Hey, You Monster

Ideological Representation and Resisting Interpellation in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

By: Jenny Fridh

Supervisor: Liz Kella
Södertörn University | School of Culture and Education
C-essay 15 credits
English | Autumn semester 2021

Abstract

This essay discusses the representation of Victorian ideologies and interpellation in Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. By utilising Louis Althusser's theories of ideology and interpellation, in combination with a critical understanding of Victorian ideologies as introduced by Rosemary Jann and Jihay Park, this essay aims to analyse the characters' representation of and submission versus the resistance to these ideologies. Additionally, by analysing whether the characters conform to the Victorian ideologies, introduced by Jann and Park, this essay proposes that non-conformity to ruling ideologies suggests resistance to interpellation, which is what constitutes a bad subject. This analysis lends itself to the discussion of how Althusser's theories may be used in literary analyses, as well as to the discussion, initiated by Judith Butler, of whether an individual's deviation from interpellation is possible. This essay argues that Dr. Henry Jekyll and Mr. Gabriel Utterson represent ideological functions by conforming to the Victorian ideologies, which constitute them as submitting to interpellation as good subjects. However, Mr. Edward Hyde's non-conformity to Victorian ideologies constitutes him as resisting interpellation as a bad subject.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Robert Louis Stevenson was a Scottish writer born in Edinburgh on the 13th of November 1850. He attended Edinburgh University between 1867 and 1871 as an engineering major and was a part of the university library and debating society, the Speculative Society. During his career, Stevenson wrote several critically acclaimed works such as *Treasure Island*, *Kidnapped* and *A Child's Garden of Verses*. Another work that garnered international success when it was published, and even today continues to intrigue and inspires readers, was *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* which was published in 1886 (Mehew). Stevenson's novella *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is the work that this essay will be focusing on.

Stevenson's novella *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* follows the experiences of lawyer Gabriel Utterson in Victorian London as he uncovers the true nature of his friend Henry Jekyll's research. Utterson encounters a hideous and violent man called Edward Hyde whom he connects to Jekyll. As the story progresses several characters experience the wicked antagonist Hyde as he rampages through London. Utterson is determined to find out the truth about Hyde, and fears for his friend Jekyll's safety. Ultimately, it is revealed that Jekyll's suspected connection with Hyde is true in the most twisted way and Jekyll, in an attempt to separate his good side from the evil one, has unleashed the darkest parts of his personality which take the form of Hyde. In the end, Jekyll's anxiety triggered by Hyde's actions and the accountability Jekyll would potentially face drive him to presumably take his own life. This is illustrated in the last chapter of the novella, but particularly by the last sentence of that chapter which reads, "[h]ere 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" (Stevenson 62).

The characters of Robert Louis Stevenson's novella *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* could be interpreted by considering several other theories, but this essay focuses on Louis Althusser's theories of ideology and interpellation. By analysing *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* this essay argues that the characters Dr. Henry Jekyll and Mr. Gabriel Utterson adhere to ideological practices of the Victorian era, and therefore portray what constitutes good subjects. However, the character Mr. Edward Hyde represents a deviation from ideological practices and is thus an example of what constitutes a bad subject.

Theoretical Framework: Louis Althusser's theories and Victorian ideologies

As its theoretical framework, this essay will follow Louis Althusser's theories of ideology and interpellation as they are outlined in his book *Essays on Ideology*. Using

Althusser's theories on ideology and interpellation in relation to the novella *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* may provide additional material when discussing character analysis by using Althusser's theoretical concepts. Furthermore, the concept of possible resistance to interpellation has been an issue heavily debated by scholars. This essay proposes that this concept may be identified by analysing the difference between characters who act according to ideological practices and those who do not. Therefore, using Althusser's theories is relevant to this essay as the concept of potential resistance of societal ideals represented by individuals is significant in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*.

Louis Althusser: ideology

The concept of ideology is definable in numerous ways, but the definition used in this essay will be that of Althusser's, while considering certain ideologies of Victorian era England. According to Althusser "Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence" (36). In other words, ideology represents the contrived requirements of society by which individuals constitute their existence. Additionally, Althusser proposes that ideology is material, occurring in the practices of the apparatus it exists in (39-40). Ideology as a material existence does not suggest that the representation lies in physical objects, such as a book or a pen. Instead, it refers to how ideology exists in actions, such as rituals or conventional behaviour. As Ideology is predominantly discussed in larger apparatuses and their practices the function of the individual needs to be established in order to be able to analyse the individual within ideology. According to Althusser,

> Where only a single subject (such and such an individual) is concerned…*his ideas are his material actions inserted into material practises governed by material ideological rituals which are themselves defined by the material ideological apparatus from which derive the ideas of that subject*. (43)

In other words, Althusser regards the individual as a subject who practices the rituals of the relevant ideological apparatus in which their existence is established (42-43). Furthermore, a subject's ideas exist in their actions, which are determined by "the material existence of an ideological apparatus" (Althusser 42) and can exist in smaller apparatuses such as a funeral, wedding, school day or political party meeting.

Louis Althusser: ideological state apparatuses

Defining what Ideological State Apparatuses[1] are and how they function is fundamental to comprehend Althusser's theory of ideology. Althusser defines ideological state apparatuses as "a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions" (17). These institutions are not necessarily controlled directly by the state but represent the ruling ideology and exist to hail subjects and thus reproduce individuals' submission to that ideology. Some examples of ideological state apparatuses include the religious, educational, legal, and cultural ideological state apparatuses (Althusser 17).

One fundamental distinction that one needs to be aware of is the distinction Althusser makes between the ideological state apparatus and the repressive state apparatus. The ideological state apparatus functions as several apparatuses under one body, while the repressive state apparatus functions as one. Furthermore, the ideological state apparatus belongs to the private domain, such as religious, educational, and family ideological state apparatuses. Finally, the ideological state apparatus functions primarily by ideology while the repressive state apparatus functions by violence (Althusser 16-19). Although these are the distinctions made between the two state apparatuses the last distinction does not entirely mean that ideological state apparatuses and repressive state apparatuses are completely separate from each other. Instead, Althusser clarifies that both state apparatuses function by both violence and ideology, though ideological state apparatuses predominantly function by ideology and secondarily by violence, while vice versa applies for repressive state apparatuses (19).

Althusser assert that without maintaining hegemony throughout the ideological state apparatuses no one class will be able to hold power over the state for long (20). Thus, the multiple bodies that function within the ideological state apparatus are prone to be sites of struggle, specifically between classes. Thus, what is seen as the dominant ideological apparatus depends on the ruling class' ideology of the relevant era (Althusser 20-21). By examining prominent ideological views of the Victorian era, it becomes apparent what ideological practices the characters in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* submit to.

---

[1] Since Louis Althusser uses different capitalisation for "Ideological State Apparatuses" (17) throughout his article, this essay will from this point on not use capitalisation to keep it consistent.

Victorian Ideologies: The Victorian gentleman and masculinity

This essay considers Althusser's theory of ideology in relation to Victorian ideologies as the conventional behaviour prescribed by society in the Victorian era by which the characters in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* constitute their existence. With the intent to stay relevant and concise, the proposed ideologies of the Victorian gentleman and masculinity closely associated with work represent two parts of Victorian ideologies, which are multifaceted to a greater extent than this essay will examine.

With the rise of the educated middle-class in society, the Victorian gentleman evolved into an educated, charitable figure. In her article "Fabian Socialism and the Rhetoric of Gentility" Rosemary Jann presents the gentleman as someone who not only exuded a certain strict professional ethic but was also invested in social welfare, such as charities, whereas selfishness was considered a social stigma (728-729). In addition to academic and professional success, one's public image was important as well and a successful person should not indulge in personal wealth without making an effort to support the public (Jann 735). Although much of the Victorian gentleman ideal is applied to educated lower classes this ideal applies to the aristocracy as well (Jann 739-740). The description of the Victorian gentleman can, according to Jann's article, be summarised as an altruistic, educated professional who carries themselves with confidence and values their gentlemen friends. In relation to Stevenson's novella the Victorian gentleman may be described in, for example, characters such as Dr. Henry Jekyll.

During the Victorian era, the professional status and work ethic of an individual was becoming increasingly associated with men and masculinity. As introduced by Jihay Park in her article on "Victorian Masculinity and Mrs Warren's Profession", this ideology of work associated with masculine standards emphasised gender division and gendered standards in Victorian society (203-204). "(T)he Victorian professionalism" (Park 204) assumes that a hardworking professional ethos was a fundamental standard for men, and the basis of middle-class masculinity, during the Victorian era. According to Park, in their "Gospel of Work", which was written during the early to mid-Victorian era, Thomas Carlyle, and Samuel Smiles continued to have an influence in the later Victorian era as well (206). In it, they contend that work was the way to transcend past sexual desires "and purge away the fleshly sins" (Park 205). They also developed the idea that work was a masculine duty which was "a man's most significant destiny to fulfil and his path to happiness" (Park 205). In the mid-Victorian era the ideology of separate spheres, which was emphasised by industrialisation, came to further relate masculinity with work, and these ideas carried over well into the 1880s (Park 206).

Louis Althusser: interpellation

Althusser's theory of interpellation alludes to a transformative process in which conscious individuals recognise and internalise ideological principles and practises presented through varying apparatuses. According to Althusser's theories regarding ideology and its function in society, interpellation, or hailing, is the recruiting process or transformation of individuals into subjects (48). Although this essay describes interpellation as a process, Althusser also proposes that "you and I…always already" (46) are interpellated subjects, as a result of perpetual recognition and practice of ideological apparatuses (46-47). An example of interpellation is the simple act of a figure of authority (e.g., police, teacher) shouting "Hey, you there!" (Althusser 48) and an individual's physical reaction to that exclamation. A physical reaction, such as turning toward the figure of authority, signifies that the individual recognises themselves in the designated You. Thus, they acknowledge the authority and the ideological practise they represent, and the implications of the interaction, and are thus interpellated as a subject. Similar situations can be seen in political speeches, news or in classrooms, where individuals recognise themselves as part of a group (e.g., as citizens, taxpayers, residents, or class).

Matthew Lampert and Althusser's theories

Matthew Lampert argues that it is not relevant to utilise Althusser's theories on an individual level in his article "Resisting Ideology: On Butler's Critique of Althusser". In his article, Lampert criticises the concept of analysing the isolated individual through Althusser's theories, as he argues "if the subject is constituted, as a product, through interpellation within and through ideological apparatuses, then it is the material practices structuring those apparatuses that must be our starting point" (Lampert 142). Lampert's insights into Althusser's theories give an alternative way to relate these theories to the relevant material. Lampert seems reluctant to give the individual importance in an Althusserian analysis and instead proposes a collective recognition of the function of certain active ideological apparatuses (137-138). According to Lampert, the existence of struggle is relevant in Althusser's work since the issue that one should address is how the force of the ruling ideology may be resisted, not completely deviated from (138).

In contrast to Lampert's article, and since ideology according to Althusser is relational to a conscious individual's perceived existence within ideological apparatuses, this essay argues that it is crucial to understand how individuals represents the ideas of the

relevant ideological state apparatuses. However, this essay agrees with Lampert's proposition that resistance rather than a complete escape from interpellation is relevant to a greater extent.

Judith Butler and Althusser's theories

In Judith Butler's analysis of Althusser, "Conscience Doth Make Subject of Us All", they[2] discuss interpellation and an individual's ability to resist it which is pertinent as this essay will analyse possible resistance to interpellation in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. By analysing Althusser's example of "Hey, you there!" (Althusser 48) Butler proposes that "existence as a subject, can be purchased only through a guilty embrace of the law, where guilt guarantees the intervention of the law and, hence, the continuation of the subject's existence" (Butler 11). To be concise, Butler argues that the basis of interpellation depends on the subject's conscious subordination to ideological apparatuses as a means to guarantee their continuous social existence. Furthermore, becoming a subject entails a perpetual process of subordinating oneself to ideological apparatuses, such as accepting the guilt one is accused of by the practices of the legal ideological apparatus (Butler 11, 16).

In Butler's analysis, they suggest that consciousness in a subject may be possible, which re-evaluate Althusser's theory of ideology. Whether it is acted upon or not, that consciousness could determine what may be interpreted as successful, or good, subjects and what may be considered a bad subject. According to Butler, "[t]o be "bad" is not yet to be a subject, not yet to have acquitted oneself of the allegation of guilt" (16). In other words, they consider a subject that does not submit themselves to the process of interpellation as a bad subject, despite the ambiguousness of what constitutes something as bad. Compared to Lambert's proposition, that resistance within the process rather than emancipation is essential, Butler seems to suggest that striving for the subject's complete deviation from the functions of ideological state apparatuses should be of interest.

This essay considers that the characters' state of interpellation in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* may depend on the individual's perpetual submission to ideological apparatuses, as Butler proposes. However, what constitutes a bad subject will be considered as a subject that continuously resists interpellating functions, rather than the self-emancipation of the subject or the avoidance of interpellation altogether.

---

[2] Since Judith Butler is legally nonbinary this essay will be using the pronoun, they/them when addressing Butler.

Previous research: Reading *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

Reading from an Althusserian perspective

According to Steven B. Smith, in the article "Ideology and Interpellation: The Case of Althusser", reading from the perspective of Althusser's theories is to produce rather than discover the conclusion one arrives at (508). From this perspective, the author is not the sole determining factor that makes meaning from a text, but instead, the reader interprets and produces meaning from that which is written. As such the author functions through ideological apparatuses as a subject subsequently interpellating the reader as a secondary subject (Smith 497-498). Acknowledging a subject's possible interpellation of others indicates that the author is a representative of the ideology which interpellates.

Previous research on Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde

Robert Louis Stevenson was and still is, regarded by literary critics as an author to be aware of, with a variety of fictional texts written for both adults and children alike. His work, *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, shows immense literary worth and from the time it was written until today has been popular worldwide, being published in approximately thirty languages. Many writers (e.g., Henry James, Vladimir Nabokov, Stephen King and Joyce Carol Oates) have provided critical commentary on the novella, and many such comments praise "the unobtrusiveness with which the tale's stylistic virtuosity and thoughtfulness of conception blend into the dramatic intensity of the narrative" (W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. xi-xii). The novella continues to spark discussion on more than the initial theme of human duality, inspiring questions regarding the characters' role in the story, what the story says about science and the impact of the Victorian setting of the novella. Stevenson himself provided minimal insights on the writing process but did assert that the idea behind the novella was inspired by dreams he had, which ultimately may have influenced his perception of humans' interaction with their desires and the dangers of hypocrisy (W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. xi-xiii).

Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde is regarded as a Gothic piece of literature, and as such, gothic aspects of the novella are commonly analysed. In the article "Character Crisis: Hegemonic Negotiations in Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*" Benjamin O'Dell states that characters in Gothic literature are less regarded for their personalities and more for their "fictional identity as a location for the representation of important social questions" (509). Furthermore, the significance of social relations is evident

in the novella, which O'Dell proposes aims to maintain the class hierarchy during the late Victorian era. In the article, the question of class and social hierarchy is primarily analysed through three separate scenes in the novella that depict a progression of "the Victorian gentleman's identity" (O'Dell 511).

First, according to O'Dell, the introduction of Utterson is a portrayal of class identity "as the quintessential representative of his class – a man who is public even in his privacy" (512-513). According to this perception Utterson is, compared to Jekyll, adept at regulating the ideal self, seeking simpler, social enjoyment of life rather than secret, socially indecent pleasures. Additionally, this image that Utterson portrays is representative of a particular social institution he is involved with, called Clubland by Elaine Showalter. This institution "provides a restricted setting within which men of power may meet and discuss" (O'Dell 514), and can be discerned by class identifiers such as luxurious dinner parties. Utterson's connection with this institution argues for the cultural and social authority he displays throughout the novella.

Second, O'Dell connects the rumours' potential to re-evaluate privilege in Victorian society to the scenes directly after Hyde murders Danvers Carew. Particularly since the victim is a highly respected member of society, the speculations are exceedingly publicised and discussed in public. This provides a decidedly pivotal turning point for Hyde, as it is after the testimony provided and subsequent speculations regarding motive that the gentleman that is Hyde is re-evaluated in the public eye. If there was any belief that Hyde was simply unpleasant, but could still behave according to social conventions, it has disappeared after the murder (O'Dell 511, 515). According to O'Dell what results in the monstrous image of Hyde lies "not in what is *hidden* so much as what gets *revealed* and *how*" (515).

Third, Jekyll's retreat from the public, which is seen as "an aberration in the social order" (O'Dell 517), represents what O'Dell refers to as the "restylization of the gentleman's code of conduct" (517). Jekyll's abnormal behaviour warrants the concern of others, such as his servants and Utterson. This aberration and warranted concern are used by Utterson to secure himself as an authorial figure who benevolently wishes to remedy Jekyll's damaged reputation. Furthermore, Utterson's involvement is a symbol of justice to the servants but one of repression to Jekyll (O'Dell 517-519).

In his conclusion, O'Dell relates these examples from the novella to the functions of the ruling class in Victorian England and Victorian masculinity. Additionally, it is concluded that the existing crisis of identity in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is not due to

shifting class relations but rather “the problem of class maintenance for the novel’s gentleman” (O'Dell 520).

Another aspect of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* that has been widely discussed is the concept of sexuality, specifically homosexuality and the Victorian era’s view that sex is immoral. These aspects are brought up in Katherine Linehan’s analysis of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, “Sex, Secrecy, and Self-Alienation in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*”. There is a distinct absence of women fulfilling any tangible role in the lives of the male characters of Stevenson’s novella. As a result of this absence, many critics conclude that Hyde is an expression of Jekyll’s secret sexual desire, written by “an author gagged by Victorian rules of reticence about sexuality” (Linehan 204). While the nature of this sexuality has been much debated some of the more prevalent theories either distinguish Hyde’s violent nature as heterosexual sadism or relate the dominantly masculine cast of characters to clandestine homosexual practises (Linehan 204-205). Linehan adds that “commentators such as Stephen Heath, William Veeder, and Janice Doane…have variously interpreted Hyde as emblematic of unrecognized male sexual neurosis…or an attraction-repulsion response to female emotionality” (Linehan 205).

However, Linehan argues that according to Stevenson himself, as recorded in a letter and other commentaries on ethics he has made, it is not sex that is the focus, but hypocrisy. This argument is further developed with the consideration that Jekyll does not take responsibility for Hyde’s actions and therefore can “avoid moral accountability” (Linehan 206) by denying his part in Hyde’s manifestation. In the previously mentioned letter, Stevenson is expressing an indignant attitude toward the Victorian idea that sex is sinful and highlights how it is Jekyll’s concealment and shame that is the basis for Hyde’s cruel nature. This criticism of the perceived sexual undertones of the novella instead proposes that it is the dividing of oneself that is dangerous, not the nature of sexual desire, therefore we should strive for a unified self (Linehan 206). In short, what is dangerous with dividing oneself is that ultimately it is the body and soul that are divided, which results in shame over the body and the self that is not seen publicly. This further results in the social self disassociating from, and thus losing accountability for, the private self (i.e., what the public does not know does not hurt me). This is the danger that Stevenson finds with the Victorian Puritan way of thinking, and what is characterised by Jekyll and Hyde (i.e., Hyde’s evil nature is actualised by Jekyll refusing to take moral accountability (Linehan 207, 209, 212).

Analysis

This analysis of Stevenson's novella *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is based on Althusser's theories on ideology and interpellation in relation to Victorian ideologies that the characters submit to. The ideological function of the author, as discussed by Smith (498), indicates that the influence of Robert Louis Stevenson is conditional on the perceived good or bad subject status of his characters. The analysis focuses on the characters Dr. Henry Jekyll, Mr. Gabriel Utterson and Mr. Edward Hyde, as these are pivotal characters about whom the novella provides the most information. By analysing the characters' portrayal of ideological views of the Victorian era this essay will identify how some of these portrayals suggest the characters' conformity versus non-conformity to ideological practises of the Victorian era. By using the analysis on ideology this essay will analyse the individual characters' state of interpellation, if the deviation from ideology may indicate an attempt at resisting interpellation, and whether the characters constitute good or bad subjects.

Characters' individual representation of ideology

In the reader's first encounter with Dr. Henry Jekyll, he is described as a handsome, clean-shaven, and kind man who surrounds himself with intellectual company:

> [T]he doctor gave one of his pleasant dinners to some five or six old cronies, all intelligent, reputable men…Dr. Jekyll…a large, well-made, smooth-faced man of fifty, with something of a slyish cast perhaps, but every mark of capacity and kindness. (Stevenson 19)

This description conforms to what Jann describes as the Victorian gentleman (i.e., an altruistic, highly educated, and intelligent professional who carries himself well and values their gentlemen friends) (728-729, 733-735). However, as we also know, Jekyll has another side that at this point in the novella has yet to be revealed but may be hinted at by including the description of Jekyll's "slyish cast" (Stevenson 19) in his introduction. Much of Jekyll's true dual nature, which this analysis will go into further detail on later, goes largely undiscovered throughout most of the novella.

Jekyll is someone who discerns himself early on as the quintessential Victorian gentleman and is a recognised social figure whose influence is primarily conveyed through his reputation and educational background. Jekyll is known as having achieved a higher education, as indicated by the many titles in his will. He has achieved not only higher education in medicine and law ("M.D., D.C.L." (Stevenson 13) but is also accomplished enough in his professional field that he has received honorary titles as well ("LL.D., F.R.S."

(Stevenson 13)) (W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 13). Besides Jekyll's stellar professional life there are also references in the novella to his social behaviour, such as regularly hosting gatherings for intellectual men: "the doctor gave one of his pleasant dinners to some five or six old cronies, all intelligent, reputable men" (Stevenson 19), and having "always been known for charities" (Stevenson 29). Considering the ideology of the Victorian gentleman as described by Jann, Jekyll fits right in as a highly educated, seemingly altruistic man (728-739). Furthermore, the dedication Jekyll shows toward his work and research is in accordance with the masculine work ideology that governed male individuals during the Victorian era as described by Park (202-206).

As a result of Jekyll's ideologically conforming nature, Jekyll's relationships are well-managed, even if some may seem strained on the surface. For example, Jekyll's relationship with his friend Dr Hastie Lanyon is slightly strained since Lanyon considers some of Jekyll's research as "unscientific balderdash" (Stevenson 14). The relationships that the book portrays in slightly more depth are the relationships between Jekyll, Lanyon, and Utterson. They are all friends from school and show a professional acknowledgement of each other. For example, Utterson is the lawyer in charge of Jekyll's legal affairs (Stevenson 12-13, 20), and while Jekyll and Lanyon do not see eye to eye regarding Jekyll's research Jekyll trusts him enough as a professional to reveal the depravity of his research. This happens when Jekyll must rely on Lanyon to collect ingredients for the transformational potion required to change between Hyde and Jekyll and subsequently transforms in front of him (Stevenson 41-47). Therefore, it can be concluded that Jekyll depends on his social image and professional relationships and thus submits to the Victorian ideologies of the Victorian gentleman and of professional duty.

Mr. Gabriel Utterson is first described to the reader as,

> [A] lawyer…of rugged countenance…At friendly meetings, and when the wine was to his taste, something eminently human beaconed from his eye; something indeed which never found its way into his talk…but more often and loudly in the acts of his life…he had an approved tolerance for others…and in any extremity inclined to help rather than reprove. (Stevenson 7)

Utterson's introduction indicates his slightly obscured altruistic behaviour, which throughout the novella illustrates Utterson as a man of action, and to an extent, those actions are also a result of his considerable dedication to his profession as a lawyer. For example, his concern over Jekyll's involvement with Hyde is due to his knowledge of his friend's will and fearing that something illegal may occur that will affect that professional relationship

(Stevenson 13, 20). Although some of it may be due to sentimental value, it is arguable that Utterson's concern is primarily rooted in both his and Jekyll's lawyer-client relationship and their past educational association. As mentioned previously relationships such as Jekyll and Utterson's follows the professional gentleman ideologies of the Victorian era. Hence, the characters not only internalise education as essential, the notion of work as a duty, social altruism, and self-regulation through professional behaviour, but also decidedly hold other men to the same standards. Particularly what is described previously as self-regulating can be interpreted as an effect of interpellation, in which a conscious subject recognises that the practices outside their prescribed ideology are inconsistent and thus need to be regulated. This is described by Althusser as follows: "every 'subject' endowed with a 'consciousness' and believing in the 'ideas' that his 'consciousness' inspires in him and freely accepts, must '*act* according to his ideas'…[i] f he does not do so, 'that is wicked'" (41-42). By analysing Althusser, while keeping Butler's article in mind, this essay interprets an individual submitting to the self-regulating behaviour described above as that individual being an interpellated, good subject.

Throughout the novella, only a few women are given an important part, such as the maid who witnesses the Danvers Carew murder, in which Hyde brutally beats a respected member of Parliament to death (Stevenson 21-22). However, they are rarely given any dialogue and their interactions with the men are limited as well. As such, one may assume that women hold little to no meaning in the relationships of the men, and the clear division between the genders exemplifies how masculinity is expressed through male, professional, relationships. As such, above all sentimentalities, both Jekyll and Utterson's relationships, and thus their characters, can be defined within the ideologies of the Victorian era.

Representation of the legal ideological state apparatus: Gabriel Utterson

By establishing Utterson's adherence to Victorian ideologies, specifically the work ideology, it can also be established that this character is defined through his social reputation and his work. Utterson is driven by his commitment to his profession, and the majority of his choices are dictated by his need for legal justice. His dedication to the societal and professional sector may be interpreted as a subject representing the legal ideological state apparatuses.

What primarily constitutes the character Utterson and his decisions throughout the story is his profession as a lawyer, thus what Utterson represents is the legal ideological state apparatus. The first example of this is seen when Utterson discovers Hyde's role in Jekyll's

will. What started as simple curiosity turns into concern as Utterson learns that "in case of the decease of Henry Jekyll…all his possessions were to pass into the hands of his "friend and benefactor Edward Hyde," but that in case of Dr. Jekyll's "disappearance or unexplained absence for any period exceeding three calendar months," the said Edward Hyde should step into the said Henry Jekyll's shoes" (Stevenson 13). What inspires Utterson to pursue Hyde is the newfound evidence of Hyde's debauched character in combination with the will itself, which "offended him both as a lawyer and as a lover of the sane and customary sides of life" (Stevenson 13). It is in search of an answer to why such a will was made by a man he considers as belonging to such a sane and customary side that Utterson begins his search for Hyde (Stevenson 15). After meeting Hyde and confirming the man's evil nature, it is not only the existence of the will that troubles Utterson, but he is also concerned that foul play may be underway. When Utterson says that "[t]hings cannot continue as they are. It turns me cold to think of this creature stealing like a thief to Harry's[3] bedside"[4] (Stevenson 19), he is representing the legal ideological state apparatus as a lawyer who aim to uphold it within the realm of ideological practices of the Victorian era.

How the character Utterson is indivisible from his profession, and the legal structures that it reproduces is demonstrated by the fact that Utterson is repeatedly referred to as "[t]he lawyer" (Stevenson 15-19, 22-23, 25-27, 32-41). While other characters, such as Poole the butler, are referred to their profession as well, none are referred quite as regularly as Utterson. Furthermore, while engaged in situations that may not conform to the upright ideologies of the Victorian gentleman, what demonstrates that Utterson is performing within the realms of Victorian ideologies is his dedication to justice as is dictated by his profession. For example, when Utterson is helping Poole figure out what is wrong with Jekyll and eventually breaks down his door (Stevenson 32-39) this could be construed as not conforming to the educated gentleman ideology nor the reserved self-preservation in work ideology. However, since Utterson is acting in the pursuit of justice and to confirm no crime is being committed, this essay argues that he is still adhering to his professional duty (Stevenson 36). In this part of the story, O'Dell also argues that from the servants' perspective Utterson's actions bring order and comfort as an individual who protects the social order, which Jekyll's aberration is threatening (517-519). Moreover, what constitutes Utterson's actions and thoughts are his

[3] The nickname of Henry Jekyll.

[4] Quotes such as this can be interpreted as hints toward repressed homosexual tendencies which Linehan brings up (204-206).

conformity to the beliefs of the Victorian ideologies and the legal ideological state apparatus. This demonstrates Utterson's conforming, interpellated state and, according to the definition of this essay may therefore be defined as a good subject.

Conscious duality: Henry Jekyll

While Utterson can be identified in specifically the legal ideological state apparatus Jekyll is not as indisputably identifiable, but this does not mean that Jekyll is not functioning within the previously mentioned ideologies of the Victorian era. As shown previously in the analysis Jekyll is submitting to the ideological functions of the Victorian era. Therefore, according to this essay that would constitute Jekyll's character as an interpellated good subject. However, what may be confusing the defined function of the individual character Jekyll is the concept of consciousness, which was discussed in the analysis of Utterson's interpellated state. While Althusser originally bases his theories around the unconscious, what this essay interprets as consciousness is based on Butler's reading of Althusser's theory of ideology which determines that a subject consciously submits and accepts ideological apparatuses (Butler 11, 16).

To understand Jekyll's sense of consciousness as a subject the way the Victorian ideologies of both the Victorian gentleman and that of professional duty works through a sense of pretence must first be discussed. Victorian morality and the way society worked was that the appearance of virtue mattered more than genuine virtue, or in the words of Walter Houghton, "what was condemned was not sin but open sin" (149). Although the character Jekyll's status as interpellated, good subject can be confirmed, it is still pertinent to mention how Jekyll is conscious of his performative obedience to ideological state apparatus. In the last chapter of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, it is revealed to the reader from Jekyll's perspective what his research is a result of. Jekyll reveals the clandestine desires that made him feel shameful as he writes that,

> the worst of my faults was a certain gaiety of disposition such as has made the happiness of many, but such as I found it hard to reconcile with my imperious desire to carry my head high…[h]ence it came about that I concealed my pleasures…regarded and hid them with a sense of shame. (Stevenson 47-48)

With his research, Jekyll finds that, according to him, "man is not truly one, but truly two" (Stevenson 48), and through this revelation, and further experimentation, Jekyll creates Hyde. Hyde is the separate, the debauched side of Jekyll, and some may consider him part of Jekyll. However, Jekyll distances himself from Hyde as according to him Hyde's actions are

self-centred, and not centred in Jekyll, "Think of it–I did not even exist! …thus his conscience slumbered" (Stevenson 52-53)[5].

Considering the hypocrisy of Victorian ideology that Houghton proposes and Linehan's arguments of the dangers of a divided self, Jekyll absolves himself of accountability for Hyde: "It was Hyde, after all, and Hyde alone that was guilty" (Stevenson 53), due to his conscious conformity to Victorian ideologies. Additionally, the distinction Jekyll makes between Hyde and himself, and the initial shame over his duality stems from Althusser's concept of when a conscious subject recognises their aversion from their prescribed ideology it is recognised within themselves as wicked (41-42). In other words, the shame and guilt Jekyll experiences are due to his consciousness constituting his duality, explicitly that which Jekyll describes as "extraneous evil" (Stevenson 49), as a wicked inconsistency (Althusser 42). Although Hyde may be seen as an extension of Jekyll due to this concept of duality, and toward the end Jekyll himself seems to be uncertain whether he is truly Jekyll or Hyde, this essay argues that it is not relevant to fully divide nor assimilate the two characters. However, what is significant is that they indicate opposite adherence to ideology and thus interpellation. While Jekyll conforms to the ideological functions of the Victorian era, Hyde does not. In Jekyll's case, his consciousness does not deter him from the interpellating ideology, rather he submits in order to avoid inconsistency and wickedness (Althusser 42). In short, Jekyll, according to this analysis, does not represent a specific ideological state apparatus, which was something identifiable in Utterson's analysis. However, while Hyde shows a defiant persona Jekyll's acceptance of and submission to Victorian ideologies confirms his interpellated state and constitutes his character as good subject.

Deviation from ideology and resisted interpellation: Edward Hyde

Jekyll describes the first time he morphs into the alternative character Edward Hyde in this manner, "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 50). The word wicked is perhaps one of the more appropriate descriptions of the character Hyde, or at least that is the other characters' depiction of him. In the novella, Hyde is one of the characters we are never provided with a direct account of and all that we know of him, and his thoughts, are from secondary sources such as Utterson, Lanyon, and Jekyll. Although some may argue that since

[5] In this quote "his consciousness" (Stevenson 52-53) refers to Jekyll's consciousness.

Jekyll turns into Hyde he would provide adequate accounts of Hyde's perspective, considering the memory loss and clear distinctions made between the two the analysis is limited to using other characters and the narrator's perspective.

Hyde is seen as a deviation, a monster, and a thing of sin, by the other characters and this is due to his sinister nature and violent actions. For example, in the first chapter, a character tells of Hyde trampling a small child (Stevenson 9-10), and later on, a maid recounts how Hyde brutally beat Sir Danvers Carew to death (Stevenson 21-22). Undoubtedly, Hyde does not conform to the reserved nature of a Victorian gentleman, nor does he devote himself to any kind of profession or similar self-regulating practises. What constitutes Hyde's character is his selfishness, "his every act and thought centered on self" (Stevenson 53), and his disregard for social conventions. Since this selfishness is shown publicly, it is a non-conformity that sets Hyde apart from other characters who are shown as conforming to social conventions dictated by Victorian ideologies. However, while Hyde does not conform to social ideologies, he does show interpellated behaviour when he hides after the Carew murder. After the Carew murder, Jekyll is attempting to salvage his reputation and erase his public connection with Hyde, "I cannot say that I care what becomes of Hyde; I am quite done with him. I was thinking of my own business which this hateful business has rather exposed" (Stevenson 26). Jekyll shows Utterson a letter he claims was written by Hyde, explaining that "the writer's benefactor, Dr. Jekyll…need labour no alarm for his safety as he had means of escape on which he placed a sure dependence" (Stevenson 26). However, in the last chapter it is revealed that instances such as the Carew murder were out of Jekyll's control, and Hyde can, to a certain extent, decide his own actions: "My devil had long been caged, he came out roaring" (Stevenson 56). It is also revealed that after this incident, the transformations happen unprompted by Jekyll, "I looked down…I was once again Hyde" (Stevenson 58), although Jekyll seems more aware of his surroundings Hyde is the one occupying the body in that instance. Hyde is not attempting to get out into the public or make a scene because he fears getting caught and the danger capture presents to his life. Jekyll describes Hyde's fear in this manner:

> His terror of the gallows drove him continually to commit temporary suicide…he loathed the despondency into which Jekyll was now fallen…and indeed, had it not been for his fear of death, he would long ago have ruined himself in order to involve me in the ruin. (Stevenson 61)

Hyde is willingly hiding as a form of self-preservation since he recognises the ideological functions in which he exists. Thus, one may assume that Hyde acknowledges his

accusation of guilt and the possible consequences that may follow. In the event of his apprehension, he would be forced to submit to the legal ideological state apparatus, and this he acknowledges; therefore, it is not as if Hyde can be seen as an un-interpellated subject.

As discussed earlier this essay takes the stance that complete deviation from interpellation is not possible but resistance is, and it is what constitutes a bad subject. O'Dell argues that the fragmented nature of the characters in *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* emphasises the correctness of social conventions which creates an ambience of horror when it is deviated from (509-510). It is because of his deviation that Hyde is seen as a monster from the perspective of other, ideologically conforming, characters. This essay interprets Hyde's non-conformity and resulting monstrosity as a form of resistance against the existing ideological state apparatus, and thus the interpellation of the ideologies of the Victorian era. Although Hyde may never escape interpellation, just as any modern individual cannot, while being a part of society, he can and does resist its effects on him through his actions and behaviour. Hyde's wickedness is what constitutes his character and is further substantiated in his resisted interpellation which constitute his character as a bad subject.

Conclusion

This essay has analysed the representation of Victorian ideological state apparatuses and the possibility of deviation from or resistance to interpellation as theorised by Louis Althusser in Robert Louis Stevenson's novella *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is analysed. The analysis is based primarily on Althusser's theories on ideology and interpellation in conjunction with examples of Victorian ideologies as introduced by Jihay Park and Rosemary Jann. Furthermore, this essay establishes its definition of what constitutes a good versus a bad subject through Althusser's theories and Lampert and Butler's readings of those theories. First focusing on the characters Dr. Henry Jekyll and Mr. Gabriel Utterson, this essay demonstrates how these characters submit to the ideological state apparatuses by analysing their adherence to Victorian ideologies. Specifically, Utterson can be determined to represent primarily the legal ideological state apparatus, while Jekyll's consciousness regarding his own duality sees him as a more general subject within the ideological state apparatuses. Additionally, that adherence determines Jekyll and Utterson as interpellated subjects, who exhibit constant submission to ideological functions. Second, focusing on the character of Mr. Edward Hyde, this essay demonstrates how his character's nature is in direct opposition to Jekyll and Utterson ideologically conforming natures. Therefore, Hyde represents a deviation from ideological functions and is subsequently resisting interpellation.

Although individuals are not able to completely free themselves from interpellation, according to this essay's interpretation, Hyde's non-conformity compared to ideologically conforming characters, illustrate his resistance. In conclusion, Jekyll's and Utterson's adherence to the ideologically sanctioned practises of the Victorian era exemplified in the essay construes them as good subjects submitting to interpellating ideological state apparatuses. Additionally, Hyde's deviation from the ideological practises of the Victorian era is an example of an individual resisting interpellation, which constitutes his character as a bad subject.

Works Cited

Althusser, Louis. “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses.” Althusser, Louis. *Essays on Ideology*. Great Britain: Verso Editions, 1984.

Butler, Judith. “Conscience Doth Make Subjects of Us All.” *Yale French Studies* 88 (1995): 6-26.

Houghton, Walter. “Hypocrisy.” W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Ed. Katherine Linehan. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2003. 146-149.

Jann, Rosemary. “Fabian Socialism and the Rhetoric of Gentility.” *Victorian Literature and Culture* 41.4 (2013): 727-742.

Lampert, Matthew. “Resisting Ideology: On Butler's Critique of Althusser.” *Diacritics* 43.2 (2015): 124-147.

Linehan, Katherine. “Sex, Secrecy, and Self-Alienation in Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.” W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2003. 204-213.

Mehew, Ernest. “Stevenson, Robert Louis.” 25 September 2014. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 20 November 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26438>.

O'Dell, Benjamin D. “Character Crisis: Hegemonic Negotiations in Robert Louis Stevenson's "Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.” *Victorian Literature and Culture* 40.2 (2012): 509-521.

Park, Jihay. “Victorian Masculinity and Mrs Warren's Profession.” *SHAW: The Journal of Bernard Shaw Studies* 41.1 (2021): 202-216.

Smith, Steven B. “Ideology and Interpretation: The Case of Althusser.” *Poetics Today* 10.3 (1989): 493-510.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. “The Text of Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.” W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Ed. Katherine Linehan. New York: W.W. Norton Company, Inc., 2003.

W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Ed. Katherine Linehan. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2003.