in Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Texas Studies In Literature & Language* 48.2 (2006): 145-170. *Academic Search Elite*. Web. 22 Feb. 2018.

- Lancaster, Ashley Craig. "Demonizing the Emerging Women: Misrepresented Morality in Dracula and God's Little Acres." *Journal Of Dracula Studies* 6.1 (2004): 27-33. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 22 Feb. 2018.
- Leatherdale, Clive. *Dracula: The Novel and the Legend*. Westcliff-on-Sea: Desert Island Books, 1993. Print.
- Light, Duncan. "Imaginative Geographies, Dracula and the Transylvania 'Place Myth'." *Human Geographies: Journal of Studies and Research in Human Geography*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2008, pp. 6-17. Web. 19 Mar. 2018.
- . "The People of Bram Stoker's Transylvania." *Journal of Dracula Studies*, vol. 7, 2005, pp. 38. Web. 29 Mar. 2018.
- Martin, Daniel. "'Some Trick of the Moonlight': Seduction and the Moving Image in Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 40, no. 2, 2012, pp. 523. Web. 21 Mar. 2018.
- McKee, Patricia. "Racialization, Capitalism, and Aesthetics in Stoker's Dracula." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2002, pp. 42-60. Web. 22 Mar. 2018.
- Mewald, Katharina. "The Emancipation of Mina? Portrayal of Mina in Stoker's Dracula and Coppola's Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Journal Of Dracula Studies* 10.1(2008): 31-39. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 22 Feb. 2018.
- Moretti, Franco. "The Dialectic of Fear." *New Left Review*, no. 136, 1982, pp. 67.
- Nead, Lynda. *Victorian Babylon: People, Streets, and Images in Nineteenth-Century London*. Yale University Press, 2000. New Haven, Connecticut./London. Print.
- Parlour, Susan. "Vixens and Virgins in the Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Irish Novel: Representations of the Feminine in Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Journal Of Dracula Studies* 11.1 (2009): 61-80. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 20 Feb. 2018.
- Pikula, Tanya. "Bram Stoker's 'Dracula' and Late-Victorian Advertising Tactics: Earnest Men, Virtuous Ladies, and Porn." *English Literature In Transition, 1880-1920* 55.3 (2012): 283-302. *Academic Search Elite*. Web. 20 Feb. 2018.
- Rago, Jane V. "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: A 'Men's Narrative' of Hysteria and Containment." *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries*. 275-285. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 22 Feb. 2018.
- Rance, Nicholas. "'Jonathan's Great Knife': Dracula Meets Jack the Ripper." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 30, no. 2, 2002, pp. 439-453. Web. 22 Mar. 2018.

- Sanna, Antonio. "Silent Homosexuality in Oscar Wilde's *Teleny* And The Picture of Dorian Gray and Robert Louis Stevenson's *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*." *Law And Literature* 24.1 (2012): 21-39. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 29 Nov. 2015.
- Schneider, Christina. "Monstrosity in the English Gothic Novel." *Victorian* 3.1 (2015): 1-11. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 20 Feb. 2018.
- Skal, David J. *Something in the Blood: The Untold Story of Bram Stoker, the Man Who Wrote Dracula*. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2016. Print.
- Stevenson, John Allen. "A Vampire in the Mirror: The Sexuality of Dracula." *PMLA*. 103.2 (1988): 139-149. Web. 20 Feb. 2018.
- Stevenson, Robert Louis. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc., 2005. Print.
- Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 2003. Print.
- Tchaprazov, Stoyan. "The Slovaks and Gypsies of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*: Vampires in Human Flesh." *English Literature in Transition (1880-1920)*, vol. 58, no. 4, 2015, pp. 523
- Waterhouse, Ruth. "Beowulf as Palimpsest." *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen. University of Minnesota Press, 1996. Print.
- Williams, M. Kellen. "'Down with the Door, Poole!': Designating Deviance in Stevenson's Strange Case of *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*." *English Literature In Transition, 1880-1920* 39.4 (1996): 412-429. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 26 Nov. 2015.