

LUBLIN STUDIES IN MODERN LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURE 40(1), 2016, [HTTP://WWW.LSMLL.UMCS.LUBLIN.PL](http://www.lsml.umcs.lublin.pl),
[HTTP://LSMLL.JOURNALS.UMCS.PL](http://lsml.journals.umcs.pl)

Bratislav Milošević
Aleksinac grammar school
Tihomira Djordjevića Street,
Aleksinac, Serbia

**Stevenson's Aesthetics of Entanglement and Non-
Disjunction in *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr
Hyde***

ABSTRACT

The paper engages with Stevenson's novel *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* from the perspective of essential duality embedded in every one's nature: it explicates the entangling nature of binaries and the aesthetics of non-disjunction of the binary self/Other as embodied in the figures of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde respectively. By the novel's end, the two aspects, the Jekyllian and the Hydeian, are perceived not only as "innately responsive and relational"¹ (Schapiro 1995: 128) to each other but also as entangled and non-disjunctive within the synthesizing model of the Hegelian dialectic.

Keywords: self; binaries; entanglement; non-disjunction; duality; bothness

¹ In her book *Literature and the Relational Self* Barbara Ann Schapiro argues that individual human beings are fundamentally "responsive and relational" (Schapiro 1995: 128). Accommodating her insightful argument on the interpersonal level, I argue that it can likewise be applied on the intrapersonal level – the two opposing aspects of every one's nature are not only responsive but also relational. Put differently, the Jekyllian aspect and the Hydeian aspect are mutually 'responsive and relational' in a complex, entangling, and intertwining way.

1. Introduction

Ever since its publication in 1886, Stevenson's masterpiece *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* has been the locus of undying interest for literary researchers, especially for Gothic scholars whose approach is psychologically oriented. Based on "extremity, in the form of that Romantic Faustianism in which a single inspired scientist is impelled to reach beyond the limits of conventional knowledge and morality" (Connor 2000: 125) in the age of "declining Victorianism ... and rising Modernism" (qtd. in Dryden 2003: 1). This canonical work is, therefore, a complex case study which engages with both social and psychological aspects of a late-Victorian/early-Modernist man. Originating from a nightmarishly strange dream, the novel is, in the words of Steven Connor, about a myth "of origin and/or reversion" (Connor 2000: 125): it gives a very personal account of the repossession of the originally dualistic human nature and the subsequent reversion to an earlier, undivided state – the beastly, primitive and uncivilized human condition. Broadly speaking, the groundwork of the Gothic narrative, based on the relationship between the self and the Other within an Other-encompassing oneness, is based on the contested, transformative, mutable concept of the self of Dr Jekyll who leads a double life: each time he takes a magic potion, his originally good self is transformed and misshapen into an evil, destructive one called Mr Hyde; however, the reversible effect of the drugs, making possible the two-way process of transformation of Dr Jekyll into Mr Hyde and back again, is not never-ending. Rather, the transformational process is by degrees thwarted because it irrevocably entails the death of the original self of Dr Jekyll and, at the same time, the ultimate physicalization of his alter ego as embodied in the figure of Mr Hyde. Throughout the book, the story alternately revolves around either a respectable, well-liked London doctor, Dr Henry Jekyll, or his devilish alter ego, Mr Edward Hyde, until its very last pages where the reader witnesses the eclipse of the nearly angelic figure of the doctor by its diabolic underside. Significantly, the novel conveys the exploration of Jekyll's own subjectivity and the

consequences of the subsequent excavation of its long-buried ‘chest’ of the hidden, the irrational, the morbid, the tabooed, and the dark. However, not being able to manage and synchronize the binaries (self/Other, rational/irrational, good/evil, etc.) within the manageable coordinates of self-repossession, Dr Jekyll is ultimately mired in his own ‘shadow’. Overall, Stevenson’s novel, I attempt to prove, even more emphatically communicates the existence of fundamental duality embedded in every one’s nature, the entangling nature of binaries self/Other, and the aesthetics of non-disjunction of the binaries – “man is not truly one, but truly two” (Stevenson 1994: 70). What I argue throughout the paper is that “[t]he ‘duality’ [...] is *not* a matter of mutual exclusion or opposition, rather of dynamic tension, or an inclusive duality” (McCarthy 2010: 20-21), ultimately illustrating the Hegelian synthesis of entangling, non-disjunctive opposites. What is challenged is in fact the mutual exclusivity of the either/or binary, giving way to the rather archetypal perception of the individual in its essential dualism and its authentic bothness, togetherness or wholesomeness.

Accordingly, I approach the Jekyll-Hyde case as the case of bothness wherein the protagonist is trapped in the non-linear, haphazard process of splitting and dividing within his psyche. Thus, my largely Hegelian perspective on the strange case – the case of split personality – is by no means either in sharp opposition to or ultimately exclusionary of the scholars’ proven/provable arguments and inferences in relation to their anatomized, dissected analyses of Stevenson’s Gothic story. Put differently, my perspective provides not a radically different view of the Jekyll-Hyde case but a view which approaches the problem of the protagonist’s personality disorder as splitting rather than split and as non-finite rather than finite until the death of one of the two otherwise inseparable halves of the self. Sadly, here it is the death of the originally good self of Dr Henry Jekyll.

Also, my approach to Jekyll-Hyde personality disorder as splitting, developmental and progressive is in accord with the aesthetics of non-

disjunction² and with the aesthetics of entanglement. In this way, the self cannot be approached and understood using an either/or disjunction because body and soul, the rational and the irrational, “[e]vil and good exist as ‘both/and’ rather than ‘either/or’ in history” (Livingston 2002: 5-6). In fact, the complexity of the self lies in the composite, intertwining and entangling nature of the elements of a binary. Arguably, it is a process of non-disjunction of the two elements which are often perceived as mutually exclusionary of each other. The truth is, however, that they co-exist and “remain ‘intimately connected’” (Coale 2011: 2): they become entangled in a complex, intriguing sort of way and, symbolically, they approximate a sense of bothness and togetherness. And apart from the death hour, which is the only moment of disruption, disentanglement and separation of the two, they remain dialectical.

To conclude, my exploration of the aesthetics of entanglement and non-disjunction not only revolves around but it also centre-stages the theme of the double. Entailing a spectrum of binaries in Stevenson’s novel, the theme of the double offers a kind of a more inclusive and insightful perception of one’s identity, counteracting the stereotypical one based on division, polarization and, not rarely, demonization of what is considered as the lesser, the undesired, the threatening and the unsettling element of a binary. My objective is, therefore, conditioned by the dual nature of one’s identity and by a more wholesome perception of one’s subjectivity. What I primarily focus my attention on is the illustration of the entangled nature of the binaries, their closeness, and their intimate/intricate connectedness through the ultimate defiance of disjunction (either/or philosophy of exclusion). At the same time, I attempt to give an insider’s perspective on the impossibility of complete disentanglement: the elements of binaries cannot exist in isolation; instead, they partake in the compositional structure of the Hegelian synthesis. And, in line with this, if disentanglement is impossible, there is always a certain possibility to approach the dark, the shadowy, the irrational etc. understandingly. In

² Either/or disjunction is challenged and negated.

this way, we can raise the awareness of the existence of binaries, of their intimate relationship and of their originary unitariness³. Only then can we hope for a less disturbing and unsettling vision of human darkness and for a more integral perception of what has always been defined as the threatening other in each binary

2. The Jekyll-Hyde Identity – Who is Dr Jekyll Hyde-ing?

Stereotypically viewed, the Jekyll-Hyde case is self-evidently and undoubtedly centered on the theme of the divided nature of the human psyche as externalized and physicalized in Stevenson's example of homo duplex. Certainly, Gothic scholars have extensively written about the protagonist, Dr Jekyll, and his alter ego as embodied in the figure of Mr Hyde⁴. Mostly approaching the case as psychoanalytically inflected, Gothic scholars have delved deep into the following areas: split personality, the unhealable rift in the psyche and the cataclysmic, overpowering effect of human darkness if it runs unbridled and spreads unchecked. Though not negating the truthfulness of their in-depth scholarly research, my approach to the problem of split or divided personality is from a slightly different angle. I make an attempt to engage with his protagonist's internal and external drama not as a result of his split, divided nature as a finite state: the writer's insightful perception that "man is not truly one, but truly two" (Stevenson 1994: 70) is looked into from an angle which is semantically synergetic in an entangling way. In my line of argument, man *is not being* one but he *is being* two in a complex, non-disjunctive and entangling way. Arguably, the real nature of Stevenson's aesthetics is closer to the notion of a divided but complexly relational self (of the kind essentially proposed by Hegel in the first part of the

³ This is in fact the road to self-repossession. It is the repossession of the concept of the self as a complete being which propagates dualistic perception of the self.

⁴ Significantly, the title of the novel, *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, is implicit of the hidden and repressed aspects of Dr Jekyll which are symbolically self-contained in the name of Mr Hyde. Throughout the novel, these aspects are being unhidden or, put differently, Dr Jekyll is un-Hyde-ing himself as a compound of the self and the Other.

nineteenth century) than to the notion of a rigidly binary and disjunctive notion of the self. A similar view has been expressed by John Herdman (1990), who claims that “[a]lthough Hyde is a projection of what Stevenson calls pure ‘evil’ Jekyll remains mixed, the same ‘incongruous compound as before” (Herdman 1990: 135). Also, Herdman quotes Chesterton’s statement that “[t]he real stab of the story is not in the discovery that the one man is two men, but in the discovery that the two men are one man” (qtd. in Herdman 1990: 137).

Therefore, man is a signifier of *bothness*, though in a very complex and entangling way. On the metaphysical plane, he *is* truly two. On the physical plane, however, he can always be the embodiment of the self which is cyclically re-physicalized into Otherness and back again – all *within* an Other-embracing oneness. Interestingly, the process of transformation is repetitive in an almost never-ending succession, justifying the philosophy of entanglement and either-or-ness, though within bothness. Overall, what is emphasized is the complexity of the process of re-entanglements of the two within the territory of bothness and the view of the self which is more of a metamorphic than a fully metamorphosed self. Selfhood is, I argue, not an overdetermined territory but more of a contested site wherein the boundaries between the self and the Other are destabilized and unfixed. Arguably, therefore, my reading of Stevenson might well be pointing to the deep structure of the writer’s philosophy of duality of human beings and reinforcing the concept of the dual as one of the defining, innate characteristics of everybody’s nature.

Bothness, as depicted in the Stevensonean idiom, is characterized by constant tension and transformation within duality itself. Furthermore, in line with the Hegelian dialectics, I argue that Stevenson’s protagonist’s self-exploration and self-examination throughout the novel lead to the following discovery: the self is defined by an entangling difference and friction *within* wholeness and the concepts of good and evil are hopelessly/helplessly entangled: “[f]or Hegel [...] nothing is transcendent to knowledge, all reality is scientifically knowable, all concepts are distinguishable but

inseparable developments (moments) of the Absolute” (Leonard 1983: 34).

From the very beginning, therefore, the novel engages with the conjunctive, entangling relationship of bothness of the self and the Other and my representation of the Jekyll-Hyde case “refers to the domain of experience of that draws upon both self and other, but is neither occupied nor fully encompassed by either” (Rothenberg 2003: 63). Thus, the narrative revolves around the intertwining nature of one’s identity embodied in the Jekyll-Hyde figure, whereby the complex case study of his dual nature points to Stevenson’s recognition that: “man is not truly one, but truly two. I say two, because the state of my mind does not pass beyond that ... I hazard the guess that man will be ultimately known for a mere polity of multifarious, incongruous and independent denizens” (Stevenson 1994: 70). In this way, the writer’s heightened consciousness about: “the thorough and primitive duality of man” (Stevenson 1994: 70) most directly introduces the reader into his Gothic world in which Jekyll-Hyde transformation entails the repeated overlapping between the real and the unreal, the light and the dark, the good and the evil, the rational and the irrational etc. For the purpose of communicating the interconnectedness between the two, the story centers upon the uncanny physicalization of Dr Jekyll’s alter ego, Mr Hyde, through the use of the magic potion and upon the subsequent birth-death-rebirth triptych: each time Dr Jekyll takes the potion his counterpart (Mr Hyde) is born, is subsequently secured a short-lived existence and then he experiences death upon the intake of the next dosage of the potion itself; then, with the nightfall and with another intake of the reviving, transformative potion, Mr Hyde’s rebirth occurs. Throughout the novel, this mutation, metamorphosis or transformation of the original into its alter/altered/alternative self and vice versa points to the co-existence of the dual/double on the psychological and physical planes alike: “I saw that of the two natures that contended in the field of my consciousness [...] **I was radically both**” [bold mine] (Stevenson 1994: 70). It is at this point that Stevenson is, arguably, putting forward the aesthetics of non-disjunction which is neither

exclusionary nor discriminatory toward one of the elements of the binary. The radical, even revolutionary, nature of Stevenson's attitude toward his protagonist lies in the fact that the writer perceives him as Jekyll *and* Hyde at the same time. In fact, his protagonist is *both* – his ego and alter ego are housed in a single person. Put differently, defying the aesthetics of disjunction through his argument that these two natures cannot “be housed in separate identities” (Stevenson 1994: 71), Stevenson claims that “[i]t was the curse of mankind that these incongruous faggots were thus bound together – that in the agonized womb of consciousness these polar twins should be continuously struggling” (Stevenson 1994: 71). What is more, the two aspects of the protagonist's bothness engage in a dynamic interplay reaching the Hegelian synthesis; in this way, they prove almost inextricably linked and interlocked.

Though largely antithetical, polarized and incongruous, the self and the Other are inextricably bound together and they slip/slide into each other in an entangling way. And it is the entangling⁵ nature of the dichotomy which helps us arrive at a more insightful perspective on the theme of the double in Gothic literature in the sense that the binaries (self/Other, good/evil, rational/irrational, nature/civilization, etc.) are not looked upon in divisive terms but rather as complicit of an entangling totality and, by nature, part of an indivisible whole. A rather static binary logic of either-or-ness is replaced by a more dynamic interplay of both-and-ness. Thus, Stevenson's use of non-

⁵ The definition of entanglement of binaries or opposites as ‘intimately connected’ unambiguously points in the direction of a kind of an invisible bond or connectivity between binaries. At this stage, I rely on the definition of entanglement as offered by Samuel Chase Coale, a Wheaton College professor of literature; he has borrowed it from quantum theory and has subsequently used it in his authored book *The Entanglements of Nathaniel Hawthorne*: “I have borrowed the term from quantum theory where nothing exists in isolation or is separate from anything else, however much our language and logic define them as contradiction and opposites. We describe particles and waves differently, but they are manifestations of the same thing simultaneously. But our language can't accomplish that, so we create the seemingly contradictory opposites in language, but they do not exist as such in ‘real’ life” (S. C. Coale, personal communication, March 15, 2015).

disjunction of binaries and their mutual re-entanglement within the Hegelian ‘synthesizing space’ has, in my line of argument, become a new and largely sustainable interpretative strategy in approaching the binaries as embodied in the figure of the double – Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde.

In fact, Jekyll is inseparable from his double or *Doppelgänger*⁶, Mr Hyde. In other words, Jekyll’s identity is a compound in which Hyde is an innate, formative element through which “Jekyll seeks of course to slough off [...] burdens of respectability, reticence, decorum, self-censorship” (Arata 2005: 193). Eventually, Hyde “comes eventually to embody the very repressions Jekyll struggles to throw off” (Arata 2005: 192) and as the story shows Hyde⁷ proves to be someone who cannot be controlled, ruled over or played with in the way Jekyll naively thinks. It is through the reversible self-Other or Jekyll-Hyde transformations that Stevenson examines not only the overwhelmingly destructive potency of the returning repressed but also the entangling complexity of duplicity of human nature. It is a kind of duplicity which illustrates a sort of intimate connection between paired, though largely warring, ‘halves’ of the self. In my line of argument, these two halves do not fall or slide into the category of exclusively disjunctive

⁶ *Doppelgänger* is the coinage of Jean Paul Richter’s from 1796 and ever since it has figured as a widely exploited literary term which implies duality i.e. dual or double nature of a person. “A mirroring or duality of a character’s persona, the concept of the *doppelgänger* refers to the twin, shadow double, demon double, and split personality, all common characterizations in world folklore [...] The term *doppelgänger* derives from the German ‘double goer’ or ‘double walker’, a complex characterization that novelist Jean Paul Richter coined in *Siebenkäs* (1796)” (Snodgrass 2005: 83).

⁷ Holly-Mary Romero argues that in the case of Stoker’s *Count Dracula*, Shelley’s *Frankenstein*’s creature and Stevenson’s *Edward Hyde* it is ironic to refer to these *doppelgänger* figures as monsters “because doubles are born from men’s psychological and physical repressions. This therefore suggests that the monstrosity attributed to *doppelgängers* is the result of the concealments of nineteenth-century British men” (Romero 2013: 23-24). Equally importantly, Romero’s well-documented argument seems to be largely supportive of my perception of the *doppelgänger* figure in Stevenson’s case because Hyde is literally born out of Dr Jekyll’s discriminatorily concealing selfhood – the self’s discriminatory politics against its own Otherness.

relations. Conversely, they slip into a bond of intrinsic, intimate connection in which they become hopelessly and helplessly entangled.

Obviously, slippage⁸ is the word most directly implicit of and referential to this intimate connection and fluidity between two opposing/conflicting aspects of the protagonist's double nature. What is more, in the Jekyll-Hyde case the word also points in the direction of some change, mutability and transformation of the 'originally' good self into its threatening counterpart, which is an act of Gothic transgression of one's integrity. And, in this way, the word *slippage* not only approximates the sense of the intrinsic connection between and entanglement of the conflicting aspects of human nature but it also emphasizes the transgression of the fixed, uniform notion of the self of the straightlaced Victorian society. Accordingly, "[d]r. Jekyll creates Mr. Hyde in an attempt to escape the restrictive spheres" (Beauvais 2009: 175) of the Victorian society and it is not surprising that the writer approaches the self as complex, fluid, transformative, mutable, mysterious and, most importantly, dual in nature,

Overall, the self, thus defined and understood, re-affirms and re-instates Stevenson's belief that "man is not truly one, but truly two" (Stevenson 1994: 70), 'upgrades' this pure duality to the level of the Hegelian synthesis and heralds, though indirectly, the postmodernist perception of the self as rather indistinct, many-faceted and slippery.

⁸ Slippage is, in my opinion, the word which is of paramount importance for the proper understanding of the double nature of the protagonist since slippage is, in the Jekyll-Hyde context, implicit of the double nature of transformational fluidity both physically and psychologically. Therefore, the word is referential to the physical as well as to the psychological transformation of the self. In this way, malformation of the originally good self, its subsequent psychological degradation and 'fall' into a beastly murderer is cyclically followed by a re-formation, restoration or re-birth of that original self until the novel's end – it is on the last pages that we witness the death of the original self entailing the birth of the beastly Other.

3. “The Story of the Door” as an Antechamber to the Chamber of Doppelgänger

Interestingly, the opening chapter, “The Story of the Door”, serves as a kind of antechamber to the theme of the duality of the self or doppelgänger, which is exploited in depth throughout the novel, either in an understated or overstated fashion. Through a powerful metaphor of the door, the introductory chapter is anticipatory of the central narrative strand of the three-tier narrative structure. Initially, the door sets an enigma, a puzzle and a mystery to the reader: ‘What is behind the door?’ or, more importantly, ‘What might the door of Dr. Jekyll’s room be hiding (Hyde-ing)?’ Undoubtedly, the door is symbolic of the theme of duality because it acts as an ‘agent’ of division or separation into the outside and the inside, the exterior and the interior etc. At the same time, though, it is a kind of connective tissue between the two – a point where the two spheres meet, collide, and slide into each other. Put differently, it is through the metaphor of the door that Stevenson heralds what will become the narrative axis of *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* – a territory of in-betweenness; since the door itself gives access both to the inside and to the outside, it metaphorizes a place of convergence of the ‘inner’ and the ‘outer’ of one’s identity. It is a meeting or contact zone between the civilized and socially acceptable identity of Dr Jekyll (the outside) and the uncivilized and socially unacceptable identity of Mr Hyde (the inside).

The theme of the double or doppelgänger, which is only vestigially touched upon in the first chapter, is progressively developed and finessed throughout the narrative. In fact, it is through the three interconnected mini narratives that Stevenson slowly builds up the grand design of his novel which is focused on the duality, doubleness or polarity of human nature as embodied in the figure of his protagonist¹: “Lanyon’s narrative reveals the identity of Jekyll and Hyde, leaving to Jekyll’s the task of explanation. (It is also necessary for Jekyll to know of Lanyon’s letter, so he can instruct Utterson to read that account before his own.) Such devices not only serve to accelerate the narrative and make it the ‘masterpiece of concision’ that James admired, they also implement a drive toward an all-inclusive

coherence" (Garrett 2003: 105). In this way, Lanyon's, Utterson's and Dr Jekyll's narratives drive toward a coherent, concise and measured account of the Jekyll-Hyde case, which is Stevenson's scientifically-aligned version of the archetypal – the archetype of the werewolf:

As a symbol of the dual nature of man, the man who appears civilized and evolved during the day, only to regress into a wild, libidinous wolf at night, reflects the conflicted nature in all of us [...] The equally famous Jekyll/Hyde character from Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886), presents a science-fiction version of the werewolf archetype, in which the means of transfiguration is achieved through science, via a chemical concoction, rather than through a magical curse (Indick 109).

The major narrative, which is driven forward by the three mini narratives, describes the process of transfiguration as animated and repetitive, entailing both physical and psychological mutation and transformation. Though the first two narratives, Lanyon's and Utterson's, keep a sustained focus on the dual nature of the London doctor, Henry Jekyll, it is the third narrative which delves minutely into the dualistic nature of Stevenson's protagonist and literally dissects it. The final narrative is arguably the fullest, most personal statement of Dr Henry Jekyll and his experience of self-Other dualism which is, in his case, primarily challenged and fuelled by "the existential quest for selfhood and identity" (Washburn 1994: 73); furthermore, dualism is unambiguously conducive not only to the fact that man's nature is dual in essence but also to the fact that both identities are operational and functional at the higher level of Hegelian synthesis.

The final narrative, which is Henry Jekyll's account of the story of his own life, powerfully illustrates the basic narrative thread of the dual identity by claiming that they "are not two different structures but rather are two different (inner and outer) dimensions of the same structure" (Washburn 1994: 73). In fact, Stevenson does not propound the one-identity concept of the self as some unquestionable and absolute category. Conversely, he is, in the manner of a true Gothic writer, openly disrespectful and transgressive of such deeply seated notion. Symbolically, he challenges it through the potion-induced,

two-directional metamorphic process of the famous London doctor, whereby the dimensions attached to the transformational process are like the extremities of life and death:

The most racking pangs succeeded: a grinding in the bones, deadly nausea, and a horror of the spirit that cannot be exceeded at the hour of birth or death. Then these agonies began swiftly to subside, and I came to myself as if out of a great sickness [...] I felt younger, lighter, happier in body; inside I was conscious of a heady recklessness, a current of disordered sensual images running like a mill race in my fancy, a solution of the bonds of obligation, an unknown but not an innocent freedom of the soul. I knew myself, at the first breath of this new life, to be more wicked, tenfold more wicked, sold a slave to my original evil (Stevenson 1994: 72).

The process of transformation, which is transgressive of the physical as well as psychological boundaries, allows Stevenson's protagonist Jekyll to get largely 'unbound' from the obliging social bonds of Victorian society and explore his own largely unknown and never completely knowable subjectivity. As a result, he gets helplessly entangled in the self-quest and realizes that his – every one's nature – is intrinsically dual and that life is not reducible to either/or dichotomy. Accordingly, one is basically both, oneness is bothness and bothness is operative at the higher level of Hegelian synthesis. Also, his own subjectivity, though never fully explored, has at least offered Jekyll a glimpse into the complexity of human nature in its duality and entanglement.

Significantly, in the first two mini narratives as well as in the third and final one, *Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of the Case*, I have managed to provide a sustainable approach to the Jekyll-Hyde case as the one of entanglement and of non-disjunctive aesthetics. Even the very last scene in the novel, depicting the death hour of Dr Henry Jekyll and the birth of Mr Edward Hyde, is in accord with Stevenson's aesthetics of entanglement and non-disjunction – "man is not truly one, but truly two (Stevenson 1994: 70). And, in Saposnik's opinion, "[b]y carefully juggling the literal and the symbolic, Stevenson details the emerging influence of Hyde, the amoral abstraction who takes possession not only of Jekyll's being but of many a reader's imagination. Hyde so dominates the popular mind that Jekyll's role

has been all but obscured. In order for the story to become fully meaningful again, their true identities must be restored" (Saposnik 1971: 351). And the restoration of the identities, the novel's climactic moment, is the moment when the death of one is coincidental with the birth of the other (Other). The death of the distinguished, reputable doctor Jekyll overlaps with the birth of his not-so-exemplary counterpart embodied in the figure of Mr Hyde:

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 [...] this is my true hour of death, and what is to follow concerns another than myself. Here, 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 (Stevenson 1994: 88).

In other words, the death scene has affirmed my initial hypothesis that the two identities are intimately related and entangled within the metaphysical boundaries of Hegelian synthesis; it is *only* at the death hour of one or the Other that they are approached as disjunctive. Stevenson's narrative has thus exposed the writer's aesthetics that one is truly both – oneness is truly bothness until death do us part. Knowing that death and birth are usually coincidental in the Gothic novel, it is hardly surprising that the death of one entails the birth of the Other. "[W]hat is to follow concerns another than myself" (Stevenson 1994: 88) encrypts the birth of the Other and its permanent physicalization in the figure of Mr Hyde.

4. Conclusion

The Jekyll-Hyde duality gives us some valuable insights into the entangling complexity of his nature. Jekyll's original self, the good one, is only a ruse: he ultimately falls into the category of the distinguished London gentlemen of the Victorian era "whose respectability provides the façade behind which their essential selves are allowed masquerade" (Saposnik 1971: 715). What is claimed to be the original self is only a part of his authentic selfhood, only a socially acceptable half. The other half, which is a Mr of darkness or Mr Hyde, is intrinsically relational to the original and, at the same time, it is formative of the totality of one's being and of Hegelian synthesis. In

line with this, his life is, if metaphorically envisaged, a kind of journeying back and into his authentic and original self which is grounded in synthesizing duality. Put differently, the original self, which is dual in essence, seems to be naturally compounded of two conflicting or opposing halves whereby each half forms an integral part of an indivisible, synthesizing whole. Arguably, the problem seems not to be so much about our dual nature as it is about our inability and, ultimately, failure to understand and keep the irrational half under control. Sadly, what is progressively running 'riot' or wild in the case of Stevenson's protagonist is that half of the self which is destructive, immoral, and devilish.

Furthermore, despite the fact that Stevenson's protagonist best exemplifies how "man is not truly one, but truly two" (Stevenson 1994: 70), he also reinstates the perception of man as having two sides which synthesize in the Hegelian manner. None of them is categorically exclusive of the other. Rather, they 'slide' into each other within an ambivalent territory: a civilized, rational human being can easily have his beastly self uncaged and be subsequently driven by the most basic, rudimental and animalistic instincts – "his shadow self" (Whitlark 1991: 208). In this sense, the paper has resurrected the archetypal symbolism of man-beast or beast-man, man-wolf or wolf-man etc. Importantly, the hyphenated word adds to my argument of the justifiable importance of the equal positioning of the otherwise antithetical elements. It follows, therefore, that the compound word man-beast/man-wolf is, both syntactically and lexically, complex alchemy of the two inseparable halves of a 'living compound' in the strange case study of Jekyll and Hyde. And man is thus shown to be compounded of the conflicting though not exclusionary elements: they are relational and synthetic.

What is more, I have hopefully succeeded in approaching the Jekyll-Hyde case from professor Samuel Coale's stance who propounded the idea of the dual/dualistic in human nature as entangling, interpenetrating and mysterious. Much in line with the Hegelian synthesis, the paper has shown that "it's probably not just dual but mysteriously integrated, a dark harmony that looks dualistic

to us because that seems to be the only way we can understand it. One interpenetrates the other.” (S. C. Coale, personal communication, May 21, 2015).

In fact, the paper has suggested that there always remains a possibility to approach duality from a different, not-so-categorical and not-so-divisive perspective: my argument openly defies the either/or dichotomy as conclusive, finite, finalized and, ultimately, exclusionary. Instead, it favours a more inclusive approach of **bothness** – bothness in the form of re-entanglements and Hegelian synthesis. There is a great likelihood that Stevenson wanted to point to bothness as essential to human nature and to the unpredictability of its constituent elements in their dynamic interplay; it follows that Stevenson’s perspective, which I largely share, can justifiably be defined as isomorphic:

From an isomorphic perspective, randomness, ambiguity, unpredictability, and uncertainty are inherent and necessary aspects of the dynamics of consciousness. Yet so too are the traditional concepts of order and certainty. With an isomorphic perspective the traditional binary opposition between order and disorder no longer operates; instead there exists a synthesis and both-ness between order and disorder (Lohrey 1997: 155).

Arguably, the synthesis in question resonates the Hegelian one. Put differently, a more holistic and synthetic attitude on the reader's part is desired in order to understand to which extent binaries are in fact “linked and connected into an integrated both-ness, a togetherness” (Lohrey 1997: 155). It is of importance to point to this condition of inseparability of the two elements and their interdependency which is archetypal in nature. What is undisputed is the universal human condition of bothness, togetherness and wholesomeness in the perception of one’s identity.

Even though the two elements fluctuate and are unstable in their interrelationship, they ultimately remain fixed in their intrinsic inalterability. And it is the recurrent transformation of the Jekyll-Hyde figure which is most paradigmatically suggestive of the complex re-entanglements of the two polarities. Arguably, the truth is that Stevensonian aesthetics of entanglement of the two aspects of every

one's nature is by no means a case study of simple dichotomy. Rather it is an in-depth investigation into the labyrinthine and non-disjunctive nature of the self. By the novel's end, the inclusivity of essential bothness and the exclusivity of ultimate either-or-ness have literally showcased the essentially dichotomous nature of the self, which is both entangled and self-entangling almost *ad infinitum*.

Furthermore, viewed through Stevenson's lens, the notion of the character of a person distantly suggests and vaguely heralds the postmodern notion of the self: in postmodernism, the character "becomes the merest series of instantiations of subjectivity, rather than a characterological entity [...] as the parameters of its figuration shift and metamorphose in temporal sequence" (Docherty 2000: 142).

Therefore, the notion of the self, put forward in Stevenson's novel, evinces a double instantiation of subjectivity. In fact, his narrative thread unambiguously points to the notion of the self as a characterological compound rather than as a characterological entity of oneness whereby the self is compounded of two differing, clashing and opposing aspects. Furthermore, despite the fact that the two aspects are clearly anti-relational in their physicalization in the form of good/evil and in the psychology of their minds (each competing for acknowledgement and legitimacy), they are archetypically relational in the construction or formation of the self. In an indirect way, though, Stevenson pointed to the biological demarcator of bothness of the self as one of the key demarcators of the self as a biologically complex being. Thus, his novel is also a literary contestation of the biologically curtailed, socially constructed notion of the self as characterized by oneness rather than by complexly entangling bothness.

In this way, the writer also showed the importance of the recognition and understanding of the darker aspects of human nature. Through the figure of the double or the *Doppelgänger*, which is an integral part of every one's nature, he exemplified and sensitized the perception of the self as complexly dual in nature; what is more, despite the fact that in the case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde the self-repossession has been conducive to the reversion to the beastly, primitive self, Stevenson pointed to the importance of the

acknowledgement of the archetypically/originary dual or dualistic human nature.

Finally, my approach to the figure of the double “variously known as the alter ego, the shadow, the Doppelgänger, the second self, the anti-self, the opposing self, and the secret self” (Wong 1993: 77) has allowed me to examine the Jekyll-Hyde figure as the figure of the proto-double: it is through the Jekyll-Hyde figure that we best see to what extent the two aspects, the Jekyllean and Hydean, are, intrinsically interrelated, ‘intimately connected’ and “innately responsive and relational” (Schapiro 1995: 128) to each other. And, significantly, Stevenson’s proto-model of the double has almost paradigmatically illustrated “the dialogue of the mind with itself” (Walker 2007: 43), the result of which is the unearthing of the hidden identity or what the self has long been Hyde-ing.

Certainly, my research has not offered any final or absolute word on the theme of the double or Doppelgänger and yet it has shown a sustainable approach to and coherent interpretative strategy in the treatment of the thematic in Stevenson’s novel. The double, the paper shows, is illustrative of the kind of bothness based on the non-disjunction and re-entanglement of the self and the Other on the metaphysical territory of Hegelian synthesis. Offering an insightful perspective of the double figure, the paper encourages Stevenson scholars to delve even deeper into this entangling relationship of bothness and possibly find some other correlations. Importantly, too, my research has shown that the exploration of the double is a kind of self-quest because “[t]he Doppelgänger makes possible an ontology of the subject” (Vardoulakis 2010: 1) itself.

Bibliography

- Arata, S. (2005). The sedulous ape: Atavism, professionalism, and Stevenson’s *Jekyll and Hyde*. In H. Bloom (ed.), *Robert Louis Stevenson*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, pp. 185-209.
- Beauvais, J. (2009). In the company of men: Masculinity gone wild in Robert Louis Stevenson’s *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. In M. Brock (ed.), *From Wollstonecraft to Stoker: Essays on Gothic and Victorian Sensation Fiction*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, pp. 172-193.
- Coale, C. S. (2011). *The Entanglements of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. New York: Camden House.
- Connor, S. (2000). Rewriting wrong: On the ethics of literary reversion. In L. Niall (ed.), *Postmodern Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers pp. 123-140.

- Docherty, T. (2000). The ethics of alterity. In L. Niall (ed.), *Postmodern Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 140-149.
- Dryden, L. (2003). *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles: Stevenson, Wilde and Wells*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Garrett, K. P. (2003). *Gothic Reflections: Narrative Force in Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Herdman, J. (1990). *The Double in Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Indick, W. (2012). *Ancient Symbolism in Fantasy Literature: a Psychological Study*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland.
- Livingston, J. D. (2002). *Healing Violent Men: A Model for Christian Communities*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Lohrey, A. (1997). *The Meaning of Consciousness*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- McCarthy, E. (2010). *Ethics Embodied: Rethinking Selfhood Through Continental, Japanese, and Feminist Philosophies*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Ninnes, E. L. (1983). Hegel on pure thought. In W. Maxwell (ed.), *Thinking, the Expanding Frontier: Proceedings of the International, Interdisciplinary Conference on Thinking Held at the University of the South Pacific, January, 1982*. Philadelphia: The Franklin Institute Press, pp. 25-40.
- Romero, H. (2013). *The Doppelgänger in Select Nineteenth-Century British Fiction: Frankenstein, Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, and Dracula*. Quebec City: Département des Littératures, Faculté des Lettres, Université Laval, Quebec.
- Rothenberg, J. D. (2003). Psychoanalysis and Jewish spirituality. In C. Spezzano and J. G. Gargiulo (eds.), *Soul on the Couch: Spirituality, Religion, and Morality in Contemporary Psychoanalysis*. Hillsdale: The Analytic Press.
- Saposnik, S. I. (1971). The anatomy of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 11(4), pp. 715-731.
- Snodgrass, M. E. (2005). *Encyclopedia of Gothic Literature*. New York: Facts on File.
- Schapiro, A. B. (1995). *Literature and the Relational Self*. New York: NYU Press.
- Stevenson, R. L. (1994). *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Vardoulakis, D. (2010). *The Doppelgänger: Literature's Philosophy*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Walker, J. R. (2007). *Labyrinths of Deceit: Culture, Modernity and Identity in the Nineteenth Century*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Washburn, M. (1994). *Transpersonal Psychology in Psychoanalytic Perspective*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Whitlark, J. (1991). *Behind the Great Wall: A Post-Jungian Approach to Kafkaesque Literature*. London: Associated University Presses, Inc.
- Wong, C. S. (1993). *Reading Asian American Literature: From Necessity to Extravagance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.