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This project explores how the Victorian middle- and upper-middle class gentleman attempted to construct his role through the avenues of work and play. However, these prove to be flawed attempts and the Victorian gentleman is simply an empty concept that tries to accommodate a constantly fluxuating middle-class Victorian masculinity. Work served as a key building block for Victorian masculinity since men were expected to produce. Play has dual meanings. The Victorian gentleman was engaged in playing a part, complete with expected behaviors and attitudes. However, he also played literal games and his performances in sports helped him to earn a place as a gentleman. Work and play, though, were subject to sliding criteria. Because these issues were so engrained in Victorian culture, they found their way into literature. As a result, they surface in works like the Sherlock Holmes stories, Dracula, and The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Both the villains and the heroes often expose these concepts as flawed, so the stories serve as good cultural reflection of the tenuous position of the Victorian middle- and upper-middle class gentleman and the flawed attempts at producing a solid, middle-class masculinity as embodied by the gentleman.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

An oft-repeated phrase in Richard Marsh’s 1897 adventure tale, The Beetle, is “Play the man.” This is usually spoken by a male to another male in order to motivate that character to action. The phrase serves as an entry point into the subject of this study: the construction of the role of Victorian middle- and upper-middle class gentleman is essentially constructed through work and play. A gentleman’s profession defined who he was, so work was a very important part of his construction. Play has two meanings. Play can literally mean playing of sports and games. Sports were grounded in masculinity; performing well on the field served as way to both teach and judge one’s manliness. However, play can also mean literal role-playing.

The concepts of work, play and male identity construction are nothing new and my point in starting this project with a quote from a lesser known work is to show that the literature of the late Victorian era reflected the culture’s views. If a lesser known work espouses them, then it would be logical to think that the more well-known adventure stories of the late Victorian era would be especially permeated by these same ideas. As a result, I am going to examine work and play and the construction of the English gentleman in various Sherlock Holmes stories (1887-1927), Dracula (1897), and The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde (1886). I have chosen these works because first of all, I enjoy reading them. Others have liked them as well and their popularity indicates that they have something to say about the era. The heroes are all middle- and upper-middle class professionals who are representative of the seemingly successful masculine performance, complete with reserve and discipline. The villains of the pieces
either expose or threaten to expose the unstable foundation of masculine performance; 
sometimes the heroes themselves are examples of this instability to the point where the 
gentleman himself is called into question. In the end, the works showcase, but ultimately 
betray, work and play as unsuccessful attempts to solidify Victorian masculinity.

John Tosh, in *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (2005), 
admits that the term manliness has often been used as the term to discuss men’s gender in 
the nineteenth century; however, this term implies that there is a “single standard of the 
manhood,” while in fact masculinity is a more encompassing term because “its meaning 
is meditated not only through class, but through ethnicity and – most of all – through 
sexuality” (2,3). Consequently, “masculinity has fractured into a spectrum of identities” 
(14). Focusing on the “study of masculinities,” Herbert Sussman observes that 
masculinities are socially constructed (Sussman 8). An emphasis on the plural 
“masculinities” “stresses the multiple possibilities of such social formations, the 
variability in the gendering of the biological male, and the range of such constructions 
over time and within any specific historical moment” (8). The “voluntaristic character” 
of the “making of manhood” suggests that manhood can be created by the individual as 
well as the social in various ways (Tosh, *Manliness* 14). In *Dandies and Desert Saints* 
(1995), James Eli Adams argues that “masculine identities are multiple, complex, and 
unstable constructions, even within the framework of a particular culture” (Adams, 
*Dandies* 3). Because of the “rhetorical fabric of self-presentation” inherent in 
masculinity (52), there is an “intractable element of theatricality in all masculine self-
fashioning, which inevitability makes appeal to an audience, real or imagined” (11).
The reliance on an audience is countered by a tradition of seeming “disinterest” since the male subject does want to appear as though he is acting for the approval of his fellow males. For instance, in *A Community of One* (1993), Martin Danahay notes, “Masculine authors represent themselves (my emphasis), in other words, as autonomous individuals” (Danahay, *Community*, 3). Within the context of Danahay’s discussion novelists want to differentiate themselves from laborers who are economically motivated (3). Danahay uses the phrase “autonomous individuals” to discuss how nineteenth-century male authors also used “feminized other[s]” to define themselves through their use of autobiography (3). This strategy is problematic, for by opposing themselves against the feminine and the working classes, middle-class writers are not really autonomous (5-6). They are actively defining themselves against something else, which shows a need for someone to see that they are in fact not like these “others.”

By suppressing other voices, the writer constructs a “distinctive form of subjectivity” (Kucich, cited in Danahay 6) and is an example of “middle-class self-fashioning” (Adams, *Dandies* 35). Using Carlyle as an example, Adams observes that the “persistence of dandyism is registered in the works of male Victorian writers who represent heroic vocations as self-conscious spectacles” (Adams, “Spectacle,” 215). Carlyle tries to distance his hero from the theatricality exhibited by the dandy, but in actuality, his writer-hero showcases the same theatricality since he also caters to an audience (Adams, *Dandies* 35). In *Novel Professions* (2006), Jennifer Ruth quotes Bourdieu: “‘disinterest’ cannot be pure self-sacrifice without turning into mere dissimulation” (qtd. in Ruth 21). Thus, total disinterest is actually a disguise; by making a point of not acknowledging the audience, one is making a show of doing so.
Much of this construction takes its form in spectacle, a “calculated self-presentation to an imagined gaze” (Adams, “Spectacle” 230). Men define themselves, not only against others, but also for the benefit of other men in their collective circles, so that masculinity is an active pursuit. Adams’s five “models of masculine identity: the gentleman, the prophet, the dandy, the priest, and the soldier” (Adams, Dandies 2), are all reflections of the performative/constructive nature of masculinity because all of these models need someone to preach to, to protect, or perform for. The gentleman is an “anxious conjunction of discipline and performance” (10), and “is centrally preoccupied with varieties of self-representation...encompassing social pursuit of mastery through self-definition” (Adams, Dandies 13). Thus, for Judith Butler, “gender is always a doing” (qtd. in Adams, Dandies 2).

What the Victorian gentleman was “doing” was presenting an image of stable masculinity steeped in discipline. As Foucault observes, power structures work best when they are able to hide their “mechanisms” (Foucault, Sexuality 86). The participants in the system are controlled in a subtle way while they appear to move freely (86). In this case, the Victorian gentleman serves as an avenue for “regulation, arbitration, and demarcation, as a way of introducing order in the midst of these powers, of establishing a principle that would temper them and distribute them according to boundaries and a fixed hierarchy” (86-87).

The more general term of masculinity, with its contradictions, is an example of Foucault’s “multiplicity of force relations,” and the “support which these force relations find in one another” (92) that gives an underlying structure to the relationships. All of these conflicting forces interact with one another and so create a seemingly unified
Middle-class and upper-middle class masculinity is shaped by various conflicts: the conflict between interest and disinterest. Likewise, the middle-class professional found himself at a crossroads because a value was placed on labor, but he did not want to be associated with workers of the lower classes. In addition, women were exerting their identities more and more, chipping away at the middle- and upper-middle class professional’s importance. All of these conflicts make up what it is to be a Victorian middle- and upper-middle class man.

These conflicts are reigned in by discipline. To maintain the appearance of discipline, the Victorian gentleman relies on the “dispositions, maneuvers, tactics, techniques,” that operate in a “network of relations constantly in tension, in activity” (Foucault, Prison 26). These techniques are what Foucault labels as ceremony, which is a type of “invisible force” (48). Male spectacle is analogous to this “force.” The “capacity for self-discipline” is a “distinctly masculine attribute” (Adams, Dandies 2). In Gender at Work in Victorian Culture (2005), Martin Danahay notes that popular Victorian images focus on “self-discipline and self-denial as building blocks of masculinity” (18). Male spectacle and reciprocal observation “functions in this as an apparatus of knowledge” (Foucault, Prison 126). The prisoners work to keep each other in line through ritual and practice; Victorian middle-class and upper-middle-class gentleman engage in a similar type of regulation.

This regulation takes place through “the principle of elementary location or partitioning” (143). Andrew Dowling, in Manliness and the Male Novelist in Victorian Literature (2001), explores the spaces in which this discipline is practiced. He writes, “Ideals of Victorian manhood exerted power, not necessarily by repressing individuals
but by constructing a ‘knowledge’ and ‘truth’ of what it meant to be a man. The hegemonic truth about manliness in the nineteenth century was established through metaphors of control, reserve, and discipline, that were placed in opposition to images of chaos, excess, and disorder” (13). Dowling’s knowledge construction of masculinity is like Foucault’s “apparatus of knowledge.” The members of the masculine group are “ranked” according to their adherence to masculine codes and are defined against images that don’t correspond to the ideal, so “men define themselves against other men...the hero is made full by the graphic images of male deviance he is defined against” (49).

The “idea” of middle- and upper-middle class masculinity serves as an ideological version of Foucault’s panopticon: “Discipline sometimes requires enclosure, the place heterogeneous to all others and closed in upon itself. It is the protected place of disciplinary monotony” (Prison 141). The purpose of this central tower in the prison is to keep in the back of the prisoner’s mind that he never knows when he’s being watched (201), so “training was accompanied by permanent observation” (294). Aware of perpetual scrutiny, the prisoner performs expected behavior. In terms of masculine theory, the guidebooks and self-help books that Victorian men sought out in order to learn how to “become” gentleman provide a means to observe others’ behavior, so that men are able to both imitate and conform to expectations; this imitation couples with a fear of being observed by other members of the group. The result is the “power of normalization” (308). The members police themselves because of the threat of being observed or even reported for not adhering to codes of proper behavior. Tosh concludes, “Ruling groups do not valorize particular features of their own masculine code; they
often marginalize or stigmatize other masculine traits in a way which cuts across more familiar hierarchies” (Tosh, *Manliness* 42).

In *A Man’s Place* (1999), John Tosh points out that the Victorian era did not create a new model of masculinity; instead the period expressed a “new dialectic between opposing tendencies” (7). New Women and new technologies challenged the idea of “men’s work” and “provoked a crisis of male-definition” (Danahay, *Gender* 7). In his examination of *Jekyll and Hyde*, Ed Cohen observes that, toward the end of the nineteenth century, the English middle-class man as a stable figure was under attack; economic crises such as depression or bankruptcy or unions organized by the working class, colonial uprisings and middle-class women who sought greater power and independence all exposed the position of the middle-class Englishman as tenuous (Cohen, “Hyding” 182).

This tenuous nature is underscored by the potential that masculinity is something that can be attained through work. Any man who “practiced self-help with single-minded discipline” could obtain manliness (Tosh, *Manliness* 86). The emphasis on self-help meant that one could construct one’s identity. Karen Volland Water sees that although the self-help books dictated strict rules, “male readers were assured on the one hand that bettering oneself was simply a matter of resolve and thrift” (30). These books raised questions about whether or not gentlemanliness was something innate or artificial (29). Adams concludes, “Self-discipline seemed a virtue open to all; hence efforts to claim it as a gendered activity are unusually revealing of the complexity and internal strain that characterize gender identity” (Dandies 7).
Mangan and Walvin suggest, "it would be wrong to imagine that manliness was a simple, single, coherent concept linked to a single locality. It was, in effect, a portmanteau term which embraced a variety of overlapping ideologies regionally interpreted, which changed over time and which, at specific moments appear to be discrete, even conflicting, in emphasis" ("Introduction" 3). This sense of overlap is accentuated by the class disarray at the time as boundaries between the types became less visible towards the end of the century (Showalter 6). For instance in the 1880s, "unemployment" first became recognized as a term (5). Walkowitz notes the "threatening appearance of the poor in the ‘wrong’ part of town” through socialist demonstrations (28). Urban homelessness also began to break down the class demarcations because the homeless camped outside shop doors and threatened business (Showalter 6).

This “new commercial landscape” was inhabited by a mix of men and women from different classes who used this newly transformed space (Walkowitz 25). Charles Booth’s study of poverty revealed that all types of people lived in the so-called poor East End (38). On the other hand, his study also showed that poor people existed outside the borders of this area (38). Thus, the city became a “contested terrain” with “new commercial spaces” (18). During the second half the century, the well-off residential neighborhoods of the West End had been transformed into a diverse mix of shops, office buildings and museums (24).

This mix of classes took on a physical manifestation through its buildings. By the 1850s new and old buildings were located right next to each other (Nead 30). As old buildings collapsed or were torn down, the new ones were built right on top of the rubble
As Lynda Nead observes, “The spaces of improvement were caught up in a ceaseless exchange with the spaces of the city’s historical past. London’s past had to be endlessly rewritten and re-imaged” (8). For instance, one could see that shops of Hollywell Street were located on the ground floors of old homes (179). Often these shops and homes offered an outward sense of respectability but pornography and obscene materials were possibly for sale there (182). What made matters worse was that often the middle class purchased them (182). As a result, one gets the sense of respectable and less respectable elements in close proximity to each other.

Nead’s “re-imaging” of London’s past runs parallel with a similar “re-imaging” of middle- and upper-middle class masculinity. All of the above examples seem to chip away at a respectable middle class. The sheer physical location of these elements breaks down the “constraining structures of traditional society” (Tosh, Place 31). For Tosh, “the alienation experienced by Victorian men of the middle class was about more than work…. Hierarchy and community, ultimately even faith itself, seemed at risk” (31). A middle-class masculinity based on discipline and self-control and more importantly, separation, is questionable because of all these “types” of people and activities located in such close proximity. The case becomes worse if these gentlemen are engaged in the activities themselves: “Yet alongside this massive silence has to be placed the incontrovertible evidence of large-scale prostitution. Where this conflicts most directly with the pieties of manly discourse is not so much the sanctity of the marriage vow as the purity of young men” (Manliness 33). What would usually be seen as working-class or less-manly pursuits were being practiced by middle-class men. This is not to say that middle-class men engaged in these activities more than the working class; the point is
that they "were as culpable as anyone else" (Tosh, Place 130). If middle-class masculinity is based on the denial of dubious activities and then middle-class men engage in them, their masculinity crumbles. As this evidence points out, middle-class masculinity is "re-imaged" as containing these contradictions. These contradictions were exemplified by the mixed physical spaces.

Thus, the later Victorian age was characterized by "ambiguities of rank and wealth in a time of social flux" (Altick 17). In 1872, the secret ballot was enacted so men could vote without having to worry about their landlords' political opinions (175 Thomson). The reform Bills of 1884 and 1885 extended the vote to agricultural workers (175). The masses were allowed to vote now; the classes were a little closer than they used to be (Altick 49). The city was filled with strangers and bred a "sense of captivity" (77). Earning money in "trade" was stigmatized in opposition to "finance, foreign commerce, the professions or moneyed leisure" (31). As Richard Altick writes, "Too close contact with money contaminated one; it was quite another matter to receive a large income through an intermediary such as an estate agent...or a solicitor" (32). Selling goods made one seem too close to a farmer or a laborer.

This class anxiety was accompanied by gender issues. For instance, the city was a place where "gender relations were (perhaps more than usually) diverse, fluid and confused" (Howell 22-23). In addition, two traditionally male spheres were beginning to break down as a result of women becoming more influential: jobs and the home. Since men were going elsewhere to work, their status as domestic heads of households diminished in the late Victorian era (Tosh, Place 145). Usually, the husband was welcomed home by his family after a hard day's work, which seemingly reaffirmed
middle-class patriarchy (145). Women would run the household while the men were off at work, but when they returned home, they would be welcomed back as in charge (145). This situation began to change in the 1880s and 1890s as the law shifted its emphasis more towards equality in the married home (145). When marriages fell apart, advice-book authors usually blamed the husbands for the trouble (145).

Acts such as the Married Women’s Property Acts of 1870 and 1882 gave women more control over their income (157). The first act let women control all the income they earned after marriage and the second one let women retain possession of all of their property, including all types of capital, at the time they were married (157). The property didn’t get transferred to the husband, so women with money had a lot more freedom even after they were married because they didn’t have to depend on their husbands for money or property if they already possessed it themselves (157). Divorce court rulings such as the 1891 Court of Appeals ruling made certain that men could not control women in other ways. Men could not force their conjugal rights on their wives by attempting to imprison them in their homes (181). Likewise, courts began to accept mental cruelty as grounds for divorce (181).

This independence from men took its form in the New Woman, who did not come to be known as such until the 1890s, but the tendencies towards her “type” were taking shape in the 1880s (152). One of the key traits of the New Woman, as Gail Cunningham points out, was that she did what she did as a matter of choice (10). Although she could not vote just yet, she could decide not to marry but rather to embark on a career (10). Availability of education allowed women to train for a career (Tosh, Place 152), so from the 1880s on more women were taking clerical and other jobs (Tosh, Manliness 46).
They also took jobs as teachers and nurses (Tosh, Place 152). In cities women worked in both shops and offices (152). These new workers, in combination with the working-class men who used office jobs for upward mobility (Tosh, Manliness 204), were a threat to a middle-class masculinity based on meaningful work.

Thus, the laws governing sexual identity and behaviors were breaking down (Showalter 3). For example, the New Woman was seen as a “highly sexual being” (Cunningham 14). She voiced her opposition to marriage as a way of leading a fulfilling life (Showalter 38). In the end, as John Tosh observes, “in the late Victorian period the gains made by women in education, employment and personal freedom, not to mention the unfulfilled but vociferous demand for an equal political voice, suggested something more formidable: a movement, even a revolt, sharing a common aspiration and graced by a galaxy of talent” (Tosh, Place 151).

Showalter adds, “the process of upheaval, the redefinition of gender that took place at the turn of the century, was not limited to women. Gender crisis affected men as well as women, and the fantasies of a pitched battle for sexual supremacy typical of the period often concealed deeper uncertainties and contradictions on both sides” (Showalter 8). Showalter continues: “By the 1890s, indeed, the system of patriarchy was under attack not only by women, but also by an avant-garde of male artists, sexual radicals and intellectuals” (Showalter 11). Decadence, homosexuals and the like challenged the authoritative position that patriarchy held (169). Works such as Max Nordau’s Degeneration (1892) attempt to “type” this sort of decadent behavior (Smith 3). Nordau’s “language of Type and Symptom, while suggesting that one can easily discern the perverse and culturally anomalous, rests on an assumption that the masculine ‘norm’
is itself stable and coherent” (3). Andrew Smith suggests that masculinity itself causes these crises, because it is bifurcated between social expectations and biological urges and desires (4). The stable surface of the Victorian middle- and upper-middle class professional is a cover for Foucault’s “multiplicity of force relations.”

Tosh writes, “Late Victorian men of the middle class included a disproportionate number who were in deep conflict with sexuality” (Tosh, Place 189). In fact, “by the 1890s a commercialized homosexual underworld in London and other cities” existed for both middle- and upper-class men (189). This sort of behavior challenged the male disciplined and “pure” lifestyle of masculinity (190) because during what Tosh calls the “The Climax of Domesticity” from 1830-1880, marriage was the determining factor for “fully achieved masculine status” (110).

Sometimes homosexual practices would take place at supposedly all-male havens such as churches or boys schools (190). All these institutions were seen as havens for middle-class men who wanted to escape their domestic lives (190). Tosh concludes, “the code of manliness in its public renderings was no more a reliable guide to men’s behaviour than it had been in the early Victorian period” (187). The homosexual was seen as “degenerate because he was effeminate” (Manliness 22), and such practices undercut all-male arenas (38). Thus, “one can say, therefore, that the dominant masculinity is constructed in opposition to a number of subordinate masculinities whose crime is that they undermine patriarchy from within or discredit it in the eyes of women. Sometimes an entire persona is demonized, as in the case of the homosexual; sometimes specific forms of male behavior are singled out” (43).
A way to control the discussion/situation is by setting up an outsider (Foucault, *Sexuality* 42). As Dowling observes, “display of discipline was predicated upon an idea of deviance” (Dowling 19). Reserve means that something needs to be reserved: “The representation of deviance created a knowledge and truth about the dark and dangerous forces within men, a truth that made reserve and control a sign of depth and profundity” (23). By defining themselves “not only against women but also against other, reviled men,” the middle-class man created a “reassuring sense of masculinity” (23). One can see this through the opposition of the heroes to Dracula, or Sherlock Holmes with his adversaries. Mr. Hyde provides an extreme opposite to gentlemanly behavior. The villains expose “the worrying gap between what men were and what they were supposed to be” (47). In order to close the gap, men would lash out at “degenerates” or homosexuals to reinforce their own status as respectable men (Tosh, *Manliness* 22). They distanced themselves as far as possible from anything deemed “feminine” (22).

Thus, Ed Cohen writes, “Since these gender attributes would come both to differentiate them from and be less significant for men of the aristocratic or working classes, the definition and policing of male character was a critical part of the ‘ideological work’ (to use Mary Poovey’s term) that bourgeois men of the nineteenth century had to perform on themselves (Cohen 15-34)” (Cohen, “Hyding” 182). For Adams, “reconfigurations of masculinity frequently compensated for the loss of traditional, more assured forms of masculine identity and authority” (Dandies 5); “self-government was the key to life on an even keel in times of adversity and doubt” (136). Along these lines, Dina Barsham argues, in her study of Arthur Conan Doyle, that Holmes and Watson serve as police against the transgressors of masculine scripts (Barsham 104).
The category of the middle- and upper-middle-class Victorian gentleman represents this police work as a “reconfiguration of masculinity.” In his article, “The Mystique of the Bachelor Gentleman in Late Victorian Masculine Romance,” Michael Skovmand observes that “the concept of the gentleman came to embody a social ideal which mediated between aristocratic and middle-class values” (Skovmand 49). Robin Gilmour agrees in The Idea of the Gentleman in the Victorian Novel (1981), noting that the gentleman was a moral category that transcended rank that became a way to “moderate” between the middle class and the aristocracy (Gilmour 3,2).

The gentleman served as a way for the middle class to define itself as a class. The middle-class and upper-middle-class gentleman was not a working-class man or a member of the aristocracy who did not work. A key adjective for the gentleman was “manly,” which drew its strength from an opposition to “effeminate dandyism” and a “masculine disregard for the niceties of etiquette” (85). The Victorian gentlemanly ideal stressed a “constricting gentleness and manliness” (86). As the century drew to a close, the concept of the gentleman “became increasingly defensive: the self-image of the beleaguered middle-class male facing the emergence of the New Woman, the organization of the working classes…” (Skovmand 50). As a literary response, “…Dr Jekyll, Sherlock Holmes, etc. this catalogue of problematic middle-age bachelor gentleman maps the late Victorian self-image of a beleaguered, defensive sense of masculinity” (Skovmand 56). In The Perfect Gentleman (1997), Waters cites “the perfect gentleman” as the “ideological construction of masculine control” (Waters 4) and “an important standard for masculinity during the Victorian era” (19). Adams’s “types” are “an incarnation of an ascetic regimen, an elaborately articulated program of self-
discipline” (Dandies 2). Like the masculine “types” that Adams uses, Philip Mason has four types of gentleman: “the officer and gentleman; the scholar and gentleman; the Christian gentleman; and the gentleman sportsman” (cited in Skovmand 49). As expressions of a norm, all these “types” of gentleman served as boundaries against threats to middle-class and upper-middle-class masculinity.

For Gilmour also, the gentleman was an uncertain category (Gilmour 3). During the middle of the century, in the 1850s and 1860s, the big question was “what is it to be a gentleman?” (85). Gilmour notes that fiction of the middle century reflected how uncertain the term had become (85). Authors of the time period were always asking what a gentleman was and how the status could be obtained. For instance, in an 1862 article, James Fitzjames Stephen addresses the term itself: “The division between those who are, and those who are not, entitled to this appellation, is as real and important as it is indefinite” (Stephen 330). He is admitting that the term is one of both inclusion and exclusion. However, the boundary that he is describing is permeable.

Stephen’s emphasis on the boundaries also foregrounds how men can bond through their common traits. He discusses what it means to be a gentleman and the assumptions that the word implies: “This tacit assumption is that the persons to whom the word applies form a body associated together for the sake of the pleasure which is to be derived from each other’s society, and not for those more serious purposes which great associations of men, such as states, churches, armies, legislative and political bodies, and the like, are intended to promote” (331). Someone may be called a gentleman if he has the qualities that allow him to fit into such societies of men (331). Stephen highlights the
social nature of the gentleman by opposing it against various business groups or political associations, highlighting its definitive nature through these oppositions.

These social and definitive aspects raised the concern of who would make the cut. Adams explains, “As the ideal of the gentleman broadened—at least in theory—it also gave new moral urgency to the banal task of distinguishing between sincerity and performance. If the status of gentleman is not secured by inherited distinctions of family and rank, but is realized instead through behavior, how does one distinguish the ‘true’ gentleman from the aspirant who is merely ‘acting’ the part?” (Adams, Dandies 53). The shifting nature of the term “had both positive and negative repercussions for middle-class men” (Waters 19). While it had “historical denotation of status which conferred power and control,” the term also provided the hope for the middle class to move up (19). However, no one was sure what the term meant because it was always changing (20). Waters cites J.R. Vernon’s comment in Contemporary Review, which she extracts from Palmer’s The Perfect Gentleman: His Character Delineated in a Series of Extracts from Writers Ancient and Modern (1892): “A Gentleman is a MAN. And he realizes what is contained in that word...the magnificent destiny” (qtd. in Waters 21). Waters explains, “the concept of the gentleman had moral as well as social implications” (21). Extracting again from Palmer, Waters quotes F. Lieber’s Character of the Gentleman: “It seems to me that we always connect the ideas of honour, polish, collectedness of mind and liberal disposition with the word gentleman, and feel that its antagonistic characters are the clown, the gossip, the backbiter, the dullard, coward, braggart, fretter, swagger, and bully” (qtd. in Waters 21). The secondary group of antagonistic characteristics is an example of “overacting” and working too hard to paint a picture of themselves.
From this second perspective, then, a gentleman is a negative role in that it defines itself against (my emphasis) what it is not (Waters 30). For example, Waters looks at Robert Louis Stevenson’s 1888 article “Gentlemen”:

Not to try to be a gentleman at all is so much more gentlemanly than to try and fail! So that this gift, or grace, or virtue, resides not so much in conduct as in knowledge; not so much in refraining from the wrong, as in knowing the precisely right. A quality of exquisite aptitude marks out the gentlemanly act; without an element of wit, we can be only gentlemen by negatives. (qtd. in Waters 29-30)

Stevenson defines the gentleman by saying what he isn’t and by what actions he should not take. He also defines the gentleman by saying what not to do. The instability of the class system fostered this emphasis on the negative definition (Waters 30), creating distance between the established gentleman and those who aspired to be one. However, in spite of all the self-help literature preaching the ability to better oneself, in reality, it was still a “class-based society within which upward mobility was relatively restricted” (30). In this manner, the gentleman itself was a negative category, full of contradictions, both democratic and not at the same time (30). Since society was so class-based, men sought to fit into the higher classes or at least wanted to appear to fit in. The self-help books suggest that one could learn the part, but one would be despised for making the attempt.

Thus, the gentleman found himself under attack as society began to offer opportunity for upward mobility. As society began to change, the definition of the gentleman followed. Stevenson, in 1888, admits the performative nature of the gentleman and explains that now a definition of the gentleman cannot be given because life has changed so much; the best one can do is give a history of what the term used to mean (“Gentlemen” 639). He looks to the past and examines the “ceremonial” nature of
life and its conventions that dictated action: "a man's steps were counted; his acts, his gestures were prescribed" (639). He goes on to discuss the "gentile man," the one who would perform the necessary "ceremonial act[s]" (640). He explains, "Whatever circumstances arose, he would be prepared to utter the sacramental word, to perform the ceremonial act. For every exigence of family or tribal life, peace or war, marriage or sacrifice, fortune or mishap, he stood easily waiting, like the well-graced actor for his cue" (640). He writes, "It is from this gentile man, the priest, the chief, the expert in legal forms and attitudes, the bulwark and the ornament of his tribe, that our name of gentleman descends" (640). Stevenson concludes, "With the decay of the ceremonial element in life, the gentleman has lost some his prestige, I had nearly said some of his importance; and yet his part is the more difficult to play. It is hard to preserve the figures of dance when many of our partners dance at random" (640). As the middle class expanded, a gentleman separated from ceremonial constraints followed: "But much of life comes up for the first time, unrehearsed, and must be acted upon the instant. Knowledge there can here be none; the man must be inspired with speech; and the most perfect gentleman is he who, in these irregular cases, acts and speaks with most aplomb and fitness" (640). Stevenson still uses the word "act" twice in his description, but this "act" needs more flexibility to deal with a changing world. Though he is still expected to behave and speak in a certain way and must be quick to do so, the gentleman is no longer a fixed point. In 1888, things just happen and a gentleman needs to be able to improvise accordingly. It cannot be a "fixed" existence.

The necessity to both blend and bend is the result of "the opposing tendencies" that Tosh uses to describe masculinity. The middle- and upper-middle class gentleman
attempts to mimic the fineness of the upper class in order to distance himself from the working classes. However, this same fineness can be taken to an extreme, an almost overemphasis on appearance, bordering on idleness. Perhaps the best word to describe it would be fixation, the complete opposite of Stevenson’s gentleman.

One of Adams’s “types” fits this negative definition perfectly: the dandy. In her discussion of the dandy, The Dandy: Brummell to Beerbohm (1960), Ellen Moers examines the song “Yankee Doodle Dandy”: “There could be no more fitting introduction for the word dandy than a song written to ridicule provincialism and vulgarity as revealed by costume, (Moer’s emphasis) then expanded to ridicule aristocratic pretensions, again as revealed by costume (Moer’s emphasis)” (Moers 12).

Moers writes, “the dandy—a creature perfect in externals and careless of anything below the surface, a man dedicated to his own perfection through a ritual of taste” (13). She examines Baudelaire’s dandy and likens him to an artist. He is wealthy, but he does not care about money (Moers 282). She writes that he is a “votary of elegance, but never a slave” (282). He presents a “mask of indifference of indifference or disdain” (282). However, despite this seeming indifference, there is a discipline involved (282). Moers notes the dandy’s extreme dedication to his toilette rituals (282). She likens his emphasis on clothing and appearance to a “form of dedication to control” (282). Most importantly, the dandy prides himself in his originality. The dandy recognizes the “need to make of oneself something original (Moers’ emphasis)—as the artist creates an original work out of his own being…” (282).

The gentleman wishes to avoid this sort of fixation on appearance or fascination with presentation. The gentleman wants to look refined but does not want to be so
wrapped up in the appearance that he appears idle, suggesting that he either has or simply makes the time to focus on appearance. The middle- and upper-middle class gentleman resides at the center-point of conflicting pulls, bordered by the aristocracy and the working classes. The gentleman constantly maintains boundaries.

As a means of creating these boundaries, the gentleman performs two examples of Foucault’s “ceremonies”: work and play. These are not without their issues, however. Danahay writes, “The history of work in the Victorian period is, therefore, the history of the attempt to define work as masculine and the male body as productive and free from the threats of feminine, idleness and sexuality” (Danahay, Gender 45). Interestingly, Danahay calls it an attempt rather than a definite definition. The Victorian “Gospel of Work” incorporated both masculinity and industry (39). Danahay also stresses that industry in the Victorian era meant not only “business” but also “hard physical labor undertaken as a form of manly duty” (40). Danahay’s dual use of the term industry suggests the unstable nature of work since it allows for two competing definitions of it; one is physical while the other is more intellectual or abstract. Though he admits that “work was the foundation of male identity in the Victorian period,” he is quick to note that it is “an unstable marker” (13).

The traditionally high place the worker held in the eyes of the Victorian writer creates this conflict. For Danahay, some intellectuals of the period had “a romanticized image of working-class labor, especially work that involves muscles and material objects” (33). However, physical work caused anxiety for the middle-class gentleman. Tosh explains, “As the middle class expanded, people became more and more preoccupied with their precise standing in it” (Tosh, Place 23). There were divisions
within the middle class itself. Some middle-class workers did deal with monetary capital and working for a wage made these men closer to the working-class laborer. Shopkeepers exchanged money with customers while clerks received paid wages (12). “Small workshop masters” who “got their hands dirty” were not the definite model of the middle class (12). However, the class as a whole was distinct since, unlike the gentry, these men had to work regular, daily hours (13). Unlike the working class, though, they did not have to engage in physical labor (13). They occupied a borderline position, so “such a status was all the more valued because it could not be taken for granted” (13).

The point is that one had to work to maintain his class status so it was not inherent. If a business failed, for instance, one could find himself occupying a dangerous position (13). Middle-class gentlemen were afraid that they might fall into the working-class category.

Danahay suggests that the types of labor men engage in create a contradiction in the definition of masculinity. He writes, “While a gentleman’s identity was often defined in opposition to the working classes, manual labor was also represented as the preeminent symbol of manly industry, which created a contradiction between the representation of ‘manliness’ and the subject position of the male artist or writer” (Danahay, Gender 5). The newly formed professional class occupies this position. As an image of masculine control and service their gender and class anxieties prompted a struggle for a space. From a gender perspective, the professional does not engage in physical labor and may not even leave his home to work so he fails to live up to traditionally masculine definitions of work.

From a class perspective, “the nascent professional also confounded assumptions about the relationship between economic and social class” (Ruth 4). He earned money
but he “did not look or act like a wage laborer” (4). He is not an investor or rent collector who possesses “financial capital” (4). Ruth believes that the professional’s worth is based on the services he provides so he possesses “cultural capital” (4). This new class suffered “from contradictory class locations” (Ruth 4).

From one perspective, the professional took some elements of the gentry. In order to establish their identity, the middle classes transformed the concepts of the “cult of work” and “cult of leisure” to fit their agendas (Perkin 121). The “cult of work” now had more value than leisure (121). The middle classes co-opted the aristocratic concept of the gentleman (368). The mark of a gentleman was no longer how much leisure one had but how one worked. These new businessmen equated themselves with the notion of the “gentlemen farmers...or as public servants” (364). Perkin notes that the school systems now sought to produce “an active, responsible, physically fit, self-disciplined elite of professional men and administrators for public service in church and state, the empire and the liberal professions” rather than a cultured leisure class (Perkin 368). Basically as these new professionals began coming to the forefront, they took the same respect and goals and status that used to be ascribed to the gentleman landowner and they applied them their new middle-class status.

New occupations began to overtake the traditional land-based way of making money through rents. Early in the nineteenth century, there was not a distinct class for men who worked jobs in law, medicine or the church because upper-middle-class and gentry men took positions in these fields (Ruth 3). However, by the conclusion of the 1850s, “professionals were an identifiable community gaining in political and social importance” (4). Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennehouse observe that, by the 1860s,
“What had seemed a subordinate sector of the middle class made up of managers, professionals, experts of various kinds was running England” (qtd. in Ruth 4). They were in charge of “managing” England and, by extension, because of the transformed concept of work, they also “managed” its masculine behavior.

These newly formed professionals are examples of what Perkin, in The Rise of Professional Society: England Since 1880 (1990), notes as a shift from land-based to professional capital (xii). He explains, “non-landed incomes and wealth had begun to overtake land alone as the main source of economic power” between the years 1850 to 1880 and following (64). The concept of the professional began to take shape during those years (Ruth 3). This change in the emphasis of wealth acquisition was the result of specialization. As industrialization grew, division of labor grew alongside it and specialization grew out of this division (Perkin 23). Perkin calls this new type of professional class the “forgotten middle class” since they are not really capitalists because they do not buy and sell goods or land. Instead, they provide service for society (xii). He notes that the difference is that the new professionals are trying to show society that their services are valuable and necessary (xii, 8). Perkin notes a shift towards management and service and he uses the term “professionalization of management” to discuss this shift (376). Ruth observes, “through the criticism of patronage and corruption from the vantage-point of the entrepreneurial ideal, and then through the criticism of the market ideal from the more service-oriented standpoint of the gentlemanly ideal, a new professional ideal came into being” (86).

Expertise differentiated the professional as a class. For instance, in her article on doctors as expert witnesses in train crashes, Karen M. Odden “suggest[s] the importance
of the fact that medical practitioners were called into law courts as experts in the railway injury trials that occurred in the second half of the nineteenth century” (Odden 33). These men were “experts” who held “special knowledge” (34). Odden is concentrating on the medical profession in her article, but her observations can be applied to the newly created professional class. For example, “personal injury law developed as a separate field with its own procedures and pay structures and debates about injury” (36). Separation is a key attribute as these men are distinguishing themselves as authority figures.

Odden points out that as witnesses, these men occupy a different space, with a “foot in both the traditional and emergent systems of valuation” (Odden 42). She writes, “Medical men are ‘honourable’ because they have the virtues of ‘gentlemen’ and a sense of ‘decorum’, but their ‘professional[ism]’ is based on their ability to marshal ‘evidence’ and to take into account ‘circumstances,’ on their sense of ‘justice’, and on their ‘principles’ and impartiality” (42). As John Tosh observes, professions such as medicine or the law or church enjoyed “high prestige”: “Membership of these ‘old’ professions was often taken to confer gentlemanly status, partly because of the requirement of formal education, and partly because giving advice or service for a fee carried little of the commercial taint attached to buying and selling in the market-place” (Place 11). Other professions, such as accounting, or architecture and engineering also gained respect (11). Based in education and training “rather than capital and entrepreneurial flair” (12), these positions represented a different type of “capital” and shift towards services rather than labor.
Like the gentleman category itself, the middle-class professional finds himself battling “opposing tendencies.” Tosh sums it up nicely:

For the middle-class man work held deeply contradictory associations: on the one hand, pride in climbing the ladder of success, providing for his family, and acquiring the esteem of his peers; on the other, resentment of time and toil required, fear of failure at the impersonal hands of the market, and revulsion from the morals of the business world. (34)

Yet, working in these arenas was necessary for the upkeep of middle-class masculinity.

Appropriate work was an attempt to consolidate middle-class respectability of a middle-class family, creating a border against both class and gender “others.” The other half of the dichotomy concerns how a gentleman played. The games field was also an attempt to consolidate middle-class respectability, allowing the gentleman player to express his energies in a controlled manner. For example, in his introduction to J.A. Mangan’s *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School* (1981), Jeffery Richards emphasizes the “social control” and the character formation that was part of the public school experience (Richards, “Introduction” xxiv). He notes how images of the chivalric gentleman found their expression in contemporary times on the playing field (xxiv). Physical exercise was believed to be “a highly effective means of inculcating valuable instrumental and impressive educational goals: physical and moral courage, loyalty and co-operation, the capacity to act fairly and take defeat well, the ability to both command and obey” (Mangan, *Athleticism* 9). These are all traits of the successful middle- and upper-middle class male. As Mangan concludes, “one of the origins of athleticism lay in the utilisation of games as a form of social control (Mangan’s emphasis)” (28).
From this perspective, athletics could be a way to showcase the traits of Victorian masculinity and a way for the English gentleman to spend his leisure time and remain manly. W. R. Browne offers a definition of the English professional gentleman and examines his physical pursuits in his 1887 article: “But in the main essentials of courtesy and truth, assuredly they are not wanting; and still less so on that special department of truth which we call courage” (Browne 269). However, due to the nature of their jobs as lawyers, doctors, or civil servants, they do not get as much of an opportunity as someone like a soldier to display their courage (269-270). Browne observes that there are other ways for these men to show their physical fortitude. In fact, “they make up for this deficiency in their play. There they show, still fresh and living, the influence of those gallant and manly exercises which were their training at the university or school” (270).

Browne’s statement places masculinity in both a physical and abstract realm. He cites “manly exercises,” which develop physical characteristics. This new emphasis on sport was part of a “heavily physical slant now given to manliness” (Tosh, Place 188). Still, his emphasis on courage suggests more abstract characteristics such as “character-building qualities of courage, self-control, stoical endurance, and the subordination of the ego to the team” (189). Sports were a way to combine the physical and more abstract developments of masculine traits in the Victorian middle-class and upper-middle-class man; they were a type of controlled physicality.

Thus, the gentleman has an avenue for “charismatic self-mastery” (Adams, Dandies 7). Adams explains, “even as it enforces the habit of emotional reserve, the ideal of the gentleman presumes that one has nothing to hide” (207). The gentleman is honest and not pushy or overly emotional, but the feelings that he does have are authentic.
an athletic perspective, the gentleman athlete is not trying to show up his opponent. He controls his emotions and above all, he is not being sneaky or a rule breaker. Thomas Arnold preached such characteristics while at Rugby: manliness based on forthright openness (74). These combined traits create a gentleman player who is a leader on the field and elsewhere through his own controlled aggression: “A man who would have authority over others must first master himself” (Tosh, Manliness 73).

Browne’s article is an example of the Victorian attitude towards athletics. The importance of games as an avenue to showcase manliness was reflected by Victorian culture. For example, through books like Tom Brown Schooldays, manliness came to be linked with an “obsessive love of games” (Mangan and Walvin “Introduction,” 4). In The Healthy and Victorian Culture, Bruce Haley observes that the Victorians were caught up in a games-playing “‘cult’” (Park 7) and by mid-century, “sports were no longer regarded as hindering moral development, they aided it” (Haley, qtd. in Park 10). Games and sports were a way to build “character” through competition (Haley 160). For example, The Boys Brigade emphasized religion as manly in order to indoctrinate working-class boys with Christian beliefs (Springhall 52). Using games with an emphasis on teamwork and hard work, the Boys Brigade could instill the manly values of discipline and moral correctness (56).

Athletics expressed such values. Roberta Park explores how athletics built the “man of character,” and that “action” was omnipresent in literature, and educational and scientific publications (Park 10). According to Bruce Haley, character “is the developed self, the superaddition of experience to the foundation of temperament through the agencies of will and intelligence…. Because manliness was synonymous with ‘character’
in the male, it is not surprising to find that word also developing specifically masculine connotations” (Haley 43, 206). Character was developed by one’s actions, and, as Smiles observes in Self-Help (1859), “character consists in little acts, well and honourably performed” (qtd. in Haley 207). Character comprised “readiness, pluck and self-dependence; and these virtues were best learned on the playing field” (161). By the 1880s, stories about how athletes were “men of character” were plentiful (Park 10). The term “men of character” is much like Browne’s concept of “bravery” in that it is not a physical characteristic.

These characteristics were developed through the observation of and participation in games. Men who played sports developed discipline and physical fitness. Conversely, people could look at the athletes as models as they watched them play: “Athletic events are, to use Victor Turner’s phrase, a type of ‘cultural performance’ in which social dramas may be powerfully enacted” (Park 11). Literal playing of games, then, is a type of role-playing. Mike Huggins recounts the development of middle-class sport’s importance: “From the second half of the nineteenth century onwards English middle-class sport increasingly functioned as a powerful cultural bond, moral metaphor and political symbol. It had a major impact on recreational culture, career access and the formation of class cultures and relationships” (Huggins 11). This combination of observation and participation led to like values and shared definitions of what athletic masculinity was.

However, Mike Huggins and J. A. Mangan challenge the notion of middle-class “respectability” of middle-class leisure. For instance, “middle-class Victorian sport was linked to such disreputable activities as gratuitous violence, obsessive gambling, sexual
licence and excessive drinking” (Huggins and Mangan, “Prologue” xiii). In theory, sports were supposed to espouse middle-class values and differentiate the class from less-reputable working-class attitudes (xi). Huggins and Mangan make a good point about sports: “However, locations hidden from the potential control and pressure of family, the work-place and the church or chapel self-evidently reduced the need for respectability, and, of course, were far more likely to offer opportunities for disreputable lifestyles” (xv).

Thus, athletics were not always the grounding element that they appeared to be. For instance, sports outside of the schools moved beyond the amateur ideal (Haley 222). As Haley explains, “In the schools games were an expensive duty; elsewhere they were a business” (222). This differentiation became an issue because, as Huggins and Mangan suggest, “The code of the mainly middle-class amateur was designed to keep the working class in proper moral subjection” (Huggins and Mangan, “Prologue” xi). The middle class wanted to use amateur sport as a means of disassociating themselves from the working classes (xi), so they presented a picture of how their sports were played for more “noble” motivations, but as Tony Collins points out, “the reality of Victorian middle-class sport was rather different from both its self-image and its image as viewed through the somewhat rosy spectacles of later generations” (Collins 172). Players often earned money for their performances (172), and, in many cases, supposedly amateur cricket players would receive as much money as those who were professionals (173-174).

In addition, the middle class was not a strictly defined category, which suggested that its sporting mentality was also less defined (Huggins 21). In his article on the development of English middle-class sports from 1850 to 1910, Mike Huggins writes,
“Ideologies such as the ‘games ethic’ or ‘respectability’ were a highly flexible means of transmitting values and so capable of being adapted to the uses and desires of a range of groups with different end results, and were responsive to changes in wider society” (21). For instance, we can also see how rugby served the purposes of its respective classes or communities with differing value systems. In his article on rugby in northern England, James W. Martens points out that, in industrial communities in northern England rugby, was more inter-mixed from a class perspective (Martens 36). As a result, middle-class business administrators ran the clubs while the workers played on them (36). The point of the contests was to win and bring glory and money to the community (37).

The working classes were able to co-opt the game to serve their own needs and values, which centered on work and the financial rewards that resulted from it rather than some higher gentlemanly ideal (Martens 32). Discussing why twenty-one northern Clubs left the Rugby Union in 1895, Martens observes, “Rather than internalizing the assumed ethos of the public schools, the northern clubs were making the game reflect their own attitudes” (39). Martens explains that working men’s values differed from those of public schools (38). “Dodges and trickery” were seen as examples of “wit” and “imagination” by the working class in northern England; they were especially valued if they led to victory (38). Many of these ideas stemmed from the fact that the northern games were played for prestige rather than for comradeship or masculine values (32). Communities felt pride when their teams won and so they began to ignore Rugby Union rules in order to achieve those ends. Rather than using the sport to foster class ideals, the northern clubs centered on community and so they were more mixed from a class
perspective (34). This more aggressive style turned the games into a business, which brought in large gates (40).

In order to accomplish these gates, the club officials engaged in practices that went against the amateurism espoused by the Rugby Football Union (40-43). For instance, club officials would pay their players just as they would pay their workers in their factories since the clubs were under the control of “the male northern bourgeoisie” and “local industrial elites” (41). Ernest Ensor’s 1898 article discussing the negative influence of football outlines this fear of “professionalism”: “The worst feature of professional football is its sordid nature…. A first-class team is now recruited by means that savour of bribery and corruption. The club agent goes to a small town where a good player is known to reside, and tries by offers of a big bonus and big wages to seduce him from his present club” (Ensor 755). The RFU disapproved of such professionalism (Martens 41). As Martens explains, “The clubs came to resemble the work experience, not only structurally but also in the relationship between officials and working-class players, to whom payment was made for physically demanding effort” (41). Such practices came to be known as “shamateurism” (41). This type of boss and worker relationship did not exist in the southern game (41) and represented a “jumbling” of middle-class values through which the supposed nature of sport, grounded in gentlemanly ideals, was turned on its head.

Thus, Huggins believes “an ‘ideal schema’ of middle-class sport is still flawed” (15). For example, athleticism did not always have the same value throughout the entire middle class, and the values being taught really depended on who was in charge. For example, Mike Huggins explains there was “regional variation” in the teacher training
colleges (18). Athleticism did not always take hold right away due to lack of resources (18). Mangan writes, "various ideologies co-existed in public schools. They overlapped, even fused on occasion, but certain of their elements were discrete and even contradictory" (qtd. in Huggins 19). Using Mangan’s insights, Huggins explains that not all public school students accepted athleticism; some reacted against it (19). Even the institutions that fostered the athletic beliefs were not uniform in their standards. 

Examining athleticism in the public school, Huggins summarizes, "It was not a simple process, since in these public schools communities there were a range of ideologies concerned with sport, linking boys, parents and staff, differently emphasized at different schools" (17). For instance, there was an emphasis on winning but within the rules; however, Huggins also notes other values such as ruthless aggression and a sense that losses, rather than teaching a moral lesson, simply equaled futility were also present (17). The sporting mentality then becomes a jumble of competing values that makes an attempt to define manliness.

This project explores the “jumbled” nature of both work and play as it comes out in the literature of the late Victorian era. The characters are representative of the “dialectic between opposing tendencies” that the middle- and upper-middle class gentleman comprises. From a surface perspective, the heroes are battling against exterior threats to the safety of London or in the case of Jekyll and Hyde, exploring a threat that is already possibly present within. These threats, though, are symbolic of the underlying concerns that faced the late Victorian gentleman. Some of the villains are representative of some of the “threats” to the middle-class professional. Yet, the heroes themselves expose some of the same concerns because of the activities they engage in. What makes
these works so intriguing is that readers could see in them some of the issues that they themselves were dealing with. Work and play inform these stories because the main characters are all middle- and upper-middle class men. We see through them all of the complexities and contradictions that would face every middle- and upper-middle class gentleman trying to establish his place in the world.

Chapter one deals with Sherlock Holmes as an example of the complex ways that work defines or fails to define the middle- and upper-middle class gentleman. Holmes is at the center point of class conflicts when it comes to the idea of work. On one hand, he is engaged in physical labor and so he is an example of the idealization of physical labor. However, because of his intellectual approach, he is also an example of the newly developed professional class attempting to distance itself from the working class but also trying to prove itself useful. Yet, because of his languid behavior in between cases he might be viewed as a leisured aesthete, as is evidenced by his drug use and his interest in cultured pursuits such as the opera or violin. In opposition, he not only utilizes working-class individuals, but dresses up as such characters himself, so his “work” becomes an amalgam and a masquerade or performance of professional and working-class enterprises. His almost non-position even draws ire from standard police who look down on him as an amateur. When examined more thoroughly, then, Holmes, the seeming epitome of upper-middle-class professionalism simply exposes how work is not really a solid way of the defining Victorian masculinity.

In chapter two I will examine how the middle-class gentlemanly ideal was fostered through sports, primarily on the field in schools. There a young man would learn values such as discipline and teamwork. One sees the lessons learned from sports,
both good and bad cropping up in the late-Victorian adventure story. For instance, we see Sherlock Holmes using boxing in order to defend himself. He and Watson work as a team and run and climb to solve a crime. However, they also blatantly break the law in order to solve a mystery. The heroes of Dracula do the same thing, working together, using violence in an appropriate context, but they too, break the law on occasion. This "rule-breaking" is similar to young athletes who "bent the rules" in order to win a particular match. Finally, Mr. Hyde is an example of how violence on the field spills over into life, often serving a very different end than the glory of a gentlemanly win.

Chapter three will be an examination of the gentleman category itself, focusing on how Dracula exposes the category as a construct. For example, Dracula himself is representative of the fear that "others" could mimic, study or buy their way into gentlemanly status. Even the mad Renfield is able to outwardly "pass" as a gentleman at times. The problem is that the gentleman is caught between the natural and manufactured. The heroes perform as gentleman, but their actions appear more natural so they blend into the story. Dracula, on the other hand, is unable to get past this "sense" of performance, bringing attention to himself and underscoring the performative nature of the gentleman. He is so focused on studying the part that he ends up exposing it as simply a part. His ability to "pass" and to get as far as he does with his plans reflects the gentleman’s fear that anyone could pass as long as he is a quick study.

Finally, in chapter four, I will use the concept of the theatre to further examine the performative nature of the gentleman and how its ultimate hollowness as a category. Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde lends itself to the theatre analogy of the melodrama because of the blurring of player and role that takes place in the novel. For example, one is never sure
whether Jekyll is the performance or Hyde is the “way” for Jekyll to act out his more sinister wishes. The other characters in the novel serve as audience members to both the “performances.” The locations within the novel serve a dual purpose. On one hand they reflect the growing proximity between “other” classes and the middle-class and upper-middle class gentleman. This closeness allows for the possibility for either class to infiltrate or “visit” the other’s domain. On the other hand, the locations serve as stages; for instance Jekyll’s front hall is a place where upper-middle-class decorum can be performed. Jekyll’s cabinet is where he is able to “switch” between costumes, so it’s like a dressing room. Audience members are not permitted in there and when they do go in uninvited, the “character” they saw on stage is exposed. The ability for a lower-class person to come into the middle-class sphere or the desire for a middle-class man to wander through a working-class neighborhood exposes the whole gentleman category as flawed.

All of these issues spring up in the late Victorian adventure stories. Work and play were significant parts of the Victorian middle- and upper-middle class professional gentleman, serving as foundations for him to lean on. However, the terms themselves betray the hollowness of gentleman. If one had to work to become a gentleman, then it would seem that gentlemanliness is artificial and this comes out through the term play in both contexts. If the gentleman is a part, then there is nothing innate about it and play in terms of games suggests that, despite all of its rules and boundaries, being a gentleman is in the end just a game. One can’t help but wonder what happens to the players when the time runs out. The fact that these issues would influence even a lesser known work such as The Beetle shows how deeply engrained they were.
Chapter 2
Holmes-of-all-Trades

In “The Adventure of the Empty House” (1903), the reader learns that Watson’s wife has died, but her death is only mentioned in the context of Holmes’ return. Holmes reassures, “Work is the best antidote to sorrow, my dear Watson...and I have a piece of work for us both to-night which, if we can bring it to a successful conclusion, will in itself justify a man’s life on this planet” (Doyle 2: 11). This statement is telling for several reasons. First, the death of Watson’s wife, barely mentioned, underscores the partnership of Watson and Holmes. Second, Holmes’s use of work as justification for a “man’s life on this planet” places him within a specific Victorian tradition of thinking about work. In Past and Present (1843), Carlyle discusses this idea: “The man is now a man.... Blessed is he who has found his work; let him ask no other blessedness. He has a work, a life purpose; he has found it!” (Carlyle, Past 230). Echoing Carlyle, Holmes is defining his purpose through this case. In Gender at Work in Victorian Culture (2005), Martin Danahay writes of Carlyle’s view that “to not work is to leave the category of ‘man’” (27). This belief is exemplified by Holmes’s comment. Work provided self-discipline, a “key tool...for Victorian men” (18) to assert their identity, especially in the company of other men.

One of the defining characteristics of Victorian masculinity, work is a conflicted category. In this chapter, I am going to look at Sherlock Holmes as a reflection of this conflict. A borderline character, he physically works but he is also involved in intellectual labor. Likewise, he is also at the center of the conflict between middle-class professionalism and aristocratic idleness because of his languid state in between jobs.
How he spends his “off time” is not unlike that of a leisured aristocrat. Also, his motivation for these “jobs” is not money; he does what he does for an intellectual challenge, so his adventures could be seen as more of a hobby than a job. At the same time, however, he willingly appears as a working-class persona at times. Straddling opposing definitions of masculine work, Holmes represents the possibilities of class slippage and gender issues that stem from the instability of work as a category. I will begin with an examination of work as a possible definition for masculinity. Examining how Victorian writers viewed the worker, especially the physical worker who produced something, I will then explore the newly emerging professional class’s struggle to define itself as separate from the working class, but also its efforts to establish itself as useful and manly. Sherlock Holmes can be examined in terms of these struggles for space and the possibilities for slippage as a result of it.

As a consulting detective, Sherlock Holmes is an example of Jennifer Ruth’s “intellectual labor” (Ruth 7). For instance, in The Sign of Four (1890), Holmes explains, “Give me problems, give me work.... The work itself, the pleasure of finding a field for my peculiar powers, is my highest reward” (Doyle 1: 100). Though the statement does not really an express anxiety, it reflects how the middle-class professional does not want to be lumped in with a leisured aristocrat but also wants to make sure his work is not overtly physical like that of the working class. With his statement, Holmes is in search of work, but his comments also betray a search for a place: “That is why I have chosen my own particular profession, or rather created it, for I am the only one in the world.... The only unofficial consulting detective” (100). His self-created profession is a way for him to negotiate these anxieties that he and other professionals face. This new type of “job”
helps him combat the traditional image of the physically productive worker by creating another way to be useful. He is a literary example of one who occupies a borderline position. He works alongside working-class figures and sometimes even acts like one himself, and he engages in physical tasks. However, he also distances himself from these very same elements. For example, he employs working-class boys for information but he will not let them into his home as equals. While he will dress up as members of the lower classes to gain information, he is always sure to clean himself up again. The shift to Ruth’s “cultural capital” parallels Holmes’s creation of his profession and “occupation” of a professional space. Holmes exists in Ruth’s “contradictory class location.”

In some ways, Sherlock Holmes fits into the traditional image of the valuable worker. The masculine ideal of physical labor is evident in the popular images of work during the Victorian period (Danahay, Gender 18). These images focus on “self-discipline and self-denial” as building blocks of masculinity (18). Victorian prose writers held the view that producing something was key to this idealization of the worker. In Past and Present, Carlyle writes, “For there is a perennial nobleness, and even sacredness in Work...in idleness alone is there perpetual despair” (Carlyle, Past 229). Carlyle places emphasis on the effort of work: “Work is of a religious nature: —work is of a brave nature; which it is the aim of all religion to be. All work of man is as the swimmer’s: a waste ocean threatens to devour him; if he front it not bravely, it will keep its word” (231). The ocean currents to which he is referring are despair, chaos, and emotion. He also uses the literal image of someone clearing a swamp to illustrate this metaphorical control: “How, as a free-flowing channel, dug and torn by noble force through the sour
mud-swamp of one’s existence like an ever-deepening river there, it runs and flows;—

draining off the sour festering water, gradually from the root of the remotest grass-blade;

making instead of a pestilential swamp, a green fruitful meadow” (230). Carlyle paints a

picture of digging and trenching in order to clear room for a town or a productive field.

Other writers view work in the same way. Morris and Ruskin both examine how

seemingly rough work can also result in control. For instance, in “How We Live & How

We Might Live” (1885), Morris writes, “he has indeed conquered Nature and has her

forces under his control” (Morris 14). This controlling of nature through activities such

as digging or stone cutting represents the self-control that needs to be attained through

work (14). His observations are similar to those of Carlyle’s descriptions of draining

swamps. Ruskin has similar views. He idealizes the physical work of stone cutters in the


rough strength and hurried stroke, he smites an uncouth animation out of the rocks which

he has torn from among the moss of the moorland and heaves into the darkened air the

pile of iron buttress and rugged wall” (Ruskin, Stones 902). Ruskin emphasizes the value

of rough strength and its ability to create architecture out of items like rocks; roughness is

what produces this control (904). Ruskin explains, “Now, in the make and nature of

every man, however rude or simple, whom we employ in manual labour, there are some

powers for better things” (904). Ruskin emphasizes that every man has an ability to

create something.

Ruskin’s roughness can also mean a lack of rules when building something, so he

also values roughness as a way for the worker to engage in a type of self-creation because

the rough work is an expression of an individual’s value: “this what we have to do with
all our labourers; to look for the thoughtful part of them…. Men were not intended to work with the accuracy of tools, to be precise and perfect in all their actions” (904). With his description of the monsters and goblins in the front of a gothic cathedral, Ruskin praises the “signs of the life and liberty of every workman who struck the stone; a freedom of thought and rank in scale of being” (905). Ruskin concludes that when a man is given a chance to freely think about his work, even if he makes errors, “you have made a man of him for all that” (904). Thus, Ruskin and Morris see work as a representation of order, democracy and freedom.

Holmes fits this tradition since there are examples where he engages in physical labor. His “unorthodox” methods are likewise an expression of Ruskin’s freedom and order. In his initial investigation in A Study in Scarlet (1887), Holmes is engaged in “dirty” work. At one point, he examines a dead body: “As he spoke, his nimble fingers were flying here, there, and everywhere, feeling, pressing, unbuttoning, examining…. Finally, he sniffed the dead man’s lips, and then glanced at the soles of his patent leather boots” (Doyle 1: 24). Later on, he literally collects dust: “As he spoke, he whipped a tape measure and a large round magnifying glass from his pocket. With these two implements he trotted noiselessly about the room, sometimes stopping, occasionally kneeling, and once lying flat upon his face…. In one place he gathered up a very carefully little pile of gray dust from the floor, and packed it away in an envelope” (26). Both of these examples place Holmes in a physically lower position, which puts him in the same position as the diggers outlined above. Also, he is engaged in a type of physical labor as he searches on his hands and knees. Literally, he is on the floor, lower than the men
observing him. Like the diggers, he “clears” a path through his dust collection, except that he is clearing a metaphorical path to the truth.

Holmes spends a lot of time in the dirt. For instance, in “Silver Blaze” (1892), “Holmes took the bag, and descending into the hollow, he pushed the matting into a more central position. Then stretching himself upon his face and leaning his chin upon his hands, he made a careful study of the trampled mud in front of him” (408). When asked how he knew that there was a key piece of evidence in the mud, Holmes replies, “It was invisible, buried in the mud. I only saw it because I was looking for it” (408). Holmes was willing to do the work necessary to find the traces of the crime. In this case, Holmes “digs” up the truth. It is not physically digging, but it is a metaphorical, literary example of digging.

He is engaged in similar enterprise in The Sign of Four. When he finds an attic secret room, he climbs up into it in order to investigate. Waiting for Watson, he lies on his face again (126) in order to hold the lamp so Watson can climb up. While up there, “He whipped out his lens and a tape measure and hurried about the room on his knees, measuring, comparing, examining, with his long thin nose only a few inches away from the planks” (127). This willingness to descend to the floor is complimented by his physicality. Watson sees Holmes on the roof, like “an enormous glow-worm crawling very slowly along the ridge” (135). In order to get down, Holmes needs to scale a drain pipe, which he does with aplomb. Watson observes, “There was a scuffling of feet, and the lantern began to come steadily down the side of the wall. Then with a light spring he came on to the barrel, and from there to the earth” (135). Holmes’s willingness to climb
around like a chimneysweep and scale a drainpipe places him in a physically parallel position to the rough workers mentioned above.

All of this climbing and digging and his overall physical approach to his investigations parallels Carlyle’s clearing of the swamps except Holmes is clearing up a mystery instead. Also Holmes’s techniques involve a scientific mastery of the scene. He uses finer tools than the digger as he “delves” into the crime. The mystery is solved through a physical manipulation of the scene and its evidence. The point is that his seemingly “rough” approach, complete with crawling on the floor, is actually something more. He is involved in careful examination. His crawling and scurrying about supplement his measurements and calculations. All of the descriptions set up the contradictions in his approach. He trots but is noiseless. He utilizes the “most exact care” while measuring distances between marks (26) but he is crawling on the floor.

His scientific approach with tools and measurement sets him apart from a common “digger” and distances him from Ruskin’s ideal worker. His tools are more advanced than the diggers use. Holmes is practicing criminal anthropology, “make[ing] darkness visible” by offering a new way to observe and detect criminals that could be right in front of us (Thomas 135). Comparing the literary detective with the history of camera, Ronald Thomas discusses how both are “observing machines” (135). “A Scandal in Bohemia” (1891) involves the recovery of a stolen photograph. Photography “both observes and defends and late-nineteenth-century European class privilege…and gender difference” (152). Holmes is working for the King of Bohemia in order to retrieve a photograph that threatens his power since Adler can use it to blackmail him. Holmes’s successful retrieval would reestablish traditional gender and class position.
Holmes’s tools, his measuring tape and his magnifying glass, accomplish the same thing and reconfigure “the framework of patriarchal power” (152). Holmes and other literary detectives represent “new forms of privilege and power, qualities invested now in a class of professionals (like themselves) who are legitimatized by their expertise rather than their birth. These literary detectives not only represent that class but also secure and safeguard it with the high-power lenses through which they observe the world and convert it into images subject to their expert surveillance” (152). This is a different type of job because Holmes is engaged in “typing” others in order to reinforce his own special class (154). In a way, he is doing a more refined version of the clearing that the swamp-diggers represent. His tools distance him from them.

In a way, his tools place him in opposition to Ruskin’s workers. The police’s attitude towards Holmes is symptomatic of this distance. To them, he is just in the way or an amateur with nothing of value to offer who dabbles for amusement rather than investigating for a living. All his efforts are met with scorn from the police. For instance, in A Study in Scarlet, “Gregson and Lestrade had watched the manoeuvres of their amateur companion with considerable curiosity and some contempt” (27). This contempt comes out in Athelney Jones’s comment in The Sign of Four: “It’s Mr. Sherlock Holmes, the theorist” (128). He later snips, “Don’t promise too much, Mr. Theorist, don’t promise too much!” (130). The policeman’s comments attempt a class separation to position himself above Holmes, similar to how a middle-class man might differentiate himself from a common worker. To the police, Holmes is just somebody silly crawling on the floor.
There is another way of looking at the situation, though. It could be that the policemen are the “real” workers, while Holmes is just a leisured amateur sticking his nose in their “business.” Jones’s use of the “theorist” suggests that Holmes is not really interested in doing the “grunt work.” The policemen’s attitude reflects a more cultural concern towards what constitutes important or “useful” work. For example, in “Useful Work versus Useless Toil” (1884), Morris takes the upper classes to task: “For first, as to the class of rich people doing no work, we all know that they consume a great deal while they produce nothing. Therefore, clearly, they have to be kept at the expense of those who do work, just as paupers have, and are a mere burden on the community” (Morris, “Useful” 101). He equates these rich with paupers since both receive comfort from others’ toil. This lack of contribution links them in their opposition to a productive male worker. Morris continues, “Moreover, this class, the aristocracy, once thought most necessary to the State, is scant of numbers, and has now no power of its own, but depends on the support of the class next below it—the middle class” (101).

As opposed to the police, Holmes has the freedom of choice as to what cases he chooses to take. “The Adventures of the Solitary Cyclist” (1904) begins as though the case is almost an afterthought for Holmes. Watson recounts, “…we first heard of Miss Violet Smith. Her visit was, I remember, extremely unwelcome to Holmes, for he was immersed at the moment in a very abstruse and complicated problem…. My friend, who loved above all things precision and concentration of thought, resented anything which distracted his attention from the matter in hand” (Doyle 2: 58). Granted, Holmes is involved in another case at this point, but the young lady’s problem is not something he is interested in at the given moment. This is hardly the attitude of someone who is trying to
“protect” a client as a policeman would do. If anything, his attitude is one of snobbery. A music teacher’s problem is unimportant: “You will let me know any development, Miss Smith. I am busy just now, but I will find time to make some inquiries into your case” (62). This aloofness extends to his treatment of Watson almost as a subordinate. When Watson asks if he will investigate, Holmes replies, “No, my dear fellow, you will go down. This may be some trifling intrigue, and I cannot break my other important research for the sake of it” (62).

If we compare this attitude with the police view of Holmes, it would appear that they are, at least, partially justified in seeing him as an amateur “theorist.” The irony of Holmes’s attitude is that his initial “theory” is proven incorrect. Miss Smith is in danger of being married off against her will. To the police, such a matter involves the legal matters of blackmail, fraud, and forced marriage. A young lady would and should be protected against those threats since it’s the job of police to serve the needs of its citizens while Holmes seems to be shunning the responsibility. As Ian Ousby observes, “Detection brings the artist that excitement in the exercise of his own powers which daily life commonly denies” (157). Holmes admits, “This case certainly presents more features of interest and more possibility of development than I had originally thought” (Doyle 2: 64). Though he realizes that the young lady needs help, this second observation about interest and development makes the case seem more like an intellectual exercise than a defense of a victim, putting him more in line the following: “To him, criminals and human problems are simply scientific puzzles...the fact that his work may serve interests of justice, or that it may have painful human consequences, is of no concern to him” (Ousby 156).
Holmes’s lifestyle fosters this attitude. In his study of *The Importance of Being Earnest*, Peter Raby makes a comment about the upper classes that is applicable to Holmes: “Surface, style, and fashion reign in this play, in physical appearance, in gesture, in speech” (Raby 43). His use of the term gesture is particularly pertinent. For example, in “The Man with the Twisted Lip” (1891), Holmes sits overnight, contemplating his evidence:

> He took off his coat and waist-coat, put on a large blue dressing-gown, and then wandered about the room collecting pillows from his bed and cushions from the sofa and armchairs. With these he constructed a sort of Eastern divan, upon which he perched himself cross-legged, with an ounce of shag tobacco and a box of matches laid out in front of him. In the dim light of the lamp I saw him sitting there, an old briar pipe between his lips, his eyes fixed vacantly upon the corner of the ceiling, the blue smoke curling up from him, silent, motionless, with the light shining upon his strong-set aquiline features. (Doyle 1: 285)

This picture of Holmes is much different from that of the hard-working, yet scientific problem solver as shown in the examples from “Silver Blaze” or *A Study in Scarlet*. In those examples, he is digging in the dirt, crawling along floors and taking measurements. His use of scientific tools, gives his work a type of “professionalism” or “authority.” In this example, he is lounging on pillows and smoking a pipe with a dreamy expression on his face. The clothing, complete with a waistcoat, that he replaces with a dressing gown suggests a certain level of comfort and leisure. Holmes exhibits a “somewhat inhuman detachment…furthered by overtones of Decadence” (Ousby 156). While he does solve the mystery, his method here just seems very casual.

As Riley and McAllister observe, Holmes is “unfettered by social constraints and expectations” (70). He also does not adhere to the “daily grind of routine at home and life” (71). Holmes is above the necessity of “making a living,” so he is free to indulge his
whims. For example, Riley and McAllister note Holmes’s excessive pipe smoking (74-75). They also point out that he has even written a tract on the subject (75). One begins to wonder how Holmes has all of this time and money to engage in these enterprises. Perhaps the police are correct; Holmes just gets involved when he wants to or perhaps, more appropriately, he is an upper-class man who “dabbles” in the professionalism of solving crimes. The fact that he does work when he is engaged in a case is undeniable, but he does it on his own terms, so his actions often cast him against the definition of middle-class masculinity defined by work.

Some of the villains are likewise opposed to this definition. Many of the descriptions of them place them against the traditionally masculine descriptions of behavior. For instance, In The Hound of the Baskervilles (1902), Stapleton seeks to pass himself off as a gentleman naturalist, but he is actually an evil former member of an aristocratic household. In Sherlock’s Men (1997), Kestner explains, “the narrative focuses on an attempt by someone to usurp the estate, but here the transgressor is an aristocratic son” (123). In this way, he represents an older way of obtaining wealth and power. The aristocracy obtained its wealth and status through inheritance and land. In opposition, the professional class sought a similar status, but re-configured it based on work.

For Kestner, the fear of “atavistic masculinity” is present in the text (125). This fear reflects the cultural anxieties of the time period (124). Atavism takes on two forms. From one perspective, middle-class masculinity is steeped in control and discipline that buries one’s desires. Atavism represents a return to the indulgence of one’s whims and desires and “animalistic” tendencies. Criminals represent this type of animalistic
reversion (10), which Stapleton’s violent nature exemplifies. As Kestner suggests, Stapleton represents a “throwback” (123); he cites Holmes: “It is an interesting instance of a throw-back, which appears to be both physical and spiritual” (qtd. in Kestner 123). Secondly, Stapleton also represents a movement back towards the aristocratic ways of conducting affairs since his sole motivation is to gain wealth through an inheritance. The text is an investigation of the “aristocratic order” (20) that reveals an indictment of the aristocracy since Stapleton’s actions reflects a land-based system that no longer fits.

Under the old land-based system, one’s position and place are not earned. That is why Morris had such a problem with members of the gentry. Stapleton is worse because he represents a corrupt version, linking aristocracy with crime in their opposition to middle-class masculine productivity. Stapleton’s violent temper and use of women to accomplish his goals link aristocracy with a sense of self-indulgence. Originally a Baskerville, he is living in South America with his wife Beryl, but is forced to flee for England because he stole some public money. He “establishes” (Doyle 1: 690) a school in Yorkshire. As Holmes explains, “His reason for attempting this line of business (my emphasis) was that he had struck up an acquaintance with a consumptive tutor upon the voyage home, and that he had used this man’s ability to make the undertaking a success” (690). As Holmes’s observations illustrate, Stapleton exhibits none of the hard work or productivity associated with manly, productive work. He steals funds to establish a school and he literally uses another worker’s efforts to make it succeed. Although words such as “establish” and “undertaking” suggest effort, Stapleton’s actions stem from his own greed and represent an aristocratic tradition.
This motive is the key difference between Holmes and Stapleton. Both create professions, but Holmes uses his job to satisfy his intellect, while providing a service to others at the same time. Stapleton’s second chosen profession is that of a butterfly collector. Though he is a “recognized authority on the subject” of entomology (690), he does not use this knowledge to offer service to anyone. The profession of collector is a good metaphor to describe what he is doing. Stapleton is a collector of wives, butterflies, and ultimately, an inheritance. Instead of working to obtain wealth and place, he wants to “collect” his inheritance. As Ruskin suggests collecting is not the same thing as earning money. Likewise, he falls into Morris’s category of the “aristocratic pauper.” He has no funds, but he wants to use his aristocratic roots as a way to get money.

Yet, for Kestner, Stapleton can be viewed as a mirror of Holmes (Kestner 125). As a supposed butterfly collector, Stapleton uses a net. He was “dressed in a gray suit and wearing a straw hat. A tin box for botanical specimens hung over his shoulder, and he carried a green butterfly-net in one of his hands” (Doyle 1: 621). His tin box with specimens is similar to Holmes’s collection of files that contains information about London and all the people who live there. In fact, Stapleton recognizes Watson, so he introduces himself. He explains, “The records of your detective have reached us here, and you could not celebrate him without being known yourself” (622). Both he and Holmes are readers and collectors of information. They both cast their nets, so to speak. Holmes later states, “My nets are closing upon him even as his are upon Sir Henry” (666). Holmes acknowledges that Stapleton is using a net to catch Sir Henry just like one of his butterflies. Kestner notes that the net imagery throughout the text ultimately links Holmes and Stapleton (Kestner 127). In fact, at one point, as Kestner notes,
Stapleton pretends to be Sherlock Holmes (125). The mirroring of the two is showcased through collection symbolism. For example, Stapleton wishes to collect money without working for it, unless one counts murder and crime as work. Holmes's collection, on the other hand, comprises evidence, files, dust and experience.

This mirroring is disconcerting because both characters “invade” the professional sphere to some extent. Stapleton presents himself as a type of “amateur” scientist, though he is also a corrupt aristocrat. Holmes does not appear to have to work for his money, picking the cases that interest him and thus choosing if and when he engages the professional sphere. In a way, both invasions stem from selfishness because of Holmes’s desire for intellectual satisfaction. While Stapleton enters and wishes to “take” from it, at least Holmes’s entrance and exit are more leisurely, and he does provide a service while he occupies that space.

However, the service he provides is called into question. Jones’s use of “theorist” to describe Holmes places Holmes against the common attitude towards “useful” work during the Victorian period. Likewise, the villains are users rather than useful. To be useful and productive were considered to be masculine traits. As Danahay points out, “Masculinity and industry are primary concepts in the Victorian ‘Gospel of Work.’ To be a man is to be industrious….To be a successful man is to be a productive man” (Gender 39). Writers like Morris and Ruskin also examined the concept. One of the ideas that Ruskin examines in The Crown of Wild Olive (1890) is “wise” work. For Ruskin, wise work is “honest, cheerful and useful” (31). Using honesty as a means of comparison, Ruskin compares the laborer with preachers and lawyers. In Fors Clavigera: Letters to the Workmen and Labourers of Great Britain (1873), he explains, “all professional sale of
justice and mercy is a sin” (Ruskin, Fors: Letter 31 24). Ruskin writes, “A man may sell the work of his hands but not his equity nor his piety. Let him live by his spade” (24).

With this statement, he is privileging digging as honest and useful. For Ruskin, wise work is “work with God” (Ruskin, Crown 31). He uses God as a way of describing order, so working with God “may be briefly described as ‘Putting in Order’” (31). This order is essentially what Holmes accomplishes with all his crawling and physical involvement with a scene. Ruskin explains, “The first thing you have to do, essentially; the real ‘good work’ is, with respect, to men, to enforce justice, and with respect to things, to enforce tidiness, and fruitfulness” (31). His statement is a qualified description of what Holmes does. While the workers Ruskin describes above are responsible for everyone, Holmes is more independent, but he “enforces justice” in his own way and keeps the London streets and the surrounding areas “tidy” for middle- and upper-middle class masculinity.

From this perspective, Holmes represents this definition of masculine usefulness. As Ruskin implores, “your chief duty, you workmen and tradesmen—to be true yourselves, and to us who help you” (32). He emphasizes that work is useful when it is productive (33). The work itself is what matters in terms of accomplishment. Holmes has this attitude as is indicated by the statement quoted at the beginning of this chapter. As Ruskin points out, “collecting money is by no means the same thing as making it” (8). This concept is something William Morris also emphasizes. In his 1885 essay “How We Live & How We Might Live,” Morris discusses the profit makers who do not work and how they are “hangers-on who live” off the toil of workers (Morris, “How” 13). Both Ruskin and Morris, then, value the laborer over the “idle” men who simply benefit from others’ work.
Stapleton’s ploy “suggest[s] a destabilizing symbiosis between the detective and the criminal” (Kestner 125). The Holmes character becomes a site for contradictions because of his “mixed” class status. Likewise Stapleton’s ability to exist exposes these tenuous definitions. More importantly, Holmes’s parallel “invasions” place him dangerously close to the criminal. In fact, in *The Sign of Four*, Watson remarks, “I could not but think what a terrible criminal he would have made had he turned his energy and sagacity against the law instead of exerting them in its defence” (Doyle 1: 127). Though Watson is making this statement within the context of Holmes’s intelligence, his remark is an entry point to examine the attitude towards work and crime in the time period. The non-working subject is often linked with the criminal.

For example, a *London Quarterly Review* article in 1888 categorizes people based on their ability or desire to work. One of the article’s focuses is on Charles Booth’s 1887 study entitled “Condition and Occupations of the People of The Tower Hamlets, 1886-7” (“Working” 257). In his study, Booth classifies the poor into classes. The language he uses to describe the poor elevates work. For example, his “Class A” of the poor is characterized as “some occasional labourers, loafers, street performers, and others” (qtd. 257). His second description is more telling: “[the] homeless outcasts of the streets, and also those who conceal criminal pursuits under a nominal trade” (qtd. 257). Booth characterizes these people as uncivilized and by extension, an example of less than the ideal of masculine control. He writes that “the whole class is really a savage life” (qtd. 257-258). He equates them with drunkenness and does not seem to believe that they actually look for work at all. He explains, “These are the battered figures who slouch through the streets and play the beggar or the bully and foul the record of the
unemployed” (qtd. 257-258). All of these descriptions place non-workers as less than human. He uses criminal and unmanly descriptions to categorize people who do not work.

His second category, “Class B,” is equally insensitive. Booth notes that this category is composed of those who are mentally or morally defective in some way and are unable to find steady work as a result (258). He is offering a seemingly quantitative and scientific analysis, yet one can see the moral implications of the language he uses in his descriptions. He also describes them as “shiftless” and “pleasure-loving” (258). Though these terms do not literally apply to Stapleton, their negativity does. For instance, Sir Henry recounts his reaction when he is talking to Beryl: “down came this brother of hers, running at us with a face on him like a madman. He was just white with rage, and those light eyes of his were blazing with fury” (Doyle 1: 638). We find out that Stapleton is actually a Baskerville and Hugo is the originator of the supposed curse. Hugo is described as having a “certain wanton and cruel humour” and he kidnaps a young lady he fancies (581). This behavioral trait finds its way into his descendent Stapleton. For instance, Stapleton abuses two women in the novel. He physically abuses his wife Beryl, but she admits, “It is my mind and soul that he has tortured and defiled...I know that in this also I have been his dupe and his tool” (686). He also uses Laura Lyons in order to kill Charles Baskerville. Her words parallel Beryl’s: “He has lied to me, the villain...I was never anything but a tool in his hands” (679). Stapleton’s behavior represents the type of excesses and criminal behavior that Booth’s non-worker exhibits: “They cannot stand the regularity and dullness of civilized existence” (Booth qtd. 258). Booth’s last statement is particularly pertinent because the unemployed are uncivilized
and undisciplined. From a masculine perspective, they are substandard since they lack productivity as well as discipline, the cornerstones of Victorian masculinity.

His attitude is not isolated, however. For example, William Ferrero comes to a similar conclusion in his 1896 article in The Forum. For Ferrero, “the habit of regular and methodical work has destroyed the violent impulsiveness of man’s primitive character” (361). Like Booth, Ferrero is juxtaposing disciplined workers with those who do not work, and so lack self-control. In fact Ferrero offers an explanation that is almost a verbatim copy of Booth: “In short, the born murderer, the born thief, and swindler are criminals because they are incapable of adapting themselves to the uniformity and regularity of work, as it exists in our civilized nations” (365). He even goes as far as to explain that even those who are intellectually superior and lack the drive for work are “imperfect individuals” (366). Though Stapleton is intelligent, his decision to circumvent working for a living and his choice to kill and cheat instead make him “imperfect,” to say the least.

Like Booth’s “scientific,” but judgmental report, Frederick Winslow Taylor uses a scientific approach to examine the efficiency of labor in his 1910 study Principles of Scientific Management. As Danahay points out, Taylor was more interested in efficiency and the profit that came from hard work (Danahay, Gender 137). However, he still places a value on the worker, suggesting how a more productive workforce can profit everyone involved. He, like Booth and Ferrero also has a disdain for laziness: “this deliberate loafing is almost criminal” (Taylor 63). This attitude informs the Holmes stories. For instance, in “A Scandal in Bohemia,” Holmes uses a disguise in order to get into Irene Adler’s home to recover a photograph when a fight breaks out when her
carriage arrives. Watson recounts, “As it pulled up, one of the loafing men at the corner dashed forward to open the door in the hope of earning a copper, but was elbowed away by another loafer, who had rushed up with the same intention. A fierce quarrel broke out, which was increased by the two guardsmen, who took sides with one of the loungers, and by the scissors-grinder” (Doyle 1: 200). Watson uses the term “loafer,” associating the term with violence. Taylor comes right out and says that loafing is criminal while both Booth and Ferrero link the loafer with violence. Holmes associates with these “loafers” since he uses them as accomplices (201). Holmes is a linchpin for working-class and professional-class interaction. Added to this link is his seemingly upper-class status, giving him the ability to participate in such enterprises because he is not concerned with the consequences. However, he exists on the border with non-workers, who in turn are lumped in with criminals.

His profession exists at the intersection of multiple class and work identities that reveal the instability of those identities. He is able to slide into professionalism from leisured aristocracy and vice-versa. Also, Holmes is very close to working-class pursuits at time, but he is also an example of the newly emerging professional class. These types of professionals are representative of “human capital” (Perkin xii). They provide service rather than labor and are an image of masculine control and service. Class-wise, they are located between the working class and the aristocracy. From a gender perspective, they are located in between traditional masculine and feminine definitions. They “work” from home, a traditionally feminine location. However, their intellectual pursuits distance them from the working-class who labor manually.
Carlyle struggled to reconcile his idealization of physical work with the “intellectual work” he is engaged in. In her article on Carlyle, Norma Clarke notes that Carlyle’s concern with literature was “its failure to offer a masculine vision equivalent in force to that which he had imbibed from his father” (Clarke 35). Carlyle’s solution was to come up with a new category—the “man of letters” as hero (40). Andrew Dowling notes that Carlyle’s “The Hero as a Man of Letters” (1841) combines the image of a Romantic artist with a businessman (Dowling 40). Carlyle’s essay attempts to bridge the gap between the concept of an isolated artist and a producer who provides a service to society (40). Faced with his sense of failure to “do something,” if you will, Carlyle constructed a “social role for himself” and a “cultural role for aspiring male writers that was redolent with possibilities of power, comfort and gratification” (Clarke 40). Carlyle attempts to give the writer a solid place:

Never, till about a hundred years ago, was there seen any figure of a Great Soul living apart in that anomalous manner; endeavoring to speak-forth the inspiration that was in him by Printed Books, and find place and subsistence by what the world would please to give him for doing that. Much had been sold and bought, and left to make its own bargain in the market-place; but the inspired wisdom of a Heroic Soul never till then, in that naked manner. (qtd. in Dowling 40-41)

Carlyle finds a place for “intellectual production” by comparing the writer to the outsider hero who still engages society and strives to change it. His service is inspired wisdom that offers a corrective to society’s ills. At the same time, a writer realizes he is involved in a market economy. Dowling writes, “Carlyle also explicitly places the author in the midst of other men, jostling in a market-place to sell his wares as other men do” (Dowling 41). Because he provides a service, he can make a living through his writing as
long as there is a public who needs his wisdom. Dowling explains, “Carlyle’s ‘Hero as Man of Letters’ draws on both the isolated genius and the canny businessman” (41).

Holmes is a very good example of this “outsider.” As Ian Ousby writes in Bloodhounds of Heaven (1976), “The detective is a gentleman, polished and suave in his manners, but reclusive and eccentric in his habits. In his work he is unhampered by official rules, being in a very real sense a law unto himself, and is intensely individualistic” (Ousby 140). Holmes is outside traditional law enforcement. He is also on the outskirts of society (Kestner 60). He must “create” a profession that suits his talents so that he can exist on this fringe. Hence, in the Sign of Four, Holmes proclaims his “unofficial” service he provides: “I have chosen my own particular profession, or rather created it” (Doyle 1: 100). The phrase “my own” emphasizes the fact that Holmes is beyond the former ways of finding a career: apprenticeship, heredity or even education. As Perkin explains, “The professional ideal was based on trained expertise and selection by merit, a selection made not by open market, but by judgment of similarly educated experts. Its ideal citizen was also a self-made man of sorts, who had risen by native ability (with a little help from his educational institutions) to mastery of a skilled service vital to his fellow citizens” (Perkin, “Preface” xiii).

Despite Holmes’s “outsider” status, he is also an expert at reading people. The detective knows “where to look and what to notice” (Thomas 134). In this way, he is very much like Dowling’s “canny businessman.” Thomas writes, “Together, camera and literary detective developed a practical procedure to accomplish what the new discipline of criminal anthropology attempted more theoretically: to make darkness visible – giving us a means to recognize the criminal in our midst by changing the way we see and by
redefining what is important for us to notice” (135). Holmes “looks” at his client or a suspect and deduces what has happened. As Ousby states, “His attentiveness to things does not merely refresh the spectator’s vision; it imparts a sense of control” (Ousby 155). Thomas stresses that Holmes’s vision is “reasoned out, rationalized, managed” (Thomas 135). Both Ousby’s and Thomas’s observations are steeped in terms of masculine self-control with their emphasis on words such as control and manage.

He achieves this control through his observations. Holmes’s ability “to read” is similar to that of a businessman who can “read” his potential customers. Both the detective and the camera serve as tools for “surveillance and discipline” and a means for “visual correction” (136). Holmes is a literal “case manager.” Using “The Musgrave Ritual” (1893) as an example, Kestner notes Holmes’s explanation: “I put myself in the man’s place, and, having first gauged his intelligence, I try to imagine how I should myself have proceeded under the same circumstances” (qtd. in Kestner 34). In The Sign of Four, Holmes explains, “I examine the data, as an expert, and pronounce a specialist’s opinion” (Doyle 1: 100). At the opening of “A Scandal in Bohemia,” Holmes is able to see through the King’s disguise and realize that it is the King. In the same story, Holmes literally “reads” the note that introduces his visitor. He carefully examines the lettering and the paper type. Holmes concludes, “It is the German who is so uncourteous to his verbs. It only remains…what is wanted by this German who writes upon Bohemian paper and prefers wearing a mask to showing his face” (190). It is interesting to note, however, that he is “out-read” by Irene Adler. To explain, how she does it, she leaves Holmes a note, momentarily occupying the position of “man of letters” since she disguises herself as a man. Her success at doing so parallels, not only the belief that
intellectual professions were deemed as possibly feminine, but also the competition that men were beginning to face from women in the job market.

To complete the charade, she dresses up as a working-class boy. Her ability to pass shows the permeability of the boundaries that surround the professional man. Holmes is out-dueled by a woman dressed up as a working-class boy, so he is outflanked on two fronts, which is a literary underscore of the “in between” space the professional occupied.

Still, this new professional category was admired. For instance, in 1888, George Hubbard discusses the value of indirect producers (Hubbard 412). He places value on those who manage: “By arranging and controlling the work of all, he makes it possible for them to work together and to use their time and energy to the best possible advantage” (410). In a discussion of magistrates, he admires their ability to “enable all to work together harmoniously and without waste of energy” (411). Taylor also believes in cooperation. He emphasizes the “scientific selection and development of the workman” with the “intimate cooperation of the management with the workmen, so that they together do the work” (Taylor 90-91). Holmes occupies such a leadership role, acting as a teacher and guide for Watson and his clients. Hubbard explains, “Teachers are producers indirectly, because, in the exercise of their profession, they are instructing those who shall afterwards engage in productive labor, and are fitting them to do more and better work than they could do if educated” (413). They are valuable because they teach others to be productive. Because of his contributions Holmes “too may claim a place in the ranks of productive laborers” (413).
In opposition, we are again confronted with Stapleton, who is an example of one who fails to fit into this newly emerging class. Stapleton is forced to use destructive and duplicitous means in order to exist in a new professional world. This inability to fit in is reflected through Stapleton's choice of profession in comparison to the profession that Holmes has created.

As Holmes explains, "There are scholastic agencies by which one may identify any man who has been in the profession" (Doyle 1: 666). This statement highlights both the authoritative and communal nature of the relationships between teachers. By consulting such teaching credential agencies, Holmes traces Stapleton and exposes him as a fake. He "cheats" his way into the teaching profession, and once the venture fails, he leaves it behind and does not participate in the process of training new professionals. His failure opposes the newly formed class of professionals who rely on each other's expertise and who are in turn called upon by those outside their respective fields.

This class formed a community based on their skills. They held each other to standards and acted in response to one another. For example, Odden notes, "a medical man could draw upon corroborating accounts from other practitioners, which enhanced their profession as self-regulating" (39). The doctors who testified did so to "allay suspicions they were self-interested" (38). As Odden explains, their testimony benefited the patients (38), but their participation in these trials lent weight to the value of their profession. She also notes that the medical reports accomplished the same goals: "This writer emphasises that his profession, properly administered is self-regulating, for members have 'self-respect' and they 'watch' each other" (43). The terms she uses, self-
regulating and self-respect, to describe this community are also terms used to describe acceptable middle-class masculine behavior.

Thus, professionalism is reciprocal among its members. During the opening of The Hound of the Baskervilles, Holmes is making another demonstration and he asks Watson to participate. For Watson, this invitation is very important. Watson muses, "I was proud, too, to think that I had so far mastered his system as to apply it in a way which earned his approval" (Doyle 1: 576). While Watson is primarily the audience for whom Holmes demonstrates his talents, Holmes's approval, his professional approval, is very important for Watson. Despite this initial approval, however, Watson is relegated back to audience after Holmes informs him that his conclusions were all wrong and that Watson's wrong guesses simply stimulate Holmes into making his correct observations. Although he does give explanations and provide little "shows" for his audience, Holmes would never be caught dead resting on his laurels. As he explains in The Sign of Four, "I claim no credit in such cases. My name figures in no newspaper" (100). Holmes's statement links him with claims made by both Ruth and Adams since he is simultaneously providing a service and distancing himself from advertising it. He is an example of Adam's professional man who is not motivated by money, personal gain, or apparent self-interest. However, his non-acceptance of credit makes him an example of masculine self-discipline for Watson and other males.

However, this same group must "show" itself as productive. Ruth asks, "How then to account for professionals who perform labor but also possess a kind of capital (mental capital in the form of measurable talent and the stored labor of knowledge acquisition)?" (4). Holmes provides an answer to this question with his comment about
his "peculiar powers" in The Sign of Four, which indicates the shift towards specialization that Perkin talks about. Holmes fits into this category with his comments in The Sign of Four: "I have a turn for both observation and deduction... They lay all the evidence before me, and I am generally able, by the help of my knowledge of the history of crime, to set them straight... You see I have a lot of special knowledge which I apply to the problem" (Doyle 1: 17, 18). Professional men did not want to be equated with traditional capitalists, yet at the same time, they wanted their services to be a means of making a living. As both Perkin and Ruth explain, they are engaged in "disinterested" interest (Perkin 370, Ruth 19-20).

They need someone to read their work, follow their advice and the like. In Dandies and Desert Saints, James Eli Adams examines the "rhetorical self-fashioning of Victorian intellectual men" (15). They "represent masculinity—and hence themselves—as spectacle" (12). He notes that the professional man has an "affiliation with the ideal of the gentleman, which...centrally depends on an appeal to 'disinterestedness,' including a professed disdain for economic self-interest" (192). In The Sign of Four, for example, Holmes states, "I don't wish to be theatrical" (Doyle 1: 136). He makes this comment to an incredulous Watson who thinks Holmes deserves credit for solving such a difficult case. Holmes simply says, "There might have been some credit to be gained out of it but for this too palpable clue" (136). With this statement, Holmes shows himself in possession of specific skills because he finds the clue.

There is another chapter entitled "Sherlock Holmes Gives a Demonstration." Such a title underscores the necessity for one who engages in intellectual work to have someone to whom he may peddle his wares. All of the clients who come to see Holmes
also reinforce the necessity of an audience. In this manner, Holmes demonstrates his value since he becomes part of an exchange. When he and Watson are trying to find out who has killed Sholto and stolen the treasure, Holmes chides Watson: “You will not apply my precept” (126). Here Holmes is actively engaging Watson in his work. Watson becomes a combination of student, co-worker and recorder. Holmes is also a teacher, not unlike Odden’s professional experts or Hubbard’s indirect producer.

This newly recognized professional class had its own space that goes beyond the class issues discussed above. Literal physical location and space are also a factor. The middle-class families of the time period were the first to experience a workplace which was separate from the home (Tosh, Place 8). The rise of industry created more factories and offices so work and home became increasingly separate (Danahay, Gender 15). Tosh, however, notes that this separation was caused by more than simply factories. Economic growth in towns was also a major factor because as cities grew with increased businesses, they became unpleasant places to live because of pollution and crowding (Tosh, Place 16). Transportation improvements such as railroads and “the horse-drawn omnibus” allowed for an easier commute (16). Tosh explains, “On the grounds of both amenity and economy, middle-class men preferred to maintain a residence away from their place of work” (16). To be able to do so granted the middle class a certain status since members still worked but could keep servants. More importantly, the home provided a refuge from the “shop” and interaction with different “types” of people. Middle-class men “needed to rescue many of their characteristic occupations from the taint of money-grubbing and sharp practice” (33). A home away from the workplace “furnished the most reassuring antidote of the alienation of city life” (32).
As a result of the separation of work and home, women were seen as having “nothing to do with” work (Tosh, Place 17). This attitude was a source of conflict because many intellectuals’ work placed them within the sphere of the domestic since they did not go someplace else to work (Danahay 15). However, Tosh also notes that the separation of work and home was not an all-encompassing definition of the middle class (Place 17). He discusses certain professions that allowed for an overlap between the domestic and workplace (17). For example, clergymen conducted much of their business from their homes because they could write their sermons at home and meet with their parishioners there (17). Doctors often saw patients at home and many lawyers combined their homes and offices (17). “Men of Letters” worked at home, sometimes even using their female relatives as secretaries (17). Their work and home life were not distinct, subverting the prevailing attitudes towards masculine middle-class work that was separate from home.

These professionals who worked within their homes needed a way to separate themselves. Thomas Carlyle built a soundproof study on top of his home in order to solidify his position as a “man of letters” (Tosh, Place 17). Literally, he wants to secure himself against noise, and the study reinforces his place as an intellectual. In “The Soundproof Study: Victorian Professionals, Workspace and Urban Noise,” John M. Picker uses urban noise as a means to discuss literal work space. Within the context of the article, Picker is discussing how street musicians and other noises disturbed a writer who worked at home. However, the same article articulates the needs of the new type of professional. These men are engaged in a type of fashioning of both space and identity. Using writers and clergymen as an example, Picker points out, “unlike members of the
more established professions, they lacked a separate, official workplace that affirmed their vocational status” (Picker 428). For instance, Holmes’s creation of his own profession reflects this quest for space and identity creation. All of his business takes place at 221B Baker Street. As Picker suggests, “With its double walls, skylights, and new slated roof with muffling air chambers beneath, the room itself signified a professional seizure of domestic space, an architectural tactic that encapsulated the oddly positioned existence of silence-seeking professionals whose living and working spaces overlapped” (429).

This aversion to noise also reflected class anxieties (Picker 431). The physical location of such street performers cut too close. In other words, the working and/or lower classes were literally knocking on the door of the homes of the middle-class professional male. Picker’s ideas, though he is focusing primarily on authors, can be applied to other professional middle-class men. He chooses to zero in on “the notion of territory” (Picker 433). As a new type of intellectual professional class emerged, those members of it sought “greater public respect and privileges as a professional class” (433). In the middle of the century, this “loose federation of middle classes” was just beginning to exert its influence and it sought respect that came along with it (434). As Picker points out, all the professions went through a “transitional period” because as the wealth of society increased so did the need for professional services (434). Part of this transition was finding an acceptable space to work.

It is informative to see where Holmes is “placed” within his adventures and how this placement mirrors the spaces sought by professionals. Again, Tosh stresses the tenuous nature of the middle class, as certain shopkeepers simply could not afford to have
a shop separate from their homes (Tosh, Place 17). Despite this combination of home and office, Tosh stresses the separation within the homes themselves (17). For example, “the office or surgery was likely to be set apart from the rest of the household; the ideal position for a clergyman’s study was just inside the front door, so that visitors could be admitted without disturbing the rest of the household” (17).

Because Holmes sees his clients at 221B Baker Street, he is an example of Martin Danahay’s term “compartmentalization” (Danahay, Gender 110). We see a successful separation between the personal and the “work” in Holmes, who is first introduced in a laboratory in A Study in Scarlet. We also get the first indication that the sitting room at 221B Baker Street will be the place where business will be conducted. Stamford takes Watson to the hospital where Holmes is studying, but Holmes is not a doctor. In fact, no one knows exactly what Holmes “does.” Stamford explains, “I have no idea what he intends to go in for. I believe he is well up in anatomy, and he is a first-class chemist; but as far as I know, he has never taken out any systematic medical classes.… Heaven knows what the objects of his studies are, and you must form your own impressions about him” (Doyle 1: 9,10). Stamford’s description sets Holmes apart from even the newly respectable medical profession and may place Holmes in the position of amateur. This placement is not without tradition, though. For instance, “the long English tradition of scientific amateurism came into full flower in the Victorian era and a host of avocational scientists were eager to help honor their hobby and promote its intellectual authority” (Altick 260). This vague description of Holmes’s “indeterminate” studies is laying the groundwork for the new profession that we will later come to know.
The laboratory is physically part of the hospital, but its separation is emphasized. Watson describes the “bleak stone staircase” and the “long corridor with its vista of whitewashed wall and dun-coloured doors” (Doyle 1: 10). The doors on either side of the hall remind one of offices or compartments, giving the atmosphere a professional feel. The doors are also “dun-coloured,” which sets them apart from the “whitewashed wall.” However, the laboratory is not only upstairs, it is even set apart from this great hallway. Watson explains, “Near the farther end a low arched passage branched away from it and led to the chemical laboratory” (10). Holmes is in the laboratory alone because he is a solitary investigator.

Holmes’s solitary space is a mix between chaos and order. Watson observes, “This was a lofty chamber, lined and littered with countless bottles. Broad, low tables were scattered about, which bristled with retorts, test tubes and little Bunsen lamps, with their blue flickering flames. There was only one student in the room, who was bending over a distant table” (10). The very first phrase used to describe the lab is “lofty chamber.” From one perspective it is positioned on a top floor like Carlyle’s soundproof room. The term “lofty” is also one of class separation. Holmes holds a “lofty position” and literally looks down upon the whole hospital. It is almost as if his profession is on a different if not higher plane. He has carved a professional space within an already established professional sphere. As an added emphasis on this professional space, Stamford states, “We came here on business” (11). This statement links Holmes and Watson in a professional sense and establishes them as middle- or upper-middle class professional men. The two are engaging in a business transaction, agreeing to share rooms in order to save money.
Like the lab, the sitting room is designed to separate business from the rest of the main dwelling. The apartment has a “single large airy sitting room, cheerfully furnished, and illuminated by two broad windows” (13). Holmes’s clientele span across classes and types of people, but he makes certain that they are to be contained (detained?) in the sitting room. Watson notes, “I found that he had many acquaintances, and those in the most different classes of society” (16). During the course of a day, “a young girl called, fashionably dressed…a gray-headed seedy visitor, looking like a Jew peddler…who was closely followed by a slip-shod elderly woman” (16) all visit Holmes to consult him. Watson describes these individuals as “nondescript,” placing them at a distance and reinforcing his own class position. To further emphasize this distance, “Holmes used to beg for the use of the sitting room, and I would retire to my bedroom” (16). By way of an explanation, and an apology, Holmes explains, “I have to use this room as a place of business…and these people are my clients” (16). As “a place” to conduct business, the sitting room mirrors those that Tosh discusses when he talks about how many doctors and lawyers worked out of their homes, designating a sitting room in the front of the home to interact with clients, safeguarding the rest of the home for any domestic concerns. With the vast array of classes of clients who ask for Holmes’s help, such “compartmentalization” (Danahay, Gender, 110) is necessary. He is keeping his class status in tact, but he realizes that he must interact with lower classes. Holmes’s sitting room accomplishes this separation.

Holmes also offers a metaphorical explanation of such separation. When Watson in A Study in Scarlet, asks him about his lack of interest in Carlyle or the solar system, Holmes gives a rather lengthy reply:
I consider that a man's brain originally is like a little empty attic, and you have to stock it with such furniture as you choose. A fool takes in all the lumber of every sort.... Now the skilful workman is very careful indeed as to what he takes into his brain-attic. He will have nothing but the tools which may help him in doing his work, but of these he has a large assortment, and all in the most perfect order.... Depend upon it there comes a time when for every addition of knowledge you forget something that you knew before. It is of the highest importance, therefore, not to have useless facts elbowing out the useful ones. (Doyle 1: 14)

His description of his mind is like Danahay's “compartmentalization.” Holmes only learns those facts that will help him with his profession. For him, anything else is trivial and simply distracts him from what he should be doing—working. Likewise, he keeps his dealings with members of the “other classes” in their “places.”

The strong emphasis on location suggests that the possibility of class “slippage” was always a nagging anxiety. For example, in The Sign of Four, Holmes utilizes some lower-class working boys, known as “The Baker Street Irregulars,” to gather information for him. When the whole group of them comes to the apartment after their mission, Holmes takes their leader aside and upon paying him (a business transaction), he instructs, “In the future they can report to you, Wiggins, and you to me. I cannot have the house invaded this way” (Doyle 1: 146). The interaction is necessary for business purposes only. The lower classes are sometimes clients and sometimes informants, but they are never allowed to “invade” the sanctity of the home. Although professional identity is a tremendous part of the male persona, it must still be “placed” appropriately.

This sense of order in the work area is underscored in “The Adventure of the Empty House,” which is the first story that takes place after the supposed demise of Holmes in “The Final Problem.” After Holmes reveals himself in, coincidentally Watson's study, Holmes asks him to be his co-worker again: “if I may ask your
cooperation, a hard and dangerous night’s work is in front of us” (Doyle 2: 8). Their “workspace” has been preserved from decay as well. Holmes’s brother Mycroft “preserved my rooms and my papers exactly as they had always been” (11). Upon returning to 221B Baker Street, Watson observes, “Our old chambers had been left unchanged through the supervision of Mycroft Holmes and the immediate care of Mrs. Hudson” (17). Class roles are reestablished in the old rooms. Mycroft is a fellow upper-middle class gentleman and Mrs. Hudson is a servant who reconfirms Holme’s upper-middle class stature. Watson notes, “the old landmarks were all in their place. There were the chemical corner and the acid-stained, deal-topped books of reference which many of our fellow-citizens would have been glad to burn. The diagrams, the violin-case, and the pipe-rack—even the Persian slipper which contained the tobacco—all met my eyes as I glanced around me” (17). Although it is unorthodox, everything is still in “working order” and in its proper “place.” Within the confines of the room, the place of experimentation, the chemical table, is placed in a corner. In the end, everything is in its place so that Holmes may conduct his business as an authority on crime.

Physical location and physical traits go hand in hand in examining the conflicts of the Victorian professional worker. In Manliness and the Male Novelist in Victorian Literature (2001), Dowling explains, “Vigorous work, active sexuality, rigid duty, proud nationality, and straightforward speech are all strategies that allow the individual man to belong to a hegemonic idea of manhood” (Dowling 3). These traits are a way for a man to define himself by setting himself apart from those who do not possess them. Work is a way to “discipline” masculinity (20). Work has traditionally been seen as a male sphere to the point that certain jobs were traditionally seen as the province of men alone.
Danahay explains that although women did work in jobs such as mining, such jobs were still considered to be male arenas, especially from the 1840s on. In the Victorian era, work became “redefined in terms of gender.” The emphasis on hands was an especially valuable way of determining “manly” work. Calloused and rough hands were considered the signs of “manly” labor. Work has a way of invigorating masculine traits.

Martin Danahay focuses on hand imagery in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde as a means to examine class anxiety in the novel. He examines the passage where Dr. Jekyll realizes he can no longer control the changes and wakes up one morning as Mr. Hyde. He writes, “As Stevenson makes clear in a passage in Jekyll and Hyde, the horror in the story resides principally in the fear that inside every upper-middle-class male body was a working-class man waiting to break out and usurp the professional doctor’s class consciousness” (Danahay, Gender 109). Danahay emphasizes the terms “corded” and “musky” used to describe Hyde’s hands. Such descriptions suggest the hands of a manual laborer and Hyde’s “regressive” nature (109). Danahay writes “The working-class identity is housed within the body of the professional male, and his hand transforms from ‘white’ and ‘comely’ (the term registering the hand’s proximity to feminine) to hairy and muscled” (110). Danahay’s emphasis on the hand “registers a particular crisis in upper-class male professional identity in terms of work” (109). Hyde’s hand is that of a working-class laborer but he also strives to satisfy his senses (109). Because he is linked with such self-indulgence, he is not an idealized working-class figure (110). He is a source of terror (110). As Danahay summarizes, “The horror here is based in class anxiety in that the ‘Dr.’ could overnight become a ‘Mr.’ and lose the class status derived
from his profession” (110). Work is divided according to class lines, so there is a split within a working individual into “conflicting work identities” (110). From one perspective, one has the intellectual, but within the same figure there lurks a working-class laborer (110). Complicating this scenario is the definition of manliness steeped in working, physical labor. Karen Volland Waters, in The Perfect Gentleman, also notes the same hand imagery. She observes, “The replacement of the ‘white and comely’ professional hand by the ‘dusky,’ knotted one suggests the possibility that the rule of the middle-class white gentleman is vulnerable to usurpation by the non-European and by the lower-class other” (109). Waters’s second point about the lower classes is particularly applicable because within the context of professionalism, the boundaries between those above and below are not as strict as they would seem.

Like Jekyll, Holmes’s ability to compartmentalize is strained when one notes the stains on his hands. When he first meets Holmes, Watson notices Holmes’s hand “was all mottled all over with similar pieces of plaster, and discoloured with strong acids” (Doyle 1: 11). Later, Watson makes a similar observation after having lived with Holmes for a few weeks: “His hands were invariably blotted with ink and stained with chemicals, yet he was possessed of extraordinary delicacy of touch, as I frequently had occasion to observe when I watched him manipulate his fragile philosophical instruments” (13). His fingers are not unlike Jekyll’s white delicate hands, but they also have ink stains and bits of plaster all over them, suggesting injuries from work, which place him in the same category as Mr. Hyde and his “knuckled” hands. These stains also parallel the calluses that Danahay discusses above, so they put Holmes in a valuable working position. They also root him in physicality, and his hands give him a certain toughness, but they also
place him in a tenuous class status. In fact, there are times when he dresses up as beggars and working-class men. Perhaps Danahay’s and Waters’s observations of Jekyll’s hands can be applied to Holmes. In “The Adventure of the Empty House,” Watson grabs Holmes by his arm and notes, “the thin sinewy arm” (Doyle 2: 8). The description is ambiguous because the arm could be thin because it is slightly effeminate from the vast amount of intellectual work that Holmes engages in, but the term “sinewy” denotes a certain amount of tightness or fitness resulting from hard work. When they initially meet in A Study in Scarlet, Watson remarks that Holmes grabs his hand “with a strength for which I would hardly have given him credit” (Doyle 1: 10). From the outside, Holmes looks non-imposing. However, the strength of his grip suggests fitness and his rough hands might even suggest a working-class background.

Unfortunately, these same sinewy arms are occasionally used for non-professional enterprises during his down periods between jobs. During the opening of The Sign of Four, Watson observes, “With his long, white, nervous fingers he adjusted the delicate needle and rolled back his left shirtcuff. For some little time his eyes rested thoughtfully upon the sinewy forearm and wrist, all dotted with innumerable puncture marks” (99). In this example his lower class, “non-professional” habits have punctured his professional exterior. He is not working at this point, so he is an example of the types of behavior that Booth and Ferero link with the non-worker. That is why work is so important for him. Work provides a buffer because of the compartmentalization it provides and he is able to interact with all classes but in a productive, serving way. This conflict is very similar to Jekyll’s observations of his own hands after they have changed. The ink, chemicals and plasters suggest physical labor that might be linked with possibly destructive non-
professional class endeavors. The cocaine habit has left him literally scarred. The ink has stained his professionalism and upper-middle-class status. However, this is offset by his long fingers and the meticulous way in which he “works.” It is almost as if when he is “puzzling” or “reasoning” a case out in an intellectual way, his fingers are at their “purest.”

Watson notes his fingers delicately playing the violin when he is trying to figure out a piece of the puzzle. This type of leisure is much more acceptable when compared to working-class vices. However, Holmes’s violin playing is more in line with aristocratic pursuits, and his use of the cocaine here recalls the “dreamy expression” as he is lounging while trying to solve the mystery in “The Man with the Twisted Lip.” In that case, his languid behavior serves as the avenue for him to solve the crime; his cocaine use in The Sign of Four distracts him from boredom. The fact that the same type of dreamy expression is used to describe both scenarios conflates destructive behavior with constructive behavior. In one instance, Holmes lounges and figures out the answer. In the other, he’s just wasting time in between cases. Kestner stresses Holmes’s cocaine use as a marker of his “‘different’ status” (60). Kestner even goes so far as to link him with decadence because of the languor he experiences whenever he is not on a case (61). Holmes’s arms and hands offer a similar conflation. His hands cannot be considered “unmanly” or too “leisurely” because he is an intellectual since he is not afraid to get his hands “dirty.”

Holmes’s hands are symbolic of his occupation of multiple classes and his ability to enter and leave the professional sphere. However, Holmes is not the only character who “leaves.” This tenuous borderline between classes and criminals is
illustrated by a character who chooses to “leave” the professional sphere: Moriarity, who is an upper-class, well educated gentleman. Holmes offers a description of someone who seems to be the perfect example of an upper-middle class professional: “His career has been an extraordinary one. He is a man of good birth and excellent education, endowed by nature with a phenomenal mathematical faculty. At the age of twenty-one he wrote a treatise upon the binomial theorem…. On the strength of it he won the mathematical chair at one of our smaller universities, and had, to all appearances, a most brilliant career ahead of him” (Doyle 1: 559). He is the perfect example of one who has obtained a position through the merit system that both Perkin and Ruth discuss. More importantly, he can “train” other professionals because of his abilities.

However, Holmes laments, “But the man had hereditary tendencies of the most diabolical kind. A criminal strain ran in his blood, which, instead of being modified, was increased and rendered infinitely more dangerous by his extraordinary mental powers” (559). His passions overturn his intelligence instead of the traditional discipline that intelligence is supposed to enforce. This turn toward evil has even greater consequences: “For years past I have continually been conscious of some power behind the malefactor, some deep organizing power…. Again and again in cases of the most varying sorts—forgery cases, robberies, murders—I have felt the presence of this force” (559). In this regard, he is almost a perverse example of the competitive exam/training system that has come to the forefront in England. He is at the center of many crimes, so he “teaches” his associates to do evil things. In opposition, Holmes is a “proper” instructor as is evidenced by the fact that he is always chiding Watson to use his methods.
It is clear that Moriarity has chosen to leave this sphere behind. As Atkinson notes, the comparison between Holmes and Moriarity is “Jekyll to Moriarity’s hidden Hyde” (qtd. in Kestner 114). Both Kestner, and Freeman in his introduction to the Barnes and Noble edition, examine two descriptions of Holmes and Moriarity. They note that in the earlier “Adventure of the Cardboard Box” (1893), Holmes is at the center of everything, with “his filaments stretching out” while in “The Final Problem” (1893), Moriarity is compared to a “spider in the centre of its web” (Freeman, “Volume One” xxxi; Kestner 114). The relationship is so parallel that, while being chased by Moriarity, Watson observes, “One would think that we were the criminals” (Doyle 1: 564). The parallel sets up the opposition between the acceptable, bonding nature of professional life and the instruction that can come from it and the choice to leave it behind and use one’s skill for personal gain rather than service. Moriarity represents an example of a “bad” professional. His interaction with Holmes produces supposed destruction for both of them rather than the cementing of their sphere as mutual professionals.

Holmes, as a mirror of Moriarity, illustrates how professionalism was not necessarily a solid boundary against crime. Like Moriarity’s and Stapleton’s invasion and occupation of professionalism, Holmes’ class status is unstable because of his ability/desire to “occupy” other classes. For example, as we have seen, his cocaine habit can be seen as a working class-vice because of its self-destructiveness, but the languor it produces mirrors the very “leisurely” atmosphere of his pipe smoking in “The Man with the Twisted Lip” as he solves the mystery. In both cases there is a sense of aristocratic leisure. In “Twisted Lip,” Holmes plays the part of an opium addict while trying to find out what has happened to Neville St. Clair. While at an opium den searching for a
missing person, Watson has his clothing tugged and he sees an “old man at my side, and
yet he sat now as absorbed as ever, very thin, very wrinkled, bent with age, an opium
pipe dangling down from between his knees, as though it had dropped in sheer lassitude
from his fingers” (Doyle 1: 275). This particular incident reflects how easily Holmes can
slide between roles. When Watson looks back at the figure who grabbed him, he
observes, “His form had filled out, his wrinkles were gone, the dull eyes had regained
their fire, and there, sitting by the fire and grinning at my surprise, and was none other
than Sherlock Holmes. He made a slight motion to me to approach him, and instantly, as
he turned his face half round to the company once more, subsided into a doddering,
loose-lipped senility” (Doyle 1: 275). His ability to “invade” the lower class and return
unscathed is illustrated by his dialogue with Watson versus how he appears to the other
addicts, “doddering” and “loose-lipped.” When he “returns,” his tone is one of wry
humor: “I suppose, Watson, that you imagine that I have added opium-smoking to
cocaine injections, and all the other little weaknesses on which you have favoured me
with your medical views” (276). This little comment places him back in his “own class.”

Once again, though, Holmes parallels the actions of an opponent. The opium den
is what links Holmes with his adversary in this story, as he has a room above it. Hugh
Boone is being held in connection with the disappearance of Neville St. Clair, a
journalist. Holmes describes Boone as “a professional beggar, though in order to avoid
the police regulations he pretends to a small trade in wax vestas” (279). Boone is the
epitome of mixed classes that were located in the city, including nuisances and the
reminder that the poor were beginning to encroach upon the more respectable classes.
The description is unsettling because of the term “professional beggar,” which seems like
a contradiction in terms. This contradiction becomes more paramount when Holmes realizes that St. Clair and Hugh Boone are actually the same person. St. Clair explains, “One day my editor wished to have a series of articles upon begging in the metropolis, and I volunteered to supply them.... It was only by trying begging as an amateur that I could get the facts upon which to base my articles” (288). The use of amateur and then professional to describe begging suggests that it is something that requires training and practice to do, a characteristic the professional class itself prided itself in. In fact, St Clair admits begging is more profitable: “Well, you can imagine how hard it was to settle down to arduous work at £2 a week.... It was a long fight between my pride and money...I threw up reporting and sat day after day in the corner which I had first chosen, inspiring pity by my ghastly face and filling my pockets with coppers” (289). Both Holmes and St. Clair use convincing disguises to make the “crossover.” In the end, neither violation is taken all that seriously. St. Clair is not charged with a crime. He is simply asked to stop performing his charade, but his presence remains symptomatic of a problem with the work definition.

Holmes’s presence likewise betrays an issue with work. Because Holmes comes into contact with all of these types of characters, he is an example of a balancing act. This balance reflects the unstable concept of work as a way of defining masculinity. For instance, he is both admired and ridiculed for his profession. The police often look down on him, yet they also work with him. Also, many come for his help rather than to the police. Holmes works but he wants to distance himself from that fact. At the beginning of A Study in Scarlet, Holmes explains, “I listen to their story, they listen to my comments, and then I pocket my fee” (18). Here Holmes is a professional, paid worker.
Later on in his adventures, though, he seeks to distance himself from the payment aspect of his profession. In *The Sign of Four*, Holmes does say that he does not want any credit and he does not want his name in the papers (100). Finally at the end of “A Scandal in Bohemia,” the King offers Holmes a ring, but Holmes refuses the payment; he asks for Irene Adler’s photograph instead in order to remind him of his opponent in that adventure (200). This memento shows that Holmes appears to be just as aligned with leisure as with work. With Holmes, one sees competing motives behind his profession that reflect the opposing definitions of how work defines the Victorian male.

These competing definitions show that work is not always a guarantee of middle-class gentleman status. For example, Holmes falls into dangerous habits that leave him physically scarred. His cocaine use suggests a lack of control. Despite this habit, though, he is still able to afford his living quarters and continue to solve whatever mysteries he chooses. The dreamy expression in eyes while taking the cocaine or the similar look while smoking his pipe gives Holmes the expression of a member of the leisured upper class. Yet, his job enables him to crawl on the ground but also think. In other instances, he plays the part of the working class. He drifts between the working class, middle class and upper class. The fact that the reader is never sure what class he actually occupies makes work an uncertain qualifier. In the end, Holmes is just as symptomatic of the issues that plague middle-class masculinity defined by work as his opponents because they often engage, to greater or lesser success, in the same balancing act. In response, Holmes attempts to create a profession that seeks to incorporate the many different definitions of male productive labor with all of its possible pitfalls but not without its merits.
Chapter 3
Athletic Issues

In the last chapter, we examined how work contributed to the definition of Victorian masculinity. In this chapter I would like to look at the other term that is the subject of this study, which is play. More specifically, I would like to examine the literal playing of sports and how that influenced Victorian masculinity for the middle- and upper-middle class gentleman. The attitudes towards and lessons learned from sports, both good and bad, found their way into other aspects of life and into the definition of masculinity in other areas. I will look at the late-Victorian adventure story as an example of this phenomenon. When examining them, one can see, if not literal examples of sports, at least examples of the values instilled by sports, whether good or bad. We catch glimpses of them in the language used in the adventures, and so the literature can be viewed as possible examples of how sporting attitudes translated into other areas of life.

For instance, in “His Last Bow” (1917), Holmes offers, “But you have one quality which is very rare in a German, Mr. Von Bork: you are a sportsman and you will bear me no ill-will when you realize that you, who have outwitted so many other people, have at last been outwitted yourself...Besides...it is better than to fall before some more ignoble foe” (Doyle 2: 490). Though militaristic in context, Holmes’s attitude is influenced by a sporting philosophy. His use of the term “more ignoble foe” magnifies his own position as one who does not cheat. Holmes’s words are suggestive of fair play and respect for one’s opponent. In other words, if one is going to lose, it is always good to lose to the best. There is no shame in that. Earlier Von Bork describes himself as “a born sportsman” (Doyle 2: 481). The repeated use of sportsman suggests that winning
game play was one attempt to define a successful Victorian male, so Von Bork’s attempt to be one underscores the term’s cultural importance.

However, despite Holmes’s complimentary attitude towards the sportsman and the games that he plays, the lessons that games provide are often contradictory. For instance, with the phrase “more ignoble,” Holmes places himself in the position of a trickster; his point is there are worse ones out there. Holmes gains his victory through the same types of tricks that Van Bork utilizes. Holmes is a literary hero so trickery is acceptable, while Von Bork is a villain so it is considered wrong, which suggests that following the rules depended on the situation. From a positive perspective, sports were seen as developing character based on courage and fair play. They also served as a means to exercise control, which was traditionally seen as a masculine trait. As John Tosh recognizes, a premium was placed on both energy and self-control in the Victorian male (Manliness 197). One needed to take action but in a non-emotional way (197). This mix of controlled energies found its outlet in team sports (197). Sports also created a sense of belonging through teamwork. However, these games could also be violence laden, sometimes encouraging cheating or a “win at all costs” attitude. If such negative traits were encouraged, then the putative lessons learned from the athletics were suspect. It would follow that using them as a means to teach and express masculine traits is equally suspect.

The concept of sports is fractured in a sense, then. On one hand, they were seen as an acceptable way for professional men to exercise battlefield traits while not actually at war. Sports were seen as “character” building, but despite these positives, they also provided less respectable lessons such as breaking the rules in order to win a contest.
Beginning in schools and carrying onto the field afterwards in life, they also emphasized violence as a way of life. We see how these values, both good and bad, found their way off the playing field. Examining episodes from Sherlock Holmes, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, Dracula, and the lesser known The Beetle, I will use the late Victorian adventure story as a means of illustrating this idea. One sees examples of both masculine control and teamwork and less savory examples of selfishness and a twisting of the traditional sporting ideal into something that can serve a less than gentlemanly purpose. In order to try to do this, I am going to look at how boys were introduced to sports in the public school systems. There they were taught manly values such as discipline, control and teamwork. However, they were also introduced to other less appealing behaviors such as violence and cheating. Thus, we see a change of attitude towards sports. As a result, the lessons it taught began to be used for other goals besides that of the Victorian gentleman.

I will use the stories to illustrate how sporting attitudes surfaced in later life. I will conclude the chapter with a comparison between Dracula and Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde that will highlight the fragility of sports as a means to define Victorian middle- and upper-middle class masculinity.

Like masculinity itself, sports were a type of performance, acting as a showcase and training ground for masculine traits such as teamwork and discipline. These "performances" "played out" on different athletic stages. The variety of sports, both individual and team-oriented, showed how engrained they were in the culture. For example, in The Healthy Body and Victorian Culture (1978), Bruce Haley examines the growth of sports popularity from 1850 through the 1880s, noting the great variety of outdoor contests that became popular (Haley 124). He discusses how cricket was the
most respected of the sports from the 1850s to the 1870s and that there were even touring
groups who played exhibition games (125). Changes in the game made it more exciting
and more of a spectacle, adding to its popularity (126). A very physically demanding
sport, rowing was also very popular, and the University Boat Race between Putney and
Hammersmith, held annually from 1856 on, was a major event in the London sporting
calendar (127, 129). Likewise, track and field events also emphasized physical fitness
(129). Most importantly, “mountaineering, athletics, and rowing were essentially the
property of the growing Victorian upper-middle class” (210). Contemporary writers
concurred; for example in his 1886 article on the English gentleman, W. R. Browne cites
sport as an avenue through which middle- and upper-middle class men could physically
express themselves.

Mountaineering was especially popular; in fact, it had become quite competitive
(132). According to Leslie Stephen, mountain climbing was “a sport to be put beside
rowing, cricket, and other time-honoured sports of Englishmen” (qtd. in Haley 132). In
her book, Victorian Writing About Risk (2000), Elaine Freedgood examines how
climbing represented a shift of values from the eighteenth century (Freedgood 111).
Richard Holt explains, “Victorian sport and sportsmanship…involved a shift away from
gambling and spectating towards hard team-work, fair play and physical exertion” (qtd.
in Freedgood 111). Stephen, “one of the heroes of the new sport” (mountaineering) (108)
sees the history of it as “the history of the process by which men have gradually
conquered the phantoms of their own imagination” (qtd. in Freedgood 109). As
Freedgood adds, “the point is that English, male, middle-class combatants – men who
performed less physically-demanding labor than their working class counterparts, and
whose physical prowess was not regularly tested or proved until the advent of pastimes like mountaineering – could develop the necessary qualities to win the battle” (113). They could do this by engaging danger and wrangling it into submission.

If they got hurt, their wounds served as a badge of honor. Such a description reminds one of the bruised and battered, but triumphant Holmes in “The Adventure of the Solitary Cyclist.” Watson writes, “Holmes’s quiet day in the country had a singular termination, for he arrived at Baker Street late in the evening, with a cut lip and a discoloured lump upon his forehead.... He was immensely tickled by his own adventures and laughed heartily as he recounted them” (Doyle 2: 64). At first, Holmes’s chuckle might seem out of place but we later come to find that he has won a fight: “I get so little exercise that it is always a treat.... I have some proficiency in the good old British sport of boxing. Occasionally, it is of service; today, for example, I should have come to very ignominious grief without it” (65). His comment about exercise is a good cultural example of Browne’s (1887) observations about how sport provides a way for a gentleman to express himself if other avenues are not available. Though not mountain climbing, the physical punishment that Holmes goes through is a sight to behold and he seems to take some pride in it. After all, as Holmes says, “It was a straight left against a slogging ruffian. I emerged as you see me. Mr. Woodley went home in a cart” (65). Because he has taken some blows, Holmes’s adventures involve risk, so he is one of Freedgood’s “middle-class combatants.”

Browne likewise uses the sport of mountain climbing as an example of how risk sharpened the gentleman’s resolve. He writes, “it is to the credit of professional men that, in these last days, they have struck out a pastime of their own, which, in the
important qualification of training the nerve, has no rival, namely mountaineering—a
sport at which squires and soldiers are apt to look somewhat askance” (Browne 270).

This particular sport combines both physical and mental prowess:

But when a man finds himself (as every mountaineer must have found himself once and again) clinging with fingers and feet to well-nigh imperceptible crevices in a well-nigh perpendicular rock; when he glances downwards and sees the said rock round itself in a rapid curve, allowing his eye to drop down to the glacier a thousand feet below; when he feels quite certain that he cannot get forward, and quite uncertain whether he can get back; then he cannot help finding out what his nerves are, and learning whether he can depend on his own hand and head to help out of a difficulty. One such experience is worth an eternity of politics. (270)

When beginning the passage with the phrase “a man finds himself,” he is talking about the literal location of the mountain climber. Within the context of his discussion, the same phrase takes on a deeper meaning. Physical and intellectual exertion allow a man to find himself metaphorically. Pushed to the limit, one can find out what his true character is. Sport, in this case mountaineering, is a way to establish the masculine traits of reserve, courage and physical prowess, all of which are types of control. Haley explains, “A mountain was no longer regarded only as a sublime object or as a place of simple recreation but as a challenge to a man’s courage” (Haley 132). This sense of challenge shifted mountain climbing from recreation to competition (132).

This attitude towards mountain climbing surfaces in Sherlock Holmes. For instance, at the end of “The Final Problem,” the reader thinks that Holmes is at the bottom of Reichenbach Fall. However, we learn in “The Adventure of the Empty House” that Holmes is able to climb a dangerous cliff successfully. He could not walk back up the path or people would know that he was alive:

On the whole, then, it was best that I should risk the climb. It was not a pleasant business, Watson. The fall roared beneath me. I am not a
fanciful person, but I give you my word that I seemed to hear Moriarity’s voice screaming at me out of the abyss. A mistake would have been fatal. More than once, as tufts of grass came out in my hand or my foot slipped in the wet notches of rock, I thought I was gone. But I struggled upward, and at last I reached a ledge several feet deep and covered with soft green moss, where I could lie unseen, in the most perfect comfort. (Doyle 2: 10)

Holmes’s ability to climb up is a literary example of Browne’s description of the ability to use both “hand and head” to escape a difficult situation. The feelings Holmes details mirror the same type of risks that is appealing in Browne’s description of the mountain climber. Holmes as a mountain climber stands for the ability to look danger in the face and do what is right, both morally and practically, a fictional example of the professional whose expertise exhibits manly characteristics of bravery tempered by self-control. He illustrates how athletic competition, whether solitary or team-oriented, translates into later real life situations off the field and even into popular literature.

The courage and self-discipline that characterize the mountain climber were the same ideals fostered by the public school system. According to Mike Huggins, in “English middle-class culture and sport (1850-1910),” mid-nineteenth century schools began to use sports as a way to foster teamwork, discipline and leadership qualities (14). Waters discusses how the gentleman was “manufactured” in public schools (5) because “he was an important standard for masculinity during the Victorian era” (19). She emphasizes how schools helped build the “character” of the gentleman (19). In his article on Christian manliness and working-class boys in the late Victorian period, Springhall observes, “In the public schools, playing games and athletics came increasingly to be looked upon as an intrinsic part of manliness and were in themselves justified as character building” (Springhall 66). This “character” was based in moral terms and the discipline and control espoused by schools served this end.
While physical fitness was directed towards spiritual ends earlier in the century, its emphasis became more secular later on in the century (Richards 103). Athleticism took precedence over godliness and manliness (104). Manliness was still key but it was characterized by ‘sporting ability and adherence to the creed of ‘playing the game’, ‘team spirit’ ‘not letting the side down’, ‘being a good loser’ etc. ‘Fair Play’ became the motto…” (104). The public schools helped inculcate the belief in empire for future adults who would be willing to fight for it (104). Sporting events in school offered an excellent proving ground: “Such ‘good work’ as the nation needed could be accomplished best by men who had tested themselves and, having been found equal to the task, were prepared to be leaders” (Park 10). Games served as an avenue to instill discipline in youngsters and indoctrinate them in a “number of important individual and collective qualities: obedience, physical commitment, accepting rules and authority and to give one’s all for the good of the team (or house, or school or country)” (Walvin 250). These qualities are traditional masculine traits since they are variants of self-control.

School leaders were responsible for passing these values on to subsequent generations. For example, A. C. Wilson, second master at Lansing from 1851-1869 (Mangan, Athleticism 277), explains, “The great value of a school is that it is, or ought to be, a place of moral discipline, and this discipline is taught as much in the playground or cricket field as in the classroom” (qtd. in Athleticism 41). Mangan concludes, “With these enthusiasts in authority, games facilities and a games ethos quickly developed, a state of affairs that reflected events in the more firmly established public schools up and down the country such as Marlborough and Harrow” (41). In order to survive, schools emulated the more successful ones, which contributed to the boom in athleticism (42).
These earlier schools and headmasters laid the groundwork and started the ball rolling, so to speak: “Ultimately the public school world in the late nineteenth century looked so favorably on games-playing staff that many undergraduates played with the express purpose of getting employment” (116). Sports were an effective means of maintaining discipline in the classroom because students would be able to identify with their masters who were athletes and not being a sports enthusiast would create isolation (119). Since it generated new teachers, who in turn preached the sporting mentality, the system was self-contained. As Mangan points out, it was a “system of maintenance’ stressing dominant values, reducing discontent, promoting acceptance of school life and providing delightful reminiscences in adulthood, which guaranteed a steady supply of recruits to the public schools” (150).

Thus, sports served as a way to express and pass on values, whether they were good or bad. In their article on teacher training colleges, J. A. Mangan and Colm Hickey look at the how athleticism was steeped in ritual (Mangan and Hickey 131). Such rituals created a “frame for experience” (Mangan, Athleticism 142-143). Athletics established “stable, ordered, hierarchical frameworks within which to operate” (Mangan and Hickey 130). According to Bernstein, Elvin and Peters, “the symbolic function of ritual is to relate the individual through ritualistic acts to a social order, to heighten respect for that order, to reverify that order within the individual and, in particular, to deepen acceptance of the procedures used to maintain continuity, order and boundary and which control ambivalence towards the social order” (qtd. in Mangan and Hickey 130). Young boys played games and learned rules as well as the satisfaction of winning through teamwork. Taking Harrow’s Lord’s Match against Eton as an example, Mangan
cites one former Harrow student: “the supreme rite when one identified oneself with every member of the side, suffered in their failures, exalted in their triumphs” (qtd. in Athleticism 143). He notes that another student was looked upon as a traitor when he chose not to attend the match, so matches served as a “value filter” (143).

Within the schools themselves, the house system also fostered this “system of maintenance.” Schools would be organized into different houses, so sometimes a sense of solidarity was achieved “by deliberately created internal diversity so that opposing groups of pupils met frequently on playing fields throughout the year” (Mangan, Athleticism 146). Mangan calls the house system “calculated segregation” that was maintained by “fiercely contested house matches” (146). These games would instill a sense of teamwork and loyalty and leadership. For R. T. C. Taylor, in A Housemaster’s Letters (1912), “A boy who, at nineteen, can rule a house at a public school, can rule a nation” (qtd. in Mangan, Athleticism 148). Mangan explains, “In this atmosphere heroes were easily made and scapegoats chosen. But, more importantly, in this way unity was effected out of diversity and retrospective affection out of immediate hostility” (154).

The potential for heroics on the field carried over into life. For James Walvin, “A player’s role and value was subsumed to the greater needs of the team itself (notwithstanding the fact that the games’ best remembered players are men whose distinctive athletic genius allowed them to flaunt team play)” (Walvin 250). Walvin’s last point about remembered players emphasizes the value of the athlete hero; in fact, school magazines praised him (Mangan, Athleticism 70). Mangan notes that the blood, a favored athlete, was a “symbol” from whom younger schoolboys took their definitions of the world. (Mangan, Athleticism 176). As Park observes, “The athlete literally
embodied (Park’s emphasis) power and prowess and provided the icon which could serve as a model for other young men – even those relegated to the role of spectator” (22).

These heroes were physically fit examples, so the observers were drawn to them. Because of this appeal, spectators could see the masculine examples of self-discipline and a willingness to work for goals (22). Their success in contests represented “discipline and mastery of self; yet it could also be mastery over opponents” (22). Men would see them perform admirably on the field and would look to them as models to emulate.

Some of the fictional characters in the late Victorian literature are symbolic of what the athletic hero represented and become extensions of their values, especially bravery and self-control in service of a greater ideal. For example, we get an image of Godalming exemplifying the ideals of the sports hero in Dracula. Of course, he isn’t playing a literal sport, but the group’s reaction to his dispatching of Lucy is not unlike a group of schoolboys who celebrate the achievements of player on the field. In fact, before they both destroy and so subsequently free her, Morris asks, “Great Scott! Is this a game?” (Stoker 224). Van Helsing’s response is a solemn one: “It is” (224). They even wear their school colors because they are dressed in black, and “Van Helsing, instead of his little black bag, had with him a long leather one, something like a cricketing bag; it was manifestly of fair weight” (228). The cricket description is an apt one because the stake that they use to destroy Lucy is a sort of altered cricket bat: “a round wooden stake, some two and a half or three inches thick and about three feet long. One end of it was hardened by charring in the fire, and was sharpened to a fine point” (228). One gets the sense of the group as Arthur’s friends encourage him to go forward.
The others look to him (229), inviting him to be part of their team (229). Van Helsing gives him the hammer and stake. Arthur comes up to “bat”:

Arthur took the stake and the hammer, and when once his mind was set on action his hands never trembled nor even quivered…. Then he struck with all his might. The Thing in the coffin writhed…. But Arthur never faltered. He looked like a figure of Thor as his untrembling arm rose and fell, driving deeper and deeper the mercy-bearing stake, whilst the blood from the pierced heart welled and spurted up around it. His face was set, and high duty seemed to shine through it; the sight of it gave us courage, so that our voices seemed to ring through the little vault. (230)

With these actions, Arthur leaves his emotionalism behind. Seward compares him to a Norse god, elevating him in physical stature and purpose. His arm is “untrembling” as opposed to the “desperately sad and broken” character we encounter earlier. The blood oozing up around the stake is analogous to the violence and injuries experienced on the sports field. Amidst this violence, the most telling part of the episode is the response from the group. Thus, we see “retrospective affection out of immediate hostility.”

Seward notes that Godalming’s actions “gave us courage.” The collective cheer brings the group members together as both spectators and teammates as they watch their new star teammate make a key play. Since he is an upper-class lord, his participation suggests an inclusive nature of sport; however, it also reflects blurred class boundaries. Their collective shout that echoes through the vault is a final congratulatory note for Godalming’s winning play. Godalming has become an “athlete hero,” using his stake as a symbolic piece of “athletic” equipment.

These types of heroes were celebrated by the Victorian public. For instance, in his 1890 article on cricket and its history in England and its colonies, W. G. Grace discusses some of the better players in English cricket. He notes the improvement in the game and he cites some players as examples of these improvements (Grace 646).
calls Arthur Shrewsbury “the finest professional batsman of the present time” (646).

First, Grace is explaining what a popular game cricket has become. Second, he uses Shrewsbury as an example of the trend that the sport is taking, and he is an example of a player fans want to see, so he is an athlete hero. Likewise, Godalming becomes someone for the group to watch and cheer on; he is a “batsman.”

Certainly Godalming is not playing a literal game of cricket. The ideals that he shares with the athlete hero connect him with such a hero. We see a man who has lost his fiancée and is now being asked to drive a stake through her heart. Instead of an emotional outburst, Godalming responds with the same type of controlled aggression that is seen on the playing field. He displays great courage in the face of what seems like a losing cause. Yet, his actions serve a greater purpose, so he is not unlike a player who sacrifices his own playing skills for the good of a team. The others’ cheers are what cement the analogy.

Some players did not measure up to the athletic hero’s standards, though. Mangan explains, “The bombardment of symbolic imagery to which the school boy was subjected left no doubt that while some types of behaviour revealed moral adequacy – the clean break for the line, the chanceless century, others displayed, for all to see, moral inadequacy – the funked tackle and the consistent duck” (Mangan, Athleticism 176). A character like Hyde, whose “every act thought centered on the self” (Stevenson 311), for example, might be somebody who represents less than virtuous lessons learned from athletics.

Thus, as we can see from the literary examples, lessons on the field could lead to heroics or perhaps, in the case of Hyde, even selfishness later in life. These games
provided a foundation: “Ritual activities and symbolic garments provided these former pupils with a familiar identity.... The rival matches at Lord’s and elsewhere, the old boy reunions and the old boy club games helped effect this transfer as well as helping to promote solidarity and permanence of identity” (Athleticism 146). Mangan explains, “More to the point, what the public school boy did was to take his school world and its symbolic actions and trappings with him into the outside world” (145).

These “trappings” were not always positive, though, so they expose the chink in the athlete’s armor. Despite the teamwork espoused by schools, the school and its rituals were not entirely composed of happy memories. The schools also instilled a kind of toughness in its students. As headmaster of Loretto from 1862-1903, H. H. Almond felt that children needed to be prepared for the roughness of life, and relied on Spencer’s 1861 Education: intellectual, moral and physical as a model for his system of physical education (50). Spencer felt that the key to succeed in life was to be like a successful animal in nature; he then moved his metaphor up levels, suggesting that a successful nation was composed of a successful group of animals (50). Proper diet and physical fitness was a key part of this preparation (50).

However, toughness was also fostered in a less virtuous manner. For instance, J. A. Mangan examines “Social Darwinism” in public schools and notes that Tom Brown was used as a template for the hard-nosed schoolboy (“Social” 137). While an 1857 Spectator article called Tom Brown “a thoroughly English boy. Full of kindness, courage, vigour and fun – no great adept at Greek and Latin, but a first rate cricketer, climber and swimmer, fearless and skilful at football, and by no means adverse to a good stand-up fight in a good cause” (qtd. in “Social” 137), the actual school experience was
much darker (138). For example, an 1858 Edinburgh Review article described a boy’s school as “an excellent opportunity of learning his own place in life.... He will learn to estimate the power, whatever he may think of the merits, of a hard coarse temperament and he will discover the immunities which a light heart and a thick skin confer on their possessors” (qtd. in “Social” 139). The article suggests that while a trait such as coarseness might seem undesirable, it was sometimes necessary to succeed later in life, and the school and its contests helped to foster it. While there was a certain moral package offered to the public, the interior workings of the school were much different, so schoolboys often experienced a much different education than what surface appearances would have you believe (139). Instead of simply a place of friendship and teamwork, the school instilled toughness and physical strength along with a sense of morality.

One had to remember that toughness was necessary in order to justify some of these rough experiences. Otherwise, a man looking back would only remember being picked on or being pushed around instead of seeing how these experiences formed him as a man. The Edinburgh Review’s description is close to “a hard, secular morality much more akin to the tenets of the Social Darwinism preached by Herbert Spencer or favoured by William Graham Sumner” (139). According to Tony Collins, the idea of the English Public School was to instill stoicism in the boys, so that they would be able to endure violence and meet it without being affected in an emotional way (Collins 175).

Schools were not only educators in morals, but also survival. As Mangan observes, “Public School life was frequently unChristian and ungentlemanly” (Athleticism 135). A hierarchy of leadership and teamwork was also created, often using violence to maintain it. These survival lessons, not confined to public schools, worked
their way into the late Victorian and Edwardian training colleges that trained teachers (130) who passed on these values, so one can see how a cycle of “place” was created. There was a very strict “pecking order” in these colleges (Mangan and Hickey 131). Enforced through physical means, these lessons were an example of Bernstein’s, Elvin’s, and Peters’s “differentiation rituals” (131). For example, P. B. Ballard describes how during the first week at Borough Road, there was a “traditional football hoax” during which the Seniors purposely lost to the Juniors (131). However, when the real match was played, it “involved a penalty for the losers (such as providing jam all round for tea), and this time the Juniors were beaten to a frazzle!” (Ballard, qtd. in Mangan and Hickey 132).

Thus, Seniors “managed” the Juniors and “educated” through humiliation (132), punishing them for lack of respect with “cold baths, gauntlets of knotted towels and the like” (More, qtd. in Mangan and Hickey 132). As Mangan and Hickey observe,

> From the first moment of their arrival these ‘freshmen’ were made sharply aware of institutional precedent. Juniors were subordinate to seniors, seniors to their elected officers (the ‘Jury’ at St. Paul’s and ‘the Poets’ at Borough) who in turn were subordinate to the junior tutors, who were subordinate to the house tutors and so on, in a reflection of the considerable importance attached to hierarchy in Victorian and Edwardian education and society. (132-133)

Like the cycle of athleticism described above, schools created a system of discipline, obedience and teamwork. This “cycle/system” was maintained through exposure to violence.

This violence found its way into athletic contests, which served as an extension of the lessons outlined above. For instance, violence in rugby was something a schoolboy would have encountered during his days at the public school (Collins 175). Schools used the “ferocity of keenly-contested house matches” to serve an imperial end (Mangan,
Athleticism 136). Violence and sports were linked; for example, at Uppingham, boys on
their runs were often accompanied by an upperclassman on a bicycle who would whip
them if they were not running fast enough (85). In Tom Brown’s Schooldays, the
violence of rugby is explained to Tom by his friend East: “it’s no joke playing-up in a
match, I can tell you. Quite another thing from your private school games. Why, there’s
been two collar-bones broken this half, and a dozen fellows lamed. And last year a
fellow had his leg broken” (Hughes qtd. in Collins 175). Hughes based his novel on his
actual experiences at Rugby, and his use of it in his novel shows how sports was
engrained in popular culture even to the point where literature, if not celebrated, at least
tolerated violence in sports.

These violence-laden survival tactics found a more individualist slant in boxing.
Learning to fight when necessary was a physical representation of standing up for oneself
but also suggested the paradoxes surrounding sport as a whole. On one hand, boxing is
violent. Yet, it was also a way to gain respect, and perhaps even friendship, from one’s
opponent and those who were watching the fights. In his article on imperialism and
hunting, John M. MacKenzie explains that “boxing, wrestling and Japanese martial arts
were recommended to the Scouts” in order to help foster qualities of discipline and
independence as well as self-reliance, which were all qualities of the middle and upper-
middle class gentleman (177). Mangan describes the positive outcomes: “For the
powerful and the pugnacious, however, there were certain well-established enjoyments.
Fist-fighting was a frequent pleasure (for winners and audience) in mid-Victorian
schools, as in the wider society. It had time-honoured legitimacy” (Mangan, “Bullies”
23). Thomas Assheton-Smith achieved fame at Eton (1783-1794) for his epic fist-fight
against his fellow pupil, Jack Musters (23). Musters was known for his physique and his athletic prowess, so Assheton-Smith’s victory over him gave him well-deserved fame (24). Mangan is quick to point out that a writer such as Thomas Hughes “provided moral license for public schoolboys to beat each other senseless” (24). Hughes writes, “Fighting with fists is the natural and English way for English boys to settle their quarrels...learn to box, then as you learn to play cricket and football. Not one of you will be the worse, but very much better for learning to box well” (qtd. in “Bullies” 24). The fact that a popular author sings the praises of boxing indicates how acceptable and popular it was.

Fights often had a formal set up; for example, at Marlborough in the middle of the century, Fleuss’s Arch was the site for formal fistfights, but fighting could take place anywhere on the school grounds such as the field or dorm (“Bullies” 25). In his “Reminiscences,” J. S. Thomas writes of the fights of Marlborough: “for the more formally arranged encounters Fleuss’[s] Arch was recognized as the appropriate spot, unless the principals were leading fellows in the school. In that case the Upper Fifth was sometimes selected” (qtd. in “Bullies” 25). The fighters had an audience, similar to a formal boxing match to the point that water and towels were secured beforehand (25). The fight would then go on until somebody won or the bell rang for classes (25).

Descriptions of such fights read like today’s sports columns. A History of Marlborough College, written by A. C. Bradley, A. C. Champneys and J. W. Baines in 1923, recounts an epic fight:

A celebrated one at this particular time took place in the fifth-form classroom, where the desks ranged in semicircular form constituted a kind of amphitheatre, and lasted from breakfast till ten o’clock school. The last really notable contest, we fancy, that took place was in 1863. The arena
on this occasion was the Upper School. The fight was a lengthy and stubborn one, and both combatants, fellows in the lower fifth, were knocked out of time and their faces out of recognition. The one was a young patrician with more spirit than physique; the other was a sturdy Irishman. Nearly the whole School, except, of course, the sixth, were present at the fight; and even a group of small boys from A house had the temerity to cross the forbidden threshold and mingle in the crowd. (qtd. in Mangan, “Bullies” 25-26)

This report is complete with an account of the crowd size. An analysis of the opponents precedes this report on the crowd. Even the little boys who join in to see the fight are given descriptions of pluck, since they need to brave their limits and join with the crowd. From this description one gets the sense that the whole school has stopped its business in order to look at “the big fight” in a makeshift “arena.”

One sees how an interest in fighting and a respect for combatants was instilled in young men during their school days. The matches also placed violence in an acceptable category. In fact, J. S. Thomas describes the same fight, impressed by their strength and “indomitable pluck” (26). Thomas writes, “one was [later] a humble-minded, earnest Christian man and the other was [later] a soldier who died in India” (qtd. in “Bullies” 26). Mangan points to the fact that Thomas emphasizes their later careers and how boxing positively affects them (26).

One can see the influence of the boxer as an athletic and masculine model. During the mid-century, for example, the fighter was more revered than the later popular games player (26). Mangan observes that it was not all positive; some students were bullied into fighting (26), and sometimes there were tragic results (24). For instance, the Eton historian Tim Card notes the violent nature of the fights: “Prize-fighting was admired nationally, and the boys settled their quarrels with their fists – on the most notorious occasion a son of Lord Shaftesbury was actually killed” (qtd. in “Bullies” 24).
Mangan points out that such occurrences did not diminish the number of students who came to the school ("Bullies" 24). Whether it was in service of the masculine ideal or a source of amusement for bullies, fighting did have an impact. This impact was multilayered because fights were violent by nature but there was an underlying concept of honor among the combatants.

Boxing finds its way into later literature. For example in, The Beetle (1897), the heroes are professional men who are trying to prevent a malevolent force known as The Beetle from infiltrating London. The Beetle was originally encountered in Egypt by a young Lessingham, one of the heroes. The Beetle follows Lessingham back to England, so the story is not unlike Dracula in the sense that a middle-class professional is the reason that the villain is in London. The heroine of the story, Marjorie, has been kidnapped by The Beetle and the heroes are trying to recover her. She is Lessingham’s fiancée but Atherton fancies that he is in love with her himself. They are adversaries and almost come to blows but Atherton gains respect for Lessingham as a result of the confrontation. When Lessingham gets angry with Atherton and tries to throttle him, Atherton’s response is one of admiration: “After all, you are a man. There’s some holding power in those wrists of yours,—they’ve nearly broken my neck. When this business is finished, I should like to put on the gloves with you, and fight it out. You’re clean wasted upon politics.—Damn it man, give me your hand!” (Marsh 254). When Atherton is attacked, his earlier view of Lessingham as a weaker rival is changed to one of respect. Atherton seems to revert back to a boy at school who admires a fellow student after a display of backbone.
This boxing imagery resurfaces when Atherton shows Lessingham Marjorie’s ring and Lessingham reacts violently again. After Lessingham again grabs his wrist, Atherton responds, “Hang me, Lessingham, if I don’t believe there is some warm blood in those fishlike veins of yours. Please the piper, I’ll five to fight you after all,—with the bare ones, sir, as a gentleman should do” (257). The two passages parallel each other since Atherton goes from surprise to admiration of Lessingham’s physical prowess and his ability to stand up for himself. In both instances, Atherton feels the best way to engage is through a proper boxing match, settling differences in a gentlemanly way. In the end, Atherton and Lessingham seem to go from enemies fighting over Marjorie to teammates trying to save her. They both swear revenge because they fear that Marjorie is dead and they are linked as fellow fighters through their oaths.

This mutual respect among boxers is also present in Sherlock Holmes. In A Study in Scarlet, Watson notes that Holmes is “an expert singlestick player, boxer, and swordsman” (Doyle 1: 15). From the footnote, a singlestick is a “One-handed fencing stick fitted with a hand guard” (15). Although his school days are not heavily detailed, he is trained in the art of fighting. In The Sign of Four, Holmes is recognized for his boxing skills. While trying to gain access to Pondicherry Lodge, he and the group are momentarily stopped by Sholto’s bodyguard:

“I don’t think you can have forgotten me. Don’t you remember that amateur who fought three rounds with you at Alison’s rooms on the night of your benefit four years back?”

“Not Mr. Sherlock Holmes!” roared the prize-fighter. “God’s truth! How could I have mistook you? If instead o’ standin’ there so quiet you had just stepped up and given me that cross-hit of yours under the jaw, I’d ha’ known you without a question. Ah, you’re one that has wasted your gifts, you have! You might have aimed high, if you had joined the fancy.”
"You see, Watson, if all else fails me, I have still one of the scientific professions open to me," said Holmes, laughing. "Our friend won't keep us out in the cold, I am sure." (120-121)

This bond between two fighters mirrors Atherton’s desire to box with Lessingham.

A second example highlights the more practical lesson that boxing provided aside from friendship and respect since it showcases how Holmes is able protect himself because he knows how to fight. His knowledge of the Japanese wrestling echoes the scouting description above. Although it does not involve boxing, the incident shows that Holmes can take care of himself in a fight. In “The Adventure of the Empty House,” Holmes details how he wrangled himself free from certain death:

He drew no weapon, but he rushed at me and threw his long arms around me. He knew that his own game was up, and was only anxious to revenge himself upon me. We tottered together upon the brink of the fall. I have some knowledge, however, of baritsu, or the Japanese system of wrestling, which has more than once been very useful to me. I slipped through his grip, and he with a horrible scream kicked madly for a few seconds, and clawed the air with both his hands. But for all his efforts he could not get his balance, and over he went. (Doyle 2: 9)

This later adventure parallels Thomas’ description of what happens to the two schoolboy boxers later in their lives. In that case, the fight prepared the boys for their respective fates. In this case, Holmes is symbolically serving the empire later in his life, much like the young man who dies in India; here Holmes’s self-controlled aggression triumphs over a charging out of control enemy. Bo doing so, he saves London from a threat.

The presence of boxing in both Sherlock Holmes and in The Beetle offers an example of how sport could be a grounding element for later life. While Holmes literally uses his fighting skills to escape danger, both he and the characters from The Beetle are able to utilize boxing as a way to identify with another character and facilitate the action. In the cases outlined above, boxing is the focal point.
In the case of boxing, the accompanying violence was idealized. This acceptance of violence underscores a movement towards less gentlemanly behaviors in sports. For example, though middle-class sports were based on a gentlemanly, amateur ideal, money did find its way as a motivating force behind play (Collins 172). Winning became important to the middle class because it cemented their superiority over the lower classes (180). Collins explains, “Rugby presents possibly the most illuminating example of this contradiction between the Victorian gentleman’s words and deeds” (172). Despite the valued lessons supposedly learned on the school playing field and the gentlemanly conduct of competition, violence was fairly commonplace and players were not above bending the rules to fit their needs (172). Cheating was acceptable as long as it was utilized “in the right context” (172). Above all, winning, rather than simply competition, was the primary reason for playing the game, and many simply quit because they could not win (173). A middle-class admission of defeat “undermined both their sense of the natural hierarchy of society and their self-confidence” (180). Their fear shifted the attitude towards playing to win in order to maintain their sense of superiority (183).

This sense of instability led to some questionable behavior on the field. According to Richard Holt in Sport and the British (1989), “Fair play meant not only respecting the written rules of the game, but abiding by what was generally understood to be the spirit of the game” (qtd. in Collins 173). In opposition, there were many examples of “using the letter of the law to undermine the spirit of the law” (180). For instance, Leeds player Ben Cariss was the first player to kick the ball out of bounds in his opponent’s territory (180). This attempt at a “territorial advantage” was well within the rules but was frowned upon at the time (180). This tactic, later adopted by the Rugby
Union and still practiced today, kept the ball out of the other team’s hands momentarily and prevented them from setting up their offense for a score (180). More important, it allowed the clock to wind down (180). During a match in 1878, A. N. Hornby told his Lancashire team to kick the ball immediately out of bounds whenever they caught it in order to run the clock (180). This strategy seems to go against the whole idea of challenge in sports, making a good go of it and other such ideals. Such a strategy seems to showcase a fear of losing more than a desire to meet a challenge head on.

Finally, an amusing example of how a team was able to take advantage of rules involved a uniform malfunction. During an 1889 contest between England and a touring New Zealand team, Andrew Stoddart’s shorts were ripped during a fray (180). Members of both teams surrounded him so that he could change, but one of the English players picked up the ball while this was going on and ran it into the end zone for a try (180). The New Zealand team protested that such a move was against the gentlemanly code, but the “referee Rowland Hill, who, as Secretary of the RFU, was one of the strongest advocates of the amateur ethos, allowed the try to stand” (180). Collins describes the episode as “perhaps the most notorious departure from the ‘spirit of the game’” (180). Technically, what the English player did was legal, but it seems to go against the gentlemanly idea of respectful play.

One sees how these questionable lessons/actions could translate into other aspects of life and into the stories I am examining. Gamesmanship, bending the rules, in athletic contests can find a parallel in the stories. Breaking the rules in favor of some higher ideal—winning a game in order to show how superior middle-class sport was—is analogous to heroes technically breaking the law in order to protect London from a threat.
For instance, when Godalming and Morris break into one of the houses in which Dracula is hiding his boxes, technically they are breaking the law. The adventurers are the protagonists, so this transgression is overlooked because Dracula is trying to accomplish something a lot worse. Godalming assures, “My title will make it all right with the locksmith and with any policeman that may come along” (Stoker 318). He also states, “under the circumstances it wouldn’t seem so bad for us to break into an empty house” (318). His use of the words “[not] so bad” mirrors the bending of rules in an athletic contest. The house is empty, so it is not as bad as attacking Dracula in his home while he’s occupying it because that would constitute assault. The “rule” committee can stand by, as is evidenced by the fact that no one notices the exchange with the locksmith, because the league wants them to win since they represent disciplined masculine ideals or perhaps the spectators have come to expect this type of “gamesmanship” and enjoy watching it take place.

Sherlock Holmes does the same thing at times. For example, in “A Scandal in Bohemia,” Holmes discusses a possibly illegal action:

“You don’t mind breaking the law?”
“Not in the least.”
“Nor running a chance of arrest?”
“Not in a good cause.”
“Oh, the cause is excellent!”
“Then I am your man.” (Doyle 1: 198)

The episode parallels the one in Dracula discussed above since it is a breakage of rules in service of a greater goal. In Victorian demons: Medicine, masculinity and the Gothic at the fin de siècle (2004), Andrew Smith maintains that there is no real crime at all to be solved because “much of the important action concerns ownership over the street” (135). He emphasizes how Holmes stages a riot in the streets in front of Adler’s
house so that he can gain access to it (135). Smith also illustrates how the final confrontation takes place in the street in front of Holmes’s Baker Street home (135). Adler is dressed up as a “streetwalker who can infiltrate the streets without fear of being molested because the male costume gives her ‘the freedom’ to do so” (137-138). Holmes really breaks into Adler’s home through his disguise in order to check for the compromising photograph. On top of that, he has Watson issue a false fire alarm, which could be potentially dangerous to the common people on the streets. In this way, Holmes and his teammate Watson are engaged in bending the rules. Likewise, Adler breaks the rules by impersonating the other team. The metaphor of the game holds even truer in this story because of its lack of a crime; it is an intellectual competition between the two adversaries. In fact, Holmes acts more like a criminal than Adler. The point is that there is no violence done in the story. There is no attempt at blackmail, as is initially feared (135). It is just two opposing game players who engage in some rule bending; in this case Holmes doesn’t bend them well enough and loses the game just as time runs out.

Aside from less than virtuous “letter of the law” practices, there was quite a bit of violence in sports themselves. In this manner, then, games became physical confrontations. I’d now like to look at how violence was present in games and connect it to some of the violence present in some of my stories. Collins explains that hacking was an integral part of rugby (Collins 175). When someone hacked, he kicked at an opponent’s shins even if he didn’t happen to have the ball at the time (175). In his article on the development of rugby football from 1830-1880, Timothy Chandler explains that there were two types of hacking. There was hacking as described above. Hacking over, the second type, “was not necessarily a violent proceeding, it might be scientific,
consisting of a gentle kick given to the runner’s back leg when in the air, so as to knock it behind the other leg, with the result of at once bringing the runner to the ground: but it might consist of a violent hack at either leg” (Pearson, qtd. in Chandler 19). Collins points out that it was so commonplace that it was just as much a part of the game as holding the ball with both hands and running with it (175). In an article for the New Rugbeian, the Rugby School paper, a pupil wrote “My maxim is hack the ball on when you see it near you, and when you don’t, hack the fellow next to you” (qtd. in Collins 175). Collins notes that this attitude was not confined to Rugby; it was present in other schools. In 1889, RFU (Rugby Football Union) president Harry Garnett recalls being told by a student at the Blackheath Proprietary School: “Boots were made specially with an extra sole piece at the toe, pointed like a ship’s ram, hardened against the bars of the fire, or with a hot poker” (qtd. in Collins 175-176). E. H. Dykes reminisces about his time as a pupil at the Durham School: “‘Hack him over’ was the cry when anyone was running with the ball, and it was the commonest thing to see fellows hacked off their feet. A scrummage was mainly an opportunity for hard hacking” (qtd. in Collins 176). Players would hammer their shins with pokers in order to toughen them up for their matches (Yorkshire Post, cited in Collins 176).

In theory, this practice of hacking was frowned upon, but it still found its way into games outside of the school. When the Football Association was first formed, an initiative to allow hacking was narrowly defeated in November 1863 (176). Hacking was deemed illegal by the new union founded in January 1871 (178). However, it was understood that teams could agree amongst themselves what rules they were going to follow (178). Even though there was a ban on it, the practice still continued and went
beyond the schoolyard (178). Harry Garnett, a proponent of hacking even into his adult career, disapproved of the use of shinguards because they were unmanly (176). He even threatened a fellow player for wearing them while playing in the 1870s (176). In 1879, Manchester played against the Manchester Free Wanderers in a match in which both sides agreed to allow hacking. Even after hacking had been removed from the game, "gentleman" still practiced violent play in the 1880s (179). For example, "When Bradford toured Scotland in 1885 its game against Edinburgh Academicals was marred by 'some of the foulest play ever perpetrated' by the Scotsmen, who left four Bradford players seeking hospital treatment following the match" (179).

This malleability of the rules is reflective of the instability of sport as an avenue for middle-class masculine definition since the rules were often changed depending on circumstance. In some cases, the goal was to play fairly, while in others it was just to win. Some of this rough play was the result of middle-class players trying to display their superiority over their working-class counterparts by dominating them (179). C. B. Grundy of Blackheath recalls how this attitude backfired in game against Yorkshire in 1881: "Their idea evidently was, 'There's a team of southern amateurs, let's frighten them by playing rough.' And they did play rough! But they never made a greater mistake in their lives. At half-time Blackheath had thirteen men left and the others eleven. The rest had been taken in cabs to the nearest hospital" (qtd. in Collins 179). Such behavior during matches was rather commonplace in the 1880s (179). This roughness was not confined to rugby as Collins points out. For example, the "soccer amateurs of Corinthians FC," considered to be a violent team, did not simply pass the ball
but employed an individualist dribbling style and often “shoulder charged” their opponents (179).

Collins concludes, “The gentleman rugby player may or may not have existed, but middle-class sporting bodies such as the RFU felt that it was necessary to invent him” (184). Otherwise, there would be nothing to differentiate them from working-class players (183). As Collins admits, though, the class behaviors on the playing field were not different from each other (183). He writes, “The only difference was that such behavior was perfectly acceptable when employed within the shared social circles inhabited by the former public school boys who led the game, but was unacceptable to the game’s rulers when used against them by those of a less exalted social background” (183-184). His observation suggests a double standard. Winning was so important because it helped to reinforce their superior status over other races or the lower social classes (183). Collins suggests that the violent tradition of public school was “uninvented” and it was replaced by the ideals of “fair play” so that the games could remain in the schools (184). As Collins points out, though, the violence was still there, which was one of the appeals of the sport (183).

The problematic category of sports and games in terms of violence and strategy is illustrated if we compare an episode from Dracula with one from Jekyll and Hyde. The respective situations reflect the possible influence of athletic lessons. Both works have violence in them, but how this violence is utilized and against whom shows that lessons learned from games could be used to serve opposing viewpoints. The novels are literary examples of how violence experienced in games could resurface in other situations. In
other words, lessons offered by games did not simply serve the ideals of the upper-middle
class gentleman.

The final attack on Dracula seems to reflect the values of the public school,
especially rugby matches. In fact, Mina’s observation of the action reads like a rugby
team going in for the winning score. In his discussion of Rugby School football,
Timothy Chandler examines the concept of running with the ball in an individualist way
(18). Jennifer Macrory explains, “a player running in knew that he would face intense
opposition. The difference was he chose to take the risk” (Macrory, qtd. in Chandler 18).
Chandler links this productive individual effort to the service of a team:

...when players were playing on representative teams (Sixth, School
House, etc.), rather than in ‘pick up’ matches, allegiance to the team,
displaying courage and daring, and risking personal injury (displaying
manliness) for the good of the team, made such blatant individualism that
much more acceptable. What might once have been considered
selfishness could now with good reason be viewed as selflessness. (18)

By engaging in such surface appearance selfishness, the individual ball carrier exposed
himself to possible injury in order to score a winning try.

One can almost see the ball carrier, as is symbolized by Morris and Harker as
they fight through the crowd of Dracula’s minions. The passage deserves to be quoted at
length. Mina observes:

In the meantime, Mr Morris had had to use force to pass through his side
of the ring of Szgany. All the time I had been breathlessly watching
Jonathan I had, with the tail of my eye, seen him pressing desperately
forward, and had seen the knives of the gypsies flash as he won a way
through them, and they cut at him. He had parried with his great bowie
knife, and at first I thought that he too had come to safety; but as he sprang
beside Jonathan, who had by now jumped from the cart, I could see that
with his left hand he was clutching at his side, and that the blood was
spurting through his fingers. He did not delay notwithstanding this, for
as Jonathan, with desperate energy, attacked one end of the chest,
attempting to prize off the lid with his great kukri knife, he attacked the
other frantically with his bowie. Under the efforts of both men the lid began to yield; the nails drew with a quick screeching sound, and the top of the box was thrown back. (400)

We can compare this description with the chorus of H.B. Tristram’s “Going Strong!”:

   Keeping close upon the ball – we drive it through them all,
   And again we go rushing along, along, along;
   O the tackle and the run, and the matches we have won,
   From the start to the finish going strong, strong, strong, going strong!
   If you live to be a hundred you’ll never forget
   How they hacked in the scrum, how they payed back the debt;
   The joy of the swing when you tackled your man,
   The lust of the fray when the battle began. (qtd. in Mangan, Athleticism 256)

Tristram was the headmaster at Loretto after Almond passed away in 1903 (Mangan, Athleticism 183). Before that, he was an assistant master and the acting head (183). This poem is taken from his non-dated collection Loretto Songs (301). Tristram’s description is not unlike Mina’s. The theme of driving through the opposition permeates both writings. The important idea of seeing the game through that is exalted in Tristram’s poem is present in Mina’s description of the attack on Dracula’s coffin. It is uncanny how the poem and the attack towards the end of Dracula “tackle” the same themes, using similar imagery. Tristram writes of “hacking the scrum” and “paying back a debt.” In a sense, Morris and Harker are symbolically doing the same thing, as Morris and Harker are literally “hacking” away at the competition with their knives so the rugby term is bent in meaning for my purposes; however, the violence translates from field to adventure.

   Mina observes “the sweep and the flash of Jonathan’s great knife,” and then watches as “Mr Morris’s bowie knife plunged into the heart” (Stoker 401). Mina sees a collective effort that ultimately “pays” back the debt, according to Tristram’s phrase. They have ended Dracula’s reign of terror. They have also righted Dracula’s soul: “even
in that moment of final dissolution, there was in the face a look of peace” (401). In this way, they have paid Dracula back for his initial victories over them. His smile at the end is a symbolic gesture of sportsmanship.

This victory is not without its casualties, however. Morris is mortally wounded. With his hand covering his wound, he presses onward. In this way, he is like the players described above who have had their shins kicked in but are happy to go out and play again. He is like the school boys with the broken legs in Hughes’s *Tom Brown’s Schooldays* discussed above. In the end, though, he has done his team proud. Instead of a plaque, the Harkers use his name for their child (402). Though an American, Morris subscribes to the English athletic ideals of sacrifice and teamwork.

The point is not that Morris and Harker are playing rugby. The point that links the episode with the athletic ideas in this chapter is the sense of sacrifice for a higher ideal such as honor. One can almost see how Harker and Morris at their respective schools would have learned lessons that would serve them during this final attack. The violence learned at an earlier age paves the way for the necessary violence of this episode.

While this episode is violent, the violence is utilized for a greater purpose, namely honor and the safety of London. In opposition, Hyde is very violent, but his purpose is more personal and self-indulgent. His initial appearance is like a ball carrier running over all those in his way. Enfield recounts:

All at once, I saw two figures: one a little man who was stumping along eastward at a good walk, and the other a girl of maybe eight or ten who was running as hard as she was able down a cross street. Well, sir, the two ran into one another naturally enough at the corner; and then came the horrible part of the thing; for the man trampled calmly over the child’s body and left her screaming on the ground. (Stevenson 257)
Besides the obvious viciousness of the attack, the incident becomes very unclear as to how it should be viewed. The violence here seems to be nothing but an extension of Hyde’s selfishness. If we use the athletic terms, Hyde’s actions are “dirty.” On a playing field, violence was often accepted as part of the game and players could get away with it. Hyde’s actions reflect how violence could leak from acceptable situations into non-acceptable ones.

It is more troubling to note that Hyde’s violent act has an appeal. Stephen Arata sees Hyde as being treated as “one of the guys” by the others in the story. Arata feels that the action serves to act “out the aggressions of timid bourgeois gentlemen” (39). In response to their vicarious satisfaction from Hyde’s actions, the men who witness this incident protect him from the women who are after him (38). Enfield recounts, “we were keeping the women off him as best we could” (Stevenson 258). Despite the fact that he stomped a girl, he represents the side of the English middle-class professional in this case, so the others tolerate and even protect him. William Veeder feels that Enfield draws “vicarious pleasure” when he observes the collision (cited in Arata 38). Arata’s description places Enfield in the position not unlike a sports fan: “Though he could easily have prevented their collision, Enfield allows them to run into one another ‘naturally enough’” (38-39). Enfield cites Hyde’s coolness, which enables him to do things the other gentlemen cannot do, which is part of his appeal. He is exhibiting self-control but in order to get away with doing something deliberately hurtful, so a seemingly positive trait learned from games is actually a negative one. Enfield and his fellow observers live vicariously through him, which parallels how fans live through the athlete. Arata cites the fact that Enfield is always calling Hyde “my gentleman” or “my man”
(38), so the episode reads like schoolboys gathering around their hero at the expense of those who don’t belong: “wild as harpies” (Stevenson 258). Arata writes, “The homosocial bonding that occurs in this scene is only intensified by its overt misogyny” (38). For Arata, the others are watching him “bust through the lines” of what are perceived as “opponents” of middle- and upper-middle class masculinity in the character of the women surrounding him. He should be condemned for his actions but the others do not turn him in to the police.

These conflicting images lead to the big problem with Hyde. His aggression spills beyond just lashing out at enemies of the middle-class professional type. He begins to run over his own “teammates.” His play becomes dirty, as is evidenced from his unkempt appearance. Hyde attacks Carew with a cane that symbolizes gentlemanly status. A cricket bat is the symbol of the gentleman cricket player. While Hyde does not use a cricket bat to attack, he does use a similar gentlemanly symbol for his attack. The attack is an extension of aggressive sporting lessons into everyday life:

He had in his hand a heavy cane, with which he was trifling; but he answered never a word, and seemed to listen with an ill-contained impatience. And then all of a sudden he broke out in a great flame of anger, stamping with his foot, brandishing the cane, and carrying on (as the maid described it) like a madman. The old gentleman took a step back, with the air of one very much surprised and a trifle hurt; and at that Mr. Hyde broke out of all bounds and clubbed him to the earth. And next moment, with ape-like fury, he was trampling his victim under foot, and hailiing down a storm of blows, under which the bones were audibly shattered and the body jumped upon the roadway. (Stevenson 273)

Using the cane for violence shifts the cane to something else. From the perspective of athletic metaphor, what Hyde does with his cane is similar to what the hackers do with their rugby boots. In both cases, the perpetrator is attacking those in his way for no other reason except intimidation. Stevenson even writes that Hyde’s actions are “out of
bounds.” The use of the word “trampling” is redolent of Tristram’s poem, with its cry to push forward. However, it is unlike that poem and Mina’s descriptions of Dracula’s destruction for that matter. The sounds of broken bones are a far cry from the cheer of a crowd. Still, this sort of destructive, selfish violence might have been something young schoolboys were exposed to either on the field or in the schoolyard. It is not hard to see how lessons learned in school and on the field could lead to such behavior later in life. Rather than serving some higher ideal, though, Hyde’s actions seem to satisfy his base desires. This undisciplined violence present in the Hyde episode betrays the fact that sports were not the safe haven of middle- and upper-middle class values that they are portrayed as.

While Morris’s and Harker’s actions come to symbolize the public school gentleman values that are more in line with the fight song quoted above, Hyde’s actions are not that at all. Both examples are violent but the ends they serve are much different. Hyde uses violence for his own pleasure. Hyde represents unfocused aggression while Morris and Harker represent focused aggression against an enemy. Hyde’s suspect practices parallel Northern Union Rugby in that both have taken seemingly middle-class values/lessons and used them for their own purposes.

As discussed in the introduction, in 1895, twenty-one clubs left the Rugby Union to form their own league (Marten 32). Instead of embracing simply competition for its own sake, the Northern Union Rugby clubs took the violence of the sport and utilized it as a means to win and achieve recognition by turning it into a business. Competition then took on more practical concerns because of the money involved. As a result, the northern teams “constantly searched for those things that would produce advantages and ensure
success in the contest, thereby bringing credit to themselves and their community” (40).
With teams comprising mixed classes and run by business owners, “strength, cunning and imagination admired on the shop floor were highlighted on the pitch” (40). New attack-oriented styles made the game different and more exciting than the amateur game (39). With these styles, the game became more violent (37). Hyde’s self-indulgent violence and the other’s willingness to be “entertained” by it, so to speak, mimic how northern rugby bent middle-class rugby to its own ends. This shift of strategy brings to the forefront the fear that sports could be used to foster values other than those espoused by the Victorian gentleman. Perhaps worse, it was a possible entry for other classes to link themselves with the Victorian gentleman.

In fact, if we examine Hyde’s appearance, his clothing and actions can make him seem like he is a member of the working class. Martin Danahay notes that when Jekyll can no longer control his transformations, at one point he finds himself suddenly awakened as Hyde and his hands look like those of a working-class man (Gender 109). Hyde acts violently to satisfy his own needs. Danahay makes an interesting point in A Community of One: “In becoming Hyde, Jekyll becomes a younger version of himself” (Danahay, Community 138). If this is this case, then perhaps Hyde represents some of the less than virtuous lessons about violence learned in the Victorian schools observed above. The potential for uncontrolled aggression is in Jekyll, and the public school playing field seems as likely a suspect as any for instilling such potential for aggression in him. In the person of Hyde, Jekyll takes acceptable violence and shifts it for ungentlemanly purpose.
In conclusion, the category of sport is a problematic one. Lessons taken from sports served different ends. On one hand we see sport as an exemplification of masculine self-control. In the schools, young men were taught courage, teamwork and discipline. These lessons prepared young men for later life and many of these lessons continued onto the playing field after school. Games allowed the Victorian middle- and upper-middle class gentleman to express his energies in a controlled way even if he was not a soldier. However, the playing field also taught some less than virtuous lessons. For example, young men were exposed to violence and they were sometimes even taught that cheating was acceptable. Selfishness was even tolerated if it served the greater value of a win.

The influence of sports is evident from the great variety of them. Writers wrote about them and their lessons even find their way into the late Victorian adventure story. For example, one can see how violence learned on school playing fields plays out in the stories. Yet, this same violence could be used for noble ends as is exemplified in the boxing examples noted above and the violence that takes place in Dracula. It is no wonder that there is so much violence in the stories because the stories seem to be an extension of both the violence and the camaraderie learned at the public schools and their accompanying athletic contests. Yet, the same type of violence can be used for base ends as in the case of Mr. Hyde. It would also seem that rules only apply in ways that suit the situation rather than one uniform, gentlemanly sporting code. If athletic heroes were able to bend the rules and still be praised for winning, then it goes to show why the reader would value his literary heroes for defeating his foe even if he needs to do something “unmanly” or “ungentlemanly” in order to do it. In the end, playing sports was no more
effective in defining the Victorian middle- and middle-upper-class gentleman than work was. Sometimes the boundary between work and play was blurred because of the participation of the working classes and the use of payments in sports. As a result, manliness as defined by the athlete seems to depend on what side of the ball one found oneself on.
Chapter 4

Studying and Passing: Dracula’s Gentlemanly Attempt

Linking the worker with the idea of gentleman, Samuel Smiles notes the sense of “togetherness” through his description of workers as gentlemen in Self-Help (1859) (cited in Danahay, Gender 32). Smiles believes that these men “form a class based on work” and can recognize each other on sight (32). Smiles writes, “gentlemen at once identify each other. They look each other in the eye and grip each other’s hands. They know each other instinctively” (qtd. in Gender 32). However, Smiles’s comments rely on the belief that the gentleman is a stable term. As we have seen in the previous chapters, two ways for a Victorian gentleman to express himself, work and play, are both unstable concepts. These are two roles that the gentleman attempts to fill.

In this chapter, I would like to use Dracula as another way of examining the instability of the Victorian gentleman as a category itself. Dracula’s activities are examples of how men could “acquire” the characteristics of a gentleman, so a gentleman is not something innate. Dracula’s outsider status reflects the fear that “others” such as the working class or immigrants could study or buy their way into middle- and upper-middle class gentleman status. If this is the case, then the gentleman as a differing or protective category crumbles. I will look at some of the definitions of the gentleman and some of the traits associated with him. One trait is the conflict between wanting to show oneself a gentleman and not wishing to make it seem as if one is consciously doing so. In some ways, then, the gentleman is like a piece of artwork because of these outward characteristics. I will examine Dracula in light of the conflict between gentleman as both natural and constructed. Dracula uses the gentleman character to conceal his real
motives, so he symbolizes the fear that “others” will study the gentleman and “pass” themselves off as one for their own purposes.

The gentleman was a way for the middle- and upper-middle class professional to define himself. As noted in the introduction, as the century drew to a close, the middle-class gentleman was a defensive category that set him apart from New Women and an emerging working class (Skovmand 50). Taking the idea of leisure from the aristocracy, the middle-class professional gentleman reconfigured that definition of the gentleman into a category based on work (Perkin 121). Thus, the gentleman is a type of moderation between the middle class and the aristocracy (Gilmour 2).

This moderated “place” was steeped in self-control (Waters 4). For instance, if we look Newman’s 1852 definition of the gentleman in The Idea of a University, the gentleman focuses on participation in but not domination of a given situation. Most importantly, “It is almost a definition of a gentleman to say he is one who never inflicts pain” (Newman, qtd. in Landrow 1). Also, “The true gentleman in like manner carefully avoids whatever may cause a jar or a jolt in the minds of those with whom he is cast” (qtd. in Landrow 1). In sum, a gentleman is “patient, forbearing, and resigned on philosophical principles; he submits to pain, because it is inevitable, to bereavement, because it is irreparable, and to death, because it is his destiny” (qtd. in Landrow 1). All of Newman’s descriptions suggest disciplined responses to situations and seamless interaction rather than attempts at showing off. In fact, “his disciplined intellect preserves him from blunder” (qtd. in Landrow 1).

Yet, as Dwight Culler points out, the definition is couched in negatives because Newman talks about what the gentleman does not do (Gilmour 91). This sense of
negativity is echoed by other contemporary definitions of the gentleman. As Robert Louis Stevenson stated in 1888, a gentleman is defined by what he is not (639). Stevenson cautions, “Not to try to spare people’s feelings is so much kinder than to try in a wrong way” (“Gentlemen” 639). Browne concurs with his 1886 definition of the gentleman: “He likes his friends, and will do much to serve them; but he seldom or never tells them so, nor do they expect it” (266). The sense of seamlessly fitting into a society of gentleman creates “knowledge” of what a gentleman is. This sense of defining against what is not sets the gentleman as a type of boundary.

This boundary is crossable, however. Browne warns, “the definition must not be in any way a question of wealth…. Wealth can do anything now-a-days” (262). Men could “acquire” characteristics of gentlemen by imitating their “superiors” if they did not have these innate qualities themselves (Waters 29). Waters notes that self-help literature of the time emphasized this type of imitation (29). For example, Moore’s What the World Wants or Hints on Self-Help (1901) instructs “Imitate the great, the noble, the successful. Why would you copy the weak and the failures?” (qtd. in Waters 29). The use of both copy and imitation can be used to describe the inherent constructive nature of Dracula’s enterprise. As Adams observes, the conflict between the act and the truth of the gentleman was always a concern (Dandies 53).

Stephen’s 1862 article emphasizes the importance of who is and who is not a gentleman, focusing on the “art” of being one. He divides the qualities of the gentleman into three categories: artistic, moral, and intellectual (331). He places emphasis on the artistic: “and of these the artistic qualities are the most definite, the most easily ascertained, and the most universally required” (331). These qualities are all methods of
“show.” He compares some of the possible faults of a man, such as telling a lie, being illiterate, or “blowing one’s nose with one’s fingers,” the latter being the most egregious (331). In this case, his gentleman is surface, behaviorally based:

Still it is by reason of their beauty, whether derived from their moral excellence or not, that we call certain dispositions gentlemanlike, and others not.... Hence it follows that when we speak of a gentleman we do not mean either a good man, or a wise man, but a man socially pleasant, and we consider his goodness and wisdom, his moral and intellectual qualities as relevant to his claims to be considered a gentleman only in so far as they contribute to his social pleasantness. (331)

In the end, Stephen believes in the bonding nature of the gentleman, with its shared beliefs and common artistic values. However, for Stephen, it is all based on surface behavior and how one “acts.”

His emphasis on art over morals goes further. He even admits that not all lies are ungentlemanly, as long as they are not “ugly and displeasing” (331). The moral nature of an action can affect its artistic merits (331). He writes, “Still it is by reason of their beauty, whether derived from their moral excellence or not, that we call certain dispositions gentlemanlike, and others not” (331).

Stephen’s emphasis on the “art” of gentlemanly behavior is conversation with Stevenson’s later exploration of the gentleman. While Stephen suggests an act, Stevenson’s emphasis on the act entails something more spontaneous. Stevenson informs us that the original gentleman was taken from the “gentile man,” who was expected to perform ceremonial acts for his group or tribe (“Gentlemen” 640). He would wait for his “cue” and perform the expected leadership role as chief or priest, a fixed role/position (640). However, that sort of ceremony was no longer needed as the middle class became
more influential. Though a gentleman was still expected to behave in a certain manner, his actions were to take on a more improvisational style.

This distancing from ceremony is accompanied by a similar distance from a character who finds himself in opposition to the gentleman: the dandy. For Ellen Moers, “The dandy’s achievement is simply to be oneself” (18). Yet this seeming nonchalance is undergirded by an opposing motivation: “it means to tighten, to control, to attain perfection in all accessories of life, to resist whatever may be suitable for the vulgar but is improper for the dandy” (18). In opposition to the above descriptions of the gentleman, the dandy “goes purposefully among the romantics, pedants, athletes, bailiffs and other bores of this world to remind them of his superiority...the dandy is permanently one-up” (19).

Moers examines Beau Brummell (1778-1840) as an example of what the dandy embodied. In some ways, he fits the above definitions of the gentleman because he seemingly does not want to be involved. She notes “Brummell’s ability to dominate a difficult situation without uttering a word” (19). Yet, his words could similarly define him. For instance, William Hazlitt recalls an incident when Brummell addresses a nobleman who wants his opinion of his coat: “Do you call that thing a coat?” (qtd. in Moers 20). Addressing a nobleman in front of another gentleman, Brummell answers with no fear (20). He cultured a sense of refinement with his use of words, which “was the essence of Brummell’s dandyism” (20).

In contrast, what really established his fineness was his appearance (21). Moers summarizes, “His independence, assurance, originality, self-control and refinement should all be visible in the cut of his clothes” (21). Brummell’s dress habits were the
envy of others: “All wanted to know how the famous cravat was tied, and how much
time the Beau gave to the performance” (31). He emphasized cleanliness, taking great
pains and engaging in elaborate ritual in order to maintain it (32-33). As Moers
concludes, “His was a costume, then, which relied for its effect on the manner and
bearing of the wearer” (35). Because of his refinement and taste in clothing and in
mannerisms, Brummell was likened to an artist (34).

Later on in the century, Oscar Wilde would facilitate a return of the dandy artist
(295). He used his clothes to pave his way (295). Wilde the artist “admired in high
society...the artificiality, the decorous surface, the mannered ritual” (300). For Wilde,
dandyism, “an attempt to assert the absolute modernity of beauty” (qtd. in Moers 301),
shifted to the position of critic (301). With statements such as “One should either be a
work of Art or wear a work of Art,” he “placed the critic, as elsewhere he placed the
dandy, among the elect who exist to be somebody but do nothing” (301,302). Wilde
explains, “through Art, and through Art only, that we can shield ourselves from the
sordid perils of actual existence” (qtd. in Moers 302).

The problematic nature of the dandy involves this type of fineness of
performance. As a piece of artwork, the dandy is separate from society but is at the same
time engaged in so far as he is watched by others. The gentleman, in contrast, is more
genuinely involved with it but in a subtle inclusive way, making those who interact with
him feel more welcome. In the end, the gentleman works with society while the dandy
works to be noticed by it. The fact that some of the definitions co-exist in both categories
suggests a problem with boundaries. For example the competing surface definitions—
working for it, paying for it, looking like one—make it difficult to tell who was representative of the real knowledge of gentlemanliness or who simply wanted to “pass.”

*Dracula* is informed by these beliefs, and Dracula’s character exposes the tenuous nature of the gentleman category. The changes that Stevenson describes betray the sliding definitions of the gentleman and Dracula’s inability to adapt to them, for Dracula operates under a fixed definition of the term. Still, because the gentleman category is so unstable, he is able to “bluff” his way into the fold to a certain extent and can present himself as an example of the refined gentleman. For example, in *Fictions of Loss in the Victorian Fin de Siècle* (1996), Stephen Arata points out the appeal of Dracula’s “act”:

“...what critics routinely note about Dracula: that he is by his very nature vigorous, masterful, energetic, robust. Such attributes are conspicuously absent among the novel’s British characters, particularly the men. All the novel’s vampires are distinguished by their robust health and their equally robust fertility” (Arata 117). These appearances are just that, though.

Towards the beginning of the novel, Harker writes, “Within, stood a tall man, clean shaven save for a long white moustache, and clad in black from head to foot, without a single speck of colour about him anywhere.... He made no motion of stepping to meet me, but stood like a statue, as though his gesture of welcome had fixed him in stone” (Stoker 22). Harker’s immediate impression reveals Dracula’s appearance. He is tall and clean shaven, so he is a bit of a dandy. Moers’s emphasis on costume, especially her observations of “aristocratic pretense” (12), is especially applicable to Dracula in this case. Dracula uses his appearance to put his victims at ease.
Dracula’s imitation of a gentleman is hollow, though. Moers calls the dandy “a creature perfect in externals” (21). Her term creature partly describes Dracula since he is not human, but it needs to be altered slightly to describe him. He is devoid of any substance under his appearance in that he is no longer human. Despite his great strength and various appealing traits, he is hollow inside, as Van Helsing explains: “He can do all these things, yet he is not free.... He cannot go where he lists.... His power ceases, as does that of all evil things, at the coming of the day” (Stoker 255). In a way, he is an example of Stevenson’s older form of gentleman fixed in ritual and ceremony, much like Moers’s dandy. In this case, Dracula must follow the same routine over and over because of his limitations as one of the undead. In order to “pass,” he fixes himself on his dress and appearance so has to not arouse suspicion.

Despite this apparent hollowness and fixedness, there is more to Dracula than his surface attributes. The danger lies in that he does have some very real intentions; he wishes to invade and conquer England. Moers’s description of the dandy is eerily apt for Dracula: “Inexcusably, in all his ghostly elegance, he haunted the Victorian imagination” (Moers 13). Van Helsing explains Dracula’s plans: “they cannot die, but must go on age after age adding new victims and multiplying the evils of the world” (Stoker 229). From a gentlemanly perspective, Dracula represents sycophants and all those who wish to “invade” the gentleman sphere, multiplying the ranks with those who do not belong. Van Helsing puts this threat bluntly: “But to fail here, is not mere life or death. It is that we become as him; that we henceforward become foul things of the night like him – without heart or conscience” (253), that is vampires, if the group fails to stop him. His last comment about heart or conscience can be applied to the substance of the category
gentleman. Whenever an impostor succeeds, something of the gentleman is lost and those who are considered gentleman lose something along with it, especially if it becomes linked with dandyism because there is no real substance to the dandy. The category is exposed as artificial when people like Dracula are able to successfully pretend to be gentlemen. Van Helsing’s fears signify how other classes could “infect” the gentleman’s sphere by earning enough money to afford a way in or learning how to “act.”

Harker’s observations of his appearance illustrate the danger. Clad in black, his lack of color makes him seem like a painting as his pale skin contrasts with his “ruddy” lips (24). As Harker observes, “the general effect was one of extraordinary pallor. Hitherto I had noticed the backs of his hands as they lay on his knees in the firelight, and they had seemed rather white and fine; but seeing them now close to me, I could not but notice that they were rather coarse – broad, with squat fingers. Strange to say, there were hairs in the centre of the palm. The nails were long and fine, and cut to a sharp point” (25). The whiteness gives him a plaster, ivory or clay quality, which renders his pose artificial. His emphasis on Dracula’s unusual appearance underscores Dracula’s false nature.

For example, his hands are fine looking from a distance. However, his pose is revealed as a pose, or more appropriately, a covering for his true self. The palms, which are usually face down, are revealed to be anything but gentlemanly. They are coarse rather than dandified. He is like a faulty piece of artwork. His hands are unnatural and Harker even notes that his breath might even reek as he becomes nauseous when Dracula approaches. Harker’s observation that Dracula is a like a statue illustrates the constructed nature of his existence. His chin is “broad and strong, and the cheeks firm though thin”
His mouth is “fixed” under his moustache (24). Like the statue that Harker compares him to, he is simply a picture of what he thinks an English gentleman should look like. Because he is so concentrated upon this image, he becomes frozen in it himself, like a piece of hardened potter’s clay.

Still, Harker’s fascination with Dracula’s appearance suggests that he participates in this artistic discourse. In a way, Harker and Dracula are involved in a type of two-fold dandyism. Moers suggests that Wilde’s homosexuality split “the genus of dandy into two classes, the old and the young, who travelled together in perilous familiarity” (306). Because of his extreme devotion to appearance, Dracula occupies the part of an older dandy. In this case, his interest in Harker places Harker in the position of performer whom Dracula admires for his youth. Wilde stated, “The condition of perfection is idleness, the aim of perfection, is youth” (qtd. in Moers 308). However, Harker’s gaze casts Dracula in the place of artwork and Harker in the position of admirer. Stephen Arata even observes how, through the course of the novel, Harker becomes “tired and white-haired” while Dracula becomes more “vigorous” (117). If this is the case, then Harker is involved in a type of “youth worship” (Moers 307), since Dracula represents eternal, if tortured youth. Wilde describes homosexuality: “it repeatedly exists between an elder and a younger man, when the elder man has intellect, and the younger man has all the joy, hope and glamour of life before him” (qtd. in Moers 307). Wilde’s last observation eerily applies to both Harker and Dracula. Harker has just obtained a new position and is recently married, expecting to start a new life as a family man. Dracula, if he succeeds, also has the “glamour of life before him.”
The interplay between Seward and Van Helsing mirrors this interplay between an older, foreign man and a younger English gentleman as enacted by Harker and Dracula. For instance, Seward recalls, “He touched me on the heart and on the forehead, and then touched himself the same way.... For reply he reached over and took my ear in his hand and pulled it playfully, as he used long ago to do at lectures” (Stoker 129). The relationship is reciprocal for Seward equally admires Van Helsing: “my old friend and master, Professor Van Helsing...with an iron nerve, a temper of the ice-brook, and indomitable resolution, self-command and toleration exalted from virtues to blessings, and the kindliest and truest heart that beats – these form his equipment for the noble work that he is doing for mankind” (122). Finally, Van Helsing compliments Seward: “You were always a careful student, and your casebook was ever more full than the rest. You were only a student then; now you are a master” (129). Within the context of the story, they are discussing Lucy’s case but Van Helsing’s caution, “You and I shall keep as yet what we know here, and here” (129), takes on a different importance if it is cast in the context of either homoerotic or “two-fold” dandyism described above. As Jason Sellers observes, “the men are comfortable touching each other and themselves. Van Helsing advocates, as does the novel in whole, the knowledge of the inter-male ‘kind’ that underlies male self-expression” (151).

This sort of interplay between the old and young casts both sets of characters as dandies in the Wildean tradition because of the homoerotic undertones. Set up as objects for both desire and observation, in some ways, their interplays represent the gentleman as art since all try to create a “picture” of the gentleman. Still, this artistic nature places the
gentleman dangerously close to a dandy. The fact that the three “heroes” participate in this exchange further emphasizes this danger.

In her discussion of the dandy, Ellen Moers discusses both a need for an audience and the seeming unconcern for it. The dandy wants to place himself in an original position. In comparison, Dracula is original but is revealed to be so in a perverse way when he is examined more closely as Van Helsing’s description expresses:

There are such beings as vampires; some of us have evidence that they exist. Even had we not the proof of our own unhappy experience, the teachings and the records of the past give proof enough for sane peoples.... The nosferatu do not die like the bee when he sting once. He is only stronger; and being stronger, have yet more power to work evil. This vampire which is amongst us is of himself so strong in person as twenty men; he is of cunning more than mortal, for his cunning be the growth of ages... (Stoker 252)

The lore about vampires comes through legends, and proof of them is hard to come by. The creatures, unlike anything else, do not die and Van Helsing’s observation about their power to do evil betrays the danger underneath the mask. This mask is the result of a self-created persona, a “himself” if you will. Van Helsing’s observation of the “cunning of ages” reflects Dracula’s intense study, but his vampirism suggests that much of this knowledge has been stolen from his victims.

He strives to appear as a gentleman who will be allowed to carry out his plans unencumbered until it is too late. In order to move around, he must be invited into a place, rather than just enter a potential victim’s home and attack. To do so, he needs to dress and act a certain way, which lends primacy to the audience. Seemingly, according to Moers, the dandy presents a “mask of indifference” (Moers 21). From this perspective, Dracula does not fit the dandy category. In fact, at one point, Dracula does
come right out and asks for Harker's help, which immediately draws emphasis towards him.

Still, he does fit Moers's second qualification: his “extreme dedication” to ritual. He dresses a certain way and is obsessed with speaking the correct way, which is why he asks Harker for help in the first place. Moers says of Brummell: “Brummell is indeed the archetype of all artists, for his art was one with his life” (263). He was a “living masterpiece,” because of his clothing and manners (263). In her examination of the fin de siècle, Moers links the dandy with the artist. The dandy heroes of the previous novels of the Regency era were replaced by “artist heroes” (310). As a self-generated piece of artwork at the center-point of all these competing definitions, Dracula puts on a performance with his dress and his attempts at English manners.

In addition, Dracula’s artistry links him with the fate of Brummell. As Moers puts it, “There remains an irreducible firmness to the Brummell figure, something compounded of assurance, self-sufficiency, misanthropy, nastiness, even cruelty, that made him feared in his lifetime and will never be explained away” (38). Dracula likewise exhibits these traits because of his viciousness towards the other characters in the novel. Moers recalls of Brummell: “Thereafter he lost, one by one, the qualities that had made him a dandy: dignity, elegance, refinement, self-control, pride and lucidity” (30). He was resigned to type of living death. As Ian Kelly notes, “As the disease took its final hold on Brummell’s brain and body, the symptoms became increasingly distressing. Syphilitics who survived into the tertiary phase, as Brummell did, suffered facial paralysis and quivering, as well as loss of bladder and bowel control. Their teeth
fell out, if they had not already, as did their nails" (309). He died, broken at a sanatorium near Caen (Moers 31).

We can compare this description to Dracula, a charter member of the living dead. Like Brummell, Dracula evokes a "tradition," as evidenced by Van Helsing’s observations of the folklore concerning vampires (Stoker 254). Van Helsing admits that "the vampire live on and cannot die by mere passing of time.... Nay; he is even more prisoner than the slave of the galley, than the madman in his cell" (254, 255). Van Helsing warns, "For it is not the least of its terrors that his evil thing is rooted deep in all good; in soil barren of holy memories it cannot rest" (256). With this statement, Van Helsing outlines the primary fear that faces the gentleman category: within each gentleman there lies the possibility of dandyism, degeneracy or some "other" mimicking the appearance of the gentleman. If this is the case, then perhaps, as Newman suggests, the gentleman category must resign itself to death.

Suggestive of this fear, Dracula’s appealing appearance makes him seem like a gentleman at times. As Stephen admits, "A man, for example, might be a perfect gentleman who was utterly dead to all sense of religious duty, or entirely devoid of charity towards his neighbor" (331). Thus, Dracula, acting the part of an appropriate host in the beginning of the novel, displays deference towards an Englishman who visits his home. Dracula explains, "But a stranger in a strange land, he is not one; men know him not – and to know not is to care not for. I am content if I am like the rest, so that no man stops if he see me, or pause in his speaking if he hear my words, to say, ‘Ha, ha! a stranger!’" (Stoker 27). With this statement, he appeals to the group that Stephen describes even he wants to fit into it for more sinister purposes. Dracula’s plea to Harker
for help in learning English and how to “fit in” reflects one of the characteristics of Stephen’s gentleman:

He owned his ignorance like an honest man, and did not talk about what he did not understand. This is an invaluable characteristic, and one which deserves the highest praise in days when everybody is exposed to eminent risk of being pretentious and conceited, and when many people, especially in the rank just above labouring men, fall into that snare to a woeful extent. (Stephen 338)

Dracula so admits his ignorance, thus fitting Stephen’s concept of a gentleman.

However, even during the years between Stephen’s essay and the publication of Dracula there was a concern over the possibilities of impostors. This fear hadn’t been assuaged when Stoker’s novel came out. Dracula does the very same thing that Stephen condemns, talking about his ignorance too much, almost in a pretentious way. In some ways, he is worse, pretending to feign ignorance in order to lessen the fears that an outsider might generate. He plays the role of a curious, foreign aristocrat who wishes to seek entry into English, masculine society. However, he is exposed as someone who has overly constructed his role, which harkens back to Adams’s observations about the concern over the false gentleman.

Later on, he makes another cordial offer to Harker: “still at your books? Good! But you must not work always. Come I am informed that your supper is ready.’ He took my arm, and we went into the next room, where I found an excellent supper ready on the table.” (Stoker 31). Such actions position him as an exact replica of the surface definition that Stephen gives, but he is both “dead to all sense of religious duty…devoid of charity towards his neighbor” (Stephen 331). In fact, he is literally dead. His undead status puts him beyond the reach of religion and in the world of superstition and so places him apart from a tradition of Christian gentleman. As Thomas Arnold writes, “A
thorough English gentleman, – Christian manly, and enlightened, – ... is a finer specimen of human nature than any other country, I believe, could furnish” (qtd. in Gilmour 88).

In terms of the second part of the Stephen’s comment, Dracula ravages his neighbors in Transylvania and he seeks to do the same to those in London. Still, as far as surface definitions go, he is a gentleman.

For Adams, the gentleman was being “reconfigured” as a piece of art (Dandies, 152). He observes that Ruskin, in the final volume of Modern Painters (1860), offers an alternative definition of the gentleman (152). Ruskin shifts the emphasis of the gentleman onto the body, where traditional definitions primarily focused on the moral and disciplinary aspects of the gentleman (152). In this manner, the gentleman becomes something aesthetic (152) and tangible rather than simply an abstract concept. According to Ruskin in “Of Vulgarity,” “A gentleman’s first characteristic is that fineness of structure in the body which renders it capable of the most delicate sensation; and of structure in the mind which renders it capable of the most delicate sympathies — one may say, simply, ‘fineness of nature’” (874). Ruskin employs specific terminology in his description. Literally, a gentleman should keep himself in proper shape so that he is attuned to everything that goes on around him. Even Van Helsing admits how strong Dracula is. However, Ruskin concentrates on the word structure; he links that word with both the mind and the body, suggesting something that is built, or more importantly, fashioned in some way. He parallels the hardness of structure with the phrases “delicate sensation” and “delicate sympathies.”

The terms fineness and sensitiveness are extensions of the artistic theme towards behavior. In addition, Ruskin feels that “the sign of nobleness is not in this rightness of
moral conduct, but in sensitiveness” (875). For Ruskin, it is not enough to do the right thing. This choice must come from an understanding of the circumstance. The ability to understand his fellow men places the gentleman in the simultaneous position of both artwork and art critic. He is a presentation of masculine traits such as control and dignity, as well as a measuring stick for whether or not others measure up to the status of gentleman. He has fashioned himself into a type of sensitive structure, which allows him to bond with other men and determine whether or not they are also gentleman.

Despite having the physical characteristics of the gentleman, Dracula exercises none of this sensitivity in his handling of his working-class helpers. The mover Bloxam recounts that “He’elped me to lift the boxes and put them in the dray. Curse me, but he was the strongest chap I ever struck, an’ him and old feller…. Why, ’e took up ’is end o’ the boxes like they was pounds of tea, and me a-puffin’ an’ a–blowin’ afore I could up-end mine anyhow – an’ I’m no chicken, neither” (Stoker 281). This incident validates Van Helsing’s comment on Dracula’s strength and the proper physical conditioning of the gentleman; however, Dracula’s strength is realized through vampirism.

Still, one is struck that someone who is of aristocratic background would “stoop” to help a mover do his job. At first it might seem that he is not affected by class boundaries because he appears to work, so he appears to be one of Smiles’s gentlemen workers. Dracula lets the men in and his actions may seem like kindness on his part, but his nature is revealed when the other helpers complain for more money (282). As Bloxam explains, “but ’e took one of them by the shoulder and was like to throw ’im down the steps, till the lot of them went away cussin’” (282). Actually, the traditional distance between the classes is upheld here since Dracula obviously expresses his disdain
for these workers when they challenge him. However, his choice of physical assault in combination with the physical labor he engages while the moving of the boxes might reflect his desire to distance himself from the position of “outsider” he shares with these working-class people. To do so, he pushes these workers around. His inability to engage properly with these workmen also places him in the position of dangerous “outsider” because he is clearly physically disruptive as he threatens to “toss” these workers out of his way. Perhaps the episode is another indication that the aristocratic class is clearly dying, as is symbolized by his vampirism. His treatment of the workers is no longer acceptable and reflects the shifting of the definition of the gentleman from aristocratic to middle class.

His actions conflict with contemporary views of the gentleman. For example, Browne stresses the group mentality of the gentleman in his 1886 article. His definition, “A gentleman is one to whom discourtesy is a sin and a falsehood a crime” (261), is not dependent on birth or wealth but much more character based (262). Browne also denigrates a mere outward show of manners because they do not form a man’s “actual nature and substance” (262). He believes “it must somehow rest upon those inward manners which make the man, and of which the outward should be only the visible sign” (263). In other words, the show that is being put on should not “feel” like a show being put on.

Browne continues by discussing how a gentleman interacts with those around him: “A gentleman will never forget the respect which is due to every man, as a man, so long as he is doing his duty and behaving in an orderly manner; neither will he ever forget the respect which is due to himself. True courtesy is neither churlish nor
patronizing” (263-264). In this gentleman category, the primary defining characteristic is how he treats his fellow gentlemen, no matter what class position they occupy. He explains, “All the homage that etiquette prescribes he will give willingly and unofficiously; but he will give it only as one freeman who renders his just dues to another” (264). One of the traits that distinguish the gentleman is the evenness of the playing field, so to speak.

This sensitive respect for others in a sensitive way shapes the relationship between classes so that the gentleman does not simply “use” others. Gilmour also examines Ruskin’s chapter “Of Vulgarity” in Modern Painters and notes that Ruskin values the notion of the gentleman and the characteristics of being well-bred (Gilmour 87). Ruskin discusses the honest nature of the gentleman as opposed to the false one and emphasizes that a gentleman needs to learn that hard work is acceptable because a false definition had appeared, one that emphasized a gentleman had the right to simply live off the work of others (87). A gentleman’s sensitivity countered this faulty notion.

Ruskin explains, “Gentlemen have to learn that it is no part of their duty or privilege to live on other people’s toil” (Ruskin, “Vulgarity” 874). A gentleman can still be a gentleman as long as the work that he does is honest (874). Dracula violates this rule because of his vampirism. The beginning of the novel hints at this violation. When the voluptuous women assault Harker, Dracula responds in violent manner. Hurling them away, Dracula hisses, “Back, I tell you all! This man belongs to me! Beware how you meddle with him, or you’ll have to deal with me” (Stoker 46). He comes right out and says that Harker belongs to him. One of the women challenges him: “You yourself never loved; you never love!” (46).
Dracula responds, "Yes, I too can love; you yourselves can tell it from the past. Is it not so? Well, now I promise you that when I am done with him you shall kiss him at your will. Now go! go! I must awaken him, for there is work to be done" (46). These lines hint at the fact that Dracula "loved" these women in the past and enslaved them as vampires, using them to feed his desires and forcing them to become his companions. This statement lays the groundwork for his more sinister purposes. Dracula’s emphasis on the work that needs to be done betrays his “use” of Harker’s solicitor abilities in order to obtain properties in England. His statement that he will turn Harker over to the women after he has served his purpose reinforces this “use.” From a story perspective, Dracula wants Harker to help him complete his real estate transactions. However, the same statement is ironic since his work is actually a scheme to move to England in order to consume it; he is buying land in order to obtain status as opposed to the work and service offered by newly formed professional class outlined in the chapter on work above.

His dubious motives are reflected by the non-masculine description of him. For instance, when Harker opens his casket, he observes, "Even the deep, burning eyes seemed set amongst swollen flesh, for the lids and pouches underneath were bloated. It seemed as if the whole awful creature were simply gorged with blood; he lay like a filthy leech, exhausted with repletion" (59-60). This description underscores his consuming nature. He is almost a caricature of a man or perhaps a mannequin. The lack of useful purpose casts him in this ugly light.

Dracula’s very un-gentlemanly interactions with servants and workers are the antithesis of how a gentleman acts towards them. In opposition, the other gentlemen in the text interact with the lower classes in a much more civilized way. Harker, for
example, makes a nice observation about Smollet, the receiver: “He is a decent, intelligent fellow, distinctly a good, reliable type of workman, and with a headpiece of his own. He remembered all about the incident of the boxes, and from a wonderful dog’s-eared notebook, which he produced from some mysterious receptacle about the seat of his trousers” (Stoker 278). Harker’s observations are recorded in his journal, so he both records and defines the value of another gentleman. Harker compliments Smollet on his professionalism and praises his intelligence, thus fitting in with Browne’s comments on how a gentleman should treat his fellow workers, whether they are of the same class or not. This appreciation is mirrored in the ritual that is performed when Godalming and Quincey employ a locksmith to break into one of Dracula’s homes. Harker records this performance: “Morris paid the cabman, who touched his hat and drove away” (319). The workman says something to a passing policeman, who “nodded in acquiescence” (319). Finally, Godalming smiles when the workman finishes his job (319). After being paid, “The man touched his hat, took his bag, put on his coat and departed; not a soul took the slightest notice of the whole transaction” (319). In his discussion of music hall performances, Peter Bailey would describe such an exchange as “a transaction or co-production” (Bailey, “Conspiracies” 146). All of these men interact under those conditions and no one notices because such behavior is so commonplace.

Their performance is a well-executed example of gentlemanly behavior with its ritual of the hats and nods. Godalming’s smile does not seem to betray any condescension on his part. Of course, Harker is the one recording the incident; it is possible, then, that he is painting a picture of his fellow gentlemen. In this way, he directs their performance according to his script, or at least, directs the reader’s
observation of it. The key observation, though, is the fact that no one notices their actions, suggesting disinterest, but Harker notices it, and the two put on a performance of gentlemanly behavior, which Harker records and gives to us as readers and the whole episode is filtered through a masculine lens.

This conflict between interest and disinterest is what sets Dracula apart as an intruder. As Ruth explains in Novel Professions, “If the artist or writer’s work is to enjoy any abiding value, we must perceive it to have been produced without regard to exchange value” (18). Although she is looking at it from an economic perspective, her comments are applicable to Dracula’s failure. In his efforts to fit in, he actually draws attention to himself. His character conflicts with Browne’s observation of the necessity of honesty in one’s actions. For example, in his discussion of snobs, he notes that the more egregious affront is when a man behaves like a sycophant in the presence of a titled person. A gentleman, by contrast, simply pays respect to the man as a fellow gentleman (Browne 264). For Browne, “It is far more likely, however that he [the snob] will distinguish himself by a cringing manner, profuse use of titles, and lavish offers of unneeded services; while the gentleman will not forget that his interlocutor, even if a Prince of the Blood, is, like himself, an English gentleman, and has no wish whatever to be treated as if he were anything more” (264). Browne suggests that a gentleman should not make it a point of showing off, showing respect, but not drawing attention towards himself as someone who is doing so.

He further illustrates this difference with an example from Walter Raleigh. He observes, “There never was an act which more clearly bespoke the gentleman, than when young Walter Raleigh flung his cloak down upon the puddle that lay in the path of the
Queen" (264). The word flung represents instinctual behavior. Raleigh simply threw his cloak down because the situation warranted that action. In comparison, “A snob would have pulled his coat off for the same purpose, and would thereby have made Elizabeth angry and himself ridiculous” (264). Raleigh’s actions are superior to those of the snob because he allows the “scene” to be played out seamlessly and effortlessly. One notices his actions, yes, but the actions do not stop in order for them to be appreciated. Browne objects to phony, sycophantic showmanship which Dracula employs. His efforts end up coming out as physically violent acts and these acts are “recorded” in the diaries of those men who try to stabilize their concept of the gentleman by keeping such leeches out.

His actions always betray his self-interest, reflecting his outsider status. Many of his actions are equivalent to temper tantrums. For instance, as noted earlier, when the women in his castle try to seduce and consume Harker, Dracula bursts in almost like a jealous female lover, which is the antithesis of gentlemanly behavior. In fact, Harker admits that he does not even want to write down what is happening: “It is not good to note this down, lest some day it should meet Mina’s eyes and cause her pain; but it is the truth” (Stoker 45). Within the immediate context, he does not want to upset his wife because he is being tempted by voluptuous women. From the perspective of masculinity, he probably does not want to record this temptation and he likewise does not want to record Dracula’s jealous, un-masculine performance. In fact, his eyes involuntarily open even though he does not wish to observe:

I was conscious of the presence of the Count, and of his being as if lapped in a storm of fury. As my eyes opened involuntarily I saw his strong hand grasp the slender neck of the fair woman and with giant’s power draw it back, the blue eyes transformed with fury, the white teeth champing with rage, and the fair cheeks blazing red with passion. But the Count! Never did I imagine such wrath and fury, even to the demons of the pit.... With a
fierce sweep of his arm, he hurled the woman from him, and then
motioned to the others, as though he were beating them back. (46)

The first thing that Harker admits is that he is conscious of Dracula’s presence and the whole picture is one of anger. More importantly, the use of the word “transform” illustrates a change in behavior on Dracula’s part. His flushed cheeks and “thick eyebrows” like “hot metal” (46) draw attention to his appearance and betray his anger. The emphasis on his skin color makes it seem as if he is wearing makeup, which gives him the appearance but not the “soul” of a gentleman.

Though he is acting like a jealous woman, perhaps his actions could be a desire to bond with a fellow male through the exclusion of females. In this way, his behavior is masculine because he is subjecting women to his will, but he does so in an over-the-top way. Perhaps he is so desperate to fit in as a gentleman that he threatens his female companions to make them keep away. Still, his appearance and Harker’s obsession with it again suggests homoeroticism, or at least, the two-fold dandyism that was discussed earlier in this chapter. Dracula flings the women away, afraid that they will damage his young art piece. Harker is culpable in this exchange, as he notes the whisper of Dracula’s voice, with both its power and seductive qualities.

Practically, though, it is more likely that he needs Harker in order to complete his transaction so he does not want Harker harmed in any manner in order to invade England as seamlessly as possible. However, such actions do quite the opposite, emphasizing his emotions and feminine attributes and underscoring his position as a performer. Harker makes it a point to comment on Dracula’s voice and projection. Dracula’s tirade distances him from gentlemanly values in a loud, undisciplined way. His actions draw
such attention to himself that Harker can barely bring himself to record such a performance.

How he treats his female minions parallels how he treats the workers demand money for their job. As Stephen Arata explains, “*Dracula* can be read as a bourgeois fantasy of aristocratic power and privilege” (Arata 114). This “fantasy” comes out in his harsh treatment of the workers. Within the context of his discussion, Arata is describing the appeal of his character, but the same comment can be used to describe how Dracula does not belong in the upper-middle-class sphere. He represents “the nobleman as warrior” and Arata describes him as an “aristocratic rake” (114). He still derives his power from land and transfers this power through blood (114). The fact that he is a member of the living dead could be taken as representative of the fact that he represents a “dying age.” His violent outbursts directed at the movers indicate his struggle against a changing world. Once again, he simply does not belong in a world populated by an emerging professional class that is marked by gentlemen’s sensitivity. Dracula is an example of the stiffness and obvious artificiality of a “pose” that Robert Louis Stevenson suggests is no longer relevant in a changing world. Perhaps, then, this is why Dracula is exposed as a villain, apart from his obvious destructive behavior.

Because Dracula is such a fixed construction, Harker cannot talk to him as a peer. For example, Harker admits, “I cannot let my ideas known to the count” (34). This statement is given within the context of his imprisonment, but it reflects how Dracula does not fit in, despite all of his studies of the way of the Englishman. Harker realizes that Dracula is still an outsider, so they cannot bond in any way. Dracula is a manufactured Westerner, whose attempts reflect Robin Gilmour’s idea that the gentleman
was a “cultural goal” (1). As Arata suggests, “Dracula is the most ‘Western’ character in
the novel. No one is more rational, more intelligent, more organized, or even more
punctual than the Count. No one plans more carefully or researches more thoroughly”
(123). Arata cites a passage describing Dracula’s book collection: “In the library I
found, to my great delight, a vast number of English books, whole shelves full of them,
and bound volumes of magazines and newspapers…The books were of the most varied
kind – history, geography, politics, political economy, botany, geology, law – all relating
to England and English life and customs and manners” (qtd. in Arata 123). The books
that he owns mimic the self-help etiquette books that men used to learn how to “act,”
since both “customs and manners” involve expectations of behavior. In the end, Dracula
is learning a part in the play or studying to pass a test. According to Waters, “if
instruction in gentlemanliness is needed, then the gentleman cannot be a natural state”
(28). Dracula is anything but natural but his goal is to appear so.

An examination of Dracula’s relationship with Renfield leads to similar concerns
about how the gentleman is a construction or pose. While observing a conversation
between Renfield and Mina, Seward comments:

He replied to her with as much courtesy and respect as he had shown
contempt to me…. Here was my own pet lunatic – the most pronounced of
his type that I had ever met with – talking elemental philosophy, and with
the manner of a polished gentleman. I wonder if it was Mrs Harker’s
presence which had touched some chord in his memory. If this new phase
was spontaneous, or in any way due to her unconscious influence, she
must have some rare gift or power. (248, 249)

In this instance, Renfield exposes the gentleman as a fraudulent category. Renfield has
been deemed insane and yet he can play the part of a polite gentleman. Seward’s
comments about what is making Renfield act so civilized parallel the questions about the
gentleman. Is he something spontaneous? Is he the result of the “influence” of someone or something?

Renfield himself acknowledges this uncertainty as he discusses his own attempts at self-control in response to what Dracula is doing to Mina. He explains, “it made me mad to know that He had been taking the life out of her…. So when He came tonight I was ready for Him. I saw the mist stealing in, and I grabbed it tight. I had heard that madmen have unnatural strength; and as I knew I was a madman – at times anyhow – I resolved to use my power” (299). Renfield admits that his power and self-control are not inherent in his personality and has to consciously control himself. In the end, this admission betrays the fact that the gentleman is simply a role, since even someone deemed “mad” can act like a “polished gentleman.” By comparison, he describes how Dracula exercises his control: “he went on as though he owned the whole place and I was nothing” (298). Renfield’s last comment about being nothing gives one the sense that underneath it all, the gentleman is nothing.

This nothingness is underscored by Renfield’s attempts to subdue Dracula. Despite his madness, Renfield is capable of more brave actions, but he is ultimately destroyed by the more “powerful” gentleman in Dracula. Seward’s last comment about Mina is telling because it shows Renfield as someone who can be influenced. This connection with Mina leads to his confrontation with Dracula, who has power over him. Even Renfield recognizes this when he begs to be sent far away. Appealing to Van Helsing, Renfield admits, “Your argument is complete, and if I were free to speak I should not hesitate a moment; but I am not my own master in the matter. I can only ask you to trust me. If I am refused, the responsibility does not rest with me” (262). His
admission that he is not his own master suggests that he has no self-control. This control that the gentleman relies on is not an inherent trait; the gentleman himself is not a given character because one can phase in and out of it. When he lets Dracula into the room, he calls “Come in, Lord and Master!” (298). The term master places Renfield in a subordinate position. However, when he realizes that he is trying to make Mina into a vampire, he attacks Dracula but is destroyed, so the gentleman role is exposed as an unsuccessful defense.

The gentleman is an unsafe foundation is because it can be infiltrated through study and mimicry. For instance, Dracula has learned a way to “stroll unhindered, through the streets of London” and “So long as no one recognizes him as a ‘stranger,’ he is able to work his will unhindered” (Arata 125). Arata emphasizes Dracula’s statement that he has used his abilities to become a “master” (125). From an imperialistic viewpoint, the English would teach their colonized “others” English values. Within the context of Dracula’s “reverse” imperialism, Arata notes that Dracula “rapidly becomes superior to his teachers” (125). He is like a secondary actor who is “stealing” scenes from his fellow actors. Arata compares Dracula’s physical prowess to that of some of the protagonists in order showcase Dracula’s talents. Arata’s observations about Dracula’s darkening hair and growing vitality in contrast to Harker’s growing paleness showcase Dracula’s talents. As opposed to the mutual admiration discussed above, these reversals can also suggest that Dracula is “stealing” the gentleman identity from Harker.

In fact, Arata notes Dracula’s use of Harker’s clothes and his ability to “pass” as Englishman by pretending he is Harker (Arata 124). When Harker looks to see Dracula’s reflection, he sees only himself (124). As Arata observes, this incident is key because
Dracula dresses in Harker’s clothes twice in order to leave the castle and plunder the town below (124). When the woman whose child was taken sees Harker, she blames him and demands her child back, calling Harker a monster (124). Harker’s reaction parallels the one that Dracula has for his victims. After she is killed, Harker recalls, “I could not pity her, for I knew now what had become of her child” (Stoker 54). At first glance, it might seem as if Harker is like Dracula who has no pity for his victims. However, his use of the phrase “not pity” is actually an example of the gentleness and empathy that Ruskin describes in a gentleman. He does not feel sorry for her death because he believes that it is better for the woman to be dead than to learn her child has been consumed. In this way, he actually feels for what has happened to her. As a result, Harker is a kind of mirror to Dracula, who does not pity those he harms. The literal link of the two through their dress symbolizes their mirrored gentleman status. One shows genuine concern while the other is based on pretense.

Arata’s emphasis on the use of clothes reflects the style books of the time. Dress was an important outward sign of a gentleman (Waters 31). As Waters explains, “The outward qualities of the gentleman might, if one worked very hard and successfully imitated the correct role models, allow a middle-class man to appear to be a gentleman” (32). This same observation can perhaps be made about Dracula’s dress. In this case, he is a member of a dying aristocratic race who is trying to fit into English upper-middle class life. Waters’s analysis of Ruskin shows that his aristocratic background is precisely why he is able to succeed. Using his Modern Painters as a way of examining how one can “become” a gentleman, Waters emphasizes a “delicate cruelty” (32). Ruskin explains, “A highly bred man, even when cruel, will be cruel in a softer way,
understanding and feeling what he inflicts, and pitying his victim” (qtd. in Waters 32). While I have noted that Dracula offers no pity, some of Ruskin’s description can be applied to Dracula’s attempts. For example, in an odd way, he is compelled to follow decorum. He cannot enter the place of his victims unless he is invited in, so he exercises correct manners. However, he does show cruelty or at least conduct unbecoming of a gentleman as shown by his treatment of the workers, Renfield, his women and even Mina.

All of Dracula’s plans are the result of the time he has spent “studying” the various scripts he has in his study that prepare him for his role. He has learned to please, or at least not overtly offend, his audience, so he is composing a “passable” story of his life. In his discussion of autobiographical writing, Robbie Gray writes, “Whether published or not, personal narratives formed part of a chain of representations, with uncertain and sometimes contentious boundaries. References to particular identities, educational backgrounds, senses, of place or other imagined communities helped stabilise some of the boundaries” (Gray 296-297). Gray’s description is applicable to the gentleman because the gentleman is essentially a “chain of representations” that attempts to define itself as a whole. Victorian men used the gentleman as an “attempt to construct a sense of settlement and achievement” (301). Victorian culture was based on “self-representation” and this culture gave structure to a man’s sense of identity (306). This identity was the product of “self-cultivation” (Castronovo, “Introduction” x). A man fostered an image of himself as gentleman.

One of the images that the gentleman cultivated was that of self-control. However, as can be seen, self-command is a troublesome characteristic for the
gentleman, as is evidenced by the above examples of Dracula’s violence and Renfield’s failed attempts. Ruskin discusses the notion of self-command, which “is often thought a characteristic of high-breeding” (“Vulgarity” 876). However he goes on to point out that self-command is actually only a “way of imitating a gentleman” (876). We see this in some of Renfield’s behavior. As noted above, he is capable of talking like a polished gentleman. While making a last plea to Seward, he is becoming emotional and is going to be put in a strait-jacket. However, he calms down and Seward observes, “He had evidently self-control” (Stoker 290). The term “evidently” brings attention to the surface nature of Renfield’s behavior, for Ruskin writes that a gentleman feels at ease with himself so there is no need to apply self-restraint (“Vulgarity” 876). Ruskin’s observation is applicable to Renfield in this case since he is “applying” his self-restraint in order to escape from Dracula’s wrath that is on its way. Self-restraint is a conscious act which can be exhibited by a questionable person for his own ends (876). Thus, Renfield’s psychosis “mocks the very criteria used by other characters to produce their master narrative” (Arata 127). In contrast, “Gentlemanliness, however, in ordinary parlance, must be taken to signify those qualities which are usually the evidence of high breeding, and which, so far as they can be acquired, it should be every man’s effort to acquire; or, if he has them by nature, to preserve and exalt” (Ruskin, “Vulgarity” 874). Ruskin admits that one should strive to acquire the characteristics of the gentleman but should not consciously exhibit them: “Only we must carefully remember that the quantity of sympathy a gentleman feels can never be judged by its outward expression, for another of his chief characteristics is apparent reserve” (875-876). Once again, we are confronted by the interest/disinterest dichotomy.
Ruskin himself emphasizes a key characteristic with his use of “apparent”: “I say ‘apparent’ reserve; for the sympathy is real, but the reserve not: a perfect gentleman is never reserved, but sweetly and entirely open, so far as it is good for others, or possible, that he should be” (876). In terms of openness, gentlemen are open to others of the same status: “To them, he can open himself, by a word, or syllable, or a glance; but to men not of his kind he cannot open himself, though he tried it through an eternity of clear grammatical speech” (876). Ruskin’s last observation is particularly applicable to Dracula. If we turn the comment around, Dracula is exposed in a parallel way. For Ruskin, an outsider will not understand a gentleman no matter how clearly he speaks. Two gentlemen, however, understand each others’ thoughts and feelings. For Stoker, Dracula is the outsider who cannot open himself up to the English gentleman Harker. Dracula studies English grammar but he does not truly understand the meaning of the words. For instance, he makes a request to Harker: “True, I know the grammar and the words, but yet I know not how (my emphasis) to speak them... rest here with me a while, so that by our talking I may learn the English intonation (my emphasis); and I would that you tell me when I make error, even of the smallest, in my speaking” (Stoker 27). It is interesting that the term intonation is used, which concentrates on pitch changes, tones and sound patterns, as the OED indicates (OED). His observations about how to speak the words remind one of an actor or a singer who has learned a part phonetically. The natural way of speaking has eluded him because has studied the forms but not the contexts. This is a concentration on sound, and by extension, appearance rather than substance. He cannot “open” himself to the Englishmen that he is trying to impersonate because he is not interested in conveying actual deeper meaning.
In comparison, the heroes seemingly have more substance to them, and are more in line with the contemporary descriptions of the gentleman, allowing their gentlemanly behavior to be exhibited in a more subtle way. For instance, at one point Godalming lets his emotional guard down in front of Mina. Mina observes:

Here he turned away and covered his face with his hands. I could hear the tears in his voice. Mr. Morris, with instinctive delicacy, just laid a hand for a moment on his shoulder, and then walked quietly out of the room. I suppose there is something in a woman’s nature that makes a man free to break down before her and express his feelings on the tender or emotional side without feeling it derogatory to his manhood. (Stoker 244)

The whole episode depicts subtle gentlemanly behavior. In response, Morris just pats Godalming in support and walks out, giving him the privacy he needs to express himself. Mina’s observation defines how a gentleman can express his emotions in front of a woman. At the same time, the gentlemanly concept of emotional control is challenged since Godalming does let his emotions show in such a raw way. However, the honesty that Browne praises is present since Godalming does express himself, which for Ruskin, does “not in the least diminish the manliness, but add[s] feminineness” (“Vulgarity” 882). The tender thoughts and emotions that Godalming expresses do not take his manliness away. Momentarily, Mina thinks that perhaps Godalming would think it too forward of her for holding his hand. However, she realizes that he would never have such a thought: “There I wrong him: I know he never will – he is too true a gentleman” (Stoker 245).

Morris’s actions also place him more line with an acceptable gentleman. He asks Mina, “How is Art?...Poor old fellow! he needs it. No one but a woman can help a man when he is in trouble of the heart; and he had no one to comfort him” (246). Morris understands that men cannot really express their emotions in front of each other in an
overt way as they might do with a woman. However, with his pat on the back and his question about “Art,” Morris is able to express his support in an acceptable manner. It is interesting to note that Morris is an American, yet he seems to fit into the gentlemanly role more easily than Dracula who is also non-English. Morris does so through his observation of decorum and willingness to help his fellow gentleman with sensitivity and decorum. When he dies at the end of the novel, Mina observes, “And, to our bitter grief, with a smile and in silence, he died, a gallant gentleman” (401).

However, the smile makes his death similar to that of Dracula, linking the two in their ability to “pass” as gentlemen. That is what is troublesome about the category since despite all of Dracula’s misdeeds, the last physical description of him is one of a composed gentlemanly smile, like that of Morris. Mina writes, “I shall be glad as long as I live that even in that moment of final dissolution, there was in the face a look of peace, such as I never could have imagined might have rested there” (401). If Dracula “passes” this way, what is to stop others from doing so? Perhaps the heroes are just “passing” as well. After all, there are moments when the characters do become emotional. There is Godalming’s emotional moment mentioned above. Earlier in the novel, Seward curses the servants when no one comes to the door when he knocks. He recounts, “I cursed the laziness of the servants that they should lie abed at such an hour – for it was now ten o’clock – and so rang and knocked again, but more impatiently, but still without a response. Hitherto I had blamed only the servants, but now a terrible fear began to assail me” (156). His first reaction is to blame the servants but he begins to realize the more serious threat. In this way, his actions are no different than how Dracula treats his women and the movers. The only difference is that he is not physically violent, but the
attitude is there, which conflicts with how a gentleman is supposed to treat people of all classes.

Even Van Helsing loses his temper when Lucy’s mother allows Dracula to enter. Seward observes, “He had been able to retain his self-command whilst the poor lady was present…. Then for the first time in my life, I saw Van Helsing break down…. and putting his hands before his face, began to sob, with loud, dry sobs that seemed to come from the very racking of his heart” (144). As noted above, such emotion is usually reserved for when a woman is present and never in the front of another man. That is why the situation is conflicted, since Van Helsing is demonstrating honesty and straightforwardness in front of his friend, but he is exploding with emotion. He even emits a “hissing inspiration” while preparing for a new transfusion. His sounds are not unlike Dracula’s snarls.

Dracula’s changing looks throughout the novel come to symbolize this uncertainty. Within Dracula, “there is no grace, no music, nor softness, nor learnedness in the man’s soul; that he is made up of forms and accoutrements” (Ruskin, “Vulgarity” 882). The last scene before he is destroyed has him “deathly pale, just like a waxen image” (Stoker 400). This mirrors our first vision of him in the novel. In fact, when he attacks Mina in the bedroom, the very same phrase, “clad in black” is used to describe him as is used by Harker in the beginning of the novel. In that instance, he has more of a dandified appearance. Here, he is a “tall, thin man…. His eyes red with devilish passion” (300). After his run-in with the movers, Bloxam describes him as “a old feller, with a white moustache, one that thin you think he couldn’t throw a shadder” (281). On the bus, Mina and Harker see him looking at a girl: “a tall, thin man, with a beaky nose and black
moustache and pointed beard, who also observing the pretty girl.... His face was not a good face; it was hard, and cruel, and sensual” (183). Even the description of him at the moment is uncertain. The hardness gives him a plastic, sculpture like quality, which casts him as an art piece, much as he is described at the beginning of the novel. However, he is also sensual, which suggests emotion and perhaps recasts him as a dandy or perhaps even feminine like Ruskin’s sensitivity. When Mina questions him, Harker responds, “It is the man himself!” (184). Within the context of the plot, Harker is warning her that the man is Count Dracula. The same statement undercuts the concept of a man or in this case a gentleman as an unstable category. “It is the man” suggests Dracula as model, but the conflicting descriptions of him in this particular instance reveal that there is no standard model. This idea becomes further symbolized by the scar on his forehead (300) that is like a chip in his plaster persona. The only common element in these descriptions is that he is noticed by someone. These changing descriptions reflect not only shifting definitions of a gentleman but also multiple attempts to find an acceptable way of blending in as one.

In the end the Victorian gentleman was not as stable a term as Victorian middle- and upper-middle class men had hoped. If one could learn how to do it, then it is a dangerous category to base masculinity on since one could use it for nefarious ends. One could appear to be a gentleman outwardly, but not actually be one at all. This type of uncertainty was reflected in the literature of the late Victorian era, especially in a novel such as Dracula. The novel is a study in conflicting definitions of what makes a gentleman and within each definition there are different emphases. Dracula is appealing in the sense that he is surrounded by wealth and women, but ultimately he is exposed as a
fraud and reduced to dust. Likewise, the heroes participate in both the construction and
de-construction of it. The category of gentleman, when pushed also collapses into dust
since it is revealed as such an unstable category. Dracula is an example of the faulty
construct of the gentleman; his final peaceful smile is really no more valuable than the
dust he turns into.
Chapter 5

“I came to act a part.” Dr. Jekyll’s Theatre

In the previous chapters, we have examined roles: the worker, the player and the gentleman. The concept of roles leads to the other meaning of the term play that will be covered in this project, play as in playing a role. In his article on narrative technique and alternative sexual identities in the Victorian era, Ed Cohen examines John Addington Symonds’s Memoirs, written in 1889 but published in 1897 after his death (Cohen, “Double” 357). Cohen notes this work was an example of “self-characterization that moved athwart the historical and narrative constraints which had heretofore circumscribed the possibilities for (his) autobiography” (357). Symonds experienced a conflict between behavioral expectations and his inner desires (361), which forced him to create an imaginative space (360) in order to tell his story in an acceptable way: “The result of my habitual reserve was that I now dissembled my deepest feelings, and only revealed those sentiments which I know would pass muster. Without meaning to do so, I came to act a part, and no one knew what was going on inside me....” (Symonds, qtd. in Cohen 360). Symonds’s outward appearance of reserve is an act, a role he plays. The only place he could discuss his feelings and desires to be something else was in his autobiography which would be later published; in terms of his daily life he was forced to play the role of a typical restrained gentleman, a fashioned image of stability.

Symonds’s dilemma about acting a part is a good segue into the subject of this chapter. I am going to use the concept of the theatre to examine male self-fashioning and attempts at a stable definition of Victorian manhood. I want to discuss masculinity as performance and then funnel it through the language of the theatre in an examination of
Robert Louis Stevenson’s *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886). I suggest that the novel can be set up as a stage, complete with actors and audience members. There are even “critiques” of masculine performances. By doing so, I hope to show that *Jekyll and Hyde* exposes the instability inherent in masculine role-playing.

I begin with a look at how masculinity is a role to be performed. Victorian masculinity is a spectacle (Adams, *Dandies* 12) for an audience of fellow men. Stevenson himself addresses this issue in 1888, concluding, “The rehearsed piece is at an end; we are now floundering through an impromptu charade” (“Gentlemen” 640). In the past, life had a more ceremonial quality to it, so “Life was a rehearsed piece; and only those who had been drilled in the rehearsals could appear with decency in the performance” (639, 640). In his essay, he employs the language of the theatre to describe how the gentleman was steeped in performance but now his actions had to be more improvisational. This later essay suggests a way to re-examine *Jekyll and Hyde* since Stevenson frames Victorian masculinity in theatrical terms in both works.

Issues such as boundaries and blurred roles apply to both masculinity and the theatre. For instance, the distinction between player and part can be confused at times. Even the role itself may be split, especially in the case of melodrama (Mayer 150). Symonds’s masculine performance outlined above also reflects such a split. Because of the split involved, I will then move towards the use of theatre language to examine *Jekyll and Hyde* as an example of the difficulties with masculine definitions. More specifically, as analogous to Victorian melodrama, *Jekyll and Hyde* can be categorized as follows: Jekyll is an actor/character while the secondary characters of Lanyon, Utterson, and Enfield serve as audience members and critics. Some of the locations used in the novel
typify class anxieties due to the proximity of the working class to the action. These same locations parallel stage boundaries and dressing rooms of the theatre. Because of their proximity and the ability to move freely between locations, the player/part role gets blurred. I will conclude with a comparison between the “reveals” by Sherlock Holmes and Mr. Hyde in order to show how one can deal with the uncertainty that underpins the “part” of the Victorian gentleman. While Holmes’s “reveal” is a more assuring attempt at cohesion, Mr. Hyde exposes the horror underneath and the insubstantiality of the performance of the Victorian gentleman.

Symonds’s observation about his “part” suggests the performative nature of masculinity. He admits that his everyday behavior as a gentleman covers up what he feels inside. For instance, Victorian masculinity was defined by work and one’s leisure time occupations. Behavior such as calm and reserve were traits that were attributed to the Victorian man. However, the underlying problem with these definitions is that they are based on appearances and potential contradictions. For example, from a class perspective, an upper-middle-class professional needed to distance himself from the working class, yet working, earning a living and providing for his family was essential to how his worth was judged. Those who worked at home aligned themselves with the domestic and thus the feminine from a gender perspective. We’ve also seen how the games mentality was co-opted by the working classes. One sees all of these conflicting issues lying in wait underneath the seemingly stable “part” of the Victorian middle- and upper-middle class gentleman. One way of attempting to combat this fragility is to make it appear whole. In order to do so, men must act and think a certain way, as Symonds admits, “act a part.”
The Victorian gentleman makes a similar attempt, seeking to present himself to a community of fellow men who judge him just as the actor who displays his skills for an audience and critics alike is judged. John Tosh writes, "manliness had to be earned, by mastering the circumstances of life and thus securing the respect of one's peers" (Manliness 86). Tosh's comments suggest that manliness is not an inherent trait but rather an acquired one if it is earned. A man wants to act in a way that is acceptable to his fellow men who watch his behavior, thus creating a sense of masculine theatricality because of the interaction between masculine "performer" and masculine "audience" (Adams, Dandies 11). The problem is that his actions should not appear as an "act"; otherwise masculinity as a stable concept would be exposed as a myth.

As a projection of unity that represents a bringing together of different personalities and characters for a unified show, the theatre is a reflection of the culture it is based in. For Nina Auerbach, it was a "prism" through which the world was filtered into Victorian culture (3). As an example of Adams's "articulation of social power" (Adams, Dandies 3), the theatre "came closer than any art, even the loveable but long Victorian novel, to becoming a universal language" (Auerbach 6). This universality stemmed from its "fluid mixture of genres that drew virtually all classes" (5). Auerbach makes these observations in opposition to the historical belief that the middle-class audience of the second half of the nineteenth century lifted the theatre from its working-class roots (4-5). Auerbach's point is that the theatre audience continued to be diverse.

Attempts at an English National Theatre reflected this desire for a common theatrical culture (Guest, "Culture" 281). Kristen Guest examines how such a project would help ease tensions between various classes and political anxieties about the powers
of other countries (281). If everyone could get behind a common cultural phenomenon national unity could be fostered (281). Likewise, in his discussion of the British Navy, Jan Rüger writes, “The naval spectacle thus served as a prime arena for symbolically uniting the four nations of the United Kingdom” (Rüger 173). Rüger concludes, “The navy was the Empire’s safeguard and global link, and it was clad in a striking imagery of heroism, steel and guns, combined with the fascination of modern technology” (178). For Rüger, the navy’s show promoted national unity in opposition to the rest of the world.

Guest’s discussion of the debate about the National Theatre illustrates why the movement was a failure. Power relations undermined an attempt at creating such a national theatre (283). In the attempt to inspire a universal cultural norm, “advocates of a National Theatre unwittingly made clear the fragility of the tradition they invoked” (284). Since the attempt at a universal culture depends on matters of taste, it creates hegemony because someone of authority would be determining taste (283). Colonies, for example, had their own historical tastes, which led to objections as to what popular taste should be the norm (283). These competing tastes highlighted how cultural identities were of a “constructed character” since there were more than one (283). If there were an intrinsic culture then it would be unlikely that there would be different ones from the different walks of life that the Empire comprised. To come up with a national one would require constructing it out of these other structures, undercutting the belief in one foundation.

Like Rüger’s shows and Guest’s National Theatre, Jekyll and Hyde, because of its theatrical attempt to present a unified whole, represents Adams’s unstable constructions (Dandies 3). The language that Stevenson employs is often that of the theatre. For
instance, when explaining his experiments, Jekyll writes, “Certain agents I found to have the power to shake and pluck back that fleshly vestment, even as a wind might toss the curtains of a pavilion” (Stevenson 307-308). The use of the term vestment suggests costume, clothing or a cover and the result of pealing it off leads to nothing underneath. Jekyll even uses the word curtain and when it is pulled back something terrible is revealed. In fact, Jekyll calls his a body a “mere aura” (308), admitting: “I did not even exist!” (311).

The “I” that Jekyll is referring to is his position as the upper-middle-class professional, “that part of me which I had the power of projecting” (313). As an actor who puts on a show as a proper English gentleman for Enfield and Utterson who observe and report what is going on, Jekyll must rely on his audience’s response in order to maintain his performance. Some of these responses take the form of critique. Lanyon operates as both audience member and critic of Jekyll’s performance. Lanyon witnesses Jekyll’s “break of character.” As a middle-class professional, his responses to both Jekyll’s experiments and Hyde’s existence reflect male middle-class anxiety that other “types” could find their way into the fold.

These performances take place in very specific locations, representing proximity between classes. Jekyll’s home is situated within a mixed-class neighborhood. Hyde can enter Jekyll’s home through a side door. As discussed in the introduction, the classes intersected as different kinds of shops were right next to and in some cases, right below homes of the middle class. The poor often camped right in front of these shops or outside homes. The poor could either come in or the “respectable” classes could go out through
something as simple as a doorway, suggesting that people could “occupy” the locations of either class.

Likewise, the fact that Jekyll and Hyde are the same person also expresses the fear that “others” might be passing themselves off as gentlemen. From a theatrical perspective, the role and player are confused. This discovery takes place in Jekyll’s cabinet, which is like a dressing room, complete with a mirror. When Utterson breaks in, breaching the actor/audience border, Jekyll’s choice to become Hyde highlights Jekyll’s position as an act. Because of the blurred roles, though, it is difficult to determine who the actor is and who the role is.

As an example of exposed, or at least flawed, masculine performance, Jekyll and Hyde reads as melodrama. Melodrama confronts contemporary issues and attempts to address them through a conflicted protagonist who must face a formidable opponent, especially one who is often himself. An example of such an issue is the middle-class professional confronted by working classes and/or women who are growing in influence. Audiences come to the show expecting certain conventions that reestablish class place by mocking poor attempts to imitate them (Bailey, “Conspiracies” 165). Jekyll and Hyde puts on an extreme “show” because the audience members are not prepared to deal with what is revealed to them.

As David Mayer points out, “Melodrama, then, is a theatrical or literary response to a world where things are seen to go wrong, where ideas of secular and divine justice and recompense are not always met, where suffering is not always acknowledged, and where explanations for wrong, injustice, and suffering are not always understandable” (148). Jekyll and Hyde fits this description because Hyde’s actions are hard to pin down.
In fact, Mayer even observes that the novella had been adapted for the stage by T. Sullivan Russell (159). Melodrama’s admission that evil and suffering are not always explainable can be shifted to a focus on the unstable aspects of masculinity. For instance, the gentleman might only be a role and so his existence is equally hard to define. For example, we have the part, the expected behaviors that other members of the same class would recognize. However, we also have the actual human being playing the part. The issue lies in that other class “types” can mimic the gentleman’s behaviors. Such mimicry exposes the gentleman as a role, which leads to the question of who is real, the gentleman or the man playing the part. In a way, then, the gentleman is inexplicable. Despite the admission that suffering or evil can be inexplicable, Mayer suggests, “Melodrama depends upon our abilities to recognize evil and to distinguish it from good, and, lest we not possess this ability, the conventions of this genre are there to assist us” (149). Likewise, it draws its effectiveness from its audience’s anxiety about such evils (148). Jekyll and Hyde assists the audience to see that sometimes good and evil reside in the same individual. The story also exposes the tenuous boundary between act and substance beneath that act.

As a result, one concern is role-playing. From this perspective the Jekyll/Hyde character fits the mode of late nineteenth-century melodrama:

While villainy remains the propelling force in melodrama, a new generation of dramatists, leagued with a handful of actors, devise a conflicted protagonist who, though criminal and frequently dissolute, longs desperately to perform good actions. This role might be called the “divided hero-villain.” The protagonist’s chief struggle is within his divided or double-self to master his evil nature and to recover in himself some evidence of decency and good, a role reprising the earlier temperance melodrama, but now the stakes are higher because there is more at risk than domestic stability and health. Moreover, these plays are fueled by a growing scientific and lay interest in human psychology and
awareness that there are deep fissures between outward behavior and inner lives. (Mayer 158-159)

Mayer’s last statement is a good literal description of the Jekyll/Hyde character but his observations also apply to Victorian masculinity as a whole. The protagonist’s attempts at self-mastery are an issue that runs through Victorian masculinity because one of the traits of the middle- and upper-middle class gentleman is control. The point is to sublimate desires into more acceptable outlets such as disciplined actions. Thus, the “stakes” are higher. If this gentleman is exposed as a mere attempt, then what happens to middle-class masculinity? The late Victorian middle- and upper-middle class gentleman as a source of differentiation from the working class, New Women or even decadent, dandified aesthetes, falters. Melodramas of the period grappled with such dilemmas. For instance, the melodramas of Frederick and Walter Melville in the late nineteenth-century and earlier twentieth century confronted anxieties such as the “New” woman or a “patriarchal society in consequent disarray” (Mayer 161).

Also, Dr. Jekyll’s experiments reflect the scientific interest in the split explored by the melodrama. Waters, looking at the story from the perspective of professionalism, underscores the point that Jekyll’s research goes out of control (110). She writes, “The tale escapes the teller” (111). Science is usually looked at with optimism, but in this case Hyde is an example of how science can be “the instrument of man’s self-destruction” (111). In this manner, the split between producer and product is emphasized.

Jekyll’s attempts to keep Hyde in check parallel the desire to reign in and “recover decency” that Mayer discusses. For example, he does stop himself from becoming Hyde: “Yes, I preferred the elderly and discontented doctor, surrounded by friends and cherishing honest hopes; and bade a resolute farewell to the liberty, the
comparative youth, the light step, leaping pulses and secret pleasures, that I had enjoyed in the disguise of Hyde” (Stevenson 314). He makes a conscious choice of roles. The descriptions of Hyde as less disciplined, equated with liberty and “secret pleasures,” contrast with the terms “honest” and “resolute,” two terms equated with the proper English gentleman. Despite this disciplined and perhaps even negative, description of Jekyll’s situation, his role allows him to bond with his male “audience.” Giving “pleasant” parties for friends, he entertains “five or six old cronies, all intelligent, reputable men and all judges of good wine” (269).

When we look at Jekyll as host, he meets the expectations of his audience, or guests. For example, after Hyde seemingly disappears, Jekyll is once again the star: “Now that the evil influence had been withdrawn, a new life began for Dr. Jekyll. He came out of his seclusion, renewed relations with his friends, became once more their familiar guest and entertainer...his face seemed to open and brighten, as if with an inward consciousness of service” (Stevenson 282). Stevenson’s use of the terms entertainer, and more importantly service, tie him in with Bratton’s “demand for the expected entertainment” (174).

As a result, Jekyll describes himself as “fond of the respect of the wise and good among my fellow-men” (Stevenson 306). If he chooses to remain as Hyde, he will be “despised and friendless” (314). With his suppression of his “leaping pulses and secret pleasures” that Hyde represents, Jekyll’s performance as controlled masculinity places him within a “known brotherhood of performers” (Bratton 174). At one point, Jekyll writes, “After all, I reflected I was like my neighbours; and then I smiled, comparing myself with the lazy cruelty of their neglect” (Stevenson 316). Jekyll fulfills the
expected conventions because he is a reflection of what the audience wishes to see itself as.

His fulfillment of these expectations calls for a response from the audience since his actions define the audience members. For Bratton, “the mixed metropolitan audience, thus interpellated, saw itself reflected and perhaps coerced into conformity” (177). Jekyll’s respectable behavior is reciprocated by those who witness his “performance.” Their interactions with each other “reflect” the example that Dr. Jekyll presents. For example, when Enfield and Utterson are first introduced, they are named as “Mr.” The rules that they live by define them in the role of quiet thoughtful gentleman. Utterson, especially, serves as an audience for masculine performance through his own disciplined masculine quietude. His position as receptive male audience member is illustrated by Lanyon’s reaction to Utterson’s visit: “At sight of Mr. Utterson, he sprang up from his chair and welcomed him with both hands. The geniality, as was the way of the man, was somewhat theatrical to the eye” (Stevenson 262). Lanyon performs a reaction: almost on cue, he springs up when Utterson pays a visit. Stevenson explains that the two were old school friends, both in private school and college, where young boys are taught such roles and rules. As James Eli Adams explains, masculinity is a “rhetorical fabric of self-presentation” (Adams, Dandies 52), so performance is woven into masculine definition. With the phrase “the way of the man,” Stevenson underscores theatricality as a primary characteristic for men because he links this phrase with Lanyon’s theatrical reaction. “The way” is suggestive of the conventions associated with Lanyon’s masculine behavior, one of which is the interaction between audience and performer.
This interaction is further illustrated by a description of Utterson at a party given by Dr. Jekyll. Stevenson writes, "Mr. Utterson so contrived that he remained behind after the others had departed. This was no new arrangement, but a thing that had befallen many scores of times.... Hosts loved to detain the dry lawyer, when the light-hearted and the loose-tongued had already had their foot on the threshold" (269). This description of Utterson parallels the episode with Lanyon examined above. Stevenson places Utterson in the role of character actor through his behavior at the party, and words such as "arrange" and "contrive" suggest the artifice of Utterson's behavior. He consciously stays behind to talk with Jekyll. Like Lanyon's "way," Utterson's interaction with the hosts of party is something that happens all the time, so it is the "way" these men behave. It is their convention.

His behavior contrasts with the more jovial guests. Utterson is dry as opposed to "loose-tongued" guests (269). An invitation to stay for a performance after the performance at the party also cements him as a special audience member invited to actively participate. Utterson's "unobtrusive" behavior makes him a focal point for masculine performance since hosts often like to sit with him, "practicing for solitude" (206). Serving as company without being intrusive, in this manner, he and his host practice quiet masculinity. He gives them a way to "sober" their minds after their jovial guests, who are described as a strain (269), have gone for the night. Utterson is a paradigm of "rich silence" (268), allowing those with him to express male bonds in a socially acceptable, male defined manner. Lanyon can act in a "theatrical" way and Jekyll can feel "for Mr. Utterson a sincere and warm affection" (269). Both of these men can express these sentiments through their silent, respectful companionship with
Utterson. He is a participating audience member for whom players can express themselves in a disciplined way in collective performance of respectability.

With his experiments, Jekyll breaks away from such respectability that Utterson, Enfield, and Lanyon as audience members expect from him. As Martin Danahay explains in *A Community of One*, “Dr. Jekyll brought about his downfall by trying to separate his double consciousness; if only, like Utterson, he had continued to simply repress his desires rather than express them, there would have been no tragedy. The text creates an ideal image of the masculine subject as self-divided and, if not happy at least respectable” (144). Danahay’s comments echo Cohen’s observations about new types of representation for the male subject. Danahay concludes, “The smooth functioning of society and the preservation of the bonds of obligation, depends upon the repression of the self-centered, antisocial tendencies that Mr. Hyde expressed. So long as repression works, society is safe. Duplicity is ultimately a way of life for the Victorian male” (144). The audience and the star are both responsible for this “duplicity.”

Calling the music-hall “an agreeable national *alter ego*, a manageable low other” (Bailey, “Conspiracies” 167), Peter Bailey’s description fits Hyde, who is a physical example of duplicity. In fact, Jekyll himself views Hyde as a disguise, “the veil of self-indulgence” as well as a “thick cloak” (Stevenson 315, 310). Like stage performances that allow an exploration of vice, Hyde allows him to engage in “secret pleasures” (315). In fact, Jekyll keeps Hyde’s clothes in his cabinet (315) much like an actor keeps his costumes locked away. If this is the case, it is further evidence of how Hyde allows Jekyll to move through the streets unobstructed; more importantly, Jekyll engages in questionable activities under the guise of Hyde. However, the “‘crime’ in *Dr. Jekyll and
Mr. Hyde is never revealed; the text’s cardinal sin is secrecy itself” (Danahay, Community 136). If Jekyll is the costume, he can still accomplish the same—“drinking pleasure with bestial avidity from any degree of torture to another; relentless like a man of stone” (Stevenson 311)—because no one recognizes him outside his performance role. The important point is that the desire to engage such pleasures remains.

The use of disguise, then, allows one to move around in arenas that one might not normally be able to access. The use of “costume” links Jekyll and Hyde with stage actors. For instance, in application to Jekyll and Hyde, Waters even acknowledges that Robert Louis Stevenson would dress up as a member of the working class so that he could visit less respectable neighborhoods in order to come up with new materials for his writing (103). It is important to note that Jekyll’s clothes are too big for Hyde. From one perspective, it validates Water’s point that Jekyll is in fact a costume. Stevenson writes, “He was dressed in clothes far too large for him, clothes of the doctor’s bigness” (Stevenson 295). One wonders if this “bigness” can be seen as a class statement; perhaps Hyde, looking like a working-class man imitating some one higher up, does not “fit.”

For Danahay, Hyde is a way of going back to his youthful self (Community, 138). Hyde represents a child version of Jekyll since he is playing “dress up” so to speak. From another perspective, the bigness of the clothes suggests a lack of restriction. Unfortunately, this looseness is only available when Hyde is not in character if we assume that Jekyll is the character. If Hyde is Jekyll playing the villain, then he is the ultimate “stretch role.” The silliness of these oversized clothes creates a ridiculous picture of “dress up.” Judith Butler suggests, “In imitating gender, drag implicitly reveals the imitative structure of gender itself—as well as its contingency” (Butler 439).
Butler’s comments are applicable to Jekyll/Hyde since he is involved in a type of “class drag.” Hyde is a “joke...at the expense of society’s high moralism” (Bailey, “Conspiracies” 163).

More seriously, though, Hyde functions like a violent, but appealing character. Citing such an appeal, Arata suggests that “Hyde can be read as a figure of leisured dissipation” (Arata 35). He acts with anger and impulse, and his appearance makes him seem as if he is from the lower classes, but “his vices are clearly of a monied gentleman” (35), who can move around because he is “one of the guys” (38). For example, Arata cites the initial incident, the “Story of the Door,” and how the men encircle Hyde when he is about to be ripped apart by the women who have witnessed his trampling of the little girl. Enfield explains, “And all the time...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; and there was the man in the middle,...frightened too, I could see that” (Stevenson, qtd. in Arata 38). Arata glosses over a bit of the line with his quotation, however. Enfield also describes him with a “black, sneering coolness” (Stevenson 258) that is mixed with this apparent fright. He is able, though frightened, to “carry[ing] it off, sir really, like Satan” (258).

While Arata chooses to emphasize how Enfield and the other men choose to protect him, Hyde’s coolness serves as another way to draw the other men to his side. He transforms the others into audience members for whom he can show off his coolness. He really does not care what he did. I also think it is important to note that Enfield is the one who is relaying this story to his close friend, Utterson, another professional man. In a way, Enfield is like Watson and other male narrators because he sets up Hyde as a
villain, but he does so in a way that offers him as a potential model. As Arata indicates, Hyde has his appealing qualities, one of which is coolness.

Hyde’s response to the situation showcases this coolness. He does not seem to be concerned about the crime he has committed because the little girl is of the working class. Arata focuses on the exchange of money to cover up the crime. Enfield recounts, “We told the man we could and would make such a scandal out of this, as should make his name stink from one end of London to the other. If he had any friends or any credit, we undertook that he should lose them” (Stevenson 258). Arata suggests that these men are more concerned with spread of slander rather than the spread of crime (Arata 41). With regards to Hyde, he is seen as “not a violent criminal but a man who cannot be trusted to respect club rules” (40). In this initial encounter, one senses that there is a “let it slide” mentality. Arata chooses to emphasize the fact that by extorting money they are teaching Hyde the importance of maintaining one’s name (40). Blackmail, for Arata, is the gentlemanly thing to do since violence is unacceptable (40). This blackmail places Hyde in the category of gentleman, since that is how gentleman get to one another; they threaten each other’s reputations (40). In fact, Arata emphasizes Enfield’s use of the term “my gentleman” to describe Hyde (38). Through these actions, the group appears to be welcoming him and indoctrinating him to male middle-class values (40).

Enfield’s threat symbolizes an audience expectation of male performance. Hyde’s response is an attempt to meet these expectations. When faced with the prospect of blackmail, Hyde admits, “If you choose to make capital out of this accident...I am naturally helpless. No gentleman but wishes to avoid a scene...Name your figure” (Stevenson 258). Hyde’s response is a form of interaction between the audience and
player, similar to the cues that are exchanged between audience and actor in a music hall performance (Bailey, “Conspiracies” 143). Arata chooses to see how Hyde is being taught, but I think that Hyde’s statement can be seen from a different angle. He defines himself as a gentleman when he talks about not wanting to make a scene. However, through this desire to avoid a scene, he is actually bringing the emphasis back on himself as someone who knows how to “act” the part of the gentleman and the use of the word scene simply reinforces it as an act. Enfield’s recall of the episode emphasizes it as such. By sternly telling them to name the price, Hyde’s command towards the others to name the price is an avenue to showcase this mix of forceful coolness. For Arata, “he simply becomes one of the boys” (Arata 41). In fact, Arata points out that before going to the bank to obtain the money, the girl’s father has breakfast with them in the morning!

Thus, Bailey writes, “respectability was assumed as a role (or cluster of roles). … Though its possession was a badge of conformity, its attainment was a matter of independent individual achievement through an ongoing process of self-discipline and self-improvement” (Popular 32, 33). As we have seen in previous chapters, concepts such as work, athletic play and even the gentleman himself are not as stable as they appear on the surface. All of them leave room for sliding definitions. These conflicts are examples of what Ed Cohen calls “antinomies.” Cohen writes, “my concern with the novel will consider the narrative’s doubling of the male body in the ‘dual person’ Jekyll/Hyde as a symptom of the antinomies that destabilize male ‘character’ itself” (Cohen, “Hyding” 181). The novel makes “visible and intelligible some of the contradictions that permeate these opposing configurations of male gender identity”
These contradictions include “normative and transgressive embodiments of late
nineteenth-century English masculinity” (181-182). For Cohen

Positing the “trembling immateriality, the mistlike transience, of this
seemingly so solid body,” Stevenson’s texts explicitly inverts and hence
subverts the natural (a.k.a ontological) assumptions upon which the
political and economic doctrine of “possessive individualism”—the
philosophical and ideological underpinning both of the middle class and of
middle-class forms of masculinity—had been established in England.
(194)

Observing Stevenson’s narrative technique as a way of dealing with these splits,
Cohen writes, “Provoked to maintain the privilege they had consolidated throughout the
middle century, bourgeois men sought to rectify these instabilities and to shore up their
positions by reimagining the naturalness of their superiority in ever more complex ways”
(183). In order to deal with the fragility of their positions, men sought “new modes of
self-representation” (183). Novels such as Dorian Gray or The Mayor of Casterbridge
“depict the vicissitudes of divided subjectivities (of course, often masquerading as
‘human’ subjectivity per se). By positing then narrating masculinity as an unstable
subjectivity, these texts helped reproduce the conditions of possibility for imagining new
forms of middle-class masculinity” (183). Cohen suggests that Jekyll and Hyde is on the
“cusp of narrative developments that have helped organize our contemporary forms of
male embodiment and / as self-representation” (183). Cohen’s observations about
narrative structure parallel Bordieu’s “dissimulation.” Authors admit the instability but
attempt to create wholeness out of that admission. Melodrama likewise attempts to make
sense of, or project such confusion in a manageable and visual way.

Cohen’s emphasis on the split subject once again casts Jekyll and Hyde along the
lines of melodrama, and more generally theatre because of the player/role dichotomy.
When he first takes the drug and becomes Hyde, he notices “I was suddenly aware that I had lost in stature” (Stevenson 309). When he drinks the antidote, he “came to myself once more with the character, the stature and the face of Henry Jekyll” (310).

Stevenson’s narrative exposes the stable concept of middle-class masculinity as a fiction (Cohen, “Hyding” 194), which is represented by Jekyll’s return to his “character” after he takes the antidote. Cohen describes Stevenson’s attempts to make something appear whole with his narrative strategies, incorporating the split as a new type of representation. This technique grapples with the unstable masculine character, much as melodrama is a way to deal with uncertainty. In more general theatrical terms, “character” and “face” are especially relevant in terms of the theatre because it sets up Jekyll as a possible act, a “whole” character composed of a split.

However, there is another aspect of the presentation, which is the actor playing the part. From a theatrical perspective, the actor himself does not exist; only the part does. The audience doesn’t recognize him as an actor, only the part he plays. The other characters, as characters within the context of a stage play, would not recognize someone who is out of character. To connect this theatricality with masculinity, as noted above, the gentleman is broken into player, part and the possibility that “others” can mimic the part. In both the theatre and the gentleman construct, nothing exists behind the representation so we are left with an unstable foundation, a nothingness. The “mistlike transience of this so seemingly solid body” is revealed when the “curtain” is pulled back. The problem that Jekyll and Hyde exposes is that we are not sure which one is the player and which one is the role.
This confusion, not only between player and role but also between “bad guy” and “good guy,” puts *Jekyll and Hyde* on the same grounds as a melodrama. Melodrama uses the villain to drive its action and the most interesting of melodramas utilize a skillful villain that makes him hard to detect (Mayer 150). For Mayer, “it is in the malign character of the villain that the best and most interesting roles lie” (150). He observes, “Indeed, melodrama becomes deeply interesting when the hero and villain are fused into one character, when the very real self of a role is sharply and deeply divided” (150). The changes that Jekyll/Hyde goes through exemplify this fuse.

Melodrama relies on visual changes to the protagonist to explore such issues. The bodily changes that Jekyll and Hyde go through illustrate the body’s inaccuracy as an identity marker. This transformation mirrors the split narrative structure that Stevenson utilizes (Cohen, “Hyding” 194), which in turn parallels the visual elements in melodrama (Guest, “Money” 637). As Guest observes, “visual depictions of the hero’s suffering are crucial to melodramatic effect” (637). The suffering that the male protagonist goes through suggests a “disharmony among seemingly natural masculine traits and therefore unsettled both the oppositional logic of melodrama and its conventional association of the body with affirmations of fixed meaning” (638).

Though Kristen Guest focuses on the relationship between male suffering and economics in her discussion of melodrama, some of her principles can still be applied to *Jekyll and Hyde*. She notes that the melodramatic victims shifted in the 1870s to “exemplars of male power” (635). The new type of privileged male victim “indicates an emerging crisis in which the middle-class subjects are expected to participate in an increasingly aggressive and competitive capitalist economy, even as long-established
standards of private, moral rectitude remain in force” (636). Though taken from an
economic slant, her observations of the opposing forces reveal “affirmative
representations of masculinity replaced by anxious depictions of male victims’ struggles”
(636). When a privileged male protagonist goes through these physical ordeals, the
audience’s attention is drawn to the fact that the male subject is a source of conflict; the
whole system of values in which the subject is located is also undercut (638). The lead
character’s bodily suffering stands for a more generalized lack of control.

The imprecise descriptions of Hyde’s character symbolize this lack of control or
worse, an unsustainable boundary. For instance, Utterson describes Hyde as “hardly
human,” possessing “Satan’s signature upon a face, “giving “an impression of deformity”
(Stevenson 266). He is not a man but something “dwarfish” or “troglodytic” (266). As a
“protégé” of Jekyll’s (263), Hyde is a kind of extension of Jekyll. According to the OED,
a protégé is somebody who is under the protection of another superior person (OED).
Rather than being separated, the two are linked, so Hyde is indistinct as a villain.

The inability to pin Hyde down represents uncertainty, something that plagued the
Victorian middle- and upper-middle class gentleman. Arata suggests that the “prime
horror” of Jekyll and Hyde is “not that the professional man is transformed into an
ativistic criminal, but that the atavist learns to pass as a gentleman” (39). Karen Volland
Waters agrees that Hyde’s “character embodies masculine fear that the perfect gentleman
is a mask which covers man’s degenerate and feminine possibilities” (115). Utterson and
Poole foreground this uncertainty when they break into Jekyll’s room; as Elaine
Showalter points out in Sexual Anarchy, “Behind Jekyll’s red baize door, Utterson sees
his own mirrored face, the image of the painfully repressed desires that the cane and axe
cannot wholly shatter and destroy" (111). Danahay observes, “Utterson and Poole look in Jekyll’s mirror and find only their own faces” (Community 144). Danahay concludes, “In the final analysis Mr. Hyde, as a metaphorical mirror in the text, is a sign of the repressed half of the Victorian male’s double existence, but a sign without specific content” (144).

The shock that Utterson and Poole experience is part of the spectacle of the novel. This sense of shock is a written description that parallels how “Stance and gesture were used by actors to illustrate and heighten the emotional subtext of the drama and to express feelings which cannot be stated in words” (Mayer 152). Hyde is the “secret half of their double lives” (Danahay, Community 144). Their fear of looking into the mirror too closely reflects the fear of their own “inner vileness” (144). This vileness, in terms of the male role, is a way of articulating that there is actually nothing underneath the role. As audience members, they have broken into Jekyll’s “dressing room.” They see themselves in the mirror because a “character” is based on audience expectation. Since the audience is the driving force behind masculine performance, they see themselves because the respectable gentleman is an empty character without someone for whom to perform. Their shock represents the anxiety that the gentleman has no substance. Perhaps an even worse shock is the realization that villains lie within all middle- and upper-middle class gentlemen.

Mayer concludes, “Moreover, the villain has a further function which helps to explain why it is that audiences continue to find melodrama a continuous source of pleasure. He helps to dispel or disguise unresolvable contradictions and conspicuous incongruities” (150). Hyde, if the villain, works on both of these fronts. For Arata, he is
a way to act out frustrations, a member of the bourgeois class even if he is not an “image of the upright (Arata’s emphasis) bourgeois male” (Arata 38). Hyde is a “bad” gentleman who gets to act out all the repressed desires that Jekyll, in his part as a professional male, cannot act out (39). Arata explains how the women are used in a misogynistic way, because they are a way for the men to bond, even with a bad “character” such as Hyde (38). For example, besides trampling the girl at the opening of the story, Hyde also strikes a prostitute (38). In both cases, the victim is a lower-class woman (38). However, the third victim is a titled individual, Sir Danvers Carew (38). Arata notes that most of his violence is directed against the types that Hyde is often seen as: “the degenerate prole, the decadent aristocrat, or the dissipated aesthete” (38). Arata points out that in the original manuscript, Hyde kills Lemsome, who is described as a “bad fellow” and “an incurable cad” (38). He is always wearing a pair of blue-tinted glasses because the light bothers his eyes (38). He is an example of an aesthete, someone who is in opposition to middle-class values of the professional male (38). Arata suggests that Stevenson’s use of Carew instead shows that the two characters are similar in their opposition to the middle-class professional (38).

From a stage perspective, Hyde’s character reveals the ambiguity that the late Victorian melodrama grapples with. A villain of the piece, he is a necessary character of the play who does their dirty work. He gets to engage in violent and unrespectable behaviors—kill Carew and go out at night and lash out at “others” such as women, snobs, or upper-class, titled characters. As “someone whose actions challenge authority and abusive power” (Mayer 154), Hyde represents the hero to these other men, who are audience members, allowing the others to vicariously break free of the constraints of the
Victorian gentleman. However, citing Elaine Hadley, Mayer admits that melodrama is both “palliative and subversive” (154). Michael Gerould observes melodrama as having a “subversive streak” that would allow audience members who saw themselves being oppressed to feel relief (Gerould, cited in Mayer 155). Most villains in the melodrama, however, are fought by virtuous members of their own class (cited in Mayer 155). This last description is taken to the extreme in the case of *Jekyll and Hyde* since the fight takes place within a single person.

Thus, Hyde is considered a villain, a character, and most important, a representation of Mayer’s “contradictions.” As such, Hyde is a disguised way for a male audience to project and deal with these “contradictions.” For Mayer, the “melodrama, providing a metaphor through which to approach disturbing subjects temporarily – throughout the melodrama and perhaps for a few hours thereafter – tames those subjects, offering relief as the problem recedes or, at the very least, becomes emotionally intelligible, congruous, and less menacing” (151). The way to deal with the instability of the gentleman is through Hyde. Hyde, if seen as the villain, “is closely identified with each hostile environment” (Mayer 151). In the case of *Jekyll and Hyde*, the environment is one of disintegrating gentlemanly integrity. The gentleman was under attack by working class upward mobility as well as empowerment of women.

Melodrama is a way of reflecting/projecting these issues, then. For Michael Booth, “Essentially melodrama is a dream world inhabited by dream people and dream justice, offering audiences the fulfillment and satisfactions found only in dreams” (qtd. in Mayer 155). Perhaps it is best if this is the case because for *Jekyll and Hyde*, the dream might be a questionable one. The novel represents two dreams. One, Hyde represents
every repressed gentleman’s desire for freedom. However, because of the desires and the 
ability to act them out, Jekyll’s representation of the solid gentleman is exposed as a 
category that can only exist in the dream world of melodrama, if it can even exist there. 

Like melodrama, masculinity is a “self-contained world of experience in which 
the individual can fashion a way of life of his or her own choosing” (Bailey, Popular 73). Because of the constructed nature of masculinity, the male gender role is blurred and 
permeable and the boundaries between them are a major problem in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. 
Hyde (Waters 115). For Danahay, the Jekyll and Hyde split is a failure of 
 compartmentalization (Gender 110). Waters sees Jekyll’s gentlemanly behavior as a 
mask (106). In a way, I think she is right. As discussed above, he does play the part of a 
distinguished gentleman. However, he doesn’t want to play the role anymore, so he 
chooses to leave the stage. If Hyde is his natural persona as Waters suggests, then he is 
simply putting on his “street clothes” so to speak. As Danahay suggests, Hyde is not an 
“‘evil’ character” (Danhay, Community 138). Hyde is a selfish inhabitant of Jekyll’s 
persona who does not worry about any social concerns, which is part of his appeal (138). 
Danahay calls Hyde a younger version of Dr. Jekyll, because he represents the freedom 
that he cannot enjoy once he becomes a doctor (138). This return to the younger, freer 
self is paralleled by Hyde’s appearance, his return to his “street clothes.” He is not bound 
by scripts. 

It is possible that it is the other way around, however. As discussed above, Hyde 
can also be looked at as the costume. In Gender at Work, Danahay examines the “Dr.” 
and “Mr.” dichotomy in Jekyll and Hyde (110). In order to analyze the split between the 
Jekyll/Hyde character, Danahay describes how men use women who do not fit into the
normal “men at work” category as a way for these men to explore their own gender positions and their contradictions (17). As an example, Danahay discusses Arthur Munby, who “fetishized working-class women as a way of rejecting the definition of himself as ‘full social adult’ (Davidoff 59), and as a good masculine subject” (112). He married his “servant-wife” Hannah Cullwick (105). Thanks to this relationship, Munby was able to “create a zone in which he could perform his rejection of himself as a productive, autonomous male and act instead as a ‘bad’ subject” (112). He dressed up his unconventional lady friend, who was strong and muscular, in working-class clothes and as his male servant (112). He also had a collection of photographs of working-class women (106). He even photographed himself with Ellen Grounds, “his favorite Wigan ‘pit brow girl,’” in her working clothes (2). In that picture, Grounds strikes a more “masculine” pose than Munby occupies (2). The way these pictures are set up allows Munby to transgress, or at least examine, gender boundaries (112).

Danahay notes how Munby’s situation parallels Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde (110). Like Munby, Jekyll/Hyde is in a borderline position. Hyde is analogous, if he is the part and not the player, to Munby’s “bad subject.” In a way, then, the fear of the split that is “performed” in the novel is based on realistic concerns as epitomized by Munby. Danahay notes the idea of “compartmentalization” that runs through both situations (110). Both Munby and Dr. Jekyll are able to separate their personalities in order to access the less acceptable areas of them (110). Munby uses his photographs the same way that Dr. Jekyll uses Mr. Hyde. From this perspective, Mr. Hyde becomes a way to “slum.” Both Munby and Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde rely on the use of costume to examine this other “zone.” On one hand, we see woman dressed in working-class clothes which
allows Munby to experience that aspect of life while still maintaining a masculine superiority. On the other hand, we see Dr. Jekyll able to walk the streets in his “costume.”

If we examine it through Waters’s viewpoint that Jekyll is the role and from the context of male performance, with his choice to become Mr. Hyde, Jekyll breaks character and returns to his regular self. He has the money and freedom associated with class, but the gentlemanly role is too restrictive, so he chooses to “undress himself.” Waters even notes that Poole sees Hyde wearing a mask shortly before Hyde’s death (Waters 116). Her point is that there are multiple layers of masks (116). If Hyde is Jekyll’s everyday/offstage self, then Jekyll’s ultimate destruction shows what happens when the male performer chooses to leave the stage. He meets with oblivion because Jekyll is only a character, and by becoming Hyde, he leaves the male group behind.

Once a story is over or a character walks off stage for good, the audience and his fellow actors have no idea what really happens to him. In a word, Jekyll quits two professions; his experiments are anti-professional (144), and he decides he longer wishes to act.

This oblivion exemplifies what Bailey would call “knowingness,” which “might be defined as what everybody knows, but some know better than others” (“Conspiracies” 138). Bailey uses the term to describe the link between audience and player in the music hall: “The content of a song or act was of course also important, but its resonance with an audience was inseparable from the manner of its performance, whose language, in the broadest sense, signaled a common yet inside knowledge of what was really going on” (145). Knowingness is an “ironic counterpoint to the language of respectability” (156). In the end, perhaps the sense of identity that knowingness presents in this case is the
sense that there may be none to cling to. Bailey concludes, “Knowingness encoded a reworked popular knowledge in an urban world which, for all the continuing force of custom and often a strong sense of community, was increasingly populous and unknowable” (167). The Jekyll/Hyde character represents this “knowingness;” but, what is “known” is that there is no clear demarcation between player and role. Like Cohen’s description of the split as a new representation of identity, knowingness in this case, is simply an acknowledgement of the terror of unknown masculine identity.

This “knowingness” comes out in what I will label “reveals.” Though some strict grammarians might object to my use of the word as a noun, I am referring to the term in a strictly theatrical way. Revelation seems like too strong a term, almost too religious. Also, though rarely used as such, the OED does cite a usage (1858) meaning “a revealing” or “disclosure.” In terms of this project, I think of it as “the reveal” as in a magic trick. To emphasize its theatrical context, I will set it apart in quotes. A “reveal” took place when a singer would appear “in character” and dress in a costume that was typical of the subject that he was singing about (Bailey, “Conspiracies” 143). Afterwards, he would then “break the role” and make himself “accessible to the audience as himself or herself” (144). Bailey notes that doing so did not destroy the character but actually increased the strength of the characterization because such a revelation shows how much of one’s self was put into the role (144). By seeing the break in character, the audience saw that it was in fact a skilled performance. Sherlock Holmes often employs such “reveals.”

I mention Holmes’s character briefly as means to examine a very sinister “reveal” in Jekyll and Hyde. Holmes is able to adopt different “personas,” but he does always
return to the traditional “costume” of the gentleman. Hyde, however, cannot make this return. Holmes’s more successful show is enacted when he makes a “return” from the depths in “The Adventure of the Empty House.” Doyle had chosen to kill off Holmes in “The Final Problem.” Due to his popularity, Doyle chose to resurrect his hero, and he was also rewarded handsomely for producing more stories (Kestner 130). While standing near the scene of Ronald Adair’s death and trying to practice the “late” Holmes’s methods, Watson accidentally “bumps” into somebody.” Watson recalls:

I struck against an elderly, deformed man, who had been behind me...the fellow must be some poor bibliophile, who, either as a trade or as a hobby, was a collector of obscure volumes. I endeavored to apologize for the accident... With a snarl of contempt he turned upon his heel, and I saw his curved back and white side-whiskers disappear among the throng. (Doyle 2: 7)

Watson does adhere to proper form, or decorum, because he apologizes, as a proper gentleman should do; the old man’s response is a snarl, which makes the climax more effective. His turning on his heel is a stage movement. Watson notices that he is not straight but deformed, his physical appearance symbolizing the part he is playing. His last observation is about the man’s side-whiskers, a physical attribute, which turn out to be part of a costume.

As Watson plays the part of shocked audience member, this performance reaches its climax: “To my astonishment it was none other than my strange old book collector, his sharp, wizened face peering out from a frame of white hair” (7). The use of the word frame suggests that the hair forms a stage on his face from out of which Holmes peers. As Watson watches this “show,” Holmes gradually reveals that he is still alive. He is literally re-formed. Watson turns away for the moment, and when he returns his gaze, “Sherlock Holmes was standing smiling at me across my study table. I rose to my feet,
stared at him for some seconds in utter amazement, and then it appears that I must have
fainted for the first and last time in my life" (8). This “reveal” mimics a magician’s
performance. Watson turns away, so that the costume change can take place in the
magician’s box, so to speak. Watson turns back and is amazed to see his friend standing
there. Holmes responds, “My dear Watson, I owe you a thousand apologies. I had no
idea that you would be so affected” (8).

Perhaps Holmes’s comment is ironic. It is at least an example of the interested
disinterestedness that characterizes masculine theory. After all, masculine definition is
based on the approval of other males. Earlier, I pointed out that Hyde states that he does
not wish to make a scene; however, in his willingness to pay the blackmail money, he is
in fact acting out the part of gentlemanly decorum by sweeping the issue under the rug.
If Holmes did not want Watson to be affected, perhaps he could reveal himself in a less
dramatic way. It is almost as if Holmes wants to showcase his return to the middle-class
gentleman role. By doing so, he emphasizes the importance of that role.

To further illustrate that his costume was just that, Holmes moves back towards
his “disinterested” persona. By doing so, his show demands attention as a show. Watson
recounts:

He sat opposite to me, and lit a cigarette in his old, nonchalant manner.
He was dressed in the seedy frockcoat of the book merchant, but the rest
of that individual lay in a pile of white hair and old books upon the table.
Holmes looked even thinner and keener than of old, but there was a dead-
white tinge in his aquiline face which told me that his life recently had not
been a healthy one. (8)

One is struck with the emphasis on separation in this description. First, Holmes is
situated opposite Watson, in the position of the observed. He is able to light his cigarette
and act in his “nonchalant manner.” He is acting in a way that almost brings attention to
his not caring, but Watson notices. Nonchalance suggests disinterest, but he is doing this “opposite” Watson so that he can record these actions. Watson makes it a point to show that Holmes has returned to his old self. Yet, he still remains in the disguise coat. His actions and the clothes he is wearing are two separate things. In fact, Watson himself describes the book merchant as “that individual.” The pile of hair and books on the table in front of Holmes emphasizes costume. With his placement of his costume in front of him, it is almost as if Holmes is saying, “Hey, it’s me. I’m back to the old self that you’ve come to expect,” while putting the “other” in its place and offering a reassuring separateness. Finally, Holmes’s pursuit of a separate personality—both from himself and fellow males—is equated with unhealthy existence. Perhaps the nature of acting is too damaging because he is both himself and not himself at the same time.

Holmes suggests that he has “straightened out.” He states, “It is no joke when a tall man has to take a foot off his stature for several hours at a time” (8). Holmes is referring to his physical height, but the stature he has lessened with his disguise also refers to his behavior. “Unhealthy” can signify the morally questionable behaviors Holmes employs to gather information. In this case, he is rude to his friend after bumping into him. This rudeness accentuates his return to the performance that Watson as audience member expects. Afterwards, Holmes has moved back into the disciplined, gentlemanly mode of life that his friend has come to expect of him. This sense of expectation from his friend includes Watson in the process, linking the two as middle-class males who play off each other’s friendship and expectations. All of these actions are being recorded and reported by Watson, as both theatre critic and biographer.
These “reveals” by Holmes with his disguises and his explanation of plans tie nicely into Bailey’s concept of “knowingness.” His actions “resonate” with Watson as audience member. Perhaps Bailey’s “resonance” parallels Waters’s description of the fear that an “atavist” can “pass” as a gentleman. In the case of Holmes, his change out of the costume is almost a “nod” at the audience saying it is ok. In his introduction to the Barnes & Noble edition of Sherlock Holmes, Kyle Freeman explains that such disguises are something “no gentleman would dream of doing” (Freeman xviii). He goes on to illustrate the fear that was present at the time: “Since these disguises help him get to the truth, we think of them, if we think of them at all, as merely techniques, albeit clever and entertaining ones, for solving crimes. But respectable men in London in the 1890s would be aghast at seeing a fellow they knew sauntering forth in a frock and a wig, or holed up in an opium den” (xviii). Holmes both reflects and assuages the fear through his “techniques”; at the same time, his persona is betrayed as a technique. Perhaps that is “the knowingness” that is being conveyed, suggesting the gentleman is not a defensive separating category after all because of Holmes’s ability to slide in and out of it.

The location allows us to see the difference between Holmes and Hyde. Holmes identifies himself in Watson’s sitting room, which is a location of the upper-middle-class professional man. In Jekyll and Hyde, the “reveals” take place in specific emphasized locations in the novel. Arata emphasizes the “domestic tableaux, invariably occupied by solitary gentlemen. When they are not walking or dining, it seems, these men sit at their hearths, usually alone” (42). This description places the men in areas such as green rooms or dressing rooms before they are required to “perform” in front of and with the other male characters.
Danahay places emphasis on the geographic location of the two personalities in *Jekyll and Hyde* since the doctor’s home is located in the West End while the “Mr.” lives in the “the working class and seedy East End” (Danahay *Gender* 109). However, in reality, the homes are not really located too great a distance away from each other, underscoring the fear of collapsing boundaries between the two classes. While following Hyde, Mr. Utterson “haunt[s] the door in the bystreet of shops” (Stevenson 264). Utterson meets Hyde on a “bystreet” lined with shops (264). When Utterson confronts him, Hyde provides him with an address in Soho. However, he produces a key that lets him right into Jekyll’s laboratory, which has its entrance on the side street. In truth, then, Hyde lives among these merchants. Jekyll’s dwelling in the main home is not very far away:

Round the corner from the bystreet, there was a square of ancient, handsome houses, now for the most part decayed from their high estate and let in flats and chambers to all sorts and conditions of men: map-engravers, architects, shady lawyers and agents of obscure enterprises. One house, however, second from the corner, was still occupied entire; and at the door of this, which wore a great air of wealth and comfort… (266)

Through this physical description one notes the overlapping of boundaries. Stevenson describes the various jobs held by men who occupy this row of houses. He presents a curious mix of professionals and non-professionals. Jekyll’s home is close to the shopkeepers, representing the taint of money that could raise the possibility that some could buy their way into middle-class status. Dr. Jekyll lives right in the middle of these “lesser professions.” Lawyers are present but they are shady. Map engravers and architects are labeled as “all sorts” of men. Finally, some are engaged in “obscure enterprises.” All of these descriptions suggest unstable categories and shifting
definitions. Arata explains, “we note that Jekyll’s house is surrounded front and back by
the trappings of bourgeois life, a life described in terms of the seedy, the disreputable, the
garish, the decayed” (50). Yet, Jekyll’s “one house” displays a “great air of wealth and
comfort.” Whenever he chooses, though, he may walk right out his door and become one
of these lesser “types.” Perhaps in the person of Hyde they can come in.

Very often, then it is “spaces rather than spoken word” (Bailey, “Conspiracies”
159) that also dictate “knowingness,” such as the fear of overlap between the classes. For
example, Utterson admires his friend Jekyll’s front hall: “a large, low-roofed,
comfortable hall, paved with flags, warmed (after the fashion of a country house) by a
bright, open fire, and furnished with costly cabinets of oak…. This hall, in which he was
now left alone, was a pet fancy of his friend the doctor’s; and Utterson himself was wont
to speak of it as the pleasantest room in London” (Stevenson 266). This hall gives one
the feeling of insulation; it is the epitome of middle-class comfort and separation.

This separation is illustrated by where Hyde stays. While following Hyde from
the shop district around the corner, Utterson notes that Hyde “drew a key from his pocket
like one approaching home” (265). Hyde enters Jekyll’s dissecting room, which is away
from the main house, through a side door. Poole explains, “He never dines here...we see
very little of him on this side of the house; he mostly comes and goes by the laboratory”
(267). There is a careful effort to separate Jekyll’s work or perhaps his role, especially in
the form of Mr. Hyde, from the rest of the home. Whether Jekyll is the player and Hyde
is the part or vice-versa, the location imagery highlights the attempt to keep the player
and role separate. However, the locations are still within one home.
Such a home is analogous to a dressing room. One is struck by the separation as Poole takes Utterson to the adjacent building. Utterson notes that it is the first time he "had been received in that part of his friend’s quarters" (277). Poole shows him "down by the kitchen offices and across a yard which had once been a garden, to the building which was indifferently known as the laboratory or the dissecting rooms" (277). Utterson "eyed the dingy windowless structure with curiosity, and gazed round with a distasteful sense of strangeness as he crossed the theatre, once crowded with eager students and now lying gaunt and silent, the tables laden with chemical apparatus, the floor strewn with crates and littered with packing straw and light falling dimly through the foggy cupola" (277). The dissecting room is all cluttered, a far cry from the middle-class "hall" described above. The purpose of the theatre is now abandoned. In fact, Stevenson writes that Jekyll had bought the house from a surgeon and modified its purpose to use it for his chemical experiments (277). This image of a theatre in disuse is the first hint Jekyll is drifting away from masculine performance. Within the context of masculinity and theatre, Jekyll’s experiments are the ultimate examination/expression of “knowingness” that the gentleman is both player and role and so does not exist as a whole.

Jekyll’s room symbolizes this “knowingness,” since one must go through the theatre to in order to access it. Not only is it located in a separate section of the house, it is also separated from the classroom/theatre like a locked office whose teacher no longer practices office hours—since the theatre is no longer used to teach surgery—or a dressing room where a secluded actor sits and will not interact with either his fans or the other actors. In comparison to the warm, friendly hallway in the main building, Jekyll’s room is a “large room, fitted with glass presses, furnished, among other things, with a cheval-
glass and a business table, and looking out upon the court by three dusty windows barred with iron" (277). The point is that this messy “dressing room” should be like the hall, with its clear demarcation of roles. The separation of the room from the surgical theatre is combined with a sense of disarray and one wonders whether the bars are there to keep the non-professionals out or the mess in.

This mess conflicts with descriptions of what a dressing room should be used for. In a mid-1880s book entitled The Actor's Handbook, and Guide to the Stage for Amateurs, by “the Old Stager,” the author states

the next subject which should claim your attention is that of your dressing-room. It is usual at the commencement of the season for the stage-manager to place a list upon the door of each dressing-room, containing the names of the persons who are to occupy the apartment; but should this not be done, you will consult the stage-manager at once. Having settled all these matters, go home and select such articles and private properties as you will need for the night, and then read your part over, or, if perfect in that, peruse some good book on the profession, the lives of eminent actors, works on the customs of different nations, on elocution, &c., or any standard literary productions calculated to expand the mind, and to improve and refine the taste. (Actor's 126)

The above description is one of order and detail, with objects needed for the night’s performance. Jekyll’s room is filled with articles that are not appropriate to the original surgical purpose. It is essential that the “reveal” take place in this room. An audience is not supposed to witness an actor changing in and out of his role but that is exactly what takes place. Like the location and separation of classes that are symbolized by the location of Jekyll’s home, separation of player and role is compromised because it takes place in a room where the physical mess represents the existential one.

Utterson and Poole, having broken into Jekyll’s dressing room, find Jekyll’s final “script,” his final statement of the case. Utterson reads it and ultimately learns that
Jekyll and Hyde are the same. Jekyll’s cabinet (296) is the place where he keeps his “props.” The physical messiness of the Jekyll’s room is mimicked by the identity mix-up that they encounter as they attempt the break-in. They hear a voice, expecting it to be Jekyll’s. Utterson exclaims, “Ah, that’s not Jekyll’s voice—it’s Hyde’s!” (295). Whether a part or the actor, it’s not what these former audience members expect to hear. In fact they are met with a “screech, as of mere animal terror” (295). Finally, they find a “body of a man sorely contorted and still twitching” (295). This twitching “thing” is the final projection of “knowingness.”

The differences in location where the “discoveries” are made, signify the differences in the “reveals” themselves. While Holmes’s reveal takes place within the comfort of Watson’s sitting room, Utterson’s and Poole’s discovery is made in a “messy dressing room.” Holmes’s “reveal” is much more reassuring. Yes, he does cause Watson to faint, perhaps temporarily places him in an unmanly position, but Holmes welcomes him back, reestablishing a boundary, even if it is permeable.

In comparison, Hyde’s final “reveal” to Lanyon is much darker. Waters examines how Dr. Lanyon treats Hyde when Hyde comes for his chemicals. This visit ends in an exposure of how masculine control can backfire (Waters 106). Dr. Lanyon’s excessive politeness towards Hyde serves as an attempt to control Hyde (106). For example, Lanyon mocks, “Come, sir... You forget that I have not yet the pleasure of your acquaintance. Be seated, if you please” (Stevenson, qtd. in Waters 106). While Lanyon’s use of manners recalls that manners were originally a sign of respect to someone stronger, he tries to bully Hyde with this excessive politeness but is eventually
destroyed (106). With his overemphasis on manners, Lanyon “overacts” as an audience member whose expectations are too strict.

He also plays the role of a critic: “He began to go wrong, wrong in the mind...Such unscientific balderdash...would have estranged Damon and Pythias” (Stevenson 262). An 1885 editorial in The Entr’acte and Limelight notes the influence of the theatre critic:

I have been told that the managers of our London theatres, before accepting a drama, now make a point of submitting it to one or two of the critics of our principal daily papers. Whether these luminaries are paid for pronouncing an opinion I have never heard. Should they vote in its favour, however, a manager by such means secures their good word; and this is something. (“Critics” 328)

As Russell Jackson points out, “There were always journalists ready to point out the ‘errors’ of theatrical managers” (Jackson 240).

In order to “point out ‘errors,’” Lanyon tries to be the epitome of masculine control. In fact, Lanyon admits, “‘Sir,’ said I affecting a coolness that I was far from truly possessing...” (Stevenson 304). This parallels the coolness that Hyde exhibits when he is confronted after he stomps the girl. Lanyon’s use of “affecting” is key since he admits he is acting. His admission that he does not possess such coolness further reinforces the fact that masculine traits are attributes one can acquire so they are not inherent. “Affecting,” coupled with the term coolness further links a masculine attribute with the idea of performance. He further admits, “I...sat down myself...with as fair an imitation of my ordinary manner...” (Stevenson 303). His use of imitation is troublesome because it questions what his ordinary manner is. At the very least, he is trying to maintain an image of what that might be. When someone insists he is not frightened but actually is, the shock of something terrifies him all the more. As an
audience member expecting certain cues of male gentlemanly performance, to see that there is no real gentleman is too much for him. Actuality clashes with what he hopes he might see.

To use a modern example, in *Twilight Zone: The Movie*, one character asks another: “Hey…you wanna see something really scary?” (*Twilight Zone*). In effect, Hyde does the same thing with his challenge to Lanyon’s disciplined, controlled approach. Depending on your viewpoint, Hyde either puts his costume back on or takes his makeup off to reveal that Jekyll and Hyde are one in the same. Either way, Lanyon cannot handle the costume change. Lanyon observes Hyde as actor: “I could see, in spite of his collected manner, that he was wrestling against the approaches of hysteria” (303).

Both men are putting on parallel performances of self-control. Lanyon loses because his position as audience member limits his imagination to what he expects. Hyde/Jekyll has the advantage of switching roles. In the end, Lanyon is destroyed by an actor who can simply walk off the stage whenever he wants and sit next to a member of the audience. This break of the “fourth wall” destroys Lanyon and whatever he represented as audience member/critic.

The difference between the two “reveals” is that Holmes’s is much more cooperative and inclusive. Hyde’s revelation to Lanyon is more vicious:

He put the glass to his lips and drank at one gulp. A cry followed; he reeled, staggered, clutched at the table and held on, staring with injected eyes, gasping with open mouth; and as I looked there came, I thought, a change—he seemed to swell—his face became suddenly black and the features seemed to melt and alter—and the next moment, I had sprung to my feet and leaped up against the wall, my arm raised to shield me from that prodigy, my mind submerged in terror. (Stevenson 304-305)
Whereas Holmes bumps into Watson, Hyde’s transformation frightens Lanyon. As he changes, his whole body transforms and his features “melt and alter.” Holmes’s change is smoother and is more costume-based. His intent is to calm Watson, while Hyde wants to scare Lanyon. Holmes “straightens” up and stands up accordingly, while Hyde “swells” into Jekyll. Yet, both “return” from death. Lanyon recounts, “for there before my eyes—pale and shaken, and half fainting, and groping before him with his hands, like a man restored from death—there stood Henry Jekyll!” (305).

Hyde parallels a technique often used by music-hall performers. This membership in the music hall relationship was a “form of self-protection” (Bailey, “Conspiracies” 153). People who did not “get it” were often subject to ridicule (165), while Lanyon is subjected to a more intense type of physical and intellectual ridicule. For example, those who could not carry out their new role were laughed at, which pleased the other sections of the audience. The actors and singers on stage would pick on those who did not make the cut, so to speak (165). Bailey discusses how men’s clothing and style were judged at such events to maintain masculine standards (165). In this way, bachelors could learn how to be gentleman through their interaction with these comic actors (165). Bailey explains, “knowingness projected a sense of identity and membership as the earned (Bailey’s emphasis) return on experience” (167). Perhaps Lanyon is attempting to teach through his taunts, but in the end Hyde exposes and “ridicules” Lanyon. Hyde’s vicious revelation “gets back” at Lanyon for being a critic who is too fixed. The fun poked at those who failed to fit in further cemented the bonds shared by those “in the know.” Unfortunately, the only one who seems to be “in the know” is the character of Jekyll/Hyde. Unlike Holmes’s temporary “unmanning” of
Watson,” the knowledge that Jekyll/Hyde shares with Lanyon destroys him. Holmes’s actions maintain the illusion, with a reemphasis on the part that can be played. Hyde exposes the part as a part, destroying its integrity.

Within the confines of a stage, nothing is certain. In the end, it is too difficult to bridge the gap between what one is and what one is expected to be. George Henry Lewes, author of *On Actors and Acting* (1875), describes the difficulty of being an actor: “The supreme difficulty of an actor is to represent ideal character with such truthfulness that it shall affect us as real, not to drag down ideal character to the vulgar level. His art is one of representation, not of illusion. He has to use natural expressions, but he must sublimate them” (Lewes qtd. in Jackson 159-160). No matter who the real self is, the Jekyll/Hyde persona reflects these difficulties of acting. From a masculine perspective, males are trying to present an “ideal” that can lend truth to the existence of the middle- and upper-middle class gentleman. Jackson explains, “The ‘ideal’/‘real’ opposition that informs this summary is common to much Victorian writing on the principles of stage effect, as to aesthetic theory in general, during the period” (160). The split that both Jackson and Lewes discuss foreshadows the observations of twentieth-century critics like Cohen and Danahay. Jackson’s comments about the “ideal/real” are particularly applicable to the split personality in *Jekyll and Hyde*. The attempt to present a unified whole by the Jekyll character is not unlike an actor who attempts to present an image for an audience, who happen to be his fellow characters within the book *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*.

Dr. Jekyll and his counterpart Mr. Hyde, are an example of the “knowingness” of the theater. In this case, they/he recognize the emptiness of masculine performance. The
line between part and player is indefinite at best. Jekyll and Hyde’s ability to change
clothes and walk in and out of whatever company they/he choose exposes this role.
Jekyll immediately recognizes the instability of the male persona: “With every day, and
from both sides of my intelligence, the moral and the intellectual, I thus drew steadily
nearer to that truth, by whose partial discovery I have been doomed to such a dreadful
shipwreck: that man is not truly one, but truly two. I say two, because the state of my
own knowledge does not pass beyond that point” (Stevenson 307). This admission places
Jekyll “in the know,” but the knowledge produces fear because he does not know what
the true self is or which one is the act. This doubleness is what informs the Jekyll/Hyde
character and he is so threatening because he is an example of what Cohen calls “a
recognized misrecognition” (Cohen, “Hyding” 194). He realizes that the male self is
simply an image, an act. There is no place to hide from the threat of non-existence
because one can easily fall off the stage, so Jekyll and Hyde exposes the “mirage of
unlimited freedom” (Mayer 161). The exposure of this mirage is summed up by “the
Old Stager’s” warning: “Never, under any circumstances, leave the theatre, or be out of
the way, when you are liable to be called for the stage” (Actor’s 125). To do so, is an
admission of Symonds’s fear: no one knows what is going on inside him. Likewise, no
one knows what’s inside the gentleman.
Conclusion: A Stranger Type of Masculinity

The repeated phrase “Play the man” in *The Beetle* is just as apt at the conclusion of this project as it was at the start. As the phrase suggests, Victorian masculinity is an attempt rather than a precise definition. The gentleman “worked at” or “played around” with the notion of middle- and upper-middle class masculinity. The jobs he worked and the games he played were modes of display rather than solid ways to define. After all, the work day does eventually end. Playing is simply a game when the time runs out for the contest and a part is only a role once the show is over. The terms themselves hint at a fictional, creative enterprise rather than something innate since both involve constructing an image.

In some ways, the gentleman’s masculinity is very much like this project itself. Perhaps the connections I’ve made are tenuous but they are like the categories themselves: open-ended and offer some grounds for further questioning. Like the gentleman category, the dissertation is whole constructed out of disparate parts. My project has a structure, but ultimately, it’s broken into parts that attempt to fit together. Victorian masculinity is similarly a collection of structures, with work and play being the most prevalent.

Overall, Victorian middle- and upper-middle class masculinity is a continuous job, with much unfinished business and games yet to be played. In a word, I think Victorian middle-class masculinity has a certain “strangeness” to it because it can’t really be pinned down. The games and the jobs that the gentleman engaged in are more “ceremonial” than Stevenson would have you believe and perhaps these avenues tried to subdue this strangeness. As an example of Foucault’s “ceremonies,” they are an
ineffective way to “monitor” masculinity since there are so many participants who check in and out of it. Ultimately, Victorian masculinity sits upon an emptiness, but I don’t think the Victorian adventure story hid this fact; their authors, whether knowingly or not, engaged in the topic, albeit in “strange ways.” Attitudes towards it are embedded and masked in the stories. For instance, the Sherlock Holmes stories are all steeped in mystery and offer an opportunity to explore the “mysteries” of Victorian masculinity through both his actions and those of his quarry. Dracula is a supernatural, gothic tale, but it does feature masculine performance on many fronts. Finally, Jekyll and Hyde is a “strange case” because of the potential slippage in the same individual. All of these tales involve “pretending” of some type. The antagonists are just fictional creations, so they have no substance in and of themselves, but their existence is representative of a deeper spectre. Their crimes are putatively crimes against gentlemanly standards but their ability to act suggests a weakness in the standard itself as evidenced through their actions and the heroes’ sometimes questionable responses to them.

In some ways, masculinity as embodied by the Victorian middle- and upper-middle class gentleman parallels the crime in the stories as an attempt at “putting one over” on Victorian society. The crime that the gentleman perpetrates is a type of fraud, a “forgery” of expected behaviors with no substance beneath them. To paraphrase a modern, cinematic example, the beginning sequence of the film The Dark Knight (2008), involves a bank robbery. After arranging to have all his accomplices eliminated and dispatching the last one himself, the lead criminal, who is wearing a clown mask, is confronted by the wounded bank manager. The manager, frustrated with this new “type” of brazen criminal, demands: “Oh, criminals in this town used to believe in things.
Honor. Respect. Look at you! What do you believe in, huh? WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE IN?” (The Dark Knight). The leader stops and kneels down in front of the manager, giving a response: “I believe that whatever doesn’t kill you, simply makes you…” At this point, he removes his clown mask only to reveal a face with macabre, runny clown makeup on it. He continues, “…stranger” (The Dark Knight). With this play on the Nietzschean statement, the audience is introduced to The Joker, the villain of the film. His unveiling upsets conventional belief; the last thing one would expect from an unmasking of criminal is the painted face of a clown.

The manager’s view of crime stems from a hierarchical, mob-based criminality that has been plaguing the city, as the bank he works for launders mob money. His comments on criminals are not unlike the belief in a fixed traditional view of masculinity as embodied by the Victorian gentleman. Like his view of the criminal, the traditional belief in the Victorian gentleman’s stable masculinity is equally flawed because it fails to take into account potential for a fluctuating set of criteria, which in turn, required the middle- and upper-middle class gentleman to constantly “play around” with or “work at” such a definition. The amount of Victorian-era articles that question the Victorian gentleman and his masculinity as well as the hints at it in the fiction reflect an “attempt” to pin this definition down. Similarly, the protagonists of the stories, who fight “others” or solve mysteries, represent someone a middle-class gentleman could identify with or aspire to be. In this way, they are models. However, the more we dig into their character, the more layers are exposed, revealing something akin to the Joker’s clown face. The ultimate joke is that the searching never ends, so that Victorian middle-class masculinity is, at its most challenging, a series of masks, whether they are worn on the
job, the playing field or any other “stage” of masculine presentation. At its “strangest,”
such masculinity is a joke on all those who search for a solid representation of it, leaving
them as frustrated and fearful bank managers.

However, the object of this study is not to “kill” the idea of late Victorian
masculinity or the gentleman’s reliance on work and play as ways to foster it. The
category simply needs to be recognized as a little “stranger” than it seems at first glance,
steeped in “ceremony” and performance. The authors discussed in this study seemed, at
least, to have noticed this in their “strange” adventures, using the tales as a way to invite
their readers into the discussion, asking them to examine the “unfinished business”
involving the middle-class Victorian gentleman and the masculinity he projects.
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