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The Spectacle of “East Meets West”: A Postmodernist Shopping Mall—Telford Plaza in Hong Kong

Ivy Lai Chun Chun, University of Hong Kong

Abstract: Like a woman embellishing herself in grandeur and elegance, the body of a shopping mall is aesthetically fashioned from time to time. The linear structure of a shopping mall is modernist itself, from which a shopping mall can depart, moving towards postmodernity by its narrative fashion. A shopping mall can be postmodernist by departing from the modernist linear structure. Telford Plaza, a local shopping mall in Hong Kong, consists of modernist and postmodernist elements, addressing the way of life of Hong Kong people through the spectacle of “the East Meets West.” The interplay of modernist and postmodernist elements evokes compelling sensations to strollers, with which “the East Meets West” resonates.
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To strollers, Telford Plaza’s modernist elements constitute the modernity of the shopping mall. In simple words, Telford Plaza is a modernist shopping mall itself. The modernist elements of Telford Plaza are functionality, structural uniformity and a progressive proximity to future that adds to the modernity of the shopping mall. To sum up, then, the modernist features are functionality, linearity and progressivity.

Telford Plaza is a modernist shopping mall that functions to attract strollers to consume goods. Conner emphasizes that functionality is tantamount to the beauty of modern architecture (Connor 1989, 6–7). The key function of a modern shopping mall is to invite strollers to spend money on consuming goods without being too obvious. A shopping mall is thus “a distinctive sign of the global dissemination of late capitalism.” (Friedberg Ann 1993, 111). In a shopping mall, strollers visit shopping malls mainly for buying commodities. Spending money on what they like to purchase has become part of the modern life. Of strollers, women have keen interests in shopping. Unlike women who lack power and social status in the past, in modernity women spend lavishly in shopping malls in order to empower themselves (118). The ability to consume is in a way to show how much power one can gain. Consumption is a gain of power. In Telford Plaza, there are more than 100 shops located for strollers to shop. Each shop is made of glass that
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allows strollers to stroll along shops to fascinatingly “window-shop.” Glass has long been adopted by international modernist architecture. Benjamin pioneers shopping arcades in Paris erected of glass roofs across inner passages in the nineteenth century. The arcades in Paris are the first international style of modern architecture (Stevenson 2003, 64), the symbols of modernist shopping malls. In many respects, shopping arcades in Paris are the forerunners to the modern department store (64). Strolling along each passage on every floor, strollers gaze at both sides of the glassy shops, taking part ardently in consuming goods.

Driven by desire, strollers unconsciously gaze at the beloved goods through the glass. Lacan points out that the cause of desire, the objects, more than the desire of the subject, drives the strollers to gaze at the objects. As this stage, looking the objects through the window and buying/consuming goods are disconnected. In delays, the desire of the subject retroactively processes the cause of desire—the objects, turning the objects into desired objects in the psychic field (Žižek 2005, 94). In other words, goods displayed in the glassy shops arouse the desire of strollers to gaze at the goods, creating the illusions of choices that retain the elevation of buying/consuming goods. Strollers are exhilarated, fascinated at buying goods while seeing the objects through the glass, that directly affects the consumption. Seeing, strolling and buying goods are closely connected to one another that constitute “the conspicuous consumption of the commodities of capitalist production” (Stevenson 2003, 64) featuring modernity. A modernist shopping mall functions to open up space to see, to stroll, to consume goods. Telford Plaza is a replica of the modernist shopping arcades originated in Paris as Benjamin saw it, however, as noted by Stevenson, Benjamin argues “the replication of built form does not result in any replication of the traditions, practices or aura of the original city or space” (Stevenson 2003, 65). Each shopping mall is connected to its specific aura in relation to power and consumption that cannot be replaced by a replica. Values of tradition and culture are embedded in each shopping mall. Telford Plaza is a modernist shopping mall that preserves values of residents of both the Kowloon Bay lower- and middle class. Outside the modernist shopping mall Telford Plaza, there is a platform (with a park) linked to different entrances of the shopping mall, some private estates on one side, and some public estates on the other side.

The design of the shopping mall as a function of a modernist shopping mall aims to preserve the
aura of the specific region to facilitate strollers’ consumption. Telford Plaza is a modernist shopping mall that retains the Kowloon Bay aura, which functions to attract consumers in the region to consume. The way in which shoppers stroll to consume could be related to the structure of the shopping mall. To facilitate strolling, Telford Plaza, having conformed to unifying geometric principles, is a modernist architecture that is linearly structured. As a modernist shopping mall, Telford Plaza is divided into two wings: the new being linear and extended from the old wing. Both wings are linked by mobile escalators with strips of films of mural paintings on the wall as decorations for strollers enjoyably to stroll along the entire shopping mall.

Le Corbusier marks that a “plan” is the generator of modernist architecture: “The whole structure rises from its base and is developed in accordance with a rule which is written on the ground in the plan: noble forms, variety of form, unity of the geometric principle. A profound projection of harmony: this is the architecture” (Stevenson 2003, 65). Telford Plaza’s plan is the expansion of the old wing to the new wing. The parallel structure of conflating the new wing with the old wing constitutes the rationality, coherence, harmony and progress of the shopping mall. The mimetic geometric principle in art is an epiphany of pure spirit found in modernist architecture (Roberts 1995, 132). The shopping mall is linearly structured which allows strollers to stroll along the shops to gaze at the objects through the glass. Telford Plaza is a shopping mall structured in accordance to geometric principles, constituting the harmony, progression and rationality that shows the modernity of the shopping mall.

A linearly structured shopping mall functioning to appeal to strollers to consume goods, Telford Plaza is a modernist shopping mall that constantly fashions itself in order to appeal to shoppers to stroll along the shopping mall. Why Telford Plaza constantly changes its fashion is to “capture the proximate future” (Sweetman 2001, 62) to gain the affection of consumers, which is a sign of modernity. Capturing the proximate future by itself is forward-looking. Catching up with the latest trend, fashion embodies the moving, progressive present in proximity to the future. Fashioning a shopping mall is a feature of modernity. To attract a great number of shoppers to stroll and re-stroll along the shopping mall, Telford Plaza constantly fashions itself aesthetically. Meaghan Morris addresses this as a paradox embedded in every shopping place (1998, 67–8). On one hand, a shopping mall is physically, monumentally present. On the other hand, a shopping mall dissolves into abstract femininity. Fashioning a shopping mall incessantly reveals a kind of femininity. In Fall 2003, the “fashion” of Telford Plaza was “Art Walk.” “Art Walk,” which
attempted to capture the proximity to the future aesthetics, exhibits an aesthetic femininity. With the theme “Art Walk,” the shopping mall Telford Plaza opens up a space for strollers to step into the world of art. It is like Baudelaire strolling on the boulevard in Paris, depicting the melancholic city through spleen poems and prose. Meaghan Morris emphasizes “walking with every step, here and there, now and then” (Morris 1998, 64) as a signifier of strollers in shopper malls. Walking “step by step” is the way that strollers stroll in the shopping malls. Given that the shopping mall is fashioned as “Art Walk,” strollers stroll along the shopping mall “step by step” so as to be devoted to aesthetics. What the strollers anticipate in the future is the world of art/aesthetics in proximity to the present modernity, in which consumer culture is intermingled with of arts in the shopping mall. Telford Plaza is a modernist shopping mall that is constantly aesthetically fashioned. While Telford Plaza is a linear structured modernist shopping mall, constantly changing its fashion mainly to attract consumers to consume goods, Telford Plaza is aesthetically postmodernist in some ways that rise above modernity.

Charles Jencks asserts that “… Postmodernism has the essential double meaning: the continuation of Modernism and its transcendence” (Jencks 1991, 6). Jencks is a representative of postmodernist architect who prestigiously dates the death of modernist architecture as July 15th, 1972 at 3:32p and gives a full account of the failure of modernist architectures to communicate with users fully and comprehensively on various levels simultaneously (9). The narrative Jencks advocates reflects the incredulity towards meta-narratives in legitimization of knowledge that Lyotard reveals (Lyotard 1984, xxiv). In postmodernity, legitimization of knowledge by scientific knowledge is open to attack. Each game has its own rules to establish the social bond with the people. In architecture, rules are open to pluralistic interpretations to achieve the communication with users/people in society. Telford shopping mall is postmodernist in this sense. Against modern architecture’s failure to communicate with users, Jencks accounts for the articulation of postmodernist architecture targeting/aiming at different “taste cultures,” pluralism for participation of a wide range of users. At times, double-coding or irony is employed to facilitate various kinds of users (Jencks 1991, 6). Double-coding is articulated at two semiotic levels; namely, it addresses a concerned minority who cares about architectural meanings, and the local
inhabitants, or the public (Woods 1999, 99). According to Jencks, the birth of postmodernist architecture comes after the date of death of modernist architecture. Telford Plaza departs from modernity and gradually moves towards postmodernity. Having fashioned itself in pluralistic ways in different sectors, Telford Plaza articulates different taste cultures to communicate with a wide range of users, from the minority who pay special attentions to architectural meanings to inhabitants in Kowloon Bay and even the public at large. Double-coding as language is at work in communicating with a large variety of users. While Modernism fails to communicate with users, Postmodernism is a continuation and transcendance of Modernism. Telford Plaza is a postmodernist shopping mall that continues and transcends its modernity by opening up multiple elements.

To continue and transcends its modernity, Telford Plaza’s post-modernist elements enable the shopping mall Telford to be postmodernistic. The postmodernist elements of Telford Plaza are hybridism, pluralism, effective communication. Pastiche, similarities and contradictions, parody, critical regions, nostalgia, the hyper-real, the popular culture, all come into play. These elements shall be illustrated by drawing on Jenck's semiotic study of architecture: “radical eclecticism,” multi-valence, ornamentation, Venturi’s “complexities and contradictions,” Frampton's Critical Regionalism, Guy Debord’s “Spectacle,” and the demarcation between high and low culture. This shows how Telford Plaza continues and transcends its modernity to move towards postmodernity.

First of all, Telford Plaza is open to pluralism. Various sectors are designed to suit the taste of various consumers. Hybridization, meaning various elements come into the same place, is hence embraced. Jencks puts the change of styles to suit the desires of consumers as “radical eclecticism” (Klotz, 243). For example, generally, children’s corner is specially designed for Kids. To kids, pools of flamingoes and doves hung on the ceiling in circular form symbolize freedom, fun and imagination. Jencks adopts a semiotic view derived from Saussure to study postmodernist architecture. The context signified is a matter of intersecting language and communications (Connor 1989, 80). Children who visit the children’s corner would be able to
comprehend the signified meanings given in the context—freedom and imagination in the children’s world. Because of the effective communication with users, Jencks draws the conclusion that postmodernist architecture mutates away from uni-valence to mutli-valence (80). Unlike the uni-valence stressed in modernist architecture that focus on the single, absolute reading of each context, post-modernist architecture allows a multiplicity of reading contexts, or an advanced reading of the contexts (80). The ornamented children’s corner, for instance, allows the children to grasp what the meaning is all about before getting into the multiple readings of the context. Whereas ornamentation could be presented as a kind of alienation or a crime in a negative sense in modernist architecture, ornaments add to contextual meanings positively in postmodernist architecture, enhancing the communication with users. Connor claims that some architects associated with the movement of Contextualism—the change of meanings subject to the change in context—emphasize that modernist architecture fails to respond to physical contexts (81). On the contrary, postmodernist architecture takes advantages of ornamentation and Contextualism to communicate with users. In the children’s corner, for example, ornaments of pools of flamingoes and doves enrich meanings in the context, through which children fall into the fantastic imaginative world. Telford Plaza is a postmodernist mall divided up into various taste cultures, contexts, specifically to communicate meaningfully with different end-users. Its pluralistic, hybrid, eclectic nature constitutes post-modernity of Telford Plaza.

Secondly, walking along the passages, strollers find complexity and contradictions between shops in Telford Plaza. Although shops are located in specific sectors for different users, shops put together in the same sector are complex and contradictory themselves. This can be seen in the contradictory shops located in Telford Plaza.

Robert Venturi speaks of architecture playfully, “Less is a bore” (Venturi 1996, 403). In the view of Venturi, postmodernist architecture is necessarily complex and contradictory based on the richness and ambiguity of modern architecture. Venturi states, “Hybrid rather than ‘pure,’ compromising rather than ‘clean,’ distorted rather than ‘straightforward,’ ambiguous rather than ‘articulated,’ perverse as well as impersonal, boring as well as ‘interesting,’ conventional rather than ‘designed,’ accommodating rather than excluding, redundant rather than simple, vestigial as well as innovating, inconsistent and equivocal rather than direct and clear” (Venturi 1996, 403–
4). In this way elements add to complexity and contradictions of architecture, fulfilling the playfulfulness of post-modernity. This can be seen in the example discussed above.

In addition, complexity and contradictions of post-modernist architecture are found in the phenomenon of “both-and” instead of “either-or.” This means that binary opposites in the hierarchy are broken down, which yields complexity and contradictions in post-modern architecture. According to Fredric Jameson, rhetorical devices are employed in postmodernist architecture more than modernist architecture to stir up playfulness. Similarities and contradictions are juxtaposed at the same place that creates a formation of “pastiche” (Ward 1997, 23). For Jencks this is “a form of quotations” (24), while Jameson says that it is “blank parody, parody that has lost its sense of humor” (Jameson 1998, 5). I think both of them make sense of pastiche, as pastiche alludes to other references in simple and plain ways. For example, in the cosmopolitan setting of Telford Plaza, a Japanese shop that sells branded Japanese desserts and cakes and a French shop that sells French perfumes and flavors respectively are found. The Japanese cosmopolitan shop and the French cosmopolitan shop are decorated, embellished in their own unique cultures. However, both shops are located next to each other in the same area contradictorily yet similarly. Interestingly, the column outside the shops is fashioned in impressionism rhetorically. The “pastiche” Telford Plaza established along the passage hence appeals to consumers of various kinds. Complexity and contradictions that forms the “pastiche” in playfulfulness is conveyed as “schizophrenia” that features postmodernity. This eradicates the sense of personal identity “I” when strolling (119).

Other than juxtapositions of shops within the shopping mall, Telford Plaza is generally divided into two wings: the old wing and the new wing as critical regions. The old wing embodies the Western culture, whereas the new wing embodies the Chinese culture. Both wings are separate critical regions joined together that demonstrate post-modernity in Telford Plaza, according to
Frampton’s Critical Regionalism.

Critical Regionalism is a strategy that “mediates” the impact of universal civilization with elements derived indirectly from peculiar places (Frampton 1983, 21). It “deconstructs” the overall spectrum of universal culture. At the same time, it yields synthetic contradiction to critique universal culture. Whereas universal culture is first and the foremost in modernity, in post-modernity universal culture is critiqued by taking elements from peculiar places to enhance the critical self-consciousness of cultures of peculiar regions, as Klotz notes. Two critical regions in Telford Plaza are the old wing of the Western style and the new wing of the Chinese style. Both regions speak of their own architectural narratives (Klotz 1992, 242): the East and the West respectively. Linking both regions together in the shopping mall constitutes the spectacle of “the East Meets West,” intensifying the critical awareness of where strollers are living in.

Moreover, in Telford Plaza, the old wing is Western. The pink embellished staircase with the theme “Art Walk” is at odds with the blue column in Impressionistic painting. A creative collage of arts is thus formed or created (Ward 1997, 26), a sign of postmodernity. It is the “collaborative authorship” by which nothing purely new is allowed to take place (Connor 1989, 83). “Radical abstraction” occurs: the historical and the poetical (Klotz 1992, 242). The historical makes a reference to the modern Western cosmopolitan culture while the poetical makes a reference to the Western arts. Trans-avant-garde is thus employed to advocate the interchangeability of languages. In this case, both languages of the Western cosmopolitan culture and the Western aesthetic are manipulated to yield contradictions and similarities. Playfulness thus comes into effect. The tectonic is the primary architectural principle that resists gravity.

Pebbled diagonal gridlines of the ceiling leads to instability of the tectonic. Ornaments, decorations, juxtapositions of similarities and contradictions and the tectonic structure achieve the sensational visual experience by the tactile of human perceptions (Frampton 1983, 29). Imbued with post-modernist Western designs and structures, the new wing of Telford Plaza lively expresses the consciousness of the Western world by its Western narrative. The critical region of
the West unveils post-modernity.

Oppositely, the new wing is Chinese. The new wing of Telford Plaza, on the other hand, is associated with the Oriental Chinese culture. Colorful bars of Chinese paintings, Chinese words and Chinese calligraphies are hanged up from the glassy roofs. It triggers off a nostalgic feeling towards the Chinese antiques. The allusions to Orientalism are references of both the historical and the poetical, the distinctive features of ‘Radical Abstraction’ (Heinrich Klotz, 242), similar to the “Radical Abstraction” drawn from the West in the old wing (as discussed above). The Chinese paintings, Chinese words and Chinese calligraphies on the colorful bars are images which draw strollers into the world of Chinese heritage. It is what Baudrillard points out, the “hyper-real” taking over the real in the image-driven world (Baudrillard 1988, 166). One cannot distinguish between the imaginary/the simulacrum and the real, as differences are eradicated from the simulacrum and the real (167). Strollers are fascinated about the seeing, while the seeing is so obscene that the simulacrum cannot be differentiated from the real (Baudrillard 1993, 346). "Seeing" becomes paradoxical. Strollers engaged in the image-driven Chinese world are incapable to realize the real, falling into the traps of the simulacra—the Chinese words.

The level of critical self-consciousness aroused thus may not be as high as the desired level proposed by Critical Regionalism. Strollers may not be highly critical to the region, but may be immersed in the region, that affects the consumption. The new wing of Telford Plaza associated with the Chinese culture is driven by the images of Chinese paintings, Chinese words and Chinese calligraphies. The allusion to the past of Chinese aesthetics in the Critical Region suffices to be postmodernist, as illustrated above from the banners of Chinese calligraphies.

The East meets the West. This can be manifested by both the old and the new wings that are linked together by an escalator with strips of films of mural paintings. Before taking
the escalator to the new wing, there is a pathway linking to other entrances. The pathway is decorated with cloudy ceilings and baskets of flowers hanging from lamp-lights. Ornaments help to fashion a Western pathway. Where the escalator goes up, there is a pink banner indicating the theme “Art Walk” and artificial butterflies hanging from the ceilings. All these ornaments help to decorate a shopping mall that is more user-friendly. Baskets of flowers, clouds, butterflies … constitute a contemporary phantasmagoria, The escalator decorated with strips of films of mural paintings and butterflies marks the division of the old and the new wings.

The design of joining both the old wing associated with the Western culture and the new wing associated with the Chinese culture constitutes the spectacle of “the East Meets West.” The spectacle, according to Guy Debord, is “the very heart of society’s real unreality” (Debord 1995, 3). It is not a collection of images, but rather “a social relationship between people that is mediated by images” (2). The spectacle of East meets West helps to construct the identity of Hong Kong people by its images. Plunged into the image-driven world, Hong Kong people are getting more alienated from the images than objects possessed and become the objects of the Hong Kong images. In other words, Hong Kong strollers have become the objects of Hong
Kong images. That is what Debord calls “the shift from being into having, and having into appearing” (3). On the whole, the spectacle of “the East Meets West” could be conceived as a pastiche made of quotations that liberate nostalgia or a parody in a critical mockery tone. There could be different interpretations strollers come up with. This is the second-order meaning of the semiological system/myths (Barthes 2000, 114). The second order meaning is the meaning encoded/interpreted by readers. As Hong Kong citizens, we all share the myth of “East meets West” in post-colonial Hong Kong. We all share the sense of belonging to Hong Kong through the nostalgic narrative or discourse of “the East Meets West”; at the same time, the post-modernist design and decoration of the shopping mall allows the spectacle of “East meets West” to make a pun/parody on Hong Kong. The post-colonial Hong Kong is cynically mocked at through the spectacle of “East meets West.” It is “in a new kind of way” (Jameson 1998, 7) in postmodernist art, which invokes the necessary failure of arts and the aesthetic but does not necessarily mean “the failure of the new, the imprisonment in the past” (ibid.) in the Hong Kong context. Strollers experience a new avant-garde art by strolling in a shopping mall in Hong Kong, the place where they live. It allows strollers to critically reflect upon their culture of “the East Meets West,” not the culture of the East nor the culture of the West alone. Hence, the spectacle of “East meets West” is post-modernist in that it welcomes and embraces pluralistic contradictory perspectives from both the East and the West.

The spectacle of East meets West is found where the demarcation between high and low culture collapses. Chinese paintings are posted outside shops in the new wing while Western paintings are posted outside shops in the old wing respectively as a kind of everyday decoration. Both the Chinese and Western cultures have been transformed into popular culture. The post-modernist shopping mall allows strollers to gain a sense of ease and comfort with “the East Meets West”
presented in the form of popular culture. Parody comes to the scene, as the boundary between high and low culture breaks down to welcome hybridity. Similar to the parody between shops, parody puts the high and low cultures together, the cultures of the East and the West together, in fragmentations. Hong Kong is neither in high nor low culture, neither absolutely in the East nor in the West but fragmented in a pastiche that cannot be defined—“the East Meets West.” Post-modernity manifests itself everywhere in Telford Plaza.

Telford Plaza is a linearly structured modernist shopping mall that constantly fashions itself to facilitate strollers to stroll along the shopping mall to consume goods. The narrative, fictional spectacle of “the East meets West” fashions the modernist shopping mall Telford Plaza, dividing the mall into critical regions of the East and the West, in which shops are similarly and differently juxtaposed and decorated with ornaments, contextually to communicate with users in playfulness and parodies. This demonstrates that Telford Plaza departs from the functional, linearly progressive modernity and moves towards the hybrid, pluralistic, communicative post-modernity, signifying that post-modernity is a continuation and transcendence of modernity, as pointed out by Jencks (Jencks 1991, 459). The spectacle of “the East meets West” is a vehicle for communicating with Hong Kong strollers, by which Telford Plaza as a post-modernist shopping mall continues and transcends modernity in critical, reflective local/indigenous dialects.
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The Many Dimensions of Silence: An Interdisciplinary Approach

Fred Guyette, Erskine College

Abstract: What is silence? According to *The Oxford English Dictionary*, silence is “abstaining or forbearing from speech.” However, an interdisciplinary approach to silence suggests that it can have many different meanings. Acoustic ecologists have a special interest in the “quiet” of natural soundscapes and the negative effects of noise on birds and marine life. As for human beings, we have a persistent drive to develop technology, and the noise of our machines is ubiquitous. In the first half of the nineteenth century, physicians began to ask about the link between certain industrial occupations and hearing loss. More recent studies in psychology have focused on the connection...
between noise and stress, and how human beings learn to cope with noise as they perform certain tasks. In education, teachers worry about the way media noise displaces reflective silence in the inner lives of their students. The spiritual significance of silence is described in Biblical tradition and in the monastic rule of St. Benedict. Many legal traditions recognize a right to remain silent. When it comes to moral decline in organizations, would-be “whistleblowers” must decide whether they will break the prevailing “code of silence.” On the other hand, we should not discount the possibility that in other social contexts, silence can be an effective form of protest and a prelude to social change.

KEYWORDS: silence, environmental noise, Benedictine Rule, the right to remain silent, whistleblowers, Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

1. The Catalyst for a Reflection on Silence

The catalyst for this reflection on silence is a certain sense of dissatisfaction with the definition provided by *The Oxford English Dictionary*: “abstaining or forbearing from speech” (OED 1989). Silence, however, can be much richer than the OED’s brief definition suggests. Johannesen marked out some directions for the kind of inquiry I pursue here:

1. The person lacks sufficient information to talk on the topic.
2. The person feels no sense of urgency about talking.
3. The person is carefully pondering exactly what to say next.
4. The silence may simply reflect the person’s normal rate of thinking.
5. The person is avoiding discussion of a controversial or sensitive issue out of fear.
6. The silence expresses agreement.
7. The silence expresses disagreement.
8. The person is doubtful or indecisive.
9. The person is bored.
10. The person is uncertain of someone else’s meaning.
11. The person is in awe, or raptly attentive, or emotionally overcome.
12. The person is snooty or impolite.
13. The person’s silence is a means of punishing others, of annihilating others symbolically by excluding them from verbal communication.
14. The person’s silence marks a characteristic personality disturbance.
15. The person feels inarticulate despite a desire to communicate; perhaps the topic lends itself more to intuitive sensing than to verbal discussion.
16. The person’s silence reflects concern for not saying anything to hurt another person.
17. The person is daydreaming or preoccupied with other matters.
18. The person uses silence to enhance his own isolation, independence and sense of self-uniqueness.
19. The silence marks sulking anger.
20. The person’s silence reflects empathic exchange, the companionship of shared mood or insight.

Following Johannesen’s lead, then, I will take an interdisciplinary approach to explore some of the many dimensions of silence.

2. Silence: Ecological Approaches

In Robert Frost’s poem, “The Census-Taker,” a civil servant, a city dweller, ventures into what is left of a Vermont forest. He is an “enumerator.” His task is to find people living on small farms,
or teams of loggers at work, and to interview them. Instead he finds that within a hundred square
miles, all the trees have been cut down and the area has been abandoned:

The time was autumn, but how anyone
could tell the time of year when every tree
That could have dropped a leaf was down itself
And nothing but the stump of it was left
Now bringing out its rings in sugar of pitch;
And every tree up stood a rotting trunk
Without a single leaf to spend on autumn

He is dumbfounded by the lifeless silence he encounters there—no birds, no human inhabitants,
only “An emptiness flayed to the very stone.” Little wonder that he is overcome with melancholy
as he surveys the desolate scene (Doreski 1988).

Wilderness places, places where wildlife can flourish, are becoming harder to find. It takes more
determination now, but human beings still seek them out, because we long for quiet and a sense
of “sanctuary” in our lives. Perhaps no one is more serious about finding quiet places than
acoustic ecologists, but when they take their sophisticated listening equipment with them into
wilderness settings, they are also anticipating that — against a background of silence -- they will
be identifying a rich matrix of many sounds, such as the humming of insects, birdsongs and calls
from animals engaging in courtship rituals (Hempton 2017).

Birds rely on a repertoire of sounds to communicate with each other, but androgenic noise —
noise created by humans and technology—can have serious negative effects that prevent them
from flourishing. Their reactions to noise vary, depending on the species of bird, the type of
noise they encounter, the frequency of the noise, its loudness, and its duration (Shannon 2016).
Noise pollution near roads and highways can be harmful to birds’ auditory systems (Francis
2017). Invasive engine noises from personal water craft and motorboats often trigger fright-flight
responses in shore birds (Burger 1998). Species that gather in colonies are especially susceptible
to noise, since as soon as one bird reacts, many or all the birds in a colony will follow that initial
fright response (Carney & Sydeman 1999). The foraging behavior of some birds can be disrupted
by noise (Canaday & Rivadeneyra 2001) and reproductive success declines when birds are
subjected to noise from all-terrain vehicles (Borneman 2016). Noise also interferes with the
ability of birds to hear and avoid predators (Barber 2010). Noise can be a major factor in the
displacement of birds from territory where they were once common (Brotons & Herrando 2001).
These territorial shifts can have an adverse effect on other forms of life, too, since the birds
missing from an area are no longer available for pollinating plants or dispersing plant seeds
(Francis 2012).

In ocean environments, humpback whales communicate with each other over vast distances by
“singing.” Marine biologists theorize that their songs may function in several ways. (1) They can
be taken as an index of association, as if to announce: “During this migratory season, I belong to
this pod.” (2) At other times, their songs function in an agonistic way, as a form of competition
in which males try to display their fitness to a prospective mate. (3) Their songs also function as
a means to organize their efforts to capture prey, a way of cooperating with each other in order to
find food (Darling 2006). Androgenic noise can interfere with whale communication, however,
making life much more difficult for them. Commercial vessels are a major source of underwater
ambient noise, which limits the geographical range of what whales can hear. Sonar blasts from
naval operations can wreak greater havoc in their world of sound, making it difficult for them to
sense where they are and what is happening in their environment (Weilgart 2017).

What these various studies have in common is an emphasis on the harmful effects of noise.
Animals communicate by transmitting specific forms of structured sound, but for these signals to
be received, they have to be heard against a background of relative silence. Too much
background noise makes it impossible for them to hear these vital messages.

3. A Public Health Perspective: Hearing Loss and Occupations

An English physician, Caleb Hiller Parry, was one of the first to make the connection between a
person’s occupation and hearing loss. He reported in 1831 that he had examined many navy
personnel who were deaf on account of their proximity to cannon fire. Among them was Royal
Navy Admiral Lord Rodney, whose flagship *Formidable* had fired eighty broadsides against the
French in the Battle of the Saintes in 1782 (Thurston 2003). Joseph Williams (1840) noted a
similar aetiology: “Artillerymen, blacksmiths, and the blasters in mines often become deaf.”
Textile mills, too, were widely recognized as places where workers might gradually lose their
hearing. The proliferation of steam engines in factories and railroads created new jobs for
boilermakers throughout the nineteenth century, but since their work involved hammering metal
plates and rivets inside of metal boilers, many of them lost their hearing after only a few years on
the job (Toynbee 1860).

Who is at risk of losing their hearing today? Conversations at home register at about 60 dB. The
traffic noise heard by truck drivers in the city is 85 dB, just below the range in which sustained
exposure can harm hearing (90-95 dB). If human beings are 50 feet away from a jackhammer
being used at a construction site, they can expect to experience a noise level of 95 dB. Many
lawnmowers produce 105 dB, which is hazardous to an operator’s hearing. Since ambulances
need to be heard over other forms of noise, their sirens are rated at about 120 dB. The estimated
range of exposure for anyone who plays in a rock band or attends a rock concert is 120-150 dB
(Chepesiuk 2005). Baggage handlers and aircraft mechanics need to be especially vigilant when
it comes to protecting their hearing, as jet engines produce noise levels of 140dB (Center for
Disease Control 2017).

A survey of workers at an underground gold mine in South Africa observed that only half were
wearing the hearing protection freely provided by their employer, even though they worked in
enclosed spaces where noise was at least 85 dB (Hansia & Dickinson 2010). Workers in lumber
mills in British Columbia are often exposed to noise levels of at least 90dB from saws and
planing machines (Davies 2009). In Nigeria, workers in a glass bottling plant showed significant
hearing loss over a two-year period after coping with noise levels from 91dB to 97dB (Olajide
2008). Spinners and weavers in India’s textile factories must deal with even more severe
conditions, as the noise of the machines they work with registers between 90 and 110 dB (Bedi
2006). These studies indicate that noise-induced hearing loss in unprotected workers continues to
be a world-wide problem (Nelson 2005).

Some theories in psychology complicate this assessment by offering a more positive account of *some* kinds of noise and by arguing that silence might not *always* be more desirable. In the 1970’s Donald Broadbent and Christopher Poulton engaged into a theoretical debate about the effects of noise on the performance of tasks. Broadbent’s model of performance states that some forms of noise increase arousal because they help a person narrow his/her field of attention (1978). At relatively lower levels of arousal, this narrowing of attention facilitates performance because it helps the individual exclude irrelevant cues. Beyond an optimal level, however, increases in arousal cause task-relevant cues to be excluded, and performance is impaired. Poulton (1976) argued for a composite model of noise effects involving arousal and the masking of inner speech. From this perspective, the gains in performance in continuous noise early in the task occur because the increase in arousal compensates for the deleterious effects of masking. However, as more time is spent on task, arousal decreases, and masking effects come to dominate.

Hancock and Warm (1989) joined the discussion ten years later. Their model of silence/noise describes a general “comfort zone” in which there is neither too much stress nor too little. There is enough noise to prevent a person from falling asleep, but not so much as to overpower his/her attention to the task. On the lower end of the scale, we might find complete silence unnerving, while on the upper end of the scale there is a point at which too much noise makes it impossible to concentrate (Lonsdale & North 2011). Yet there appears to be a fairly wide zone in which noise can work to our advantage—an alarm clock prevents me from being late for work, a warning bell reminds me to fasten the seatbelt in my car, the chiming of the kitchen timer suggests that the bread is ready to come out of the oven ... Other types of noise can be annoying, though not completely distracting: the sounds made by a dishwasher (Ozturk 1996), the whine of a vacuum cleaner (Fatima & Mohanty 2012) or the colleague who insists on playing “his” kind of music in the office (Hodgetts 2014).

Reflecting more generally on the interplay between stress and the desire for a completely stress-free life, Kaplan suggests human beings need phases of stimulation followed by phases of restoration. The rhythm between them “is essential to a coherent life and to the identification and carrying out of worthwhile purposes. Looking back on a life of purpose and productivity, even if one experienced some stress along the way, might well be more satisfying than looking back on a stress-free life in which little was accomplished” (Kaplan 1995).

5. The Noise of Media Versus the Child’s Need for Silence

Audiologists have expressed concern that recreational MP3 use might be causing physical damage to the hearing of an entire generation of young people (Twardella 2017). Researchers at The Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF) have been asking a somewhat different question, however: Does the noise of media displace reflective silence in the inner lives of children? KFF conducts surveys on media use by young people, from newborns to 18 years old. In 2005, KFF reported that young people spent an average of 6 hours per day with television, music, or computer-based entertainment (Rideout 2005). In 2010, that average had jumped to about 7.5 hours per day, or 53 hours per week – the equivalent of a full-time job with overtime (Rideout et al 2010). Newborns
are initiated into media use almost as soon as they come home from the hospital, and year by year their exposure to the “noise” of electronic media increases, until they reach a plateau in high school (Altimier & Phillips 2016). Young people are strangers to silence, and the odds are good that they will grow into adults who are strangers to silence, too.

Teachers witness the results every day. Their students are always learning from an informal curriculum of commercial ads from television, recorded songs, cartoons, televised gossip, sports images, viral videos and smart phones (Gitlin 2003). The official curriculum approved by an older generation will almost certainly have less appeal. It cannot deliver the same emotional jolt that popular culture can, since the two primary characteristics of the informal curriculum are permissiveness and immediate entertainment. And if the real world should turn out to have long stretches in which nothing exciting happens and the range of choices is unexpectedly narrow? Students may not have developed the inner resources to cope with such challenges. At some point in life, those resources need to be nourished in reflective silence – silence, rather than continual noise.


The story of the prophet Elijah is found in 1 Kings. The respect for silence that Buber describes was not part of Elijah’s natural make-up. Elijah stirred up dramatic events wherever he went. After he challenged the prophets of Ba’al to a contest of fire up on Mt. Carmel, he called upon God to send down lightning. YHWH obligingly did so, and Elijah took this a sign that he should purge the land of Jezebel’s prophets. In the wake of Elijah’s victory, four hundred prophets of Ba’al were put to the sword without mercy. Fleeing, then, from the anger of Queen Jezebel, Elijah hid in a cave and waited for the Lord to come and rescue His most faithful servant from danger.

A great wind passed by the mouth of the cave, strong enough to break the rocks in two. Elijah expected his mighty God to speak to him from out of that wind, but he heard nothing. Then came an earthquake, and Elijah thought that God might speak to him through an event of that magnitude, but God was not in the earthquake. After the earthquake came a roaring fire, but God did not address Elijah from the fire, either. Elijah must have been disappointed when God finally did speak to him, in a still, small voice (1 Kings 19:12). Elijah had been expecting great signs and wonders, but suddenly he was forced to question the correlation he had been making all along between faith in God and the annihilation of all his enemies (Tonstad 2005). At the cave on Mt. Horeb, God did not come to Elijah as an overpowering champion to be summoned for every battle that Elijah himself wanted to fight, but as a voice that was very close to silence.

Christian monasticism has been shaped by the practices of silence since the time of St. Benedict (480-543AD). Benedict and his followers deliberately chose geographical settings that were far away from the noise and business of the city. St. Benedict’s Rule seeks to replicate the silentium of the wilderness within the walls of the monastery. The Latin word silentium is often translated into English simply as “silence,” but “stillness” might be a more appropriate word. Benedict teaches that, while silence is a monastic ideal, complete silence is not possible (Gehl 1987).
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Chapter 6 of Benedict’s *Rule*, “On The Spirit of Silence,” focuses on the importance of keeping silence – *taciturnitatis*. Benedict says, “Much talk will lead to sin,” an admonition based on Proverbs 10:19. There are specific times and places in which the monks must do their best to be silent: at meals, in the dormitory (Chapter 48) and in the oratory. Apart from praying or chanting The Divine Office, monks are to observe “complete silence” (*sumnum silentium*) while in the oratory (Chapter 52). They may enter the oratory at other times for personal prayer “in secret” (*secretium orare*), but they are not to pray “in a loud voice” (*non in clamosa voce*). When they are eating in the refectory, the monks should observe a deep silence *summo silentio*, giving their attention to *lectio divina*, a continual cycle readings drawn from Scripture and from the Church Fathers (Chapter 38).

In Chapter 42, “Let No One Speak after Compline,” Benedict employs both *silentium* and *taciturnitas*. The monks should endeavor to abide by “this rule of keeping silent” (*hanc taciturnitas regulam*). Yet, there are other times when the silence of the monastery might be broken legitimately: for the reading of scripture, for the sake of hearing confessions, for the business of chapter meetings, for the instruction of novices, for practice in chanting The Psalms, and for helping a fellow brother in need. Even in Trappist monasteries, “there is a special dispensation from the rule of silence for the monks who deal with the abbey livestock when they are actually addressing their dumb charges” (Fermor 1957, 66).

### 7. The Historical Origins of the Right to Remain Silent

Beginning in the year 1215, the Catholic Church sometimes made use of a legal process called *inquisitio* in order to discover whether a person held heretical views or inner thoughts contrary to Church teaching. The inquisitor had very broad powers of discovery, including the ability to question the accused directly in an attempt to force him to confess that he held views that were unauthorized by the Church. In 1252, Pope Innocent IV issued a bull, *Ad extirpanda*, that added torture to that list of powers. If the accused did not reveal enough information about his beliefs to satisfy the inquisitor, the inquisitor was allowed to order that he be tortured. The goal was to extract a confession from the accused that could be used against him. It was legally permissible for the accused to be imprisoned for years in a dark dungeon, in solitary confinement, starved, nearly frozen, and helpless, and then brought to the rack, in an effort to make him given evidence against himself.

While the *inquisitio* thrived on secrecy, judicial proceedings in England were more open to the public, and English judges were much more likely to refrain from using torture. The Star Chamber, however, was a notable exception. Operating under royal prerogative, it began meeting in secret sometime in the fourteenth century. Subsequently, the Star Chamber was responsible for issuing most of the torture warrants in England for three centuries. Its power grew during the reign of Henry VIII. When Henry united church and state under his supreme leadership in 1534, the distinction between heresy and treason disappeared and they were blended into one offense. Whoever disagreed with the king in matters of religion or state policy was in danger of being executed. Many people in England came to resent the power of the Star Chamber, as it was used more and more to suppress religious and political dissent. Just prior to the English Civil War, the Star Chamber was abolished by the Long Parliament (Levy 1968, 281).
Today, most liberal democratic societies have a judicial process that (1) focuses on culpable actions rather than on inner thoughts, and (2) a system in which there are multiple actors with specific roles to play – accuser, prosecutor, defense attorney, judge and jury – since the power of a single inquisitor is deemed too great. The right to remain silent is protected in Canada, for example, under sections 7 and 11(c) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. According to these provisions, no person shall be compelled in a court of law to be a witness against himself.

8. Speaking Up/Remaining Silent: Moral Life in Society

In organizations, employees are sometimes faced with a moral choice that weighs heavily on their consciences. If they have knowledge that someone in their organization has acted in an immoral way, they must decide: Will they speak up about what they have learned, or will they keep on with their work, acting as if they know nothing?

Knoll and van Dick (2013) discuss four forms of employee silence: acquiescent, quiescent, prosocial and opportunistic silence. (1) Acquiescent silence implies that the employee is discouraged and has no expectation that his information will be heard or acted upon by those above him in the organization. Because he has given up hope for improvement, he is not willing to exert the effort to speak up, get involved, or attempt to change the situation (Farrell 1983). (2) Quiescent silence refers to withholding relevant information in order to protect oneself, based on the fear that the consequences of speaking up would be personally unpleasant – being shunned by co-workers, being dismissed, losing the possibility of promotion, and in some cases, risk of physical harm. Fear is the key motive for quiescent silence (Morrison & Milliken 2000). (3) Prosocial silence refers to withholding work-related information with the goal of benefiting other people in the group, based on cooperative motives. A “code of silence” among police officers or a reluctance to reveal information about a company’s flawed consumer product are examples that might be regarded as silence based on a misguided sense of loyalty to the group (Westmarland 2005). (4) Opportunistic silence refers to an employee’s decision to withhold information for more selfish reasons – such as retaining power or status in the organization. Opportunistic silence is essentially a decision to hide or cover up wrongdoing (Connelly 2012).

Yet, some people do find the courage to reveal the truth about wrongdoing in the organizations they have served. In a well-publicized case, Sherron Watkins was the accountant who spoke up about financial fraud at Enron in 2001 (Beenen & Pinto 2009). Integrity, courage, moral outrage and hope that a public stand might make a difference on behalf of others—these considerations help explain why some people decide to become whistleblowers, overcoming the temptation to remain silent.

There are other settings, however, in which silence can be an effective means of protest. South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) provided a forum in which the horrors of apartheid could be brought out into the open. The guiding principle of the TRC was that those who testified about their unjust actions under the former regime would receive immunity from prosecution. Under normal courtroom procedures, the truth about what happened to lost loved ones would never be revealed—that would be one kind of “silence,” the silence of guilt and cover-up. This transitional body, however, was given the task of discovering “antecedent
circumstances, factors and context of gross human rights violations as well as the causes, motives and perspectives of the persons responsible (Motsemme 2004).” Surviving family members and perpetrators might meet face to face, and testimony concerning the truth of the victims’ fate might make it possible to build a new future for South Africa, without the need to settle old scores. Restorative justice would be the ideal, rather than retributive or punitive justice.

Though the Truth and Reconciliation proceedings are typically thought of as a national drama, the women who lost relatives in the violence of the old regime usually told their stories in very personal terms about the hardships and separations their families faced after their loved ones “disappeared.” Mothers often told of how they withheld information from the white policemen when they came to inquire about the whereabouts of their sons—they kept silent, for the sake of their children—a silence of resistance (Motsemme 2004, 915).

The testimony of the mothers of South Africa reveals another use for silence: silence providing the illusion of stability. When older children were no longer at home—because they were fleeing from the special police or because they had been killed—many mothers decided not to speak to the younger children about these absences. They deemed it better carry on as normal for the sake of their younger children, though there was violence going on all around them—a shielding kind of silence, employed by mothers who wanted to carve out an imaginary haven of calmness in the context of their home. In some respects, it was a silence of denial, while in other respects it was a strategy for survival. Otherwise, hope for the future of their younger children might have been lost to fear (Motsemme 2004, 921).

At other points in their testimony before the TRC, women described their recourse to prayer as a way of asking God for new strength, even for the reconstitution of self (Motsemme 2004, 925). In the silence of prayer, they felt free to pour out their grief before God. In the silence of prayer, they could ask God to transform the broken world, to create a new heaven and new earth.

The catalyst for this interdisciplinary reflection was a sense of dissatisfaction with the limitations of The Oxford English Dictionary and the definition it gives for “silence.” It is not that the venerable OED is wrong, but it does not go far enough or deep enough to cover the many possible meanings of silence. Yet, how could any dictionary do that? So, biologists know something about silence, as do physicians, lawyers, psychologists, monks and mothers. There is a time to speak and a time to keep silent, according to Ecclesiastes 3:7, but it may take an uncommonly wise person to discern the difference. And now I will bring this reflection to a close by stating a haunting paradox: we have need of a more sustained dialogue on the meaning of silence.
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1,451,215명에 이르고 있다. 즉 20년 동안 3배 이상 어린이집에 다니는 영유아가 증가하였다고 할 수 있다.

<표1> 2016년 12월 어린이집 연도별 보육아동 현황

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>구분</th>
<th>계</th>
<th>국·공립 어린이집</th>
<th>사회복지법인 어린이집</th>
<th>민간·단체등 어린이집</th>
<th>가정 어린이집</th>
<th>협동 어린이집</th>
<th>직장 어린이집</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,451,215</td>
<td>175,929</td>
<td>99,113</td>
<td>45,374</td>
<td>745,663</td>
<td>328,594</td>
<td>4,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750,122</td>
<td>91,124</td>
<td>52,038</td>
<td>23,638</td>
<td>385,046</td>
<td>168,970</td>
<td>2,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>701,093</td>
<td>84,805</td>
<td>47,075</td>
<td>21,736</td>
<td>360,617</td>
<td>159,624</td>
<td>2,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,452,813</td>
<td>165,743</td>
<td>99,715</td>
<td>46,858</td>
<td>747,598</td>
<td>344,007</td>
<td>4,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750,621</td>
<td>85,961</td>
<td>52,333</td>
<td>24,279</td>
<td>385,507</td>
<td>177,103</td>
<td>2,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>702,192</td>
<td>79,782</td>
<td>47,382</td>
<td>22,579</td>
<td>362,091</td>
<td>166,904</td>
<td>1,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,486,980</td>
<td>154,465</td>
<td>104,552</td>
<td>49,175</td>
<td>775,414</td>
<td>364,113</td>
<td>3,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>768,523</td>
<td>82,306</td>
<td>55,049</td>
<td>25,478</td>
<td>400,579</td>
<td>188,152</td>
<td>2,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>718,457</td>
<td>74,531</td>
<td>51,786</td>
<td>23,697</td>
<td>374,835</td>
<td>177,098</td>
<td>1,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,348,729</td>
<td>149,677</td>
<td>113,049</td>
<td>51,841</td>
<td>706,256</td>
<td>364,113</td>
<td>3,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>769,573</td>
<td>77,321</td>
<td>59,562</td>
<td>26,867</td>
<td>397,270</td>
<td>187,899</td>
<td>1,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>717,788</td>
<td>74,531</td>
<td>51,786</td>
<td>25,478</td>
<td>374,835</td>
<td>176,214</td>
<td>1,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,348,729</td>
<td>143,035</td>
<td>112,688</td>
<td>50,676</td>
<td>706,647</td>
<td>308,410</td>
<td>2,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>699,806</td>
<td>73,850</td>
<td>59,408</td>
<td>26,341</td>
<td>366,164</td>
<td>159,878</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>648,923</td>
<td>69,185</td>
<td>53,280</td>
<td>24,335</td>
<td>340,483</td>
<td>148,532</td>
<td>1,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,279,910</td>
<td>137,604</td>
<td>114,054</td>
<td>51,841</td>
<td>671,891</td>
<td>236,843</td>
<td>1,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>665,905</td>
<td>71,959</td>
<td>60,124</td>
<td>26,846</td>
<td>348,844</td>
<td>146,009</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>614,965</td>
<td>66,409</td>
<td>53,930</td>
<td>24,204</td>
<td>323,047</td>
<td>135,427</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,175,049</td>
<td>123,405</td>
<td>113,894</td>
<td>53,818</td>
<td>615,647</td>
<td>210,438</td>
<td>1,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,135,502</td>
<td>119,141</td>
<td>118,211</td>
<td>55,906</td>
<td>612,484</td>
<td>177,623</td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,099,933</td>
<td>114,657</td>
<td>120,551</td>
<td>58,808</td>
<td>582,329</td>
<td>148,240</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,040,361</td>
<td>111,911</td>
<td>125,820</td>
<td>56,374</td>
<td>552,360</td>
<td>129,007</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>989,390</td>
<td>117,911</td>
<td>130,820</td>
<td>54,374</td>
<td>522,360</td>
<td>119,007</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
영유아교사는 수유, 급·간식, 수면, 청결 등의 양육에 해당되는 돌봄과 각 연령대에 적합한 발달을 도모할 수 있는 적절한 교육적 환경과 성인의 상호작용에 해당하는 교육이 동시에 제공되어야 하는 반달시기라고 할 수 있다. 또한 이시기는 무엇보다도 성인에게 의존하는 정도가 다른 시기보다 절대적으로 높은 몸이 영유아를 돌보는 교사의 자질과 능력이 더욱 필요하다고 할 수 있다.

본 논문에서는 영유아교사가 교사로서 요구되는 자신의 자질과 능력을 충분히 발휘하는 것과 관련된 직무스트레스와 교수효능감 사이의 관계를 알아보고자 한다.


유치원 교사의 직무스트레스를 살펴본 연구에 의하면 교사들이 가장 많은 스트레스를 받는 요인은 업무와 관련된 것이었다. 특히 수업에 필요한 교재의 부족, 수업 준비 시간의 부족, 많은 행사와 임무 등이 스트레스로 비유해요인으로 작용하는 것으로 나타났다(권정해, 2004; 송애란, 1993; 정향림, 2005).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>년도</th>
<th>백분율</th>
<th>높음</th>
<th>중간</th>
<th>낮음</th>
<th>미분류</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>930,522</td>
<td>107,335</td>
<td>135,531</td>
<td>48,414</td>
<td>507,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>858,345</td>
<td>103,474</td>
<td>140,994</td>
<td>37,911</td>
<td>461,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>800,991</td>
<td>103,351</td>
<td>142,035</td>
<td>30,289</td>
<td>425,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>734,192</td>
<td>102,118</td>
<td>161,419</td>
<td>16,483</td>
<td>369,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>686,000</td>
<td>99,666</td>
<td>157,993</td>
<td>15,949</td>
<td>336,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>640,915</td>
<td>99,866</td>
<td>151,652</td>
<td>13,195</td>
<td>301,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>556,957</td>
<td>91,260</td>
<td>141,616</td>
<td>9,290</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>520,959</td>
<td>89,002</td>
<td>123,567</td>
<td>6,727</td>
<td>227,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>403,001</td>
<td>85,121</td>
<td>99,119</td>
<td>2,735</td>
<td>153,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

이와 같이 영유아교사의 직무스트레스와 교수효능감은 실제 영유아교사의 업무 수행과 영유아와의 상호작용의 절에 영향을 미치는 요인이라고 할 수 있다. 따라서 본 연구에서는 영유아교사의 변인에 따른 직무스트레스와 교수효능감의 관계를 알아보고자 한다. 이로써 영유아교사들이 자신의 전문성을 최대한 발휘하여 유효하게 일할 수 있는 여건을 마련하는 기초자료로서 활용될 수 있도록 한다. 본 연구의 연구목적은 다음과 같다.

1. 영유아교사 변인에 따른 직무스트레스는 어떠한가?
2. 영유아교사 변인에 따른 교수효능감은 어떠한가?
3. 영유아교사의 직무스트레스, 교수효능감은 어떤 관계가 있는가?

II. 연구방법

1. 연구대상

본 연구를 위하여 경기도에 위치한 어린이집에 근무 중인 영유아교사를 대상으로 설문지를 배포하였으며, 연구대상은 총 185명으로 연구대상의 배경은 <표2>와 같다.

<표2> 연구대상 영유아교사의 교육경력, 담당 영유아 연령, 학력

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>변인</th>
<th>구분</th>
<th>비도(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>교육경력</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1년 미만</td>
<td>7(3.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1년 이상~3년 미만</td>
<td>26(14.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3년 이상~5년 미만</td>
<td>24(13.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5년 이상~10년 미만</td>
<td>76(41.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10년 이상</td>
<td>52(28.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>담당 영유아 연령</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>영아</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한 0세</td>
<td>131(70.8)</td>
<td>22(11.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한 1세</td>
<td>52(28.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한 2세</td>
<td>57(30.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>유아</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한 3세</td>
<td>54(29.2)</td>
<td>22(11.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한 4세</td>
<td>17(9.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한 5세</td>
<td>15(8.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>학력</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>고졸</td>
<td>63(34.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>전문대졸</td>
<td>87(47.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>대졸이상</td>
<td>35(18.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<표2>와 같이 연구대상 교사의 교육경력은 1년 미만이 7명(3.8%), 1년 이상~3년 미만이 26명(14.1%), 3년 이상~5년 미만이 24명(13.0%), 5년 이상~10년 미만이 76명(41.1%), 10년 이상이 52명(28.1%)로 나타났다. 담당 영유아 연령은 영아가 131명(70.8%), 유아가 54명(29.2%)이었다. 연구대상 교사의 학력은 고졸이 63명(34.1%), 전문대졸이 87명(47.0%), 대졸이상이 35명(18.9%)로 나타났다.

2. 연구도구
1) 직무스트레스


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>하위요인</th>
<th>문항번호</th>
<th>문항수</th>
<th>신뢰도</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>유아들과의 활동요인</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>업무관련요인</td>
<td>6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>행정적 지원요인</td>
<td>15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>대인관계요인</td>
<td>23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>경제적 안정요인</td>
<td>34,35,36,37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>개인관련요인</td>
<td>36,37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>계</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) 교수효능감


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>하위요인</th>
<th>내용</th>
<th>문항수</th>
<th>신뢰도</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>일반교수효능감</td>
<td>교사가 영유아에게 영향을 미칠 수 있다고 생각하는 영역</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>개인교수효능감</td>
<td>교사 자신이 잘 할 수 있는지에 대한 자신감</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>계</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. 연구절차

본 연구의 자료수집은 2017년 5~6월에 진행되었다. 경기도에 소재한 어린이집 교사 중 보수교육과
승급교육에 참여한 교사에게 질문지를 배포하고 작성 후 그 자리에 곧바로 회수하였다. 총 200부 중 담변에 누락이 있어 사용될 수 없는 질문지를 제외한 185부가 자료분석에 사용되었다. 질문지는 영유아교사의 일반적 배경을 묻는 질문을 포함하여 영유아교사의 일반적인 변인, 직무스트레스, 교수효능감을 묻는 질문으로 구성되어 있다.

4. 자료분석

수집된 자료는 SPSS 12.0 for WIN 프로그램을 이용하여 다음과 같은 방법으로 분석되었다. 영유아교사의 직무스트레스, 교수효능감은 기술통계를 사용하여 각각의 하위요인별 평균과 표준편차를 구하였다. 영유아교사의 일반적 배경에 따른 직무스트레스와 교수효능감의 차이를 알아보기 위해 독립변인 t 검증과 일원배치분산분석(ANOVA)을 사용하였다. 마지막으로 직무스트레스와 교수효능감과의 관계를 알아보기 위하여 이변량 상관계수를 구하였다.

III. 연구결과 및 해석

1. 영유아교사 변인에 따른 직무스트레스

영유아교사의 직무스트레스 하위요인별 평균과 표준편차는 다음과 같다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>변수</th>
<th>하위요인</th>
<th>평균</th>
<th>표준편차</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>직무스트레스</td>
<td>유아들과의 활동요인</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>업무관련요인</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>행정적 지원요인</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>대인관계요인</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>경제적 안정요인</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>개인관련요인</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>계</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

영유아교사의 직무스트레스는 2.16(.44)이었다. 하위요인별로 살펴보면 업무관련요인의 스트레스가 2.49로 가장 높았으며 대인관계요인은 1.91로 가장 낮았다.
다음은 경력에 따른 직무스트레스의 평균과 표준편차, 그리고 경력별로 직무스트레스에 차이가 있는지 독립변인 t 검증을 실시한 결과이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>변수</th>
<th>하위요인</th>
<th>경력 0~3년 (n=33)</th>
<th>경력 3년 이상 (n=152)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>직무스트레스</td>
<td>유아들과의 활동요인</td>
<td>2.31(.41)</td>
<td>2.20(.46)</td>
<td>1.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>업무관련요인</td>
<td>2.39(.41)</td>
<td>2.51(.54)</td>
<td>-1.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>행정적 지원요인</td>
<td>2.14(.52)</td>
<td>2.20(.66)</td>
<td>-.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>대인관계요인</td>
<td>1.98(.44)</td>
<td>1.89(.53)</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>경제적 안정요인</td>
<td>2.09(.55)</td>
<td>2.05(.63)</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>개인관련요인</td>
<td>2.01(.55)</td>
<td>2.07(.68)</td>
<td>-.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>계</td>
<td>2.16(.33)</td>
<td>2.16(.46)</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
영유아교사의 경력별 직무스트레스는 경력 3년 미만의 교사와 3년 이상의 교사 사이에 평균 2.16으로 차이가 없는 것으로 나타났다. 직무스트레스의 하위요인별로 살펴본 결과 역시 3년 미만의 교사와 3년 이상의 교사 사이에 유의한 차이가 나타나지 않았다. 다만 '유아들과의 활동요인', '대인관계요인', '경제적 안정요인'에서 3년 미만의 교사들이 유의하지는 않지만 직무스트레스를 더 느끼는 것으로, '업무관련요인', '행정적 지원요인', '개인관계요인'에서 3년 이상의 교사가 직무스트레스를 더 느끼는 것으로 나타났다.

다음은 영유아교사의 담당 영유아 연령에 따른 직무스트레스의 차이를 알아본 결과이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>하위요인</th>
<th>영아담당(n=131) 평균(표준편차)</th>
<th>유아담당(n=54) 평균(표준편차)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>업무관련요인</td>
<td>2.14(.50)</td>
<td>2.26(.45)</td>
<td>-1.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>행정적 지원요인</td>
<td>2.19(.69)</td>
<td>2.17(.60)</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>대인관계요인</td>
<td>1.84(.50)</td>
<td>1.92(.54)</td>
<td>-1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>경제적 안정요인</td>
<td>2.09(.63)</td>
<td>2.01(.62)</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>개인관계요인</td>
<td>2.10(.69)</td>
<td>2.03(.64)</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>계</td>
<td>2.12(.46)</td>
<td>2.17(.43)</td>
<td>-.724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

영유아교사의 담당 영유아 연령별 직무스트레스는 영아담당 교사와 유아담당 교사 사이에 각각 평균 2.12와 2.17로 유의한 차이가 없는 것으로 나타났으나 유아담당 교사의 직무스트레스가 좀 더 높은 것으로 나타났다. 직무스트레스의 하위요인별로 살펴본 결과 역시 영아담당 교사와 유아담당 교사 사이에 유의한 차이가 나타나지 않았다. 다만 '행정적 지원요인', '경제적 안정요인', '개인관계요인'에서 영아담당 교사들이 유의하지는 않지만 직무스트레스를 더 느끼는 것으로, '유아들과의 활동요인', '업무관련요인', '대인관계요인'에서 유아담당 교사가 직무스트레스를 더 느끼는 것으로 나타났다.

다음은 영유아교사의 학력에 따른 직무스트레스의 차이를 알아본 결과이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>변수</th>
<th>하위요인</th>
<th>고졸(n=63) 평균(표준편차)</th>
<th>전문대졸(n=87) 평균(표준편차)</th>
<th>대졸이상(n=35) 평균(표준편차)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>직무스트레스</td>
<td>유아들과의 활동요인</td>
<td>2.14(.50)</td>
<td>2.32(.39)</td>
<td>2.34(.49)</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>업무관련요인</td>
<td>2.33(.53)</td>
<td>2.51(.47)</td>
<td>2.72(.56)</td>
<td>1.708**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>행정적 지원요인</td>
<td>2.11(.68)</td>
<td>2.22(.57)</td>
<td>2.25(.71)</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>대인관계요인</td>
<td>1.83(.55)</td>
<td>1.92(.44)</td>
<td>2.02(.62)</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>경제적 안정요인</td>
<td>2.03(.62)</td>
<td>2.07(.59)</td>
<td>2.10(.66)</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>개인관계요인</td>
<td>1.94(.66)</td>
<td>2.12(.61)</td>
<td>2.12(.75)</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>계</td>
<td>2.06(.49)</td>
<td>2.18(.37)</td>
<td>2.28(.51)</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01

영유아의 교사의 학력별 직무스트레스는 고졸, 전문대졸, 대졸이상의 평균이 각각 2.06, 2.18, 2.28로 유의한 차이가 없었으나 대졸이상이 가장 높고, 전문대졸, 고졸의 순으로 나타났다. 하위요인별로 살펴보면 '업무관련요인'에서 유의한 차이가 나타났는데 대졸이상이 2.72로 가장 높고, 전문대졸 2.51, 고졸 2.33으로 나타났다(F=1.708, p<.01). '업무관련요인' 이외의 하위요인에서는 유의한 차이가 나타나지 않았으나 모든 하위요인에서 대졸이상의 직무스트레스가 가장 높고 고졸의 직무스트레스가 가장 낮은 것으로 나타났다.
2. 영유아교사 변인에 따른 교수효능감

영유아교사의 교수효능감의 하위요인별 평균과 표준편차는 다음과 같다.

<표9> 영유아교사의 교수효능감에 대한 평균과 표준편차

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>변인</th>
<th>하위요인</th>
<th>평균</th>
<th>표준편차</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>교수효능감</td>
<td>일반교수효능감</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>개인교수효능감</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>계</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

영유아교사의 교수효능감은 2.93이었다. 하위요인별로 살펴보면 일반교수효능감은 2.90, 개인교수효능감은 2.95로 비슷하게 나타났다. 다음은 경력에 따른 교수효능감의 평균과 표준편차, 그리고 경력별로 교수효능감에 차이가 있는지 독립변인 t 검증을 실시한 결과이다.

<표10> 영유아교사의 경력에 따른 교수효능감의 평균, 표준편차와 독립변인 t 검증

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>변인</th>
<th>하위요인</th>
<th>3년 미만 (n=33)</th>
<th>3년 이상 (n=152)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>교수효능감</td>
<td>일반교수효능감</td>
<td>2.82(27)</td>
<td>2.92(31)</td>
<td>-1.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>개인교수효능감</td>
<td>2.83(32)</td>
<td>2.98(33)</td>
<td>-2.252*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>계</td>
<td>2.82(25)</td>
<td>2.95(26)</td>
<td>-2.525**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.01, ** p<.05

영유아교사의 경력별 교수효능감은 경력 3년 미만의 교사와 3년 이상의 교사 사이 평균이 각각 2.82, 2.95로 경력 3년 이상 교사의 교수효능감이 유의하게 높게 나타났다 (t = -2.525, p<.01). 교수효능감의 하위요인별로 살펴본 결과 일반교수효능감은 3년 미만이 2.82, 3년 이상이 2.92로 유의하지는 않지만 3년 이상 영유아교사의 평균이 높았다. 개인교수효능감의 경우 3년 미만의 교사와 3년 이상의 교사 사이의 평균이 각각 2.83과 2.98로 3년 이상의 교사의 개인교수효능감이 유의하게 높게 나타났다 (t = -2.252, p<.05).

다음은 영유아교사의 담당 영유아 연령에 따른 교수효능감의 차이를 알아본 결과이다.

<표11> 영유아교사의 담당 영유아 연령에 따른 교수효능감 평균, 표준편차와 독립변인 t 검증

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>변인</th>
<th>하위요인</th>
<th>영아담당 (n=131)</th>
<th>유아담당 (n=54)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>교수효능감</td>
<td>일반교수효능감</td>
<td>2.94(30)</td>
<td>2.89(31)</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>개인교수효능감</td>
<td>2.97(34)</td>
<td>2.95(33)</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>계</td>
<td>2.95(27)</td>
<td>2.92(25)</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
영유아교사의 담당 영유아 연령에 따른 교수효능감은 영아담당 교사와 유아담당 교사 사이 평균이 각각 2.95, 2.92로 유의하지 않지만 영아담당 교사의 교수효능감이 높게 나타났다. 교수효능감의 하위요인별로 살펴본 결과 일반교수효능감은 영아담당교사가 2.94, 유아담당 교사가 2.89로 유의하지는 않지만 영아담당 교사의 평균이 높았다. 개인교수효능감의 경우 영아담당 교사와 유아담당 교사 사이의 평균이 각각 2.97과 2.95로 유의하지 않지만 영아담당 교사의 개인교수효능감이 높게 나타났다.

다음은 영유아교사의 학력에 따른 교수효능감 차이를 알아본 결과이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>변인</th>
<th>하위요인</th>
<th>고졸(n=63) 평균</th>
<th>전문대졸(n=87) 평균</th>
<th>대졸이상(n=35) 평균</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>교수</td>
<td>일반교수효능감</td>
<td>2.94(.26)</td>
<td>2.88(.31)</td>
<td>2.90(.36)</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>효과</td>
<td>개인교수효능감</td>
<td>2.99(.34)</td>
<td>2.93(.34)</td>
<td>2.92(.26)</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>계</td>
<td>2.96(.24)</td>
<td>2.96(.28)</td>
<td>2.91(.25)</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

영유아교사의 학력에 따른 교수효능감은 학력에 따른 유의한 차이가 없었다. 교수효능감의 평균은 고졸 2.96, 전문대졸 2.96, 대졸이상 2.91로 나타났다. 교수효능감의 하위요인별로 살펴본 결과 일반교수효능감은 고졸 2.94, 전문대졸 2.88, 대졸이상 2.90, 개인교수효능감은 고졸 2.99, 전문대졸 2.93, 대졸이상 2.92로 전반적으로 대졸이상보다 고졸 교사의 교수효능감이 유의하지는 않지만 높게 나타났다.

3. 영유아교사의 직무스트레스와 교수효능감과의 관계

영유아교사의 직무스트레스와 교수효능감 사이에 어떠한 관계가 있는지 알아본 결과는 <표13>과 같다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>직무스트레스</th>
<th></th>
<th>교수효능감</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. 유아들과의 활동</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 업무관련</td>
<td>.548***</td>
<td>.283***</td>
<td>.082*</td>
<td>.189*</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.190*</td>
<td>.178*</td>
<td>.219*</td>
<td>.164*</td>
<td>.188*</td>
<td>.178*</td>
<td>.508***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 행정적지원</td>
<td>.554***</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>.092*</td>
<td>.198*</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td>.185*</td>
<td>.314**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.231*</td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td>.500***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 개인관계</td>
<td>.573***</td>
<td>.409***</td>
<td>.096*</td>
<td>.199*</td>
<td>.495**</td>
<td>.190*</td>
<td>.181*</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>.226*</td>
<td>.225*</td>
<td>.496**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. 경제적인안정</td>
<td>.300***</td>
<td>.504***</td>
<td>.094*</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.180*</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.317**</td>
<td>.227*</td>
<td>.234*</td>
<td>.497**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. 일반</td>
<td>.430***</td>
<td>.488***</td>
<td>.098*</td>
<td>.204*</td>
<td>.579***</td>
<td>.195*</td>
<td>.178*</td>
<td>.546***</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>.233*</td>
<td>.235*</td>
<td>.504***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. 개인</td>
<td>.723***</td>
<td>.814***</td>
<td>.083*</td>
<td>.201*</td>
<td>.883***</td>
<td>.195*</td>
<td>.180*</td>
<td>.849***</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>.230*</td>
<td>.236*</td>
<td>.511***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. 계</td>
<td>.606***</td>
<td>.684***</td>
<td>.096*</td>
<td>.207*</td>
<td>.606***</td>
<td>.197*</td>
<td>.180*</td>
<td>.683***</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>.230*</td>
<td>.231*</td>
<td>.469***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

영유아교사의 직무스트레스와 교수효능감은 부적인 상관관계가 있는 것으로 나타났다(r=-.187, p<.01). 교수효능감 중 일반교수효능감은 직무스트레스와 유의한 상관관계가 없었다. 그러나 교수효능감
중 개인교수효능감은 직무스트레스의 '유아들과의 활동'(r = -.344, p < .001), '업무관련'(r = -.221, p < .01), '행정적지침'(r = -.226, p < .01), '대인관계'(r = -.208, p < .01), '개인관련'(r = -.253, p < .001) 요인과 부적인 상관관계가 있었다. 교수효능감 전체와는 직무스트레스의 '유아들과의 활동'(r = -.283, p < .001), '업무관련'(r = -.164, p < .05), '개인관련'(r = -.151, p < .05) 요인에서 부적인 상관관계가 있는 것으로 나타났다.

IV. 논의 및 결론

영유아교사의 교육과 직무스트레스, 교수효능감과의 관계를 알아보는 결과 대체적으로 유의한 관계가 있는 것으로 나타났다.


반면 영유아교사의 직무스트레스 중 대인관계요인, 경제적 안정요인, 개인관련요인은 상대적으로 낮은 결과를 보였다. 영유아교육기관은 대부분 작은 규모로 운영되며 구성원의 대부분이 여성으로 이루어져 있는 점을 감안할 때 동료나 원장과의 대인관계에 대한 스트레스가 높을 경우 이직을 고려할 정도의 심각한 스트레스가 될 수 있다. 그러나 본 연구에서 나타난 바에 의하면 영유아교사들이 대인관계 요인에서 덜 스트레스를 받으며 경제적, 개인 관련 요인에서 안정된 상태라는 점에서 긍정적이라고 할 수 있다.

다음으로 영유아교사의 경력, 담당 영유아 연령, 학력에 따른 직무스트레스의 차이를 알아보는 결과


교사의 직무스트레스는 적어도 그로써 직무만족도가 상승하고 교수효능감도 효과적으로 상승할 수 있다. 직무스트레스가 경력, 담당 영유아 연령에서의 차이가 없었으나 학력이 높을수록 직무스트레스 차수가 높다는 것을 유의하여 살펴보 필요가 있다. 학력이 높을수록 직무스트레스가 높은 이유로 학력이 높은 교사의 경우 점 높은 수업에 대한 요구가 많은 반면 적절한 지원이 이루어지지 않음에 대하여 스트레스가 높게 나타났을 수도 있다. 또한 이유로 영유아교육기관에서 학력이 높은 교사에게 파다한 행정적인 업무가 주어졌을때 파다한 스트레스를 겪게 된 것은 아님에 대해 연기한 주의가 필요하다고 할 수 있다.

다음으로 영유아교사의 교수효능감은 살펴본 결과 영유아교사의 교수효능감은 대체적으로 4점 만점에 2점에 2점을 넘는 평균보다 약간 높은 정도의 스트레스를 받고 있는 것으로 나타났으며 일반교수효능감과 개인교수효능감의 차이는 크지 않았다. 영유아교사의 교육과 관련 교수효능감에 차이가 있는지 알아본 결과 영유아교사의 경력에 따라 교수효능감에 차이가 있었던 반면 영유아 연령과 학력에서는 유의한 차이가 나타나지 않았다.

영유아교사의 경력이 3년 이상으로 높을수록 교수효능감이 높았으며 특히 개인교수효능감이 높게 나타났다. 개인교수효능감은 '교사로서 자신이 얼마나 잘하고 있는지에 대한 스스로의 평가'로 영유아교사들은 경력이 높을수록 스스로가 잘하고 있다고 생각하는 것으로 볼 수 있다. 육계숙 외(2011)의 연구에 의하면 교사의 교수효능감은 경력이 높을수록, 담당성과의 연령이 낮을수록 높게 나타났다. 본 연구에서와 같이 교사의 교수효능감에 영향을 미치는 교사의 교육과 경력으로 교사의 경력이 일관되게 긍정적인 영향을 미치는 것으로 나타난다. 영유아교육의 경우 이론적인 지식보다 중요하지만 실제 영유아와 생활하면서 얻게 되는 경력교사로서의 실제적 지식이 증가함에 따라 실제 가르치는 내용과 방법 등에서 교사의 교수효능감이 높아진다고 할 수 있다. 즉 교사의 경력이 높아진에
직무스트레스와 교수효능감의 관계를 알아보면 결과 직무스트레스가 높을수록 교수효능감은 낮은 것으로 나타났다. 특히 직무스트레스가 높을수록 개인교수효능감이 낮은 것으로 나타났다. 영유아교사의 교수효능감의 경우 일반교수효능감과 개인교수효능감은 비슷하게 나타났는데도 불구하고 직무스트레스가 일반교수효능감보다 개인교수효능감에 더욱 영향을 미치는 것으로 나타났다. 즉 영유아교사의 경우 스트레스가 많을수록 교사로서 자신이 잘 할 수 있다고 생각하지 않는 것으로 생각한다고 할 수 있다. 이러한 직무스트레스가 교사의 교수효능감에 부정적인 영향을 미치므로 교사의 직무스트레스를 감소시킬 수 있는 방안을 모색해야 할 필요가 있다.

영유아교사의 경우 직무스트레스의 '경제적 안정'을 제외한 '유아들과의 활동', '업무관리','행정적 지원','대인관계','개인관리' 하위요인이 높음을수록 개인교수효능감이 낮아지는 부적 관련이 있었다. 또한 직무스트레스의 '유아들과의 활동', '업무관리'이 높음을수록 교수효능감 전체와 부적 관련이 있었다. '유아들과의 활동'과 '업무관리'는 다른 하위요익보다 영유아교사의 주요업무에 해당되는 것으로 교사들에게 지원이 필요한 부분이고 교수효능감에도 부정적인 영향을 미치므로 더욱 유아들과의 활동과 업무관련에서 교사들이 어려움을 받지 않도록 지원하는 것이 필요하다.

본 연구의 결론 및 제언은 다음과 같다.

첫째, 영유아교사는 평균보다 약간 높은 정도의 직무스트레스를 경험하고 있었다. 특히 업무관리 요인과 영유아 활동 관련 요인에서 상대적으로 높은 스트레스를 받고 있었으며 교사의 학력이 높음을수록 업무관련요인에서 스트레스가 높았다. 따라서 영유아교사의 업무관련 요인에 해당하는 스트레스를 낮출 수 있는 서류작업의 간소화, 행정업무 간소화 등의 방안이 필요하다고 할 수 있다.

둘째, 영유아교사의 교수효능감은 평균보다 약간 높았으며, 특히 경력이 많을수록 개인교수효능감이 높은 것으로 나타났다. 따라서 영유아교사의 교수효능감을 높이기 위해 경력이 많은 교사들이 가지는 실제적 지식을 활용할 수 있는 현장에서의 업무수행지식에 관한 재교육을 통하여 교사의 교수효능감을 높일 수 있는 방안을 모색할 필요가 있다.

셋째, 영유아교사의 직무스트레스와 교수효능감은 여러 연구에서와 마찬가지로 부정적인 상관계가 있는 것으로 나타났다. 직무스트레스와 교수효능감은 영유아 교사의 가르치고 돌보는데 있어서 실제적인 영향을 미치므로 이를 개선할 수 있는 연구가 계속적으로 필요하다.
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Euzhan Palcy: Resistance and Empowerment through Film

Elizabeth Johnson, Indiana University Northwest and
Donald Culverston, Governors State University

Abstract: Director Euzhan Palcy continually challenges conventional ways of seeing the struggles of African Diaspora people in films like *Sugar Cane Alley* (based on Joseph Zobel’s book *Black Shack Alley*) and *A Dry White Season* (Andre Brink’s novel of the same title). Palcy brings an understanding of the depths and dignity of collective resistance in Martinique and South Africa respectively during the colonial and post-colonial eras. Rather than essentialize female characters from these novels, Palcy draws from gender relationships to construct new visions of empowerment for men and women. This paper uses intersectionality theory and comparative historical analysis to explore Palcy’s process of converting books-to-films, how her films present new ways to frame female experiences, and how they expand female visibility and inclusion. This is accomplished by comparing four other books-to-film examples to legitimize the fidelity of the films to its source material since it is often unlikely that the viewers of the films have read the books.

There are few times that films arising from books add new dimensions for a viewer. When it does occur, it is due primarily to creative use of a filmmaker’s tools to enhance the book’s major themes. Director Euzhan Palcy continually challenges conventional ways of seeing struggles of African diaspora people in films like *Sugar Cane Alley*¹ (based on Joseph Zobel’s book *Black Shack Alley*) and *A Dry White Season*² (Andre Brink’s novel of the same title). Palcy brings an understanding of the depths and dignity of collective resistance in Martinique and South Africa respectively during the colonial and post-colonial eras. Rather than essentialize female characters from these novels, Palcy draws from gender relationships to construct new visions of empowerment for men and women.

Intersectionality theory and comparative historical analysis can be used to explore Palcy’s process of converting books into films, how her films present new ways to frame female experiences, and how they expand female visibility and inclusion.³ Intersectionality theory is useful because it provides a theoretical foundation for situating the experiences of groups ordinarily confined to the margins of societies. Similarly, historical comparative analysis, influenced by the writings of film scholar and sociologist Pierre Sorlin, affords a foundation to study the merit of films in not only a historical/era perspective, but also in how film communicates to viewers’ meanings of cultural attitudes, biases and understandings of populations and atmospheres. Said another way, it helps to understand the historical realism conveyed in visual and audible cues given in films.⁴ Combining these two approaches provides readers with tools for dissecting the complexity of marginalized experiences, while at the same time understanding the historical economic plights, geographic spaces and diversities of being black and female. Based on these aforementioned premises, such tools offer constructive channels for considering how Palcy’s films interpose male-dominated narratives to shed light on the different ways that women experience violence and oppression, as well as on the transformative power of female roles.

Palcy’s films can be used as templates for critically viewing struggles within African diaspora settings. They reveal attention to four areas: a) systems of racial inequality, b) centering the role of gender in struggles against injustice, c) exploration of landscapes as elements of oppression, and d) use of the body as a text for understanding and reacting to oppression. Palcy offers engaging stories about individuals struggling against domination, but each of those characters is

---

¹ This was Euzhan Palcy’s first film. It was made in 1983 and won 17 international awards (Demissie 2008, 101).
² This was Palcy’s second film made in 1989 where actor Marlon Brando, the lawyer, Ian McKenzie, seeks justice for a murder by the police labeled a suicide. It was nominated for several best supporting role awards (*A Dry White Season*). What makes this film a feather in Palcy’s cap is that it won her recognition as the first black female to direct a film for a major American studio—*Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc.* (MGM).
³ This is part of Kimberlé Crenshaw’s definition of intersectionality theory in “Why Intersectionality Can’t Wait.”
⁴ French sociologist Pierre Sorlin has written seven books on film history and numerous articles and chapters on history and criticism of the performing arts. While much of his work focuses on Europe, he does address many films made in the United States and their reception by American audiences.
symbolic of broader relationships. Also, in her films, women and girls, even when playing secondary roles, are indispensable for explaining systems of oppression. Thirdly, Palcy uses different landscapes to demonstrate the comprehensiveness of inequality, as well as to explore reactions to it. Fourthly, she exhibits the body, in all of its ages, genders and physical conditions, as a text for revealing and resisting oppression. Overall, the complexity of Palcy’s films invites reimaging of emancipatory possibilities across diaspora communities.

Adapting a book to film may seem straightforward, but seldom, if ever, is it a simple linear process. Books and films use different methods for telling stories, and the strengths of one don’t easily translate to the other. A book may use shifts in narrative voices or points of view, while moving easily back and forth between action and interior exploration. Filmmakers often face the challenges of compressing 300 or more pages of a book into two hours of film, or around 120 pages of screenplay. A film relies on imagery, dialogue and action, all of which necessitate abbreviation of the book. Moreover, the costs of making films are so much higher, and engage configurations of finance, labor, technical expertise, promotion and artistry that can breakdown at any moment. Some of the risks are offset when either the book or film contain substantial equity that might enhance the prospect that portions of the films budget can be recouped, if not make a profit. Equity dividends pay off when the loyal followers of the author of the book, or the fans of the director or actor/s, have vested interests in a successful merging, thus forming a built-in audience for the film. While the anticipations of those respective audiences can rationalize adaptation, there is no guarantee that one, or both of them, will not be disappointed when the final product materializes.5

Book-to-film translations take on even greater risks when the subject matter and its central characters emerge from stories conventionally marginalized by mainstream film industries. The presentation of characters that defy stereotypes, shedding light on unfamiliar landscapes, exposing parallels between legitimate and illegitimate practices, as well as detailed description of violence, may prove difficult to keep within the boundaries of conventional cinematic production. As a result of these effective narrative strategies, numerous books remain “in development” with major movie studios, indicating that a movie project is highly unlikely to be completed. And for those that make it through the gauntlet of marketability, the final project may entail significant revisions made for the sake of simplicity and pacing that make it unrecognizable to devoted readers of the book, and frequently to its author. Examining four African American-themed films illustrates the challenges of framing black life in ways that can increase the likelihood of box office or television success.

Four films of interest are: Their Eyes Were Watching God (2005), A Raisin in the Sun (2008), Precious (2009) from the book Push (1997), and For Colored Girls (2010) from the book For Colored Girls Who Have Considered Suicide: When the Rainbow is Enuf (1977). A common theme in each is the intersectionality of black women’s struggles that offer windows into how they are constructed and interpreted by mainstream film industries. Additionally, storylines revolve around black women characters who struggled to overcome institutionalized barriers within the household, as well as outside.

5 Keaton 2012, 123-24.
The differences center on the timeframes of the book’s settings, along with common challenges facing black communities in each era. For example, *Their Eyes* was based on the classic 1937 book. Similarly, *A Raisin* and *For Colored Girls* emerged from popular plays of the early 1950s and early 1970s respectively. *Push*, the only twenty-first-century book, deals with a teenager’s coming of age, as opposed to the other films that focus on women in their early 30s. The common thread in all of these books is black women at different stages of finding voice and agency. This speaks to the complexity of black women’s experiences.

Zora Neale Hurston’s 1937 novel, *Their Eyes Were Watching God*, is widely accepted as a seminal work for giving voice to black women and gender issues. Hurston’s masterpiece celebrates the rich diversity of black experiences incorporating race, class and gender. Its use of multiple narrative voices enables readers to understand how the past and present were intertwined in shaping the early twentieth-century rural southern landscape negotiated by black women. The 2005 two-hour made-for-television American Broadcasting Company (ABC) film of the same name adheres to the plot of the novel, but its omission of major characters and events denies the audience opportunities to appreciate its social and political complexity. Emphasis on the love and marriage of Janie, the central character, glosses over significant issues of race, class and gender that frame Hurston’s book. The focus on her personal growth as a human being leaves little room for considering how Janie’s journey through the rough terrain of obstacles reflects black women’s efforts to develop agency and voice. For example, marriage is culturally constructed expectation of women and an aspired destination, but for Janie’s marriages are more connected to isolation and suffocation of her life journey.

Similarly, the 2007 remake of *A Raisin in the Sun* for ABC, replicates the themes of Lorraine Hansberry’s play, as well as the 1961 film. As with its predecessors, the film illuminates the competing visions of pursuit of the good life, along with the accompanying defenses of those preferences by blacks in the first few decades of the post-World War II era. Walter Lee Younger, the man of the house, wants to use the anticipated money from an insurance policy to open a business, while his mother Lena wants to buy a house for the family to escape their cramped apartment, and Beneatha, his sister prefers to put some money aside to pay for her medical school education. The 2007 film adds a few scenes set outside the Younger’s Chicago apartment to illustrate how pervasive racial discrimination is on black life. However, the updated version fails to shed light on key dimensions of Hansberry’s play that would likely resonate more with contemporary audiences than with those of the early-1960s. The first is the rising voice of black feminism. Each of the lead female characters strategically challenges Walter Lee’s forcefully argued, yet ill-conceived notions of progress.

The assertiveness of these women raises questions about who should control three areas of black life: the family, a woman’s body and relationships with the diaspora. Hansberry’s exploration into the latter issue was best illustrated in Beneatha’s contrasting suitors, George Murchison, the son of a wealthy business owner, and Joseph Asagai, a Nigerian student who supports

---

6 Comb’s approach toward the character was one-dimensional as an angry, driven black man. By contrast, Phylisha Rashad, Audra McDonald and Sana Lathan, were outstanding in their roles, and in refining aspects of the 1961 characters to heighten the centrality of gender in family relations. The 2007 version allows too much space for Walter Lee at the expense of telling a fuller story about the black family, which can be viewed as a surrogate for the community.
Beneatha’s efforts in challenging Western myths about Africa. George simply wants to continue the assimilationist-driven wealth accumulation path of his father, while Joseph endorses Beneatha’s aspirations to become a doctor and invites her to return to Africa as his wife. Despite the problems with the film, it succeeds in its depiction of the early-postwar frontiers of racial conflict. Yet, more sensitivity to gender relations could have yielded a more far-reaching film.

In 1982, American Playhouse released Ntozake Shange’s play version of *For Colored Girls Who Have Considered Suicide: When the Rainbow is Enuf*. This production features many up-and-coming black actresses, including: Alfre Woodard, Lynn Whitfield, Trazana Beverly, Laurie Carlos, Crystal Lilly and Sarita Allen. It is the story of six women, in poem form, that opened on Broadway in 1976 as a choreopoem before the book was released in 1977. Each of these women is identified by a color instead of a name (e.g. lady in red, lady in brown, lady in yellow, etc.). By using colors instead of names, viewers associate the obstacles the women face, such as domestic violence, rape, loss and abandonment, with their color and are able to envision effective responses. For example, in one scene, the lady in blue went through the trauma of an abortion. By using the blue color, instead of a name, the intensity of the experience is heightened and allows the viewer to focus on the multiple dimensions of a life-changing—before, during and after.

The film *Precious*, based on the novel *Push*, was praised as the “Best Picture of 2009” by *Rolling Stone magazine*. It tells the story of Precious Jones, a Harlem teenager who faces the tragedies of sexual, physical, and verbal abuse from her mother and father. The incestuous relationship between Precious and her father led to two children – the first, a female with Down syndrome and the second, a male who may be infected with the HIV/AIDS virus. In spite of these obstacles, Precious overcomes illiteracy, homelessness, and incest recovery, while battling the HIV/AIDS virus transmitted by her father.

One major difference in Sapphire’s book *Push* from the film is that, in the former, Precious is forced to perform sexual acts on both her father and mother, on separate occasions. Made clear in *Push*, Precious’ mother chastised Precious for “taking her man” and thus Precious is required to please the Mother sexually – instead of the father. Viewers cheer on Precious as she finds the courage to leave home and raise her children away from her mother, courage that she gets from her enlightened alternative high school. Filmmaker Lee Daniels does an excellent job of helping viewers see the obstacles confronting Precious in battling morbid obesity, incest survival, and using journaling as a means of gaining inner strength.

Underscoring the rough subject matter in these films that emerged from books is a segue toward understanding strategic interventions in the books-to-film process, as well as to highlight the importance of intersectionality theory and historical comparative analysis as tools for reading films. What one can see in the comparison of the four films, and what serves as the groundwork for understanding the reading of Paley’s films is to legitimize the fidelity of the film to its source materials, when is it highly unlikely that the viewers of the films have read the books.\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) *A Dry White Season* was first released in the United States as a book in 1980 and then reprinted in 2006. At the time of its initial release, the *New York Times* gave the book a “Notable Book of the Year Award.” But the movie was not released until 1989 and the DVD version later in 2005. In addition, *Black Shack Alley* was initially written in French and translated into English in 1980 and is the inspiration for the film *Sugar Cane Alley*, which premiered in
Intersectionality Theory and Historical Comparative Analysis

Intersectionality theory emerged as a way of understanding the overlap or intersections between social identity development and systems of oppression. It is widely used in the social sciences and cultural studies to explore how different power structures interact in the lives of marginal groups, specifically black women (Thornton Dill and Zambrana 2009, 2; Adewunmi 2014). Another explanation constructs intersectionality as a system of study whereby race, class, gender, sexuality, religion, ethnicity, and age are examined to see how the intersections of any social status meet and impact individual lives (Castiello Jones, Misra, and McCurley 2013). Yet another way of defining intersectionality is as a tool for analysis, advocacy, and policy development that addresses multiple discriminations, and helps one understand how different sets of identities impact on creating access to rights and opportunities (Symington 2004). All of these approaches help to challenge overly simplistic ways of examining race as a category by emphasizing the complexity of all identity categories. The choice to highlight intercategorical complexity of intersectionality affords readers insight into the complicated nature of lived experiences.

This paper takes an intercategorical approach to intersectionality theory, similar to what Leslie McCall explains to document relationships of inequality among social groups and changing configurations of inequality along multiple and conflicting dimension (McCall 2005, 173). One way of understanding intercategorical complexity is looking at black communities during Reconstruction. For example, since black men had the right to vote, but black women didn’t, debates, conventions, and conferences consisting of males and females explored how the men should exercise their votes, which effectively transferred ownership of votes from individuals to the community (Austin 2015, 25). Men acquired some degree of power because, as legal possessors of votes, their civic and personal value increased within their communities.

An example of intersectionality theory is seen in the works of Fog. Filmmaker Chelsea Woods uses social media as a follow-up in educating the audiences on topics presented in her short films. For example, Fog focuses on the mental health issues (specifically depression and anxiety) of Valerie, a black attorney, who attempts to balance and make sense of her career, parenting, and daily existence. Valerie’s story of living through a fog speaks to the obstacles that many blacks face in battling mental health issues and not seeking support, and/or rebuffing the social stigmas attached to mental health labels. Woods compliments her film with the blog websites “Crowned Leader of Defective Cybermen,” (Woods n.d.) and Facebook.com®, to educate the audience on mental health myths, facts and resources steered directly to blacks. A change agent in her own right, Woods acknowledges that being a black female filmmaker is a challenge in attempting to secure funding. But fortunately for her, being a student at the American Film Institute (AFI) Directing Workshop for Women opened some doors for her initial film production. Fog fits into intersectionality theory in that it shows examples of mental health

---


8 For more information on the history and mission of the American Film Institute (AFI) Directing Workshop for Women, go to the website http://www.afi.com/dww/.

9 Chelsea Woods, personal interview with the authors, August 25, 2016.
obstacles in black communities that go untreated, and how this failure cripples so many black women in their efforts to do other things.

A comparative historical analysis, used frequently in the social sciences/cultural studies, is a means of explaining substantively important outcomes connected to cultures. James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer explain that such a process involves looking at the situation as a puzzle and understanding what were some of the underlying causes that formulated the puzzle and resulted in defragmentation (Mahoney and Rueschemeyer 2003, 4-6 & 8). And when one understands the complexities of the puzzle, one can better understand the constituent elements of daily life. An illustrated example is given in Figure 1 to explain the complexities of the puzzle and comparative historical analysis.

![Figure 1](image)

More specifically, Pierre Sorlin explained that the steps needed to complete a comparative historical analysis of film involves understanding the originality of the film, its relationship to current events, its favorable reception by the public and the fact of its being produced and distributed during a time of crisis (Sorlin 1980, 36). Media and film studies scholars use comparative historical analysis because the objective is not to present ideas of the fictional films from a theoretical perspective, but rather assess a film’s historical value by exhausting the paradigms, or by concentrating upon syntagms (narration of successive events) (Sorlin 1988, 4).

An example of a historical analysis is the work done by Candace Ming at Chicago’s South Side Home Movie Project. Ming shared the digitizing of still photos, slides, and 8 mm film from Jean Patton’s personal collection.10 Patton, a longtime resident of Chicago, captured images of family, community and national events dating from 1950-1980. In the presentation, Ming narrated the process of reviewing such precious and personal archival material that enlightened the audience on black, Chicago and gendered histories. Since many people learn history from visual sources, the work that Ming completed for this University of Chicago project, serves as a changing agent to how people may construct past and present Chicago, and more importantly, how women’s film history can teach the world.

---

10 Candace Ming, e-mail message to the authors, September 10, 2016.
The Euzhan Palcy Method in *A Dry White Season*

While Euzhan Palcy’s most marketable films were done in the 1980s, to reduce her body of work to measures of box office success devalues her career, especially as one whose cinematic visions are guided by a diaspora empowerment outlook. Her path breaking films *Sugar Cane Alley* and *A Dry White Season* not only explored topics marginalized by the mainstream, but also have stood the tests of time in providing foundations for altering representations of diaspora people and issues. Palcy’s films speak to audiences, especially those around the diaspora, in ways that force them to contest constructions of spaces and relationships that underwrite established systems of race, class and gendered oppression.11 Her illumination of specific landscapes draws from historically-documented systems of exploitation that transcend particular places, thereby enabling viewers to become more active consumers of the film.12 For example, female characters in her films are more than targets of violence. They also act as sources for resisting, or even deflecting the intensities of violence. In doing that, Palcy forces viewers to examine the multi-layered structures of oppression and to identify those potential emancipatory spaces. She makes concerted efforts to depict the black body as text, resistance and emancipation in the above-mentioned films.

This strategy is illustrated in the beginning of *A Dry White Season*, where two kids, one black and one white, are playing together. Later on, viewers see the black child, Jonathan Ngubene (Bekhithemba Mpofu), arrested at an anti-apartheid protest. Jonathan’s bruised body, like those of other black children, becomes the text for viewing the intense violence of apartheid, especially later when lying in the morgue after his murder by police. Here, Palcy shows viewers a historical context of racial injustice, though they may be unfamiliar with South Africa’s apartheid structure. She presents the puzzle pieces of white supremacy that include the brutality of institutionalized racism, to lay a foundation for comparative historical analysis. Again, Sorlin reminds readers that comparative historical analysis of films is valuable.

Films, like historical novels and history books, concentrate upon a period, in other words a more or less defined time with its beginning and its end. They narrate and, in order to make the narrative more thrilling, they seize upon some sort of climax—the turning point of a war or the height of a crisis (Sorlin 1998, 209). When audiences see these scenes, it invokes historical parallels of racial oppression, such as Jonathan’s disfigured body being similar to Emmett Till’s 1955 lynching in the United States. Thus, Palcy can be seen as a cinematic historian in the sense that her films make a significant impact on public perceptions of history (Toplin 1998, 6).

An additional element in using Jonathan’s body is that it compels viewers to extend views of childhood vulnerability to invasions by the broader society, and thereby envision the body as a catalyst for change. In a few short scenes Jonathan has evolved from an innocent playful child to

---

11 This point is also affirmed with Paul Weinstein’s comments, “Filmmakers often feel that despite some factual deviations they have effectively and honestly captured the spirit of history” (Weinstein).

12 Pierre Sorlin deals with film and history by noting: “In Europe, as well as in the United States, about ten percent of the films made during the first half of our century dealt, be it indirectly, with a period which, because it was remote or because of its cinematic treatment, could be labeled ‘historical.’ It has often been noted that the tendency of Americans to see their history in terms of images derived from films creates a virtually impenetrable barrier to seeing the events on which they are based in verifiable historical terms. They are seen as ‘metahistory,’ that is to say as a contrived but very effective reconstruction of the past” (Sorlin 1998, 206).
a body whose life (and death) acquire meaning because it uncovers the limits to oppression. By slowing down how systems of oppression operate, Palcy enables audiences to see their constitute elements, their weaknesses, and how acts of resistance enhance prospects for change.

Similarly, Palcy uses an intertextual approach to frame white violence. Contrasting scenes of the disparities in the quality of white and black lives challenges the normalization of meanings, thereby forcing the viewer into deeper interrogation of the apartheid structure. The ease in which whites enjoy their exclusive schools, clubs and social gatherings is framed by institutionalized state efforts to constrain the mildest of black efforts to organize and assert their basic human rights. Images of black bodies piling up are routinized as well-meaning whites consistently rationalize violent destruction of black aspirations. And, after one such episode of white violence against blacks, Palcy shifts to a scene in a school where white students recite propagandistic lessons on how the Afrikaner people were victimized, not only by the British, but also by indigenous Africans.

One of the strongest impacts of Palcy’s intertextuality is demonstrating that the systematic violence of apartheid represents a threat to the most basic of human institutions, the family, in its white, as well as black manifestations. Ben du Toit (Donald Sutherland), a central white character, initially expresses disbelief when informed about the brutal treatment of his black gardener’s son at the hands of police and security forces. Palcy allows this façade of fairness to break down as the tolls on black life mount, but uses it to show white willingness to overlook the violence of apartheid that underwrites their privileges. Subsequently, Ben’s expression of the mildest sympathies for black victims leads to separation from his wife and adult daughter, ostracism from the teachers at his school, and later dismissal from his teaching job. Even his young son cannot escape the association of his father’s support for black rights as bullies beat him at his school.

Another strategy employed by Palcy is the shifting the narrative to give prominence to ordinarily marginalized voices. In *A Dry White Season*, Stanley Makhaya’s (Zakes Mokae) entrance into the film during its first act effectively shifts the narrative from concern with how whites experience the rough edges of apartheid to how blacks are repeatedly subjected to its brutalities. Stanley is detached from the routines that subject blacks to daily control by whites, which affords him opportunities to navigate the gray areas of the apartheid system. He occupies an array of landscapes from the black township to white suburban enclaves, and even state courtrooms, to give viewers a sweep of how pervasive are the structures for upholding white privilege. Even though he is well-aware of the limitations of his independence, Stanley’s range of observations disrupt conventional white narratives on apartheid.

This is an example of intersectionality theory as Palcy constructs Stanley’s role as a transcendent character, rather than one defined by simple linearity. His assertiveness in seeking justice for black victims is far from fantasy, but grounds the narrative in black life, and legitimizes black resistance as essential for destroying apartheid.

Palcy’s elevation of a black narrative voices is similarly demonstrated by omitting from the film the romantic relationship between the two major white characters in Andre Brink’s novel. A love story between two American stars, Donald Sutherland and Susan Sarandon, might have
expanded the movie’s box office appeal, but Palcy chose to avoid it to instead heighten the film’s focus on its black characters (Collins 1989).

The film’s broadening of narrative possibilities allows women’s voices to emerge in critical stages of the story. Early in the film when a young black student witnesses her sister being shot to death by a solider, she confronts the solider and tells him to kill her as well. In addition to establishing that some of the victims of apartheid’s brutality are young girls, the scene depicts women as agents rather than mere victims. Later, this same student offers critical testimony to be used in generating a legal and public media campaign against the South African state. Likewise, Emily Ngubene (Thoko Ntshinga), the wife and mother of victims tortured and killed by the security forces, emerges to actively resist state efforts to silence her, even as it leads to her own death. Symbolic of wives and mothers of martyrs, Emily justifies her continued vigilance in the face of overwhelming odds by saying: “The dead will open the eyes of the living.” Another critical woman’s voice is that of the white journalist Melanie Bruwer (Susan Sarandon), who not only helps educate Ben du Toit (Donald Sutherland) on the harsh realities of South African state violence, but also risks her own safety in spreading news about the violence to the international media.

The film effectively uses images that resonate throughout diaspora political struggles. For example, the heroes are the common people, who perform heroically in giving face and voice to the brutalities of apartheid. Early in the film a small demonstration of student protest gathers steam and gradually morphs into a wide-angle shot of hundreds of boys and girls marching for justice. Later, an anonymous black woman hospital worker provides information to document the medical condition of prisoners before they were executed. Relatedly, a black man testifying at an inquest as a witness for the state, rips off his shirt to reveal the violence that the state has inflicted upon his body to force his signed testimony. These individual courageous acts gradually transform into the foundations for collective resistance.

**The Euzhan Palcy Method in *Sugar Cane Alley***

As in *A Dry White Season*, Palcy again uses childhood as important political terrain in *Sugar Cane Alley*. The film is set in 1930s Martinique, where Jose (Garry Cadenat), grandson of M’Man Tine (Darling Légitimus), resides on a former sugar cane plantation. The focus is the coming of age and struggles that Jose encounters seeing education as an opportunity for economic and social advancement. Rather than allowing this film to be a simplistic story of an individual’s determination to overcome obstacles, Palcy uses the boy’s story to show Martinique’s collective experiences struggling against colonialism. For example, M’Man Tine and Jose’s relocation from a rural area to the town to be near the school that he wants to attend evokes the larger issue of colonized people being forced to migrate to cities to improve opportunities. This is an enduring reflection of the diaspora and the continual search to escape domination.

Palcy effectively uses landscapes and lighting to reflect the obstacles and opportunities confronting the central characters. Throughout much of the first half of the film, as workers toil on the sugar cane plantation, the camera angles are very tight and dark with little in view except the harsh conditions of servitude. However, as the prospects for Jose acquiring an education
begin to improve, the camera moves back to allow a bright panoramic view of the landscape. Similarly, a later scene features a group of black kids innocently swimming in a pond. A wealthy white landowner drives up in his automobile and attempts to discipline the boys, but he slips and falls into the water, suffering what will later prove to be fatal injuries.

Similar strategies are used to convey multiple dimensions of the inhumanity of the colonial system. Colonial oversight and control is seemingly everywhere: pressing sugar cane workers to increase their production in the fields, doling out meager wages that will immediately be spent at the plantation store, and utilizing a range of black workers from pre-school age children to old, frail adults. Even the pursuit of education is depicted as another process which can re-enforce race-class stratification. An elementary school teacher informs the students that the school certificate exam given at the end of the year will separate those eligible for further education from those who will return to the sugar cane fields. Each stage of Jose’s pursuit of education is met with challenges, such as his receiving only a partial scholarship, which forces his elderly grandmother to take in laundry to help pay his school fees, or, later, being accused by his teacher of plagiarizing an essay.

While not as overt as in *A Dry White Season*, Palcy again uses the body as a site for exhibiting the cruelty of colonialism in *Sugar Cane Alley*. The harsh lives and deaths of the old man Medouze (Douta Seck), and later Jose’s grandmother M’Man Tine, are written all over their broken bodies. In a later scene Palcy shows the harshness of the color line when the French father of Leopold (Laurent Saint-Cyr), the mixed-race boy, is on his deathbed, but refuses to give the boy his last name. Leopold, who on several occasions has disobeyed his parent’s advice to avoid socializing with black children, flees his home, but not before taking his father’s ledger to prove to the sugar cane field workers that they have been grossly exploited. After his capture, Leopold is led to jail like a captured animal, having lost all access to near-white privileges.

Lastly, Palcy draws from and elaborates on common themes in African diaspora resistance. Jose is drawn to the old man Medouze, who tells him stories about Africa, the ruptures generated by the slave trade, and about slave revolts in Martinique. Medouze serves as the spiritual mentor who provides Jose with a platform for imagining himself beyond his present circumstances. Similarly, M’Man Tine refuses to allow Jose to work in the fields, even when all of his peers have been drafted. She is committed to not allowing Jose to be consumed by the forces that limited her life and the life of her deceased mother. Although poor, uneducated, and in bad health, M’Man Tine moves beyond her limitations to advance life prospects for her grandson. In one of the last scenes in the film, Jose questions a black woman cashier who despises other blacks by claiming that, “Her character is white.” The young boy, expressing intelligence far beyond his years, reminds the woman that the colonial system, not race, shapes the behaviors that she so thoroughly detests.

Such movements going on across the diaspora are analogous to historical comparative analysis. Jose’s puzzle of how to acquire access to education breaks down, necessitating a search for an alternative route. The movement is a response to the broken puzzle. Palcy uses Jose and his grandmother to show that they too must move to pursue visions of progress. The film’s focus on the individual can be viewed as a reflection of broader struggles colonized groups confront in trying to use education as a tool for social advancement. While pursuing an education, Jose
experiences European cultural biases from the school administrators, from the teacher, and from some of his peers. Yet, in overcoming those obstacles, he reflects on the stories told to him about Africa by Medouze, the old man on the sugar cane plantation. Memories of these stories give Jose a cultural foundation that he can draw from to challenge the status quo, white supremacist worldviews. Palcy uses the strength of the African diaspora to help Jose navigate the barriers to his quest for an education. His summoning of strength from an African identity enable him to reject European standards and put him on a path toward empowerment.

As mentioned earlier in the discussion of Fog, Woods, as a female filmmaker, models many of the patterns explored in Palcy’s films. An example is the camouflaging of mental stresses and strains that the grandmother exhibits in Sugar Cane Alley. M’Man Tine experienced performativity13 demons in fighting for opportunities for her grandson to the point that she gets physically sick. Suppressing mental anguish and anxieties lead to her being bedridden for a time. The mask of compliance often conceals larger problems that can have long-term debilitating effects. What Palcy and Woods do as filmmakers is help the audience see that something is real and that such events happened in history (Sorlin 1980, 37). The underlying logic of history is what makes many films a valuable historical tool because they select facts, develop them, and show the connections between them (Sorlin 1980, 38). Such can be said about facts of blacks that are brought out in the films by Palcy and Woods. Their films select facts about black culture, develop them, and show the connections and contributions to the lives of all people.

Every culture in Palcy’s cinematic universe has an element where contributions are made by individuals who go beyond themselves and understand that life is bigger than just the self. For example, M’Man Tin wants her grandson, Jose, to receive an education (selected fact) so that he will not have to repeat the cycle that she, her daughter, and many others of that generation had encountered (developed those facts). The way that Palcy makes the connection is that she establishes the relationship between facts or situations and offers a pan-African view of the struggles that they engender (Sorlin, 1980, 38). Palcy tells historical stories that make viewers think about situations that go on today. She is a filmmaker, but also a historian with a camera. She tells facts about the past that comment on our present and future understandings of the black experience. While Palcy’s work dates back over 30 years, her attention to details help us think about Diaspora women today.

Palcy’s work has a feminist outlook that illuminates the storylines of her films. Women have seldom had opportunities to direct films, even when black women are the focus of the story. One recent survey indicated that only 10% of the world’s film directors are women, as are only 15% of screenwriters.14 Without question, American male filmmakers like Oliver Stone, Alan Parker, Edward Zwick and Steven Spielberg are given credit as being cultural historians, but seldom is such attention given to women (Toplin 1998, 5). Palcy’s films expand female visibility and inclusion, and, at the same time, show her to be a cinematic historian. Her work has the ability to challenge the viewer. Her films show stories unfold and invite you to become part of the story through your own diaspora experience. This speaks to her vision and to how she tells the story.

13 Performativity speaks to putting a band-aid over problems by going through the motions as they are expected to do in the role one is expected to play.

Critical to these new angles is not simply a vision of women as the opposite of men, but one that highlights the varied experiences of what it means to be a woman, along with how that role is very dynamic and not static. Palcy said, “I’m not trying to make films just for the money and I don’t want to make a film, just to make a film.”

Conclusion

What can we learn through an analysis of the book-to-film translation? John Tibbetts argues that such a process allows one to “reconsider the relationship of visual media to historical representation and supports visual discourse as a uniquely relevant and valid enterprise” (Welsh 2005, 88). Such statements are the rationale for publications like The Columbia Companion to American History on Film, which serves as a reference for volumes of essays that meet such demands. Though Palcy’s films have never appeared in this reference book, such inclusion would fit in a historical and social science analysis of her films on a global level, since watching films is how many viewers learn about history.

This paper has examined Palcy’s process of turning books into films to explain how she is a filmmaker of resistance and empowerment for black viewers. If we can agree that film is a form of literature, Paul Weinstein’s argument that film has a tremendous cultural impact that has unpredictable and unintended effects on audiences becomes more understandable (Weinstein 1–2). We see Their Eyes Were Watching God, A Raisin in the Sun, Precious, from the book Push, and For Colored Girls as books-to-films that speak to communicating the lives of black women amidst adversity. So too do Palcy’s Sugar Can Alley and A Dry White Season. All of these books-to-film offer a diaspora focus, rather than just a story about one person in one country at one moment. In addition, these books-to-film offer the imperative of re-examining how women experience oppression, and how their experiences can be transformed into spaces of power.

---

15 In the introduction of Celluloid Ceiling: Women Film Directors Breaking Through (2014, 9–10), Gabrielle Kelly and Cheryl Robson explain the struggles of many international female filmmakers (on six of the seven continents) – both independent and feature films.

16 Euzhan Palcy, personal interview with the authors at the University of Chicago, May 27, 2015.

17 Similar to Palcy’s work, the novels of Walter Mosley and the plays of August Wilson not only chronicle black experiences, but offer new perspectives on the meanings of freedom from differently-situated people.
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Architectural Othering in *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*

Samantha Morgan, Middle Georgia State University

Abstract: The importance of architecture in Hugo's work cannot be over-emphasized. The only locations mentioned in detail are those which have some tie to the Gothic; these locations are also where the novel is bound. Hugo does well in personifying buildings such as Notre Dame, giving the cathedral as much of a voice as those who dwell within her. Within the confines of the Gothic cathedral, human depravity at its fullest is displayed through characters such as Frollo, while the same walls showcase the grandeur of human achievement through the beauty of Notre Dame. The cathedral and the Court of Miracles are not bound by the staunch rules of society, choosing rather to shelter those whom the world rejects inside their dark confines. Likewise, characters such as Quasimodo, Frollo and Esmeralda doubtlessly see themselves reflected in the supposedly unfeeling architecture, choosing to live within a realm which ordinary society cannot understand.

KEYWORDS: gothic, other, architecture, sublime, orientalism, forbidden knowledge, insanity.
Since its publication in 1831, Victor Hugo's masterpiece *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* has attracted Medieval enthusiasts as well as general audiences worldwide. The novel's fame has led to multiple studies and film adaptations in the twentieth century, including the Disney film *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* in 1996. Some scholars possibly read Hugo's novel as a depiction of life in medieval Paris; however, not everyone sees *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* in this light. Upon closer examination Hugo's novel is less about depicting life in Medieval Paris than it is about the author's true passion—Gothic architecture. Although Hugo was a member of various committees devoted to saving the medieval buildings of France (Novikoff), his decision to present his love for Notre Dame in novel-form granted him and his cause global fame. Yet Hugo does more in his novel than simply establish the magnificence of Notre Dame: he also includes several Gothic motifs after the traditional Gothic novel was no longer in style. In *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*, Victor Hugo connects Gothic architecture with the concept of the “Other” in a way that bolsters a conventional concept of the Other, as well as different aspects of othering, madness, the sublime, and the atmosphere of “carnival.”

Gothic is a term used by many, but understood by few. Thankfully, scholars such as David Punter, Nick Groom, Alex Novikoff, Edward Said, Edmund Burke, Valdine Clemens, Julia Kristeva, Mikhail Bakhtin and Christopher Finch have contributed to society's growing understanding of the Gothic. The Gothic deals with anything out-of-the-ordinary—supernatural, horrific and psychological phenomenon—that humans cannot understand; the term also describes an architectural style dating from the twelfth through the fifteenth centuries A.D. According to David Punter, “Gothic fiction frequently depicted, and sometimes appeared to revel in, vice and violence” (8). While neither vice nor violence are Gothic in and of themselves, the two attributes often pave the way for traditional Gothic characteristics. For example, the vice and violence present in both the society and individual characters of *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* lead audiences through the dark back streets of Paris to a pursued gypsy, a corrupt clergyman, and a deformed hunchback. Punter also claims that in Gothic fiction: “The worlds portrayed are ones infested with psychic and social decay, and coloured with the heightened hues of putrescence. Violence, rape and breakdown are the key motifs; the crucial tone is one of desensitised acquiescence in the horror of obsession and prevalent insanity” (3).

Hugo depicts the common people of his novel as morally depraved, encouraging the torture and death of the innocent rather than crying out at the injustice of their society. Every major character in the novel suffers from mental, physical, or emotional decay: Phoebus is shown to already be decayed emotionally at the novel's genesis because of his lack of compassion for Esmeralda; Esmeralda decays mentally as well as physically when Phoebus rejects her and she is wrongfully imprisoned for his murder; Frollo progressively decays mentally and emotionally due to his lust for Esmeralda and alchemic pursuits, and both he and Quasimodo are both physically decayed at the start of the novel, one from birth, the other from forbidden knowledge. Punter also argues that “In dealing with terror, Gothic deals with the unadmitted” (18). Hugo's medieval Paris is unwilling to admit it is decrepit, yet Hugo proves it is through the architecture as well as through the characters Frollo and Quasimodo.

While Punter covers certain Gothic characteristics, Nick Groom does a broad overview of the genre in a historical, literary and architectural sense, although only his findings on architecture will be discussed here. Along with giving a specific Gothic architectural timeline, Groom points
out that by the early sixteenth century, “the painter and biographer Giorgio Vasari was explicitly referring to 'Gothic' architecture to distinguish the medieval period from the classical” (13). With Gothic architecture being characteristic of the Middle Ages, it is little wonder Hugo strived to make his audience love the architecture that was his passion. In painting a vivid picture of medieval Paris, Hugo cements the locational Gothic in his audience's mind, validating the idea of the Gothic being architecturally exclusive.

In examining the Gothic, it is necessary to reference Edmund Burke's theory of the sublime. Burke states “Indeed terror is . . . the ruling principle of the sublime” (58). In *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*, the sublime is a determining factor of the Gothic: it is a defining characteristic of both the architecture and characters in Hugo's novel, personifying locations such as Notre Dame cathedral as well as breathing life into what could be seen as archetypes such as Quasimodo, Esmeralda and Frollo. In using the sublime, Hugo effectively manipulates his audience's thoughts and emotions through the humanization of architecture as well as through stock characters in the Gothic genre.

Valdine Clemens' theory of Repression further humanizes the Gothic. In her novel *The Return of the Repressed*, Clemens states “Gothic fiction arose in periods of heightened social anxiety . . . after the American and during the French and Industrial Revolutions” (24). While Hugo wrote his novel thirty years after the French Revolution, he makes subtle references to the period of social anarchy through his medieval Parisians during the Festival of Fools. Also, *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* was written at the end of the Industrial Revolution. The Industrial Revolution brought innovations and drastic changes to the daily lives of nineteenth century Americans and Europeans, creating friction between those who desired change and those who advocated for tradition. Hugo addresses this tension by attempting to convince rash intellectuals of medieval architecture's significance while urging traditionalists to acknowledge that some changes need to be made to both the societal and judicial systems.

In short, the Gothic is an investigation of society. The genre contains characteristic elements—Othering, the sublime, obsession, madness, the carnivalesque, architecture, decay, supernatural occurrences, imprisonment and death – but these traits are reflective of the mindset of the age in which the genre was formed. Gothic fiction was conceived during times of social upheaval and turmoil, and the genre gives readers an opportunity to examine their worst fears from a distance and therefore safely confront them (Clemens 31). The supernatural in the Gothic effectively distances readers from personal fears of illegitimacy, powerlessness, physical and emotional pain, and death; yet when the supernatural is stripped from the genre, readers are left with the realization that the angst of former generations is still present within themselves. The Gothic's purpose is to reflect the inherent fears of humanity; however, the genre does not offer solutions to expel mankind's terrors. However, the Gothic as a defined genre offers a sense of unity by readers and authors alike sharing the same anxieties. Therefore, the Gothic forms a community that spans hundreds of years between individuals who will likely never meet, yet are attempting to deal with their personal apprehensions through fiction.

One of the motifs present in *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* is Othering. In defining the “Other,” Julia Kristeva writes, “he is the hidden face of our identity, the space that wrecks our abode, the time in which understanding and affinity founder” (2). Othering is simply the act of determining
an Other – someone or something which lies outside society's view of normalcy. While traditionally the Other exists in the form of monsters imposing themselves on society (such as in the case of Grendel in the epic Beowulf), Hugo's Other co-exists in society alongside common people and society imposes itself on the grotesque. Hugo adds to the tradition of Othering by giving it a modern twist: Hugo's Others are the criminals of society, the insane, the obsessed, the deformed and the beautiful; in other words, those whom society has chosen to give up for lost and forgotten.

Othering in *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* relies heavily on architectural location. Hugo's Other can exist only in areas distinctly Gothic, yet when Gothic places are controlled by society—such as the Palace of Justice and the Place de Grève—these havens become antagonistic towards the Other. An example of this is seen when Gringoire first sees Esmeralda in the Place de Grève the evening following the Feast of Fools. In the crowd watching her dance, Gringoire wonders “Whether this young girl was a human being, a fairy, or an angel . . . Gringoire . . . could not decide . . . so fascinated was he by this dazzling vision” (Hugo). In the night air dancing before the fire, Esmeralda controls the atmosphere of the Place de Grève, dominating the Gothic square with her exotic presence. Yet, when the public have control of the Place de Grève in the light of day, Esmeralda is executed for the very attributes society adored during the night. Also, when Pâquette lives as a recluse in the Tower of Roland, she remains safe from society; however, when the king's troops forcibly remove her from the Tower, she is slain shortly thereafter. Architectural location is so vital to the Gothic in *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* that Hugo felt it necessary to devote an entire chapter to describing Paris from atop the cathedral. According to Novikoff: “One of the novel’s notable accomplishments is the lively evocation and indeed inclusion of multiple strata of medieval society within a single panorama . . . Hugo was determined to trace current social and political problems back to their medieval roots, and to achieve the maximum effect he must carefully embed his tale within a painstaking reconstruction of medieval Paris, its buildings and its public” (Novikoff).

In the chapter “A Bird's-Eye View of Paris,” Hugo reveals an unexpected structure of medieval Paris. Here, he reveals, “In the fifteenth century, Paris was still divided into three wholly distinct and separate towns, each having its own physiognomy, its own specialty, its manners, customs, privileges and history: the City, the University, the Town” (Hugo). Paris in the fifteenth century was essentially three cities in one, with Notre Dame and the Palace of Justice located in the City – the island-mother of Paris – and the Place de Grève, the Tower of Roland and the Court of Miracles situated in the newest portion of the medieval capital, the Town. Interestingly enough, the Gothic is absent from the intellectual district of medieval Paris, yet it thrives in the oldest and poorest parts of France's capital.

Hugo's depicts the Other through three characters, each of whom provide a different view of the complex issue of Othering. Quasimodo is the closest Hugo comes to creating a “traditional Other.” The hunchback, deformed from birth, is adopted by both Notre Dame and Frollo, both of whom become his surrogate parents. Society as a whole, however, rejects Quasimodo because of his birth defects, shown when the citizens of Hugo's Paris call him “mask of Antichrist” (Hugo). Hugo, however, offers another view of the hunchback's deformities. In the chapter “Immanis Pecoris Custos Immanitor Ipse,” Hugo writes that with Quasimodo, “It is thus that, little by little, developing always in sympathy with the cathedral, living there, sleeping there, hardly ever
leaving it, subject every hour to the mysterious impress, he came to resemble it, he incrusted himself in it, so to speak, and became an integral part of it” (Hugo). In writing that Quasimodo's body becomes part of Notre Dame as he lives there, Hugo argues the case of Quasimodo's being the cathedral's son, and his deformities in fact represent of one of the world's most beloved cathedrals—Notre Dame. Hugo's reasoning is also supported by Burke, who claims: “No passion so effectually robs the mind of all its powers of acting and reasoning as fear . . . . Whatever therefore is terrible, with regard to sight, is sublime too, whether this cause of terror be endowed with greatness of dimensions or not . . . . And to things of great dimensions, if we annex an adventitious idea of terror, they become without comparison greater” (57).

Aside from his physical deformity, Quasimodo's deafness effectively classifies him as Other. Secluded from society in Notre Dame, Quasimodo becomes deaf providing a service for the public—ringing the cathedral's bells—and his disability only further isolates him from the world. Quasimodo is the only character forced to live a life of solitude, although Frollo willingly lives a solitary life by choosing to pursue alchemy and his lust for Esmeralda, as well as by his status as archdeacon of Notre Dame. The two men's lives reflect Burke's sentiments on solitude when he states, “an entire life of solitude contradicts the purposes of our being, since death itself is scarcely an idea of more terror” (43). While Hugo appears to sympathize with both characters, he presents only Quasimodo in a positive light, bolstering the “traditional Other” by contrasting the hunchback's aching humanity with the inherent evil inside of Frollo, which is deemed acceptable by society. Surprisingly enough, Quasimodo and Esmeralda share two characteristics which classify them as Other—their Oriental appearance as well as their orphan status.

The European fascination with “the Orient” has existed since the Middle Ages. According to Said, “The Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences” (1). Both Quasimodo and Esmeralda are referred to as appearing Oriental numerous times in Hugo's novel, although Quasimodo is the only character who is of non-European ethnicity. When Quasimodo is tortured in the Place de Grève, Jehan says the hunchback resembles, “a knave of oriental architecture, who has a back like a dome, and legs like twisted columns” (Hugo). Ironically, Hugo attributes the hunchback with traits of Oriental architecture the Romantics were enamored with in the early nineteenth century while those who are non-European are treated poorly in the novel. Perhaps Said has this in mind when he writes, “Even the rapport between the Orientalist and the Orient was textual” (52). Quasimodo seems to be Hugo's response to his contemporaries' fascination with the Orient: from a distance the foreign Other can take on any shape or form an individual wishes, yet when viewed closely, the fantasy surrounding Orientalism fades, even though the one deemed a foreign Other is internally good.

While Quasimodo is ostracized for being a foreign Other, Esmeralda is actively pursued by Frollo as well as society because she appears to be an exotic Other. Esmeralda is presented in the Place de Grève as being “swarthy of complexion, but one divined that, by day, her skin must possess that beautiful golden tone of the Andalusians and the Roman women” (Hugo). Esmeralda is intoxicatingly foreign to the Parisians, yet her foreignness as well as her beauty classify her as an Other and eventually lead to her death. Of her beauty, Hugo writes: “All around her, all glances were riveted, all mouths open; and, in fact, when she danced thus, to the humming of the Basque tambourine, which her two pure, rounded arms raised above her head, slender, frail and
vivacious as a wasp, with her corsage of gold without a fold, her variegated gown puffing out, her bare shoulders, her delicate limbs, which her petticoat revealed at times, her black hair, her eyes of flame, she was a supernatural creature” (Hugo).

Hugo describes Esmeralda's beautiful foreignness in a way which sets her apart from women of normal society, yet the two things that classify her as an Other also place her in the position of being the “pursued maiden” in the novel, a trait found in Gothic fiction. The gypsy's establishment as a desired object further classifies her as an Other in that she is the only woman actively pursued by men in The Hunchback of Notre Dame. Said could have had Frollo's pursuit of Esmeralda in mind when he writes, “In quite a constant way, Orientalism depends for its strategy on this flexible positional superiority, which puts the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand” (7). What makes Esmeralda an Other by default of beauty and foreign appearance cements Frollo as being Other as well because of his obsessive lust for her.

While Quasimodo and Esmeralda are different in appearance, the orphan statuses mark them as being Other in Hugo's novel. As previously mentioned, Quasimodo is adopted by both Notre Dame and Frollo, yet because of his appearance he is first rejected by his birth mother, his potential adoptive mother, as well as by the worshippers of Notre Dame. When Quasimodo is placed on the orphan's table in the cathedral's entrance, the parishioners as well as most of the clergy scorn the child, calling him a demon and refuse to touch him. Frollo, however, chooses to adopt Quasimodo—albeit it for selfish reasons—and hides the hunchback atop Notre Dame, much like one of the cathedral's gargoyles. Although historians are not entirely sure of the purpose of gargoyles in Gothic cathedrals, many claim the terrifying figures were formed to protect cathedrals from demons. Perhaps Quasimodo's connection with the stone guardians of Notre Dame further endears him to his adoptive mother, making him ever loyal to her. Esmeralda is also set apart from society by her orphan status and is not who society perceives her to be. The gypsy is in fact a native French girl, raised among the gypsies after they steal her from her mother's bed. Esmeralda's orphan status motivates her to guard her chastity because of the magic charm she carries, which ensures she will find her parents. However, the knowledge that she has never known a man motivates both Phoebus and Frollo to pursue Esmeralda, ultimately resulting in her death. Frollo's being an orphan classifies him as an Other as well, although many facets of this character set him apart from society in The Hunchback of Notre Dame.

While Frollo is technically a part of normal society, he is also set apart from normalcy in the sense that he is the archdeacon of Notre Dame. Frollo is described as being “a priest, austere, grave, morose; one charged with souls; monsieur the archdeacon of Josas, the bishop’s second acolyte, having charge of the two deaneries of Montlhéry, and Châteaufort, and one hundred and seventy-four country curacies” (Hugo). Frollo begins his service to the clergy with the graveness that comes from being responsible for souls, yet he strays from practicing holiness by delving into alchemy. While a priest using what would have been considered magic in the Middle Ages may astonish readers, Clemens notes that, “In an attempt to assert some individual control over a universe charged with hostile and beneficent supernatural forces, people in the Middle Ages apparently resorted frequently to magic” (19). Frollo's alchemic pursuits are an open secret among Notre Dame's clergy, and while Frollo knows that practicing alchemy is morally suspect (19), he does so anyway out of despair. The archdeacon's alchemic pursuits further classify him
as Other because in studying magic, he is acting outside of accepted priestly behavior. Frollo plots to possess Esmeralda in his laboratory hidden in one of Notre Dame's towers, yet unlike other Gothic authors, Hugo leads readers down the slope of Frollo's moral decay until the archdeacon leads the executioner directly to Esmeralda when she refuses to accept him as her lover.

Frollo's moral decline slips rapidly from alchemy into obsessive lust as he stalks Esmeralda throughout the novel. Frollo's succumbs to his lust when Gringoire reveals that “She wears on her neck an amulet which, it is affirmed, will cause her to meet her parents someday, but which will lose its virtue if the young girl loses hers” (Hugo). Knowing Esmeralda is a virgin ripe-for-the-picking is too much for the archdeacon, and he plots to possess her with abandon. Among Hugo's contemporaries and public, “The topic of rape . . . would not in itself have shocked . . . for it occurs often enough in earlier eighteenth-century novels” (Clemens 34). Frollo obviously desires Esmeralda sexually yet restrains himself from raping her, and his continuous repression wears on Frollo's mind, resulting in the archdeacon's insanity.

Insanity is one of the mankind's most gripping terrors, and Hugo does not hesitate to present two cases of it in The Hunchback of Notre Dame. Both Frollo and Pâquette, Esmeralda's mother, suffer from madness, and thus each of their maddened states manifests differently. Frollo's decaying mental state is not implemented until after Pâquette is introduced, and he festers in his laboratory in Notre Dame. Interestingly enough, the cell had been built long before Frollo by the Bishop “Hugo de Besançon, who had wrought sorcery there in his day” (Hugo). The laboratory reflects Frollo's mental state as being unsound when it is described from Jehan's perspective as containing, “A large furnace, which he had not at first observed, stood to the left of the armchair, beneath the window . . . Upon the furnace were accumulated in disorder, all sorts of vases, earthenware bottles, glass retorts, and mattresses of charcoal” (Hugo). Frollo's laboratory contains a large unlit furnace and unused scientific instruments, both symbolic of his dead passion for forbidden knowledge, slain in the face of previously unexplored lust. The archdeacon does not actively practice alchemy again as his lust for a human being slowly replaces his thirst for knowledge. On madness, Burke states: “The violent effects produced by love, which has sometimes been even wrought up to madness . . . . When men have suffered their imaginations to be long affected with any idea, it so wholly engrosses them as to shut out by degrees almost every other, and to break down every partition of the mind which would confine it” (40–41).

At the peak of his madness Frollo reveals to Esmeralda in the Palace of Justice's prison that “his breast was in fact, mangled as by the claw of a tiger, and on his side he had a large and badly healed wound” (Hugo). When Frollo sees Esmeralda sentenced and tortured for the murder of Phoebus, rather than coming forth and admitting his hand in the attempted murder, he repeatedly stabs himself under his cassock in the Palace of Justice. When Frollo flees to the countryside, he realizes the consequences of his actions: “Then he laughed frightfully, and suddenly became pale again, when he considered the most sinister side of his fatal passion, of that corrosive, venomous malignant, implacable love, which had ended only in the gibbet for one of them and in hell for the other; condemnation for her, damnation for him” (Hugo).

Frollo's laughter signals the final departure of his sanity, a fact which is reinforced by an episode of schizophrenia at the end of the chapter “Deliirium.” Thus Frollo's madness, caused by his
uncontrolled lust, is irreversible. Pâquette's madness, on the other hand, is temporary. The location which houses Pâquette's madness is the Tower of Roland, where she and her prison are described, “The cell was small, broader than it was long, with an arched ceiling, and viewed from within, it bore a considerable resemblance to the interior of a huge bishop's mitre . . . It was one of those spectres, half light, half shadow” (Hugo). In her Gothic cell, which is incapable of being opened from the inside, Pâquette is more frightening than Frollo because in his insanity the archdeacon keeps a semblance of humanity. Pâquette, on the other hand, resembles a ghost to passerby, frightening and other-worldly in appearance. The recluse obsesses over an object as well, although unlike Frollo, her object is not a human being. Throughout the novel, Pâquette's affections are fixed on “a tiny shoe of pink satin, embroidered with a thousand fanciful designs in gold and silver” (Hugo). The tiny homemade shoe is all Pâquette has left of her stolen daughter, and throughout the novel she fawns over the little shoe, hugs it, weeps over it, and even kisses the soiled fabric. In fact, Pâquette's obsessive-compulsive tendencies do not end until her daughter is brought back to her in the form of the grown Esmeralda, whom she has blamed for the loss of her child over the course of the novel. It is worth noting that while Pâquette spends years longing for her daughter, she heartlessly rejects the young disabled boy the gypsies left in the girl's place—Quasimodo. Perhaps the reason Pâquette's sanity returns in the final chapters of The Hunchback of Notre Dame is because she is driven mad by true love whereas Frollo's insanity is the result of his lust. Also, in secluding herself to a life of prayer in the Tower or Roland, Pâquette is essentially going to God to deal with her madness and overwhelming loss while Frollo does not, which is interesting considering his position as archdeacon of Notre Dame.

In The Hunchback of Notre Dame, the sublime is used to characterize Notre Dame as well as make characters classified as Other stand out to readers. The relationship between Hugo and Notre Dame is intriguing in that the cathedral is not only presented as a character but also as an Other. Hugo introduces Notre Dame as being uniquely Other when he writes, “Notre-Dame is not, moreover, what can be called a complete, definite, classified monument. It is no longer a Romanesque church; nor is it a Gothic church . . . It is an edifice of the transition period” (Hugo). Hugo paints Notre Dame as not architecturally definable. The cathedral is neither Romanesque nor Gothic, but rather a marriage of the two different styles, a “Frankenstein's monster,” if you will, of the architectural world. In fact, Burke states “The apparent disorder augments the grandeur, for the appearance of care is highly contrary to our ideas of magnificence” (78). Although Notre Dame is an integral part of Hugo's medieval Paris, the cathedral is effectively set apart from society due to its role as a channel between people and God. According to Burke, “Infinity has a tendency to fill the mind with a sort of delightful horror, which is the most genuine effect, and truest test of the sublime” (73). Notre Dame's being an Other makes it the perfect residence for those society considers to be Other in Hugo's novel.

In acting as Quasimodo's sanctuary, Notre Dame both protects the hunchback and contributes to his being seen as an Other by society. One aspect of the sublime is obscurity, of which Burke says, “To make any thing very terrible, obscurity seems in general to be necessary” (58). Hugo's medieval public views Quasimodo as terrifying partly because of his perpetual concealment inside of Notre Dame as the cathedral's bell ringer. Another way in which Quasimodo is obscured to the Parisians is his unknown heritage, something he and Esmeralda have in common. According to Novikoff, “The protagonists’ lack of background is relevant” (Novikoff). While
readers eventually discover where both characters' origins lie, this information is never revealed to Hugo's fictional Parisians, and this adds to the public's anxiety towards both Quasimodo and Esmeralda. The public's fear of Quasimodo is assayed somewhat when he rescues Esmeralda from execution in the square before Notre Dame, and they believe that Quasimodo saves her "with the force of God" (Hugo). By linking the feared Other with God, Hugo's medieval Parisians grant Quasimodo a legitimacy he has never before possessed, and this causes their sentiments towards him to change.

In being Quasimodo's sanctuary, Notre Dame also functions as Esmeralda's prison. After rescuing her from certain death, Quasimodo brings Esmeralda to a hidden cell in Notre Dame where he tells her "During the day you will remain here; at night you can walk all over the church. But do not leave the church either by day or by night. You would be lost. They would kill you, and I should die" (Hugo). Quasimodo knows if Esmeralda leaves the sanctuary provided by Notre Dame she will be seized and hanged immediately, yet the hunchback's home is a prison to the young gypsy girl, as it would be to anyone threatened with lifetime confinement. Her cell is described more as a dungeon than a room in a church, a place through which she can see life taking place in the streets of Paris, but cannot participate. When Esmeralda eventually escapes from Notre Dame she is killed shortly thereafter, proving the theory that the Other is safe only in the locational Other – in this case, Notre Dame.

As mentioned previously, Notre Dame houses Frollo's alchemic laboratory. Frollo's hideout is concealed in the tower of Notre Dame, and the description of his laboratory combined with that of Esmeralda's cell momentarily transforms Notre Dame into a Gothic castle. Frollo's repression spawns Esmeralda's imprisonment, first in the dungeon of the Palace of Justice and again in her cell in Notre Dame, a chain reaction that leads to both of their deaths. In this sense, Frollo is perhaps based on a character found earlier in the Gothic tradition—Matthew Lewis' Ambrosio in The Monk. On The Monk, Clemens mentions the novel's "pervading argument, which concerns the dangers of excessive repression in both the individual and the social spheres" (59). Frollo and Esmeralda can also be examined through the depictions of what Burke calls the "individual" and the "generation." Burke states that, "The passions belonging to the preservation of the individual, turn wholly on pain and danger; those which belong to generation, have their origin in gratification and pleasures" (40). Esmeralda's constant flight from Frollo is due to her preservation of self, from her rightly perceiving the archdeacon as a threat to her well-being. Frollo, on the other hand, is driven by the passions of the generation, which come from his overwhelming lust for the gypsy girl and lead him to pursue her literally to death.

Quasimodo, Notre Dame, and Esmeralda can be examined through the sublime lens by contrasting beauty and ugliness. In order for something to be beautiful, Burke claims the object must possess “An appearance of delicacy, and even fragility” (116). Esmeralda's petite frame is mentioned throughout The Hunchback of Notre Dame, yet Burke's definition of beauty contradicts Notre Dame being beautiful because of its grandiose size. In fact, Burke also states that for women “First, the colours of beautiful bodies must not be dusky or muddy, but clean and fair” (117). In contrast to Burke's statement, Esmeralda is described as being dark on multiple occasions, as is Notre Dame. An example of this is seen when in describing Notre Dame, Hugo says, “it is time which has spread over the façade that sombre hue of the centuries which makes the old age of monuments the period of their beauty” (Hugo). There is the possibility of Hugo
imposing his personal infatuation with foreign women (or at least with the actresses who play them: I am thinking of his affair with Juliette Drouet, whom he met while she was playing the role of an “oriental princess”) on both his readers and Notre Dame, yet that seems unlikely because millions of people see Notre Dame as beautiful. Quasimodo is described as being dark as well, yet his apparent Oriental lineage does nothing to make him handsome. Furthering his discussion on appearances, Burke says, “But I would by no means insinuate that ugliness of itself is a sublime idea unless united with such qualities as to excite a strong terror” (119). Throughout the novel Quasimodo is classified as being “ugly,” and while ugliness is not sublime in itself, Quasimodo's facial features are indeed sublime because all except Frollo are afraid to look upon him. Thus, in writing _The Hunchback of Notre Dame_, Hugo makes four of his main characters, including Notre Dame, both sublime and the Gothic Other, creating an unexpected depth which makes his novel memorable.

Another unexpected aspect of Hugo's work is the inclusion of carnival. The Middle Ages is definable partly by the presence of carnival, which forms “A boundless world of humorous forms and manifestations opposed the official and serious tone of medieval ecclesiastical and feudal culture” (4). The society described by Hugo's medieval Paris is a tense environment, a world in which the honest are abused and all people have unrealistic expectations forced upon them. The strained state of humanity in Hugo's novel—much like the time period it strives to represent—could explain why Hugo's medieval public laughs frequently, even in socially unacceptable situations. Bakhtin theorizes, “Laughter and its forms represent, as we have said, the least scrutinized sphere of the people's creation” (4). The need for comedic relief in Hugo's novel eagerly paves the way for the atmosphere of carnival, enchanting Hugo's characters and audience alike.

À la Bakhtin (1984, 5–10), the carnivalesque present in _The Hunchback of Notre Dame_ is centered in two locations—the Palace of Justice and the Court of Miracles. Hugo introduces his medieval world to modern readers through the Feast of Fools, implemented traditionally by the Church. Bakhtin writes, “Besides carnivals proper . . . there was the “feast of fools” . . . consecrated by tradition” (5). The Feast of Fools and other amusements were initially allowed by the Church in order for a purge to take place in stratified medieval society. Hugo sets the Feast of Fools both inside of and in the shadow of the Palace of Justice, creating parallel worlds of fantasy and reality which medieval commoners dually occupied. The locational Gothic of the Feast of Fools also reflects the social unrest in both Hugo's society and his perception of medieval France. Tensions between the nobility and French public are evident in the novel when, after becoming impatient waiting for Gringoire's mystery to begin, the crowd muses on how to entertain themselves, shouting “let us begin the hanging with his sergeants” (Hugo). Although the crowd does not really hang members of the military, the soldiers momentarily fear for their lives in the face of the angry mob; yet the scene is written in such a way that the reader does not consider the seriousness of social tensions in the Middle Ages.

Another aspect of the carnivalesque present in Hugo's Feast of Fools is the crowning of the Pope of Fools. According to Bakhtin, “Minor occasions were also marked by comic protocol, as for instance the election of a king . . . to preside at a banquet ‘for laughter's sake’ (roi pour rire)” (5). While the Festival of Fools is a feast day, Hugo uses the carnival tradition for his own purposes in _The Hunchback of Notre Dame_. When the time comes to select the Pope of Fools, the Flemish
ambassador suggests the Parisians choose their Pope as the Flemish do, “we collect a crowd like this one here, then each person in turn passes his head through a hole, and makes a grimace at the rest; the one who makes the ugliest, is elected pope by general acclamation” (Hugo). In this way, Quasimodo is chosen as the Pope of Fools because he has the ugliest face, and in the atmosphere of carnival he is able to become part of the society which normally rejects him.

The Court of Miracles is brimming with the spirit of carnival as well, although unlike the Festival of Fools, only criminals and vagabonds are allowed to dwell in this section of the Town. The Court of Miracles as a carnivalesque location is supported by Bakhtin: Carnival is not a spectacle to be seen by people; they live in it, and everyone participates because its very idea embraces all the people. While carnival lasts, there is no other life outside it. During carnival time life is subject only to its laws, that is, the laws of its own freedom (7).

Criminals in the Court of Miracles guard their home by executing any Bourgeois person who invades their territory and is unable to become a Truand. Hugo describes the Court of Miracles: “It was a vast place, irregular and badly paved, like all the squares of Paris at that date. Fires, around which swarmed strange groups, blazed here and there. Everyone was going, coming, and shouting. Shrii laughter was to be heard, the wailing of children, the voices of women. The hands and heads of this throng, black against the luminous background, outlined against it a thousand eccentric gestures” (Hugo).

This vast Gothic square surrounded by decayed houses and filled with morally decayed people is more Gothic than the Feast of Fools, and it is here that the atmosphere of Carnival flourishes. However, the Truands' multifaceted society cannot exist outside of their square in the Town or in the light of day. Hugo demonstrates the fragility of the locational Gothic by showing the Truands and their topsy-turvy world only by night, as well as by including the Truands' failed raid on Notre Dame in the City, during which many of their numbers died. Much as in Notre Dame, in the Court of Miracles those born of different social ranks are on level ground. Also, in the decayed Gothic square the Truands can truly be anything they want to be, such as when Jehan is recorded there as “The individual who had thus screwed a whole outfit upon his body, was so hidden by his warlike accoutrements that nothing was to be seen of his person save an impertinent, red, snub nose, a rosy mouth, and bold eyes. His belt was full of daggers and poniards, a huge sword on his hip, a rusted cross-bow at his left” (Hugo).

The Court of Miracles is truly a place where anything can happen: a literal wonderland in which a scholar steps into thievery and consequently knighthood, a poet transforms into a street-performer, miscreants of society attempt heroic deeds, and a common criminal rules over all as king. The absurdity of society's filth fulfilling roles such as these in a Gothic text is nothing short of extraordinary, yet Hugo allows his readers to revel in the carnivalesque along with his characters in the Court of Miracles.

Another aspect of carnival in The Hunchback of Notre Dame is the use of oaths by Hugo's characters. In the Middle Ages, “Profanities and oaths were not initially related to laughter, but they were excluded from the sphere of official speech because they broke its norms . . . Here in the carnival atmosphere they acquired the nature of laughter and became ambivalent” (Bakhtin 17).
Oaths are used regularly by multiple characters in the novel, although only two instances will be mentioned here. When Phoebus saves Esmeralda somewhere between the City and the Town and she gets away from him, he uses the oath “nombrill of the Pope” (Hugo). This phrase translates to “the Pope's navel” in English, although what Phoebus means by it is uncertain. Likewise, Clopin king of the Truands uses an oath when he shouts “by the devil's claws” (Hugo). While the origins of these oaths remain unknown, they allow their speakers to vent their frustration as well as add to the comedic aspect of the novel.

Since the invention of film in the late nineteenth century, several adaptations of *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* have been made, although only Disney's version will be examined here. While Disney's perception of Hugo's novel has been criticized for taking certain liberties, the company's version of *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* corrects some of the mistakes made by earlier film adaptations. For instance, in earlier film versions Quasimodo appears to be older than he is in the novel because the actors playing him were all middle-aged; yet in the Disney version, the producers present Quasimodo, “as a troubled adolescent fascinated by a world he could only experience from a distance” (Finch 345). While Disney's Quasimodo pines after medieval Paris in a way that Hugo's does not, viewers are able to relate to the “new” Quasimodo on a personal level because he is able to take center-stage in a way he cannot in the novel because of Hugo's use of Pierre Gringoire as a Romantic filter of the Gothic.

Disney visually reproduces many of the aesthetics from Hugo's novel. Finch notes this when he states, “*The Hunchback of Notre Dame* derives from its strong sense of place, and its use of architecture as a way of symbolically describing different aspects of the human condition” (348). Disney achieves architectural characterization through the use of talking gargoyles, the warm colors of Notre Dame, and musical numbers such as “God Help the Outcasts,” where Esmeralda relates her “Other” status to Jesus Christ. Also, the song “The Court of Miracles” sets the putrescent hideout of the gypsies in the crypts below Paris rather than in plain sight, reflecting the moral and social state of the “Other” group. Disney went to great pains to understand Hugo and the world he lived in by sending teams to study Notre Dame in person: “Concept artists, and layout artists . . . began to research this world, studying photographs, as well as the works of many artists, including those of Victor Hugo . . . they began to set down on paper a very concrete image of the city that would appear on screen. The square in front of the cathedral . . . was established in great detail so that . . . every shop, every tavern, every home, every warehouse facing into the square was delineated with as much detail as the facade of the cathedral itself” (345–347).

Disney effectively recreates Hugo's view of medieval Paris in the film *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* while giving his characters a life of their own. Aside from Quasimodo, the character who receives the most attention in the film is Frollo. While Hugo informs readers of Frollo's past and therefore makes his audience sympathetic to the antagonist, Disney feels no inclination to do so, and thus transforms Frollo into a more Gothic character than Hugo depicts. An example of this is seen in “Hellfire,” a song which begins with Frollo praying to the Virgin Mary but quickly turns sinister when he realizes the state of his own soul. Disney's artists present Frollo's reaction to his lust in great detail, tracking the judge's expression and body language as they shift from open supplication to definite horror. This scene is also an example of how Disney took a story meant
for a Catholic audience and told it through a Protestant lens. Frollo's apparel more closely resembles that of a Protestant preacher than a Catholic official, and Disney's Frollo also blames Esmeralda for his lust while Hugo's Frollo does not.

Another scene made more Gothic because of Disney's visualization and music is “Sanctuary,” where Quasimodo saves Esmeralda from being burned at the stake as a witch. Based loosely on Quasimodo's saving the gypsy in the novel, this scene's Gothic presence is reached because it combines two scenes from Hugo's work: the first where Quasimodo descends Notre Dame's bell tower to save Esmeralda from hanging, and the second scene in which Quasimodo defends Notre Dame from the Truand invasion. Through its presentation of Frollo as a Gothic villain similar to Walpole’s Manfred from *The Castle of Otranto*, as well as its use of visual and auditory aids to present Quasimodo without a Romantic filter, Disney succeeds in making their film more Gothic than Hugo's novel.

*The Hunchback of Notre Dame* is a multifaceted work overflowing with the Gothic. While Victor Hugo presents many elements pertaining to the Gothic in his novel, he remains true to his original love of architecture through basing the Gothic in specific locations. In having the Gothic occur in Notre Dame, the Place de Grève, the Palace of Justice, the Tower of Roland, and the Court of Miracles, Hugo separates the Gothic as well as the Carnivalesque from normal medieval society; however, this does not stop the Gothic from invading different parts of Paris. Hugo effectively presents Quasimodo as a “traditional Other” worth defending, making the hunchback a valiant hero in a world full of men with selfish ambitions. Through Quasimodo, Hugo opens a door to the world of the Other, a world which before his time was relatively unexplored. In Esmeralda, Hugo portrays a self-sufficient Oriental Other who refuses to remain the helpless “pursued maiden” of Gothic fiction. Although she has her moments of giving into despair, Esmeralda fights her fate until her last breath, unlike former Gothic heroines such as Walpole’s Isabella and Hippolita from *The Castle of Otranto* who place themselves at the mercy of their oppressors. Frollo provides a new perception of the Other that exists within society because of his alchemic practices and overwhelming lust for Esmeralda while under the guise of priesthood. Frollo is both part of and apart from society, although unlike Notre Dame he is a sinister Other with only his self-interests in mind. Hugo surprises readers by his depiction of Notre Dame as both a character and an Other, a point which the author defends through the cathedral's unique melding of architectural styles and its providing a haven for the Other, regardless of his or her intentions. Criminals' classifications as being Other in *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* is astonishing, but as Burke points out, “The passion caused by the great and sublime in nature, when those causes operate most powerfully, is astonishment; and astonishment is that state of the soul, in which all its motions are suspended, with some degree of horror” (57).

Hugo astonishes through his perception of the sublime and the role it plays in both architecture and the shaping of his characters. Only in a Gothic novel can the simultaneous operations of beauty and ugliness, love and madness, and pain and death be seen along with the terror that plays in the background of daily life. Terror is exemplified in Hugo's novel by two characters who succumb to madness, although while Pâquette overcomes her insanity when she sees her grown daughter alive, Frollo's sanity never fully returns, possibly as punishment for plotting rape and committing murder because of his lust. The carnivalesque in *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* is Gothic because it creates a society separate from the normal society of medieval Paris. Hugo's
use of the carnivalesque aligns with Bakhtin's later work, seen when the literary theorist states, “Thus carnival is the people's second life, organized on the basis of laughter” (8). Whereas not all of Hugo's persecuted characters are able to enjoy the atmosphere of carnival, thankfully this hidden world is shared with readers. In presenting an alternate and seemingly unlimited world, however, Hugo creates a type of medieval “Neverland” which readers can see yet not partake in, but at least the Truand sanctuary can be appreciated for what it is: the decayed, stinking slums of the Town where the impossible becomes possible and social equality exists regardless of deformity, birth, race, or age. Through *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*, Hugo presents a Gothic story that is uniquely tangible because of the characters declared Other by society and the architectural structures that house them. Ultimately, Hugo's tale leaves the impression that the Gothic is just as relevant today as it was in times past, and the genre is as indomitable as the stone walls of Notre Dame.
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Prefatory Comments: Questions of Style, and Voice

Cultural Studies is a movement across disciplines where artistic expression, activism, and scholarship take place. In re-considering the state of Cultural Studies (while recognizing that such a unity may be illusory), I touch base in all three domains: creative expression, public sphere work, and scholarship. My involvement in Cultural Studies followed this trajectory, first songwriting and activism, and later scholarship.

Here I must address readers directly, with a forewarning about the style of my “stance and engagement” (Hyland 2005). I am arguing for a kind of cultural analysis that is grounded in practical experience. So I find it necessary to defend the value of personal voice. One reader of this project suggested that “detailed personal references seem at odds” with ambitious scholarly inter-weaving. While I share an aversion to the excesses of the merely personal, I take issue with the idea that the personal and the scholarly cannot be mutually beneficial. In fact, in agreement with Michael Billig (2013) about the generally atrocious state of social science and humanities writing, I would go further. I align myself with those who have insisted that the loss of personal voice is not only the root of bad, theory-clotted writing, but that such writing can often amount to a sort of self-marginalizing “mental slavery.”

The co-existence of a more personal and even literary style of writing, and academic rigor, was generally not an issue before the 1980s. With the influx of theories such as post-structuralism, some writer-scholars began to push back against theoretical abstractions, and bad writing. I will give just two examples, to situate my approach in recent historical examples, specifically in relation to counter-currents in feminism, and ethnography.
In her 1987 essay “Me and My Shadow,” Jane Tompkins quotes the late Ursula Le Guin, who differentiated between the “father tongue,” which is spoken from above and does not expect an answer, and the “mother tongue,” which is conversational. She then puts this theory into practice by pulling Guattari and Foucault off her bookshelf, and “reading them” to her readers. She finds their language “incredibly alienating” and “disappointingly magisterial,” and concludes that she is “not willing to go along for the march” (2137, 2139). By contrast, Tompkins observes, “Sometimes, when a writer introduces some personal bit of story into an essay, I can hardly contain my pleasure… I feel I'm being nourished by them” (2131).

I share this feeling of exhilaration when writers combine the personal with the analytical. But the personal became more difficult to integrate, as theorists gained hegemony. This is not un-related to the ascendency of Cultural Studies in the late 1980s and the 1990s. By 1990, when Michael Kleine published “Beyond Triangulation: Ethnography, Writing and Rhetoric,” the field of rhetoric and composition was turning against writerly traditions such as expressivism, or the process school. Kleine felt that compositionists had missed a golden opportunity by not following the lead of self-reflexive ethnography. He issued a polemical call-to-arms:

We must…allow ourselves to write even more in the first-person singular, to write personal diaries--even confessions--about our experiences as ethnographers. Perhaps these diaries should…supplant formal academic articles for a while. By studying ourselves, we will come to terms with our own rhetoric (my emphasis) (Kleine 124).

This call for a more personal “time out” was not generally followed, as ethnography largely went underground while post-process or “the social turn” achieved apparent hegemony in composition studies. However, there have been numerous writers working on the borderlands between composition studies, creative writing, and cultural studies, such as Wendy Bishop, and Linda Brodkey, who achieve theoretical sophistication through personal narrative.

With the passing of the “theory wars” in composition studies, more pragmatic domains opened such as Writing Studies from about 2003 on, and Creative Writing Studies in the last decade. In these fields, it is possible to fuse a literary personal voice with scholarly grounding. One example of my own work in this mode is “Split-Screen Freedom” (Stephens 2017). In short, the argument for the co-existence of personal voice, literary style, and scholarly rigor has deep roots, disciplinary legitimacy, and an ability to travel. But Cultural Studies, intent on establishing disciplinary credentials, has largely missed out on these developments of integrating personal voice into scholarly work. When I suggest that a more fluid form of processual cultural analysis can benefit from fields such as ethnography, and Creative Writing Studies, this is rooted in personal experience, but it is far from a merely personal style, or opinion.

Let me make clear the context in which I call on personal experience as an entry point to scholarly debates. My personal points of reference, which I believe are relevant to my critique of the romance of resistance, are three-fold: 1) having a background in the practice of popular culture, which precedes academic study; 2) living since 2004 primarily outside the continental United States, with nine years residence to date in Jamaica, Saudi Arabia, and Puerto Rico, which means that my point of view will be different from much of Cultural Studies scholarship in either the United States, or Great Britain; 3) working for the past four years as a teacher of Creative Writing, not merely as artistic expression, but as a pedagogy with great relevance for
both other disciplines, and for post-academic life (Stephens 2017). So in cultural analysis, as in Creative Writing, I subscribe to the argument that we cannot retain relevance, as teachers and scholars, if we do not maintain the capacity to speak in the language of cultural practitioners, and creative writers themselves (Leahy 2016, 7).

Thus I want to be clear about what is and is not on my agenda here. I am not offering a comprehensive survey of Stuart Hall’s work, or Cultural Studies scholarship, although I dip into both in some depth. I am not going to offer any commentary about the kinds of cultural analysis that might emerge from the various disasters that Puerto Rico has suffered. I do address these issues, and model a more ethnographic form of cultural analysis, in a monograph, “Three Birds Sing a New Song: A Puerto Rican Trilogy on Dystopia, Precarity, and Resistance” (to be published by Intermezzo at http://intermezzo.enculturation.net/). What I do offer in the present essay is an often-personal account of a “journey through Cultural Studies,” which is something of an outsider’s point of view. After attempting to “translate” some of Stuart Hall’s posthumously published work, I conclude that although some of Hall’s ideas remain useful, the field of Cultural Studies (still) needs to be revitalized (Peterson 1979; Rodman 2015). I offer a preliminary version of a processual theory of cultural analysis as a step in that direction.

* My overview is informed by post-romantic culture studies, and critiques of the “culture concept” in anthropology and other social sciences, as well as by my encounters with institutionalized Cultural Studies during the 1990s. The publication of a group of Stuart Hall’s speeches, political writings, and a memoir provided a framework for my reconsideration. I have three intersecting objectives. One objective is a reflection about my “walk through Cultural Studies.” A secondary objective is to sketch some of what is involved in translating Cultural Studies into Hispano-Caribbean context. It is through my own engagement, and the attempts to “translate Hall,” that my critique of the romance of resistance is developed.

A certain touchiness among those committed to defending Cultural Studies as a field, or who feel a possessive insideriness about Stuart Hall’s legacy, became evident to me while reading earlier comments from a major Cultural Studies journal. So to the question of “positionality”: I use the singular term “culture studies” intentionally to indicate a larger domain of cultural analysis. This domain is not co-extensive with Cultural Studies. The “official story” of Cultural Studies, with a root in Hall’s tenure at the Birmingham Center for Cultural Studies, continues to arouse respect on my part. When I picture younger readers/graduate students who are drawing on some variant of “Cultural Studies,” I would like for them to maintain a critical perspective towards “official versions,” and be aware of a wider set of resources for the study of culture, which the official version may at times obscure. I am telling a particular version of this story, which foregrounds the strengths and weakness of my own entry points.

There are three contexts or sources for my re-evaluation of institutional Cultural Studies. First, my entry point was as a songwriter for “politically conscious” dance music in Austin Texas during the 1980s. This was a valuable introduction, since Cultural Studies was, in its origins, an effort to create space to study how we live through culture, or cultural expression. Cultural expression as a lived culture, rather than the academic study of dead texts, was a primary focus of early Cultural Studies. This was in the first instance an oppositional move: rather than focusing on canonical texts or establishment leaders, people who did cultural studies were
determined to open space for the practice of, and the study of, *everyday cultures*: popular culture, the material bases of identity politics, etc. (Miller 2006, 1).

My second formative context was grad school in California; especially versions of Cultural Studies to which I was exposed in the University of California in the 1990s. This included study of the work of Stuart Hall. My engagement with several of Hall’s books published 2016-17 gives me an occasion to re-evaluate one of Cultural Studies’ founding fathers “from the margins,” as it were, of the Caribbean region where Hall was born and raised.

The third context is as a professor of English at the University of Puerto Rico-Mayagüez. When I gave a Spring 2017 seminar in Cultural Studies, the way I taught the material was quickly “taken over” by current events, man-made and natural disasters, and wider currents in the Caribbean world. Let me explain. While teaching Cultural Studies I was writing an earlier version of this essay for a University of the West Indies conference, “Whither the Caribbean? Stuart Hall’s Intellectual Legacy.” I had been a Lecturer of “Cultural Studies and Film” at UWI-Mona from 2004-08. On return I was also critically re-engaging with what I saw as a reactionary conception of race and resistance in Jamaica (Stephens 2011). The voices of racial victimization at the conference reminded me that Jamaicans seem unfamiliar with Hall’s critique of “an essentialized conception of race” (2017c, 74), despite their efforts to reclaim him as their own.

My revisioning of Cultural Studies was further reshaped by a series of shocks Puerto Rico suffered in 2017. First there was a severe fiscal crisis, with a U.S. supervisory board taking on oversight of the island’s finances. Student strikes shut down University of Puerto Rico for two months. I had framed my seminar through some of Hall’s theories, such as conjunctural analysis. Now, unable to meet with students, I analyzed the rhetoric of resistance in Spanish-language commentary about the student strike (Stephens 2018).

Finally, in September 2017, Puerto Rico was devastated by Hurricane Maria, which left the island in a “post-apocalyptic state.” Rethinking “the state of cultural studies” in this context, I had little tolerance for theoretical abstractions. And I was impatient with an entrenched romance of resistance. This romance had blinkered both Puerto Ricans who wanted to imagine alternatives to colonial dependency (Acosta Cruz 2014), and many on the liberal-left who glorify and reify opposition wherever it remained, or could be imagined.

The theoretical foundations of Cultural Studies were not always adequate for what I saw in the Caribbean. However, I did find value in a “post-romantic turn” in Cultural Studies, whose proponents were critical of Hall’s somewhat rosy view of *symbols of resistance*. Such post-romantic roadmarks (Miles 2014, 76-87) build on earlier critiques of the romance of resistance by anthropologists such as Lila Abu-Lughold, Michael Brown, and Sherry Ortner. However, the post-romantic turn was difficult to teach in Puerto Rico, where opposition to the United States colonial presence often co-existed with a full immersion in U.S. commercial culture (Cruz 2014). In translating Cultural Studies into a form that made sense in “The Last Colony,”1 I relied on
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1 See Márquez (2015) and Collado-Schwarz (2012).
ethnographic methods, along with key ideas translated by Hall, such as Raymond Williams’ “structures of feeling,” and Gramsci’s often misunderstood concept of hegemony.

A Chorus of Reconsiderations

Many authors of books about the field in recent years have asked variants of Gilbert Rodman’s chapter title “Cultural Studies: What’s Wrong?” from Why Cultural Studies? (2015). In its emergent or insurgent era, up through its boom years in the 1990s, Cultural Studies rattled the cage of the status quo. “Done properly cultural studies should agitate, provoke, disturb, and unsettle you,” Rodman writes (2). Lawrence Grossberg begins his recent book with a sort of call-to-arms: that teachers, students, and activists who want to renew this spirit of “agitational energy” must take up the challenge “to wake cultural studies out of….its ‘dogmatic slumber’” (1992, 4). Stuart Hall anticipated much of this self-critique.

Rodman describes two basic accounts of the field’s origins. 1) Cultural Studies was an “offshoot of English that came about when literary scholars turned their attention to the analysis of television, rock’n’roll,” etc. 2) “In another version of the story, cultural studies is what happened when communication scholars began to treat the mass media as a form of culture, rather than as an arena where messages and information moved from one point to another” (24).

The latter sounds like the version of “Cult-Stud” I saw as a grad student in Communication at the University of California-San Diego (1992-1996). Coming out of a career in Austin as a songwriter, and having written a thesis about interracial dialogue in rap music, the rebelliousness and interdisciplinarity of Cultural Studies appealed to me. It offered a temporary home, and a forum in which to publish. Yet I soon saw that rebellion was often a pose; it had become a profession. As a field Cultural Studies had often degenerated into versions of, “look, isn’t my favorite TV show or pop singer really cool?” And, “don’t I seem really oppositional in how I decode the mainstream media?” Stuart Hall himself had a “profound skepticism” about what academic Cultural Studies was becoming (Ang 30); he distanced himself from the superficiality of much of Cultural Studies in its boom period (Bérubé 2009; Raud 2016, 3). He also was critical of the fetishizing of theory by Americans in particular (Slack and Grossberg 1983, xi).

In adapting a flexible form of cultural analysis that can travel, and be used in the Writing Studies classes that have become my bread and butter, I have sought to ground Cultural Studies in transferable definitions of culture. Clear working definitions of culture must be at the heart of any attempt to appraise the state of Cultural Studies, in my view. Founders like Raymond Williams often drew on anthropology for their definitions of culture (Highmore 2013, 181).

One core definition to which I return is that cultures are distinguished by patterns that repeat themselves, or “dynamically recurring patterns in social life” (Heath and Street 2008, 11). This focus on repeating patterns is widespread in cultural anthropology and related fields (Benedict 1934; Geertz 1973; Harris 1974, 144; Peterson 1979, 138; Keesing 1994, 68; Gatewood 2001, 237; Pryor 2004, 397). Culture is our matrix: a mostly invisible, largely unconscious structure.
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2 This is related to, but not the same as the research tradition of “Teaching for Transfer” (TfT), as I discuss in “Transferble Skills” (Stephens 2017a).
Two definitions which I have found valuable are that a) culture is an “invisible structure of life” (Reynolds & Valentine 2013, xvii); and b) culture is “a vast unexplored region of human behaviour that exists outside the range of people’s conscious awareness, a ‘silent language’ that is usually conveyed unconsciously,” as Edward Hall wrote (xix).

Within various GE writing courses, I distill this in three words, for the purposes of my students: culture is an invisible structuring pattern. In auto-ethnographies and other assignments, I teach writing students to make the patterns visible, and to narrate their structuring force. I want students to develop a sense of culture as relational (Desmond 2014), distributive (Rodseth 1998; Gatewood 2001), and attuned to the “connections and interconnections” of lived cultural processes (Abu Lughod 1991, 472).

In developing an interdisciplinary form of cultural analysis, I have found it necessary to address a sustained critique of the view of culture as a thing, rather than a process (Evans 2007, 429; Trouillot 2002, 43). A critique of “bounded” culture (Wolf 1972, 6) has continued for decades precisely because static conceptions of culture remain pervasive. Anthropologists have fiercely criticized the essentialist version of culture-as-other, which has become hegemonic (Morsy 1988, 70) in the social sciences, in Cultural Studies, and in institutional practice. Static views of culture and identity are pervasive in the cultural rhetorics that have emerged in the wake of Ethnic Studies. Political and educational institutions are deeply invested in essentialized definitions of cultural, ethnic, or racial identity. Surveying the sustained critique of the “bounded culture” concept (Fox & King 2002; Abu Lughod 1991; Fernandez 1994; Trouillot 2002; Bashkkow 2004; Raud 2016), one finds that the largely static, essentialized version of culture which predominated in Cultural Studies has become a poster child for what ails cultural analysis. In his book subtitled Outline of an Integral Theory of Culture, Rein Raud voices what I take to be something close to a consensus view, in the broader domain of cultural analysis towards which I am gesturing, when he writes:

> In spite of its original opposition to the oppressive hierarchies of its day, ‘cultural studies’ have by now become the new orthodoxy, a conservative and state field within which nothing really new has appeared for decades (Raud 2016, 3).

My objective is to attempt to look at institutional Cultural Studies from the outside, and to become more fully aware of the field’s repeating patterns, which have aroused such a sustained, often convincing critique. The repeating patterns in a culture are usually invisible to its participating members. Study of our own cultures thus requires a process of defamiliarization. One must get outside of a culture, to see it whole. This defamiliarizing process requires one to be a fish out of water, estranging the familiar as a way to see “the water”—one’s culture—with new eyes. But that would seem to be like “the rich man going through the eye of the needle” for a field now invested “in its own professionalization” (Rodman 2015, ix). Cultural Studies is now firmly entrenched on the inside of universities, and is often self-absorbed, as Hall himself came to believe. To some extent it has become irrelevant to wider disciplinary streams of scholarship.

The repeating patterns I have seen in grad students are like what I experienced at Cultural Studies conferences in the 1990s: expressions of resistance to an othered center, an oppressive power. One claims moral superiority from the margins, but these “margins” have become big business, arguably the mainstream in recent publishing and hiring trends. This is what I saw in
California in the 1990s, which was to some degree an outgrowth of oppositional politics of the 1980s, when Cultural Studies was “imported” in the U.S. The political context—Thatcherism in the UK, and the “Reagan Revolution” in the U.S., helps explain the tenor of Hall’s reception in the U.S., with the near-reverent attitude certainly conditioned by the fact that Hall was—often a surprise to those who saw him for the first time—a black man of Jamaican origin.3

**Stuart Hall’s American Star Turns: 1983 and 1994**

Stuart Hall was 51 years old when he delivered a series of eight lectures at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in the summer of 1983. Lawrence Grossberg, who became Hall’s disciple in the U.S., remembers Hall’s 1983 lectures as “riveting.” Few knew of Hall’s work at the time, but word spread, and hundreds came to hear Hall, some driving for hours. “The mood during the lectures was electric” (Grossberg and Slack 2016, viii). The language used about this theoretical “British invasion” in the Introduction to *Cultural Studies 1983* (Grossberg and Slack 2016, vii-xiv) reminds me a bit of the conversion experiences of Spaniards listening to an emissary of the anarchist Bakunin in 1868, resulting in “marvelous Pentecostal scenes” (Brenan 1964, 141).

Reading this book in 2017, I found myself underlining and “talking back” in the margins throughout. But the language often seemed taxing. Hall’s prose reconfirms my long impression that Marxist writers are rarely a pleasure to read. The 1983 conference organized by Cary Nelson and Larry Grossberg, after all, was titled “Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture: Limits, Frontiers, Boundaries.” I can look back and understand the perception that Hall was *electric* in person, after watching John Akomfrah’s film *The Stuart Hall Project: Revolution, politics, culture and the New Left Experience*. But writings such as Duke UP’s releases of Hall’s lectures, political writings, and his “memoir” *Familiar Stranger*, don’t have the benefit of a Miles Davis soundtrack, which gave me an emotional connection to Akomfrah’s film, in which Hall’s rich voice and Davis’ “lonely fire” music work in tandem.

Davis’s music was also a soundtrack for many of my formative experiences. But the only “soundtrack” to Hall’s published writing and lectures is a presumed familiarity with Marxist theory. As the *Selected Political Writings* editors observe in their “Introduction,” Hall “never… vacated the theoretical terrain of Marxism” (Davison et al 2017, 4). On one level this is an admirable consistency, especially for loyalists to this quasi-faith. But it may also be part of why late in life Hall came to feel like a “dinosaur.” As *Stuart Hall Project* and *Familiar Stranger* make clear, Hall’s intellectual formation took place primarily during the 1950s. His work on the *New Left Review* is arguably closer to his “true vocation” that his later, often collaborative writings while serving as director of the Birmingham Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies.

The “Cultural Studies” Hall from a Birmingham base, and later the feted Sociology professor at the Open University post in London, were the versions Americans first came to know. But his style remained rooted in Marxist debates of the 1950s, and to a degree the 1960s. Hall’s late
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3 Henry Louis Gates first heard about Hall while doing a tutorial with Raymond Williams at Cambridge 1973-74. It was another decade before Gates realized that Hall was black. Forty-odd years later Gates finds it “somewhat astonishing” that Williams never told him that Hall was black (2017, xx).
career as prophet of “race and representation” seems even more distant from his intellectual formation, in my view. But it was his work on “race,” reprinted in Harvard University Press’ publication of his 1994 lectures in The Fateful Triangle: Race, Ethnicity, Nation, which has given Hall the most enduring afterlife with United States, primarily in Black Studies now, it seems. The Hall of Fateful Triangle was 62 years old, and far removed from both the public sphere debater we see in Stuart Hall Project, or the cultural studies guru of the 1983 lectures, with their deep soundings into Marxist Structuralism, and Hegemony. There is only a brief discussion of race in the “Ideology and Ideological Structure” chapter of Cultural Studies 1983.

Hall’s Afterlife in U.S. Cultural Studies and Identity Politics

When one thinks about an operative matrix for American Cultural Studies, the door-stop volume Cultural Studies, published by Routledge in 1992, seemed to have a weight (both literal and metaphorical) that no other text in the field would be able to equal. No less an authority than Dick Hebdige, author of the influential Subculture: The Meaning of Style, called this collection “a new agenda for cultural studies in the 90s” (blurb). This book drew from the Urbana-Champaign summer “teaching institute” and conference where Stuart Hall had delivered his inaugural American lectures in 1983. Hall was a sort of godfather to the project.

Those 1983 and 1992 dates also have a personal meaning for me, shaping how I first saw, and later had second thoughts about, the state of cultural studies. In 1983, as Hall delivered his seminal lectures, I was beginning my career as a songwriter in Austin. In 1992, I was entering the PhD program in Communication at the University of California-Diego. The interim marked, for me, an evolution from the practice to the scholarly study of popular culture. I remember that the Cultural Studies reader was everywhere, assigned by TA’s, photocopied by professors, etc. The field of Cultural Studies seemed to have no discernible center, which was a short-term strength, and a long-term weakness. Hall himself threw shade on the faddishness of American Cultural Studies, which “has become an umbrella for just about anything,” he remarked in 1990 (22). You could find almost anything you looked for, at least on the left.

This collection had a healthy number of black authors. The black American presence in the 1992 tome included Bell Hooks, Michele Wallace, and Cornel West. In addition to Hall, whose “Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies” prefigures Cultural Studies 1983, there were two younger Black Brits who had worked with Hall, Kobena Mercer and Paul Gilroy. I met them both in Santa Cruz, and shopped for music with Gilroy in Davis. Gilroy was an academic star then, but many African American intellectuals treated him as an existential threat.

Hall had long been moving away from Cultural Studies as a fashion. He described the mid-1960s Birmingham Center as “the locus to which we retreated when that conversation in the open world could no longer be continued: it was politics by other means” (Hall 1990, 13). In 1990, Hall was blunt about their outsider status: a) the Humanities were “relentlessly hostile” to Cultural Studies from the start; b) Raymond Williams, Edward P. Thompson, Hall, and Richard Hoggart all came from traditions “entirely marginal to the centers of English academic life” (12); c) Coming in from “the dirty outside world,” many “had always planned never to return to the university, indeed, never to darken its doors again” (Ibid). Hall’s disdain, decades later, for how Cultural Studies pioneers had been treated, is remarkable. Hall never came to terms with the
notion of Cultural Studies as an academic enclave to which leftists retreated when they no longer had a voice in the public sphere. Hall had a grander view of the role of the public intellectual, which was informed by scholarship, but was not centered on scholarly production.

In later years, Hall focused on diasporic identities, post-colonial theory, and questions of race and multi-culturalism, especially as refracted through young “Black Brit” artists. But what Cultural Studies picked up on from Hall seemed to be primarily two models: his “Encoding and Decoding” theory of media studies, first published in 1973, and the Resistance Through Rituals framework (which dates to 1976). My perspective is based both on what I experienced as a grad and post-grad in the 1990s, and on critiques of Hall’s romanticized view of symbolic resistance being articulated within the post-romantic turn from the late 1990s on. “The problem with the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies’ approach,” according to critics such as Steve Miles, Simon Winlow, and Steve Hall, is that “it tends to imply that youth cultures are somehow free from the seductions implied by a consumer culture” (Miles 2014, 82). “Perhaps such work over-estimates the extent to which young people were (and indeed still are) capable of reworking the meanings attached to the world of consumerism,” Miles suggests. In a review essay which includes a critique of a 2007 re-issue of Resistance Through Rituals, Winlow and Hall ask a series of questions which merit being addressed:

- Can genuinely oppositional counter-values [survive when] channels of communication are dominated by consumer values that now permeate every nook and cranny of everyday life? Are young people really subverting the metaphors of capitalism and stamping their own identity on their world because they appear ‘creative’ when reworking and ritualizing the symbolism of corporate goods? (2007, 395)

In the spirit of Kenneth Burke’s entering a conversation,4 I want to suggest the breadth of efforts to rethink resistance. Let’s start with the voice of an Arab-American scholar, Rayya El Zein, who in her ethnographic study of Palestinian hip hop artists and their “scenes” says that her decision to “abandon a search for and theorization of resistance” (2017, 95) was rooted in dissatisfaction with the model pioneered by Dick Hebdige and Stuart Hall. El Zein believes this model too often led to merely celebrating resistance (or difference). This problem is rooted in “Foucault’s blanketing understanding of power,” she argues (92)—rightly in my view (Stephens 2016b). El Zein suggests that “it may be necessary to set aside resistance as the central lynchpin in discussions of politics in cultural production” (92).

The broader field of “Resistance Studies” has called into doubt its ability to recover from its misplaced moral fervor (Gledhill 2012, 1), and a “fundamentally romantic” (Ortner 179) impulse to “discover…resistance almost everywhere” (Brown 730). But this self-critique seems mostly absent within Cultural Studies. The urge to “discover resistance everywhere” seems to operate on an unconscious level, as a defining “repeating pattern” of American Cultural Studies.

In 2016, Jameson asked, “do we know any longer what oppositional means in this total system, or what might ‘subvert’ it, or even function as its critique?” (Baumbach 2016, 144). Implicitly, we cannot presume that we any longer clearly understand what “oppositional” means. In fact, it
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is hard to imagine a space within which to practice effective resistance or subversion. Many in
the post-romantic turn agree that the idea of “genuinely oppositional counter-values” is
delusional, when little or no space remains that has not been permeated by consumer values.

Can we name anything that has not been commodified? That question drives Dana Spiotta’s
novel *Eat the Document*. I have taught this book to hundreds of students in GE courses since
2011, first at the University of South Florida, and then in Puerto Rico. Spiotta, who lived the
romance of resistance as a student in the Northwest, defamiliarized the idea of resistance
in fictional form. Her novel allows us to ask whether youths, or ex-radicals, can really “subvert the
metaphors of capitalism” through creative reimagining of corporate symbols. Spiotta does offer,
through ex-Weather Underground member Nash, a counter-argument about “keeping resistance
vital” by practicing symbolic resistance. The youths in this novel are practicing their resistance
chops, just as musicians practice their chops on their instruments between gigs. There is
something to be said for muscle memory. In a similar way, perhaps symbolic resistance has a
value of simply keeping alive the notion that “another world is possible,” as the Zapatistas said.

In 1990 Lila Abu-Lughold voiced her uneasiness with the fixation on “finding resistors” (41).
Her critique became mainstream in anthropology. But the compulsion to find and celebrate
resistors remains normative in Cultural Studies. Recent critiques of the romance of resistance
have come from the margins of Cultural Studies, in fields such as Marketing, Management,
Urban Studies, and Criminology. A representative sample of revisionist views on the nature of
protest is “Anti-corporate protest as consumer spectacle,” published by Higgins and Tadajewski
wisdom about the nature of resistance in consumer society. Characteristic of this body of work is
Bauman’s “uncomfortable suggestion that any such resistance, and the spectacle it entails,
inevitably serves to reinforce the very ideology it is designed to resist” (Miles 2014, 77 emphasis
added). This is certainly the primary conclusion towards which *Eat the Document* points.

**From the Outside: Implications of Hall’s Critique of Cultural Studies’ “Marginality”**

Seeking to understand Hall’s critique of a romanticized Cultural Studies, I returned “The
Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis of the Humanities.” Addressing American leftist
intellectuals in 1990, Hall gave a heart-felt account of the birth of Cultural Studies. This essay
was required reading in my PhD program. Re-reading it in 2017, I see it as a still-timely critique
for those who agree that Cultural Studies can be “awakened” or renewed (Smith 2011).

Hall recalls how, under attack by Sociologists and the Humanities, the key work at the Center for
Cultural Studies “had still to be invented.” Hall describes “a series of raids on other disciplinary
terrains” (Hall 1990, 16), since there was no discipline “where one could find the concept of
culture seriously theorized” (Ibid, 15). Legitimacy was gained through a “program of translation
of European work” (16). Cultural Studies “would not have survived the 1970s,” Hall remarks,
without this imported European theory. Perhaps so: the theorists Hall names, and relies on in the
1983 lectures—Foucault, Althusser, Gramsci, Marx and Benjamin, were treated as “Ur-texts”
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of Indigenismo in Zapatista Discourse.”
everywhere on the scene. This led to some flaws: the theoretical foundations of Cultural Studies were largely imported; they were intensely Eurocentric; women were absent in Hall’s pantheon. Moreover, I came into academia as a creative writer, so Cultural Studies was tainted, for me, by too much theory-congested writing. Having long admired cultural anthropology in its more literary dress—and having studied self-reflexive ethnography at the University of California-Davis—I was convinced that this repeating pattern, the compulsion to theorize from a European foundation, largely divorced cultural theory from the languages of cultural practice. And the “celebratory” tendency became too much like preaching to the choir for my tastes.

Perhaps Hall’s “optimist claims” (Mercer 2017, 10) for alternative cultures are possible—that during crises, “cultural processes anticipate social change” (1992, 10). That has been the hope of many counter-cultures. But an “antiromantic…conception of culture,” as Hall remarked in 1983, is less sanguine. A post-romantic conception recognizes that breaking rules “always constitutes another set of rules” (Hall 2016, 70). Today’s alternative rock or grassroots resistance is tomorrow’s mainstream commodity. Is that the sort of social change that Hall and most Cultural Studies practitioners really envision, and celebrate?

I would like to see more mature forms of critique—especially self-critique. Clear-headed analysis is needed of how repeated claims to represent the margins, and to resist the center, have become a well-funded, institutionally protected way of arriving at and remaining in the center of academic knowledge production. But the “master-trope” of “focusing on the margins of power” tends to reproduce “established lines of force and authority” (Czaplicka 1995, 3).

The dogmatism noted by Grossberg is similar to a stance in much of composition studies, which long ago became a forum for “preaching” key tenets of Cultural Studies. This has been widely observed, including the ethnographic study by Russell Durst, Collision Course (1999). Much of Cultural Studies, in its missionary form, migrated into Freshman English classes. Such content has often been at odds with the pragmatic concerns of most students, with the result that much of Cultural Studies has self-marginalized. Claims to location on the “margins of power” have become a claim to power. There were and are many incentives to claim such a location on the margins, and to speak from these “marginalized” spaces. However, one of the recurring critiques of Cultural Studies as an institution and academic practice is that it is increasingly divorced from its roots—political, and cultural practice. I argue that the claim to marginalization, within institutional contexts, is itself a betrayal of the roots of Cultural Studies.

These original motors of a lower-case cultural studies were seen by Hall and others as having three principal sources:
1) cultural practices outside of academia, including performing/writing about this;
2) political activism using cultural forms;
3) an area of academic inquiry, or some might say, an academic discipline.

Pedagogical considerations were not central for Hall. This is a blind spot in the tradition, other than the demand for classroom consciousness raising or indeed conversion that one finds in Critical Pedagogy in Freirean Cultural Studies. What the future looked like at Cultural Studies’ apogee has proven inaccurate. In a 1994 interview with Gary Olson, J. Hillis Miller forecast Cultural Studies as “the future of English Studies” (194, 317). The apogee was misleading.
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would argue that Writing Studies is proving to be the most viable growth area of English Studies, while Cultural Studies operates more on content options—as part of its palette, or tool kit.

In concluding, I want to distill what I have drawn from “Hall and his legacy,” as to what remains valuable in teaching cultural analysis to students in a non-dogmatic way.

**Four Key Characteristics and Tools of Cultural Studies**

From 2010, the primary avenue open to me has been teaching writing. For the most part, these have been General Education classes. Since 2014, my main emphasis has been on Creative Writing, and Creative Nonfiction, as GE courses for STEM students (Stephens 2017a).

Regardless of the class, I always incorporate four key elements which can be credited in part to the lower-case culture studies tradition. I start every class with number one:

1. An expansion and redefinition of what constitutes a text.

Students are inclined to define a text as printed words. But any human activity which can be interpreted is a text; activities such as dance, worship, and concerts are therefore texts. Students usually grasp this as an obvious, “previously invisible” truth. This understanding of texts, and textual analysis, has been one of the most valuable legacies of Cultural Studies. But the notion of context-specific-texts has been developed most fully in Rhetorical Genre Studies.

2. Increased attention to cultural context.

Cultural Studies has predisposed us to be attentive to cultural context. The Latin *contextus* means to join together; *contexere* means to weave together. Applying this to cultural analysis, one pictures how other texts join with the text in question to produce meaning. “When we try to make sense of a text we always bring to it a set of presuppositions, which provide a framework for our analysis,” John Storey wrote in *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture* (2015, 14). This is a thumbnail description of inter-textuality, a cornerstone of any form of cultural analysis.

3. Social theory—especially attention to social and political structures.

In his 1983 lectures, Hall drew on Durkheim and Lévi-Strauss to argue: “if a society is to reproduce itself, it must also reproduce those collective representations and normative structures” which have “a powerful structuring effect on our behavior” (57-58). Hall notes that “social order is dependent on constraint … Only through punishment does a society reaffirm its normative integration and the power of its normative structure” (58). “Cultural analysis must always seek to identify,” Hall argues, “underlying… significant patterns” (34). This awareness of structuring patterns is a foundation from which to better understand how direct resistance to the constraints of a social order often merely re-inscribes the underlying pattern.

Hall also re-framed the concept of hegemony in ways that still merit closer examination. Hegemony explains how the dominant culture re-inscribed both from above, and below. Hall’s adaptation of the theory of hegemony can help us understand the limits to mere resistance. Hall’s
lecture on “Domination and Hegemony” remains a valuable corrective for the tendency in Cultural Studies to read Gramsci through a reductive version of Foucault, as power imposed from above. By contrast, Hall quotes Gramsci’s flexible notion of “organic ideologies” which “organize human masses, and create the terrain on which men move, acquire consciousness of their position, struggle, etc.” (165). As a ground or a field, hegemony is not a thing which can be imposed, or blindly resisted. “There is never any one, single, unified, and coherent ‘dominant ideology’ which pervades everything,” as Hall puts it (167). Although “hegemony is never without coercion…the moment of hegemony is never a moment of pure coercion” (171). Both coercion and consent are always operative in “systems of exploitation.”

This view of hegemony enables Hall’s conjunctural analysis. In his October essay, Hall in fact described Cultural Studies, in its Birmingham Center origins, as “A Gramscian project” (17). This perspective leads him to a powerful conclusion about “the moment of hegemony”: “the notion that this has nothing to do with culture…is absolutely absurd” (1983, 179).

Hall’s Gramscian view of hegemony was a corrective to The Frankfurt School, which in “vulgar Marxist” mode, saw the cultural industry as a brainwashing process, producing “false consciousness.” Veering in the opposite direction, Cultural Studies has allied itself with post-structuralism, and then post-modernism. Having foresworn structure, participants could create “oppositional utopias.” This has been one result, perhaps, of the (mis)use of Hall’s “Encoding and Decoding” theory, which arguably leaves too much power with the decoder. Simply declaring independence from social or ideological structures does not mean that we are free of their work—the way they “hail” us, as Hall insisted, adapting Althusser.

4. Self-reflexive mode

A key component of how I teach cultural analysis is to connect the dots between individuals, and their social structure. Drawing on the “Academic Literacies” tradition, as well as ethnography, I want to valorize first-person experience, and combine individuality with cultural specificity in analyzing how we “make” or “consume” culture.

I have come to mistrust missionary-minded education, whether from the right, or the left. The left version of this predominates both in Composition Studies, and in Cultural Studies. Hall concludes his 1990 essay by arguing that people in other fields must be “won over and drawn into an understanding of the large historical/political project that now confronts us” (Hall, “Emergence” 23). Such assertions seem heavy-handed to me, at this remove. More modesty is called for. Our task should not be to recruit students or colleagues to our “project,” I believe, but to give students or readers tools to see more clearly, and communicate more effectively, without trying to “win them over,” or enlist their (hopefully) enlarged literacies in ideological fashion. This is the crossroads where I feel Cultural Studies has much to gain from dialogue with fields such as Academic Literacies and Writing Studies. Multiple literacies, better listening skills, and effective dialogical communication are all highly valuable in their own right. The time has come for Cultural Studies to emphasize the acquisition of these skills as a proper outcome, and to let go of the ambition to pre-structure or project the way in which students or readers will use them.
Beyond the Romance of Resistance             Gregory Stephens
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Letters and Reviews


Mary Christian, Middle Georgia State University

As Robert A. Gaines notes in his book’s preamble, a good many articles have been written to explain Bernard Shaw’s views on marriage as set forth in this or that play; yet few have attempted a big-picture view of the ways in which his understanding of the subject evolved throughout his nearly seventy-year writing career. For this project, Gaines has recruited twelve Shavian scholars to discuss Shaw’s treatment of marriage in his plays, novels, and personal life. Shaw stated in his preface to Getting Married: “[W]e use the word [marriage] with reckless looseness, meaning a dozen different things by it, and yet always assuming that to a respectable man it can have only one meaning” (Complete Plays with Prefaces III: 454-455). Gaines takes this quotation, along with two others from the same preface, as an unofficial motto to open the book. One need not read far into the collection to suspect that in this recklessly loose “we,” Shaw included himself, for his writings on marriage defy any concise definition of the term.

Leonard Conolly, in a chapter on Shaw’s three early Plays Unpleasant, seems to offer such a definition. Alluding to the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, he concludes that in Shaw’s first three plays, “the piousness about ‘the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church’ [is] shown to be a sham” (25). In Widowers’ Houses, The Philanderer, and Mrs. Warren’s Profession, marriage, Conolly notes, is simply a business agreement, one that abets other equally shabby business agreements and also supplies a socially accepted pretext for gratifying animal sex instincts; any talk of marital love, virtue, holiness, or honor is merely a screen to mask these ugly facts. The definition is as unambiguous as it is bleak.

Yet this cynical simplicity was far from being Shaw’s last word on the subject, as other contributors show. After exposing the hypocrisies of the marriage institution in his Plays Unpleasant, he turned his critique in a more constructive direction. His subsequent plays experimented with potential improvements on marriage itself, through changes either in the laws governing it or in individuals’ understandings of their own partnerships; they also presented marriage as both a metaphor and a practical catalyst for broader, more collective changes needed to improve the world—radical changes in the economic, political, scientific, and philosophical assumptions and practices underpinning society.

Jennifer Buckley, for example, in the chapter following Conolly’s, describes the marriages depicted in Plays Pleasant as “pragmatic partnerships” into which women and men enter, not necessarily discarding affection or desire, but rejecting the religious and sentimental idealism that the earlier “unpleasant” plays had deflated, and frankly acknowledging the financial, social, and ideological compromises their partnerships will require. These marital compromises, Buckley reminds readers, were not unlike those Shaw found himself obliged to make as he began, with Arms and the Man and the other “pleasant” plays, to launch himself as a dramatist in
the realm of commercial theater. Lawrence Switzky, regarding Three Plays for Puritans, argues that these dramas turn on “decoy marriages”—that is, relationships between characters not legally united, but perform some pretense or approximation of marriage. Such “simulated marriages,” he concludes, can potentially offer lessons in social responsibility and rational citizenship that traditional legal marriages cannot: they “allow otherwise aloof, self-interested, or excessively passionate characters to establish personal obligations, while also assuring that any virtuous actions [the partners] perform on each other’s behalf are not based on the ‘interests’ of love, legal contracts, or sexual desire” (59). Michel Pharand and Peter Gahan, focusing the first decade of the twentieth century, argue that in the plays of this period, Shaw characterized marriage as a process contributing to humanity’s “salvation”—whether this be defined in terms of evolution, business, or political ambition (90, 108-109).

The book’s early chapters suggest, then, that while Shaw early discarded the traditional Christian doctrine of marriage as “the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church,” he came over time to ascribe to it numerous other social and symbolic meanings, in keeping with his developing convictions on science, ethics, and political organization. Shaw unabashedly claimed socialism and creative evolution as his religions—and these religions, it turns out, present their own forms of “mystical union,” vesting the marriage tie (or a much modified version of it) with new significance.

While issues of gender equality and women’s rights receive attention throughout the book, they come especially to the forefront in the chapters by Ellen Dolgin, Audrey McNamara, and Dorothy Hadfield, who examine plays written during World War I and in the years immediately before and after. As first the women’s suffrage campaign and then the war and its aftermath disrupted assumptions about women’s’ legal, political, and occupational status, Shaw depicted women such as Eliza Doolittle, Ellie Dunn, and Joan of Arc searching for a wider range of choices—be it a choice of marriage conditions and partners or choices for life outside marriage and domesticity.

The book naturally contains considerable comment on Shaw’s personal experience of marriage, both from his early observations of his parents’ unhappy misalliance and his four-decades-long marriage, companionable but famously sexless, with Charlotte Payne-Townshend. Rodelle Weintraub contributes a brief sketch of Shaw’s various romantic and sexual relationships, identifying likely real-life prototypes for several dramatic characters and concluding that unlike some of his characters, the author himself was never a “philanderer” (84). Several contributors speculate on the ways in which Shaw’s experience of marriage (his own and other people’s) might have been reflected in his writing, in particular Richard Dietrich, examining Shaw’s early novels and short stories, and Matthew Yde, discussing his last handful of plays.

The contributors, in outlining the gradually widening scope of Shaw’s vision of marriage—from interpersonal contract to citizenship training to salvific strategy—present a narrative cohesion unusual in edited collections, especially collections with more than a dozen participants. Reading, one envisions Shaw not as literary monolith, but as writer and human being under development, always outspoken yet often ambivalent. Moreover, the book tells not only a story of Shaw but a story of marriage and the ways in which it has evolved over the past two centuries—a story which, in the age of online dating and LGBTQ marriage equality, is still very
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much in the making. As Jean Reynolds reminds readers, “Marriage . . . is still going strong, despite Shaw’s warning in 1908 that ‘if marriage cannot be made to produce something better than we are, marriage will have to go, or else the nation will have to go’ (CPP III:418). More than a century later, hopeful couples continue to think that their version of marriage will ‘produce something better than we are.’” (189). As in Shaw’s time, this hope not infrequently ends in disappointment—and yet, as Shaw did, we continue to look to marriage with hope, both for individual companionship and for a more just, effective society—an engine for “salvation” and for “world-betterment,” to use Shaw’s phrases.

~ ~ ~


Monica Miller, Middle Georgia State University

One of the highlights of this year’s Modern Language Association Conference in New York City for me was a rock star panel consisting of Judith Butler, Angela Davis, Anthony Romero, and Cathy Davidson. I got to this Presidential Plenary on “States of Insecurity” very early and managed to snag a seat at what was ultimately a standing-room-only event with an audience of hundreds, despite the snow and storms outside. To be honest, I was mostly excited to be there as a fangirl of Judith Butler, whose work since Gender Trouble has influenced so much of my own scholarship. And while all of the panelists gave engaging and provocative talks, I left the panel most excited and energized by Cathy Davidson’s presentation which she titled, “Schooled,” based on her new book The New Education: How to Revolutionize the University to Prepare Students for a World in Flux.

What was most encouraging to me about Davidson’s inclusion in this MLA plenary session was her focus on teaching, which has often felt like a secondary concern to me at MLA. In her book The New Education, Davidson emphasizes the importance of higher education as a place of transformation for students, making the role of the teaching in the academy a critical one. Tracing the evolution of the university from the seventeenth century through today, Davidson calls our attention to the reasons why many of the aspects of higher education we take for granted—graded assessment, stated student majors, and the expectation of faculty service and research in addition to teaching—were developed in the first place. As many of these fundamentals of the academy emerged as a result of the changing industrial economy of the nineteenth century, Davidson argues that our contemporary world has moved far beyond the nineteenth-century paradigms that the current university was designed for, and that it’s past time for colleges and universities to evolve as well. In The New Education, Davidson outlines proposed changes in both theory and practice for higher education which she argues will better serve our students.

Davidson takes her title from an 1869 article for The Atlantic Monthly titled “The New Education” by Charles Eliot, a nineteenth-century “critique of existing forms of higher education
in America and a manifesto for the higher education revolution he would go on to lead in his forty-year reign as president of Harvard” (7). *The New Education* similarly functions as a manifesto for twenty-first-century higher education, examining how we got here, what the most pressing issues are, what solutions have been proposed to solve them, and what she sees as the most promising way forward.

I admit, I was dubious about her stated goals of completely restructuring and redesigning education, which she explains as:

> demand[ing] institutional restructuring, a revolution in every classroom, curriculum, and assessment system. It means refocusing away from the passive student to the whole person learning new ways of thinking through problems with no easy solutions. It shifts the goal of college from fulfilling course and graduation requirements to learning for success in the world after college. (8-9)

However, Davidson’s subsequent arguments and calls for action are based not only on current scholarship of teaching and learning (“SOTL”) but also on her own experience in a broad range of higher education institutions. She has taught at a well-funded private university, a public, R-1 university, as well as in an international MOOC. And beyond these polemics, *The New Education* contains much that is insightful and immediately usable in the classroom.

For me, there are two important highlights of the book: her chapter on community college practices and her balanced approach to technology as a pedagogical tool. First, in her chapter “College for Everyone,” she argues that one of the most important changes that needs to happen in all four-year colleges and research universities is a shift to a community college mindset:

> Whereas the research university puts its institutional reputation first, community college prioritizes student growth” (49). These differences lead to very different administrative priorities and teaching strategies. Davidson explains, “The infrastructure of the research university is based on exclusion, sorting, selecting, and ranking; the infrastructure of the community college is based on inclusion, remediating, improving, and offering first changes—and second, third, or however many are required for success” (50). And ultimately, “the task is not for the student to replicate the expertise of the professor but, rather, for the student to gain the basic literacies required to move ahead” (50). Indeed, Davidson’s focus on the importance of metacognitive pedagogical strategies mirrors much of my own approach to teaching. Certainly, Composition Studies has long focused on metacognition and student reflection in the classroom, but I’m interested in how we can more fully build in such activities in other kinds of courses as well.

I also appreciate Davidson’s balanced approach to technology in the classroom. In her chapter “Against Technophobia,” she encourages instructors to take a much more open approach to student use of smart phones and laptops in the classroom. In fact, she argues we should welcome them: “[W]e should allow devices in the classrooms more frequently than we now do because sustained, careful, critical practice with devices helps us use them better” (90). However, technology in the classroom requires more than simply giving students access to iPads or laptops. Rather, Davidson cautions that we must “think deeply about what the technology can do, what the students can learn with it and about it, and how devices can help students think together, remix one another’s ideas, iterate, respond, and contribute to an evolving whole” (90).
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She continues her measured approach to technology in the following chapter, “Against Technophilia.” In this chapter, Davidson gives an account of her experiencing overseeing a massive open online course (or “MOOC,” as they are commonly known) while on the faculty of Duke University, a program which involved thousands of students online around the world in one course on the history of higher education. Davidson was quite frank in her expression of her reservations about the experience. In addition to her issues with the business model of the MOOC, the experience was extremely demanding for her, even though she had a team of graduate students who were helping create, develop, and supervise the course along with her. Further, the costs of keeping up with the technology necessary not only for MOOCs but for face-to-face teaching needs keeps rising: “As funding sources continue to shrink, universities and colleges find they must keep up their technology infrastructure even while cutting faculty and course offerings. That’s a terrible trade-off. And it’s a trade-off that is crucial to consider as we design the new education” (121).

And ultimately, that’s the one aspect that’s missing from The New Education: how to fund (and enact) the significant changes for which she is advocating. Davidson herself has had great success hardwiring significant changes in the myriad institutions she has worked with, but she has no easy answers or magic bullets for instituting (or funding) the kinds of wide-sweeping changes she argues are critical for higher education to succeed. To be fair, in her chapter “Why College Costs So Much,” Davidson provides a clear explanation of why tuition costs have skyrocketed and advocates for serious change; however, she ultimately concludes that, “The United States has ended its era of strategic investment in its youth” (187), and that it will take both a renewed national support in higher education coupled with a new vision of how to provide this education to truly solve this problem, as well as prioritizing the kind of funding necessary to do so.

Nevertheless, there is plenty here that individual instructors, cohorts, or departments can implement without such significant structural changes. If for no other reason, this book is valuable for its two appendices: “Ten Tips for Getting the Most Out of Your College Experience” (which I plan to assign in my future English 1101 classes) and “Ten Tips for Transforming Any Classroom for Active, Student-Centered Learning,” some of which I have already tried out this semester. And I think that is Davidson’s ultimate message is to provide encouragement for large-scale change through these much more small-scale, individual strategies. It is possible to enact change one classroom at a time.

~ ~ ~


Andrew Reeves, Middle Georgia State University

Anyone who has ever looked at the wall map of Europe in a history classroom will have seen the Holy Roman Empire sitting astride Central Europe and Northern Italy for much of medieval and early modern history. But when we push a bit and ask what this Empire was, we find ourselves
falling back to Voltaire’s quip that it was neither holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire or (for those of us who teach surveys) that it was a collection of states in Central Europe. We know that it was no modern nation-state, but that it endured for just over a millennium from Charlemagne’s coronation by Pope Leo III on 25 December 800 to its dissolution on 6 August 1806. Peter H. Wilson manages to tell the story of this entity in about eight hundred surprisingly readable pages.

The Holy Roman Empire is a difficult topic. Unlike other polities in Western Europe, the Empire was the precursor to no modern nation-state and so it is harder to write with a particular telos in mind. Wilson solves this dilemma by eschewing a straightforward chronological narrative (The reader who wants this approach can follow the fifty-three page timeline in the back of the book.) Rather, he examines the empire via themes, with the book divided into four parts: Ideal, Belonging, Governance, and Society. This approach can sometimes be difficult. If the reader does not already know the basic ligaments of the history, people or places referred to in, for example, “Ideals” might not come up again until hundreds of pages later (or might only appear in the timeline). Nevertheless, this approach does allow the history to be divided into more manageable chunks, which keeps the reader from being overly daunted by a thousand years of history.

One of Wilson’s great strengths is that he takes much of the German-language historiography of the Empire over the last four decades and makes it accessible to Anglophones. Gone is the view of German nationalists that the Empire was a failure on the road to German nationhood and the view of Italian nationalists that it inhibited Italian national ambitions until the Risorgimento. In its place, we have the realization that although the Empire was not a centralized nation-state with a sovereign exercising top-down authority, it was never meant to serve as such. Rather, it functioned by consensus and cooperation and indeed, Wilson suggests that elements of its decentralized form of government could serve as a model for supranational entities like the European Union of our own day.

Wilson also points out that the Empire had institutions throughout its German-speaking regions that endured through the end. The postal service of Thurn and Taxis familiar to the readers of Pynchon’s *Crying of Lot 49* makes an appearance as Europe’s first postal service—hardly reflective of an Empire that was a dysfunctional hybrid. Likewise, its courts of highest appeal, the Reichskammergericht and Reichshofrat, may have dragged on with the cases on their dockets, but in so doing, Wilson shows us, they forced all parties to come to consensus. Along the way we learn that even in Northern Italy (which usually ceases to be part of the Empire on maps of Europe after the sixteenth century) appeals to the Reichshofrat continued through the end of the Empire, and until 1797 the Emperor called upon the service of his Italian vassals (225-6).

It is a truism that after the Peace of Westphalia and the Hapsburg defeat in the Thirty Years’ War the Empire remained only as a collection of territories. Wilson puts this commonplace to rest by showing the Empire’s strength *qua* Empire in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth century, framing the wars with the Ottoman Empire not as wars of Hapsburg Austria, but as wars of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation.
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If there is a weakness, it is that by emphasizing the continued functionality of the Empire through the eighteenth century Wilson downplays the extent to which Prussia and Austria increasingly acted as sovereign nations even within the Imperial framework by the eighteenth century—although discussing the War of Austrian Succession as a civil war within the Holy Roman Empire is a useful corrective to a tendency to treat it purely as a conflict between nation states.

The thematic framework of the book is strongest in the first three sections, Ideal, Belonging and Governance, but by the second half Wilson ends up falling into a more narrative style of history in spite of himself. The chapter on Justice (603-54) thus feels like a jarring interruption as what had been an account of the eighteenth century briefly returns to the Empire’s Carolingian and Ottonian beginnings before eventually resuming its narrative flow and bringing us to the end of the Empire and the final chapter entitled Afterlife, explaining how the German-speaking states dealt with the radical changes of Napoleon’s destruction of the Empire.

Twenty-two maps allow the reader to make sense of most of the place names occurring in the text, and three appendices of Emperors, Kings of the Romans and Kings of Italy, respectively, are an excellent supplement to the Ottonian, Hohenstaufen, and Habsburg genealogies appearing in the front matter.

All told, Wilson’s work is a qualified success, allowing an English-speaking reader to make sense of an empire that covered much of the heart of Europe and which, pace Voltaire, if not holy or Roman, did indeed serve as a functional Empire.

~ ~ ~


Jason M. Wester, Middle Georgia State University

McGuire’s *Teach Yourself How to Learn* serves an extension of her well-received *Teach Students How to Learn: Strategies You Can Incorporate into Any Course to Improve Student Metacognition, Study Skills and Motivation*, which was published in 2015. While the latter’s target audience is teachers, the former aims at students, taking much of the same material and repackaging it in an easygoing and accessible style well-suited to college freshmen who are making the transition from high school to college. McGuire emphasizes strategies that students can use to improve their academic performance, employing theory (especially ideas about metacognition and Bloom’s taxonomy) only insofar as it can help freshmen understand why these strategies work.

The dominant theme of the book is that of changing mindsets, the idea that students must change the way they think about school. If most students approach their studies like Aesop’s Hare, McGuire argues they ought to emulate the tortoise; slow and steady wins the race. She opens the
book with the statistic that 72% of high school students estimate their intelligence and academic skills are higher than those of their peers, a perception which, of course, doesn't reflect reality, but, she argues, shows that high school is less-than-challenging for many students. She insists that most high school students don't have to try very hard to earn As and Bs; they can succeed by cramming for their exams and regurgitating facts on their multiple-choice tests. She calls this mindset "study mode." For students adept at cramming in their approach to academic study, college can be a rude awakening when their As and Bs turn into Fs and Ds. In college, Students often find that professors are more concerned with students' ability to apply the material, which McGuire calls "learning mode." This distinction between studying and learning is key to the entirety of the book. While students come out of high school able to cram, very little in their high school experience has prepared them to learn.

In study mode, students cram so that they can earn a good grade on a test, and once that test has been taken, engagement with that material is over. The shift in mindset students must make to improve their college performance begins with one question: Could you teach this material to someone? The answer to this question reveals McGuire's overarching recommendation to students, the strategy that she claims will shift the mindset from studying to learning: Students ought to approach course materials like a teacher. With this strategy established, McGuire then goes into specifics about how teachers prepare to teach their courses, which includes note-taking, active reading and paraphrasing. And in a particularly deft turn, she cites anecdotes from students who shifted to the learning mindset, making the case that this slow-and-steady approach to course materials is more efficient than the often chaotic bursts of cramming that are done the night before the test. Don't focus on the grade, she advises. Focus on teaching the material to someone, and good grades will follow.

One of the book's weaknesses lies in its oversimplifications and over-reliance on dichotomies. Though the target audience is students and a certain amount of simplification is certainly warranted to approach that audience, at more than one point I expected her to at least give a nod to the complexity of these ideas. For instance, in addition to the mindset change from studying to learning, McGuire discusses a mindset change with regard to how students envision intelligence, moving from a "fixed intelligence mindset" to a "growth mindset." She claims that, from their earliest educational experiences in primary school, students believe that intelligence is fixed and unchangeable, which she claims is an erroneous belief that leads to fatalism. In other words, students learn early on that they are either smart or they aren't. She pleads with students to expel that all-or-nothing mentality and embrace the idea that intelligence can be expanded, but currently the data about that is far from clear. Intelligence researchers are engaged in ongoing dialogues about how much of human intelligence is inherited and how much is influenced by environment.

Certainly, while I agree with her that students would do well to embrace the idea that they can grow, McGuire would have done well to clarify and define what she means by intelligence, or perhaps instead discuss growth in ability, knowledge, or skill. Her declaration that "all students are capable of excelling," reveals that she places a great deal of weight on environment, yet, while I read, I thought to myself, “I could study calculus using all of her strategies, prepare like a teacher, and yet the chances of my being an effective math teacher or of earning an A in a calculus course are somewhere between slim and none.” There's a reason I am an English
professor instead of a computer engineer. My highest intelligence is linguistic in nature. Put simply, intelligence is much more complicated than McGuire demonstrates.

Nevertheless, McGuire's question ("can you teach the material?") strikes me as a powerful tool for helping students recognize that the "cramming" approach to their courses limits their ability to excel. As a professor of English who specializes in composition and who teaches composition courses with regularity, I focus a large portion of the content of those composition courses on writing as a practice and a process. To write well takes time, planning and the writing of multiple drafts. Certainly I would love to see more of my students employing the slow-and-steady approach to their essays instead of writing them the night before the day of the deadline.

Long have I argued that freshman composition is a unique site at the university because almost all students take those courses, and for me they are spaces in which life and literacy intersect. In my courses, I often use journal writing to expand the scope of my composition courses into realms of personal growth for students, and I am always looking for journal prompts that speak to students' needs and concerns. McGuire's advice that students ought to go to their professor's office hours, read the syllabus, buy their textbooks and understand that criticism is intended not as an insult, but as a prompt toward improvement, can to professors seem like common sense, but McGuire is clear that freshmen coming from high school are often unaware of these basics. If I want students to be good college students, I have to teach them what good college students do, and I could use journal writing to teach these ideas. Certainly, I'd recommend this book to any student looking to improve his or her performance, and I'd recommend it to my colleagues looking to reconnect with the needs and concerns of their students. This is for me where McGuire's book really shines. It served as a reminder that we are all people playing the roles of teachers and students, struggling to manage our time, to get plenty of sleep, to eat right and to just generally manage ourselves more effectively, and that compassion and understanding ought to form the foundation of our interactions.

~ ~ ~
Editor’s Corner: Notes and Queries

Intertextuality and Intratextuality: Does Mary Shelley “Sit Heavily Behind” Conrad’s Heart of Darkness?

Chris Cairney, Middle Georgia State University

An awareness of a “ghostly presence” is something that is often associated with Conrad and with Conrad criticism in any age. Richard Curle discusses it as early as 1914 in Joseph Conrad: A Study, talking about Conrad’s ability to conjure characters with an eerie aptness and “photographic fidelity” as if in the “presence” of “ghostly friends” perceived in “the rosy light of remembrance” (103). John Stape (2007) found it in the “ghostly presence” of Poland (4), while Allan Simmons (2006) finds it in the Conrad short story “Karain” (160). R. N. Sarkar (1993) also discussed how Karain is “dogged” in the story by “his dead friend’s ghostly presence” (36). Padmini Mongia (1998) adds “spectral women” (155) while Justin Edwards (2005) discusses “the ghostly presence” in Conrad in terms of “the trope of the phantom” in the Gothic novel (xxix). Robert Lynd (1919) contributed the pervasive “ghost of romance” in Conrad as a “presence” that is “like an aura” (217). This paper looks at phantom manifestations of Mary Shelley as we consider the “ghostly presence” of Frankenstein in the works of Joseph Conrad. Mary Shelley was of course a literary figure associated with “ghosts”: her famous mother, Mary Wollstonecraft, her sisters, even her husband’s ex-wife. She was also associated, of course, with Percy Shelley, and with Byron and Polidori (author of the first “vampire” novel), in some very personal, as well as literary, ways. She read ghost stories. She was also immersed, as were no doubt the others mentioned, in the work of Wordsworth and Coleridge.¹ Let us consider (1) Romanic influence from Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein—going forward—and (2) Joseph Conrad’s novel Heart of Darkness: considering these two works on either end of a timeline, it may become possible show a merely probable or likely (and therefore “ghostly”? ) influence from Frankenstein onto Conrad and therefore into several of his works.

Romantic influence is potentially a process that crosses genres, times an even art forms: some Gothic and Romantic scholars, for example, see among Fuseli’s influential paintings around the end of the eighteenth century one (The Rosicrucian Cavern, 1803) that “may have been” among the inspirations for Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein (Roberts 1992, 63), and another that may have been the inspiration for Byron’s Manfred:

Byron believed that Ezzelin Musing over Meduna (first exhibited 1780) was taken from a real subject, yet Fuseli told him that he created the subject out of his own imagination.

¹ In the opening letters of Frankenstein, Mary Shelley causes Walton to tell his sister “but I shall kill no albatross” (2012, 12), an obvious reference to Coleridge’s Rime of the Ancient Mariner. Also, “this deadly weight hanging round my neck” (2012, 108) recalls Rime (141–2). She also makes Frankenstein quote Byron’s Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage (3.62.2; Jansson 1999, 59).
Could Fuseli’s painting in turn have influenced Byron’s poem *Manfred* perhaps? It is a tempting thought (Fincher 2011). Fuseli is sometimes thought to have been influenced himself by contemporaneous Gothic fiction (Fincher 2011). In a similar way, as an example of influence and perhaps “borrowing,” it is easy to recognize Wordsworth’s famous poem “Tintern Abbey” as having been on the writing table of Mary Shelley as she wrote Walton’s letters which eventually were placed at the fore of *Frankenstein*. Though similarly “unprovable,” the similarity is none-the-less unmistakable and such borrowing goes beyond the direct quotation from “Tintern Abbey” found in chapter 18 of the main text (2012, 112). The more obvious “candidates” for influence here between Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (1818) and William Wordsworth’s “Tintern Abbey” (1798) make the less obvious ones more meaningful.² The more obvious candidates include “Six years have passed since I ….” (Shelley 2012, 8), compare “Tintern Abbey” (1–2): “Five years have past; five summers, with the length / Of five long winters! and again I hear ….”; “from his own lips, with what interest and sympathy shall I read it in some future day!” (Shelley 2012, 18), compare “Tintern Abbey,”: “in this moment there is life and food / For future years (66) and “with what healing thoughts / Of tender joy wilt thou remember me, / And these my exhortations! (145–47), and “for the first fourteen years of my life I ran wild on a common ….” (Shelley 2012, 10), compare “Tintern Abbey,” “run wild” (17) and: “changed, no doubt, from what I was, when first/I came among these hills; when like a roe/I bounded o’er the mountains, by the sides/Of the deep rivers, and the lonely streams,/Wherever nature led;/..The coarser pleasures of my boyish days (67–75). Also compare with “spirit,” “deep,” “beautous forms,” “beauty,” “power,” “elevated” and “grief” in “Tintern Abbey” the following from *Frankenstein*:

… no one can feel more deeply than he does the beauties of nature … these wonderful regions seem still to have the power of elevating his soul from earth … he may suffer misery and be overwhelmed by disappointments, yet when he has retired into himself, he will be like a celestial spirit that has a halo around him, within whose circle no grief or folly ventures (2012, 17).

And here, compare “wanderer,” “wanderings,” “judgments,” and “We see into the life of things” from “Tintern Abbey” with *Frankenstein*:

Will you smile at the enthusiasm I express concerning this divine wanderer? You would not if you saw him. You have been tutored and refined by books and retirement from the world …. I have endeavoured to discover what quality it is which he possesses that elevates him so immeasurably above any other person I ever knew. I believe it to be an intuitive discernment, a quick but never-failing power of judgment, a penetration into the causes of things, unequalled for clearness and precision; add to this a facility of expression and a voice whose varied intonations are soul-subduing music (2012, 17).

Regarding examples of intertextuality and allusion in Conrad, there are essays on Conrad’s textual relationship with such writers as Maupassant, Balzac and Dickens in Conrad, Intertexts and Appropriations (Moore, Knowles and Stape 1997). Kirschner, in the preface to Comparing Conrad, his examination of Conrad’s penchant for borrowings, both literal and thematic, from many well-known writers, remarkably opines that “The word ‘plagiarism’ today has been largely replaced by the term ‘intertextuality,’ covering a vast variety of infiltrations of one literary text into another” (2009, vii). Artese, in reviewing Kirschner’s book, fleshes out the implications in no uncertain terms: “the study whispers in your ear a wealth of hard-won knowledge about the books in Conrad’s life, books not just on his shelves and in his intellectual background, but those that had unquestionably lain open on his writing desk—and often uncomfortably close to his pen” (2013, 172).

In a similar way to these musing on influence, I want to introduce Frankenstein as one of the influences, even a key or formative influence, behind a number of Conrad’s works of fiction. Indeed, I am compelled to make the case enthusiastically for the Shelleyan novel as a definitive inspirational “lightning bolt” in various ways for several of Conrad’s fictional productions. And I wonder whether Heart of Darkness would be recognizable now as such if one could take away this possible, even likely—but not proven—Shelleyan influence. There are other places one can get influences, but there are hints here of numerous paths back to Frankenstein from several Conrad works. Because of this, I want lay out a case of speculative literary detection of influence in the belief that it is likely, for much of his career, he had a copy of Frankenstein within reach of his reading chair or dog-eared somewhere on his desk or near his typewriter. It is just a thought, an enriching, speculative thought, but one based upon the efficacy of textual analysis and one motivated by the possible light which might be thrown into the dark but fascinating caverns of Conradian meaning: this is “deep” Conrad, the cosmic profundity possible in man filtered through the writings of the great Pole. This is Conrad as prophet, as a prophet. It is a gaze, and further textual study may give more strength to this idea of Shelleyan and related Romantic influences on Conrad.

On the other hand, I want to make clear in this note that I am not suggesting that herein lies proof that Conrad based a number of his works overarchingly on Frankenstein. But I also want to emphasize in strong terms that I am suggesting that it seems highly likely, given the information I give, taken in aggregate, that Frankenstein—more than some other Gothic novel—was the one “often picked up” while he was going through the complex universe of ideas that writers make recourse to in the most complex and surprising—and probably anything but straightforward—ways while writing. The Gothic itself is a variously though not always thoroughly approached
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topic.\textsuperscript{3} Its bourgeois sexuality or erotic psychological aspect cannot be denied—the relief of ennui: take the early German Gothic \textit{Schauerroman} (“shudder novel”). Mary read such stories lakeside in Geneva along with Byron, Polidori and her future husband during that “year without a summer” (1816). In any case, I am saying no more and no less than that it seems likely, given the aggregate of parallels I point out, That \textit{Frankenstein} was one of those works that were “near to or on” the Polish writer’s desk or reading chair side-table. So I am saying not that it \textit{did} but that it \textit{could} have, and after reading this note the reader will perhaps agree that \textit{Frankenstein} could have been the inspiration or source for a number of key elements in Conrad’s fiction, and that that idea could help us better address various complexities of meaning.

So, again, there were many influences on Joseph Conrad’s novelistic practice. We can point to Flaubert and to the influence, again, of French style and also French syntax and grammatical patterns (Hervouet 1990, 1–10). We can as well point to Polish influence in the areas of linguistics, culture and politics (Szczech-Wojnarska 2010, 221–46). Russian influence can be located via the Slavophile Dostoyevsky and the western-looking Turgeney (Pudełko 2010, 323–34), and English influence can be located, for example, via Shakespeare (Batchelor 1992, 125–51) and Dickens (Epstein 1997, 119–140). Clearly we could say that “all Europe contributed to the making of Conrad’s art” (Conrad 2010, 95). Taking a closer look at stylistic and textual influence from English, if we were to look beyond Shakespeare and Dickens for a single work from the English literary tradition that may show an outsized influence on Conrad, on a number

\textsuperscript{3} Perhaps hypnotic or even mesmerizing, it is also at times a challenge to the rational that may reveal the rational as a contested space. The key elements of the Gothic are often said to include castles or vaults (associated of course with potential imprisonment or loss of freedom or agency and a sense of psychologically involved mystery or potential personal investment in an intrigue), things spectral, medieval, superstitious or supernatural, Romance and the sublime and anything to make the reader “squirm,” fearfully, but, again, in a titillating way as well. Often in the Gothic a sleepy world of dream and anxiety contrasts with daytime bourgeois values and decorum: a daytime social veneer of controlled emotions and situations vs. a literary flirtation with “crossing over” to an unknown but alluring world involving a loss of control. To this we can add the political dimension (ideological reaction), and, I would suggest, the temporal dimension involving (faulty?) memory across generations, pertinent also to tradition and law, both predictably irrational “rational” spaces. The Gothic was also likely influenced by political upheavals—beginning with the English Civil War and culminating in a Jacobite rebellion (1745) not long before the first Gothic novel (1764). Collective political memory and attendant and deeply held cultural fears likely contributed to early Gothic villain characters—literary representatives of defeated Tory barons or Royalists “rising” from their political graves in the pages of the early Gothic to terrorize the bourgeois reader of late eighteenth-century England. The Gothic impulse especially problematizes the fallacies of history and memory, but the Gothic is also a way of interrogating alternative “ways of being” in a way that “histories,” ideologically manipulated, do not. The Gothic is a liminal space of illusion involving fallacy and a manipulation of “history” and even the (partially taken) definition of words (loss or change of meaning): compare “oral” faith in preliterate times vs. the concept of “faith” in literate society—in terms of psychodynamics—or consider ancient Greek “democracy” vs. modern American “democracy”). There are fallacies now in the synchronic but diachronically there is the Gothic, an example somehow of how words can subtly change or be changed for ideological purposes and become, while apparently familiar, “zombies” of their former fullness and context, simultaneously losing—and hiding the loss of—part of their spectrum of meaning (and of how “history” is continuously written and re-written by the “winners”). In the Gothic the “voice” of the dead can nevertheless “live on” and problematize with the manipulated memory one finds in “official” or “government sanctioned” (read: “ideologically altered”) texts. Here the Gothic could be said to also reflect the need for the irrational in a rational world (much of the writing and reading—the appreciation or the allure, if not the origin—of Gothic novels involves the psycho-sexual being foregrounded or brought forward vs. an \textit{a priori} forced social rationality leading to “the return of the repressed”).
of his works and on his overall tendency in terms of themes, structures and meanings, we need look no further than Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*. My purpose is to review what scholars have said about any perceived *Frankenstein–Conrad* connection, to look at examples of likely Shelleyan influence within a number of Conrad texts and, finally, to give a sense of the scope of this suggested influence from the standpoint of intertextuality. This will not only shed light on Conrad’s method and purpose, but will also illuminate instances of intertextuality and intratextuality between and among specific works by two highly creative and confident writers of significant personal “voice,” making this a case study of sorts examining the intersection of influence, allusion and structural modelling on the one hand and personal narrative method on the other in the authorial process generally.

What critics have said about possible connections between *Frankenstein* (published in 1818) and any work by Conrad (active 1895–1924) has been fairly restrained. In terms of connections with *Frankenstein*, D.W.F. Kerr notes “unsettling correspondences between ‘Amy Foster’ and Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (1818), one of the less important being the temporary settlement of the alien creature in a wood-lodge” (2016, 361, note 8), while Daniel Cottom feels that Victor’s move to “dismember the woman he had started to create …. anticipates the ending of Conrad’s ‘Heart of Darkness,’ where a symbolic equation is effected between ‘the horror’ and Kurtz’s Intended” (1980, 70–71).

In *The Endurance of Frankenstein*, George Levine discusses “echoes” as he references a striking similarity with Conrad’s *The Secret Sharer* (1910):

Even those verbal and melodramatic elements of *Frankenstein* which can seem absurd to us now have their echoes in later literature, echoes that suggest an uncanny rightness in the adolescent’s dream vision. What, we might ask, do we make of a book whose initial dramatic moment is of a man in a dog sled on an ice floe in the frozen Arctic, who pauses to look up at the captain of a ship and says, as *Frankenstein* does, with drawing room politeness, “Before I come on board your vessel … will you have the kindness to inform me whither you are bound?” (1979, 18).

A nearly identical situation occurs in *The Secret Sharer*. Levine begins with the beginning:

Yet in *The Secret Sharer*, in which Joseph Conrad takes up several of the motifs of *Frankenstein*—especially that of the *doppelgänger*—the first dramatic scene duplicates, with new literary sophistication, the opening of Mary Shelley’s novel. Miles from shore, Conrad’s captain-double looks over the side of his ship and asks the man swimming by, “in my ordinary tones,” “‘what’s the matter?’” And the escaped murderer Leggatt looks up, casually, to answer, “Cramp.” Both scenes blend the astonishing with the commonplace in ways that mark their mutual Romantic heritage. Both books assume and enact in their language the discontinuity and incompleteness of conventional moral life (1979, 25).

Along with this striking similarity between the textual beginnings of the two stories, the pregnant initial moments of both narratives, Levine also compares *The Secret Sharer* with *Frankenstein* in terms of moral entropy:

In *The Secret Sharer* there is no amiableness of domestic affection, but there is the same moral entropy we have seen in *Frankenstein*. This too is fiction about birth, the rescue and delivery of Leggatt from the ship, the moral birth of the captain himself. Again we see that the expense of life is death; the mark of Leggatt’s living is his killing of the mate
of the Sephora, and the captain himself can only be “born” by risking his ship and coming close to strangling his own mate (1979, 25).

Reading Frankenstein, for Conrad, could have included the anonymous first edition of 1818 (2nd ed., with author’s name, published in 1823), the French edition translated by Jules Saladin (1821) or the revised 1831 version. Conrad was well-read, and while he does not specifically mention a love for Frankenstein, or mention the novel at all for that matter, we are tempted for a number of reasons to look beyond that and see influence from the earlier text onto the later writer. Conrad’s father, the poet, translator and political activist Apollo Korzeniowski, was deeply immersed in Romantic literature in both Polish and English, and Conrad was exposed to it as well—in close association with his father—from a young age (Fletcher 11). Joseph Conrad’s birth name was Józef Teodor Konrad Korzeniowski: in choosing one of his middle names, “Conrad,” as his pen name, Conrad also implicitly linked himself to the famous narrative poem Konrad Wallenrod (1828), a Polish nationalist classic in the vein of Goethe and Byron by Adam Mickiewicz, the great Polish Romantic poet, which in turn, in a similar literary genealogy, links to the compelling Romantic story of the pirate “Conrad” in Byron’s The Corsair (1814), the story of a man turned against humanity in his youth. Given Apollo’s deep commitment to Polish nationalism through literature, that is to say through Romanticism, it is hard to see the father’s choice of “Konrad” as a name for his son (assuming he would have had a hand in the choice) outside of this suggested Mickiewiczian context (Fletcher 10). In “Youth,” Conrad seems to make his own nod of homage towards the Romantic image of the Corsair:

On the background of flames twisting in fierce tongues above their heads they seemed at home like salamanders, and looked like a band of desperate pirates. The fire sparkled in the whites of their eyes, gleamed on patches of white skin seen through the torn shirts. Each had the marks as of a battle about him—bandaged heads, tied-up arms, a strip of dirty rag round a knee—and each man had a bottle between his legs and a chunk of cheese in his hand. Mahon got up. With his handsome and disreputable head, his hooked profile, his long white beard, and with an uncorked bottle in his hand, he resembled one of those reckless sea-robbers of old making merry amidst violence and disaster (2010, 32).

In back of this there is also in “Youth” a reference to all of Byron’s work, and one can easily sense the autobiographical element to the short story (2010, 20). And as Najder points out in discussing The Sisters in Conrad in Perspective: Essays on Art and Fidelity, “It should not surprise us that Conrad is in fact alluding to Byron’s Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” (1997, 74). After all, as Najder states, “Which poet of the period kindled the ‘fashion’ of solitude? Who popularized the pose of the misunderstood and alienated hero-wanderer?” (73). Byron’s Faustian character Manfred in Manfred famously exclaims “Away! I’ll die as I have lived—alone” (3.4. 106), while Conrad’s Marlow in Heart of Darkness avows, “We live as we dream—alone” (2010, 70).4 Seemingly comparable to Byron’s Manfred, Kurtz’ and Marlow’s feelings of

---

4 Nevertheless, “empty” Gothic castles somehow continuously inhabited by reclusive or even solitary birthright villains make little sense—though such literary situations were no doubt titillating to many contemporaneous readers, perhaps reflecting a nostalgia of sorts for the medieval past in a rapidly changing world where long-held assumptions were being overturned “left and right.” Any such “nostalgia” would have a political/ideological side too: A hankering for the medieval would indicate in part social “withdrawal symptoms” from the social construction attended to by new power elites in the wake of the English Civil War. Gothic novels with their hidden vaults and
personal superiority as “supermen” of feeling and faith in an idea are linked with oblivion, the fate of Kurtz’ person, his memory and his seemingly important “papers.” And Kurtz’ existential victory in seeking truth and facing it directly seems also to mirror Manfred, especially during the dramatic “end” they both face.

Given such likely English and Romantic tie-in’s here, it is hard to imagine both Korzeniowski father and Korzeniowski son “missing” a short, accessible (it had been translated early into French and German) and famous novel from the English Romantic tradition such as *Frankenstein*, a work not only widely read but also widely known by reputation by virtue of its plot’s ability to seize the imagination of people who had not actually read the novel itself. And, perhaps most importantly here, we know that Conrad was not always in the habit of acknowledging his sources anyway. That Conrad did not always acknowledge his literary forefathers and mothers can be inferred from the example of Goethe: though Conrad specifically claimed that he had “never read a line of the great man” (Conrad 2008a, 5.174), there is plenty of evidence that he did (Batchelor 1988,170; Firchow 1976, 60–74; Kirschner 1979, 65–81), including a quoted extract from Goethe’s play *Torquato Tasso* in *Lord Jim* (2012b, 160). The point is that there may be strong indications, textually, of connections between Conrad and *Frankenstein* that must then be evaluated by means of a textual (and intertextual) analysis rather than, say, by analysis of evidence gleaned from letters, notes or correspondence mentioning Shelley or her inaugural novel by name. If one knows about or reads Byron and Goethe, one likely knows Percy Shelley as well, but does such a one know that his wife Mary wrote a book called *Frankenstein*? There is nothing really surprising in this suggestion to increase awareness of Shelley other than perhaps a feeling that *Frankenstein* has been, heretofore, “in a dark corner” of the otherwise seemingly well-lit room of Conrad studies (perhaps because it was originally
“placed” there by Conrad himself), but moving Mary Shelley a bit more into the light, as suggested here, seems warranted and will likely benefit Conradian hermeneutics generally.

Judith Wilt’s Gothic gesture for Frankenstein is to discuss the similarity of Frankenstein and Conrad’s Lord Jim (1900) in terms of the “walking away” of the “Separated One” (1979, 35–36). I would add to this that Renouard also “walks away” in a similar fashion in the Conrad story “The Planter of Malata” (1915), and that sentimental attachment to a girl is also involved. Beyond the Gothic, Ursula Lord explores another Conrad connection and almost locates Frankenstein as behind Nostromo (1904), but inserts Marx as, literally, an intermediate text (1998, 291). Like Victor Frankenstein and Frankenstein’s creature, The Goulds, Decoud and Nostromo all die without heirs, effectively ending their revolutionary impulses, which become “tempests in a teapot,” rendered impotent for all their Bourgeois sorcery (Lord 1998, 291).

Looking to Peter Brooks (1996, 82–4) and Cedric Watts (1977, 22), Ludwig Schnauder in his book Free Will And Determinism in Joseph Conrad’s Major Novels emphasizes the differences in the respective use of the frame tale in Frankenstein and in Conrad’s Heart of Darkness (1899), while nevertheless pointing out their shared use of “‘oblique narrative’” (Watts 1977 quoted in Schnauder 2009, 148–9). In both novels we can talk of multiple frame narratives. One thing the frame may do in both stories is target (or at least identify) “ideal readers” of the text. Both incorporate that “story within a story” literary device in which a character in the novel narrates an embedded story (Victor does this, as does Marlow). Frankenstein has a frame involving letters and gentlemen and ladies: Heart of Darkness has a “Marlow” frame involving a gentleman’s letters to be given to a lady (Kurtz’s Intended). In this sense both novels involve a “story within a story within a story,” and perhaps more: Walton–Victor–Creature (and the family) in Frankenstein; The narrator–Marlow–Kurtz (and the manager) in Heart of Darkness (though Marlow’s special affinity is with Walton). Both stories thus contain nested layers of narrative. In Frankenstein the Creature “breaks through” to the top level at the end of the story, the time of his “horror”: in Heart of Darkness Kurtz unfortunately does not make it “out” that far before he meets his “horror” (Conrad 2010, 159). For Victor Frankenstein we have, suggestively, “weighed down by horror and despair” (Shelley 2012, 65).

Admittedly Conrad did not have to turn to Frankenstein alone or even at all to find a model for or inspiration for his own practice of the frame tale. But there seems to be a weight of evidence pointing towards that: a strong and often quite direct debt to Frankenstein, holistically and sometimes even page-by-page. If there exist multiple originals we could try to claim for Conrad’s inspiration to use frame tale narration in, for instance, Heart of Darkness, Frankenstein should be high on the list because it too involves a gentleman’s frame of another gentleman’s story: it is Walton for Victor Frankenstein and Marlow for Kurtz. Frankenstein speaks for the Creature who is in danger of being “voiceless” (except that he is able to show up and speak to Walton directly—for himself—at the penultimate moment of the novel). Kurtz speaks for the “voiceless” natives (and interprets self-servingly to Marlow) until his demise, after which the natives can, and indeed must, speak for themselves, because “Mistah Kurtz—he dead” (Conrad, 2010, 117). Furthermore, Conrad’s epistolary direction in Heart of Darkness (also connected to the frame like Mary Shelley’s) is, as with Frankenstein, connected to a caring invested and interested—but disengaged—woman of the same class (Walton’s sister, Kurtz’s “Intended”) who is the “intended” direction of the letters and the intended direction of the story and the meaning, Heart of Darkness being “something quite on another plain” from just a story of a man going
mad while in Central Africa (Conrad 2008a, 2.417). The epistolary beginning of *Frankenstein* may have led to, via a kind of intertextual suggestion, the “packet of letters” in *Heart of Darkness*. But neither novel is really about true madness anyway—both are about excess and its aftermath.

Mary Shelley took from Goethe’s *Faust* (Shattuck 1996, 79–100) and also from *The Sorrows of Young Werther* (Burwick 1993, 47–52), but Conrad’s Faustian fiction may be more widely gotten, hearkening back to the Marlowe original, such as here where he makes Marlow talk about Kurtz:

> The wilderness had … consumed his flesh, and sealed his soul to its own by the inconceivable ceremonies of some devilish initiation …. The thing was to know what he belonged to, how many powers of darkness claimed him for their own. That was the reflection that made you creepy all over. It was impossible—it was not good for one either—trying to imagine. He had taken a high seat amongst the devils of the land—I mean literally. You can’t understand. How could you? ... no fool ever made a bargain for his soul with the devil (2010, 94).

Conrad obviously owes (and disowns) his debt to Goethe, but character names like “Marlow” (for the character in *Heart of Darkness* corresponding to *Frankenstein*’s Walton) and also the nautical frame of *Heart of Darkness* (involving, as it does, would-be Romantics who have become would-be sailors and Captains and doppelgängers: Marlow and Kurtz, like Walton and *Frankenstein*) would support the idea of the latter author’s having made a further reach for the Faustian into Christopher Marlowe and Mary Shelley and into Shelley’s *Frankenstein* also for the frame tale, *Frankenstein* providing Conrad both in one place (think of it as “one stop shopping”). It is a compelling but not exclusive argument regarding doppelgängers: there is every reason to also suggest Dostoyevsky’s *The Double* (1846) as an influence, though that work matches more closely with the plot of *The Secret Sharer* (as also Dostoyevsky can be seen on the horizon of any reading of *Under Western Eyes*) than it does with *Heart of Darkness*, which matches better in terms of doppelgängers with *Frankenstein*—the relation displayed of alter-egos involving the older and younger men in each tale (Walton–Frankenstein; Marlow–Kurtz). As Mary Shelley causes Walton to say, talking of *Frankenstein*: “Such a man has a double existence” (2012, 17). Obviously a case can also be made for *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886) as an influence, given Conrad’s links to that writer (Dryden 2009, 10–14).

The sense of the double—the doppelgänger—sits close too with Baudelaire. Baudelaire harangues or accosts his reader with it in “Au Lecteur” from *Les Fleurs du mal* (1857): “Hypocrite lecteur,—mon semblable,—mon frère!” (“Hypocrite reader,—my double,—my brother!”) (40). Baudelaire may look back to his own translations of Poe in this. Also there is Conrad’s epigraph for *The Shadow-Line* (1916), also from Baudelaire’s *Les Fleurs du mal* (“La Musique”): “D’autre fois, calme plat, grand miroir/ De mon desespoir!” (At other times, dead calm, great mirror/ Of my despair!) (13–14). Conrad here plays also with the mirror (“a wide looking-glass”) in the sense of pondering the reflection of other or potential selves while looking at a reflection of himself “Deep within the tarnished ormolu frame” (Conrad 2012e, 44).

---

5 Dostoyevsky’s *The Double* (1846) reacted to Gogol’s “The Overcoat,” etc. In including the scene of the spectral and overcoated Haldin lying in the snow in *Under Western Eyes* (Conrad 2013, 35-6), Conrad seems to acknowledge this and even join in the interplay of later writers shamelessly appropriating and freely and emotionally reacting to earlier works.
Baudelaire also combines the words “dark” and “horror” in close proximity in *Les Fleurs du mal* in “Au Lecteur,” which is the first poem on the first page of text, in line sixteen (being the last line of the fourth quatrains on the first page and thus highly assessable to any reader, including Conrad): “Sans horreur, à travers des ténèbres qui puent” (“Without horror, through the darkness which smells rank”) (16). Kurtz is also perhaps anticipated by these lines from “L’Irréparable,” also in *Les Fleurs du mal*: “Aimes-tu les damnés? Dis-moi, connais-tu l’irrémisible?” (Do you love the damned? Tell me, do you know the irrevocable? The unpardonable sin?) (31–2). Nevertheless, finding influence on Conrad from *Frankenstein* would be the path of least difficulty, given what we know, and easier to conceive of than having Conrad derive the frame from, for him, more obscure sources. What is a *doppelgänger* after all? And what is a literary “double,” and who can be called *homo duplex*? These are all three versions of an archetypal duality expressed variously both in human nature and, of course, in literature. Thus far we have reviewed attempts by various scholars to negotiate similarities between *Frankenstein* on the one hand and *The Secret Sharer, Lord Jim, Heart of Darkness* and *Nostromo* on the other. These attempts hint at multiple connections between a text, *Frankenstein*, and not a single text but rather multiple texts by an author, Joseph Conrad. It is interesting because it seems to indicate that Conrad looked back on *Frankenstein* in a number of ways and at various times throughout his career. In this sense *Frankenstein* might be said to have been a continuous influence on the writer of *Heart of Darkness*. This all suggests a broader Conradian affinity with *Frankenstein* and its author Mary Shelley. But what more can be said about other possible threads of influence from *Frankenstein* to Conrad?

With regard to further possible indications of Shelleyan influence on Conrad, I would begin by mentioning Byron, Coleridge, and Percy Shelley. Kurczaba invokes Percy Shelley’s theories while connecting Gombrowicz intertextually to Conrad (1993, 85), while Alvey links Percy Shelley with Conrad by suggesting that Shelley’s Minotaur from “Oedipus Tyrannus or Swellfoot the Tyrant,” “the mightiest/ Of all Europa’s taurine progeny” and “...the grotesque British heir to all Europe” (2.2.103–4), anticipates the contribution of “all Europe” to “the making of Kurtz” in Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (2009, 148). If the connections established between Conrad on the one hand and Coleridge, Byron and Percy Shelley on the other, for example by Mario Curreli (2004, 96), Katherine Isobel Baxter (2010, 65) and Stephen Bernstein (1995, 35–6) are any indication, it should not be too much of a stretch to expect also a connection with Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (Cairney 2005, 65–76). For example, I am assuming any even oblique reference to Prometheus, such as “chains” in “Amy Foster” (1946a, 111) or the “sacred fire” at the beginning of *Heart of Darkness* (2010, 45), might also reference at least one Shelley, and probably both, even as it may also reference the Promethean poems of Goethe and Byron. For example, in the 1818 edition of *Frankenstein* we have: “chains and darkness were the only objects that pressed upon me” (Mary Shelley 2012, 142–3). Along with “darkness” here, “heart” is also suggestively placed by Shelley for Conrad’s notice: 34 times in the 1818 edition and 36 times in the edition of 1831. Goethe’s poem “Prometheus” first appeared in 1785; Byron’s “Prometheus” appeared in 1816 followed by Percy Shelley’s Prometheus—as a four-act lyrical drama—in 1820. Though “dark,” “heart,” and “horror” appear in many Gothic stories, do such stories hold a near-constant omnipresence next to his typewriter? Such words as these are only *part* of what points us back to *Frankenstein*. The implication is in the aggregate.
Conrad makes a specific reference to Prometheus in part three, chapter one of *The Arrow of Gold* (1947, 111). There are also a series of references to “chains,” “links” or “fetters” both in *Frankenstein* and in a number of Conrad stories, and many of these instances come in narrative situations analogous to or possibly involving allusions to the Promethean story. Again, for example, for Victor: “chains and darkness were the only objects that pressed upon me …. Liberty, however, had been a useless gift …” (Mary Shelley 2012, 142–3). Such conscious or unconscious allusions to Prometheus—“Modern” or otherwise—dominate portions of both editions of *Frankenstein* (seven in the first edition of 1818 and nine in the revised 1831 edition).

In the 1818 version of *Frankenstein* (changed in the 1831 edition) Victor states: “like the archangel who aspired to omnipotence, I am chained in an eternal hell” (Shelley 2012, 152). In the 1831 edition: “I had unchained an enemy” (Jansson 1999, 141). It is interesting that Walton is made to address some of his letters from “Archangel” (*Arkhangelsk* in Russia)—which serves as the real starting point for his ambitious project (thus potentially equating his project with the spirit of a Romantic “Satan” from *Paradise Lost*). Compare the Creature’s Satan-inspired comments at the beginning of Part III, Chapter VIII: “Cursed, cursed creator! Why did I live? Why, in that instant, did I not extinguish the spark of existence which you had so wantonly bestowed? (Mary Shelley 2012, 95). Does Victor transgress the “accepted” in contemporary terms, and does he act the part of both “Satan” in *Paradise Lost* and perhaps of Prometheus, or is it the Creature in the “Prometheus” slot and Victor in that of Zeus? In his interviews with Frankenstein, Walton remarks on “the greatness of his fall” (152). Of course we can also again note the Miltonic epigraph to *Frankenstein* itself, from *Paradise Lost*: “Did I request thee, Maker, from my clay/To mould me man? Did I solicit thee/From darkness to promote me?” (10.743–45; Mary Shelley 2012, 3; Werblowsky 47–63). This could be either the Creature “speaking back to” Frankenstein or Frankenstein “speaking back to” God. Of course, Prometheus also can be equated with Jesus, given his obsession with helping mankind and his similar crucifixion and “wounding in the side.” Against the backdrop of “inaccessible peaks” (Mary Shelley 111), we have: “I dared to shake off my chains, and look around me with a free and lofty spirit; but the iron had eaten into my flesh …” (115).

We see that allusions to Prometheus also occur, significantly, in Conrad’s *The Nigger of the Narcissus*, “The Return,” *Lord Jim*, “Amy Foster,” *Nostromo*, “Prince Roman,” and *Under Western Eyes*. They are also germane to *A Personal Record*. In *The Nigger of the Narcissus* we have the following scene set with a Promethean metaphor: “He had panted in sunshine, shivered in the cold; suffered hunger, thirst, debauch; passed through many trials—known all the furies. Old! It seemed to him he was broken at last. And like a man bound treacherously while he sleeps, he woke up fettered by the long chain of disregarded years. He had to take up at once the burden of all his existence, and found it almost too heavy for his strength” (Note the allusion to the Passion of Christ on the *Via Dolorosa*) (1946b, 99). In “The Return” we have “This fit of hot anger was succeeded by a sudden sadness, by the darkening passage of a thought that ran over the scorched surface of his heart, like upon a barren plain …. all those feelings, concealed and cruel, which the arts of the devil, the fears of mankind—God’s infinite compassion, perhaps—kept chained deep down in the inscrutable twilight of our breasts” (2012d, 114), which does double duty as evoking both Prometheus intertextually and *Heart of Darkness* intratextually. In *Lord Jim* we have “The land, the people, the friendship, the love, were like the jealous guardians of his body. Every day added a link to the fetters of that strange freedom” (2012b, 198). In *Nostromo* we have: “his fetters were struck off by the light of a candle …. His heart was beating
violently with the fear of this liberty” (1966, 374), while in “Prince Roman” the main character “walks in Chains” (1955, 53).

_Nostromo_ echoes _Frankenstein_ with “he had been chained to the treasure” (1966, 495) as Henry Clerval was “chained to the miserable details of commerce” (Jansson 1999, 36). For Peter Ivanovitch in _Under Western Eyes_: “‘My fetters’—the book says—‘were struck off on the banks of the stream, in the starlight of a calm night by an athletic, taciturn young man,’” the village blacksmith (2013, 101). Here the blacksmith stands in for Hercules who (there are various versions) strikes off Prometheus’ fetters, though here, for Peter Ivanovitch (and Prince Roman and some historical figures, Korzeniowskis), some links are (required to be) worn by each new Prometheus figure as a reminder of authoritarianism, or, more to the point, Russian autocracy. For the author of _Frankenstein_ it is the act of bringing the idea of Prometheus to bear in some way on her own writing; for Conrad it is more complex: the same possibly Prometheus analogies and allusions via the figurative use of chains, fetters and links are present but these can also do double-duty for Conrad as allusions to “Korzeniowski” chains from the Czarist practice of making exiled Polish patriots—including some of Conrad’s immediate relatives of his father’s generation—literally walk in chains from Poland to locations in Siberia, or, for Conrad, chains can be used as a way of referencing the chains of “Prince Roman” (Brodsky 2010, 66; Omelan 2010, 96, 113; Conrad 1955, 53). There is also a kind of segue in both Conrad and Mary Shelley at such points to the “wild man” motif as well: in the Creature’s wonderings in forests and mountains in _Frankenstein_ and prominently in Conrad’s _A Personal Record_ and _Under Western Eyes_ (soldiers reverting to a beastly state because of hunger in _A Personal Record_; Peter Ivanovitch “reverting” to a feral state in _Under Western Eyes_).

Such implicit Prometheus allusion underscores both the intertextual and the intratextual nature of Conrad’s art: intertextual in this instance back possibly to _Frankenstein_ and intratextual in a way that demonstrates that Conrad’s texts can all be seen as inter-related in terms of references, allusions and themes (and of course meanings). Such intratextuality can essentially be said to link some (if not, on some level, all) of Conrad’s body of work together as “one text,” where an answer, discussion, key reference or clarifying commentary for a novel, let’s say, “over here” is revealed or included in a story or novel, let’s say, “over there.” For example, while _Heart of Darkness_ can be said to include a strong Prometheus element, these Prometheus theme-trigger words, “chains,” “ links” and “fetters,” while they operate deeply in many of Conrad’s texts, do not appear in _Heart of Darkness_ apart from the “clink” of the chain connecting six Congolese prisoners—more of a familial and political reference (Korzeniowski chains) than a Prometheus one (2010, 56–7): the point is that because of the number of Prometheus “clinks” in other Conrad stories, intratextually, we can confidently put more “weight” on the “clink” that appears in _Heart of Darkness._

---

6 Some of these Conradian texts (and less immediately so, perhaps all Conradian texts), on some level, act as “one text”: perhaps not even very “high” above the texts themselves, they are probably (at one time in the mind of the author and in the mind also of the reader) “one text” or it is possible for them to be profitably treated as such by the critic. It is not such a wild idea for any author, or any texts, and perhaps for Conrad the level of such “cosmic unity” may be closer than average to the terrestrial realm of the text, whereas with other authors such “cosmic unity” is probably so relatively “high in the stratosphere” as to be more of a moot point. This is something similar to the way Joycean texts can “stand together” in relation to each other yet simultaneously “stand alone.” The author’s “deep structure” vs. the “surface structure” of the text, to put it in Chomskyan terms (1964).
However, Conrad’s allusions to Prometheus do not match the thrust of Goethe’s, Byron’s or even Percy Shelley’s use of Prometheus (Baker 1981, 123). Conrad’s allusions are more in line with the “Modern Prometheus” metaphor of Mary Shelley which has Victor Frankenstein “stealing” from “the gods” (God), than it is in line with the “rebellion and defiance” preoccupation one can find in the other three authors, or arguably in her “Creature” (again, see her epigraph from Milton (Shelley 2012, 3). Or is it more in line with Percy Shelley’s idea of poets as the carrier of the spark of genius, “legislators or prophets …. of the world”? (Percy Shelley 1915, 76–118). Goethe has Prometheus in a surprisingly Christian context, thinly veiled, while Byron’s obsession is proving his superiority through manly suffering—both physical and psychological. What does Prometheus do? He helps mankind in various ways; in the process he rebels against “God” by rejecting control in favor of creative freedom. He becomes a willing sacrifice for mortals, for mankind, he is crucified and repeatedly wounded in the side. What does Faust do? He does not heed the expressed warnings about the danger of seeking and finding forbidden knowledge, and signs away his soul in a pact with the Devil. What does Satan do? Satan (Paradise Lost) rebels against God though of such high station that he “should” defend him, and then goes on not only to reject his own creation but to meddle with God’s vision for mankind.7 For his part, Victor Frankenstein steals the spark of life—the ability to create life—from God and also creates, like the Titan, a race of men. The power to create or the act of creation: that is the first order of business in the novel. The Creature’s rebellion against the “father” is the second order of business in Frankenstein, and that second order does match somewhat with Percy Shelley’s eventual work, as it does with the preceding work by Goethe and Byron. Similarly, the Conrad theme in Heart of Darkness is a bit more “stealing fire from the gods” (unrestrained Romantic creativity) than “open rebellion” (against society, law or any restrictive principle of authority): that it is here Victor who is the “Modern Prometheus,” not the Creature, is suggested by the Creature lamenting the loss of fire “which I had obtained through accident, and knew not how to reproduce …” (Mary Shelley 2012, 72). Such “rebellion” (in this sense of stealing the “fire” of the gods or of God) recalls the tradition of Nietzsche’s übermensch and stretches back at least to Byron (Lansdown 2012, 159; Pointner 2004, 237–41; Said 1976, 65–76).

Given that a “Faust” theme and Prometheus and Promethean chains are all available at one time in one text, Frankenstein, and taking that along with the nautical, Romantic, bourgeois and female-related themes or subjects, all available in Frankenstein, it is not necessarily “better” to say that it was Byron who “gave” Conrad Faustian or Promethean themes, or that it was Goethe who was the source. Cope discusses “Faust in Frankenstein” (2014, 122–26), and it should be noted that Mary’s husband Percy Shelley was also a translator of Goethe’s Faust, Part I (Hutchinson 1970, 748–62). The Faust legend was a potent influence on Byron and other Romantics (Parker 2008, 107–123; Hewitt 2015, 79–118). For “Faust in Conrad” we see Marlow in Heart of Darkness refer to (and visually describe) the brickmaker of the central station as a “papier-mache Mephistopheles” (2010, 68)—a reference to the Faust legend—and we can find hints of Faust in Victory as well (Werres 2008, 4; Raphael 1932, 41–73; Karl 1997, 263). Conrad also refers to interpreting the Faust legend in “The Life Beyond” (1921a, 66–70), while Marlow, again, comments about Kurtz in Heart of Darkness: “The thing was to know what he belonged to, how many powers of darkness claimed him for their own” (2010, 94). Certainly Conrad could also have looked, beyond Byron and Goethe, at Percy Shelley and Mary Shelley.

---

7 One of the major cultural nodes “grabbing”—at a time, a cultural moment—and propelling Prometheus and Faust (in the guise of Satan from Paradise Lost and in his own guise too) into the future, together, is Frankenstein!
together, linked as they were in several ways: by last name, by being husband and wife, and by using “Prometheus” prominently in the titles of some of their works (Mary Shelley: *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus*; Percy Shelley: *Prometheus Unbound*). Again, regarding the “Faust” theme in *Heart of Darkness*, the uncertainty of the spelling of Marlow’s name in “Youth” (1902) almost begs us to take it as “Marlowe” with an “e” which would lead us to “that” Faust as well. At the beginning of “Youth” the narrator introduces Marlow by writing “Marlow (at least I think that is how he spelt his name),” inviting the reader to supply the final “e” for themselves and thereby make the connection to Marlowe’s *Faust*. An additional possibility, probably just a coincidence, is that “Marlow” also references the fact that Percy Shelley and Mary Shelley moved into a house in the town of Marlow in 1816, where Mary finished *Frankenstein*. In the front matter of the 1831 edition of *Frankenstein*, Percy Shelley’s preface ends prominently with “MARLOW, September 1817” (Jansson 1999, 10). A rather large “Marlow,” then, is the last thing the reader sees before diving into the text itself. If this process was the genesis of the character name in *Heart of Darkness* it would also point to the genesis of the theme-trigger “a facility of expression, and a voice whose varied intonations are soul-subduing music” (Jansson 1999, 24), which only appears in Letter IV (for August 13) in the 1831 edition of *Frankenstein* (though Victor Frankenstein’s “voice” features in Walton’s letter of September 5th in both versions (Mary Shelley 2012, 155; Jansson 1999, 161): Marlow’s developing discussion of the power and significance of the great man’s (Kurtz’) “voice” is given a lot of space over the course of *Heart of Darkness*. Indeed, Mary Shelley’s precocious medical student “F(rankenstein),” who “acts” like a “doctor,” may even be a code, conscious or unconscious, for “Dr. F(austus).” Conrad, then, probably perused this edition (which we would expect anyway because it was the more available edition). Additionally, Thomas Love Peacock, who had a hand in the Shelleys’ moving to Marlow, wrote *Nightmare Abbey* (1818) at a nearby house in the months following the initial publication of *Frankenstein*. Among many things Peacock’s novel mocks are Gothic-Philosophical gloom and also schemes to improve the colonies—a nod back to Percy Shelley’s awkwardly titled “Proposals for an Association of Those Philanthropists who, convinced of the inadequacy of the moral and political state of Ireland to produce benefits which are nevertheless attainable, are willing to unite to accomplish its regeneration” and a nod forward to the ill-fated “report” of Kurtz in *Heart of Darkness*, another possible tie-in here. So the story of “Faust” as an influence, both Byron’s (*Manfred*) and Goethe’s and also Marlowe’s, but through or with *Frankenstein*.

But again, this Conradian affinity with *Frankenstein* involves more than just *Heart of Darkness*. Some of the Conrad texts that can be said to show possible influence from, or at least thematic similarity with, or are comparable in some way to *Frankenstein* include: *The Nigger of the...*
Narcissus (1897), Heart of Darkness, Lord Jim, “Amy Foster” (1901), Nostromo, The Secret Agent (1907), The Secret Sharer, Under Western Eyes (1911), Chance (1913), “The Planter of Malata” (1915), The Shadow Line (1917) and some of Joseph Conrad’s own essays and letters, particularly A Personal Record. So in terms of specific textual novel-to-novel or novel-to-story comparisons, while the majority of these similarities line up with Heart of Darkness, there are a few others. In Lord Jim: Jim’s self-banishment echoes Victor Frankenstein’s self-banishment, while Victor’s intention, “If I returned, it was to be sacrificed” (2012, 121), seems to anticipate Jim’s developing ethos over the course of the novel and his eventual fate. The wealthy bourgeois Walton of Frankenstein, while on a ship, dreams of a friend and class double—a dream later built upon or perhaps fulfilled in The Secret Sharer, evidence in Conrad’s method of a type of “bricolage” (Nöth 341). The same area of the text of Frankenstein supplies a second plot element for The Secret Sharer: the captain’s personal disconnection from the rebellious crew. The crew of Walton’s ship is against him while his “secret friend,” if you will, is the man in his cabin and in his bed, Victor Frankenstein, who is brought on board in a way similar to the way Leggatt is brought on board in The Secret Sharer, as we have seen. There is a similar scene in the first part of Under Western Eyes where Razumov and Haldin converse privately in Razumov’s rooms while Haldin takes repose on his bed (2013, 26). The class issue is there: the bourgeois aristocrats justify each-other in the face of the crew who should appreciate them out-of-hand and do what they’re told! This is ironic because Walton is so busy “talking with himself” if you will, that he is no good “captain” of his “ship”:

September 9th, the ice began to move, and roarings like thunder were heard at a distance as the islands split and cracked in every direction. We were in the most imminent peril, but as we could only remain passive, my chief attention was occupied by my unfortunate guest whose illness increased in such a degree that he was entirely confined to his bed (2012, 156–7).

It is almost as though the Conrad text is the “dream extension” of the conscious musing of Walton on his ship: Leggatt and the captain in The Secret Sharer are “Conway boys” (2008c, 88). Like Marlow’s director (2010, 11), Jim is also “a Conway boy” (Conrad 2012b, 11) and “one of us” (Conrad 2012b, 313) and can sit at the mahogany table and drink claret with us (2010, 11) and reminisce in the spirit of a sort of Burnsian toast (Freedman 2014, 61–67): “here’s to us and those like us (the Scots toast usually goes something like: “Here's tae us; wha's like us? Gey few”).” Levin discusses Conrad’s use the term “one of us” (1979, 42): the term occurs, self-consciously, 13 times in Lord Jim. The Russian in Heart of Darkness prefaces the telling of his secret information by calling himself a “brother seaman” to Marlow, and informs Marlow that, had they not been “of the same profession,” he would have “kept the matter to himself” (2010, 160). Compare Genesis 3.22–24, “And the LORD God said, behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil”:

… and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore the LORD God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life (KJV).

In the chain of associations placing “one of us” in ideational proximity to “the tree of knowledge” compare here Manfred’s discovery in Byron’s Manfred:
But grief should be the instructor of the wise; Sorrow is knowledge: they who know the most/Must mourn the deepest o’er the fatal truth,/The Tree of Knowledge is not that of Life (1.1.10–13).

See also Frankenstein: “You seek for knowledge and wisdom, as I once did; and I ardently hope that the gratification of your wishes may not be a serpent to sting you, as mine has been” (2012, 17).

And then Nostromo. In Frankenstein, rowing on the lake, Victor contemplates suicide:

… and sometimes, after rowing into the middle of the lake, I left the boat to pursue its own course and gave way to my own miserable reflections. I was often tempted, when all was at peace around me, and I the only unquiet thing that wandered restless in a scene so beautiful and heavenly—if I except some bat, or the frogs, whose harsh and interrupted croaking was heard only when I approached the shore—often, I say, I was tempted to plunge into the silent lake, that the waters might close over me and my calamities forever (Mary Shelley 2012, 62).

Taking it a bit further in Nostromo, Conrad has the journalist Decoud shoot himself out of a rowboat and into the water in a successful suicide (1966, 500–1). In the same way that “Gould”—the surname of the mining family in Nostromo—suggests “gold” (Knowles and Moore 2001, 101), perhaps “Decoud” suggests both découdre (metaphorically, to fall apart) and en découdre (to fight, to do battle). With regard to “meaningful names” we can add “Fresleven” (2010, 49), the Danish captain in Heart of Darkness (Marlow’s predecessor as Steamboat captain) killed over some chickens. Conrad appears to have changed the name from the historical “Freiesleben”—his own real-life predecessor on the Congo River—to perhaps to create a sense of “inexperience” or “naiveté” (“freshly-made bread”— Compare “fresh meat”) leading to disaster. Hence the old doctor’s warning forefinger: “Du calme, du calme” (2010, 53), echoing Victor’s father in Frankenstein: “A human being in perfection ought always to preserve a calm and peaceful mind …” (2012, 34).

Thus Decoud and Jim both arguably “mirror” the Creature—and his double (not his alter-ego and not his opposite but somehow his double) Victor—in this way: they seek Romantic-inspired Wertherian oblivion through suicide. Or, is it a “Roman” impulse of self-punishment for failing in reaching so high, and acknowledging “the horror” of having fallen so far? Thoughts of suicide are also personal for Conrad—consider Conrad’s own suicide attempt in Marseilles as a young man (Stape 2007, 31). Suicide by hanging by frustrated European agents occurs in both “An Outpost of Progress” (2012a, 99) and Heart of Darkness (2010, 56). It is interesting to note another personal connection: that both Walton the character in Frankenstein and Marlow go from a love of literature (or of maps anyway!) to a life on the sea (As Conrad himself arguably does, given his early years with his dear father Apollo Korzeniowski, the translator of literature, and his later career in the Merchant Marine). It is also interesting to note the role of both literal and figurative “self-reflection”—in addition to Frankenstein’s miserable reflections on a peaceful silent lake (2012, 62), the Creature reacts to his literal reflection in water, which he reflects negatively upon:

I had admired the perfect forms of my cottagers—their grace, beauty, and delicate complexions; but how was I terrified when I viewed myself in a transparent pool! At first I started back, unable to believe that it was indeed I who was reflected in the mirror; and when I became fully convinced that I was in reality the monster that I am, I was filled
with the bitterest sensations of despondence and mortification. Alas! I did not yet entirely know the fatal effects of this miserable deformity. (Mary Shelley 2012, 79).

For his part, Conrad uses titles like The Mirror of the Sea and makes extensive use of mirrors and self-reflection in The Secret Sharer and in The Shadow Line: A Confession. It is, of course, indicative of a Romantic heritage that extends back through his father, the Mickiewicz tradition including Konrad Wallenrod (1828) and back to Shelley, Byron, Goethe and even to MacPherson, author of Fingal (1761). So we can say that with Conrad, the Romantic tradition continued, that Conrad’s roots in the Romantic were ample and secure, and that the Romantic tradition was a source of continuing literary nourishment for the Polish author.

Let us return now to Heart of Darkness. With regard to seeking after or attempting to locate some influence on Conrad from the novel Frankenstein, in addition to any sense of connection one might suspect in a particular Shelleyan or Conradian quote, there is also to be considered the cumulative weight of such instances spread between mise en scène, theme, structure, subject and character. We started by suggesting that the character Walton in Frankenstein is comparable to the character Marlow in Heart of Darkness: he behaves in a similar way by preserving and then presenting a record of the great man (and in communicating it all to a woman), and in this way both play ingénue to a jefe character (Frankenstein or Kurtz). Granted, one is structured by an epistolary and one by a spoken narrative, but both feel similarly framed and structurally related or similar. For his part, Victor in Frankenstein compares favorably with Kurtz in Heart of Darkness: they both represent the product of wealth and of the best broad though perhaps quirky (by our standards) European education. The importance of preserving the record of the great man by the younger friend is certainly there, while Walton’s nautical English friend’s choice of extreme wandering at sea over staying with his betrothed or not putting off or away his engagement (did you believe that Wertheresque story?) is echoed in Kurtz’s physical and emotional remoteness from his “Intended” (and also echoed, arguably, in Conrad’s story “The Planter of Malata” where the planter also gets “well away” from another woman) as Kurtz too

---

9 Again, in the popularity or appeal of the Gothic Byronic character or hero/villain, there are ripples of a town-middle class-Protestant (Whig?) fear of ideological (baronial) revenge, one which the Gothic novel titillatingly massages. Eventually this comes in, in literature, as the hero both as Gothic and from the hero-villain archetype (Satan in Paradise Lost): the outcast Byronic hero. It’s all about an ideologically predicable and acceptable “Protestant middle class” in agonistic resistance to a self-sovereign “Northern/Catholic” baronial-feudal villain. Ann Radcliffe’s "unrepentant" Gothic villains (beginning in 1789 with the publication of The Castles of Athlin and Dunbayne, a Highland Story) foreshadow the moody, egotistical Byronic "villain" nascent in Byron's own juvenilia, some of which looks back to Byron's Highland upbringing and Gordon relations (like Macpherson’s relations, Highland aristocrats or Jacobites now lost between two worlds (Cairney 1995 and 2004; Milbank 1995). For example, in Byron's early poem "When I Roved a Young Highlander" (1808), we see a reflection of Byron's youthful Scottish connection, but also find these lines:

As the last of my race, I must wither alone,
And delight but in days, I have witness’d before (4.3–4).

These lines echo William Wordsworth's treatment of James Macpherson's Ossian in "Glen-Almain" (1807):

That Ossian, last of all his race!
Lies buried in this lonely place (31-2).

Thus Byron's poem seems to show that a brooding, melancholy influence not only from Wordsworth but also from Macpherson was very much on his mind at an early date. Lord Ruthven's evocative and locative noble (Scottish, Highland, Gaelic) name (Lord Ruthven as a Gothic and Byron-inspired villain character in both Polidori's The Vampyre and Lady Caroline Lamb's Glenarvon) points to Byron's similar Gordon background and is also the name (Ruthven) of the Highland town where James Macpherson was born.
displays “ignorant carelessness” (Jansson 1999, 17) in actively rejecting the settled domestic life offered to him. There is also that three-part narrative chain in both (Walton–Victor–Creature; Narrator–Marlow–Kurtz), but if Marlow is like Walton, then Kurtz is both “Victor” and “the Creature” (homo duplex) in much the same way as Victor and the Creature are themselves doppelgängers or doubles of each other, almost satisfying the phrase “like father, like son.” For example, the Creature says: “I learned from your papers that you were my father, my creator” (Mary Shelley 2012, 97). Indeed, at those points in the text where I would assert that “Victor=the Creature” or “Victor=the Creature=Kurtz,” Victor seems Byronic in seeking “a few moments of forgetfulness” (Mary Shelley 2012, 36), while the Creature, towards the end of his story, says “I am content to suffer alone” (Mary Shelley 2012, 159) and, at the very end, adds: “Polluted by crimes, and torn by the bitterest remorse, where can I find rest but in death?” (2012, 161). Victor and the Creature both see themselves as “wretched”: they are also “joined” by their self-proclaimed wretchedness. Victor proclaims it: “such a wretch as I am” (Jansson 1999, 69) …. the wretched Victor” (Jansson 1999, 159). A “Satanic” wretch? At the end, the Creature has become his father, proclaiming “it is true that I am a wretch” (2012, 70, 160). Victor is “A miserable wretch” (Jansson 1999, 118).

“Dark,” “heart” and “horror” in *Frankenstein*—all of which appear prominently in *Heart of Darkness*—also tie Victor and the Creature “together.” Elizabeth is concerned about Victor’s posture of “despair” and “revenge” and encourages him to “banish these dark passions” (Janson 1999, 72), while Victor declares guilt and that he “bore a hell within” (Mary Shelley 2012, 59). Victor calls attention to the “tortures of my own heart,” “my prophetic soul … torn by remorse, horror and despair” (Jansson 1999, 70). It could be Kurtz! Later, similarly (as a double), the Creature declares “I, like the arch fiend, bore a hell within me” (Mary Shelley 2012, 95), a reference to Satan in *Paradise Lost* (1.156) and to the Miltonic epigraph to *Frankenstein*, and mentions “the fiend that lurked in my heart” (Mary Shelley 2012, 64).10 Also it should be noted that Kurtz (2010, 148) and Victor share a need for confession, Victor to Walton and the Creature to Victor. Who is übermenschen: Kurtz, Victor or the Creature? This is another indication of the duality expressed in the two characters in *Frankenstein*, which matches with the duality expressed inside Kurtz, homo duplex, in *Heart of Darkness*. Thus, while Victor and his creation, the Creature, can be described as alter egos “gone wrong” (in both the “second self” sense of the word for a trusted friend similar in nature and in the sense of an “alternative personality held within” as a potential identity for the self) or as doubles, almost as doppelgängers, the separation between Victor and the Creature, or between Marlow and Kurtz, is, among other things, a code for the separation within, *Heart of Darkness* (HD) being a code, perhaps, for “homo duplex” (HD) in an internal “Jekyll and Hyde” way for Kurtz. Arguably both Mary Shelley and Joseph Conrad use “between” to, in reality, discuss “within” in addressing the essential duality or dualities of man. For Conrad it is a Modernist reduction aimed perhaps at accounting for the “truth” of, and perhaps resolving the complexity of, human nature. Faust and Satan are implicated in this more than Prometheus. First of all, the Creature reads *Paradise Lost* and *The Sorrows of Young Werther*: "I can hardly describe to you the effect of these books. They produced in me an infinity of new images and feelings, that sometimes raised me to ecstasy, but more frequently sunk me into the lowest dejection (Mary Shelley 2012, 89). Victor, in distinctly Wordsworthian terms, sounds similar: “I could hardly sustain the multitude of feelings that

---

10 Victor Frankenstein declares, “I was cursed by some devil, and carried about with me my eternal hell” (Janson 1999, 155). Compare *Paradise Lost* (4.75) and Marlowe’s *Dr Faustus* (1.3.77).
crowded into my mind. I passed through scenes familiar to my youth, but which I had not seen for nearly six years. How altered everything might be during that time! (2012, 48). Walton found another side, or what became another side, of himself (outside, an alter ego) in Victor Frankenstein and presumably he will manifest what he has learned on the inside after Frankenstein’s death. Frankenstein and the Creature, for their part in the chain, are developed as two sides of same coin, and this internalizing of an external relationship is something we eventually see again in the captain and Leggatt in “The Secret Sharer” (1910).

The reader might think that Walton has learned by the end: by the time the frame returns he has learned to show restraint and put his internal duality under some version of Jekyll-Hyde hierarchy and control. Has he learned anything at the end, by the return of the frame? In a sense he is no longer Walton, inexperienced, he is Frankenstein, in the same way that Marlow, as he becomes experienced, internalizes Kurtz and it changes him: the heart of darkness is the homo duplex. So, their journey, mental and physical, figurative and literal; it is a quest by the “self-separated one.” For the wanderer, the time in Asia or Africa is not for travel, to “see” places: that is the physical journey. Rather it is to “see” how someone “like Kurtz,” an übermensch, responds to certain unique and distant, but very real, stresses. It is curiosity, and eventually a seeking for self-knowledge. A deep, yearning desire to satisfy answers by seeking a voice to rescue a voice: is it to bring lost wholeness? The doppelgänger is, in a sense, in one person (the captain and Leggatt are also Jekyll and Hyde), and we are teasing out the allusions and as intertextuality leads to meaning, so the nameless are named, and it is as if it was a transcendent unity with God somehow or a higher consciousness which they sought, in some Buddhist or Eastern way: Marlow as Buddha-like after meeting and hearing and processing his encounter with Kurtz (Conrad 2010 43–47, 126).

Like Walton, Marlow is established as a reliable narrator with a similar style of narration for events, a reporter if you will, and of course Victor and Kurtz end in a dismal failure and death that is so ironic compared to their “lofty” beginnings. When the Creature says “all men hate the wretched” (2012, 67), the Creature (one of the wretched) can easily be taken to be metaphorically represented by Conrad as the contemporaneous Congolese as they are portrayed in Heart of Darkness, wretched, or, as an additional metaphorical extension in chain, as the wretched state of Poles vis-à-vis Russia. The beginning so good but the ending so bad: “kill” on the one hand (Jansson 1999, 77); “exterminate” on the other (Conrad 2010, 95). Victor Frankenstein wants to kill the Creature, his creation, because of his own feelings of frustration, despair and repulsion—despite his big plans in going to the trouble to create in the first place in order to show his übermensch-like power to conceive and attempt such work. Compare Kurtz’s “immense plans” ending in comparable “horror” and his famous textual outburst “exterminate all the brutes!” (2010, 95). We are talking of course about Kurtz’ last words, arguably the most famous line in Heart of Darkness, emanating hoarsely from his deathbed and repeated three more times by Marlow during the coda: “The Horror! The Horror!” (2010, 117). Once failures,
each in their way, they all become cynics: Frankenstein, the Creature, Kurtz. Intratextually speaking, this, and Kurtz’ outburst (“exterminate all the brutes!”) with its Congo context, can also be traced to Conrad’s previous short story “An Outpost of Progress,” also set in the Congo (1897): “Kayerts sat on his chair and looked down on the proceedings, understanding nothing. He stared at them with his round blue eyes, called out to Carlier, ‘Here, look! look at that fellow there—and that other one, to the left. Did you ever such a face? Oh, the funny brute!’” (2012a, 82). That Kayerts is the “funny one” here, the real “brute,” clearly is the intended ironic meaning. Here in “An Outpost of Progress” we can compare the self-deception—isolated from the natives and thus a European problem—with the portrayal of foolish casual racism in the actions of Kayerts and Carlier: this is not Conrad’s racism, this is Conrad’s ironic and critical look at racism, his exposure of racism (Glazzard 2017, 31; Wiegandt 2015, 3). One might suggest that Heart of Darkness is a widening—in various ways—of the shorter “An Outpost of Progress,” but with an injection of deeper and more universal meaning facilitated in part through the influence of Frankenstein. So if Heart of Darkness follows, intratextually, “after” “An Outpost of Progress” as an extension of it, then the difference between them is, perhaps, exactly Frankenstein. There are other influences on Heart of Darkness of course, but Frankenstein may be a definitive one, structurally and thematically.

If Kayerts (compare “Kurtz”—the name of Kayerts co-worker, Carlier, recalls a French version of “Charles,” Marlow’s given name) turns out to be, ironically, more brutish than “that fellow” (a native) in “An Outpost of Progress” (2012a, 82), there is also in Frankenstein the irony that, as Bloom points out, the Creature is more human than Victor Frankenstein (2006, 4). In the Conrad configuration, the position of the “Creature” vis-à-vis Victor Frankenstein is, one could say, filled by the Congo (or, if you will, by Poland), while Victor Frankenstein himself in this configuration equates with Belgium (or, if you like, with Russia). Victor Frankenstein’s journal and his story as told to Walton are comparable to Kurtz’s papers, “rescued” by Marlow. Alongside the episode in Frankenstein where the Creature dances and burns the cottage down after his friends desert him, the episode of the shaman’s dance by Kurtz’ hut and the fire (Promethean chains, Promethean fire) makes more sense than it does by itself in the context of Heart of Darkness alone (Conrad 2010, 112). Many things in Frankenstein seem to have thus suggested to Conrad his presentation of other, but similar, things in Heart of Darkness. The weight is in the aggregate: so many webs of pliable connection suggest that the “spider” did indeed travel from Frankenstein over to Heart of Darkness. In any case, such local commentaries in parts of Heart of Darkness where Conrad waxes ironic about racism serve more generally and globally as symbols or metaphors for the overarching themes of Heart of Darkness about life, about men in society, and lead us to understand Heart of Darkness as a parable about Polish suffering at the hands of Imperial Russia.

Pyotr Ivanovich Bagration—a Napoleonic-era Russian General who invaded Poland and figures also in Tolstoy’s War and Peace). This is suggestive of the level of intertextuality between Conrad texts containing significant “deathbed dramas”—the seemingly inevitable and eventual death of James Wait who finally gets what he and the reader were made to “wait” for in The Nigger of the Narcissus and of course the similar death of Kurtz at the end of Heart of Darkness—and both the death of Frankenstein in Frankenstein and the death of Ivan Ilyich in Tolstoy’s short story. Compare Psalm 55: “… the terrors of death are fallen upon me …. and horror hath overwhelmed me” (55:4–5 KJV). Note the profound power of recognition, and the effect on meaning here and the aesthetic pleasure of recognizing allusions when they occur.
It does seem, then, that in some form or fashion, *Heart of Darkness* is a rewriting of *Frankenstein*. Conrad never admits that (just as he never admits an obsession with Byron or his obvious familiarity with and borrowing from Goethe (but it is there). According to Kirschner (2009, x), for example, “Conrad uses Goethe’s romantic idiom only to question Goethean optimism.” Kirschner adds:

Hervouet, however, showed that in the MS of *Victory* Conrad had translated a whole paragraph analyzing Olivier Bertin’s love for Mme de Guilleroy and later omitted most of it from his novel, proving that he had used Maupassant’s text as a scaffolding which he afterwards dismantled, leaving telltale bits behind (2009, vii).

I am proposing something similar here for *Heart of Darkness* and *Frankenstein*. As Kirschner also points out, “The word ‘plagiarism’ today has been largely replaced by the term ‘intertextuality,’ covering a vast variety of infiltrations of one literary text into another” (2009, viii). So *Frankenstein* is perhaps just another one that he “does not admit,” and I am suggesting that it is perhaps because it is so powerful, that connection with *Frankenstein*, and I would even suggest that it might not have been written, that *Heart of Darkness* might never have been written, if it had not been for the existence of (and his familiarity with) the earlier *Frankenstein*. Both as a copying or modelling of, or as a reaction to, even as a retelling or intellectual sequel if you will, or as a *Conradizing* of *Frankenstein*, the debt seems there on many levels: *Frankenstein* as a profound instigator, as a model, as an intellectual nemesis. For Conrad in some way it seems his rewriting, his response to, his reaction, as well as copying. Blatant borrowing at times by the Polish author—the characters given new names and slightly different opinions perhaps—are mixed with the usual intratextual and intertextual processes.

In some sense, then, *Heart of Darkness* may have “had its birth” in *Frankenstein*, and a review of the opening letters in *Frankenstein* shows that *Heart of Darkness* is likely modeled, to some extent, on the Shelley text. However, that is just the tip of it: such a review of structural similarities seems indicative of a deeper ideational connection which becomes more strongly credible once the evident “modelling” influence is established. Once such a connection is reasonably established between *Frankenstein* and *Heart of Darkness*, the deeper and more profound implication is that, both intertextually to *Frankenstein* and intratextually throughout Conrad’s body of work, something of *Frankenstein* could act in some way as a “secret” key to *Heart of Darkness*, to certain meanings and discussions (as, intratextually, *Heart of Darkness* could be said to serve as a key to *Lord Jim*). As we have already seen, the narrative frames are quite similar, to the extent that *Frankenstein*, both in its structures and narrative arrangements of characters, and in its themes, appears to have been like a font to which Conrad returned again and again for inspiration for his own work. Here, for example, Walton’s “Lieutenant” in *Frankenstein*, in the opening letters, is a more standard “type” of maritime professional than Walton:

Well, these are useless complaints; I shall certainly find no friend on the wide ocean, nor even here in Archangel, among merchants and seamen. Yet some feelings, unallied to the dross of human nature, beat even in these rugged bosoms. My lieutenant, for instance, is a man of wonderful courage and enterprise; he is madly desirous of glory. He is an Englishman, and in the midst of national and professional prejudices, unsoftened by cultivation, retains some of the noblest endowments of humanity. I first became

---

12 “It [Lord Jim] has not been planned to stand alone. H of D was meant in my mind as a foil, and *Youth* was supposed to give the note” (Conrad 2008a 2.271).
acquainted with him on board a whale vessel: finding that he was unemployed in this city, I easily engaged him to assist in my enterprise (Mary Shelley 2012, 11).

As Walton is introduced in the text, he can be “played off” this lieutenant to show off Captain Walton’s “superior” cast (modern, educated, full of “enlightened” Romantic sensibility), much, again, as Marlow is introduced to the reader toward the beginning of Heart of Darkness:

He was the only man of us who still "followed the sea." The worst that could be said of him was that he did not represent his class. He was a seaman, but he was a wanderer, too, while most seamen lead, if one may so express it, a sedentary life. Their minds are of the stay-at-home order, and their home is always with them—the ship; and so is their country—the sea. One ship is very much like another, and the sea is always the same. In the immutability of their surroundings the foreign shores, the foreign faces, the changing immensity of life, glide past, veiled not by a sense of mystery but by a slightly disdainful ignorance; for there is nothing mysterious to a seaman unless it be the sea itself, which is the mistress of his existence and as inscrutable as Destiny. For the rest, after his hours of work, a casual stroll or a casual spree on shore suffices to unfold for him the secret of a whole continent, and generally he finds the secret not worth knowing. The yarns of seamen have a direct simplicity, the whole meaning of which lies within the shell of a cracked nut. But Marlow was not typical (if his propensity to spin yarns be excepted), and to him the meaning of an episode was not inside like a kernel but outside, enveloping the tale which brought it out only as a glow brings out a haze, in the likeness of one of these misty halos that sometimes are made visible by the spectral illumination of moonshine. (2010, 45).

Again, if the “kernel” is the story of Kurtz, then the real meaning is, counter-intuitively, within the frame, “And this also has been one of the dark places of the earth” (2010, 45), or else it is in Frankenstein (where we can place the narrative of Victor Frankenstein as the “glowing” core of meaning reflecting back on the frame of Walton’s impressionable need). So Kurtz is like Victor Frankenstein, he lacks “restraint,” and the framed narrative sheds its meaning back into the “haze” of the frame: in the case of Frankenstein it is from Victor’s narrative back onto Walton, in the case of Heart of Darkness it is from Kurtz’s narrative back onto the idea of Roman Britain expressed by Marlow in the frame (as the frame’s “haze” reveals an earlier Europe just as “dark” as the contemporaneous Congo, where colonial forces oppress the local people with conquest, as in Poland), and then even beyond that potentially back to Frankenstein itself, where we have Victor’s ultimatum, “hear me,” just before he begins his narrative in earnest (Jansson 1999, 23), operating so much like Marlow’s own “And this also…” operates to introduce his imagined narrative of Belgium and the Congo (Conrad 2010, 45), or, if you will, if the “kernel” is Heart of Darkness, the meaning “surrounding” it, intertextually, is in Frankenstein.

Also, ironically, it is as though Conrad’s sea experience is, intertextually, filtered through Walton’s (which is Mary Shelley’s) sea experience and nautical sense which must be second-hand or imagined at best. But it is in English and a winning model to follow. So it is perhaps not directly Conrad here, but seems Conrad through Mary Shelley. It would seem remarkable that a real sailor, such as Conrad, would, in such a way, filter his own experience on the sea through the Frankenstein text’s discussion of sailing or of the nature of the experience of being a sailor (something Conrad already knew about or was the “real” expert about, directly). It’s ironic
because Mary Shelley was obviously not a sailor herself (absence of direct experience/presence of “textual” experience and hearsay). Conrad has Marlow say:

Now when I was a little chap I had a passion for maps. I would look for hours at South America, or Africa, or Australia, and lose myself in all the glories of exploration. At that time there were many blank spaces on the earth, and when I saw one that looked particularly inviting on a map (but they all look that) I would put my finger on it and say, ‘When I grow up I will go there.’ The North Pole was one of these places, I remember. Well, I haven’t been there yet, and shall not try now. The glamour’s off. Other places were scattered about the hemispheres. I have been in some of them, and ... well, we won’t talk about that. But there was one yet—the biggest, the most blank, so to speak—that I had a hankering after (2010, 48).

In one of his many ironic inversions, it has become somehow a place of “darkness” rather than an illuminated space thanks to European scrutiny:

“True, by this time it was not a blank space any more. It had got filled since my boyhood with rivers and lakes and names. It had ceased to be a blank space of delightful mystery—a white patch for a boy to dream gloriously over. It had become a place of darkness. But there was in it one river especially, a mighty big river, that you could see on the map, resembling an immense snake uncoiled, with its head in the sea, its body at rest curving afar over a vast country, and its tail lost in the depths of the land. And as I looked at the map of it in a shop-window, it fascinated me as a snake would a bird—a silly little bird (2010, 48).

Compare Frankenstein:

I shall satiate my ardent curiosity with the sight of a part of the world never before visited, and may tread a land never before imprinted by the foot of man. These are my enticements, and they are sufficient to conquer all fear of danger or death and to induce me to commence this laborious voyage with the joy a child feels when he embarks in a little boat, with his holiday mates, on an expedition of discovery up his native river. But supposing all these conjectures to be false, you cannot contest the inestimable benefit which I shall confer on all mankind, to the last generation, by discovering a passage near the pole to those countries, to reach which at present so many months are requisite; or by ascertaining the secret of the magnet, which, if at all possible, can only be effected by an undertaking such as mine (Mary Shelley 2012, 8).

He searches for the “Pole”: this would seem very evocative in a potent semiotic/psychological suggestiveness: did this English, “pole,” appear to the Pole, Conrad, to make “the Pole” (Poland, things Polish) his subject? And not the North Pole, because it had been done and covered in the Shelleyan “urtext” Frankenstein, and so as Conrad’s Marlow says, again, “the glamour’s off”:

The North Pole was one of these places, I remember. Well, I haven’t been there yet, and shall not try now. The glamour’s off. Other places were scattered about the hemispheres (2010, 48).

He also shows he keeps an interest in ‘the pole’ as a geographical point, and the homonym in English must have stood out to Conrad the Pole: “pole” in Polish being “biegun” and “Pole” being “Polak.” But the pole, the North Pole, had been done and covered by Mary Shelley, so “the glamour’s off,” and so hence the Congo River?

In any case, selfish Kurtzian megalomania is there in Walton’s discussion, above, of “an expedition of discovery up his native river,” along with the concomitant appearance of the words
“Child,” “river” and “boat,” with Conrad likely having read these opening letters with an open and covetous eye as a reader and author, and so all these suggested themselves, it seems, for ready insertion into *Heart of Darkness* as he expanded it from its beginning in “An Outpost of Progress.” Marlow is made to say, in the context of maps, “the North Pole,” a straight line from Walton’s “map,” yet another suggestive connection here. “Child” is there, while Walton’s “little boat” becomes Marlow’s “Nellie,” and Walton’s “native river” becomes Marlow’s Thames, full of ancient “wild” (native) Britons (2010, 46). It is also curious because, in presumably filtering his own textual representation of sailing experience and emotion, experiences which he certainly knew, and knew as a Pole, and as a French sailor: by filtering that through Shelley, he is not only using/borrowing “sailor talk” from a bourgeois non-sailor, he is also using English, and so maybe it is the English filter rather than the sea-talk itself that was the attraction, a ready-made English way of talking about the sea that could be expected to “work” with English Victorian readers, his monetarily significant audience. But, again, “river” here in the *Frankenstein* text is associated, by proximity, with “child” (Mary Shelley 2012, 8) and so I want to link that with two locations in the *Heart of Darkness* text: *Heart of Darkness* opens, the first lines of the frame, on a river, the Thames (45–6), and also a short time later Marlow talks about a river (Congo river) and how it was on the map to him like “a snake,” and he a child, “like a silly little bird.” It presented itself to him on a map, perhaps making Walton a “silly little bird” rather than a seasoned sailor in Conrad’s view as a kind of commentary in retrospect or reverse on the earlier novel.

In *Frankenstein*, we hear of the supposed “inestimable benefit which I shall confer on all mankind to the last generation” (sounds like the would-be Byronic hero and übermensch—Kurtz), and the “steady purpose,—a point on which the soul may fix its intellectual eye”:

> These reflections have dispelled the agitation with which I began my letter, and I feel my heart glow with an enthusiasm which elevates me to heaven, for nothing contributes so much to tranquillize the mind as a steady purpose—a point on which the soul may fix its intellectual eye (2012, 8–9).

Compare the end of “The Planter of Malata”:

> For to whom could it have occurred that a man would set out calmly to swim beyond the confines of life—with a steady stroke—his eyes fixed on a star! (2012c, 73).

This “eye” and this “star,” have deeper implications, including an idea (or ideas) surrounding “fate.” We can compare this coda to “Malata” with the coda to “The Secret Sharer”:

> “Walking to the taffrail, I was in time to make out, on the very edge of a darkness thrown by a towering black mass like the very gateway of Erebus—yes, I was in time to catch an evanescent glimpse of my white hat left behind to mark the spot where the secret sharer of my cabin and of my thoughts, as though he were my second self, had lowered himself into the water to take his punishment: a free man, a proud swimmer striking out for a new destiny (2008c, 119).

“Erebus” imagery of course occurs in *Heart of Darkness* as well (2010, 44). Earlier, at the captain’s introduction to the watery Leggatt at the beginning of the story (2008c, 88), the captain

---

13 See, early in *Frankenstein*, resolutions “fixed as fate” (2012, 11). The “heart of darkness” here seems to be, in light of *Frankenstein*, the one that thinks itself “bright” but has only a darkling, groping knowledge of itself, the self. This could almost be said to echo Luke 23.34 (KJV): “Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.”
says: “I had somehow the impression that he was on the point of letting go the ladder to swim away beyond my ken—mysterious as he came.” Leggatt’s response to the captain reinforces the theme: “Yes. I’ve been in the water practically since nine o’clock. The question for me now is whether I am to let go this ladder and go on swimming till I sink from exhaustion, or—to come on board here” (2008c, 88). The idea of a “strong, free, naked swimmer suggests some sort of Promethean “rebirth” or über-proud Byronic defiance of terrestrial fate. Kurtz’ final destiny is like that of Frankenstein and the Creature in its profundity but also replete with suggestions of the attainment of some existential “victory” of faith, loyalty and truth and authenticity—and memory—over death and Byronic oblivion. It is a repeated phrase: “The horror! The horror!” (2010, 120–122). Compare “A voice! a voice!” (107).

Finally, we turn to Under Western Eyes (1911). First we look at one of the main characters, Victor Haldin, whose actions drive the plot in the first part of the novel: he has a forename, “Victor,” and a possibly Finish surname, “Haldin,” but not a particularly Russian one. There are a lot of simultaneous interpretations possible with this, both in terms of possible meaning and in terms of possible authorial intention. Was it “fate” that led the Magi on their biblical journey to visit the Christ-child by following that star? Such a journey could then be said to have been “in their stars”: The philosophy of the Magi, erroneous though it was, led them to the journey by which they were to find Christ. Magian astrology postulated a heavenly counterpart to complement man’s earthly self and make up the complete human personality. His "double" (the fravashi of the Parsi) developed together with every good man until death united the two (Drum 1910, 529).

Pope Francis equates the star with sight as knowledge or understanding of truth via faith: “Those who believe, see; they see with a light that illumines their entire journey” (2016, 3–4). The star is something that “illuminates” the “journey”: “a star to brighten the horizon of our journey at a time when mankind is particularly in need” (2016, 5). He also indicates the star-initiated “path of discovery” aspect of the journey also emphasized by Conrad, an ancient western trope:

An image of this seeking can be seen in the Magi, who were led to Bethlehem by the star (cf. Mt 2:1–12). For them God’s light appeared as a journey to be undertaken, a star which led them on a path of discovery (2016, 29).

As Conrad has it for Renouard (and for Leggatt in “The Secret Sharer,” another “strong swimmer”) in his story “The Planter of Malata”: “For to whom could it have occurred that a man would set out calmly to swim beyond the confines of life—with a steady stroke—his eyes fixed on a star!” (2012c, 73). Wilkinson, for the Magi, adds the “unknown” aspect of the journey also emphasized by Conrad: as a “star” had been Renouard’s guide, a star had been their guide as they travelled, “not knowing where their journey would end” (1869, 226). Kurtz’ unavoidable “fate” is placed in close proximity to the “fixed stars” (2010, 93).

Suggestive near homophones and homographs have been suggested for the “origin” of “Haldin” as a meaningful name choice, but the possibility of seeing it as a Finnish name allows an automatic sense of ethnic resistance to the Russian government that may be a code for Polish resistance as well, but one that allows Conrad to “finish” his novel without directly “getting into” the Polish question in this particular book, which arguably was focused on Russia per se. Take for instance the name “Jane Eyre” from the novel by Charlotte Brontë: Jane is also, of course, thematically, and rather hopefully, “Jane the heir”: that is the preoccupation, this idea of being an heir, of anybody at any time, making you a sort of worthy or respectable person in that worldview. To be a valid or otherwise worthwhile person, a person who matters, a person with privileges in the contemporaneous British society, to match with (a) Rochester, you have to be an heir (which is quite a commentary of and on the time and place of the setting of the novel and also something deeply seated in the psyche of English readers/readers of English because of the cultural past or laden English linguistic culture through Victorian times and even, possibly, up to today). Jane Eyre’s needing to be an “heir” and fighting those struggles, she thinks, may lead eventually to Harry Potter’s struggles under the stairway in J. K. Rowling’s The Philosopher’s Stone with his own “Aunt Reed,” and also to his going off to his own version of Lowood School. Given the attractiveness to (damaged?) readers, these are apparently things many can deeply and easily relate to.
metaphorically like Victor Frankenstein in the sense that he too wants to create something new, a new society rebelling against the “gods” of Russian autocracy and stealing their “fire.” However, as a fugitive from the authorities, he gets “hauled in.” That act sets the whole book in motion. Haldin is (after being betrayed by Razumov) arrested by the authorities, themselves agents of the “gods,” the “Prince K’s,” of the Russian political system. Victor Haldin in *Under Western Eyes* is like Victor Frankenstein in trying to do something radical, shocking and daring—to reanimate the Russian political “body” by giving the “fire” of self-government and enlightenment and freedom to the serfs/people of Russia (as Kurtz does to the Congolese of the upper river—but he comes up “short”). The origin of Razumov is significant: Razumov in *Under Western Eyes* is a parody of Raskolnikov in Dostoyevsky’s *Crime and Punishment*. Besides the similarities of being loner students who think too much and hold themselves aloof, there are other clues that Conrad carefully mediated his parody: toward the beginning of *Under Western Eyes*, when we are first being introduced to Razumov, we are told that he is supposed to be the son of an “Archpriest” (Orthodox), and then we learn that he is actually the illegitimate son of the Archpriest’s daughter by Prince “K—,” the full name remains mysterious. Since Dostoyevsky himself was said to be a descendant of an Orthodox Archbishop in the Ukraine, I suspect that Conrad’s implication is to equate Dostoyevsky himself with Razumov, and thereby “call” Dostoyevsky “a bastard” (at the least to suggest the slang sense of the word). Think of it as a private joke, a kind of “literary revenge.” Besides the link provided by Razumov being involved in rejecting the friendship and intimacy of his peers, similar to Raskolnikov, his name itself, “Razumov,” seems also to establish the link to *Crime and Punishment* when you consider that the name of Raskolnikov’s only friend is, as previously noted, “Razumihin,” a name which rather significantly means “reason” as Razumihin sits as a character-in-contrast to the only pseudo-reasonable Raskolnikov. While Dostoyevsky’s choice makes perfect sense within *Crime and Punishment*, the choice by Conrad of the name “Razumov”—which also means “reason”—for the main character in *Under Western Eyes* seems to be meant sarcastically given the context of the story and also Conrad’s negative opinions about “the Russian mind” in general. Sort of “I’ll show you what ‘reason’ means to a Russian.” This sort of feeling. The choice by Conrad for Razumov’s full name, Kirylo Sidorovich Razumov, seems also to be a nod toward Polish Nationalism: Prince Andrey Kirilovich Razumovsky was a famous Ukrainian Count and Russian Ambassador to Vienna whose family remains influential to this day. He was created a Prince in 1815, hence perhaps the name “Prince K—,” which Conrad gives Razumov’s father in *Under Western Eyes*: a play on “Kirilovich.” This historical Razumovsky was the architect of the Second Partition of Poland, and was alleged to have had a role in the murder of Gustav III of Sweden and Paul I of Russia. His brother, Aleksey Kirilovich Razumovsky, was minister of education of the Russian Empire from 1806–1816, and had been highly criticized by Pushkin for his reactionary policies. It is inconceivable that Conrad would not have known of one or the other of these figures when naming his character. So Conrad’s Polish agenda gets lots of traction from the associations of the name in support of his criticism of Russian Autocracy.

However, Dostoyevsky’s ancestry is actually Lithuanian before it was Ukrainian, and since Lithuania is a place where Polish Catholics and Russian Orthodox priests fought a kind of proxy war, it seems a little unfair for Conrad to dismiss Dostoyevsky as the soul of things Russian since that somewhat obscures the fact that Poland also had its sights on Lithuania. Poland, then, was not entirely a simple victim of Russian-Slavic and Orthodox expansion. And all of this suggests Conrad’s intimate knowledge of and study about Dostoyevsky, and so we should look with some
suspicion on Conrad’s curt dismissal of the Russian writer he owed so much to, a dismissal that recalls perhaps the line from Hamlet: “The lady doth protest too much, methinks.” Friedrich Nietzsche, another influence Conrad attempts to hide, referred to Dostoyevsky as "the only psychologist from whom I have something to learn: he belongs to the happiest windfalls of my life, happier even than the discovery of Stendhal" (Mihajlov 1986, 127–45; Shestov 1969, 319).

Such important political meanings aside for the moment, the connection, on the other hand, between Under Western Eyes and Frankenstein has to do with “the raw and the cooked,” an evocation of Levi-Strauss and perhaps yet another duality of the many we are called upon to address in the wake of Conrad’s cryptic comments to Waliszewski: “Both at sea and on land my point of view is English, from which the conclusion should not be drawn that I have become an Englishman. That is not the case. Homo duplex has in my case more than one meaning” (Conrad 2008a, 3.89). The perception of this sense of duality, “the raw and the cooked,” psychologically or culturally, may help us securely connect the episode of the escape of Peter Ivanovitch in Conrad’s Under Western Eyes to the wanderings of the Creature in Frankenstein, similarly wild—both like wild men (Novak 1972, 183–222). We find “wild beast” in Frankenstein (2012, 95), “wild men” in Heart of Darkness (2010, 46), “wild beast” in Under Western Eyes (2013, 99) and also “wild man” (100). Suggested intertextual connections—varying from general to specific and weak to strong—between Mary Shelley and Conrad gain a weight of likelihood by their sheer number and their broad occurrence between Conrad’s works and Frankenstein (showing us multiple independent “lines” which could be drawn from Frankenstein towards multiple Conrad texts). Such already-suggested connections between multiple Conrad texts and Frankenstein inevitably also lend weight to any argument that might be made regarding a connection between Frankenstein and Under Western Eyes, as we zero in now particularly on the almost inexplicable episode “the escape of Peter Ivanovitch” (to which are devoted less than 2000 words towards the beginning of Part II, Chapter 2).

That this relatively short “escape” episode here hardly seems necessary to the rest of the 120,000 words of the novel (in terms of the plot you could “lift it out” and not miss it) suggests that it is aimed outward or that it pertains, not to the text it is found within, but to another text entirely. Or texts. Or that it also reaches “back” or “outward” to help “give the note” somewhere.16 “The escape” also stands independently in its interest and appeal as a real “episode” because it seems clearly to point back to Heart of Darkness—and ultimately to Frankenstein. In the “escape,” a prisoner is “forced” to become a “wild man” as he runs through entire regions of forest, and his humanity is “saved” by a woman by a stream at the edge of the forest (symbolically a liminal space, also psychologically), much as happens to the Creature in Frankenstein, similarly at the edge of the forest. In Frankenstein, despite the perceived threat of a sexualized danger, the Creature rescues the girl. Conrad changes the theme: for Conrad in Under Western Eyes (the “escape” episode) and other works, the girl instead—by the power of her womanly nature—“rescues” the man (in more ways than one—and again in spite of the hovering aura, somehow, of a sexualized danger), Peter Ivanovitch. Of course the “escape” episode in Under Western Eyes also serves to show the vanity and character flaws of Peter Ivanovitch, a caricature meant to satirize Tolstoy (while the rest of the book implicitly satirizes Dostoyevsky).

---

16 See note 12.
Certainly there are “wild men” in Conrad’s corpus: in *Heart of Darkness*, “all that mysterious life of the wilderness that stirs in the forest, in the jungles, in the hearts of wild men” (2010, 68); in “Almayer’s Folly,” “Was he a wild man to hide in the woods and perhaps be killed there—in the darkness—where there was no room to breathe?” (2013, 126); in *An Outcast of the Islands*, “You are only a wild man” (1949, 315); in *Lord Jim*, “get Sherif Ali with his wild men” (195); in *Nostromo*, “a wild mass of men” (1966, 477); in *The Rescue* “wild men who eat their enemies” and “wild men” (1921b, 48, 266), and in “Amy Foster,” “he might have expected to find wild beasts or wild men” (1946a, 112). In-between *Under Western Eyes* and the earlier *Heart of Darkness* is “Amy Foster,” which seems to channel a vision of Victor Frankenstein’s creature in its description of another “foreigner”: is Conrad saying that a free Pole abroad is a “Prometheus Unbound,” that is to say, a “modern” Prometheus, or, generally speaking, a Promethean figure in the world? Consider this quote from “Amy Foster”:

"Yes," said the doctor to my remark, "one would think the earth is under a curse, since of all her children these that cling to her the closest are uncouth in body and as leaden of gait as if their very hearts were loaded with chains. But here on this same road you might have seen amongst these heavy men a being lithe, supple, and long-limbed, straight like a pine with something striving upwards in his appearance as though the heart within him had been buoyant. Perhaps it was only the force of the contrast, but when he was passing one of these villagers here, the soles of his feet did not seem to me to touch the dust of the road. He vaulted over the stiles, paced these slopes with a long elastic stride that made him noticeable at a great distance, and had lustrous black eyes. He was so different from the mankind around that, with his freedom of movement, his soft—a little startled, glance, his olive complexion and graceful bearing, his humanity suggested to me the nature of a woodland creature (1946a, 111).

So we have the wild man motif that we will see again in *Under Western Eyes*—and “hunger and elemental survival” too, that theme, mixed with autobiography and also mixed in is a reading, a memory it seems, of Frankenstein’s Creature as Rousseauian Natural Man and Byronic/Nietzschean übermensch. It goes on:

"Yes; he was a castaway. A poor emigrant from Central Europe bound to America and washed ashore here in a storm. And for him, who knew nothing of the earth, England was an undiscovered country. It was some time before he learned its name; and for all I know he might have expected to find wild beasts or wild men here, when, crawling in the dark over the sea-wall, he rolled down the other side into a dyke, where it was another miracle he didn't get drowned. But he struggled instinctively like an animal under a net, and this blind struggle threw him out into a field. He must have been, indeed, of a tougher fibre than he looked to withstand without expiring such buffetings, the violence of his exertions, and so much fear. Later on, in his broken English that resembled curiously the speech of a young child … (1946a, 111–112).

A natural man, a free agent unrepentant and unsuppressed naively and natively trying to learn the cultural norms of the locals: very like Frankenstein’s Creature—his wanderings and attempt to have intercourse with the local peasants “simply” to communicate. Certainly there are “wild men” in back of the “escape” episode too, the folkloric Polish Leshy, a wild feral forest dweller who, like Peter Ivanovitch, often carries an axe. The woodwose.

“Amy Foster” acts both intratextually in echoing the “escape” of Peter Ivanovitch in *Under Western Eyes* (in the way Yanko becomes an inarticulate “wild man” in rural England and is
“saved” by Amy Foster, a local village girl) and intertextually because of its obvious links between Yanko and the Creature in *Frankenstein* (the forest wanderings, the negative interaction with male villagers and particularly the use of clandestine concealment in primitive sheds or huts as a way to advance the narrative). The Creature’s desire for a woman to “fix things” for him in *Frankenstein* is echoed at the end of the “escape” episode in *Under Western Eyes* and also at the end of *Heart of Darkness*, and the same perhaps conventional placement of women is echoed negatively in “The Planter of Malata” and is an issue in *Chance*.17

Both the Creature and Peter Ivanovitch represent the *unity* of the raw and the cooked, the civilized and the savage, in one man:

For it was as though there had been two human beings indissolubly joined in that enterprise. The civilized man, the enthusiast of advanced humanitarian ideals thirsting for the triumph of spiritual love and political liberty; and the stealthy, primeval savage, pitilessly cunning in the preservation of his freedom from day to day, like a tracked wild beast” (2013, 99).

Both involve promethean chains broken: the prominent fugitive “chain” in the episode of Peter Ivanovitch’s escape “links” this story back to the Creature in *Frankenstein*, where Victor says, “I had unchained an enemy” (Jansson 1999, 141). Here it is clearly Victor who is now “Zeus” and the *Creature* who plays the role of Prometheus (where Victor had clearly acted as Prometheus in bestowing life in defiance of God).

The dualities implicit in the term “homo duplex” can be seen to exist culturally or anthropologically through the application of the term “the raw and the cooked” (Lévi-Strauss), but, perhaps more importantly, can also be seen, simultaneously, to operate “in one person” in the novel, in a “Jekyll and Hyde” way, particularly in individual character development, as the narrator of Peter Ivanovitch’s “escape” episode in *Under Western Eyes* makes clear. “Heart of darkness” (HD) also codes “homo duplex” (HD)—the real meaning of the story perhaps being the dual nature of man: “heart of darkness” really is “dark heart” in that “Lord Jim” sense of the term (“inscrutable at heart,” liminal and unpredictable in our choices), rather than simply a title alluding indistinctly to “dark” and “evil” doings associated with or located in Congo. In the same way, “Amy Foster” may code “Almayer’s Folly.”18 The reference to a dark *place* might also be seen to serve as a metaphor: “darkness” on the outside is like darkness on the inside. Conrad causes his character Marlow in *Heart of Darkness*, to say “And this also has been one of the dark places of the earth” (45), while in *The Nigger of the Narcissus*, the narrator wonders “What ideas do his polished and so curiously insincere sentences awaken in the simple minds of the big children who people those dark and wandering places of the earth?” (1946, 6). In *An Outpost of Progress*, the narrator relates how “They also found some old copies of a home paper. That print discussed what it was pleased to call ‘Our Colonial Expansion’ in high-flown language. It spoke

---

17 There is a complex “female” theme at work intratextually in Conrad—the “failure” of Amy Foster and the Intended and the discussion on women in *Heart of Darkness* (2010, 93)—which may go back, and perhaps be understood more clearly, by considering Goethe’s discussion of the female in Faust II (Goethe 2008).

18 And Joseph Conrad (J.C.), as chosen from a full name (Józef Teodor Konrad Korzeniowski) my “encode” or point to a Catholic and spiritual, or religious, meaning (Jesus Christ) to go along with all the other meanings or possible implied suggestions (i.e. Conrad Wallenrod, Byron’s “Conrad” in “The Corsair”). Conrad certainly did at one time fundamentally identify subjectively as a Polish noble and Catholic (Fletcher 1999, 10): Always a Polish noble, perhaps always Catholic on some Polish level as well—though he may have felt the need to encode it in order to more initially foreground other associations and meanings and “delay decoding” (Knowles and Moore 2001, 103).
much of the rights and duties of civilization, of the sacredness of the civilizing work, and extolled the merits of those who went about bringing light, and faith and commerce to the dark places of the earth” (2012a, 82–3). It is perhaps as if the unpredictability “out there” (from a culturally centric point of view) is an emblem of the unpredictability inside a person: “Have respect unto the covenant: for the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty” (Psalms 74.20 KJV). Being rejected by “civilized” man initiates the turn towards violence for the Creature in *Frankenstein*, which comes on the inside (Stape 2004, 144–61; Carabine 1996, 71; Wallaeger 1990, 170). The senses of Homo Duplex are strong here:

As an orphan at the age of twelve, Conrad was placed under the care of his maternal uncle, Tadeusz Bobrowski, who introduced a new approach to life to the young boy. Instead of the revolutionary beliefs that Conrad was accustomed to from his father, he was instead implanted with ideas of conservatism, or strict social discipline. The aforementioned contrasting ways of life which Conrad experienced as a youngster contributed to his “awareness of himself as homo duplex, suspended between revolutionary and conservative, chivalric and egalitarian, romantic and pragmatic traditions” (Knowles 1996, 6–7).

We are potentially invited here to entertain any number of dualisms in light of this quote. Dualisms from *Frankenstein* might include good and evil, self-preservation/self-destruction, wisdom/ignorance, action/inaction, inclusion/isolation, studious life/active life, responsibility/irresponsibility and of course the Cartesian dualism, mind and body. For Conrad we might add European/native, us/them, inside/outside, subject/object, English/Polish, writer/sailor, Korzeniowski/Babrowski, natural/artificial, Apollonian/Dionysian, spiritual/material, fate/free will, reason/reaction, rational/political, aristocrat/peasant, bourgeois/proletarian, spirit/flesh, man/nature, advanced/primitive, civilized/wild (culture/nature), idealistic/skeptical (Turgenev), charity/self-love (Browne), socialization (restraint)/bodily appetite (Durkheim) and a kind of Nietzschean “man/superman.” The “homo duplex” situation is, again, either inside, à la “Jekyll and Hyde” (or like Wilde’s “Dorian” dualism), or “outside” (psychologically or sociologically) like the Captain and Leggatt, or more contrastively, like Haldin and Razumov. This is “two natures in one person” (Browne 2012, 74), the other sense of “alter ego,” or as Bazar has it, “the severance of my body and my inner being” and the “frequent severance of our two natures” (1901b, 180–1). It was Balzac himself who went on to say that man “has a double life” that “distinguishes our latent senses from our corporeal senses!” This is what Balzac calls “homo duplex” (1901a, 2) in anticipation of Durkheim’s own eventual notions of homo duplex (1960, 328). As well as the usual dualities, however, “homo duplex” also implies personal liminality and raises the issue of “potential lives” as Cedric Watts points out in his introduction to *Lord Jim*: “Probably most of us come to feel what the text suggests: that we contain more potential lives than real life permits us to realize” (1977, 11).

The literary link here to *Frankenstein* seems strong. After reading the episode of the Promethean escape of Peter Ivanovitch in *Under Western Eyes*, the reader’s mind naturally goes back to *Frankenstein* (especially if they are familiar with the text) and the wanderings of the Creature as recorded in that text, and the image of the Creature constantly on the run through forest, mountain and even “Amidst the wilds of Tartary and Russia” in *Frankenstein* (251) becomes Peter Ivanovitch running through Siberia in *Under Western Eyes* (97–99). At first the Creature,

---

19 “One can learn something from Balzac…” (Conrad 2008a, 6.228).
the natural man in a wild state, subsists on nuts, berries and roots (Mary Shelley 118–122). He tries to join society through the liminal space of a relatively primitive wooden hut or shed, but ultimately he sees only the horrified reaction of the humans. Later, heading back into the wilderness, the Creature understands that he will not be accepted, that he is always to be rejected, by human beings. His learned distrust of “man in society” is echoed both in Yanko’s character in “Amy Foster” and in the character of Peter Ivanovitch in Under Western Eyes. The historical references in the “escape” episode, on the other hand, are to various historical imprisonments of various Russian and Polish figures (chains, the threat of political imprisonment), some even in Conrad’s own family, making the episode of the “escape” a composite (none of the historical stories themselves exactly match here though the links of each seem obvious). In the Piotrowski narrative for example (1863, 291–304), the fugitive never loses his humanity or his composure, has “normal” nightmares, and is drawn in a realistic rather than mytho-poetic light. His beard too is a premeditated disguise, like “false beards” in Under Western Eyes (2013, 69), rather than a physical manifestation of the growing wildness within or of his withdrawal from human community or into himself—like Razumov elsewhere in the text when he meets Peter Ivanovitch’s “double,” Councilor Mikulin (Mikhail Bakunin?), as that official almost dreamily avoids breaking the chain of Razumov’s faulty internal reasoning (think Raskolnikov in Crime and Punishment) by “glancing down his [own] beard” (2013, 73–81). Razumov answers loudly “without looking up” and “mumbles” (2013, 76).

The female issues in the escape episode (while being generally a common Conrad subject) link here more directly to Frankenstein, and there is also, intratextually, the discussion of “the place of women” in Heart of Darkness (2010, 93). Thus the narrative of the Creature running, in a primeval way, on the “edge” of civilization, even given a number of sometimes quite personal historical allusions which can be suggested for the “escape” episode (Brodsky 2010, 66; Omelan 2010, 96, 113; Conrad 1955, 53; Piotrowski 1863, 292), also transcends these composite historical references and also transcends the mocking attack on Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy implicit in Under Western Eyes and the character of Peter Ivanovitch to still have its broader essential or primary links to Frankenstein: hiding out in the woods eating nuts and berries (2012, 76–77), lonely and miserable, the care of the woman (this also links to “Amy Foster”), and “the woman by the stream”—both in the episode of the “escape” of Peter Ivanovitch and in Frankenstein—in both literary cases it is a moment of decision: it is for the Creature and, in another direction, it is for Peter Ivanovitch. To help or to be helped? Both are potentially redeeming gestures by an alienated subject towards reinstatement in society (some community) and reintegration with humanity—through the love of a woman (like Manfred in Byron’s poem and like Shelley’s Captain Walton, Victor Frankenstein and the Creature). But which woman?” Conrad seems to say: “not any woman.” Which woman could “save” Kurtz (or anybody else)? A woman, some woman, some women, but not any woman.

I want suggest then that Heart of Darkness is perhaps, to some significant degree, a rewriting of Frankenstein: I want to show that it could be, significantly, and so I want, based upon this note, to be able to say confidently to the question “Is Heart of Darkness a rewriting of Frankenstein?” that “it might well be.” Effort is made to show how Frankenstein could have contributed to the meaning of Heart of Darkness and could also, therefore, help a reader decode meaning in the Conrad text. Along the way, examination of some kind of intertextuality between Frankenstein and Heart of Darkness demonstrates that some of Conrad’s texts operate to some degree, and
certainly on some level, intratextually speaking, as “one text.” The idea is that certain deeper meanings in one novel or short story may be unlocked, intratextually, by examining “textual keys” planted (consciously or unconsciously?) by the author in other works. Using the concepts of intertextuality and intratextuality to decode meanings leads us to certain deeper and simultaneously extant meanings shared between texts which come into focus only when we step back and consider *Frankenstein* and *all* texts by Conrad as one intertextual web. No doubt webs of this kind involving other hypotexts besides *Frankenstein* can also reveal meanings in Conrad, and we can consider such found intertextual and intratextual relationships in general as models of a process by which meaning in a text might have been created by an author and later can be decoded by a reader: indeed, any reader should be able to similarly examine any number of literary works in order to glean meanings in a similar way. Writing is a complicated process and so there are many ways, fleeting or otherwise, that can lead one to decide how much, viscerally or in the course of genius and inspiration, to use another work to push off from. We have already seen how Mary Shelley “pushed off,” in her frame-letters, from Wordsworth’s “Tintern Abbey” (among other works). Clearly the implication does push towards “Tintern Abbey,” though there is no proof, in the same way it appears that *Frankenstein* quite likely was there in some way or at some point(s) on the bedside table or on the desk not too far away from the typewriter as Conrad was working through his creative process during the composition of a number of his works, especially those that seem closest within the sub-universe of *Heart of Darkness* and Charlie Marlow.

One can “talk all day” about how there is no proof that Conrad had *Frankenstein* in mind with regard to some of these Gothic references and allusions, but in looking at how Shelley herself looked back to Wordsworth and “Tintern Abbey,” here someone could make the same argument and say “there is no proof”—that it could have been some other Romantic writer, some Romantic writer and the zeitgeist of the time—but it is clear nevertheless that the likelihood or obvious implication is that Mary Shelley was thinking of and probably looking specifically at a cherished copy of Wordsworth’s famous poem during the composition of the letters at the beginning and end of her novel. In a similar way for *Heart of Darkness* this speculative essay asks the question(s) and examines the evidence, examines the reasons why we can ask or not ask the question(s), suggests a possible answer and that is as far as it goes. This essay does not provide a definitive answer, but the answer it gives traces threads of meaning that are rewarding, fascinating and worthy of further research.
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