Four Cinema Versions of *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886): focusing on the Thanhouser version (1912), the John Barrymore version (1920), the Fredric March version (1931), and the Spencer Tracy version (1941).

Edwin Thanhouser established the Thanhouser Company in the fall of 1909, and on March 15th, 1910, released its first film, *The Actor's Children*. It continued to produce at least a half dozen films through December of that same year. They produced seven films between 1911 and 1915 including: *Only In the Way* (1910), *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1912), *The Cry of the Children* (1912), *Petticoat Camp* (1912), *The Evidence of the Film* (1913), *A Dog's Love* (1914), and *Their One Love* (1915). This group is currently available on a DVD named, *Thanhouser Classics DVD*. In addition, there are six volumes of a DVD version named, *Thanhouser Classics Video Collector's Set*, which includes many other films as well.

Including 69 separate topic areas concerning Shakespeare and Henrik Ibsen's plays, *A Doll's House* (1911), *Pillars of Society* (1911), and *The Lady From the Sea* (1911), and ranging over an extensive collection of literature, the Thanhouser Company cinematized multifarious literary works, including works of fiction, stories, novels, and even poems. Thanhouser films associated with literary works include *The Vicar of Wakefield* (1910) and *She Stoops to Conquer* (1910), which adapted Oliver Goldsmith's novel and comedy; Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre* (1910); *Thelma* (1910), Mary Mackay's romantic melodrama; *Rip Van Winkle* (1910), a famous story by Washington Irving; a great Charles Dickens, *The Old Curiosity Shop* (1911),

Copperfield series, *Little Em'ly And David Copperfield* (1911), *The Early Life of David Copperfield, Loves of David Copperfield* (1911), *Nicholas Nickleby* (1912), *Little Dorrit* (1913); *Lucile, Parts I and 2* (1912), a poem by Owen Meredith; *The Cry of the Children* (1912), a poem by Elizabeth Barrett Browning; *Aurora Floyd* (1912), which adapted May Elizabeth Braddon's novel; *Undine* (1912), a German tale; *Carmen* (1913) which was famous as a Bizet opera; *Cardinal Richelieu's Ward* (1914), which stemmed from a story by Edward George Bulwer-Lytton; *Hellen's Babies* (1915), originally published as a novel in 1876 by John Habberton (1842-1921); *Mr. Meeson's Will* (1915), an H. Rider Haggard novel; *Her Father's Gold* (1916), whose working title was *The Water Devil*, a story by Frank R. Stockton; *The Flight of the Duchess* (1916), a poem by Robert Browning; genius George Eliot's *Silas Marner* (1916); a comedy drama by Agnes Christine Johnston, *Prudence The Pirate* (1916); and finally *Master Shakespeare, Strolling Player* (1916) a series of fictionalized events by Philip Lonergan.

Along with these films, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1912) is an adapted cinema version of an original novel, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr.Hyde* (1886), by Robert Louis Stevenson. In addition to this version, there are other cinema versions of the novel, "starring King Baggott (1913), Sheldon Lewis (1920), John Barrymore (1920), Fredric March (1932), and Spencer Tracy (1941), etc" (Brian A. Rose, 1996:6). The original novel was adapted many times to different genres. According to Charles King, "There have been at least 88 film and

television adaptations, including shorts and some less-traditional variations. Since 1908, there has not been a period of longer than five years without a version of the story" (Katherine Linehan, 2003:158). Nevertheless, the adapted versions are, for the most part, not faithful to the structure of the original novel. As Brian A. Rose puts it, "There has never been an adaptation that makes use of Stevenson's technique of epistolary revelation of character through narrative flashbacks, the complete absence of any notable female in the story, or, for that matter, the original complexities of the character of Dr. Jekyll" (1996:30). In this essay, I will conversely delve into the Thanhouser version and the other three cinema versions of Stevenson's novel as well. This will include: Barrymore, March, and Tracy's versions, and will be based on the comparison of each film version with the original novel and each other, examining on the basis of differences in acting, sexuality, and the monstrosity of Mr. Hyde.

Before going into the comparisons, I will mention the ghosts and monsters in Thanhouser films because, interwoven with Gothic tradition, *Dr.Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1912) is considered to be a western horror film. Ghosts, and monsters, such as vampires, aliens, zombies, and psycho killers in slasher films, are crucial factors in engendering fear in western horror films. Mr. Hyde, in these films, is a monster. According to the synopsis on the CD Rom, *Thanhouser Films: An Encyclopedia and History 1909-1918* (2001) by Q. David Bowers, the Thanhouser films in which ghosts appear are *When Ghost meets Ghost* (1913), *The Mystery of*

Haunted Hotel (1913), *A Clever Collie's Comeback* (1916), *Stronger Than Death* (1914), *The Phantom Witness* (1916), and *A Dog's Love* (1914). Other films concerning ghosts, even if a ghost does not actually appear in them include: *For the Man She Loved* (1913) in which a bad guy mistakes a good guy who survives a bad guy's wicked intrigue to kill him for a ghost, *Checkmate* (1911) in which a female character mistakes a man for a ghost who appears in front of her, *His Great Uncle's Spirit* (1912), in which a young magician tricked a magnate into believing that the spirit of his-great-uncle was displeased with him, and *She* (1911) in which a ghost is mentioned in order to describe a witch's figure. Coincidentally and interestingly, female ghosts in *Stronger Than Death* and *The Phantom Witness*, are similar to those in Korean and other Asian horror films: in that after they died of suffering or were killed by somebody (mostly men), they become a ghost. Specifically, a female ghost in *The Phantom Witness* has exactly the same connotation, in that she told her sweetheart, as the helper, how she was murdered by somebody's plot, and she asked him to seek revenge for her. The crucial narrative difference between these two films and the Korean female ghost film is that in these two Thanhouser films, the female ghosts' men die and get together as souls with ghosts in the other world.

In Korean horror films, a female ghost disappears; wishing for her man's happiness after her revenge is complete. In Korean horror films, the female ghost's emotion is called '*han*' which is, "taken by Koreans to be the essential national experience." According to David James

this, “is constituted from sentiments of loss and rage at the severance of wholeness and continuity between self and history” (*Film Quaterly*, Vol 54, Spring 2001:19). *Han* is connected to female mentality and topographical connotations connected to female subjectivity in that Korean society is a strong patriarchal society, and Korean history is metaphorized as female because Korea was only passively invaded by foreign powers. Therefore, in Korean horror films, a female ghost stands for social and cultural oppression, and nationality disguised as a form of individual revenge. A female ghost in Korean horror films visualizes and metaphorizes the oppression to women in the society and Korean history, which is afflicted with incessant external aggressions. Thus, even though there are similarities in the way they avenge themselves and are killed: between the female ghosts in Korean horror films and those in the Thanhouser films, their social and cultural connotations are different. The connotation of ghosts in Thanhouser films is not extended to nationality; but is, instead, limited to a dimension of individuality, which cannot be connected to nationality.

Along with ghosts, including *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1912), monsters are found and mentioned in Thanhouser films such as: *Freddie, The Fake Fisherwoman* (1915), *Lobster Salad and Milk* (1913), *The Five-Rose Sisters* (1911), and *She* (1911). Besides these films, even if *Lizards of the Desert* (1914), *The Star of Bethlehem* (1912), and *The Early Life of David Copperfield* (1911) are all regarded as being concerned with monsters, they do not involve

genuine monsters, but make metaphorical expressions such as evil or just animal for film production. What we consider typical monsters, which appear in western horror films, specifically in Thanhouser films include: Mr. Hyde in *Dr.Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, a ferocious monster in *Lobster Salad and Milk*, and a witch in *She*.

Noel Carrol distinguishes monsters in horror films from those in fairy tales: “In works of horror, the humans regard the monsters they meet as abnormal, as disturbances of the natural order. In fairy tales, on the other hand, monsters are part of the everyday furniture of the universe” (1990:16). Mr. Hyde may not be considered a typical monster in the western horror film tradition because he looks like a human being, even as the other self-assuming monstrous form of Dr. Jekyll. Nevertheless, he still can be said to be a monster because he scares people who see him, and he engenders fear from them. If Dr. Jekyll is a mad scientist, he is another Frankenstein. As shown in the film, as a byproduct of destroying the natural order by misusing science, he is a monster.

The synopsis of the film, in *The Moving Picture News* on January 6, 1912, calls Mr. Hyde a monster: “And in those stages of existence the courtly, polished, tender-hearted Dr. Jekyll becomes Mr. Hyde, a monster who is feared and halted.” Focused on how the original novel was cinematized and concerning the representation of Mr. Hyde’s monstrosity in cinema versions, as well as the actors’ acting and sexuality: I will compare Thanhouser cinema versions

of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde with the Barrymore version in 1920, the Fredric March version in 1932, and the Spencer Tracy version in 1941.

Original Novel vs. Cinema Versions

The original novel (1886) consists of epistolary chapters written by the various characters. Its structure is a circular chronological order. In a word, the speaker 'I' in each chapter is a different person and their temporal perspective is different as well. Cinema versions simplified narrative order, and have a linear chronological order. Cinema versions also took the omniscient perspective, and the third person point of view, except the first part of the Fredric March Version, which took the first person perspective. In the original novel, Dr. Jekyll is described as a middle aged man: "Dr. Jekyll was no exception; and as he now sat on the opposite side of the fire – a large, well-made, smooth-faced man of fifty, with something of a slyish cast perhaps, but every mark of capacity and kindness" (Martin A. Danahay, 1999:44). There are no sexual connotations at all regarding Dr. Jekyll because no female characters appear in it. Consequently, Jekyll's young, handsome appearances such as with James Cruze in the Thanhouser film, and John Barrymore, Fredric March, and Spencer Tracy in the other three cinematic versions, must be the strategy of Hollywood to gather an audience who wanted to see and identify with the stars acting Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in the film: except James Cruze

because in fact, Harry Benham acted Mr. Hyde in the Thanhouser film version. According to notes in the column of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde with the CD Rom, *Thanhouser Films: An Encyclopedia and History 1909-1918*, "Benham stated that he had played the role of the crazed Mr. Hyde in several scenes, because it was easy to do, as Hyde was made up in disguise, and as he and James Cruze were about the same build." On the other hand, the description of Hyde's appearance as garnered from characters, such as Mr. Enfield, was a monster-like non-human being: "He is not easy to describe. There is something wrong with his appearance; something displeasing, something down-right detestable…. he gives a strong feeling of deformity" (Danahay, 36). Additionally, Jekyll's butler, Poole describes Hyde to Utterson as, "more of a dwarf" (*Ibid*. 63). The speaker in the chapter of the original novel, *Search for Mr. Hyde*, describes Hyde as follows: "Mr. Hyde was pale and dwarfish, he gave an impression of deformity without any nameable malformation, he had a displeasing smile… and he spoke with a husky, whispering and somewhat broken voice; all these were points against him, but not all of these together could explain the hitherto unknown disgust, loathing and fear with which Mr. Utterson regarded him" (41).

This Hyde's appearance exactly corresponds to Noel Carrol's definition of the monster in horror films:

> "The monsters are regarded to be violations of nature, and abnormal, and this is made clear in the reactions of protagonists. They not only fear such monsters. They find them repellent, loathsome, disgusting, repulsive and impure… in consequence, they illicit disgust from fictional characters, and in turn, they are supposed to elicit a congruent response from the audience" (54)

All of the cinema versions focus on Dr. Jekyll's transformation into Mr. Hyde. Specifically, the 1931 and 1942 versions devoted a relatively long period to the process of transformation by close-up. In the original novel, the transformation, which in cinema versions, appears almost at the end of the film, is described by Mr. Lanyon: "He put the glass to his lips and drank at one gulp. A cry followed; he reeled, staggered, clutched at the table and held on, staring with injected eyes, gasping with open mouth; and as I looked there came, I thought a change – he seemed to swell – his face became suddenly black and the features seemed to melt and alter" (75). Jekyll's transformation into Mr. Hyde could be the most crucial factor to visualizing verbal description. Even the review of *The Morning Telegraph*, January 21, 1912, in the Thanhouser version mentioned the transformation: "It is admirably acted, double exposure and other tricks of the camera effecting the changes of the character of Dr. Jekyll to Mr. Hyde, and vice versa, in a way quite impossible in stage presentations." In the film, the transformation denotes the connotation of the double self in human beings. One signifier, which consists of the transformation of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, represents a signifier, good and evil in human beings, unlike in Bunuel's *That Obscure Object of Desire* (1977) where two actresses, as two signifiers,

act to reveal two personalities of a woman representing the two signified.

There are no sexual connotations or family relationships concerning Dr. Jekyll as a middle aged man. There are no female characters in the original novel, but the cinema versions, except for the Thanhouser one, inserted two antithetical female characters, which concern conspicuous sexuality and family relationships, considering they have a young and handsome Jekyll as the main character. In the cinema versions of Barrymore, March, and Stacy, like in their western counterparts, two kinds of female characters appear antithetical to each other. One is a placid and biddable woman who represents family. The other is a spirited lady who mirrors sexual relationships outside the family.

The Thanhouser Version (1912)

This cinema version was a one-reel film, which was released January 16th, 1912. Its running time is 11 minutes. It was already the second cinema version of the story produced in America. This version abbreviates the theatrical version, which was already adapted and dramatized. The film begins with an inter-title read as: “The taking of certain drugs can separate man into two beings, evil and good.” In his laboratory, Jekyll takes a drug and is transformed into Mr. Hyde. The transformation is short and simple. As mentioned previously, Harry Benham’s Hyde is visualized as similar to what the speaker in a chapter, *Search for Mr. Hyde*,

described in the original novel above, except for the darker face. The mirror played an important role in identifying Hyde, just like in other versions. When Hyde looks at the mirror, as soon as Jekyll is transformed into him, he is delighted to see him in the mirror as Jekyll. Lacanian theory confirms that Jekyll, as a baby in the mirror stage, is mistaken for Hyde in the mirror at this time. Later, misrecognition as Hyde overpowers reality as Jekyll. Also, as a Freudian term, the return of the repressed as Hyde ultimately punishes and kills Jekyll.

There is not much to say about James Cruze, who was Jekyll in this Thanhouser version. He was a leading actor in the Thanhouser Company (1911-1915) and a director in Famous Players, as well. According to *Liberty* magazine, April, 1929, “Six feet tall, with heavy muscular body, eyes deep-set, quick, and dark – he has the mannerisms of an Indian.” Among several hundred actors and actresses, he was one of the best-known male actors, and these included the likes of William Russell, Morris Foster, and Harry Benham. Florence LaBadie was the best-known actress in the Thanhouser Company. Besides the adults, Marie Eline called “The Thanhouser Kid,” and Helen Badgley named “Thanhouser Kidlet,” were child stars of the Thanhouser Company. There was also a famous Shepard named “Thanhouser Collie.”

The love relationship with a minister’s daughter, which does not exist in the original novel, is inserted as a marketing strategy to appeal to American audiences. This love relationship with a woman is extended to the double relationships with two women, which is

interwoven with sexuality in the later versions. This becomes the pivotal narrative structure for Jekyll's tragedy to move on. There is a scene in which Hyde walks over to a girl; emphasizing Hyde's cruelty, this is mentioned in the original novel. This scene reappears in the Barrymore version, but not later in March and Stacy's. This version omits Mr. Carew who is linked to the connotations of family and love relationships. With considerable adaptations, it visualizes the pith and marrow of the narrative of the original novel, which is extended in the later full-length narrative film version with love relationship and family issues. Even if this version is short, it has almost everything needed to be extended to a full-length Hollywood film with what is in the original novel. This film version is the most faithful to the original novel in that the main plot and story are the most similar to those of the original novel, except for a female character. Jekyll kills himself as Hyde at the end of the film—like in the novel, and Hyde's appearance is closest to what is described in the original novel. So, while later cinema versions insert and extend Jekyll and Hyde's sexuality concerning the relationship with women and Jekyll's familial relationship as the crucial axis of the narrative, this version both adopts and tries to visualize the story and plot of the original novel. Therefore, instead of focusing on Jekyll's transformation with special effects as a visually climatic moment, the moment of 'high-impact,' it makes a filmic reproduction of the original novel.

The Barrymore Version (1920)

In the original poster of this version, a picture of John Barrymore, which occupies the right half of the poster, standing like a huge statue with the lines of introduction, “The Screen’s Greatest Actor in a Tremendous Story of Man at His Best and Worst,” was already a star-brand like Tom Cruise is today. On the upper left side of the poster, there are the large introductory words of the film, “John Barrymore in ‘Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.’” In it, a kid makes a respectful gesture, spreading out his arms upward to the huge John Barrymore. Also, a lady is clasping her hands, looking at him, she is about to burst into tears.

John Barrymore was a legendary maestro of the age on both the stage and in film. He moved from comedy to serious drama. His first film debut was as a minor character in a comedy named *Dream of a Motion Picture Director* (1912). Seven years later, he made a genuine film debut in serious drama, *The Test of Honor* (1919). His acting in this film was praised by critical reviews. According to the *New York Times*, 7 Apr. 1919, P. 11, “John Barrymore has turned from screen force to near-tragedy in the Test of Honor… and the least that may be said is that he has proved himself as much a master in his serious work as in his comic” (Martin F. Norden, 1995:91). The review of *Photoplay*, 1919 says, “A very ordinary melodrama, but Mr. Barrymore’s performance magnificent. He reminds me… of Caruso glorifying a song out of tin-pan alley.” (*Ibid*. 91) The next year, 1920, he acts Jekyll and Hyde in the film. *New York Times*,

29 Mar. 1920, P. 18 reviews his performance in the film:

> "It is what Mr. Barrymore himself does that makes the dual character of Jekyll and Hyde tremendous. His performance is one of pure motion-picture pantomime on as high a level as has ever been attained by anyone. In a story that was written as a 'stocker' and a play that is always a melodrama, he creates such a genuinely beautiful Jekyll and compellingly hideous Hyde, and emphasizes the contrast between the two with such a sure eye for essentials, that one must believe in both while he sees them and afterwards admire a work of art." (*Ibid.* 92)

This version begins with an inter-title about the two natures of man, and shows Dr. Jekyll who is experimenting in his laboratory. This version has concrete sexual denotations (even if it becomes more clear in March and Stacy's) and connotative familial relationships in the narrative. There are two worlds concerning female characters, the frivolous community and family. Also, in contrast with the evocation of Jekyll's sexual instinct, this version, by showing his humanistic work in the human repair shop, consolidates its narrative strategy to emphasize two sides of a man living in two worlds, on one hand, the world of an ordinary man as a humanist scientist; on the other hand, the world of sensuality Jekyll is repressing. Hollywood began to exploit and transform the crucial storyline of Stevenson's original novel in order to suit its taste to appeal to the audience. As Charles King points out, "The films tend to emphasize sexual repression as the major force underlying Jekyll's transformation and present the unleashing of sexual desire as the main manifestation of the beast within" (Kathryn Linehan, 2003:159). This version germinates a seed to visualize sexuality associated with Jekyll and the

female characters by paying more attention to Barrymore as an actor. Using female character stars, March and Tracy's versions adopt this sexual repression as the main subject in the films.

In parallel with the two sides of Dr. Jekyll, the two contrasting worlds in the narrative divide the storyline into two worlds, the happy world of Gina and the family of Milicent — by two girls; and another of the two worlds, the scientific world represented by Dr. Jekyll who trusts the power of science and the conservative world by Sir. George Carew who distrusts it. In this version, Sir. George Carew is portrayed as selfish, worldly and conservative — as Jekyll's antithesis. He reveals his snobbery about his giving aid to the poor in the following conversation with Jekyll: "In devoting yourself to others, Jekyll, aren't you neglecting the development of your own life?" Jekyll replies, "isn't it by serving others that one develops oneself, Sir. George?" There is an antithesis between them. Also, it is Carew who brings Jekyll to Gina in the happy quarter. He seduces Jekyll into an error to be overcome by sexual desire, which goes toward an outside institutional love relationship, family. Therefore, as Brian A. Rose puts it, "Jekyll's murder of Carew eliminates both of the film's centers of domestic instability… Carew's murder becomes an act of retribution, both for releasing evil via Jekyll and for his own social hypocrisy; his murder serves to reinscribe domestic values in a double manner" (74-5).

In this version, we see the scene in which Hyde runs over a girl and gives her family a check as compensation. This was exactly like in the original novel, and the Thanhouser version

— without the scene of compensation. This scene is, however, missing in March and Tracy's versions. This scene uncovers Hyde's monstrosity, but has nothing to do with a burst of repressed sexual desire in that he makes compensation for his misbehavior with his check. This scene plays an important role in identifying Jekyll and Hyde because on the back of the check, there is Dr.Jekyll's signature. It is an exaggeration to think that this scene exposes Hyde's sexual desire. Sexual desire repressed in Jekyll and gushing out of Hyde has to do with two adult female characters, Gina and Milicent, who connote sexuality and family where sexual desire legally and institutionally are satisfied. Therefore, it is an egregious error to think that repressed sexual desire is directed toward a little girl since Hyde is a monster to scare people, not a pervert.

Transformation by make-up and special effects in this version makes Hyde closer to a monster than what was described in the original novel. The transformation of Hyde's appearance first focuses on his hand. Jekyll's hand is shown to be changed into one of Hyde's in a close-up, but his face changes quickly. In this version, Hyde is visually depicted as a huge spider, which symbolizes the monstrosity of Hyde's nature, which overwhelmingly takes possession of Jekyll's body and mind by crawling over the bed to Jekyll.

The roles of the characters in this version are different from those in the original novel. Sir. Danvers Carew, in the original novel, becomes Sir. George Carew who is an antithesis of Jekyll. Because this version is the first full-dress silent cinema version of the original novel and

the most sophisticated one in the 1920s, it adds a love relationship with Milicent to the plot and story of the original novel. Nevertheless, it does not deviate from the crucial story line that is based on Jekyll.

The March Version (1931) and The Tracy Version (1941)

Even if the magnificent Barrymore's fame overshadows theirs, when they acted Jekyll and Hyde in these versions, Fredric March was a matinee idol and Spencer Tracy an outstanding movie star who had moved from stage to Hollywood. March was considered to be the second Barrymore. As Deborah C. Peterson puts it about Fredric March on the stage, "He deliberately imitated Barrymore's gestures, profile acting and quick, darting mannerisms. It was not surprising that his well thought out mimicry in the role soon brought him to the attention of "the" John Barrymore" (1996, 44). Even if March's acting is similar to Barrymore's, his Jekyll and Hyde reveals his own talent. Especially, his Hyde, which was reborn by several make-ups, was, "a new character, the complete opposite of the cultured and celebrated Dr. Jekyll" (*Ibid*. 62).

When he moved to Hollywood, after signing the Paramount contract on December the 7th, 1928, March's voice was well fit for sound film: "Fredric March's deep-throated delivery was the answer to Paramount Studio prayers, for not only did he have a handsome profile that

could accommodate the most rigorous requirements for camera close-ups, he also possessed a stage actor's well-trained voice" (*Ibid*. 45). Hollywood was about to move from the silent period to one of sound. March's version was the first talkie film of Stevenson's original novel. His acting was praised in reviews: "*New York Evening Post*: 'Mr. March's performance is inexpressibly good…. There can be no doubt that Mr. March is an actor of high intelligence and of hitherto unsuspected power" (*Ibid*. 63).

Even if he was also a stage actor, Spencer Tracy's acting was different from that of other ex-stage actors like Barrymore and March. His acting was delicate and natural. While Barrymore and March's acting was similar to a grandiloquent theatrical performance with active movements, his idiosyncratic acting style lies in "its diversity and naturalness" (James Fisher, 1994:7). He acted, "without a radical transformation of his physical persona, but through the revelation of a unique facet of his intellectual and emotional personality" (*Ibid*. 2). This was the reason why his Hyde is akin to a human form without a change in make-up or special effects; while Barrymore and March's Hyde respectively looked like a deformed monster, and a monkey or Neanderthal. Somerset Maugham visited the set and heard that, in contrast with March; "Tracy differentiated the roles without any changes in makeup" (*Ibid*. 63). Tracy's acting, reflecting his own personality, thusly created a different Hyde. According to Katharine Hepburn, who kept a secret love relationship with him for a long time, "Through the years, Tracy's

subdued, understated acting confounded imitators who otherwise flourished on their mimicry of Tracy contemporaries like Edward G Robinson, Clark Gable or James Cagney. His naturalistic immersion in the inner life of his characters made it impossible for imitators to locate the sort of identifying mannerisms needed for parody" (*Ibid.* 3).

In that the 1941 version imitates the 1931 version, I deal with these versions simultaneously since they are like cinematic twins. These two versions both have a clear narrative structure designed to cater to the Hollywood ideology of making the most profit possible by casting famous actors and actresses: Fredric March in the 1931 version, and Spencer Tracy, Ingrid Bergman, and Lana Turner in the 1941 version. These versions openly exploit sexuality and family issues on a full scale. Two female characters represent two worlds, on one hand, the world of sexuality and on the other hand, the world of institutional family. What is interesting about these versions is that there are different names for some of the characters: for Sir. Danvers Carew in the original novel, Sir. George Carew in the 1920 version becomes General Carew in the 1931 version and Sir Charles in the 1941 version. Two female characters, Gina and Milicent in the 1920 version, become Ivy Pearson and cheerful Muriel in the 1931 version; and Ivy Peterson and quiet Beatrix in the 1941 version. Each version has a slightly different ending. While in the ending of the 1920 version Jekyll kills himself with a poison (like in the original and Thanhouser version), in the ending of the 1931 and 1941 version Jekyll is

shot to death by another character in the 1931 version and by Lanyon in the 1941 version. Additionally, what attracts attention in the 1941 version is the switch of the female star's image. In the 1941 version, Ingrid Bergman plays the role of Ivy and Lana Turner does Beatrix because, "Ingrid Bergman, weary of playing 'good girls,' convinced director Fleming to allow her to play the 'bad girl'"(*Ibid*. 190). The 1941 version got a relatively lukewarm response from critics compared with that of previous film versions, and even though Stacy's subtle and natural acting is clearly distinct from that of Barrymore and March's theatrical acting style, the review of *Newsweek*, August 25, 1941, Vol. 18, p 53 on the film reveals disappointment about his acting: "As the gentle Dr. Jekyll…. Spencer Tracy is fine; but although his Mr.Hyde is a subtler, less grotesquely fanged-and-fiendish monster than those of his predecessors, the characterization is still hard to take, even with mustard (*Ibid*. 190). His Hyde is inferior to that of March.

What is striking in the 1931 version is the first person point of view of the camera in the beginning of the film. We can see only two hands playing the organ, and the camera is panning to a mirror, which allows us to see the handsome Dr. Jekyll reflected in it. By the strategy of Hollywood, this was a moment of cinema attraction for the female audience. It was not mentioned in the original novel, but the mirror was always used to reflect Hyde's appearance in both the Thanhouser and Barrymore versions. It shows a Dr. Jekyll, Mr. Hyde who is another self, a dark ego. This tool for Jekyll is used to identify Hyde as a signifier of his inner self.

Director Mamoulin seems to concretize the subject of sexual oppression by making Hyde shout, “Free!” when he sees himself in the mirror. The sexuality from this version begins to be foreshadowed. By first showing Jekyll’s (March) handsome figure reflected in a mirror, Director Mamoulin maximizes the contrast between Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. In the 1931 version, Hyde’s external feature is the most monkey-like, which can suggest racial connotations, while in the 1941 version, Tracy’s make-up is the least monster-like of all, in that there is no huge change of the face through make-up.

These two versions make the process of transformation from Jekyll to Hyde a spectacle, a wow moment based on the special effects available in contemporary Hollywood films of that day. Transformation scenes in these versions are caught in close-ups and they enslave our eyes with curiosity about them. The close-ups in these versions are different from what Bela Balasz discussed: “Good close-ups are lyrical; it is the heart, not the eye, that has perceived them” (Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen, 1999:305). Balasz’s close-up corresponds to static cinematic images, such as those in Dreyer’s *The Passion of Joan of Arc* (1927). Dynamic and strong attention for the eye are paid to close-ups of transformation. Close-up in the 1931 version is first used to focus on Dr. Jekyll when he is addressing a conference about the duality of the human mind. Dr. Jekyll, in this close-up, is contrasted with Hyde after transformation in order to underscore Jekyll’s status as a tragic figure.

The 1931 version begins at Jekyll's home and the 1941 version in the church. Especially, in the 1941 version, Jekyll seems to challenge the authority of the church, which is considered to be conservative. Home and church are institutionalized systems for oppressing sexual desire. Along with these institutions, the foreshadowing of sexuality outside the institution has to do with the contrasting female characters. As mentioned previously, in these two versions, there are two clearly divided worlds based on two female characters, Muriel and Beatrix, who symbolize an institution which represses sexual desire; and Ivy Pearson and Ivy Peterson who incite sexual desire. These two girls are directly linked to familial relationships and sexual desire, which becomes the crucial theme of the films. Unlike the Thanhouser version, in which we cannot see sexual connotation as a subject, in these two versions, sexuality more clearly lies in the foreground than in the Barrymore version. Star power, and the exploitation of sexuality through female stars are major marketing strategies in Hollywood. The two Ivies are objects of Jekyll's oppressed sexual desire, which is visualized in Jekyll's dream in the 1941 version. The sexuality associated with the two female characters becomes a crucial aspect of these films.

Conclusion

The Thanhouser version of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* can be considered the foundation for the future cinema version of the original novel, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*.

It is visualized as abridged with crucial elements in the original novel. Barrymore, March and Tracy's versions develop more sophisticated narratives with the addition of sexuality and family issues interwoven with into the storyline, cinematically catering to Hollywood production system. In addition, the Thanhouser version, I think, is the most faithful to the original novel—except perhaps the fact that it has a linear chronological structure achieved by deconstructing the epistolary structure with multifarious points of view. The acting styles of the male actors are distinctly different from each other. While James Cruz, John Barrymore, and Fredric March's acting styles are all theatrical and dramatic, Spencer Tracy's acting is spontaneous and calm — even as Hyde. Sexuality is inextricably bound up with the female characters as the subject is even more explicitly foreshadowed in March and Stacy's versions than in the Barrymore version. For the future, I wonder what kind of dimensions will be added to the cinema version of the original novel and what future cinema versions will really be like .