Georgia State University
ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

English Theses | Department of English

4-29-2010

The Presence of Jacques Lacan's Mirror Stage and Gaze in Robert Louis Stevenson's Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and in Rouben Mamoulian's 1931 Film

Enoch Shane Smith
Georgia State University, esmith35@student.gsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/english_theses

Recommended Citation
Smith, Enoch Shane, "The Presence of Jacques Lacan's Mirror Stage and Gaze in Robert Louis Stevenson's Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and in Rouben Mamoulian's 1931 Film" (2010). *English Theses*. Paper 75.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of English at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

THE PRESENCE OF JACQUES LACAN'S MIRROR STAGE AND GAZE IN ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON'S *STRANGE CASE OF DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE* AND IN ROUBEN MAMOULIAN'S 1931 FILM.

by

ENOCH SHANE SMITH

Under the Direction of Calvin Thomas

ABSTRACT

For many years, theorists have turned to popular movies and books to help interpret the difficult principles of Jacques Lacan. However, one story that has gotten very little attention is Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and its derivative body of film adaptations. Both the novella and Rouben Mamoulian's 1931 film are a small part of an intertextual body of work which contains scenes that play out the Lacanian principles of the mirror stage and the gaze very well. Since art imitates life, an in depth exploration of the way that these scenes play out can illuminate how Lacan's abstract theories might look in the real life formation of identity and in male/female relations.

INDEX WORDS: Robert Louis Stevenson, Jacques Lacan, Rouben Mamoulian, *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* – Novel, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* – 1931 Film, Mirror Stage, Gaze, Adaptation

THE PRESENCE OF JACQUES LACAN'S MIRROR STAGE AND GAZE IN ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON'S *STRANGE CASE OF DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE* AND IN ROUBEN MAMOULIAN'S 1931 FILM

by

ENOCH SHANE SMITH

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

In the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2010

Copyright by

Enoch Shane Smith

2010

THE PRESENCE OF JACQUES LACAN'S MIRROR STAGE AND GAZE IN ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON'S *STRANGE CASE OF DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE* AND IN ROUBEN MAMOULIAN'S 1931 FILM

By

ENOCH SHANE SMITH

Committee Chair: Calvin Thomas

Committee: Paul Schmidt

Jack Boozer

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

May 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank those who have helped or inspired me during the writing of this thesis. I'd like to acknowledge Calvin Thomas, who has chaired this committee and given me direction on which of the many texts written by Jacques Lacan would be the most beneficial for my purposes. Dr. Thomas also recommended the secondary texts that I used in this thesis. I would also like to acknowledge and thank Jack Boozer, who has guided me in the film adaptation portion of this paper. I would also like to acknowledge and thank Paul Schmidt for coming on board and being my third reader. His instruction in my ENG 8000 class was crucial for getting me started in my outside research on this project.

This project would never have gotten off the ground in the first place if it hadn't been for the guidance of Murray Brown, who taught my ENG 8001 class and helped me to put together my initial proposal. Other teachers in the GSU English department who may have forgotten me by now, but who played a part in the formation of this paper include Chris Kocela, who introduced me to Lacan in his ENG 8070 class, and Michael Galchinsky, who helped me to study Robert Louis Stevenson in his ENG 8650 class.

Outside of GSU, I'd like to thank the faculty and staff of the departments of English and Film at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, especially film department chair Francisco Menendez, for preparing me for graduate school. I would also like to thank the faculty and staff of the Dodge College of Film and Media Arts at Chapman University for giving me such a strong background in film studies. From Chapman I would especially like to thank Tony Alosi, who assigned me to write an adaptation proposal, which I chose to do on *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. That little assignment in the fall of 2005 was the conception of what would turn into this massive academic project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Robert Louis Stevenson Composes a Masterpiece 1

1.2 Freudian Readings of *Jekyll and Hyde* 3

1.3 Where is Jacques Lacan in These Discussions? 4

1.4 The Purpose of My Thesis 5

2. WHY STUDY THE BOOK *AND* THE FILMS? 7

2.1 Each New Generation Has Always Adapted Canonical Stories 7

2.2 A Very Brief History of *Jekyll and Hyde* Adaptations 7

2.3 Intertextuality 11

2.4 From Bakhtin to Adaptation Studies 12

2.5 The State of Adaptation Studies Today 13

3. LACAN'S MIRROR STAGE 16

3.1 Why Start with the Mirror Stage? 16

3.2 What is the Mirror Stage? 17

3.3 The Mirror Stage in the Novella 19

3.4 The Mirror Stage in the 1931 Film 23

3.5 Mirror Stage Conclusions 28

4. THE GAZE 30

4.1 Lacan's Concept of the Gaze 30

4.2 The Gaze in the Novella 32

4.3 The Gaze in Past Film Studies 36

4.4 The Gaze in the 1931 Film 42

5. CONCLUSIONS 46

Works Cited 49

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Robert Louis Stevenson Composes a Masterpiece

Robert Louis Stevenson was a struggling writer with "bankruptcy at [his] heels" (Letter "To His Wife") when he published *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* in January, 1886[1]. The novella was the culmination of a lifetime of works in which Stevenson "had long been trying to write a story on […] that strong sense of man's double being" ("Chapter on Dreams," 136).

As early as 1864, Stevenson began composing his play, *Deacon Brodie or the Double Life*. Inspired by the real-life William "Deacon" Brodie, respected cabinet maker and Edinburgh city councilman by day, notorious thief by night, the play finally went into production in December of 1882. It was a spectacular failure in its initial, and only, production. Stevenson followed that up by writing a book that he had titled *The Travelling Companion*. Stevenson says that the book "was returned by an editor on the plea that it was a work of genius, and indecent, and which I burned the other day on the ground that it was not a work of genius, and that *Jekyll* had supplanted it" (Dreams, 137). Stevenson also published a short story, "Markheim," in December of 1885 to satisfy his yearly Christmas ghost story obligation to a magazine. Strangely reminiscent of Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*, "Markheim" is a story about a man torn between his good and evil sides after he kills a pawnshop owner. After Markheim engages in a debate with a man, whom he assumes to be the Devil, over the dual good and evil natures of man, he comes to realize that he has completely turned his life over to his inner dark side.

That Stevenson was obsessed with the dual nature of man's psyche should come as no surprise to those who know Stevenson's history. As a child, he had a chest in his bedroom that

[1] Note the lack of the definite article, "The," at the beginning of the title. Richard Dury, in writing about the strange use of language in Stevenson's novella, says that "The slight strangeness that makes the reader linguistically-aware starts with the title of the work, where we feel an initial definite article would be more normal" ("Strange language," 34). If I put the definite article at the beginning of the title when quoting other scholars, it is because the scholar that I am quoting has put it there, not because that's the way that Stevenson had intended it.

had been made by Deacon Brodie. Stevenson's nanny regaled him with tales of Brodie's double life throughout his childhood, which would, of course, be the inspiration for Stevenson's play.

As an adult, Stevenson was an avid reader, and several critics have suggested that much of what he read might have been books about human psychology and behavior. In his essay, "Books Which Have Influenced Me," Stevenson specifically identifies Herbert Spencer as a direct influence on his writing, saying, "I should be much of a hound if I lost my gratitude to Herbert Spencer" (113). Christine Persak uses Stevenson's essay to explore "The connection between Hyde's primitivism and Spencer's theory of evolution" (13). She makes several connections, but admits that "There is, however, a contrast between the 'ending' of Spenceer's theoretical narrative and that of Stevenson's famous tale about 'the primitive duality of man' […] which indicates that Stevenson's embrace of evolutionary theory was indeed tentative" (14).

Other critics have also tried to make connections between other writers that Stevenson *might* have read and *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Mary Rosner parallels Stevenson's novella with James Pritchard's theories of moral insanity, which comes from Pritchard's 1835 publication of *Treatise on Insanity*. But while she makes a convincing case that Stevenson was aware of the moral insanity issue, she stops short of linking the novella directly with Pritchard's work. Based on Fanny Stevenson's assertion that her husband was heavily influenced by French publications of psychiatric case studies, Richard Dury tries to find specific links to the novella and known case studies, but he confesses that "Judging by the evidence the most credible conclusion is that such an article simply does not exist" ("Crossing the Bounds" 237). But regardless of whether there's evidence to prove any specific connections or not, the plethora of articles that try to make those connections suggests that it is not unreasonable to

believe that Stevenson may have been influenced at least a little by the scientific writings of his day.

1.2 Freudian Readings of *Jekyll and Hyde*

Over 120 years after its initial publication, the *Jekyll and Hyde* "culture text" still strikes a chord with readers and movie goers worldwide[2]. Kamilla Elliott points out that "*The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *Dracula* vie with Dickens's *A Christmas Carol* and *Oliver Twist* for the most adaptations of a single work" (126). Therefore, one of the questions that must be raised is why Stevenson's story is so universal that it must be told over and over again.

There are many possible answers to that question. I believe that one of them could be the Freudian aspects of the text. For example, the term "Jekyll and Hyde personality" is very common in modern day parlance to refer to a person whose behavior can be radically different under certain conditions. The differing parts of a person's personality struggling for dominance plays into Freud's concepts of the ego, id, and superego. As long as there is a balance between the three, then a person is healthy. However, when one part of a person's personality is too dominant, neurosis can occur. Drives, which is a very Freudian, as well as Lacanian concept, influence Henry Jekyll's and Edward Hyde's behavior throughout the narrative. One could also say that the characters' drives literally "drive" the action of the narrative.

The relevance of Freud to the interpretations of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is apparent in the plethora of Freudian scholarship that's been written about the story. Good examples of scholarship

[2] Brian Rose used *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* as a demonstration of his concepts of "tracer text," "group text," and "culture text." In a nutshell, the "tracer text" is the original text, the "group text" is a body of adaptations confined to within a specific time period, and the "culture text" is the entire body of a work and its adaptations. A culture text is broken up into group texts based on the social concerns and attitudes that are reflected in the group of adaptations for that time period. For a more in-depth explanation and how it applies to *Jekyll and Hyde*, see Rose's book, *Jekyll and Hyde Adapted: Dramatizations of Cultural Anxiety*, cited in the works cited page of this thesis.

which address the fracturing of Jekyll's personality, and the problems that it causes in the formation of his identity include William Veeder's "Children of the Night," Cyndy Hendershot's "Overdetermined Allegory in *Jekyll and Hyde*," and Judy Cornes's *Madness and the Loss of Identity in Nineteenth Century Fiction*[3]. Of the many articles that address drives in *Jekyll and Hyde*, I find some of the most interesting ones the articles that examine the Victorian struggle with reconciling human physiological drives with a moral code. Two noteworthy articles along this vein include two articles which I have mentioned above, Mary Rosner's "'A Total Subversion of Character': Dr. Jekyll's Moral Insanity" and Christine Persak's "Spencer's Doctrines and Mr. Hyde: Moral Evolution in Stevenson's 'Strange Case.'"

1.3 Where is Jacques Lacan in These Discussions?

Despite Jacques Lacan's immense influence on psychoanalytic theory, I have been surprised to discover that no scholar has published an in-depth analysis of Lacanian principles in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* or its derivative works. In the rare case that an article or book does address both *Jekyll and Hyde* and Lacan, there is very little in-depth analysis.

Dylan Evans states that "The whole of Lacan's work can only be understood within the context of the intellectual and theoretical legacy of Sigmund Freud" (67). In speaking of Lacan's break from the organization that Freud founded, the International Psycho-analytical Association (IPA), Evans says that "Lacan proposed to lead a 'return to Freud,' both in the sense of a renewed attention to the actual texts of Freud himself, and a return to the essence of Freud's work which had been betrayed by the IPA" (68). If Lacan's work was so invested in Freud's

[3] I also want to mention John A. Sanford's excellent book *Evil: The Shadow Side of Reality*. While this is technically a Jungian reading of the story, it is noteworthy, not only because it is cited frequently, but also because Jung started off his career as Freud's student, and Sanford does make references to Freud's ego, id, and superego throughout the book.

work, then it would seem logical to me that an analysis of Lacanian principles in any work of literature would be just as appropriate as an analysis of Freudian ones.

On the other side of the coin, critics who have performed Lacanian readings of literary and filmic texts have neglected to include *Jekyll and Hyde*[4] in any of those discussions. Slavoj Zizek, for example, has done volumes of work on applying Lacanian principles to books and movies. In *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan through Popular Culture*, Zizek analyses how nearly every significant film of the last 80 years demonstrates Lacanian principles. However, of the over seventy movies and fifty books that Zizek analyzes in *Looking Awry*, he doesn't mention Stevenson's novella or any of its cinematic adaptations at all.

1.4 The Purpose of My Thesis

In this thesis, I would like to do an analysis of how Robert Louis Stevenson's novella, *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and its most highly regarded cinematic adaptation, the 1931 film directed by Rouben Mamoulian and starring Fredric March, provides an intertextual body of work that when closely examined can provide useful insight into Lacan's principles of the mirror stage and the gaze. While some discussion of the spectator experience is inevitable when discussing the film, my main focus in this thesis is going to be on the texts of the novella and film, and not on spectator experience. Todd McGowan and Sheila Kunkle discuss the rise and fall of Lacanian psychoanalysis in film studies in the introduction of their collection, *Lacan and Contemporary Film* (2004). They write that in the 1960s and 70s:

> Lacan—or at least a certain understanding of Lacan—provided film studies with a way of making sense of film's appeal. Specifically, Lacan's insights into the

[4] Throughout the rest of this paper *Jekyll and Hyde* will indicate the entire body of work that comprises of Stevenson's novella and its derivative works. If I include the titles *Dr.* and *Mr.,* then I am referring to either the novella or the film.

> process of identification allowed film theorists to see why film was so effective in involving spectators in its narrative. As a result, Lacanian psychoanalysis became *the* approach within film studies. (xi-xii, emphasis theirs)

However, I want to mention that I agree with McGowan and Kunkle's assertion that "Though Lacanian theory set the terms of debate within film studies, it did so very narrowly, and this narrowness eventually resulted in its evanescence. At an increasing rate over the last ten years, Lacanian psychoanalysis has disappeared from film studies" (xii).

In focusing on the texts in this thesis, rather than the spectator experience, I hope to carry on McGowan and Kunkle's theory that the interpretation of a work can be done without having to continuously justify the effect that the work has on the spectator. McGowan and Kunkle found their justification for interpreting a text, even though no text has a definitive meaning, in Lacan's own words. In Seminar XI Lacan says:

> it is false to say, as has been said, that interpretation is open to all meanings under the pretext that it is a question only of the connection of a signifier to a signifier, and consequently of an uncontrollable connection. Interpretation is not open to any meaning. […] The fact that I have said that the effect of interpretation is to isolate in the subject a kernel, a *kern*, to use Freud's own term, of *non-sense*, does not mean that interpretation is in itself nonsense. (249-50, emphasis Lacan's)

With that kind of endorsement from Lacan himself, I now move forward to try and interpret the *Jekyll and Hyde* text using Lacan's own principles.

2. WHY STUDY THE BOOKS *AND* THE FILMS?

2.1 Each New Generation Has Always Adapted Canonical Stories

As far back as 350 B.C., Aristotle recognized the importance of adapting old stories for new audiences. In *Poetics* he wrote, "Stories, even ones which have been the subject of a previous poem, should first be set out in universal terms when one is making use of them oneself" (28). With all of the different media available to story tellers today, any story can be reused in any variety of formats. Newspaper articles are often turned into books. Books can be adapted into stage plays, radio programs, feature films, or television programs. It is not unusual for a filmmaker to adapt an old film into a new one. If Aristotle's advice seemed apropos 2300 years ago, then it seems to me that it is even more so now.

2.2 A Very Brief History of *Jekyll and Hyde* Adaptations[5]

Due to its enormous popularity, derivative works of *Jekyll and Hyde* began to appear almost before the ink on the books' pages was dry. The book was first published in January of 1886, and according to Brian Rose, the first stage adaptation was "a burlesque entitled *The Strange Case of a Hyde and Seekyll* and produced at L.C. Toole's Theatre in London on May 18, 1886"(42). This burlesque was only the first of many stage adaptations.

The most well known stage adaptation was the 1887 version. It was based on a script written by Thomas Sullivan and starred Richard Mansfield in the dual role of Jekyll and Hyde. This version introduced a fiancé named Agnes into the story and, unlike the novella, it featured

[5] By very brief history, I mean a *very* brief history. A quick look at the Internet Movie Data Base (IMDB) reveals that there have been no less than 125 movie and television versions either made or in the works from the silent version of 1908 to a version currently in pre-production based on a script written by Justin Haythe (*Revolutionary Road*) and starring Keanu Reeves. For more details on specific adaptations, see *The Definitive Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde Companion* by Harry M. Geduld (1983) and "*Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde:* A Filmography" by Charles King (1997). For an in-depth study of versions dating from Richard Sullivan's 1887 stage play to 1995, see *Jekyll and Hyde Adapted: Dramatizations of Cultural Anxiety* by Brian A. Rose (1996).

Mansfield making the transformation from Jekyll to Hyde "coram publico"[6] (Letter "To Thomas Russell Sullivan"). These two conventions that were introduced in Sullivan's play are important to note, because they have appeared in every significant adaptation of the Jekyll and Hyde story since. Mansfield's play is also significant, because it is the only play that Robert Louis Stevenson is known to have endorsed. Stevenson wrote in a letter to Sullivan:

> I am not in the least struck by the liberties you have taken; on the contrary, had I tried to make a play of it, I should have been driven to take more: I should have had *Jekyll married;* […] I should imagine your actor *may* carry you (and me) on his back. (Letter "To Thomas Russell Sullivan," emphasis Stevenson's)

Stevenson's letter demonstrates that he knew that once his work started to be adapted to other media, the adaptors would take liberties with his story. It also shows that if the changes served his story's needs well, then he would endorse them.

The earliest known film version of *Jekyll and Hyde* was released in 1908 by the now non-existent Polyscope Company. Directed by Otis Turner and starring Hobart Bosworth, no copies of the 16 minute film are known to have survived. Since most silent films were only one or two reels, most early silent versions of the story tended to concentrate only on Jekyll's transformation after drinking the potion.

The most significant version of the silent era is the 1920 one directed by John S. Robertson and starring John Barrymore in the lead role. This version was released by Famous Players-Lasky in direct competition with Pioneer's film starring Sheldon Lewis[7]. The Famous Players version won the competition in both box office and critical success, and has since been

---

[6] This Latin phrase translates into "before the eyes of the public".

[7] There is some dispute over who the director of the Pioneer film since it was never issued a director credit. While most people are certain that the film was directed by Charles Hayden, British director George Edwardes Hall has also been recommended as a likely candidate.

recognized as a better and more enduring film. However, the Pioneer version still gets some attention by scholars and film buffs today.

By the 1930s, sound films had supplanted silent films permanently. By this time, the running times of films were also much longer, allowing for more character and plot development in a movie.

On December 31, 1931, Paramount premiered its version of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* in Los Angeles.[8] This film was directed by Rouben Mamoulian and starred a young Frederic March in the dual lead role. Of all of the film versions of *Jekyll and Hyde*, this version has withstood the test of time the best. Charles King has even gone so far as to assert that this film is "Usually regarded as the best version." The film was a huge critical success during its time. Frederic March's performance was so strong that it earned him the Best Actor Oscar at the 1932 awards. This version is also important, because it became the touchstone for all future film adaptations of the story.

The most well known version after 1931 is the 1941 version released by MGM, directed by Victor Fleming, and starring Spenser Tracy. MGM was so determined to release a version of *Jekyll and Hyde* that they purchased the story rights from Paramount. When MGM shot the film, they used Paramount's script as their guide rather than the novella. According to Scott Allen Nollen, "To ensure its investment MGM purchased the rights to Paramount's masterpiece and exiled it to the depths of a film vault for the next three decades" (199). The result is that the 1941 film version can be considered more of a remake of the 1931 version than an adaptation of Stevenson's novella. Despite all of the obvious similarities, however, the 1941 film was not the box office or critical success that the 1931 version was.

---

[8] Some people mistakenly believe that the film premiered on January 2, 1932. This is because Jan. 2 is the date of the New York City premiere. However, since the L.A. premiere was on the last day of 1931, then technically, this version of the film premiered in 1931.

Although there have been numerous cinematic, television, stage, and radio adaptations of *Jekyll and Hyde* since 1941, very few of the close adaptations have been noteworthy. The most noteworthy adaptations have been variations on the Jekyll and Hyde theme. There have been comic takes on the theme, such as the various versions of *The Nutty Professor* (1963, 1996). There have been versions that deal with gender change, such as *Dr. Jekyll and Sister Hyde* (1971), or cross-dressing, such as *Mrs. Doubtfire* (1993). There have been films based on true stories, such as *Sybil* (1976) or *The Three Faces of Eve* (1957). Although these films don't directly adapt Stevenson's novella, they still address the duality (or in the case of *Sybil*, the thirteen different personas) of a single human. There have also been books and films that tell the *Jekyll and Hyde* story from the point of view of an outside observer. A notable recent example of this would be *Mary Reilly* (1996) based on Valarie Martin's book (1990), told from the point of view of one of Jekyll's servants and adapted into a movie starring Julia Roberts and John Malkovich.

In the interests of keeping the scope of my study narrow enough to fit into this paper, I'm only going to focus on the most highly regarded film version: the 1931 March version. I have chosen the 1931 film version for three reasons. First, I believe that, of the over 125 adaptations of the story, it is the most representative one in relation to Jacques Lacan's principles. Second, there is already a lot of scholarship on the 1931 version. That's not to say that there is no scholarship on the others, but most of the scholarship on other films compares them (often unfavorably) to the 1931 version[9]. Third, I wanted to keep my focus narrowed onto the closest adaptation that exists. While there is value in studying looser adaptations, I have chosen not to

[9] See Charles King's quote above. A more direct example of a film to film comparison would be Nollen's assertion that MGM's 1941 remake is "a pretentious, overlong, and dramatically bankrupt imitation" (199) of the 1931 film.

do so, because I want to explore how the intertextuality of the Stevenson novella and its closer faithful adaptations address Lacanian principles.

2.3 Intertextuality

According to Andrew Horton and Stuart McDougal, Julia Kristeva "introduced the notion of *intertextuality*, a term to designate the ways in which any text is a skein of other texts" (3, emphasis Horton/McDougal's) into the scholarly discussion of Mikhail Bakhtin. While Bakhtin didn't address the concept of cinematic adaptation directly, in "Discourse in the Novel," he did discuss a concept that he called "re-accentuation," (419) which is similar to adaptation. In a nutshell, re-accentuation is language's distortion of a narrative to fit the audience that is receiving it.[10] The transmogrification can either occur while the author is adapting the narrative, or it can occur when audiences of a different place or time interpret the work differently from the way that its intended audience was supposed to. According to Bakhtin, re-accentuation is an ongoing process. He writes, "Within certain limits, re-accentuation is unavoidable, legitimate, and even productive" (420). But he warns:

> [T]hese limits may be easily crossed when a work is distant from us and when we begin to perceive it against a background completely foreign to it. Perceived in such a way, it may be subjected to a re-accentuation that radically distorts it. Such has been the fate of many novels from previous eras. (420)

Bakhtin then goes on to say that "The process of re-accentuation is enormously significant in the history of literature. Every age re-accentuates in its own way the works of the immediate past"

[10] This is a gross oversimplification of Bakhtin's concept of re-accentuation. But Bakhtin's concept is very complex, and to give it its full due diligence would be another paper in and of itself. I want to concentrate only on what is applicable to my study.

(420-1). This re-accentuation of works from our immediate past plays a very important role in adaptation studies.

2.4 From Bakhtin to Adaptation Studies

In his 1957 ground-breaking book, *Novels into Film*, George Bluestone, most likely without even knowing it, takes up Bakhtin's cause for the study of re-accentuation.[11] The main thesis of Bluestone's book is that "there is no necessary correspondence between the excellence of a novel and the quality of the film in which the novel is recorded. […] In short, the filmed novel, in spite of certain resemblances, will inevitably become a different artistic entity from the novel on which it is based" (63-4).

The Bakhtinian applications of re-accentuation apply when Bluestone writes, "Like two intersecting lines, novel and film meet at a point, then diverge. At the intersection, the book and the shooting-script are almost indistinguishable. But where the lines diverge, they not only resist conversion; they also lose all resemblance to each other" (63). Bluestone also takes re-accentuation/adaptation a step further than Bakhtin does, because of the different nature of the film media versus the print media. Bluestone writes, "what is peculiarly filmic and what is peculiarly novelistic cannot be converted without destroying an integral part of each. That is why Proust and Joyce would seem as absurd on film as Chaplin would in print" (63).

[11] I say most likely without knowing it, even though there is no way to know for certain whether or not Bluestone had ever had any exposure to Bakhtin prior to 1957. I came to my conclusion for two reasons. First, he never quotes Bakhtin directly. Second, it's unlikely that Bluestone was influenced by Bakhtin, because Bakhtin's work was largely unknown in the U.S. until the 1960s.

2.5 The State of Adaptation Studies Today

Bluestone's book launched an academic discipline that is now referred to as adaptation studies. For many years, this new field concentrated mostly on comparisons of a film to the book that it was adapted from. This form of comparison has been labeled "fidelity studies." This strict comparison of a movie to its source book is not something that should be completely ignored. As David Kranz and Nancy Mellerski point out:

> [T]here's both big money and psychological satisfaction in film adaptation, and fidelity is no small part of the equation. […] we think it safe to say that the majority of filmgoers nationwide and perhaps worldwide, when they know a film is an adaptation, will compare it to its source and find it at least partly wanting if it lacks a good measure of fidelity. (2)

But in the world of academia, fidelity studies got stale very quickly. Rochelle Hurst gives a laundry list of reasons why theorists want to get away from focusing on the fidelity of a book to a movie:

> [F]idelity is frequently and primarily dismissed as 'literally impossible' given the movement between media and the differing conventions of each. […] the notion of a faithful filmic rendition of a novel is also perceived as innately problematic given that every adaptation is but one of many possible interpretations of a source text, […] Underlying the insistence of fidelity, furthermore, is the 'mistaken assumption' that fidelity is the singular aim of the adaptation process […] fidelity [is] problematic in that it artificially inheres a hierarchy. Fidelity-based assessment unfairly positions the film as inevitably inferior to the novel. (173-4)

With all of the problems that a strict look at a film's fidelity to a book causes, then the obvious question becomes what *should* adaptation studies focus on? There is no easy answer to this question. Every significant theorist in the field has published an essay or book trying to answer that question, and the answers that they provide are as varied as the people writing them. For example, the aforementioned Hurst posits that the best way to look at adaptation is through Derrida's concept of "undecidables" (cited by Hurst on page 186), which "disrupts and disturbs binary oppositions, exposing them as problematic and flawed" (186).

Today, the discipline is divided into two main camps. The first is a sociological camp. Dudley Andrew has announced that "It is time for adaptation studies to take a sociological turn" (35). James Naremore expands on Andrew's ultimatum by saying, "I would suggest what we need instead is a broader definition of adaptation and a sociology that takes into account the commercial apparatus, the audience, and the academic culture history" (10). Simone Murray also strongly advocates the sociological approach. She writes, "I am contending that adaptation studies urgently needs to divert its intellectual resources from a questionable project of aesthetic evaluation, and instead begin to understand adaptation sociologically" (10).

The other camp consists of scholars who want to focus on intertextual readings of adaptations. For example, Thomas Leitch proposes that adaptation studies as a discipline is stuck in a rut, because many adaptation theorists have privileged books over films. But, as Leitch points out, "the primary lesson" (12) of film adaptation studies should be "that texts remain alive only to the extent that they can be rewritten and that to experience a text in all its power requires each reader to rewrite it" (12-3). Leitch's solution: "To revitalize adaptation study, we need to reframe the assumption that even the most cursory consideration of the problem forces on us—source texts cannot be rewritten—as a new assumption: source texts

must be rewritten; we cannot help rewriting them" (16). Linda Hutcheon furthers this idea by writing that audiences gain pleasure from "repetition with variation, from the comfort of ritual combined with the piquancy of surprise" (4). She proposes that "If we ask what kind of 'work' adaptations do as they circulate stories among media and around the world, indigenizing them anew each time, we may find ourselves agreeing that narrative is indeed some kind of human universal" (175). Therefore, "adaptation is the norm, not the exception" (177).

To me, the most compelling argument for an intertextual approach to adaptation studies comes from Robert Stam. In his introduction to the anthology *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*, he writes, "Many of Bakhtin's conceptual categories, although developed in relation to the novel, are equally germane to film and to adaptation" (26). Stam concludes his introduction by stating:

> By adopting an intertextual as opposed to a judgmental approach rooted in assumptions about a putative superiority of literature, we have not abandoned all notions of judgment and evaluation. But our discussion will be less moralistic, less implicated in unacknowledged hierarchies. We can still speak of successful or unsuccessful adaptations, but this time oriented not by inchoate notions of "fidelity" but rather by attention to "transfers of creative energy," or to specific dialogical responses, to "readings" and "critiques and "interpretations" and "rewritings" of source novels, in analyses, which always take into account the gaps between very different media and materials of expression. (46)

Is one of the camps right and the other wrong? Kranz and Mellerski don't think so. They suggest that "a plurality of critical approaches (rather than the infinity of perspectives promoted by relativistic post-structuralism or the reductive and evaluative approach represented by near-

absolute fidelity criticism) will allow adaptation studies to thrive in the future" (5). While there may be value in both approaches, it should be clear by now which camp I'm going to be aligning myself with in this study. I will be foregrounding my study in the Bakhtinian idea that stories must be told over and over again to survive, and that each new generation retells iconic stories in a way that serves its purposes best. In other words, as I explore the evolution of *Jekyll and Hyde* from 1886 to 1931 and what it means to us today, I will be taking an intertextual approach to my analysis of the story and its evolution over time.

3 LACAN'S MIRROR STAGE

3.1 Why Start with the Mirror Stage?

The first reason to start with the mirror stage is that chronologically, it was the first concept that Lacan introduced to the world. He first spoke of it at a conference in Marienbad, Czechoslovakia in 1936. Although that paper was never published, he delivered a similar paper at the Sixteenth International Congress of Psychoanalysis in Zurich on July 17, 1949, which has been published as "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the I Function as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience" in Lacan's *Ecrits*. Ever since the 1936 conference, "the mirror stage forms a constant point of reference throughout Lacan's entire work" (Evans, 114).

The second reason to start with the mirror stage is that mirrors appear often throughout the novella and the film. In both cases, the first thing that Hyde does when he is released from within is look in a mirror. Just as the mirror stage is an early step in childhood development, so too is the mirror an early stage in Hyde's development as a being free from Jekyll's constraints. Therefore, the mirror stage seems like a logical place to start.

3.2 What is the Mirror Stage?

The mirror stage is a very early step in a child's development of its own identity. According to Lacan, the stage begins when the child is six months old. Lacan writes, "It suffices to understand the mirror stage […] *as an identification* […] namely the transformation that takes place in the subject when he assumes [assume] an image" (*Ecrits*,76, italics Lacan's).

The stage starts when the human child first recognizes its own image in a mirror. At this point in the child's life, it is helpless, relying exclusively on its caretaker for everything. The child also doesn't have full control over its motor skills. While the child can't always exercise control over its own body, it quickly realizes that by making whatever motions it can, it can exercise a sort of control over the image in the mirror, which gives it great pleasure.

Another important factor in the mirror image is that prior to it, the child only recognizes itself in parts, (hands, toes, etc). However, all of that changes in the mirror stage. As Sean Homer points out:

> While the infant still feels his/her body to be in parts, as fragmented and not yet unified, it is the image that provides him/her with a sense of unification and wholeness. The mirror image, therefore, anticipates the mastery of the infant's own body, and stands in contrast to the feelings of fragmentation the infant experiences. What is important at this point is that the infant *identifies* with this mirror image. The image is him/herself. This identification is crucial, as without it—and without the anticipation of mastery that it establishes—the infant would never get to the stage of perceiving him/herself as a complete or whole being. (25, italics Homer's)

But that is not the end of the story. While the mirror stage helps the child to develop a sense of identity in a narcissistic way, it also has an alienating effect. In Lacan's words:

> The mirror stage is a drama whose internal pressures pushes precipitously from insufficiency to anticipation—and for the subject caught up in the lure of spatial identification, turns out fantasies that proceed from a fragmented image of the body to what I will call an "orthopedic" form of its totality—and to the finally donned armor of an alienating identity. (*Ecrits*, 78)

In other words, although the child starts to identify itself as a complete being during the mirror stage, it also starts to feel a sense of hostility towards the image that's representing itself. Sean Homer writes that "from the moment the image of unity is posited in opposition to the experience of fragmentation, the subject is established as a rival to itself" (26). Homer then takes it a step further by saying, "The same rivalry established between the subject and him/herself is also established in future relations between the subject and others" (26).

Joan Copjec explores the narcissistic angle of a subject's hostility towards its mirror image. She writes:

> Narcissism, too, takes on a different meaning in Lacan, one more in accord with Freud's own. Since something always appears to be missing from any representation, narcissism *cannot* consist in finding satisfaction in one's own visual image. It must, rather, consist in the belief that one's own being exceeds the self-image, with which the subject constantly finds fault and in which it constantly fails to recognize itself. What one loves in one's image is something *more* than the image ("in you more than you"). (37, italics Copjec's, quote comes from Lacan's Seminar XI)

Copjec seems to be suggesting that the hostility that one finds in one's own image continues on beyond the mirror stage, as the subject believes that the image is more flawed than itself. What this means is that the hostility that the subject starts to feel towards its alienated image as a toddler continues on throughout the subject's lifetime.

3.3 The Mirror Stage in the Novella

The first mention of the "cheval glass" (25) in the novel occurs during Utterson's first visit to Jekyll's laboratory. The narrator tells us that "It was the first time that the lawyer had been received in that part of his friend's quarter" (25). The mirror in the room takes precedence, as it is the first thing that the narrator mentions when describing the room's furnishings. I find it telling that the narrator mentions that it was "furnished, among other things, with a cheval glass and a business table" (25). To the casual observer, it may not seem like an important detail that the narrator mentions the mirror before he mentions the business table, but as we will soon see, the mirror will play a prominent role as the novel progresses.

The key mirror scene in the novella from a Lacanian standpoint comes after Jekyll drinks the potion and becomes Hyde for the first time. Before I launch into that analysis, I feel that it is imperative to note that Lacan's initial concept of the mirror stage is that of a stage in the very early development of a baby. With that in mind, the novella is the only work that I'm aware of in which Edward Hyde is portrayed as a younger version of Henry Jekyll. In his statement, Jekyll proposes the theory that since he has repressed his baser instincts for his entire life, that "Edward Hyde was so much smaller, slighter, and younger than Henry Jekyll" (51). Therefore, when Hyde sees his own reflection for the first time in the novella, it plays out more closely to Lacan's version of the mirror stage than any of the movie versions do.

When Jekyll drinks the potion for the first time in the novella, he immediately notices that he is a changed person. His first impressions are that he's a more wicked person than he was before he drank the potion. Then he says, "I stretched out my hands, exulting in the freshness of these sensations, and in the act, I was suddenly aware that I had lost in stature" (50). Like any reasonable person, once he realizes that his outer appearance has changed, the first thing he wants to do is look at his reflection in a mirror to see what effects the potion has had on his appearance. The problem, as Jekyll so succinctly puts it, is that "There was no mirror, at that date, in my room" (50).

In order to get his first glimpse at himself as Hyde, he has to sneak out of his laboratory, across his own garden, and through the hallways of his mansion as "a stranger in my own house" (51). He manages to make it to his bedroom without running into any of his servants and causing a scene. Once there, he gets his first look at himself as Edward Hyde.

The image that's reflected back at him as he looks into the mirror for the first time is different from anything that he's ever seen there before. Edward Hyde has a much more sinister countenance than Jekyll. Jekyll says that "evil was written broadly and plainly on the face of the other" (51). However, like the Lacanian subject when it first sees its reflection in the mirror, Jekyll "was conscious of no repugnance, rather a leap of welcome" (51); because, "This, too, was myself" (51).

Judy Cornes argues that at this point, "Not only does Stevenson's protagonist see Hyde for the first time, but he also becomes supremely obsessed with that reflection in the glass. […] He becomes a type of perverted Narcissus, one whose reflection is just as enchanting in its own way as Narcissus had found his to be" (140).

I would argue at this point that Cornes has misread the scene. In the next paragraph of his statement, Jekyll writes, "I lingered but a moment at the mirror; […] it yet remained to be seen if I had lost my identity beyond redemption and must flee before daylight from a house that was no longer mine" (51). At this point Jekyll successfully sneaks back into his lab, drinks a new potion, and transforms back into Jekyll. I read the lingering but only a moment and then fleeing immediately back to his lab to change back into Jekyll not as a moment of supreme narcissistic obsession, but rather, as a moment of fear. I read it as Jekyll's being afraid that he might have done irreparable harm to his public persona. He needed to know right away if he could ever go back to his old self again, or if he was fated to live with a new identity for the rest of his life as a strange person in a strange house.

Lacan's assertion that the subject develops a rivalry with its mirror image plays out literally in Jekyll's rivalry with Hyde. Just as the subject sees its image as flawed, so too does Jekyll see Hyde as a flawed version of himself. Jekyll says in his statement that "even as good shone upon the countenance of [Jekyll], evil was written broadly and plainly on the face of [Hyde]" (51). To emphasize how flawed Hyde's appearance is, Jekyll states that "Evil […] had left on that body an imprint of deformity and decay" (51) and he calls his image that of an "ugly idol" (51).

Narratively speaking, Jekyll's main need from this point forward is to control his alter ego. Jekyll's need to immediately suppress his other identity after glimpsing it for the first time is the beginning of a rivalry with Hyde. In his "Statement of the Case," Jekyll likens the conflict to a father and son rivalry by saying, "Jekyll had more than a father's interest; Hyde had more

than a son's indifference" (55). Jekyll's analogy is significant here, because this statement invokes Lacan and Freud's struggles to define the role of the father[12].

I believe that the scene where Jekyll actually writes his "full statement of the case" is important, because it substantiates Lacan's assertion that the subject becomes alienated from itself. Jekyll has the mirror positioned beside his desk as he writes his statement. He does so while "under the influence of the last of the old powders" (61), and he knows that the next time he transforms into Hyde will be his last. While he writes the last of his statement, he reflects on the fact that "This, then, is the last time, short of a miracle, that Henry Jekyll can think his own thoughts or see his own face (now how sadly altered!) in the glass" (61). The mirror motif comes full circle here. The mirror was the first thing that Jekyll sought out after he realized that he had transformed into Hyde. And now, as Jekyll is making his final statement, he takes one final look in the mirror and sees how the events that he's writing about have changed him forever.

Cyndy Hendershot writes that:

> Lacan argues in "The Mirror Stage" that the formation of the ego begins with the infant's perception of his or her body as a stable reflection, a reflection which becomes internalized as the ego. For Lacan, however, this recognition is a misrecognition. The ego is an ideological illusion: Identity is fractured and no stability is possible. Through his experiment Jekyll demonstrates the instability of the ego which lies behind the unified reflection. (36)

---

[12] The role of the father in Lacan is too complex to treat in this thesis. But essentially, Dylan Evans says that Lacan identifies three types of fathers. The first is the symbolic father, which occupies "a position in the symbolic order" (62) that imposes and enforces laws upon the subject. The second is the imaginary father, which "can be construed as an ideal father" (62). The third is the real father, which Evans says has a "quite obscure" (63) definition, but "it seems possible to argue that the real father is the biological father of the subject. However, […] it would be more precise to say that the real father is the man who is *said to be* the subject's biological father. The real father is thus an effect of language" (63).

I believe that this demonstration of instability of the ego that Hendershot refers to is reflected in Jekyll's final look in the mirror. He calls his own face "sadly altered." This alteration could be the result of the instability that's been raging in him since he drank his potion for the first time.

The way that Hyde dies in the novella not only plays into the rivalry between Jekyll and Hyde, but it also reflects Lacan's interpretation of the "death drive." To put it in Lacanian terms, Hyde is a creature that's driven by desire. When Jekyll tries to deny Hyde the chance to attempt to satisfy those desires, then Hyde comes out more angry and dangerous than ever, because he refuses be denied those things that give him pleasure. Hyde overtakes Jekyll more and more frequently, and Jekyll has to re-administer the antidote more and more frequently, and in double doses, to keep Hyde suppressed. In the end, when it becomes clear that the Hyde identity will permanently overcome the Jekyll identity, Jekyll defeats Hyde the only way that he can. After finishing his statement with the words, "Here then, as I lay down the pen and proceed to seal up my confession, I bring the life of that unhappy Henry Jekyll to an end" (62), he commits suicide

3.4 The Mirror Stage in the 1931 Film

As I was preparing for this study, I had decided that I was going to concentrate solely on the texts of the novella and the film. I had no desire to comment on film spectatorship, which has been the theoretical focus of applying Lacan's mirror stage to film studies ever since the 1970s. I was in full agreement with Todd McGowan and Sheila Kunkle, who said, "The equation of the cinematic experience with the mirror stage was a decisive moment in the history of film theory, as it focused all theoretical energy on the reception of film at the expense of the filmic text itself" (xix). However, thanks to some decisions made by director Rouben Mamoulian, I am in a

position where I have no choice *but* to touch on spectatorship in my analysis of the 1931 adaptation. Yet despite Mamoulian's methods, I am determined not to focus solely on spectatorship at the expense of the filmic text itself.

After the film's opening credits roll, the camera fades in on organ pipes. The camera pans downward, pausing briefly on pages of sheet music. The most distinguishing feature of this shot is the shadow of a person's head that's cast upon the pages. This turns out to be Dr. Henry Jekyll's shadow. After that brief moment, the camera pans down to the organ keys. Once there, we see Jekyll's two hands as they produce the music by playing the keys.

These opening shots mimic Lacan's assertion that before a child ever sees its image reflected back at itself in a mirror, it sees itself as a fractured hodgepodge of body parts. Mamoulian, by choosing to open the film this way, has chosen to introduce us to Dr. Jekyll not as a whole being, but rather, first as a shadow, and then as a pair of hands. The Lacanian implications become even more apparent as the scene progresses and we realize that we are actually inside of Jekyll, looking at the world through his eyes.

We remain in Jekyll's point of view as he follows Poole, his butler, through the mansion. When Jekyll reaches a mirror, he turns to look at it. At this moment, we as the audience get our first look at Jekyll as a unified being. Still, we don't actually see him. What we see, is his reflection in the mirror. Just as Lacan claims that the child sees itself as a unified being for the first time when it recognizes itself in the mirror, the audience recognizes Jekyll for the first time as it sees him in the mirror from Jekyll's own point of view. The main difference in Lacan's theory and the movie's opening sequence of shots is that Mamoulian, the director, is still in full control of what the audience sees, while Fredric March, the star, is in full control of Jekyll's

actions. However, due the director's camera-work, the viewer is still put into the position of identifying Jekyll for the first time as a reflection in a mirror, even if it is from a passive position.

As Jekyll continues his journey out of the house, into the horse-drawn carriage, and across town to the university, we remain inside, as a part of him. We go along for the ride as he enters the lecture hall, and see that it is packed full of students and academics who are anxious to hear his speech. Finally, at around the four and a half minute mark, we leave Jekyll's body, and become a part of the auditorium's audience. At this point, when we become part of the auditorium's audience, we identify with them—and like them—we too are anxious to hear what Dr. Jekyll has to say.

Unlike the novella, the mirror in the film is already located in the laboratory before Jekyll takes his first drink of the potion. While this may seem like a minor detail, this changes how we, as the audience, experience the initial transformation dramatically.

At the 26:40 mark of the movie, Mamoulian places us back in Jekyll's point of view just before the doctor takes his first drink. Through Jekyll's eyes, we see his reflection in the mirror as he looks at it one last time. Jekyll knows that he's taking the risk of never being able to return to his old self again. He also knows that he's literally risking his life (he writes a goodbye note to Muriel, his betrothed, just in case all doesn't go well). As Jekyll takes one last look at his reflection, he knows, as do we, that this may be the last time he ever sees his own reflection in the mirror again. He takes a deep breath, and then, bottoms up!

We witness the beginnings of Jekyll's transformation into Hyde in the mirror's reflection. Then, he collapses. While still inside of Jekyll, we experience the dizzying process of his transformation while his memories of the movie's earlier scenes play out before us. When the transformation is over, Jekyll picks himself up off the ground, and staggers around the lab in a

daze. We are still inside of him as he makes his way over to the mirror. As he looks into the mirror, we witness at the same time that Jekyll does his first look at his new reflection. Just as before, when we got our first look at Jekyll as a reflection in the mirror, so too, do we get our first look at Hyde as a mirrored reflection. It's a moment that Mamoulian keeps us in very briefly, and then we're back in third-person POV again.

Hyde's first reaction at his reflection is one of confusion. At first, he doesn't identify with his reflection at all. But in a moment, he realizes that the image that he sees in the mirror is his own. Once he comes to that realization, his first words are "Free! Free at last!" (29:00). This reaction is clearly one of a man who is deriving pleasure from his own image.

However, what Hyde doesn't realize is that Jekyll has no intention of allowing him to run free. Once again, just as in the novella, Jekyll immediately feels the need to change back into his "normal" persona. This time he changes back, because Poole is banging on the laboratory door. The audience doesn't see Hyde transform back to Jekyll. Rather it waits outside the door with Poole, and is surprised when the door opens to discover that Jekyll, not Hyde, has opened it. Jekyll tells Poole that Hyde visited the lab, but left through the back door. This decision by Jekyll to answer the door in the identity that Poole is familiar with, and his lie that Hyde left out the back door, already imply that Jekyll wants to fully contain Hyde.

However, just like in the novella, Hyde gains strength with the passage of time. Unlike in the novella, Hyde's desire is clearly driven by sexual lust[13]. Hyde imprisons Ivy and rapes and brutalizes her. Later, Jekyll takes the potion to revert back to his "good" persona and realizes with chagrin what horrible things that Hyde has done to Ivy. Jekyll releases Ivy and

[13] Stevenson wrote a letter to John Paul Bocock to defend against charges that his novella was immoral. Stevenson says, "The harm was in Jekyll, because he was a hypocrite—not because he was fond of women; […] but people are so full of folly and inverted lust, that they can think of nothing but sexuality." He further tells Bocock that Hyde "is no more sexual than another."

promises her that she'll never see Hyde again. At the time that he releases her, he truly believes that he will be able to suppress Hyde for good.

However, Hyde's desire has grown too strong for Jekyll to suppress forever. When the sight of a cat attacking a bird triggers an involuntary transformation, Jekyll knows that his other identity is strong enough to overcome him. Once Hyde escapes from Jekyll, the sexual desires that have driven him to the point of horrifying brutality become even more insatiable. Hyde visits Ivy again; only this time, he does more than rape her. He escalates the violence by murdering her. In a Lacanian sense, Ivy had to die, because she couldn't completely fulfill Hyde's desires. She could only appease them for a moment. But desire is never fully fulfilled. The satisfaction of one desire only creates more desire, until in the end; death is the only thing that can stop it.

The problem with Ivy's death is that Hyde is still alive, and he still has intense desires. Only now, the intensity of his desires have grown so strong, that they not only violent, but now they are lethally violent. Furthermore, Hyde is still going to continue to desire, unless he is stopped. Unlike in the novel, Jekyll doesn't overcome Hyde by self-destruction. Instead, Hyde is defeated when a policeman shoots him as he tries to escape arrest for the murder of Carew[14]. But in the movie version, Jekyll's identity still overcomes Hyde's. While in the novella Hyde maintains his identity in death, in the movie Hyde's corpse reverts back to Jekyll after his last breath has escaped him. While the methods of Jekyll's ultimate victory over Hyde are different, death is the thing that brings Jekyll victory over Hyde at the end of both versions.

[14] Carew died protecting his "pure" daughter from Hyde, after she had screamed for help while Hyde was attacking her.

3.5 Mirror Stage Conclusions

To summarize, Lacan's mirror stage is the beginning of the formation of an infant's self awareness. The infant only identifies itself as a loose collection of body parts until it sees its reflection in the mirror and, for the first time, identifies itself as a complete individual. The infant, who cannot control its own body, derives a sense of pleasure in the control that it has over the "other" person in the reflection. Paradoxically, while the infant identifies itself with the reflection in the mirror, it is also alienated from it. It develops a sense of rivalry with the mirror image as a child. That rivalry continues into adulthood. This is because the child sees the image as a flawed representation of its actual self.

In the novella, Jekyll hypothesizes that Hyde is a younger, less developed version of himself. When he sees his reflection for the first time, he welcomes it. Yet I find it telling that in the next paragraph, he rushes back to the lab to find out if he has "lost [his] identity beyond redemption" (51). He finds it very relieving that after drinking the potion again, he "[comes] to [him]self once more with the character, the stature, and the face of Henry Jekyll" (51).

In the 1931 film, Mamoulian uses the camera to place the spectator in a position to relive the mirror stage experience. Just as the infant identifies itself for the first time as a disconnected collection of body parts, the viewer is also introduced to the film's main character as a shadow, and then a pair of hands. Like the infant sees itself as a unified being for the first time when it sees its reflection in the mirror, so too does the audience see Jekyll as a unified person for the first time in a mirror. The audience doesn't experience pleasure the same way that the infant does, because Mamoulian and March are controlling where the audience's site is focused, as well

as Jekyll's actions, but it was probably as close as a director could get to putting the audience in a position of reliving Lacan's mirror stage in the early 1930s[15].

Just as Lacan postulates that the infant develops a rivalry with its mirror image that lasts for a lifetime, Jekyll and Hyde literally develop a rivalry and a hatred for each other. The rivalry is based on desire. Hyde tries vainly to satisfy his desires, while Jekyll tries vainly to repress Hyde, and by proxy, his own desires. As Hyde satiates his desires for a moment, they only become more intense. This is reflected in the increased violence of Hyde's actions. In the end, the only way that Jekyll can overcome Hyde permanently is through death.

In discussing how Lacan's mirror stage plays out in the novella, Ed Cohen also brings the linguistic aspects of Jekyll's "Full Statement of the Case" into play. He describes how Jekyll's letter, which was written in front of a mirror, helps Jekyll to reflect on how splitting his personality has caused problems with settling on a single identity (194-5). Indeed, Jekyll's confusion of his identity becomes linguistically clear in his sentence, "He, I say—I cannot say, I" (59). Cohen says:

> The brilliance of this formulation is at once narrative and theoretical. Within the context of Jekyll's statement, it serves as the elusive point of juncture between Jekyll and Hyde, linguistically effecting the slippage that the narrative repeatedly attempts to signify but cannot since it is constrained to maintain the distinction between the "two" characters as the impetus for its diagetic movement. (195)

To Cohen's statement, I would like to add that this confusion persists not only throughout Jekyll's written statement, but throughout the text. Stevenson didn't write *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* as a horror story. He wrote it in the form of a detective story told primarily

[15] Modern day motion simulator technology, where the audience can control the action onscreen could change that in the future. See Linda Hutcheon's book *A Theory of Adaptation*, cited in the works cited page, for more on this.

through a variety of points-of-view. At times, the narrator tells of events. At others, Utterson hears the testimony of witnesses. Sometimes he gets the testimonies verbally, such as when Enfield opens the narrative by telling him about the time that Hyde trampled a little girl. At others, he gets it in writing, such as Lanyon's and Jekyll's written statements.

One also has to remember that Utterson's mission in this story is to find out the identity of Edward Hyde. This task is made more difficult by the fact that, as Richard Dury points out, "Stevenson gives the reader a similar experience to that of hearing or reading a strange but perfectly understood foreign language" ("Strange Language" 33). The task is also made more difficult in the fact that Hyde's appearance cannot be put into words. Reflecting back on his first site of Hyde, Enfield tells Utterson "I can't describe him. And it's not want of memory; for I declare that I can see him this moment" (12). Therefore, in addition to the physical and visual experiences that help to form the child's identity during the mirror stage, one must also consider how memory acts as a mirror throughout a person's life. Their identity is defined by how others linguistically describe them. The inability of Enfield, and later, Jekyll himself, to describe Hyde in words, makes pinning down an identity of Mr. Hyde very problematic.

4 THE GAZE

4.1 Lacan's Concept of the Gaze

The transition from the mirror stage to Lacan's gaze concept seems like a natural transition for me. Film theorists have been applying the two in conjunction with each other ever since Jean-Louis Baudry's influential 1970 essay "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus." I will go more in depth on Baudry's essay and Lacan's influence on film theory when I discuss the film.

According to Evans, "Lacan's first comments on the gaze appear in the first year of his seminar (1953-4) in reference to Jean-Paul Sartre's phenomenological analysis of 'the look'" (72). However, Evans goes on to state that Lacan didn't put out his own theory of the gaze until 1964 in conjunction with his debut of *objet petit a*. His 1964 seminar, his eleventh, has been published as *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. The entire second section of the seminar that year, is titled "OF THE GAZE AS *objet petit a*." Here, he defines the gaze as a split. In this split, the subject, or the "I" of the equation, can "see only from one point" (*FFC*, 72). But in the other side of the equation, "I am looked at from all sides" (*FFC*, 72). While one might believe that the gaze would be associated with the eye, in Lacan's world, it is not. As Zizek points out, "the eye viewing the object is on the side of the subject, while the gaze is on the side of the object. When I look at an object, it is always already gazing at me from a point at which I cannot see it" (*Looking Awry*, 109).

The fact that I (the subject) am being looked at from all sides, particularly from a place where I cannot see it, should be disturbing. However, according to Lacan, there is a certain pleasure in being gazed upon. In *Four Fundamental Concepts*, he gives the example of how "this all-seeing aspect is to be found in the satisfaction of a woman who knows that she is being looked at, on the condition that one does not show her that one knows that she knows" (75). In *The Lacanian Subject*, Bruce Fink mentions how "The woman may be interested in little else in her companion than his ability to give her that look; should he no longer be able to, due to a turnaround in their relationship, she may well move on" (92).

On the other hand, the gaze can be a violent and unsettling thing. Think about the woman who is made uncomfortable because some guy is leering at her. Once he starts making her feel uncomfortable, then the gaze creates a hostile environment for her. Zizek sums this

hostility up when he says "There is something extremely unpleasant and obscene in this experience of our gaze as already the gaze of the other. Why? The Lacanian answer is that such a coincidence of gazes defines the position of the pervert" (*Looking Awry*, 108). This perversion can lead to some serious complications.

4.2 The Gaze in the Novella

The first argument that I would like to propose about Dr. Jekyll is that even though he is unaware of Lacan's concept of the gaze, he is still in some intuitive way aware that he was always under the gaze of the public. If the general public plays the role of a big Other in the story, then Jekyll is trying very hard to avoid the big Other's scrutiny, even as he and his alter ego are both drawing attention to himself.

Jekyll conducts his experiments in secret. Nobody, neither his friend, Utterson, nor his live-in-butler, Poole, know what Jekyll was up to behind the locked door of his lab. Jekyll conducts his experiments alone under the cover of night, mainly because he knows that they are ethically questionable.

The very reason that Jekyll does his experiments in the novella in the first place is to protect his reputation. Jekyll opens his statement of the case with a mini autobiography: "I was born in the year 18—to a large fortune, endowed besides with excellent parts"[16] (47). Jekyll defines his worst fault as "a certain impatient gaiety of disposition, such as made the happiness of many, but as such I found it hard to reconcile with my imperious desire to hang my head high, and wear a more than commonly grave countenance before the public" (47-8). The opening of Jekyll's statement is the basis upon which Stevenson himself, angered at a critic who "writing like a journalist, has written like a braying ass" (Letter "To Bocock"), wrote, "The harm was in

[16] Linehan, the editor of the version that I am using, puts a footnote here defining "parts" as "abilities."

Jekyll, because he was a hypocrite" ("To Bocock"). What made Jekyll such a hypocrite is that he wanted to engage in the same kinds of activities that other men his age were involved in, but he didn't want "the wise and good among my fellow men" (47) to know what he was up to.

What Jekyll didn't count on was that once released, Edward Hyde would draw a lot of attention to himself. The novella opens with Enfield's account of an event in which Hyde trampled a little girl on the street in the middle of the night. Later in the novella, Hyde murders Danvers Carew for no good cause in plain sight. The murder is witnessed by a lowly maid who happens to be looking out of her window when Hyde brandishes his cane and "with ape-like fury, he was trampling his victim under foot, and hailing down a storm of blows, under which the bones were audibly shattered" (22). This event forces Jekyll to renounce Hyde, because he knows that Hyde's despicable act has been witnessed by an unseen person (the gaze comes from a place where the one being gazed at cannot see it). Jekyll also knows that he will go to the gallows if he gets caught in his Hyde persona.

The differences between Jekyll when he was going through his transformations from himself to Hyde and back, and Jekyll when he thought that he had rid himself of Hyde for good, are very telling in relation to the gaze. While Jekyll was conducting his experiments and running amok at night as Mr. Hyde, he is rarely seen by his friends. He knows that they are watching his every move in both identities, and he shuts himself in his lab to avoid them. But after Hyde murders Carew, Jekyll tells Utterson, "I swear to God I will never set eyes on [Hyde] again. I bind my honor to you that I am done with him in this world. […] mark my words, he will never more be heard of" (25).

This declaration, coupled with Jekyll's sincere belief that Hyde will never roam the streets of London again, marks a significant change:

> A new life began for Dr. Jekyll. *He came out of his seclusion*, renewed relations with his friends, became once more their familiar guest and entertainer; and whilst he had always been known for charities, he was now no less distinguished for religion. He was busy, he was *much in the open air*, he did good; his face seemed to open and brighten, as if with an inward consciousness of service; and for more than two months, the doctor was at peace. (28-9, emphasis mine)

Those two months would be the last happy ones for Dr. Jekyll. It would be logical to believe that Jekyll wants to be seen by the Other while he is doing good works and going to church. His belief that all anyone would ever see of him would be the image that he wanted to project to them meant that he wasn't at all terrified of putting himself out there to be gazed upon.

But, just as suddenly as he becomes a pillar of the community, he barricades himself back in his house again. "On the 8th of January Utterson had dined at the doctor's with a small party. […] On the 12th, and again on the 14th, the door was shut against the lawyer. 'The doctor was confined to the house' Poole said, 'and saw no one'" (29). And Jekyll rarely did see anyone again after that sudden, unexplained change.

Utterson (and we readers as well) would get the explanation for Jekyll's extremes in behavior from Jekyll's full statement. Once Jekyll has cast off the yoke of Hyde following Carew's murder, he resolves to do as much good as he can to redeem himself of the monstrous crime. While all was going well, Jekyll doesn't mind being a man in the public eye. But one day, Jekyll involuntarily transforms in Hyde while sitting on a public park bench in the middle of the day. Once this happens, Jekyll can no longer be seen in public, or receive his friends in his home, for fear that Hyde will come out again at an inopportune time.

The public is always watching. The gaze is always focused on us from every angle. Dr. Jekyll knows this. He obsesses over it. His need to always be the subject putting forth a pure and chaste image while under the gaze of the object (the Other) is his driving motivation for every action in the novella.

Because, as Stevenson has pointed out, Jekyll is a hypocrite, his motivation to conduct his experiments to liberate his baser nature in the first place is to hide his illicit nocturnal activities from the public. He also does these experiments in private, because he doesn't want his friends or his servants to know what he is up to, because the experiments that he conducts would pose serious ethical questions. The proof that the "Other's" knowledge of Jekyll's experiments would have negative repercussions comes from Dr. Lanyon's statement. After witnessing Hyde's transformation into Jekyll Lanyon says, "I saw what I saw, I heard what I heard, and my soul sickened at it; […] As for the moral turpitude that man unveiled to me, even with tears of penitence, I cannot, even in memory, dwell on it without a start of horror" (47). However, what Lanyon fails to mention is that he really has only himself to blame. Hyde tried to take the potion out of Lanyon's house so that he could consume it in private, but Lanyon insisted, simply out of curiosity, that he be allowed to watch Hyde drink it. Perhaps Lanyon's horrified reaction to the sight that he provoked out of Hyde is what Lacan refers to in his Seminar XI that "When [the world] begins to provoke [the gaze], the feeling of strangeness begins" (75).

The implications of Jekyll's behavior after swearing off Hyde has in relation to the gaze are also important. A subject desires to be desired by the Other. Knowing that the Other is always watching, the subject behaves in such a way as to provoke desire. In Jekyll's case, the Other is his group of peers. Once Jekyll is convinced that Hyde will never be heard from again,

he becomes more open and sociable. His sociable and charitable activities are an effort to become accepted by his group again the way that he used to be. In other words, Jekyll's desire to be desired by the group motivates his actions to be seen in a positive light. But once Hyde makes his uninvited reappearance, Jekyll barricades himself within his own house to hide from the gaze of that same Other that he has so diligently sought to be accepted by. This is important, because Jekyll knows that if his group knows that *he* is the one who trampled a little girl and murdered Sir Danvers Carew, then they will no longer desire his company. In fact, the knowledge of the group (aka the Other) that Jekyll is a cold blooded murderer would most likely lead not only to the group's rejection of him, but also to his imprisonment and execution.

4.3 The Gaze in Past Film Studies

The 1970s saw an explosion of Lacanian scholarship in film studies. In regards to the gaze and the mirror stage, most of this scholarship focused on film spectatorship. Sean Homer says that the "shift in the use of psychoanalysis from interpreting the content of individual texts to an analysis of how our subjectivity and identity are constructed through the structure and form of texts has been arguably the most important contribution of Lacanianism to contemporary cultural studies" (27).

Jean-Louis Baudry opened the door for Lacanian psychoanalytic applications to film theory with his essay, "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus." In his essay, he combines the gaze and the mirror stage by comparing the screen to a mirror and the projector to an object that focuses the spectator's gaze. According to Baudry, the images that the spectator sees on the screen reflect reality, although what the spectator sees isn't really reality. It is not reality in the sense that it is what Baudry calls an "objective reality" (352). The spectator sees it

in a darkened room on a screen that is "bordered with black" (352). Furthermore, by being in a darkened room, which Baudry compares to Plato's darkened cave, then "those who remain there, whether they know it or not (but they do not), find themselves chained, captured, or captivated" (352). Therefore, although the screen acts like a mirror of sorts, it is a mirror that reflects a reality prescribed to the audience by the collaborators of the film (director, cinematographer, actors, editors, etc).

What is also a key point in Baudry's version of the screen as a mirror is the fact that the spectator does not see his own body in the screen like he would in an actual mirror. Therefore, the spectator does not identify his real self in the screen image, but rather, he forms a secondary identity with the main character on the screen. This identity with characters would form the basis for other scholars to follow. But Baudry places importance in this "secondary identification" because:

> the reflected image is not that of the body itself but of a world already given as meaning. […] Thus the spectator identifies less with what is represented, the spectacle itself, than with what stages the spectacle, makes it seen, obliging him to see what it sees. […] Just as the mirror assembles the fragmented body into a sort of imaginary integration of the self, the transcendental self unites the discontinuous fragments of phenomena, of lived experience into unifying meaning. (354)

Where the gaze comes into play in Baudry's essay is that the audience's attention is directed not by the camera that captured the images, but by a projector that projects those images onto the mirror-screen. As Baudry describes it: "'reality' comes from behind the spectator's head, and if he looked at it directly, he would see nothing except the moving beams from an already veiled light source" (352). The fact that the audience would not see images by looking directly at the

projector, and in many cases may not see the projector itself, is representative of Lacan's conception that the gaze comes from a place where one cannot see it. It also allows the projector and the screen to work together to determine the subject. In his Seminar XI, Lacan says:

> What determines me, at the most profound level, in the visible, is the gaze that is outside. It is through the gaze that I enter light and it is from the gaze that I receive its effects. Hence it comes about that the gaze is the instrument through which light is embodied and through which—if you will allow me to use a word, as I often do, in a fragmented form—I am *photo-graphed*. (106, emphasis Lacan's)

In other words, the projector uses light to project images onto the screen. It is because of this projector that the gaze can affect the spectator. Baudry even goes so far as to suggest that the camera is an ideological mechanism that the subject identifies with. Baudry says, "The ideological mechanism at work in the cinema seems thus to be concentrated in the relationship between the camera and the subject" (354). Baudry argues that effect that the filmmaker wants to have on the spectator is to "appear as a sort of psychic apparatus of substitution, corresponding to the model defined by the dominant ideology. The system of repression (primarily economic) has as its goal the prevention of deviation and of the active exposure of this 'model'" (354-5).

However, as Sean Homer points out, "there are a number of problems with Baudry's work. In 1975, Christian Metz challenges Baudry's assumption that the spectator identifies with the characters on the screen. Metz reiterates that "there is one thing and one thing only that is never reflected in [the screen]: the spectator's own body" (802). Metz continues, "At the cinema, it is always the other who is on the screen; as for me, I am there to look at him. I take no

part in the perceived, on the contrary, I am *all-perceiving*" (803). By putting the spectator in a position of being all-perceiving, Metz argues that "the spectator *identifies with himself*" (803, emphasis Metz's), and not with the characters on the screen. Baudry also puts the spectator in a God-like position, where the spectator doesn't participate in the screen action at all, but rather, just observes what the characters are doing. The characters aren't aware of the spectator, putting the spectator in the position of the object, which in Lacanian theory possesses the gaze.

In "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," Laura Mulvey turns up the heat a little bit by declaring that "Psychoanalytic theory is thus appropriate here as a political weapon" (833). Her target is the use of film, particularly the mainstream Hollywood film, in a patriarchal society. In her effort to destroy "pleasure, or beauty" (835) by analyzing it, she identifies three levels of the gaze. The first, building on Baudry and Metz's work, is the gaze of the camera. She argues that scopophilia is one of the primary pleasures that film offers the spectator, and the camera is the tool that, in Freud's terms, takes "other people as objects, subjecting them to a controlling and curious gaze" (835). The controlling part of the gaze is the main issue that Mulvey wants to attack in her essay. She asserts that "The cinema satisfies a primordial wish for pleasurable looking, but it also goes further, developing scopophilia in its narcissistic aspect" (836). This, Mulvey argues, can be a problem in Hollywood's "production of ego ideals as expressed in particular in the star system, the stars centering both screen presence and screen story as they act out a complex process of likeness and difference (the glamorous impersonates the ordinary)" (836).

On the second level, Mulvey argues that the gaze is heavily weighted to the gaze of the male characters on the screen. She argues that "In a world ordered by sexual imbalance, the pleasure in looking has been split between active/male and passive/female. The determining

male gaze projects its phantasy on to the female figure which is styled accordingly" (837). In other words, the way that the camera directs the spectators' gaze onto the screen forces the spectator to take the male point of view. In this scenario, the audience then identifies mainly with the male characters. Mulvey goes on to say that "Women displayed as sexual object is the leit-motiff of erotic spectacle: […] Mainstream film neatly combined spectacle and narrative" (837).

On the third level of the gaze, Mulvey argues that "Traditionally, the woman displayed has functioned on two levels: as erotic object for the characters within the screen story, and as erotic object for the spectator within the auditorium, with a shifting tension between the looks on either side of the screen" (838). The gaze of the spectator in the auditorium is the third level of the gaze. As Sean Homer points out, "this gaze is facilitated by the previous two positions—of the camera and of the protagonists within the film—it is an inherently male position to adopt" (30).

Homer also points out that "Mulvey's formulation of the 'male gaze' provided the starting point for many debates around the possibility of elaborating feminine, black, and gay spectator positions" (30). However, Mulvey was not without her detractors. Gaylyn Studlar wrote "Masochism and the Perverse Pleasures of the Cinema" to offer "an alternative model to the current discourse that emphasizes voyeurism aligned with sadism, the male controlling gaze as the only position of spectatorial pleasure, and a polarized notion of sexual difference with the female regarded as lack" (773)[17]. In her essay, Studlar looks at "masochism's relationship to visual pleasure" (775). In doing so, she attempts to turn the whole idea that visual pleasure is only a sadistic pleasure on its head. Studlar argues that "In masochism, as in the infantile stage

[17] Unfortunately, while Mulvey's essay is frequently anthologized in every significant theory collection, Studlar's essay has long since fallen out of favor. I find this unfortunate since I believe that dissenting opinions to iconic essays are just as important as the essays themselves are.

of helpless dependence that marks its genesis, pleasure does not involve mastery of the female but submission to her. This pleasure applies to the infant, the masochist, and the film spectator as well" (782). Therefore:

> the narrow view that the female in film can only function as the object of a sadistic male spectatorial possession must yield to other considerations. The female in the masochistic aesthetic is more than the passive object of the male's desire for possession. She is also a figure of identification, the mother of plentitude whose gaze meets the infant's as it asserts her presence and her power (782).

The main problem with the psychoanalytic film debate in the 1970s and 80s was that it focused too narrowly on the spectator experience, and not enough on the texts of the films themselves. I've already pointed out above where McGowan and Kunkle write that "Though Lacanian theory set the terms of debate within film studies, it did so very narrowly, and this narrowness eventually resulted in its evanescence" (xii).

Joan Copjec offers up another reason for Lacan's fade from film theory. In her book, *Read My Desire*, Copjec argues that "the central misconception of film theory [is] believing itself to be following Lacan, it conceives the screen as a mirror; in doing so, however, it operates in ignorance of, and at the expense of, Lacan's more radical insight, whereby the mirror is conceived as screen" (15-6). Copjec argues that theorists such as Baudry, Metz, Mulvey, and others have confused Lacan's concept of the gaze with Foucault's panoptic gaze, which she argues "defines *perfectly* the situation of the woman under patriarchy: that is, it is the very image of the structure that obliges the woman to monitor herself with a patriarchal eye" (17, emphasis Copjec's).

In structuring her argument the way she does, Copjec takes the position that the Lacanian gaze and Foucault's panoptic gaze are clearly two different things. She states that "My purpose here is not simply to point out the crucial differences between Foucault's theory and Lacan's, but also to explain how the two theories have failed to be perceived as different" (18-9). Therefore, Lacanian film theory became intertwined with Foucault in which "film theory operated as a kind of 'Foucauldization' of Lacanian theory; an early misreading of Lacan" (19) which led to "Foucault's ascendancy over Lacan in the academy" (19).

The point of this little history lesson is to establish the fact that my reading of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is not a Foucauldization of Lacanian theory in the 1931 film. Rather, I am going to focus primarily on the text of the film. Although Mamoulian structures the shots of the film in such a way that the audience literally participates in the action at times, I am not concerned with the role that the controlling male gaze plays in the spectator experience. If anything, I am in agreement with Studlar that the male characters and spectators are actually in a masochistic position, especially when they fall under Ivy's spell. I also want to further my argument of how the gaze of *Victorian society* motivates Jekyll's behavior throughout the movie, and not the gaze of the audience.

4.4 The Gaze in the 1931 Film

In no version of the Jekyll and Hyde story does the gaze play as important a role as it does in Rouben Mamoulian's film. That's because Mamoulian uses the gaze on both sides of the screen. What I mean is that Mamoulian uses the gaze to play directly with the audience's psyche, while at the same time, the characters on the screen also use the gaze against each other as weapons to seduce to or destroy.

Eighteen and a half minutes into the film, Jekyll rescues Ivy, a street-wise prostitute, from an attack. He chases away her attacker, and then he picks her up and literally carries her upstairs to her flat. She rages against her attacker while Jekyll carries her into her room and gently places her on her bed. She continues her tough talking monologue until she gets her first good look at her rescuer. Seeing that Jekyll's a handsome, young, and well-dressed man, she pauses long enough to look him up and down, simultaneously undressing and devouring him with her eyes (19:20).

The rest of the scene in her flat plays out like a game of cat and mouse. Ivy tries very blatantly to seduce Jekyll, while he meekly concentrates his efforts on getting out of there with his virtue intact. She makes him turn his back while she undresses for bed. At this point, Jekyll could have just left the room, but he doesn't. Under the auspices of making sure that she gets to bed alright, he stays in the room while she undresses.

Jekyll doesn't get to watch Ivy's striptease show, but the audience does. Ivy turns her gaze directly at the camera and starts removing her garters and stockings in a very provocative fashion (this was prior to the Hayes Production Code). Peter Lehman reminds us that "It is of course one of Hollywood's famous unwritten rules that an actor should never look directly into the camera lens; yet Ivy clearly does" (59). Ivy's show plays on two different levels here. On the one hand, it blatantly arouses desire within the audience, which would play into Mulvey's argument that the woman is portrayed on-screen as a sexual object. But on the other hand, Ivy is clearly in control here. By breaking Hollywood's unwritten rule, she has taken on the role as aggressor, which plays into Studlar's argument that the woman is the one in a position of power. However, in this respect, since Jekyll doesn't get to watch the show, the viewer is the one that experiences masochistic pleasure.

Getting back to my purpose of a textual analysis, once Ivy's naked, she pulls Jekyll down and plants a kiss on him. Who knows how far it would have gotten if Lanyon hadn't walked into the room at that moment, catching Jekyll in a compromising position with a naked lady of the night? Ivy may not have gotten her man then, but what she doesn't know is that she has planted the seeds in his mind that will lead him back to her as Mr. Hyde. Marc Vernet points out that "Ivy signs her own death warrant by her attempt at seduction. Mr Hyde looks at her and fixes her with his look while the Dr. Jekyll side of him turns politely away" (60). Vernet takes it even further by saying that "This is simultaneously a scene of seduction and a scene of death—of death because it is a scene of seduction" (60). This intertwining of seduction and death plays into Lacan's notion of the death drive, as the desire that Ivy arouses in Jekyll, and by proxy Hyde, during that scene is the first of a chain of events in which Hyde's escalating desire leads to Ivy's death.

At 21:45, Ivy drapes her naked leg over the bedside and swings it like a pendulum. She locks eyes with Jekyll and invites him to come back to her soon. Mamoulian puts the audience directly into Jekyll's point of view. As Bryan Senn points out, "Ivy looks at Jekyll—and directly into the camera—and smiles, delicious and inviting. This point-of-view transforms the viewer from a detached voyeur into an involved participant in Ivy's game of coquettish seduction. We *become* the bemused (and aroused) Dr. Jekyll, to whom this beauty beckons so delectably" (20, italics Senn's). As Jekyll leaves the flat, Mamoulian puts in a dissolve, with the image of Ivy's swinging leg superimposed over Jekyll and Lanyon walking down the staircase, as her voice softly and seductively whispers "come back, soon." What Mamoulian seems to be suggesting with this dissolve is that Ivy is now seared into Jekyll's mind. Although Jekyll and Lanyon are discussing his conduct, the superimposition of her leg and her whispering voice over the scene

suggests that Jekyll, or at least the Hyde lurking deep within Jekyll's subconscious, is thinking only about Ivy. This subconscious desire playing out on screen seems to support Vernet's assertion that Hyde has fixed Ivy with his gaze, even as Jekyll tries to suppress those memories.

Just as in the novella, Jekyll is aware of the fact that he is being looked at from all directions. Very early in the movie, Jekyll delivers a speech where he expounds upon his theory that man's psyche is not one, but two, to a room full of colleagues and students at the local university. At the 5:30 mark of the movie, Mamoulian positions the camera behind Jekyll. A very large audience looks on as Jekyll gives his impassioned speech. The auditorium is so full that many students have to sit in the aisles, because there aren't enough seats. Collectively, this audience represents the gaze, looking on at Jekyll from every direction as he tries to win its approval. Just like Lacan's woman who derives pleasure from knowing that she's being looked at, Jekyll also knows that he's being looked at from all directions by the individuals in the collective group. He can't possibly see all of them at the same time. But he derives some sort of narcissistic pleasure from it, and he amps up his lecture accordingly.

Yet just as in the novella, he performs his experiments in private. In the movie Jekyll's secrecy is shown more explicitly. He locks the door to the lab just before he drinks the potion for the first time. Then, after he has already changed into Hyde, he changes back in to Jekyll when Poole knocks on the door.

Jekyll is also worried about the image he projects, because he's a gentleman. When Poole suggests that "London offers many amusements for a gentleman like you, sir" (33:33), Jekyll curtly reacts with, "A gentleman like me daren't take advantage of them" (33:36). Although Jekyll's fiancé and his future father-in-law are out of town, and Jekyll is aware that they won't return for another month, Jekyll still doesn't dare to put himself in a compromising

position. He knows that he is under constant scrutiny, and the appearance that he projects is important to him.

But, as in the novella, Jekyll has a solution to this problem. That solution lies in the potion that allows him to assume his alter ego in order to pursue his animalistic desires. If Carew would have consented to allow Jekyll to marry Muriel rather than taking her far away from him, then Jekyll would never have drank the potion a second time. But, once again, Jekyll's dual desire to fulfill his basic needs, while at the same time act in such a way as to win the approval of his peers and society, motivates him to drink the potion that would ultimately be his undoing.

5 CONCLUSIONS

So what was this study all about? In this paper, I have tried to use *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and its most highly regarded film version as a demonstration of Lacan's principles of the mirror stage and the gaze. In doing so, I have tried to demonstrate how the *Jekyll and Hyde* body of texts provide an intertextual body of work that can be very illuminating in clearing up difficult Lacanian principles.

I grant that I only used one film version of the story to base my arguments on. However, I have chosen the film that I believe demonstrates Lacan's principles most effectively. Furthermore, the 1931 film is as influential, if not more so, on later adaptations as the novella is. Of the 125 film adaptations of Stevenson's novella, I know of none that follow the structure of the book very closely. However, nearly all of the films after 1931, most notably the 1941 version, incorporate at least some of Mamoulian's innovations.

From a practical perspective, Lacan's work was not primarily intended for use by literary critics. Sean Homer writes, "Lacan was first and foremost a clinician and then a teacher. He

was not an academic or a writer and he remained deeply suspicious of the university and of what he called the discourse of the university" (9). The audiences that he spoke to at conferences and in his seminars almost always consisted of psychoanalysts like himself.

I take the position that art can be just as beneficial in explaining psychoanalytical concepts as science can. In analyzing *Jekyll and Hyde*, I have tried to show how the texts play out some of Lacan's principles in a practical way. As they relate to the mirror stage, I can think of no scene in any other story which plays out the Lacanian idea of a child gaining pleasure from its own reflection as well as Hyde's first look at his own reflection. But, as Lacan suggests, the subject is also alienated from its reflection. That's why Jekyll and Hyde have an intense hatred for each other. I also believe that the film's opening moments allows the audience to relive the experience that an infant goes through when it encounters its own reflection for the first time. However, there are crucial differences, because Mamoulian and March actually control the sights and actions on the screen.

In relation to the gaze, Jekyll's obsession with the image that he projects to his peers and society as a whole, which in my argument represents the Other, drives his actions throughout both versions of the story. He knows that he is always being watched from every direction, although he cannot see where the gaze is coming from. While he is conducting unethical experiments, he hides from the gaze of the public in his lab, and when he goes out at night to experience pleasures that may be forbidden to him, he does so under the disguise of his alter ego, Hyde. When he thinks that he is going to suppress Hyde for the rest of his life, he comes out of hiding. In a narcissistic way, he derives pleasure from knowing that he is being watched, and that he is putting forth the correct image. After all, there is pleasure at being looked at, as long as that gaze doesn't become so intrusive that it is strange. However, once he knows that Hyde

can come and go at will, Jekyll hides again (in the novel) or cancels his engagement (movie), because his life literally depends on it. Jekyll knows that Hyde is destined for the gallows, and by implication, he is too if Hyde gets caught.

In the novella, once Jekyll knows that Hyde is going to take over permanently, he does the only thing that he can: He commits suicide. In the movie, Jekyll doesn't overcome Hyde through suicide. But when Hyde is shot to death by a police officer, Hyde's face transforms into Jekyll's face. Therefore, even in death, the last memory anyone will have of Jekyll is his own image, and not Hyde's.

Jacques Lacan's work is very important. It is also very difficult to understand. I hope that this paper will in some small way contribute to a better understanding of what Lacan's principles are and how, if art reflects life, that they apply to real world situations.

Works Cited

Andrew, Dudley. "Adaptation." *Film Adaptation*. Ed. James Naremore. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2000. 28-37. Print.

Aristotle. *Poetics*. 350 B.C. Trans. Malcolm Heath. London: Penguin, 1996. Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981. Print.

Braudy, Leo and Marshall Cohen, eds. *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. 5th ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. Print.

Baudry, Jean-Louis. "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus." 1970. *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. 5th ed. Eds. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. Print.

Bluestone, George. *Novels Into Film*. 1957. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2003. Print.

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 (2003): 181-99. Web. 5 Apr. 2010.

Copjec, Joan. *Read My Desire: Lacan Against the Historicists*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994. Print.

Cornes, Judy. *Madness and the Loss of Identity in Nineteenth Century Fiction*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2008. Print.

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Dir. Rouben Mamoulian. Perf. Fredric March, Miriam Hopkins, and Rose Hobart. 1932. Warner Bros., 2004. DVD.

Dury, Richard. "Crossing the Bounds of Single Identity: *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and a Paper in a French Scientific Journal." *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries*. Ed.

Richard Ambrosini and Richard Dury. Madison: U of Wisconsin P., 2006. 237-51. Print.

---. Introduction. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. By Robert Louis Stevenson. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2004. xix-lxii. Print.

---. "Strange language of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*." *Journal of Stevenson Studies* 2 (2005): 33-50. Print.

Elliott, Kamilla. *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.

Evans, Dylan. *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.

Fink, Bruce. *Lacan to the Letter: Reading* Ecrits *Closely*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2004. Print.

---. *The Lacanian Subject: Between Language and Jouissance*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995. Print.

Hendershot, Cyndy. "Overdetermined Allegory in *Jekyll and Hyde*." *Victorian Newsletter* 84 (1993): 35-8. Print.

Homer, Sean. *Jacques Lacan*. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.

Horton, Andrew and Stuart Y. McDougal, eds. *Play it Again, Sam: Retakes on Remakes*. Berkley: U of California P, 1998. Print.

Hurst, Rochelle. "Adaptation as an Undecidable: Fidelity and Binarity from Bluestone to Derrida." *In/Fidelity: Essays on Film Adaptation*. Eds. David L. Kranz and Nancy C. Mellerski. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Pub., 2008. 172-96. Print.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.

King, Charles. "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: A Filmography." *Journal of Popular Film*

And Television 25.1 (1997): n. pag. *MLA International Bibliography*. EBSCO. Web. 8 Dec. 2008.

Kranz, David L. and Nancy C. Mellerski, eds. *In/Fidelity: Essays on Film Adaptation*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Pub., 2008. Print.

Lacan, Jacques. *Ecrits*. Trans. Bruce Fink. Collaborators Heloise Fink and Russell Grigg. New York: Norton, 2006. Print.

---. *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Dennis Porter. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. New York: Norton, 1992. Print.

---. *Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. New York: Norton, 1998. Print.

Lehman, Peter. "Looking at Ivy Looking at Us Looking at Her: The Camera and the Garter." *Wide Angle* 5.3 (1983): 59-63. Print.

Leitch, Thomas. *Film Adaptation and its Discontents: From Gone With the Wind to The Passion of the Christ*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2007. Print.

McGowan, Todd and Sheila Kunkle, eds. *Lacan and Contemporary Film*. New York: Other, 2004. Print.

Metz, Christian. "*From* The Imaginary Signifier." *FilmTheory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. 5th ed. Eds. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. Print.

Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. 5th ed. Eds. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. Print.

Murray, Simone. "Materializing Adaptation Theory: The Adaptation Industry." *Literature*

Film Quarterly 38.1 (2008): 4-20. Web. 29 Jan. 2009.

Naremore, James, ed. *Film Adaptation*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2000. Print.

Nollen, Scott Allen. *Robert Louis Stevenson: Life, Literature, and the Silver Screen*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1994. Print.

Persak, Christine. "Spencer's Doctrines and Mr. Hyde: Moral Evolution in Stevenson's Strange Case." *Victorian Newsletter* 86 (1994): 13-8. Print.

Reed, Thomas L. *The Transforming Draught: Jekyll and Hyde, Robert Louis Stevenson, and the Victorian Alcohol Debate*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2006. Print.

Rose, Brian. *Jekyll and Hyde Adapted: Dramatizations of Cultural Anxiety*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1996. Print.

Rosner, Mary. "'A Total Subversion of Character': Dr. Jekyll's Moral Insanity." *Victorian Newsletter* 93 (1998): 27-31. Print.

Senn, Bryan. "*Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1931): Science, Society, and Sexuality." *Science Fiction America: Essays on Science Fiction Cinema*. Ed. David J. Hogan. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2005. 17-23. Print.

Stam, Robert. "Introduction: The Theory and Practice of Adaptation." *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*. Eds. Robert Stam and Alessandra Raengo. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005. 1-52. Print.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. "A Chapter on Dreams." 1888. *R. L. Stevenson on Fiction*. Ed. Glenda Norquay. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999. 127-38. Print.

---. "Books Which Have Influenced Me." 1887. *R. L. Stevenson on Fiction*. Ed. Glenda Norquay. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999. 110-16. Print.

---. "*To his Wife*." 20 Oct. 1885. "Selected Letters." *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Ed. Katherine Linehan. New York: Norton, 2003. 81. Print.

---. "*To John Paul Bocock*." Nov. 1887. "Selected Letters." *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Ed. Katherine Linehan. New York: Norton, 2003. 86-7. Print.

---. "*To Thomas Russell Sullivan*." 27 Jan. 1887. "Selected Letters." *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.* Ed. Katherine Linehan. New York: Norton, 2003. 85-6. Print.

---. *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. 1886. Ed. Katharine Linehan. New York: Norton, 2003. Print.

Studler, Gaylyn. "Masochism and the Perverse Pleasures of the Cinema." *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. 4th ed. Eds. Gerald Mast, Marshall Cohen, and Leo Braudy. New York: Oxford UP, 1992. Print.

Veeder, William. "Children of the Night." *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde After One Hundred Years*. Eds. William Veeder and Gordon Hirsch. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988. 107-60. Print.

Vernet, Marc. "The Look at the Camera." *Cinema Journal* 28.2 (1989): 48-63. Print.

Zizek, Slavoj. *How to Read Lacan*. New York: Norton, 2006. Print.

---. *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan Through Popular Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991. *NetLibrary*. Web. 13 Apr. 2009.

Zupancic, Alenka. *Ethics of the Real: Kant, Lacan*. London: Verso, 2000. Print.