

Animalistic Alcoholics:  
Respectability and Degeneration in Sensation

by

Kade Langlitz

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

The Department of English

State University of New York

New Paltz, New York 12561

December 2024

Kade Langlitz

State University of New York at New Paltz

We, the thesis committee for the above candidate for the

Master of Art degree, hereby recommend

acceptance of this thesis.

Jed Mayer, Thesis Advisor

Department of English, SUNY New Paltz

Submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree

in The Department of English

at the State University of New York at New Paltz

## 1. Introduction

What does an alcoholic look like? What does an alcoholic sound like? For Victorians these questions had seemingly clear answers. However, the reality of alcoholism often defied expectations and revealed complexities that made most Victorians uncomfortable. Plunging into this cultural tension, this essay explores the treatment of alcoholics in sensation literature and science fiction. Although substance abuse disorders were only marginally understood in the nineteenth century, this essay understands “alcoholism” to be the habitual consumption of alcohol to excess (“Alcoholism”). Additionally, this essay understands alcohol to be inseparable from affect, or the expression of the emotions. As such, sensation fiction—produced to elicit emotional reactions from its readers—offers an apt medium through which to explore the treatment of alcoholism in late Victorian literature. Specifically, this essay addresses *Lady Audley’s Secret*, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *The Island of Dr. Moreau*. By tracking the portrayal of alcoholics throughout time, from 1862 to 1896, this essay explores Victorians’ evolving understanding of the impact of alcohol—and affect—on society. Of particular interest is the way alcoholism was thought to be the vice of the working class as well as a sign of degeneration, as this will reveal the social biases—and fears—of the middle class. As such, this essay chiefly utilizes the lenses of Foucauldian constructionism, social performance, and human-animal studies to perform its literary analysis.

## 2. Brutal and Brutalized Bodies: Alcohol, Petkeeping and Cross-Class Sympathy in M. E.

Braddon’s *Lady Audley’s Secret*

Although they publicly denounced such fascinations, Victorians readily consumed the spectacle of the alcoholic in their literature. Peaking in the 1860’s as an offshoot of the Gothic, sensation fiction engaged social taboos like alcoholism to elicit emotional reactions from readers:

fear, shock, outrage. Although a practical strategy to sustain readership in a diversifying market, this affective engagement often challenged the limits of readerly sympathy. These fictional portrayals reflected real discourses and had real consequences (Gilbert 2-3). For instance, in Mary Elizabeth Braddon's 1862 *Lady Audley's Secret*, the character Luke Marks grotesquely embodies working class degeneration. However, through his interactions with Lady Audley and Robert Audley—who both provide him with assistance—Luke unearths the radical dependence of middle-class subjectivity on the objectification of the working classes. Luke performs the narrator's dehumanizing rhetoric, and this preserves his bodily autonomy, but the text's inability to relinquish middle-class rhetorical biases reflects doubts about the limitations of cross-class sympathy broadly.

Like most mid-nineteenth century novelists, Braddon relies on physiognomy as a means of characterization. Reaching its zenith in the Victorian era, physiognomy was the pseudo-science “of reading character in the face” (Fahnestock 325). In her article “The Heroine of Irregular Features...” Jeanne Fahnestock explains that novelists adopted this practice in order to suggest character “personality” through “physical description” (325). As a “shared system of meaning” between writer and reader, physiognomy allowed Victorian texts to show, instead of tell, readers about a character before they saw that character in action (325). However, these characterizations were often embedded in social biases. What made a character intelligent or ignorant, courageous or cowardly, trustworthy or deceitful reflected and reified racist, classist and misogynistic stereotypes. A deviation from the physiognomic convention entailed a deviance from social norms. For instance, in her article “Phrenology and Representations of Physical Deviance in Victorian Fiction,” Tamara S. Wagner elaborates, “[i]nfluenced by... phrenology, racial theories, and... ethnocentrism, the reading of the ‘other’—foreign, criminal, lower- and

upper-class–body becomes a popular spectacle that takes up considerable space in Victorian fiction,” and this was especially true for the sensation novel (2). What Wagner exposes through her list of “other[ness]” is the most common perpetrators of these “spectacle[s]”: the Evangelical middle class. Through the circulation of physiognomic values, both “lower-” and “upper-class” bodies were marked as “other,” deviants from the middle-class norm. As Valentine Cunningham reveals in his article on “Victorian Literature and Values for the Middle Class Reader,” most nineteenth century texts writing about the under classes of England were “produced within the prosperous classes for... prosperous readers” (120). As such, the middle classes’ preoccupation with the portrayal of othered bodies—like the under classes—manifested in these racialized and gendered uses of physiognomy in contemporary literature.

Likewise, Braddon’s narrator relies on physiognomy to inscribe Luke Marks in a discourse of “deviance.” “Chapter III: Hidden Relics” introduces Luke to the reader, through a meeting with his cousin and betrothed, Phoebe, who is also Lady Audley’s maid. The narrator describes how Luke’s “dark *red* hair grew *low* upon his forehead” (Braddon, italics added). For practitioners of physiognomy, forehead size was associated with intelligence: “the higher and broader the forehead, the more intelligent the owner,” and Victorian “[h]eroes are often admired for their lofty foreheads” (Fahnestock 345). That Luke’s “hair grew *low* upon his forehead” suggests his relatively poor intellect. The narrator continues that “*animal* in expression, *red*-haired, and *bull*-necked, he was not unlike... [an] *ox*” (Braddon, italics added). This exaggeration of Luke’s body as “animal[istic]” exposes physiognomy’s shortcomings: rather than conveying an individual “personality,” physiognomy often reduces its characters to caricature, and these caricatures often support racialized, gendered and classed discourses on moral superiority. In Luke’s case, the focus on his “red[ness],” coupled with his “animal” likeness, emphasizes

associations with anger, blood, and violence, rendering Luke's body hyper visible in a discourse of brutality.

This brutality exposes the way in which Luke's physical deviance reflects middle class discourses on morality. In particular, Luke's animality—in addition to his alcohol use—is used to render him a symbol for working class immorality. In the previous quotation Luke is likened to a “bull” and “ox,” common work animals in England. Still, Luke is not just “like” an animal; he is an animalistic alcoholic. Lady Audley complains of Luke to Phoebe, “your brutal husband is no doubt brutally drunk... and brutally... in his drunkenness” (Braddon). The repeated polyptoton of “brute” in such a short sequence relies on hyperbole to link alcohol to violence, or “brutality.” Likewise, Luke's subplot revolves around his extortion of money from Lady Audley—to fund his public house. Luke coerces Phoebe, “[t]here's... money to be made out of a public-house” (Braddon). This declaration draws upon contemporary anxiety over the prevalence of beer shops among the working class. Although ‘beer shops’ and ‘public houses’ were not synonymous establishments in the Victorian era, the close association evokes these discourses on working class vice, epitomized as excessive alcohol consumption (Mason 118). Luke's character engages these contemporary anxieties.

Although well established by the time of Braddon's novel, this link between the working class and alcohol use was not always as ubiquitous, and understanding the history of this phenomenon better contextualizes Luke's character. In his article “The Beer Act of 1830 and Victorian Discourse on Working-Class Drunkenness,” Nicholas Mason explains that the Beer Act of 1830 democratized beer production in England. This led to an immediate decrease in the price of beer—and an increase in beer-selling establishments known as “beer shops.” These beer shops quickly became a symbol of the working class's moral failings: after 1830 “Victorian discourse

on working-class drunkenness repeats a narrative in which the Act... placed a beer house in every neighborhood... exposing the poor to temptations they were too weak to resist” (115). This “narrative” of unprecedented debauchery among the working classes exacerbated public anxieties of class conflict. For example, one chief constable “reported that there had been *three* times as many arrests for drunkenness in his city in the thirty months since the Beer Act [of 1830] as in the preceding three years” (116). Regardless of the actuality of the constable’s claim, which suggests its own fabrication in its hyperbolic use of “three”s, accusations like this dominated legal rhetoric in England in the decades following the Beer Act. Linking drunkenness to crime, this narrative implicated the working class as the prime cause of “the [moral] decay of English society”—which persists to this day (121).

Public fears of “decay” reflect the Victorian preoccupation with degeneration generally. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the first documented use of “degeneration” within a biological context comes in 1844, but the word’s definition as “the falling off from... earlier excellence” or “declining to a lower... stage of being” dates back to the early seventeenth century (“Degeneration”). As evolution studies established a continuum between the human and non-human in the second half of the nineteenth century, the Victorians’ obsession with degeneration, or ‘de-evolution,’ grew. If brute could become man, surely man could become brute. Public rhetoric identified the source of this backsliding as England’s “culture of violence” (Bates 15). This violence was macro and micro, institutional and individual. The middle class feared that mass capitalism estranged men from one another. This estrangement enabled cruelty. For instance, in 1868 Queen Victoria lamented, “the English are inclined to be more cruel... than... other civilized nations” (qtd. in Ritvo 126). Moreover, as aforementioned, discourses on

the Beer Act of 1830 linked the working class to violence and cruelty, and in this way, the working class became Victorians' touchstone for moral degeneration.

To prevent further degeneration, the middle classes wielded humanitarianism as a tool of intervention into working class behaviors. In "Vivisection, Virtue, and the Law..." from *Anti-Vivisection and the Profession of Medicine in Britain*, A. W. H. Bates explains that the middle class imagined that "[the] underclass[es]... lacked the wherewithal to regulate themselves"—and thus manage their "violent impulses": they feared that "if permitted to acquire a taste for blood," the working class would "become ungovernable" (15). This discursive conflation of behavioral "regulat[ion]" and legal "governance" evokes theorist Michel Foucault's critique of social assistance. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault documents the outgrowth of the modern prison as a model for social control. He characterizes the carceral by its unique "disciplinary technique:" a "mode of intervention" enforced by "technicians of behaviour" and "engineers of conduct" (1491-2). Targeting "behaviors" and "conduct," the prison extended its reach from "crim[inals]" to "deviant[s]," from the legal to the social (1495). Over time, the carceral amassed a network of covert and overt forces to uphold the cultural influence of the ruling class through a process of homogenization. In the Victorian era, the rise of social assistance programs reflects the middle-class use of this "prison model" (1494). Citing "charitable societies, moral improvement associations... workers' estates and lodging houses" among others, Foucault inculcates humanitarianism as a collection of organizations that handed out social assistance—to practice "surveillance" of the norm (1494).

For the Victorians, this norm was respectability. In his study on "The Social Order of Mid-Victorian Britain," Geoffrey Best stresses the centrality of respectability to Victorian society. Respectability was more than an inclination towards manners; it was a way of life. In



fact, Best defends respectability as *the* social division of Victorian England—above and beyond any other marker of social identity like race, class or gender. Best maintains that while respectability was practiced in “a variety of styles,” some of its “hall-marks” were “absolute”: “respectable people did not get drunk... or behave wildly;” instead, “they maintained propriety... and decorum” (283-84). Best often returns to sobriety as a key tenant of respectability, and this exposes its central paradox. A respectable man might be rich; he might be poor. Respectability was, “within reach of all who wanted it” *and* “could... afford it” (286). Simply, respectability transcended class—*while* being deeply embedded in its material realities. As such, because of their “violent tendencies” and habitual vices, the working class was often seen as unrespectable—and thus deviant. This deviance was criminalized, allowing the middle class to justify their interventions as “a form of social self-defence” (Foucault 1499, Bates 15). However, as Bates and Best uncover, these discourses went beyond mere criminalization. Instead, they also dehumanized the working class, who were “ungovernable,” with “a taste for blood,” habitually “drunk,” and “wild[ly]” degenerate. This conflation of alcoholism, violence and animality within humanitarian discourses thus contextualizes the portrayal of Luke Marks’s physical and social deviance in Braddon’s novel. Inscribed in a rhetoric of working-class degeneration, Luke’s animalistic body and alcohol consumption become inseparable, marking his threat to the social hegemony.

Braddon’s text reflects this ambivalent relationship between the middle class and the “brutes” they sought to reform through Luke’s relationships to Robert Audley and Lady Audley. In brief, Lady Audley supports Luke’s public-house as an act of self-defense: he blackmails her with information on George Talboys’s disappearance, which the Lady was responsible for. Luke’s physical deviance informs this conflict. Hostility between Lady Audley and dogs recurs

throughout the novel. Her fear of her stepdaughter Alicia's Newfoundland, Caesar, prompts her to claim, "The brute *knows* that I am frightened... and *takes advantage* of my terror" (Braddon, italics added). Sustained by a suggestion of an inter-species power struggle, or "advantage[s]," this tension contextualizes Luke's later complaint about Lady Audley's treatment of him. He confesses, "what was give to me had been... flung at me as if I was a dog, and was only give it to be kep' from bitin.'" Luke's frustration—"[his] blood b'iled agen her"—reveals his resentment of Lady Audley's begrudging assistance: the detail of his "b[o]il[ing]" "blood" reiterates previous associations with the color red, and the phonetic transcription of his speech renders him almost unintelligible. Violent and inarticulate, like a "bitin[g]" "dog," Luke's conflict with Lady Audley parallels Caesar's own aggression. The tension between these characters thus draws upon contemporary interclass relations. Like the upper-middle class at large, Lady Audley sought self-preservation from the corrupting influence and violent threat of the working class, embodied by Luke, and by dehumanizing him as deviant, Lady Audley attempts to distance herself from the process of degeneration.

Inversely, this compulsion to differentiation reflects Lady Audley's proximity to degeneration. The veneer of the Lady obscures the reality of Helen Talboys, the daughter of a drunken sailor, Captain Mauldon, and the wife of a disinherited deserter, George Talboys. Corrupted by this working-class background, Lady Audley fails to perform middle-class charity. In contrast, Robert Audley's relationship to Luke models respectable virtue: he saves Luke's life by risking his own. Threatened by Robert's investigation into George Talboys's disappearance, Lady Audley sets fire to Luke's public-house—with Robert and the drunken landlord inside. Robert's self-endangerment elicits an appreciation for "the sincerity" of humanitarian rhetoric. In her discussion of The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Harriet Ritvo

acknowledges, “reformers... were... genuinely moved by the plight of those they wished to rescue” (133). Similarly, Robert may have been “genuine” and “sincere” in his “rescue” of Luke. However, the rhetoric surrounding Luke’s rescue soils Robert’s act with the middle-class ego. For instance, distraught at Lady Audley’s arson, “Phoebe worries, ‘There’s Luke, too tipsy to help himself, unless others help him; there’s Mr. [Robert] Audley asleep—’” (Braddon). Phoebe’s ambiguous reference to “others” distances Luke’s “help[lessness]” from his immediate situation to suggest his dependence is an ongoing condition. Robert’s “sleep,” applied as an adjective, carries no such connotations. This difference suggests an implicit power dynamic between Luke and Robert that draws upon humanitarian narratives. In her introduction to *Victorian Dogs, Victorian Men*, Keridiana W. Chez describes scenes in humane periodicals of “the middle-class man as the... hero” that relied on his “command” of the working class, pictured as a “crowd of unfeeling... brutes” (9-10). Contextualized by this masculine narrative of “leadership” (10), Robert emerges as one of these “middle class hero[es],” as he literally rescues Luke, the “brute,” from his/the public house. Lady Audley’s transactional assistance underscores fears of working-class violence, but Robert’s condescending rescue reinforces fantasies of behavioral reform through middle-class intervention.

Complicating Robert’s aid to Luke is the fact that Luke’s alcoholism and animality are intimately linked, so it is pertinent to analyze Robert and Luke’s relationship through Anti-Cruelty discourses, in addition to Temperance narratives. Robert’s class identity has generated much scholarship: by the end of the novel, is our “hero” upper or middle class? And what are the implications of this change—or lack thereof? In “Gathering ‘stray and benighted curs’...” Sarah Rick argues that Robert performs his middle-class identity through pet keeping. Rick contextualizes her analysis with Chez’s work on men and dogs. Chez explains that in the

Victorian era, traditional masculinity—which had relied on a “distancing from nature”—was being redefined as “the power to... connect with animals... developing the ability to govern via affective intimacy rather than violence” (Chez 3). Chez’s diction highlights the ambivalence of this supposedly new relationship to nature. The radicalism of a “connec[tion]” through “affective intimacy” juxtaposes the perseverance of the androcentric “power” “to govern,” exposing the hegemonic agenda of pet keeping. Chez’s articulation of the goal of pet keeping furthers this ambiguity. As aforementioned, Victorians feared that the mass violence of industrialization would dull men’s sympathies for each other. To rectify this, dogs were employed as emotional “prothes[e]s” (Chez 3). Chez elaborates that through the “exercise of his emotional facilities,” “[w]hat a man felt for his dog... was expected to develop his ability to be in sympathy with *the rest of humanity*” (3, italics added). In this way, Victorian men relied on their dogs to “provide [them]... an essential characteristic” of what it meant to be human: “the ability to feel and connect” (3). In other words, the pet dog’s purpose was to mediate human relations—and facilitate the human/e identity.

As such, Rick argues, “Robert’s humaneness defines his [middle class] masculinity” (par. 11). Rick contrasts Robert’s affinity for “curs” and “strays” with the use of “pure-breds” by other aristocrats in the text (Braddon qtd. in Rick par. 13). This attention to breed underscores the intersection of classism and speciesism in Victorian society that inscribes Luke’s physicality. For example, in “Science, Sensitivity and the Sociozoological Scale...,” an exploration of the role of discourses on the human-animal boundary at the 1875 Royal Commission on Vivisection, Tarquin Holmes unearths the disproportionate valuing of pure-breeds over mutts as an extension of classism, the valuing of the middle and upper classes over the lower classes (195, 202). Inversely, Robert saves both the dog and the dog-like, the animal and the working class. His

compassion compels him to gather “benighted curs”—and rescue “drunken brute[s].” In this way, Luke becomes one of Robert’s pets, one of his objects of affect.

Nevertheless, Rick’s analysis suggests that Robert’s relationship to his pets reveals a failure of their prosthetic function: “Robert... connect[s] emotionally to... dogs in ways he does not, or cannot, with other human beings” (par. 8). Indeed, Robert’s preference for his pets distances him from his peers rather than integrating him into their “social fold” (Chez 3). For instance, Robert’s cousin Alicia often contrasts his negligence of her with his attachment to his dogs. This culminates in her accusation, “selfish, Robert Audley! You take home half-starved dogs!... You... pat the head of every good-for-nothing cur” (Braddon). This complaint echoes contemporary anxieties over the human-dog relationship. That the dog provided the man their humanity imprinted the man with an uncanny proximity to the dog. Was not the function of pet keeping to distance the affected man from the unfeeling brute? Then, how could the dog constitute the man? This paradox sustained an “ever-present” sense of “danger in proportion to how much [dogs] were loved” (Chez 22). To love the dog more than the dog loved you or to love the dog more than you loved other humans threatened the “proper power dynamic between human user and animal tool” (21).

Further, that Robert’s preference for his dogs is “self-ish” spotlights his pet keeping as not merely an *additive* but a *substantive* aspect of his subjectivity: where does the dog end and the human begin? What is Robert without his “curs”? The answer is unclear, and this blurs the subjectivities between the subject-master and object-pet, between man and animal. However, as Holmes stresses, speciesism never operated in isolation but intersected with other discriminatory discourses. Likewise, viewing Robert and Luke’s relationship through Chez’s lens of emotional prosthesis reveals the way in which middle-class subjectivity is radically dependent on the

objectification of the working class. Simply, the middle class is human/e—because the working class is animal/istic. Simply, the working class is the middle class’s prosthesis.

The question thus remains: is Luke an objectified prosthesis, or is he an autonomous subject? Overemphasizing Robert’s role in their relationship ignores Luke’s own understanding of his “brutality.” An advocate for writing back to power through self-reflexivity, academic Judith Butler argues that identity is a performance. For instance, in their theorization of drag as a performance of gender, Butler reveals gender to be a “pastiche”: an imitation without an original operating at the level of discourse (176). Class operates similarly. For example, Butler articulates “the boundaries of the body as the limits of the socially hegemonic,” or dominant, so that “any kind of unregulated permeability constitutes a site of... endangerment” that “disrupts the very boundaries that determine *what it is to be a body at all*” (167-69, italics added). Contextualized by their discussion of AIDs, the “kind of unregulated permeability” Butler discusses here is sexual fluids. However, a similar framework can be applied to drug use and class identity. Class, like gender, is not fixed or natural; it is performed and policed, or “limit[ed],” by “the socially hegemonic.” Through habitual class performances, the “boundaries” of the body emerge. Any action—such as habitual drug use—that violates these boundaries “endanger” and “disrupt” the definition of this social body. In this way, alcoholism among the working class—when self-reflexively performed—becomes a “kind of unregulated permeability” that “constitutes a site of endangerment” of the middle-class norm, and Luke Marks’s articulation of his alcoholism operates under this lens.

Although the narrator frequently compares Luke to animals, Luke often adopts this likeness himself, particularly in his reflections on class, as aforementioned in his complaints of Lady Audley. However, Luke employs a similar metaphor in explaining his relationship to

Robert. After Robert saves Luke, Luke reflects, “I’m not grateful to folks in a general way,” but “when a gentleman... puts his own life in danger to save a drunken brute like me, the drunkenest brute... feels grateful like to that gentleman” (Braddon). Luke’s shrewd differentiation between Lady Audley and Robert Audley’s support juxtaposes his portrayals as ‘low-foreheaded’ and inarticulate. Further, the narrator clarifies this critique is the result of “no moral transformation,” undermining Robert-the-hero’s role in facilitating this understanding. In brief, the rhetoric of Luke’s “gratitude” unveils his self-reflexive performance—or drag—of class stereotypes. Instead of referring to ‘Robert,’ he speaks of “a” or “that gentleman,” and instead of referring to himself, he speaks of “a drunken brute like me” and “the drunkenest brute.” Luke’s ambiguous use of articles—“a,” “the,” “that”—estranges Robert and himself from their class subjectivities. In this way, Luke differentiates the performance of class identity from its individual performers while recognizing the material consequences of these performances. Simply, Luke’s dialogue exposes his appreciation for the ways social discourse becomes violently embodied. Further, by including Robert, “that gentleman,” in his critique, Luke suggests how these rituals of embodiment are a cross-class issue.

Nevertheless, Luke complicates this fledgling sense of cross-class solidarity—or at least “intimacy”—between Robert and himself by expanding upon his “dogged” metaphors (Braddon). In part, Luke’s “know[ledge]” here refers to his role in the novel’s resolution. To express his gratitude towards Robert, Luke confesses his knowledge of George Talboy’s disappearance and relinquishes his possession of George’s letters, the objects of blackmail that he stole from Lady Audley in the third chapter. George’s letters resolve Robert’s search for him, solving the mystery driving the narrative. This is Luke’s last act before his death. As Rick notes, in picturing Robert’s knowledge of Luke’s, Luke employs a hunting metaphor (par. 25): he is

Robert's "game... turned... inside out." This likens Luke and Robert's relationship to an act of inter-species domination—with keen resonances to Foucault's theory of "power-knowledge" (1493). Through surveillance, the carceral amasses a "body of knowledge that is a knowledge of bodies" in order to identify, capture and regulate deviance—to render deviants governable, or "docile" yet "useful" (1499). Dying yet cooperative, Luke becomes this governable deviant by the novel's conclusion. Luke surrenders his "body of knowledge"—likened to Robert's "knowledge of [his] bod[y]"—which had afforded him power, to his class superior. In this way, despite Luke's critique of the Audley's, he is still expressed through—and inscribed in—the very discourses he critiques.

This limitation to Luke's class performances aligns with Valentine Cunningham's assessment of the portrayals of working-class depravity in Victorian novels. As Cunningham explains, the majority of Victorian novels were written by and for the middle class—which Braddon was. Among other texts, Cunningham explores Charles Kingsley's sermon on "Human Soot," which Cunningham understands as a denunciation of industrialization. Nevertheless, this denunciation arises from Kingsley's hyper-objectification of the lowest classes as "soot," the calculated excesses of urbanization (112-13). Thus, even in the most sympathetic texts, Cunningham argues that "the moralised language of darkness, depravity, [and] filthiness *carries on sticking* to the poor" (118). In this way, the animal "stick[s]" to Luke, and its stickiness binds him to middle-class narratives of the working class's moral degeneration.

Nevertheless, the subversive potential of Luke's character should not be understated. As per Foucault's theory of biopower, Luke's "knowledge" *is* his power. *Lady Audley's Secret* interrogates the precarious borders of human and animal, and middle and working class through—and on—Luke's body, and despite the narrator's attempts to confine Luke within



discourses of moral degeneration, he asserts a complex agency through his awareness of his role in the social hierarchy. In particular, his gratitude towards Robert Audley challenges the binary of savior and savage—and reveals a nuanced web of relational power. This acknowledgment of mutual complicity in class structures offers a glimpse of solidarity, albeit fraught with tension. Thus, Braddon's text reflects Victorian biases, but it also, like any good sensation novel, invites readers to interrogate the era's prevailing discourses and highlights the struggle for agency within a system designed to marginalize. In this way, *Lady Audley's Secret* endures not merely as a reflection of Victorian anxieties but a testament to the complexities of class identities and the potential for subversion within representation.

### 3. The Strange Case of Victorian Affect: Degenerative Drinking and the Collapse of Class Boundaries in R. L. Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*

As suggested by Lady Audley's failed performance of the aristocracy and Luke Marks's self-reflexive performance of the poor, the binary between the respectable middle class and the unrespectable lower class obscures the complexity of Victorians' lived realities. Although they feigned ignorance of such practices, the middle class gambled, had sex and drank. Thinly veiled by the curtain of respectability, traces of debauchery soiled the middle-class social fabric, and towards the end of the century, or *fin de siècle*, many texts played with and in this curtain between rhetoric and reality. Robert Louis Stevenson's 1888 novella *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was one such text. The main character, Mr. Utterson, perceives the relationship between Jekyll and Hyde in terms of a conflict between respectable middle-class affect and degenerate lower-class brutality. However, illuminated by anxieties about his own degeneration, Utterson's efforts to distance Hyde from Jekyll reveal uncertainty about the stability of middle-class respectability broadly. Ultimately, the text's epistolary fragments evade

his attempt to distance the middle class from degenerative drinking, as Jekyll reveals himself to always already have been Hyde, and this dramatization of failed respectability reveals that the working-class degenerate of sensation fiction to be a projection of the middle class's fear of their own degeneration.

Academia has long acknowledged Stevenson's preoccupation with de/evolution. Although relevant throughout the Victorian era, degeneration studies dominated public consciousness during the century's last two decades, partly due to the sensationalization of experimental physiology during the same period. Utilized as the conceptual framework for this burgeoning science, evolutionary theory—and its popularization after the publication of Charles Darwin's 1871 *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*—proliferated cultural discourses on degeneration (Mayer 400). *The Descent of Man* followed Darwin's seminal 1859 *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, where he broadly explicated his theory of evolution. However, *The Descent of Man* scandalized public sentiments by applying a similar framework to humanity: coupled with growing concerns about society's decline, the possibility that "human beings were essentially highly developed animals" threatened to overhaul any sense of stable English identity (Mayer 401). For the first time, degeneration seemed to not just be a general social possibility but a real biological occurrence.

However, scandal did not entail rejection. In fact, many academics found the study of de/evolution to be a fruitful endeavor. As such, in the final decades of the century, newfound interest in degeneration wrought a hoard of "new sciences," such as criminal anthropology, evolutionary psychiatry, and sexology (Manning 183). However, these pursuits labored under the lasting influence of the era's earlier pseudo sciences like physiognomy and phrenology. As such, degenerationists often colored lived realities in hegemonic discourses. In "The Hyde We Live

In..." Pascale McCullough Manning argues that Stevenson's descriptions of Hyde's physicality can be understood through this framework. For instance, respectively drawing upon the work of psychiatrist Henry Maudsley and criminologist Cesare Lombroso, literary scholars Robert Mighall and Stephen Arata uncover Hyde's link to the overlapping studies of degeneration and criminology during the fin de siècle. Manning reiterates that Maudsley defended his belief in "a brute brain within the man's," accounting for the "trace [of] savagery in civilization" (Maudsley qtd. in Manning 183). Likewise, Lombroso forwarded a model of the "atavistic" criminal who regressed to "the ancestral type" (Manning 183). According to Mighall and Arata, Hyde mimics this degenerative criminal. For instance, Hyde is repeatedly admonished for his "ape-like fury," "ape-like tricks" and "ape-like spite" (Stevenson). This focus on his apish-ness, which renders him violent, "fur[ious]" and "spite[ful]," recalls *The Descent of Man's* explication of the genealogical continuity between *homo sapiens* and other primates. Engaging these evolutionary and criminological frameworks, Hyde's character exposes late Victorian fears that an inherited savagery lurked beneath a civilized veneer.

However, rather than degeneration generally, Hyde embodies the degenerative effects of alcohol specifically. In *The Transforming Draught: Jekyll and Hyde, Robert Louis Stevenson and the Victorian Alcohol Debate*, Thomas L. Reed recovers the neglected link between Hyde and alcohol. Rather than miming the picture of the alcoholic seen in *Lady Audley's Secret*, Hyde gives "Alcohol (with that capital 'A') 'a local habitation and a name'" (Reed 142). In other words Hyde personifies the Drink Trade itself and the discourses surrounding it in the late nineteenth century. For instance, Richard Enfield—the cousin of the main character of the novella's first eight chapters, Gabriel John Utterson—narrates the readers' introduction to Hyde: "the man trampled calmly over [a] child's body and left her screaming" (Stevenson). He then

likens Hyde to a “Juggernaut,” a popular figure of Temperance rhetoric. For example, in George Cruikshank’s 1833 illustrated *Sunday in London*, “the devotees of Jaggernaut [*sic*],” “the Great Spirit Gin,” “do but put themselves in the way of being crushed... beneath his chariot wheel” (qtd. in Reed 136), and the “devotees” thought to be most “crushed” were children. Inventor and surgeon John Dunlop echoes Temperance’s rallying cry when he laments that more “children are now gone in... drunkenness” (qtd. in Reed 140). Simply, focusing on children, teetotalers—or those who advocated for the “total” ban of alcohol—emphasized the generational reverberations of alcoholism in English society and in doing so reified its degenerative threat to the nation.

Leveraging teetotalers’ investment in the image of “drunken” children, this introduction to Hyde’s character mirrors Stevenson’s picture of the “emerge[nt],” or early, *homo sapien*. In his 1888 essay “Pulvis et Umbra,” Stevenson strives to render the “indefiniteness, evanescence, and immateriality” of modern scientific language “communicable and practical” (Manning 182, Stevenson qtd. in Manning 182). As such, he describes the “emerge[nt]” human as “‘a monstrous spectre,’ in his bid for survival a ‘thing to set children screaming’” (Manning 205). Stevenson’s image of a “monst[er]” that leaves “children screaming” parallels Enfield’s description of Hyde’s “Satan[ic]” “trampl[ing]” of the girl (Stevenson). Moreover, from this quaint “tale,” Hyde emerges as a “spectre:” the following night, Utterson dreams of “that human Juggernaut trod[ding] the child down” (Stevenson). Like the early man, more ape than man, who haunts England’s genealogical tree, Hyde, more “Juggernaut” than “human,” lurks in Utterson’s unconscious. In brief, Hyde prefigures the “monstrous spectre” Stevenson theorizes about in “Pulvis et Umbra,” and in this way, Hyde emerges as a figure of the threat of degeneration wrought by alcoholics.

Specifically, Hyde's evocation of the degenerative effects of alcohol elicits the image of working-class vice that pervaded Victorian literature; Reed suggests this connotation when discussing Hyde's namesake: Hyde Park. In the 1880's teetotalers advocated for Local Option, which described policies that allowed communities to vote on whether to license the sale of alcohol in their district. Teetotalers hoped that Local Option would gradually instate Prohibition by avoiding the controversies associated with a national ban (Reed 99). Still, English public officials warned of popular resistance to the restrictions of such licenses by recalling the Sunday Trading Riots of 1855 (151). These riots were characterized by working class resistance to laws restricting economic activities on Sundays—such as the sale of alcohol—as they disproportionately impacted the lower classes: the upper and middle classes could drink at home, but the lower class depended on beer shops and local pubs for their alcohol. Like many public demonstrations in the Victorian era, these riots occurred at the “notorious” Hyde Park (Reed 149). In fact, in 1855 the “numbers and vehemence” of the working class “inspired [Karl Marx] to proclaim that ‘the English Revolution began yesterday in Hyde Park’” (Reed 150). Three decades later, aggravated by pushes for Local Option, the memory of Hyde Park loomed on English consciousness like a narrowly contained threat of working class “[r]evolution.” Fitting, then, that Jekyll imagines Hyde as “growl[ing] for licence” with “assaults of temptation” (Stevenson). Contextualized by “licence” and “temptation,” Hyde’s “growl[s]” and “assaults” resemble the “vehemence” of the working-class anti-temperance protests evoked by his namesake. Compounded by his allegorical function for degeneration, Hyde thus emerges as the embodiment of the degenerative violence engendered by the working class’s propensity for alcoholism.

As Jekyll's above comment begins to suggest, the doctor labors extensively to differentiate these charged allusions to alcoholism from his middle-class identity. Most often Jekyll and Hyde are articulated as dual, reflecting Jekyll's framing of the "case" in his letter to Utterson (Stevenson). He begins by pondering "the *duality* of man" and "the *two* natures that contended in... my consciousness:" "the unjust" and "just" "twin[s]." Likewise, throughout the text, Jekyll and Hyde's "natures" juxtapose each other, and this difference is most clearly seen in their varying affective capacities. Although scholarship has separately linked *The Strange Case* to degeneration and alcohol, there remains an exploration of how the text engages contemporary discourses on affect that reveals the web of association between emotions, degeneration and alcoholism in the fin de siècle.

Like most consumers of alcohol throughout history, the Victorians used the substance to manipulate affect, and *The Strange Case* grapples with these different uses. The novella's first paragraph describes Utterson as "backward in sentiment" but "eminently human... *when* the wine was to his taste" (Stevenson, italics added). Reinforced by the positive connotation of "eminen[ce]," this "human[ization]" of "sentiment" by wine aligns with the popular belief in "its capacity to... inspir[e] 'kindness of feeling and openness of heart'" (Reed 20). However, this jovial affectation always risked excess: if alcohol could excite, it could also sterilize. In fact, although popularly used as a "pick-me-up" (36), alcohol was also employed as a sleeping-aid, painkiller and disinfectant (32, 49). Thus, as early as 1821, Thomas De Quincey explains that wine "advantageously affected the faculties—brightened.... the consciousness," yet "a man who is inebriated.... feels... the merely human, too often the brutal, part of his nature" (De Quincey 42). De Quincey recognizes the "advantageous" "brighten[ing]" associated with wine but limits this "to a *certain* point, and with *certain* men" (41, italics added). Thus, contrasting Utterson's

“eminen[t]” “sentiment” under the influence, De Quincey characterizes “inebriat[ion]” as “feel[ing]... brutal.”

This anxiety over “brutal” affect mirrors Victorians’ broader fears about emotions and the human-animal boundary. A year after *The Descent of Man*, Darwin published *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. Characterized by anecdotal observations of “shared emotional responses in human and nonhuman animals,” this study furthered theories of evolution through a narrative of “emotional kinship” (Mayer 401, 405). This claim to emotional continuity between humans and animals was appropriated by an array of discourses. Just as it vindicated middle-class investments in the human-animal bond as a token of respectability, modeled by Robert Audley in *Lady Audley’s Secret*, it also challenged the middle class’s claim to difference from—and superiority over—animals and the animalistic. This complex interplay of alcohol, emotion and degeneration underscores the relevance of affect in understanding Jekyll and Hyde’s differences in *The Strange Case*. Specifically, by engaging discourses on un/respectability, Jekyll and Hyde’s affects illuminate the relevance of class conflict in sustaining the text’s narrative tension.

Hyde’s affect—and its relevance to the text’s narrative on the Drink Trade—can be appreciated by returning to the aforementioned scene of Hyde’s child-trampling. Enfield’s sequencing of events is essential. He recalls that Hyde and the girl “ran into one another *naturally* enough,” but “*then* came the horrible part:” “for the man trampled calmly over the child’s body *and* left her screaming” (Stevenson, italics added). It is not the act of “r[u]n[n]ing into” the child that is “horrible”—that was “natural enough”—but his lack of remorse for this act: Hyde “calmly” “trampled,” then “left” the girl. Enfield reiterates this deficit when he describes Hyde’s “sneering coolness.” The oxymorons of “trampl[ing] calmly” and “sneering

coolness” signal Hyde’s *unnatural* feeling, and contextualized by his allegorical link to degenerative drinking, these perverse emotions—or lack thereof—recalls the brutalizing effects of inebriation.

Juxtaposing Hyde, whose violently underdeveloped emotions are fueled by his associations with alcohol, Dr. Jekyll displays “every mark of capacity and kindness” with “sincere and warm affection.” “Mark[ed]” by his affective “capacity,” Jekyll models the Good Doctor—and secures his claim to respectability. Contextualized by the broader concerns about emotions in the *fin de siècle*, Victorians oft debated the proper amount of feeling to be expected from doctors and scientists (Bates 18). A. W. H. Bates epitomizes the most conventional standpoint on the role of affect in the professions when he writes, “[Victorians] tended, as patients still do, to choose their doctor on the basis of *personal attributes* such as compassion, kindness and humanity rather than on purely *technical ability*” (18, italics added). Bates elaborates that “the ideal medical character was a balanced one... neither unduly sentimental... nor so insensitive that they became callous” (21). Likewise, through Utterson’s vision of him as “kind” and “affection[ate],” Jekyll evades association with the Cruel—or “insensitive” and “callous”—Doctor. Thus, contrasting Hyde’s working-class brutality, Jekyll embodies middle-class benevolence: “known for charities” and “distinguished for religion,” he is the ideal of middle-class Evangelical masculinity: the picture of respectability. Thus, *The Strange Case* contrasts Hyde’s degenerative brutality with Jekyll’s respectable benevolence—and in doing so moralizes their respective class statuses, communicated through the medium of affectation.

Sustained by these juxtapositions, Jekyll may be expected to be an abstainer—*if* Hyde was an alcoholic. However, he is not. He is Alcohol, or rather he embodies the degenerative effects of alcohol, and it follows that Jekyll’s relationship to drink is similarly complicated. In



fact, in his book's third chapter, "Alcohol in the Text...", Reed explicates Jekyll's allegorical function as the text's alcoholic. Through repeated allusions to the drug that transforms Jekyll into Hyde and Hyde into Jekyll as a "liquor," "draught" and "cup," all contemporary euphemisms for alcohol, Reed establishes Jekyll's addiction to alcohol and Hyde as his drunken persona. Still, it is not until Jekyll's letter, the novella's closing chapter, that the repercussions of this alcoholism are realized. For instance, narrating his first experience under the influence, Jekyll describes, "something strange in my *sensations*... a current of disordered *sensual* images... delighted me like wine" (Stevenson). The polyptoton of 'sense' in "sensation" and "sensual" grounds Jekyll's alcoholism in contemporary fears of alcohol's perversion of affect and doctors' capacity for feeling, as the drug's effect is "like[ened]" to wine's. This scene recalls—and reverses—Uttersson's humanizing wine-drinking at the beginning of the novella and thus subverts his perspective of Jekyll as the epitome of middle-class respectability.

In truth, Jekyll was always already Hyde. The doctor elaborates, "[t]he drug... shook the doors... of my disposition" (Stevenson). The Oxford English Dictionary defines "disposition" as the "relative position" of "parts" or "elements" of "a whole" ("Disposition"). Sh[a]k[ing]" up or re-"position[ing]" these "parts," the drug dislodges Hyde from Jekyll's "whole." Hyde is not Jekyll, but Jekyll *has always been* Hyde. This ambivalent positioning between and within their subjectivities becomes apparent throughout Jekyll's letter through the variance in pronoun use. Sometimes events are narrated from Jekyll's point-of-view and at others from Hyde's. This ambiguity culminates in Jekyll's expression, "He, I say—I cannot say, I" (Stevenson). At first, Jekyll's meaning seems clear: he cannot use "I" when writing of Hyde, who is othered as a "he." However, in his essay "The Antinomies of Masculinity in *The Strange Case...*," Ed Cohen dubs this the text's "most extraordinary sentence" (195). This is due to its rich ambiguity. What, really,

“can” and “cannot” Jekyll say? As Cohen notes, a negation, or “not,” on the side of Jekyll’s “I” disrupts the sentence’s parallelism. For Cohen this articulates “the elusive point of juncture” or “slippage” between Jekyll and Hyde” (195). More specifically, it performs the chimeric multiplicity of subjectivity itself. As a disgruntled positioning of parts under the influence of the drug, Jekyll “cannot” articulate a singular, unified “I.” Thus contextualized by the text’s class-coded discourses on degeneration, this failure on the part of Jekyll’s subjectivity threatens the uniformity of middle-class male respectability. Furthermore, it suggests that degeneration is never merely an external threat but an internal reality. Respectability erected an impenetrable wall between working-class vice and middle-class virtue, yet Jekyll’s identity as the drunkard-doctor reveals the hypocrisy of these rhetorical distinctions.

This hypocrisy reverberates in Utterson’s character. Utterson’s dedication to Jekyll is not altruistic: Hyde’s proximity to Jekyll exposes Utterson’s own insecurities in his middle-class subjectivity. To dispel with Hyde would be to secure both men’s status. As such, Utterson reconstructs Jekyll and Hyde’s relationship in the terms of a class conflict. Enfield “suppose[s]” that Hyde’s access to Jekyll’s checkbook—used to pay off the spectators to Hyde’s child-trampling—to be the result of “[b]lackmail” (Stevenson). Thus framed, Utterson navigates the “strange case” of Jekyll and Hyde through his class anxieties. For instance, reflecting on Hyde’s supposed blackmailing, Utterson admits that Jekyll “was wild when he was young,” and Hyde must be “the ghost of some old sin” (Stevenson). The diction “young,” “ghost” and “old” erects a temporal distance between Jekyll and Hyde but in doing so recalls “Pulvis et Umbra”’s emergent man, or “wild... you[th].” This precarious meditation on Jekyll’s past sparks a contemplation of Utterson’s own: it “was fairly blameless... yet he was humbled to the dust by the many ill things he had done, and raised up again into a sober... gratitude by the many he had come so near to

doing.” The contradiction in the quantitative modifiers “*fairly* blameless” and “*many* ill things” obscure the reality of Utterson’s past, and this ambiguity heightens his “near[ness]” to “many” more “ill things.” Moreover, his claim to being “humbled to the dust” recalls “Pulvis et Umbra,” literally meaning ‘dust and shadow,’ where man “is the disease of the agglutinated dust” (Stevenson qtd. in Manning 182). In this way, Jekyll’s proximity to Hyde forces Utterson into contact with, or “humble[s]” him to, his own “near[ness]” to degeneration.

Why, though, does Utterson feel “so near” degeneration? As with Jekyll, the answer lies with his drinking—and its affective manifestations. In the previous quotation Utterson’s contemplation of his past is “sober[ing].” This allusion to sobriety is meaningful in the repeated mentions of Utterson’s drinking. As Reed announces, Utterson was a “confirmed tippler,” in contrast to a teetotaler (28). In and of itself, this was not unrespectable: to drink was not to get drunk. Additionally, by the end of the nineteenth century, the upper and upper-middle classes began to distance themselves from teetotal Temperance: teetotalers’ calls for a ban of *all* alcohol sales upset many respectable men who enjoyed wine as a marker of their class status (98-99). In fact, as it is today, wine was exclusively associated with the upper classes in the nineteenth century. This connection underscores the moral privilege of the elite, as evidenced by earlier references to alcohol’s positive affect being *wine*’s in particular. In contrast, gin, “traditional[ly] tie[d] to crime and the social ‘residuum,’” was imagined to be the drink of the lower classes (29). The moral defect associated with the poor is likewise apparent in the popular personification of alcohol’s degenerative effects as the *Gin-Juggernaut*. *The Strange Case* follows suit: by mapping wine and gin onto different classes, Utterson and Hyde’s characterizations engage the moral connotations of different alcoholic beverages.

Nevertheless, Utterson's drinking habits disrupt this binary of alcohol type—and affective capacity. The novella's first paragraph introduces Utterson: "He... drank gin... to mortify a taste for vintages; ...But he had an approved tolerance for others; sometimes wondering, almost with envy, at the... spirits involved in their misdeeds" (Stevenson). Like Jekyll and Hyde, Utterson's drinking informs his affect: both reek of the potential for excess. That Utterson risks contact with gin—and "the downgoing men" that it begets—to "mortify" his "taste" for wine betokens the necessity of this discipline: Utterson "sometimes wonder[s]" and "almost... env[ies]" the "spirits involved in" others' "misdeeds." Referring both to emotional intensity and alcoholic beverages, these "spirits" expose Utterson's fascination with—and perhaps longing for—indulgence without reserve. Is this not what Hyde is for Jekyll? Unrestrained by the regimen of respectability, he "drink[s] pleasure" and "tast[es] delight." He resides in Soho near a "gin palace," but his apartment houses "a closet filled with wine." Is this not what Utterson yearns for? Like Utterson allows gin into a middle-class space, Hyde invites wine into a working-class environment. Each entails an unorthodox proximity of wine and gin—and thus an uncanny proximity of respectability and degeneration.

Hyde's uncanny likeness to Utterson accounts for the lawyer's failure to enforce narrative resolution. Colloquial use of the term 'uncanny' originates from psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud's theory of the return of the repressed past. In the original German the 'uncanny' was the "unheimlich," literally translating to "unhomely" (Freud). This reflects Freud's articulation of the *unheimlich* as something once familiar but now strange. Thus, the *unheimlich* describes an encounter with something/one that triggers repressed memories of childhood experiences or developmental trauma (Freud). Hyde provokes the *unheimlich* for Utterson. For example, as aforementioned, Hyde literally haunts Utterson's dreams—and thus unconscious. Utterson's first

meeting with Hyde confirms this: Hyde enters Jekyll's laboratory "like one approaching *home*" (Stevenson, italics added). That Hyde is "*like* one" suggests he is, in fact, *not*. This spotlights Utterson's incredulity at Jekyll's laboratory and Hyde's "home" being the same place. Further, upon confrontation, Utterson finds that Hyde is "without any nameable malformation" but excites "hitherto unknown disgust... and fear" (italics added). Utterson's failure to "name" or "know" the origin of his visceral emotional response underscores his unconscious's role in this reaction, and in this way, Hyde embodies not only the return of Utterson's repressed past—but the return of *humanity's* biological past, and this recalls Hyde as the model of the early human in "Pulvis et Umbra."

As such, Hyde's primal body stalls narrative progression by suspending Utterson's unconscious in the past and undermining his agency to push the plot toward resolution. As Cohen highlights, this deferment of narrative resolution "complicates the... identification of narrative as the 'space' within which the male [middle-class] character is textually embodied" (187). Specifically, in light of his "tipp[ing]," Utterson's failure to "embody" a textual resolution—and his "withdrawal to the position of reader" to the text's closing letters—enables the insight that (187), just as Utterson fails to estrange Jekyll from Hyde through the discourse of class conflict, the spectacle of the working-class drunkard fails to mask the presence of degeneration within middle-class subjects themselves, and the collapse of these borders underscores humanity's universal vulnerability to degradation.

In this way, the intertwined narratives of Jekyll-Hyde and Utterson expose the fragile borders between virtue and vice, civilization and savagery, temperance and excess. Hyde's embodiment of degeneration unearths the unsettling proximity of these traits within the ostensibly respectable middle class. Meanwhile, Jekyll's cohabitation with Hyde signifies the collapse of these

distinctions and suggests that the border between the respectable and the degenerate is not only fragile—but *illusory*. Further, by situating Utterson as both a participant in and a reader of these events, the novella implicates its audience in this rupture and challenges them to confront the *unheimlich* presence of their own transgressions. Thus, by building on the sensation fiction of the 1860's, *The Strange Case* spotlights the meta-use of affect in fin de siècle texts: the horror *in and of* the novella ensured its popular circulation—yet enabled social critique, and as the decades wore on, texts tested the limitations of this affect as a vehicle for the taboo.

#### 4. Becoming Beast: Animalistic Appetites and Perverse Empathies of the Middle-Class in H. G. Wells's *The Island of Dr. Moreau*

The subversive potential of *The Strange Case*'s investigation into middle-class degeneration is somewhat inhibited by its use of Hyde as an externalization of that degeneration. However, emboldened by the success of late sensation fiction, texts published during the final years of the century stripped away this veneer of externalization to directly confront the degenerated self. For example, H. G. Wells's 1896 *The Island of Dr. Moreau* implodes the boundaries of respectability by interrogating the intersections of class, affect and alcohol within the framework of vivisection—and the de/evolutionary discourses it was couched in. Specifically, the text contrasts Montgomery and Prendick as divergent models of middle-class male subjectivity through their varied tolerances for alcohol and the Beast Folk as hallmarks of degeneration. Ultimately, Prendick's dependence on the Dog-man, paralleled to Montgomery's perverse empathy for M'ling, occasions his own degeneration, and this challenges the reader's sympathy with Prendick as a middle-class hero by implicating them in this degeneration.

To probe the fragile borders of human identity, *The Island* taps into late fin de siècle anxieties surrounding degeneration—and vivisection. Fears of degeneration peaked in the

1890's, the same decade Wells published *The Island of Dr. Moreau* ("Degeneration"). This surge in degenerative discourses coincided with the rise of experimental physiology, or rather the use of vivisection by experimental physiologists. Defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as "the action... of performing dissection, or other painful experiment, upon living animals as a method of... study" ("Vivisection"), vivisection sensationalized Victorian discourses on affect and debates on how to define humanity through humaneness. In truth, the English Antivivisection Movement was almost synonymous with the Humanitarian Movement broadly, creating a cultural backdrop that equated a Victorian's stance on vivisection with their moral—and social—identity. As a result, debates about vivisection became entangled with notions of class, gender and race (Bates 14).

Specifically, the practice of vivisection ignited fin de siècle debates around moral degeneration—and all its socioeconomic implications. As Jed Mayer elucidates in "The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Laboratory Animals," the rhetoric of de/evolution was used by both defenders of and activists against vivisection to justify their varied views on the role of the emotions in science and medicine. Supposedly exemplified by the practitioner's ability to vivisect, "[t]he triumph of scientific reason over... the emotions" was "regarded as an evolutionary triumph of the human" over the animal (410). Inversely, in the writings of antivivisectionists, this sterilization of the emotional kinship between humans and animals was "figured as... devolutionary regression," or degeneration (401). As A. W. H. Bates elaborates, public sentiment often aligned with the latter stance, and this was partly due to sensational portrayals of vivisectioners. For example, in the 1820's French physiologist François Magendie performed public vivisections—and "shock[ed]" English spectators with his sadism. As Bates confirms, sustained by multiple eyewitnesses, "the rumour that Magendie found experimentation

pleasurable” was not “unreasonable” (17). Magendie’s reported “pleasur[es]” transgress practitioners’ rhetorical appeals to scientific objectivity—and exemplifies why such pleas were often ineffective. Public scandals like Magendie’s augmented fears that vivisection did not just passively sterilize affect—but actively corrupted it.

*The Island*’s characterization of Dr. Moreau recalls these fears. Scholars have long noted the novel’s sensationalization of degeneration through its portrayal of vivisection. On a remote island off the South American coast, Dr. Moreau—the archetypal Cruel Doctor—transforms animals into humans through painful, live experimentation, creating the island’s “Beast Folk.” Defending his vivisection against Prendick’s “horrors,” the doctor propounds the evolutionary advantage of prioritizing “intellectual desire” over “[s]ympathetic pain” (Wells). This dichotomy of “intellectual[ism]” and “sympath[y]” recalls Mayer’s explanation of practitioners privileging “reason” over “emotions.” However, Moreau taints his claim to intellectual objectivity by discussing his “desire[s],” and this implicates his experiments in the nexus of sadistic “pleasur[e]” associated with vivisectors throughout the nineteenth century. Thus, recalling fears of degeneration through the brutalization of affect, Moreau’s defective desire acts as a touchstone against which Montgomery and Prendick’s affects are measured.

Specifically, Moreau’s regressive desire recalls broader fears of degenerative leisure, and this discourse on pleasure/leisure contextualizes Montgomery and Prendick’s varied relationships to affect by recalling Victorian anxieties over alcohol. In *The Transforming Draught* Thomas L. Reed explains that as an advent of industrialization, wage labor increased the working class’s free time, or leisure, and the upper and middle classes feared that under this “monster called Leisure,” “‘pleasure’ was.... devolving into... ‘abuse’” (Reed 171). Accordingly, the pleasures said to be most “abuse[d]” were in the public-house and among the



lower classes—to purportedly degenerative consequence. In fact, Reed quotes Brian Harrison’s seminal *Drink and the Victorians*, “the nineteenth-century temperance debate was really an argument about *how leisure should be spent*” (qtd. in Reed 171, italics added). Nevertheless, the lower classes were not the only Victorians “leisur[ing],” and in his article “Leisure, Respectability and the Male Middle Classes...,” Mike J. Huggins calls for greater scholarly attention to *middle-class* leisure. He asserts that the historical focus on “formal, institutional, and respectable” recreations obscures the middle class’s lived experiences (585). As such, he exposes the ways in which members of the middle class “weake[ned]” respectability by “associat[ing] with... gambling, sex and alcohol” (588). In these “contested” cultural spaces, male leisure in particular became “a zone where social distinctions were vulnerable,” and “association[s] were cross-class” (588). Under this lens of male middle-class leisure as contested cultural space, *The Island*’s exploration of middle-class male identity takes on new significance, particularly as seen in Montgomery and Prendick’s varied relationship to alcohol as a framework for their affective capacities.

For instance, Montgomery’s excessive drinking challenges middle-class respectability. His education in biology from London’s “College University” suggests his middle-class status by linking him to a respectable profession—and a prestigious education (Wells). Nevertheless, despite being an “educated man,” Montgomery frequently drinks “whisky” and “brandy.” Unlike Utterson, his preference does not lie with wine, and this challenges the discursive link between the middle class and respectable drinking. As Geoffrey Best elucidates, “respectable people did not get drunk” (283). However, as the narrative progresses, Montgomery’s “vice of drunkenness” becomes apparent: unlike Utterson and more like Jekyll, he does not drink liquors to mortify himself; he drinks to get drunk. However, to be middle class and unrespectable was

oxymoronic, so Montgomery's simultaneous "educat[ion]" and "vice" positions the middle class—the paragons of respectability—in uncanny proximity with unrespectability, typically associated with the lower classes and their drinking. This juxtaposition sustains the tension between class identity and moral degeneration that characterizes Montgomery's character arc.

In particular, Montgomery's alcoholism is likened to an animalistic appetite. This not only challenges middle-class respectability but connects it to biological degeneration. Similar to Luke Marks's animalistic body in *Lady Audley's Secret*, recurring references to Montgomery's "slobbering articulation, with... a lisp" and a "dropping nether lip" that reveal "irregular teeth" likens his physicality to the grotesque qualities of the Beast Folk (Wells). In particular, the focus on his mouth—"lisp," "lip," "teeth"—suggests a connection between his animality and drinking. Dr. Moreau reinforces this correlation when he remarks, "I wish... you [Montgomery] had kept your taste for meat in hand." Compelled by his desire for fresh meat, Montgomery releases rabbits upon the island. The Leopard-man and Hyena-swine-man hunt and eat these rabbits, and this indulgence in their natural hunger marks the beginning of the Beast Folk's regression from man to animal. In this way, the Beast Folk's "tast[ing]" of "blood" parallels Montgomery's "taste for meat," and this inscribes their mutually excessive appetites in a discourse of moral/biological degeneration. For example, one of the Beast Folk confesses, "for every one the want is bad," and that the want is "bad" speaks to both its quality and quantity: it is wanted "bad[ly]," and this is "bad." This "bad[ness]" evokes Victorian discourses on morality, but by mirroring the Beast Folk's hunger, Montgomery's degenerative appetite—for meat *and* alcohol—surpasses moral rhetoric into biological reality.

Montgomery's animalistic alcoholism exacerbates this suggestion of middle-class degeneration, as the Beast Folk's likeness to the working class couches their appetites—and thus

Montgomery's—in middle-class anxieties about the lower classes' abuse of alcohol.

Traditionally, the Beast Folk have been compared to a racial or colonial Other, but there persists a reading of the Beast Folk as the working class. For instance, Bates notes that Victorian anti-cruelty associations sought “to control... an underclass who... if permitted to acquire a taste for blood, might... become ungovernable” (15). Bates's use of the phrase “taste for blood” parallels the Beast Folk's “tast[ing]” of “blood.” Likewise, the Leopard-man and Hyena-swine-man's literal consumption of blood leads to the collapse of order on the island by kick-starting the Beast Folk's degeneration, and this resembles the middle-class belief that the lower class's abusive appetites would result in social upheaval. Moreover, Prendick describes the Beast Folk as “slave[s]” and “serfs,” “trained... to their [Montgomery and Moreau's] service” (Wells). This characterizes the power difference between Montgomery/Moreau and the Beast through the exploitation of labor, or “service.” In this way, the Beast Folk are not only symbols of biological degeneration but representations of the lower class as targets of middle-class subjugation, or “control,” driven by fears of that degeneration.

*The Island's* use of the Beast Folk as a working-class allegory is particularly evident through the Beast Person M'ling, ironically described as Montgomery's “man,” or servant (Wells). Prendick reveals, “Montgomery had *trained* [M'ling] to... discharge all... *domestic offices*” (italics added). He elaborates that M'ling was “scarcely so intelligent as the Ape-man, but far more docile.” Enriching the text's commentary on class power, the distinction between M'ling and the Ape-man invokes Michel Foucault's concept of the “docile and useful” body—a body that, through ritual discipline, becomes an instrument of power (1499). It is not his “intelligen[ce]” but his “docil[ity],” or ability to be “trained,” that sets M'ling apart from the rest of the Beast Folk. As such, his utility derives from his compliance with authority, and this echoes

Foucault's concept of biopower, which describes the power over bodies sustained by inscriptions of that power on the body (1499). This accounts for the text's obsession with M'ling's physicality. Upon meeting, Prendick repeatedly describes M'ling: a "hairy" and "black figure" with a "deformed" body and eyes that "shone with... light" (Wells). By recording M'ling's body over and again, Prendick seeks to regain control over it—by knowing it. Thus, through the text's treatment of M'ling, *The Island* spotlights the ways in which the middle class subjugated the working class through rhetoric, and this attention to discursive class power further complicates Montgomery's own subjectivity.

Simply, Montgomery's affinity for—and likeness to—M'ling fully develops the conflict between his class identity, alcohol consumption and affective capacity. Marked by deviance in different ways, M'ling and Montgomery's bodies are both hyper visible in the text. As such, both Moreau and Prendick suspect Montgomery's perverse empathy for the Beast Folk. Moreau suggests that Montgomery "regard[s] them as almost normal human beings," and Prendick remarks that Montgomery "half likes some of those beasts" (Wells). Through qualifiers like "almost," "half" and "some," Moreau and Prendick reveal their mutual incredulity at "regard[ing]" or "lik[ing]" the Beast Folk. In contrast, after Moreau's death, Montgomery, drunk, delivers a "maudlin defence of the Beast People" and champions M'ling as "the only thing that... cared for him." Juxtaposed by Prendick's frequent complaints of Montgomery's "expressionless eyes" "void of expression," this outburst of emotion reflects contemporary fears about affect. Like Robert Audley from *Lady Audley's Secret*, Montgomery struggles to "express" feelings towards Prendick but demonstrates a "maudlin" "care" for M'ling. Moreover, that his affection is "maudlin," or drunkenly excessive, delegitimizes his empathy in a manner that recalls Moreau's defense of vivisection: as Bates explains, physiologists who supported

vivisection as a medium for scientific progress often dismissed antivivisectionists as unduly sentimental, “deficient in... manly, Christian virtues” like “fortitude and resolve” (21).

Prendick’s description of Montgomery’s emoting recalls this disregard for sentimentalism.

Moreover, Montgomery’s emotional “deficien[cy]” is informed by his alcoholism: as Montgomery’s drinking escalates, his association with the Beast Folk deepens. For example, after Montgomery’s “maudlin” demonstrations, Prendick concedes, “You’ve made a beast of yourself” (Wells). Whether referring to his emoting or drinking, Prendick identifies Montgomery’s habitual excesses as “beast[ial].” Specifically, the act of “ma[king] a beast” recalls—and reverses—Moreau’s acts of making men—i.e., the Beast Folk,—and this confirms Montgomery’s alcoholism as a degenerative process, as it sustains his transgressive empathy for the Beast Folk. In brief, Montgomery’s animalistic alcoholism threatens the discursive boundaries of respectability that shielded the middle class from accusations of degeneration, and Prendick attempts to mitigate this threat by dehumanizing his body and his emotions.

Expectedly, Prendick appears to perform a stable middle-class respectability—through both his abstinence and affect. Denying Montgomery’s offer of brandy early in the novel, Prendick explains to the reader, “I have been an abstainer from my birth” (Wells). Linking abstinence to “birth,” Prendick uses his drinking—or lack thereof—to distance his human identity from Montgomery’s animalistic appetite. By the end of the century, teetotal Temperance was becoming increasingly associated with working class extremists. Nevertheless, Prendick’s abstinence, when in addition to his education in “biology” and training by the prominent evolutionist Thomas Henry “Huxley,” serves as a marker of his upper-middle class respectability—in contrast to Montgomery’s drinking and, as will be discussed, Moreau’s cruelty.

Bolstered by this abstinence, Prendick's respectability informs his affectation. Unmoved by Moreau's evolutionary defense of vivisection, Prendick condemns the doctor's experimentations as "wantonly cruel" (Wells). In fact, "[i]t was th[is] wantonness of it that stirred [him]." His fixation on Moreau's "wantonness" evokes the rhetoric of Anti-Cruelty legislation. For example, the Cruel and Improper Treatment of Cattle Act of 1820, the first major Anti-Cruelty law to be passed, outlawed "wanton"—in contrast to justifiable—violence against cattle animals (Bates 17). As such, Prendick's rhetoric aligns him with English humanitarianism. Nevertheless, as suggested in his attitude towards Montgomery's emoting, he is still careful to maintain an affective boundary between himself and the beasts. In this way, he demonstrates a respectable capacity for moderating affect: he is neither "cruel" like Moreau nor "maudlin" like Montgomery, as too little or too much affect could threaten his humanity.

This contrast between Montgomery and Prendick builds tension between the men as the narrative progresses. Despite his early declaration that he "felt [he] understood" Montgomery, Prendick distances himself more as Montgomery's drinking worsens. Ultimately, he concedes that Montgomery's "long separation from humanity, his secret vice of drunkenness, his evident sympathy with the Beast People, tainted him to" Prendick. Lacking a coordinating conjunction, the closely paralleled phrases "separation from humanity," "vice of drunkenness," and "sympathy with the Beast People" explicitly equate species identity, biological degeneration, and affective capacity. Plus, Montgomery's "taint[ing]" evokes Prendick's recurring reference to "*bestial taint[s]*" (italics added). In this way, Prendick regulates his relationship to Moreau and Montgomery through discourse—in order to police their social identities, and through this, Prendick upholds the middle-class male identity Montgomery threatens—morally, socially and biologically.

For example, contrasting Montgomery's defective empathy for M'ling, Prendick's relation to the Dog-man seems to model proper middle-class sympathy. After Moreau and Montgomery's deaths by the Beast Folk, Prendick readily accepts the Dog-man as a "slave" and assumes the role of the "Master" (Wells). The Dog-man's deference to Prendick's authority bolsters the distinction between Prendick and Montgomery/the Beast Folk's working-class associations. For instance, the Dog-man is interchangeably called the "Saint Bernard-man." This specification may seem arbitrary, but as explored with Robert Audley's mutts in *Lady Audley's Secret*, breed matters. To reiterate, Tarquin Holmes outlines the Victorian middle-class "belief in... specific breed... moral characteristics," culminating in the privileging and valuing of "pedigrees and lapdogs" over "street mutts" (202). Thus, Prendick's relationship with the Saint Bernard-man couches him in the middle-class male tradition of petkeeping. In particular, Prendick identifies the Dog-man as "this poor dog of mine, my last friend" (Wells). Here Prendick communicates sympathy through the words "poor" and "friend," but he maintains a middle-class hierarchy, or ethos of ownership, through the specification of "mine" and "my." This aligns with Keridiana Chez's articulation of the goal of respectable petkeeping: fostering feeling and exemplifying governance. In short, Prendick's relationship with the Dog-man reinforces his performance of middle-class authority by balancing sympathy with dominance.

Nevertheless, Prendick's reliance on the Dog-man unveils the fragility of this authority. Upon the Dog-man's death, now just a dog, Prendick, too, regresses. After the Hyena-swine kills the dog, Prendick confesses, "I too adopted... the practice of slumbering in the daytime... to be on my guard at night" (Wells). Without his dog to protect, or "guard," him, Prendick confronts the new law of the island, governed by Darwin's theory of survival-of-the-fittest. As such, he concedes, "I too must have undergone strange changes." He hedges his statement with the verb

phrase “must have,” like he is unsure if he ‘had,’ but he nevertheless admits that his skin “tanned,” hair grew “long” and “matted,” and eyes became “brigh[t]” and “swift.” These details mirror the recurring descriptions of the Beast Folk’s uncanny bodies, especially M’ling’s. Further, in both statements, Prendick begins with, “I too,” and this repetition of “too” reinforces Prendick’s identification with the Beast Folk. He degenerates *alongside* them. In this way, the Dog-man’s death collapses the boundary between the human and the animal for Prendick: not only does he look like a beast, but he acts like one, too. Discourse cannot save him. In brief, Prendick’s dependence on the Dog-man disrupts his respectable identity and destabilizes the distinction between species and classes that he once clung to and sought to maintain. As in *Lady Audley’s Secret* and *The Strange Case*, the kinship between man and animal allows for the subversion of hierarchies: that the Dog-man “guard[ed]” Prendick echoes the text’s enactments of Foucauldian power: If the Dog-man was the “guard,” was Prendick not the inmate? This hints at the ways in which middle-class bodies are disciplined and punished by the very discourses they proliferate (Foucault).

As such, Prendick’s degeneration undermines the reader’s identification with him. Besides a brief introduction by his nephew, Prendick’s narration constitutes the text. Framing Prendick’s journal, underneath the title “The Island of Dr. Moreau,” there is an aside in parentheses, “(The Story written by Edward Prendick.)” (Wells). Assumedly penned by the nephew, this stages the authenticity of the text and coerces the reader to sympathize with Prendick—especially in contrast to the other humans in the “story” like Montgomery and Moreau. Moreover, at moments in the text, Prendick addresses the reader directly. He goads, “Imagine the scene if *you* can!” or “Imagine *yourself* surrounded by all the most horrible cripples and maniacs...” (italics added). This use of the second person draws the reader closer to



Prendick's point-of-view. His incredulity draws upon his preconceived notion of his reader's middle-class sensibilities, and this exacerbates the affect—*in* and *of* the text—of Prendick's ultimate regression. Like Prendick degenerates alongside the Beast Folk, the reader is invited to degenerate alongside Prendick. Similar to the meta-use of affect in *The Strange Case*, this shared experience brings the text's discourse on the instability of class—and species—identity into the real world through the reader's "imagin[ation]" and sympathy.

Thus, Well's *The Island of Dr. Moreau* intersects affect, class and alcohol to implode the middle class's policing of identity. Through Montgomery's alcoholism and Prendick's abstinence, the text reveals the arbitrary boundaries that separate man from animal—and the social from the biological. Moreover, by coercing the reader to assume Prendick's increasingly compromised perspective, *The Island* extends its critique of its middle-class characters to its middle-class audience. Ultimately, the text suggests that the very discourses that uphold class and species distinction are just as capable of dissolving them. As in *Lady Audley's Secret* and *The Strange Case*, this reinforces Victorians' real investments in critiquing mainstream discourses by sensationalizing them.

##### 5. Conclusion: A Summary of and Reflection on Victorians' Use of Sensation Literature as a Mode of Cultural Critique

This exploration of alcohol and its affect in late Victorian sensation literature reveals the era's ambivalent engagements with its own cultural anxieties. By linking intoxication to emotional excess, animalistic behavior and moral decline, texts like *Lady Audley's Secret*, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, and *The Island of Dr. Moreau* underscore the middle class's fraught negotiations with respectability. Specifically, affect, in its excesses and/or

deficiencies, becomes a vehicle through which these texts destabilized the borders between the human and animal, respectable and degenerate, self and other.

In Mary Elizabeth Braddon's 1862 sensation novel *Lady Audley's Secret*, alcohol begets affect by magnifying working-class brutality and embodying middle-class fears of social collapse. However, as the text's animalistic alcoholic, Luke Marks's self-awareness exposes the dependence of middle-class respectability on the dehumanization of the lower classes and in doing so challenges readers to consider their own complicity with the discourses that produce such deviance.

Then, Robert Louis Stevenson's 1888 horror novella *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* proliferates this critique by allegorizing alcohol as a disruption to the barriers between respectability and degeneration. Specifically, through Dr. Jekyll's failure to master his alcoholism and Utterson's inability to justify it, the text exposes the myth of the middle-class ideal and its complicity in the very degeneration it seeks to suppress. By embedding this critique within a narrative of failed resolution, the novella implicates its readers in the deconstruction of this myth.

Finally, H. G. Wells's 1896 science fiction *The Island of Dr. Moreau* eschews the pretense of externalizing degeneration and instead directly confronts the degeneration of middle-class subjectivity. Explored through Montgomery and Prendick as divergent models of middle-class male identity, alcohol and vivisection arise as twin forces of degeneration that blur the lines between man and animal. Despite his attempts to mediate this corruption through discourse, Prendick regresses, too, and this challenges the limits of readers' sympathies by implicating them in this regression.

Adept at articulating—and even subverting—the often-unspoken fears and desires of the time, sensation fiction wielded alcohol not just as a motif of vice but as a medium for and reflection of social taboos. Together, the texts explored harness the affect of the sensation genre to push at the limitations of middle-class propriety and unpack the real-lived consequences of these discourses. Significantly, in these texts affect bridges the gap between narrative and reader, and in doing so they do more than mirror their cultural moment: they challenge it. This impetus towards resistance unveils Victorians' appreciation for their culture's shortcomings—an insight that still resonates today, as the English-speaking world still grapples with the lasting consequences of Victorian norms and taboos.

## Works Cited

- “Alcoholism.” *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, July 2023. Accessed Nov. 2024.
- Bates, A. W. H. “Chapter 2: Vivisection, Virtue, and the Law in the Nineteenth Century.” *Anti-Vivisection and the Profession of Medicine in Britain: A Social History*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, London. *National Library of Medicine*, pp. 13-41.
- Best, Geoffrey. “The Social Order of Mid-Victorian Britain.” *Mid-Victorian Britain, 1851-1875*, Weidenfield & Nicolson, London, 1971, London. *InternetArchive*, pp. 250-305.
- Braddon, Mary Elizabeth. *Lady Audley’s Secret*, produced by Jonathan Ingram et al. *The Project Gutenberg*, Dec. 2020. Accessed Nov. 2024.
- Butler, Judith. “Chapter Three: Subversive Bodily Acts.” *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, 1990. *Taylor & Francis e-Library*, 2002, pp. 101-80.
- Chez, Keridiana. “Introduction: The Rise of the Prosthetic Dog.” *Victorian Dogs, Victorian Men: Affect and Animals in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture*. The Ohio State University Press, 2017, pp. 1-24.
- Cohen, Ed. “Hyding the Subject? The Antinomies of Masculinity in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*.” *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 37, no. 1-2, 2004, pp. 181-99.
- Cunningham, Valentine. “Goodness and Goods: Victorian Literature and Values for the Middle Class Reader.” *Victorian Values: A Joint Symposium of the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the British Academy, December 1990*, edited by T. C. Smout, Oxford University Press. *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Oxford University Press, 1992, pp. 109-27.
- De Quincey, Thomas. *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*, edited by Robert Morrison, Oxford University Press, 2013.

“Degeneration.” *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, June 2024. Accessed Nov. 2024.

“Disposition.” *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, Mar. 2024. Accessed Nov. 2024.

Fahnestock, Jeanne. “The Heroine of Irregular Features: Physiognomy and Conventions of Heroine Description.” *Victorian Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Social, Political, and Cultural Studies*, vol. 24, no. 3, 1981, pp. 325-50.

Foucault, Michel. “The Carceral.” *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated by Alan Sheridan, 1975. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, edited by Vincent B. Leitch et al., no. 2, pp. 1490-1502.

Freud, Sigmund. “From *The ‘Uncanny.’*” *The ‘Uncanny,’* translated by Alix Strachey. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, edited by Vincent B. Leitch et al., no. 2, pp. 824-41.

Gilbert, Pamela K. “Introduction.” *A Companion to Sensation Fiction*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2011, pp. 1-10.

Holmes, Tarquin. “Science, Sensitivity and the Sociozoological Scale: Constituting and Complicating the Human-Animal Boundary at the 1875 Royal Commission on Vivisection and Beyond.” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, vol. 90, 29 Oct. 2021, pp. 194-207.

Huggins, Mike J. “More Sinful Pleasures? Leisure, Respectability and the Male Middle Classes in Victorian England.” *Journal of Social History*, vol. 33, no. 3, St. Martin’s College, 2000, pp. 585-600.

- Manning, Pascale McCullough. "The Hyde We Live in: Stevenson, Evolution, and the Anthropogenic Fog." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 46, no. 1, 2018, pp. 181-99.
- Mason, Nicholas. "'The Sovereign People are in a Beastly State': The Beer Act of 1830 and Victorian Discourse on Working-Class Drunkenness." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2001, pp. 109-27.
- Mayer, Jed. "The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Laboratory Animals." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 50, no. 3, 2008, pp. 399-417
- Reed, Thomas L. *The Transforming Draught: Jekyll and Hyde, Robert Louis Stevenson and the Victorian Alcohol Debate*, McFarland & Company, 2006, North Carolina.
- Rick, Sarah. "Gathering 'stray and benighted curs': Pet-keeping and Masculinity in *Lady Audley's Secret*." *Nineteenth-Century Gender Studies*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2022.
- Ritvo, Harriet. "A Measure of Compassion." *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age*, Harvard University Press, 1987, Cambridge. *The American Council of Learned Societies Humanities Ebook Collection*, pp. 125-66.
- Stevenson, Robert Louis. *The Strange Case Of Dr. Jekyll And Mr. Hyde*, produced by David Widger. The Project Gutenberg, Sept. 2016. Accessed Nov. 2024.
- "Vivisection." *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, July 2023. Accessed Nov. 2024.
- Wagner, Tamara S. "Phrenology and Representations of Physical Deviance in Victorian Fiction," edited by Richard Brewster. *Postgraduate English*, no. 5, 2002, pp. 1-17.
- Wells, H. G. *The Island of Dr. Moreau*, produced by Judith Boss and Andrew Sly. *The Project Gutenberg*, Dec. 2023. Accessed Nov. 2024.