STUDY OF THE PROTAGONISTS IN FOUR OF STEVENSON'S NOVELS

THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF PROTAGONISTS IN ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON'S WORKS: A STUDY OF FOUR OF STEVENSON'S NOVELS

BY,

KIM ALLEN GEORGE

12 SEPTEMBER, 1977

in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

of Master of Arts, English, McGill University

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the protagonists in four of Robert Louis Stevenson's novels. It determines not only how the protagonists differ from one another, but also establishes common traits among them and shows how each protagonist is a composite of the earlier ones. To trace the progression of Stevenson's protagonists from the "flat" characters in his earlier works to the more fully developed ones in his later efforts, this thesis examines several themes which run throughout his opus. The theme discussed most thoroughly is that of man's dual nature. Each of the four novels contains the element of the Double or Doppelgänger; as Stevenson becames more adept at dealing with this theme, his protagonists became more fully rounded and believable characters. Also discussed is how Stevenson changed his opinions concerning "romantic" and "realistic" fiction and the effect which that change had on the types of protagonists and antagonists he created.

L'ABSTRAIT

Cette thèse examine les protagonistes de quatre romans de Robert Louis Stevenson. Elle détermine non seulement comment les protagonistes diffèrent les uns des autres, mais elle etablit aussi certains traits communs et démontre comment chaque protagoniste est un ensemble composite des précédents. Cette thèse, se proposant d'analyser la progression des protagonistes dans l'oeuvre de Stevenson depuis leur aspect schématique jusqu'à leur traitement complexe, lors de ses dernières tentatives, examine plusieurs thèmes récurrents dans son oeuvre. Le thème le plus profondément analysé est celui de la nature double de l'homme. Chacun des quatre romans contient l'élement du Double ou Doppelgänger: A mesure que Stevenson devient plus habile à traiter ce thème, ses protagonistes deviennent des personnages plus complexes et plus convaincants. Nous discutons aussi comment Stevenson modifie ses opinions vis à vis de la fiction "romantique" et "réaliste" et comment ce facteur change le type de protagonistes et d'antagonistes par lui créés.

This thesis is dedicated to Dori Gruneau, Claude Gagnon, and Abraham Sosnowicz, whose insecurities and doubts about their theses helped me to cope with the problems I had with my own.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Theresa Tower, who first suggested Robert Louis Stevenson to me as a possible subject. Dori Gruneau, Claude Gagnon, and Priscilla Lore, whose backgrounds in critical theory far surpass my own meager knowledge in that area were all of great help. I am indebted to Michelle Mangin of U.C.S.D., who helped me to translate the abstract into french. My father, Earl George, took on the task of helping me proofread this thesis, for which I am grateful. Lastly, I would like to thank Professor Alec Lucas, who tirelessly (and endlessly!) revised my work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The four novels I have chosen to work with are representative of Stevenson's career as a novelist. They include his first novel, Treasure Island, his first financial and critical success, The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, his strongest completed work, The Master of Ballantrae, and one of his two unfinished novels, Weir of Hermiston, which is considered by most critics (and me) to be his masterpiece. By choosing works from these four distinct periods of Stevenson's writing career, I will show a progression in his thinking in respect to the role of the protagonist in the novel.

I am using the word "protagonist" instead of "hero," because in Stevenson's works the two are often not the same character. In the works of other novelists of the Victorian age--in Dickens or Hardy or Eliot, for example--the protagonist generally is the hero or heroine of the piece, so the reader knows immediately with whom he is to identify. Stevenson breaks from this tradition, however, by often having unattractive or weak protagonists, and dynamic and attractive antagonists whom the reader admires. Having an attractive antagonist is not the same thing as having a Byronic or Satanic hero, whose evil grandeur and nobility are to be applauded and whose conversion to the ranks of "goodness" is never expected. Stevenson gives

heroic flair to his antagonists, but he always casts his ultimate sympathies with the protagonists in his works.

By virtue of being most prominent in the reader's view, the protagonist is generally the most interesting character in a piece of fiction. Stevenson, however, in these four novels at least, works contrary to this notion by comparing his protagonists unfavourably with their far more interesting foils. Jim Hawkins is seen in comparison with Long John Silver, Dr. Jekyll with Mr. Hyde, Henry Durie with his brother James, and Archie Weir with his father, Adam. In all of these cases the antagonist is the more flamboyant in the pairs, the one who catches the reader's attention and sustains an interest in the stories. If the antagonists were as mildly villainous as the protagonists are mildly heroic, there would be far less interest generated by Stevenson's novels.

The four works that I have chosen to work with differ from one another and call for different sorts of protagonists. Jim Hawkins is the archetypal "adventurous hero," but is cast as a boy to fit in with the pattern of the novel. Dr. Jekyll is both the "hero" and the "villain," since he combines both good and evil in his two "personalities." Henry Durie at first seems to be a meek and rather boringly "good" character, but, as he becomes infected with his brother's brand of evil, he becomes a much more believable, if villainous, protagonist. Since

Weir of Hermiston is but a fragment, it is more difficult to define Archie Weir's role as a protagonist than it is with the other three. He is about as unexciting as Henry Durie in the beginnings of their respective novels, but his character rapidly develops in a far different manner fron Henry's. From what we know of Stevenson's plans for the novel, it would seem that Archie was to become Stevenson's most believable "romantic hero."

These four novels, with their different types of protagonists, are not so far removed from each other as it might seem, and I will show how the novels follow from one another logically. The duality of man's nature, toyed with in the pairing of Jim Hawkins and Long John Silver, is further defined and experimented with in the pairing of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, and is ultimately polished and refined in dealing with the two Duries and the two Weirs.

In several of the critical essays Stevenson wrote throughout his career, he formulated and continued to refine his own theories of the art of writing fiction. His ideas concerning the importance of characterization and of plot were at odds with the theories of other critics of his time. Since Stevenson's theories have an important effect on the ways in which he develops and presents his protagonists and antagonists, I will discuss these theories briefly before discussing the role

of the protagonist in his fiction.

Stevenson recognized that the sort of romance Dumas and Scott had developed and mastered in the novel form had lately begun to wane in favour of realism. Stevenson obviously did not approve of this trend:

> A man of the unquestionable force of M. Zola spends himself on technical successes. To afford a popular flavour and attract the mob, he adds a steady current of what I may be allowed to call the rancid. That is exciting to the moralist; but what more particularly interests the artist is this tendency of the extreme of detail, when followed as a principle, to degenerate into mere <u>feux-de-joie</u> of literary tricking.[1]

Later in the same essay, "A Note on Realism," Stevenson says,

> The immediate danger of the realist is to sacrifice the beauty and significance of the whole to local dexterity, or, in the insane pursuit of completion, to immolate his readers under facts; but he comes in the last resort, and as his energy declines, to discard all design, abjure all choice, and, with scientific thoroughness, steadily to communicate matter which is not worth learning.[2]

Stevenson believed in strict economy in writing, hence one of his major objections to realism was that its followers interjected more "facts" than were necessary into their works. This overabundance of detail made the reader lose track of the plot, and for Stevenson, at this stage of his career (these essays were written at about the same time as <u>Treasure Island</u>), plot was everything. In "A Gossip on Romance," he observed that,

> English people of the present day are apt, I know not why, to look down on incident, and reserve their admiration for the clink of teaspoons and the accents of the curate. It is thought very clever to write a novel with no story at all, or at least a very dull one.[3]

Stevenson was asking in these essays that novelists stay free of realism and naturalism and reconsider the value of the element of "romance" to the novel. He was not asking that detail of characterization be done away with entirely, but rather that the author place more importance on the role of the story or plot than the naturalists and realists deemed necessary.

The major thrust of Stevenson's theory of fiction lies, however, not in his view on realistic detail, but in his feeling about the development of character. He thought that it was important for the reader to be able to project himself into the story, to live the lives of the characters, as it were. He said,

> While we read a story, we sit wavering between two minds, now merely clapping our hands at the merit of the performance, now condescending to take an active part in fancy with the characters. This last is the triumph of story-telling: When the reader consciously plays at being the hero, the scene is a good scene.[4]

The reader can either think himself a passive observer or a vicariously active participant. Stevenson goes on to say that

> in character-studies the pleasure that we take is critical; we watch, we approve, we smile at incongruities, we are moved to sudden heats of sympathy with courage, suffering, or virtue. But the characters are still themselves, they are not us; the more clearly they are depicted, the more widely do

> they stand away from us, the more imperiously do they thrust us back into our place as spectator. . . . It is not character but incident that woos us out of our reserve. Something happens as we desire to have it happen to ourselves, some situation, that we have long dallied with in fancy, is realised in the story with enticing and appropriate details. Then we forget the characters, then we push the hero aside; then we plunge into the tale in our own person and bathe in fresh experience; and then, and only then, do we say we have been reading a romance.[5]

To Stevenson, reading a novel was an escape, not in the pejorative sense of what is known as "escapism," but rather, a complete savouring of the work read, to the extent that the reader is able to discard his own existence and live the lives of the characters, as one would try on various robes. In order that this identification be easily accomplished, Stevenson felt that the author should take care lest he draw his characters too precisely and make it seem that only one person (that specific character) could ever experience the events unfolding. If the author can weave a story with universal appeal that any reader can recognize and wish to be a part of, then he has created what Stevenson calls a romance, or novel of romance.

In each of the four novels I shall discuss, Stevenson is continually making an effort to construct characters that are "universal archetypes," characters with whom the reader can feel an affinity. In the case of the "darker sorts," like Silver, Mr. Hyde, and James Durie, Stevenson reveals our own

"dark side, and earns our praise for his ability to portray the less desirable aspects of human nature so well. The plots in some of Stevenson's novels may well be unbelievable and fantastic, but they are so well-drawn that they never lose the reader's interest.

The theme in Stevenson's works that I shall discuss most thoroughly is that of the duality of man's nature. By comparing the ways in which Stevenson illustrates this duality in each successive novel, I will show the progression in his theory of man's nature. What is only casually touched on in Treasure Island--that man is composed of both good and evil--becomes a central theme in his later works.

Related to Stevenson's and his protagonists' discoveries of the duality of man's nature is a slow realization by Stevenson of the importance of the influences made on a person's character development by others around him. Stevenson discovered early in his career that all men have a Mr. Hyde within them, and that such "inner" influences cannot be supressed without disastrous results. By the end of his life, Stevenson reached the conclusion that "outer" influences, such as friends and relatives, and ancestral heritage, are also of importance in the development of character. This thesis will trace the development of Robert Louis Stevenson's theories of the duality of man's nature and of the various influences which contribute to the development of a man's character and nature.

FOOTNOTES TO INTRODUCTION

[1]Robert Louis Stevenson, "A Note on Realism," The Works of Robert Louis Stevenson (New York, 1923), IV, 415-416. (Hereafter all references to Stevenson's works are to this edition.)

[2]Stevenson, "A Note on Realism," IV, 422.

[3]Stevenson, "A Gossip on Romance," XII, 193-194.

[4]Stevenson, "A Gossip on Romance," XII, 200.

[5]Stevenson, "A Gossip on Romance," XII, 200-201.

CHAPTER ONE

JIM HAWKINS: THE "ADVENTUROUS HERO" AS PROTAGONIST

Robert Louis Stevenson wrote Treasure Island ostensibly as an adventure story for boys. He began it as a "rainy day's amusement" for his stepson Lloyd Osborne, and it abounds in many of the elements of the typical boys' adventure tale. It contains buried treasure, ruthless pirates, well-placed "yo-ho-ho's," and a juvenile hero with whom the readers of Young Folks could identify. On the level of children's literature the book is certainly a success, but there is much more to Treasure Island than its "penny dreadful" aspects, which make it worthy of being criticized along with Stevenson's more mature works. The word "mature" here has a two-fold sense; on the one hand as a reference to its projected audience, since it was written more for children than were Stevenson's later novels, and on the other hand, as a reference to the book's place in Stevenson's writing career; that is, comparing Treasure Island, his first novel, with novels written later in his career. To analyze the role of the protagonist, Jim Hawkins, I will consider Treasure Island on the following two levels; in terms of Jim's place in the tradition of the boys' adventure story "hero," and his function as a protagonist, in comparison with the protagonists in Stevenson's later works.

One of the ways in which Treasure Island conforms more with the typical novel of adventure than with the typical novel of Robert Louis Stevenson is in the strength of the protagonist, Jim Hawkins. Unlike Dr. Jekyll, Henry Durie, and Archie Weir, Jim demonstrates that he can wrench control of a situation away from his antagonist, when it seems that the antagonist will be victorious. The other three protagonists are much less likely to dominate their foils, and these "heroes" are usually of secondary importance to the reader. More in keeping with the general trend of Stevenson's fiction is the fact that the antagonist, Long John Silver, is, to the reader, the more fascinating of the two major characters. Silver has in common with Stevenson's other antagonists the fact that at the end of the book his fate is scarcely less desirable than the fate of the protagonist. In fact, in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and The Master of Ballantrae, the antagonists have exactly the same end as the protagonists: simultaneous death.

Another element that Treasure Island has in common with other boys' adventure stories is that it has few intrusions of parental authority. This is important to the development of Jim's character as protagonist, since he is granted the independence to act as an adult with the "grown-ups" in the story. If Jim's father had remained alive, he, not the boy, would have gone on the quest with the doctor and the squire; Jim would

probably have had to remain at home with his mother. Stevenson conveniently gets rid of the father, and in fact, never mentions his name. Jim grieves the loss of Billy Bones to the point of tears, but mentions the death of his father only in passing, and then in reference to Bones:

> as things fell out, my poor father died quite suddenly that evening, which put all other matters on one side. Our natural distress, the visits of the neighbours, the arranging of the funeral, and all the work of the inn to be carried on in the meanwhile kept me so busy that I had scarcely time to think of the captain, far less to be afraid of him.[1]

In this sort of fiction a true father would hinder the actions of the boy "hero," but Jim has many surrogate fathers in the course of the narrative who treat him as a son. Black Dog tells him, "I have a son of my own, as like you as two blocks, and he's all the pride of my 'art." (22-23) Long John Silver later tells him, "I've always liked you, I have, for a lad of spirit, and the picter of my own self when I was young and handsome." (253) Most of the other adults in the story, from the squire to Ben Gunn, seem also to heap praise upon Jim. Such adulation helps Jim to achieve the self-confidence necessary to capture the ship from Israel Hands and perform other feats of heroism. As the adolescent reader begins to identify with this "super-boy," the unlikelihood of the hero's adventures evaporates. His self-confidence also helps to distinguish Jim Hawkins from the other Stevenson protagonists, since they

are rarely so sure of themselves and of their actions as Jim is.

Treasure Island, like most boys' adventure stories, has little or nothing to do with women or sex. Stevenson emphasizes in "My First Book" That "Women were excluded."[2] But the fact that women are not of major importance in the book does not set it apart from Stevenson's other, more "adult" novels, since, in all but his last work, Weir of Hermiston, women are never of more than minor importance.

The lack of interest in women that the men in Treasure Island show is echoed by Jim's similar indifference, and is another aspect of his character which he has in common with the typical hero of a boy's adventure tale. The reader knows more of Jim's mother than of his father, but there is the same sense that the presence of a parent is undesirable to the boy. Jim's mother makes an early appearance in the book, but she quickly shows herself to be petty and ineffectual. She wants only what is "fair" (her share of Bones' money for the rent), and under threat of danger, she distinguishes herself by fainting and having to be dragged under a bridge. Jim says, "How I cursed the cowardice of the neighbours; how I blamed my poor mother for her honesty and her greed, for her past foolhardiness and present weakness." (47) She is obviously unimportant to the story and to Jim, since, except for an occasional reference to his "poor mother" back home, Jim is hardly aware of

her existence. She is not even mentioned at the end of the book, when the fates of all the other characters are recorded.

An interesting observation concerning the dearth of parental figures in Stevenson's fiction is the fact that he never included a fully-developed father in his novels until after the death of his father, and he never used a well-rounded mother figure--perhaps due to the fact that Stevenson's mother outlived him. I hesitate to draw conclusions from this lack of parental figures in Stevenson's fiction, but his well-known simultaneous disapproval of his parents and desire to please them may well be reflected in his unwillingness to attempt fictional portayals of parents until late in his writing career. It might also be noted that he had a similar disinclination towards portraying a love-involvement between man and woman until late in his career, which is perhaps indicative of a similar ambivalence towards his wife Fanny.

As Stevenson showed in his critical essays, he emphasized plot development over character development. He later modified his belief that character development was relatively unimportant to the whole work, as he became adept at creating characters and plots. However, with Treasure Island, an early work, Stevenson is still at the stage where he leaves his characters rather shallow and stereotyped. One can describe and analyze the "role" that Jim Hawkins plays, but when forced to discuss

him as an individual, distinct from other boy heroes, one is hardpressed to make any startling revelations. Granted, Jim is the central figure, who, more than any of the other characters, determines the course of action, but Stevenson has presented the story so that it usually emphasizes Jim's adversaries and the forces against which Jim operates.

Jim is an "active hero" in that he is always in the right place at the right time: he takes the keys from Bones' body and begins the whole chain of events; he is in the barrel and unveils Silver's plot to the others; he stumbles upon Ben Gunn and befriends him; he cuts the schooner loose and pilots it to safety; and he has the presence of mind to accept Silver's advances in the end, thereby saving both of them from the other pirates. Richard Kiely says, "Treasure Island is Jim's story in every way. He responds resourcefully to trouble throughout the adventure and is actively embroiled in dangerous exploits from beginning to end."[3] Kiely is not altogether correct here. As long as Long John Silver is not in view, Jim is the centre of attention, but when Silver does appear, Jim fades into the background. Not until near the end of the novel, when Jim tells the pirates that he has been aware of all their plots for a long time, does he stand on equal terms with his rival.

As will be seen in later chapters, Robert Louis Stevenson's other protagonists always have some personality traits

which keep them from fitting into the standard notion of the "hero." As Richard Kiely puts it,

> Unlike Stevenson's sickly villains, the ailing hero is neither cowardly nor ultimately ineffectual, but becomes rather an effective innocent, a peacemaker, a potential martyr. Although he may be physically incapable of defending himself, he still thinks and talks like a hero--is loyal to friends, unwilling to yield on a point of honor, unafraid to die. When heroic action is called for, the protagonist's flesh sometimes proves weak, but his spirit is usually willing. (101)

From what is known of Jim Hawkins, he does not seem to be an "ailing hero" (nor, for that matter, is Silver a "sickly villain," except for his wooden leg), as Dr. Jekyll, Henry Durie and Archie Weir are; Jim may at times be in temporary danger from the pirates, but the reader has no doubt that he will emerge victorious at the end of the tale. The mere fact that this is the only one of the four novels to be told in the first person (except for extracts from Dr. Jekyll's journal, presented after the reader knows him to be dead) implies a certain optimism that the other books lack. The reader knows that Jim had to have returned safely from his adventures in order to tell his tale, while the fates of the other protagonists are less certain, by virtue of their stories being told from another's point of view.

One way to link Jim to the other, weaker protagonists is to note that Jim is a boy, and therefore by definition is

physically "weaker" than a man. Also, his character is less fully drawn than the characters of the other protagonists, hence he is a weaker portrayal of a protagonist than the other three are.

The passage cited from Kiely above could apply directly to other of Stevenson's protagonists, but it is also relevant to the revelation scene between Jim and Long John Silver. Jim says, "I'm not such a fool but I know well what I have to look for. Let the worst come to the worst, it's little I care. I've seen too many die since I fell in with you."(255) He goes on to tell the pirates his own part in their undoing and then continues, "The laugh's on my side; I've had the top of this business from the first; I no more fear you than I fear a fly. Kill me, if you please, or spare me."(256) Here Jim shows that he is neither cowardly nor ineffectual. He offers himself as a peacemaker (saving the pirates from the gallows if possible), and he is a potential martyr, since he knows that the pirates could easily dispose of him once his value as a hostage disappears. He <u>is</u> physically incapable of self-defence against the pirates (unless they are severely wounded like Israel Hands), but he certainly does not sound like an ailing hero. Furthermore, when he has the opportunity to escape with the doctor, he refuses, having given his word.

From Jim's speech, Long John Silver at last realizes how

formidable an opponent the boy is and casts (or seems to cast) his own lot with Jim. From this point onward, Silver's own heroic stance is deflated, and he becomes merely a useful pawn to Jim's king piece. It does not matter that after returning to the squire's party Jim drops back into his old stature of boy among men; they all realize the importance of the part he played, and more importantly, so does the reader. So while Jim may be said to foreshadow Stevenson's later weak protagonists by way of his physical and intellectual inferiority to his antagonist, he is ultimately a different sort of "hero" from the other protagonists. In view of the fact that Stevenson's characters are usually not very strong or capable of controlling events, it might be said that he did not think very highly of the capabilities of mankind. If this is so, then the fact that it is a boy, Jim Hawkins, who exercizes the most control in the book, is a wry comment on the strength of man's nature indeed!

Jim's greatest strength is perhaps his sense of morality. His character is the closest thing to a "moral force" in the book. Jim shows that he is a person of his word when he passes up the opportunity of escape from the pirates. Dr. Livesey assures Jim that he will take responsibility, but Jim counters that "you know right well you wouldn't do the thing yourself; neither you, nor squire, nor captain; and no more will I. Silver

trusted me; I passed my word, and back I go."(279) Jim represents some sort of religious code as well; he makes an attempt at saving the soul of Israel Hands, spouting talk like, "you can kill the body, Mr. Hands, but not the spirit."(228) He is the only one of the four protagonists, except perhaps Archie Weir, who can be said to be a "moral force." The fact that Jim has the same moral viewpoint at the end of his adventure as he had at the beginning suggests a lack of spiritual growth on his part, rather similar to James Durie's case in The Master of Ballantrae; whereas Henry Durie's moral sensibility degenerated (and therefore changed, though for the worse), James remains a rather static character from beginning to end. So, in a sense, is Jim a much more static and undeveloped protagonist in comparison to Stevenson's other protagonists.

Comparing Jim Hawkins' story to those of other Stevenson protagonists, the reader might well have difficulty in taking Jim's plights as seriously as he does, say, Dr. Jekyll's. The fact that Jim is a boy certainly has something to do with the reader's difficulty in identifying with Jim as "hero," unless one also happens to be a young boy. The element of the "fantastic" is no more prevalent in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde than in Treasure Island; pirates and buried treasure are no more familiar to our reality than are Dr. Jekyll's magic powders. The main difference between Jim and Stevenson's other protag-

onists has to do, I think, with motivations. Jim does not experience the grave doubts and bitter disappointments of Dr. Jekyll, Henry Durie, and Archie Weir. His decisions are all made in reaction to circumstances and things (plot) rather than problems within his own psyche. The reader never doubts that Jim has made the right decisions as he doubts the decisions of the other, more adult protagonists.

Stevenson is not wrong in making Jim a shallow character in comparison to the other protagonists; it would be absurd for the boy to have Hamlet-type misgivings and self-doubts in this sort of story. Jim reacts as a boy should react in a boys' adventure story: spontaneously and instinctually. He has credibility within the confines of the book, because he does react as he does. If he behaved as a normal man would, the resulting story would be a failure. Hence Stevenson, even at this early stage of his career, was in a sense a realist, since he was careful to make his boy hero behave as a boy hero should. Thus, rather than aiming for pure "romance," it would seem that Stevenson believed in writing romance tempered with realism.

The sense of "realism" in Treasure Island is further illustrated when Jim, the older and wiser narrator of the book frequently condemns himself for his impetuous and unpredictable behaviour--stowing away on the first boat that leaves the Hispaniola, and abandoning the fort when he was needed to go and romp in the forest--but these are the actions of an

adventurous boy, and they add psychological reality to his character. Boys who always do as they are told and do not seek excitement are not "real" boys, according to Stevenson, and therefore have no place in such a story.

One of the themes with which Stevenson was preoccupied throughout his career is that of the Doppelgänger or Double. The theme reaches fruition in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and The Master of Ballantrae, but even in Treasure Island can its presence be observed in a rough form.[4]

Jim Hawkins, as protagonist, is to be thought of in terms of his actions, since Stevenson does not give him psychological depth; in other words, Jim is what he does, not what he thinks. Thus, Long John Silver might be said to be an aspect of Jim's character (a Doppelgänger of Jim) since he, as antagonist, creates many of the situations in which Jim acts. In other words, Jim does what he does (is what he is) largely because of the motivations of Long John Silver. Granted, this is a very crude handling of the element of the Double, but Stevenson's later efforts show that he learned how better to portray conflicts within one personality, and conflicts between two personalities.

Jim is fascinated by Long John Silver from their first encounter, and the reader shares his enthusiasm. Long John Silver is the most complex character in the book, and he is the first in a long line of Stevenson's antagonists to possess a

dual nature. When Silver is first introduced he is smiling and good-natured, much like Billy Bones. But he later shows the other side of his personality, the cruelty and brutality which link him with Pew.

Whereas Pew alienates the reader with his inhumanity, Long John Silver shows by his actions that he is not totally evil, and thereby captures the reader's interest and sympathy. Edwin Eigner points out that "no matter how high he [Stevenson] permitted the hellish energy to run in his villains, he always was careful to provide them with powerful and understandable motivations for their wicked actions."[5] Silver's motivations are two-fold: he goes on the quest for treasure so that he can become financially secure and perhaps set himself up as a gentleman in London, and he also wants what he feels is due him for all his years of service to Captain Flint.

Were Treasure Island a moral tract, with everyone receiving a reward or punishment according to his moral worth, Long John Silver, like the rest of the pirates, would have had to hang for his crimes. As Richard Kiely puts it, however,

> Silver has murdered, robbed and lied, but he has also been a good cook, a remarkable physical specimen in spite of his lost leg, and a rather affectionate if irresponsible replacement for Jim's dead father. Above all, he has been entertaining, and in a timeless, placeless, nearly conscienceless world, Stevenson seems justified in paying him off and sending him packing. To have killed him would have implied a punishment,

> a moral judgement Stevenson apparently did not want to make in his book. By the same token, to have rewarded him too generously or to have brought about his conversion would also have introduced a moral element not anticipated by anything earlier in the novel, and therefore hardly appropriate at the conclusion. (p. 79)

The only "moral" which seems applicable to Treasure Island is that if a character has been entertaining to the reader, and has shown enough good qualities at least partially to counteract his bad ones, then he deserves th escape from the island with a portion of the treasure. And, on an artistic level, since Stevenson's favourite "characters" were always his plots (the one "thing" in each book to which he paid most attention), if a character has proved himself valuable enough to the continuance of the plot, then he will be rewarded in the end. The only exception to this rule is Israel Hands, who dies because either he or Jim must die, and Jim is obviously more important th the plot.

There is a personal note to the creation of Long John Silver which is interesting and which helps to explain Stevenson's great care in creating his antagonist. Edwin Eigner says,

> he told [W.E.] Henley that 'it was the sight of your maimed strength and masterfulness that begot Long John Silver. . . . the idea of the maimed man, ruling and dreaded by the sound, was entirely taken from you.' In Long John Silver he aimed 'to deprive' Henley 'of all his finer qualities and higher graces of temperament, to leave him with nothing but his strength, his courage, his quickness and his magnificent geniality, and to try to express these in terms of the culture of a raw tarpaulin." (p. 165)

This real-life model for Stevenson's antagonist may even conceivably be balanced with a similar model for the protagonist: Stevenson himself. His biographies are all illustrated with copious examples of Stevenson's child-like qualities, which he possessed throughout his life. The boy who created kingdoms in his bowls of porridge is the same person who, well past the age of thirty, would play with tin soldiers for hours. Stevenson's unadventurous friends felt that his many voyages and excursions were a childish attempt to escape from reality and responsibility, but as his many works have demonstrated, such "escapes" were a necessary part of the development of Stevenson's creative artistry.

Surely, for a man with an active imagination and urge for adventure such as Stevenson's, the prospect of lying in bed month after month because of illness was a dreaded fate. Treasure Island was written during one such sick spell, supposedly to entertain his stepson, but surely as well, to entertain himself. It is not hard to imagine Robert Louis Stevenson propped up in bed, reliving vicariously the active and adventurous boyhood he had never had, in the telling of this exciting tale.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

[1]Robert Louis Stevenson, Treasure Island, V, 33-34.

[2]Stevenson, "My First Book," XXIV, 453.

[3]Robert Kiely, Robert Louis Stevenson and the Fiction of Adventure (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), 99. (Hereafter, all references to Kiely are to this work)

[4]A more complete discussion of the Double will appear in the next chapter.

[5]Edwin Eigner, Robert Louis Stevenson and the Romantic Tradition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), 15. (Hereafter, all references to Eigner are to this work)

CHAPTER TWO:

DR. JEKYLL AS PROTAGONIST AND ANTAGONIST

In Treasure Island, Stevenson shows that he is aware of the presence of good and evil in man, through his characterization of Long John Silver. The reader senses that Silver is the most well-rounded of the characters in Stevenson's first novel, because the pirate is a composite of different "types," while the other major characters are either "good" or "bad." Silver's personality tempers the pure evil of Pew with the blustering good nature of Billy Bones. But Long John Silver is not a "complete" person, in the sense that he could stand alone in the book; Silver's and Jim's characters are interdependent. They need the presence of one another to be goaded into thought and action.

Ralph Tymms says that "Doppelgänger are pairs of friends (in the original sense of 'fellows, two of a pair'), who together form a unit, but individually appear as a 'half,' dependent on the alter ego."[1] The pair of Jim Hawkins and Long John Silver is an early attempt by Stevenson to use the Doppelgänger or "double" as a way of portraying the complexity and duality of man's nature. In The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, Stevenson reveals that he has given much thought to the battle between the forces of good and evil in man's soul.

Tymms says that

> In The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, Stevenson advances from the boundaries of allegory towards the realm of psychological realism; though never does he lose from sight his point of departure. The basic conception of the Doppelgänger, to which he remains true, assumes the moral dualism of man; and he states his thesis by means of an allegory which displays the reverse process to that of Markheim, in which the good self finally rose in revolt against the predominance of evil. . . . In the second allegory, Jekyll maintains the contrary thesis; that evil has its right to freedom; and by a magical drug releases the slumbering monster in his nature to replace the predominantly good self habitually in control.[2]

Stevenson's use of the Double shies away from the sort of Doppelgänger fiction that uses ~~a pair of~~ twins--one good, one evil--to make its point, in favour of a more complex portrayal of man's nature. Jekyll and Hyde are not identical physically; Jekyll, the "better half," is an attractive, well-built man of fifty, while Hyde is younger, smaller, and repulsive to look at. Still, there is more to Stevenson's allegory than that physical appearances are a reflection of moral strength; Dr. Jekyll may look sound of body, but "internally," in his soul, he is rotting away with his desires. It is because of this disintegration that Jekyll wishes to create Mr. Hyde. Jekyll thinks that with Hyde outside of his body, he will become the "good" doctor the world thinks him to be.

Robert Rogers makes the following observations about the Double in literature:

> When an author portrays a protagonist as seeing his double, it is not simply a device or gimmick calculated to arouse the reader's interest by virtue of the strangeness of the episode but is, in fact, a result of his sense of the division to which the human mind in conflict with itself is susceptible.
>
> An equally obvious inference to be drawn is that when an author wishes to depict mental conflict within a single mind a most natural way for him to dramatize it is to represent that mind by two or more characters.[3]

Obviously, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde is firmly entrenched in the tradition of the Doppelgänger. Jekyll and Hyde represent two different sides of the same mind, but their dilemma cannot be so simply put as to say "Dr. Jekyll equals good and Mr. Hyde equals evil." Nor can it be said that Jekyll is the protagonist and Hyde the antagonist, since the two roles are played by one man, Dr. Jekyll; Mr. Hyde is simply the personification of one aspect of Dr. Jekyll's character. In a traditional novel, a character often has characteristics that seem incongruous, but Dr. Jekyll's is a special case and requires a re-working of the terms protagonist and antagonist.

The plot of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde as Stevenson wrote it (not as it has been mis-represented by many critics over the years) concerns a man who is conscious--as most men are--of certain drives that force him from the path he has chosen for his life. As long as the doctor recognizes that these drives are an integral part of himself and that he cannot totally ignore them, he is as "normal" as other men. Most people sup-

press what they think are their undesirable qualities, but Dr. Jekyll is an exception; he wants to divorce his "upright twin" from his "unjust half," without losing the sensations felt by the latter.

Mr. Hyde at first seems to be the answer to Dr. Jekyll's problems; the doctor's body does not perform Hyde's "lowly actions," but his mind retains their memory. As long as Jekyll still believes that Edward Hyde is a part of himself, he is a whole person whose personality is complete. Later, however, when the doctor begins to deny that the two men are the same person, he becomes an incomplete being--half of a pair of Doubles--and his/their breakdown ensues. In terms of the protagonist and antagonist, the"whole" Dr. Jekyll, who contains both good and evil and who recognizes that he is a composite of these forces, is the protagonist. The Dr. Jekyll who denies that he and Hyde are the same person and Hyde himself are the antagonist. I say antagonist instead of antagonists because, as the reader knows, they are in fact the same man, even though they take different forms.

Traditional criticism of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde has usually drawn a line between the doctor and his creation; the former being the hero and the latter the villain. In my reading of the novel, however, I see very little of the "heroic" in Dr. Jekyll. As with other of Stevenson's protagonists (ex-

cluding Jim Hawkins), he shows himself to be weak-willed and prone to human frailty, while his nemesis, Jekyll/Hyde the antagonist, has flashes of that heroic villainy that makes Long John Silver so attractive an antagonist. Jekyll, the protagonist, lived for fifty years hiding his desires from the world until that part of him, Jekyll, the antagonist, had the courage (or perhaps, merely the ingenuity) to set Mr. Hyde free.

The purpose of this chapter, then, is to show the difference between the two characters, Jekyll and Jekyll/Hyde, as seen through the eyes of Jekyll himself and those of the other narrators. A constant merging of the roles of the two characters, the protagonist and the antagonist, is inevitable, since they spring from the same person. This confusion of roles is, I think, an essential part of Stevenson's allegory; the reader should experience the same frustration in sorting out the two personalities that Jekyll himself experiences. The tale is by no means "realistic" in the sense of the realistic fiction of Zola, but there is a psychological realism in the plight of Dr. Jekyll, which makes Stevenson's tale universally applicable.

Of Dr. Jekyll the protagonist, the reader knows only what is revealed in "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of the Case," since Utterson and the others know only the false front which Jekyll has erected to hide his secrets from the world. Jekyll the protagonist exists in the book only in Jekyll/Hyde's mem-

ory, since the transformations have already begun when the novel opens. The reader knows little of the protagonist directly since it is up to Jekyll the narrator (who is also the antagonist) to supply the information about his early life. There are, however, parallels to Dr. Jekyll the protagonist in the stories of Dr. Lanyon and Mr. Utterson. By piecing together the lives of these two men, the reader can understand the drives which lead Dr. Jekyll to "split" himself into two "half-men."

Mr. Utterson and Dr. Lanyon are from the same social background as Henry Jekyll, and all three are thought to be respectable gentlemen. When Mr. Utterson hears of Mr. Hyde from Mr. Enfield, his curiosity is aroused, and he becomes obsessed with the notion of viewing Dr. Jekyll's mysterious friend. Utterson's curiosity to see Hyde recalls Jekyll's desire to unleash Hyde. Utterson begins to dream of Mr. Hyde, whose appearance Enfield has had so much trouble describing:

> And still the figure had no face by which he might know it; even in his dreams, it had no face, or one that baffled him and melted before his eyes; and thus it was that there sprang up and grew apace in the lawyer's mind a singularly strong, almost an inordinate, curiosity to behold the features of the real Mr. Hyde. If he could but once set eyes on him, he thought the mystery would lighten and perhaps roll altogether away, as was the habit of mysterious things when examined. . . . At least it would be a face worth seeing: the face of a man without bowels of mercy: a face which had but to show itself to raise up, in the mind of the unimpressionable Enfield, a spirit of enduring hatred.[4]

Utterson is preoccupied with Hyde because he fears that Dr. Jekyll is endangered by being involved with him. Utterson pursues Hyde as in a game: "'If he be Mr. Hyde,' he had thought, 'I shall be Mr. Seek.'" (p.362) Utterson quickly loses his spirit of game-playing, however, upon meeting his prey face-to-face. He, too, feels disgust and loathing and decides that Dr. Jekyll must be the victim of some sort of blackmail:

> 'Poor Henry Jekyll,' he thought, 'my mind misgives me he is in deep waters! He was wild when he was young . . . it must be that; the ghost of some old sin, the cancer of some concealed disgrace: punishment coming, pede claudo, years after memory has forgotten and self-love condoned the fault.' And the lawyer, scared by the thought, brooded awhile on his own past, groping in all the corners of memory, lest by chance some old Jack-in-the-Box of an old iniquity should leap to light there. His past was fairly blameless; few men could read the rolls of their life with less apprehension. Yet, he was humbled to the dust by the many ill things he had done, and raised up again into a sober and fearful gratitude by the many he had come so near to doing, yet avoided. (p.368)

Apparently, Jekyll's youthful escapades were no more notorious than those of other men of his class and age, but whereas men like Utterson outgrew their "vices," Jekyll remained obsessed with his. Mr. Utterson shows, however, that he, too, still has guilty feelings concerning his past conduct. He possesses the same sort of paranoia as Henry Jekyll; he fears that somehow his past will come to haunt him. Utterson shows through these fears that he is the same sort of neurotic Victorian gentleman as Jekyll.

Utterson escapes from his confrontation with Mr. Hyde with only a few nightmarish reflections on his own past (and, presumably, much shock upon reading Henry Jekyll's confession), but he can count himself lucky when he compares his fate to Dr. Lanyon's. The reader never knows exactly what caused the breach between Drs. Jekyll and Lanyon, but does know the latter believed Jekyll had gone "wrong in the mind," and that Lanyon was sceptical of Jekyll's scientific practices. Unfortunately for Dr. Lanyon, his scepticism does not make him immune to curiosity, so that when Hyde approaches him with the prospect of viewing the transformation, Lanyon, like Pandora, cannot resist the temptation:

> 'And now,' said he [Hyde], "To settle what remains. Will you be wise? will you be guided? will you suffer me to take this glass in my hand and to go forth from your house without further parley? or has the greed of curiosity too much command of you? Think before you decide, you shall be left as you were before, 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 shall so prefer to choose, a new province of knowlege and new avenues to fame and power shall be laid 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. (p.425)

Dr. Lanyon is of course too inquisitive to allow Mr. Hyde to leave, and thus his curiosity about areas of knowlege he had formerly ignored seals his fate. Hyde, or rather, Jekyll, since he speaks of "our profession," gleefully effects the transfor-

mation before the horrified Dr. Lanyon. The doctor signs his letter to Mr. Utterson as Hastie Lanyon; an ironic note, since it is his haste--first in discounting Dr. Jekyll's discoveries, then in ignoring Hyde's warnings--which brings about Lanyon's death.

Both Utterson and Lanyon represent, then, earlier stages of the kind of development that produced the monster Jekyll. Irving Saposnik says,

> If Lanyon is afraid to admit vital truths about himself, Jekyll fears these same truths once he discovers them. Dedicated to an ethical rigidity more severe than Utterson's, because solely self-centered, he cannot face the necessary containment of his dual being. However he may attempt to disguise his experiments under scientific objectivity, and his actions under a macabre alter-ego, he is unable to mask his basic selfishness. As he reveals in his final statement (the bare legal term is better than the more sentimental "confession"), he has thrived upon duplicity and his reputation has been maintained largely upon his successful ability to deceive.[5]

The reader knows considerably more of Mr. Hyde and Jekyll the antagonist, than of Dr. Jekyll the protagonist. Mr. Hyde inspires an immediate dislike in all who see him; he need not even open his mouth to become hated. When Mr. Enfield describes the trampling of the child he says,

> I had taken a loathing to my gentleman at first sight. So had the child's family, which was only natural. But the doctor's case was what struck me. He was the usual cut and dry apothecary . . . about as emotional as a bagpipe; every time he looked at my prisoner, I saw that Sawbones turn

> sick and white with desire to kill him . . . we were keeping the women off him as best we could, for they were as wild as harpies. I never saw a circle of such hateful faces. (p.351)

Each of the other characters who views Mr. Hyde has similar hateful feelings towards him. Dr Lanyon describes his impression of Hyde as follows:

> He was small, as I have said; I was struck besides with the shocking expression of his face, with his remarkable combination of great muscular activity and great apparent debility of constitution, and--last but not least--with the odd, subjective disturbance caused by his neighbourhood. This bore some resemblance to incipient rigour, and was accompanied by a marked sinking of the pulse. At the time, I set it down to some idiosyncratic, personal distaste, and merely wondered at the acuteness of the symptoms; but I have since had reason to believe the cause to lie much deeper in the nature of man, and to turn on some nobler hinge than the principle of hatred. (p.422)

Dr. Lanyon's comments are an attempt by a scientist to explain "scientifically" the universal reaction that the sight of Edward Hyde prompts. Lanyon's admission that he feels a "subjective disturbance" suggests that the mind cannot deal "rationally" with the concept of evil as represented by Hyde, but must deal with it emotionally (which prompts irrational behaviour). Dr. Jekyll says that "all human beings, as we meet them, are commingled out of good and evil; and Edward Hyde, alone among the ranks of mankind, was pure evil." (p. 434) He is perhaps suggesting that when people see Hyde, they see a projection of their own evil side fully developed, without any of the

forces which normally keep that side of man's nature in check. The irrationality of such a being existing free in nature prompts an equally irrational response in those who view Edward Hyde. They are frightened, but also, I think, attracted somewhat by him. Their own "evil" side sees Hyde running free and craves a similar freedom, but their own "righteous" side forbids any such revolt. Hence Edward Hyde provokes a "revolt among the members" of each person who sees him.

The reader does not know the nature of many of Hyde's crimes, nor does he really need to. Mr. Hyde tramples a child, murders a man, and writes blasphemies in Dr. Jekyll's religious books; these actions are no more shocking than those of Long John Silver, but the spirit in which Hyde performs them provides the key to understanding his personality. If it were Dr. Jekyll the protagonist who had performed these deeds, he would have been racked with guilt, but Hyde does not give a second thought to his actions. His deeds are not premeditated like those of a criminal, but rather, they are the spontaneous reactions to any given situation. In Freudian terms, Hyde's are the actions of an id that has no governing superego.

The modern reader, like his Victorian counterpart, tends to attribute to Hyde a lascivious nature, from the sense that there are many of Hyde's actions that go untold. But there is no evidence in Stevenson's version of the tale that Mr. Hyde's

excesses are sexual. In a letter, Stevenson says that Hyde

> was not good-looking . . . and not, Great Gods! a mere voluptuary. There is no harm in voluptuaries; and none, with my hand on heart and in the sight of God, none--no harm whatsoever in what purient 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 think of nothing but sexuality. The Hypocrite let out the beast of 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 love a woman, that they make such a cry about.[6]

That the reader today also assumes Jekyll's guilt to be related to sexual excesses is natural enough; the language Jekyll uses to describe his youthful faults does suggest some perversity of behaviour. Jekyll emphasizes, however, that "many a man would have even blazoned such irregularities as I was guilty of." (p.428) He says further that "The worst of my faults was a certain impatient gaiety of disposition." (p. 428) This "gaiety" could include anything from enjoying a drink on the sly to frequenting prostitutes and opium dens. The specific nature of Jekyll's gaiety is left to the reader's imagination, and the reader of course assumes the worst, since Jekyll himself makes such a fuss over his transgressions. The clue to Dr. Jekyll's "antagonist" personality and his conception of evil is found in the completion of the quotation given above. Jekyll says,

> The worst of my faults was a certain impatient gaiety of disposition, such as has made the happiness of many, but such as I found it difficult to reconcile with my imperious desire to carry my head high and wear a more than commonly grave countenance before the public. Hence it came about that I concealed my pleasures. . . . It was thus rather the exacting nature of my aspirations than any particular degradation in my faults, that made me what I was, and, with even a deeper trench than in the majority of men, severed in me those provinces of good and ill which divide and compound man's dual nature. (pp.428-29, my italics)

Dr. Jekyll admits that his "forbidden pleasures" are commonplace and not very evil, but the passage I underlined tells all. He is more concerned for his public image than for his private happiness; he is unwilling to have his secret pleasures widely known, but he is also unwilling to give them up. So Jekyll finds it necessary to hide (the play on the word "hide" with "Hyde" is inescapable) his less laudable activities from the world through the disguise of Edward Hyde.

Dr. Jekyll states that he is not a hypocrite, but Stevenson says otherwise, and the doctor's actions prove that he is. A hypocrite is, according to the dictionary definition, "one who seeks not merely to cover his vices, but to gain credit for virtue." Dr. Jekyll is certainly guilty on both counts. By virtue of his ability to change into Mr. Hyde, Dr. Jekyll is hypocritical in a manner different from other men: he says, "men have before had bravos to transact their crimes, while their own person and reputation sat under shelter. I was the first that ever did so for his pleasures." (p.436)

This last quotation points to the fact that Dr. Jekyll feels that his "pleasures" are criminal. The story of Dr. Jekyll's fall is an allegory for the lives of many Victorian men. Stevenson felt that they were so repressed by their society and its twisted values that they believed that any activity which gave pleasure must necessarily have been sinful, and therefore had to be repressed. As Irving Saposnik puts it,

> Henry Jekyll is a complex example of his age of anxiety: woefully weighed down by self-deception, cruelly a slave to his own weaknesses, sadly a disciple of a severe discipline, his voice is out of "De Profundis," a cry of Victorian man from the depths of his self-imposed underground.[7]

There is a personal note in the plight of Henry Jekyll. Robert Louis Stevenson was brought up in the rigid, Calvinist society of Edinburgh, even more repressive, it seems, than the society of Victorian England. Though he violently rejected the hypocrisy of his society's values early in his life, Stevenson, throughout his adult life, could not help being influenced by his childhood training. He could intellectually reject the values under which he had been raised and engage in the activities certain to shock his parents (such as frequenting pubs and engaging prostitutes), but Stevenson could never shake off the guilt that he felt in taking pleasure from "worldly" activities. Thus Stevenson felt some of the same pangs of guilt which drove Dr. Jekyll to split his personality asunder:

> The recollection of . . . excursions into Edinburgh slums with their exciting antithesis to the respectability of the society to which he belonged and his knowledge of the impulse in a member of that society to escape occasionally from the atmosphere of respectability for a brief taste of its utmost contrast, recurred years later a medium for illustrating the theme of dual personality in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.[8]

Stevenson is aware of the dichotomy between what he wants to do and what his society said he should want to do. To show the degree to which this conflict within one person can go, Stevenson uses the device of the Double in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. The tone of the book is one of moral allegory, but not simply one of good versus evil. There is pure evil in the book, as represented by Mr. Hyde (just as Pew represented it in Treasure Island), but there is no pure good.

Since Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde is a fable, it is rather sketchy in its characterization; the reader knows more of what forces Jekyll and Hyde represent than of their nature as characters. In his next major novel, The Master of Ballantrae, Stevenson concerns himself with the same basic problem--man's dual nature--but it is much more of a "traditional" novel than the earlier two books, so there is a stronger character development. The next chapter will examine the protagonist and antagonist in The Master of Ballantrae, and show how they are a continuation of, and improvement on, the character types found in his earlier novels.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

[1]Ralph Tymms, Doubles in Literary Psychology (Cambridge, Eng. 1949), 29.

[2]Ibid., 92.

[3]Robert Rogers, A Psychoanalytic Study of the Double in Literature (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1970), 29.

[4]Robert Louis Stevenson, The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, VII, 361-62.

[5]Irving Saposnik, "The Anatomy of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," Studies in English Literature, (1500-1900), 11 (1971), 721.

[6]Letter to John Paul Bocock, 1887, quoted in George S. Hellman, The True Stevenson: A Study in Clarification (Boston, 1925), 129-30.

[7]Saposnik, 721.

[8]Malcolm Elwin, The Strange Case of Robert Louis Stevenson (New York: Russell and Russell, 1971), 58.

CHAPTER III:

HENRY DURIE AS A SYNTHESIS OF JIM HAWKINS AND DR. JEKYLL

The Master of Ballantrae, which is usually considered Robert Louis Stevenson's strongest completed work, is a synthesis of the types of novels Treasure Island and Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde represent. Like the former, The Master of Ballantrae has elements of the adventurous romance, though on a more "adult" than "boyish" level, and like the latter, it explores the question of the duality of man's nature, but at a more sophisticated level than the earlier novel. In respect to characterization, The Master of Ballantrae also represents a synthesis of the types of characters found in the earlier two novels. David Daiches describes James Durie, the antagonist, as "Long John Silver given psychological reality and subtlety--the attractive bad man."[1] In Henry, the protagonist, the reader sees the slow realization by a "normal" man of his own dual nature, and his eventual destruction because of his inability to deal with the conflicts within his personality--a more detailed analysis of Dr. Jekyll's story, as it were. In each of these two cases, the reader can see that the author's talents have matured considerably.

As in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, the element of the Doppelgänger or Double is an important part of The Master of Ballantrae. The two brothers Durie at first seem to be opposites:

James evil and Henry good. The plot of the novel involves Henry's slow transition from a "good" to an "evil" character. As is common with Double stories, the first self loathes the second self but begins to emulate him in spite of the hatred. The protagonist (the first self)

> recognizes an irrational element in his nature which he has hitherto repressed. At the same time, he encounters some object or person that seems purely evil to him, and equates this with his own irrationality, regarding it as a projection or double of himself. As the hero comes to despise the double and his fascination for it, he grows more and more like it, until, in terror and madness, both he and it are destroyed.[2]

The main difference between Stevenson's treatment of the Double in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and in The Master of Ballantrae is found in the degree of subtlety with which he portrays good and evil in his characterization in the two novels. In the former novel, Dr. Jekyll makes no startling discoveries about himself; he has known all along that a Mr. Hyde dwells within him. In the latter novel, however, Stevenson has Henry Durie go through the whole process of that discovery. Henry is at first a man whose evil side is repressed. Unlike the case of Dr. Jekyll, the impetus for Henry's change comes not from within, but from without: his brother James.

Robert Rogers calls the type of "doubling" found in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde "subject doubling"; the decomposition reflects a division of one self. Another type of "doubling" is

"object doubling," in which the division or "split vision" concerns two or more characters, as with Henry and James Durie. Rogers says that

> While the dynamics of object doubling are always ultimately subjective in origin (the split symbolizing conflicting attitudes on the part of the perceiver rather than significant dualities in the object) . . . doubling by division of objects occurs without exception as a result of the perceiver's ambivalence toward the object.[3]

In other words, although Henry hates his brother James, he also envies James' freedom and flamboyant lifestyle, which contrast highly with his own drab existence as landlord of Ballantrae. This ambivalence is similar to Dr. Jekyll's mixed feelings about his "righteous" life. Both cases reflect Stevenson's own discomfort when he was more or less forced by his father to study law, as a way of insuring a steady income.

Authors frequently adapt episodes from their own lives to their fiction. In The Literature of the Second Self, which is a rather psychoanalytically oriented study of the Double, C. F. Keppler says,

> The figure of the second self is created by its author, either consciously or unconsciously, to express in fictional form the division within his own psyche, whether caused by purely personal problems or by the wider problems of his culture or both. This figure usually embodies the author's own shortcomings, his "darker side," the self which he really is as against the self he would like to be, or at least would like to be thought to be: "pure," outgoing, ageless, immortal, infinite, enlightenedly rational, transcendently

> irrational, wholesome, and whole. As a result, though occasionally the roles of the hero and his Doppelgänger may be reversed . . . predominantly the second self is a figure of menace and loathing, who arouses shame, fear, and often murderous hatred in his counterpart, the first self, with whom the author tends to identify himself. In other words, this figure is never simply a technical device; he is a symptom (or collection of symptoms) of the writer's inward disorder. But he is a symptom in peculiarly devious form, which by being expressed in this fashion is also disavowed; he is a trick whereby the writer contrives to put the undesireable aspect of his character outside himself and so to disown it. In the very broad sense of the word he is a scapegoat, upon whom the writer has unloaded his own limitations and poisons, and whom the writer frequently punishes with death.[4]

The above analysis of the relationship between the second self (the antagonist) and the first self (the protagonist) fits nicely the case of James and Henry Durie. James is indeed "a figure of menace and loathing, who arouses shame, fear and . . . . murderous hatred" in Henry. It at first seems too simplistic to assume that James is some sort of representation of Stevenson's id, but Stevenson himself gives credence to the theory when he says, "For the Master I had no original, which is perhaps another way of confessing that the original was no other than myself."[5] The battles between Jekyll and Hyde, and Henry and James are, as Keppler suggests, Stevenson's expression of "the division within his own psyche." Just as Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde can be seen as an allegorical representation of man's divided nature, so can The Master of Ballantrae be seen as a

more dramatic rendering of the same universal problem. Whether or not Stevenson's own "second self" was as maniacal as Mr. Hyde or James Durie is not the central issue of this study; what is central is understanding the relationship between the protagonist and his Double.

As with the other two novels I have considered thus far, The Master of Ballantrae contains a protagonist from the mundane world eclipsed by his far more interesting antagonist, who seems to have been summoned from the depths of some sort of hell. Henry Durie has the thankless task of being protagonist to his brother James' antagonist; "thankless" because, on a first reading of the novel, the only emotion that the reader can summon for Henry is pity mixed with disgust. Henry's seeming inaction at first makes him seem a flat character in comparison to James, who travels the world and sweeps the reader off his feet whenever he appears on the scene. But a further examination of the novel reveals that James is the same man at the end that he was at the beginning, while Henry undergoes radical personality changes to the point where Edwin Eigner can say of him that "he is the most complex figure to appear in Stevenson's fiction."[6]

The first mention made of Henry Durie shows that even his strongest champion, Ephraim Mackellar, thinks of him as very much "the second son." Mackellar says that Henry "was

neither very bad nor yet very able, but an honest, solid sort of lad like many of his neighbours." This dismissal of Henry as boringly good follows a much longer and more vivid description of James, Henry's older brother. The neighbours, indeed, the family itself, are very much aware of James' presence, while they tend to forget that Henry exists as anything other than the miserly son who handles the estate finances. The reader, too, holds this impression of Henry well into the novel.

The initial conflict in the book concerns the question of which son will "go out" with Prince Charlie and which will remain at home, pretending loyalty to the king. Lord Durrisdeer, Alison, and Henry all agree that James should be the one to stay behind, so that if the rebellion fails, the family's position will not suffer too greatly from the king's wrath. One senses that Henry is not much interested in the adventure of "riding out" with Prince Charlie, but that he is resigned to do so for the safety of the family's honour, always his first concern. James, on the other hand, is fascinated by the prospect of personal glory should the adventure succeed. He accuses Henry of wishing to ruin his prospects: "'And there spoke Envy! Would you trip up my heels--Jacob?' said he, and dwelled upon the name maliciously." (p. 30) Several more times in the course of the novel Henry is referred to as Jacob the Usurper; in the opening pages he is innocent of the charge, but as will be seen,

Henry eventually begins to see himself in that light and to act the part accordingly.

The reader senses that it is James and not Henry who brings about the change in Henry's nature. As a result of James' constant jibes and the other characters' seeming agreement with these accusations, Henry finally begins to act the part of the usurping younger brother. The first time that James is presumed dead, the old lord determines that Alison should marry Henry, though there is no love on either side. Henry, Alison and the old lord all realize that Alison's money is needed desperately by the Durrisdeers, and it is pride of the family name, not love, which eventually compels Alison to marry. Everyone involved, including Henry, feels that Alison should have been James' wife, so that when James returns, all of them are conscious of the wrong that has been done.

Since James was presumed dead, Henry naturally took over the position of head of household, but again, the situation ought to have been reversed when James appeared, according to the laws of primogeniture. Since James presumably had a price upon his head (later proven false), however, he does not resume his former position. He seems to prefer making Henry squirm in his uncomfortable position as false Master of Ballantrae.

James had long pillaged the family coffers in his youth,

leaving Henry, as bookkeeper, to repair the damages as well as he was able, thereby making him unpopular because of his deeming niggardliness. When James is found to be alive and demands more money, Henry determines to honour the request, at whatever cost to his reputation. When Mackellar objects, wishing to deny James any further cash, Henry says, "nothing is mine, nothing. This day's news has knocked the bottom out of my life. I have only the name and shadow of things--only the shadow; there is no substance to my rights." (p.113) James knows just the right chord to strike to awaken guilty feelings in his brother; again the name Jacob arises. The narration by Mackellar reads as follows:

> "'My dear Jacob'--this is how he begins!" cried Henry--"'My dear Jacob, I once called you so, you may remember, and now you have done the business, and flung my heels as high as Cuffel.' What do you think of that, Mackellar," says he, "from an only brother? I declare to God I liked him very well; I was always staunch to him; and this is how he writes! But I will not sit down under the imputation"--walking to and fro--"I am as good as he; I am a better man than he, I call on God to prove it. I cannot give him all the monstrous sum he asks; he knows the estate to be incompetent; but I will give him what I have, and it is more than he expects. I have borne all this too long. See what he writes further on; read it for yourself: 'I know you are a niggardly dog.' A niggardly dog! I niggardly? Is that true, Mackellar? You think it is? . . . Oh, you all think so! Well you shall see, and he shall see, and God shall see. If I ruin the estate and go barefoot, I shall stuff this bloodsucker. Let him ask all--all, and he shall have it! It is all his by rights. Ah!" he cried, "and I foresaw all this and worse, when he would not let me go [with the prince]. (pp. 113-14)

I have quoted this passage at length to show Henry's machinations and the effect which James' words have on Henry's already guilty conscience. Henry's first tone is one of bitterness; he cannot understand how one brother could treat another as cruelly as James does. Henry next jumps to his own defence, declaring that he is as good a man as James, if not better. As if to prove himself superior and more generous than James, Henry determines to keep his brother in money, even if it means ruining the estate and further lowering himself in the eyes of others. This episode is the first in which Henry's insanity is apparent. Henry recognizes that it is futile to hope ever to raise his esteem in the eyes of others, but he seems determined to elevate his own self-esteem at whatever cost to his reputation. He cares little if he becomes a more strict budget-master, since everyone already thinks him "niggardly."

Years pass and still James continues to plunder the family's money, with Henry's help and Mackellar's disapproval. Henry "gave what was asked of him in a kind of noble rage. Perhaps because he knew he was by nature inclining to the parsimonious, he took a backforemost pleasure in the recklessness with which he supplied his brother's exigence." (p.118) Henry's "recklessness" in providing the money can be compared to James' recklessness in spending it; although Henry thinks he is proving himself a better man, he is actually only emulating his brother's behaviour.

James' return to Durrisdeer starts a more serious business than the mere wasting of money. Sensing that Henry's refusal to send more money to Paris is an attempt to free himself from bondage, James returns to the family to begin a more personal attack on Henry. James is a master of two-facedness; he manages to vent all of his scorn for Henry when the two are alone, and then he acts the part of the loving older brother when others are present. Henry, who at this point has none of James' (or Dr. Jekyll's) ability to appear to be what he is not, is chastised by the old Lord and Alison when he rejects James' supposedly friendly advances. Henry's pride is too great to allow him to tell the others of James' double-dealings, and besides, he suspects that the others would not believe him. Henry is trapped in a situation which no "normal" man could endure without changing radically. Richard Kiely says that James' presence

> awakens in Henry anxieties about himself which suggests, if only faintly at first, that Ballantrae may be an inverse reflection of his own worst faults, repressed, feared, even hated, but inextricably tied to him by birth and an instinctive attraction. . . . Consciously, Henry disapproves of Ballantrae's politics, sexual and financial extravagance, disregard for family, and general irresponsibility. But he envies him all of it. Psychologically as well as literally, he is Jacob the usurper. His older brother is the living symbol of his own untried adventures and uncommitted sins--as much a rebuke as a temptation. Ballantrae is a reminder of a private part of the self Henry's public character cannot tolerate.[8]

Henry Durie is initially an adult version of Jim Hawkins from Treasure Island; they are both as "good" as Stevenson ever made his characters. In the course of the novel, however, as Henry's reputation repeatedly suffers by comparison to the world's false image of James, the younger brother begins to defend himself in the only way possible; by fighting evil with evil. Henry is told so many times that he is miserly and envious and unloving that he begins to believe he is, and to act accordingly. He begins to resemble Henry Jekyll, the protagonist, in that each is governed by unwanted passions, and each, consequently, possesses a great self-hatred.

Like Dr. Jekyll, Henry needs an out for the "evil" side of his nature. Jekyll was able to create another person, Mr. Hyde, to act out his undesirable characteristics, but Henry has no such opportunity, so consequently he becomes his own Mr. Hyde. The fact that Stevenson uses no magic powders in The Master of Ballantrae shows that he is attempting a more realistic portrayal of the battle within the self than his use of allegory in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. There are elements of the "fantastic" in The Master of Ballantrae--the famous trick ending, for example--but overall it is a much more believable tale than the earlier two novels are.

James' baiting of Henry culminates in the "Account of all that passed on the Night of February 27, 1757." James finally

provokes his brother to the point where Henry strikes him on the mouth. For the first time Henry appears to be as strong as his brother. He says that dealing the blow "was the most deliberate act of my life." (p.164) They hold a duel by candlelight in the frost-ridden shrubbery, which Henry wins in spite of foul play by James. In this scene Henry shows the same deadly earnest with which Jim Hawkins faced the pirates in the stockade; at these two points the protagonists are truly the "heroes" of adventurous romance.

Henry, thinking that he has killed James, becomes deathly ill for a time. When he recovers, his mind is altered, and he is obviously insane. Mackellar says,

> His whole mind stood open to happy impressions, welcoming these and making much of them; but the smallest suggestion of trouble or sorrow he received with visible impatience and dismissed again with immediate relief. It was to this temper that he owed the felicity of his later days; and yet here it was, if anywhere, that you could call the man insane. A great part of this life consists in contemplating what we cannot cure, but Mr. Henry, if he could not dismiss solicitude by an effort of the mind, must instantly and at whatever cost annihilate the cause of it; so that he played alternately the ostrich and the bull. It is to this strenuous cowardice of pain that I have to set down all the unfortunate and excessive steps of his subsequent career. (pp.201-02)

It is as though the strain of acting "heroically" on that one occasion is too much for Henry, so that his defences are weakened, and his "evil" side slips out. This episode might

be compared to Dr. Jekyll's first transformation into Mr. Hyde, after which point Hyde, Dr. Jekyll's "evil" side, can never totally be supressed. Henry has flashes of rational behaviour, but for the most part he shows either childish pettiness or the same sort of demonic cruelty which his brother exhibits. Edwin Eigner sums up the situation as follows:

> Henry can be a pure cipherer while his fevered delirium lasts; when at length the sickness passes, he stands forth predominantly the smuggler in the same way that Jekyll, after the experiment, stands forth as Hyde. His hatred for James continues, but paradoxically, he begins now to resemble his brother. We remind ourselves at this point that Henry has been stepping into James' shoes from the start of the romance. Previously he had taken his brother's bride and his estate. After the duel he was gratified to hear his father call him "my son" for the first time. But now he begins to assume James' character. He becomes more lively, he refuses to dwell on painful matters, and he turns slack in business affairs. Although he still believes that he has murdered his brother, he feels no guilt. The civilized paralysis has entirely passed, and Henry develops now into the kind of master who beats his servants. We have already seen Henry move to one extreme of his character; what we now witness is his progress to the other pole.[9]

Henry's guilty conscience at first led him to the extreme of ruining the family estate for James' benefit. When the duel and his delirium are over, however, Henry's conduct swings to the other extreme. At the outset of the tale, Henry tried to be as nearly the opposite of James as possible; his eventual counter-reaction is to become exactly the same type

of person as James. By the end of the book, the only remnant of a "conscience" that Henry has left is Mackellar, who occasionally is able to provoke Henry into behaving decently toward his family. For the most part, Henry is now as callous toward his family and friends as he had once accused his brother of being.

When James once again returns to Durrisdeer, Henry is determined to stand his ground, lest he be thought fearful of his brother. Mackellar, Henry's "good" side, convinces him to flee to New York only after much arguing, but he cannot force Henry away from his desire for revenge. When James and Mackellar arrive in New York later, Henry says, "There is a long score to pay, and now--at last--I can begin to pay it." (p.286) With a fiendish delight reminiscent of James' conduct, Henry arranges to humiliate his brother, much as he himself had long been humiliated.

Mackellar notices that Henry is extremely healthy and jovial and conceives a suspicion that his master must have a mistress in town. Following him one day, Mackellar is shocked to observe Henry gazing upon James in his degrading occupation as tailor:

> Here was his mistress: it was hatred and not love that gave him his healthful colours. Some moralists might have been relieved by the discovery; I confess that I was dismayed. I found this situation of two brethren not only odious in itself, but big with possibilities of further evil. (pp.294-95)

Henry thinks that he is finally breaking James' spirit, and for once, it seems as though he has the upper hand. James humbles himself to the point where he can say to his brother,

> I have for once made a false step, and for once you have had the wit to profit by it. The farce of the cobbler ends to-day; and I confess to you (with my compliments) that you had the best of it. Blood will out; and you have certainly a choice idea of how to make yourself unpleasant. (p.297)

This is all a ruse, though. James merely wants to extract more money from Henry; so he plays up to the latter's vanity. Henry, however, takes the words at face value, and judges himself an equal opponent at last. The stage is set for the final adventure in the wilderness. Henry arranges that members of the treasure-hunting party will murder James after he has led them to the bounty. This final episode of The Master of Ballantrae is patterned after the plot of Treasure Island, in which Jim and the rest of the squire's party are to be killed after uncovering Flint's treasure. The evil machinations of the pirates in the earlier novel do not seem nearly so sinister as the plot against James' life, perhaps because in The Master of Ballantrae the protagonist, not the antagonist, is intent upon murdering his rival. Even when James is at his most sinister, earlier in the novel, the reader never thinks that he would try to kill Henry without at least the appearance of a fair fight. Henry, however, seems perfectly willing to entrust his

brother to a band of cutthroats. The transition of the protagonist is complete; Henry has gone from being an innocent victim of James' malicious humour to a heartless monster, from a Jim Hawkins to an Edward Hyde.

Following the pattern of other "Double" stories, The Master of Ballantrae has a protagonist whose motives are determined both by his inner conscious and unconscious selves, and by an "outer self," as represented by the antagonist. Edwin Eigner observes that

> In Jekyll and Hyde, remember, Hyde grew to hate Jekyll because he resented the latter's disapproval of him, and this disapproval pushed Hyde farther towards the extreme of pure evil and wildness. In The Master of Ballantrae the exact oposite occurs, for here it is the conscientious man who reacts to the smuggler's contempt and who is consequently pushed towards the other end of his character, to the extreme of meanness. What we have, in effect, is the lawless man acting as a kind of jeering, insulting conscience; a Freudian turnabout perhaps, but a very effective dramatization of Stevenson's continual discomfort at the passive solutions of his overcivilized heroes.[10]

Part of the "continual discomfort" which Stevenson felt concerned the issue of reward and punishment. Stevenson was loath to chastize Long John Silver, so he allowed the pirate to escape with a share of the booty. In the next book, the problem of who should receive the greater punishment, the protagonist or the antagonist, was solved by the fact that when one dies, so must the other, according to the laws of the transformation. In The Master of Ballantrae, however, Henry

and James do not inhabit the same body, as did Jekyll and Hyde, so they need not necessarily receive simultaneous or equal punishments. The "trick ending"--James' eyelids fluttering, thereby triggering Henry's heart attack--has been criticized since the novel appeared. Stevenson, like other authors of his age, could never have allowed either of the two brothers to escape punishment; his problem was, I suppose, how to destroy both characters without seeming to favour one or the other. Stevenson chose to follow his sense of justice rather than his sense of artistic continuity, though it is known from various letters that he, too, was dissatisfied with the ending.

Though The Master of Ballantrae has many realistic elements which link it to Stevenson's last works, the fact that he opted for the "simultaneous death" ending (which had worked so well in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde) with all of its "romantic" implications shows that this is indeed a transition novel; that is, The Master of Ballantrae spans the gap between the pure romance of Jim Hawkins and Dr. Jekyll and the psychological realism of the battle between the two Weirs. In the next chapter I will discuss Weir of Hermiston, which has another of the "overcivilized heroes" of which Eigner speaks. Archie's "solution" to his problems, as Stevenson had planned it before he died, is quite different from the solutions chosen by Dr. Jekyll and Henry Durie.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

[1]David Daiches, Robert Louis Stevenson, (Norfork, Conn.: New Directions Books,1947), 81.

[2]Edwin Eigner, Robert Louis Stevenson and the Romantic Tradition (Princeton: Princeton University Press,1966), 138.

[3]Robert Rogers, A Psychoanalytic Study of the Double in Literature (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1970), 109.

[4]C.F. Keppler, The Literature of the Second Self (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1972), 189-90.

[5]Quoted in: Elsie Noble Caldwell, Last Witness for Robert Louis Stevenson (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960), 118.

[6]Eigner, 178.

[7]Robert Louis Stevenson, The Master of Ballantrae, XIV, 28.

[8]Robert Kiely, Robert Louis Stevenson and the Fiction of Adventure (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), 220.

[9]Eigner, 185.

[10]Ibid., 183.

CHAPTER IV: ARCHIE WEIR AS "ROMANTIC HERO"

It is unfortunate that Robert Louis Stevenson died in the midst of writing Weir of Hermiston, for, completed, the novel would have firmly established his place among the great writers of the Victorian age. As it stands, the fragment of Weir of Hermiston is the best piece of writing Stevenson ever did; he reaches a balance between plot development and character development quite different from that which he favoured in his early critical essays:

> Weir of Hermiston, in its acknowledgment of the human tragedy represents the final shattering by Stevenson of his own rigid romantic convention which had been designed to keep the "dazzle and confusion of reality" out of his fiction. His early attempts to subordinate character to incident simply do not extend to The Master of Ballantrae or Weir of Hermiston. But personality is not the only element Stevenson has allowed to enter with vigor into his art. Accompanying it with full force is a good deal of the monstrousness, illogic, and poignancy of life; we find morality, for a change instead of moralizing; and into a mold still somewhat cumbersome and brittle with boyish inexperience pours a torrent of adult passion.[1]

Archie Weir is the protagonist of Weir of Hermiston, and he has two antagonists, his father, Adam Weir, and Frank Innes. As in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and The Master of Ballantrae, the antagonists are "Doubles" of the protagonists. Much information

concerning the development of the protagonist, Archie, can be gleaned from an examination of the two antagonists, since each represents important (if supressed) parts of Archie's personality. In fact, often when Stevenson speaks of Archie he does so with respect to Adam or Frank, so that the reader, too, begins to think of the protagonist in terms of his antagonists. This practice is hardly new to Stevenson, though. In each of the other novels I have discussed, the protagonist is considered in light of the importance of the antagonist in his development.

Frank Innes is the same type of antagonist as Adam Weir, in that, when Archie compares himself to each of his antagonists, he feels that he resembles neither in the least, whereas in reality, each is the embodiment of aspects of Archie's personality from which he would like to divorce himself. Frank provokes Archie "with an unwanted mirror of himself, or at least that aspect of himself from which he had tried to escape when he left Edinburgh: the glib, supple-witted, self-pampered law student with nothing but contempt for those with rougher and perhaps larger minds than his own."[2]

Frank and Archie are "two handsome lads [who] followed the same course of study and recreation, and felt a certain mutual attraction, founded mainly on good looks."[3] Essentially a shallow man, Frank surprises the reader on two occasions with his ability to interpret correctly the dangerous situations in which

Archie places himself. It is Frank who drags Archie from the scene of the execution of Duncan Jopp and who warns Archie of the consequances of his involvement with Christina. Frank is not, however, totally the "good Samaritan" he thinks himself to be. After spiriting Archie away from the hanging, Frank "hastened smilingly to spread the news of Weir's access to insanity, and to drum up for that night a full attendance at the Speculative, where further eccentric developments might certainly be looked for." (p.252) When Innes sees Christina for the first time and realizes the extent of Archie's involvement with her, he becomes, "with the first look," a rival for her attentions. Frank also sets about to ruin Archie's reputation around Hermiston--inadvertently, at first--by dropping hints of Archie's misdeeds in town. Frank only acts against Archie to make himself more important in the eyes of others, and does not act with any particular malice towards Archie specifically:

> It was his practice to approach any one person at the expense of someone else; he flattered you by slighting him; you were drawn into a small intrigue against him before you knew how. Wonderful are the virtues of this process generally; but Frank's mistake was in the choice of the someone else. (p.355-56)

Archie, thanks to his father's reputation, is too popular a figure for Frank's methods to work among the people of Hermiston. Frank's distress at being "a young Apollo cast among such rustic barbarians," and his ill success at gaining a foothold

in their society, combined with Archie's cool manner with him frustrates Frank to the point that, when he discovers Archie's secret, Frank has no hesitation in making Archie squirm:

> There was nothing vindictive in his nature; but, if revenge came in his way, it might as well be good,--and the thought of Archie's pillow reflections that night was indescribably sweet to him. He felt a pleasant sense of power. . . . Poor cork upon a torrent, he tasted that night the sweets of omnipotence, and brooded like a deity over the strands of that strange intrigue which was to shatter him before the summer waned. (p.372)

In Weir of Hermiston, as it stands, Frank Innes as antagonist is little more than an annoying pest to Archie. From the proposed plans for the book, however, it would seem that Frank was to play a very important part in the plot. After causing the rift between the two lovers, he was to seduce Christina and thereby provoke Archie into murdering him. The plans for the book call for Archie to be tried before his father, "hanging Hermiston," to be found guilty and condemned to death (and later to be rescued by the four black brothers). Thus by way of his confrontation with Frank Innes, Archie will be lead to the final conflict with his more important antagonist, his father.

Richard Kiely points out that "Archie's crime against his father is, after all, in the same catagory as Innes' crime against Archie: defamation of character." Kiely goes on to say that,

> The very purity and simplicity of Innes' crime against Archie provides the young Weir with a

> naked image of his own soul and the sin of envy committed against his father. Once again, as in The Master of Ballantrae, Stevenson has confronted a character with a double in whose countenance he sees not a grotesque mask induced by chemical powders, but an undisguised glimpse of the darkness that lies within. (pp.255-56).

Stevenson gives Archie not one, but two Doubles. Frank is a mild equivalent for Archie of the inner self Dr. Jekyll possessed before he created Mr. Hyde; presumably, Archie had, while still in Edinburgh, at least a part of the flippancy and shallowness represented by Innes. After Archie denounces his father's authority and goes to Hermiston, he seems to have divorced himself from that part of his self personified by Frank; but Frank, when he arrives at Hermiston, serves as a constant reminder to Archie of the lifestyle he has fled.

Archie's other Double is his father, Adam Weir. Stevenson says constantly that Archie hates and fears his father, but reveals that there is also a great love between the two men, of which they are hardly aware. Archie had been taught from birth that he was his mother's son, that his nature was as gentle and sensitive as Adam's was harsh and unsympathetic. The boy early noticed the conflicts between his parents and sided with his mother, who was his constant companion and teacher:

> The character and position of his father had long been a stumbling block to Archie, and with every year of his age the difficulty grew more instant. . . . Tenderness was the first duty, and my lord was invariably harsh.

> God was love; the name of my lord (to all who knew him) was fear. . . . Archie tallied every mark of identification, and drew the inevitable private inference that the Lord Justice-Clerk was the chief of sinners. (p.229)

Archie's mother, Jean Weir, could hardly reconcile her husband's coarse behaviour with her own meek and loving nature, so there is little wonder that she failed to impress on Archie his father's inherent good. A child judges people by their actions, since he frequently cannot understand their thoughts. That Archie should find his father "the chief of sinners" is not supprising, since the Justice-Clerk's actions were unusually harsh in comparison to his mother's, and his thoughts even more incomprehensible than those of most men:

> My Lord Justice-Clerk was known to many; the man Adam Weir perhaps to none. He had nothing to explain or to conceal; he sufficed wholly and silently to himself; and that part of our nature which goes out (too often with false coin) to acquire glory or love, seemed in him to be omitted. He did not try to be loved. He did not care to be; it is probable the very thought of it was a stranger to his mind. (p.237)

Richard Kiely sums up the character of Adam Weir as follows:

> [He] is the most impressive character in the novel and one of the great characters in Stevenson's canon. He is called Rhadamanthus because of his inflexibility as a judge, "an aboriginal antique," an "adamantine Adam," and a "usurping devil . . . horned and hoofed." We are told in the first sentence of the book that "The Lord Justice-Clerk was a stranger in that part of the country," and reminded ever after that he seems to derive his preternatural vigor from some other time or place. Even when Archie seems most to hate

> his father, he grants that "he struck me as something very big," and wonders whether his filial defiance is against "God or Satan." (p.237)

Adam seems to have the same effect on all who meet him; "Hermiston's hanging face" is just as terrifying to his neighbours and peers as it is to Archie. As an antagonist, Adam Weir resembles James Durie, in that they both seem "larger than life" in comparison to those around them. The language used to describe Adam and James makes them seem to be "Byronic heroes"; each is called Satan or the Devil, each appears to be evil at times (though Adam shows much more "good" in his nature than does James), and each seems to be out of place in the world occupied by the other characters:

> Hermiston's tragedy is unfulfillment--emotional, moral, and physical. Lacking an enemy of equal dimension, lacking a lusty mistress and a manly successor, he is condemned to waste his rage on petty criminals and to conceal his passion from a wife and son who misunderstand and fear him.[4]

A conflict in the boy's mind arises, because he forgets that he is his father's son as well as his mother's, and also that his mother is descended from the "riding Rutherfords." Archie

> had inherited from Jean Rutherford a shivering delicacy, unequally mated with potential violence. In the playing fields, and amongst his own companions, he repaid a coarse expression with a blow; at his father's table (when the time came for him to join these revels) he turned pale and sickened in silence. (p.240)

Just as James Durie is the personification of several aspects of Henry's personality, so Adam Weir is the distillation of the "Hermiston" side of Archie. Archie is not often aware of just how closely he resembles his father, but others are quick to notice the kinship. When Archie acted as president of the Speculative (a college debating society) on the evening of the execution,

> he sat with a great air of energy and determination. At times he meddled bitterly and launched with defiance those fines which are the precious and rarely used artillery of the president. He little thought, as he did so, how he resembled his father, but his friends remarked upon it, chuckling. (p.253)

Later in the book, when Frank is trying to accompany Archie on one of his trysts with Christina, Archie becomes "completely Weir, and the hanging face gloomed on his young shoulders." (p.363) Archie tries to ease out of the situation gracefully, but Frank persists: "He hated to be inhospitable, but in one thing he was his father's son. He had a strong sense that his house was his own and no man else's; and to lie at a guest's mercy was what he refused." (p.364) The very spirit in which Archie expresses his defiance of his father shows their similarity:

> He stood a moment silent, and then--"I denounce this God-defying murder," he shouted; and his father, if he must have disclaimed the sentiment, might have owned the stentorian voice with which it was uttered. (p.250-51)

The tragedy which would have ensued (the father having to judge his own son) had Stevenson finished the book is caused by the two Weirs' inability to communicate with one another. Adam does attempt to befriend his son, but such attempts always end in failure:

> As time went on, the tough and rough old sinner felt himself drawn to the son of his loins and sole continuator of his new family, with softness of sentiment that he could hardly credit and was wholly impotent to express. With a face, voice, and manner trained through forty years to terrify and repel, Rhadamanthus may be great, but he will scarce be engaging. It is a fact that he tried to propitiate Archie, but a fact that cannot be too lightly taken; the attempt was so unconspicuously made, the failure so stoically supported. Sympathy is not due to these steadfast iron natures. If he failed to gain his son's friendship, or even his son's toleration, on he went up the great, bare staircase of his duty, uncheered and underdepressed. There might have been more pleasure in his relations with Archie, so much he may have recognised at moments; but pleasure was a by-product of the singular chemistry of life, which only fools expected. (pp.243-44)

The fault of their inability to communicate is not totally Adam's; just as he tries to "propitiate" Archie and fails, so Archie abandons all attempts to befriend his father. Stevenson says that Archie

> made no attempt whatsoever to understand the man with whom he dined and breakfasted. . . . If he made a mistake, and my lord began to abound in matter of offence, Archie drew himself up, his brow grew dark, his share of the talk expired. (pp.244-45)

Archie, instead of persevering with the task of gaining

his father's friendship, prefers to transfer his filial love and admiration to Lord Glendalmond, in whom Archie sees many of the personality traits he had been taught to appreciate by his mother:

> The beautiful gentleness of the old Judge, and the delicacy of his person, thoughts, and language, spoke to Archie's heart in its own tongue. He conceived the ambition to be such another; and, when the day came for him to choose a profession, it was in emulation of Lord Glendalmond, not of Lord Hermiston, that he chose the bar. Hermiston looked on this friendship with some secret pride, but openly with the intolerance of scorn. (p.241)

That Adam sees and understands Archie's preference of Lord Glendalmond over himself explains his "intolerance of scorn," but in keeping with his own character, Lord Hermiston refuses to change his nature to suit Archie's. Adam is aware of the fact that he is different from his son, his wife, and his friend Lord Glendalmond, but his contempt for their "Signor Feedle-eerie" aesthetics prevents Adam from ever taking the others seriously.

Lord Hermiston is referred to as "a stranger in that part of the country," a man whose origins are unknown and surrounded by mystery. He may well be the last of his wild race, just as Jean Rutherford is the last of hers. Their son Archie carries the seeds of both of these races, but lives without realizing the importance of the influence of his ancestors on

his life, hence Archie's frequent confusion over his impulsive--perhaps instinctual--actions. For example, young Weir's "rational," decorous side cannot understand why his impulsive side blurts out the public condemnation of his father. Edwin Eigner explains the situation as follows:

> The facts are that Archie cannot understand himself and therefore cannot predict his own behavior. He thinks of himself as entirely his mother's son. He sees no evidence even of her wild Rutherford ancestry in his character. When Jean Weir dies, Archie takes the studious and gentle Lord Glendalmond as a spiritual parent and uses him, as previously he had used his mother, as an auditor for his speeches of revulsion at his father's character.[5]

One of the ways in which Archie differs from other Stevenson protagonists is that, for the first (and last) time in his novels, Stevenson writes a realistic portrayal of a man falling in love. As I have noted earlier, there are relatively few women in Stevenson's works, and fewer still that are "well-rounded" characters. Weir of Hermiston has three female characters of importance: Jean Weir (the mother), Kirstie (the housekeeper), and Christina, Kirstie's niece.

The three women all love Archie inordinately, and thereby influence his development. Jean is almost obsessive in her desire to raise a son as unlike her husband as possible. Kirstie is in love with a boy many years her junior, and in her jealous rage at losing their nighttime chats together, she does her

best to dissuade Archie from loving her niece. Christina, who loves and is loved by Archie but who realizes that decorum will probably prevent their marriage, is the cause of Archie's murder of Frank Innes. It is not unusual in Stevenson's novels for a protagonist to be affected by the emotions and actions of other men, but the case of Archie Weir is the first in which Stevenson shows that women can be as important as men as influences on the development of a protagonist.

As with the stories of Stevenson's other protagonists, there are several facets of Archie Weir's character and actions which may be autobiographical. One of the central themes of Weir of Hermiston is the eternal conflict between father and son, a conflict Stevenson knew only too well. Like Archie, Stevenson, in early manhood, renounced his father and the values of his father's society, and, as did Archie and Adam Weir, the two Stevensons had many bitter quarrels over their opposing views. Like Archie, though, Stevenson most resembled his father when defying him. In a very autobiographical passage, Stevenson says,

> It is a fact, and a strange one, that among his contemporaries Hermiston's son was thought to be a chip of the old block. "You're a friend of Archie Weir's?" said one to Frank Innes; and Innes replied, with his usual flippancy and more than his usual insight: "I know Weir, but I never met Archie." No one had met Archie, a malady most incident in only sons. (p.243)

Further examples of the author's close ties with his protagonist are the facts that Stevenson, too, once raised the question of "whether capital punishment be consistent with God's will or man's policy," and that he shared his mother's pyhsical delicacy (his father was as robust as Adam Weir) and tended to think himself more her son than his.

The comparisons between Archie and Stevenson would have to come to an end, however, if the book had been completed; whereas Robert Louis Stevenson and his father eventually patched up their differences and managed to live together in relative harmony, Archie and Adam were to continue their breach to the point where Adam Weir was to convict his son for the murder of Frank Innes. This ending could of course be a symbolic representation of a breach that Stevenson secretly felt could never be mended.

It is regretable that Weir of Hermiston ends as abruptly as it does, because the potential of Archie as a "romantic hero" is never fully realized. From the plans that Stevenson left for his unfinished novel, it would seem that the saga of Archie Weir was to be a continuation of and artistic improvement on the types of stories represented by the other three novels I have used. The element of "adventurous romance" which permeates Stevenson's fiction is still present in his last

work, but Stevenson's world view has greatly altered since the relatively innocent dream world he constructed in Treasure Island. The problem of the duality of man's nature, which is central to Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and The Master of Ballantrae, is also dealt with in Stevenson's last novel. Whereas in the earlier books, however, Stevenson seems to accept the existence of this duality unquestioningly, in Weir of Hermiston he seems to be asking why it should, after all, exist. Edwin Eigner points out that it is perhaps for the best that Stevenson never finished Weir of Hermiston, "for Stevenson had no solution to the problem of duality which he could bring himself to impose on his fiction."[6]

To those critics, such as David Daiches, who feel that Stevenson "botched" the ending of The Master of Ballantrae because "something made him shy away from the concession to the tragic implications of his own imagination,"[7] the fact that Weir of Hermiston is incomplete is a blessing; they feel certain that Stevenson would have lost interest in the book, since he did lose interest in his books occasionally, and he might not have taken the book to the necessary tragic conclusion. Such critics feel that for the book to be truly tragic, Archie would have to die as a result of his father's judgment. Stevenson is not the type of author, however, who feels that in order to educate the reader it is necessary to kill off the hero and

heroine.

Hopefully, if the book had been completed, Stevenson would have shown Archie realizing the folly of his position in respect to his father, leaving him a scarred, yet wiser man. If Adam Weir is to die of the shock brought on by sentencing his son (as Sidney Colvin suggests), much as Dr. Lanyon dies of shock upon learning Dr. Jekyll's secret, that should not exclude the possibility of Archie, "the sole continuator of his new family," beginning a new life with Christina. The fragment of Weir of Hermiston ends with a positive note of new awareness on Archie's part, which suggests that Stevenson planned that his young protagonist should become perhaps the first of his characters able to cope with the world around him. Stevenson says,

> There arose from before him the curtains of boyhood, and he saw for the first time the ambiguous face of woman as she is. In vain he looked back over the interview; he saw not where he had offended. It seemed unprovoked, a wilful convulsion of brute nature. . . .

The fact that "the curtains of boyhood" arose and gave Archie a new, if confusing, perspective on his life suggests to me that Archie will eventually come to terms with his heritage and form a "new" life for himself and Christina, while Adam, Frank, and Kirstie, those inflexible representatives of the "old" order, will be destined to die unaware, as Jean

Rutherford died unaware, of the folly of their inability to view their lives from a new, if uncetain, point of view.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

[1]Robert Kiely, Robert Louis Stevenson and The Fiction of Adventure (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), 250.

[2]Ibid., 255.

[3]Robert Louis Stevenson, Weir of Hermiston, XVIII, 251.

[4]Kiely, 244.

[5]Edwin Eigner, Robert Louis Stevenson and the Romantic Tradition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), 225.

[6]Ibid., 227.

[7]David Daiches, Robert Louis Stevenson (Norfork, Conn.: New Directions Books, 1947) 76.

CONCLUSION

This study has examined the protagonists in four of Robert Louis Stevenson's novels, and has tried to determine not only how they differ from one another, but also to establish common traits among them and to show how each protagonist is a composite of the earlier ones. The most obvious trait that Stevenson's protagonists have in common is that each of them is weak in some manner. The protagonist closest to being an exception to this rule is Jim Hawkins, whose only real weakness lies in the fact that he is a boy. He may well be strong and resourceful for a child, but he is still a boy, and is therefore, physically at least, a "weaker" character than the typical adventurous hero--a Robin Hood or an Ivanhoe, for example. Dr. Jekyll's weakness is a moral weakness; he lacks sufficient moral strength to combat his baser instincts, and so falls victim to them. Henry Durie, like Jim Hawkins, is physically weaker than his adversary, and like Dr. Jekyll, he also lacks strong moral fortitude; his conscience cannot survive the battles with James without altering for the worse. Archie Weir, about whom the reader knows comparatively little (since in the fragment of Weir of Hermiston, Stevenson had not yet developed Archie's character very fully), is a bewildered young man who fails his first test to show strength of character, when he makes an

emotional attack on his father's integrity but cannot back up his attack using his intellect. From what is known of Stevenson's plans of Archie, however, it would seem that young Weir was to redeem himself later in the book, thereby making him the first (and last) of Stevenson's protagonists to emerge from a major moral dilemma an "unbroken man."

Stevenson began his writing career in fiction believing that the romance was a more noble and "artistic" mode than the realistic novel. He also believed that the two modes, the realistic and the romantic, were incongruous. Hence his earlier novels like Treasure Island and Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde have the aura of fable or fantasy, and cannot be thought very "realistic." A gradual change in Stevenson's way of thinking occurs throughout his writing career, however, to the point where, in Weir of Hermiston, he has all but done away with the tricks and magic of his earlier works. Richard Kiely says that

> the adventure which Stevenson launches again and again in his fiction has changed considerably since Treasure Island. He began, like some of his most memorable characters, hoping to plunge deeply enough into a literary dream to leave the world behind. When he discovered that the images in his dreams were only inverted, distorted, or oddly colored fragments of nature, he tended for a while . . . to think of them as shams, and of himself as a trickster. The Master of Ballantrae and Weir of Hermiston begin to show the impressive consequences of the transition in Stevenson's fiction from sleight-of-hand to artistry, from

> adventure as an entertaining counterfeit to adventure as a symbolic chart of the formidable risks in which life involves all men.[1]

Each of Stevenson's earlier protagonists lives in a "romantic" world; Jim Hawkins is surrounded by pirates and buried treasure, Dr. Jekyll has his magic powders and monstrous alter-ego, and Henry Durie has a demonic brother who refuses to die. Archie Weir lives in a much more mundane and modern world than the other three protagonists, but the Stevensonian aura of romance is still present in Archie's myth-like parental heritage. His father, Adam, resembles the biblical Adam, in that he appears out of nowhere and has no past history. His mother is the last remnant of "the old riding Rutherfords of Hermiston," whose past glories are still very much alive to the local folk. The trend in these four novels is toward a progressively more realistic world in which the protagonist can come to terms with his own complex nature.

Unlike Dr. Jekyll and Henry Durie, Archie Weir's dilemma is not to dissociate himself from his own nature and family ties, but to recognize his connection to his ancestral heritage and to restructure his life accordingly. This sense of reuniting oneself with one's past behaviour and self, as opposed to divorcing oneself from them, represents a turnabout in Stevenson's way of thinking. The reversal is representative of a

change in Stevenson's attitude towards his own life. In his youth, Robert Louis Stevenson rejected thoroughly the values of his parents and their society, or so he thought. Years later it became as obvious to Stevenson as it is to the reader of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde that the rigid morality on which he had been weaned was inescapable.

Stevenson cannot divorce himself from his past, just as Dr. Jekyll cannot escape from his own worst thoughts and past deeds; it is futile, therefore, for the author to expect or hope for his protagonists to ignore their personal or ancestral pasts when he himself cannot. Just as Mr. Hyde is an essential part of Dr. Jekyll, so the riding Rutherfords are an essential part of the "whole" Archie Weir. Archie's frustrations spring from his desire to disown his ancestral past and live the life that his mother had so foolishly taught him to desire. The "shivering delicacy" and wish to be unlike his father to which she molded Archie would seem to destine young Weir to be as unsatisfied (and unsatisfying) a character as Dr. Jekyll or Henry Durie. Stevenson offers hope, however. His plot outline calls for Archie to rise against Frank Innes in a Rutherford-like rage, and to avenge the rape of Christina, thereby acknowledging his ancestral influences. Then, after a suitable stay in prison for murder, he was to be saved from the gallows by the "four black Brothers" and packed off to America with Christina.

Stevenson's earlier protagonists show no such ability to assimilate their past mistakes and live with the consequences. Jim Hawkins does not really have any "mistakes" to reconcile himself to; he behaves as a boy should under the circumstances. Dr. Jekyll at first seems to accept responsibility for his base actions, but, by the end of the book, he has denied that he and Mr. Hyde are the same person, in an attempt (however futile) to exonerate himself. Henry Durie well understands the gravity of his brother's sins, but loses his sanity before he is able to recognize similar evil in his own nature. Archie Weir is the only one of these four protagonists who (one hopes) will be able to acknowledge the mistakes of his past life and somehow build a future for himself and Christina without ignoring his past.

There is a progression in Stevenson's way of thinking in respect to the duality of man's nature which can be illustrated by comparing the characters of the four novels I have used. In Treasure Island, Stevenson makes an unsure attempt to portray man's dual nature in his characterization of Long John Silver; Silver shows himself to be both good and evil, but to no extreme either way. The character of the protagonist, Jim Hawkins, is not developed in terms of duality; he is simply a "good boy."

In the next novel, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, Stevenson ob-

viously feels more competent to deal with the subject of man's dual nature, since he makes it the central theme of the book. He still works within the framework of "good-versus-evil," but there are "shades of grey"--the fact that Dr. Jekyll, even before the transformation was never totally "good"--which suggest that although Stevenson may not doubt the possibility of purely evil men, he certainly does doubt that there can be purely good men.

The next novel, The Master of Ballantrae, shows a more complicated venture into the problem of the complexity of man's nature, expressed by Stevenson in more realistic terms than in the former two novels. The aura of fantasy in the earlier books has almost disappeared, so that the reader has far less difficulty relating to the story of Henry Durie's dual nature than he did with the stories of Long John Silver and Dr. Jekyll. In The Master of Ballantrae Stevenson also seems to ponder whether man's nature is determined primarily by himself, or whether a person's character can be radically changed primarily by contact with another person, as Henry Durie is influenced by his brother James.

In his last novel, Weir of Hermiston, Stevenson seems to have reached the conclusion that a man's nature is determined by his interactions with the people around him, whether or not the man is aware of these outside influences. The task man faces,

then, is to become aware of the various influences on his life and personality development, and not to deny their importance.

In his works, Stevenson speaks frequently of "man's dual nature," but I think that it is obvious that he refers to only two sides as a matter of convenience (or convention). Dr. Jekyll speaks for Stevenson when he says,

> man is not truly one, but truly two. I say two, because the state of my own knowledge does not pass beyond that point. Others will follow, others will outstrip me on the same lines; and I hazard the guess that man will ultimately be known for a mere polity of multifarious, incongruous, and independent denizens.[2]

Dr. Jekyll's discovery of his theory that man is composed of many different sides reflects a similar discovery by Stevenson, which can be illustrated by comparing the four protagonists. Jim Hawkins, Stevenson's first protagonist, is a one-sided character; he represents Stevenson's lack of confidence in dealing with Jekyll's "theory"; though the duality sometimes observable in Silver's character indicates that Stevenson was at least aware of the theory.

Dr. Jekyll is, of course, aware of his own duality, and he suspects that there are more than two sides to his personality, though he cannot be sure. At this stage of Stevenson's career, he shares the same suspicions that Jekyll voices.

In the next book, Henry Durie represents a more refined

version of a similar stage in Stevenson's development of the "Jekyll theory." With Henry, Stevenson goes into more detail than he did with Dr. Jekyll to show that man does possess at least two sides to his nature. The fact that although Stevenson and the reader (and Mackellar) are much more conscious of the duality of Henry's personality than Henry is, indicates that Stevenson is still a bit unsure of himself and his theory. Mackellar, who represents Henry's "conscience" throughout the work, is most sensitive of the duality of Henry's personality, which may be a symbolic statement that Henry, in his subconscious, is also aware.

In Weir of Hermiston, Stevenson seems to have firmly concluded that man is composed of several "multifarious, incongruous, and independent denizens," The author repeatedly informs the reader that Archie is what he is because of influences made on him by his father, his mother, his ancestors, his lover, his housekeeper, and his "friend" Frank Innes. Young Weir is not totally aware of such influences when the fragment ends, but I suspect that Stevenson planned for Archie to recognize, as Dr. Jekyll recognized, that a man cannot ignore those parts of himself which he finds undesirable (as Archie wishes to disregard his links with his father), but that he must accept what he considers to be his "bad" sides as well as his "good."

FOOTNOTES TO CONCLUSION

[1]Robert Kiely, Robert Louis Stevenson and the Fiction of Adventure (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), 268.

[2]Robert Louis Stevenson, The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, VII, 429.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

Stevenson, Robert Louis. The Master of Ballantrae, The Works of Robert Louis Stevenson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923. XIV.

_____. The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. VII.

_____. Treasure Island. V.

_____. Weir of Hermiston. XVIII.

Secondary Sources:

Aring, Charles D. "The Case Becomes Less Strange." American Scholar, 30 (Winter, 1960-61) p.72.

Balfour, Sir Graham. The Life of Robert Louis Stevenson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901.

Bevington, Merle M. "Locke and Stevenson on Comparative Morality." Notes and Queries, 7 (1960) p.73.

Bonds, Robert E. "The Mystery of The Master of Ballantrae." English Literature in Transition. 7 (1964) pp.8-11.

Buckley, Jerome H. The Victorian Temper. New York: Vintage Books, 1964.

Buitenhuis, Elspeth MacGregor. Fractions of a Man: Doubles in Victorian Literature. Unpub. Doctoral Thesis from McGill University, Montreal, Canada, 1970.

Butts, Dennis. Robert Louis Stevenson: A Monograph. London: Bodley Head, 1966.

Caldwell, Elsie Noble. Last Witness for Robert Louis Stevenson. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960.

Campbell, Joseph. The Hero With A Thousand Faces. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Chesterton, Gilbert Keith. Robert Louis Stevenson. London: Hodden and Stroughton, 1927.

Cooper, Lettice Ulpha. Robert Louis Stevenson. London: Burns and Oates, 1969.

Cornford, Leslie. Robert Louis Stevenson. Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1900.

Daiches, David. Robert Louis Stevenson. Norfork, Conn: New Directions Books, 1947.

_____. Robert Louis Stevenson and His World. London: Thames and Hudson, 1973.

_____. Stevenson and the Art of Fiction. New York, 1951.

_____. "Which Robert Louis Stevenson?" Nineteenth Century Fiction, 7 (1951)pp.61-70.

Dalglish, Doris N. Presbyterian Pirate: A Portrait of Stevenson. London: Oxford University Press, 1937.

Egan, Joseph J. "From History to Myth: A Symbolic Reading of The Master of Ballantrae." Studies in English Literature (1500-1900), 8 (1969) pp.699-710.

_____."The Relationship of Theme and Art in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde." English Literature in Transition (1880-1920), 9 (1966) pp.28-32.

Eigner, Edwin. Robert Louis Stevenson and the Romantic Tradition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Elliott, Nathaniel. "Robert Louis Stevenson and Scottish Literature." English Literature in Transition (1880-1920), 12 (1969) pp.79-85.

Elwin, Malcolm. The Strange Case of Robert Louis Stevenson. New York: Russell and Russell, 1971.

Furnas, J. C. "Full Circle: Stevenson and His Critics." Atlantic, 188,(October) pp. 67-71.

_____.Voyages to the Windward: The Life of Robert Louis Stevenson. New York: William Sloane Associates, 1951.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. New York: Atheneum, 1965.

_____. The Educated Imagination. Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corp., 1963.

Gwynn, Steven. Robert Louis Stevenson. London: Macmillan, 1939.

Hannah, Barbara, Striving Towards Wholeness. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1971.

Hellman, George S. The True Stevenson: A Study in Clarification. Boston, 1925.

Keppler, C. F. The Literature of the Second Self. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1972.

Kiely, Robert. Robert Louis Stevenson and the Fiction of Adventure. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1964.

McLaren, Moray. Stevenson and Edinburgh: A Centenary Study. London: Chapman and Hall, 1950.

Miyoshi, Masao. The Divided Self: A Perspective on the Literature of the Victorians. New York: New York University Press, 1969.

_____. "Dr. Jekyll and the Emergence of Mr. Hyde." English Literature in Transition (1880-1920), 27 (1966) pp.470-80.

Phelps, William Lyon. Essays on Modern Novelists. New York: Macmillan, 1910.

Pollard, Arthur. The Victorians. London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1970.

Pope-Hennessey, James. Robert Louis Stevenson. London: Cape, 1970.

Rank, Otto. "The Double as Immortal Self" in Beyond Psychology. New York: Dover, 1956, pp.258-68.

Reed, John R. Victorian Conventions. Ohio University Press, 1975.

Rice, Edward. Journey to Upolu: Robert Louis Stevenson, Victorian Rebel. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1974.

Ridley, M. R. Robert Louis Stevenson. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Robeson, W. W. "The Sea Cook: A Study in the Art of Robert Louis Stevenson," in On The Novel: A Present for Walter Allen on His Sixtieth Birthday From His Friends and Collegues, ed. B.S. Bendikz. London: Dent, 1971.

Rogers, Robert. A Psychoanalytic Study of the Double in Literature. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1970.

Rosenfield, Clair. "The Shadow Within: The Conscious and Unconscious Use of the Double," Daedalus 92 (Spring 1963), 326-344.

Saposnik, Irving S. "The Anatomy of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde." Studies in English Literature (1500-1900), 11(1971) pp.715-31.

_____. Robert Louis Stevenson. New York: Twayne, 1974.

Scholes, Robert. Structuralism in Literature: An Introduction. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Scott, Anne M. "The Images of Light in Robert Louis Stevenson's Weir of Hermiston." English, 19 (1970), pp.90-92.

Smith, Janet Adam. Henry James and Robert Louis Stevenson: A Record of Friendship and Criticism. London, 1948.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. The Works of Robert Louis Stevenson, Vailima Edition, 26 Volumes. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

_____. The Essays of Robert Louis Stevenson, ed. Malcolm Elwin. London: Macdonald, 1950.

Stewart, W. S. The Divided Self. London: George Allen and Unwin LTD, 1964.

Swinnerton, Frank. Robert Louis Stevenson: A Critical Study. New York, 1923.

Tillyard, E. M. W. The Epic Strain in the English Novel. London: Chatto and Windus, 1958.

Tymms, Ralph. Doubles in Literary Psychology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1949.

Wain, Marianne. "The Double in Romantic Narrative: A Preliminary Study." The Germanic Review 36, no. 4 (Dec. 1962), pp. 258-68.

Warner, Frederick B. Jr. "Stevenson's First Scottish Story." Nineteenth Century Fiction, 24 (1969) pp.335-44.

Wilson, Colin. The Outsider. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1956.

Young, G.M. Victorian England: Portrait of an Age. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.