Ca' Foscari
University
of Venice

Master's Degree Programme

in European, American and Postcolonial
Languages and Literatures

Final Thesis

Exit Jekyll, Enter Hyde:

A Comparative Study of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*
and Its Three Early Stage Adaptations (1887-1897)

Supervisor
Ch. Prof. Alessandro Cabiati

Assistant supervisor
Ch. Prof. Lucio De Capitani

Graduand
Giulia De Gobbi
889105

Academic Year
2025 / 2026

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 1 5

1.1. The Victorian Era 5

1.2. Stevenson and the Novella 10

1.2.1. The Novella *11*

1.3. Adaptation and Theatre in the 19th Century 15

1.3.1. Adaptations *15*

1.3.2. Theatre in the Victorian Age and in the U.S. *18*

1.4. The Three Adaptations 24

1.4.1. Richard Mansfield's Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde *26*

1.4.3. Forepaugh and Fish's Adaptation *38*

CHAPTER 2 43

2.1. Science in the Novella 43

2.2. Condensing Science 45

2.3. The "Elixir of Life," The "Devil's Mixture" 50

2.4. Jekyll and Lanyon 53

2.5. Faustian Undertones in the Stage Adaptations 59

CHAPTER 3 63

3.1. Female Quasi-Absence in Stevenson's Novella 63

3.2. From Absence to Presence on the Stage 65

3.2.1. The New Domestic Framework *66*

3.2.2. The Female Protagonists *67*

3.3. Beyond the Angel: Female Agency 78

3.4. The Expansion of the Female World 91

3.5. The Dramatic Functions of the Female Presence 93

CHAPTER 4 95

4.1. Psychological Ambiguity to Theatrical Visibility 95

4.2. Reimagining Jekyll 99

4.2.1 Mansfield's Tragic Jekyll *100*

4.2.2 The Spiritualized and Virtuous Jekyll of Bandmann and Forepaugh & Fish *104*

4.3. RECONSTRUCTING HYDE 113
4.3.1. Mansfield's Embodied Evil 113
4.3.2. Bandmann's Demonic Creature 117
4.3.3. Forepaugh & Fish's Melodramatic Villain 120
4.4. STAGING THE TRANSFORMATION 123
CONCLUSION 131
BIBLIOGRAPHY 135

Introduction

> Translation means doing violence upon the original, means warping and distorting it for foreign, unintended eyes. So then where does that leave us? How can we conclude, except by acknowledging that an act of translation is then necessarily always an act of betrayal?
>
> —R. F. Kuang, *Babel, or The Necessity of Violence*

R. F. Kuang's quotation offers a provocative starting point for this thesis, which is focused on adaptations. Although translation and adaptation are not equivalent practices, they have often been compared to one another (Hutcheon, 2006: 16): both involve the transfer from one system of communication into another and, as such, raise questions about transformation, loss, fidelity. Linda Hutcheon states that "just as there is no such thing as a literal translation, there can be no literal adaptation" (2006: 16) and observes that

> because adaptations are to a different medium, they are re-mediations, that is, specifically translations in the form of intersemiotic transpositions from one sign system (for example, words) to another (for example, images). This is translation but in a very specific sense: as transmutation or transcoding, that is, as necessarily a recoding into a new set of conventions as well as signs. (2006: 16)

From this perspective, an adaptation needs not be considered as a poor attempt to faithfully reproduce its source text. Rather, the changes produced by the transition from one medium to another reveal the demands, possibilities, conventions, needs of the new medium in the particular historical, cultural, and social context. For this reason, the question is not only what an adaptation retains from its source, but also what it changes, what it adds, or what emerges in the process of transformation.

Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) is a text which has proved remarkably adaptable, inspiring a number of writers and dramatists to adapt it. The exploration of divided identity, scientific experimentation, mystery, morality, the relationship between Jekyll and Hyde, all have generated a long afterlife across different media. Its earliest stage adaptations, in particular, appeared shortly after the publication of Stevenson's work and they provide the opportunity to analyse how the story was transformed for the theatrical performance. The translation from prose to stage required more than the simple compression of Stevenson's narrative. The novella,

which relies on retrospective narration, written testimonies, psychological ambiguity, had to be reshaped to fit the new medium, which requires a form of communication through dialogue, action, movement, gesture, expression, scenery, and props. That is why the stage adaptations do not faithfully reproduce Stevenson's narrative in another medium, but they reinterpret it according to the opportunities and conventions of theatre.

This thesis examines three stage adaptations produced in the decade following the publication of Stevenson's novella: Richard Mansfield and Thomas R. Sullivan's 1887 adaptation, Daniel E. Bandmann's 1888 version, and Luella Forepaugh & George F. Fish's 1897 production. These adaptations have been chosen both for their proximity to the original narrative and for the differences in which they reshape the story. In particular, Mansfield's adaptation was chosen because it represents the earliest major stage production of the novella and it contributed to establishing a model for following adaptations. Bandmann's version, which appeared on stage only a year later, provides a useful point of comparison, as it was produced in competition with Mansfield's adaptation but did not achieve the success its producer had anticipated. The comparison between these two closely timed adaptations makes it possible to see the different approaches to theatrical adaptation of the same source text and to examine how this may have contributed to the different receptions of the plays. Finally, the Forepaugh & Fish adaptation was selected to analyse how the novella was reimagined on stage approximately a decade after the publication of the novella and after the first adaptations. These three adaptations show that the transfer to the theatre did not produce one single model for interpretation of the novella's themes and characters. Moreover, the three adaptations share a number of tendencies that showcase broader processes of theatrical translation. These early stage adaptations transform the ambiguities of Stevenson's novella into forms much more compatible with the new medium and, especially, with the melodramatic conventions of the late 19th century. The analysis therefore is concerned not with the fidelity of the stage versions to the novella, but with the new meanings produced by the differences from it. A comparative approach makes it possible to consider the changes in plot, characterisation, dialogue, scientific representation, gender issues, and the theatrical construction of Jekyll and Hyde as deliberate responses to the conventions of performance.

The thesis first establishes the historical and theatrical framework necessary for understanding the transformations, considering Stevenson's novella alongside the context of late Victorian and American theatre and introducing the three adaptations and their reception. Subsequently, this work analyses three main topics. First, it turns to the representation of scientific discourse and knowledge on stage, examining their reduction and redistribution and the transformation of scientific experimentation into dramatic action. Then, the following chapter considers the introduction of a new domestic framework and new female characters, who allow for a reconfiguration of character and the

presentation of a romantic structure to the plot. Lastly, this thesis examines the reconstruction of the Jekyll/Hyde duality, considering how the stage externalizes and dramatizes the divided self and how the adaptations transform Stevenson's ambiguity into a more visible opposition between Jekyll and Hyde.

Chapter 1

"Have We Changed Places Already": From Novella to the Stage

> Invention, it must be humbly admitted, does not consist in creating out of void, but out of chaos; the materials must, in the first place, be afforded; it can give form to dark, shapeless substances, but cannot bring into being the substance itself.
>
> —Mary Shelley, *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus*

1.1. The Victorian Era

In the 19th century, the whole of Europe underwent rapid and far-reaching changes, moving away from the pre-industrial and aristocratic 18th century. The 1800s saw many transformations on different levels, ranging from politics and economics to culture and society. Britain in particular became a key force in this framework: at the beginning of the century, it started growing steadily more in terms of resources and wealth, and its prosperity would last for many years to come. The Victorian period, which conventionally coincides with Queen Victoria's reign (1837-1901), was, in the words of Clarice Swisher, a "jigsaw puzzle of change—economic, political, social, cultural, intellectual, and spiritual, but unlike a jigsaw puzzle, the pieces fitted together loosely, overlapping and interconnecting" (2000: 11).

When Victoria came to the throne, many things had already changed from the previous century: Britain was becoming one of the most powerful countries in the world, with its Empire extending across India, Australia, South Africa, and Canada. Moreover, it was accumulating considerable wealth, not only thanks to the colonies but also because of the Industrial Revolution, which had started the century before and was still underway. Labelled the "Workshop of the World" (Hoffman, 1998: 280), industrial Britain was the stage on which new inventions were created, which helped, along with the factory system, with the centralization of production (Swisher, 2000: 12). While the population grew exponentially, Britain became "the first modern urbanized society" (Swisher, 2000: 12), where it was easier to move up the social ladder. Consequently, a new middle class was born, characterized by growing wealth and social influence, which increasingly challenged the traditional superiority of the nobility.

As Hilary and Mary Evans suggest, "[the Victorian middle class's] victories were won only

by neglecting many of the civilised elements in life. It is not without reason that we think of them as bigoted, hypocritical, blinkered" (2000: 52, 53). The Industrial Revolution and the massive population growth brought positive outcomes as well as drawbacks. Indeed, while some did benefit from the 19th century radical changes, many others grew poorer and more destitute than before. The impoverishment of the people, however, had begun even before the industrialization process. T. Walter Wallbank and Alastair M. Taylor observe that the enclosure system had "thrown great numbers of peasants off their holdings" (2000: 59). The enclosures disrupted many rural communities and deprived them of access to land, thus contributing to the growth of an increasingly poorer rural population. Having fewer opportunities for work in the countryside, many were drawn towards the expanding industrial cities, where workers were crowded into inadequate housing. Working and hygienic conditions, which already were deplorable, worsened. Combined with urban overcrowding and poor sanitation, they contributed to the spread of epidemics and diseases which proved difficult to root out. Nonetheless, these illnesses eventually diminished by the second half of the 19th century thanks to the progress made in the field of medicine and improvements in public health (Mitchell, 2000: 93). Meanwhile, the new middle class prospered, becoming wealthier, and emerged as the "backbone" of the Victorian community, creating the conventions of the age and forging its values (Evans and Evans, 2000: 52).

Together with the aristocracy, the middle classes embraced a set of moral values and wanted to define themselves through ideals of respectability and propriety. They wanted to distinguish themselves from the lower classes, which were considered morally inadequate and degenerate, their values not aligning with those of the upper classes. Hence, despite the apparent possibility to climb up the social ladder, a real division was created between the poor and the wealthy. Not only was this separation economic and cultural—although reforms were introduced in the education of the poor, it would take until 1870 to make school compulsory (Gash, 2000: 145)—but it was also spatial. As Judith R. Walkowitz states, London had become "an immense world-city, culturally and economically important, yet socially and geographically divided and politically incoherent" (2003: 141). In particular, the West End had undergone significant renovations in the second half of the 19th century:

> It had been transformed and diversified into the bureaucratic centre of empire, the hub of communications, transportation, commercial display, entertainment, and finance. In the process, a modern landscape had been constructed […] to service not only the traditional rich of Mayfair but a new middle class of civil servants and clerks. (Walkowitz, 2003: 142)

However, even in the most respectable neighbourhoods and at the heart of the city, areas remained

which seemed closer to the "archetypal London slum" (Joyce, 2003: 165). Tellingly, Mr. Hyde lives in a "dismal quarter of Soho," which to Utterson looks like "a district of some city in a nightmare," (Stevenson, 1886: 23). As Simon Joyce points out, Soho is a neighbourhood located between two fashionable parts of London, namely Mayfair and the Strand, and it "might well have been a favoured spot for slumming interlopers" (2003: 166). Not far from Hyde's residence lives Dr. Jekyll, whose lodgings are located in a respectable part of town, according to his status as an upper middle-class doctor.

These spatial and economic divisions reflected the broader mentality of the Victorian middle-class, which had set high standards of respectability and morality. Victorians maintained particularly strict standards regarding sexual morality, and discussions of sexuality were considered a taboo. On this subject, historian J.B. Priestley states that

> they had a strongly conscious dislike and fear, almost amounting to horror, of whatever seemed to them ruinously wasteful, distracting businesslike attention, recklessly consuming energy. It was this, rather than the old puritanical hatred of pleasure that made them so prudish, so suspicious of sex, so determined that this notorious spendthrift of energy should be kept within narrow bounds. (2000: 211)

This, along with the strong emphasis on respectability, reinforced by both religious and social norms, fostered a culture of repression and hypocrisy. Walter Houghton (2003: 146), in describing Victorians' behaviour, suggests that they "concealed or suppressed their true convictions and their natural tastes," thus sacrificing sincerity to propriety. Furthermore, they "pretended to be better than they were," with piety and morality being the most important features. Lastly, Houghton argues that among the "hallmarks of Victorian hypocrisy" was the tendency to pretend that whatever was ugly and displeasing to the eye simply did not exist (2003: 146). These tensions are reflected in the *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, where one of the central concerns is indeed hypocrisy, particularly as embodied by Jekyll.

Meanwhile, the academic discourse began to focus on biological theories of evolution and degeneration, also fostered by the widespread anxieties that plagued Victorian society. Although scientific discussions about natural evolution had already begun to emerge in the late 18th century, thanks to the works of naturalists such as Buffon and later Lamarck, it was Charles Darwin's *Origin of the Species* (1859) that transformed the debate. With his study on transmutation and natural selection, Darwin challenged the Christian's interpretation of the origin of life, according to which life on earth was created by God. However, along with these studies came also the belief that evolution could work in reverse: if a species could perfect itself and progress forward, then "evolution could consist in a movement from complexity to a more simple form of organism" (Margree and Randall,

2012: 218). Indeed, degeneration started to be studied seriously, while other pseudoscientific theories gained momentum, such as phrenology and physiognomy, which claimed to identify deviance or moral deficiency through physical characteristics such as the size of the face and the skull. Arguing that the brain was made of muscles that could be trained and therefore hypertrophied, phrenology and craniometry were used to justify racial discrimination, cultural stereotypes, and imperialism (Pick, 1989: 37). Thankfully, these pseudosciences were later rejected by most of the scientific community, as they were clearly based on scientific racism, though they significantly influenced Victorian thought (Postlethwaite, 1998: 601).

However, not only were these theories functional to support imperialism and colonization, but also "to scrutinise portions of the population at home: the 'other' was outside and inside" (Pick, 1989: 39). Italian criminologist Cesare Lombroso focused his studies on the 'born criminal,' an atavistic being whose behaviour and physical traits have reverted to a primitive state. He believed that criminality was natural but unacceptable: "natural in its relation to heredity […], unacceptable in its social consequences" (Pick, 1989: 126). Moreover, Lombroso thought that the body would show the criminality of a man: with craniometry and physiognomy he identified criminal types thanks to specific physical features, the stigmata—for instance, he recognized as such traits enormous jaws, high cheekbones, or prominent superciliary arches (Lombroso, as cited in Pick, 1989: 122). Degeneration was thus a recurrent concern in Victorian society, causing anxieties and fears about the possibility of declining both physically and morally. Edward Hyde could be considered a prime example of the biological degenerate: he is described as "pale and dwarfish," and "ape-like," giving off an "impression of deformity without any nameable malformation" (Stevenson, 1886: 17, 22).

Towards the end of the 19th century, significant advances both in medicine—especially in surgical techniques and germ theory—and in the treatment and classification of mental illness were made (Mitchell, 2000: 89-92). At the same time, the study of the mind began to be taken more seriously, and a growing interest emerged among the scientists. These new developments contributed to the early formation of modern psychology and psychiatry. However, such disciplines were far from neutral and instead reflected contemporary cultural anxieties. Victorian psychology and psychiatry viewed mental illnesses through the lenses of biological determinism and were thus linked to theories of degeneration and regressive evolution, which, as discussed above, posited that moral and psychological decline were hereditary or could be seen as physical traits. As Ledger and Luckhurst state, "the interplay of mind and body meant that somatic illnesses and lesions would produce mental equivalents" (2000: 244), thereby collapsing any clear boundary between mental and bodily functioning. Within this framework, mental disorders such as hysteria blurred the lines between bodily pathology and psychological state. For example, H.B. Donkin, whose studies focused on

female mental illnesses and particularly on hysteria, argued that "for the normal working of the human organism there must be a given amount of systemic nervous control or stability, and a certain sum of environmental conditions" (1892: 245). His emphasis on mental stability and environmental influence further demonstrates how mental disorder was understood as a result of the unstable interaction between physiological processes and external factors.

Similar interpretations of mental disorders inevitably called into question the concept of unity of the self. If psychological unity could be disrupted by underlying psychological processes, then identity itself could be potentially unstable and easily fragmented. Therefore, Victorians were particularly interested in the notion of the divided personality: prominent figures such as Henry Maudsley and Frederic W. H. Myers were central in this academic discourse. Myers focused his studies on the Multiplex Personality, exploring the idea that human personality is not single nor fixed, but is actually "multiplex and mutable" (1886: 496). He exchanged letters with Stevenson regarding the *Strange Case*, because Myers offered some suggestions to solve what he deemed to be the weak points in the novella.

Duality is indeed one of the central concerns of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and reflects the much broader 19th-century fascination with the concept of a divided self. Throughout the century, both British and non-British authors engaged with this notion, as exemplified by works such as *The Double* by F. Dostoevsky of 1846 or J. Hogg's *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* of 1824. While it is true that defining the double is a difficult task, its evolution from a supernatural motif to a psychological and literary device has been widely discussed by critics. As Karl Miller observes, "there can be no satisfying short description of what doubles are, or of what they have become in shedding some part of their supernatural origins, as harbingers of evil and death, and growing into an element of individual psychology and a domestic feature" (2003: 125, 126). He further underlines the functional duality inscribed in these figures:

> They have often been about running away, and revenge […]. One self does what the other self can't. One self is meek while the other is fierce. One self stays while the other runs away. There are meanings which can be discovered as we patrol the secret passages of the literature of duality, and they can also be discovered in folklore. Doubles may appear to come from outside, as a form of possession, or from inside, as a form of projection. Doubles are both, and we see them as both […]. (2003: 126)

In this sense, the double is both an externalized presence and an internal projection, revealing the multiplicity of the self. Miller's statement highlights how figures of the double are not only narrative devices but are also expressions of deeper psychological tensions, thus providing the framework to a better understanding of Stevenson's work.

1.2. Stevenson and the Novella

Robert Louis Stevenson's short yet eventful life notably influenced his writings. It is indeed widely accepted among critics that Stevenson's concerns on duality and on the dichotomy of good and evil must have been affected by his strict Calvinist upbringing, as well as by his relationship with his controlling and religious father, Thomas Stevenson (Beattie, 2001: 318). Moreover, in his childhood his weak health and the frequent fevers, accompanied by hallucinations, rendered him vulnerable to nightmares, also fostered by the tales narrated by his nurse, Alison Cunningham, or 'Cummy.'

Born in 1850 to a family of deeply religious people, Stevenson grew up in a strict environment, and was assailed from infancy by respiratory problems, increasingly weakening his constitution. Because his mother was of a weak constitution herself, young Louis was left to the care of his nurse, Cummy, who instilled in him deep religious fear, with her profound devotion and Calvinist morality (Beattie, 2001: 323). She, however, was also the one who introduced him to tales of covenanting martyrs and to the Bible, "[nurturing] the young Stevenson's literary gift through her command of Scots dialect" (Beattie, 2001: 325). It was also his parents who fostered his literary talent: they recorded and wrote down on paper his stories, dictated by Stevenson himself, and told him tales of adventure to put him to sleep after a night terror.

However, growing up in such a strict Calvinist environment which emphasized the distinct separation of good and evil, of virtue and sin, and the continual struggle between these two forces, instilled in young Stevenson an acute awareness of the duality of the self. This conflict, embedded in Stevenson since an early age, was further intensified by his relationship with his father, who embodied the concepts of respectability, duty, and devotion. Because of his illness, Stevenson was mostly educated privately at home, so his relationship with his father grew stronger, also because Thomas introduced his son to the family profession of engineering and lighthouse design. The father wanted him to follow his footsteps and become an engineer himself, and that is why Stevenson started studying that subject at Edinburgh University (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 23). However, young Louis resisted his father's expectations: the career path chosen for him did not interest him at all, so he decided to pursue a life of letters and, after compromising with his father, changed his degree from engineering to law.

Much like his character Jekyll, Stevenson lived a double life in his university years: he led a respectable one on the surface, with his parents; and he led a very different one, almost Bohemian, when he was away from home (Beattie, 2001: 328). The tension that Stevenson experienced between outward conformity and inner rebellion reflects the struggle between the expectations and the respectability requested by society, and the repressed desires that he wanted to pursue, thus anticipating the duality exposed in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. It is during these years that Stevenson's

faith crumpled and ultimately, he became agnostic. This decision jeopardized the relationship with his parents, and especially his father, whose "self-regard [was] washed away by this further blow to his hopes for his heir, no longer an engineer and now not even a Christian" (Beattie, 2001: 329). Stevenson did try to escape his family home and move away, but he seemingly reconciled with his parents because of health and economic reasons. However, even in his twenties, Stevenson was unable to detach himself from them because he could no longer "negotiate the process of internal separation from primary objects" (Beattie, 2001: 332), meaning that he could not distance himself from such important figures. His will to leave was also hindered by his father's illness and ensuing depression, which would concern Stevenson up until Thomas' death in 1887.

Stevenson travelled a lot in his brief life, and during one of these trips he met in France his future wife, Fanny Van de Grift Osbourne, a divorced American woman, older than him by twelve years with two children. They fell in love and married in 1880 in America, then went back to England, where she established a caring relationship with Stevenson's parents (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 24). Moving back and forth from the States to Britain, Stevenson's health deteriorated and the married couple settled in the south of England in 1884. It is in this period that he wrote his major successes, namely *Treasure Island* (1883), *Kidnapped* (1886), and *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886).

While Stevenson's mind was occupied with *Jekyll and Hyde*, his father's health rapidly declined and he started becoming increasingly erratic, affecting the author's mental state as well. Thomas Stevenson died one year after the publication of the novella, in 1887, leaving his son relieved that his father's sufferings had finally ended, especially because Thomas had undergone a personality change due to his illness (Beattie, 2001: 350). After this tragedy, Stevenson decided to move out of the British Isles and go to the Americas, where he settled at Saranac Lake with his family. Due to his health, however, he needed a more hospitable climate, so he started travelling in the South Seas, finally settling in Samoa, where he also became politically engaged in Samoan affairs (Beattie, 2001: 353). Stevenson died there in December 1894, probably because of a cerebral haemorrhage, and was buried on Mount Vaea, in the Samoan islands.

1.2.1. The Novella

The genesis of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is closely related to the conflict between the conscious and subconscious and literary creation, while also reinforcing the connection with the inner duality that characterized the entirety of Stevenson's life. The topic of the "duality of man's nature and the alternation of good and evil" largely occupied Stevenson's mind in the mid-1880s (Balfour,

2003: 77), however he could not bring himself to write something as impacting as the novella of 1886. As Stevenson himself notes,

> I had long been trying to write a story on this subject; to find a body, a vehicle for that strong sense of man's double being which must at times come in upon and overwhelm the mind of every thinking creature. (1888: 90)

Then suddenly he had a dream, in which he visualized some scenes from the novella and, in a burst of creative surge, wrote the first draft of the novella in just a couple of days:

> For two days I went about racking my brains for a plot of any sort; and on the second night I dreamed the scene at the window, and a scene afterward split in two, in which Hyde pursued for some crime, took the powder and underwent the change in the presence of his pursuers. All the rest was made awake, and consciously, […]. (Stevenson, 1888: 91)

According to his wife Fanny, it only took him a couple of days to write the first draft; however, he was dissatisfied with it, so he burned it and put himself back to work. Stevenson rewrote the novella in a matter of days, incorporating his wife's feedback and refining the psychological allegory behind it (Balfour, 2003: 79). *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was published a month or six weeks afterwards, following a hard work of editing to bring it to its present form. The novella reached the hands of its readers in 1886, and it immediately reaped great success, quickly becoming a cultural phenomenon, as it highly resonated with the Victorian readership, whose main concerns were those of degeneration, moral decline, fear of the other, and the limits of science.

The novella does not follow a linear narrative; instead, it adopts a multi-layered and fragmented structure that reflects the main thematic concern. The narration is presented from different points of view, starting from that of Gabriel John Utterson, a rational lawyer whose function inside the novella is that of discovering the truth behind Jekyll's behaviour and his connection to Hyde's violent actions. The narrative is split between multiple documents, such as letters, statements and confessions; this technique, which in itself builds suspense, is also useful to reinforce the idea that identity is not stable and unique but is instead fragmented and never fully accessible through a single perspective.

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde can be inscribed in the long tradition of Gothic texts as it contains many elements that belong to the genre, combining horror and mystery with the psychological exploration of the mind. At the same time, the novella is located in a transitional space between Gothic fiction and early Science fiction. Indeed, the line between Gothic and Science fiction is fine, as "the

conventions of science fiction derive from the conventions of fantasy and romance, and especially from those of the Gothic romance. Science fiction grows out of literary forms that are antithetical to realism […]" (Brantlinger, 1980: 30). However, while Gothic fiction's supernatural elements and their irrationality—it is not possible to give a rational explanation of them—contribute to the feeling of horror and uncanny which the genre is characterized by, Science fiction wants its readership to believe that the fantastic elements are real, thanks to the new discoveries made by humankind in the scientific domain. Thus, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* falls in the limbo between the two genres, because it features elements of Gothic horror and mystery, but it also tampers with scientific experimentation, even though the author does not add specific details about it. Moreover, Jekyll's daring experiments exemplify the growing authority of scientific inquiry at the end of the 19th century; however, the catastrophic results of his experimentation also reflect the impending fears and anxieties that plagued Victorian society.

The novella lends itself to a wide range of interpretations, broadening the critical panorama beyond that of a simple moral allegory. Duality is the central principle of the novella: Stevenson explores the idea that human beings are not wholly good or wholly evil but are instead composed of conflicting impulses difficult to repress, suggesting that Victorian morality is far more malleable and complex than it appears. As Irving S. Saposnik suggests, Stevenson's use of duality as a structural and thematic device opens the text to a wider range of interpretations that extend beyond moral opposition (1971: 716). Indeed, it would be reductive to read *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* merely as a story of the struggle between good and evil. As Daniel L. Wright highlights, Hyde cannot be understood as fully evil, because his existence depends upon Jekyll (1994: 255). Among the many possible interpretations, the split between Jekyll and Hyde may be seen as the embodiment of the conflict between social respectability and repressed desire. From this point of view, the novella becomes a critique of Victorian social norms, hypocrisy and repression, exposing the unsustainability of the puritanical lifestyle demanded by society. Utterson himself is the emblem of the repressed Victorian: he enjoys the theatre but has not been at one in twenty years; he drinks gin when he much prefers wine; he feels envious at the others' transgressions but refuses to indulge in them himself (Stevenson, 1886: 7). Unlike Jekyll, who is the epitome of the hypocrite—Stevenson says so himself in a letter to John Paul Bocock in 1887—Utterson does not act upon his desires.

The novella also presents all the elements to be read as a tale of addiction, associated with either alcoholism or drug dependency. Jekyll's behaviour resembles that of an addict who denies his addiction: he resists admitting to his addiction by telling Utterson that "the moment [he] choose[s], [he] can be rid of Mr. Hyde" (Stevenson, 1886: 20), insisting on a level of control over Hyde that he clearly does not possess. At the same time, Jekyll cannot help but enjoy the state of intoxication that

is being Hyde—Jekyll describes the experience of the first metamorphosis and admits that that "[he] knew [him]self […] to be more wicked, tenfold more wicked, sold a slave to [his] original evil," and yet "the thought, in that moment, braced and delighted [him] like wine" (Stevenson, 1886: 50). This comparison is significant because it reinforces the link between Hyde and addictive pleasure. Moreover, Wright associates Jekyll's behaviour with Patrick Carnes' four-step cycle of addiction—namely, preoccupation, ritualization, compulsive behaviour, and despair—arguing that the respectable doctor progressively loses his autonomy over Hyde while his addiction to him increasingly intensifies (1994: 257), ultimately leading to his suicide. With this interpretation, Hyde becomes the embodiment of a desire that Jekyll cannot control nor renounce to. However, this dynamic extends far beyond addiction and opens the possibility for broader interpretations focused on repression and secrecy.

Another, and perhaps less obvious, reading is based on queer theory. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* belongs to a series of Gothic works of the *fin de siècle* which could be read as dealing with the matter of homosexuality: indeed, as Antonio Sanna suggests, the Gothic genre "allow[s] its writers to suggest or implicate controversial issues by means of its nonrealistic forms and subjects of representation, of its portrayal of supernatural phenomena, and by inviting readerly acts of interpretation" (2012: 25). As one can imagine, in the 19th century male homosexual relationships were illegal: in the patriarchal and homophobic Victorian society, queer people had to supress their nature and hide it, as the heteronormative legislative power was enacted (Sanna, 2012: 23, 24). There are many instances in the novella which could be interpreted homoerotically, such as Jekyll's and Hyde's bond, which is described as incredibly intimate: Hyde is "knit to [Jekyll] closer than a wife" (Stevenson, 1886: 61). Although less evident, Utterson and Enfield's relationship could be read under this same light: their connection is "a nut to crack for many" (Stevenson, 1886: 8), and they both cherish their moments together, to the point that they "[count] them the chief jewel of each week, and not only set aside occasions of pleasure, but even [resist] the calls of business, that they might enjoy them uninterrupted" (Stevenson, 1886: 8). This reading is also reinforced by the almost total lack of women in the novella, an absence that will instead be filled in the stage adaptations.

Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde thus emerges as far more than a simple tale of horror. Its appeal lies in its richness of interpretations: it is a complex apparatus whose many possible meanings have made it a literary masterpiece and have secured its place as one of the most enduring works of Victorian literature. As such, the novella has also inspired countless adaptations, across a wide range of media, including theatre, film, television, literature, and comics.

1.3. Adaptation and Theatre in the 19th Century

During the 19th century and the Victorian age, it was common practice to adapt novels for the stage. Many authors' works were rendered for the stage, with or without the intervention of the writer. However, as Renata Kobetts Miller observes, we are often left with no complete material work of the stage performances but for traces of scripts, images, and descriptions of the performances (2017: 53). Moreover, she adds, Victorian dramatic adaptations are usually overlooked because of their being "derivative" work and because of the generalization that they "lack artistic merit," making drama "the neglected stepchild of Victorian studies, attracting interest from theatre historians but eclipsed in literary and cultural study by fiction and poetry" (2017: 54). Miller also argues that the stage adaptations of Victorian novels were considered lowly by both contemporaries and contemporary criticism (2017: 58). However, despite their ephemerality and devaluing features, these productions were influential because "they were the first steps toward abstracting from the original novel what Paul Davis has called a 'culture-text" (Miller, 2017: 58). Similarly to Linda Hutcheon, who compares adaptations to palimpsests, arguing that adapted works resonate with other works in our memories (2006: 8), Miller expands this idea within the context of 19th-century theatre and argues that

> the emergence of a culture-text creates a frequently renewed audience for the originating text, and the Victorian practice of adapting novels to the stage was a key element in the creation of a culture-text. Beyond extending the audience, there were several aspects of theatre production that contributed to the culture-text, namely the repertoire and revival system, the association of roles with particular actors who helped to perpetuate the text, and the particular ways in which the original novel's characters were embodied. When a novel was first adapted to the stage, that theatrical production encouraged the formation of a culture-text, beginning a process that it could help to shape long after the theatrical production itself had been forgotten. (Miller, 2017: 58)

Miller's observation is particularly relevant to this study and to *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, whose theatrical adaptations—especially those of the *fin de siècle*—contributed significantly to the transformation of the novella into a broader cultural phenomenon.

1.3.1. Adaptations

Writing at the beginning of the 19th century, Elizabeth Inchbald states that "the Dramatic Writer exists but under a despotic government. […]—he is the very slave of the audience" (1807: 16). She argues that the playwright is faced with many challenges—from economic to law-enforced conditions—particularly, they must face public taste, which they are pushed to "humour" (Inchbald, 1807: 16).

Inchbald's observation, though written almost half a century before, anticipates many of the requisites that would influence late Victorian and American theatre, where audience expectations and dramatic conventions increasingly shaped the productions. Following this logic, the dramatic adaptation of literary texts, a practice that became very popular in the 19th century, is not simply a transfer from one medium to another, but rather it is an operation moulded by the demands of contemporary economic pressures and of spectatorship.

In the 19th century, the adaptation of literary texts for the stage was a common practice among playwrights and it became even more widespread by the *fin de siècle*. Indeed, as the population and the number of literates grew, so did the theatregoers; such was the context that the "demand for theatrical entertainment increased very substantially, and to fill that demand in rushed the hack dramatists with versions of virtually every recent novel" (Bolton, 1987: 15). Theatre managers and playwrights were encouraged to adapt successful novels because these productions would almost certainly attract large audiences and so bring great benefits to the theatre and its workers. The works of literature would not only be transferred from the narrative to the visual medium, but they would be reshaped to fit the conventions and demands of contemporary theatre. On this note, Linda Hutcheon describes adaptation as a product as well as a process of creation; as such, it "involves both (re-)interpretation and then (re-)creation" (2006: 8), in which the source text is reconfigured within a new framework. Indeed, one of the reasons why the adaptation practice became so popular has to do with the pleasure of repetition, recognition and remembrance of the works adapted, but also with the variations that come with it (Hutcheon, 2006: 4).

The process of adaptation from prose fiction to the stage is particularly interesting because it involves fundamental structural changes, as the characteristics of narrative writing are profoundly different from those of theatrical performance. Narrative writing relies on description, both of exteriority and interiority, provided by the narrator, who mediates the reader's access to the information. However, on the stage, this dynamic changes. As theatre theorist Keir Elam observes, "the production of meaning on stage is too rich and fluid to be accounted for in terms of discrete objects and their representational roles" (1980: 20). Narrative writing and stage performance rely on two different modes, namely the telling and the showing mode, which engage the consumer of the work differently: the first tackles the imagination, whereas the other engages with our perception (Hutcheon, 2006: 23). In the showing mode, as Hutcheon states, language is not the only way to express meaning; however, "a shown dramatization cannot approximate the complicated verbal play of told poetry or the interlinking of description, narration, and explanation that is so easy for prose narrative to accomplish" (2006: 23). Meaning in a theatrical performance is conveyed through the interaction of multiple elements—dialogue, gesture, staging, costume, lighting, music, and the actor's

presence on stage. Unlike prose fiction, where the psychological conditions of the characters are revealed through narration and introspection, theatre externalizes interiority, necessarily relying on the interaction between verbal and visual elements. Consequently, the transposition from one genre to another necessarily involves transformations to the structure of the source text, as many narrative techniques cannot be reproduced on stage.

In the case of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, structural transformations are inevitable, because the structure of this text relies heavily on suspense, secrecy, delayed revelation, all of which are hard—though not impossible—to represent on stage. As stated before, the novella builds suspense not only through its chilling details, but also thanks to its fragmented framing: the mystery unfolds through testimonies and legal documents that allow the reader restricted access to the entirety of the information, permitting the full understanding of the story only at the end, with Jekyll's confession. Uncertainty is privileged over certainty and ambiguity over direct explanation, also reflecting the themes of split identity and mystery. Even with the character of Hyde, the reader meets him largely through the perceptions of other characters, never knowing who he really is—the reader can only guess at his character. He is revealed fragmentarily throughout the text: his presence is described through the reactions of other characters to him—Enfield says that he has "taken a loathing" to Hyde at first sight (Stevenson, 1886: 9), while Utterson, after meeting Hyde, cannot explain "the hitherto unknown disgust, loathing and fear with which [the lawyer] regarded him" (Stevenson, 1886: 17). Real access to Hyde—who he actually is, and what are his origins—is gained only at the end, with Jekyll's full statement. The novella, rather than unfolding in a linear and chronological progression, delivers its narrative progressively, compelling the readership to reconstruct the events retrospectively.

Such structural features are considerably challenging to transpose to the stage, because they depend on narrative mediation. The novella controls the reader's access to the information through narrators, documents, and delayed revelations, whereas theatrical performance needs a progression of events to present before the audience. The delay of information is one of the principal narrative strategies of the novella; however, it is impossible to deliver the same suspense on stage. In the first dramatic adaptation, Richard Mansfield's—which set the pattern for all later adaptation—this fragmented narrative is replaced by a linear and chronological structure. The spectator is not left imagining and guessing at the plot for long, for it is much less fragmented than the novella: the information is delivered not immediately, but much more rapidly, and the connection between Hyde and Jekyll is made much more apparent from the beginning. Moreover, Hyde's appearance happens earlier and more constantly in the performance, whereas the murder he commits occurs in the first act of all the three adaptations analysed in this study, thus anticipating the violence and dramatic conflict

that in the novella are found later. In accordance with 19th-century theatrical conventions, this anticipation foregrounds emotional intensity and sensationalism, which the audience longed for.

Another aspect that is hard to transpose is the interiority of the characters, which in narrative writing is provided by the narrator and can be described fully or partially. On the stage, it is impossible to present the consciousness of characters in the same manner, so it becomes necessary to translate and externalize this interiority into a visible and audible performance. What in novels remains psychological and internal, in a dramatic performance is achieved through dialogue, actions and gestures. In all three theatrical adaptations of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Jekyll indulges in monologues in which his thoughts and emotions are stated clearly in speeches directed to other characters or directly delivered to the audience. In the novella, Jekyll's voice is heard—or better, read—in his full statement at the end of the book, which is addressed to Utterson, along with Lanyon's narrative. Thus, the adaptations require more than a simple change of medium: they require a reworking of the narrative structure, characterization and modes of representation to meet the demands of theatrical performance in vogue in the second half of the 19th century.

1.3.2. Theatre in the Victorian Age and in the U.S.

The Victorian era was a culturally rich period: it was abundant in prose, poetry, fiction, philosophical enquiries, and scientific discoveries. Theatre, on the other hand, has been neglected, both at the time and now, and has been looked down upon by many critics, according to Renata Kobetts Miller (2017: 58). Because of its ephemerality, it is more difficult to study: Nina Auerbach suggests that the theatre, for its being "collaborative, messy, and lost," has "generally, and wrongly, [been] dismissed as sub-canonical" (2004: 3). However, as she and many other academics state, theatre in 19th-century culture had a position of centrality: Cary M. Mazer claims that it "was […] perhaps the most widespread arena of popular culture" (2004: 210). Its development and eventual success among the masses was connected to urbanisation, the expansion of commercial entertainment culture, and the emergence of a more heterogeneous audience. Theatre was one of the most popular forms of entertainment which attracted socially different spectators, and it increasingly functioned according to commercial rather than artistic interests. Melodrama, pantomime, and spectacle dominated the Victorian stage, which was also characterized by emotional intensity and visual realism. Moreover, the competition between playwrights and actors was fierce, as their incomes depended on the success of their play.

In order to better understand the composition of the Victorian theatre audience, it is necessary to consider the broader changes that reshaped British society in the 19th century. Industrialization, urbanization, and the growth of a new middle class not only altered Britain in terms of economy, but

also in terms of entertainment, contributing to the increasingly diverse audiences. Micheal R. Booth observes the following, highlighting the profound connection between theatre culture and issues concerning class and social mobility:

> All this fuss and worry about categorising theatre and music-hall audiences by class is peculiarly Victorian (and immediately pre-Victorian), a theatrical manifestation of great social changes in the nineteenth century that as a matter of course produced significant changes in the composition of audiences. (1991: 3)

From the beginning of the 19th century, the population increased exponentially, moving from an agricultural to an industrial society; as a consequence, the potential audience for the theatre grew. With new theatres being built, the Theatre Regulation Act allowed all theatres to perform farce, tragedy, and comedy, that is, the "'legitimate' drama" (Booth, 1991: 6)—with 'illegitimate' drama being light comedies with songs, burlesques, melodramas; before, only a handful of theatres had the right to stage legitimate drama. With this new variety and with lower fares, minor theatres attracted a much larger audience than before. However, this strategy, which was meant to draw more people to the theatre, also attracted an audience which had a lower income and was of a lower class, inevitably affecting the repertory of a theatre: to have a full house, popular taste had to be accommodated. Thus, theatre landed on melodrama, farce and spectacle, increasingly becoming and ultimately positioning itself as a mass entertainment industry (Booth, 1991: 7, 11).

As the 19th-century audience changed, so did theatre: differently from the previous centuries, theatregoers no longer took pleasure in refined or high-status productions—though that did not stop playwrights from writing tragedies. The public was much more drawn to melodrama, whose characteristic features provided the audience with straightforward emotional stimulation. Booth defines the genre in this way:

> Melodrama contains every possible ingredient of popular appeal: emotion, both pathetic and potentially tragic, low comedy, romantic colouring, remarkable events in an exciting and suspenseful plot, physical sensations, delineated stock characters, domestic sentiment, domestic settings and domestic life, love, joy, suffering, morality, the reward of virtue and the punishment of vice. (1991: 150, 151)

The conventions of this genre proved compatible with Gothic fiction, as its contents, themes and suspense could easily be translated into performances that fit the expectations of the audience. One needs only think about the first stage adaptation of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, Richard Brinsley Peake's *Presumption; or, the Fate of Frankenstein*, which reaped great success in 1823, to the point

that the changes he made to the plot would greatly influence later adaptations of the novel.

Moreover, other aspects provided inspiration for melodrama: the British naval victories of the first decades of the 19th century inspired the military and nautical melodrama, which tended to glorify Britain (Booth, 1991: 152). The rise of this kind of performance highlights how easily contemporary events influenced and shaped the stage. Along with the nautical drama, domestic melodrama emerged and dominated the stage in the decades of the second half of the century. It featured lower- and working-class characters, showed them compassion and respect, while also dealing with social problems such as drinking, crime, poverty (Booth, 1991: 153). In any case, the power that melodrama had over its audience must be found in "a content that in its social and mental life closely related to the daily existence and imaginative needs of its audience" (Booth, 1991: 155).

As the population grew more literate and novels were increasingly in vogue, playwrights felt the need to capitalize upon the knowledge of the public with these narratives. Thus, adaptation became a very popular practice, attracting people from all classes to the theatre, as they were already familiar with the stories and were curious about the reshaping of the narratives following theatrical conventions. Bolton (1987: 9) states that "novels and other narratives were dramatized even more frequently than before, partly for economic reasons," and, as among the audience grew the number of poor people, ticket fares were lowered. Thus, "it became necessary to make plays as cheaply as possible; and dramatizing books was less expensive than writing plays entirely new" (Bolton, 1987: 9). Consequently, the complexity of the narratives was frequently simplified on stage, allowing easier intelligible access to the audience and favouring visuals and actions. On this matter, Bolton claims that "the early nineteenth century entertainment industry generally followed certain empirically tested principles in manufacturing products for public consumption: among these was the distillation of a novel to its lowest common denominator, its most elemental appeal" (1897: 26). This statement, however, could apply more generally to the entirety of the century, as the patterns of adaptation from novel to stage were broadly the same—that is, maintaining the basic elements of the story, the most alluring, in order to attract audience. Among the authors most frequently adapted were Charles Dickens, Walter Scott, and Wilkie Collins (Bolton, 1987), who were also directly involved in the transposition of their works from novel to the stage. Their novels, as well as many others', circulated both as printed texts and as theatrical performances, thus reaching a far greater number of people.

The Victorian audience also had a great taste for spectacle, a taste that was "homogeneous" and "ubiquitous" (Booth, 1981: 3), regardless of social class and economic situation. Spectacle was embedded in melodrama and pantomime, the former being "spectacular from its birth" (Booth, 1981: 60), because it was from the beginning stereotypically visual in its representation of content. Spectacle was important particularly for Gothic melodrama, as it was essential to shock and horrify the

audience, especially in the representation of supernatural apparitions (Booth, 1981: 62). Along with spectacle, another tendency of Victorian theatre was "an ever-increasing accuracy in the realistic depiction of everyday life," (Jackson, 2004: 53)—namely, realism. In the 19th century many new technologies brought developments to the stage, from lighting to scenic design to improvements in machinery. Gas lighting was introduced at the beginning of the century and it was slowly replaced by electric lighting (Jackson, 2004: 55); these new lighting effects provided appropriate illumination but they also enabled productions to manipulate the atmosphere, as they could dim or turn the lights up, accordingly to the needs of the performance (Jackson, 2004: 56). In addition, scenic design became increasingly more elaborate, with colourful paintings and furniture which decorated the stage almost unnaturally, as critics of the age often complained about (Booth, 1981: 16). On the other hand, developments in machinery and scenic tricks to improve the credibility of the performance were implemented progressively, allowing the staging of transformations, disappearances, storms, and many other visual displays (Booth, 1991: 70-80). Such effects were not merely decorative but were essential to draw the audience in theatres, while they also contributed to the illusion of the performance.

On the other hand, successful plays were not merely performed in one theatre, but the popular productions travelled throughout different urban centres with touring companies. The circulation of these companies was facilitated by the expansion of the railway network, both in Britain and in the United States, allowing them to bring the play or the repertory at farther distances. Two kinds of touring companies existed: those that toured with the latest dramatical hit, travelling with only one play—be it a comedy, a comic opera, or a drama—and then disbanded; and those which travelled with a repertory of a number of plays and that kept touring as long as the finances and management allowed (Booth, 1991: 18). Touring companies not only travelled in the provinces, but, if the play was successful and the finances allowed it, they reached overseas and toured there, where they profited greatly. For example, Henry Irving's Lyceum company went to North America eight times between 1882 and 1903, earning him a great deal of money, with which he sustained the Lyceum at difficult times in later years (Booth, 1991: 20). Another figure who went on tour with different companies throughout his life is Richard Mansfield, whose role as Baron Chevrial in the French hit play *A Parisian Romance*, which was performed in different cities across America, brought him fame and respect as an actor (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 12).

Acting and the actor's job in the Victorian period were shaped by the consolidation of the star actor system, as well as by the expansion of the touring companies. The 19th century was, as Booth claims, an age of star actors, who rose to fame not on their first appearance but instead over time (1991: 99). Their names attracted audiences and guaranteed the success of the play, much like today's

Hollywood stars. Names like Henry Irving, Ellen Terry, and Richard Mansfield were easily recognizable by the people and their acting was adapted in accordance to the requirements of melodrama and pantomime. Booth says that "acting was also traditionally pictorial, and the use of stylised and sometimes stereotypical gesture, attitude, and facial expression—at least in tragic and poetic drama, and certainly in melodrama—pictorialized character and emotional response" (1981: 11). Therefore, melodramatic acting relied on codified gestures, as well as an emphatic delivery of the lines, together with an intelligible expressiveness designed to communicate the emotional state of the character to the audience. Indeed, George Taylor claims that "the actor's expression of elemental emotions had to be explicit, intense, and infectious" (2018: 113). Moreover, given the fact that at the time people believed in the correspondence between appearance and character—one need only think about the theories of degeneration and moral corruption that were circulating in the 19th century—and also in the correspondence between action and emotion, actors adopted a physical style of performance (Taylor, 2018: 118). Villainy, moral conflict, deep emotions were all represented through exaggerated movements of the body and amplified voice. However, as any genre, melodrama is not static and its techniques changed over time. By the 1880s and 1890s, stereotypes of earlier melodrama were refined, the villains became more nuanced as actors sought greater psychological complexity and realism in characterisation (Taylor, 2018: 121, 122). These innovations were influenced both by the changing theatrical conventions of *fin de siècle*, but also by the growing interest in the psychology of a person. Emphasis on posture, as well as small and at first insignificant details in the acting style, and other techniques were adopted to stress inner emotions and "to communicate to the audience a character's inner process. It is an exercise in physical semiology, with a transmitter and a receiver" (Taylor, 2018: 123).

At the same time that theatre was experiencing these changes in Europe, America was improving its own theatre culture. Theresa Saxon states that it is possible to "trace a 'polyphonic exchange' between the narratives of travel and exploration, and the narrative of European and American theatre history" (2011: 9), establishing a strong connection between the two continents' dramatic histories. While in Britain the conventions of theatre were as described above, in America, especially after the 1870s, things started to change rapidly, both in economic and organizational terms. If in the first half of the 19th century the basic unit of the theatre was the stock company, later it was replaced by the combination company. The stock company was based in one city, would have a repertoire of plays and a certain number of actors, who could reach fame only locally (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 29). The combination company, which was *de facto* a touring company, travelled around the whole country and was centred around one star actor; they usually would play successful hits on the long run, meaning that they would take advantage of the popularity of the play and perform

it for an extended period of time (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 29). American theatre was thus subjected to a radical change, according to the increasingly dominant capitalist imperatives. John Frick acutely states the following:

> Not surprisingly, the theatre, being subject to both economic and cultural forces in such a period of radical reorientation, was likewise transfigured. Throughout the final years of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth, artists and entrepreneurs waged private wars for this most public of cultural institutions, and the changes they wrought, in the process, markedly transformed the structure of the American stage. The theatre, by the beginning of [the 20th century], had become yet another American industry composed of a series of interlocking professions, each dependent upon others, with its business operations centralized structurally and geographically. It had, in the course of the nineteenth century, become less democratic in both its administration and appeal and had assumed the role of manufacturer of a product prepared and packaged for nationwide distribution. The long run had become its principal goal; the star system and the star vehicle had become the means to that end; the combination company had become recognized as the standard producing unit of the commercial theatre; and the practices of theatre management and play production, once the domain of the actor-manager, had become discrete and separate endeavours. (1999: 198)

Urban growth, the expansion of the railway network, and the new consumer and leisure culture facilitated the emergence of this new kind of theatre (Postlewait, 1999: 160). Moreover, the touring-based system contributed to the expansion of the audience, which was socially and culturally diverse. Like in Britain, American theatre relied on popular preferences and American taste revolved around melodrama, the Gothic, and light comedies. Melodrama was particularly liked and was considered as "popular and democratic entertainment for the people" (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 31). In addition, all plays that had success in the United States had elements of melodrama (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 32). However, it is important to highlight that American theatre in the 19th century was not fixed but had instead a wide range of performance types, characterisations and critical attitudes, which "functioned as an investigation of the range of national concerns and anxieties that could not be collocated into one particular dramatic 'type'" (Saxon, 2011: 137).

As the 19th century progressed and new discoveries were made, theatre and especially American theatre started using special effects: shipwrecks, battles, horse races were all performed on stage and became the selling points for melodramas, mesmerizing and astonishing the audiences (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 32). Stage lighting became extremely important throughout the years and quickly became an integral part of the performances. Especially important was the new invention of Thomas Edison, the electric light bulb, which was incorporated in the Kiralfy brothers' *Excelsior*,

a production featuring extravagant scenery, dance, and music: together, they designed a production finale illuminated by more than five hundred light bulbs attached to the costumes of the dancers and to the scenery to represent the newly built Brooklyn Bridge (Postlewait, 1999: 129). Richard Mansfield himself made use of the new lighting innovations in his transformation scenes from Jekyll to Hyde and vice versa. He used two different sets of light for the one and the other, changing appearance before the public by distorting his face under different lights and using the shadow of his hands to create eery shapes, a practice named "shadowgraphy" (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 32).

In the 19th century, the American theatrical system developed strong transatlantic connections with British theatre culture. Actors, playwrights and productions often travelled between Britain and the United States to increase the profits and to reach stardom also abroad. Both Richard Mansfield and Henry Irving toured in America and in Britain: Mansfield's *Jekyll and Hyde* was brought to London the year after its premiere in 1887, whereas Irving had already established himself as an international star both in England and in the U.S. (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 15). English literary pieces and materials were often adapted by Americans to benefit from their success; these adaptations fit the conventions and preferences of the American public. In the case of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, its theatrical afterlife is deeply connected to the American commercial theatre and melodramatic performance traditions: the three adaptations this thesis is analysing are all written and produced by Americans, and they all premiered in the U.S.; only later did these productions reach the London stage—if they ever reached it at all.

1.4. The Three Adaptations

The sudden and great popularity of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* led many playwrights to write theatrical adaptations, the earliest debuting only one year after the publication of the novella. The themes discussed in Stevenson's work were particularly appealing both to the audience of the late 19th century and to dramatists, especially American dramatists. Victorian and American audiences had a preference for melodrama, spectacle, and emotional intensity, all of which the novella had potential for. Thus, the theatrical productions of *fin de siècle* tended to match these expectations, adapting and reshaping the novella according to the likings of the public.

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, since its publication in 1886, has been adapted for the stage, for the screen and comic books hundreds of times. Despite the variety of media, many adaptations have in common one structural feature: the fragmented, epistolary narrative of Stevenson's novella is abandoned in favour a more linear progression of events. Brian A. Rose observes that adaptations of the story employ "linear structures of narrative manipulations" to enhance a sense of verisimilitude,

because the translation of the narrative into linearity "enhances the believability of the action" by creating an apparent structure of cause and effect (1996: 26). According to Rose, while Stevenson's structure contributes to the mystery and delayed revelation characteristic of the novella, the linearisation of the adaptations allows events to be presented more immediately to the audience, thus facilitating the "histrionic illusion" that, to Rose, is essential to performative art (1996: 26).

Not only does this translation into linearity reinforce verisimilarity and draw the adaptations nearer to realism, but it also allows the inscription of the melodramatic, as Rose claims. He writes,

> the opportunity for melodramatic inscription lies in the story's structural capacity as a site for the projection of characters exhibiting dichotomous polarities […]. Melodramatic inscription allows a polarization of the character of Jekyll, which provides for more convenient insertion of social message. (1996: 26)

Therefore, by replacing narrative ambiguity and inscribing the melodramatic, most adaptations highlight the Jekyll/Hyde opposition and foreground an easier and more accessible emotional framework.

Moreover, Rose argues that the shift from Stevenson's fragmented narrative to a linear progression of events does more than simplify the story for the performance. He believes that this reorganization also transforms the novella from an allegorical text into a verisimilar narrative:

> The use of story-time, as opposed to Stevenson's manipulation of discourse-time, partially effects the change from Stevenson's use of the story as an allegory to the adapters' collective intentions of presenting a 'realistic' or verisimilar story that contains more easily decodable and applicable social information and thus greater impact. […]. By removing the story from the site of allegory, and placing it within the site of the 'believable' through restructuring along the lines of verisimilar performed art (stylistically inscribed within the generic parameters of melodrama), several things are accomplished. […]. In addition, the imposition of performative verisimilarity strengthens the inscription of the melodramatic: the domesticity and social connections against which the fantastic action unfold acts as the banality that reflects the horrific. (1996: 32-33)

The presentation of events in chronological order and placing Jekyll within a more developed social environment allow the adaptations to reduce the uncertainty that instead hovers over Stevenson's novella. In this new melodramatic framework, moral tensions, social relationships, and emotional conflicts are much more easily recognizable by the audience. In addition, the domestic scenes and the romantic subplots ground the fantastic and horrific elements of the story in what appears to be an

ordinary world, intensifying the contrast between Jekyll's respectability and Hyde's violent transgressions.

Numerous stage adaptations have been produced since the publication of *Strange Case*; however, three are particularly relevant for understanding the transformations made to Stevenson's text and the impact they have on later stage and screen adaptations. The first is Thomas Russell Sullivan's adaptation starring Richard Mansfield as Jekyll/Hyde in 1887; this play is then followed by Daniel Bandmann's competing version of 1888; and lastly stands Luella Forepaugh and George F. Fish's production, which premiered in 1897 and whose script was published in 1904. These adaptations illustrate how *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* evolved from a literary piece to a theatrical and popular cultural phenomenon. All the productions, but especially Mansfield's version, contributed to establishing a set of trends and patterns that would significantly shape later versions of Jekyll and Hyde well beyond the 19th century. The following sections provide an overview of these three adaptations, focusing on their production, the narrative structure and how they were received by the public of the *fin de siècle*.

1.4.1. Richard Mansfield's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

Premiered at the Boston Museum on May 9, 1987, Richard Mansfield's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was the first theatrical adaptation of Stevenson's famous novella. After having read the story, Mansfield pushed for a quick adaptation of the literary piece, as he recognized the dramatic potential of the story and guessed—correctly—that many other playwrights would jump at the chance and benefit from it, especially because of the lack of copyright laws in America at the time (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 13, 14). Moreover, Mansfield believed that the dual role of Jekyll and Hyde would demonstrate his ability as an actor and would earn him international popularity. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was written in collaboration with Thomas Russell Sullivan, who had just started his career as a playwright and novelist. Written and rehearsed in speed time, the play opened in Boston and later moved to New York, where it was performed at the Madison Square Theatre on September 12, 1887; the adaptation was a success, bringing both fame and financial issues. What drew the audience to the theatre—apart from the story itself—was Mansfield's acting and his ability to change from Hyde to Jekyll and vice versa on stage, before the public. This was achieved through the use of different lightings, special makeup, and body contortions; it was so terrifying to the audience that many speculated on how he could transform himself in such a radical way, but the actor always sustained that he did not use any tricks, just his voice and face (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 15). The play gained so much attention that Henry Irving, a famous international actor, attended one of the performances and was so struck

with Mansfield's acting that he leased to him the Lyceum Theatre in London, where the American actor could perform his repertoire. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* opened in London on August 4, 1888. Despite the high hopes, the play did not have the same success as it did in America: the reviews were ambivalent and the public was not as fascinated. Moreover, the English capital was a very expensive place in which to perform, and Mansfield was losing much more money than making it (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 16). At the same time, Jack the Ripper's murders started, and Mansfield's acting was so convincing that he was accused of being the killer. Many speculated that it was for this reason that the *Jekyll and Hyde* production was closed, but it was actually due to the lack of funds (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 37).

Mansfield and Sullivan did make some changes to the storyline, while retaining the basic plot elements from Stevenson's novella. The most radical change is the addition of a relevant female character, Agnes Carew, daughter of Sir Danvers Carew; this addition makes up for the almost total lack of women in the original work, and it also serves to build an additional romantic subplot to the story. The topic of women will be discussed in a later chapter; however, it is significant to highlight that, while the addition of Agnes aligns with the melodramatic conventions that were so popular at the time, Mansfield's version of *Jekyll and Hyde* set a trend for later adaptations, in which the doctor is given a love interest that makes him a much more sympathetic character. Moreover, while the novella mainly focuses on Utterson's investigations and slowly builds the mystery surrounding Hyde, Mansfield's play reveals key elements before, and a greater emphasis is put on action.

The first act opens at Sir Danvers Carew's house, where Dr. Lanyon tells "The Story of the Door," differently from what happens in the novella, where it is Enfield who reports it. This story worries Utterson, aware of the new will recently made by Henry Jekyll in favour of Edward Hyde, the villain in Lanyon's story. Jekyll arrives and is confronted on the subject, but he reassures Utterson that everything is under control. Then Jekyll is ready to break off his engagement with Agnes because of his hidden sins; however, his fiancée does not accept it and tells him that they will resist any trouble that comes their way. Jekyll leaves and Sir Danvers comes back on scene; soon after, Hyde appears and wants Agnes for himself, causing a fight between the two men that results in the death of Sir Danvers. Unlike the novella, the murder here is shown on stage, whereas in Stevenson's work it is only reported afterwards. Suspicions grow and in the second act, Hyde's landlady Rebecca, after being profusely paid, reveals that the murderer is Hyde. Utterson immediately confronts Jekyll, who protects Hyde by forging a letter telling of Hyde's escape. In the last moments of the second act, Agnes comes to the stage and tells Jekyll that she wants to go to the police to provide a description of the killer, whom she saw on the night of the murder. Jekyll, however, refuses to go with her. The third act opens and Dr. Lanyon is given instructions from Jekyll to give powders and chemicals to a

visitor at midnight, as happens in the book. When Hyde arrives and concocts the potion to turn back into Jekyll, Lanyon discovers that the two men are actually the same person. In the final act, Jekyll reveals that he has been changing from himself to Hyde and vice versa without the need of the potion. Unable to recreate the formula, he becomes trapped in Hyde's body, and, when the police together with Utterson arrive to arrest him, he commits suicide.

The play's reception

The reception of T.R. Sullivan and Richard Mansfield's adaptation of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was characterized by a striking contrast between critical reviews of the script and responses to the American actor's performance. While many reviewers criticized the changes made to the structure and its departure from the original novella, Mansfield's embodiment of Mr. Hyde was almost universally acknowledged as the production's greatest feature.

The earliest American reviews were generally in favour of both the adaptation and the leading actor. Boston reviewers praised Sullivan's restructuring of Stevenson's work, highlighting how effective the play was in terms of theatrical experience. The *Boston Post* described the adaptation as "coherent, compact, intensely and even oppressively exciting," commending both dialogue and dramatic situations (*Boston Post* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 110). Nonetheless, even the positive reviews did have their criticism: they tended to distinguish between Mansfield's two roles. In the article cited above, the author observed that "if Mr. Mansfield is not wholly satisfactory as Dr. Jekyll, little but praise can be given to his Mr. Hyde" (*Boston Post* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 110). The distinction between the two parts would actually become a recurring feature of the play's reception, as reviewers found Mansfield's Hyde much more compelling than his Jekyll, suggesting that the adaptation found more important and thus foregrounded monstrosity and transformation over psychological introspection. Mansfield's physical representation of Hyde was what most struck Boston critics. The *Boston Globe* described Hyde as "the very embodiment of evil," praising Mansfield's ability to produce almost a visceral response from the public. The article says that "one seems to feel that strange sense of repulsion for the uncanny character whom this actor's skill has so perfectly embodied on the stage" (*Boston Globe* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 112). Mansfield's Hyde was therefore not merely a literary character translated for the stage but rather a performative creation which depended exclusively upon the actor's physical presence; even those who criticized the performance acknowledged the power of Mansfield's Hyde. The *Boston Evening* found Jekyll too sombre, arguing that his "perpetual gloom becomes tiresome," and yet concluded that "[Mansfield's] Hyde—ah, there is a triumph!," and praised the portrayal of evil passions as

"superb" (*Boston Evening Transcript* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 114).

New York reviews had a similar position, even though the focus was more on Mansfield's ability to differentiate between the two identities. Critics kept on criticizing his portrayal of Jekyll, which the *New York Herald* described as melancholy and monotonous, while also calling Mansfield's Hyde "powerful" (*New York Herald* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 116). Other reviewers recognized that the success of the performance lay only in the leading actor's capacities and in how he managed the duality of the part on stage. The *New York Tribune* wrote that Mansfield's success depended both on his terrifying Hyde and on his ability to "interblend the angel with the demon," while also rendering the characters "distinctly individual" but still connected (*New York Tribune* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 119), praising the actor because he had been able to translate the psychological duality of the novella into a tangible theatrical performance.

The reception of the production significantly changed when the play moved to London. While Richard Mansfield's acting continued to receive admiration, the reviews became much more hostile towards the adaptation itself. London reviewers argued that the play failed as drama because it sacrificed narrative coherence in favour of showcasing the leading actor. The *Sunday Times* described *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* as "not a play at all, but a series of episodes designed to give the actor opportunities for depicting the two distinct personalities of the dual man as conceived by Mr. Stevenson" (*Sunday Times* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 122). Similarly, *The Daily Telegraph* criticized the play because the playwright had taken for granted that everybody would be familiar with the original story and therefore the production simply functioned as "a mere vehicle for the display of the remarkable talent of a young actor" (*The Daily Telegraph* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 124).

However, despite these reservations, London reviews did acknowledge Mansfield's extraordinary ability in acting. *The Daily Telegraph* stated that "it could not have lasted an hour had not the attention of the audience been arrested by the dominant power of the actor, who forced the story by the intensity he displayed in elaborating the revolting Hyde" (*The Daily Telegraph* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 124). *The Era*, while also criticizing Sullivan's adaptation and the too sentimental interpretation of Jekyll, concluded that "there can be no two opinions as to the excellence of Mr. Mansfield's impersonation" (*The Era* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 131).

Ultimately, among American and British responses to the theatrical adaptation, a general consensus on Mansfield's acting, and especially on his Hyde, emerged. Therefore, whether it was viewed as an exceptional performance, or as a demonstration of an actors's capability, or even as the justification for an otherwise flawed adaptation, Hyde's portrayal was considered the production's

most successful feature.

The Jack the Ripper Controversy

The London run of Sullivan and Mansfield's adaptation of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* coincided with one of the most famous episodes of the Late Victorian period, namely the Whitechapel murders of 1888. Happening at more or less the same time, the play and the murders became inevitably entangled with each other, fostering fears for violent crimes and for the possibility that evil could easily hide behind a façade of public respectability. Thus, the adaptation quickly became part of a broader discourse, not only concerning theatre itself, but also the cultural phenomena that surrounded the homicides and how they were understood.

Between August and November 1888, five working-class women were murdered and mauled at the hands of Jack the Ripper, all in the neighbourhood of Whitechapel, London, disseminating fear and anxiety among the public. The first woman who is conventionally thought to be the first victim of Jack the Ripper is Mary Ann 'Polly' Nichols (Sugden, 1994: 42)—there were two other victims in August 1888, but their death cannot be attributed to the same murderous hand (Sugden, 1994: 34). Her body discovered on August 31, 1888, Polly Nichols' throat had been cut opened from ear to ear, while her abdomen ripped apart (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 36). A week later, a similar fate was encountered by Annie Chapman, whose murder was much more gruesome: her throat cut, her abdomen ripped open and its contents put beside her right shoulder, the womb cut away from its place, the horrible homicide gave rise to the Burke and Hare theory and to the common belief that the murderer possessed some medical skills (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 36). On September 30, 1888, the streets of Whitechapel were witness of what came to be known as "the double event:" the bodies of two women were found, one after the other, the second murder the fiercest of the two. The first body was that of Elizabeth Stride and only her throat had been severed; presumably, the killer must have been disturbed before concluding his business. Forty-five minutes later, the butchered body of Catherine Eddows was found (Sugden, 1994: 175). Catherine Eddows's body had been violently mauled: her throat had been cut, the abdomen opened and its contents put above her right shoulder, her face had been heavily disfigured, and a segment of her intestines had been placed between her body and her left arm (Sugden, 1994: 178). All of this happened in less than fifteen minutes, during which the murderer had drawn his victim into Mitre Square (where the killing happened), killed her, and escaped, bringing along her left kidney and womb (Sugden, 1994: 181). The last murder ascribable to Jack the Ripper was Mary Kelly's: her body was found in her room on Friday 9, 1888, laying on the bed, slaughtered and eviscerated in ways even worse than the previous victims; her

heart was cut away and never found (Sugden, 1994: 319). This murder brought an end to the killing spree of Jack the Ripper.

As the case remained—and remains—unsolved, the figure of Jack the Ripper quickly developed into a cultural phenomenon, extending far beyond the criminal investigations. Speculations about who he might be spread rapidly: people believed it was a doctor or someone with medical knowledge, or even someone from the upper classes, living in apparent respectability but giving in to his true impulses in the middle of the night. Moreover, the murders fostered fears and anxieties of degeneration and the monster within. This was also encouraged by the inevitable entanglement between the homicides and the *Jekyll and Hyde* play, because of the way in which the original novella had been reshaped by Sullivan. While Stevenson links Hyde to degeneration and atavism, the play reduces the animalistic elements surrounding him and instead brings Jekyll and Hyde into closer proximity. Sarah A. Winter, in her illuminating article, argues that "the lack of atavistic language suggests that Sullivan toned down the novella's focus upon Hyde as a degenerative ancestor, and concentrated upon the idea that respectability may conceal violent impulses with the potential break through the veneer of civilisation" (2015: 178). Thus, the adaptation emphasises the continuity between the two identities. Indeed, "Hyde's closer resemblance to Jekyll, […], merges the two roles closer together, which placed a stronger focus on the superficiality of respectability" (Winter, 2015: 179). Bringing the personalities closer together had powerful impacts on contemporary audiences, for the horror of the story came from the possibility that violent tendencies could exist behind the outward appearance of respectability. Winter claims that "the real possibility of a doctor hiding violent impulses beneath a veneer of respectability was expressed through theatre, which first foreshadowed the Ripper, then fuelled suspicions over the killer's identity" (Winter, 2015: 177). By presenting Hyde as less animalistic and more normal on the stage, the melodrama merged with the Ripper more easily in newspapers and popular imagination (Winter, 2015: 179).

Press coverage frequently made use of the convergence between the Ripper, the novella, and the adaptation, employing the language of *Jekyll and Hyde* when discussing the killer and using it as a framework for interpreting the murders. *The Pall Mall Gazette* referred to the murderer as "Mr. Hyde at large in Whitechapel" (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 171), while *The Star* suggested that "the murderer is a Mr. Hyde, who seeks in the repose and comparative respectability of Dr. Jekyll security from the crimes he commits in his baser shape" (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 171). Even in America the case stirred fears and parallels between Jack and Jekyll and Hyde were quickly drawn there too: *The Philadelphia Inquirer* wrote, "the Whitechapel murders are the result of a case in real life of 'Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde'" (as cited in Danahay and Chisolm, 2005: 186).

The murders were increasingly understood through the lenses and imagery of the original novella but also through Mansfield's production and performance. Rather than being simple entertainment, the play appeared to the public as a disturbingly realistic reflection of the events plaguing Whitechapel, reinforcing the fears about the instability of appearances as well as the unreliability of conventional signals of class and status. Richard Mansfield stood at the centre of these anxieties. His Hyde, as has been discussed in the above section, was highly praised, especially for the disturbing realism with which Mansfield acted. Yet, it was this realism that brought the actor in the middle of the Jack the Ripper discussion. As Winter writes, "against the backdrop of real widespread fear, Mansfield's ability to mesmerise his London audiences made them more susceptible, thereby rendering the production far more deeply terrifying and affective" (2015: 187). Mansfield's Hyde was so convincing that it affected some spectators who struggled to maintain a clear distinction between performance and reality. For instance, the *St. Stephen's Review* published the story of a young man who, after attending the performance, "found himself beside a most repulsive-looking man, whom he immediately concluded must either be the Doctor himself or the Whitechapel murderer" (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 175). Similarly, *The Daily Telegraph* published a letter in which the writer suggested

> […] "that the perpetrator is a being whose diseased brain has been inflamed by witnessing the performance of the drama of 'Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde'—which I understand is now wisely withdrawn from the stage. If there is anything in this, let the detectives consider how Mr. Hyde would have acted—for there may be a system in the demonic actions of a madman in following the pattern set before him." (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 178)

This clearly demonstrates the psychological impact of the performance on the susceptible minds of the citizens of London, already affected by the irrational fears fostered by the murders.

The blurring boundaries between performance and reality reached their extremes when, on October 5, 1888, the London Police received an anonymous letter which accused Mansfield of being Jack the Ripper himself. The transcript below reproduces the letter in its original form, including its numerous mistakes.

> Dear Sir
>
> Now That these Horrable Murders are being Comited I think it the duty of Every one to let the Police know if they Suspect anyone. What I am going to Say Seems Allmost imposable but Still Strange things have Happend at times. I have A great Likeing for Acters So that I Should be the Last to think because A man take A dretfull Part he is therefore Bad but whan I went to See Mr Mansfield Take the Part of Dr Jekel & Mr Hyde I felt at once that he was <u>the Man Wanted</u> & I have not been able to get this Feeling out of my Head. I have no Rest of

A night or day I thought the dritfull manor he Works himself up in his Part that It might be Posable to work himself up So that he would do it in Reality I do not think there is A man Living So well able to disgise Himself in A moment as he does in front of the Public. Who So we able to Baffel the Police, or Public he Could be A dark man. Fair man. Short man. or Tall in A five Seconds if he carried A fine Faulse Wiskers &c in a Bag.

I thought it Strange this Play Should have Commenced before the Murders for it is Realy Something after the Same Stile. The Murders Take Place on Saturday Nights Mr M never has A Preformance on Saturday. The Murders Once Took Place on Friday & once Mr M Was to ill to Preform at the Saturday morning Preformance. But weather it was at this time I dont know. I thought it Funney when the Safe was Robed of £200 & no one knew by wolme it looks as if there was a Bad Person about.

I Read in the Globe the outer night that the Same dretfull murders took Place in America & were never discovered Mr M is I think A American But weather he Came from there I dont know.

As it has woried me So I thought it best to let you know for you could let A man watch him without Causing any Bother. ~~For I think~~ For I think you ought to know where he Lodges & what Sort of A man he is. I dont know Whats Put this into my Head I Can assure you it is not because I See him Take Such A dretfull Part for I have Friends on the Stage take Bad Parts but did not think they were bad in Conquence Yours one who Prays for the murdrer to be Caught. M. P. (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 180)

Fortunately, the accusation was not taken seriously by the investigators and, although many believe that the London run of *Jekyll and Hyde* was closed because of the associations with the murders, it actually was because of financial reasons (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 37).

While financial difficulties were indeed a pressing concern for Mansfield during the London run of *Jekyll and Hyde*, the production also faced growing competition. Earlier that year, another theatrical version of Stevenson's novella had premiered in the U.S. and its producer and leading actor, Daniel E. Bandmann, was now seeking to present his play in London at almost the same time as Mansfield. This competition evolved into a heated rivalry between Mansfield and Bandmann and their productions of *Jekyll and Hyde*, a contest that ended only when Bandmann's adaptation was forced to close after only two performances.

1.4.2. Daniel E. Bandmann's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

Although Richard Mansfield's version of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* has been widely discussed both at the time when it was performed and in subsequent criticism, it is not the only adaptation that came out in the late 19th century. Given the huge success of Stevenson's novella, others recognized its dramatic and commercial potential and, among the earliest competitors was German actor Daniel E. Bandmann, whose adaptation premiered at Niblo's Garden, New York, on March 12, 1888. While his play has attracted much less scholarly attention than Mansfield's, it nevertheless needs to be considered in the process of theatrical appropriation of the novella.

Born in Kassel, Germany in 1837, Bandmann debuted as an actor at only 18 years old, playing Hamlet only a few years later (Warrington, 2016: 57). He moved to New York and learned English, debuting as Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*, attracting both positive and negative attention from the press. However, he kept on acting, adding to his repertoire roles such as Macbeth, Othello and Iago, Jekyll and Hyde (Warrington, 2016: 58). Bandmann established himself as an international actor whose career extended across America, Great Britain, Ireland, but also Australia, New Zealand, China, and India (Warrington, 2016: 57). He also wrote and published *An Actor's Tour, Or Seventy Thousand Miles with Shakespeare*, a memoir of his two-year long tour across the eastern world, narrating his journey from Australia, to New Zealand, to India and China (Warrington, 2016: 57). As actor/manager, he had considerable control over the productions in which he appeared, and in 1888 he chose to adapt for the stage Stevenson's novella, as it had numerous opportunities for showcasing his ability as an actor.

Bandmann's involvement with *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* occurred almost at the same time as Mansfield's; in particular, both of them wanted to open their London run in the summer of 1888. The dispute between Mansfield and Bandmann was not a simple rivalry between actors, but rather a feud over who could or could not play the part, and over which of the adaptation could legitimately be performed. Mansfield was originally to perform his version on September 3, 1888, at the Lyceum; however, in July of the same year, the press released an article claiming that Bandmann's *Jekyll and Hyde* would open at London's Opera Comique Theatre on August 6 (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 133). As soon as he heard the news, Mansfield reassembled his company that was scattered throughout Europe and managed to anticipate the opening date to August 4; moreover, to prevent Bandmann from advancing his opening night, temporary tenancy of the Opera Comique was secured until August 5 (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 133). Court action was immediately taken by Mansfield and Stevenson's publisher, Longmans, Green & Co., the owners of the copyright of the novella in the U.K. *The Daily Telegraph* published the following article on July 27, 1888:

> DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE.—Messrs. Longmans and Co., as owners of the copyright of "The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," beg to state that MR. RICHARD MANSFIELD, of the LYCEUM THEATRE, London, is the SOLE PERSON AUTHORISED to present in dramatic form in Great Britain and Ireland, and that, under the recent decision in the High Court of Justice, any other person copying or colourably imitating any portion of the above work will be proceeded against without further notice. (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 134, 135)

However, Bandmann did not back down and kept on asserting that he had the right to perform his version of the novella (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 135). Despite the publication in *The Star* of the

correspondence between Mansfield and Robert Louis Stevenson that stated that the actor's version was fully authorised by the Scottish writer, Bandmann performed his adaptation twice before it was closed and could never again be repeated in London (Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 137).

Bandmann's adaptation is not any more different from Sullivan and Mansfield's adaptation. Similarly, it steps away from the fragmented structure of the original novella and reorganizes the narrative in a linear sequence. The feminine element is added here as well: while Mansfield's version introduces Agnes Carew as Jekyll's love interest, Bandmann replaces her with Sybil Howell, daughter of Reverend William Howell. Sybil's presence in the play aligns with the melodramatic, allowing the development of the sentimental and domestic elements typical of the genre. Sybil is also at the centre of the dramatic action, as she witnesses her father's murder at the hands of Hyde and she also participates in the investigations. In Bandmann's version, the "story of the door" is narrated by the vicar, and not by Lanyon; moreover, it is the vicar himself who sees Hyde trampling not a little girl, but a little boy. The most significant departure from the novella and from Mansfield's adaptation is Hyde's victim. While both in the original work and in Sullivan's script, Hyde murders Sir Danvers Carew, Bandmann has the villain kill Reverend Howell in front of his daughter. In the second act, the investigations begin: the walking stick used to kill the vicar is Jekyll's, given to him by Utterson, who immediately recognizes it. Later, as in Mansfield's version, Jekyll gives the lawyer a letter, which he forged to protect Hyde. The doctor then delivers a speech in which he confesses that he is the murderer and that he is haunted by his misdeeds. Placed at this point in the play, the confession reduces the ambiguity in the play and highlights a reading of the drama as a tragedy of moral and scientific transgression. Meanwhile, Sybil, who is torn apart by her father's death, vows to get revenge for it. To cheer her up, some choirboys sing a song for her, and in the meantime, Utterson and Inspector Newcomen speak about laying a trap for the murderer and Sybil insists on going with them. However, the ploy to capture Hyde does not work and instead Jekyll's name is mentioned, as he apparently allows Hyde into his laboratory. Sybil learns about this and is so upset that she takes matters into her hands and starts investigating herself: she visits Hyde's landlady who tells her, after being paid, that Hyde often speaks about killing Jekyll. Later, Hyde finds out about this and threatens to kill her. In the last scene of the third act, Layon witnesses the transformation from Hyde into Jekyll, like it happens in the novella and in Mansfield's adaptation. Four months have now passed and Jekyll, who refuses to see anyone, has become increasingly unable to control the transformations. Bandmann puts greater emphasis on the romantic relationship between Jekyll and Sybil, and on the impossibility of marriage, all leading up to the melodramatic conclusion in which Hyde finally kills Jekyll by drinking poison.

Bandmann's adaptation of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* demonstrates how quickly

a theatrical model for the novella emerged after its publication. It has many similarities with the more famous Mansfield's version, but it also introduces new elements that make it stand out. The changes made to the novella show how flexible Stevenson's narrative is and how much the melodramatic conventions influenced the theatrical adaptations of the novella.

The Reception of Bandmann's play

In the UK, the critical reception of Daniel E. Bandmann's adaptation of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was not favourable but was overwhelmingly negative, standing in contrast to the generally approving response given to Mansfield's version in America. The *Theatre* stated that "there can be but one verdict as to the version produced [in London]—that it was bad" (as cited in Nollen, 1994: 166). While Mansfield's production was criticised for its dramaturgical weaknesses but commended for the actor's performance of the dual role, Bandmann's play was found to have little merit in both the adaptation itself and the interpretation of Jekyll/Hyde. Contemporary criticism condemned its departures from the original novella, the excessive pantomimic and melodramatic elements exhibited in it, but also Bandmann's acting, thus showcasing the inferiority of the German producer's *Jekyll and Hyde* compared to Mansfield's.

The adaptation's tendency towards the melodramatic was considered excessive by the reviewers, who objected to the addition of comedic elements that undermined the complexity of Stevenson's novella. According to *The Daily Telegraph*, Bandmann "[discarded] the much-vaunted psychology and [threw] the mental gymnastics of Mr. Louis R. Stevenson to the winds," adding familiar melodramatic conventions and stock comedic characters, which included "our old friends the marauding policeman, the affectionate cook, and the time-honoured rabbit-pie" (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 163). This same review ridiculed scenes that involved frightened servants and exaggerated tantrums, arguing that this version of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* reduced the brilliant work of Stevenson to almost a parody.

At the same time, the adaptation's fidelity to the original text was heavily criticised. Rather than considering Bandmann's version as another theatrical interpretation of the novella, several reviewers found it to be too close to Mansfield's production while devaluing the original story. *The Pall Mall Gazette* wrote that "the adaptor has adapted, not Mr. Stevenson's book, but Mr. Mansfield's play, […] inventing nothing […] and vulgarizing everything," suggesting that Bandmann appropriated elements from another's work and even failed to successfully add any innovations of his own (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 165). Such criticisms were also related to the legal battle over the copyright of the story. Bandmann's adaptation was apparently so ridiculous that "it

wanted no legal injunction, no claim for infringement of copyright, to sound the death knell of such a ludicrous exhibition" (*Sunday Times* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 165). On the other hand, *The Star* avoided attending the performance altogether because it disapproved of Bandmann's conduct in the dispute with Mansfield, while also adding that, after having gathered some ideas of the "ludicrous character of [Bandmann's] performance," they were "doubly glad [they] were not there" (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 165).

Bandmann's performance received equally harsh criticism. While Mansfield's Hyde had been widely praised because of its capacity to generate fear and terror in the spectator, Bandmann failed to give such a convincing performance of the dual role. *The Daily Telegraph* stated that Bandmann had "for some occult reason made the genial Dr. Jekyll infinitely more repulsive than the revolting Hyde," while also describing the doctor as "mouthing, mannered, and equally toothless […], whose very presence is a shudder, and whose kiss on a young woman's brow and hair is an unpardonable insult" (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 164). Instead, particularly concerning is the suggestion that the audience responded to Hyde not with fear but with amusement. Spectators "laugh[ed] outright at the merry demon with the tombstone-teeth," but felt discomfort when "the revolting and oleaginous" Jekyll appeared on stage with his exaggerated rhetorics and mannerism (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 164). Similarly, the *Theatre* suggested that

> Mr. Bandmann's Dr. Jekyll was a canting, sanctimonious humbug of Pecksniffian appearance; his Mr. Hyde a malevolent dwarf-like creature with large teeth, that was ridiculous from its monkey-like tricks, which only produced laughter and derision where they should have inspired terror. (as cited in Nollen, 1994: 166)

Even the technical execution of the transformation was found at fault: in Mansfield's it had been highly commended, but Bandmann's transformations were dismissed as unconvincing, also because, even if the stage was darkened, the audience could still see the mechanics of the process (*Pall Mall Gazette* as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 165). Moreover, the same article asserted that, even if the production had used the most elaborate stage machinery, it would have been impossible to make "[Bandmann's] Hyde more unpleasant than his Jekyll."

Some critics even directly compared the two productions of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. In doing so, *The Sunday Times* acknowledged that the Lyceum version possessed "the extraordinarily powerful, although repulsive acting of Mr. Richard Mansfield" and that the transformation scenes were "uniquely startling and marvellous as histrionic *tours de force*" (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 165). On the other hand, the reviewer critiqued Bandmann's production, as it possessed "no redeeming features," and they described the interpretation of Jekyll as "nauseous" (as

cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 165-166).

These reviews suggest that Bandmann's production was—and would have been even if it had run for a longer time—a failure, on both dramatic and performative grounds. Unlike Mansfield's production, whose weaknesses are often overlooked thanks to the extraordinary acting ability of the leading actor, Bandmann's version was overall criticized, both for its staging and its acting. The reception of both plays furthermore reveals that Mansfield's adaptation had become the theatrical model of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*.

1.4.3. Forepaugh & Fish's Adaptation

Unlike the Mansfield and Bandmann adaptations, which appeared in theatres in the two years following the publication of Stevenson's novella, the last adaptation that will be studied in this thesis was performed almost a decade later. Premiering on March 14, 1897, at the Forepaugh Family Theatre, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, Or a Mis-Spent Life* is a four-act play written by Luella Forepaugh and George F. Fish. This version was performed when the story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde had already established itself as a very popular production on stage.

The figure of Luella Forepaugh is particularly significant in this context, as she was one of the relatively few women that occupied an important position in the management of a theatre in the late 19th century. After her husband John Forepaugh's illness and death, she assumed management of the Philadelphia's Forepaugh Family Theatre in 1895 and ran it until 1902 (Curry, 1994: 125). The Forepaugh theatre was a "popular price" stock company, where tickets were low-priced and the local audience could attend performances of plays that had already proved successful elsewhere (Curry, 1994: 125). Moreover, during Forepaugh's management, female attendance was actively cultivated through daily matinees, advertisements that encouraged bringing along children, and a programme designed to draw families in (Curry, 1994: 125). Moreover, Luella Forepaugh proved to be highly skilful in the management of the theatre, maintaining its profitability and choosing the plays that were most likely to attract audience, while also securing performance rights and staging productions effectively (Curry, 1994: 125). In writing the adaptation of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* she collaborated with George F. Fish, who was already associated with the Forepaugh theatre. Their version, which is closer to Bandmann's production than to Mansfield's, reflects the already standardized conventions of popular American theatre. Brian A. Rose writes that

> the story has lost all vestiges of its origin in the Gothic atmosphere of detection and mystery and has been completely transformed, generically, through melodramatic inscription […]. […]; the Fish version displays the generic and stylistic qualities expected from an early twentieth-century melodramatic

> potboiler created for localized or regional consumption. The story has become pure melodrama in the vernacular pejorative usage of the term, […]. (1996: 52)

Forepaugh & Fish's adaptation, like Mansfield's and Bandmann's, follows a chronological progression of events, leaving behind the fragmented structure of Stevenson's narrative. The opening scene is modelled after the first chapters of the novella, in which Utterson learns of Hyde's assault upon a little girl from Reverend Edward Leigh—much like in the other adaptations, it is not Enfield who tells the story. The main female character, Alice, is then introduced: she is the daughter of the vicar, who will be killed by Hyde at the end of the first act, and she is in love with Jekyll. The first transformation from Jekyll to Hyde is anticipated and happens on stage in front of the audience during the opening act. Hyde then attacks Alice and murders her father, thus establishing the central conflict of the drama. With these events, Forepaugh and Fish follow the pattern set by Bandmann: indeed, both adaptations replace Sir Danvers Carew, whose murder is central in the novella and in Mansfield's version, with a clergyman directly connected to the female protagonist. As in Bandmann's adaptation, the heroine is not a passive observer but takes on a more active role in the investigations and in confronting Jekyll's apparent complicity with the murderer. Many elements from the novella are retained, such as Utterson being a central investigative figure, or Lanyon's witnessing of the transformation and consequently his death.

The representation of Hyde is also particularly interesting. Like in Mansfield's version, he is the embodiment of violent and antisocial behaviour; however, in Forepaugh & Fish's adaptation his moral depravity is much more emphasised. For example, Hyde openly expresses his pleasure in harming women and children and explicitly states his hatred for Jekyll. Here, the Hyde and Jekyll characters are much more clearly differentiated and polarized, as the adaptation makes Hyde an overtly villainous creature who deserves to be punished, as per the conventions of melodrama. As happens in the novella, Jekyll starts losing control over his transformations and is unable to obtain the correct ingredients to make the potion. He realizes his powerlessness because he cannot contain Hyde anymore. Yet, the adaptation highlights the romantic subplot even more than Mansfield or Bandmann: Jekyll expresses his desire to marry Alice repeatedly, thus including the domestic element even more in the dramatic narrative. In the end, Hyde drinks the poison and dies, along with Jekyll.

With this adaptation, the progressive standardization of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* on the American stage is further illustrated, also because a screen adaptation based on this script would appear in 1908.

The Play's Reception

Both the marketing and the reception of Forepaugh & Fish's adaptation reveals how *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* had already become an established theatrical attraction by the end of the 19th century. This production was not simply advertised as a dramatization of Stevenson's novella but as a phenomenal theatrical event that combined elaborate scenic effects with new forms of entertainment. Differently from the reception of Bandmann's adaptation, the Forepaugh & Fish production was received enthusiastically by both reviewers and audience, who praised the quality of the staging, the performances of the stock company, and the economic accessibility of a play that, until then, had been associated with Richard Mansfield and his high-priced touring company.

Several reviews highlight the commercial success of the production from the premiere. *The Philadelphia Times* praised the theatre for having secured the rights to *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, describing it as a "decided triumph," and noting that the low-priced tickets represented "a boon to many who have long desired to see these famous characters depicted" (16 March 1897). The same article also observed that the audience was quickly attracted by this production, with an attendance "even more than usually large and demonstrative." Such comments suggest the popularity of Stevenson's novella, which had remained unchanged even after a decade from its publication. Moreover, Luella Forepaugh's decision to present plays of such popularity to local audiences at affordable prices proved effective. "More than ordinary interest" surrounded the production, as *The Philadelphia Inquirer* stated, highlighting the reputation of the play as well as the celebrations for the theatre's anniversary (14 March 1897).

The reviews also showcase how the production was promoted through spectacle. According to Forepaugh's interest in scenically elaborate performances, critics praised the visual aspects of the staging. *The Philadelphia Times* commented that "the scenic requirement of such a large attraction were met in the customary adequate way that is the rule of this establishment" (16 March 1897), whereas *The Philadelphia Inquirer* anticipated a "splendid" performance (14 March 1897). Hence, the production's appeal did not only stand in the story itself, but it depended also upon the visual resources of the theatre. The transformation scenes which had been the principal attraction of previous adaptations, still functioned as important theatrical spectacles. The theatre also wanted to emphasise visual novelty, by including "Lumiere's Cinematographe and the wonderfully amusing and instructive pictures," which "have made a most remarkable success at Forepaugh's Family Theatre, where the views are shown between the acts so that the intermissions are filled with entertainment and pleasure for the patrons of that progressive, prosperous and popular house" (*The Philadelphia Times*, 14 March 1897).

Critics responded positively to the performances of the company's actors, in particular that of

George Learock in the dual role of Jekyll and Hyde. Where Bandmann's acting had been unsatisfying and had failed to distinguish convincingly between the two personalities, Learock's portrayal was praised for its realism. *The Philadelphia Times* wrote that he performed the dual part "in such a manner as to leave nothing to be desired" (16 March 1897), while *The Philadelphia Inquirer* argued that the transformation "from the mild-mannered, kind-hearted Dr. Jekyll to the fiendish animal-passioned Mr. Hyde" required exceptional talent, a skill that Learock definitely possessed as his performance earned him "round after round of applause" (16 March 1897). Like Mansfield, Learock was commended for his ability to embody both aspects of the character convincingly.

Even in newspapers, the comparison between the Forepaugh & Fish's production and Mansfield's version was inevitable. However, instead of referring to the Forepaugh & Fish adaptation as a rival, critics talked about it as a successful alternative that made a celebrated theatrical work accessible to a wider audience. *The Philadelphia Inquirer* explicitly reminded its readers that Mansfield had recently performed the play in Philadelphia to those who could afford its high prices, presenting this as evidence of the drama's long-lasting appeal rather than as a challenge to the Forepaugh production (14 March 1897). Significantly, another review from *The Philadelphia Inquirer* stated that the adaptation staged by the Forepaugh stock company was "fully as interesting if not more so" than the version presented by Mansfield (16 March 1897). Unlike Bandmann's adaptation, constantly judged and deemed inferior to Mansfield's, the Forepaugh & Fish's version benefited from the already established reputation of the earlier production.

Reviewers also stressed the subtle differences in tone and emphasis to the story in the Forepaugh & Fish adaptation, reflecting the needs of the intended audience of the Forepaugh Family Theatre. The emotional accessibility of the narrative was highlighted by *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, which wrote

> A spirit of passionate sincerity marks every incident and its sympathetic qualities are exceedingly well presented. It is a page of life with realism of purpose and a directness of appeal that reaches every heart. The story is one of love and double nature—one of good and one of evil—so clearly blended as to make one almost marvel at its portrayal. The voice of unseen power is shown in every character and whether as the handsome, charitable physician or the malignant and murderous Mr. Hyde, the strength of the dramatist is unequivocally shown. (14 March 1897)

These changes aligned with the theatre's programming strategy, which emphasised sentimental melodrama and sought to appeal to family audiences, making the theatrical experience as entertaining as possible.

While Mansfield's production was celebrated mainly because of its star performance, and

Bandmann's version was dismissed by many critics as a failed imitation, the Forepaugh & Fish adaptation was commended for its overall effectiveness as a commercial enterprise. The reception of this production confirms that *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was not merely a literary work transposed to another medium, but it had become a theatrical commodity that still attracted audiences and thus income.

This Chapter has placed Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* within the historical, scientific, literary, and theatrical contexts that shaped its adaptations for the English and American stage. As discussed before, the transposition from novella to play involved more than a simple change of medium. The conventions of late Victorian and American theatre, as well as the expectations of the audiences, and the practical requirements of dramatic representation contributed to the restructuring of Stevenson's novella. Moreover, despite the differences, the adaptations by Sullivan and Mansfield, Bandmann, and Forepaugh & Fish have common tendencies, suggesting that a model for the adaptation of this narrative had been progressively created. Each version adds a romantic subplot and stronger moral opposites, with closer attention to emotions, all features of melodrama. In each adaptation, Hyde's presence is foregrounded, while dramatic action is favoured over mystery and delayed revelation. The reception of these productions reveals that audiences and critics responded both to the adaptations themselves and to the performers and visual effects. The success of Mansfield's performance, the controversy of the Whitechapel murders, Bandmann's failure, and the commercial popularity of the Forepaugh and Fish production illustrate the capacity of Stevenson's narrative to acquire new meanings through performance.

After having established the contexts within which these adaptations were produced, the following Chapters will move to textual analysis, focusing on specific themes that emerge across the three versions. It will be shown how each adaptation reshapes, emphasizes, and reinterprets elements already present in Stevenson's novella while simultaneously introducing new concerns and perspectives.

Chapter 2

"A Curse Upon the Science that Can Reveal Half Truths and Then Betray Us": The Performance of Science

MEPHISTOPHELES. In this sense, even, canst thou venture.
Come, bind thyself by prompt indenture,
And thou mine arts with joy shalt see:
What no man ever saw, I'll give to thee.

—Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Faust*

2.1. Science in the Novella

The 19th-century interest in science and experimentation, along with the various scientific theories disputing on evolution and degeneration, inevitably influenced the literature of the era and fostered many literary pieces whose main concern was science, the scientist, and their experiments. Therefore, many works of Gothic fiction are replete with storylines and details concerning these topics, highlighting the strong connection between the Gothic and science. One only needs to think about *Frankenstein, or The Modern Prometheus* (1818) by Mary Shelley to understand this: science is the driving force that stands underneath Viktor Frankenstein's and the creature's story.

The relationship between science and the Gothic also lies at the heart of Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Although the novella is mainly remembered because it deals with the theme of the double and the split personality, it is also concerned with the possibilities and the limitations of science and scientific inquiry. Instead of relying on the supernatural and on the fantastic to create horror, Stevenson relocates it in a laboratory where Jekyll experiments, thus making science the catalyst for psychological fragmentation as well as physical transformation. On this note, Sian MacArthur observes that *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is "another perfect example of the perfect harmony that can exist between science fiction and the Gothic," combining scientific thought with Gothic concerns over "unchecked ambition and arrogance within mankind" (2015: 11). Hence, science does not simply allow Jekyll to transform into Hyde, but it is also the framework within which Stevenson questions human identity and the consequences of exceeding natural limits.

Concerned since "an early date" with the duality of man and the nature of human identity, Jekyll's research is initially motivated by selfish reasons, as he wants to separate the different

identities in order to relieve life of "all that [is] unbearable" (Stevenson, 1886: 49):

> […]; the unjust might go his way, delivered from the aspirations and remorse of his more upright twin; and the just could walk steadfastly and securely on his upward path, doing the good things in which he found his pleasure, and no longer exposed to disgrace and penitence by the hands of this extraneous evil. It was the curse of mankind that these incongruous faggots were thus bound together—that in the agonised womb of consciousness, these polar twins should be continuously struggling. (Stevenson, 1886: 49)

Jekyll struggles in the attempt to understand and separate the good and evil sides of man, as per his belief that "man is not truly one, but truly two" (Stevenson, 1886: 48), ultimately managing to succeed in his experiments—or at least in part. His inquiries are not merely born out of scientific curiosity but instead originate in a broader philosophical theory of the divided self, making Jekyll's laboratory not only the space in which scientific experiments are made, but also a place where philosophy and morality intersect. Moreover, Stevenson deliberately avoids providing the reader with specific details about the chemical process responsible for Jekyll's transformation: in his "Full Statement," Jekyll explicitly states that he "will not enter deeply into this scientific branch of [his] confession" (Stevenson, 1886: 49). The readers' attention is thus shifted away from scientific plausibility—even though the novella remains grounded on scientific experimentation and does not rely on supernatural explanations. Instead, Jekyll informs the reader and the recipient of his confession, Utterson, that, while experimenting, he knew he risked death and recounts the first transformation:

> But the temptation of a discovery so singular and profound, at last overcame the suggestions of alarm. I had long since prepared my tincture; I purchased at once, from a firm of wholesale chemists, a large quantity of a particular salt which I knew, from my experiments, to be the last ingredient required; and late one accursed night, I compounded the elements, watched them boil and smoke together in the glass, and when the ebullition had subsided, with a strong glow of courage, drank off the potion.
> The most racking pangs succeeded: a grinding in the bones, deadly nausea, and a horror of the spirit that cannot be exceeded at the hour of birth or death. Then these agonies began swiftly to subside, and I came to myself as if out of a great sickness. (Stevenson, 1886: 50)

This is as many details the reader is given on the specifics of the experiment: a particular salt and other ingredients are compounded together and Jekyll shifts to Hyde. Christopher C. Tourmey states that this way of representing the "paraphernalia of science" is particularly effective, because "it empties the rationalism out of the tangible evidence of science, so that the physical paraphernalia is included in the view that all reality is ambiguous, illogical, and mysterious. Thus does antirationalism

tame rationalist science" (1992: 414). This refusal to explain the details of the experiment preserves the scientific plausibility of Jekyll's discovery while also maintaining the mystery. Science is a source of authority rather than certainty which provides a convincing framework for the narrative without dismissing the Gothic ambiguity. The stage adaptations inherit and reshape this balance between scientific credibility and unexplained phenomena.

The early stage adaptations of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* retain the scientific premise but reproduce it with less fidelity to the original work. While talking about the adaptations of the first few decades after the publication of the novella, Brian A. Rose suggests that "science is reduced to being one of a constellation of activities that serve to remove the melodramatic hero from the domestic world: hence its social danger" (1996: 67). He attaches the distancing of science in the early adaptations to the imposition of the melodramatic form (1996: 67): as will be discussed further, scientific discussions, or debates on Jekyll's theory of the duality of man are only occasionally mentioned in the Mansfield, Bandmann, and Forepaugh & Fish adaptations.

Many are the elements through which the theme of science is articulated in the novella and they are easily identifiable. These include first and foremost the intellectual opposition between Dr. Jekyll and Dr. Lanyon, who have conflicting views over which kind of science is legitimate to inquire: Dr. Jekyll's scientific studies lead "wholly towards the mystic and the transcendental" (Stevenson, 1886: 48) and are considered by Lanyon as "unscientific balderdash" (Stevenson, 1886: 14), whereas Jekyll deems Lanyon as "an ignorant, blatant pedant" (Stevenson, 1886: 20). Jekyll's theories and reflections on the duality of human nature are made clear in the "Full Statement," where he recounts his "profound duplicity of life" (Stevenson, 1886: 48), even though Stevenson does not go into details. As far as the experimentation in itself and the chemistry behind it go, a description of the preparation of the concoction that allows Jekyll to transform into Hyde (and vice versa) can be found in "Dr. Lanyon's Narrative" (Stevenson, 1886: 46). These elements are mainly present in the dramatic adaptations; however, they do not remain unchanged. Instead, they are selectively condensed and reduced or even omitted. While still being essential for the narrative, the dramatic function of science and especially of scientific discourse change: rather than providing the framework for an intellectual discourse to investigate human nature, they serve more as the justification for the dramatic action and the characterization of the protagonists.

2.2. Condensing Science

The representation of scientific discourse is one of the most significant transformations in the early

theatrical adaptations of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*.[1] In Stevenson's novella, the function of science goes beyond that of simply being a narrative device. Jekyll's reflections on the duality of human identity, his exchanges with Lanyon, and his final confession present scientific inquiry as a means of exploring broader philosophical questions on the dual nature of man, on morality, and on the limits of knowledge. Hence, scientific discourse shapes both the narrative structure and the thematic concerns of the novella.

The early stage adaptations retain the scientific premise but do not reproduce its complexity in its fullness. Owing to the formal conventions and the dramatic priorities of the late 19th-century stage, extended scientific discussions or philosophical debates are generally abbreviated and simplified, or omitted altogether. Rather than inviting the audience to engage with and reflect upon Jekyll's theories as extensively as in the novella, the adaptations prioritize concise dialogue and dramatic action, thus making Jekyll's experimentations and thoughts the motivation for the unfolding of the plot. As a result, science remains indispensable to the narrative; however, its role changes and it becomes a justification for the dramatic actions. While the three adaptations do not condense scientific discourse to the same extent, yet all privilege dramatic effectiveness.

Among them, Sullivan and Mansfield's version is the one that preserves the greatest degree of Stevenson's scientific discourse and remains the closest to the author's treatment of science as both an intellectual and philosophical problem. This is particularly evident in the exchange between Jekyll and Lanyon in Act II, Scene 3, where the opposition between the two doctors and between innovative and orthodox scientific thought of the novella is retained. While in the literary work the confrontation between Jekyll and Lanyon takes place off-page and is reported only retrospectively in a few lines, in Mansfield's adaptation the two scientists discuss about Jekyll's views on human identity and their divergence is shown explicitly:

> JEKYLL. You know my views, Lanyon – that every man has two natures, a power for good and an evil power. One, pure, noble divine. The other, working in darkness—
>
> LANYON. Your old hobby horse – not unsaddled yet.
>
> JEKYLL. No. Call it what you will. I still believe that by some means, the good and evil in man may be housed in separate identities.
>
> LANYON. In short, that you or I may walk out of that door, not one man, but two distinct creatures, with substance, form, reason, all the rest of it.
>
> JEKYLL. Yes.

[1] The scripts of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* by T.R. Sullivan and Richard Mansfield and of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* by Daniel E. Bandmann are reproduced in Danahay, M. A., and Chisholm A. (eds.), *Jekyll and Hyde Dramatized*. Hereafter, quotations from these plays are cited by act, scene, and page number.

LANYON. (*Rising*) Pardon me. Are you serious?

(Act II, Scene 3, p. 64)

Jekyll reiterates his theory that "every man has two natures," while arguing that somehow the good and evil part can be separated; he does not simply want to transform the human body but instead wants to free the virtuous self from the darker impulses of the other part of human nature, placing it in another body entirely. Hence, Jekyll's pursuit is not born merely out of reckless scientific curiosity and his experimentations, however unwise, are the practical application of his theory.

Lanyon contrasts Jekyll and embodies the voice of conventional and rational scientific thought. Sullivan and Mansfield thus retain the ideological conflict between the two physicians, whose conceptions of science and scientific inquiry diverge: one is grounded in empirical observation and conventional medical studies, whereas the other is driven by speculative ambition and the will to transcend limits imposed by nature.

However, the more extensive discussions on Jekyll's theories, which in Stevenson's work are developed gradually throughout the novella and in the final statement, are simplified and compressed into the dialogue just discussed, which establishes Jekyll's motivations and Lanyon's disapproval. Yet, the discussion only lasts for a few lines, then dramatic action resumes. Sullivan and Mansfield's adaptation preserves the scientific debate that in the novella is only mentioned while it also reduces its explanatory purpose. Instead of encouraging the audience to reflect on Jekyll's theories, Mansfield provides just enough scientific context to legitimize the experiment and Jekyll's ideas before shifting the attention towards its consequences. Science still instils the narrative, but it is clear how it is beginning to yield to the requirements of theatrical economy, anticipating the more pronounced condensation or lack of the scientific theme in the later adaptations.

The progressive condensation of scientific discourse is even more evident in the adaptations by Bandmann and Forepaugh & Fish, which similarly retain the scientific premise but substantially reduce its theoretical development. Unlike Mansfield, who stages a full, though brief, discussion between Jekyll and Lanyon on the nature of human identity and on the legitimacy of scientific inquiry, the later versions compress Jekyll's theory into simple declarations. In Bandmann's adaptation, Dr. Jekyll asserts the following:

JEKYLL. There are two natures in every man one of good and one of evil which divide and compound man's dual character, and he it is who can always keep the evil counterbalanced by the good who is the happiest and most deserving of men.

(Act I, Scene 1, p. 143)

Similarly, the Forepaugh & Fish version offers an almost identical formulation:

> JEKYLL. […]; there are two natures in every man – one of good and one of evil. He who has them under such control that the good always balances the bad is indeed blessed.
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, p. 17)

These passages preserve the philosophy behind Stevenson's narrative, however doing so in an abbreviated form that presents Jekyll's theory as an already established truth, rather than an idea worth of further scientific investigation, while also setting up the idea as to justify dramatic action. Unlike Mansfield's version, in these two adaptations the debate between Jekyll and Lanyon, where Lanyon challenges the theory's plausibility and Jekyll defends his views, disappears. In Bandmann and Forepaugh & Fish, there is no similar exchange: Jekyll's statements remain unchallenged while the audience is allowed to barely engage with the implications of his claims. Here, the emphasis is placed on the conclusiveness of Jekyll's idea and on how it motivates his actions.

As far as the experiment itself is concerned, like it happens in the novella, the adaptations do not show the first brewing of the drug that allows Jekyll to transform. Likewise, while in Stevenson's work Jekyll recounts his first transformation and the chemistry behind it (though with few details), the stage versions do not mention it. As in the novella, the composition of the formula or its scientific principles are not provided in the adaptations either; instead, they show how Hyde brews the potion before Lanyon's eyes. In this way, the chemical experiment becomes a spectacle for the audience to see, thus making chemistry a visually and verbally present element of the narrative.

Although the scientific explanation of Jekyll's theories is gradually reduced across the three adaptations, his authority as a scientist is preserved and intensified through the comments and opinions of the characters who surround him. Jekyll's credibility is not established through extended debates over his ideas or through detailed accounts of his experiments; instead, his identity as a trustworthy doctor is built through the admiration and respect that his friends, colleagues, and servants express. His authority is thus shown as a matter of social recognition and reputation rather than actual scientific demonstration: from the first act of all the adaptations the audience is encouraged to perceive Jekyll as an extraordinarily gifted physician. In Mansfield's adaptation, Mrs. Lanyon calls Jekyll "the cleverest" man, despite believing that his ideas are "quite too far advanced" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 49), thus acknowledging his brilliancy as well as the controversial nature of his scientific research. Jekyll himself reflects upon his public identity, describing himself as "the philanthropist, the man of science, the distinguished surgeon" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 53); however, this is how he is perceived by the eyes of others. Significantly, this description is immediately followed by half a confession to Agnes, his love interest:

JEKYLL. (*Breaking from her.*) It is you who do not know me. I am unfit to live upon the same earth as you. (*Crosses to L.*) You do not know me, I tell you.

AGNES. (*Following him*) Are you not Henry Jekyll?

JEKYLL. The philanthropist, the man of science, the distinguished surgeon – before the world – yes. How if it were all a lie? If I were like one possessed of a fiend – wearing at times another shape, vile, monstrous, hideous beyond belief?

AGNES. (*Hiding her face in hands.*) Oh, be silent.

JEKYLL. Yes, a fiend, without a conscience, and without remorse – inventing crimes and longing only to commit them.

(Act I, Scene 1, p. 53)

Therefore, Mansfield and Sullivan establish a striking contrast between Jekyll's public reputation and his real self: the audience gradually discovers that behind his character there is a deep psychological instability, whereas society believes him to be an exemplary scientist. Agnes further reinforces this idealized belief by praising his "human skill," "with more than human patience and devotion" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 54), qualities that present Jekyll as a compassionate man, as well as being an accomplished doctor.

In Bandmann's adaptation, even more attention is given to Jekyll's public image before introducing the consequences of his experiments. Instead of focusing on his theories, many characters praise him as both a physician and a philanthropist. Lilian, Utterson's niece and Sybil's friend, proudly refers to Jekyll as "the famous Dr. Jekyll," while Poole remarks that "everybody likes the doctor," because he is "such a king, good genial man" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 142). Like Agnes in Mansfield's version, Sybil praises Jekyll's generosity, saying that she "never knew a man so generous and unselfish," and noting that "two thirds of his life are devoted to his fellow men" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 143). She also commends his tireless commitment to treating the poor. Even Dr. Lanyon, despite having some reservations about Jekyll's ideas and experiments, says he has a noble nature and would make an excellent husband to Sybil. Positively described as he is, the audience cannot help but admire Jekyll and his achievements before learning of his transgressions. A similar pattern is followed by Forepaugh & Fish, who introduce Jekyll as "the most sought after doctor in the city" and as "a man respected by all" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 10, 12). Moreover, Jekyll's fiancée, Alice, states that he is "so gentle, so kind" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 16) and Lanyon, as happens in Bandmann's adaptation, believes he possesses a noble nature, despite his growing mistrust in Jekyll's scientific views. These descriptions establish Jekyll's authority through the opinions of others and his status as physician is accepted as a certain fact, with no need for explanation or proof. The construction of such a respectable identity before Jekyll's fall makes his transformation and the appearance of Hyde more

impacting. The audience is not simply witnessing the transformation from a simple scientist to Hyde, but the collapse of a man who has been actively described as the ideal Victorian gentleman and the most reputable physician in all London.

2.3. The "Elixir of Life," The "Devil's Mixture"

The making of the potion that enables Jekyll to transform into Hyde and vice versa is briefly discussed in the novella when the doctor seeks the help of his friend Lanyon. As discussed above, Stevenson does not go into details and instead describes the composition of the concoction only in general terms:

> [Hyde] measured out a few minims of the red tincture and added one of the powders. The mixture, which was at first of a reddish hue, began, in proportion as the crystals melted, to brighten in colour, to effervesce audibly, and to throw off small fumes of vapour. Suddenly and at the same moment, the ebullition ceased and the compound changed to a dark purple, which faded again more slowly to a watery green. (Stevenson, 1886: 46)

Although the passage includes references to tinctures, powders, and chemical reactions, Stevenson provides no explanation of the formula itself or of the scientific principles underlying its effects. Instead, the emphasis falls on the visible—or, readable—effects of the experiment and on Lanyon's horrified reaction. In the adaptations, the scientific dimension, already limited in the novella, is simplified even further. Rather than focusing on the chemistry behind it, the adaptations transform the preparation of the potion into a visual performance—some more than others, as will be seen later—shifting the attention to dramatic spectacle, as per the taste of late 19th-century audience.

This tendency is particularly evident in Bandmann's adaptation, where a great emphasis is placed on the brewing of the potion. The scene is choreographed through detailed stage directions that require Hyde to mix and manipulate the different ingredients before Lanyon's eyes, while also directing his attention:

> HYDE. A glass of water. (*Lanyon gives it him*). And now Dr. Lanyon watch my mixture. […], here is the elixir of life. (*throws in powder*) See how it brightens. It will grow deeper (*throws in another*) Watch me, here is the last ingredient, moral power, how I hate it. (*throws in another*) My drink is brewed, […].
>
> (Act III, Scene 3, p. 158)

As Hyde adds the powders to the mixture, he comments upon the visible changes of his concoction.

Thus, the audience witnesses science in action, while the performance never develops into scientific explanation. Instead, each stage of the process is shown as an orchestrated theatrical event, all adding to the dramatic illusion of the play and lending credibility to the experiment. Moreover, terms such as "mixture" or "tincture" create the impression of technical precision, without ever clarifying how and why the experiment is successful.

This performative dimension is further developed in the Forepaugh & Fish version. While the dialogue closely follows Bandmann's, this adaptation presents the preparation of the potion through a sequence of actions, which is much more detailed. Moreover, stage directions are more meticulous and precise:

> HYDE. Thank you. Now, Dr. Lanyon, watch my mixture. (*smiles, then turns to drawer on chair, from which he takes a small bottle with red tincture and empties part of it into glass and puts bottle back in drawer*) See how it brightens! It will grow darker! (*takes powder and puts it in glass*) This powder changes the purple into light green. (*as he puts in last powder*) The last ingredient, moral power, how I hate it! […].
>
> (Act III, Scene 2, p. 33)

Compared to Stevenson's brief description, the scene is expanded into a sustained spectacle on stage, where movement, gestures, colours become as important, if not more so, as the dialogue itself. The audience is not required to understand the chemistry behind the experiment but instead to watch its enactment as the prelude to the transformation scene. In addition, the performance of the experiment is reinforced by the extensive instructions that accompany the script. Unlike the other adaptations, the Forepaugh & Fish version preserves detailed property and gas plots which offer a valuable insight into how this scene was supposed to be staged:

> PROPERTY PLOT
>
> […]
>
> Act III. – Lighted lamp; pistol on table L. 2; put armchair at change R.; clock strikes 12 at cue and knock; fireplace R., lit; graduated glass on table L. (Dark change and set to vision scene.) Box matches for Lanyon; drawer for business; bottle of red tincture and powder for business; graduated glass to break on table L.; […].
>
> (Forepaugh & Fish, 1897: 4)

> GAS PLOT
>
> […]
>
> Act III.—[…]. Scene 2.—House lights out; borders out; foots down; when DR. LANYON turns up

> lamp, foots three-quarters up at cue. … Foots out. Lighting back of screen drop on MR. HYDE; when DR. LANYON comes on with lamp back of screen, light bunch L. 3 E. ; when DR. LANYON opens door, white calcium on him from R. 3 E.; green medium from fireplace R 2 E. on HYDE as he enters from L. 2 E., until he changes to DR. JEKYLL, then calcium out and foots up three-quarters. Picture—second curtain—Bunch L. 3 E. lights when DR. LANYON comes on with lamp; lighting R. 3 E.
>
> (Forepaugh & Fish, 1897: 5)

Not only does the property plot specify the scientific paraphernalia required for the experiment—a graduated glass, a bottle of red tincture, powders, a lamp, and the drawer containing the chemicals—but it also specifies the precise placement of each object on stage, allowing the reader of the script to imagine the scene as best as possible. Similarly, the gas plot provides an elaborate lighting scheme, coordinating the illumination of Hyde and Lanyon throughout the part. When Hyde enters, coloured lighting—which also included a green medium projected from the fireplace—combines with calcium illumination to heighten the atmosphere, before shifting again at the moment of the transformation. Detailed technical instructions such as these demonstrate that the making of the potion in this scene was not conceived merely as an event to bring the plot forward, but as a carefully choreographed theatrical spectacle. The scientific apparatus described in the property plot serves two fundamental functions: it lends authenticity to the transformation from Hyde to Jekyll and reinforces Jekyll's identity as a man of science, and it simultaneously serves as stage machinery designed for visual impact. The lighting, the strategically placed props, as well as timed effects, all direct the public's attention towards the incoming transformation rather than towards the scientific explanation that makes it possible. Therefore, the production documents confirm the tendency to give way to theatrical representation. With this orchestrated combination of gestures, props, and lighting, spectators are invited to witness the effects of the experiment rather than understanding how it works.

Mansfield's adaptation adopts a different strategy. Unlike the later adaptations, it dedicates relatively little attention to the physical preparation of the potion. Hyde is simply instructed the following:

> HYDE. (*Snatching glass*) (*He goes to table L. C. measuring out powder and liquor in the glass by the light of the fire. As he measures he crouches over the fire.*)
>
> (Act III, Scene 1, p. 72)

After this, the action proceeds directly towards the transformation. The audience does observe the experiment, yet neither Hyde nor the stage directions dwell upon each step of the process. This relative brevity is significant when considering Mansfield's earlier treatment of science. While

Bandmann and Forepaugh & Fish substantially reduce the philosophical discussion surrounding Jekyll's theories and compensate by expanding the visual performance of the experiment, Mansfield has already established the scientific foundations of the narrative through the debate between Jekyll and Lanyon discussed above. Therefore, the preparation of the potion is less theatrically elaborate and greater attention is given to the dialogue between Hyde and Lanyon.

The three adaptations reveal not the disappearance of science from the stage, but instead of its role and its presence. As the philosophical debate surrounding Jekyll's theories and research is progressively condensed, the visual performance of scientific practice becomes increasingly more elaborate. Mansfield privileges scientific debate—though it remains compressed—while staging the experiment with relative economy; Bandmann abbreviates the theory but transforms the preparation of the potion into a theatrical spectacle; Forepaugh & Fish follow this tendency and pursue it even further through the use of detailed stage props and lighting effects. The result is a gradual shift in the representation of science from discourse to performance. Scientific authority is no longer established primarily through explanation or debate, but rather through gestures, coloured lights, and the spectacle of the experiment itself. Science is not left behind in the adaptations of the novella; instead, it is gradually translated into theatrical language, allowing the public to witness it.

2.4. Jekyll and Lanyon

The scientific dimension of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is articulated also through the scientific relationship—or lack thereof—between its two principal physicians, Dr. Henry Jekyll and Dr. Hastie Lanyon. Instead of representing a unified scientific community, Stevenson builds a conflict between two contrasting conceptions of scientific practice. On the one hand, Lanyon embodies the principles of orthodox Victorian medicine: he values empirical observation, professional respectability, and established methods. As C. T. Toumey correctly states, Lanyon personifies the conscience of science, he belongs to the "ethical scientists who caution mad scientists to cease their experiments and return to conventional morality" (1992: 415). On the other hand, Jekyll represents a more speculative and experimental approach to scientific inquiry, challenging conventional limits in pursuit of discoveries that could transform human nature itself. Their disagreement therefore reflects broader 19th-century tensions between established and conventional science and more unorthodox forms of research.

Across the three adaptations, Lanyon consistently functions as the representative of orthodox Victorian science and his position remains remarkably stable throughout the action: his conception of science is founded upon the adherence to established medical principles. His disagreement with

Jekyll, far from being a personal quarrel, is presented as a conflict between competing approaches to scientific inquiry. Significantly, Lanyon's objections emerge long before Jekyll's experiment proves disastrous. He rejects Jekyll's theories because he considers them professionally unacceptable. This attitude is most fully developed in Mansfield's adaptation, where, as seen above, Lanyon dismisses Jekyll's theory as another of his "old hobby horses" (Act II, Scene 2, p. 63) while also repeatedly questioning its plausibility. Moreover, he firmly condemns Jekyll's ambition by saying that he has no right to "dabble in these occult sciences. It is unprofessional" (Act II, Scene 2, p. 64). By describing Jekyll's research as such, Lanyon places it outside the boundaries of legitimate scientific inquiry, whereas the accusation of being unprofessional frames the issue as one of scientific ethics rather than intellectual curiosity; Lanyon's concern is whether such investigations should be undertaken at all.

While in Bandmann's adaptation there is no scientific debate between the two doctors, the essential ideological opposition remains intact. Early in the play, Lanyon explains to Utterson that he and Jekyll "merely differ in [their] scientific views" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 141), a remark that clarifies the division between the two physicians. The conflict is one of scientific principles rather than personal hostility: indeed, when Utterson asks whether they are no longer "on the same good terms," Lanyon strongly states that they are "on the same footing as before" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 141). Likewise, Forepaugh & Fish reinforce Lanyon's position by using the same words as Stevenson. When recalling Jekyll's speculative interests, Lanyon remarks that he "began to grow wrong—wrong in mind," dismissing his ideas as "such unscientific balderdash" that they "would have estranged Damon and Pythias" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 13). In addition, in the scene where Lanyon discovers Jekyll's secret, Hyde mocks him for having "grovelled in the ditch of unbelief," for denying "the virtues of transcendental medicine," and for having been "bound to the most narrow and material views" (Act III, Scene 2, p. 33). Although Hyde intends these statements as insults, they also define Lanyon's identity as a scientist: he rejects transcendental medicine precisely because it lies beyond the limits of empirical science and clashes with the rational principles upon which Lanyon's scientific authority is founded. These portrayals demonstrate that Lanyon consistently embodies the values associated with conventional science. His resistance to Jekyll's theories is motivated by a commitment to his professional boundaries and to scientific legitimacy. For him, scientific investigation must remain accountable to recognised methods and ethical standards, and he refuses to endorse the abandonment of empirical evidence. Thus, Lanyon represents institutional science, against which Jekyll's transgressions are measured; he also functions as the moral and professional framework that ultimately Jekyll violates.

In contrast to Lanyon, Jekyll always presents himself as the scientist who is willing to challenge the *status quo* and the limits imposed by conventional medicine. In the novella and in the

adaptations, he rejects what Lanyon embodies, believing established science to be excessively conservative and resistant to innovation. For Jekyll, genuine scientific progress can only be achieved by questioning accepted doctrines and pursuing ideas that initially appear impossible. The opposition is particularly evident in Mansfield's *Jekyll and Hyde*, where Jekyll dismisses Lanyon as a "hide-bound pedant" and states that he has never been more disappointed in someone than in him (Act I, Scene 1, p. 52). When Lanyon shows his scepticism on his theories, Jekyll reminds him that "steam and electricity were sneered at once" (Act II, Scene 3, p. 64), invoking significant advances of the 19th century as examples of innovations that were initially dismissed before becoming essential to modern society. By drawing this comparison, Jekyll positions his research within a broader narrative of scientific progress, implying that every new discovery must first face the resistance of conservative thoughts. Moreover, his ambition is much greater, as he imagines that his work may lead "to fame and immortality—to cures of which Hippocrates never dreamt" (Act II, Scene 3, p. 64). The reference to Hippocrates, conventionally regarded as the founder of Western medicine, is particularly important, as it reveals that Jekyll is not rejecting medicine itself, but rather he seeks to surpass even its historic foundations.

Although Bandmann and Forepaugh & Fish considerably reduce the exchanges between Jekyll and Lanyon, they nonetheless preserve the characterisation of Jekyll as the advocate of unconventional science. In both adaptations, Jekyll dismisses Lanyon as "that pedant" (Bandmann, Act I, Scene 1, p. 143), while Forepaugh & Fish intensify the insult by having him describe his colleague as "a hide-bound pedant for all of that, an ignorant blatant pedant" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 14). This reflects Jekyll's perception that orthodox science, that represented by Lanyon, has become stagnant, incapable of recognizing ideas that could change the world, all because they challenge paradigms.

Mansfield's adaptation is particularly significant in this discourse because it substantially reconfigures the relationship between Jekyll and Lanyon following the revelation of Hyde's true identity. In Stevenson's novella, Lanyon's discovery of Jekyll's experiment marks the end of his role in the narrative, because he finds himself unable to reconcile what he has witnessed with his understanding of reality and of scientific knowledge. Owing to this inability and the shock following the revelation, his health rapidly declines and he dies. Bandmann and Forepaugh & Fish largely preserve this narrative function: although the details vary, Lanyon essentially remains the sceptical witness who dies after discovering the truth about Jekyll. Mansfield, however, departs from this model and the manner in which he rearranges Lanyon's role is striking. Instead of removing him from the action, he transforms Lanyon into one of Jekyll's principal companions in the fourth and final act, fundamentally changing both their relationship and Lanyon's symbolic function within the drama.

In Mansfield's version of *Jekyll and Hyde*, after the discovery of Hyde's true nature, Lanyon's health does not decline, nor does he die. Instead, after having exhausted every possibility of reproducing the potion, the physician actively helps Jekyll in the search for the original salt. Lanyon explains that he has personally searched London's chemists "praying to find some crate that had been overlooked" (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 75):

> JEKYLL. […] Lanyon's knock! What! Can heaven be merciful! (*Goes to door R. and draws back the bolts. Enter Lanyon*)
>
> LANYON. (*At door.*) Harry!
>
> JEKYLL. Come in.
>
> (*Lanyon to C. bolting door and looking eagerly at Lanyon's face.*)
>
> You have not brought it. (*To R. C.*) (*Lanyon shakes his head.*) I saw it in your face. Sit down, my poor Lanyon, you are trembling.
>
> LANYON. (*Sitting R. C.*) It is nothing. I have not been myself since – since –
>
> JEKYLL. (*Crosses to C. sitting in arm chair*) Since that night – I understand. You saw the Chemists?
>
> LANYON. Yes, they remembered your first purchase of the salt, but assured me that the old supply was long ago exhausted, that furnished you lately was from a fresh invoice.
>
> JEKYLL. And it is useless like all the others, with Poole's help, I have ransacked every chemist's shop in London. This last interview of yours was my forlorn hope. Did you beg them to search their cellars?
>
> LANYON. More than that. I searched with them. Praying to find some crate that had been overlooked, but in vain.
>
> JEKYLL. All is over then. The first supply was impure, I am persuaded that unknown impurity gave the drug its power, we cannot reproduce it. (*Rising*) I am a dead man Lanyon.
>
> (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 75)

Rather than distancing himself from Jekyll after the revelation of Jekyll's experiments, Lanyon chooses to help him, sharing both the practical efforts in the search for the missing ingredient and his emotional burden. When Jekyll admits that "the evil power within [him] has the mastery" (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 75), Lanyon's response is not one of horror or condemnation, but rather he feels for him and is sympathetic towards him: "My poor Henry," he utters (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 76). While Jekyll feels guilty for having dragged Lanyon into this situation, his friend tries to find a solution and to convince him to flee:

> JEKYLL. To prolong my own agony I have destroyed your peace of mind. Forgive me Lanyon. The nightmare which has haunted you will soon be over – soon I shall trouble you no more.
>
> LANYON. You must seek a place of safety. Here, new dangers threaten you.

JEKYLL. What new danger can I fear?

LANYON. Utterson has found a clue.

JEKYLL. The forged letter – I had forgotten that.

LANYON. He believes you to be Hyde's accomplice. At any moment the police may search the house. You must leave it at once and go with me.

JEKYLL. To whom do you say this – to Dr. Jekyll or to Mr. Hyde?

LANYON. Harry, I entreat you – (*Step forward.*)

JEKYLL. To force you to compound felony and make that monster your companion? Why? To what end? He is proscribed and branded. He would not be safe one hour. No, leave him to himself. The police for Hyde have no terrors, he will escape them in his own time, in his own way.

LANYON. But here you cannot escape from yourself. There is danger for you even in the sight of these surroundings.

JEKYLL. (*To C.*) That is true, there is not an instant to be lost.

(Act IV, Scene 1, p. 76)

Here, Lanyon no longer attempts to persuade Jekyll to abandon his theories, nor does he condemn what the physician has done. His attention is not on their scientific agreement, but it shifts towards Jekyll's immediate welfare, showing care and concern for his friend. Lanyon recognizes that the greatest danger now is Jekyll's inability to escape the consequences of his meddling with science. At the same time, by addressing Jekyll as "Harry" and urging him to flee with him, Lanyon shows that he privileges friendship over judgement, showcasing his narrative transformation to devoted physician and friend.

Moreover, throughout the entire scene, Lanyon repeatedly encourages his friend not to surrender to despair, urging him to "have faith" and trying to reassure him:

LANYON. I understand, and I will do it, but on one condition. Give me your promise first?

JEKYLL. What promise?

LANYON. That until this change you fear has come you will make no attempt upon your life.

JEKYLL. I promise. (*Gives his hand.*) There's my hand upon it. Once more, I promise.

LANYON. (*Holding his hand – other hand on shoulder*) Meantime have faith, do not give way, do not despair.

JEKYLL. Farewell, old friend, whatever happens, pity me and forgive me if you can.

LANYON. Whatever happens, my place is here with you.

JEKYLL. (*Crossing and unbolting door R.*) Yes. First bring her there: and come to me afterwards alone. I will watch for your signal.

LANYON. (*Crosses to door.*) Courage! Courage!

(Act IV, Scene 1, pp. 76-77)

Lanyon's concern extends beyond simple sympathy, as he also attempts to protect Jekyll from both the authorities and from himself, persuading him to leave the house before the police arrives and making him promise not to take his own life, at least not until the change into Hyde has happened. Most significantly, Lanyon's last lines declare that "[his] place is here with [Jekyll]" (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 76), signalling that their relationship is defined no longer by scientific disagreement but by loyalty and friendship.

The reinterpretation of Lanyon's role represents a significant departure from Stevenson's novella, and it also differs from both Bandmann's and Forepaugh & Fish's adaptations. In Mansfield's play, the ideological conflict between the two doctors is still present, but once the consequences of Jekyll's experiment become irreversible, scientific disagreement is replaced by friendship and medical responsibility. Lanyon does not function as the representative of orthodox science anymore; instead, he assumes the role of friend and physician, refusing to abandon a patient—that is, Jekyll—whose condition he neither understands nor approves of. Rather than keeping on judging and condemning Jekyll, Lanyon tries to alleviate his sufferings, to preserve his life, and to offer some comfort. Therefore, Mansfield foregrounds humanity and the ethical obligations conventionally associated with the medical profession, suggesting that care is both a friend's and a physician's duty, even if there is conflict between the two parties.

This reinterpretation also responds to the demands of theatrical adaptation. While Stevenson's novella uses retrospective narration through letters and confessions after Lanyon's discovery, the stage requires sustained interaction between the characters. By allowing Lanyon to survive, Mansfield employs dramatic dialogue to enable Jekyll's final confession, guilt, and regret to unfold. Mansfield's decision to make Lanyon the principal interlocutor is particularly significant. Rather than assigning this role to any other character, the adaptation uses the physician who had previously opposed Jekyll. This choice fundamentally reshapes their relationship. In the novella, respectable science collapses when confronted with the truth of Jekyll's forbidden knowledge, and Lanyon's death symbolises the irreconcilability of transgressive and orthodox science. Instead, Mansfield imagines the possibility of reconciliation through the intervention of compassion, humanity, and friendship. Although Lanyon never accepts Jekyll's theories, he does not reject Jekyll himself. Friendship and professional duty ultimately win over ideological opposition, transforming Lanyon from the tragic victim of forbidden knowledge into the embodiment of compassionate ethics. By keeping him at Jekyll's side until the end, the audience's attention is redirected towards friendship and love. In doing so, this adaptation aligns more closely with the emotional priorities of late 19th-century melodrama.

2.5. Faustian Undertones in the Stage Adaptations

Although the dramatic adaptations focus less on the transgressive ambition and hypocrisy of Jekyll and instead more on the dichotomy between the "good" Jekyll and the "bad" Hyde, they keep on framing the story within a recognisable Faustian discourse of forbidden knowledge and transgression. As MacArthur observes, one of the earliest predecessors of the Gothic scientist is Christopher Marlowe's *The Tragicall Historie of Doctor Faustus*, whose ambition to transcend the limits of knowledge leads him to damnation (2015: 26). While the story of Dr. Faust is a "dynamic story" that changes "its moral lessons from generation to generation over five centuries" (Toumey, 1992: 417), the Gothic scientist inherits many of his defining characteristics, namely his dissatisfaction with current knowledge, his confidence in his intellectual superiority, and the belief that certain boundaries should be crossed. Jekyll does not make a pact with the devil, as Faust does; however, his determination to go beyond the limits set by orthodox science, as well as his willingness to experiment on himself to pursue his ideas, locate him within the Faustian tradition.

In Stevenson's novella, Jekyll's conviction in the possibility of transcending scientific boundaries and his transgressive ambition in the pursuit of his theories are central to his final statement. His account of what happened returns to the motivations behind his experimentations, emphasising his confidence in his ideas. Jekyll eventually realizes the catastrophic consequences of his discovery but still finds refuge in his hypocrisy and in the illusion that it is Hyde who bears the responsibility for the crimes. In all three stage adaptations, Jekyll's confidence and scientific ambition are concentrated almost entirely in the opening sections of the plays, before Hyde commits murder at the end of the first act. It is in these scenes that Jekyll dismisses Lanyon and his view of science and imagines the extraordinary benefits that his discovery might bring to humanity, still believing that his experiment represents progress, when in reality it only bears catastrophe. In Mansfield's version, the debate with Lanyon is placed after Hyde has committed the murder; nevertheless, the discussion happens before Jekyll abandons his confidence in his research and is consumed by the consequences of his experiment.

The Faustian dimension of Jekyll and Hyde is particularly evident in the confrontation between Hyde and Lanyon, a scene that survives across all three adaptations with little alteration. In both Stevenson's novella and the stage versions, Hyde presents the revelation of his identity not merely as a scientific demonstration but as the offer of forbidden knowledge. This dynamic recalls the temptation at the centre of Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, in which the pursuit of infinite knowledge beyond conventional limits entails tragic consequences. In Mansfield's adaptation, his language echoes one of temptation:

HYDE. (*Back to fire – smiling and looking closely at Lanyon*) And now to settle what remains. Will you be wise? Will you be guided? Will you suffer me to take this glass in my hand and leave your house without further parley?

LANYON. (*Putting hand on pistol*) By the night above us, no!

HYDE. (*L. C.*) Ah! the greed of curiosity has too much command of you.

LANYON. (*R. C.*) Curiosity? What has that to do with it? You ask me calmly to let a malefactor loose upon the world. I refuse. You are my prisoner.

HYDE. (*Crosses to Lanyon – Lanyon recoils to R.*) Foolish words. You rather are in my power now. Again I give you the choice. Think before you answer, for it shall be done as you decide. As you decide, you shall be left as you are now and neither richer nor wiser, unless the sense of service rendered to a man in mortal distress may be counted as a kind of riches of the soul, or, if you so prefer, a new province of knowledge and new avenues to fame and power shall be open to you, here in this room upon the instant: and your sight shall be blasted by a prodigy to stagger the unbelief of Satan.

LANYON. (*Aside*) What does he mean? It seems as though my heart stopped beating. (*Aloud*) You speak enigma, and I hear them with no impression but that of doubt. You cannot wonder at it. (*Recoils to R.*)

HYDE. (*Following him to C.*) Choose! Sleep in peace: or learn that all your science is a cipher. Learn marvels of which Hippocrates never dreamed!

LANYON. (*Aside in terror.*) Why, those were Jekyll's words! (*Aloud*) I have gone too far to retreat. At last, I own to the greed of curiosity. Go on! I must know the end.

HYDE. Good. Lanyon you remember your vows. What follows is under the seal of your profession, and now, you who have so long been bound by narrow and material views, you who have denied the virtue of a medicine for the soul – Behold! Man of unbelief! Behold!

(Act III, Scene 1, p. 73)

Recalling what Stevenson wrote in the novella, the tempting offers uttered by Hyde remind the reader of the ones made by Mephistopheles to Faustus, who accepts them and their consequences:

MEPH. […] But, tell me, Faustus, shall I have thy soul?
And I will be thy slave, and wait on thee,
And give thee more than thou hast wit to ask.

FAU. Ay, Mephostophilis, I'll give it him.

MEPH. Then, Faustus, stab thy arm courageously.
And bind thy soul, that at some certain day
Great Lucifer may claim it as his own;

And then be thou as great as Lucifer.

(Scene V, 45-52)

The Faustian pattern is redistributed among the characters. Jekyll is the one who has already gone beyond the boundaries of conventional knowledge, while Hyde is the tempter. This temptation, which seduced Jekyll before, is now directed to Lanyon, who is required to make the choice whether to know the truth or not. In Mansfield's adaptation, Hyde asks the doctor whether he wishes to remain "neither richer nor wiser" or instead discover "a new province of knowledge" (Act III, Scene 1, p. 73). Lanyon at last admits that the "greed of curiosity" (Act III, Scene 1, p. 73) has had the best of him, so in the end he gives in to temptation as well.

Bandmann and Forepaugh & Fish reinforce this Faustian rhetoric by intensifying Hyde's language of superiority. In Bandmann's adaptation, Hyde asserts that he will demonstrate "what science and progress has accomplished, over arrogance, over ignorance, and darkness," before ridiculing conventional science and claiming that there are "powers in the brain of man beyond your logical A.B.C." (Act III, Scene 3, p. 158). Similarly, Forepaugh & Fish closely follow Stevenson's text, presenting Hyde as the one possessing a superior form of knowledge inaccessible to conventional science. Hyde assumes the role of the tempter, the bringer of a truth that cannot be reached through ordinary means, and he invites Lanyon, who has "grovelled in the ditch of unbelief," who is bound to "the most narrow and material views" (Forepaugh & Fish, Act III, Scene 2, p. 33), to abandon all of his certainties.

At the same time, the stage adaptations preserve an essential element inherited from the novella. Hyde's promises are not entirely false: Jekyll's discoveries—though limited—do indeed overturn Lanyon's understanding and beliefs of science. Yet, this revelation brings neither fame nor power. Instead, it generates psychological collapse, horror, and it ultimately leads to Lanyon's death—apart from Mansfield's adaptation. Thus, the promise of unthinkable knowledge proves to be deeply ironic. Like Faustus, who strikes a deal with the devil to achieve limitless knowledge at the cost of his soul, Jekyll's scientific discoveries are inseparable from his self-destruction.

The analysis of the three dramatic adaptations has shown that the theme of science does not disappear in the transition from page to the stage. Instead, it undergoes a process of transformation in which scientific discourse is increasingly condensed, while its dramatic and symbolic functions are preserved. The adaptations retain the premise of Jekyll's experiment and continue to present him as an eminent physician who drives the narrative forward. However, the philosophical discussions are abbreviated and reduced to concise exchanges or even isolated statements; visual performance is also prioritized, along with dramatic action. Science is thus reconfigured and performed, becoming the catalyst for spectacle.

Chapter 3

"Out of The Province of a Woman": The Performance of Femininity

I'm not afraid of storms, for I'm learning how to sail my ship.

—Louisa May Alcott, *Little Women*

3.1. Female Quasi-Absence in Stevenson's Novella

When compared to its stage adaptations, one of the most important features in Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is the predominance of its male characters. Even though women are not completely absent from the text, their role is only peripheral, and they do not perform any significant function within the narrative. Instead, the novella focuses on male characters and is structured around male relationships and predominantly male spaces, the principal figures being Utterson, Lanyon, Jekyll, and Hyde. Moreover, the investigation surrounding Hyde's identity is conducted exclusively by men. The narrative itself is concerned largely with male professional and social networks, from Utterson's conversations with Enfield, Lanyon, and Jekyll to the declarations made by servants. As a consequence, the novella offers little opportunity for a female perspective on the story of Jekyll, his transformation and on the violence perpetrated by Hyde.

Despite the minor role that women have in the novella, they nevertheless appear at crucial moments in the narrative, especially as victims or witnesses of Hyde's actions. The earliest example occurs at the beginning of the story, in the description of the trampling of a young girl whom Hyde meets while wandering the streets of London at about three o'clock in the morning. This episode is witnessed by Richard Enfield, who recalls that the child was "a girl of maybe eight or ten" (Stevenson, 1886: 9), who was running down a cross street before the collision with Hyde. The violence that follows is described with striking brevity: Hyde "trampled calmly over the child's body and left her screaming on the ground. It sounds nothing to hear, but it was hellish to see" (Stevenson, 1886: 9). The child, significantly a girl, is among the first victims through whom Hyde's brutality is established, and yet she has no voice within the narrative. This awful episode is entirely mediated through Enfield's recollection, consequently making her disappear from the story. Likewise, when after the incident Hyde is stopped by the crowd, Enfield remembers that "[they] were keeping the women off him as best [they] could, for they were as wild as harpies" (Stevenson, 1886: 9-10). Here, women

appear as a collective unit emotionally affected by Hyde's violence; however, they remain unnamed and undifferentiated. Their hateful reaction does not provide a female perspective on Hyde's actions; instead, it is useful in the depiction of Hyde as a disturbing and upsetting presence within the otherwise apparently respectable urban community.

A similar pattern can be seen in the chapter called "The Carew Murder Case," where the murder of Sir Danvers Carew at the hands of Mr. Hyde is narrated. The homicide is witnessed not by one of the main characters, but by a simple maid who lives alone in an apartment, and who from her windows happens to see the encounter between the two men. She is the only character in the novella who directly witnesses the murder of Sir Danvers; yet, even with this important function, her perspective remains marginal. The maid is introduced through a remarkably subjective description: she is "romantically given," and while sitting at the window she falls "into a dream of musing" (Stevenson, 1886: 21). She also experiences a sense of peace and kindness towards the world which she has never felt before. Consequently, her perspective is framed through the characterization of her emotional and sentimental disposition. When she is witness to the murder, the experience is overwhelming and "at the horror of these sights and sounds, the maid faint[s]" (Stevenson, 1886: 22). She is not allowed to relate her story as an active witness contributing to the investigation; instead, she is made temporarily incapable of action by fainting, and her testimony is used as evidence within the male investigation into the murderer. Robbie B. H. Goh draws attention to this aspect of the maid's characterization, observing that her description as "romantically given" and the emphasis on her tears and fainting introduce "a kind of disparaging sexism" into the narrative, associating her with sentimentalism and weakness (1999: 169). This is significant because the principal male characters are generally described through their rationality, their professional status, and their respectability. By contrast, the maid is presented only through her emotional response. Therefore, her encounter with Hyde illustrates not only the marginal position occupied by women in the novella, but also the gendered differentiation between the rational male characters and the female witness who experiences her emotions.

In the novella there are other female figures who remain at the margins of the narrative. Among them is the "ivory-faced and silvery-haired old woman" who opens the door to Hyde's lodging and whose face is described as "evil" and "smoothed by hypocrisy" (Stevenson, 1886: 23). Like the maid, she is important for her connection to Hyde and to the investigations surrounding him. Her reaction to Inspector Newcomen's arrival—"A flash of odious joy appeared upon the woman's face. 'Ah!' said she, 'he is in trouble! What has he done?'" (Stevenson, 1886: 24)—suggests her hatred towards Hyde, placing her near the women "as wild as harpies" of the first chapter. Her function however remains largely circumstantial: she has knowledge of Hyde, which could be helpful

to the investigations, but the narrative does not develop her character further nor grant her a bigger role.

The limited presence of women in a novella populated almost entirely by men is striking. The women that are present are the victims and witnesses of Hyde's violence and remain largely disconnected from the central narrative of Jekyll's identity. The child whom Hyde tramples, the women who react to his arrest, the maid who witnesses Carew's murder, and the woman associated with Hyde's lodging, all of them contribute to the construction of Hyde as a figure of violence and social disruption, without ever becoming important within the narrative. Most importantly, none occupies a position remotely comparable to the female protagonists later introduced by the stage adaptations. In the novella, the little girl is reduced to the victim of a single encounter, the maid's testimony is incorporated into a male investigative structure, while the other women remain unnamed or briefly characterized. Moreover, Stevenson does not give Jekyll a romantic interest through which his identity could be represented in domestic or emotional terms, as instead happens in the stage adaptations. Jekyll's most important relationships in the novella are with other men. There is no female character who embodies the social and emotional life that Jekyll risks losing through his experimentations, nor is there a woman who occupies the position of both loving Jekyll while simultaneously being connected to Hyde's first victim.

The three stage adaptations analysed in this thesis substantially change this configuration, with the addition of a female protagonist being the most important, rearranged feature of the productions. Mansfield introduces Agnes Carew, Bandmann presents Sybil Howell, while in the Forepaugh & Fish play there is Alice Leigh. These new female characters become central in the narrative: their relationship with Jekyll is not only romantic but also familial, as they are all the daughters of Hyde's first murder victim. The presence of these new characters is important as Hyde's violence is directly connected to the emotional and familial lives of the main characters. Moreover, the addition of these women transforms the narrative from being predominantly male-oriented into a broader dramatic story that involves love and family, highlighting the consequences of Jekyll's actions for those around him and whom he loves dearly.

3.2. From Absence to Presence on the Stage

The transition from page to the theatre in the three adaptations studied in this thesis entails a significant transformation in the representation of women. As previously discussed, the new female characters are embedded into the originally only male social dimension, thereby changing the narrative and the ways in which Jekyll, Hyde, and the consequences of their actions are represented.

3.2.1. The New Domestic Framework

The introduction of a romantic interest for Jekyll is one of the most important departures from the original novella; Rose observes that "Sullivan established the important convention of a love life for Jekyll" (1996: 54). With this new addition, also retained by the subsequent adaptations, Mansfield and Sullivan introduce a change in the position occupied by Jekyll. If in the novella Jekyll's main—and only—relationships are with men, and his character is built around his professional reputation, his scientific research, and his hypocrisy, the introduction of a fiancée in the stage adaptation becomes relevant as it shows a part of Jekyll's character never seen before, that is his personal and emotional side. Because Jekyll is now a member of a familial network and a soon-to-be husband, the transformation into Hyde is even more menacing, for not only does it entail the destruction of Jekyll's psychological identity, but it also represents a very concrete threat to his possible domestic future. In Mansfield's adaptation, the scene presents a mixed social world in which women coexist alongside the principal male characters. Agnes Carew is introduced in the company of Mrs. Lanyon, Sir Danvers Carew, and Mr. Utterson; this way, Agnes is positioned within a new domestic social environment, while the other female figure, Mrs. Lanyon, participates in a conversation concerning Jekyll, his work, and his health. The scene is remarkedly different from Stevenson's male-centred narrative: Jekyll's persona is established through his relations with both men and women, whereas his anticipated union to Agnes allows the audience to better understand his social position as a respectable Victorian gentleman ready to marry. Brian A. Rose identifies this when he argues that "the Sullivan adaptation begins the process of melodramatic inscription of the familiar in its first scene" (1996: 55). The ordinary world of familiarity, society, and respectability provides here the background against which Jekyll's transformations take place.

The domestic framework is particularly important when considering Jekyll's character and his relationship with Agnes. Stevenson presents Jekyll's ideas and experimentation as both an intellectual and psychological transgression; the stage adaptations, however, place this transgression within a recognizable world preoccupied with marriage and social and domestic expectations. Rose states that the shift from the Gothic, which permeates the novella, to melodrama involves "the reinscription of horrific action unrolling against a background of domesticity," which "serves to rehabilitate Stevenson's Jekyll while foregrounding and framing his crisis" (1996: 55, 56):

> It rehabilitates through displaying Jekyll not as an isolated neurotic (Stevenson) but a revered if complicated member of a bourgeois society expected to participate in its usual patterns of quotidian action. The melodramatic translation frames his crisis by citing, as the essential treasure lost to Jekyll through his choices, the denied bliss of love and domestic relations. The process of translation also highlights the implication that his work and attitudes are a danger to all such social systems. This use of

> the female and her domestic (and, hence, legitimated) sexual connection to social systems to anchor the story in the realm of the melodramatic is the first and most important role played by Dr. Jekyll's love interests as they reappear throughout its adaptational history. (Rose, 1996: 56)

Not only does Agnes provide Jekyll with a romantic subplot—which still remains essential to the adaptation—but this new subplot and her introduction place Jekyll's experiment within the conventions of melodrama, where emotions and a threatened domestic happiness are usually brought to the foreground. She embodies the domestic and social world from which his ideas and experimentations distance him. Agnes is the representation of what Jekyll's life might have become had he not strayed from social conventions and respectability, and his marriage to her is concretely endangered by his transgressions. This melodramatic reconfiguration, which is present also in the later adaptations with Sybil and Alice, contributes to Jekyll's rehabilitation. By presenting him as a respectable gentleman engaged to a respectable woman, as a man who loves and is loved, the adaptations invite the audience to sympathise with him. His ultimate downfall, which acquires the logic of melodrama, is even more tragic: Jekyll, who could have reached happiness within the social order, puts this happiness in jeopardy with his transgressions and he ultimately destroys it. The horror of Jekyll's transformation into Hyde, important in the novella, is intensified in the adaptations, not only by the presence of the monstrous double, but also by the progressive destruction of a possible happy domestic life. Therefore, the introduction of the female characters in the adaptations is central to the melodramatic inscription of Stevenson's story. Their function is not limited to providing an emotional connection for Jekyll, but they are essential to the transposition of the novella into a melodrama. Agnes, and later Sybil in Bandmann's adaptation and Alice in the Forepaugh & Fish version, represent the respectable domestic world that Jekyll risks losing—and ultimately does lose. The adaptations transform Jekyll's tragedy from the psychological and Gothic narrative of Stevenson's novella into melodrama, where the loss of love and social belonging become the most tangible consequences of his double life.

3.2.2. The Female Protagonists

Agnes Carew, Sybil Howell, and Alice Leigh all fulfil the role of Jekyll's romantic interest; however, they are also figures characterized through combinations of affection and filial love, domesticity, and agency. Their first appearances are important as they introduce them as the central female figures of the adaptations, also establishing the models of femininity for subsequent adaptations. In all three plays, the heroine is introduced within a domestic or familial environment, thereby reinforcing the melodramatic inscription discussed above. However, the three characters are not carbon copies of

each other; instead, they present slight but relevant differences. While Agnes is initially characterised through her bond with Jekyll and with her father, Sybil can be associated with romantic love while also being given a strong capacity for emotional expression and action. Alice, on the other hand, is introduced as both an affectionate daughter and a woman capable of asserting her own judgement. Their initial characterisation establishes different versions of the central female figure who is both Jekyll's beloved and the daughter of Hyde's victim.

Mansfield's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is perhaps the clearest example of the melodramatic inscription of the familiar identified by Rose. The first act opens in the home of Sir Danvers Carew, placing Agnes in an already familial and social circle and introducing her alongside her father, Utterson, and Mrs. Lanyon. She is characterized through her relationships: she is Carew's daughter, Mrs. Lanyon's niece, and Jekyll's fiancée, making her identity more relational than independent. It is precisely these relationships, in the end, that Jekyll's transformation will threaten. From the first lines, the emphasis is on her emotional attachment to Jekyll. She is concerned about his absence:

> MRS. LANYON. […] Dr. Lanyon will not leave his patients, and his poor wife is of secondary importance. You see what comes of marrying into medicine.
>
> AGNES. […]. I can't understand why Harry did not dine here as he promised.
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, p. 48)

She also expresses her concern for her fiancé by observing that he has recently looked pale and is overworking. Agnes is here presented as caring and attentive to Jekyll's physical and emotional condition. At the same time, Mrs. Lanyon's comments remind us of the conventionality of their relationship, describing Jekyll as the "dearest and best man in London" and advising Agnes to refrain from criticizing him before the marriage:

> MRS. LANYON. (*Passing tea cup*) Take some tea, dear, and quiet your nerves. And when Dr. Jekyll comes, don't scold him. Keep your criticism until after marriage — you will need them. Don't say I'm malicious. I simply forecast the future with the best of motives.
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, pp. 48-49)

Jekyll and Agnes' relationship and engagement is therefore presented as the typical arranged marriage between the ideal husband and the respectable woman who will stand by his side as his wife.

Agnes' characterization becomes more complex when Jekyll finally appears on stage and admits to possessing a hidden and troubling side, for which he must part from her:

AGNES. (*Round in front of chair.*) Yes, there is something wrong. I have seen it in your face for days. What is it Harry? You must let me share in this. How else am I to help you?

JEKYLL. (*Turning away his face.*) You cannot help me. There is no help for me on earth.

AGNES. Harry!

JEKYLL. We are at the cross roads – we must part before it is too late. (*Crosses to R*) I must go on alone.

AGNES. Part!

JEKYLL. Yes.

AGNES. Are you out of your senses? Do you know me? I have promised to be your wife – I love you. Look! This is I – Agnes Carew. (*Arms round his neck.*)

JEKYLL. (*Breaking from her.*) It is you who do not know me. I am unfit to live upon the same earth as you. (*Crosses to L.*) You do not know me, I tell you.

(Act I, Scene 1, p. 53)

Agnes' response to Jekyll's decision confirms one of the most important aspects of her character: her devotion to Jekyll is unconditional. She refuses to abandon him when he has clearly already made his decision, and instead fights this choice:

AGNES. (*Following him*) Part? How little you know me! If you have sins to conquer, I have mine. Who is there without sin in all the world? We are born into it to help one another. And when you need me most, am I to give you up – to leave you?

JEKYLL. You can say these things? You ask me nothing?

AGNES. No, you have won my love, you must accept it.

(Act I, Scene 1, pp. 53-54)

The role played by Agnes is precisely the one identified by Rose when he describes the female love interest as a figure through whom Jekyll can be associated with goodness (1996: 60). She does not condemn him for his unexplained sins, but she interprets them through compassion and Christian morality. Romantic devotion is relevant in how she reacts, while she also constructs a moral framework within which love might help Jekyll overcome his struggles. This becomes even more explicit when Agnes tells him, "Who ever lived that was not tempted by the fiend. To be tempted is not to yield. We will resist." (Act I, Scene 1, p. 54). This is significant as it anticipates the play's central conflict between Jekyll and Hyde. Agnes does not know that the "fiend" is real, is haunting Jekyll, and it is Jekyll himself. She interprets her fiancé's confession in terms of temptation and resistance. Her objection to Jekyll's decision places her as the moral opposite of Hyde even before their first encounter: while Hyde embodies surrender to the impulses and to violence, Agnes represents restraint, devotion, and even the possibility of redemption. Moreover, Agnes has witnessed

Jekyll's goodness: when she recalls their first meeting in the hospital, she describes Jekyll as the physician who stayed by her dying nurse's side "night and day, with all that human skill could do, with more than human patience and devotion" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 54), presenting him as a compassionate and selfless man. With this testimony, and with the declaration "That is the man I know" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 54), Agnes thus establishes the respectable and benevolent side of Jekyll. However, it is important to highlight that fact that the novella does show a "benevolent" Jekyll:

> I resolved in my future conduct to redeem the past; and I can say with honesty that my resolve was fruitful of some good. You know yourself how earnestly in the last months of last year, I laboured to relieve suffering; you know that much was done for others, and that the days passed quietly, almost happily for myself. Nor can I truly say that I wearied of this beneficent and innocent life; I think instead that I daily enjoyed it more completely; but I was still cursed with my duality of purpose; and as the first edge of my penitence wore off, the lower side of me, so long indulged, so recently chained down, began to growl for license. (Stevenson, 1886: 57-58)

However, his benevolence is not genuine but instead it is born out of guilt for Hyde's transgressions. Jekyll tries to atone for his double's crimes through acts of charity, as though these good deeds could counterbalance the harm caused by Hyde.

Not only is Agnes devoted to Jekyll, but she also demonstrates her filial affection and devotion towards her father and her late mother. After Jekyll leaves, Sir Danvers reflects on his daughter's happiness and remembers his own marriage, stating that "it is for this that we come into the world:"

> SIR DANVERS. Agnes! Jekyll! (*Up at window*) Oh, I see – there they go! Poor dears (*Crossing to L.*) Just as I was at their age. (*Sits L. in arm chair at fire*) It is for this that we come into the world, and when a man gets beyond love it is time for him to be mustered out. Heigho! Here I sit like a one legged fowl upon his perch, waiting for the old butcher, Death to despatch him.
>
> The Good die first
> And they, whose hearts are dry as summer dust
> Burn to the socket.
>
> I dare swear I shall live to be a hundred. My poor wife! I tried her sometimes with my quick temper but I have never outgrown my love for her, thank God, though she has been gone these twenty years.
>
> (*Re-enter Agnes from window C.*)
>
> AGNES. (*At window*) Papa! Has everybody gone? (*Coming down a little*)
>
> SIR DANVERS. Yes, Agnes. What? And Jekyll too?
>
> AGNES. (*Back to window, looking out*) Yes, he was called away – an important case, he said. There he goes now, through the trees. Look papa. The moon is coming up, it is beautiful.

SIR DANVERS. Yes, darling. Almost like a moonrise in the East.

AGNES. (*Same, closes window*) A falling star! They say, for every star that falls, a mortal dies on earth. (*Down to L. back of arm chair in which Sir Danvers is sitting*) Do you believe that, Papa?

SIR DANVERS. (*Sadly, leaning back in chair.*) Why not? There is no earthly moment without death. it is very near us always. Agnes do you remember Mangalore? (*Takes her hand from behind him and puts her arms round his neck.*)

AGNES. Not clearly. Strange things come back to me – trifles that mean nothing: the shore of the river, a red macaw that always swung on the verandah, a tall brown man who carried me sometimes, and – and –

SIR DANVERS. Your mother, Agnes?

AGNES. Yes, dear mamma. How large her eyes were: what slender wrists she had, what tiny little hands. (*Sir Danvers moved*) Oh papa, papa. (*She throws her arms about his neck*)

SIR DANVERS. Now it is strange that a great blustering trooper like me should have even one tear left in his dry old eyes. There – there – play something, dear.

AGNES. (*Going to piano R.*) What, papa?

SIR DANVERS. The Indian air.

AGNES. Mamma's?

SIR DANVERS. Yes.

(Act I, Scene 1, pp. 55-56)

This scene reinforces the idea of family as a site of affection, devotion, and longing, and establishes it as a space in which love persists beyond physical separation. Sir Danvers' recollection of his late wife and the shared memories with Agnes bring together the family's past and present, highlighting the importance of familial bonds. Thus, Agnes is presented as an affectionate and devoted daughter, embodying the idealized image of feminine affection within the domestic sphere.

In the first act, Agnes is primarily characterised as the domestic and devoted heroine; however, the first act lays the foundations for her later narrative. At first, she waits anxiously for Jekyll, defends him, and imagines a future with him; by the end of the play, she will have to confront the possibility that the man she loves is connected to the murder of her father. This is significant when analysing the play retrospectively: the more strongly she is established as the embodiment of Jekyll's domestic happiness, the more destructive Hyde's intrusion into that world becomes.

In Bandmann's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, the female heroine, Sybil Howell, occupies a position within the domestic and moral world, similarly to Agnes; however, her characterisation is somewhat different from Mansfield's heroine, as the scene presents Sybil as young, affectionate, romantic, and idealistic, which makes her vulnerable to the contrast between Jekyll and Hyde. This creates a direct connection between the female protagonist and the duality which is central to the narrative.

Sybil Howell, daughter of Reverend Howell, first appears on the stage when conversing with Dr. Lanyon; she is presented as a young woman deeply in love with Jekyll. When Lanyon tries to object to their love—he does not like Jekyll and warns her about the difference in their ages—Sybil answers with Shakespeare's *Othello*, emphasizing how she values Jekyll's inner character rather than his appearance or age:

> DR. LANYON. Indeed. I fear my advise comes too late. You seem to take a warm interest in Dr. Jekyll?
> SYBIL. I do. And if it is on that subject you wish to speak to me and I strongly suspect it is, for I am no longer a child you need go no further, for I have fully made up my mind and I know what I do.
> DR. LANYON. It is on that subject, but I fear I am too late.
> SYBIL. You are; we understand each other.
> DR. LANYON. Perfectly?
> SYBIL. No, but just as well.
> DR. LANYON. But you are so young, think of the discrepancy in your ages, you twenty and he –
> SYBIL. Oh I answer with Desdemona "I saw his visage in his mind"
> DR. LANYON. Well, if it has gone so far, I say no more; I am too old to convince a woman in love against her will and too sensible to hold my tongue. God bless you my child, and although I do not like Dr. Jekyll for reasons I do not comprehend he certainly has a noble nature and may make an excellent husband; I sincerely hope he will.
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, p. 143)

The invocation of Shakespeare's *Othello* complicates Sybil's characterization. In this scene, she asserts her feelings for Jekyll and her willingness to carry on with her decision. Sybil answers by quoting Desdemona: "I saw his visage in his mind," a quotation that comes from Desdemona's defence of her marriage to Othello before the Venetian Senate:

> That I did love the Moor to live with him,
> My downright violence and scorn of fortunes
> May trumpet to the world. My heart's subdued
> Even to the very quality of my lord:
> I saw Othello's visage in his mind,
> And to his honours and his valiant parts
> Did I my soul and fortunes consecrate; (1.3.246-252)

Desdemona explains that her love is based not on Othello's outward appearance, but on the "quality" of his character and on his "honours and his valiant parts." When Sybil appropriates Desdemona's

words, she asserts that Jekyll's inner nature is more important to her than his age or physical appearance. She is not easily malleable and her choice to stay by Jekyll's side has already been taken, despite Lanyon's reservations on the subject. This parallel further strengthens Sybil's agency, for like Desdemona, she openly declares her decision and refuses to let an older male authority choose for her. Her response to Lanyon shows that she is confident enough to defend her relationship with Jekyll, while still remaining respectful towards the older man and accepting his—reluctant—blessing. At the same time, this reference is deeply ironic when considering the context of the Shakespearian play. Desdemona's belief that she has seen Othello's visage in his mind assumes that her husband's inner nature is as she perceives it to be. She believes she has married the noble, valiant, loving Othello, when in reality Othello is much more than that—and negatively so. Similarly to Jekyll, Othello is divided, as his existence is characterized by different tensions that make his identity unstable: Othello is a Venetian general, but also an outsider; he is a Christian, but also a Moor; he is a respected public figure, but becomes a violent criminal consumed by jealousy; he is a loving husband, but becomes his wife's murderer. The difference between Othello and Jekyll lies in the fact that the former's unstable nature emerges psychologically through his jealousy and the violence he perpetrates, whereas the latter's split identity is explicitly externalized as Hyde. Like Desdemona, Sybil believes to know Jekyll's true self. And like Desdemona, she is wrong. The difference between the two women is that Sybil's story does not end in her tragic death at the hands of her lover.

Moreover, Sybil also explicitly acknowledges the effect the love for Jekyll has done for her, since it has changed her significantly: she describes herself as formerly "wilful, daring, and high-spirited" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 143), suggesting that love has made her gentler and more emotionally stable. Sybil and Jekyll's relationship goes beyond romantic love, because he has actively educated her: he has "introduced [her] into the mysteries of our glorious arts" and "taught [her] your science how to extract poison out of flowers, to read men's thoughts, how to love and be loved" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 143). With this language, Sybil combines science with love, reflecting the adaptation's tendency to locate Jekyll and his scientific world within a broader domestic and emotional framework.

Sybil's response to Jekyll's theory of human duality is revealing because, when he explains that "there are two natures in every man one of good and one of evil" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 143), she identifies him with the good side of this duality:

> JEKYLL. Better had I not done so, Sybil. There are two natures in every man one of good and one of evil which divide and compound man's dual character, and he it is who can always keep the evil counterbalanced by the good who is the happiest and most de-serving of men.
>
> SYBIL. That is your nature, Henry, and for that I love you.
>
> JEKYLL. You judge with loving eyes and therefore prejudice. Were I such a nature and could infuse it

into others life would indeed be deprived of much that is unbearable. What good might not be done by one who could keep mankind from its inherit wickedness, needeth to a upright steadfast life and countercheck man's ingrafted evil.

(Act I, Scene 1, p. 143)

Sybil's comment demonstrates that she is emotionally driven and that she believes unconditionally in his good nature, showcasing her devotion to Jekyll but also her idealized perception of him. This becomes even clearer when Jekyll challenges her judgement, saying that she "judge[s] with loving eyes and therefore prejudice" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 134): it is plainly acknowledged that Sybil's perception is shaped by her affection to Jekyll and therefore is not objective. She is unable—or unwilling—to see the darker side Jekyll himself recognizes within human nature. Sybil's romantic idealism is even more reinforced when Jekyll introduces the discussion of Faust and Margerite, arguing that Faust was able to be forgiven because of his love for Margerite:

SYBIL. But love Henry levels all these things the good as well as the bad.

JEKYLL. Not the bad Sybil. There must be some spark of good, some affection to lean upon or the most undying love finds no response. Look at an instance upon the story of Faust and Margerite Faust bargains his soul to the devil and is forgiven because of his undying love for Margerite. Margerite ascends to heaven, she had but sinned in loving Faust, the devil alone stands cheated of his bargain because of his satanic nature there is not one spot of love. Love reigns supreme throughout the universe, in heaven or on earth, in the airy regions or the masy substantials, every animal cries, every bird sings, every animal that has the germ of life in it reads but in that one rapturous delight, that one little word love.

SYBIL. (*Running across stage*) And such shall be our ours.

JEKYLL. What are you doing?

SYBIL. Imitating Margerite.

(Act I, Scene 1, p. 144)

Sybil imagines her and Jekyll's relationship as the embodiment of Faust and Margerite's love, wherein love is redeeming, and therefore his sins can easily be forgiven. The reference to Faust and Margerite[2] strengthens Sybil's association with the redemptive power of love. Whether Bandmann's adaptation draws specifically on Goethe's *Faust*, Gounod's version, or simply on the Faustian tradition is difficult to determine. The episode described by Jekyll seems to recall a combination of

[2] The reference to Margerite in Bandmann's adaptation is not consistent with either Goethe's or Gounod's *Faust*. In Goethe, her name is Margarete (often rendered as Gretchen, its diminutive), whereas Gounod calls her Marguerite. The reference in the adaptation's passage seems to reflect a conflation of these two versions rather than a precise reference to one source.

the two works just mentioned, since Margerite's redemption and her ascent to heaven evoke both the conclusion of Goethe's *Faust Part I* and Gounod's *Faust*, whereas the idea of Faust himself being saved and redeemed is closer to the conclusion of Goethe's *Faust Part II*. In this context, by "imitating Margerite," Sybil imagines herself in a similar salvific position as Margerite, where love is capable of redeeming her lover despite his transgressions. This response characterizes her as a deeply romantic and idealistic woman who believes in the power of love and in Jekyll's essential goodness. However, while Goethe's Margarete contributes to Faust's salvation—she guides him to heaven—Sybil's love does not prevent Jekyll from transforming into Hyde. Indeed, this optimistic declaration is immediately followed by Jekyll's transformation, creating a direct contrast between Sybil's belief in the redemptive power of love and Hyde's embodiment of unrestrained desire. Sybil declares that their love will overcome the opposition between good and evil, but immediately after Hyde appears:

> SYBIL. Stand back fellow, and let me go.
> HYDE. No I won't. I want you; your beauty excites me. I love you, I like you.
> SYBIL. Father! Father!
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, p. 144)

She longs to be the redemptive woman for Jekyll, but her desire only remains an aspiration, as Hyde emerges. Moreover, the repetition of the language of love is significant in this scene, because Hyde appropriates this vocabulary of affection but empties it of the emotional meaning that Sybil associates with it. His "love" is instead reduced to sexual desire and possession. The irony of the scene lies indeed in the immediate transformation of Jekyll into Hyde after the declaration that love conquers all, exposing the limits of Sybil's belief that love can overcome evil.

The other important relationship that characterises Sybil's character is that with her father. Similarly to Agnes, Sybil is a devoted daughter, although in Bandmann's play their bond is not as explicitly shown as in Mansfield's adaptation. However, both her central relationships—that with her father and that with Jekyll—are placed in direct conflict by Hyde's apparition and subsequent violence. When Hyde appears, Sybil recoils from his advances and calls for help. Her first cry for help is for Jekyll, who obviously cannot come, so she calls for her father, who intervenes and becomes Hyde's victim. From the romantic heroine represented a few lines before, Sybil becomes fatherless, a grieving daughter deprived of a parent in the matter of seconds. Sybil's femininity is not built only around romantic love, but it is defined also through familial loyalty and attachment. Indeed, as the play develops, her grief is motivation for action: she refuses to stand by and wait for the male characters to discover Hyde's whereabouts and starts searching for him herself. She occupies a position between conventional melodramatic femininity and female independence: Sybil is the loving

daughter and devoted fiancée whose love and grief propel her into the dramatic action.

Alice Leigh's characterization closely resembles Sybil's, particularly in their first appearance on stage. Firstly, they are both daughters of clergymen. Their familial identity is relevant not only because it places them within a domestic environment, but also because they connect Jekyll to the religious and moral structures of society. As Rose observes, "the melodramatic motif of familial connections for Jekyll is heavily emphasized in [Mansfield's and Forepaugh & Fish's] theatrical adaptations" (1996: 57). By tying Jekyll to the families of respected religious figures, the adaptations situate his romantic relationship within a social and moral world that is in contrast with the unconventional nature of his pursuits. Rose further argues that

> by tying the action of the story to family structure, the inscriptive melodramatic form of the adaptations provides values that remove the story from the Gothic and place it squarely in a site permitting audience recognition, association and appropriation. (1996: 57)

The familial connection here is striking because both Sybil and Alice are daughters of religious authorities, and it is even more intensified when both fathers become Hyde's victims. Again, Rose states that the use of "a religious figure to establish familial connections for Jekyll as well as serve as subject of murder" has particular significance because it ties Jekyll's melodramatic conflict to a "rejection not only of familial connections, but of social and religious ones" (1996: 57). In both adaptations, Hyde's violence is directed towards figures who embody the religious and social order where the heroines and Jekyll are situated. Their deaths disrupt the very social and familial world to which Jekyll is tied through his romantic relationships.

The similarity between Sybil and Alice is not limited to the function of Jekyll's romantic interest. Like Sybil, Alice is a young woman deeply in love with Jekyll, while simultaneously being a devoted daughter to her father. Both women—but also Agnes—are placed between two forms of affection: romantic attachment to Jekyll and filial love to the man who will become Hyde's victim. This parallel grows stronger when noticing the remarkably similar language that is used in the first act of both plays. Just as Sybil insists upon her feelings for Jekyll and resists the doubts brought forward by Dr. Lanyon, so does Alice, declaring that she is "no longer a child" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 16). This recalls Sybil's confidence in defending her relationship, presenting both women as heroines who can assert their own judgement. The similarity is even more pronounced in the way in which Alice idealizes Jekyll. She too is witness to his goodness and this reinforces the contrast between the physician she knows and the violent Hyde who is connected to him. Her idealized description, along with Sybil's, establishes the emotional stakes of the Jekyll/Hyde duality, as the women lose their lover and are also forced to confront with the fact that the man they love, trust, and admire is

connected to the figure responsible for their grief. Like Sybil, Alice's reaction to her father's murder is that of agency, actively participating in the investigations, and she refuses to stand aside because of her gender.

The initial characterization of Agnes, Sybil, and Alice could also be analysed in relation to the Victorian ideal of domestic femininity commonly associated with the figure of the Angel in the House. Deborah Gorham writes that the Victorian middle class developed a "cult of domesticity" in which the family and the home were idealized as a refuge from the anxieties of the public world (1982: 4). This ideal was connected to the notion of separate spheres: public life, which included business and politics, belonged to men, whereas women belonged to the private sphere of "love, the emotions and domesticity" (Gorham, 1982: 4). As a consequence, the ideal woman was imagined as dependent and submissive, innocent, pure, gentle, and self-sacrificing, with a life confined to the domestic sphere (Gorham, 1982: 4-5). M. Jeanne Peterson also observes that the social role of the stereotypical Angel varied according to age and status: as a daughter, she was expected to contribute to the domestic life and prepare for her future role as a mother, while as a wife and mother she had to promote the physical and spiritual wellbeing of her husband and family (1984: 678). According to this ideology, femininity was associated with affection, devotion, morality, and service to the family. On this note, Auerbach argues that "the Victorian angel is defined by her boundaries" (1982: 72): her identity is thus inseparable from the limits imposed upon her sphere of action.

The initial presentation of the three heroines is permeated with these conventions. Agnes, Sybil, and Alice are all introduced through their relationships with men, as loving daughters and as caring partners. Their characterizations associate them with the domestic and emotional values described by Gorham and Peterson—namely, affection for their fathers, devotion to Jekyll, the expectation of marriage and the prospect of a future domestic life. Their position as daughters is particularly relevant. Gorham states that, in the Victorian constructions of family life, daughters were attributed with tenderness and spirituality, especially because they were imagined as future wives and mothers while still occupying an important role within the household (1982: 5-6). Agnes, Sybil, and Alice are presented as women closely integrated into the family structure and are initially defined by their emotional and familial attachments. In this sense, their first appearances draw upon conventions generally associated with the Angel in the House and help establish the domestic world that, as discussed above, the melodramatic adaptations place at the centre of Jekyll's story.

This association is also relevant when considering it in relation to Jekyll and the heroines' relationship with him. The three women represent the possibility of domestic stability, a domestic stability that Jekyll's experiments progressively threaten. Their love ties him to the social structure of family and marriage, while their affection and trust serve as evidence of his position as a

respectable and worthy man. Therefore, in the beginning, the heroines' influence is primarily emotional, corresponding to the feminine moral authority associated with domestic ideology. Their role is not that of investigators or independent agents, at least not initially; instead, their function is that of establishing relationships and embodying the potential domestic future for Jekyll. Hence, their initial characterisation corresponds to the Victorian feminine ideal described by Gorham: they are associated with the private sphere, emotions, and family, while the public and professional world is occupied by male characters, such as Jekyll, Utterson, Lanyon.

Nonetheless, the narrative development of Agnes, Sybil, and Alice complicates any straightforward identification with the ideal of Angel in the House. Auerbach's definition of the Angel as a figure "defined by her boundaries" becomes particularly significant, for the dramatic trajectories of the three heroines repeatedly involve attempts to overcome or negotiate those boundaries. Their domestic and familial identities remain fundamental to their characterization, but they progressively refuse to remain exclusively within that sphere assigned to them at the beginning of the plays. As will be further discussed, their agency develops from, rather than against, their domestic identities. Love for Jekyll and devotion to their fathers provide the motivations that bring them into action; however, these relationships also give them reasons to question male authority, seek information, and actively intervene in the narrative. Agnes, Sybil, and Alice should not be understood as simply abandoning the Victorian feminine ideal as the plays progress. Instead, the plays, some more than others, establish a tension between conventional domestic femininity and female agency. Their actions do not completely erase the conventions of the Angel in the House, but they reveal the limitations of these conventions when the circumstances require women to act.

3.3. Beyond the Angel: Female Agency

The social and domestic world of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is expanded thanks to the addition of the central female characters in the three adaptations. However, the introduction of the three main female protagonists also changes another important aspect within the narrative, namely the agency of the characters. As previously stated, Stevenson's novella places men at the centre of the narration, having them investigate the mystery of Hyde. Enfield, Utterson, Lanyon, Poole, and the police are the characters who witness and investigate Hyde's crimes, whereas the few women who appear on the page largely remain out of these processes. The stage adaptations retain the male investigators and authorities, but the addition of central female characters creates the possibility for female active participation in the dramatic action. While they are introduced in the typical and conventional roles of daughters and fiancées, the three protagonists are not confined to the domestic sphere. Indeed, as

the plots develop, they question the male characters, demand information, make decisions, and participate in the search for Hyde to different degrees. However, their agency is not a rejection of conventional femininity; instead, it emerges from the relationships through which they are first defined, namely their love for Jekyll, the devotion to their father, as well as their attachment to family.

Mansfield's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is the first that stages this tension, which is visible in the characterisation of Agnes. As discussed above, she is presented within the domestic environment of Sir Danvers Carew's house and she appears as Jekyll's devoted and worried fiancée, while also being the loving and caring daughter of Carew. However, as the plot goes forward, she is allowed much more room and can move beyond the simple role of conventional yet passive female character. Agnes' first form of agency consists in her determination to understand Jekyll's behaviour and to help him. She refuses to simply accept his attempts at excluding her when she finds him upset:

> AGNES. (*Round in front of chair.*) Yes, there is something wrong. I have seen it in your face for days. What is it Harry? You must let me share in this. How else am I to help you?
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, p. 53)

Here, Agnes explicitly claims the right to participate in and share Jekyll's burdens, which he attempts to keep for himself. Although she does not yet discover the true nature of Henry Jekyll, her reaction showcases that her devotion is not passive or represented through pliant obedience. Instead, she insists on knowledge and on the possibility of helping her lover.

Agnes' agency becomes more substantial after her father's murder, especially since she is the only person who has witnessed the crime and has seen the murderer. When she asks Jekyll to accompany her to the police to identify the murderer, his hesitation raises her suspicions and she learns of his connection to Hyde when Poole brings some keys, suggesting that they may belong to Hyde. Feeling betrayed, she breaks off their engagement off-stage, a decision the audience learns about only later, when Mrs. Lanyon criticizes her choice. Her agency goes beyond simply ending their engagement. Instead of being an accessory female figure, she actively intervenes in the investigation when the question arises on whether to give money to Rebecca, Hyde's greedy landlady, in exchange for information about the murderer. After having received the money, Rebecca gives Lanyon a half-burnt cheque signed by Jekyll in favour of Hyde. Later, when Agnes is questioned about bringing this evidence to the police—evidence that would incriminate Jekyll—she replies:

> LANYON. Child, think what you are doing! If Jekyll should be innocent? Will you bring evidence against him?

AGNES. No. Against my father's murderer.

(Act III, Scene 1, p. 69).

Agnes recognizes that her connection to Jekyll does not erase her responsibility towards her father, and, by defining the evidence as directed against the murderer, she is claiming a position independent of the romantic relationship. At the same time, Agnes' decisions reveal the limits and contradictions of her agency. Her ability to act does not allow her to resolve the conflict between her filial and romantic loyalties. This is evident when she chooses to destroy the cheque that could compromise Jekyll, choosing to protect him by burning it:

AGNES. I can never see him, never hear of him again.
MRS. LANYON. (*L. front*.) What! You do not love him then? (*Agnes hesitates*.)
LANYON. (*Speaking for Agnes*) No! she does not love him.
MRS. LANYON. That is not true.
AGNES. No, it is not true. I do love him – I cannot help it. (*Crosses to fire, burns cheque*) There!
LANYON. (*To Agnes*) What have you done? (*at table.)*
AGNES. (*Crossing to R. centre*.) I have saved his life, but I must never see him – never! (*Hides her face in Lanyon's arms.*)

(Act III, Scene 1, p. 70)

This scene shows that Agnes is capable of making decisions of her own; however, the decision she makes is shaped by the contradictory obligations imposed by the position she occupies within the melodramatic family structure: she is both the daughter of Hyde's victim and Jekyll's beloved. Thus, she is forced to negotiate between them, to choose between them, and in the end, she chooses to save her lover but to never see him again. Mansfield's adaptation gives Agnes the possibility to influence the narrative, while also preserving the emotional and domestic framework within which she is positioned.

Sybil's development follows a pattern towards a more direct action, even more than Agnes does; Bandmann's heroine is given a particularly active role in the investigation. Sybil's characterization is shaped by a tension between conventional melodramatic femininity and a more assertive form of agency. While she is introduced and repeatedly defined through her love for Jekyll, her reaction to her father's murder shows that her identity cannot be reduced to simply that relationship. When in Act II she learns that Jekyll has given some information about Hyde that could help in his search, Sybil shows her true self:

SYBIL. I was told you were here, and I came to thank you Henry.

JEKYLL. For what love?

SYBIL. For the service you have rendered me in handing over to the police that guilty wretch.

JEKYLL. What in the name of Heaven are you talking of? I do not understand you.

SYBIL. You do not want to understand you wish to leave the honour of having found this fiend to others, it is your usual kindness that hinders you from speaking.

JEKYLL. Sybil, cannot you let this matter rest others will fight for you and do you justice, come let us talk of love and our future marriage.

SYBIL. So we will after this affair is settled. Bring the murderer of my innocent father to justice and you shall have my hand, but why do you look on me with that searching eye, that frowning brow.

JEKYLL. Oh no, no, no I have no frown for you but peace and love, but Sybil to revenge is unchristian like and out of the province of a woman.

SYBIL. In this case it is the most filial obligation of a child to her most outraged parent.

JEKYLL. To forgive is godly.

SYBIL. You say that Henry because you are beyond the average human race, a gentle noble self-sacrificing nature, but I am human with all the spirit of a injured woman and I will not be content until I have seen the law in its minutest point executed an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.

(Act II, Scene 1, p. 148)

Sybil challenges Jekyll's assertion that revenge lies "out of the province of a woman," a statement that highlights the gendered spheres of actions allowed to the characters. His objection is not only moral and religious—he introduces revenge as "unchristian like"—but it is explicitly gendered: specific actions and emotions are presented as belonging outside of the appropriate sphere of femininity. Associating womanhood with forgiveness and implicitly asserting that the pursuit and administration of justice belong to men and public institutions, Jekyll tries to place Sybil in a more conventional and private role. His invitation to talk about love and their future marriage reinforces this already clear distinction, trying to redirect her attention towards more "woman-friendly" topics, towards the domestic world which she conventionally belongs to. Her response is significant because she rejects this definition of her and goes out of her "province." Although it is not a rejection of her identity as woman, she refuses to accept the passivity and quality of forgiveness that femininity would require, describing herself as an "injured woman" and insisting on her right as daughter to demand justice.

The scene that follows Sybil's confrontation with Jekyll further complicates her characterization, for while she is capable of resisting the conventional definition of a woman, her conversation with Lilian reveals the extent of her attachment to him. Sybil describes her love as "the only anchor to which I cling" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 149), suggesting that despite her moral

determination, Jekyll is the principal source of stability in her life. This dependence is also what prevents her from recognising the threat implicit in Lilian's instinctive distrust of him—when she admits that she does not "feel comfortable in his presence," Sybil admonishes her and defends Jekyll as a "noble man," dismissing her concerns as the remarks of a "chatterbox" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 149). The juxtaposition of these two scenes presents Sybil as a character capable of asserting her moral position while still being emotionally dependent on Jekyll and with an idealised perception of his character.

However, her attachment does not stop her from becoming a source of authority. When she discovers Jekyll's connection to Hyde—namely, that Hyde has access to Jekyll's house—she refuses to stand by and declares she will confront and force him to choose "between a murderer's companionship and [hers]" (Act III, Scene 1, p. 154). She makes a demand of her own, instead of remaining passive. Her agency becomes even more explicit the moment she decides to investigate Hyde herself. Because of the impossibility to confront Jekyll—he is nowhere to be found—she chooses to "look for Hyde [her]self:"

SYBIL. I will look for Hyde myself.

LILIAN. Are you mad? What the entire force of Scotland Yard is unable to accomplish you hope to succeed in.

SYBIL. A woman's wit goes further than the police force of the entire world, this Hyde must be somewhere concealed and my instinct tells me his hiding place.

LILIAN. And that is?

SYBIL. At his old lodgings. His landlady is an avaricious hag who will do anything for money, if Hyde had communications with Jekyll is it not natural that she might have seen him there as well and if that is the case Jekyll must be guilty.

LILIAN. But how are you to find that out, she has so far been silent to all.

SYBIL. But she will not be to me. Money and persuasion and perhaps a little mercy for my position, for after all she is but a woman will go farther than the art of detectives.

LILIAN. Then you propose to send for her?

SYBIL. No, that would arouse suspicion I propose to go to her.

LILIAN. Oh, you are mad? Do you know where she lives?

SYBIL. How many hundreds of good women visit the slums of London every day without fear or danger and why should not I do the same, besides it is my duty and Heaven will protect me.

LILIAN. Let uncle go with you.

SYBIL. No, I'll go alone.

LILIAN. Not alone Sybil; if you are determined I will go with you.

SYBIL. God bless you darling, no harm will come to us we'll be off at once.

(Act III, Scene 1, pp. 154-155)

This is perhaps the clearest assertion of female agency in the adaptation: when Lilian questions whether she can succeed where the police have failed, Sybil answers that "a woman's wit goes further than the police force of the entire world." Here, Sybil is contrasting her own capacities with that of a male institution, suggesting that the methods employed by the police are not enough to find the criminal, and that perhaps the abilities of a woman are more useful. Significantly, when entering the investigative narrative, Sybil does not reject her femininity: on the contrary, she explicitly identifies her capacity as "a woman's wit," suggesting that her methods are associated with forms of knowledge available only to women. Her intention is that of visiting Hyde's landlady, who might have some information about him but who has not given away any, and Sybil believes that "money and persuasion and perhaps a little mercy for my position" will succeed. Therefore, Sybil does not want to occupy a traditional male position, nor does she want the authority of a man; instead, the play builds her agency through gendered forms of intelligence, persuasion, and sympathy. In the investigative process, her femininity is part of the means through which she hopes to succeed.

Her choices also involve a physical movement away from the domestic environment in which she was first introduced. In order to visit Hyde's landlady, Sybil and Lilian must go to a dangerous place. Lilian expresses her concern about the dangers involved but Sybil responds by saying, "How many hundreds of good women visit the slums of London every day without fear or danger and why should not I do the same, besides it is my duty and Heaven will protect me." With this line, Sybil justifies her departure from the domestic sphere, associating her actions with "good women" and with a sense of moral duty. Her agency is thus framed not as a rebellion against femininity itself but as an extension of her filial responsibilities.

The allusion to *Othello* establishes another parallel between Sybil and Desdemona which goes beyond their misplaced confidence in the men they love. Both women must face a conflict between filial duty and romantic attachment, albeit in different directions. Desdemona explicitly describes her position as one of "divided duty:"

My noble father,
I do perceive here a divided duty.
To you I am bound for life and education;
My life and education both do learn me
How to respect you: you are the lord of duty,
I am hitherto your daughter. But here's my husband;

> And so much duty as my mother showed
> To you, preferring you before her father,
> So much I challenge that I may profess
> Due to the Moor my lord. (1.3.179-188)

Desdemona is not rejecting her obligations to her father but instead is redirecting them towards Othello, arguing that marriage has created a new and legitimate form of duty towards her husband. Her decision to marry the Moor is thus an assertion of female agency, for Desdemona openly defends her choice before the Senate and insists on her right as his wife to follow her husband. Sybil similarly asserts her decision of loving and marrying Jekyll when questioned by Lanyon, stating that she knows what she is doing. However, this parallel is complicated by the development of Sybil's narrative, because while Desdemona must choose between her father's authority and her chosen husband, Sybil is placed in a worse position when her father's murder makes her love for Jekyll incompatible with her filial duties. Her agency derives from her being a grieving daughter who seeks revenge and justice for her poor father. In this sense, the adaptation develops the domestic and feminine roles to become the basis for action: Sybil does not abandon her identity as daughter or devoted woman, but it is precisely these relationships that compel her to act.

Sybil's agency develops further in the final stages of Bandmann's play, when she actively chooses to finally confront Jekyll despite the danger she could put herself in. After Utterson decides to follow Poole and force his way into Jekyll's study, Sybil's immediate reaction is to demand she goes with him, refusing to remain a passive observer. Utterson accepts, under the condition that she remains calm and collected, to which she responds that her experiences have "turned [her] into a fearless and alas undaunted woman" (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 160). Her fearlessness is not an innate quality but is the result of the suffering she has endured, particularly the murder of her father and the uncertainty surrounding her lover. This statement suggests that the events of the play have transformed Sybil into a woman capable of confronting danger herself. Her decision to seek Jekyll out is also consistent with her resistance to conventional feminine passivity expressed when claimed that revenge was "out of the province of a woman." However, when she stands in front of Jekyll, her agency is complicated by the emotional dependence for him. Her declaration from outside the door of Jekyll's study—"It is I your Sybil who on great peril comes to see you" (Act IV, Scene 2, p. 162)—emphasises her courage and her devotion, since she knowingly puts herself in danger because of the love she feels for him. Even when she sees that something is wrong with Jekyll, Sybil does not pursue this suspicion: instead, Jekyll's explanation that it is an illness seems to satisfy her, and she immediately returns to her familiar role of the caring and loving future wife—"Oh Henry why don't you let me nurse you" (Act IV, Scene 2, p. 162). The audience knows that Jekyll's appearance and

behaviour has changed for a specific reason, which Sybil does not and will never know. Therefore, while she is increasingly capable of acting independently, she still remains excluded from the knowledge that is at the centre of the play—she will never know Hyde's true identity.

The last scene of the play also returns to Sybil's struggle between justice and forgiveness. Earlier in the play, she had insisted that the murderer of her father must face justice; now, she accepts to forgive all who have injured her:

> JEKYLL. As soon as I am well we will marry. Yes love. I dreamt last night that we were married and both in Heaven, there were green woods and lulling waters there as well as here and we saw the stars quite near; and we were so happy – no frowns – no starts – no chills – no horrid images – but everything was calm and bright and beautiful, your face was like an angel's, and your voice as pure and sacred as the children's in the choir.
>
> SYBIL, Oh, how beautiful! Go on.
>
> JEKYLL. And then we heard a voice so calm and clear which went right deep into your most inmost hearts; it said "How can you be so happy here when you know that there are other restless souls craving for pardon for their guilty lives?" It struck me as a warning, and when I awoke I forgave all who in this world had injured me.
>
> SYBIL. And so will I. May all who injured me find pardon there as I forgive them there.
>
> (Act IV, Scene 2, p. 162)

Forgiveness is not something that Jekyll imposes upon her as the appropriate behaviour of a woman, but it is something that Sybil embraces voluntarily. Nonetheless, this moment is marked by dramatic irony, since Jekyll's description of "restless souls craving for pardon for their guilty lives" evokes his own guilt, which Sybil is still unaware of. The final exchange between Jekyll and Sybil exposes the limits of her agency: she can confront him, express her love, react to his sufferings, and yet she cannot access the truth that would allow her to understand all. This tension culminates in her repeated expectation of a future together:

> JEKYLL. (*solemnly*) Amen. God bless you for that prayer my child, may all who injured me find pardon there as I forgive them there. I feel so happy now and like a child could cry with joy. Good bye my love we'll meet again.
>
> SYBIL. When, tomorrow?
>
> JEKYLL. Perhaps!
>
> SYBIL. To-morrow then.
>
> (*As she is at the door he rises and goes to her*)
>
> JEKYLL. Sybil, adieu, my love!

SYBIL. Husband! To-morrow.

(*Exit*)

(Act IV, Scene 2, p. 162)

Her final word is deeply ironic, for she leaves believing in a future with Jekyll that the audience knows will never happen.

Sybil's characterization moves beyond that of a passive, conventional, melodramatic heroine: her pain creates resilience, while her love motivates her to action. At the same time, her agency remains constrained by her emotional dependence on Jekyll and by her exclusion from the whole truth about his double identity. She has an active role in the events that concern Jekyll's downfall, yet she is denied the information necessary to fully understand them.

In the Forepaugh & Fish's adaptation of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, the heroine Alice Leigh follows a similar path to Sybil's, as her characterization combines the conventional roles of loving daughter and future wife with an increasing determination to participate in the dramatic action. Like Sybil, Alice's grief is motivation for action and from her first appearance on stage after her father's murder, she actively seeks information about the investigation, asking "What news is there?" or "Does no one know anything or hear anything?" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 23). Although Utterson tries to send her back to her room—and thus to her domestic sphere—saying that she must be tired, Alice expresses a clear demand for justice:

UTTERSON. (*goes with Alice to L. 2*) You are worn out, my child, and had better return to your room, and rest assured that I will do all in my power to bring the assassin to justice.

ALICE. Do so, Mr. Utterson. He was your truest friend; avenge my kind, poor old father. (*exit, D. L. 2*)

(Act II, Scene 1, p. 23)

As with Sybil, filial love and devotion are the foundations of Alice's actions: she is no longer confined to the domestic life she conventionally belongs to and instead insists on finding the murderer and confronting the consequences of the crime. Her determination can be seen in her conversation with Jekyll, which closely parallels Sybil's confrontation with him:

JEKYLL. Oh, Alice, can you not let the matter rest! Others will fight for you and your rights.

ALICE. Do all you can to bring the murderer to justice. (*embraces him*)

JEKYLL. To seek revenge is unchristian like and out of the province of a woman.

ALICE. You say that, Harry, because you are different from other men, but in this case it is not.

JEKYLL. To forgive is godly.

ALICE. But I am human, and I am determined to unravel this mystery and bring the murderer to justice. I will never rest until I see him standing on the scaffold. "An eye for an eye-a tooth for a tooth." (*crosses R.*)

(Act II, Scene 1, p. 24)

Like in Bandmann's version, Jekyll tries to define the limits of the appropriate behaviour for a woman, asserting that revenge belongs outside of the sphere of femininity and implicitly assigning Alice to a more passive role. However, she resists this definition and refuses to allow her gender to determine both her moral and emotional response to such a situation. She is determined to participate in discovering the truth and her statement that she will never rest until the murderer has been brought to justice further emphasises the intensity of her commitment, while also recalling Sybil's confidence. In both plays, Bandmann's and Forepaugh & Fish's, the daughters' grief is transformed into a form of agency that challenges the conventions. Thus, Alice's emotional response to her father's murder cannot be contained by the ideal passive suffering that conventionally characterises femininity and her demand for justice is grounded in filial devotion.

Nonetheless, Alice's desire to participate in the action does not stop. When Utterson and Newcomen prepare to go to the Vicarage looking for Hyde, she wants to go with them. This request recalls Sybil's decision to follow the male investigators, and both these moments showcase the tendency to move the female protagonists into spaces conventionally and originally occupied only by men. Initially, Alice is not allowed to go, but she insists explaining that she cannot bear the misery and anxiety of remaining behind:

ALICE. Oh, just think of the misery and anxiety, remaining here while you are away. Believe me, Mr. Utterson, I will be strong. The Vicarage was my home, and there the spirit of my father dwells.

(Act II, Scene 1, p. 25)

Once again, her determination is connected to her relationship with her father and the domestic space associated with him. This is significant because the domestic environment is not a place where she feels restricted, but it is her home and the very reason she potentially puts herself in danger. In the end, she is allowed to go with the investigators since she can recognize Hyde, being the only one who has seen him. This grants her a practical role in the investigation and her knowledge becomes valuable to the male detectives; however, her participation is conditional: she has to promise not to leave Utterson's side. While Alice has agency to move from the protected domestic space, she is not fully independent, because she remains under the eyes of the male characters.

When Alice later learns that Hyde has access to Jekyll's house, she is forced to reconsider her

lover's position. The possibility that Jekyll is protecting "the slayer of his bride's father" (Act III, Scene 1, p. 30) is a threat to the relationship that had previously structured Alice's identity. Significantly, Alice does not wait for Utterson to decide what to do, but instead declares the following:

> ALICE. You say so and yet take no action in the matter, and that is no doubt the reason he fell on his knees and begged for pardon. Henry Jekyll hiding the murderer of my father! It is my father for whom I mourn! My God! This is terrible! The very thought will drive me mad – frantic! (*crosses to R.*) I know what I'll do. (*crossing up to D. L.*) I'll go to him and tell him to choose between a murderer's companionship and mine.
>
> UTTERSON. (*crosses R.*) You will not find him, Alice. He has not been seen for days.
>
> ALICE. No matter, I will see him if I have to search from one end of the city to the other. If I have to see all London in a blaze, I will see into this at any cost. (*exit, much excited, L. 2*)
>
> (Act III, Scene 1, pp. 30-31)

Her determination is reinforced and emphasised by the language she uses when telling Utterson that she will find Jekyll. The repetition of "I will" makes Alice the grammatical and the dramatic subject of her own actions, highlighting how she is not simply waiting for male characters to solve the mystery, but that she intends to search for Jekyll herself. At the same time, her determination is repeatedly framed by intense emotions: worry, anxiety, and anger are among the fiercest she feels. However, Utterson dismisses this emotional reaction, saying "let her rave and storm; she'll be calmer when it's over" (Act III, Scene 1, p. 31), revealing the dichotomy between Alice's understanding of her actions and how male characters perceive them. Alice is determined and with a purpose, whereas Utterson interprets this behaviour as an excessive emotional reaction. However, it is precisely her emotional intensity that motivates her to act.

Alice's development continues in the following act, when she reads Jekyll's letter explaining that he will not see her. Although she initially worries about his wellbeing, she quickly asserts her independence:

> ALICE. (*rises to C.*) How could I do otherwise? Why should he give me no explanation concerning Hyde? Think of it – my future husband – but instead he shuts himself up as a wronged and injured saint.
>
> UTTERSON. That's true! That's true!
>
> ALICE. Well, Dr. Henry Jekyll, if you can be proud, so can I, and I swear that until you clear your name of every vestige of suspicion, so not a speck remains, we must be strangers. (*crosses R.*)
>
> (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 34)

Alice expresses her frustration at Jekyll's behaviour and uses her position as his future wife to establish boundaries. Earlier, her love had been presented as a source of emotional dependence; here, she demonstrates that love does not require unconditional acceptance. Alice refuses to continue the relationship with Jekyll while his association with Hyde is still unexplained. However, despite the many instances in which she has proved to be useful to the investigations, Alice is still treated with paternalism from the male characters. Utterson calls her "my dear child" and tells her she is taking the matter "too seriously" (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 34), minimising her and her suspicions, even if they are justified.

Like Sybil, Alice insists upon going to Jekyll's house, where Poole has said that someone is in the doctor's cabinet. Once again, Utterson allows her to come with them on the condition she remains calm. She says that "[he] need[s] have no fear of [her]. The experiences of the last few weeks have made a changed woman of [her]" (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 37). This phrase explicitly acknowledges that, like Sybil, Alice has undergone a transformation since the murder of her father: those events have made her more resilient and less willing to accept the position traditionally assigned to her. Both women describe suffering as having made them stronger and braver. However, both women's agency is still subject to male control, as they remain under Utterson's supervision.

The final encounter between Alice and Jekyll demonstrates the limits of her developing agency, similarly to Sybil's. When she arrives at his house, she expresses the willingness to enter this dangerous place, recalling her earlier insistence that she would search all London for him. She is still acting on her own initiative, motivated by her determination and her love for him. Yet, when she sees him, she recognizes that something is wrong with him and, like Sybil's corresponding final scene, she cannot interpret what she sees, returning to the familiar role of the caring woman and wife-to-be: "Why don't you let me nurse you?" (Act IV, Scene 2, p. 39). This last scene parallels Bandmann's final act, because of the transformation in Alice's attitude towards justice and forgiveness:

> ALICE. (*kneeling in front of him*) Why don't you let me nurse you?
>
> JEKYLL. That's impossible, besides it's not a bodily ailment, but the mind I'll soon recover –
>
> ALICE. And then we'll be united never more to part.
>
> JEKYLL. When I am well we'll marry and be happy. I dreamed last night we were married and in Heaven. There were green lawns and sparkling waters there as here. We saw the stars quite near and we were so happy and your face was as white as marble.
>
> ALICE. How beautiful!
>
> JEKYLL. Then all at once a voice said: (*rises*) "How can you be so happy when you know there are other poor souls miserable below, pleading for mercy." It struck me as a warning and when I awoke I pardoned all on earth who had injured me. (*chimes heard and starts*)

ALICE. (rises) And so will I! (*raises her face towards Heaven*) May all who have injured me find pardon there as I forgive them!

JEKYLL. (*embraces her*) May all who have injured me find pardon there as I forgive them here. God bless you for that prayer, Alice, I feel so happy that, like a child I could cry for joy. You must leave me now; we'll meet again.

ALICE. When? To-morrow? (*on his R.*)

JEKYLL. Perhaps.

ALICE. Then I will say good-bye! (*starts to go*)

JEKYLL. Alice!

ALICE. (*in his arms*) Henry!

JEKYLL. My darling!

ALICE. Husband!

JEKYLL. Farewell!

ALICE. No, not farewell-only good-bye, until to-morrow. (JEKYLL *goes with* ALICE *to C. D., exit* ALICE *C.*)

JEKYLL. *(locks door and comes down C.)* Until to-morrow – to-morrow – on which no sun shall ever rise for me; but now my soul is clear I can die in peace.

(Act IV, Scene 2, pp. 39-40)

This final encounter intertwines romantic love and religious morality, transforming Jekyll and Alice's farewell into a scene of spiritual reconciliation. Alice's presence in this scene is increasingly moral and spiritual. Initially the couple imagines their future together, happily married and united, then the focus shifts towards Jekyll's dream. This heavenly vision in which they are married and happy is interrupted by a voice asking how they could be so when there are other souls asking for forgiveness, leading Jekyll to interpret this dream as a warning and deciding to forgive all who have injured him. Alice does not simply endorse his decision but voluntarily declares that she too will forgive those who have injured her. Her words are significant in light of the loss of her father, since they frame forgiveness as an active response to personal suffering. Her agency in this scene is thus primarily moral and emotional: she cannot change what has happened, but she consciously chooses her response to the suffering inflicted upon her. At the same time, this response remains embedded within the idea of Victorian femininity, associating women with compassion, selflessness, and moral influence over the private sphere. This scene combines Alice's characterization as a devoted partner with a more active moral function, as her ability to forgive becomes essential to Jekyll's final sense of redemption. His response to her prayer and the assertion that his soul is now clear and that he can die in peace suggest that Alice's love is ultimately not only a source of consolation, but also a means through which spiritual reconciliation is possible.

3.4. The Expansion of the Female World

Agnes, Sybil, and Alice are not the only female characters introduced by the adaptations: there are also a number of minor female figures who contribute to the social and domestic environments that surround the protagonists. Although these women have a less central position and less narrative space compared to the heroines, their presence still remains significant because it broadens the range of female relationships represented on stage. In Stevenson's novella, interactions between men are at the centre of the narrative, especially within professional and investigative networks. By contrast, the adaptations create room for women where they can speak, discuss, participate in family decisions, provide emotional support to one another. Mrs. Lanyon in Mansfield's adaptation and Lilian in Bandmann's version contribute to the creation of a female social world extending beyond the relationship between the heroine and Jekyll. At the same time, they serve to demonstrate that the addition of women in the adaptations does not create a single model of femininity, because, while the female protagonists are associated with romantic devotion and moral virtue, these minor characters have different positions within the domestic and social spheres.

Mrs. Lanyon is the example of an older woman whose presence is firmly rooted in the domestic sphere while not being passive. As Agnes' aunt and Dr. Lanyon's wife, her position within the family is one of authority and she takes an active interest in Agnes' engagement to Jekyll. When her niece breaks off the relationship, Mrs. Lanyon intervenes and describes Agnes' decision as "positively sinful" (Act III, Scene 1, p. 69), revealing the extent to which she interprets marriage through the conventional values of family, social respectability, and economic security. Her concern is that Agnes will jeopardise her future and that of the family:

> MRS. LANYON. She will be the death of us all! (*To Lanyon*.) Why do you stand here and take her part? Do something.
>
> LANYON. There is nothing to be done.
>
> MRS. LANYON. Nothing? She will die an old maid in a black frock, and he calls it nothing. (*Crossing to L*.)
>
> LANYON. She is perfectly right. (*Up L. C*.)
>
> MRS. LANYON. To break her word like a weather cock? Write to him, Agnes, call him back: think of your family think of your worldly prospects! (*Down L. C*.)
>
> (Act III, Scene 1, p. 70)

Through Mrs. Lanyon's eyes, marriage is not only a romantic union but a social and economic institution upon which the family's reputation and prospects depend. Her attachment to domestic and familial values places her near the ideological sphere associated with conventional Victorian

femininity and the ideal of the Angel in the House; however, she does not embody the submissive version of domestic womanhood. She is outspoken and willing to confront both Agnes and her husband to make her niece change her mind about the engagement. Mrs. Lanyon even declares that she "could almost marry [Jekyll] [her]self to save the family reputation" (Act III, Scene 1, p. 70): despite it being deliberately comic, this statement showcases how important she considers the preservation of the family's respectability and how she considers it a woman's responsibility. Her repeated assertion that she is simply doing her duty reinforces this aspect of her character. When her husband tells her that it is best not to interfere in these matters, she replies:

> MRS. LANYON. Interfere! I interfere? How dare you say such things?
> LANYON. Why, just now –
> MRS. LANYON. Just now, I did my duty.
>
> (Act III, Scene 1, p. 70)

Mrs. Lanyon understands her intervention in Agnes' romantic affairs not as an illegitimate intrusion but instead as an obligation, a duty arising from her position within her family. She also wants Agnes to restore the engagement, while Agnes refuses to do so. When Mrs. Lanyon asks whether she loves him, and Agnes admits that she does, the aunt does not understand the niece's decision, because the older woman interprets the situation primarily through conventional social expectations. Nonetheless, her concern for Agnes and Jekyll's relationship, along with her preoccupation on the family reputation, reveal her investment in the stability of the domestic unity. Mrs. Lanyon therefore represents a different form of female agency: instead of acting against the expectation of domestic femininity, she derives her authority precisely from those expectations. Her presence expands the female world in the adaptation, introducing an older woman whose influence works through family relationships and domestic authority.

A different model of female interaction emerges from Bandmann's adaptation through Lilian, Mr. Utterson's niece. Her relationship with Sybil provides the only example of female companionship among the three adaptations. Unlike Mrs. Lanyon, whose actions serve to preserve the family and social respectability, Lilian functions as Sybil's companion and confidante, as well as a comedic relief. Their conversations establish their different attitudes towards emotions and romantic love. Lilian presents herself as less susceptible to emotional suffering, declaring that "if [she] make[s] up [her] mind to be happy – [she's] happy and nothing shall interfere with [her] intentions" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 149). She also hopes never to love, as she has seen how unhappy her friend is. Therefore, Lilian does not define her identity through romantic attachment, and her character widens the spectrum of femininity represented in the adaptations.

Lilian's scepticism extends not only to love, but to Jekyll himself. She admits that she is not comfortable in his presence and, when Sybil defends her fiancé, Lilian retreats into the comic self-description of a "silly blab" (Act III, Scene 1, p. 149). However, retrospectively, her apparently frivolous observation is significant, because her instinctive distrust of Jekyll comes before the revelation of his connection with Hyde. The interaction between the two women creates a dialogue through which different interpretations of Jekyll can be voiced. Instead of supporting Sybil's view, Lilian disagrees with her, giving their relationship greater complexity.

When Sybil decides to investigate Hyde herself, Lilian's role becomes more significant. Initially, she believes her friend mad, because not even the police could find him. Sybil, however, decides to act and, despite her initial concern and fear, Lilian insists upon going with her. Lilian's panic does not prevent her from participating. While the events have made Sybil fearless and undaunted, Lilian still remains scared: her courage consists not in the absence of fear but in her willingness to act despite it. Her decision to accompany Sybil also introduces an element of female solidarity, forming a temporary partnership to replace the exclusively male process of investigation that characterizes Stevenson's novella. Even though Lilian remains a minor character and does not possess the same degree of independence that Sybil has, her willingness to follow her friend shows that female agency in this adaptation can take the form of loyalty and companionship.

The importance of these new minor female characters lies in the social relationship that they make possible: Mrs. Lanyon is the older female voice grounded in domestic duty and reputation, whereas Lilian's presence allows a space for friendship, disagreement, and solidarity. The dramatic versions of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* reconstruct the social world of the novella so that women are visible not simply as lovers and daughters, but as companions and caretakers as well. The adaptations create a network of female relationships and points of view which are completely absent in the masculine world of the novella.

3.5. The Dramatic Functions of the Female Presence

In these three early-stage adaptations, the expansion of female presence could be understood as part of the broader process of adapting Stevenson's novella for the 19th-century stage. The introduction of female characters is not merely a decorative addition to the narrative but actually serves important dramatic and emotional functions. The creation of Agnes, Sybil, and Alice adds a romantic plot into the narrative that is absent from the novella and provides Jekyll with personal relationships that go beyond the simply professional, and which make the consequences of his actions more emotional and tragic. The possibility of marriage and domestic happiness builds up a future progressively threatened

and ultimately destroyed by Jekyll's connection to Hyde. As a consequence, his downfall involves the loss of his reputation, his relationships with his male friends, but also the loss of a potential domestic and romantic future. The heroines give the audience a different form of emotional investment in Jekyll's fate, adding to the narrative scenes of separation, sacrifice, and mourning, which are all compatible with the conventions of melodrama.

Moreover, the addition of female characters contributes to the emotional and domestic transformation of the narrative. If Stevenson's novella is organized around male relationships and spaces, the plays connect the central conflict to families, homes, daughters, and romantic relationships. Jekyll's experimentations and Hyde's violence acquire a more personal and affective dimension, as they threaten not only Jekyll himself, but also the women he is emotionally connected with. The female characters also provide a different perspective on the events of the plays, for through their love, compassion, loyalty, and forgiveness, they offer a contrasting view to the transgression and violence associated with Hyde. Nonetheless, their function is not to be reduced to that of morally redeeming or humanizing the male protagonist. As shown in the previous sections, the adaptations construct the heroines though the ideals of Victorian femininity, but they also allow them moments of independent action and choice.

More broadly, the introduction of women reflects the demands of adaptation from narrative fiction to melodramatic theatre. As discussed in Chapter 1, melodramatic plays require explicit emotional relationships, sustained emotional conflict, as well as recognizable character types and scenes able to induce sympathy and compassion in the audience. Thus, female characters are useful in the transformation to the stage, as it is because of them that romantic and familial bonds are created. Moreover, they allow the expansion of the domestic setting and provide opportunities for dialogue and emotional confrontations. Most importantly, the presence of women makes the consequences of Jekyll's actions visible through their effects on others. The authors of the adaptations reconstruct Stevenson's predominantly male world into one in which domesticity, romance, family, and relationships are central to Jekyll's story, reshaping the emotional, social, and moral framework of the novella.

Chapter 4

"The Curse is on My Double Life": The Performance of Duality

Already even then I had my underground world in my soul.

—Fyodor Dostoyevsky, *Notes from the Underground*

4.1. Psychological Ambiguity to Theatrical Visibility

The representation of the duality between Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde is the core centre of Stevenson's novella and at the same time is another point of departure between the original work and the stage adaptations under analysis. In the novella, the relationship between the two figures is substantially psychological: although Jekyll and Hyde seem to constitute two different identities, they remain the manifestations of a single individual whose contradictory impulses cannot be separated. G. K. Chesterton observes that "the real stab of the story" is not in the discovery that "one man is two men," but rather lies in the knowledge that "the two men are one man" (2003: 183). The horror of Stevenson's story derives not only from the existence of an evil double, but also from the impossibility of isolating evil from the self that seeks to repress it. Jekyll's experiment and theories fail precisely because he cannot escape the moral and psychological burden of his own nature: as Chesterton explains, the narrative shows that a man can neither separate himself nor escape his conscience (2003: 184). The duality as represented by Stevenson is not a symmetrical opposition between an intrinsically good Jekyll and a purely evil Hyde, but it is a conflict produced by the coexistence of contradictory impulses within the same individual.

When considering the characterization of Hyde, this distinction is important, because Stevenson's Hyde cannot be reduced to simply Jekyll's antithesis, even though later representations of the novella have understood Jekyll and Hyde's relationship as the opposition between good and evil. Indeed, Saposnik argues that Hyde is "not the antithetical evil to Jekyll's good;" rather, he emerges from Jekyll's own inner compulsions (2001: 727). His relationship with Jekyll is therefore reciprocal: "without Jekyll there could never have been a Hyde, and without Hyde one can never fully know Jekyll" (Saposnik, 2001: 727). Hyde's importance to the narrative lies in the fact that his apparent otherness hides an intimate connection with the respectable doctor. His physical deformity serves as a metaphor for a moral and psychological condition, rather than as the outward appearance

of the monster within. Saposnik describes Hyde as a figure who gives form to the "shadow side of man" and to the primitive impulses that civilized society tries to repress (2001: 728). The novella thus resists the possibility of a clear division between the socially acceptable self and the desires it suppresses. Jekyll's tragedy lies in the fact that he attempts to separate elements that are constitutively part of himself and in his hypocrisy.

This understanding of duality is also connected to Stevenson's own thoughts and treatment of Jekyll's moral responsibility. Jekyll must not be interpreted as an innocent victim: he is as guilty as Hyde, because the creation of Hyde is his responsibility. Jekyll's desire to divide his nature arises from his inability to accept the coexistence of his respectable identity and his forbidden impulses: "It was the curse of mankind that these incongruous faggots were thus bound together—that in the agonised womb of consciousness, these polar twins should be continuously struggling. How, then, were they dissociated?" (Stevenson, 1886: 49). As Saposnik notes, Stevenson's own explanation of the story locates the problem not in Jekyll's sexual appetites, but in his hypocrisy:

> He was not good looking however; and not, Great Gods! a mere voluptuary. There is no harm in a voluptuary; and none, with my hand on my heart and in the sight of God, none—no harm whatever—in what prurient fools call "immorality." The harm was in Jekyll, because he was a hypocrite—not because he was fond of women; he says so himself; but people are so filled full of folly and inverted lust, that they can think of nothing but sexuality. The Hypocrite let out the beast Hyde—who is no more sexual than another, but who is the essence of cruelty and malice, and selfishness and cowardice: and these are the diabolic in man—not this poor wish to have a woman, that they make such a cry about. (Letter to John Paul Bocock, as cited in Stevenson, 1886 [2003]: 86)

The experiment does not produce an independent evil creature; it exposes the limitations of Jekyll's attempt to escape the contradictions of his own identity. The relationship between the two selves is one of interdependence, and therefore the destruction of one entails the destruction of the other. It is in this sense that the novella is fundamentally tragic: it refuses the possibility that good and evil can be neatly divided and assigned to different identities.

The translation of such internal conflict into the theatrical medium inevitably creates significant representational problems. Stevenson's novella easily explores Jekyll's divided consciousness through the first person narrative, retrospective narration, gradual revelation; this allows the reader to slowly and gradually understand the relationship between Jekyll and Hyde. In the theatre, however, this is difficult to represent. Indeed, the stage works through the presence of actors, physical bodies, voices, movements, costumes, and scenery. Any internal psychological conflict must therefore be externalized: it needs to acquire a visible and tangible form. The adaptation

of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* to the theatre encourages precisely the separation that Stevenson's novella questions: two aspects of one personality need to be presented as two visibly distinguishable characters. As P. K. Garret notes, stage, film, and television versions of the novella tend to "exaggerate" the story's dualism by making its moral oppositions "more symmetrical" (1988: 71). Therefore, theatre as a medium reproduces Stevenson's duality; however, its conventions encourage a transformation into a more immediately legible opposition between the two identities.

This process is particularly evident in the changing characterization of Jekyll. Stevenson presents him as a mature, socially isolated, and morally compromised figure; by contrast, the stage adaptations progressively build his character as a young and sympathetic hero. K. Linchan observes that one of the changes introduced in the adaptations is the presentation of Jekyll as a "relatively youthful and heroically high-minded" man, pursuing his scientific research for "altruistic or visionary motives" (2003: 151). This represents a fundamental departure from Stevenson's "paunchy, fifty-year-old socially isolated hypocrite" (Linchan, 2003: 151). Brian A. Rose similarly identifies a change in Jekyll's characterization in the adaptations:

> He is thus repositioned by adapters as a properly "noble" character, who challenges both forces of nature (which are seen by his opponents as divinely ordained and sacrosanct) and the very social order that is defined by its opposition to his ideological and technological subversion. (Rose, 1996: 35)

This transformation is significant, because the more Jekyll is idealized, the more easily Hyde can be assigned the role of his moral opposite. Jekyll's goodness establishes a clear moral baseline against which Hyde's behaviour can be measured; moreover, Jekyll's romantic attachments provide the emotional stakes needed in melodramatic dramas. Therefore, in the adaptations there is a significant redistribution of moral responsibility: instead of being presented as a hypocritical man deliberately seeking to separate his respectable identity from his transgressive impulses, Jekyll increasingly appears as a sympathetic protagonist vulnerable to the consequences of his experiments. Indeed, Rose correctly states that "the largely selfish neuroticism of Stevenson's Jekyll becomes the adapted Jekyll's heroic and self-sacrificial search for salvation for mankind from evil" (1996: 40). As has already been discussed, his romantic relationships place Jekyll within a network of social and emotional relations that reinforces his respectability. His attachment to a female protagonist induces the audience to sympathise with him and it also creates affections that Hyde threatens. Jekyll's scientific ambitions are presented alongside love and devotion, rather than associating them only with hypocrisy. This contributes to the progressive separation of the two identities: Jekyll is increasingly morally sympathetic, while the impulses that would complicate his character are concentrated in Hyde.

This same process affects the representation of Hyde. Once Jekyll has been established as the young, sympathetic hero, Hyde assumes a much more clearly defined role of villain. Linchan observes that

> as Jekyll shifts character from Stevenson's paunchy, fifty-year-old socially isolated hypocrite to a largely likeable young victim of ambition, the focus of villainy comes to rest increasingly strongly on Hyde. The shock effect of that villainy is amplified by the need to create a striking visual presence on stage or screen for what in the story remains Hyde's physically elusive aura of evil. (2003: 151)

Moreover, according to Linchan, Hyde's villainy is also increased through his relationship with the victims of violence, particularly women, thereby allowing the threat represented by Hyde to become more immediate within the dramatic structure (2003: 151). The stage then transforms Hyde from a disturbing manifestation of Jekyll's repressed self into a figure who serves as the identifiable antagonist in the plays.

This shift also changes the balance between Jekyll and Hyde. The novella's ultimate concern is with Jekyll's attempt to understand and control his divided nature and with his unresolved hypocrisy, whereas the theatrical adaptations increasingly construct a conflict where Jekyll and Hyde can operate as opposing dramatic forces. Stevenson himself objected to the tendency of stage versions to make Hyde more important than Jekyll. As Linchan records, Stevenson complained that "Dr. Jekyll should be the central figure and not Mr. Hyde," while on the stage "the first character is made subservient to the second" (as cited in Linchan, 2003: 151). This comment points to the tension between the psychological structure of the novella and the demands of theatrical representation. The internal conflict that is central in Stevenson's narrative is less spectacular than the external figure of Hyde, whose appearance and violence provide the stage with more opportunities for dramatic effect.

The three adaptations analysed in this thesis participate in this process to different degrees. Sullivan and Mansfield's 1887 *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyd*e marks an important stage in the development of this oppositions. While retaining the basic premise of Jekyll's divided nature, this version places greater emphasis on the moral contrast between the two identities. Here, Jekyll is a noble and sympathetic figure whose scientific ambitions are associated with idealistic motives, while Hyde increasingly embodies the destructive consequences of the experiment. Bandmann's adaptation develops this opposition even further by adding an explicitly spiritual and religious dimension into Jekyll's struggle. His conflict with Hyde is framed in terms of sin and repentance, while Hyde is associated with violence and hostility towards the moral and religious order represented by Jekyll and the other characters. Forepaugh & Fish's 1897 play develops towards melodramatic polarisation, placing greater focus on Jekyll's virtue and on Hyde's villainy, which threatens the protagonist and

the world surrounding him.

The differences between the three adaptations should be understood as part of a broader trajectory in the theatrical representation of duality. In Stevenson's novella, Jekyll and Hyde cannot be meaningfully separated because both belong to the same individual. The adaptations instead make the separation narratively and morally possible. Jekyll becomes more clearly aligned with the values of respectable society and more sympathetic to the audience, while Hyde's character absorbs the narrative's violence and transgression. The more sharply these qualities are distributed, the more clearly the adaptation establishes a conventional opposition between good and evil, between hero and villain. On the other hand, the connection between Jekyll and Hyde does not disappear entirely. The stage versions still maintain it, because the dramatic effect of the transformation derives from the recognition that the two figures are manifestations of the same character. It is the way in which this connection is communicated that changes. In Stevenson, it is primarily psychological and gradually revealed throughout the narrative; on the stage, it becomes external and visible. The audience must be able to distinguish Jekyll from Hyde while also understanding that they are connected to one another, producing a tension between separation and continuity which is central in the dramatic adaptations.

The transition from psychological ambiguity to theatrical visibility is one of the main changes made to Stevenson's novella and the concept of duality. In the literary piece, the horror lies in the impossibility of dividing the self: Jekyll's failed attempt to separate his transgressive impulses shows that the two identities cannot be separated. The stage versions make the separation the basis of dramatic representation. Jekyll and Hyde increasingly occupy different moral, social, and dramatic positions, letting the audience perceive the conflict as an opposition between two distinct characters, rather than as a contradiction contained within one. Therefore, the theatrical externalisation of duality makes the opposition visible but it also actively reshapes the moral identities of the two characters and, as a consequence, the meaning of the duality itself.

4.2. Reimagining Jekyll

This section will focus on the progressive idealisation of Henry Jekyll, taking into account how the three adaptations transform Stevenson's morally compromised and hypocrite scientist into an increasingly sympathetic and virtuous melodramatic hero.

4.2.1 Mansfield's Tragic Jekyll

In Mansfield's adaptation, Stevenson's Jekyll undergoes a radical transformation: from being characterized by an ambiguous combination of respectability, hypocrisy, and a desire to experience his inner and transgressive impulses without suffering the consequences, he becomes a man whose intentions are essentially benevolent. The goal of his experiment is not associated with the gratification of forbidden desires, but instead with an idealist attempt to improve human nature:

> JEKYLL. […] I still believe that by some means, the good and evil in man may be housed in separate identities.
>
> […]
>
> Think then, how we might dispense with those that lie hidden here. (*Touching his breast*) If our unjust half could hold his course without remorse—if the just could do good free of all disgrace, untrammeled, unhampered.
>
> (Act II, Scene 2, p.64)

However, the consequences of his experiments turn him into a victim of the very discovery he had hoped would benefit humanity:

> JEKYLL. Oh what horrors incredible this glass has seen and known, and yet with what wild joy I first looked here upon the face I hate and loathe, believing my discovery a blessing to mankind. Alas it was dreadful in its incompleteness!
>
> (Act IV, Scene 1, pp. 74-75)

Mansfield's Jekyll embodies the model of the "high-minded" scientist (Linchan, 2003: 151): his scientific ambition is presented as an extension of his concern for humankind, rather than as a means of escaping moral responsibility. Here, Jekyll is less characterized by the hypocrisy that lies at the centre of Stevenson's novella and is instead more defined by the suffering produced when his experiment goes out of control.

Jekyll's conversation with Utterson in Act I already establishes the revised moral framework of this new narrative, presenting Jekyll as a man willing to sacrifice his own happiness to protect others from the dangers of his secret. His very first line in the play acknowledges that, because of this wretched situation, marriage is impossible:

> JEKYLL. (*Stopping at window, which Lanyon has left open*) (*Aside*) It must not be. I can never marry her, with this hideous secret, this new danger threatening me at every step. My duty is clear. I must

see her no more.

(Act I, Scene 1, p. 51)

The language of duty establishes self-denial as a defining feature of his character: instead of trying to conceal this secret to preserve his relationship with Agnes, Jekyll initially decides that he must renounce the possibility of marriage and happiness. The stakes are too high, and he must protect his beloved. This decision, however, becomes another reason for his suffering: he truly loves Agnes, and to protect her he believes he must stay away from her. Although he looks adamant in his choice, as it has already been discussed, Agnes manages to convince him to stay with her, as she believes they can face any problem together. Since the first Act, the contrast with Stevenson's Jekyll is striking: Mansfield's doctor is someone who would willingly give up the possibility of happiness because he believes that his condition makes him a threat to those he loves.

Jekyll's refusal to disclose the truth even to Utterson—a scene that is present in the novella—could be analysed in these self-sacrificing terms as well. As in the original work, Utterson offers the doctor his confidence and promises to help him if only Jekyll told him the truth about Hyde; Jekyll, however, insists that Hyde is a "private matter" and asks him to let it "sleep" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 52). This secrecy seems to reproduce the concealment of Stevenson's Jekyll, but the motivations in the play could be different because of the different characterization of Jekyll. His secrecy is not an attempt to preserve his social respectability or to continue indulging his forbidden desires, but he could want to prevent others from becoming involved in this dangerous situation. This becomes even clearer when Jekyll, like in the novella, asks Utterson to "bear with [Hyde] and get him his rights," explaining that "it would take a weight off [his] mind" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 52). In self-sacrificing terms, Jekyll's concern seems to be directed beyond himself. The language of responsibility and obligation presents him as a man attempting to manage the consequences of an experiment which has already begun to go out of his control. The following lines make his suffering even more explicit:

JEKYLL. (*Alone*) Poor humankind. Bound by laws as rigid as the sheepskin covers of the book that holds them. And I, who have toiled for man am doomed to eternal wretchedness, the possessor of a secret I dare not even whisper. Ah, Heaven help me, Heaven help me!

(Act I, Scene 1, p. 53)

The contrast between his "toiled for man" and "eternal wretchedness" showcases the conception of his character. Jekyll has worked for the good of humanity, and yet his reward is suffering; his scientific attempts, associated with service to others, have now become the cause of his destruction. Agnes' presence further emphasizes this conception of Jekyll, because she makes his self-sacrifice

emotionally real. His initial decision to renounce marriage is a sacrifice of the domestic future he desires. In later stages of the play this becomes more important, when Jekyll's efforts are not directed only towards his survival, but also towards preserving Agnes from discovering the truth about him. When Lanyon offers to help him flee, Jekyll's principal concern is not his own safety but whether Agnes might discover his secret, while at the same time he desperately wishes to see her:

> JEKYLL. Do not fear. While I live, I would not have her know my story, I dare not speak with her, I might betray myself. It is not that, but yet I must see her, Lanyon once, only once, while I am still myself.
>
> LANYON. But how?
>
> JEKYLL. I have found the way. From that window, I could see her face. The court is narrow – we are high above it. Bring her there upon some pretence, no matter what, she will never see me, will never know. But I may look at her for one moment. – one moment before –
>
> (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 76)

The tragedy of Jekyll here is even more evident: he desires the emotional closeness and consolation of seeing the woman he loves, yet he refuses to endanger her by letting her know the truth. His love for her is thus expressed through restraint: he wants to be with her, but knows he cannot, so he settles for only looking at her from far away. Jekyll no longer imagines a future with her; he asks only for a glimpse of her while he is still himself. Yet, even this seemingly peaceful moment in which he looks at his beloved is framed by the expectation of death: he knows that it is inevitable. Jekyll is ultimately aware that the last transformation, which is moments away, will strip him of every relationship and possible future.

The moral reorientation of Jekyll can be seen in his response to the failure of his experiment. As the drug which allowed the changes cannot be reproduced anymore, he does not try to escape accountability for what has happened. Jekyll recognizes the progressive loss of control over himself: "I have trifled too long with my conscience. I have destroyed the balance of my soul. The evil power within me has the mastery" (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 75). The words he uses evoke both a moral and spiritual crisis, even more when he refers to his original identity as his "better self" (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 75), thus establishing a clearer distinction between Jekyll's moral position and Hyde's. Yet, the stage does not deny Jekyll's responsibility. On the contrary, at the end of the play he seems to show an increasing willingness to accept the consequences of his actions. He declares that he has "not spared" (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 77) himself in writing his confession, suggesting that one of his final acts is of moral accountability.

Jekyll's remorse is evident in his relationship with Lanyon. After drawing him into the

consequences of his experiment, Jekyll explicitly asks for Lanyon's forgiveness, reinforcing the construction of him as a morally conscious character because he has acknowledged that he has harmed yet another person. In a similar way, when Lanyon tries to persuade him to leave, Jekyll refuses to endanger his friend even further by making him an accomplice to his crimes. Once again, this presents Jekyll as willing to bear the consequences of his mistakes alone. Even when escape might save his life, he refuses to do so.

His attitude towards death is what crowns Jekyll's transformation into a tragic character. At the beginning, he believes his experiments to be beneficial for humanity; by the end, he understands that what he has done does not benefit humankind, nor is it reversible. Jekyll concludes that only his death will prevent any more harm. He describes himself as a "dead man" (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 75) when he finds out that the original drug cannot be reproduce. Nonetheless, his greatest fear is not death, but the loss of control over himself and the possibility that Hyde might survive him:

> JEKYLL. […], rather let me die now in my own shape which even as I speak may be taken from me. (*Shuddering*) Ah, anything but that! Let the dead man's face they look at be Henry Jekyll's not the face of Hyde. (*up C.*) I laid the poison ready for the time when it should come. It has come now. (*Shudders*.) That shudder again! Is it the warning, am I too late already?
>
> (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 74)

His decision to take the poison might be read both as an act of responsibility and as an act of despair: death is better than Hyde surviving. In this sense Mansfield's Jekyll can be read as a tragic protagonist. The very end of the play reinforces this concept. As the transformation into Hyde is taking over him, Jekyll calls out to Agnes, desperately trying to see her one last time before he loses control. When she is finally near, Jekyll irrationally decides he wants to see her, talk to her, hear her voice. However, it is in this precise moment that the transformation into Hyde comes to an end. The dramatic irony in this last scene lies in the fact that Jekyll's final desire will not be fulfilled, as he becomes Hyde for the last time. Jekyll's final action is to poison himself as Hyde, with the last speck of control he has over his double. His death is the consequence of his attempt to protect those he loves from himself. After Hyde drinks the poison and dies, Poole identifies the body not as Hyde's but as "[my] master['s]" (Act IV, Scene 1, p. 78), restoring the connection between the monstrous figure on stage and the benevolent and tragic Jekyll.

Mansfield and Sullivan thus revise Jekyll's character and morality, associating him with duty, conscience, regret, love, and self-sacrifice. This transformation makes Jekyll more sympathetic to the audience, but the changes made to his figure also alter the moral structure of the narrative, relocating much of the responsibility for evil onto Hyde and presenting Jekyll increasingly as the tragic victim

of his own experiment. Mansfield' adaptation establishes the basic pattern that later adaptations will intensify: the clearer Jekyll's alignment with virtue becomes, the more easily Hyde can be blamed for all the evil committed and can be regarded as Jekyll's polar opposite. Bandmann retains this idealized conception of Jekyll and develops it further in a more explicit spiritual direction.

4.2.2 The Spiritualized and Virtuous Jekyll of Bandmann and Forepaugh & Fish

If Sullivan and Mansfield's Jekyll is transformed into a noble and self-sacrificing philanthropist, Bandmann and Forepaugh & Fish take a different direction, reconfiguring the protagonist by placing his divided identity within a spiritual and religious framework. Although these two versions differ in emphasis, they share a similar characterization of their protagonist, both moving away from Stevenson's morally compromised and hypocritical Jekyll. Both adaptations present Jekyll as a fundamentally virtuous man caught in a struggle to preserve his morality. The conflict between two different aspects of the self is still present, but it is articulated more in terms of sin, guilt, punishment, and redemption. The result is a protagonist who struggles not only at the psychological or scientific level but is also in a spiritual crisis. The difference between the two lies in the degree to which this characterization is simplified. Bandmann's Jekyll is characterized by an attempt at self-discipline, restraint, and lastly at redemption for the dark parts within himself, giving more importance to his spiritual conflict. The religious vocabulary to which Bandmann often resorts suggests that the conflict between Jekyll and Hyde is ultimately a struggle over the fate of Jekyll's soul. Forepaugh & Fish retain the religious framework while also making Jekyll's goodness more explicit, placing him closer to the conventional melodramatic hero.

The spiritualization in Bandmann can already be detected in the conception of human nature. Jekyll's divided identity is presented as a universal human conflict:

> JEKYLL. […] There are two natures in every man one of good and one of evil which divide and compound man's dual character, and he it is who can always keep the evil counterbalanced by the good who is the happiest and most deserving of men.
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, p. 143)

According to this theory, Jekyll and Hyde represent two impulses existing within the same individual, and the tragedy that arises is caused by the inability to control them. In these terms, Bandmann retains part of the psychological complexity of the novella, because Stevenson similarly presents Jekyll's experiments as an attempt to separate the conflicting parts of human nature (1886: 49). However, Bandmann gives it an explicitly moral and religious dimension.

After the vicar's murder, the internal crisis that Jekyll suffers starts becoming clearer. He admits, after being asked about his mental welfare, that "there [he is] ill, quite ill" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 145). This underlines how Jekyll's conscience is troubled by what he has done, making his sufferings inseparable from his awareness of responsibility. Although he insists that he knows nothing of Hyde and declares that "the very thought of him fills [him] with terror" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 145), Jekyll knows the truth and what he fears is not discovery or punishment but rather confronting a part of himself that he can no longer control. These statements do not erase his connection to Hyde, but they establish Jekyll as a figure horrified by the violence associated with his double. Bandmann's adaptation encourages the audience to sympathize with Jekyll, as he is depicted as the victim of an experience he wishes to escape. His following soliloquy makes it even more explicit:

> JEKYLL. My papers in Soho are all destroyed and I am safe in spite of Utterson's suspicions. But I am haunted by my thoughts, they draw me near her, where she dwells, innocent sufferer of my crime, but it was not my deed it was Hyde's, Hyde's who gloats upon his crime devises others for the future. Am I responsible for him, I stand aghast before his acts and shudder at his guilt. What then should I fear, there is no danger, the dead will not return, they sleep in peace, I may lay my busy brain against the bosom of my love and rest assured at night the tender clasp around my neck is not the hangman's grip; back then to thyself though selfish, peevish heart, be stilled and watchful let not the secret stir from out its gloomy depths, I'm safe. But why cannot I sleep at night? Why lay awake and start and now that I am guilty. Oh God hold me not answerable for his deeds, hear my prayers You who can look into the hearts of all, look into mine; it is as pure now as when a child I walked beside my mother in Thy house of worship, you have seen me went face to face with death for others I have challenged danger, you have seen me drain my own heart's blood for my fellow men. Am I then answerable for the horrors of that damned night.
>
> (Act II, Scene 1, pp. 147-148)

Jekyll is torn between the two parts of himself: he feels the forbidden impulses that draw him to Sybil, that push him to commit other crimes, but he feels not accountable for Hyde's crimes. He asks himself whether he is responsible for Hyde and this is crucial to his characterization, because it makes responsibility the core of Jekyll's struggles. The difficulty lies in determining whether Hyde's actions can be separated from his moral identity. However, Jekyll does not reach a conclusion, because he repeatedly tries to convince himself it was not his deeds but Hyde's, despite his conscience not accepting this distinction—in this soliloquy, he often uses the pronoun 'I' when describing what Hyde has done, suggesting that deep inside he knows he is responsible for him. Here, the religious dimension emerges from Jekyll's words. He appeals directly to God, asking for divine judgement: "Oh God hold me not answerable for his deeds, hear my prayers You who can look into the hearts of

all, look into mine" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 148). He also recalls his willingness to sacrifice himself for others when he declares, "you have seen me went face to face with death for others I have challenged danger, you have seen me drain my own heart's blood for my fellow men" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 148). With this appeal, Jekyll is trying to build his moral character, his goodness, through his selflessness: his past actions are evidence that the man standing before God cannot possibly be identified with Hyde's violence, cannot be responsible for him—and yet, he is. Thus, he asks God not to hold him accountable of these deeds. With this demand, the spiritual and religious world takes part in the play, introducing an authority—God—that goes beyond the law and beyond human judgement. Jekyll fears for his soul, for how it will be judged. Moreover, his insistence on his heart being as pure as when he was a child builds Jekyll's character through a religious conception of innocence and adds to the construction of Jekyll as a man who cannot be responsible for Hyde.

At the same time, however, the denial and rejection of accountability quickly transform into something else.

> JEKYLL. […] What's this? The prayers are unheard my lying words still re-echo in my ears, my eyes are wild, my blood is cold, and my burning brain wanders what ghastly mockery is this? See the crowd of hideous images they gather, they scream aloud, they clamour for my blood, see they point towards the snowy locks of that pale faced old man whom I have foully murdered, he lifts his mournful eyes up to the throne of heaven and pleads for justice against my damned crime. His prayers are heard I am condemned dragged to the gallows, shame and despair must follow, oh horrible, horrible, courage, Henry, courage, it is not too late, Hyde shall no more return it shall henceforth be impossible to me, I am resolved I have done problems back dark hellish past, come future with Sybil by my side a better life is still in store for me.
>
> (Act II, Scene 1, p. 148)

The soliloquy moves to a sort of hallucination which implies a recognition of guilt. Jekyll imagines the vicar whom he—as Hyde—has murdered, pleading for justice, also imagining himself being condemned and dragged to the pits of Hell. He recognizes his own guilt and that his experiment to separate himself from Hyde cannot remove his responsibility for what Hyde has done. The religious vocabulary used in this soliloquy is central to the reconfiguration of Bandmann's Jekyll, as he makes numerous references to God, prayer, sin, punishment, hell, and the soul. Such language underlines the spirituality and religiosity of Bandmann's narrative.

Forepaugh & Fish reproduce this pattern with remarkable similarity. Their Jekyll describes himself as ill in mind and experiences the same anxiety after Hyde's violence. When Utterson confronts him about the will, Jekyll asks him to respect his choices:

UTTERSON. Well, I will consider, and now one word more, Henry. It was Hyde who dictated the terms in your will about the disappearance? (*[Jekyll] nods as if not liking to speak*) I knew it he meant to murder you – you have had a fine escape.

JEKYLL. I have had what is more to the purpose. I have had a lesson. Oh, God! what a lesson I have had. (*bus*.) You must allow me to go my own dark way. I have brought on myself a punishment and a danger I cannot name. If I am the chief of sinners, I am the chief of sufferers, too. I could not think that this world contained a place of suffering and terror so unmanning. You can do but one thing, Utterson, to lighten my destiny, and that is to respect my silence. (*exit C. D. L.*)

(Act II, Scene 1, p. 21)

Here, the consequences of his experiment provide a form of moral education: Jekyll has been forced to confront the consequences of his actions and to recognize the pain they have caused. He admits to a degree of responsibility, thus not presenting himself as entirely innocent. He acknowledges that his present condition is, at least in part, a consequence of his own actions. Yet, after this admission, he immediately focuses on his own suffering. The antithesis between "sinners" and "sufferers" is in line with the adaptation's construction of Jekyll as a sympathetic protagonist. He acknowledges his sins, but this is immediately balanced out by the suffering he has endured, encouraging the audience to perceive him as a tragic figure already experiencing punishment for his mistakes. Jekyll is presented as neither wholly innocent nor evil, but as a man who has transgressed and has recognized the consequences of his transgression and suffers as a result. The secrecy he asks of Utterson is presented more as a burden, a burden of a man unable to reveal why he is suffering. Immediately after, Jekyll pronounces the following, paralleling Bandmann's soliloquy:

JEKYLL. I have been to my rooms in Soho and destroyed all my papers. I am safe in spite of Utterson's suspicions. Then why does this heaviness hang over my heart? Why does my conscience accuse me still? The deed was not mine – it was Hyde's. Hyde, who gloats over his crimes with light-heartedness. Am I responsible for Hyde's actions? I, who stand aghast before this horrible deed of violence? Courage, Henry, courage! It is not too late. My future will be devoted to my better self. Away, dark past! Come, future, with Alice at my side. There's a better life in store for me.

(Act II, Scene 1, p. 23)

As in Bandmann, conscience is one of the principal markers of Jekyll's moral identity: his capacity for remorse distinguishes him from the violence that surrounds him and places him at the centre of the drama. Yet, Forepaugh & Fish make the distinction between Jekyll's morality and Hyde's actions even more explicit. Jekyll states, "The deed was not mine – it was Hyde's. Hyde, who gloats over his crimes with light-heartedness. Am I responsible for Hyde's actions? I, who stand aghast before this

horrible deed of violence?" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 23). The similarity with Bandmann is striking, but Forepaugh & Fish put particular emphasis on Jekyll's horror at Hyde's violence, more than Bandmann, thus presenting Jekyll as the virtuous self, threatened by an identity that he cannot control.

Nevertheless, neither Bandmann nor Forepaugh & Fish fully eliminate the hypocrisy that characterizes Stevenson's Jekyll. Both adaptations retain a tension between the acknowledgement of responsibility and Jekyll's attempt to distance himself from Hyde's actions. Unlike Stevenson's Jekyll, however, this hypocrisy no longer derives from the conscious concealment of his immoral and forbidden desires: the adaptations present him as genuinely horrified by Hyde and his violence, and desperate to get rid of him. His failure lies in his attempts to separate his moral identity from the actions of his own experiment. In this sense, Bandmann and Forepaugh & Fish preserve a limited form of Jekyll's hypocrisy: Jekyll may want to avoid responsibility for Hyde, at least initially, but his remorse, suffering, and desire for redemption encourage the audience to perceive this first denial of accountability as a virtue, because of his consciousness, rather than as an evidence of moral corruption. Moreover, the reconfiguration of Jekyll as a more sympathetic yet troubled character is reflected in the title of Forepaugh & Fish's version, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde; or, A Mis-spent Life*. The subtitle underlines Jekyll's life as a wasted life, highlighting how this adaptation is a story of moral decline and remorse. This title encourages the audience to read Jekyll's transgressions as the tragic consequence of a misdirected life, thus encouraging both pity and condemnation.

Indeed, Jekyll is presented as a man struggling between moral destruction and possible salvation. In Bandmann, he recognizes his guilt and this is followed by a renewed determination at self-discipline: when he states "courage, Henry, courage, it is not too late, Hyde shall no more return it shall henceforth be impossible to me, I am resolved I have done problems back dark hellish past, come future with Sybil by my side a better life is still in store for me" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 148), he is trying to reassert control over himself, showing resolution and self-control. Likewise, Forepaugh & Fish's Jekyll envisions his future: "Courage, Henry, courage! It is not too late. My future will be devoted to my better self. Away, dark past! Come, future, with Alice at my side. There's a better life in store for me" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 23). This decision is immediately associated with the possibility of a future with Sybil and Alice, who, as a consequence, become associated with the opportunity of beginning a better life and abandoning the "dark hellish past" (Bandmann, Act II, Scene 1, p. 148). Jekyll's objective is now to regain control over his experiment and to return to the virtuous identity worthy of a future with the woman he loves. The possibility of a renewed life further underlines his being a sympathetic character: Jekyll does not want to preserve his double life, but he will try to actively abandon it and recover his former moral self.

Jekyll's hope is short-lived, because both Bandmann and Forepaugh & Fish make their

protagonist extremely conscious of the consequences of his actions. His relationship with the love interest is important because it makes him want to redeem himself or at least try and control himself. However, she is the daughter of the man he killed and he is painfully aware of that. In Bandmann, Jekyll's next soliloquy showcases the impossibility of reconciling these two realities:

> JEKYLL. Oh God! upon what an abyss do I stand another step and I am lost, she haunts the murderer and he stands before her, she seeks revenge and with the same breath thanks the slayer of her father. The curse is on my double life from which I never found release for Hyde is on my heels wherever I meet him, the spirit of hell was in me when I did that crime, but am I not safe? I'm not Hyde! I'm Jekyll! For how long? What's to become of me when I have lost the means to remain as Jekyll, and once more turn into the fiendish Hyde, a hunted, houseless murderer, […].
>
> (Act II, Scene 1, pp. 148-149)

In a similar way, Forepaugh & Fish's Jekyll declares the following:

> JEKYLL. Another step and I am lost. She hunts the murderer of her father, and he stands before her – speaks of revenge and his own breath answers her. (*goes C.)* Oh, God! Hold me not answerable for the actions of this demon. […] But what have I to fear? I am not Hyde! I am Jekyll! For how long, though? The fiend may come upon me at any moment.
>
> (Act II, Scene 1, pp. 24-25)

As has been already discussed in the previous Chapter, in both plays the love interest is determined to seek revenge and, ironically, the one who has murdered her father stands before her. The situation is characterized by dramatic irony because love is founded upon the conviction that Jekyll and Hyde are two entirely different individuals, whereas the audience knows, and Jekyll knows, too, that that is not true, further intensifying his guilt. Moreover, Jekyll acknowledges that his double life has become a curse. Jekyll himself is no longer sure about his own identity: he can call and recognize himself as Jekyll, but he cannot guarantee that this identity will endure. He fears he may lose the capacity to remain Jekyll, which transforms the scientific experiment into an existential problem, because Jekyll may not be able anymore to maintain his moral and personal identity.

In Bandmann's final scene, Jekyll's self-discipline becomes even more accentuated. Having no more supplies of the original powders to create the drug that allows the transformation, he understands that he may very well never come back as Jekyll. He states that "short of a miracle," this might be the very last time that "Henry Jekyll can think his own thoughts or see his own face in the glass" (Act IV, Scene 3, p. 161). Jekyll also describes his condition as a process of both moral and spiritual

degeneration:

> JEKYLL. […]. Terrible, terrible! I am losing my original self and becoming more and more incorporated with my second worse, and thus I stand for ever despised and friendless, it is not the gallows that I fear but the horror of sinking back to the animal Hyde, the personification of evil, I go to bed as Jekyll and I awake as Hyde at any moment I may turn again into the brute that is within me.
>
> (Act IV, Scene 3, pp. 161-162)

Jekyll's fear of being incorporated into Hyde underlines the impossibility of control over the two identities: Hyde is increasingly coming to the surface, whereas Jekyll is unrelentingly losing his own self—his moral self.

This same scene reveals the extent to which Jekyll understands his suffering as deserved punishment. After Sybil leaves, he cries to God hoping He would forgive him:

> JEKYLL. […] oh God forgive me for my crime, it was wrong to tempt me thus and I am justly punished.
>
> (Act IV, Scene 3, p. 163)

Here, the clearest expression of Jekyll's spiritualization can be seen. He no longer fears damnation nor punishment; instead, he acknowledges that he deserves it. The statement "I am justly punished" (Act IV, Scene 3, p. 163) is strongly in contrast with his earlier plea to God not to be held responsible for Hyde's crimes. Jekyll has undergone a transformation: he is no longer asking for exoneration, but he is expressing repentance, finally accepting and acknowledging his guilt instead of denying it. The relationship with Sybil contributes to his path of repentance. Jekyll knows that he has caused her immense pain and sufferings, and this knowledge tears him apart. While at the beginning of the play the possibility of a life with Sybil had encouraged him to try and control his impulses, now he is aware that he cannot return to the innocent and respectable Jekyll, nor can he control himself anymore. Sybil's forgiveness to all who have injured her, though not referring directly to Jekyll, is significant in this situation because it represents the opportunity for Jekyll to be morally restored despite his crimes and transgressions. His longing for forgiveness, both from God and from Sybil, showcases that Jekyll has acknowledged his guilt and is ready to face the consequences of his actions.

Forepaugh & Fish retain the same structure in the final scene:

> JEKYLL. (*locks door and comes down c.*) Until to-morrow – to-morrow – on which no sun shall ever rise for me; but now my soul is clear I can die in peace. (*chimes*) Ah, those chimes remind me of that terrible night. (*on one knee C.*) O God, look into my heart and forgive my sins, you were right – I

was wrong to tempt you! (*rises and with hands to Heaven. Lights down*) Ah, I must pray – pray to keep away the demon.

(Act IV, Scene 2, p. 40)

Here, Jekyll's spiritual resolution is made explicit through both dialogue and stage action. By declaring that his soul is clear and that he can now die in peace, Jekyll frames his death as the culmination of his moral purification. The stage directions make it even clearer (Act IV, Scene 2, p. 40): he kneels before God to ask for forgiveness, before rising and raising his hands towards Heaven. The physical movement accompanies his spiritual progression towards penitence. Jekyll also explicitly accepts moral responsibility, acknowledging that his transgression was not something that happened to him, but a mistake for which he must repent. Prayer becomes the means through which Jekyll tries to resist Hyde, making it a weapon in the spiritual conflict between a repentant Jekyll and a seemingly external evil force. His death thus provides a form of moral closure: after having confessed his sins, accepted his mistakes, repented, and turned towards God, Jekyll can die with his soul at peace.

The desire for redemption and repentance is what distinguishes Bandmann's and Forepaugh & Fish's Jekyll from Stevenson's. In the novella, the doctor does admit to his transgressions; however, his confession is complicated by many attempts at justifying his experiments and distinguishing his respectable self from the forbidden impulses he has to repress. Jekyll admits that he had to conceal his pleasures, but when Hyde came into the picture, things changed:

> and as my pleasures were (to say the least) undignified, and I was not only well known and highly considered, but growing towards the elderly man, this incoherency of my life was daily growing more unwelcome. It was on this side that my new power tempted me until I fell in slavery. I had but to drink the cup, to doff at once the body of the noted professor, and to assume, like a thick cloak, that of Edward Hyde. (Stevenson, 1886: 52)

The admission that Hyde allowed him to indulge in his forbidden pleasures reveals that Jekyll's experiments originate in the desire to escape the constraints of his public and reputable self. Bandmann reduces this ambiguity and hypocrisy, making his Jekyll more concerned with his suffering, his remorse, and his desire for forgiveness in order to recover his moral self. Bandmann's Jekyll is a tormented man who recognizes the consequences of his transgressions and looks for spiritual forgiveness, thus leaving behind the hypocrisy that characterized Stevenson's doctor. Forepaugh & Fish inherit these features and simplify them further, presenting Jekyll's better self as a moral individual, making his suffering, remorse, and repentance evidence of his virtue. The

relationship with Hyde is another point of difference. Stevenson's Jekyll describes his other self as a means through which he can escape the obligations dictated by society, whereas Bandmann's Jekyll treats Hyde's existence as a spiritual enemy from which he must be relieved. The repeated references to God, prayer, punishment, guilt, repentance, and forgiveness characterize his struggles in religious terms, a concept that is absent from Stevenson's more psychological and morally ambiguous narrative. In the adaptation, the focus shifts on whether Jekyll can overcome and atone for what Hyde has done.

Moreover, in Bandmann's adaptation, the narrative culminates in a final, grand apotheosis. Differently from the novella and the other two adaptations analysed in this thesis, Bandmann frames the conclusion with a final movement of transcendence:

> HYDE. […] Jekyll I told you I would kill you. (*Drinks poison and falls centre*.)
> (*The door falls open Enter Utterson & Poole*)
> *Curtain*
> *Apotheosis*
> *Curtain*
>
> (Act IV, Scene 3, p. 163)

The religious vocabulary that has characterized Jekyll's lines throughout the play finally acquires actual significance here: Jekyll's death is not only the inevitable consequence of his actions, but it is the final stage of his spiritual struggle. His physical destruction is connected with the possibility of moral restoration. In this sense, the apotheosis confirms the tendency to elevate Jekyll and characterize him differently from the morally ambiguous Jekyll of Stevenson's novella. With this apotheosis, Bandmann's Jekyll has finally overcome the internal struggle between opposing moral and spiritual forces. Indeed, as the *Daily Telegraph* wrote in 1888 in a review of the play, "[Bandmann] provides us with a transformation scene or apotheosis that is supposed to convey the notion of the good fairy, Dr. Jekyll, going up to heaven, and the bad demon, Mr. Hyde, descending to the lower regions" (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 163).

Bandmann's and Forepaugh & Fish's Jekyll is therefore characterized by a tension between transgression and redemption. He repeatedly tries to deny responsibility for Hyde, yet his conscience forces him to recognize that he cannot ultimately be morally separated. His appeals to God initially are for protection but then they transform into pleas of repentance. His fear of punishment ultimately becomes accepted as he justly deserves it. His theory of "two natures in every man" (Bandmann, Act I, Scene 1, p. 143) acquires a religious dimension: the divided self is not a psychological condition but a moral struggle that requires discipline, accountability, and repentance. Bandmann and

Forepaugh & Fish idealize Jekyll even more than Mansfield does, representing him as a spiritualized tragic hero whose sufferings are caused by the attempts to save his better self from the evil within. The final apotheosis in Bandmann highlights this conception even further, turning Jekyll's destruction into the culmination of repentance and redemption.

4.3. Reconstructing Hyde

If the adaptations progressively transform Jekyll into a sympathetic hero and morally elevated character, Hyde is consequently reconstructed as the embodiment of evil that Jekyll tries to escape from. In Stevenson's novella, Hyde is not an autonomous antagonist: he is the physical manifestation of the forbidden impulses which already belong to Jekyll. The two identities are interdependent, and Hyde's existence cannot be separated from Jekyll's. The stage adaptations increasingly externalize this relationship by giving Hyde a more clearly defined body, appearance, as well as a clear dramatic function of villain. As Garret states, theatrical adaptations and other kinds of adaptations tend to "exaggerate" the dualism of the original text by making the moral oppositions "more symmetrical" (1988: 71). This is particularly evident in the new characterization of Hyde, who becomes increasingly more associated with violence, sexual desire, cruelty, physical deformity, and supernatural or demonic imagery. Nonetheless, the three adaptations do not erase the connection between Jekyll and Hyde; rather, they negotiate a tension between Hyde as an apparently autonomous villain and Hyde as originating from Jekyll himself.

4.3.1. Mansfield's Embodied Evil

Mansfield' Hyde represents the first major transformation into a recognizable embodiment of evil. While in Stevenson's novella Hyde's appearance is left largely indeterminate, describing him primarily through the reactions of those who meet him, Mansfield's version gives Hyde a more defined moral and dramatic identity. He is not only a man who commits immoral acts, but his presence is immediately associated with violence and violation of social and moral boundaries. His encounter with Sir Danvers provides the first example of this construction:

> SIR DANVERS. And now, Sir, what business brings you to my house?
> HYDE. Agnes, why did you send her away? (*Down a little*)
> SIR DANVERS. My daughter's name! Why, what's that to you?
> HYDE. Your daughter, yes. Call her back. I must speak with her.
> SIR DANVERS. (*Furious*) How dare you?

HYDE. (*Fiercely*) Call her back, I say. I saw her face through the window, and I like it.

SIR DANVERS. Scoundrel, leave my house!

HYDE. (*Laughs*) Eh? That's good (*Laughs defiantly*)

SIR DANVERS. Monster! Who and what are you. Go, or –

HYDE. (*To C. laughing*) Go? I. Why, I will make the house mine, the girl mine if I please.

SIR DANVERS. (*Springing at him*) (*L.*) Infernal villain, I'll –

HYDE. (*Throwing him off*) Hands off, or it will be your death, I warn you.

SIR DANVERS. By Heaven! I'll – (*Grapples with him C.*)

HYDE. Eh? Good! One more, one less, what does it matter? There! If you will have it!

(*They struggle*)

SIR DANVERS. Help! Help!

(*Hyde throttles him – Door R. thrown open and Agnes rushes in*)

(Act I, Scene 1, p. 56)

After having seen Agnes, Hyde expresses the desire to possess her, thus reducing both the domestic space and the woman within it to objects whose possession is decided at his will. Hyde's characterization is defined through dominance and entitlement, and when Sir Danvers tries to protect his daughter, Hyde responds with gratuitous violence to this resistance. During the struggle and before throttling the older man, Hyde shows a complete indifference to human suffering and death, presenting life as not worthy of any value. Whether a person dies or another survives is completely irrelevant to Hyde. His violence is not the result of a loss of control, but the expression of his indifference to human life. The fact that he laughs defiantly during this scene further intensifies this impression, because the laughter transforms the murder into an almost playful cruelty, making Hyde's enjoyment of violence one of his defining characteristics. Hyde is characterized by the inversion of the values of respectable Victorian society: his desire to possess Agnes, his rejection of Sir Danvers' authority, his willingness to kill without hesitation establish him as a figure with no moral or social restraint. The rhetorical question "One more, one less, what does it matter?" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 56) suggests that he is far beyond the boundaries of humanity. He does not care about the others and about the principles which society is founded upon. His own language showcases this: it contrasts with Jekyll's, who repeatedly speaks of duty, accountability, protection of others. Hyde instead speaks in terms of possession, power, and gratification, establishing a stronger and clearer opposition between the two identities.

The concentration of evil onto Hyde is further reinforced by the reactions of other characters, who describe him in terms that go beyond the simple characterization of an ordinary criminal. Sir Danvers calls him a "monster" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 56), while Utterson states that "if ever [he] read

Satan's signature in a man's face it is there in the face of that new friend of [Jekyll's]" (Act II, Scene 2, p. 62). The reference to Satan transforms Hyde into the embodiment of an evil that is supernatural and hellish. Similarly, Lanyon describes him as "ghastly as the grave," with a "distorted face" and "evil look" (Act III, Scene 1, p. 71), while his hand is said to contain "death" (Act III, Scene 1, p. 72). These descriptions clearly establish a connection between Hyde's physical presence and his moral identity—or lack thereof. His appearance is a visible sign of the corruption associated with him. Moreover, Mansfield's performance—which will be talked about later—further intensifies this conception, allowing the adaptation to make the moral opposition between Jekyll and Hyde even more immediate.

At the same time, Mansfield's Hyde remains connected to Jekyll in such a way that prevents the opposition from becoming sharper and fixed. Jekyll himself refers to Hyde as "the monster [he] [him]self created" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 53), acknowledging that he originates from within himself. Hyde is not an autonomous force, but his existence depends on Jekyll, even if the adaptation increasingly treats him as a separate character. This tension is visible also in Hyde's soliloquy in the second act:

> HYDE. Still as death! Not a sound! I thought some one followed me in the street. I saw the shadow. (*Seeing his own shadow on wall of landing*) It was my own. Shut it out! Shut it out! (*Closes door and laughs, crosses to L. sees himself in mirror C. and starts*) Who's there? (*Trembles and then laughs, indicating himself*) Why it is this – this that I love. Who would suspect harm of this? That this could kill, and kill and kill, for the sport of killing? Why no one. My own self is my sanctuary. I need not fear. But no more shadows, no more shadows.
>
> (Act II, Scene 1, pp. 57-58)

Hyde's reaction reveals that he does not see himself as the alien and monstrous figure everybody else perceives; for him, the identity that others perceive with horror is instead an object of pleasure. Once he looks in the mirror and recognizes his reflection, his response is that of narcissistic delight: Hyde looks at his image and takes pleasure in his capacity for violence. By describing his own self as his sanctuary, Hyde is celebrating the fact that he possesses a self completely free from any restraint. Unlike Jekyll, who feels his identity divided, burdened, and threatened by Hyde, Hyde finds security in the self that Jekyll has tried to isolate and reject. Nevertheless, the scene retains an element of Stevenson's novella in the conception of Hyde as the "wholly evil" (Stevenson, 1886: 52)—in the words of Jekyll—counterpart, but the adaptation makes the moral opposition between them more explicit by presenting Hyde as a figure of conscious evil. Yet the scene is not reducing Hyde to an independent villain: the repeated confrontation with his own image, the language of the shadow, the momentary failure of self-recognition all keep the question of identity at the centre of the scene. Even

when Mansfield's play builds Hyde as the distinct embodiment of evil, it cannot entirely sever him from the psychological logic of the double that is central in Stevenson.

This same connection can be seen through Agnes' recollection of Hyde:

AGNES. (*She sits beside him*) Harry, I have come here for your help. They told you did they not that the police are on the track of – of that man –

JEKYLL. Yes, yes. I know.

AGNES. But there is something more. Harry! It was I who saw him.

JEKYLL. (*Shuddering*) Saw him? Saw whom?

AGNES. The man – Hyde.

JEKYLL. You saw him? When?

AGNES. That night. I remember every line of his face. No other ever wore a look so wicked. It haunts me everywhere. I see it in my dreams. Here at your side, I see it even now.

JEKYLL. (*Turning away and trying to escape – aside*) No, no! No!

(Act II, Scene 3, p. 66)

Agnes' statement that she sees Hyde now at Jekyll's side places Hyde's image psychologically closer to Jekyll's physical presence. The woman obviously does not identify the two figures as one single individual, but she claims to see him beside Jekyll, actually placing the two identities side by side. It seems as though the impression Hyde has made on her is so deep that subconsciously she can no longer separate the memory of him from her perception of Jekyll. The doctor's reaction suggests that he recognizes the meaning of her words and fears the recognition they anticipate. This scene allows the audience to perceive the connection between Jekyll and Hyde even before it is explicitly articulated. The adaptation thus establishes a proximity between Jekyll and Hyde, while at the same time Hyde is perceived as a distinct and evil creature.

This distinction is central to Mansfield's construction of Hyde. On the one hand, he is made considerably more monstrous, morally unambiguous, violent, cruel, indifferent to human life. On the other, the adaptation still highlights the fact that Hyde originates from within Jekyll. This characterization thus oscillates between externalization and psychological continuity. Hyde is represented as all that Jekyll rejects, but his existence is still rooted in Jekyll's experiment. Mansfield's Hyde is significant in the broader process of adapting the novella, because he makes Hyde a clearly recognizable villain for the purposes of melodramatic theatre, while retaining the central motif of the divided self.

4.3.2. Bandmann's Demonic Creature

In his adaptation, Bandmann intensifies the separation between Hyde and humanity, making him a criminal and a morally corrupted individual, but also a figure whose very being is questioned. This is evident from the very first scene, where the vicar recalls his encounter with Hyde, which introduces the idea of a man who goes beyond any human boundary:

> VICAR. First let me ask you, have you ever seen a man without a soul.
>
> UTTERSON. Certainly who has not.
>
> VICAR. Every body in the sense you mean; but not in mine; for the first time in my life I have seen a being who has neither a soul or any thing human about him, and the memory of that vision produces a revulsion in my nature from which I shall never be relieved until my dying day –
>
> […]
>
> I saw to my amazement in a narrow court a figure standing over a little boy, and pounded away at him for a dear life. I took a hold of the ruffian and I looked into his face, such a face as I shall never forget as long as I live; It makes me sick to think of it, a miserable shrunken figure, half dwarf, half man, but with an expression of brutality so horrible that every sinew in my body seems to weaken at the very memory of it.
>
> […]
>
> VICAR. I plucked up all my courage, and wrenched the stick from his hand in spite of his superhuman strength – "What do you want snarled he into my face with a voice I cannot describe. Half comic, half human, half animal, "I want you said I, I'll teach you how to pound away on this poor little half starved boy and I'll hand you over to the police" – having quite recovered my usual equilibrium and seeing a crowd gather round us who were ready to back me, I became defiant. That word Police seemed to have struck him with terror so did the threatening glances of the crowd. "Police snarled he what's the good of that. Here are a few sovereigns for the brat's wounded feeling which are more sensible than your police."
>
> […]
>
> VICAR. I shall never forget it. It has impressed itself with a horror upon my memory I seem him standing before me now, a being without a heart, soul or mind – an illustration of everything that is evil, in fact an incarnate Satan.
>
> UTTERSON. But what was his name.
>
> VICAR. Edward Hyde.
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, pp. 139-140)

The vicar's account of his meeting with Hyde establishes the creature as basically inhuman. When reflecting on whether he has ever seen a man with no soul, the vicar tells Utterson that he has seen for the first time in his life a "being" with no soul, nor anything "human about him" (Act I, Scene 1,

p. 139). The shift from "man" to "being" reveals that Hyde is no longer described as simply an immoral human being who violates social and religious laws, but he is removed from the category of humanity itself, even linguistically. The insistence that Hyde has no soul nor a speck of humanity within him highlights the absence of a moral or spiritual dimension in him. This is further underlined when Hyde is described as "a being without a heart, soul or mind – an illustration of everything that is evil" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 140). This description empties Hyde of anything that is human: he is not a man with an evil nature; he is the embodiment of evil itself, "an incarnate Satan" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 140). Hyde is also described physically in terms that progressively destabilize his human form. The Vicar recalls seeing "a miserable shrunken figure, half dwarf, half man," who is marked by an expression of "brutality so horrible," with a voice "half comic, half human, half animal" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 139). The repeated use of "half" places Hyde in-between human and non-human boundaries, whereas "animal" associates him with animalistic features, such as instinct and brute force. His "superhuman strength" contributes to his non-humanity, combining physical power with the apparently smaller body of a shrunken and dwarf-like figure. This dehumanization is closely connected to Hyde's violence against the vulnerable members of society. Differently from what happens in the novella, where Hyde tramples a little girl, here he tramples a little boy, described as "poor" and "half starved" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 140). When the vicar intervenes, Hyde responds aggressively and reduces the incident to a financial transaction, offering money for the child's "wounded feeling" and dismissing him as a "brat" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 140), showing no compassion or remorse for his actions. Therefore, Hyde systematically rejects any kind of social and moral obligations: his violence towards children, his defiance and indifference reinforce his characterization as an anti-social and non-human being.

Hyde's character, his violent behaviour, his sexual appetite, and his hatred towards Jekyll is made explicit in a later scene in which he openly declares the following:

> (*Enter Hyde*)
>
> HYDE. (*chuckling*) I love to torture women and children they are so helpless, this is the place where I killed the old chap serve him right. He'll never get another fifty pounds out of me because I was gently thrashing little brats, for spoiling my fun, how I do hate that goody goody fellow Jekyll, I'll kill him one of these days sure, he's another one of these church fellows, he prays and sings songs, I know what'll I do I'll go in and spoil all his holy books.
>
> (Act II, Scene 2, p. 152)

Hyde's enjoyment of violence removes any suggestion that his brutality is simply born out of uncontrollable impulses. Violence is a source of pleasure for him; he delights in it and that is why he

perpetrates it. Hyde also expresses his hatred for Jekyll, dismissing him as a "goody goody fellow," before identifying the moral and religious differences that separate them: "he's another one of these church fellows, he prays and sings songs" (Act II. Scene 2, p. 152). Significantly, he immediately decides to ruin his holy books. From this, it emerges that Hyde's hostility towards Jekyll cannot be severed from his hostility towards the religious principles Jekyll embodies. This contrast is deliberately polarized: Jekyll is associated with prayer, religious observance, moral respectability; Hyde, instead, seeks to profane the objects associated with them. These lines make explicit what the vicar had already suggested through the image of the "incarnate Satan" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 140): Hyde is the antagonist not only to individual characters, but to the religious and moral structure of the world they belong to. This opposition is also reinforced by the reactions of those who meet him. Utterson asks "What's that thing hopping along there?" while Sybil answers, "the horrible creature" (Act II, Scene 2, p. 152). The choice of vocabulary here is not random: "thing" and "creature" echo the vicar's refusal to describe Hyde as a man and demonstrate the consistency with which the adaptation removes him from the human category. His monstrosity is built collectively: the characters fear and perceive him as something existentially abnormal, alien. As it happens in the novella, Hyde's effect on others becomes part of his characterization, because his presence provokes horror, rejection, revulsion.

Bandmann's construction of Hyde as demonic also creates a tension with Jekyll's own understanding of their relationship. As discussed above, Jekyll tries to differentiate himself from Hyde, insisting on the fact that he is not him, and describing him as "the fiendish Hyde," "the hunted, houseless murderer" (Act II, Scene 1, p. 149), "the animal Hyde, the personification of evil" (Act IV, Scene 3, p. 161). The vocabulary he chooses is significant because Jekyll himself adopts the same language used by the vicar and other characters, underlining his being a separate creature that Jekyll fears will replace his "original self" (Act IV, Scene 3, p. 161). This is an important development from Stevenson's treatment of the double: rather than confronting Hyde as an expression of his own repressed desires, Bandmann's Jekyll conceptualizes him as an autonomous evil being. However, as discussed above, the connection between the two identities is not completely eliminated, as Jekyll acknowledges that Hyde is his other self and fears he will become Hyde permanently. The transformation preserves an element of continuity even if the adaptation increasingly moralizes and externalizes the relationship.

In Jekyll's final soliloquy, the threat posed by Hyde is expressed as a loss of human identity. Jekyll fears he will "[sink] back to the animal Hyde" and he even imagines the possibility of dying "an animal" (Act IV, Scene 3, pp. 161-162). The language of regression used here presents the transformation as a movement away from civilization. This regression, however, remains internal to Jekyll and thus preserves the logic of duality: the animal is not an external monster that has entered

his life, but a form his own body can assume. The final scene nevertheless pushes towards externalization. As the authorities are approaching, Hyde declares the following:

> HYDE. They are coming to take me to the gallows I will not die on the gallows whilst there is good poison here, I have killed two souls already here goes for the third, Jekyll I told you I would kill you. (*Drinks poison and falls centre*.)
>
> (Act IV, Scene 3, p. 163)

Here, Hyde explicitly imagines Jekyll as his enemy and himself as the one who will destroy him, turning the psychological conflict between the two identities into a battle between apparently distinct and autonomous beings. Significantly, Hyde speaks directly to Jekyll, addressing him as if he was an external opponent. The adaptation's tendency to give Hyde an independent dramatic will culminates here: the conflict is staged as a confrontation between two opposing figures. Dramatically, it is Hyde who wants to kill Jekyll, emerging as an apparently autonomous villain who threatens Jekyll's moral and physical existence and ultimately brings about his destruction. This scene is the clearest example of externalization of the double, as the conflict within a single self is presented as a struggle between two apparently separate beings, even though they come from within the same individual.

4.3.3. Forepaugh & Fish's Melodramatic Villain

Forepaugh & Fish largely retain the characterization of Hyde established by Bandmann, while further consolidating it into the figure of conventional melodramatic villain. As in Bandmann's adaptation, Hyde is described as physically abnormal, as someone who enjoys gratuitous violence and delights in causing suffering. The vicar's account of his first encounter with him recalls the previous adaptation:

> VICAR. […] at once I saw two figures: one was a little man, who was stumbling along eastward at a good walk, the other a little girl, running as fast as she could across the street. The child was about eight or ten. (*gets up and comes to* UTTERSON R.) Well, sir, the two ran into one another, naturally, at the corner, and then came the horrible part, for the man trampled the child under his feet with a fiendish joy. I took hold of my gentleman. He made no resistance, but he gave me one look that brought out the perspiration.
>
> […]
>
> UTTERSON. What was the man like?
>
> VICAR. He is not easy to describe; he was a fellow nobody would have anything to do with. There was something wrong about his appearance – something downright detestable. I never saw a man I

> disliked so. He must be deformed, although I could not specify the point, yet he lives in my memory so vividly that I can see him this moment,
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, pp. 11-12)

As in Bandmann, Hyde's physical presence serves as an immediate indication of his moral character. The vicar cannot identify precisely what it is that is "downright detestable" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 11) of him, yet he remembers his as a figure that inspires instinctive repulsion. Forepaugh & Fish preserve the association between Hyde's body and his villainy that is in the novella, taking features already established by previous adaptations and placing them more firmly within the conventions of melodramatic villainous characterization. This is even more evident in the way the adaptation stages Hyde's violence. His attack on Alice and the vicar turns violence into a highly spectacular theatrical scene:

> ALICE. (*who has been working with flowers at extreme end during change bus*.) How dark it has grown. I must go in. (*turns R. towards house, sees* HYDE*, starts and utters exclamation*) Who are you? What do you want?
>
> HYDE. You! (*advances towards her*)
>
> ALICE. (*retreating from R. C. to R*.) Leave this place at once, or I'll call for help! Dr. Jekyll! Dr. Jekyll!!
>
> HYDE. Don't call him - I hate him – I'll kill him if he comes.
>
> ALICE. (*calling*) Dr. Jekyll! Dr. Jekyll! (HYDE, *catching her by the waist, is about to dash her to the ground, when* VICAR *enters from church and throws* HYDE L. ALICE *runs up stage screaming.* HYDE *picks up cane and strikes* VICAR *on head*. VICAR *falls L. of C.* HYDE *continues striking him after he falls, then springs upon him, seizes him by the throat, all the time laughing with fiendish glee. Voices heard approaching*. HYDE *exits into house L*.)
>
> (Act I, Scene 1, p. 18)

This sequence intensifies the violence already associated with Bandmann, Mansfield, and the original novella, but its importance lies in its theatricality. The audience witness Hyde's aggression, while his laughter provides an unmistakable sign of enjoyment of this violent assault. The combination of movement, attack, and expressive stage action leaves no room for ambiguity when considering Hyde's dramatic function: he represents danger, violence, and cruelty, he is the villain the other characters must face and react against. This scene also strengthens Hyde's opposition to the social and moral order represented by the other characters. When Hyde attacks the innocent Alice, her father intervenes but is killed, thus transforming a religious authority in the victim of gratuitous and enjoyed violence. Jekyll appears immediately after the fact and is visibly horrified by what has happened, strengthening the horror of this scene. This dramatic arrangement separates the two identities also

according to their moral and emotional function: Hyde produces violence and suffering, while Jekyll responds to that suffering with horror and "great agony" (Act I, Scene 1, p. 18).

Like in Bandmann, Hyde himself explicitly talks about his recent acts of violence and the amusement he feels when he commits these kinds of actions:

> HYDE. (*laughs*) A woman just now offered me a box of matches. I struck her in the face and she fled. (*laughs*) I love to torture women and children because they are so helpless. (*laughs*) This is the place I killed that preacher chap. (*smiles*) It serves him right for spoiling my fun that night and making me pay 100£ for trampling on that brat. What a jolly night I had, I'll go in and drink on it. (*turns as if he hears some one behind him*) It's no one! It's no one! That goodie-goodie Dr. Jekyll, how I hate him! I'll kill him some day! I'm so cold! – I'm always freezing! – I know what I'll do. I'll go into the house and write blasphemies all over his pious books.
>
> (Act II, Scene 2, p. 27)

With these lines, Hyde reveals that it is the vulnerability of his victims that brings him pleasure. His violence is not a loss of control, but something that he consciously enjoys and revels in. He recalls killing the vicar and trampling the child, describing the murder as something that "serves him right for spoiling [his] fun" (Act II, Scene 2, p. 18). The use of this kind of language reduces the violence towards the child to simple entertainment and the murder of the Vicar to a necessary consequence for ruining the moment. Hyde is thus defined through his rejection of any social, moral, religious, human order, and Forepaugh & Fish make this conception of Hyde even more straightforward and explicit than Bandmann ever does. The audience is thus expected to recognize him as a violent, remorseless villain.

The polarization between Jekyll and Hyde is also established by Hyde's hatred of Jekyll. Like in Bandmann, Jekyll is associated with religious observance, which causes repulsion in Hyde. Therefore, he decides to write blasphemies on his religious books. While this is something coming from the novella, the contrast between the two identities is made even more explicit because Hyde presents himself as an enemy of everything Jekyll stands for. This is characteristic of the adaptation's increasing polarization of the relationship between the two identities.

The ending scene, which parallels Bandmann's, shows the last transformation from Jekyll into Hyde and his ultimate demise:

> JEKYLL. […] Ah, I must pray – pray to keep away the demon. (*making change*) Ah, the fiend is coming – yes, Hyde is here. (*green lights on, organ playing*) Stop that damned organ, it offends my ears. (*going to table R., takes up goblet*) Ha, ha, ha! (*loud rapping outside and* MR. UTTERSON *demands*

admittance and as the scene goes on makes it louder) They've come for me. (HYDE *jumps on chair beside table and, taking bottle, breaks another with it till table is clear, being careful to have poison in hand*) They're going to take me to the gallows – (*uncorks bottle*) – but Hyde don't die on the gallows – he-he-he-he-ha! I've killed two people already – here goes for the third – Jekyll – I've always told you I'd kill him – (*drinks poison and falls C. quivering – dies. Door broken open and enter* UTTERSON *and* POOLE, UTTERSON *goes L.*, POOLE *R. at back of* HYDE. *Looks at HYDE in astonishment*)

PICTURE.

CURTAIN.

(Act IV, Scene 2, p. 40)

This scene demonstrates Hyde's pure hatred of Jekyll. He openly mocks Jekyll when he says that he has always told him he would kill him, treating his other identity as an explicit enemy rather than an inseparable part of his own psyche. Hyde also displays no remorse and acts purely out of spite and self-preservation. He chooses to drink the poison not only to kill Jekyll, but also to avoid being captured and face justice, rather than choosing death out of regret. Hyde's death is portrayed as final act of defiance against Jekyll and the moral and social order. His hatred and repulsion for the sacred world are once again made visible when he demands to "stop that damned organ," as it "offends [his] ears" (Act IV, Scene 2, p. 40). This is symbolic, because organ music is usually played at church and Hyde's rejection of this holy music highlights his demonic, unreligious, immoral nature. Ultimately, by silencing the sacred music and destroying Jekyll, Hyde grounds his status as an irredeemable force of evil who rejects both human and divine authority.

The three adaptations reveal a progressive transformation of Hyde into an increasingly autonomous and recognizable villain. Across these different versions, Hyde ceases to function primarily as the embodiment of an internal contradiction and becomes instead an externalized figure of evil, against which Jekyll defines himself. The theatrical visibility contributes to a broader transformation of Stevenson's duality: what in the novella remains a disturbing recognition of the coexistence of contradictory impulses within one individual is rendered on stage as a conflict between two opposing beings.

4.4. Staging the Transformation

In the adaptations, the progressive polarization of Jekyll and Hyde is achieved through characterization, but it also interesting to see how different these two identities are represented on stage and particularly how the transformation is made. Stevenson's novella represents the change

through description and narration, specifically that of Dr. Lanyon and of Jekyll himself:

> He put the glass to his lips and drank at one gulp. A cry followed; he reeled, staggered, clutched at the table and held on, staring with injected eyes, gasping with open mouth; and as I looked there came, I thought, a change—he seemed to swell—his face became suddenly black and the features seemed to melt and alter—and the next moment, I had sprung to my feet and leaped back against the wall, my arm raised to shield me from that prodigy, my mind submerged in terror. (Stevenson, 1886: 47)

> The most racking pangs succeeded: a grinding in the bones, deadly nausea, and a horror of the spirit that cannot be exceeded at the hour of birth or death. Then these agonies began swiftly to subside, and I came to myself as if out of a great sickness. There was something strange in my sensations, something indescribably new and, from its very novelty, incredibly sweet. I felt younger, lighter, happier in body; within I was conscious of a heady recklessness, a current of disordered sensual images running like a mill race in my fancy, a solution of the bonds of obligation, an unknown but not an innocent freedom of the soul. I knew myself, at the first breath of this new life, to be more wicked, tenfold more wicked, sold a slave to my original evil; and the thought, in that moment, braced and delighted me like wine. I stretched out my hands, exulting in the freshness of these sensations; and in the act, I was suddenly aware that I had lost in stature. (Stevenson, 1886: 50)

The play must adapt the change for the stage, therefore employing any means necessary to translate the transformation through the actor's body, their movements, their voice, the costumes, lighting, and stage effects. Sullivan and Mansfield were the firsts who had to deal with this issue, especially because their adaptation redefined Jekyll as a morally conscious protagonist. Indeed, as Pinkston observes, they created a "principled, sympathetic Henry Jekyll," establishing meaningful relationships between him and other characters and also developing a dramatic plot that retained all the major events of Stevenson's novella (1986: 22-23). Therefore, Mansfield's performance had to communicate this change in character and the transformation scene needed to show not only a change in appearance but also the conflict between the virtuous Jekyll and the evil he perceived as progressively taking control over him.

In Mansfield's production, the transformation was achieved primarily through the actor's astonishing performance without the use of any mechanical effect. Mansfield transformed from Jekyll into Hyde in the first Act and from Hyde to Jekyll in the second Act offstage; however, in the third Act, he performed the transformation from Hyde to Jekyll in front of the audience. Pinkston observes that both Winter and Wilstach, Mansfield's contemporary biographers, attributed the effect to a "change of body posture, facial expression, and good acting" (1986: 35). Mansfield himself, states Pinkston, claimed that he only used his "natural body" (1986: 35). Indeed, in an interview for the *Pall*

Mall Gazette, the American actor was asked about the transformation scene:

> "Now, Mr. Mansfield, will you say how you effect the transformation?"
>
> "Absolutely without adventitious aid […] I think I can show you as complete a transformation as is necessary and permissible to the case by acting pure and simple; by change of features, disarrangement of the hair, and collapse of the figure—all in sight of the audience." (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 103)

At the same time, critics disagreed about whether he used make-up for the change (Pinkston, 1986: 34). Nonetheless, the uncertainty surrounding the use of make-up draws the attention away from technological or any other kind of illusion and instead draws it towards the actor and his body, making it the principal instrument through which the duality is portrayed.

Contemporary reviews strongly emphasise and praise Mansfield's performance and his ability to transform from one identity to the other before the audience's eyes. The *Boston Post* reports that, when in Act III he transforms from Hyde to Jekyll, Mansfield "throws back his overhanging hair, runs his hands across his face," after which "the visible evil spirit dies out of his eyes and lips" (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 110). The reviewer explicitly describes it as "in every way a psychological transformation," praising it for being powerful and impressive without any need for "mere contortion and grimace" (as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 110). Mansfield's transformation does not depend on simply making Hyde physically disappear and Jekyll physically reappear. The actor gradually alters his expression, his bodily behaviour, it seems as though his features change, all so that the audience perceives a change in the character's psychological as well as physical state. The *Boston Globe* similarly emphasises the difference between the two personas: before the transformation, Hyde is seen with "trembling hands, stooping form and satanic face," whereas after Mansfield passes a hand over his forehead, "the figure seems to rise to new height and dignity," his face changes and "Dr. Jekyll, weak and trembling, but still Jekyll's own, unmistakable self, stands on the stage," while Hyde has apparently "vanished as utterly as though he has been in very truth spirited away" (*Boston Globe*, as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 112). The two identities are differentiated through distinct, opposing physical signs: if Hyde has a stooping position, Jekyll is associated with height; Hyde has trembling hands and a satanic face that may signify immorality and disgrace, whereas Jekyll possesses dignity and respectability. The transformation thus reverses bodily and character's aspects, rather than simply changing the external appearance, highlighting the moral distinction between the two identities.

The emphasis on physical performance corresponds to Mansfield's own conception of Jekyll and Hyde. He explicitly rejected the idea of simply reproducing Stevenson's characters, explaining

that his Jekyll is a young, wealthy and philanthropic physician, "in love with science" and characterized as a "dreamer and a visionary" (*New York Sun*, as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 101). Once Jekyll realizes that he is losing himself to the monster he has created, he becomes "an unhappy and most wretched man:"

> The very fact of his goodness makes the knowledge of his badness overwhelming. The terrific strain upon his once powerful system takes its toll, and he finds himself generally less and less able to withstand, both physically and mentally, the encroachment of evil. He is struck with remorse at the thought of the monster he has conjured up, a monster who has come between him and the woman he loves. He feels responsible for the crimes he has committed in his other form, and he finds too late that the good in him must suffer for the indulgence of evil in him. Accordingly, Mansfield did not attempt to present the Jekyll of Stevenson's novel; he did not bring to the stage a middle-aged, convivial sort who was capable of forgetting his life as Edward Hyde. For Mansfield, Hyde always haunted Jekyll, because Jekyll was a man of morals. (Pinkston, 1986: 40)

Mansfield conceived the relationship between Jekyll and Hyde as an internal conflict that haunted Jekyll every day. Pinkston also observed that, regardless of whether Mansfield employed make-up, his greatest achievement was that the transformation "came from within" (1986: 35). Pinkston also reports that Winter similarly described the effect as representing the "simultaneous possession of the body by both Jekyll and Hyde" (1986: 35). The formulation is revealing for understanding Mansfield's staging: although the transformation creates two visually different figures, it does not sever them entirely. Hyde remains something that inhabits Jekyll's body, and the actor must be able to communicate both separation and continuity in his performance.

Another feature that contributed to the visual distinction between the two identities is lighting. Wilstach states that the "gray, green-shot gloom" that accompanied Hyde's appearances throughout the production generated a sense of anticipation among the audience (as cited in Pinkston, 1986: 28). In this way, lighting established a recurring visual association with Hyde before and during his appearances, helping to create a theatrical pattern through which his presence could be easily recognized. Therefore, the transformation was part of a wider stage language in which movement, posture, facial expression, and lighting worked together to distinguish Hyde from Jekyll.

If for Mansfield's performance there is a considerable number of reviews, interviews, and articles from which to gather information about his acting and his Jekyll/Hyde character, the surviving evidence for Bandmann's production is notably more limited, and relatively little can be established about the precise techniques he used on stage. Nonetheless, reviews of the time suggest a remarkably different approach from Mansfield's. Rather than praising a more psychological transformation

achieved through acting, critics repeatedly describe Bandmann's changes as blatant theatrical tricks. A review from *The Standard* reported that when Jekyll announces that the change is coming and that in a moment he shall be Mr. Hyde, the actor "turns away, rearranges his hair, fastens on a large set of false teeth, and Hyde is understood to have taken Jekyll's place" (7 August 1888). Moreover, the same review considered Bandmann's Hyde "merely a species of pantomime demon" and described the later transformation in Lanyon's study as "absurdly ineffective," since the actor simply hid behind a table and fixed his teeth, while disarranging his hair (*The Standard*, 7 August 1888). Another article similarly criticized the change as "far too obvious," comparing it to that of "a ventriloquist or an entertainer" (*The Scotsman*, 7 August 1888). A review from the *Sydney Morning Herald* describes the entire performance and the transformation scenes as ridiculous:

> In the hands of a less capable actor than Mansfield, "Jekyll and Hyde" might have been ridiculous. Out the Monday following the Saturday of Mansfield's appearance Bandmann gave his "Jekyll and Hyde," and the entertainment was more than ridiculous. It was screemingly funny, as Jekyll and Hyde Bandmann was wildly silly; his Jekyll was as mad a burlesque of the horrible as his Hyde, and his Hyde was too much of a bogey to frighten anybody; moreover, twice he forgot to take out his big false teeth when he changed back to Hyde, and the effect was "too funny." The audience roared at the whole thing. (29 September 1888)

These reviews are valuable because they reveal the contrast between Mansfield's celebrated technique and Bandmann's more artificial and simple method, which was also badly represented. In an interview, Mansfield himself alluded to Bandmann's play and talked about the use of props and tricks:

> [Adventitious aid] is mere clowning, certainly not artistic in its method. As it will be given 'in another place,' you will see that the impersonator will be furnished with another wig and a set of teeth by a man stationed underneath the table. (*Pall Mall Gazette*, as cited in Danahay and Chisholm, 2005: 103)

While Mansfield's transformation was praised for apparently emerging from the actor's body and expression, Bandmann's was instead perceived as a conventional stage trick which employed far too recognizable mechanisms.

Forepaugh & Fish provide considerably more information about the transformation in the script itself, because their printed text includes explicit instructions as to how to achieve the transition between the two identities. Their adaptation specifies the actor's costume and alterations to it, the precise sequence of movements required of him, and lighting effects:

Transitions of Dr. Jekyll to Mr. Hyde and Mr. Hyde to Dr. Jekyll are accomplished as follows:

Dr. Jekyll is played straight, and is dressed in full black suit with Prince Albert coat, wears dark wig with long hair; wig is so arranged that it can be brought over so part of the hair can be brought over the eyes. Prince Albert coat is made with pleat down back, centre. The pleat will vary from four to five inches at the collar to about eighteen inches at the tails.

The first change at the end of the first act from Dr. Jekyll:– At commencement of change the footlights are half lowered, making stage partially dark. Dr. Jekyll writhes as though in physical pain; assumes crouching position; during this with one hand he pulls portion of the wig which is brought forward and falls in a tangled mass over his forehead and eyes, at the same time with other hand he releases button or hook which releases pleat and causes coat to hang like loose gown, thus concealing the fact that the character is standing in crouching position. Green medium calcium is invariably used for Hyde. (See gas plot.) The character of Jekyll is played natural, without effect, and as easy as possible. Mr. Hyde is a dwarf; speaks in jerky manner, and aspirates his words.

The change in the third act – from Hyde to Jekyll – is simply the reverse of this. After taking the drug in Lanyon's office, Hyde rolls on floor in agony, getting behind and back of table. When change is complete Jekyll rises from behind table with face to audience, at the same time lights are raised.

All other changes are made off stage in like manner.

(Forepaugh & Fish, 1897: 3-4)

The transformation involves a coordinated alteration of body, costume, lighting, movement, and voice. Here, the change is turned into a carefully regulated stage effect, with its rules to follow, rather than being left to the actor's interpretation. Here, Jekyll is represented as the bodily and performative norm: he is "played straight," and "natural, without effect" (Forepaugh & Fish, 1897: 3-4). Hyde is instead presented as a distortion of the natural Jekyll. The transformation involves a change of identity and a visible alteration of posture, costume, and movements. Jekyll's upright and conventionally dressed body is changed into the crouching, less natural, less human Hyde. The instructions also describe Hyde as "a dwarf," who speaks "in jerky manner, and aspirates his words" (Forepaugh & Fish, 1897: 3-4). The difference between the two identities is thus delivered through different registers: Hyde's body is smaller and crouched, his hair hangs loose and obscures his face, the clothing hangs differently and his voice is altered. The transformation in Act I is further proof of how systematically the effect was construed. Forepaugh & Fish basically codify Hyde's appearance in a series of signs that immediately differentiate him from Jekyll. First of all, it happens on stage in front of the audience; Jekyll has just finished talking with Alice and is now feeling the change incoming, so he must leave and go to his cabinet. However, it is too late:

JEKYLL. (*starts towards door of house, having coat over his arm and cane in hand. In C. he drops cane*

and coat and staggers) Too late—too late! (*appears to be in intense agony—writhes and changes into* HYDE. *When change is complete, throw green calcium light onto* HYDE *who is C. of stage in crouching position*)

(Act I, Scene 1, p. 18)

Unlike Mansfield, Forepaugh & Fish's version makes the mechanics of the change deliberately visible and more detailed in the script itself. The actor's body changes position, the costume changes shape becoming longer and making the figure more menacing, the green calcium lighting changes the atmosphere into a gloomier scene, and Hyde's mannerism and voice take a darker turn.

The different approaches to the staging of the transformation reveal a development in the techniques and mechanics of the change. The visible characterizations of Jekyll and Hyde correspond to the adaptations' reconfiguration of the two figures. Mansfield retains the strongest sense of psychological continuity between his Jekyll and his Hyde, relying mostly on physical performance and facial expressions to convey the transformation. Bandmann instead relies more heavily on theatrical devices, making the transformation appear as an overt stage trick. Forepaugh & Fish codify the distinction through costume, lighting, posture, movement, and vocal shift. The transformation becomes progressively more spectacular as the adaptations increasingly construct Jekyll and Hyde as opposing theatrical identities.

Conclusion

The comparative study done in this thesis has shown that the early stage adaptations of Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* are not to be understood as attempts to faithfully and literally reproduce the novella in the dramatic medium. The passage from prose to stage necessarily involves transformations to the plot, the structure, and the characters, since the strategies through which Stevenson built his story needed to be reconfigured according to the possibilities of the new form. The three adaptations taken under consideration—Sullivan and Mansfield's, Bandmann's, and Forepaugh & Fish's—all accept this challenge and respond in different ways, demonstrating that adaptation is not straightforward reproduction, nor is it "slavish copying" of the original work (Hutcheon, 2006: 20). It is instead a process of rearrangement, expansion, reinterpretation, creation, through all of which the source text acquires new meanings. The changes highlighted in this thesis tend to move the adaptations away from the psychological and moral ambiguity of Stevenson's novella, and place it in a clearer and more linear structure. The narrative of the novella, its delayed revelations, its written documents and testimonies, its retrospective accounts all allow Stevenson to maintain the suspense and the mystery about Jekyll and the precise nature of his relationship with Hyde. By contrast, theatre requires a greater degree of visibility and immediacy: what in the novella can be easily delayed or hidden thanks to the narrative structure, on the stage it must be represented before an audience, whereas what is felt within must be communicated through dialogue, action, bodily movement. Consequently, the adaptations make explicit aspects of the novella that are instead more elusive in the original work.

This is evident in the treatment of science and scientific knowledge. While it is a topic for which the novella does not provide many details, some space is still devoted to the explanation of Jekyll's experiments, as well as their implications. Necessarily, the adaptations need to condense this discourse and also redistribute it across dialogue, action, props, and stage effects. Jekyll's reputation, as such, becomes more important than the demonstration of his scientific reasoning, while the potion and its making acquire a specific theatrical and spectacular function. Scientific knowledge remains an important element to the story, but it is transformed into something that can be seen and performed. The contrast between conventional scientific authority, represented by Dr. Lanyon, and unconventional, transgressive science, whose representative is Jekyll, is likewise reconfigured for dramatic effect in Mansfield's adaptation.

The introduction of new female characters, with a bigger role in the narrative, is perhaps the

greatest departure from Stevenson's novella. It also demonstrates how adaptations can reshape the social and emotional framework of the story. In the stage versions, the predominantly male world of the novella is expanded by the addition of female protagonists—Agnes, Sybil, and Alice—whose relationships with Jekyll provide the adaptations with a romantic and a domestic dimension that is absent in the original work. Such new characters were added both to satisfy the theatrical conventions of 19th century melodrama, but also to change the structure of the narrative itself, because through these relationships Jekyll's actions acquire both emotional and moral consequences. At the same time, the three heroines are not carbon copies of each other, and all exert their agency in different ways while remaining faithful to their duties as daughters and still identifying in their femininity. The social and emotional world of Stevenson is broadened even further by the inclusion of secondary female characters who add new meanings and emotional relationships to the narrative.

The changes made to the Jekyll/Hyde duality is another point of interest in this thesis. In Stevenson, Jekyll's relationship with Hyde is rooted in forbidden desires and impulses that he already feels the need to satisfy, and his attempt to separate his reputable self from his darker inclinations ultimately exposes his underlying hypocrisy. The stage adaptations retain the fundamental idea of the divided self, but the ambiguity of Stevenson's novella is more faded. Jekyll is re-characterized as a more sympathetic figure: he is a philanthropist, a physician who cares deeply about his patients, he is a lover and also a man who is struggling against dark forces that threaten to overcome him. Jekyll also becomes a figure who feels guilt and remorse for Hyde's crimes, while also longing for redemption. Consequently, Hyde becomes increasingly externalized as the embodiment of Jekyll's evil impulses. The interdependence between these two figures is transformed into a recognizable external conflict between opposing moral forces. This has also consequences in the theatrical representation of the double and of the transformation. If on page Stevenson sustains the uncertainty surrounding Jekyll and Hyde through a fragmented narrative and gradual disclosure of information, on stage the relationship between the two must be communicated to the audience through performance. Therefore, the stage adaptations present a clearer opposition between two dramatically distinct figures.

This comparative study shows that the process of adaptation is neither uniform nor linear, and that these three plays are not merely derivative versions of the original. Instead, they are reinterpretations shaped by the cultural, theatrical, commercial, and social contexts in which they were produced. It is precisely the differences from Steveson that make these adaptations relevant to this study. Returning to the question of adaptation raised at the beginning of this thesis, the changes made by the adaptations could be described, in Kuang's terms, as forms of "warping" or "distortion." Yet, the comparison undertaken here suggests that this should not be understood as betrayal.

Adaptations inevitably alter the source, as they speak through a different medium, to a different audience, in different contexts, and within different theatrical conventions. It is true that something must be "lost in translation," but it is also accompanied by something new. Hence, it could be argued that the adaptations have the same value as the original, and should not be considered secondary work. The early theatrical afterlife of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* shows that adaptation is a process of reimagination and "of making the adapted material one's own" (Hutcheon, 2006: 20).

Bibliography

'Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde at Forepaugh's', *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 16 March 1897, p. 5. Available at: https://www.newspapers.com/article/the-philadelphia-inquirer/9096429/

'FOREPAUGH'S—"Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 14 March 1897, p. 20. Available at: https://www.newspapers.com/article/the-philadelphia-inquirer/9098110/

'Forepaugh's,' *The Philadelphia Times*, 16 March 1897, p. 7. Available at: https://www.newspapers.com/article/the-philadelphia-times/9098024/

'London Theatricals', *The Scotsman*, 7 August 1888, p.5. Available at: https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/london-theatricals/docview/487863705/se-2

Auerbach, N. (1982). *Woman and the Demon: The Life of a Victorian Myth*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Auerbach, N. (2004). 'Before the Curtain', in K. Powell (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian and Edwardian Theatre*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-14.

Balfour, G. (2003). 'Summary of Composition and Early Reception', in K. Linchan (ed.), *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Norton & Company, pp. 77-79.

Beattie, H. J. (2001). 'Father and Son: The Origins of *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*', *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 56(1), pp. 317-360. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00797308.2001.11800678

Bolton, H. P. (1987). *Dickens Dramatized*. London: Mansell Publishing.

Booth, M. R. (1981). *Victorian Spectacular Theatre 1850-1910*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Booth, M. R. (1991). *Theatre in the Victorian Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brantlinger, P. (1980). 'The Gothic Origins of Science Fiction', *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, 14(1), pp. 30-43. https://doi.org/10.2307/1345322

Chesterton, G. K. (2003). 'The Real Stab of the Story', in K. Linchan (ed.), *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Norton & Company, pp. 183-184.

Curry, J. K. (1994). *Nineteenth-Century American Women Theatre Managers*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Danahay, M. (2013). 'Dr. Jekyll's Two Bodies', *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, 35(1), pp. 23-40.

Danahay, M. A., and Chisholm, A. (eds.) (2005). *Jekyll and Hyde Dramatized*. Jefferson: McFarland.

Donkin, H.B. (1892). 'Hysteria', in S. Ledger and R. Luckhurst (eds.), *The Fin de Siècle*, Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 245-250.

Elam, K. (1980). *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. New York: Routledge.

Evans, H. and Evans, M. (2000). 'The Rise of a Strong Middle Class', in C. Swisher (ed.), *Victorian*

England, Greenhaven Press, pp. 52-53.

Forepaugh, L., and Fish, G. F. (1897) [1904]. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, or a Mis-Spent Life*. New York: Samuel French.

Frick, J. (1999). 'A Changing Theatre: New York and Beyond', in D. B. Wilmeth and C. Bigsby (eds.), *The Cambridge History of American Theatre. Volume Two: 1870-1945*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 196-232.

Garret, P. K. (1988). 'Cries and Voices: Reading Jekyll and Hyde', in W. Veeder and G. Hirsch (eds.), *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde after one hundred years*, The University of Chicago Press, pp. 59-72.

Gash, N. (2000). 'The Reform Acts Expanded Democracy', in C. Swisher (ed.), *Victorian England*, Greenhaven Press, pp. 137-146.

Goh, R. B. H. (1999). 'Textual Hyde and Seek: "Gentility," Narrative Play and Proscription in Stevenson's *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde'*, *Journal of Narrative Theory*, 29(2), pp. 158-183.

Gorham, D. (1982). *The Victorian Girl and the Feminine Ideal*. New York: Routledge.

Hoffman, W. J., (1998). 'Factories', in S. Mitchell (ed.), *Victorian Britain: An Encyclopaedia*. Garland Publishing, p. 280.

Houghton, W. (2003). 'Hypocrisy', in K. Linchan (ed.), *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Norton & Company, pp. 146-149.

Hutcheon, L. (2006). *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge.

Inchbald, E. (1807). 'To The Artist', *The Artist: a Collection of Essays, Relative to Painting, Poetry, Sculpture, Architecture, the Drama, Discoveries of Science, and Various Other Subjects*, 1(14), pp. 9-19. Available at: https://cha.artsci.tamu.edu/CriticismArchive/HTML/InchbaldOnNovWriting1807.html

Jackson, R. (2004). 'Victorian and Edwardian stagecraft: techniques and issues', in K. Powell (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian and Edwardian Theatre*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 52-69.

Joyce, S. (2003). *Capital Offences: Geographies of Class and Crime in Victorian London*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Ledger, S., and Luckhurst, R. (eds.) (2000). *The Fin de Siècle*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Linchan, K. (2003). 'Performance Adaptations', in K. Linchan (ed.), *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Norton & Company, pp. 150-151.

MacArthur, S. (2015). *Gothic Science Fiction: 1818 to the Present*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Margree V., and Randall B. (2012). 'Fin-de-siècle Gothic', in A. Smith and W. Hughes (eds.), *The Victorian Gothic*, Edinburgh University Press, pp. 217-233.

Marlowe, C. (n.d.). *Doctor Faustus*. Edited by J. D. Jump. New York: Routledge, 1965.

Mazer, C. M. (2004). ‘New Theatres for a New Drama’, in K. Powell (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian and Edwardian Theatre*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 207-221.

Miller, K. (2003). ‘The Modern Double’, in K. Linchan (ed.), *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Norton & Company, pp. 124-126.

Miller, R. K. (2017). ‘Nineteenth-Century Theatrical Adaptations of Novels: The Paradox of Ephemerality’, in T. Leitch (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, Oxford University Press, pp. 53-70.

Mitchell, S. (2000). ‘Health and Medicine’, in C. Swisher (ed.), *Victorian England*, Greenhaven Press, pp. 83-93.

Myers, F. W. H. (1886). ‘Multiplex Personality’, *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, 4, pp. 496-514. Available at: https://oregondigital.org/concern/documents/df670g87n

Nollen, S. A. (1994). *Robert Louis Stevenson: Life, Literature and The Silver Screen*. Jefferson: McFarland.

Peterson, M. J. (1984). ‘No Angels in the House: The Victorian Myth and the Paget Women’, *The American Historical Review*, 89(3), pp. 677–708. https://doi.org/10.2307/1856121

Pick, D. (1989). *Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pinkston, C. A. Jr. (1986). ‘The Stage Premiere of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde’, *Nineteenth Century Theatre Research*, 14(1), pp. 21-43.

Postlethwaite, D. (1998). ‘Phrenology’, in S. Mitchell (ed.), *Victorian Britain: An Encyclopedia*. Garland Publishing, p. 601.

Postlewait, T. (1999). ‘The Hieroglyphic Stage: American Theatre and Society, Post-Civil War to 1945’, in D. B. Wilmeth and C. Bigsby (eds.), *The Cambridge History of American Theatre. Volume Two: 1870-1945*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 107-195.

Priestley, J.B. (2000). ‘Double Standards in Middle-Class Sexual Morality’, in C. Swisher (ed.), *Victorian England*, Greenhaven Press, pp. 210-220.

Rose, B. A. (1996). *Jekyll and Hyde Adapted: Dramatizations of Cultural Anxiety*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Sanna, A. (2012). ‘Silent Homosexuality in Oscar Wilde’s *Teleny* and *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and Robert Louis Stevenson’s *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*’, *Law and Literature*, 24(1), pp. 21-39.

Saposnik, I. S. (1971). ‘The Anatomy of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*’, *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 11(4), pp. 715-731. https://doi.org/10.2307/449833

Saxon, T. (2011). *American Theatre: History, Context, Form*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Shakespeare, W. (1604). *Othello, the Moor of Venice*. Edited by M. Neill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Stevenson, R. L. (1886). *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Edited by K. Linchan, London: Norton & Company, 2003.

Stevenson, R. L. (1888) [2003]. 'A Chapter on Dreams', in K. Linchan (ed.), *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Norton & Company, pp. 87-91.

Sugden, P. (1994). *The Complete History of Jack the Ripper*. London: Robinson Publishing.

Swisher, C. (ed.), (2000). *Victorian England*. San Diego: Greenhaven Press.

Taylor, G. (2018). 'Melodramatic Acting', in C. Williams (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Melodrama*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 112-125.

The Philadelphia Times, 14 March 1897, p. 20. Available at: https://www.newspapers.com/article/the-philadelphia-times/9097347/

The Standard, 7 August 1888, p. 3. Available at: https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/august-7-1888-page-3-8/docview/2721361467/se-2

The Sydney Morning Herald, 29 September 1888, p. 6. Available at: https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/september-29-1888-page-6-22/docview/2523118217/se-2

Toumey, C. T. (1992). 'The Moral Character of Mad Scientists: A Cultural Critique of Science', *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 17(4), pp. 411-437.

Walkowitz, J. R. (2003). 'London in the 1880s', in K. Linchan (ed.), *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, Norton & Company, pp. 141-144.

Wallbank, T. W. and Taylor, A. M. (2000). 'New Technologies Fostered the Industrial Revolution', in C. Swisher (ed.), *Victorian England*, Greenhaven Press, pp. 58-66.

Warrington, L. J. (2016). 'Herr Daniel Bandmann and Shakespeare vs. the World', *Journal of Global Theatre History*, 1(2), pp. 56-70. https://doi.org/10.5282/gthj/2016-2p56-70

Winter, S. A. (2015). ''Two and the Same': Jack the Ripper and The Melodramatic Stage Adaptation of *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*', *Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film*, 42(2), pp. 174-194.

Wright, D. L. (1994). '"The Prisonhouse of My Disposition": A Study of the Psychology of Addiction in "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde"', *Studies in the Novel*, 26(3), pp. 254-267. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20831878

Dichiarazione del ricorso a strumenti di Intelligenza Artificiale (IA)

La sottoscritta Giulia De Gobbi, matricola numero 889105, iscritta presso Ca' Foscari al corso di Laurea magistrale in Lingue e Letterature Europee, Americane e Postcoloniali, autrice della tesi di laurea *Exit Jekyll,Enter Hyde: A Comparative Study of Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and Its Three Early Stage Adaptations (1887-1897)*, relatore Alessandro Cabiati, consapevole delle sanzioni previste dall'art. 76 del Testo unico, D.P.R. 28/12/2000 n.445, e della decadenza dei benefici prevista dall'art. 75 del medesimo Testo unico in caso di dichiarazioni false o mendaci, sotto la propria personale responsabilità ai sensi degli artt. 46 e 47 del D.P.R. 28/12/2000 n. 445,

DICHIARA

di aver fatto ricorso a tecnologie di intelligenza artificiale generativa per supportare vari aspetti della ricerca e della scrittura della mia tesi di laurea, in particolare

- Grammarly (versione base/free), ChatGPT (GPT-5.6, versione rilasciata a luglio 2026);
- Sono stati utilizzati come strumenti di supporto esclusivamente per la revisione e ottimizzazione dei testi per migliorare chiarezza e coerenza;
- Si dichiara che gli interventi di revisione grammaticale, correzione di refusi e ottimizzazione dei testi hanno interessato l'intera tesi;
- Gli strumenti di Intelligenza Artificiale sono stati utilizzati per revisionare testi redatti dalla sottoscritta. Non avendo generato informazioni o testi, la correttezza, la qualità e l'attendibilità erano già state precedentemente verificate.

DICHIARA INOLTRE

che tutto il materiale generato dall'IA è stato attentamente verificato, rivisto e rielaborato dall'autrice, che si assume la piena responsabilità per la qualità, l'accuratezza e l'integrità scientifica del lavoro.