New Horizons in English Studies 8/2023

LITERATURE

Julia Zygan

The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
juliazygan@wp.pl
https://orcid.org/0009-0009-1502-1393

Strange Case of the Spin-off and the Classic: An Intertextual Analysis of Valerie Martin's *Mary Reilly*

Abstract. This article aims to analyze Valerie Martin's novel *Mary Reilly* (1990) from the perspective of intertextuality and claims that her work creates a dialogue with its hypotext. Before the analysis, this paper presents a short historical overview of intertextual theories, from the ideas dating back to ancient times regarding this matter, through the theories that contributed to the coinage of the term, to the three directions in which the notion of intertextuality developed – structuralist, poststructuralist, and socio-political. Martin's text is analyzed according to Gérard Genette's notion of transtextuality, concentrating mainly on one of its categories, hypertextuality. However, the study also employs the theory of spin-offs, arguing that Martin's text very directly leads the reader towards its one intertextual source. *Mary Reilly* initiates a dialogue with its main pre-text, Robert Louis Stevenson's novella *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) by redirecting the focus of the story that is already familiar to the reader, and presenting aspects previously omitted in the classic. This text introduces a very specific dynamic between the figures of a father and a daughter. Their relationship is present on the level of the story, but also on the level of authorship, discussing the situation of a female writer. Moreover, this spin-off creates a space for once silenced characters, such as members of the working class, or the Irish, to be finally heard.

Keywords: Valerie Martin, intertextuality, spin-off, dialogue, contemporary fiction,

1. Introduction

One does not have to be a literary expert to know Robert Louis Stevenson's novella *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. A classic of the literary canon and a story most people are familiar with, this text focuses on the story of the respected Dr. Jekyll and his evil alter ego, Mr. Hyde. The novella is mostly acclaimed for its "investigation

DOI: 10.17951/nh.2023.8.105-118

of duality" and the portrayal of the archetype of the double (Herdman 1990, 128–31). Character-wise, the text is centered around respectable men of high social status and their dilemmas. A century after the publication of the Gothic classic, Valerie Martin introduced the character of Mary Reilly (a young housemaid in love with her employer) to this story, in a rewriting of the classic from the perspective of Jekyll's servant.

The aim of this paper is to examine the intertextual connections between Stevenson's and Martin's texts. To do that, the analytic part of this paper is preceded by a short outlook on the history of intertextual theories. Gérard Genette's notion of transtextuality is then used in the following analysis. Nevertheless, besides Genette's approach, Martin's text can be discussed as a very specific type of intertextual work – a spin-off. Thus, this intertextual study of *Mary Reilly* combines both – the theory of intertextuality and more contemporary notion of a spin-off.

2. A Short Glimpse of the History of Intertextuality

To argue that a writer's text is not original would not be a groundbreaking statement to make, as such intertextual ideas go back to ancient times, centuries before the term intertextuality was coined in 1966. Plato was one of the first philosophers who proclaimed ideas later identified as intertextual. According to Alfaro, Plato argued that a "poet" does not create an original work, but constantly copies texts which were written before. Moreover, those previous texts are also copies of earlier works (1996, 269). However, despite being present from ancient times, intertextual ideas evolved significantly in the 20th century.

Two theorists who paved the way for later developments were Ferdinand de Saussure and Mikhail Bakhtin. In his *Course in General Linguistics* (1959), the former presented revolutionary concepts of a linguistic sign, a non-referential to the outside world combination of *a signifier* and *a signified* (1959, 13–15). An approach to language contrasting with Saussure's to a great extent was proclaimed by Mikhail Bakhtin. Instead of an arbitrary, non-referential, abstract system, language for Bakhtin is strongly connected with social interactions as it always emerges from them (Bakhtin and Volosinov 1986, 94). Therefore, instead of Saussure's language sign, he proposes utterance to be the smallest language unit. This change highlights the social aspect of language, as utterance is by nature dialogic – always a reaction to some previous utterance. In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984) and *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981), Bakhtin introduced the concept of a dialogic novel – a heteroglossic and polyphonic work.

In 1966, Julia Kristeva coined and explained the term 'intertextuality' in her two essays: "Word, Dialogue, and Novel" and "The Bounded Text." She refers to Bakhtin's ideas of dialogism and considers them with reference to literature presenting texts as a constantly growing net of connections. While Bakhtin argues that the social context of the utterance is used to understand its meaning, for Kristeva the context is ex-

panding endlessly; thus, it is impossible to understand the text's meaning as it is under constant change (Kristeva 1980, 66). According to Kristeva, one text presupposes the existence of another text (1980, 86–87). Thus, all texts are intertextual because each of them is based on a previously existing thought, statement, or text.

After the term 'intertextuality' was coined, this notion evolved in three directions: structuralist, poststructuralist, and socio-political (Alfaro 1996, 277). The first direction follows Saussure's semiologic reasoning and positions a literary text as a part of a large system emphasizing its relational nature. Although a text exists inside a certain system, it does have a meaning. Gérard Genette is a prominent figure representing a structuralist movement. Dissatisfied with the term 'intertextuality' as it was too broad, in *Palimpsests* (1982) he presented his own terminology and categorization. Instead of intertextuality, Gérard Genette introduced a new term – transtextuality, which means textual transcendence and is further divided into five categories. The first one is intertextuality but understood as "a relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts" (Genette 1982, 1), such as quotations or plagiarism. Paratextuality concerns paratext; whereas Genette's category which involves critical commentary of one text on another is called metatextuality. The fourth type, hypertextuality, concentrates on the relation between the hypotext (the older pre-text) and the hypertext (a new text that was created based on the pre-text). Genette also introduced the notion of architextuality, which is a text's reference to the whole genre (1982, 4).

Poststructuralism is the second direction in which intertextual theories evolved. Among others, a French literary theorist and philosopher, Roland Barthes, significantly contributed to this development. The most popular claim made by Barthes comes from his essay, "The Death of the Author" (1986). Since the text is an endless net of intertextual connections, it is impossible to uncover the meaning intended by the author to be there.

The third direction of the development of intertextual ideas is socio-political. This paper focuses only on a part of it, more precisely a feminist critics' reaction caused by Harold Bloom's concept of intertextuality. Harold Bloom applied the Freudian notion of the Oedipus Complex to the relationship between a poet and his precursor. Bloom viewed a poet as "a man rebelling against being spoken to by a dead man (the precursor) outrageously more alive than himself" (1975, 19). He claimed that the poet is motivated to write by two *drives.* The first one is to imitate the precursor, his *poetic father,* as a way of paying homage. The second is to create his own, uninfluenced text, which is, according to Bloom, impossible. Those two *drives* conflict with one another since, as described in Bloom's *The Anxiety of Influence* (1997), any new text can only imitate the already existing one. The poet's titular anxiety results from the inevitable influence of the other artist's work upon his own.

Bloom's notion of intertextuality provoked discussion among feminist critics because it completely excluded female writers. Like other male critics, Harold Bloom claimed that there is one canon of literature that every author follows, ignoring the fact that this canon is traditionally created by male writers. After the problem was

raised, Elaine Showalter coined the term gynocriticism in 1990 and described it as "the feminist study of women's writing, including readings of women's texts and analyses of the intertextual relations both between women writers (a female literary tradition), and between women and men" (189). Gynocriticism stresses the differences between anxieties of female and male authors. The notion of the anxiety of influence does not seem to apply to women's writing since women have different struggles, which are more related to culture and the woman's place in this culture. Therefore, instead of the anxiety of influence, Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar propose to talk about *anxiety of authorship* which is "a radical fear that she [female writer] cannot create, that because she can never become a 'precursor' the act of writing will isolate and destroy her" (1979, 49). Similarly, Barthes' concept of the death of the author is rejected by gynocriticism. For female critics the question of authorship, who wrote the text – a woman or a man – is essential (Friedman 1991, 158).

In 2006, in *A Theory of Adaptation,* Linda Hutcheon explained the notion of adaptation, which is highly intertextual. "[W]e experience adaptations […] as palimpsests through our memory of other works that resonate through repetition with variation." They always require "extensive transposition of a particular work," which means a change in medium, genre, or perspective (8). A contemporary theory that alludes to Hutcheon's notion of adaptation is Birgit Spengler's theory of spin-offs. They are intertextual forms in which "the relation to one pre-text is specifically highlighted […], as opposed to the relation to possible additional intertexts that support, amplify, or enrich what can be described as the primary intertextual 'dialogue'" (2015, 33). This relation concerns only written texts and is usually manifested strongly in the main body of the text as well as in its paratextual elements. The example of a famous spin-off is *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966), Jean Rhys's retelling of *Jane Eyre* (1848) "from a previously neglected perspective" (Spengler 2015, 13). In this article, I am going to mostly rely on structuralist and gynocritic approaches to intertextuality as well as Spengler's theory, which I find the most relevant in discussing *Mary Reilly*.

3. *Mary Reilly* – An Intertextual Novel

Valerie Martin's *Mary Reilly* is an intertextual neo-Victorian novel. Mark Llewellyn describes neo-Victorian fiction as stories "which desire to re-write the historical narrative of [… the Victorian] period by representing marginalised voices, new histories of sexuality, post-colonial viewpoints and other generally 'different' versions of the Victorian" (2008, 165). This genre is, therefore, intertextual as it emerged from reading 19th century texts. Besides its generic intertextual quality, *Mary Reilly* directly refers to a specific classic Gothic novella. From the characters to the events mentioned in this work, the reader can easily identify its intertextual nature.

The novel is set in London during the Victorian period and follows the story of a young woman, Mary Reilly, who works as a housemaid for respected Dr. Henry Jekyll. In the story, Jekyll's house is visited by mysterious Mr. Hyde – the doctor's as-

sistant. This plot is quickly recognized by the reader and identified as the plot of Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. While *Mary Reilly* includes the main events from the classic, it offers a completely different take at the story and shifts its focus from Mr. Utterson to a young housemaid's perspective. Mary, the narrator, describes her daily routines as a maid and discloses her feelings and emotions. Besides the events that happen at Jekyll's house, the reader also learns about her past, her relationship with her parents, and her opinions about the surrounding world. Some parts of the story are already known to the reader, such as the identity of Hyde, the murder of Sir Danvers Carew, or the ending of the text when Jekyll dies. Yet, at the same time not only is the reader confronted with a different perspective but is also pushed towards a different reading of the already familiar story.

As the existence of *Mary Reilly* would not be possible without the existence of its pre-text, the relation between the two falls into the category of Genette's hypertextuality, where the former is a hypertext and the latter a hypotext. The characters from Stevenson's story, such as Dr. Jekyll, Mr. Poole, Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Utterson, Dr. Lanyon, actively participate in the events in Martin's work. Yet, the hypotext extends the spectrum of characters, presenting and naming new figures, for instance, Annie, Mary, her father, and her mother. The hypertext amplifies its pre-text not only in length, but also in the representation of various characters and events. At the same time, this hypertext should not be treated as an extended version of its pre-text as it has never intended to be one. *Mary Reilly* does not include events from Stevenson's work plus additional parts, but it is rather a revisionary story that focuses on the housemaid's life and her perspective.

Even though Gérard Genette's ideas can be applied in analyzing *Mary Reilly*, combining them with the theory of spin-offs will be more efficient. A spin-off purposely and plainly leads the reader towards its intertextual connotations to one specific pre-text so that it can be read as a spin-off, not as a work of endless sources. While the novel by Valerie Martin includes intertextual connotations to other texts, it directly makes references particularly to Stevenson's work including the same characters and events. In doing so, it invites the reader to a specific reading of this novel centered around the dialogue with its main pre-text – *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Mary Reilly* seemingly revisits the same settings, reanimates the same characters, and recreates the same story. However, they are all the same only *prima facie* since the focus of the story is redirected. A reader aware of the fact that he/she is reading a spin-off automatically activates the knowledge about its pre-text and, while reading, consciously compares those two works and simultaneously reflects upon the changes. Interestingly, because Stevenson's novella is a well-known classic such a comparison may occur even if one has never read it but is familiar with the story via popular culture.

The first aspect which distinguishes *Mary Reilly* from its pre-text is the aforementioned change in perspective. It is manifested in first-person, autodiegetic narration. Mary is the narrator and focalizer of her journals. This change from third-person narration in Stevenson's text is crucial as the voice is given to a character who was previ-

ously deprived of it. Mary's character is mentioned in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* only during one scene as a nameless maid crying and weeping when Mr. Utterson and Poole came to check on Dr. Jekyll in the chapter "The Last Night." While crying she was immediately silenced, "only the maid lifted her voice and now wept loudly. 'Hold your tongue!' Poole said to her" (Stevenson 1886, 70). The maid did not utter any word, but only weeped; thus, she did not even have a chance to speak nor explain her reaction. Valerie Martin confesses in an interview, "I always thought that I'd like to know why that servant was crying" (Graeber 1990, 7). In Martin's spin-off, she gives the maid a name; therefore, she makes her a real character with personality traits and history, instead of being just a nameless, background character playing the role of a servant. Interestingly, this change is significantly powerful in the case of this specific story. In Stevenson's text, all the main characters were men of high social status. From this point of view, the moment when Poole quiets the maid reflects the situation of women in the pre-text – their story and voice are absent. Martin does in practice what feminist critics advocated in theory – she represents women in a male monologic discourse on two levels. First, she does it on the level of the story by giving the voice to the character of a woman of low status. Using Bakhtinian terminology, Stevenson's and Martin's texts create a dialogue – the constant echoing of a pre-text in its spin-off generates a double-voiced discourse. Secondly, Martin represents women on the level of authorship by rewriting the classic from a male literary canon as a female writer herself.

As the change in perspective is of major nature, it could be assumed that the same happens with the narrative structure. However, both the hypotext and the hypertext follow the same narrative structure – they both consist of three narratives. Stevenson's work starts with a third-person narrative, then presents the narrative of Dr. Lanyon, and that of Henry Jekyll. In *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde,* each next narrative explains more and more to the readers, strengthens their understanding of the story, and fills in the blanks. At the beginning, the reader observes puzzling events mostly from the perspective of Mr. Utterson, only to discover the truth later from the two remaining narratives. The text follows the typical detective story pattern of unveiling the mystery by showing more bit by bit to display the full picture at the end. Martin's text also consists of three narratives: Mary's narrative which she wrote for Jekyll, Mary's narrative from her journals, and the editor's afterword. Bette B. Roberts claims that *Mary Reilly* is a detective story as well (1993, 39–41). However, I would argue that it does not intend to be one for two reasons. First, the fact that *Mary Reilly* is a spin-off of a well-known classic precludes the possibility of building suspense and making it a detective story since one already knows the mystery behind Jekyll's double nature. Secondly, contrary to Stevenson's novella, its narratives disintegrate the story rather than implement one another. The novel starts with a short narrative of Mary describing a terrifying event when she was locked in the closet by her father. Reading the first presented narrative, readers are misled into thinking that this is the main story, until the second narrative starts with the words, "[t]his is the account I wrote for my

master nearly a year ago" (Martin 1990, 7). This is the moment when readers realize that what they have read so far is a part of another story. The second narrative is the longest one and consists of Mary's diary entries. The afterword, which is the third presented narrative, is yet another moment when the readers realize that they have been tricked again. It starts with the statement: "The preceding extraordinary diaries came to light three years ago in a transferral of property at Bray, in Berkshire, west of London" (Martin 1990, 257). It is the presumable editor who now claims that is in control of constructing Mary's story as some parts of it were deleted in the process of selection. The editor's contemporaneousness alludes to the neo-Victorian quality of the text, which cognately positions a contemporary author in control of rewriting a Victorian story. In the very last sentence of Martin's work, the editor even questions the authenticity of Mary's story, "[there] is the possibility that the sad and disturbing story unfolded for us in the pages of Mary's diaries is now and always was intended to be nothing less serious than a work of fiction" (Martin 1990, 263). Therefore, just as the first narrative is part of the second, the second narrative is, in the same way, part of the third. Thus, the use of three narratives in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *Mary Reilly* serves different purposes. Whereas, in the pre-text, it integrates and strengthens the story as one, in the spin-off, it disintegrates it and highlights the text's intertextual character. As each next narrative in *Mary Reilly* is an element of another one, similarly, the whole work is also a previously untold part of its hypotext.

4. *Mary Reilly* – An Intertextual "Offspring"

In *Mary Reilly,* a father is a vital figure that appears in the story on many different levels. From the first narrative, the reader learns about Mary's father and his abusive behavior, although it is not until the second narrative that the identity of the abuser is revealed during a conversation with Jekyll. Mary's father has influenced her deeply and is the reason for her trauma and fears. Mary herself is conscious of this influence, "I feel that my father put this dark place in me that brings sadness on me unawares" (Martin 1990, 35). Mary's father was an alcoholic who was aggressive and sadistic under the influence of the substance. However, when Jekyll calls him a monster, Mary disagrees saying, "Oh, I don't think he were a monster, sir, […] [h]e were an ordinary man, but drinking did for him as it has for many another" (Martin 1990, 27). The young woman sees her father not as a monster, a fictional creature, but as an ordinary man, a human being who is capable of such evil and whose evil side can be manifested because of the addiction. Mary explains it to Jekyll:

> "When I was very small, […] [f]ather didn't drink so much. He […] weren't cruel to me. […] [W]hen he was drinking […] He was a different man then—he even looked different, sir, as if the cruel man was always inside him and the drinking brought him out."
> "Or let him out," Master said softly. (Martin 1990, 27–8)

Jekyll's response is very suggestive. In the same manner as Mary's father, after drinking his potion, Jekyll transforms into wicked Mr. Hyde. Both transformations concern the mental and the physical aspect of the characters – their behavior and appearance changed as if they were different people. This proves that such a transformation takes place not on a scale of one individual but it is a universal phenomenon. It shows that people, regardless of their social status and wealth, have their second, evil side which can be triggered or awakened by not only something particularly special and mysterious as Jekyll's unknown potion, but also as ordinary as excessive drinking, drug use, or other issues. Thus, a man does not have to experiment with the laws of nature or God to artificially "unlock" his other side.

Hyde/Jekyll and Mary's father are double characters in this story. For Mary, unconsciously, the former resembles and embodies an alcoholic father – Jekyll representing his sober side and Hyde the abusive one. Both of those aggressors, the father and Hyde, share similar sadistic tendencies. They evoke a similar fear in Mary and sometimes even identical reactions. While being harassed by her father, she says, "Sir, don't do this" (Martin 1990, 4). Later, tortured by Hyde, she reacts similarly, "Please, sir. Do not do this" (Martin 1990, 238). Moreover, when Mary hears Hyde walking around the house, a petrifying fear and trauma of her father reveal themselves. It is visible in the following fragment:

> I knew he [Hyde] was gone and I had nothing more to fear. But I was crouched on the floor, quivering, trying to make myself small and cursing the tears in my eyes. He [father] always hated me to cry, it enraged him more than anything I could do and I always paid for it if he saw me. [... I]f I kept myself small I hoped he would not notice me.
> Who was it I pleaded with? (Martin 1990, 97–8)

Mary experiences similar fear just thinking about Hyde in a situation that seems safe. He evokes the same feeling of being put in a dark place, which she has already experienced because of her father. "I cannot be like others and look forward to the future, making plans and provisions for a shared life […]. All I could see then was blackness and I could feel his hand pressing against my mouth and the sickening weakness that rushed over me" (Martin 1990, 165). Mary concludes that she will never be happy because of this trauma. The fear will always be with her, wherever she goes, because it is united with her unconscious. Her relationship with her father influenced her forever. She even falls in love with a man whose nature is so alike her father's. She unconsciously follows the already familiar pattern of relationship.

It is precisely this familiarity that makes Hyde an even more terrifying figure for Mary. Marta Miquel-Baldellou notices that Mary is deeply afraid of the familiar that reminds her of her past. Not only does Miquel-Baldellou mention the father and Hyde, but also pays attention to Mary's hyperbolized reactions to the trip to Soho, which the scholar calls a "regressive process into her childhood," and to the swear words written by Hyde in Jekyll's books (2010, 129–131). Those reactions are results of

Mary's trauma, which, based on this observation, is not merely a trauma of her father, but everything that reminds her of her past life that she wants to escape. Thus, Hyde representing this past is a constant reminder that it cannot be escaped. When he fills Jekyll's books, which Mary has been secretly reading, with explicit language for Mary to see, he reminds her of her origin and past. Even though Mary learned to read, moved out, and wants to live a better life, Hyde puts her back in her place, which is dictated by Victorian order.

Hyde and Mary's father are not the only father figures present in Martin's work. She dedicated her novel "To the memory of two beloved seafarers JRM and RLS." The latter initial refers to Robert Louis Stevenson, who many times traveled by sea himself and wrote texts with sea-centered themes – the most popular one being *Treasure Island*. The former initials are more personal as JRM can possibly stand for John Roger Metcalf, Valerie Martin's father, who was a sea captain (Smith 1993, 254). They are both father figures, one to the author, the other to her text. This dedication together with the image of a father from the text's main body confronted with Bloom's theory regarding a poetic father introduce a new relationship – father-daughter (the one that was previously omitted and overlooked). Immediately, the suggestion arises that Mary's fear of her father and his influence on her can be read as a symbolic representation of fears of female authors previously "hidden in the cupboard," and discriminated against. Even though those writers finally have a chance to speak up, they are and will be forever influenced by the past, just as Mary describes the impact of her father on her as everlasting. Thus, female writers will always, even if unconsciously, write from a perspective of a once silenced group which partially corresponds to Gilbert and Gubar's anxiety of authorship.

5. "The Unworthy" in *Mary Reilly*

Besides taking the feminist approach, this spin-off also offers a different take on the reality of the Victorian period. Because the story is told from a housemaid's perspective, it embraces the world of people of lower status whose lives differ greatly from the ones of Mr. Utterson or Dr. Lanyon. Stevenson's text incorporates three narratives – third-person, which follows Mr. Utterson, the narrative of Dr. Lanyon, and lastly, Jekyll's perspective. All of those are narratives of wealthy men, none of whom have ever suffered the kind of problems that the lower status class is striving against. Although those narratives vary in the characters' points of view regarding moral judgment and the amount of information they possess, the three of them present only one perspective in terms of social status. Valerie Martin, writing a neo-Victorian text, creates the space for exploration of servants' struggles – ones that would be unworthy of mentioning in the pre-text. Thus, she opens a dialogue with a previously monologic, in this aspect, discourse.

Mary is a character who is aware of her inferiority – the fact that she calls her employer her "master" is very telling itself. While serving different masters and mistresses, she has always seemed invisible to them; yet, they easily noticed her every little

mistake (Martin 1990, 164). The editor from "The Afterword" writes that from a very early age "she was under the influence of a lady's maid named Mrs. Swit […], who filled her head with maxims about the proper relations of servants to masters" (Martin 1990, 258), one of those maxims being to remember your place as a servant (Martin 1990, 9). The fictional editor notices that "she always failed to capitalize the word "i" and never failed to capitalize the word "Master" (Martin 1990, 259). However, on numerous occasions, Mary was upset if Jekyll reassured her of her inferiority by acting in a certain way, "[h]e looked at me so cold [… as if] I was some object to him, useful like his pen or his cheque, such as only exist to serve his will. A rush of anger came upon me, but I fought it down, remembering my place and my duty" (Martin 1990, 120–1). Mary detested that feeling since she secretly loved her master but knew that this love could not be reveled due to her lower status. At the very end of Book 3, when Mary finds Jekyll's dead body, she finally breaks social appropriateness, she steps out of "her place" saying to her dead master, "[b]ut you said you no longer care for the world's opinion, (…) nor will I." After that, she kisses his hand and lies down next to him, putting her head on his chest. "Well, let them come" are Mary's last words in this novel, which mean that she decides to come forward with her highly inappropriate feelings at that time, but also with her story. The last sentence before "The Afterword", "[t]hat was how they found us" (Martin 1990, 256), suggests that they were seen by other people. Yet, this event was never mentioned in Stevenson's version – Mary was completely "cut out" from it due to her insignificance and lower status.

Mary's nationality is important in discussing "the unworthy" of the Victorian period. Mary is an Irish woman, or at least of Irish origin. Her nationality is not stated explicitly in the text, yet, when writing her journal, she uses some grammatical constructions that resemble Irish English. Dara Downey analyzed Mary's use of Hiberno English, patterns which are a direct translation from Irish into English, combined with the character's occasional usage of Northern English words. The scholar concludes that Mary is most probably "second- or third-generation London Irish" (2020, 9–10). The fact that the Irish were associated with the Catholic, the barbarous, the less evolved, the inferior, and the double of the British identity during the Victorian period (Jackson 2013, 79) greatly complicates Mary's position. She is the assimilated Irish whose Irishness manifests itself only through her use of language. Downey notices that the farther into the narrative Mary uses her dialect less frequently which implies "a growing identification with the class she serves" (2020, 10). However, it is not only about the class, but also, precisely, about the nationality. Mary, as an assimilated Irish, the double, rejects the Irish part of her identity and tries to gain a new one by breaking with the past. Nevertheless, this proves to be impossible as this past haunts her in her present.

The aspect of Mary's nationality becomes even more complex when the nationality of the author of the text is considered. Martin writes about an Irish servant as an American writer herself. In the 19th century, because of the Great Famine, a lot of emigrants from Ireland became domestic servants in America. Together with the African-American servants, they were often dehumanized (Howes 2009, 98). This

fact, along with a very particular way in which Mary addresses Jekyll – as her master, implies certain allusions to slavery. As the term "master" signifies a slave-owner relationship, by means of choosing this specific title, Martin opens the possibility of reading this novel as a neo-slave narrative – a contemporary text written using the first-person voice of a slave (Rushdy 1999, 3). In her first-person narration, Mary, tries to hide her origins, suppress her past, and even to some extent, act as a person of a higher class – by reading books and having one-to-one conversations with Jekyll concerning serious matters. She can do all that as her condition at Jekyll's household is better than at her father's – her previous owner. However, Jekyll's not being directly abusive towards Mary does not change the fact that he is still her master – owns her "like his pen or his cheque, such as only exist to serve his will" (Martin 1990, 120–1). Even though Jekyll is the only character in the novel who wants to change the situation of the poor by, for instance, allowing them to have access to education, he fails this mission – he dies in the end. Simultaneously, he supports the oppressive system, which manifests itself in a form of his evil side Hyde abusing Mary. By incorporating an allusion to slavery into her story, Martin's spin-off comments on its pre-text on a broader scale, showing that silencing certain voices and stories is not a problem that occurred only in one region or culture.

6. The double

Since Stevenson's classic is mostly acclaimed for its "investigation of duality" (Herdman 1990, 128–31), Martin's novel also engages in an intertexual dialogue concerning the concept of the double. It does that on three different levels, which I want to present resorting to Berlo's model of communication from *The Process of Communication* (1960). This model lists four main components of communication: sender, message, channel, and receiver, which I will use as a basis for my analysis. I will exclude one of the components – channel (understood by Berlo in terms of five senses which transfer the message) – as it is irrelevant to this examination, since both texts resort to the same form (a literary one) and the same channel (seeing).

As regards to the sender, Martin creates an intertextual dialogue with the pre-text on the level of the authorship. The duality between Stevenson and Martin evinces in anxieties which they experience as writers. The male writer portraying the double in his novella paid homage to Dostoyevsky or Hoffman (who explored "mental and moral duality"), simultaneously repeating their ideas (Herdman 1990, 127). In doing so, he experienced the *anxiety of influence*. On the other hand, Martin writing a spin-off cannot become a 'precursor,' and thus, confirms Gilbert and Gubar's worries suffering from the *anxiety of authorship*. Those two writers, facing their literary anxieties, become each other's double.

In relation to the message, I investigated the content of Martin's novel. As Smith notices every event from *Mary Reilly* is "doubly seen" since it has its double in Ste-

venson's text (1993, 246). Yet, the spin-off, on its own, addresses the double concept. Just like Stevenson's text portrays the duality between Jekyll and Hyde, Martin does it as well, simultaneously broadening the spectrum of dyads of characters. Besides the obvious Jekyll-Hyde double connection and already discussed relationship between Jekyll/Hyde and Mary's father, Mary acts as Jekyll's double. Similarly to her employer, her nature is also dual: she wants to act according to her position, but at the same time to express her feelings towards Jekyll. Miquel-Baldellou claims that "[i]f Mary is able to perceive Jekyll's apparent doubleness is precisely because her nature is also double-sided" (2010, 127). Even though they may seem distant, the servant compares them to "two sides of the same coin" (Martin 1990, 34) noticing the similarity between them. Mary acts also as Hyde's double figure (Smith 1993, 253) which becomes apparent when she sees him in her own reflection (Martin 1990, 253). Mary's fear of familiarity in Hyde's behavior only confirms the connection between those two characters.

In terms of the receiver, the audience of *Mary Reilly* and that of Stevenson's novella also act as each other's double. While the classic addressed 19th-century readers and offered a detective, Gothic story with the portrayal of dualities, the contemporary novel addresses an entirely different audience. Embracing feminist, postcolonial, and Marxist discourses, Martin brings to the fore the voices of women, slaves, and working classes in order to confront the 20th-century receivers of *Mary Reilly* with a retelling that includes new, previously omitted perspectives and issues.

7. Conclusion

Rather than just an intertextual text, *Mary Reilly* is a spin-off written to create a dialogue with Stevenson's classic. Its aim is to rediscover the well-known story by including in it previously omitted aspects, such as the father-daughter relationship, or problems of the discriminated and unheard. The former is introduced in Martin's text on two levels: first, on the level of the story, and secondly, on the level of the authorship, describing a relationship between the female writer and the author of the pre-text. Besides this gynocritical reading, this spin-off, juxtaposed with Stevenson's text, can be read as a space for characters of lower social status to be noticed and heard.

References

Alfaro, María Jesús Martínez. 1996. "Intertextuality: Origins and Development of the Concept." *Atlantis* 18, no. 1/2 (June/December): 268–85. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41054827.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.* Translated and edited by C. Emerson. Minneapolis MN: University of Minnesota Press.

---. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* Translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist, edited by M. Holquist. Austin TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M., and V. N. Volosinov. 1986. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language.* Translated by L. Matejka and I. R. Titunik. Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press.

Barthes, Roland. 1986. "The Death of the Author." *The Rustle of Language,* translated by Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang.

Berlo, David K. 1960. *The Process of Communication: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bloom, Harold. 1975. *A Map of Misreading.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 1997. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry.* Second Edition. New York Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Downey, Dara. 2020. "The 'Irish' Female Servant in Valerie Martin's *Mary Reilly* and Elaine Bergstrom's *Blood to Blood*." *Humanities* 9, no. 4: 128. https://doi.org/10.3390/h9040128.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. 1991. "Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author." In *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, edited by Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, 146–180. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Genette, Gérard. 1982. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.

Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. 1979. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven CT and London: Yale University Press.

Graeber, Laurel. 1990. "Scenes Stevenson Never Imagined." Review of *Mary Reilly*, by Valerie Martin. *New York Times,* February 4, 1990.

Herdman, John. 1990. *The Double in Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Howes, Marjorie. 2009. "How Irish Maids are Made: Domestic Servants, Atlantic Culture, and Modernist Aesthetics." In *The Black and Green Atlantic: Cross-Currents of the African and Irish Diasporas*, edited by Peter D. O'Neill and David Lloyd, 97–112. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

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

Jackson, Emily A. Bernhard. 2013. "Twins, Twinship, and Robert Louis Stevenson's Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde." *Victorian Review* 39, no. 1 (Spring): 70–86. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24497000.

Kristeva, Julia. 1980. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon S. Roudiez, edited by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.

Llewellyn, Mark. 2008. "What is Neo-Victorian Studies?" *Neo-Victorian Studies* 1, no. 1 (Autumn): 164–185. http://www.neovictorianstudies.com.

Martin, Valerie. 1990. *Mary Reilly*. New York: Doubleday.

Miquel-Baldellou, Marta. 2010. "Mary Reilly as Jekyll or Hyde: Neo-Victorian (re)Creations of Femininity and Feminism." *Journal of English Studies* 8: 119–140. https://doi.org/10.18172/jes.154.

Pfister, Manfred. 1991. "How Postmodern is Intertextuality?" *Research in Text Theory: Intertextuality,* edited by Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Roberts, Bette B. 1993. "The Strange Case of Mary Reilly." *Extrapolation* 34, no. 1 (January): 39–47. https://doi.org/10.3828/extr.1993.34.1.39.

Rushdy, Ashraf H. A. 1999. Neo-Slave Narratives*: Studies in the Social Logic of a Literary Form*. New York: Oxford UP.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1959. *Course in General Linguistics.* Translated by Wade Baskin, edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. New York: Philosophical Library.

Showalter, Elaine. 1990. "Feminism and Literature." In *Literary Theory Today,* edited by Peter Collier and Helga Geyer-Ryan, 179–202. Oxford: Polity Press.

Smith, R. McClure. 1993. "The Strange Case of Valerie Martin and Mary Reilly." *Narrative* 1, no. 3 (October): 244–264. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20107014.

Spengler, Birgit. 2015. *Literary Spinoffs: Rewriting the Classics—Re-Imagining the Community.* Frankfurt-on-Main: Campus Verlag GmbH.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. 1886. *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.