

**Hyde and Seek in an Age of Surveillance:
Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*
and the BBC's *Jekyll***

Anna Lepine

(John Abbott College, Montreal, Canada)

Abstract:

Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* depicts a world in which crimes are constantly being "overlooked": witnessed and then ignored. Mr Utterson and his gentlemen's network strive to maintain silence about the crimes of their fellows, yet they find their authority threatened by those on the periphery of this community, especially servants, who transmit knowledge of crime to the new authorities of the police and the law. Unlike *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, which critiques the community's unwillingness to exorcise its inner monster, the BBC's *Jekyll* suggests instead that Hyde, who in the series represents love, might be an appropriate antidote to a society governed by corporate greed and surveillance.

Keywords: community, corporation, crime, Hyde, Jekyll, law, servant, Robert Louis Stevenson, surveillance, witnessing.

In Henry Jekyll's account of his double life, he remembers rejoicing at the knowledge that his murder of Sir Danvers Carew had been "overlooked"; because his crime has been witnessed, he can no longer assume the shape of Hyde without risking death (Stevenson 2005: 88). His choice of word is apt, for Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886) is a story of overlooking in both senses of the term – witnessing and pretending not to see. Importantly, the witnesses all belong to the same social group; as a result, while what they have seen is uncontrollable, what they say and whom they say it to is fiercely guarded, and they take justice into their own hands to protect the community. It is only when a peripheral member of this network of gentlemen calls on outside law enforcement that Jekyll can no longer hide, prompting the chain of events that leads to his suicide.

In the BBC's recent sequel to Stevenson's tale, *Jekyll* (2007), the dry old lawyer Utterson, whose role is to control the dissemination of information about his friend and client Dr Jekyll, becomes transmuted into the powerful corporation of Klein and Utterson. Rather than controlling the

flow of information to the public, Klein and Utterson controls everything: it specialises in surveillance and acquisition, and it has “more money than God” (Lipsey 2007: episode 6). As a descendant of Dr Jekyll (or, more appropriately, of the bastards sired by Mr Hyde), Tom Jackman embodies the dilemma of the modern individual living in an industrialised and highly panoptic society. Unlike Dr Jekyll, who is protected from his monstrous self by a network of friends willing to help rescue his image, Jackman’s world is governed by distrust, so that at the beginning of the series, almost everyone he knows is spying on him; not only that, but Jackman uses technology to spy too – on himself. Intent on keeping his secret even from his wife, Jackman rents a separate flat, equips it with surveillance cameras, hires a psychiatric nurse to watch over his transformations, and tracks his alter-ego’s movements using a dictaphone and a GPS device. Yet Jackman’s fears are misplaced. Whereas *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* critiques the community’s unwillingness to exorcise its inner monster, the BBC’s *Jekyll* posits, by contrast, that the biggest threat in our current world is not Hyde but the conscienceless corporation, and that Hyde (who in the series represents love) might be the only antidote to a society governed by greed and surveillance.¹

Reading Stevenson’s *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* alongside *Jekyll* suggests new avenues of interpretation, highlighting especially the importance of surveillance and community in the novel. Christian Gutleben and Susana Onega have named this conversation between classic and revised works “refraction.” They apply a “visual metaphor to literature and film in order to designate a double process involving the ways in which a text exploits and integrates both the reflections of a previous text *and* the new light shed on the original work by its rewriting” (Gutleben and Onega 2004: 7). Mark Llewellyn similarly describes the relationship between Victorian and neo-Victorian works in terms of doubleness, as a kind of “critical f(r)iction”, using the analogy of the palimpsest: “The importance of the palimpsest lies not in the writing of new texts over old ones, but in the simultaneous existence of both narratives on the same page, occupying the same space, and speaking in odd, obscure, and different ways to one another” (Llewellyn 2008: 170). The inherent duality of the Jekyll/Hyde character thus lends itself particularly well to neo-Victorian two-fold revisions. Furthermore, the emphasis on technology in *Jekyll*, particularly its use of video cameras with their multiple replays and reproductions of (self-)

images, echoes the doubled reflection of old and new texts within the same created space. In addition, the technological angle focuses attention on how Stevenson's novel foreshadows the uses and potential pitfalls of surveillance, and even its anticipation of present-day surveillance technology.

The Victorians tried to contain crime by coding the city into areas of light and dark, rich and poor, safe and unsafe; however, *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* demonstrates the fragility of such boundaries. After all, Hyde commits his most notable crimes not in darkened, impoverished Soho but under the bright lamps of bourgeois neighbourhoods. In his essay 'A Plea for Gas Lamps', Stevenson describes the new electric street lighting as "a lamp for a nightmare!" because, he claims, "[s]uch a light should shine only on murders and public crime, or along the corridors of lunatic asylums, a horror to heighten horror" (Stevenson 1905: 131). Rather than preventing crime, shining a light on it merely creates awareness of its existence. As Linda Dryden points out, Hyde's crimes "occur under the lamplight designed to reduce crime, or enable its detection. The fact that such illumination does not deter Hyde's brutality is even more sinister" (Dryden 2003: 93). Just as the Victorians could not seem to reduce crime by illuminating it, so Western governments have been unable to eliminate major or minor offences through surveillance. As Laura K. Donohue explains, CCTV cameras offer valuable opportunities for collecting evidence after disasters have happened (such as the London transit bombings of July 2005); however, the secrecy surrounding the use of surveillance by governments makes it difficult to collect reliable information about whether crime is actually prevented by cameras (Donohue 2008: 214). Paradoxically, in the nineteenth century and today, shedding light on criminals can breed distrust, which seems only to increase the presence of 'evil' in our streets.

With their penchant for classification and control, the Victorians not only divided neighbourhoods into safe and unsafe, but also notoriously classified people into law-abiding and criminal types. Inspired by the evolutionary writings of his half-cousin Charles Darwin, Francis Galton used composite photography to determine the facial features shared by the "criminal type." Galton's process superimposed the portraits of criminals, making their common traits appear bolder and their individual traits fade away, resulting in ghostly, almost-human "criminal" faces. In his essay 'Composite Portraiture', Galton explains: "Nobody who glanced at one of

them for the first time would doubt its being the likeness of a living person, yet, as I have said, it is no such thing; it is a portrait of the type and not of an individual” (Galton 1883: 222). Galton’s composite photographs of criminals, which depict a “criminal type” but not an individual, eerily evoke Hyde, who is virtually impossible to describe yet seems to possess all the known features of evil. While Galton’s ideas now seem terribly outdated, the Victorian desire to recognise and quantify evil continues to motivate our current surveillance environment. The BBC’s *Jekyll* updates this desire by exploiting (even enhancing) the Orwellian conditions under which the British population currently lives. With ten percent of the world’s CCTV cameras operating on British soil (with an estimated 2.5-4 million such cameras distributed around Britain in 2003), Britons are the most observed people on earth. Furthermore, some of these cameras now include facial recognition software, which searches the crowd for known criminals (Donohue 2008: 214). While this software seeks individual faces, whereas Galton’s composite photographs sought “criminal types”, in both cases technology is used to recognise the features of criminality in an attempt to control aberrant and illegal behaviour. Both Stevenson’s novel and *Jekyll* convey a distrust of the powers of anonymous surveillance, and the alternative that each offers is intimately linked to its specific historical moment.

1. **Overlooking Evil in *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde***

The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde is a tale of witnessing and remaining silent, of wilful blindness about the evils that exist within the community. Importantly, ‘overlooking’ crimes is a feature of this tight communal network: crimes are witnessed, and criminals are protected, at least for a time. The smallness of the community soon becomes apparent, for all the major characters belong to the same tight network, what Raymond Williams would call a “knowable community”, distinct from the unknowable city. Williams stresses that community is less a question of geographical proximity than of consciousness; in much of Jane Austen’s fiction, for example, large sections of the population are simply erased from view (Williams 1973: 65-66). In *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, the knowable community is largely comprised of bourgeois gentlemen, including Hyde; on the periphery of this community are the servants, who belong both to the novel’s knowable community and to an unknown network outside the

boundaries of the novel. Virtually everyone in the novel is connected to this community: Enfield is Utterson's cousin; Dr Lanyon is an old friend of both Utterson and Jekyll; the maid who witnesses the murder of Sir Danvers Carew knows Mr Hyde, who has visited her master on business; Sir Danvers Carew is Utterson's client; the butler Poole and the rest of Jekyll's servants transact with their master and his entire circle, including Hyde, Utterson, and Lanyon. Importantly, though he has "numbered few familiars," even at the beginning of the narrative Hyde is an implicit member of this community, known not only to Jekyll but also to the witnessing maid, to her master, to Poole, and (in name) to Utterson (Stevenson 2005: 49). Paradoxically, while Jekyll hopes that each of his selves "could but be housed in separate identities" (Stevenson 2005: 79), going so far as to set up an apartment in Soho, a separate bank account, and practicing a different handwriting, his self-contained and vigilant community ensures that Hyde soon becomes known to everyone.² Hyper-visible and strange to look upon, Hyde is an evil hidden in plain sight, invisible to the community's members exactly because he is known to them. Watching its borders to keep evil out, the community does not observe the evil within its midst or, when it does, it protects the offender.

Hyde exploits the community's fear of the unknown by striking when the streets are virtually empty. He then quickly invokes his membership in the knowable community, so that the crime is absorbed by the network of gentlemen to which he belongs. With a name suggesting a lack of utterance (utter-sans), Mr Utterson acts as the community's primary witness and secret keeper, "the last reputable acquaintance and the last good influence on the lives of down-going men" (Stevenson 2005: 31). He listens quietly to accounts from eyewitnesses before enjoining them to an increasingly untenable silence on the subject of his friend Dr Jekyll. Mr Enfield, who narrates Hyde's first crime in the novel, tells Utterson that the night Hyde struck was so silent it seemed "as empty as a church" and invoked "that state of mind when a man listens and listens and begins to long for the sight of a policeman" (Stevenson 2005: 33). Significantly, it is the absence of community – not the presence of crime – that compels Enfield's desire to see law enforcement. Into this void, Hyde strikes, trampling a little girl in a manner that Enfield notes was "hellish to see" (Stevenson 2005: 33). As Linda Stirling observes, Stevenson's rendering of the nocturnal city sets the scene for "a clear eyewitness account of events,"

and his technique “of cutting between characters and scenes to create suspense” in some ways “foreshadow[s] the invention of the cinema” (Stirling 2004: 84). Similarly, John Tagg notes photography’s use as a form of credible evidence since the mid-nineteenth century, connected to the development of disciplinary institutions such as schools, asylums, the police, factories, and prisons (Tagg 1988: 5). Photography and law enforcement were linked in 1846, when the portraitist Mathew Brady was hired to record images of criminals for a British criminology textbook. By the end of the nineteenth century, Alphonse Bertillon’s version of the mug shot, the *portrait parlé* (or talking picture) had been adopted by police departments across Europe and America. As Ronald Thomas notes, “the assumption was, [the suspect’s] photograph could ‘talk’ too, and would invariably tell the ‘real’ truth about him” (Thomas 1995: 155-156). A human witness, Enfield utters a “view halloa”, which summons not the police, but “quite a group” of the local community (Stevenson 2005: 33). Thus, it is the community, and not the law, who must judge Hyde and his crimes.

Such personal witnessing proves painful, as to look at Hyde is to loathe him. The doctor himself “turned sick and white with a desire to kill him” (Stevenson 2005: 33). An embodiment of pure evil, Hyde is an affront to the community. To look at him is to desire to exorcise him, to obliterate him, never to *see* him again. Nevertheless, while the assembled company threaten to make Hyde visible by making “his name stink from one end of London to the other,” Hyde placates them (and remains invisible) by invoking his own belonging to the community, noting: “No gentleman but wishes to avoid a scene” (Stevenson 2005: 33-34). By calling himself a gentleman and naming a member of the community – the cheque he produces is made out in Dr Jekyll’s visible (“well known and often printed”) name – both Hyde and Jekyll escape exposure, as the tight-lipped Enfield “can’t mention” the name on the cheque even to his cousin Utterson (Stevenson 2005: 34). Enfield defends his secrecy with a metaphor that hints at the interconnectedness of the society to which he belongs:

You start asking questions and it’s like starting a stone. You sit quietly on the top of a hill; and away the stone goes, starting others; and presently some bland old bird (the last you would have thought of) is knocked on the head in his

own back garden and the family have to change their name.
 No sir, I make it a rule of mine: the more it looks like Queer
 Street, the less I ask. (Stevenson 2005: 35)

While Enfield does not know Hyde, he certainly knows someone who does. Hence, although he continues to watch the door, and although he can see Hyde in his mind's eye at any given moment, he makes a bargain with Utterson "never to refer to this again" (Stevenson 2005: 36).

Fittingly, it is the novel's detective figure, Mr Utterson, who famously thinks: "If he be Mr Hyde ... I shall be Mr Seek" (Stevenson 2005: 40). The need to see and know Hyde obsesses Utterson, so that "out of the shifting, insubstantial mists that had so long baffled his eye, there leaped up the sudden, definite presentiment of a fiend" (Stevenson 2005: 37). As the narrative's chief "eye," the perspective from which most of the limited omniscient tale is told, Utterson's need to see and record Hyde's presence echoes the reader's desire to "see" through the mists of narration and to envision the demon who haunts the pages.³ Although known to many of the community's members, however, Hyde is notoriously difficult to describe. He has "never been photographed," and although his image plagues the minds of all who see him, viewers describe a "haunting sense of unexpressed deformity" rather than specific physical characteristics (Stevenson 2005: 49). The desire to capture the ephemeral Hyde's image with some sort of technology recurs with some frequency, hinting at a future world in which surveillance is no longer communal, but institutional, and where the community no longer bears responsibility for policing illicit activity within its borders. Ronald R. Thomas argues that literary detectives like Mr Bucket and Sherlock Holmes popularised a system of "visual correction" and ultimately validated

photography as a technique of surveillance and discipline, an endorsement that may well have led to the widespread deployment of photography in actual nineteenth-century police work and to the transformation of the camera from an artistic device for portraying and honoring individuals to a powerful political technology with which to capture and control them. (Thomas 1995: 136)

Sherlock Holmes and Mr Bucket, however, are intent on exposing crimes. By contrast, Utterson's desire to see and know Hyde is motivated by a desire to keep Jekyll's secrets within the community. By witnessing and remaining silent, he helps to compound Hyde's crimes. When Utterson recalls his cousin's tale, he seems to long for surveillance tapes: "Mr Enfield's tale went by before his mind in a scroll of lighted pictures" (Stevenson 2005: 39). He dreams of a faceless figure who glides through "sleeping houses" and "through wider labyrinths of lamplighted city, and at every street corner crush[es] a child and leave[s] her screaming" (Stevenson 2005: 39). As Utterson's dreams attest, Hyde embodies a fear of the anonymity of crime that lurks within the city, an evil that seems too pervasive to be contained within a small community, yet is too important to be ignored.⁴ Just as Jekyll initially refuses to accept responsibility for his actions as Hyde, so too does the community fail to see that Hyde – however strange and unpleasant – is not an anonymous evil but one that comes from within itself.

In Stevenson's novel, the servants exist on the edges of the knowable community. Looking in and looking out, they also often know more than their masters. In *Aurora Floyd* (1862-63), Mary Elizabeth Braddon reveals a common perception about these "household spies": "Your servants listen at your doors, and repeat your spiteful speeches in the kitchen Nothing that is done in the parlour is lost upon these quiet, well-behaved watchers." (Braddon 1862-63: 238) Paradoxically, servants were hired to be looked at but were often accused of too much looking. As Judith Flanders points out, "many took having a servant as the definition for being middle class," a necessary status symbol (Flanders 2004: 93); on the other hand, servants could be dismissed for being too "curious" about their employers' business (Flanders 2004: 115). The nameless maid, who breaks the community's silence over the deeds of Mr Hyde and summons the police, exists on the fringes of the gentleman's network but, crucially, will never belong. Overlooking the street like a surveillance camera, the scene lit for her by the full moon, she witnesses the murder of Sir Danvers Carew. Her servant status places her bedroom at the top of the house and affords her the omniscience of her class, overlooking, as ever, the activities of her masters. At the point where Carew and Hyde meet, "they had come within speech (which was just under the maid's eyes)" (Stevenson 2005: 46). With her attention initially focused on the "old-world kindness" and elegance of

the elderly MP, she next becomes aware of Hyde: “Presently her eye wandered to the other, and she was surprised to recognise in him a certain Mr Hyde, who had once visited her master and for whom she had conceived a dislike” (Stevenson 2005: 46). Unlike a surveillance camera, the maid has the power to record and judge simultaneously. Yet like a surveillance camera, she is powerless to pursue the offender; she faints when she witnesses a murder committed on one member of her community by another, not coming to until the murderer has escaped. Importantly, though, as soon as she wakes up she summons the police, and this external knowledge of the crime is what ultimately causes Jekyll’s downfall. While the maid may have betrayed the gentleman’s network of secrecy, she trusts in the larger Victorian power structures of the police and the law.

Like the maid who loses consciousness upon recognising Hyde as a member of the community, Lanyon goes into a decline after witnessing the murderer Hyde “melt and alter” into his old friend Dr Jekyll “before [his] eyes” (Stevenson 2005: 77). While the maid recovers and seeks outside help, however, Lanyon remains silent. Importantly, Dr Lanyon was given a choice: to witness or not to witness this transformation. The presence of a murderer in his house is not enough to shake Lanyon’s faith, but to know that his own friend is the criminal undermines his reason: “I saw what I saw, I heard what I heard, and my soul sickened at it, and yet now when that sight has faded from my eyes, I ask myself if I believe it, and I cannot answer.” (Stevenson 2005: 77) Unable to ignore the evidence collected by his own eyes and ears, Lanyon nevertheless protects his friend’s secret by dying from the shock of witnessing the transformation and leaving an explanatory note to be opened only after Jekyll’s death or disappearance. A crime within the community is a crime *of* the community; Lanyon is willing to take his secret to the grave rather than publish it.

Dr Jekyll himself is willing to acknowledge Hyde as an aspect of himself only after his life is endangered by the fact that his murder of Sir Danvers Carew has been witnessed. In his “Full Statement of the Case,” Jekyll vacillates between the first and third person pronouns when speaking of himself and Hyde.⁵ Even after he has transformed into Hyde for the first time without the potion, he speaks of sleeping and waking in the first person: “I had gone to bed Henry Jekyll, I had awakened Edward Hyde” (Stevenson 2005: 84). Hurrying back to his laboratory, he switches from first to third person:

I ... had soon passed through the house, where Bradshaw stared and drew back at seeing Mr Hyde at such an hour and in such a strange array; and ten minutes later, Dr Jekyll had returned to his own shape and was sitting down, with a darkened brow, to make a feint of breakfasting. (Stevenson 2005: 85).

Although he is representing the viewpoint of Bradshaw, Jekyll's use of the third person for both his selves demonstrates that they are still on an equal footing. Importantly, though he will later distance himself from the act, he narrates the murder of Sir Danvers Carew in the first person: "With a transport of glee, I mauled the unresisting body, tasting delight from every blow" (Stevenson 2005: 87). He also describes his second unplanned metamorphosis in the first person: "the hand that lay on my knee was corded and hairy. I was once more Edward Hyde" (Stevenson 2005: 89). Throughout his planned and unplanned metamorphoses, therefore, Jekyll acknowledges Hyde to be a part of himself. It is only once he fears becoming visible to the community as a criminal, "an object marked out for observation," that Jekyll begins to distance himself from his evil side (Stevenson 2005: 90). Once he lacks the certainty of returning to his socially invisible self, he starts to speak of Hyde as a foreign "creature", distancing himself from the deeds of his visibly evil side: "He, I say – I cannot say I" (Stevenson 2005: 90). Once the maid has reported Hyde to the authorities, Jekyll fears rejection and punishment. Hyde's suicide provides Jekyll with the desired escape from the prying eyes of his community.

As a butler in Jekyll's household, Poole must be a master of overlooking: he fuses the omniscient qualities of a servant with the emphasis on secrecy of the gentleman's network. Jean Fernandez notes that the butler, like other servants, was a visible marker of class; unlike most servants, however, the butler resembles his master: "Exempt from livery, a butler's right to gentlemanly costume was a visible sign of his complicity with his employer's social ambitions." (Fernandez 2004: 364) Fernandez argues that a Victorian audience would have recognised the sensationalism inherent in Poole's decision to "abandon discretion" and tell on his closeted master (Stevenson 2005: 365). However, because Poole aspires to the rank of the class of gentlemen he serves, he in fact makes a very discreet choice, summoning not the police but a member of the inner circle, Utterson. To

Utterson he gives firm instructions to wait outside the laboratory to hear and not to be heard – in other words, to behave like a servant. After Jekyll is questioned, Poole triumphantly asks Utterson to corroborate his testimony, demanding: “was that my master’s voice?” (Stevenson 2005: 62) While Utterson clings to physical evidence, pointing out papers written recently in Jekyll’s own hand, Poole draws attention to his own eye-witnessing: “But what matters hand of write? ... I’ve seen him!” (Stevenson 2005: 63) By trusting the community of gentlemen and not law enforcement, Poole finds his testimony questioned and dismissed by Utterson, who will stop at nothing to maintain Jekyll’s reputation.

Even after Poole and Utterson break down the door to Jekyll’s laboratory, Utterson is determined to hide the truth from the world at large. Such secrecy is aided by a lack of visual evidence. Jekyll has “disappeared” into the body that will “Hyde” his secret, even in death (Stevenson 2005: 69). True to form, Utterson continues to advocate secrecy. Pocketing Jekyll’s note, he says to Poole: “I would say nothing of this paper. If your master has fled or is dead, we may at least save his credit. It is now ten; I must go home and read these documents in quiet; but I shall be back before midnight, when we shall send for the police.” (Stevenson 2005: 69) As with Enfield’s initial encounter with Hyde, the community will resolve its own crimes. The dry lawyer will presumably feed the police only selective information, and Jekyll’s reputation will remain untainted. Utterson, the represented reader of these final letters, disappears from the novel’s end: “He vanishes from the end of the book in an unexpected and inexplicable way, just as he presumably attempts to grasp the significance of his investigations.” (Hirsch 1988: 242) Still, the novel’s readers may look over Utterson’s shoulder as he reads both Lanyon’s and Jekyll’s explanations, so while the police may not gain access to such information, the reader sees into the workings of the community and is made to witness the evil within. As Glenda Norquay observes, “for Stevenson his role as a reader was always a dominant factor in his thinking” (Norquay 2007: 5). By requiring his readers to sift through the final evidence without an omniscient narrator to guide them, Stevenson effectively makes them complicit voyeurs responsible for naming the evil and overlooking it once more.

2. Surveillance and Conformity in *Jekyll*

In contrast to the relatively insular nineteenth-century community of masters and servants in Stevenson's novel, *Jekyll* presents us with the eerily anonymous twenty-first century world of omnipresent surveillance and distrust. When the members of Dr Jekyll's community watch and witness his crimes, they are marked by them and react either by losing consciousness or taking responsibility for their fears; they cannot remain indifferent because the evil emerges from inside their social body. *Jekyll*, however, presents its viewers with two distinct types of surveillance: personal and impersonal. For the purposes of this paper, personal surveillance involves keeping an eye on people we know out of concern for their wellbeing or the wellbeing of the community. Impersonal surveillance refers to watching everyone, known or unknown, with an emphasis on distrust. The latter, of course, is the type of surveillance the presence of which grew throughout the nineteenth century to become so ubiquitous in our own time. Jonathan Crary argues that in the early nineteenth century, vision was dissociated from other senses, in particular, tactility: "This autonomization of sight, occurring in many different domains, was a historical condition for the rebuilding of the observer fitted for the tasks of 'spectacular' consumption" (Crary 1990: 19). Citing Foucault, Crary stresses that the observer becomes an agent of surveillance without any necessary relationship to what he or she observes.

In a post-9/11 world, such mutual distrust has become routine, even advisable, and everyone is a source of potential evil. Nor is surveillance exclusively the business of the state; while police operate some of the surveillance network spread across the West, much of the business of spying is left to corporations, whose interest is often motivated by financial gain and whose accountability has been lessened by laws such as the US Patriot Act (Andrejevic 2007: 7). Laura K. Donohue stresses the ubiquity of surveillance in our current world:

None of the ordinary activities that any one of us engages in – going to school, seeking medical care, buying food, reading, or writing letters – is new. But the recording of this information, its integration, and its swift recall – by private or public entities – are unprecedented. Access to such data gives others insight into who you are, who you have been,

and who you are becoming. It allows people to get inside your mind and to learn about how you react, what your emotional states are, what issues you care about, and what drives you. A critical point here is that *the information is individualized*. It relates specifically to you, and can be recalled specifically in relation to yourself. (Donohue 2008: 186)

Jekyll presents an extreme version of corporate surveillance; the Klein and Utterson Corporation was created to study the clones and descendants of Dr Henry Jekyll: “who [they] are, who [they] have been, and who [they] are becoming” (Donohue 2008: 186). The Klein and Utterson Corporation and Hyde (initially, at least) are revealed to be psychopaths, conscienceless “bodies” with a complete disregard for the wellbeing of others.⁶ Although the corporation wishes to use Hyde’s superpowers to fight disease, its motives are not benevolent but financial. By fusing Dr Jackman’s conscience with Hyde’s physical might, however, the series suggests that trust, love, and community might form a viable antidote to our world of corporate greed and rampant surveillance.

When cameras have reached into every avenue of our daily lives, it seems only logical that the next frontier would be the self. Indeed, according to Michel Foucault’s highly influential analysis of Western society in *Discipline and Punish* (1975), the presence of surveillance relies less on external policing and more on coercing individuals into policing themselves. Dr Jackman’s profoundly unregulated self refuses to be held in, forcing him to set up his own self-surveillance. Unlike Dr Jekyll who, crucially, shares memories and desires with Hyde and is thus responsible for his actions, Dr Jackman recollects nothing of what his alter-ego does when they switch places. After he meets Claire, Jackman begins to see Hyde’s reflection in mirrors and to receive his written messages, but he finally loses memory when Hyde emerges out of a primal desire to punish a man who has humiliated his new wife. Jackman awakens on a deserted beach with no knowledge of how he got there, eventually discovering the man’s severed ear in his pocket. Thus, to keep watch over Hyde, Dr Jackman sets up a system of “mutual surveillance” (Mackinnon 2007: episode 1). *Jekyll* opens on a scene that evokes a torture chamber, with a chair fitted with straps and a close-up of a clock approaching midnight ticking audibly on the wall. Dr

Jackman, speaking to Hyde through a digital recorder, highlights the panopticism of the room, noting: “the cameras are on” (Mackinnon 2007: episode 1). Unable to trust Hyde, Jackman traps him in what Mark Andrejevic calls the “digital enclosure,” “where places and activities become encompassed by the monitoring embrace of an interactive (virtual) space” (Andrejevic 2007: 2). Just as surveillance cameras operate along principles of constant distrust and implicit threats of prosecution, so Jackman keeps Hyde from serious crimes by keeping an eye (and ear) on him through a digital recorder, a GPS device, and a Dictaphone. The shared body of Jackman and Hyde encompasses both law enforcement and criminality: if Hyde commits murder, Jackman will turn himself in; if Jackman finds a cure, Hyde will put a bullet through their shared brain. Jackman’s particular form of spying is motivated by his love of others (he fears Hyde will kill someone) and his distrust of self. In an updated version of Dr Jekyll’s cheval glass which “has seen some strange things” (Stevenson 2005: 68), Dr Jackman not only converses with Hyde in mirrors, but also records his own bodily transformation with a video camera. Attempting to forge a connection, Hyde asks his “Daddy” why he is so afraid, reminding Jackman that he is not an external other but part of the protagonist himself: “I’m in your head!” (Lipsey 2007: episode 4) Jackman, however, distrusts his alter-ego so much that he destroys the television and his own image (though Hyde, predicting such an outcome, has arranged for the delivery of a replacement television). Thus, as Hyde asserts his presence, Jackman makes ever greater efforts to deny and repress his other self. He resists Hyde’s attempts to self-actualise, mocking his (albeit amusing) favourite music “The Lion King and other Disney Favourites,” and complaining, “Jesus! I can’t even get equal rights with myself!” (Mackinnon 2007: episode 2). While Jackman is terrified of what Hyde might do when he is “asleep”, Hyde has no such fears about Jackman. Jackman the good is predictable; Hyde the bad requires constant surveillance.

As the series ultimately demonstrates, however, Jackman’s distrust is largely unfounded. As in the twenty-first century, many good, law-abiding citizens think that they require constant vigilance against the threat of terror, whereas what can be more damaging than the unknown evil is a society founded on distrust. As in Stevenson’s novel, the greater evil comes from within the society. In *Jekyll*, Hyde is not hate, but love. The director of the final three episodes, Matt Lipsey, explains: “In some respects I see

Jekyll as a love story, of one's man's struggle against his inner self, but the theme of love permeates throughout. It was love that created the monster in the first place – love as a psychopath” (BBC Press Office 2007). Hyde's superhuman powers derive from a primal urge to protect his loved ones, and his destruction is waged against those who threaten his wife and children. Thus, while Hyde initially shares characteristics with the corporation, he ultimately fights against it.

At the beginning of the series, unable to trust even himself, Jackman by his own admission is “paranoid” (Mackinnon 2007: episode 2). Black vans follow him everywhere and, unbeknownst to him, everyone he loves or trusts is spying on him: his wife, his assistant, his best friend, and his divided mother (Mrs Jackman and Ms Utterson, a female Jekyll and Hyde pairing). While each of these spies initially seems sinister, by the end of the second episode they have been divided into personal and impersonal surveillance networks. Furthermore, those who genuinely care for Tom Jackman begin to form a community to help him to fight against the corporation's surveillance team. On his side are his mother, Mrs Jackman; his assistant, Katharine Reimer; private detectives (and lovers) Miranda Callendar and Min; and, most importantly, his wife, Claire. Their spying is motivated by love. Working against Tom for Klein and Utterson are his best friend Peter Syme; the sadistic executive Benjamin Lennox; and his other-mother Ms Utterson. Their spying is motivated by greed, and they reveal themselves to be more inhuman at every turn.

When her husband begins to disappear for long stretches of time, Claire assumes the worst (or so she thinks) and engages detective Miranda Callendar to catch him having an affair. Miranda and her partner Min become some of Jackman's most important allies and sources of information. Miranda and Min are expecting a child; their relationship is thus visually associated with love. Motivated by concern and not greed, Miranda warns Jackman about the presence of a giant corporation intent on buying everything and everyone in order to get to Hyde. Miranda cryptically advises him that she has not been the source of his paranoia: “The most important thing in your life is: I don't own a black van” (Mackinnon 2007: episode 2). Later, Miranda and Min reveal the information they have gleaned to Jackman: that he is a descendant of Dr Jekyll, that he resembles his ancestor, and that he was abandoned in a railway station as a baby. When Miranda sees the signs that Jackman is shifting over to Hyde, she

sends the pregnant Min away from the room. Yet she still seems to trust the being who confronts her: “How often do we mistake a miracle for a monster. He doesn’t have to be a monster.” (Mackinnon 2007: episode 2) A piercing scream follows, for the series is not short on suspense; by the end of the episode, however, viewers learn that while Hyde locks Miranda and Min in their cellar, he does not wound them. Having learned that Jackman has a family, Hyde wishes to see them. Nor do Miranda and Min hold a grudge, continuing to help Jackman and risking death in the process. In contrast to the ‘monster’, Klein and Utterson would have shot them without compunction, and only a massive power outage, caused by Hyde himself, saves the investigators.

Hired by his good mother (the kind, grey haired, British-accented Mrs Jackman) Jackman’s assistant Katharine also initially seems to have sinister motives. In the second episode, she drugs Jackman’s tea in order to search through his belongings in an attempt to verify that Mrs Jackman is indeed his mother and can be trusted. Katharine then edits the video footage to remove the traces of her actions, referring to the Orwellian conditions under which she works: “It’s like Big Brother in here.” (Mackinnon 2007: episode 2) Of course, Jackman’s surveillance system is useless without trust, so when Katharine modifies the digital record, she in effect impairs Jackman’s ability to control his unknown. The cameras are on to watch over Hyde, and Katharine is in real danger with the lights and cameras down. Ultimately, Katharine’s secrecy and desire to protect Tom stem from an unspoken infatuation. Fortunately for Jackman, both Katharine and his mother are motivated to spy on him out of love, not greed; thus, what initially seems to be a sinister infiltration of Jackman’s surveillance system ends up being a positive intervention that creates allies for Tom, not enemies. Along with Min and Miranda, Katharine risks her life to protect Dr Jackman.

Mystified by her husband’s mysterious behaviour and charmed by his ‘cousin Billy’ (Hyde himself), Claire nevertheless continually reaches out to both sides of her husband and refuses to give up on either. Her early encounters with Tom are necessarily strained. Nevertheless, when she finally sees Jackman transform into Hyde, she is remarkably accepting of him as another side of her husband. Unlike Jackman, who wishes to rid himself of his other self, Claire insists on knowing and claiming Hyde. She demands to know how many women he has slept with, affirms despite his

protests that he is indeed her husband, and insists, “I’m Mrs Jekyll and Hyde” (Lipsey 2007: episode 4). As it turns out, Claire was cloned from Jekyll’s former servant Alice, and she is the catalyst for releasing Hyde. Still, Claire refuses to be afraid of the superhuman being she has married, slapping him, verbally abusing him, and even hitting him over the head with a wine bottle. Despite the series’ many suspenseful scenes, Claire’s instinct not to fear her husband’s dark side is vindicated. As Hyde later asserts: “I’m a psychopath with superpowers and you’re my girl” (Lipsey 2007: episode 5) It is better to be on Hyde’s side than on the corporation’s, as Claire quickly discovers.

Founded soon after Dr Jekyll’s death, the Klein and Utterson Corporation immediately recognised the commercial applications of the doctor’s transformative powers. Although the novel’s Mr Utterson is never mentioned in the series, the corporation’s title implies that he exploited his secret knowledge for financial gain.⁷ Although she is unlikely to be a biological descendant of Mr Utterson, Ms Utterson shares with her namesake qualities of secrecy and power. Whereas the novel’s Mr Utterson struggles to protect Jekyll based on their shared fragile status as bourgeois gentlemen, the series’ Ms Utterson betrays Jackman, who is standing in the way of her corporate ownership of Hyde and of potential profits to be made. Like the corporation she heads, Ms Utterson is a psychopath, stopping at nothing to obtain Hyde and the resultant profit he is expected to bring. The corporation tracks him with black vans, throws his son Eddie in with a pride of lions at a zoo, locks him (and later his sons) in claustrophobia-inducing ‘Total Self-Contained Life Support Systems,’ and attempts to murder Katharine, Miranda, and Min. What makes Hyde different from his other-mother Ms Utterson is family. Both Hyde and Ms Utterson represent the selfish, greedy, childlike side of the personality, whereas Dr Jackman and Mrs Jackman stand for the more adult, conscience-bound, relational side. Unlike Hyde, however, Ms Utterson is never redeemed in the series, which ends with a close-up of her mouth, sharp teeth bared violently. They seem to differ fundamentally in whom they allow themselves to love (and allow to love them). Mrs Jackman, presumably fearing what her alternate self was capable of, abandoned her baby, Tom, at a train station. She also may have killed Tom’s father. When asked how her husband was killed, she replies: “I expect I did. I must check.” (Lipsey 2007: episode 6) By isolating herself, she allowed Ms Utterson to grow more powerful. Attached to a large

corporation, Ms Utterson found her negative qualities enhanced and encouraged by the conscienceless environment. While Tom Jackman tries initially to separate himself from his family, by renting a separate apartment and hiding from Hyde, the fact that he is married and his overwhelming need to protect his family force him to test Hyde, learn about him and, ultimately, to come to trust him.

The Klein and Utterson Corporation exults in its ownership of people and places and its ability to broker all deals through financial means. One of the company's more sadistic executives, Benjamin Lennox, dismisses the value of human life in pursuit of profit. For Benjamin, placing Jackman's son Eddie inside the lion enclosure constitutes a mere "experiment" to unleash Hyde's potential. "Money – it's the new war," he declares, a war he feels sure of winning (Mackinnon 2007: episode 2). He can hire a mercenary army, unleash hundreds of black vans full of surveillance equipment, and buy up anything in his way. Hyde's self-professed "owner" – in a "corporate rather than an individual sense" – Benjamin feels that his power is restricted only by state surveillance (Mackinnon 2007: episode 1). He laments: "We can't just pull him off the streets. This is England – like the Third World, with rights." (Mackinnon 2007: episode 2) Like Utterson, who attempts to limit the involvement of the police in Jekyll's crimes, the Klein and Utterson Corporation enlists private surveillance to escape the eye of the state. Of course, as the series demonstrates, Benjamin greatly overestimates his capacity to buy allegiance. Despite having "more money than God," despite having "weapons tech that would give a nun a hard on," and despite a mercenary army bankrolled by unlimited funds, Klein and Utterson is no match for a man with a conscience, albeit a superman (Lipsey 2007: episode 6).

Whereas the original novel hinges on a fear of devolution, showcased by a small, apelike, and deformed Hyde, the series presents its Hyde as a superman, who contains the potential to fight disease and to make millions for Klein and Utterson. Hence, he is "worth almost anything" (Lipsey 2007: episode 6) to Peter Syme, motivated by pure greed to befriend Jackman. Not only is Hyde taller, younger, and stronger than Jackman, but Klein and Utterson considers him the next phase in evolution. As Syme explains:

The human species no longer evolves, remember? We change the world, it no longer changes us. But at what cost? Millennia pass and homo sapiens remains unchanged, unimproved, century after century. And then one day, Dr Jekyll drinks from a flask, and what do you know? There's life in the old girl yet. (Mackinnon 2007: episode 3)

Benjamin, an African-American, also hints at a certain neo-Victorian tinged irony about this superman: "The most powerful creature on the planet, that's what I'm looking at. And you're British, so it's even funny." (Mackinnon 2007: episode 2) Benjamin alludes to residual Victorian colonial attitudes that asserted the superiority of the British race, but also prompted fears of a return to primitive violence, as embodied by Hyde. By making the Americans Ms Utterson and Benjamin Lennox the most powerful figures at Klein and Utterson, *Jekyll* highlights the idea that British imperialism based on ethno-cultural superiority has been replaced by an American neo-imperialism that seeks control through globalisation and the pursuit of economic, scientific, and intelligence dominance. While such neo-imperialism is not motivated by racism, corporations like Klein and Utterson aim to own the world by owning people. Benjamin's exultation in his ability to buy and sell human beings paradoxically evokes the slave trade, hinting that corporations may get away with practices long considered inhuman.

While Tom struggles to connect his two selves, Klein and Utterson attempts to reprogram him, using inhumane methods to divide the conscience from the psychopath. Early in the series, at a fast food restaurant, Dr Jackman jokingly tells his son Eddie that if his nose does not stop running he will have to be sent back to the factory. Later, in an attempt to awaken Hyde, Klein and Utterson place Eddie in the lion cage. The young boy interprets his imprisonment as punishment, lamenting "I don't want to go to the factory!" (Mackinnon 2007: episode 2). On a superficial level, Eddie exhibits a childish misunderstanding of an adult joke: having lost control of a minor bodily function, Eddie fears losing his parent's love and being returned as faulty goods. On another level, being the darker of the twins, associated with Edward Hyde, Eddie represents the abnormal human, the one requiring 'fixing'. Yet the Klein and Utterson Corporation instead seeks to permanently 'fix' Eddie's father into the Hyde persona, by

consigning Jackman to a “Total Self-Contained Life Support System” designed to induce his fear of claustrophobia and ‘kill’ him.

To Klein and Utterson, to cure the Jackman/Hyde split is to divide; yet, as the series reveals, a more positive solution is to integrate Jackman with Hyde. When she sees Hyde emerge from the life support system, Claire refuses to give up on the notion that her husband is lurking somewhere inside. She appeals to Tom’s memories. In Stevenson’s novel, Jekyll and Hyde share memory; indeed, Jekyll’s knowledge of and participation in Hyde’s murderous activities make him as guilty as his evil self. In the series, however, Jackman and Hyde have had to use technology to communicate with one another and neither has any knowledge of what the other has done. Such ignorance of the other’s activities prompts Tom to confess to murdering his wife, so little does he trust his alter-ego. The superman Hyde, however, has moments of almost technological prescience. He can “call” Jackman on his mobile phone to warn him of Eddie’s abduction at the zoo; he can appear to emerge from the television on which his image has been recorded; he can transmit repetitive messages to communications networks; most importantly, once he emerges triumphant from the corporation’s containment system, he can access not only Jackman’s memories, but even a kind of ancestral memory – back to Dr Jekyll himself. As the Klein and Utterson executives and scientists watch in amazement, they notice that Hyde seems to be downloading Jackman’s memories. Hyde exults in these memories, noting “I’ve got rewind” and “it’s like Sky+” (Lipsey 2007: episode 5). He remembers feeding ducks with Claire, the number of their honeymoon hotel room, rocking their infant twins. Rather than acts of suspicion-prompted surveillance, however, these “recordings” of past memories and events function to bond Claire and Hyde, since she acknowledges that her husband must still be inside Hyde’s body. While Hyde does not consciously betray her trust, however, he cannot protect his family. As Ms Utterson realises, her son Hyde cannot kill himself to save others: “You’re just a child, Mr Hyde. We took the man in you away.” (Lipsey 2007: episode 5) Despite his superhuman strength, photographic memory, and telepathic powers, Hyde lacks Jackman’s emotional strength and moral integrity; in short, all his powers are useless without a conscience. As his family is transported away in a helicopter, Hyde calls out to Tom: “I’m supposed to be a superman. Why am I not a superman?”

Daddy!” (Lipseley 2007: episode 5) The two agree to join forces to help Claire; by trusting one another, they become stronger.

Motivated by greed and fueled by suspicion and distrust, the heads of the Klein and Utterson Corporation consistently underestimate the man whose life is the basis of their business. Syme believes that by isolating him from his family, they have rendered him harmless: “He’s remarkable, yes. But he’s alone. No one to turn to. No one he can trust. Everything he knew has betrayed him. No friends, no home, no hope. Not even Tom Jackman, not even Hyde himself’s a threat, when he’s completely alone.” (Lipseley 2007: episode 6) Of course, Syme does not know that Jackman and Hyde have fused with one another, so that neither is alone. Furthermore, the conscienceless Hyde sacrifices himself for Jackman, refusing to share any physical damage he endures. While Hyde succumbs to his multiple injuries at the end of the series, he lives on in Jackman’s son Eddie. When locked in the corporation’s containment systems, the twins, Harry and Eddie (after Henry Jekyll and Edward Hyde), who shared a single heartbeat in their mother’s womb, are able to switch places when they get bored, as they admit to their mother afterwards. The series implies that the twins will never be alone but will trust one another, thus healing the breach between selves that plagued Jackman and Hyde.

If Hyde is the psychopath love, then his other-mother Ms Utterson is the psychopathic corporation. The two are pitted against one another throughout the series, which ends with the image of Ms Utterson’s toothy jaws but does not resolve which of the two opponents prevails. In 1886, Stevenson could write a shilling shocker that would rivet its Victorian audience by exploiting anxieties about the decay of the gentleman’s authority in an unknowable city and the degeneration of the species as a whole. The authority of the hierarchical power structures is threatened by those who reside at the edges of the knowable community, especially servants, who witness and narrate crimes to the new authorities of police and law. In 2007, *Jekyll* warns that the power structure controlling the dissemination of information is no longer the bourgeois gentleman or even the police, but the corporation – not Mr Utterson, but Klein and Utterson (with Ms Utterson at its helm). Through surveillance, murder (real and attempted), betrayal, kidnapping, and a disregard for human affections, Klein and Utterson, not Hyde, proves itself to be the criminal on the loose. Whereas *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* casts suspicion on an inward looking, self-

protective community, the BBC series celebrates the values of a mutually supportive community, which may prove the most powerful defence and deterrent against the insidious 'evil' of corporate greed and capitalist exploitation.

Reading *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* through the lens of the BBC's *Jekyll* refocuses the earlier text's concerns with the observation and recording of crime and its anticipation of surveillance technology. Conversely, Stevenson's nineteenth-century text highlights questions about the control of knowledge and power taken up by the series. The palimpsestic nature of the neo-Victorian allows the two narratives to be read through one another, revealing insights otherwise left obscure. In the former text, a small community of gentlemen relies on the subjectivity of vision to record and control reports of Hyde's activities. Surveillance technologies are suggested by Utterson's cinematic nightmares of Hyde trampling children on every street corner and the maid's camera-like position above a lamp-lit street; however, the actual absence of such technologies and the fact that Hyde has "never been photographed" allows Utterson to control the dissemination of information in order to protect the power of his gentleman's network from the encroaching eyes of the police (Stevenson 2005: 49). In *Jekyll*, the ubiquity of surveillance technologies suggests a world in which trust has broken down so that individuals spy even on themselves. Just as the novel critiques Utterson's unwillingness to release information about Jekyll's activities to the authorities, so the series critiques Klein and Utterson's relentless and inhuman pursuit of financial gain outside the parameters of the law or human decency. Jonathan Crary observes that in our digital age, "[m]ost of the historically important functions of the human eye are being supplanted by practices in which visual images no longer have any reference to the position of an observer in a 'real,' optically perceived world" (Crary 1990: 2). However, both the Victorian novel and neo-Victorian sequel warn that regardless of recording technologies, the observer must maintain a responsibility to society; whether the evil is internal or external, it must be witnessed and confronted.

Notes

1. The series' version of Hyde is a psychopath, but his psychopathic behaviour is motivated by love; his aggression stems from a desire to protect his wife and children from harm.
2. I differ with some critics on this point, for Hyde is often read as a symbol of the unknown, frightening, violent neighbourhood of Soho where he takes up residence (see, for example, Arata 1996: 34; and Dryden 2003: 93).
3. In Gordon Hirsch's discussion of *Jekyll and Hyde* as a problematic mix of detective fiction and the Gothic, he calls Utterson the novel's "central intelligence" (Hirsch 1988: 225).
4. An example of the potential for unknown and anonymous urban violence emerged soon after *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* was published, as Jack the Ripper began to terrorise the streets of London in 1888.
5. To Andrew Smith, this "narrative mobility" indicates an instability of the self that is associated with modernity (Smith 2004: 39).
6. The term corporation is derived from the Latin word *corpus* (literally 'body'), and such entities have the legal rights of individuals.
7. While Stevenson's Dr Jekyll can never possess the secret of his own transformation, which occurs due to an unknown impurity in the salt, the series changes the formula, proposing that love (Jekyll's servant Alice, cloned and resurrected as Jackman's wife Claire) forms the catalyst for the metamorphosis.

Bibliography

- Andrejevic, Mark. *iSpy: Surveillance and Power in an Interactive Era*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2007.
- Arata, Stephen. 'The Sedulous Ape: Ativism, Professionalism, and Styevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde*', in *Fictions of Loss in the Victorian Fin de Siècle*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, 33-53.
- Braddon, Mary Elizabeth. *Aurora Floyd* [1862-63], Richard Nemesvari and Lisa SurrIDGE (eds.). Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview, 1998.
- Crary, Jonathan. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1990.
- Donohue, Laura K. *The Cost of Counterterrorism: Power, Politics, and Liberty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

-
- Dryden, Linda. "'City of Dreadful Night': Stevenson's Gothic London', in *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles: Stevenson, Wilde, and Wells*. New York: Palgrave, 2003, 74-109.
- Fernandez, Jean. "'Master's Made Away With...': Servant Voices and Narrational Politics in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*', *Literature Interpretation Theory*, 15 (2004), 363-387.
- Flanders, Judith. *The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed*. London: HarperCollins, 2004.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Alan Sheridan (trans.). New York: Vintage, 1979.
- Galton, Francis. 'Composite Portraiture' [1883], in *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development*. London: J. M. Dent, n.d., 223-234.
- Gutleben, Christian; and Susana Onega (eds.). *Refracting the Canon in Contemporary British Literature and Film*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004.
- Hirsch, Gordon. 'Frankenstein, Detective Fiction and *Jekyll and Hyde*', in *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde After One Hundred Years*, William Veeder and Gordon Hirsch (eds.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988, 223-246.
- BBC Press Office. 'Jekyll Production Interviews', BBC, 23 May 2007. BBC, viewed 21 December 2008, http://www.bbc.co.uk/pressoffice/pressreleases/stories/2007/05_may/23/jekyll_other.shtml
- Lipsey, Matt (dir.). *Jekyll*, Episodes 4-6, Steven Moffatt (writ.), James Nesbitt, Denis Lawson, Michelle Ryan, Gina Bellman, and Meera Syal (perf.). BBC One, Showcase, 29 August – 10 October 2007.
- Llewellyn, Mark. 'What is Neo-Victorian Studies?', *Neo-Victorian Studies*, 1:1 (Autumn 2008): 164-185.
- Mackinnon, Douglas (dir.). *Jekyll*, Episodes 1-3, Steven Moffatt (writ.), James Nesbitt, Denis Lawson, Michelle Ryan, Gina Bellman, and Meera Syal (perf.). BBC One, Showcase, 29 August – 10 October 2007.
- McGrath, John E. *Loving Big Brother: Performance, Privacy, and Surveillance Space*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Norquay, Glenda. *Robert Louis Stevenson and Theories of Reading: The Reader as Vagabond*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Smith, Andrew. *Victorian Demons: Medicine, Masculinity, and the Gothic at the Fin-de Siècle*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Stevenson, Robert Louis. 'A Plea for Gas Lamps', in *Virginibus Puerisque, and Other Papers*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1905, 129-132.

-
- . *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* [1886], Martin A. Danahay (ed.), Second edition. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview, 2005.
- Stirling, Kirsten. “‘Dr Jekyll and Mr Jackass’: *Fight Club* as a Refraction of Hogg’s *Justified Sinner* and Stevenson’s *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*”, in *Refracting the Canon in Contemporary British Literature and Film*, Christian Gutleben and Susana Onega (eds.). Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004, 83-94.
- Tagg, John. *The Burden of Representation: Essays in Photographies and Histories*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.
- Thomas, Ronald R. ‘Making Darkness Visible: Capturing the Criminal and Observing the Law in Victorian Photography and Detective Fiction’, in *Victorian Literature and the Victorian Visual Imagination*, Carol T. Christ and John O. Jordan (eds.). Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995, 134-168.
- Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.