# Representations and Manifestations of Madness in Victorian Fiction

A thesis

Submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree

of

**Master of Arts**

at

**The University of Waikato**

by

## Susanna Bennett



2015

# Abstract

This thesis explores the complex ways in which mental illness was portrayed in Victorian fiction. It situates the literature within historical contexts, but primarily focuses on fictional representations of madness. At times the fiction studied replicates the dominant attitudes towards mental illness in the period. On other occasions the literature forms a dialogue with the historical record, challenging Victorian attitudes and assumptions.

These texts form the core of my discussion: *Jane Eyre*, *Far From the Madding Crowd*, *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* and *He Knew He Was Right*. Some of these are best described as sensation and Gothic fiction, the authors dawn to the sensational and dramatic narrative opportunities provided by madness. Other authors depict madness in a more understated way in keeping with their social realist mode. Thus a range of perspectives on and attitudes towards madness are discussed.

The analysis focuses on three distinct, but at times interconnected, themes. In the first chapter issues of gender and madness in Victorian literature are addressed, the analysis highlighting the particular association between women and madness but also considering depictions of male madness. Next, the thesis turns to questions of race and class, exploring the relationship between racial and socio-economic identity and madness. Here, the multiple fictional examples of professional, middle and upper-class men who are afflicted with madness forms a counter narrative to the historical coupling of madness with racial and class otherness. Finally, the thesis turns to the behaviour of fictional characters described as being mad.

Madness frequently manifests in violent and destructive ways in Victorian fiction and thus the connection between madness and criminality is a necessary avenue of analysis.

# Acknowledgments

First and foremost to Dr Kristine Moffat for her tireless work as my supervisor. Her patience and encouragement meant that I completed this thesis, no small task! I hope it met all your expectations at the end!

Next to my parents Ray and Debbie Bennett. Their constant financial support aided me so I could focus on my work and not worry about my next meal.  Thank you for being supportive of my decision to do this degree (especially from my Dad who is an Engineer!)

To the graduate students who helped me in the minefield of referencing and general problems. Emma Nelson and Brendan Sheridan thanks for the encouragement and advice!

To my proof reader Matthew Ferri, thank you for reminding me about the importance of the Oxford comma!

To my literature chums Yvette, Emily and Rosalie for always being interested in my monologues about my topic and all the problems that I had to contend with. Your support was very heartening.

To my Uncle and Aunt Dr Robert Vosslamber and Dr Andrea Vosslamber for your insights into the academic world. Your suggestions,

recommendations and advice from your foray into higher education were invaluable.

But last to my maker for creating me with a passion for literature, the ability to write and the motivation to strive for better things.

# Table of Contents

# Introduction: Madness in the Victorian Era

> In strictness we are all mad when we give way to passion, to prejudice, to vice, to vanity; but if all the passionate, prejudiced, vicious and vain people in this world are going to be locked up as the lunatics are, who is going to keep the key to the asylum?[1]
>
> *The Times*, 22 July 1853

A useful summary of the symptoms of madness is found in *The Adventure of the Creeping Man* by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. In this 1923 short story Professor Presbury, a physiologist of repute, is found to exhibit strange symptoms, which are diagnosed by Dr Watson as mania. Watson believes that an upset in the brain has caused this change because of a passionate love affair turned toxic. Watson also speaks from a medical point of view when he recommends a visit from an alienist to cure the symptoms. These symptoms include a sudden secretiveness coupled with an aggressive fury directed at anyone who enquires after his mysterious disappearances or international correspondence. His own dog, usually a docile and faithful creature, turns against him, biting him more than once and he, in return, becomes violent, aided by an increased physical strength. He is also seen one night 'dark and crouching'[2] as he crawls along a passage and Sherlock Holmes observes that the Professor's knuckles have grown 'thick and horny'.[3] He comments at the conclusion of the story that 'the highest type of man may revert to the animal if he leaves the straight road of destiny',

relating Presbury's madness to a return to his primitive being by the means of imbibing a drug derived from an anthropoid.[4]

Madness was an ambiguous topic in the nineteenth century, a theme popular with novelists because of the narrative potential it provided. During this time the term encapsulated organic illnesses, psychological issues and social problems under its broad terminology. Increasingly madness was regarded as an illness in need of medical treatment, although residues of eighteenth century anxieties about madness as an absence of reason and even a moral evil remained. There were many words used to describe mental illness in the nineteenth century. Madness is the most popular term, and the term which I use most frequently throughout this thesis, but lunacy, insanity and mania were also commonly used.  In both nineteenth century discourses and more contemporary historical analyses of the subject these terms are often used interchangeably, although the word mania is usually prefixed with a type of insanity (for example, monomania and kleptomania). The opening example of how madness was characterised in popular novels signals the amalgamation of symptoms that attributed to the diagnosis of insanity during the Victorian period.

It is important to acknowledge at the outset that understandings of madness have changed significantly since the nineteenth century. Indeed, even the term 'madness' is now a contested and controversial term, with the emphasis now firmly placed on mental illness as a medical condition. In the twentieth century Michel Foucault influenced attitudes with his insistence that madness is a social construct. He wrote

It's not a history of the development of psychiatric science but of the imaginary moral and social context within which it developed. There's no objective knowledge to madness, but merely the formulation of a certain experience.[5]

When madness existed, he argued, it was as a result of separation from reason. Insanity is 'reason dazzled'[6] which can be cured through doses of 'art and philosophy'.[7] However, historians Andrew Scull and Roy Porter both criticise Foucault for offering 'a mode of modernisation without a compelling historian's narrative'.[8] His disregard for other agencies such as 'social class, kinship networks and political movements in the shaping of the treatments offered for insanity at different periods in different societies' skewed his perspective concerning institutions.[9] Writing as I am in  post-Foucauldian space it is inevitable that my thinking about my chosen texts will be coloured at times by twentieth and twenty-first century perceptions of mental illness. However, my core focus is on the way in which Victorian novelists represented madness so my analysis is thus grounded in nineteenth century discourses and understandings of madness.

My three chapters will explore the intersections between madness and three inter-related themes: gender; race, and class; and crime.

My core texts are: *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Brontë; *The Picture of Dorian Gray* by Oscar Wilde; *Far From the Madding Crowd* by Thomas Hardy; *Lady Audley's Secret* by Mary Elizabeth Braddon; *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* by Robert Louis Stevenson and *He Knew He Was Right* by Anthony Trollope. I also examine a range of other texts that relate to a particular theme: *Wuthering Heights* by Emily Brontë; *Great*

*Expectations* by Charles Dickens; *The Woman in White* by Wilkie Collins; *The Adventure of the Creeping Man* by Arthur Conan Doyle; and 'The Beetle Hunter', also by Doyle.

These texts fall variously under the genre umbrella of sensation, Gothic and realist fiction providing a wide cross section of how madness was portrayed in nineteenth century literature (and early twentieth century fiction in the case of Doyle). Both sensation fiction and Gothic fiction drew upon exaggerated stereotypes of hysterical women and mad men to enhance their plots and characters. The understanding of insanity in texts such as *Jane Eyre*, *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, and *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is typically of an uncontrollable disease, compelling characters to commit heinous crimes and acts. Debates about the purpose and worth of this kind of fiction varied in the Victorian period; Robert Buchanan writing of the perception that these texts 'enfeebling the minds of men and women, making flabby the fibre of their bodies, and undermining the vigour of nations'.[10] It was a genre despised by many for its exaggerated depictions of bigamous marriages, murders, ghostly hauntings, crime, and supernatural beings. Sensation novels were believed to induce immorality in readers who witnessed gruesome scenes in which the criminal indulged his or her macabre fancy, like an 'agent of contamination'.[11] In addition,

> many sensation novels implied that both personal and class identity in contemporary Britain were fluid and unstable rather than secure and potentially subject to manipulation, misinterpretation and outright theft.[12]

The play on current Victorian anxieties helped defame this fiction in the eyes of the public, whose minds were already filled with fears of degeneration, atavism and racial origin.

The character of the lunatic was also frequently used in sensation fiction. Insanity 'offered an opportunity to explore the extremities of human mental and emotional suffering, uniting the fascination of the strange and the abnormal with the familiarity of the known and shared'.[13] Many authors of this time, such as Charles Dickens and Charlotte Brontë visited mental asylums to gather information for their novels. Mary Elizabeth Braddon had an affair with her publisher John Maxwell whom she could not marry due to the existence of a mad wife. She later married him after the death of his wife and they had five children.[14] Charlotte Brontë dedicated *Jane Eyre* to W.M. Thackeray whose wife was insane and whom speculators believed was the prototype for the mad characteristics of Bertha Mason.[15]

The other genre of fiction that I will be using is realist fiction, such as *Far From the Madding Crowd* and *He Knew He Was Right*. These texts present more realistic depictions of madness, which are not influenced by preternatural events or enacted as a sensational form of illness. Instead, these texts focus on the causes and effects of insanity, which tend to follow the slow process of mental decay. These novels read more like the case studies of a mental hospital because they follow so closely the symptoms which alienists associated with madness. So instead of using madness as a plot mechanism, realist fiction illustrates insanity as a serious illness which has grave repercussions.

**Historical Contexts**

Before turning to the fictional representations of madness that lie at the heart of my thesis, it is necessary to have an understanding of the historical context in which these authors were writing. Madness was a complex subject in Victorian Britain, regarded as an illness, but also embodying many of the things the Victorians feared: immorality, social disorder, criminality, lack of femininity, and even 'un-Englishness'. I will examine Victorian madness in three stages, looking first at the causes, then at the behaviour and symptoms associated with the illness and lastly at the treatment provided.

1. Causes

Hereditary madness was also a common occurrence in Victorian fiction, and mystery over a character's parentage was usually a precursor to revealing a mad relative. It was also considered to be a sound method of detecting insanity, which was believed to cluster in certain family groups. The case study of Constance Kent is a good example of this. Constance is famous for having murdered her younger brother in 1861 for no apparent reason by slitting his throat. But further investigation found that 'her grandmother had been unsound of mind', her mother was 'of weak intellect', and her Uncle was 'twice confined to a lunatic asylum'.[16] Thus, hereditary degeneration was confirmed as a way of discovering the root cause of lunatic behaviour.

The rising periodic interest in madness can also be partially attributed to the public derangement of the British monarch King George III, who was known colloquially as 'Mad' King George.[17] The idea that a royal could be afflicted with weakness of the mind stimulated public discussion as it called

into question the assumption that madness was an illness that only struck the lower classes and the degenerate. Even his granddaughter Queen Victoria was 'reportedly haunted by fears of her own potential madness' due to the insanity of her grandfather.[18]

Benedict Morel was a 'mid-Victorian degeneration theorist' who wrote the *Treatise on the Degeneration of the Human Species.*[19] Kelly Hurley interprets his theory on progressive degeneration as 'centred on the probability of the sins of the parents being visited upon their children'.[20] These theories created an anxiety throughout Victorian society that once moral degeneracy began in a family line, it was impossible to eradicate. If medically diagnosed, it could be called 'faulty heritage'.[21] Hereditary insanity was not the only type of madness which caused anxieties to rise during this time, there was also the social problem of moral insanity. The term 'moral insanity' was first coined by James Cowles Prichard who defined it as 'a morbid perversion of the feelings, affections, habits without any hallucination or erroneous conviction' affecting the person's judgement.[22]

Of course, the way in which madness was viewed by the Victorians was influenced by their social context, as evidenced in the gendered approach to madness. Females were believed to be emotionally unstable and therefore were likely to manifest symptoms of lunacy when burdened with too much emotion. Their perceived madness encapsulated a great number of mental illnesses which were later discovered to have different natural triggers. Females were the main demographic affected by the label of lunatic because many natural female disorders were subsumed under the diagnosis of insanity. Anything from 'depressive disorders, pregnancy, post-

natal depression, pre-menstrual tension, menstruation and menopause' was explained away as symptoms of insanity.[23] Indeed the word 'womb' is derived from the Greek *hysteros* or hysteria.[24] Hysteria was said to be both everywhere and nowhere as a vague psychiatric illness that could be used as a general diagnosis without being defined.[25] But this illness was particular to women because of their biological makeup according to historical thought. It was a common belief then that 'women's bodies were taken over by their devouring wombs which destroyed their mental health'.[26] The part of the body that evidenced sexual activity was the cause of the hysteria, an ambiguous term encapsulating organic mental illnesses that impact females. Insanity was intrinsically part of women since birth as it was diagnosed from biological symptoms that they were born with as females.

Women were not the only ones to be singled out as prone to certain types of madness. Those who were of the lower or working classes were suspected of degeneration, which was manifested through criminality, physical deformity and mental illness.[27] Degeneration was thought to be the opposite of evolution, the devolving of a group or individual as a result of class or racial origin. The idea that madness was caused by a hereditary taint was rife during this era; this notion was called progressive degeneration. It was an increasingly popular opinion during this time in connection to many illnesses, including madness.

However, each social class was prone to some lunacy; where you belonged in social hierarchy influenced the type of insanity you were likely to be diagnosed with. Both poverty and riches influenced the psyche negatively and produced certain forms of madness according to Victorian

beliefs. For example, the insanity of the poor was said to be caused by 'beer and gin, malnutrition, a dreary monotony of toil, muscular exhaustion, domestic distress, misery and anxiety.'[28] The lunacy of the middle classes was said to be caused by 'stress of business, excessive competition, failures and…reckless and intemperate living'; [29] while the madness of the upper class was caused by dipsomania, intemperance, 'excessive brain work in after life, undisciplined wills, desultory life'.[30] The apparent cause of lunacy for the upper class was an over-consumption, while a constant lack of material necessities triggered suffering in the poor who saw the weighty anxieties of poverty as being causation, while the rich didn't have enough to occupy their minds. A mix of all these symptoms is seen in the middle class, who had neither excess nor plenty.

But those who were wealthy did have one advantage. They had the chance to defend themselves from the stigma of suspected madness with expensive lawyers. Atavism too was no longer an anxiety for them as 'hereditary insanity could be defended by the rich, who could provide the [costly] evidence.'[31] They could also afford the expensive fees of the private asylum where they benefited from better treatment than the public asylums.

Those who were poor also suffered from the public opinion that their poverty was the result of immorality. In Victorian times, 'poverty...was seen as the result of personal inadequacies' instead of economic climate or lack of education.[32] Social problems were perceived as the result of immorality, like the criminal who is diagnosed as morally insane.[33]

Race was often linked to madness, especially in Victorian fiction, where fears of atavism, degeneration and immorality are conflated. The

races who had darker skin were often seen as less civilised and therefore more likely to develop atavism, degeneration and devolution.[34] Foreigners were also suspected of criminality and events such as the Whitechapel murders emphasised the suspicion surrounding certain racial groups at this time.

Among the negative attributes associated with the foreign other was mental weakness, which was regarded as the result of atavism. The symptoms of atavism were thought to be 'physical appetites, unchecked by moral consciousness', which was believed to lead to insanity.[35] It was atavism that was threatening 'the very fabric of society' and perceptions of the racial other were growing fearful.[36]

2. Symptoms and Behaviour

Darwinian psychiatrists asserted that certain characteristics in physiognomy indicated a predisposition to the disease of madness and the problem of criminality. Any disharmony of features, tics, unsymmetrical facial structuring or stammering of words were, to the trained eye signs of the future lunatic and criminal.[37] Indications of minor abnormalities were understood to be degenerate traits, a physical symptom signifying a mental state. The blurring of the lines between the biological and the mental was typical of this period. Italian criminal psychologist Cesare Lombroso believed the criminal followed impulses that were as natural as their inherited primitive physical features.[38] Lombroso stated that:

> if we examine a number of criminals, we shall find that they exhibit
> numerous anomalies in the face, skeleton, and various psychic and

sensitive functions, so that they strongly resemble the primitive races.[39]

During this time, criminal behaviour was thought to be a manifestation of madness, especially repeated offending. Lack of conscience was especially alarming in a criminal because it demonstrated a constant immorality which deadened the criminal's integrity and led him to insanity. Those who were ruled by instinct rather than being amenable to social control were seen as dangerous and were liable to be locked up for that very reason.[40] Indeed, the treatment of the insane and the treatment of the criminal were very similar, both subject to sequestration by law and medical treatment and observation by professional men. Progress was made in systems used to identify criminals. Alphonse Bertillon pioneered a theory 'in which descriptions of the criminal's physical attributes (hair colour, eye colour, skin colour) and measurements of his body were recorded in an index' in the belief that it would make the criminal easy to identify.[41] This was called phrenology, the belief that you could diagnose mental illness from bumps on the skull.[42]

As crime was thought to be something which could be diagnosed physically, it was also something which was clearly present in the actions of a person. Those who exhibited signs of excess, for example, were not unlike the criminal and were linked to the insane through commonalities. Addiction was one of the behaviours that the morally degenerate or morally insane exhibited, proving a lack of personal strength in combatting temptation. This reasoning was typical of the period, when it was believed an 'individual possessed the powers and the will to combat insanity' and therefore also

the excesses that caused lunacy.[43]  Conversely, it was feared that if the addicts' substance was made unobtainable, it might trigger mania, for 'the emotions of the mind produced by ardent and ungratified desires - by domestic troubles - and by affections and passions - are frequent causes of insanity'.[44] Both possession and imbibing of a substance caused insanity, while withdrawal from it also caused lunacy. The only solution, it would seem, is for the Victorian person to stay away from addictive habit-forming solutions.

Even alcoholism was believed to be a type of madness, identified by the title 'alcoholic psychosis'.[45] Drunkenness proliferated in Victorian society, as 'there were no licensing hours and spirits, wine and beer were extremely cheap.'[46] Meanwhile, the word 'dipsomaniac' contains the suffix 'maniac', and those under the influence of alcohol were likely to behave in a way that brought public stigma, just as madness did. A person imbibing a large amount of liquor was more likely to behave in a way that brought infamy upon themselves. Criminal acts for example (which were thought to be a symptom of madness) were more likely to be committed when the person was intoxicated and not in a reasoning state of mind.

Another category of insanity popularly diagnosed in the Victorian period was monomania. Monomania was a type of madness often depicted in literature as an insanity which only impacts one aspect of the victim's life. Kleptomania, pyromania and nymphomania would all be examples of this.[47] Criminal anthropologist Cesare Lombroso believed that monomaniacs also suffered from delusions and become convinced that 'they are the object of general persecution'.[48] Today we would call this condition schizophrenia.

3. Treatment

To combat all the differing types of insanity that were emerging during this time, there was a system developed for institutionalising those 'insane' members for treatment. The nineteenth century is particularly known as the era typified by the emergence of the discipline of psychiatry and psychiatric doctors who established their profession in mental asylums throughout England. People who were diagnosed as mentally unstable were sent to these hospitals and treated through either violent or placating means. The treatment in asylums employed by the psychiatrists differed according to their ideologies. Some believed that 'the mad were linked to wild beasts requiring brutal taming, and shock therapies and drugs [were to be] used time out of mind; physical restraint, bloodletting, purges and vomits.'[49] Others used pacifying means as derived from the diagnosis of moral insanity.

The Victorians were eager to solve the mystery of the criminal mind, as well as the origin of madness. With the emergence of Darwinian science, it was hoped that the criminal and the lunatic could be cured by the accurate biological diagnosis of the source of their behaviour. The subsequent ridding the public of these two scourges was one of the optimistic hopes that flowed from the publication of such radical science. This was a key endeavour in the public mind which saw the betterment of society resulting in the expulsion of certain social problems with which it was laden with.

Treatment was most commonly seen in these asylums, where alienists developed cures according to the symptoms that the patient was exhibiting. There were different kinds of asylums: public and private; the

private hospitals were exclusively for those who could afford their large fees while the public asylums served the remaining lunatics. The asylum system of segregating the sane from those thought insane helped fuel the idea that the mentally unstable were dangerous and had no place in civilised society. One of the oldest running institutions, Bethlehem (Bedlam) Hospital in London allowed its patients to be on display to at least 96,000 people annually. The idea behind this was to present madness as safely contained within the walls of an establishment as well as a spectacle to be gazed at.[50] This was because 'before the middle of the nineteenth century, the people of villages and small towns had a horror of those who were different, an authoritarian intolerance of behaviour that did not conform to rigidly drawn norms'.[51] This horror attracted the interest and fascination of those drawn to the macabre and the strange unexplainable phenomena that madness was thought to be. The nineteenth century institutionalisation of the insane and the criminal helped ease these anxieties, as people were afraid of the afliction that a mad person or a criminal might spread to the public. It also pandered to the morbid public interest in lunacy.  The solution to this multifaceted illness was to find a cure to fit all the different strains which Victorian psychiatrists had discovered. The idea that madness could be cured by an institution was derived from the enlightenment thinking of the previous century.[52]

A treatment known as moral management was developed during this time as a way to combat the weaknesses of the mind that were believed to lead to moral insanity. This included encouraging the patients to use their self-control, therefore combatting their passions and consequently their lunacy. The psychiatrist's mantra was simply to limit excess in everything.

Johann Christian Heinroth, a Lutheran priest, preached that insanity was linked to sin and the only cure was to 'expose the lunatic to the wealthy and devout personality of the alienist'.[53] It was even believed that those who had committed wicked acts would suffer the death of the mind (insanity) as punishment and those who were very wicked would die a physical death. To those of this persuasion, madness was understood to be 'the literal struggle between the divine and the temptations of the Evil One for possession of an individual's soul'.[54]

Sigmund Freud was known as the man who 'made the mad talk' and also as a philosopher interested in developing theories concerning hysteria.[55] He believed that hysteria was the result of 'primitive sexual experience belonging to the first years of childhood', which produced traumatic memories.[56] The only cure for this hysteria was the psychiatrist's couch, where Freud listened to his patients detail their particular memories. The object of this treatment was to relieve the sufferer from reminiscences regarding their sexual experience, which he believed was the cause of their hysteria. His first published work *Studies on Hysterics* was published in May 1895, which he co-authored with his contemporary Dr Joseph Breuer, a 'well-known physician in Vienna'.[57] However, Freud had reason in 1914 to renounce his pet theory of hysteria when Breuer found that some of the traumas which Freud believed were the cause of hysteria were, in fact, fictitious. This contradiction caused the breakdown of his etiology, which Freud accepted with no shame, rather with victory.

It is against this complex background of causation, symptoms and treatment that representations of the mad in Victorian fiction play out. In

investigating the associations between gender, race and class, and criminality and madness in Victorian fiction the following discussion is alert to the ways in which the literature of the period intersects with the historical record. At times the literature serves as a window into dominant Victorian attitudes and beliefs, reflecting societal views. Indeed in much of the sensation and Gothic fiction the behaviour of the mad is exaggerated for the shock factor and entertainment, reinforcing the fears and anxieties of many Victorians through a construction of madness as dangerous and violent. However, in some narratives the figure of the madwoman and madman is treated with much more empathy, literature working to question, critique, and expand attitudes towards insanity.

[1] Vieda Skultans, *Madness and Morals: Ideas on Insanity in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited, 1975), p. 9.
[2] Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Adventure of the Creeping Man*, PDF found on <https://sherlock-holm.es/stories/pdf/letter/2-sided/cree.pdf> [accessed 15 April 2015], pp. 1-9 (p. 3).
[3] Conan Doyle, *The Adventure of the Creeping Man*, p. 8.
[4] Conan Doyle, *The Adventure of the Creeping Man*, p. 9.
[5] Chris Horrocks and Zoran Jevtic, *Foucault for Beginners* (Cambridge: Icon Books Limited, 1997), p. 32.
[6] Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilisation: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971) trans. by Richard Howard , pp. 104, 108
[7] Horrocks and Jevtic, p. 46.
[8] Andrew Scull, 'Psychiatry and Social Control in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries', *A History of Psychiatry*, Volume 2 (1991), pp. 149-169 (p. 164), cited by Joseph Melling and Bill Forsythe, in *Insanity, Institutions and Society, 1800-1914: A Social History of Madness in Comparative Perspective* (London: Routledge Limited, 1999), p. 2.
[9] A. Digby, 'The Changing Profile of a Nineteenth-Century Asylum: The Retreat', *Psychological Medicine*, 14.4 (1984), pp. 739-748 (p. 744), cited by Joseph Melling and Bill Forsythe, in *Insanity, Institutions and Society, 1800-1914: A Social History of Madness in Comparative Perspective* (London: Routledge Limited, 1999), p. 2.

[10] Edith Wharton, 'The Vice of Reading', *The North American Review*, 177.563 (1903), p. unknown, cited by Andrew Maunder and Grace Moore, in *Victorian Crime, Madness and Sensation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), p. 60.

[11] Andrew Maunder and Grace Moore, *Victorian Crime, Madness and Sensation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), p. 60.

[12] Maunder and Moore, p. 97.

[13] Valerie Pedlar, *Most Dreadful Visitation: Male Madness in Victorian Fiction* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004), p. 1.

[14] Marie Ann Grigsby, 'The Victorian Craze: The Appeal of Madness in Charles Reade, Wilkie Collins and Charles Dickens' (Published Dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1998), p. 5.

[15] Grigsby, p. 4.

[16] Samantha Pegg, ''Madness is a Woman': Constance Kent and Victorian Construction of Female Insanity', *Liverpool Law Review*, 30.3 (2010), pp. 207-223 (p. 210).

[17] Grigsby, p. 6.

[18] Maunder and Moore, p. 25.

[19] Maunder and Moore, p. 60.

[20] Maunder and Moore, p. 64.

[21] Jenny Bourne Taylor and Sally Shuttleworth (ed.), *An Anthology of Psychological Texts 1830-1890* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 277, cited by Andrew Maunder and Grace Moore, in *Victorian Crime, Madness and Sensation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), p. 181.

[22] Skultans, p. 6.

[23] Pegg, p. 212.

[24] Phyllis Chesler, *Women and Madness* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 1.

[25] Yannick Ripa*, Women and Madness: The Incarceration of Women in Nineteenth-Century France* (Paris: Polity Press, 1990), p. 78.

[26] Ripa, p. 1.

[27] Linda Dryden, *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles: Stevenson, Wilde and Wells* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 8.

[28] David Hack Tuke, *Insanity in Ancient and Modern Life with Chapters on its Prevention* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1878), p. 54, cited by Vieda Skultans, in *Madness and Morals*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited, 1975), p. 124.

[29] Hack Tuke, p. 124.

[30] Hack Tuke, p. 124.

[31] Ripa, pp. 212-213.

[32] Skultans, p. 19.

[33] Skultans, p. 19.

[34] Dryden, pp. 83-4.

[35] Dryden, p. 9.

[36] Dryden, p. 77.

[37] Elaine Showalter, *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), p. 106.

[38] L. Perry Curtis, *Jack the Ripper and the London Press* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), p. 85, cited by Linda Dryden, in *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles: Stevenson, Wilde and Wells* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 36.

[39] Gina Lombroso-Ferrero, *Criminal Man: According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso,* in Project Gutenberg, unpagenated.

[40] Pegg, p. 212.

[41] Maunder and Moore, p. 196.

[42] Edward Shorter*, A History of Psychiatry: From the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac* (Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, 1997), p. 42.

[43] Skultans, p. 2.

[44] Skultans, p. 33.

[45] Shorter, p. 49.

[46] Catherine Arnold**,** *Bedlam: London and its Mad* (London: Simon and Schuster, 2008), p. 60.

[47] Roy Porter*, Madness: A Brief History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 134.

[48] Lombroso-Ferrero, p. 279.

[49] Porter, p. 100.

[50] Horrocks and Jevtic, p. 43.

[51] Shorter, p. 2.

[52] Shorter, p. 8.

[53] Porter, pp. 140-141.

[54] Andrew Scull, *The Most Solitary of Afflictions: Madness and Society in Britain, 1700-1900* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), p. 177, cited by Marie Ann Grigsby, in 'The Victorian Craze: The Appeal of Madness in Charles Reade, Wilkie Collins and Charles Dickens' (Published Dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1998), p. 8.

[55] Horrocks and Jevtic, p. 46.

[56] Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud Volume 1: The Formative Years and the Great Discoveries 1856-1900* (New York: Basic Books, 1953), p. 264.

[57] Jones, p. 222.

# Chapter One: Gender

One, two, three, women are all crazy, except for my nanny who makes apple pie.

Sixteenth Century Nursery Rhyme[1]

Women are represented as the main victims of insanity by both psychiatry and fiction. 'It was believed that the inherent physical weakness of women and their obvious mental fragility were very closely linked'.[2] Women were also more frequently diagnosed as mad when their behaviours contradicted their role as the angel in the house, which was one of the constructs that society used to define femininity during this time. After the case of Constance Kent *The Telegraph* asserted the opinion 'better a hundred times that she should prove to be a maniac than a murderess'.[3] Preserving the ideal of femininity was more important to the Victorians than acknowledging the capability of females to commit crimes as well as men. A misdiagnosis of insanity was better than a deserved sentence for a criminal female and thus the prison was replaced by the asylum.

The female offender, according to Lombroso, was less common than the male offender and her criminal acts were of completely different type. She usually indulged in prostitution as her offence, which satisfied 'the desire for licence, idleness, and indecency, characteristics of the criminal nature.'[4] An obvious sexual desire in a woman was seen not only as a sign of lunacy but also of degeneracy, a fall 'from women's place near the top of

the evolutionary moral and social trees.'[5] Her adherence to her feminine role guaranteed her respect in society as someone thoroughly unaffected by the disease of degeneration. Women were seen as the 'guardians of society [and] any diversion from moral accountability was a greater fall from grace' than for anyone else.[6]

Unmarried women were also seen as prone to madness. In 'the dictionaries of the time…they gave spinsterhood as one of the causes of madness'.[7] Without a man a woman would remain permanently a child and she could not escape the inevitable diagnosis of insanity.[8] Spinsters in Victorian times were the butt of many jokes as they were not validated by their contribution to society. However, those who did have children were liable to be diagnosed with puerperal insanity also known as insanity of childbirth or in modern terms post-natal depression.[9] The erratic behaviour seen either initially after birth or delayed by a few weeks could range from a melancholic disposition to dangerous acts, the former symptom liable to send the sufferer to an asylum

In this chapter I will address the issue of gender and madness. Were female lunatics really over-represented in Victorian novels? Or was it just that the female example was more memorable? Was this because the expectation of the female as the angel in the house contrasted with mentally disturbed behaviour, resulting in severe judgements? I will also focus on the figure of the madman: how does he differ from the female lunatic, if at all? Are these representations of madness entrenched in the gender of the aflicted person?

Representations of female madness in the nineteenth century were based on biological cycles, stereotyped ideas and the rejection of inherent social roles. The hormonal cycles of women, whether it be menstrual, natal or menopausal, were seen as impacting the mental stability of women worldwide.

The characterisation of madness in men centred on a world of violence, addiction and fixation that sets masculine madness apart from female madness. Women also played a part in male madness, becoming either an object of oppression or obsession, depending on what type of madness was being portrayed. Patriarchal longings also characterise some strains of male madness, the wish to be seen as inherently better setting masculine insanity apart from female insanity.

In the first part of my chapter, I will examine five female examples of the 'madwoman' from Victorian fiction, which range from characters whose behaviours are savage and unbalanced to those who are wrongly labelled as 'mad' by a patriarchal society. I will begin with *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Brontë*, Lady Audley's Secret* by Mary Elizabeth Braddon and *Wuthering Heights* by Emily Brontë. I will then move on to *Great Expectations* by Charles Dickens and finish with *The Woman in White* by Wilkie Collins. Throughout, I will illustrate the varying symptoms which were attributed to madness during this era, many of which were gendered. My analysis will also explore the authors' stance on madness: whether they were sympathetic to their mad women and critical of the typical attitudes of their day or whether they concurred more with the attitudes of the day.

In the second part of my chapter I will turn to male examples of madness through the use of four core novels. I will start with Mr Boldwood from *Far from the Madding Crowd* by Thomas Hardy, a character who is latently insane. Then I will continue with the infamous title character from Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, whose madness is depicted as the result of a male environment, promoting violence against the female body. This will be followed by the dual personalities of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde from *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* by Robert Louis Stevenson and the fixation of Louis Trevelyan in Anthony Trollope's *He Knew He Was Right.* In the same vein as my discussion on female characters, I will be looking at how male madness is depicted. Does fixation and obsession play a key role in male madness? Is addiction a fault that leads to male madness?  Is male madness characterised by violence, crime and substance abuse consistently, or just in some of my chosen novels?

### Jane Eyre

The archetypal Victorian fictional madwoman is undoubtedly Bertha Mason from Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*. On the surface, Bertha can interpreted as the stereotypical depiction of the lunatic: savage, foreign and crafty. Bertha's foreign origins, after all, were a symbol of the 'otherness' with which the Victorians tended to label their more despicable criminals and lunatics. However, this chapter will be focusing on the madness of Bertha and how it is manifested in regards to her gender. Is her behaviour a pivotal part of her diagnosis because it displays an irregular trait for women; promiscuity? Is this why Rochester chooses to confine her, or is it not as simple as that?

Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar offer a complex reading of Bertha Mason's behaviour in *Jane Eyre* in *Madwoman in the Attic*. According to them, Bertha is Jane's reinterpreted dark double, 'the angry aspect of the orphan child' repressed from Gateshead onwards.[10] Jane's well behaved aspect is only made possible by Bertha's freedom of violent expression. The repressed Jane is balanced through the opposite nature of Bertha, and it is only through Bertha that Jane can maintain her image. Even Jane's pacing up and down whenever she is in a difficult situation is mirrored by Bertha's 'running backwards and forwards on all fours in the attic', while the scene in the red room at Gateshead points to the mental instability of Jane Eyre.[11] Both women are constantly paralleled; Rochester compares Jane and Bertha when he marks out the deficiencies in the latter's character: 'she had neither modesty, no benevolence, no candour, nor refinement in her mind or manners'.[12]

But Gilbert and Gubar do not want Bertha's madness to be romanticized. Viewing Bertha as 'a rebellious woman subverting the patriarchal order by burning down her husband's estate…has a certain irresistible appeal', but is nonetheless wrong.[13] This is because there is something fundamentally broken in terms of Bertha's mental state, which should not be glamorised by imaginings of her heroic behaviour. It is easy to dismiss the behaviour of Bertha from the position of a contemporary interpretation as a label enforced by patriarchy (Rochester) to enforce the morality of the female social role on Bertha. It is her sexual behaviour that disgusts Rochester and leads to her early confinement, even though his own sexual behaviour is not beyond reproach.

However, Charlotte Brontë herself wrote of Bertha's insanity to W.S. Williams in January 1848:

> There is a phase of insanity which may be called moral madness, in which all that is good or even human seems to disappear from the mind and a fiend-nature replaces it. The sole aim and desire of the being possessed is to exasperate, to molest, to destroy, and preternatural ingenuity and energy often exercised to that dreadful end…Mrs Rochester indeed, lived a sinful life before she was insane, but sin itself is a species of insanity.[14]

Charlotte saw Bertha as being the victim of excess, living without moral boundaries which transformed into a destructive form of insanity. As Rochester points out, 'her excesses have prematurely developed the germs of insanity'; where Jane has remained constrained, Bertha has not.[15]  This leads to Bertha being the exact antithesis of Jane, both exhibiting vastly different natures and characters. Bertha's sexual appetite is a particular difference, with her 'snarling canine noise[s]',[16] animalistic passion and 'grizzled hair, wild as a mane'.[17] She is also described as a 'hyena', her physical strength parallel to her sexual desire, both of which are stronger than Rochester's.[18] This can be seen through Rochester's need to contain Bertha in order to maintain control of her, while he is subject to her fits of anger.  It is essential for him to retain this advantage in order to have power over her sexual physical self, not allowing her the opportunity for deviance or violence.

Bertha's depravity is marked in his belief that she has no modesty,[19] despite his own life being an example of immoral living.[20] As a reader we

can question this account of Rochester's, as there is no other witness to Bertha's previous actions leading up to incarceration. After all, as Andrew Maunder argues:

> sexual 'depravity' among women in particular – including any sexual interest outside of marriage was regarded as a sign of nymphomania or lunacy, but also as regression or degeneration: a horrible fall from women's place near the top of the evolutionary, moral and social tree.[21]

Bertha's sexual appetite and loose behaviour point towards her lunacy, according to Brontë, who terms this as both sin and insanity.

However, as Valerie Beattie points out, 'Bertha enacts a split between feminist literary theory, regarding interpretations of female madness'.[22] Feminist theory is concerned with the interpretation of female madness, especially when authored by a female writer. One group of critics see Bertha as a representation of racial and female madness, which Brontë uses to display an archetype. Another group (Gilbert and Gubar) prefer to see Bertha as part of the uninhibited Jane, not mad but instead signifying the act of repression and feminist rebellion. Elaine Showalter claims that 'to contemporary feminist critics, Bertha Mason has become a paradigmatic figure', who is protesting against the double standard of morality, where men like Mr Rochester may live a loose life but Bertha may not.[23]This example serves to uncover the base double standard that existed during this time.

### *Lady Audley's Secret*

In the nineteenth century, it was considered that every woman had a responsibility to behave within the narrow perceptions of respectable behaviour or otherwise be suspected of having something wrong with her.[24] Lady Audley is lacking in maternal affections, which sets her apart from her expected Victorian role as the mother and loving carer of her son. Lady Audley does not fulfil her role of mother and wife, so in this context her character is considered unnatural given her non-maternal but ambitious nature. In this way she is distanced from what Edward Shorter calls her 'inherited social role', preferring instead to turn to crime to procure wealth and a title for herself.[25] In her ambition to create class mobility for herself, Lady Audley abandons her son for a better future. While possessing a lock of her son's hair in a locket, however, she does not miss it when the gardener steals it. She admits: 'I did not love the child, for he had been left a burden upon my hands'.[26]

Lady Audley's femininity is at odds with her character as a 'madwoman' guilty of bigamy, attempted murder and arson. Sir Michael's cousin Robert Audley recognises this and tells her 'henceforth you must seem to me no longer a woman', but rather a representation of evil.[27] The virtue which was believed to be equated with womanhood is not present in Lady Audley and consequently her actions point to a character who is masculine rather than feminine. This ties in with the twentieth century performativity theories of Judith Butler who asserts, 'one performs gender as society expects that repetitious ritualised performance'.[28] Those who do not behave according to the predictable patterns that society has outlined

for them no longer represent their gender. In this way, Lady Audley is side-lined by her context that demands women live the role of the angel-in-the-house rather than the life of a criminal in disguise.

Published in 1862, *Lady Audley's Secret* denotes the 'anxieties over women's changing roles which…are certainly evident in the early 1860s'.[29] Early on in the novel she is separated from the female role she is expected to play, foreshadowing an even bigger distinction between her and the idealised Victorian female which comes later in the novel. Her criminal past becomes more evident here and her list of crimes includes bigamy, arson and attempted murder. These unfeminine traits contrast with her golden curls and blue eyes, which seem to suggest innocence rather than astute criminality.

Lady Audley secretly marries her second husband by using a pseudonym and faking her own death to put her first husband off his guard. Publishing in the newspaper her own obituary and erecting her own gravestone at Ventnor, she seeks to create her own death and subsequent new identity through subterfuge.[30] Consequently, her original husband George grieves for the wife that is not dead, his 'one great sorrow' in life.[31] Clearly Lady Audley cares little for the grief of her first husband or for her second husband, whom she also does not love. Her marriage to Sir Michael Audley is also on material grounds, rather than based on a genuine love, illustrating that she lacks scruples in more than one area. It is in this way that we see (as Pamela Gilbert points out) that the females in the novel 'express a clear understanding of the relations of power'.[32]

Sexual figures were seen as threatening to Victorian society, which is why sensation novels such as *Lady Audley's Secret* capitalised on this anxiety. Lady Audley uses her sexual attractiveness to marry into the landed gentry despite her previous marriage to George Talboys. This act of defiance against her husband is the catalyst for the detective-style narrative that follows, with George and Robert trying to seek out the true identity of Lady Audley. Her sexual threat can be seen when even Robert admits 'she is certainly a lovely creature'; even he is susceptible to the charm of golden curls and blue eyes.[33]

But your sexuality could also destroy you as, during this time, there was a belief that the womb could extinguish the mental health of a woman, according to Yannick Ripa's research into this topic.[34] Womanhood and madness were conflated into one image and were inseparable, the implication being that if you were a woman, you would inevitably experience madness. Their bodies were thought to be 'taken over by their devouring wombs, which destroyed their mental health.'[35] This was, of course, linked to natal illnesses which were not recognised or diagnosed at this time. It was another reason why madness was more likely to be linked to females than males, as it was believed that pregnancy and birth could drive a woman over the edge.

The role of the men in this novel, such as Robert Audley, seems to be to return normality and counteract the madness that Lady Audley exudes.[36] Robert plays the role of the detective, unmasking the criminal to condemn her and put her away. He restores the so called 'order' in the book, insisting on putting Lady Audley in an asylum, where she dies. The

normative order is one of patriarchal leadership, which is contravened by Lady Audley and the control she not only exhibits over her own life, but also the life of her husband, Sir Michael Audley. Her diagnosis and incarceration represent the way in which she, as an assertive and dominant female character, is silenced by the authoritative male.

Frustrated with being left alone with her child and with no means to help raise herself above her lowly station, Lady Audley uses the only attribute she possesses, her beauty, to obtain social mobility. In rising above her station and obtaining money, as a female, Lady Audley expresses an independence that horrifies Robert. According to him, she is not performing according to her inherited social role, which is one of moral and lawful obedience. Indeed, 'recent critical consensus has dismissed this 'insanity', seeing in it merely a convenient device for explaining away perfectly rational behaviour unacceptable in a female protagonist.'[37] Butler's work on performativity illuminates this; she asserts that the way a person behaves is expected to be in line with their gender role of the context.[38] She argues that 'gender is performativity produced and compelled by the regulatory practices of gender coherence'.[39] Because Lady Audley behaves outside of her role, even for understandable reasons, she is declared mad and is quickly sequestrated by the men in the novel. There she conveniently dies, leaving the family name intact and restoring peace to the Audley family.

### *Wuthering Heights*

Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* contains a 'madwoman' whose egomania causes her to suffer from brain fever, delirium, self-starvation and self-harm.

Catherine Earnshaw is split between the man she claims to feel a deep affinity for and the man who can give her the future she wants. Consequently, she represses her natural feelings for her childhood soul mate Heathcliff. When in the company of Edgar Linton, the wealthy gentleman of the neighbourhood, she adopts 'a double character', as she restrains the wild side of her nature to attract Edgar.[40] But Catherine goes on to claim that she is Heathcliff,[41] that they are one and the same person and that they share the same miseries.[42] When Catherine finds that Heathcliff has discovered her plan to betray him and therefore herself, she falls into a state of 'delirium'[43] and narrator Nelly Dean remarks, 'I thought she would go mad'.[44] Catherine is previously mentioned as being out in the rain looking for Heathcliff, the inference being that her physical fever had repercussions on her mental state. Her grief is described as 'uncontrollable', foreshadowing her inevitable lack of mental control which the severing of the relationship with Heathcliff causes.[45] After her fever has dissipated, Dr Kenneth warns her family not to annoy or vex Catherine as her 'mental constitution has been weakened by her illness'.[46]

In marrying the antithesis of Heathcliff, Catherine represses the Heathcliff in herself and, in the melodramatic style of the Gothic tale, the repercussions of this repression are enormous. This is particularly evident when Catherine meets Heathcliff three years later, resulting in her becoming ill with a brain fever, which causes her mind to degenerate to that of a child. She exhibits childish behaviour, which turns into violence. When she argues with her husband she stamps her foot and later regrets the break in her fast because she knows it will please her husband, whom she wishes to anger. When reaching the peak of her fever she finds 'a childish diversion in pulling

the feathers from the rents she had just made, and ranging them on the sheet according to their different species'.[47] Her emotions change quickly, like the fleeting sentiments of a child, and Nelly laments that 'our fiery Catherine was no better than a wailing child'.[48]

Of course, the birth of the child a few months later and the subsequent death of the mother could be seen as a contributing factor to the madness that Catherine exhibits. Victorians classed any behaviour under natal influences as lunacy; however, Catherine's wild acts could be viewed by a modern reader as resulting from the impact of her pregnancy, upsetting her emotional equilibrium and depriving her of reason as Foucault would describe it.[49] According to his philosophy, 'madness actually represents a crisis in reason'.[50] Thormählen also asserts that 'a tendency to mental illness was apt to be activated by pregnancy and childbirth'.[51]

Perhaps megalomania or extreme egoism is Catherine's only fault in believing she could be the wife of a wealthy gentleman and yet still remain soul-mates with his rival. Marianne Thormählen calls Catherine 'pathologically egotistical'[52] and points out that Heathcliff is 'an integral component of her egomania, which is why she cannot understand why her marriage to Edgar should mean separation from Heathcliff.'[53] She uses the example of phrenologist Johann Gaspar Spurzheim who argues that 'the high incidence of insanity in England was connected with the rampant selfishness (manifest, among other things, in the English preoccupation with commerce) of her people.'[54] Catherine's obsession with Heathcliff renders her unable to acknowledge the unlikeliness of Edgar accepting Heathcliff (or vice versa). Likewise, her own high opinion of herself makes her believe

that both men would be happy to tolerate sharing her because she is such a great prize to them. But Thormählen argues that this is what drives her to insanity, the realisation that she cannot have both Heathcliff and Edgar, a realisation that is forced upon her when Heathcliff calls on her after years of being apart. She asks Edgar to make friends with Heathcliff 'for my sake', but witnesses the conflict between the two when in close proximity.[55]

A contrasting view is the idea that Catherine was driven mad because of her suppressed feelings for Heathcliff. This type of madness would be particular to females in Catherine's position because she was forced, like so many women at the time, to choose between marrying for money or for love. The resulting repression of feelings towards Heathcliff (as well as her pregnancy) unbalanced her mentally, just as it unbalanced Heathcliff (who survived her). So her insanity here can be interpreted as the practical choice of a woman having to decide whether to gain material comfort over affection and pauperism.

What does Brontë mean by illustrating madness this way? Catherine's maniacal behaviour can be interpreted as the result of her attachment to Edgar and Heathcliff, which drives her (after a period of fever) to mad ravings and delirium. Her expectation of an unlikely cohabitation of all three of them is disappointed. Her first madness is visited upon her when Heathcliff deserts her when she reveals her plan to marry Edgar. Her second bout of madness happens when Edgar and Heathcliff almost come to blows over her. The last and final mania she experiences after Heathcliff has married Isabella, just before the birth of her daughter. All of these examples show that Catherine's madness is provoked by the revelation of

the improbability of having a relationship with Heathcliff while being Mrs Linton. Madness provoked by hormonal changes is also implicated, as the birth of her daughter happens shortly after the severest bout of brain fever.

I agree with the critical work of Thormählen on this novel when she asserts that the realisation that Catherine could not have both men literally drove her to insanity and then death.[56] The pressures associated with her gender (marrying for money and having children) drove her to a mad end, grieving all the while for her lost relationship with Heathcliff.

### *Great Expectations*

The female disappointed by love seems to be a common theme in Victorian novels with mad characters, Miss Havisham in Charles Dickens' *Great Expectations* plays the role of the jilted fiancée turned insane. However, unlike Catherine, she is not actually insane, instead preferring to play the role to gain attention from and power over her relations. Her lunacy is presented as an inability to move past the moment when she was abandoned by the man she loved, which results in an exaggerated and fixated grief. She shapes her environment around this grief, her bridal clothing still clinging to her shrunken frame and one shoe immobile on the table behind her. Her home, Satis House, is darkened like a prison with barred windows and few visitors. However, although we might presume that these details all point to the madness of Miss Havisham, there are a few contradictory points to her lunacy. Her constant glances into a looking glass 'signifies her strong need of reassurance that she is what she wants to be.'[57] Her dramatization of the grief she suffers illustrates her awareness that she

is, in fact, on show. Like an actress on stage, she sets the scene, wears her costume and recites her lines to Pip, who indeed refers to her as a 'waxwork'.[58] Her repetition of the command to Pip to love Estella is like the key line of a script used to draw attention to the warped nature of Miss Havisham. Even in death Miss Havisham wishes her body to be laid out so 'they shall come and look at me', as her last performance.[59] This is what she seems to enjoy, throwing herself into the role of the 'madwoman', delighting in telling Pip the morbid arrangements for her funeral. Miss Havisham also seems to take delight in the attention she receives from Pip and her relatives when performing her morbid madness (not unlike Catherine Earnshaw). She gives the impression of being fully aware of the madness that she is conveying, her mask slipping once or twice when her lucidness is apparent. When conversing with Miss Pocket and Mrs and Mr Camilla, she retorts 'with exceeding sharpness' and rebuffs their attempts at concern over her wellbeing.[60]

In this way Miss Havisham exhibits self-conscious performativity, through which she has agency. She uses certain presumptions about the manifestation of madness to construct her mad body through repeated representations. Perhaps through doing this she also performs her gender, as the link between the female and the unbalanced mind was thought to be very strong during this time. As Butler posits in her book *Gender Trouble*, 'gender is performativity produced and compelled by the regularity practice of gender coherence. Gender is always doing'.[61] In other words, gender is interpreted through the actions a person, which also references cultural practice and cultural beliefs. Miss Havisham performs the female through

her feigned madness and emotional imbalance: traits which were clearly gendered.

However, her need to wreak revenge on her old lover through Pip is not altogether a mad impulse. When causing Pip's heartbreak, Miss Havisham feels release in finally being able to be the aggressor instead of the victim of the relationship, giving her a strange kind of closure. When she asks Pip if he thinks Estella is increasing in attractiveness, he answers in the affirmative, she enjoys it 'greedily'.[62] At another time she experiences 'malignant enjoyment'[63] accompanied by a 'disagreeable laugh'[64] when she realises that Pip is disappointed that Estella is abroad. Miss Havisham encourages Estella to 'break his heart' frequently throughout the novel, which is reflected by Estella's cruel treatment of Pip.[65] She laughs at his calling Knaves Jacks and his coarse hands and thick boots, making him feel ashamed of his humble upbringing.[66] Indeed, some critics have likened the relationship between Miss Havisham and Estella to that of Narcissus and Echo, where Miss Havisham's words are repeated by Estella. Miss Havisham exerts control over Estella and subsequently over Pip.[67] Some critics have argued that Estella is Miss Havisham's version of Frankenstein's monster, created from fragments of her life and for a destructive purpose.[68] When Pip admits to wanting to be a gentleman for her sake, it is phrased as a 'lunatic confession'.[69] But, as Lurt Hartog has pointed out, Estella's warning to Pip that she will never return his affection attracts Pip instead of repelling him.[70] The love he feels for Estella seems to be irrespective or, perhaps, because of her cruel treatment of him. This masochistic love gives Miss Havisham what she wants: the inversion of the

power relations gives her the satisfaction of being the victimiser rather than the victim.

According to the Victorians, Miss Havisham's madness is like the madness a woman would experience when having lost a child, 'mak[ing] it possible for the mother to believe her child was still alive.'[71] Miss Havisham employs her lunacy for a similar purpose and to the same effect, to isolate herself from the cruel reality of being jilted right before her wedding day. In *Jane Eyre*, Rochester calls this 'sweet madness', a chosen escape from reality but not in fact genuine madness.[72] Rather, she is representational of what madness was believed to be composed of and how it was likely to be exhibited. In an inverted way, instead of the madness having control over her, she controls it and has agency over it.

Perhaps Miss Havisham identifies with Pip because they both have destructive natures, hers shown in her attitude towards Estella and his shown by his hopeless love for Estella. So what is Dickens trying to convey in his feigned madwoman Miss Havisham? He suggests that madness can be a guise used as a defence mechanism against painful realities, such as Miss Havisham being jilted. Her example shows us that madness can be feigned effectively by a pretence of fixation with the addition of stage props, costumes and raving speeches.

### The Woman in White

Laura Fairlie from Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White* represents the wronged female, who has the label of madness imposed upon her to conveniently sequestrate her, like Lady Audley. Her example of the

madwoman is useful in illustrating the muteness that the label of female lunatic caused. Anyone diagnosed with the illness of lunacy was silenced by the disregard shown to those considered mentally deranged. This is embodied in the text; Eleanor Salotto points out that Laura never narrates despite the multi-narrative style of the novel.[73] Neither does the other supposed 'madwoman' Anne Catherick. Indeed, one of the gaps in the narrative is the space where Laura is imprisoned in the asylum where the reader is not permitted to join her. Collins thus reinforces Victorian attitudes towards madness and muteness, even although his text reveals the falseness of some diagnoses and the ways through which the system could be abused by patriarchy.

A woman who was claimed ill by her male counterparts could be imprisoned in an asylum on that evidence alone, the power balance being loaded in favour of the patriarchy during this time. Men ruled the professional classes and the role of the alienist was open uniquely to the masculine body. Therefore the symptoms of madness were solely theorised and established by men, based on their understanding of the female mind and body. It was believed that women were physically weaker than men, and since the mental and physical aspects of a person were thought to be linked, this translated also as a mental weakness.[74] These attitudes influenced literary depictions of madness. Any behaviour seen as contradictory to the female role of wife and mother, especially in Victorian times, was likely to be diagnosed as a type of lunacy. Non-conformist behaviour and characteristics like criminality, sexual appetite and a spirited nature were read as potential forerunners to evidence of madness.

This is similar to Michel Foucault's interpretation of madness. He argues that madness is a social construct that enables the sequestration of those who are deemed inconvenient. Although his argument focuses more on political rather than gendered reasons for silencing, the relevance of his theory still applies. Foucault's belief that madness could be a label created when no lunacy existed can be seen in the example of Laura in *The Woman in White*, whose context works against her as a woman disadvantaged in a society ruled by patriarchy. This agrees with the scholarship of Katrien Bollen and Raphael Ingelbien who see Collins acting as a 'social critic who engages in a social critique of the hypocrisies involved in constructing and sustaining Victorian bourgeois respectability.'[75] Collins's novel acts as an exposé, revealing the lengths to which he believes bourgeois patriarchs will go to in order to preserve their wealth and ownership in a Victorian context.

*The Woman in White* is also concerned with the undermining of identity through the diagnosis of madness. The identity of Laura is displaced by the label of 'madwoman'. Indeed, the keeper of the asylum claims that 'madness [has] a necessary tendency to produce alterations of appearance externally'.[76] He argues that this is not an unusual occurrence, but a reflection in the form of a delusion. Even Anne Catherick's fixated delusion had changed, he marvels, which was no doubt the reason why her mannerisms and appearance had also altered. The inward workings of her mind are seen as having a direct influence on her physical characteristics; the change in her fixation results in a slight change of face and movements. But as readers, we know that the perceived Anne is really Laura, which is the real reason for the slight change in physicality noticed by the keeper of the asylum.

However, even Miss Halcombe admits that the imprisonment in the asylum has caused Laura's face and manner to change to the point where the servants at Limmeridge House will not admit to recognising her. The experiences of the asylum have scarred her identity, so that people that were formerly sure of her character now find themselves in doubt as to who she is. The account of the other supposed lunatic, Anne Catherick, has been fixed in their minds and they assume her character and Laura's to be the same because of their similar physical appearances. This supposes that madness is a physicality to be worn as a mask where the face once was. The experiences of the asylum mean that both Anne and Laura wear this mask, no longer as individuals but as a sole representation of the mad type. They are both lumped together in the lack of individuality that the label of 'madwoman' brings. In a similar way, Salotto makes the claim that the encasing of both Laura and Anne in the asylum is 'symbol[ic] of re-creating their lack of origin in the sense that they originate from and in institutions.'[77] This is part of the horror of the novel, she argues, playing with the anxiety that Victorians felt about fluid origins instead of steadfast ones.[78]

This perceived fusion between outward appearance and behaviour and character points to the work of Cesare Lombroso, who believed that mental illness was displayed as physical representations to be measured and observed scientifically. His theories pertain mainly to the physicality of the criminal type and his conviction that there were 'numerous anomalies in the face, skeleton, and various psychic and sensitive functions, so that they strongly resembled the primitive races'.[79] Therefore, all felonious peoples were likely to resemble each other in their deformed and primitive features, not unlike the appearance of a 'madwoman'. The effect is an erosion of

individual identity and the subsuming of the individual into the type or label, which is precisely what happens to Laura.

Laura's own uncle and guardian refuses to see 'a madwoman, whom it was an outrage to have even brought into his house at all', referring to his own niece.[80] He prefers to believe her dead and buried in Limmeridge churchyard, rather than mad, and 'would call on the law to protect him[self] if before the day was over she was not removed from the house'.[81] Such was the stigma of madness, which even if untrue left a mark on whoever was thought to be mad.

In nineteenth century texts, female madness is presented in two ways; it is either a natural mental degeneration or a pretence to benefit the pretender or those diagnosing the illness. The fact that madness is illustrated to be, in some cases, feigned meant that the previously agreed diagnosis could be called into question. Not all females who appeared to be mad, or were labelled as such were indeed ill; Collins and Dickens illustrate a hesitation in assuming accurate diagnosis determined on gender. Because women were believed, at this time, to be mentally weak and biologically susceptible to lunacy, it was more likely that behaviour outside of marked bounds would be assumed to be madness. For these reasons the authors of these texts challenge the underlying assumptions of the time, which saw women as being subject to fits of insanity if exposed to small provocation.

Male madness, however, is also common in nineteenth century literature, suggesting that in spite of the particular associations between women and certain kinds of madness (such as hysteria), mental illness was

not regarded as solely a women's complaint. Granted, many of the examples of men I will be using exhibit different symptoms than the female characters, as they are more masculine. The madman tends towards violence, substance addiction, crime, obsession and false identities. This lunacy is also physically manifested; whether the male characters become dwarf-like in stature or gaunt in the face, it is usually more physically apparent than female madness.

### *Far From the Madding Crowd*

In a different mode to the depictions of madness seen in *Jane Eyre*, Thomas Hardy's *Far From the Madding Crowd* focuses on the mental degradation experienced by the lunatic. Bertha is physically warped into the figure of an animalistic creature, illustrating the physical toll of madness as well as the semblance of masculine madness on a female body. In contrast, Farmer Boldwood is tortured by mental fixation, and although his physical appearance alters somewhat, his symptoms are concentrated in his head, where they are less visible and less severe. In this sense, his madness is feminised, being depicted as neither violent nor physical (as most male madmen are), but instead focusing on the impact of insanity on the mind (like Catherine Earnshaw, for instance). This novel is neither a Gothic text, nor part of the sensation fiction genre. Instead it is a social realist text, depicting a more realistic form of madness than the supernatural manifestations in the works of Wilde and Stevenson.

Boldwood depicts latent insanity, which becomes apparent when confronted with an object of fixation. In this case it is when the beautiful

Bathsheba Everdene, whom he does not notice when she makes her 'débût' appearance, unlike all the other men at the cornmarket. She notices him however, describing him as 'a black sheep amongst the flock' whose outstanding attribute is dignity, setting him up on a pedestal from which he will inevitably fall.[82] His disinterest troubles her as the Daniel[83] in her kingdom, the only man who would not give an 'official glance of admiration which cost nothing at all.'[84] He even goes through an entire church service without suffering to turn his head once and look at her.[85]

The latter sentiments of Bathsheba promote the catalyst for the plot. She sends Boldwood a valentine with the words 'Marry Me' without admitting that it was from her. Bathsheba's ignorance in this matter is made obvious by Hardy: 'of love subjectively she knew nothing'.[86] In describing her lack of intent, Hardy removes any menace from the act which prompts Boldwood's madness, making it clear that Bathsheba is not at fault. This is despite Hardy's obvious allusion to Bathsheba in the Bible, who tempted the godly King David to lust after her and caused a myriad of tragic events to follow. Her maid, Liddy, owns that Boldwood 'met with some bitter disappointment when he was a young man and merry.'[87] Vieda Skultans writes in her book on madness: 'the emotions of the mind produced by ardent and ungratified desires – by domestic troubles – and by affections and passions – are frequent causes of insanity'.[88] The emotion felt by Boldwood on being jilted by a woman has caused damage to his mental state, which he is aware of, causing him to avoid even looking at the tempting figure of Bathsheba. This is a parallel situation to the acted madness of Miss Havisham, who also experiences mental pain when confronted with the rejection of her love.

However, as Geoffrey Thurley argues, Bathsheba's act does not give Boldwood the chance to ignore her; indeed he is forced to notice her and so his instability is revealed.[89] Boldwood, Thurley continues, lives in a self-created world which has been invaded by Bathsheba who appears to him to be desirable.[90] Hardy describes the catastrophic effect of the card: 'Boldwood had felt the symmetry of his existence to be slowly getting distorted in the direction of the ideal passion'.[91] His previous sweethearts are described by Liddy as 'all the girls, gentle and simple, for miles around', by whom he was disappointed.[92] But now he feels the opportunity to fill the void with an idealization of Bathsheba, fuelled, as Barbara Schapiro points out, 'by narcissistic loss, and by the needs and fantasies such loss generates'.[93] The subsequent obsession 'is divorced from the reality of Bathsheba as a living, breathing "troubled creature like himself"' and is instead fixed on an unobtainable ideal that he expects her to live up to.[94]

In his fixation, Mr Boldwood is forceful with Bathsheba, urging her to accept his offer of marriage, even when she is clearly unsure about her feelings. But when she comes to reject him, he breaks down: 'Bathsheba – have pity upon me!', having degenerated from his initial state of dignity to begging her to accept him because she pities him.[95] He goes on to admit, 'I am beyond myself in this, and am mad', presenting to Bathsheba the true state of his fixation and the lack of control he is experiencing.[96] But instead of blaming her for the rejection, which would cause him to destroy his idealization of Bathsheba, he blames Troy: 'he stole your heart away with his unfathomable lies!'[97] His subsequent effort to bribe Troy to stay away from Bathsheba illustrates the amount of control Boldwood wishes to have

over her.[98] He is willing to degrade himself further, morally, and to expose his feelings to Troy in order to obtain Bathsheba.

To emphasise the instability of Boldwood at this time, Hardy juxtaposes Boldwood with Gabriel Oak, as Rosemary Sumner points out, acting as a contrast of a stable man experiencing the same emotional torment.[99] Both men are in love with Bathsheba and have proposed marriage to her, only to be rejected. However, Hardy describes the resolution of Oak when discovering her marriage to Troy: 'Gabriel soon decided too that, since the deed was done, to put the best face upon the matter would be the greatest kindness to her he loved'.[100] Instead of being consumed by the repercussions of Bathsheba's marriage on himself, Gabriel focuses on putting on a brave face in order to soothe her feelings. Contrast this with the actions of Boldwood, which are purely to obtain Bathsheba, even through immoral means. As Sumner argues, Gabriel notices the world outside himself even when in grief and notices Boldwood's tortured demeanour, while Boldwood 'remains totally wrapped up in himself, oblivious to all externals'.[101] His mental fixation consumes him, eventually leading to the ruining of his farm as his inattention meant that 'much of his wheat and all his barley of that season had been spoilt by the rain'.[102] When juxtaposed with the initial account of Boldwood, a wealthy, successful and dignified farmer, the current depiction illustrates just how far his madness has taken him. This takes not only a mental toll, but also a physical toll: 'the veins had swollen, and a frenzied look had gleamed in his eye' instead of Roman features and skin 'which glowed in the sun with a bronze-like richness of tone'.[103] It is this depiction that highlights the femininity of Boldwood in contrast to Oak, whose name certainly suggests a sturdy and

strong character. Boldwood is illustrated as being unable to control his emotions and their impact while Oak decides to channel his negative emotions into positive actions in a decidedly masculine act of self-control.

Perhaps Hardy is also playing on a Victorian anxiety over the uncontrollable disease which has irreversible effects. The novel gives the impression of a snowballing effect, an unstoppable dangerousness that increases constantly. Thurley's argument certainly agrees with this: 'Boldwood has been set in motion, against his will, but unstoppably', his latent madness rearing its head at the provocation from Bathsheba.[104] But, as I have previously mentioned, Hardy does not blame Bathsheba for the disastrous outcome of the valentine.

Critics such as Schapiro believe that this novel demonstrates 'the transforming power of passion' not only physically but also the mental reaction to Bathsheba's initial tease.[105] His subsequent fantasises urge him to expect Bathsheba to marry him, even when she does not absolutely promise to do so. Does he have the power to maintain his sanity? Thurley argues not, claiming that 'it is inescapably part of Boldwood to react as he does' to Bathsheba.[106] Certainly, this seems to tie in with the hereditary insanity hinted at previously. Sumner writes that 'Hardy is concerned with how people make choices…the interplay between their psychological states and the events which impinge on them'.[107]

So what was Hardy's purpose in illustrating female madness on a masculine body? Perhaps it is to demonstrate the falsity of assuming that lack of emotional control is confined to the female gender. Other novels also invert this prescription of gendered madness, such as Brontë's depictions

of Bertha as a masculine madwoman. Boldwood's manifestation of madness implies that the madness he experiences is not wholly tied up in the biological body of the woman, but can occur in the male body also, an inversion of Victorian thought.

***The Picture of Dorian Gray***

The title character of Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* contrasts with the previous example of Boldwood and his justified fall into mental instability. Also contrasting with Boldwood is the way in which the insanity is manifested, concentrating on acts of maliciousness, heartlessness and violence to display the degradation of Dorian's mind. This depiction of madness leans more to the masculine idea of madness, with acts of aggression, obsession, crime and hints of addiction taking a physical toll on his soul in the painting.

One of the main influences on him is his choice of male companionship in Sir Henry Wotton, who encourages a hedonistic way of life which some believed lead to the immorality of which madness was believed to consist. It is this same madness that is worsened through his use of his gender. His position as a male allowed him access to places which women of respectable character were never allowed to enter, such as the East End. It is here that Dorian imbibes illegal substances, the excess of which was thought to be catalytic for a case of moral insanity. The lower-classes were also thought to be more likely to spread mental instability like a contagion and therefore mixing with them would have made Dorian susceptible to madness (as I will discuss in Chapter Two). The

manifestation of this lunacy can also be seen in his treatment of the only significant female in the novel, Sibyl Vane, to whom he causes harm through his heartless disposal of her. These influences and manifestations create a picture of the way in which male madness was differentiated from female madness at this time.

Perhaps the painter Basil Hallward also had as much hand in the madness of Dorian as did Wotton. He is, after all, the man who first mentions Dorian to Wotton, which prompts Wotton to exclaim, 'Basil, this is extraordinary! I must see Dorian Gray!'[108] Basil also paints Dorian's portrait, which many argue is the catalyst for Dorian's downfall. Oates explains:

> Basil presented him with an utterly new, unrequested, and irresistible image of himself – if, that is, the terrible logic of the imagination had not set into play a tragic sequence of events of which Dorian happened to be the central figure.[109]

Both Basil and Wotton are central to the degradation that Dorian begins to experience when he knows both men. With Wotton and 'his strange panegyric on youth and his terrible warning of its brevity' comes the realisation that the beauty and the benefits he gained from it were temporary.[110] This propels Dorian to exclaim that he would give his soul for eternal youth, if only it meant that the picture aged when he did not.[111] This becomes so, adding a supernatural element to the story as Dorian's soul becomes entrenched in the painting with his conscience, rendering him heartless. It is this fact that drives Dorian to experience madness, during which his actions exemplify his unbalanced state of mind (the murder of Basil especially, which I will address in Chapter Three). During this act,

Dorian is described as having 'the mad passions of a hunted animal', taking revenge on the man who helped create the painting that drove Dorian to utter lunacy.[112] Therefore, the impact of both these men in the life of Dorian is one of mental instability, which Wotton encourages through his soliloquys on the fleeting nature of beauty, while Basil creates the painting through which Dorian is tortured.

It is his masculinity that allows Dorian the mobility to venture into the darker shadows of London, to its opium dens, brothels and rough streets. His male identity allows him to roam the streets at night, where any female presence would be considered inappropriate unless she was a prostitute. Therefore the double is then one of the guises that masculine madness takes, employed by those wishing to savour the types of delights that the Victorians thought led to moral insanity.

The last example of how madness is manifested is in the treatment of the female in the book, which causes her destruction. Sibyl's desire to end her own life is as a result of Dorian's harsh disregard for her after having described her as 'perfection' and encouraging her to hope that he will marry her.[113] His reaction to a bad performance on stage in front of his friends is to turn on her and claim, 'you have no idea what I suffered' while watching the imperfect performance of the actress.[114] While it is not Sibyl who ended the relationship, Dorian blames her for it, saying to her 'you killed my love'.[115] But it is Dorian's unrealistic expectation of Sibyl as an art form, that idealises her figure on stage as a perfectly shaped sculpture which turns his love sour. His realisation that she is but a poor and fallible actress jolts him into reality, where he inverts the situation and victimises himself. It is through

this action that he destroys Sibyl, the only significant female character in the entire novel. She is representative of her gender, annihilated through the cruel treatment of a lunatic, which propels her to poison herself. It is here that Dorian finds that he cannot feel the tragedy as he expects to and he asks Wotton, 'I don't think I am heartless. Do you?'[116] What he is experiencing is his inability to feel compassion, the split of his soul clearly referenced in his cold-bloodedness towards a woman who he had just claimed he would marry. His madness is characterised by his absolute unrealistic fixation on objects of art, which he projects onto a human being with horrific consequences. As Dryden writes, 'Wilde reveals the shallowness of an aestheticism that fails to recognise the need for human conscience'.[117] Here, it is clearly illustrated that Dorian's increasingly degraded state-of-mind is destructive and dangerous, focusing in this example, on the female body.

So how does Wilde depict the gendered madness that this chapter is focused on interrogating? Well, first the tipping point for Dorian's madness happens when he meets his hedonist friend Sir Henry Wotton, through whom he inadvertently splits his soul. It becomes ensconced in a painting by his friend Basil Hallward, whom he later blames for his soulless body. It is the influence of these two male friends that is the catalyst for his degradation into madness. This lunacy becomes more potent as he wonders the forbidden streets of the East End, indulging in the immoral pleasures that were mainly accessible to men and lower-class women. Dorian gets away with being an upper-class gentleman in unrespectable locations because of his gender, which allows him to disguise himself while wandering around at unsuitable hours. His madness comes to a point when

he ends his relationship with Sibyl, who becomes a victim of his extreme idealisation. Through all these symptoms it is clear to see the split between the male and female in the novel. Dorian's madness is the result of male friendship, which then victimises the female in a need to obtain perfect beauty.

### The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde

Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* is renowned for the dual nature of the main character whose uninhibited double commits atrocities. The madness of Jekyll/Hyde can be seen through the violence of the crimes, which he perpetrates through the double. This example of madness is somewhat alike the madness which Dorian experiences, manifested as criminal acts which are possible because of his gender, allowing him easier access to the environment which influences his madness. It draws both characters to the undesirable places at the dark hours where mysterious acts are committed or hinted at. Ed Cohen would argue that this is a madness induced by living in an unbalanced world where the softening influence of the female is not felt.[118] The only women in the novel tend to either be victims of Jekyll/Hyde or play a part witnessing the atrocities that are committed. They do not play a part in the intervention of the moral decay of Jekyll/Hyde, and are instead marginalised as bystanders. Jekyll/Hyde's moral insanity is only made possible through his gender as a male because many of the settings of his crimes are inaccessible to females of equal rank in class. This insanity is also

presented as a feminine weakness, as when Jekyll/Hyde loses complete control of himself, the sound is likened to a female weeping.

Perhaps it is living in a masculine world without the influence of a female which, Cohen would argue, turns Jekyll into this insane monster.[119] His world is solely a male middle-class universe, his friends being Mr. Utterson, the lawyer, Mr Enfield the narrator and Dr Lanyon the doctor. Even the murdered Sir Danvers Carew represents the male gender as well as Jekyll's butler Poole. The only females in this narrative are on-lookers, observers to his evil, who are unable to seek justice or intervene while evil is being committed. The child whom Hyde tramples at the beginning is female, as are some of the on-lookers, women who are described as being 'as wild as harpies'.[120] When Hyde is committing his second crime, trampling Sir Danvers, he is seen by a maid watching from an upper-window, who subsequently faints at witnessing such violence and evil.[121] None of these female observers are of much help to the investigating police, the women in the first instance succumbing to their agitation and the maid in the second instance fainting so Hyde could make his getaway before she called for the police. When Jekyll is thought ill, his housemaid breaks 'into hysterical whimpering' at the appearance of Mr Utterson, emphasising the female role in this novel, on the side-lines, as relying on the males to return order.[122] As Cao Shuo and Liu Dan write, the females in this novel are at a disadvantage in terms of representation but also in terms of their socio-economic status.[123] All of the women in the novel who are mentioned are generally of the lower-classes and subject to the scrutiny of such professional men like Utterson, Jekyll and Enfield, whose professionalism dominates.

In the last stages of his duality, Jekyll is described by his butler as 'weeping like a woman', presenting to the reader the feminine characterisation of his madness.[124] Jekyll is presented to us as sounding like a female when mad, promoting the idea that insanity is synonymous with the female sex. It is this world, free of the influence of the nurturing female, that turns Jekyll into a madman. Its imbalanced distortion creates the violence that is rampant within him, uninhibited by the softening influence of any present females. Instead, we are presented with an aggression unparalleled and unchallenged by the reasoning of a woman.

One of the main gaps in the novel is the gender gap; where there is an excess of male professionals, there are no women to offset the masculinity. This imbalance of environment creates a breeding ground for the madness which Jekyll/Hyde suffers from. His gender also allows him (like Dorian) to inhabit spaces that were not as accessible to women and in which his moral insanity is enacted. His madness is clearly the result of a masculine world, appearing like feminine hysteria at its peak.

Of course, the manifestation of female madness in a male body is a reversal of Victorian thought, as I mentioned in reference to Boldwood. Instead of being trapped in the female body, the madness is instead in Jekyll/Hyde's body and the product of a male centred environment. However, it is manifested as female hysteria so cannot be completely distanced from the gender of the female. This representation is a somewhat convoluted image Stevenson constructs of madness, neither conforming to the general ideas of the day, nor contracting them altogether.

**He Knew He Was Right**

Like the madness of Jekyll/Hyde (which seeks to destroy the female) Louis Trevelyan from Anthony Trollope's *He Knew He Was Right* seeks to victimise the female character of his wife (Emily) through the blackening of her moral character. His madness induces a self-righteous indignation at Emily's steadfast refusal to bow to his dictation. His relentless need for confirmation of his male authority in the marriage drives him to extreme acts of lunacy, driven by patriarchal urges.

Louis Trevelyan from *He Knew He Was Right* is the epitome of the madman driven to lunacy by a self-induced fixation. In a Foucauldian sense, his madness deprives him of reason and instead of trying to remedy the rift that he creates between him and his wife, he widens it by his aggravating self-righteousness. When first introduced, like Mr Boldwood, Trevelyan's credibility and eligibility are set up in order to contrast with his eventual state of complete madness. He 'was a man of whom all people said good things'[125] and was 'very wise in many things'.[126] The catalyst for his madness is first lighted upon when it is discovered that the strong will of husband and wife clash. Louis is described as liking to have his own way[127] when Lady Rowley answers, 'But Emily likes her way too', creating a problematic situation from the outset.[128] It is in this contest that Louis represents 'a chilling portrayal of the decline of an obsessed human creature' while Emily is the stubborn wife who is too proud to admit wrong where none exists.[129]

One way in which the madness of Louis is manifested is in the obsessive need for control over situations and people. This is not unlike the

behaviour of Boldwood, who also uses his money and status to try and manipulate the men around Bathsheba. Emily first discovers Louis's manipulative control when he is displeased with the visits of an old family friend Colonel Osborne. Trollope explains that 'by this time Mr Trevelyan had begun to think that he should like to have his own way completely' and his disapproval at Osborne's visits goes unheeded.[130] His suspicions, Trollope makes it clear, are completely unfounded as Osborne is 'a man older than [Emily's] own father, who had known [her] since [she] was a baby'.[131] However, here Trevelyan displays a knowledge of his social context. He knows that any female under suspicion of having a love affair was likely to be found guilty under the smallest of evidences because women were seen as weak and therefore susceptible to temptation. Suspicion of her husband alone was enough to send her away from the evil that he imagined to exist. But even the women in their circles believe Emily to be at fault, like Lady Milborough, who warns Louis that Osborne is an evil man and likely to take advantage of his pure wife.[132] Louis tries to enforce his wife's separation from Osborne by saying, 'you shall not see Colonel Osborne. Do you hear me?'[133] When Emily refuses to promise this, Louis in return refuses to listen to her reasonable explanation about the nature of Osborne's visits. He does, in fact, render her mute like the 'madwoman' and ensures she knows that he is in control of the situation. Emily certainly feels the disadvantage of her gender, confessing, 'it is a very poor thing to be a woman', knowing that her husband has society on his side and the power to take away her child and income when he wishes.[134]

Trevelyan and Lady Milborough expect that Emily will give way and admit wrongdoing in order to pacify her husband, even when she has not

committed any offence. But, as Trollope mentions often in the text, Emily is strong-willed and so unlikely to admit anything to satisfy her increasingly fixated husband. His fantastic expectations of absolute patriarchy are laid out by Trollope as being treated as Emily's 'one god upon earth'.[135] This is where the problem of Trevelyan's insanity comes from, claims critic David Oberhelman. Trevelyan 'tries to convince himself that he is right to exact obedience from [Emily] rather than make his mastery more palatable'.[136] His unreasonable demands upon her are not fulfilled and therefore Trevelyan becomes insecure about his wife's constancy. He tries to obtain her confession of immoral behaviour throughout the novel through manipulative means. He tries to use their son little Louey as a bargaining tool and the wealth he possesses to tempt her into a false confession.[137] At the same time, he retains his belief that he must try and save Emily from her refusal to give up her immoral behaviour.[138] In essence, he sets himself in the higher place in the relationship, exacting full obedience from Emily. But, 'she is headstrong and will not be ruled', and his attempts to manipulate her through his status as a male are unsuccessful.[139]

The use of his masculinity throughout the novel as a manipulative tool and his belief that his status as a male entitles him to perfect obedience characterises these delusions as madness. His increasing insanity is as a result of Emily's steadfast refusal to give in to his absolute notion of patriarchal authority. Indeed, even before death Louis clutches to the remnants of this ideal, letting it consume him to the last. The same delusions are deeply rooted in a grandiose belief of his importance as the man in the marriage. Trevelyan's behaviour towards his wife and his need to exert control over her demonstrate the height of his lunacy, especially when she

will not bow to him. His extreme reaction to her resistance depicts how his madness is founded in his identity as a man, his masculinity, which she offends.

Trevelyan is unwilling to consider that he might be wrong in his assumption of his wife's infidelity, as the novel states: 'he had taught himself to believe that she had disgraced him'.[140] He sinks into a self-induced melancholy, lamenting his lot in life,[141] and becomes increasingly paranoid that everyone is speaking about the situation behind his back.[142] Even the private detective that Trevelyan hires, Bozzle, comes under suspicion. His increasingly degenerating state of mind can also be seen in his physical state, which he no longer cares for. He withdraws from society,[143] relies on doses of alcohol,[144] and becomes 'pale, and haggard, and mean.'[145]

Trevelyan realises upon marrying Emily that she will not bow and scrape to him as he wishes. He invents the infidelity to force her to confess wrongdoing and therefore be held accountable to him. In this way he would be at an advantage in the power relationship. Emily would then be seen as the weaker one in the marriage, as immorality translated into a weakness of character. Socially and among personal friends she would always be considered as needing to be 'saved' by her husband, who was gracious enough to forgive her debauchery. His determination to succeed in this plan drives him mad when he fixates on the need to have his wife confess. He admits that Emily 'must be crushed in spirit…before she can again become a pure and happy woman' and before he will accept her back as his wife.[146]

However, Oberhelman claims that Trevelyan's insanity, according to the 1843 M'Naghten rules, would be enough to acquit him of any

wrongdoing because he was not in his right mind.[147]  Because he was not conscious enough to realise the pain and suffering that he was causing with his obsessive behaviour, and also because he may not have had control over his actions, some would consider Trevelyan innocent.[148] Trollope himself argues that Trevelyan 'was trying to be good. But he could not do it. The fiend was too strong within him.'[149] The book itself shows him oscillating between his two natures, as if unable to control morphing between them.

So what is Trollope trying to convey to his audience about the male madness of Trevelyan? Perhaps that outward signs of moral degradation are just a symptom of an uncontrollable disease, which they are victim to. However, in my reading of the text I struggle to consolidate the idea of victimisation with the behaviour of Trevelyan. I would argue that Trevelyan's fixation is symbolic of his obsession to gain complete control of his wife, the failure of which drives him mad. Trevelyan's belief that his masculinity entitles him to complete control of Emily is challenged by his wife, driving him to extremes which manifest in insanity. Therefore, his masculinity causes his madness. In this way, some of his actions may have been influenced by his state of mind, but the double nature of his lunacy ensures that Trevelyan experiences intermittent sanity. The continual worsening of his state of mind is indicative of his unwillingness to forgive his wife, even though he is sometimes in a present enough mind to do so.  Once again, he is unwilling to give up his belief that he should own complete control of his wife, even to the point of stifling her with unreasoning jealousy. Trollope is conclusively challenging this same ideal himself, by demonstrating the destructive nature of Trevelyan pursuing such a belief of his marriage, his physical self, his wife and his sanity.

*  *  *  *

In my exploration of madness and gender I have found that there are varying stances that authors take with regards to the gender of their mad character and how this character's madness was manifested. During this analysis it has become clear that in nineteenth century fiction there was a definite gendering of madness. Women either represent an archetype of madness (Bertha) or are presumed to conform to this archetype (Lady Audley, Miss Havisham and Laura Fairlie). There are also characters who are genuinely mad, such as Catherine Earnshaw, reflecting historical figures like Constance Kent. But the authors of these texts make it clear that women were more likely to be branded with the label of madness to silence them as inconvenient voices.

By contrast the men, based on the novels I focused on, suffer less from the assumption of madness and instead are illustrated as genuinely mad. Because they do not have such stringent gender constrictions when it comes to behavioural roles, men had more freedom to conduct themselves as they wished. They have social and moral boundaries, but these are not as limiting as those imposed on Victorian women; therefore their actions were less likely to be interpreted as symptoms of mental instability, as a lesser amount of symptoms were attributed to male madness. However, this madness sometimes involved a woman (Boldwood's idealisation and Trevelyan's lack of), although in both texts it is made clear that the woman is not to blame.

These authors were plainly aware of the archetype of madness being gendered against women, which is why they chose to invert the idea that

women are more susceptible to madness than men. The male representations are just as potent and therefore I must conclude that although some historical thought indicated madness as being mainly a female form of degeneration, literature has balanced out these representations.

---

[1] Yannick Ripa, *Women and Madness: The Incarceration of Women in Nineteenth-Century France* (Paris: Polity Press, 1990), p. 1.

[2] Ripa, p. 1.

[3] *Pall Mall Gazette*, 26 April 1865, cited by Yannick Ripa, in ''Madness is a Woman': Constance Kent and Victorian Construction of Female Insanity' (Paris: Polarity Press, 1990), p. 30.

[4] Gina Lombroso-Ferrero, *Criminal Man: According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso,* in Project Gutenberg, unpagenated.

[5] Andrew Maunder and Grace Moore, *Victorian Crime, Madness and Sensation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), p. 63.

[6] Ripa, p. 222.

[7] Ripa, p. 56.

[8] Ripa, p. 58.

[9] Joseph Melling and Bill Forsyth, *Insanity, Institutions and Society, 1800-1914: A Social History of Madness in Comparative Perspective* (London: Routledge Limited, 1999), p. 137.

[10] Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth Century Literary Imagination* (Cumberland: Yale University Press, 1980), p. 360.

[11] Gilbert and Gubar, p. 361.

[12] Charlotte Brontë, *Jane Eyre* (London: Penguin Books Limited, 1994), p. 303.

[13] Elizabeth J. Donaldson, 'The Corpus of a Madwoman: Toward a Feminist Disability Studies Theory of Embodiment and Mental Illness', *The National Women's Study Association Journal*, 14.3 (2002), pp. 99-119 (p. 100).

[14] Clement Shorter, *The Brontës: Life and Letters* (New York, Haskell House, 1969), pp. 383-84, cited by Sue Thomas, in 'The Tropical Extravagance of Bertha Mason', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 27.1 (1999), p. 4.

[15] Donaldson, p. 106.

[16] C. Brontë, p. 209.

[17] C. Brontë, p. 291.

[18] C. Brontë, p. 291.

[19] C. Brontë, p. 303.

[20] C. Brontë, p. 148.

[21] Maunder and Moore, p. 63.

[22] Valerie Beattie, 'The Mystery at Thornfield: Representations of Madness in Jane Eyre', *Studies in the Novel*, 28.4 (1996), pp. 493-505 (p. 2).

[23] Elaine Showalter, *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), p. 68.

[24] Samantha Pegg, ''Madness a Woman': Constance Kent and Victorian Construction of Female Insanity', *Liverpool Law Review*, 30.3 (2010), pp. 207-223 (p. 213).

[25] Edward Shorter, *A History of Psychiatry: From the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac* (Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, 1997), p. 2.

[26] Mary Elizabeth Braddon, *Lady Audley's Secret* (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1997), p. 280.

[27] Ripa, p. 274.

[28] N. McHugh, 'Performativity', in *Feminist Philosophies A-Z* (Edinburg: Edinburgh University Press, 2007) <http://search.credoreference.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/content/entry/edinburghfem/performativity/0> [accessed 10 March 2015], unpagenated.

[29] Maunder and Moore, p. 74.

[30] Braddon, p. 31.

[31] Braddon, p. 40.

[32] Pamela K. Gilbert, 'Madness and Civilisation: Generic Opposition in Mary Elizabeth Braddon's Lady Audley's Secret', *Essays in Literature*, 23.2 (1996), pp. 218-233 (p. 222).

[33] Braddon, p. 46.

[34] Ripa, p. 1.

[35] Ripa, p. 1.

[36] Gilbert, p. 220.

[37] Gilbert, p. 229.

[38] McHugh, <http://search.credoreference.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/content/entry/edinburghfem/performativity/> [accessed 10 March 2015], unpagenated.

[39] McHugh, <http://search.credoreference.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/content/entry/edinburghfem/performativity/> [accessed 10 March 2015], unpagenated.

[40] Emily Brontë, *Wuthering Heights* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown), p. 67.

[41] E Brontë, p. 84.

[42] E Brontë, p. 84.

[43] E Brontë, p. 90.

[44] E Brontë, p. 90.

[45] E Brontë, p. 90.

[46] Marianne Thormählen, 'The Lunatic and the Devil's Disciple: The 'Lovers' in Wuthering Heights', *The Review of English Studies*, 48.190 (1997), pp. 183-197 (p. 188).

[47] E Brontë, p. 126.

[48] E Brontë, p. 129.

[49] Eleanor Salotto, *Gothic Returns in Collins, Dickens, Zola and Hitchcock* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 34.

[50] Salotto, p. 34.

[51] Thormählen, p. 190.

[52] Thormählen, p. 186.

[53] Thormählen, p. 186.

[54] J.G. Spurzheim, *Observations on the Deranged Manifestations of the Mind, or Insanity* (London: Marsh, Capen and Lyon, 1817), p. 167, cited by Marianne Thormählen, in 'The Lunatic and the Devil's Disciple: The 'Lovers' in Wuthering Heights', *The Review of English Studies*, 48.190 (1997), p. 190.

[55] E Brontë, p. 97.

[56] Thormählen, pp. 190-91.

[57] Adina Ciugureanu, 'The Victim-Aggressor Duality in Great Expectations', *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas*, 9.2. (2011), pp. 347-360 (p. 353).

[58] Charles Dickens, *Great Expectations* (Glasgow: Collins Classics, 1970), p. 63.

[59] Dickens, p. 87.

[60] Dickens, p. 88.

[61] McHugh <http://search.credoreference.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/content/entry/edinburghfem/performativity/> [accessed 10 March 2015], unpagenated.

[62] Dickens, p. 96.

[63] Dickens, p. 115.

[64] Dickens, p. 115.

[65] Dickens, p. 65.

[66] Dickens, p. 65.

[67] Ciugureanu, p. 356.

[68] Lurt Hartog, 'The Rape of Miss Havisham', *Studies in the Novel,* 14.3 (1982), pp. 248-265 (p. 249).

[69] Dickens, p. 126.

[70] Hartog, p. 258.

[71] Ripa, p. 65.

[72] Brontë, p. 428.

[73] Salotto, pp. 26-27.

[74] Ripa, p. 1.

[75] Lyn Pykett, *Wilkie Collins: A Casebook* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), p. 3, cited by Katrien Bollen and Raphael Ingelbien, in 'An Intertext that Counts? Dracula, The Woman in White, and Victorian Imaginations of the Foreign Other', *English Studies*, 90.4 (2009), p. 407.

[76] Wilkie Collins, *The Woman in White* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown), p. 386.

[77] Salotto, p. 37.

[78] Salotto, p. 38.

[79] Lombroso-Ferrero, p. 5.

[80] Collins, p. 393.

[81] Collins, p. 394.

[82] Thomas Hardy*, Far From the Madding Crowd* (London: Heron Books, 1970), pp. 103, 104.

[83] From the Bible. Daniel refuses to give up praying to God during the reign of King Darius, who has decreed that no one should pray to either God or man for thirty days. See book of Daniel.

[84] Hardy, p. 110.

[85] Hardy, p. 109.

[86] Hardy, p. 111.

[87] Hardy, p. 105.

[88] Vieda Skultans, *Madness and Morals: Ideas on Insanity in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited, 1975), p. 33.

[89] Geoffrey Thurley, *The Psychology of Hardy's Novels: The Nervous and the Statuesque* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1975), p. 76.

[90] Thurley, p. 205

[91] Hardy, p. 112.

[92] Hardy, p. 84.

[93] Barbara A. Schapiro, 'Psychoanalysis and Romantic Idealization: The Dialects of Love in Hardy's Far From the Madding Crowd', *American Imago*, 59.1 (2002), pp. 3-26 (p. 9).

[94] Hardy, p. 141.

[95] Hardy, p. 230.

[96] Hardy, p. 230.

[97] Hardy, p. 236.

[98] Hardy, p. 261.

[99] Rosemary Sumner, *Thomas Hardy: Psychological Novelist* (London: The Macmillion Press, 1981), p. 51.

[100] Hardy, p. 271.

[101] Sumner, p. 51.

[102] Hardy, p. 380.

[103] Hardy, p. 104.

[104] Thurley, p. 76.

[105] Schapiro, pp. 134, 23.

[106] Thurley, p. 73.

[107] Sumner, p. 20.

[108] Wilde, Oscar, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown), p. 30.

[109] Oates, p. 421.

[110] Wilde, p. 41.

[111] Wilde, p. 42.

[112] Wilde, p. 144.

[113] Wilde, p. 110

[114] Wilde, p. 87.

[115] Wilde, p. 88.

[116] Wilde, p. 99.

[117] Linda Dryden, *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles: Stevenson, Wilde and Wells* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, p. 116.

[118] Ed Cohen, Hyding the Subject?: 'The Antinomies of Masculinity in The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde', Novel: A Forum on Fiction, 37.1/2 (2003), pp. 181-199 (p. 181).

[119] See Ed Cohen, 'Hyding the Subject?: The Antinomies of Masculinity in *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*'.

[120] Robert Louis Stevenson*, The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown), p. 23.

[121] Stevenson, pp. 34-35.

[122] Stevenson, p. 47.

[123] Cao Shuo and Liu Dan, 'Femininity in *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*', *English Language and Literature Studies*, 2.1 (2012), pp 123-127 (p. 124).

[124] Stevenson, p. 51.

[125] Anthony Trollope, *He Knew He Was Right* (London: Omnium Publishing, 1994), p. 2.

[126] Trollope, p. 2.

[127] Trollope, p. 3.

[128] Trollope, p. 3.

[129] Robert Davies, 'Introduction', in *He Knew He Was Right*, by Anthony Trollope (London: Omnium Publishing, 1994), p. xi.

[130] Trollope, p. 3.

[131] Trollope, p. 4.

[132] Trollope, p. 23.

[133] Trollope, p. 24.

[134] Trollope, p. 36.

[135] Trollope, p. 38.

[136] David D. Oberhelman, 'Trollope's Insanity Defence: Narrative Alienation in He Knew He Was Right', *Studies in English Literature*, 1500-1900, 35.4 (1995), pp. 789-806 (p. 797).

[137] Trollope, p. 229.

[138] Trollope, p. 224.

[139] Trollope, p. 231.

[140] Trollope, p. 226.

[141] Trollope, p. 284.

[142] Trollope, p. 317.

[143] Trollope, p. 228.

[144] Trollope, p. 497.

[145] Trollope, p. 524.

[146] Trollope, p. 525.

[147] Oberhelman, p. 791.

[148] Oberhelman, p. 793.

[149] Trollope, p. 20.

# Chapter Two: Race and Class

At times of economic crisis, as the factories emptied, the asylums filled up.[1]

By the 1890s, with the culmination of high imperialism, several texts had been published which suggested that superior and inferior races could be distinguished by physical appearance – colour of skin and hair, stature, physiognomy – and judgements concerning intelligence and fitness for self-rule were made on that basis.[2]

Race and class, as well as gender, had complicated relations with madness during the Victorian period. During the nineteenth century, perceptions of madness were frequently conflated with attitudes towards race. Indeed, many British writers, medical practitioners, and cultural ethnographers argued that insanity was more likely to affect those of a non-British racial heritage. Lunacy was equated with mental weakness and was thought, therefore, unlikely to affect the citizens of one of the most powerful empires of the time. Instead, some Victorian belief systems regarded the so called 'primitive' races - those with darker skins and different features – as the likely victims of mania. This racial diagnosis was as a result of the increasing diversity of cultures within Britain, which in turn caused anxieties to emerge about racial heritage, and indeed 'racial purity'. These anxieties were founded on various beliefs, historical events and scientific theories. Firstly,

there was an existing belief that origin had an irreversible shaping effect on a person's mental faculties.[3] Secondly, the Ripper murders of 1888 sparked fear about the perpetrator, who was speculated to be a 'Malay or Jew', an outsider seeking British blood.[4] Thirdly, it was believed that foreign races were likely to be degenerative, criminal and immoral, causing crime to spread throughout Britain. Therefore, those who were foreign were marginalised by pre-conceived ideas about their potentially lunatic reversions and immoral behaviour. These were problems that the English believed plagued other races, instead of their own, which they thought to be imperialistically superior. It is important to read nineteenth century literature with this in mind, as Patrick Brantlinger points out. We must remember, he writes, that imperialism was seen as a social mission for England at this time, and was a crucial part of the way the English were represented to the English.[5] The illustrated depiction of the outsider is then implicated, as the way in which the foreigner was portrayed would usually be as inferior to the imperial Britons.

A contributing factor to these views was the publication of *The Descent of Man* (1871) by Charles Darwin. His book denoted the evolutionary scale, upwards from ape, to primitive man, to civilised being. As Andrew Maunder and Grace Moore write, 'in the post-Darwinian climate fears regarding any forms of cultural descent ran high' and racial awareness was widespread.[6] Although Darwin's graduated scale was only illustrated to work one way, others appropriated his theories to hypothesise about a downward progression: devolution and regression. Those who were on the outside, the 'primitive' races, were believed to be the product of a lesser civilisation, further down the evolutionary scale. Consequently, they were

thought to display primitive behaviour derived from animal instincts, which dominated their beings, those who would be 'ruled by instinct rather than amenable to social control'.[7] Connected to the concept of species devolution were Victorian ideas about the lurking presence of the primitive self within the civilised being. This involved mirroring a specific trait of an ancestor or ancestors gone before, reverting to a more primitive state, which is called atavism. If atavism was purged, it would mean that a race could evolve beyond these animal instincts, to a state of civilisation.[8] The fear of this downward spiralling of the human race caused further anxiety over the potential decline of Britain. One symptom of this perceived deterioration was the Ripper murders of 1888, which were seen by newspaper editorials of the day as a sign of 'moral malaise'.[9] Criminal behaviour, sexual depravity, immorality and addiction were all regarded as symptoms of this devolution.

As nineteenth century English biologist Thomas Henry Huxley wrote in his book *Evolution and Ethics* (1893): 'every theory of evolution must be consistent not merely with progressive development, but with an indefinite persistence in the same condition and with retrogressive modification.'[10] So if a person can progress in civilised development, that same person must also be subject to the opposite reaction, devolution.

Class also signposted the likeliness of a person being affected by lunacy; madness was thought to affect the lower-classes and the poor more than the middle and upper-classes. There are many reasons for this, one being that poverty was thought to induce types of madness. Yannick Ripa writes that 'dictionaries of the time made this fact official by giving pauperism as a cause of madness.'[11] Another is that poverty was thought to be the

result of personal inadequacies, as moral problems were translated as personal problems.[12] It was thought that the working classes were an undisciplined mob, susceptible to political agitation and persuasion as they were not evolved enough to discern the difference between an agitator and an honest person.[13] Linda Dryden outlines this when she states:

> the lower classes emerge as an undisciplined mass motivated by instinct, not much better than beasts from which they have evolved and pretty easy for manipulative political agitators.[14]

They were, therefore, more prone to corruption committed for the sake of earning money. For instance, the East End was known as a place where prostitutes solicited and opium dens thrived, poverty driving people to beseech the wealthy who frequented the streets at night. These class distinctions were even seen in treatment, as the poor were allocated their own asylums (pauper asylums) while the wealthy paid for private care. At a private asylum called Ticehurst, 'aristocratic patients could ride to the hounds with the asylum hunt, or enjoy the bowling-green, aviary, pagoda, theatre, and seahouse'.[15]

During the nineteenth century, the practice of eugenics was thought by some to be the solution to stop the spread of pauperism. The 'term eugenics was first coined in 1883 by British explorer and natural scientist Francis Galton.'[16] The aim of eugenics is, through selective reproduction, to gain control of future evolution; in other words to regulate certain inherited traits which were considered negative in order to improve the overall quality of a race.[17] Elaine Showalter encapsulates this view, writing of this attitude: 'the only remedy was to exterminate the brutes – not by murder, but by

studied neglect and population control'.[18] Selective breeding was promoted as a tool with which the British could rid themselves of the 'ugly, feeble, ignorant and immoral'.[19] Implicated in this belief was the theory that pauperism was hereditary, like madness, and could only be eradicated through extinguishing the family line.

Social Darwinism was an interpretation of Darwin's evolution theory which also sought to address social issues (especially within Victorian Britain). The first socio-biologist was said to be Hebert Spencer, not Darwin,[20] and his theories were seen by some to be somewhat brutal, such as his opposition to poverty laws, which he thought interfered with self-motivation to gain a better standard of well-being.[21] If, he argues, people are forced to live in an unpleasant environment with little food, they might be compelled to improve their state lest they die.[22] The overall result would be either the death of those in poverty or 'evolution to a higher state of being'.[23] This is a form of natural selection, the concept of which Spencer applied to a social rather than biological context. Thomas Malthus, the founder of Malthusian theory and a famous mathematician, also believed that state support for the poverty-stricken was a bad idea. He thought it would encourage the reproduction of the lower-classes, when they could not afford to feed themselves.[24] Consequently this would induce a Malthusian panic, where food was scarce as the production of provisions was outstripped by the growth of the population.[25] His solution was twofold, the first part consisting of natural disasters, violence and diseases, which helped control the population size without intervention.[26] The second part was through "preventative checks' such as late marriage, moral restraint

and chastity', which he believed should all lead to a constrained population growth.[27]

Cesare Lombroso's work on phrenology, the science of interpreting physicality as criminal potential was also very influential at this time. Many of the features that Lombroso describes as indicative of the criminal type are the typical physiognomies of certain races. In this case, someone could be judged as having a felonious face without having committed any wicked acts, pre-judged on inherited features. Many of these features were typical of foreign races, especially those with darker skins, who were considered 'primal' races.[28] These ranged from 'the projection of the lower part of the face and jaws (prognathism) found in negroes' to the 'supernumerary of teeth…as in the Peruvian Indians'.[29] These outsiders were therefore considered more likely to develop criminal tendencies because of their inherited features.

Similarly, Dr F. W. Mott thought that a neuropathic taint was carried by those born 'to [the] feeble-minded, to the pauper, to the alien Jew, to the Irish Roman Catholic, to the thriftless casual labourers [and] to the criminals.'[30] Again, eugenics and selective breeding are implicated in this belief as the only way to ensure quality of race. It is also clear that certain races were labelled as outsiders and those same races were also regarded as more likely to exhibit mental instability.

The historical record indicates that in Victorian Britain mental illness was typically associated with racial otherness and low socio-economic status. Victorian literature, however, does not necessarily follow this pattern. Instead Gothic, sensation and realist novels of the time illustrate an even

spread of victims, from the professional upper-class gentleman to the foreign 'other', suggesting that madness is a condition that can affect anyone, regardless of status or ethnicity.

A racial depiction of madness is seen in the novel *Jane Eyre*, while *He Knew He Was Right* illustrates the inverse, the mad Briton. In the first text there is a clear representation of the stereotypical foreign other as mad. Bertha Mason has inherited her insanity from her Creole mother and the novel thus illustrates nineteenth century anxieties about atavism and hereditary taint. This view is challenged in Trollope's novel. Trevelyan embodies the racial bigotry of his day, believing that his wife is unfaithful because of her foreign origins and upbringing. Trollope exposes this belief as a delusion, and proof of Trevelyan's paranoid and obsessive state, locating 'madness' firmly within the Victorian gentleman rather than the racial other.

Novelists likewise tapped into associations between lower-class origins and a predisposition towards madness. In *Lady Audley's Secret*, the title character is believed to be mad because of her upbringing in the slums. Not only do her actions contravene the behaviour that an upper-class gentrified female was expected to exhibit, but her lower-class origins also represent a threat for the noble Audley family. They mobilise Victorian attitudes towards both gender and class as a convenient means of ridding their family name of the taint of Lady Audley's questionable conduct and pauper background by putting her in an asylum, silencing her through a wrongful diagnosis.

In *Far From the Madding Crowd*, madness affects Boldwood to the point where he almost bankrupts his own farm. His fixation with Bathsheba does not allow for the business sense he once held and therefore he is almost driven to poverty through his lunacy. Hardy is illustrating that if a man is mad, he cannot exist in the same state of financial sufficiency as a sane man and is more likely to sink to the poverty of the lower-classes.

In some texts the themes of race and class as triggers for madness are conflated. Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Adventure of the Creeping Man* and 'The Beetle Hunter' illustrate the atavistic reversion of the mad through physical form and also the class degradation of both characters. *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* also presents a similar trend, with Dr Jekyll becoming primitive in stature and behaviour when experiencing mania. By illustrating lunacy as a reversion to an inward primitive self, Stevenson questions the unswerving belief that some held: that the upper-classes in Britain were free from such atavistic taints.

**Race and Madness**

*Jane Eyre* is one of the few texts in this thesis that depicts the 'other' as a victim of mania. Bertha Mason is a Creole woman who falls prey to hereditary madness. She completely embodies the role of the degenerate outsider, so feared by the Victorians. Brontë gives her creation a savageness that is indicative of a reversion to an animalistic and uncivilised ancestral type. Bertha's appetite for debauchery, drink and danger forms a contrast with British Jane, who refuses to marry Mr Rochester, even though she loves him. However, some critical interpretations, such as that of Gilbert

and Gubar, suggest that Bertha is not in fact representative of the outsider. Instead she symbolises the illicit pleasures which the Victorians disapproved of and which Jane does not act on, but Bertha does.

Bertha's racial heritage is emphasised in her madness, her Creole features amassing into an animalistic portrait of savageness and excess. She makes 'snarling canine noise[s]'[31] and looks like a 'clothed hyena'[32] using her teeth, like an animal, to threaten and wound those who anger her.[33] Bertha's hair falls like a mane about her face [34] while she wanders about on all-fours like a creature.[35] These actions points towards a reversion to a primitive uncivilised state of being. Not only does this affect her behaviour, which becomes savage and unreasonable, but also her physiognomy, mimicking the degeneration within. These mannerisms mirror the scientific publications which were emerging at this time such as Alexander Monison's *The Physiognomy of Mental Disease* (1840), linking a change in physiognomy with mental instability.[36]

Bertha's heritage of having 'maniacs through three generations' and a lunatic drunkard for a mother depicts family origin as the root of her madness.[37] Yet, as her husband Edward Rochester diagnoses, 'her excesses had prematurely developed the germs of insanity', so it was no longer the sole fault of her hereditary disposition.[38] Her nature is not one which recognises the need for restraint, the lack of which prompts her early emergence of lunacy. Like moral insanity, her madness requires personal virtue to constrict and eventually exterminate it. As Elizabeth J. Donaldson states in her critical reading of the text:

The gestation of her madness is specifically linked to her drinking and her sexual appetites – failures of the will, not of the body in Rochester's opinion. Therefore, despite Bertha Mason's fated madness, Rochester still holds her morally accountable for her illness.[39]

Here, Rochester represents the Victorian audience, who also viewed immorality and excess as a cause of madness. Sue Thomas diagnoses sin as a 'species of insanity' and in Bertha's case there is a clear link between her increasingly depraved behaviour and her madness.[40] So it is not only her birth into a mad family that affects Bertha, but also her own illicit actions which are implicated in her lunacy. Her mother was a Creole, which is a person of white skin 'of Spanish descent, naturalized by birth in Spanish America'.[41] Does this mean that Charlotte Brontë is suggesting that her racial heritage is, in fact, responsible for her complete lunacy? Is it because her alcoholic mother never taught her the value of moderation that Bertha herself does not know how to control her overindulgence? Perhaps so; it is clear that any deficiencies in a child were clearly the fault of the mother, who was supposed to teach good habits as well as lead by example.

Bertha may be mad, but she does not have the intellect to hide this madness and therefore live without the constraining chains of the lunatic. As 'the darker races were widely regarded as further down the evolutionary ladder', Bertha's behaviour appears purely primitive, lacking the cunning of some maniacs.[42] Her 'pigmy intellect' only allows her to trick Grace Poole into inebriation, when Bertha creeps about Thornfield Hall to wreak havoc on its inhabitants.[43] But it does not stretch to allow her to conceal the mania

within, which becomes increasingly obvious to Rochester. It is Bertha's atavistic reversion to her primitive type which means that her madness is not controlled by her intellect. Brontë's depiction of Bertha's racial heritage signifies that Bertha cannot regulate her lunacy through her intelligence, as she is lacking in that also.

Roy Porter writes that the process of 'othering' is 'socially and anthropologically driven, arising from a deep-seated and perhaps unconscious [need] to order the world by demarcating self from other'.[44] In *Jane Eyre*, Bertha is clearly separated through her race and consequently through her mad state, from the other central characters in the novel. Her skin colour and mad behaviour set her apart as well as her antagonistic role as the foreign 'other'. However, the criticism of Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar in *Madwoman in the Attic* highlights the similarities between Jane and Bertha, instead of the differences. Their analysis invites readers to see the two characters as a double personality, Jane being the socially respectable side and Bertha inhabiting the 'uninhibited and often criminal self.'[45] Each side of the double is reliant on the other to maintain balance; Jane cannot be as subdued as she is without an outlet for natural inclinations, Bertha. Therefore Bertha no longer represents the outsider, rather she is a representation of the socially unacceptable behaviour which Jane is distant from.

So is Brontë suggesting that foreigners are susceptible to lunacy, manifesting as savage and atavistic natures? Although it appears that Brontë was looking to imitate the beliefs of the day in representing madness in the foreign character, it does not follow that she agrees with this depiction.

Bertha follows the archetype so closely that it becomes a cliché. Gilbert and Gubar's reading of the text depends on the multi-layered reading beyond the surface of the novel.

In contrast to *Jane Eyre*, however, *He Knew He Was Right* demonstrates the falsity of the link between the foreign other and madness. Instead, Trollope portrays the British gentleman Trevelyan as the lunatic who is obsessed with the belief that his wife has been unfaithful to him. This idea characterises his madness, which is centred on the conviction that his wife's infidelity is caused by her foreign upbringing, which is inferior to that of a genteel English lady. Trollope's depiction of Trevelyan as a monomaniac indirectly criticises the beliefs he holds on to, which clearly are a symptom of his state of mind and not the calculated conclusion of a reasoning mind.

Perhaps it is not only because of his status and wealth that Trevelyan holds himself in such high regard, but also his racial heritage. He pictures himself as 'one god upon earth' while he views his wife and her life in the Mandarin Islands as inferior.[46] In hindsight he states:

> …no man should look for a wife among the tropics, that women educated amidst the languors of those sunny climes rarely came to possess those high ideas of conjugal duty and truth which a man should regard as first requisites of a good wife.[47]

Trevelyan blames Emily's upbringing for her strong-willed nature, as the foreign environment was not suited for bringing up a female to a marriageable (or submissive) state. The 'high ideas' which he expects her education to have impressed upon her are not present because of the

tropical climate. For the same reason, Lady Milborough suspects Emily of having an affair with Colonel Osborne. Trevelyan, she believed, 'would have promoted his own welfare by falling in love with the daughter of some English country gentleman, or some English peer' instead of the daughter of the governor of a foreign island.[48] Emily's suspected immorality is seen to stem from her background in the Mandarin Islands instead of from her English husband's over-suspicious mind.

Trevelyan and Lady Milborough see themselves as responsible for saving Emily from the charms of Colonel Osborne, like some imperial power invading a foreign country to civilize it. Trollope describes Trevelyan's attempts as 'a desire to achieve empire',[49] to conquer his wife, who 'must be crushed in spirit'[50] in order for their mutual happiness in marriage. Perhaps this is also an implied critique of the act of colonisation, which he seems to be mirroring in the relationship here. Trevelyan's need to destroy Emily's spirit before happiness can be achieved between them depicts the need for colonisers to eradicate the existing culture and establish their own empire as a replacement. Like an oppressive regime, Trevelyan expects his wife to sacrifice her independence and rely fully on him in order for their co-habitation to work. To do this, Trevelyan imposes greater and greater restrictions on his wife and, like a dictator, does not listen to her reasons for seeing Colonel Osborne. These restrictions also mirror, as stated by Deborah Denenholz Morse, the behaviour which an empire would exert over a colony which is under its governance and is kept close.[51] Trevelyan sees himself as the victim, instead of the victimiser, because of his background as an English gentleman, which he thinks is superior. This idea becomes a

fixation and later an obsessed madness, as Trevelyan is unwilling to admit that his foreign wife has been in the right all along.

Is Trollope, then, offering a critique on the idea that a person's racial heritage influences their mental state? After all, Trevelyan is the mad character in the novel, despite his standing as an upper-class gentleman who was well respected in the community. His erroneous placing of blame on the foreign other, his wife, is representative of a mode of thought that existed during the Victorian period. Yet, Trollope makes it clear that the wife is blameless throughout the entire novel, establishing her as the victim rather than the cause of Trevelyan's madness. He even ensures that it is clear that this madness was caused by some latent desire in Trevelyan to be the victim in the matter, causing his unreasonable inability to accept Emily's innocence. Rather, the blame for the lunacy is placed squarely on the shoulders of the Englishman Trevelyan, who erroneously heaps guilt on Emily because of her racial heritage. This contrasts with the first example of Bertha, who is representative of the mad other instead of challenging this branch of Victorian thought, as Trollope does.

**Class and Madness**

Class was regarded as an important signifier when it came to identifying symptoms of madness in Victorian England. Lady Audley from *Lady Audley's Secret* represents the archetype of madness through lower-class birth, which was another popular trope in sensation novels at the time. Lady Audley tries to create social mobility for herself by marrying into an aristocratic family and is consequently claimed to be a madwoman. The

reasons for this are twofold. The Audley family are ashamed of being linked to her lower-class origins, which they initially had no idea about. They also feel humiliated when they find out about the crimes that she has committed, crimes which contradict with the role that the Victorian lady of the upper-classes was supposed to play. Subsequently, they claim that Lady Audley is mad and send her to an asylum, where she dies in sequestrated silence. So, for the Victorian reader, she appears as the complete archetype of the madwoman, acting on inherited lunacy and lower-class origins, both of which were thought to cause mania. However, modern critics have re-interpreted the story as one of oppression, where social class is used to suppress the non-conformist female and usurper. Lady Audley's madness is a construct, composed of the wrongful suspicions that were held at the time.

Lady's Audley's attempt to create class mobility for herself through desperate measures places her in an asylum. Her aristocratic family by marriage (Audley) claim that she is mad for a number of reasons. Her lower-class origins, with a drunk father and mad mother, shock the bourgeois sensibilities of the Audley family, who had connected themselves to Lady Audley's origins without knowledge of them. Her claimed madness could be seen as a clever ruse by an aristocratic family to rid themselves of the shame of association with the degradation of the working classes. As Yannick Ripa points out, 'the bourgeoisie would not accept the slightest trace of abnormality at its very heart'; any non-conformist behaviour was likely to be supressed through the sequestration of the victim.[52] Therefore, Lady Audley's apparent mania can only be diagnosed as false through the retrospective gaze which recognises the part that social construct played in

the diagnosis of madness in the nineteenth century. The Audleys for example, claimed Lady Audley was mad in order to put her in an asylum and silence her. Just as in the case of murderess Constance Kent, it was considered to be better to view Lady Audley as mad, rather than as a criminally minded woman (not a feminine quality).

Class was an important signifier in the nineteenth century. Your class was seen as a way of identifying you, a stable basis for perception. If, for example, you were born into the lower-classes, as Dryden states, you would be assumed to be brutish, instead of a reasoning being (reserved for the upper-classes.[53] Therefore class mobility was not very easily obtained, as moving above your social class was seen as a challenge to the identity you were born into, your origin. If you can change your identity, then identity is no longer an accurate method by which to assess another person, as it is easily manipulated. Lady Audley's ascension into another class marks her out as a usurper, having control over something that nature dictated at birth. Replacing the age old hierarchies that had been in place in Britain for hundreds of years, she is marked out as the antagonist to a Victorian audience as soon as she marries Sir Michael Audley.

However, many modern critics have overturned this idea by arguing that Lady Audley's madness is a social construct used by the Audley family to maintain their status. In a Foucauldian interpretation, the institutionalisation of Lady Audley silences her just as the label of madwoman subverts her. The true character of Lady Audley must be hidden away, especially when connected to an aristocratic family. As I have argued previously, I do not believe that Lady Audley is mad, but is a representation

of an unconventional female who tries to achieve social mobility. Braddon uses Lady Audley's birth into a lower-class family of dubious mental background to produce suspicion in the Victorian mind about Lady Audley's mental state. However, the underlying argument in her novel is the belief that madness can be used as a label to silence women who do not conform to the role of femininity, especially by the privileged classes, who could afford to put away those who were inconveniently connected to them. As historian Edward Shorter argues, the asylum failed because people who were social misfits were confined for convenience.[54] Therefore, Braddon challenges the idea that those of lower-class backgrounds, who were assumed to be mad were in fact so. She calls into question the use of social hierarchy when dealing with issues of madness and lunacy.

The next example is in contrast to the previous one, however, illustrating the class decline of a madman who finds himself unable to maintain his status due to his fixated lunacy. *Far From the Madding Crowd* depicts the effects of madness on Farmer Boldwood, who almost loses his livelihood because of it. The impact which his mania takes is monetary, which results in a threat to his status. Thomas Hardy's novel depicts the upper-class professional man becoming mad, which in itself challenges the perception that madness was mainly a lower-class illness. In this case, Farmer Boldwood begins to neglect his crops because of his fixation with Bathsheba Everdene. If allowed to continue down this path, Boldwood would eventually become impoverished, a member of the lower-classes, losing all the respect and status that he had once held. In this way, his madness had the potential to result in his class descent into the lower orders if others had not intervened.

It is Boldwood's inertia, his complete lapse of business sense which threatens his class status when he becomes mad. His fixated obsession with Bathsheba means that his farm begins to fail because he is no longer paying attention to it. Contrast this with when he first meets Bathsheba, as the proud and wealthy owner of a successful farm and employer of many. His idleness is due to his inability to focus on any task that does not involve Bathsheba. It is also a characteristic that was linked to the lower classes at the time, as it was thought that their poverty was the outcome of their laziness. But for Boldwood, it was his lunacy which had potential to impact his class status and degrade him to the level of the lower-classes.

From 'a gentlemanly man' to a hopeless wretch, Hardy uses Boldwood's failure at husbandry to demonstrate the slow progression into madness.[55] As he explains towards the end of the novel, 'a few months earlier Boldwood's forgetting his husbandry would have been as preposterous an idea as a sailor forgetting he was in a ship'.[56] Oak too sees the change in the Farmer and claims that Boldwood was 'not the man he had once been', hinting at some degradation in his status as well as his being.[57] As Rosemary Sumner diagnoses:

> Hardy shows that [Boldwood] has been a highly competent farmer. As his balance becomes more and more disturbed, he becomes less able to grapple with external problems; the neglect of the stacks, dramatically contrasted with the sane Gabriel's fight to save Bathsheba's shows effectively the insidious increase in the neurosis.[58]

In almost losing some of his grain and wheat by leaving it to be soaked by the rain, Boldwood risks losing his only source of income for a season.[59] The subsequent consequences of this incident would be eventual ruin, pauperism and complete loss of status in the community; in other words, the transformation from a wealthy gentleman farmer to a lower-class man through madness. This novel also represents a challenge which Hardy presents to his audience, the idea that madness can exist in such extremities in the middle and upper-classes of British society.

## Degradation and Degeneracy of Professional Men

Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Adventure of the Creeping Man* embodies Victorian fears of atavism experienced by a man who imbibes a substance extracted from a large monkey. Instead of progressing in civilisation, he gradually begins to resemble the said animal and its characteristics. He becomes hunched over and ape-like in his physicality, sprouting hair on his knuckles and becoming exceedingly strong. 'The Beetle Hunter', on the other hand, illustrates the atavistic degeneration which Sir Thomas Rossiter is affected with through a hereditary taint. When experiencing a mad fit, he becomes the semblance of a primitive man, squat and violent, until the episode is over. Both these texts reference racial themes when dealing with the victim of madness and contradict the typical linkage of madness with poverty and racial otherness.

In *The Adventure of the Creeping Man*, Doyle depicts a 'famous Camford physiologist' of 'European reputation', Professor Presbury, who displays signs of insanity through using an untested drug taken from an

anthropoid.[60] Previously, he had been disappointed through a passionate affair that did not end in marriage because her family disapproved of the gap in ages, his age being older. The Professor goes to the length of taking this drug to help him regain his youth and strength and, consequently, his lover. But under the influence of the substance, his actions become more and more like those of a madman, as he becomes 'furtive and sly', yet 'savage'. His intellect remains untouched and Holmes denotes his cunning nature which contributes to the secrecy that the Professor maintains.[61]

His physiognomy also changes when he becomes 'dark and crouching' and stronger than he has ever been before. His knuckles become 'thick and horny' and he displays virility unnatural to his aging frame.[62] His ape-like ability to balance on tree branches and his teasing behaviour towards his once-loyal dog demonstrate the change from human to monkey species. As Holmes observes at the end of the story, 'the highest type of man may revert to the animal if he leaves the straight road of destiny'.[63] If the natural progression of evolution is interrupted, one may devolve into his former species, as in this example. Having taken a drug specifically formulated from the Langur, 'the great black-faced monkey of the Himalayan slopes, biggest and most human of all climbing monkeys', the Professor starts this process of regression.[64] This story illustrates what many Britons believed, that not only was progression possible, but also the opposite. So Conan Doyle embodies the views of the Victorian mind which not only believed in the possible evolving of a person, but also the devolving of the same being.

In 'The Beetle Hunter', there is a clear example of the professional man who falls to insanity because of a taint in the family. Sir Thomas Rossiter oscillates between sanity and unconscious insanity, from calm professionalism to savage, unreasoning violence. This is foreshadowed by the appearance of Sir Thomas, whose 'ill-nourished beard and harsh irregular features' are features that criminologist Cesare Lombroso references as criminal anomalies.[65] His facial spasms are also indicators of mental instability according to Darwinian psychiatry. This taught that:

> Physical characteristics, detected by the trained eye, indicated a predisposition to madness and criminality. These included an 'irregular and unsymmetrical conformation of the head, a want of regularity and harmony of the features, malformations of the external ear, tics, grimaces, stammering and defects of pronunciation.'[66]

When in a mad state, Sir Thomas's physical state becomes like that of 'a squat and misshapen dwarf'[67] with a foaming and glaring face[68] and savage violence. But after his homicidal bouts of mania, Sir Thomas falls into a stupor and does not recollect his dangerous behaviour later.[69] His physical state mimics that of the primitive man, who was believed to be shorter than Victorian men due to a lack of nourishment. Sir Thomas' mania takes the form of an atavistic reversion to his ancestral type, taking on their physical form while the madness has control of him. While he may be bodily present, the fact that he does not remember these reversions illustrates the mental absence through which these episodes happen. Sir Thomas clearly has no control over these happenings as he admits to having missed his wife in her absence, while having unleashed his madness on her and wounded her.

The control that his blood taint has over him is one of the anxieties during this time in regards to madness.

Both these examples replicate the reversion of atavism, but also contradict the theory that atavism is a trait mainly seen in the lower-classes. Both Professor Presbury and Sir Thomas Rossiter represent the upper-classes, those that some thought immune from this primitive reversion through their evolved states. Their madness is not only present in British subjects, but by the established in the respectable classes instead of the foreign usurper and pauper. The reversion illustrated is present within both men, the primitive within the gentleman. This example also simultaneously contradicts the idea that the racial other is the only type to exhibit mental degradation.

However, there is also an embodying of Victorian attitudes in terms of the troglodytic appearance if the madman. This signalled devolution, a clear regression into a former state of being, mirrored in the savage behaviour and atavistic mind. In a complex manifestation, while the madman is British, the symptoms of his madness are typical of the primitive that was thought to exist in all of us. However, the fact that the primitive exists even in the British race is yet another contradiction of common thought at the time.

Similarly, *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* depicts the professional man impelled into madness through a double self, which physically differentiates between the mad and sane self. While Jekyll's appearance remains untouched, his madness is portrayed through the entity of Hyde who, like Sir Thomas Rossiter, appears to be a throwback to

the ancestral type. As a result of illustrating madness as a form of devolution, it is hinted that lunacy is not common amongst the Victorian British, who are part of a well-developed civilisation. Instead, it is necessary that a person decreases from sophisticated culture to a primitive type in order to be a lunatic, which is physically obvious by that person's change in features and form. For Hyde, this meant appearing 'pale and dwarfish' as a 'troglodytic' man, embodying this madness.[70] It is also clear in the book that whoever comes into contact with Hyde is struck by his hideous appearance, feeling that something more sinister lurks beyond his form, 'a strong feeling of deformity'.[71] This echoes the madness that Hyde is experiencing within, as the Victorians believed that mental deformity was likely to impact physical features and overall figure noticeably.

One of the fears of Victorian society was that the civilisation they put their trust in was actually just a façade, under which the true ugliness of their ancestors was concealed. Jekyll represents the complete respectability of the upper-class British, being both an educated, professional man and wealthy enough to employ servants and entertain people. Enfield describes Jekyll to Utterson as a man in 'the very pink of proprieties, celebrated too and…what of your fellows who do what they call good.'[72] Enfield goes on to assume that the hold Hyde has on Jekyll is one of a blackmailer, who has discovered the sins of Jekyll's past youth.[73] Here, he infers that nothing in Jekyll's present life would suggest scandal, nothing worth blackmailing for. However, the behaviour of Hyde illustrates the falsity of the emphasised respect in which people of Jekyll's class and education were held.

Another interpretation of the novel is that the primitive self, inside all of us, will become stronger when we give in to these primitive cravings. A fortnight after Hyde tramples a little girl, Jekyll gives a dinner in the chapter titled: 'Dr Jekyll is quite at ease'. Clearly Jekyll still feels that he has control over Hyde. Yet a year later, after Hyde murders Sir Danvers Carew, a horrified Jekyll swears to Mr Utterson that he will rid himself of Hyde. For a while Jekyll succeeds, until he starts turning into Hyde unintentionally. It is only then that Jekyll realises that the only way to rid himself of Hyde is to commit suicide. Here we see the Victorian perception that 'race itself was succumbing to degenerative tendencies [which] threatened the very fabric of society.'[74] Hyde represents this 'wild tree-top blood', and Jekyll, the civilised being who gives dinner parties but also wishes to indulge in primitive pleasures.[75] But by giving into these wishes Jekyll feeds Hyde until he is the weaker double and Hyde the stronger. Hyde can then choose to emerge whenever he likes and the only eventual remedy is the destruction of both beings.

Yet there is a different interpretation of Hyde, one that goes beneath the surface reading which Enfield and Lanyon present. Stephen D. Arata argues that instead of Hyde being a representation of lower-class impulses he is instead a gentleman. Hyde, Arata claims, has 'vices [which] are clearly those of a monied gentleman', his forays into the streets at night hint at these indulgences.[76] Not only this, but the other men in the novel refer to Hyde as a 'gentleman' rather than the expected disapproving names usually associated with the lower-class atavistic monster.[77] Therefore, Hyde represents the upper-classes and Arata presents us with the link between the atavistic man and the gentleman of the city.

So what is racial about Stevenson's depiction of madness through Jekyll and Hyde? His depiction insists on the primitive Hyde being the lunatic and therefore responsible for all the crimes that were committed. Because Hyde is representative of the primitive, this also suggests that the crimes he committed were the result of this primeval influence. Therefore, the British citizen, represented by Jekyll, can only try to keep his primitive double under control. Those belonging to his class were thought to have more self-control, as it was the lower-classes that were thought to be typified by the lack of discipline as living according to instinct.[78] But Stevenson offers a contradiction to the latter conviction in this novel, offering both an upper-class gentleman and a British civilian to show an increasing lack of restraint over the primitive instinct. His illustration of the primeval in connection to respectability also contravened the idea that it was a working-class quality.

This novel plays on a key anxiety of the Victorians, which was centred on the inescapability of the primitive self, which in this novel is present within Jekyll. It gains strength from his weakness for primitive pleasures and begins to overpower his own will. Like Rossiter and Presbury, his madness is characterised by the primitive appearance and savage actions of an unreasoning mind. The race and class which Jekyll represents are at odds with Hyde and demonstrate the juxtaposing representations of both civilised man and primitive self or the id.

* * * *

Despite the dominant perceptions of the day, which assumed that foreigners and lower-class members of society were more prone to episodes of madness this chapter has shown the opposite to be true. While

Bertha remains an embodiment of the typical beliefs about the racially mad, many of the other mad examples are British and not only that, but respectable members of the middle-classes or gentry.

Therefore, the textual evidence contradicts the belief that was held by some Victorians about madness in relation to class and race. The only example I addressed that proved the link between race and madness was *Jane Eyre*, which represents exactly the ideas of that time. Bertha is indeed the ultimate depiction of Victorian anxieties over the mad other, who is savage and animalistic in her insanity. In the class section there was only one depiction that referenced the link between poverty and madness, that of Lady Audley. Although different interpretations quibble over the verdict of her madness, it is made clear that the Audley family benefit from a diagnosis of insanity and consequent imprisonment. The other novels and short stories point towards madness being found in the upper-classes, the professional man and the gentleman. The challenge has been put forward by the authors, who questioned the way in which those who were impoverished and (or) foreign were linked (rather unfairly) to mental instability and atavistic degeneration.

[1] Yannick Ripa*, Women and Madness: The Incarceration of Women in Nineteenth-Century France* (Paris: Polity Press, 1990), p. 69.

[2] Roy Porter*, Madness: A Brief History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 235.

[3] Eleanor Salotto, *Gothic Returns in Collins, Dickens, Zola and Hitchcock* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 37.

[4] Linda Dryden, *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles: Stevenson, Wilde and Wells* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 35.

[5] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), p. 113, cited by Patrick Brantlinger, in 'Let's Post-Post-Post "Victorientalism": A Response to Erin O'Connor', *Victorian Studies*, 46.1 (2003), pp. 95-105 (p. 104).

[6] Andrew Maunder and Grace Moore, *Victorian Crime, Madness and Sensation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), p. 5.

[7] Phyllis Chesler, *Women and Madness* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 212.

[8] Dryden, p. 76.

[9] Dryden, p. 47.

[10] Thomas Henry Huxley, *Evolution and Ethics*, ed. by Michael Ruse (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), p. 4.

[11] Ripa, p. 69.

[12] Vieda Skultans, *Madness and Morals: Ideas on Insanity in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited, 1975), p. 19.

[13] Dryden, p. 59.

[14] Dryden, p. 59.

[15] Richard Alfred Hunter and Ida Macalpine, *Psychiatry for the Poor: 1851 Colney Hatch Asylum-Friern Hospital 1973* (London: Dawsons, 1974), p. 44, cited by Elaine Showater, in *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), p. 38.

[16] *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 'Eugenics', online (2005) <http://academic.eb.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/EBchecked/topic/195069/eugenics> [accessed 24 March 2015], unpagenated.

[17] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, <http://academic.eb.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/EBchecked/topic/195069/eugenics> [accessed 25 March 2015], unpagenated.

[18] Elaine Showalter, *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), p. 110.

[19] Showalter, p. 110.

[20] Iain Stewart, 'Commandeering Time: The Ideological Status of Time in the Social Darwinism of Herbert Spencer', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 57.3 (2011), pp. 389-402 (p. 1).

[21] P. Bowler, 'Malthus, Darwin, and Social Darwinism', in *Encyclopaedia of the Human Genome* (Hokoken: John Wiley and Sons, 2003) <http://search.credoreference.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/content/entry/wileyhg/malthus_darwin_and_social_darwinism/0> [accessed 24 March 2015], unpagenated.

[22] Bowler, <http://search.credoreference.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/content/entry/wileyhg/malthus_darwin_and_social_darwinism/0> [accessed 24 March 2015], unpagenated.

[23]Bowler, <http://search.credoreference.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/content/entry/wileyhg/malthus_darwin_and_social_darwinism/0> [accessed 24 March 2015], unpagenated.

[24] Bowler, <http://search.credoreference.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/content/entry/wileyhg/malthus_darwin_and_social_darwinism/0> [accessed 24 March 2015], unpagenated.

[25] Bowler, <http://search.credoreference.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/content/entry/wileyhg/malthus_darwin_and_social_darwinism/0> [accessed 24 March 2015], unpagenated.

[26] Bowler, <http://search.credoreference.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/content/entry/wileyhg/malthus_darwin_and_social_darwinism/0> [accessed 24 March 2015], unpagenated.

[27] Bowler, <http://search.credoreference.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/content/entry/wileyhg/malthus_darwin_and_social_darwinism/0> [accessed 24 March 2015], unpagenated.

[28] Gina Lombroso-Ferrero, *Criminal Man: According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso,* in Project Gutenberg, unpagenated.

[29] Lombroso-Ferrero, pp. 7-8.

[30] Fredrick W. Mott, *Hereditary and Eugenics in Relation to Insanity* (California: Eugenics Education Society, 1912), pp. 1259, 1251, cited by Elaine Showalter, in *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), p. 110.

[31] Charlotte Brontë, *Jane Eyre* (London: Penguin Books Limited, 1994), p. 209.

[32] C. Brontë, p. 291.

[33] See *Jane Eyre* p 212 and 291 (Mason and Rochester)

[34] C. Brontë, p. 291.

[35] C. Brontë, p. 291.

[36] Elizabeth J. Donaldson, 'The Corpus of a Madwoman: Toward a Feminist Disability Studies Theory of Embodiment and Mental Illness', *The National Women's Study Association Journal*, 14.3 (2002), pp. 99-199 (p. 104).

[37] C. Brontë, p. 290.

[38] C. Brontë, p. 304.

[39] Donaldson, p. 106.

[40] Sue Thomas, 'The Tropical Extravagance of Bertha Mason', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 27.1 (1999), pp. 1-17 (p. 4).

[41] Thomas, p. 2.

[42] Dryden, pp. 83-84

[43] Brontë, p. 304.

[44] Porter, p. 63.

[45] Claire Rosenfeld, 'The Shadow Within: The Conscious and Unconscious Use of the Double', in *Stories of the Double*, ed. Albert J Guerard (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1967), p. 314, cited by Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, in *Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth Century Literary Imagination* (Cumberland: Yale University Press, 1980), p. 360.

[46] Anthony Trollope, *He Knew He Was Right* (London: Omnium Publishing, 1994), p. 37.

[47] Trollope, p. 38.

[48] Trollope, p. 107.

[49] Trollope, p. 659.

[50] Trollope, p. 525.

[51] Deborah Denenholz Morse, '"Some Girls Who Came From the Tropics": Gender, Race and Imperialism in Anthony Trollope's *He Knew He Was Right*', in *The Politics of Gender in Anthony Trollope's Novels: New Readings for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. by Margaret Markwick, Deborah Denenholz Morse and Regenia Gagnier (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), pp. 77-98 (p. 85).

[52] Chesler, p. 55.

[53] Dryden, p. 9.

[54] Edward Shorter, *A History of Psychiatry: From the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac* (Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, 1997), p. 33.

[55] Thomas Hardy, *Far From the Madding Crowd* (London: Heron Books, 1970), p. 104.

[56] Hardy, p. 294.

[57] Hardy, p. 419.

[58] Rosemary Sumner, *Thomas Hardy: Psychological Novelist* (London: The Macmillion Press, 1981), p. 52.

[59] See page 380 of the novel

[60] Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Adventure of the Creeping Man*, PDF found on <https://sherlock-holm.es/stories/pdf/letter/2-sided/cree.pdf> [accessed 24 March 2015], pp. 1-9 (p. 2).

[61] Conan Doyle, *The Adventure of the Creeping Man*, pp. 2, 3, 5.

[62] Conan Doyle, *The Adventure of the Creeping Man*, pp. 3, 8.

[63] Conan Doyle, *The Adventure of the Creeping Man*, p. 9.

[64] Conan Doyle, *The Adventure of the Creeping Man*, p. 9.

[65] Arthur Conan Doyle, 'The Beetle Hunter', in *Tales of Terror and Mystery*, Project Gutenberg, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/537/537-h/537-h.htm> [accessed 28 November 2014], unpagenated.

[66] Showalter, p. 106.

[67] Doyle, 'The Beetle Hunter', <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/537/537-h/537-h.htm> [accessed 2014], unpagenated.

[68] Doyle, 'The Beetle Hunter', <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/537/537-h/537-h.htm> [accessed 2014], unpagenated.

[69] Doyle, 'The Beetle Hunter', <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/537/537-h/537-h.htm> [accessed 2014], unpagenated.

[70] Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown), p. 30.

[71] Stevenson, p. 25.

[72] Stevenson, p. 24.

[73] Stevenson, p. 24.

[74] Jane V. Rago, 'Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde: A 'Men's Narrative' of Hysteria and Containment', in *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries*, ed. by Richard Ambrosini and Richard Dury (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), pp. 275-285 (p. 253)90

[75] Julia Reid, 'Stevenson, Romance and Evolutionary Psychology', in *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries*, ed. by Richard Ambrosini and Richard Dury (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), pp. 215-227 (p. 219).

[76] Stephen D. Arata, 'The Sedulous Ape: Atavism, Professionalism and Stevenson's Jekyll and Hyde', *Criticism*, 37.2 (1995) <http://ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/docview/200410629?accountid=17287> [accessed 13 July 2015], unpagenated.

[77] Arata <http://ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/docview/200410629?accountid=17287> [accessed 13 July 2015], unpagenated.

[78] Dryden, p. 59.

# Chapter Three: Madness and Crime

A highly popular murder had been committed and Mr Wopsle was imbrued in blood up to the eyebrows.[1]

To some extent, psychiatrists were the victims of their own propaganda. They had insisted that many of the aberrant and antisocial behaviours traditionally labelled vice, sin and crime were actually mental disorders in need of the doctor and the asylum.[2]

There is scarce any offence against public decorum that has not been frequently the result of mental disease.[3]

In the nineteenth century criminality was thought to be a symptom of madness. This chapter focuses on the depiction of criminal acts in Victorian texts and analyses whether these acts are portrayed as manifestations of madness by nineteenth century novelists.

Victorian criminal categorisations considered sexual deviance to be a criminal offence, particularly for women. According to criminologist Cesare Lombroso, prostitutes represented the majority of female criminal types.[4] Although this is a specifically nineteenth century view of criminality, it is relevant to the madwomen I am studying, most of whom are represented as promiscuous. Andrew Maunder and Grace Moore argue that 'sexual "depravity" among women in particular, including any sexual interest outside

of marriage was regarded as a sign of nymphomania or lunacy'.[5] Many women were diagnosed as insane as a result of their perceived debauchery, whether this was sexual or an abuse of alcohol and substances (such as opium)[.6] As a result, insanity was often a misdiagnosis, functioning more as a critique of what was regarded as socially unacceptable behaviour which contradicted the female ideal than as a medical condition.

In the nineteenth century, those who were criminal were thought to be so because they failed to resist temptation and instead yielded to their demons.[7] Those who were diagnosed as mad (especially those who were 'morally insane') were also thought to be so because they did not curb their immoral passions. This meant that criminals were often believed to be mad because their actions proved their lack of moral fibre and self-control, the deterrents of insanity. Symptoms such as drunkenness,[8] 'sexual appetite'[9], violence, and failures of the will presented both a criminal and lunatic aspect to a Victorian society. Indeed, it was asserted by Joel Peter Eigen that 'the jury was much more likely to meet prisoners who claimed the intervention of devilish, not alcoholic, spirits propelling them to murderous violence'.[10] Harking back to the times when insanity was thought synonymous with demon possession, society (as represented by a jury) would have rather believed that the accused was propelled by supernatural forces than responsible for their wrongdoing by drinking to excess. Exhibiting either criminal or immoral characteristics was likely to lead to a diagnosis of moral insanity, which could be cured by curbing every unruly appetite in moral therapy.[11] According to the Lutheran Priest J.C.A. Heinroth, insanity was indeed linked with sin, as 'both were voluntary and hence culpable renunciations of God's gift, free will.'[12]

Giving way to these 'baser drives of human existence'[13] meant that faculties such as reason and restraint were no longer present.[14] Consequently, the actions of the person affected were believed to be representative of the primitive present in every person. Madness was representative of the result of living without moral boundaries, manifested in immorality and sometimes criminality. Some viewed this as a reversion to atavism (which I discussed in my previous chapter), a common fear in the Victorian period.

Law was usually very clear on what was legal and what was not. Bigamy, murder, homosexuality, drunken disorder, arson, forgery and soliciting were all considered unlawful at this time. However, there is some ambiguity around acts of domestic violence, where Victorian understandings of gender muddied the waters. Women tended to get larger sentences when found guilty of crimes because of their assigned place as nurturer and carer. Like in the case of Constance Kent, women who dipped into the criminal life were likely to be considered insane instead of criminal and so no longer culpable for their actions. Constance admitted to the murder of her brother in 1865[15] and was found insane, as The Telegraph stated at the time, "better a hundred times that she should prove a maniac than a murderess".[16] As women were also generally thought to be more likely to develop insanity than men, their behaviour was thusly interpreted.

Although there was a continued blurring of the line between immorality and madness in the nineteenth century, there was also an increasing awareness about mental disease that resulted in several acts and laws being passed that looked to either protect those who were clinically

defined as mad or determine whether those who were believed to be so had been appropriately diagnosed. An example of this is the McNaughten rules, which were established to define madness in a court of law. Named after Daniel McNaughten,[17] these rules were meant to differentiate between conscious crime and lack of awareness when perpetrating a crime.[18] This was labelled as not being 'doubly aware' and was applied to cases like a sleepwalker committing murder or the accused pleading amnesia at the time when the wrong was being committed.[19]

During the nineteenth century a number of pseudo-sciences emerged that sought to establish a link between insanity and the body. Cesare Lombroso believed that 'if we examine a number of criminals, we shall find that they exhibit numerous anomalies in the face, skeleton, and various psychic and sensitive functions'.[20] In other words, Lombroso believed that many criminals had certain physical attributes that indicated their predisposition to unlawfulness. Physical traits were also linked with criminality through the study of phrenology, founded by William Charles Ellis.[21] This practice was based on the understanding that bumps on the skull denoted mental illness.[22] The diagnosis of insanity also followed the same route, looking to physical features and form to portray the disease. Any irregularities of physicality were seen to depict the unstable mind within, as Vieda Skultans writes: 'a quiver of an eyebrow or the tremor of a lower lip can betray the incipient lunatic.'[23]

Criminals were treated in a similar fashion to the insane, institutionalised and kept away from the general public. These men and women were locked away and often examined by those interested in the

increasingly popular anthropologic branches of science, but at the same time were also silenced by their label.

In the pages of nineteenth century fiction, authors present many examples of characters who are depicted as criminals and whose actions would have been perceived as the result of mental instability. I will examine these characters by focusing on the types of crimes they committed, which all relate to violent acts. My first section will be on violent crime, the murderers or attempted murderers who, through their madness, became aggressive. These include characters like Dorian Gray, Mr Hyde and Farmer Boldwood, all of whom committed murder under the influence of their insanity. Those who attempted murder, like Lady Audley and Bertha Mason, still suffer under the conviction of their insanity, demonstrated in their violence towards other characters.

My second section will detail the abuse of the innocent, such as women, children and animals, by those who are insane. There are many examples of this type of abuse, such as Lady Audley abandoning her child, Louis Trevelyan using his child for manipulative purposes or Hyde trampling a child on the street. Women too are the subject of the same abuse, as illustrated by Sir Thomas Rossiter striking his wife while having a fit of madness. Their pets also become victims of their mania, such as Dr Presbury's treatment of a dog while under the influence of a drug, or Sir Percival Glyde's cruel punishment of his dogs.

My final section will address self-harm and self-destructiveness, and the connection these have with insanity. There are those characters who indulge in drink such as Sir Percival, mimicking the thinking of the time which

was that excess was one of the symptoms of madness. I will also address Catherine Earnshaw, who tries to starve herself during a period of insanity, causing much harm. Suicide is also detailed in these novels, as both Dorian and Jekyll see no other way out of their madness than to kill themselves.

While criminality was regarded as a manifestation of madness by many in the nineteenth century, it is important to note that not all criminals were thought of as insane. Complex thinking about morality, sin, social and economic conditions, and environment all intersected with understandings of crime. As stated by Valerie Pedlar: 'imaginative representations of madness are inevitably influenced by cultural conceptions of insanity, whether they are medical, juridical, philosophical, or a composite that has entered into popular currency'.[24] The connection that was thought to exist between crime and madness was influenced by a number of aspects that were formed by that time period and culture. In fiction as well as in the historical record, there are many examples of criminals whose actions are not linked to mental instability. This can be seen in *Great Expectations*, where the criminality is clearly calculated and not a symptom of madness, nor a precursor of it.

Orlick commits criminal offences, but is clearly sane. He calls Pip's sister Mrs Gargery 'a foul shrew', assaults Mrs Gargery and eventually causes her death.[25] After her injury, Mrs Gargery draws a hammer on a slate, indicating that she wishes to see Orlick who used to be a blacksmith. She then expresses 'the greatest anxiety to be on good terms with him', with the man having 'a curious loose vagabond bend in the knees'.[26] Later in the novel, Orlick tries to get revenge on Pip for losing him his place as a

blacksmith and getting between himself and Biddy. He expresses a wish to commit his second murder: 'I will kill you like any other beast- which is wot I mean to do and wot I have tied you up for'.[27] Pip is rescued promptly by his friends and is not murdered by the ferocious Orlick, whose actions seem to indicate an exaggerated sense of vindictiveness. However, his crimes do not paint him as a madman, just as Miss Havisham's actions do not paint her as the criminal. Instead, she acts the role of the madwoman without any of the key criminal characteristics associated with insanity during this time, such as violent intent and sexual deviance. Rather, Dickens represents these two archetypes as separate in this novel, instead of linked as in the latter examples.

**Violent Crime and Madness**

A predisposition towards violent crime was regarded as one of the symptoms of insanity in the nineteenth century, and this attitude is exemplified in several Victorian texts. Some of these characters are guilty of wilful murder, such as Dorian Gray, Mr Hyde and Farmer Boldwood. All of these men take another life through means which would have convinced a Victorian audience of their imbalanced state of mind. Others, such as Lady Audley and Bertha Mason, attempt to kill others for selfish reasons, but fail in their efforts. Both women use arson as a tool for their crime to rid the world of their enemies, carelessly putting the lives of others at risk at the same time.

*The Picture of Dorian Gray* presents the reader with a character driven to such a frenzy by his madness that he murders one of his friends.

His behaviour leading up to the murder is described in the novel using words such as 'wildly',[28] 'mad passions',[29] and 'uncontrollable feeling of hatred'[30] as if Dorian is being controlled by something else. The death of Basil Hallward is described by Wilde in graphic detail from the moment Dorian seizes the knife to the convulsions of the dying man:

> As soon as he got behind him, he seized [the knife] and turned around. Hallward stirred in his chair as if he was going to rise. [Dorian] rushed at him and dug the knife into the great vein that is behind the ear, crushing the man's head down on the table, and stabbing him again and again.[31]

The anatomical precision of the knife's position is evidence of the calm thought of Dorian during this act, choosing an area that would yield ample blood, enough to be fatal. The repetition of his act also illustrates Dorian's intent, the act is both impulsive and definite. Dorian stabs Basil upwards of five times and afterwards notes how calm he feels after having committed his first murder.[32] Dorian also takes advantage of Basil's seated position, which puts him at a disadvantage as he is relaxed and vulnerable. Dorian also comes up from behind Basil, using the element of surprise to his benefit, as Basil is not able to defend himself from the attack. This careful approach, as well as his act, would have been an indication of his madness to a Victorian audience, because it suggests the calm forethought of someone who is determined to murder and so positions himself advantageously so as to be successful. This criminal intent would be translated in their minds as moral insanity (caused by immorality). The lack of remorse and horror felt by Dorian either shows that he does not

understand the enormity of his crime or that he does not care about it. Joyce Carol Oates diagnoses this as Dorian's 'loss of humanity' caused by Basil's painting of his portrait.[33]

Mr Hyde from *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* perpetrates savage violence towards complete strangers when he is in the form of Hyde. These episodes lead to the harming of a child and the murder of an old man in unprovoked attacks of ferocity. Mr Hyde is always the perpetrator of these violent crimes, taking on an appearance 'like Satan', reflecting the base nature of Hyde.[34] The murder of Sir Danvers Carew is described by an observer to have been like watching the actions of a madman, so sudden and malicious were Hyde's actions. He is described during this crime as breaking 'out of all bounds' while 'clubbing [Carew] to the earth', as if throwing himself free of the constraints of the law.[35] This action, in particular, demonstrates the increasing madness of Jekyll while in the form of Hyde; he grows increasingly ungovernable – by law, morals or conscience. As pointed out by Dryden, it is through this lack of conscience that we are able to see that 'Hyde is an expression of a bestiality that is part of the human condition, and the human dilemma is that the Hyde in each of us should be supressed.'[36] She goes on to emphasise that Hyde is 'the savage side of Jekyll, kept repressed' but eventually becoming too powerful for Jekyll's control.[37] This was a particular worry for the audience of the time, which viewed the human conscience as one of the only things that separated man from animal in a time of Darwinian panic. The separation of a man from his conscience is a symptom of atavism (as Dryden indicates), which I explored in my second chapter.[38]

In *Far From the Madding Crowd*, Farmer Boldwood murders Sergeant Troy at the climax of his madness. His disappointment at no longer having a monopoly over the lovely Bathsheba, who was thought to be a widow after her husband disappeared for many years, drives him to shoot her husband when he reappears in her life, alive. Hardy describes Boldwood at the moment of his despair as having been transformed by it, until nobody around him recognised who he was. Likewise, his act of murder is also uncharacteristic and unrecognisable from the man we were introduced to in the beginning of the novel. His face looks as though 'his veins had swollen, and a frenzied look had gleamed in his eye'.[39] His weapon consists of a gun taken from a 'gun-rack, as was usual in farmhouses', placed by the fireplace in clear sight of Boldwood who, until now, has no thought of murder.[40] When Troy goes to grab Bathsheba, Boldwood impulsively 'take[s] one of the guns, cock[s] it, and at once discharge[s] it at Troy', who falls to the ground.[41] After he shoots Troy, Boldwood also attempts to kill himself, knowing that if that failed he was bound to be hanged anyway. He, at least, expresses some contrition for his act of vengeance, something which a Victorian audience would have appreciated. His murder was not premeditated, as is clear by the weapon he uses and the remarkable circumstances that led to his crime. Hardy constructs this act as one of sudden madness and provoked from extreme stress and strain, which he had previously illustrated. This is described by Nicola Lacey as being a reference to the Victorian fascination with the unconscious crime and the uncontrollable passion, both of which were symptoms of madness.[42] Therefore the sympathy is more likely to lie with Boldwood, rather than his victim, as is reflected in his punishment.

In courts today, if you plead guilty to a sentence and show remorse, you are more likely to be looked on favourably than if you do not. In the nineteenth century, remorse was reflective of the perpetrator understanding the magnitude of their crime and the consequences of it. It also reflected a conscience which was sensitive to wrong actions. But perhaps it is different if the person is considered so lucid as to know exactly what they are doing when they commit the crime. Insanity is a cause for lesser sentence because it impacts reason, and so the perpetrator is no longer as culpable for their actions while in this state. A good example of this is Edward Oxford, who tried to shoot Queen Victoria in 1840, an act which was regarded as high treason, a very serious crime.[43] However, he 'was found insane at trial'.[44] His insanity was later questioned, as 'subsequent progress cast doubt on the diagnosis of a psychotic illness'.[45] Initially he was placed in Bedlam (Bethlehem) asylum,[46] but was freed after twenty seven years of sequestration and headed for the colonies.[47] Under the name John Freedman, he became a respectable member of Melbourne society and even married and had children.[48] Because of the doubt cast over his sanity at the time, Oxford was not hanged for his crime (which was one of the most serious offences one could commit at the time). Instead the verdict of guilty through influence of mental instability won Oxford his life and eventually a new identity in Australia, as sympathies lay with him and his questionable state of mind at the time.

Boldwood's insanity is taken into account when considering what charge he would face. Clearly, the characters in the novel are convinced that Boldwood would not have behaved in such a way had he been sane. Those in a court room, who are charged to pass judgement on Boldwood,

hoped to remove the crime, in a moral point of view, out of the category of wilful murder, and lead it to be regarded as a sheer outcome of madness.[49]

So instead of being hanged for the murder of Troy, Boldwood is 'confined during Her Majesty's pleasure', whether it be in an asylum or prison it is not known.[50] But compassion is extended to him for the madness which he experienced when committing his crime. This contrasts with the treatment of Jekyll/Hyde and Dorian, whose murders were plainly premeditated and therefore they received harsher ends and less sympathy. As Rosemary Sumner writes about Hardy's depiction of Boldwood's insanity, it does not allow 'a detached or analytical attitude to the character' who is suffering.[51]

Lady Audley's madness has more than one facet, being both an inherited illness which is exemplified by her criminal behaviour and a label imposed upon her. She attempts to murder those who stand in the way of her maintaining her place in the upper-classes, Robert Audley and George Talboys. Both men try to unmask her fraudulent claim on Sir Michael Audley's wealth and position, and the 'diseased mind' of Lady Audley leaps to the conclusion that she must attempt some felonious act to stop them.[52] At first she had determined on a lesser criminal action of bribing George, but she does not find him amenable to her money.[53] After this, she admits 'it was then I was mad' and fears losing her position at Audley court, which George threatens to make happen.[54] When he confronts her they argue and in Lady Audley's own words she 'drew the loose iron spindle from the shrunken wood, and saw my first husband sink with one horrible cry into the black mouth of the well.'[55] After the murders, Lady Audley listens to make

sure that George is indeed dead and, hearing no response, assumes that he is.[56] She states a little while later: 'I crossed that invisible line which separates reason from madness' suggesting that she was indeed aware of her criminal intent before the attack on George.[57] What Lady Audley determines as crossing the line is used by Braddon to represent the crossing of the line between appropriate female behaviour and the opposite, criminality. However, as Andrew Maunder and Grace Moore point out, the concept of Lady Audley as a criminal character is exploited by Braddon without her actually being guilty of the two murders in the novel.[58] It is an idea used to fuel the plot of this sensation novel, without the crime being successful and Lady Audley being a murderess. Like her madness, it is used as a concept to excite a Victorian readership without it being an actuality.

Her attempt to take Robert's life is more thought out, staged around the precarious Castle Inn where he is staying. Lady Audley uses this environment to place suspicion about whether the fire was set intentionally or just the result of the unreliable wooden structure and a drunken landlord. After taking a candle upstairs to the room of Phoebe Marks to 'get some cold water' she places the candle dangerously near 'the lace furbelows about the glass, so close that the starched muslin seemed to draw the flame towards it'.[59] When Phoebe asks where she left her candle on her return, she tells her that 'the wind blew it out' and so she 'left it there'.[60] On the way back to Audley Court, Phoebe looks back to see a glow in the sky from the fire and accuses Lady Audley of having started the fire to get rid of Robert Audley. This accurate accusation sums up the calculated crime of arson, which takes advantage of the dubious structure and its drunk landlord,

where a fire could easily have been caused by accident. Lady Audley ensures her access to the room while alone where she can leave the candle in a place where it will likely cause a fire. This planned attack only illustrates the calm way in which Lady Audley goes about indirectly causing harm to Robert, whom she feared would expose her past and remove her from the grandeur of Audley Court. It also indicates a presence of mind which calls into question the link between madness and insanity.

However, juxtaposing the Victorian ideas about crime, femininity and madness are recent critical interpretations of this text. As Pamela Gilbert argues, these contemporary assessments of the text see Lady Audley's 'insanity' as a convenient diagnosis which explains away what is actually rational behaviour.[61] However, the men in the text (Robert and George) seek to place Lady Audley in a position where her words are invalidated as the ravings of a 'madwoman'. D.A. Miller points out that 'though her acts "qualify as crimes" they are more conveniently treated as madness'.[62]

Bertha Mason, the infamous madwoman from *Jane Eyre*, attempts to murder her husband Mr Rochester more than once and also risks the lives of other people at Thornfield. Fire is the weapon she favours and she uses it to try and kill her husband, setting fire to his bed with 'a demonic laugh – low, suppressed, and deep'.[63] Later, Bertha almost succeeds in killing Rochester by setting 'fire first to the hangings of the room next to her own' only to then set fire to Jane's former bed below.[64] When Mr Rochester tries to save Bertha from the fire she lights, she jumps from above the battlements of Thornfield Hall, '[smashing] on the pavement.'[65] He does not die in the fire, but becomes blind from the heat of the flames.

Bertha's attempt to kill Rochester is a complete act of vindictive madness, like her haunting visits of Jane's bedroom before she leaves Thornfield. She seeks to murder him and Jane through the only means available to her: fire. Her violence is clearly indicated in the semblance she takes, the animalistic shape emitting 'snarling canine noise[s]'[66] and being compared to a tigress[67] and hyena,[68] both of which hunt for their kill.

Bertha not only tries to murder the man who sequestered her but also her brother, Richard Mason. Her desire for violence seems to stretch even to family with her own brother becoming a target for her savagery. She makes of her brother 'a pale and bloody spectacle'[69] and as Jane is nursing his wounds, she 'feared he was dying'.[70] Afterwards, Mason admits to having been bitten by his sister, who claimed that she would drain his heart of all its blood.[71] Her attack having been almost fatal, this is Bertha's second attempt at murder after trying to burn Mr Rochester in his bed. She is not blamed by Mason, who pleads with Rochester before leaving: 'let her be taken care of: let her be treated as tenderly as may be'.[72] Clearly, it is her hereditary insanity that is blamed for her murderous acts, instead of Bertha herself, who is instead an object of pity, even to her victims.

Perhaps Brontë is trying to evoke the same emotion in her readers, who would be more predisposed to blame Bertha for the violence she exudes. Bertha, after all, never manages to perpetrate any lasting damage on the protagonists in the novel (Rochester's sight returns later). Instead, the immoral actions of Bertha can perhaps be understood as symptoms of a character's frustration with the constant imprisoned state which has been imposed on her. Significantly, both the victims of Bertha's rage are male,

while the females who are also vulnerable to these attacks, such as Grace Poole and Jane, are never physically touched. Men represent jailers to Bertha; she has been locked up because of the reasoning of one such male. As Valerie Beattie notes, 'it would appear that madness and confinement generally presented Brontë with a powerful analogy for patriarchy's reception of female rebellion', as it does in this novel.[73]

**Abuse of the Innocent**

Abuse of the innocent and is presented as one of the signs of madness in nineteenth century fiction. It takes the form of a predatory instinct, targeting those who are vulnerable and making use of the environment they may be in.  This abuse takes several forms, particularly the mistreatment of children, animals and women.

One of the ways in which a Victorian audience would view the abandoning of a child was as the unnatural act of a mother, whose mind was imbalanced. Lady Audley is aware that the birth of her son was the trigger for her mania, as she had inherited her mother's form of madness after she gave birth. She admits in the book: 'I did not love the child, for he had been a burden upon my hands', because of his association with her forays into insanity.[74] This is further emphasised when Phoebe Marks steals 'a baby's little worsted shoe rolled up in a piece of paper, and a tiny lock of pale and silky yellow hair, evidently taken from a baby's head'.[75] Clearly, this is one of the only remnants of her son, but even so, Lady Audley does not notice that it goes missing. She is so entranced with the beauty of the

gifts which Sir Michael gives her that her own child becomes a distant memory. Her attitude towards her son is the antithesis of the maternal instinct which was considered not only natural but also essential for women to feel towards their offspring. This attitude couples with the previously mentioned criminality, both of which contradict her expected role in Victorian society.

Braddon's purpose of depicting Lady Audley this way is to emphasise the extremity of her madness in a way the audience of that time would understand. Her heartless treatment of her child in disregarding him for wealth creates an antagonism between her and the Victorian audience, although from a modern perspective, this act can be understood as the abandoning of the child whom Lady Audley understood to represent the beginnings of her so-called madness. Since she believed that giving birth was the catalyst for her insanity, her wish not to be reminded of her affliction is the natural act of someone who did not wish to be reminded of their illness. Considering the background from which Braddon was writing, which was one of cultural anxiety over gender roles, sexuality and moral boundaries, it is no wonder that she chose to focus her novel on such fears. If Lady Audley behaved as an appropriate female was expected to, as Maunder and Moore explain, she would not be the subject of a sensation novel.[76]

In *He Knew He Was Right*, Louis Trevelyan uses his own child to manipulate his wife Emily's emotions and so gain power over her. His madness is depicted by his being completely devoid of love for his son,

seeing him instead as a bargaining tool to persuade his wife to admit to a wrong she did not commit. Trevelyan even resorts to stealing little Louey from Emily, despite the fact that he was able to procure the child by going through the court system.[77] When the child does not respond well to him, Trevelyan believes it is the result of his education: 'that's how it has been taught'.[78] Little Louey is constantly being used by Trevelyan to justify his treatment of Emily, the reason he left his wife and for whose sake his wife must remain pure. The way he behaves towards his child illustrates the hold that his mania has over him; everything revolves around his wife's imagined infidelity even to the detriment of his own flesh and blood. Trollope uses this aspect of Trevelyan's illness to illustrate the consuming impact that his madness has had on him, overruling his love for the child or his wife.

*The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* also includes an instance of child abuse by a person who is mentally imbalanced. When Hyde is walking at night, he tramples 'calmly over [a] child's body' and carries on without glancing back, despite the cries of the young girl.[79] Once brought back to the scene of violence, Hyde remains calm, 'perfectly cool and made no resistance' when attempts were made to bring him to justice.[80] After Enfield chooses to make the punishment, one of forced financial assistance to the girl's family, Hyde acquiesces to a one hundred pound fine. But his lack of emotion after having harmed a child is a chilling reminder of his madness, which takes the semblance of unprovoked acts of random violence and a body without a conscience. Stevenson uses this example of violence as a spring board into the increasingly fierce behaviour of Hyde, who is first noticed by the other characters in the book through this

happenstance. It is also where Stevenson establishes the idea of atavism in connection with Hyde, whose body is split from the moral conscience that Jekyll possesses.[81] It is this split which enables Hyde to commit atrocities of Gothic proportions without the hindrance of personal inhibitions. Jane Rango writes that Stevenson presented Hyde's increasing control over Jekyll as 'an emerging anxiety of the late nineteenth century: the perception that race itself was succumbing to degenerative tendencies'; Hyde's criminal deeds are evidence of this degeneration.[82]

The connection between domestic abuse and madness is alluded to in Arthur Conan Doyle's short story 'The Beetle Hunter'. In this narrative Lady Rossiter is described by the narrator of the story as having a 'serious wound' above her right eyebrow.[83] Conan Doyle goes on to depict her husband Sir Thomas Rossiter as having 'homicidal bouts' as part of his inherited insanity.[84] During these spasms, he often hits his wife, causing wounds which are symptoms of the seriousness of his mania. The violence of these spasms is also detailed in Rossiter's attack upon Lord Linchmere and Dr Hamilton, which is ferocious and leaves Rossiter 'foaming and glaring'.[85] However, Rossiter still longs to see his wife, even after he has injured her, suggesting that he has no memory of the attack. This is yet another sign of mental instability, periods of blank memory when Rossiter is no longer 'doubly aware'.[86]

The behaviour and treatment of animals is often used in Victorian literature to indicate madness, such as in *The Woman in White* and *Lady Audley's Secret*. *The Adventure of the Creeping Man* also follows this

theme, with Professor Presbury's dog biting him once he begins to take on the characteristics of the anthropoid. However, his treatment of the same dog also illustrates the change in Professor Presbury, who is becoming increasingly ape-like and less stable of mind. It is in this guise that Presbury begins to tease his dog who is tied up:

> He took handfuls of pebbles from the drive and threw them in the dog's face, prodded him with a stick which he had picked up, flicked his hands about only a few inches from the gaping mouth, and endeavoured in every way to increase the animal's fury, which was already beyond all control.[87]

Thus the Professor meets his demise, having, in his madness teased his dog until it broke free and bit his neck. The risk he took in baiting the dog illustrates his madness, his close proximity to the feverish face of the Newfoundland, and his precise aiming of the stones to hit the dog. The dog senses the madness of his owner, which is not only manifested in physical attributes but also mental degradation. Conan Doyle's depiction of the abuse of his dog only demonstrates how far Presbury has fallen, as does the reaction of his pet. His loss of humanity for an animal that used to be his cherished pet also impacts the sympathy that the audience might have felt had the dog not been provoked. Atavism is suggested where Presbury finds he has periods where he is separated from his conscience and instead has his behaviour dictated by his anthropoid instincts. The madness of Presbury is also self-inflicted, induced by the voluntary imbibing of a dangerous drug, which causes him to exude ape-like characteristics. This too would influence an audience's reaction to his demise, which makes it clear that Presbury is

the perpetrator of his fate instead of the victim of it as he chooses his degraded form.

Another example of the abuse of the innocent can be found in the character of Sir Percival Glyde from *The Woman in White.* He willingly admits to his own mistreatment of animals as well as letting those in his employment mistreat them without censure. Laura's dog, a 'cross-grained pet greyhound', barks and snaps at Sir Percival while behaving amiably to Walter Hartright.[88] Animals were often seen as having an incorruptible sense of personality, and a dog's hostile conduct towards a character often foreshadowed a darker turn than that same person; this also proves to be the case in this novel. Sir Percival orders that the keeper of Blackwater Park shoot any unfamiliar dogs on his estate, depicting even further how madness and lack of humanity towards animals are linked. Sir Percival's own dogs are also victims of his mania, as the novel describes him as having beaten 'one of the spaniels'.[89]

## Self-abuse and Self-destruction

In nineteenth century literature, characters, on occasion, direct their violence towards themselves rather than others. This lack of interest in self-preservation not only illustrates the excesses of madness but also the recklessness of the insane person.

Alcohol was thought to affect the drinker by bringing them to a state where 'mental faculties of reason, restraint and duty fall prey to the physical

of the baser human drives of human existence', which can be seen in the behaviour of several characters.[90]  Sir Percival Glyde's madness is less pronounced than many of the other characters I have previously discussed. It manifests as a series of defects of character:

> His incessant restlessness and excitability – which may be caused, naturally enough by the unusual energy of character. The other his short, sharp, ill-tempered manner of speaking with the servants.[91]

The above symptoms were usually associated with madness in the nineteenth century, as are Sir Percival's drinking habits, which would have been diagnosed as 'alcoholic psychosis'.[92] If the cause of his madness is excess, the treatment of it is self-control, with 'every unruly appetite [to] be checked' with a dose of moral therapy.[93] His consumption of an 'excessive quantity of wine' makes his temper break 'out in the most violent and alarming manner'.[94] Those around him diagnose it as 'a kind of panic or frenzy of mind', associating his drunkenness with his state of mind.[95]

In the novel *Wuthering Heights*, Catherine Earnshaw goes on a hunger strike for two days, threatening to starve herself in order that her husband's death would follow. Her treatment of herself illustrates her contempt for her own body and life as well as her mental instability. She considers her options: 'I'll choose between these two: either I'll starve at once…or to recover and leave the country'.[96] Her use of bodily harm and starvation to manipulate a situation demonstrates her childish nature. It also illustrates her mania, which the Victorians thought was linked with most forms of self-harm. As noted in an article written by Sarah Chaney on the subject, 'the term "self-injury," while ostensibly distinct from suicide, was

used in case notes, textbooks and journals to refer to a wide variety of acts, ranging from refusal of food to many attempted suicides'.[97] The above symptoms were thought to be signs of insanity in both fictional depictions and alienist societies. While Catherine knows that Edgar holds great affection for her and would do her will to avoid seeing her starve herself and uses his devotion to her advantage. But when Nelly tells her that Edgar is philosophically resigned to her death, she is driven into a feverish anger.[98] She muses: 'if I were only sure it would kill [Edgar]…I would kill myself directly!'[99] The lack of concern and love from her husband sends her from 'feverish bewilderment to madness' as Catherine realises that her husband will no longer bow to her manipulation.[100]

Many female ailments were linked to the reproductive cycle, and as such women were believed to be more vulnerable to physical and mental illness.[101] It is possible that Catherine's act of starvation is just a precursor of her giving birth to her first and only child a few months later. From a more modern perspective, Catherine might also be thought to be suffering from anorexia nervosa, which is a lack of appetite or enforced starvation in order to establish control over one aspect of life.[102]

In the nineteenth century, suicide was still an illegal act as it was believed that God was the only being empowered to end life. As the majority of Victorians still believed that man was created by God, the decision to end your own life prematurely is an act of defiance against the deity who was responsible for life. Those who did commit suicide were not able to be buried in consecrated ground, as if their bodies were diseased and likely to spread anarchism among the dead buried there. This may also be because there

was such great emphasis on repentance at this time, and suicide is the one sin you cannot repent of. As well as this

> From January 1844, standardised admission papers in the Bethlam Royal Hospital asked whether or not the patient was "disposed to suicide or otherwise to self-injury" suggesting separate, albeit related symptoms of mental disorder.[103]

It was an accepted fact among these alienists that suicide and self-harm were symptoms of a deeper insanity, lurking within. This view agrees with a prevalent belief of the time, which was that body and mind were inextricably linked and the degradation of one was likely to be manifested in the other. This idea can be seen through certain examples, such as the one Shorter highlights in which a fever is seen as one cause of madness.[104] The novels of the time, too, link self-harm to dubious characters whom I would argue are mad in their treatment of their bodies.

Both Jekyll and Hyde die when Jekyll decides to commit suicide in Robert Louis Stevenson's tale. The madness of Hyde persuades Jekyll that this is the only way to rid himself of the double that begins to plague him. He comes to this conclusion when he realises that Hyde is no longer under his control. This is epitomised when he wakes up as Hyde when he expects to have remained as Jekyll.[105] This lack of control is further indicated when Jekyll realises that 'Hyde had grown in stature' and that 'the powers of Hyde seemed to have grown with the sickliness of Jekyll'.[106] In some way his act of suicide was the only means of self-preservation that remained to him.

Jekyll/Hyde's act of suicide is somewhat confused due to the dual nature of his being. Jekyll writes the confession of his crimes and eventual

suicide, which also ends the life of his mad self, Hyde. Jekyll confesses to pitying Hyde but also to feeling that fate is 'closing on us both' and that some form of action was needed.[107] However, Jekyll understands the outcome of his death to be that Hyde still survives as he muses: 'will Hyde die upon the scaffold?'[108] His last words are those which describe his own life being at an end, but only in singular terms, as if he expects Hyde to survive the suicide. His act, then, is one which is focuses on his need to escape the power of Hyde, who has grown fierce. From a Victorian perspective, the criminal act of suicide by Jekyll was prompted by the increasing criminality of Hyde, who drove his original self to destruction. This suicide then, is the final act of madness that Stevenson allows for Jekyll, the madness that Hyde created.

Dorian, like Jekyll, meets his demise through trying to rid himself of the evidence of his criminal past. When meditating on life, Dorian finds himself 'longing for the unstained purity of his boyhood' which has been ruined by the immorality of his later life.[109] His beauty becomes a mockery of his depraved life, his flaxen curls a symbol of the innocence he has long lost. But what troubles Dorian the most is 'the living death of his own soul', which he still considers to be Basil's fault.[110] Picking up the same knife he used to kill the painter, he 'stab[s] the picture with it' and in doing so kills himself.[111] His act is a desperate attempt to rid himself of the painting that had acted as his conscience, haunting him with reminders of his criminal past. But it is not necessarily an attempt at suicide, as Dorian does not directly try to harm himself but the painting. But in not understanding the link between the painting and himself, he causes his ultimate demise.

When his body is discovered, it is found with a knife plunged into it instead of in the painting, and all Dorian's eternal youth has been replaced by wrinkles.[112] His being, as it were, has been split in two, yet one cannot live without the other (like Jekyll and Hyde). In death, the two selves are united and therefore Dorian takes on the characteristics of the painting as a corpse. Yet, I think there is an element of accidental death in this scene, although before his act he laments over the turn his life has taken. The purpose of his act, as Dorian sees it, is so that 'It would kill this monstrous soul-life'[113] and 'he would be at peace'[114] without the reminder of his conscience. Carol Oates explains further that this freedom he craves is only possible if he remains separated from his humanity, which he tries to obtain through getting rid of the portrait.[115] But in the whole scene Dorian never contemplates the bond between the painting and himself as one being, and therefore his impulsive act results in his own accidental suicide.

\* \* \* \*

As highlighted at the beginning of the chapter, the association between crime and madness is not infallible. *Great Expectations* shows us a criminal who is completely sane but who is nevertheless violent and cruel.

This chapter has interrogated whether or not criminal activity is a manifestation of madness in Victorian fiction. Certain crimes were used to illustrate gradations of madness from the murderer to the self-destructive type. The more violent crimes such as murder, attempted murder, arson and domestic abuse, point to a serious and usually incurable madness. Also, the crimes involving a person harming an innocent by the mad character were punished more than those who harmed themselves.

While there is a clear connection between madness and criminality in the Victorian mind, it is not always borne out by the literature of the time. Some authors, such as Charlotte Brontë and Mary Elizabeth Braddon, challenge the notion of crime being linked to madness. Modern critics have highlighted the various ways in which these authors undermine this association through their representations.

[1] Charles Dickens, *Great Expectations* (Glasgow: Collins Classics, 1970), p. 130.

[2] Roy Porter, *Madness: A Brief History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 119.

[3] Vieda Skultans, *Madness and Morals: Ideas on Insanity in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited, 1975), p. 7.

[4] Gina Lombroso-Ferrero, *Criminal Man: According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso,* in Project Gutenberg, unpagenated.

[5] Andrew Maunder and Grace Moore, *Victorian Crime, Madness and Sensation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), p. 63.

[6] *Pall Mall Gazette*, 26 April 1865, cited by Samantha Pegg, in ''Madness is a Woman': Constance Kent and Victorian Construction of Female Insanity', *Liverpool Law Review*, 30.3 (2010), pp. 207-223 (p. 222).

[7] Samantha Pegg, ''Madness is a Woman': Constance Kent and Victorian Construction of Female Insanity', *Liverpool Law Review*, 30.3 (2010), pp. 207-223 (p. 211).

[8] Nicola Lacey, 'Psychologising Jekyll, Demonising Hyde: The Strange Case of Criminal Responsibility', *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 4.2 (2010), pp. 109-133 (p. 113).

[9] Elizabeth J. Donaldson, 'The Corpus of a Madwoman: Toward a Feminist Disability Studies Theory of Embodiment and Mental Illness', *The National Women's Study Association Journal*, 14.3 (2002), pp. 99-199 (p. 106).

[10] Joel Peter Eigen, *Unconscious Crime: Mental Absence and Criminal Responsibility in Victorian London* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2003), p. 161.

[11] Edward Shorter*, A History of Psychiatry: From the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac* (Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, 1997), p. 18.

[12] Porter, p. 141.

[13] Lisa Butler, '''That Damned Old Business of the War in the Members": The Discourse of (In)Temperance in Robert Louis Stevenson's The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde', *The Gothic from Ann Radcliffe to Anne Rice*, 44 (2006), pp. 1-28 (p. 14).

[14] Butler, p. 14.

[15] Pegg, p. 209.

[16] *Pall Mall Gazette*, 26 April 1865, cited by Samantha Pegg, in ''Madness is a Woman': Constance Kent and Victorian Construction of Female Insanity', *Liverpool Law Review*, 30.3 (2010), p. 222.

[17] Eigen, p. 8.

[18] Eigen, p. 18.

[19] Eigen, p. 19.

[20] Lombroso-Ferrero, p. 5.

[21] Shorter*,* p. 42.

[22] Shorter, p. 42.
[23] Skultans, p. 22.
[24] Valerie Pedlar, *Most Dreadful Visitation: Male Madness in Victorian Fiction* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004), p. 1.
[25] Dickens, p. 113.
[26] Dickens, pp. 122, 121.
[27] Dickens, p. 389.
[28] Oscar Wilde, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown), p. 145
[29] Wilde, p. 144.
[30] Wilde, p. 144.
[31] Wilde, p. 145.
[32] Wilde, p. 145.
[33] Joyce Carol Oates, '"The Picture of Dorian Gray": Wilde's Parable of the Fall', *Critical Inquiry*, 7.2 (1980), pp. 419-428 (p. 426).
[34] Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown), p. 23.
[35] Stevenson, p. 35.
[36] Linda Dryden, *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles: Stevenson, Wilde and Wells* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 32.
[37] Dryden, p, 32.
[38] See Dryden p. 32.
[39] Thomas Hardy, *Far From the Madding Crowd* (London: Heron Books, 1970), p. 434.
[40] Hardy, p. 434.
[41] Hardy, p. 434.
[42] Lacey, p. 125.
[43] Richard Moran, 'The Punitive Uses of the Insanity Defence: The Trial for Treason of Edward Oxford (1840)', *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, Volume 9 (1986), pp. 171-190 (p. 171).
[44] David V. James, Paul E. Mullen and Michele T. Panthé, 'Attacks on the British Royal Family: The Role of Psychotic Illness', *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, 36.1 (2008), pp. 59-67 (p. 64).
[45] James, Mullen and Panthé, p. 64.
[46] James, Mullen and Panthé, p. 62.
[47] James, Mullen and Panthé, p. 62.
[48] James, Mullen and Panthé, p. 64.
[49] Hardy, p. 444.
[50] Hardy, p. 446.
[51] Rosemary Sumner, *Thomas Hardy: Psychological Novelist* (London: The Macmillion Press, 1981), p. 55.
[52] Mary Elizabeth Braddon, *Lady Audley's Secret* (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1997), p. 210.
[53] Braddon, p. 312.
[54] Braddon, p. 313.
[55] Braddon, p. 313.
[56] Braddon, p. 313.
[57] Braddon, p. 280.
[58] Maunder and Moore, p. 82.
[59] Braddon, pp. 255, 257.
[60] Braddon, p. 257.
[61] Pamela K. Gilbert, 'Madness and Civilisation: Generic Opposition in Mary Elizabeth Braddon's Lady Audley's Secret', *Essays in Literature*, 23.2 (1996), pp. 218-233 (p. 229).
[62] D.A. Miller, *The Novel and the Police* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988) cited by Andrew Maunder and Grace Moore, in *Victorian Crime, Madness and Sensation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), p. 81.
[63] Charlotte Brontë, *Jane Eyre* (London: Penguin Books Limited, 1994), p. 149.
[64] C. Brontë, p. 422.
[65] C. Brontë, p. 423.
[66] C. Brontë, p. 209.
[67] C. Brontë, p. 211.
[68] C. Brontë, p. 291.
[69] C. Brontë, p. 209.

[70] C. Brontë, p. 210.

[71] C. Brontë, p. 212.

[72] C. Brontë, p. 214.

[73] Valerie Beattie, 'The Mystery at Thornfield: Representations of Madness in Jane Eyre', *Studies in the Novel*, 28.4 (1996), pp. 493-505 (p. 3).

[74] Braddon, p. 281.

[75] Braddon, p. 26.

[76] Maunder and Moore, p. 76.

[77] Anthony Trollope, *He Knew He Was Right* (London: Omnium Publishing, 1994), p. 495.

[78] Trollope, p. 275.

[79] Stevenson, p. 23.

[80] Stevenson, p. 23.

[81] See Dryden, p. 9.

[82] Jane V. Rago, 'Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde: A 'Men's Narrative' of Hysteria and Containment', in *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries*, ed. by Richard Ambrosini and Richard Dury (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), pp. 275-285 (p. 253).

[83] Arthur Conan Doyle, 'The Beetle Hunter', in *Tales of Terror and Mystery*, Project Gutenberg, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/537/537-h/537-h.htm> [accessed 28 November 2014], unpagenated.

[84] Doyle, 'The Beetle Hunter', <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/537/537-h/537-h.htm> [accessed 2014], unpagenated.

[85] Doyle, 'The Beetle Hunter', <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/537/537-h/537-h.htm> [accessed 2014], unpagenated.

[86] Eigen, p. 19.

[87] Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Adventure of the Creeping Man*, PDF found on <https://sherlock-holm.es/stories/pdf/letter/2-sided/cree.pdf> [accessed 24 March 2015], pp. 1-9 (p. 8).

[88] Wilkie Collins, *The Woman in White* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown), p. 139.

[89] Collins, p. 207.

[90] Butler, p. 14.

[91] Collins, pp. 180-181.

[92] Shorter, p. 49.

[93] Shorter, p. 18.

[94] Collins, p. 365.

[95] Collins, p. 366.

[96] Emily Brontë, *Wuthering Heights* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown), p. 125.

[97] Chaney, Sarah, '"A Hideous Torture on Himself": Madness and Self-Mutilation in Victorian Literature', *Journal of Medical Humanities*, 32.4 (2011), pp. 279-289 (p. 280).

[98] E. Brontë, p. 125.

[99] E. Brontë, pp. 125-6.

[100] E. Brontë, p. 126.

[101] Susan Rubinow Gorsky, '"I'll Cry Myself Sick": Illness in Wuthering Heights', *Literature and Medicine*, 18.2 (1999) <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/docview/750483125?pq-origsite=summon> [accessed 6 July 2015], unpagenated.

[102] Rubinow Gorsky <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/docview/750483125?pq-origsite=summon> [accessed 6 July 2015], unpagenated.

[103] Chaney, p. 280.

[104] Eric T. Carlson and Meribeth M. Simpson, 'The Definition of Mental Illness: Benjamin Rush (1745-1813)', *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 121.3 (1964), pp. 204-214 (p. 209), cited by Edward Shorter, in *A History of Psychiatry: From the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac* (Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, 1997), p. 27.

[105] Stevenson, p. 67.

[106] Stevenson, pp. 67, 73.

[107] Stevenson, p. 74.

[108] Stevenson, p. 74.

[109] Wilde, p. 193.

[110] Wilde, p. 194.

[111] Wilde, p. 196.

[112] Wilde, p. 196.
[113] Wilde, p. 196.
[114] Wilde, p. 196.
[115] Oates, p. 426.

# Conclusion

My examination of representations of madness in the Victorian novel had highlighted the complex ways in which creative authors engaged with contemporary attitudes and preconceptions towards mental illness. By grounding my discussion in relevant historical contexts, I have shown that some authors reflected and reinforced the beliefs of the time through their depictions of madwomen and madmen who are violent and depraved and who are seen to be predisposed towards madness through their gender, race and class. On the other hand, other authors critique the prevailing stereotypes and assumptions of the time and treat insanity sympathetically, some suggesting that madness is a convenient gender and social construct and others regarding madness as an illness which can torment anyone, regardless of rank or ethnicity. Indeed, some novelists highlight madness as a condition prevalent among middle and upper-class professional men, characterisations which both complicate typical Victorian associations of madness with the racial and sexual other and illustrate nineteenth century anxieties around atavism and degeneration.

My first chapter addressed and answered the question: was madness gendered in Victorian fiction? While the issue is complicated, so is the answer and the texts offer various responses to the question. The madness of *Jane Eyre*'s Bertha, for example, can be seen as inextricably linked to female promiscuity, but can also be interpreted as a label indicative of a patriarchal need for control, represented by Mr Rochester. Likewise, the title character of *Lady Audley's Secret* earns the title of 'madwoman' as

because of the various ways in which she contravenes expected female roles. Both rebellion against and conformity towards gender roles is depicted as provoking insanity. Catherine Earnshaw marries according to social expectations, but is driven to acts of self-harm and madness provoked by her emotional separation from her soul-mate, Heathcliff. There are also women who are labelled as mad, but whose authors challenge the accuracy of this designation, such as Miss Havisham and Laura Fairlie. Both Charles Dickens and Wilkie Collins contradict the idea that women are prone to madness and instead present them as the victims of this assumption.

The male representation of madness usually involves the figure of a woman as a trigger, such as in *Far From the Madding Crowd*, where Farmer Boldwood's fixation with the beautiful Bathsheba Everdene drives him to insanity. *He Knew He Was Right* also depicts the fixation of a man; Louis Trevelyan wants to impose patriarchal oppression on his wife, the failure of which literally drives him mad. Dorian Gray, however, is influenced by his male friends to idealise the female body, and in his madness destroys the only significant female figure in the novel. The story of Jekyll and Hyde also includes an episode of violence against the female body, in a masculine world which perhaps can be regarded as a fertile seeding ground for the lunacy which Jekyll/Hyde experiences. Male madness, then, typically manifests as the obsession and mistreatment of the female through violence and oppression. This challenges the idea that madness was mainly a female ailment, showing that male madness was just as potent and harmful.

Madness, as depicted in chosen texts, was likewise not always associated with the lower classes or the racial other, although during the period British assumptions about the condition tended to regard the poor and the ethnically other – as well as women – as more prone to the illness. A split in thought is evident in the contrasting ways in which madness is depicted in the novels *Jane Eyre* and *He Knew He Was Right*. The first illustrates the mad foreign 'other', while the second challenges that portrayal with the mad Briton, whose madness is driven by the idea that his foreign wife is unfaithful. Lack of class status as well as race is depicted as triggers for assumptions of madness, with Lady Audley labelled as mad because of her humble class origins. This is further emphasised through Thomas Hardy's illustration of the inability of a man to maintain his class status and wealth when he becomes obsessed with acquiring a beloved object. However, this can also be read as evidence of madness existing within the upper-classes, which once again challenges the idea that insanity typically occurs in poverty-stricken places. Likewise, the short stories of Arthur Conan Doyle and *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* by Robert Louis Stevenson associate madness with the professional classes, as well as the British gentleman.

In the narratives I have examined the mad are depicted as indulging in criminal activity, which is regarded by most authors as a manifestation of mental imbalance. Some, such as Dorian Gray and Lady Audley, commit violent crime against others, such as murder and attempted murder. Others abuse those who are innocent and defenceless, particularly women, children and animals. One common symptom of insanity in Victorian fiction

is self-abuse and self-destruction. These abuses include alcoholism, self-induced starvation and suicide, witnessed in characters such as Sir Percival Glyde, Catherine, Jekyll/Hyde and Dorian. There are also examples those who are criminal and not mad, evident in the example of Orlick from *Great Expectations*. So while crime is often a sign of mental instability in Victorian literature, it is not *always* depicted as a symptom of madness.

This thesis highlights the many ways in which madness is represented in Victorian fiction. Regardless of whether authors were sympathetic to sufferers or keen to mine the trope of the madman or madwoman for sensational effect, one thing is clear. Madness was clearly a narrative thread which enticed and excited authors because of its multiple plot and character possibilities and its ability to shock a readership for whom the condition was in many ways a mystery.

# Bibliography

Arata, Stephen D., 'The Sedulous Ape: Atavism, Professionalism and Stevenson's Jekyll and Hyde', *Criticism*, 37.2 (1995), unpagenated

Arnold, Catherine, *Bedlam: London and its Mad* (London: Simon and Schuster, 2008)

Bazin, Claire, 'Screm (me)s Wuthering Heights', *Victorian and Edwardian Notebooks,* 73 (2011), 27-36, 7, 257

Beattie, Valerie, 'The Mystery at Thornfield: Representations of Madness in Jane Eyre', *Studies in the Novel*, 28.4 (1996), 493-505

Bollen, Katrien and Raphael Ingelbien, 'An Intertext that Counts? Dracula, The Woman in White, and Victorian Imaginations of the Foreign Other', *English Studies*, 90.4 (2009), 403-420

Bourne Taylor, Jenny and Sally Shuttleworth (ed.), *An Anthology of Psychological Texts 1830-1890* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)

Brantlinger, Patrick, 'Let's Post-Post-Post "Victorientalism": A Response to Erin O'Connor', *Victorian Studies*, 46.1 (2003), 95-105

Butler, Lisa, '"That Damned Old Business of the War in the Members": The Discourse of (In)Temperance in Robert Louis Stevenson's The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde', *The Gothic from Ann Radcliffe to Anne Rice*, 44 (2006), 1-28

Braddon, Mary Elizabeth, *Lady Audley's Secret* (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1997)

Brady, Anita and Tony Schirato, *Understanding Judith Butler* (London: SAGE Publications, 2011)

Brontë, Charlotte, *Jane Eyre* (London: Penguin Books Limited, 1994)

Brontë, Emily, *Wuthering Heights* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown)

Carlson, Eric T. and Meribeth M. Simpson, 'The Definition of Mental Illness: Benjamin Rush (1745-1813)', *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 121.3 (1964), 204-214

Chakravorty Spivak, Gayatri, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999)

Chaney, Sarah, '"A Hideous Torture on Himself": Madness and Self-Mutilation in Victorian Literature', *Journal of Medical Humanities*, 32.4 (2011), 279-289

Chesler, Phyllis, *Women and Madness* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005)

Ciugureanu, Adina, 'The Victim-Aggressor Duality in Great Expectations', *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas*, 9.2 (2011), 347-360

Clausson, N., '"Cultural Corruption". Paterian self-development versus Gothic degeneration in Oscar Wilde's The Picture of Dorian Gray', *Papers on Language and Literature*, 39.4 (2003), 339-364

Cohen, Ed, Hyding the Subject?: 'The Antinomies of Masculinity in The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde', *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, 37.1/2 (2003), 181-199

Collins, Wilkie, *The Woman in White* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown)

Davies, Robert, 'Introduction', in *He Knew He Was Right*, by Anthony Trollope (London: Omnium Publishing, 1994), xi-xvi

Denenholz Morse, Deborah, '"Some Girls Who Came From the Tropics": Gender, Race and Imperialism in Anthony Trollope's *He Knew He Was Right*', in *The Politics of Gender in Anthony Trollope's Novels: New Readings for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. by Margaret Markwick, Deborah Denenholz Morse and Regenia Gagnier (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 77-98

Dickens, Charles, *Great Expectations* (Glasgow: Collins Classics, 1970)

Digby, A., 'The Changing Profile of a Nineteenth-Century Asylum: The Retreat', *Psychological Medicine*, 14.4 (1984), 739-748

Donaldson, Elizabeth J., 'The Corpus of a Madwoman: Toward a Feminist Disability Studies Theory of Embodiment and Mental Illness', *The National Women's Study Association Journal*, 14.3 (2002), 99-119

Doyle, Arthur Conan, *The Adventure of the Creeping Man*, PDF found on <https://sherlock-holm.es/stories/pdf/letter/2-sided/cree.pdf> [accessed 24 March 2015], 1-9

Doyle, Arthur Conan, 'The Beetle Hunter', in *Tales of Terror and Mystery*, Project Gutenberg, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/537/537-h/537-h.htm> [accessed 28 November 2014], unpagenated

Dryden, Linda, *The Modern Gothic and Literary Doubles: Stevenson, Wilde and Wells* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

Ebbatson, Roger, *The Evolutionary Self: Hardy, Forster, Lawrence* (Brighton: The Harvester Press Limited, 1982)

Eigen, Joel Peter, *Unconscious Crime: Mental Absence and Criminal Responsibility in Victorian London* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2003)

Ferris, Paul, *Dr Freud: A Life* (London: Pimlico, 1998)

Foucault, Michel, *Madness and Civilisation: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason,* trans. by Richard Howard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971)

Gilbert, Pamela K., 'Madness and Civilisation: Generic Opposition in Mary Elizabeth Braddon's Lady Audley's Secret', *Essays in Literature*, 23.2 (1996), 218-233

Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar, *Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth Century Literary Imagination* (Cumberland: Yale University Press, 1980)

Gorsky, Susan Rubinow, '"I'll Cry Myself Sick": Illness in Wuthering Heights', *Literature and Medicine,* 18.2 (1999), 173-191

Grigsby, Marie Ann, 'The Victorian Craze: The Appeal of Madness in Charles Reade, Wilkie Collins and Charles Dickens' (Published Dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1998)

Hack Tuke, David, *Insanity in Ancient and Modern Life with Chapters on its Prevention* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1878)

Hardy, Thomas*, Far From the Madding Crowd* (London: Heron Books, 1970)

Hartog, Lurt, 'The Rape of Miss Havisham', *Studies in the Novel,* 14.3 (1982), 248-265

Herbert, Christopher, 'Trollope and the Fixity of the Self', *PMLA,* 93.2 (1978), 228-239

Horrocks, Chris and Zoran Jevtic, *Foucault for Beginners* (Cambridge: Icon Books Limited, 1997)

Hunter, Richard Alfred and Ida Macalpine, *Psychiatry for the Poor: 1851 Colney Hatch Asylum-Friern Hospital 1973* (London: Dawsons, 1974)

Huxley, Thomas Henry, *Evolution and Ethics*, ed. by Michael Ruse (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009)

James, David V., Paul E. Mullen and Michele T. Panthé, 'Attacks on the British Royal Family: The Role of Psychotic Illness', *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, 36.1 (2008), 59-67

Jones, Ernest, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud Volume 1: The Formative Years and the Great Discoveries 1856-1900* (New York: Basic Books, 1953)

Lacey, Nicola, 'Psychologising Jekyll, Demonising Hyde: The Strange Case of Criminal Responsibility', *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 4.2 (2010), 109-133

Lombroso-Ferrero, Gina, *Criminal Man: According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso,* in Project Gutenberg, unpagenated

Markwick, Margaret and Deborah Denenholz Morse, 'Introduction', in *The Politics of Gender in Anthony Trollope's Novels: New Readings for the Twenty-First Century* (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 1-8

Maunder, Andrew and Grace Moore, *Victorian Crime, Madness and Sensation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004)

Melling, Joseph and Bill Forsyth, *Insanity, Institutions and Society, 1800-1914: A Social History of Madness in Comparative Perspective* (London: Routledge Limited, 1999)

Miller, D.A., *The Novel and the Police* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988)

Moran, Richard, 'The Punitive Uses of the Insanity Defence: The Trial for Treason of Edward Oxford (1840)', *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, Volume 9 (1986), 171-190

Mott, Fredrick W., *Hereditary and Eugenics in Relation to Insanity* (California: Eugenics Education Society, 1912)

Oates, Joyce Carol, '"The Picture of Dorian Gray": Wilde's Parable of the Fall', *Critical Inquiry*, 7.2 (1980), 419-428

Oberhelman, David D., 'Trollope's Insanity Defence: Narrative Alienation in He Knew He Was Right', *Studies in English Literature*, 1500-1900, 35.4 (1995), 789-806

Oliver, Paul, *Foucault: The Key Ideas* (London: Hodder Education, 2010)

Pedlar, Valerie, *Most Dreadful Visitation: Male Madness in Victorian Fiction* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004)

Pegg, Samantha, ''Madness a Woman': Constance Kent and Victorian Construction of Female Insanity', *Liverpool Law Review*, 30.3 (2010), 207-223

Perry Curtis, L., *Jack the Ripper and the London Press* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001)

Porter, Roy*, Madness: A Brief History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)

Psomiades, Kathy Alexis, '*He Knew He Was Right*: The Sensational Tyranny of the Sexual Contract and the Problem of Liberal Progress', in *The Politics of Gender in Anthony Trollope's Novels: New Readings for the Twenty-First Century* (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 31-44

Pykett, Lyn, *Wilkie Collins: A Casebook* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998)

Rago, Jane V., 'Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde: A 'Men's Narrative' of Hysteria and Containment', in *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries*, ed. by Richard Ambrosini and Richard Dury (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 275-285

Reid, Julia, 'Stevenson, Romance and Evolutionary Psychology', in *Robert Louis Stevenson: Writer of Boundaries*, ed. by Richard Ambrosini and Richard Dury (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 215-227

Ripa, Yannick*, Women and Madness: The Incarceration of Women in Nineteenth-Century France* (Paris: Polity Press, 1990)

Robbins, Ruth and Julian Wolfreys, eds*, Victorian Gothic: Literary and Cultural Manifestations in the Nineteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000)

Rosenfeld, Claire, 'The Shadow Within: The Conscious and Unconscious Use of the Double', in *Stories of the Double*, ed. Albert J Guerard (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1967), 326-344

Salotto, Eleanor, *Gothic Returns in Collins, Dickens, Zola and Hitchcock* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006)

Schapiro, Barbara A., 'Psychoanalysis and Romantic Idealization: The Dialects of Love in Hardy's Far From the Madding Crowd', *American Imago*, 59.1 (2002), 3-26

Scull, Andrew, 'Psychiatry and Social Control in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries', *A History of Psychiatry*, Volume 2 (1991), 149-169

Scull, Andrew, *The Most Solitary of Afflictions: Madness and Society in Britain, 1700-1900* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005)

Shorter, Clement, *The Brontës: Life and Letters* (New York, Haskell House, 1969)

Shorter, Edward*, A History of Psychiatry: From the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac* (Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, 1997)

Showalter, Elaine, *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985)

Shuo, Cao and Liu Dan, 'Femininity in *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*', *English Language and Literature Studies*, 2.1 (2012), 123-127

Singh, Shubh M. and Subho Chakrabarti, 'A Study in Dualism: The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde', *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 50.3 (2008), 221-223

Skultans, Vieda, *Madness and Morals: Ideas on Insanity in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited, 1975)

Stevenson, Robert Louis, *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown)

Spurzheim, J.G., *Observations on the Deranged Manifestations of the Mind, or Insanity* (London: Marsh, Capen and Lyon, 1817)

Stewart, Iain, 'Commandeering Time: The Ideological Status of Time in the Social Darwinism of Herbert Spencer', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 57.3 (2011), 389-402

Sumner, Rosemary, *Thomas Hardy: Psychological Novelist* (London: The Macmillion Press, 1981)

Talairach-Vielmas, Laurence, 'Wax, Death and Crime in Dickens's Great Expectations', *European English Messenger*, 22.1 (2013), 23-27

Taghizadeh, Ali, 'Aestheticism versus Realism? Narcissistic Mania of the Unheeded Soul in Oscar Wilde's The Picture of Dorian Gray', *Theory and Practice in Literary Studies*, 4.7 (2014), 1445-1451

Thomas, Sue, 'The Tropical Extravagance of Bertha Mason', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 27.1 (1999), 1-17

Thormählen, Marianne, 'The Lunatic and the Devil's Disciple: The 'Lovers' in Wuthering Heights', *The Review of English Studies*, 48.190 (1997), 183-197

Thurley, Geoffrey, *The Psychology of Hardy's Novels: The Nervous and the Statuesque* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1975)

Trollope, Anthony, *He Knew He Was Right* (London: Omnium Publishing, 1994)

Vine, Steven, 'The Wuther of the Other in Wuthering Heights', *Nineteenth-Century Literature,* 49.3 (1994), 339-359

Voskuil, Lynn M., 'Acts of Madness: Lady Audley and the Meanings of Victorian Femininity', *Feminist Studies*, 27.3 (2001), 611-639

Wharton, Edith, 'The Vice of Reading', *The North American Review*, 177.563 (1903), 513-521

Wilde, Oscar, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (London: Heron Books, publishing date unknown)

Wright, David, 'The Certification of Insanity in Nineteenth Century Wales and England', *History of Psychiatry*, 9.35 (1998), 267-290