

## Tyrants' Self-Fashioning: Conrad's "The Secret Sharer" and Marryat's *Peter Simple*

Takashi Nishimura (西村 隆)

"The Secret Sharer," Joseph Conrad's short story contained in *Twixt Land and Sea* (1912), has long been regarded as enigmatic. The chief focus of the enigma is the problem of why the narrator, the young captain of the ship, should identify himself with Leggatt, an officer of a ship who has committed a murder. After helping Leggatt escape, the narrator says:

*as though he were my second self, [Leggatt] had lowered himself into the water to take his punishment. (295, emphasis added)*<sup>1)</sup>

We wonder why the narrator should thus regard Leggatt, who has committed a murder and who, accordingly, has to "take his punishment," as his "second self," because so far as we know the narrator has not committed any crime. But it is certain from this sentence that the narrator has a strong sense of guilt which makes him identify himself with the murderer. Where does the narrator's sense of guilt come from? What "guilt" has he constructed for himself?

Douglas Hewitt explains that "Leggatt is an embodiment of [the narrator's] original feeling of being 'a stranger' to himself, of that fear that there are parts of himself which he has not yet brought into the light of day and that these aspects of his personality may interfere with 'that ideal conception of one's own personality every man sets up for himself secretly.' ... There is a potentially evil or discreditable side to the natures of all [Conrad's] central characters, a seed of corruption."<sup>2)</sup>

This may be true, but it leaves a lot unexplained. Why is there "a potentially evil or discreditable side" and "a seed of corruption" in the narrator? Every one of us may have some potential sense of guilt to a certain extent, but not to such an extent that we identify

ourselves with *a murderer*. It would seem necessary to locate special and unusual reasons for the narrator's feeling such a strong sense of guilt.

I should like to suggest in what follows that the narrator's sense of guilt derives from his sense of being a captain, an absolute commander, in a situation in which he doubts that he is worthy of such a role<sup>3)</sup>:

"In consequence of certain events of no particular significance except to myself, I had been appointed to the command only a fortnight before. ... [I was] The youngest man on board (barring the second mate), and untried as yet by a position of the fullest responsibility[.] ... I could do what I liked, with no one to say nay to me within the whole circle of the horizon[.]" (245, 265)

Such an explanation may, however, provoke further questions about how "being a captain" can make the narrator identify himself with a murderer, and it is my aim to examine these questions. I shall do this through an analysis of the story in question, but also by a comparison with Frederick Marryat's *Peter Simple*.

### I

To think about the reason the narrator identifies himself with Leggatt, it is useful to examine first how Leggatt and his crime seem to the narrator. Leggatt describes the situation in which he has committed a murder on the *Sephora*, the ship on which he has been a first mate, as follows:

"[Though the *Sephora* was in danger, her skipper] never gave an order. He stood there with me...and whimpered about our last hope — positively

whimpered about it and nothing else — and the night coming on! To hear one's skipper go on like that in such weather was enough to drive any fellow out of his mind. It worked me up into a sort of desperation. I just took it into my own hands and went away from him, boiling.... Do you think that if I had not been pretty fierce with them [the crew] I should have got the men to do anything? Not it!" (276)

Leggatt insists that, in place of his irresolute skipper who cannot give any order to save his ship, he has had to be "fierce" with his men; according to him, being "fierce" with his men has been a necessity to save his ship. This has led him to kill one of his men who has rebelled against him. "He wouldn't do his duty," he says about the man whom he has killed, "and wouldn't let anybody else do theirs"(253). Thus, according to Leggatt, the murder has been an unfortunate consequence of his efforts to save the ship from danger.

The skipper of the *Sephora*, an irresolute coward, is contrasted with this excessively resolute man. The skipper is, according to the narrator, "shy"(268), and according to Leggatt, is "afraid of [his] men, and also of [the] old second mate of his...and his steward"(259). "Devil only knows what the skipper wasn't afraid of"(259), Leggatt says to the narrator. The skipper of the *Sephora* himself reveals his irresolution to the narrator: "[While the ship was in danger,] I hardly dared give the order. It seemed impossible that we could touch anything without losing it, and then our last hope would have been gone"(270).

As seamen, both the skipper and Leggatt are "immoral" in different senses: the skipper is "immoral" because, though he is a commander, he is too cowardly and irresolute to save his ship, and if it had not been for Leggatt, the ship and its crew might not have been saved; on the other hand, Leggatt is "immoral" in that he has offended against a wider moral code and killed a man.

But this is too simplistic and moralistic a judgement. The problem which this story shows to us is that a commander is, in the last analysis, inevitably either an irresolute coward (like the skipper of the

*Sephora*) or an excessively resolute tyrant (like Leggatt), and that, in a situation of the utmost extremity, there is no half-way position between these "immoral" types. If a commander decides to do resolutely what he thinks is best, he is in danger of becoming a Leggatt, because, if one is firmly determined to make his men obey him in any situation, he may, in an extremely emergent situation, try to make rebels obey him even by force, as Leggatt has done. On the other hand, if a commander is afraid of being "fierce" with his men, he may not be able to make his panic-stricken men do their work in an emergent situation.

It is for this reason that Leggatt does not want to be judged in court; he says to the narrator: "You don't suppose I am afraid of what can be done to me? Prison or gallows or whatever they may please. But you don't see me coming back to explain such things to an old fellow in a wig [a judge] and twelve respectable tradesmen [jury], do you? What can they know whether I am guilty or not — or of *what* I am guilty, either?"(283-84) Leggatt thinks that those who work peacefully on land — judges or "tradesmen" — do not understand the hardship of being a commander on a ship. They may simply conclude that Leggatt has committed an extremely evil crime, but he refuses such a judgement and insists on the mystery of his profession which is unfathomable to outsiders.

Conrad thus problematizes easy moral judgements, and this theme is suggested in the opening sentence of this short story. The narrator depicts the landscape here as follows: "On my right hand there were lines of fishing-stakes resembling a mysterious system of half-submerged bamboo fences, incomprehensible in its division of the domain of tropical fishes, and crazy of aspect"(243). This symbolic depiction foreshadows one of the themes of this story — what is easily and simply called good/evil is actually "incomprehensible in its division," but at the same time is somehow distinguished by "a mysterious system."

Leggatt seems to believe that, as an officer of a ship like himself, the narrator would understand the difficulty of moral judgements and the nature of his "crime," unlike judges or "tradesmen" on land:

“You know well enough the sort of ill-conditioned snarling cur [the man whom Leggatt killed] — ” He [Leggatt] appealed to me as if our experience had been as identical as our clothes. And I knew well enough the pestiferous danger of such a character where there are no means of legal repression. And I knew well enough also that my double [Leggatt] was no homicidal ruffian. ... [Leggatt goes on:] “You understand the sort of weather....[Y]ou may guess what it had been like for days. ... I tell you I was overdone with this terrific weather.... [T]he ship running for her life, touch and go all the time, any minute her last in a sea fit to turn your hair grey only a-looking at it.” (253-55)

Leggatt wants the narrator, as an officer of a ship, to share the idea that what has driven him into the murder despite himself is the emergency peculiar to a sailing ship in a storm. He emphasizes that an officer of a sailing ship must be resolute to an extent that people who live peacefully on land would think excessive. From this point of view, his resolution has been a double-edged sword which has both saved his ship and led to the murder.<sup>69</sup>

Indeed, what annoys the narrator is a similar dilemma: the narrator knows that, as a captain, he must be resolute, but at the same time he is too afraid of hurting (mentally or physically) his men as Leggatt has regrettably done.

## II

At the beginning of the story, the narrator is very nervous and self-conscious; as a captain, he does not want to hurt anyone, and he tries to be benevolent and kind to his men:

as our [the narrator's and the second mate's] eyes happened to meet I detected a slight quiver on his lips. I looked down at once. It was not my part to encourage sneering on board my ship. (245)

For the last two days the crew had had plenty of

hard work, and the night before they had very little sleep. ... I proposed to keep on deck myself[.] (247)

Because of this attitude of the narrator to his men, their sense of duty becomes slack:

I observed that the rope side-ladder...had not been hauled in as it should have been. I became annoyed at this, for exactitude in small matters is the very soul of discipline. Then I reflected that I had myself peremptorily dismissed my officers from duty, and by my own act had prevented the anchor-watch being formally set and things properly attended to. I asked myself whether it was wise ever to interfere with the established routine of duties even from the kindest of motives. (248-49)

The narrator finds here that “the kindest of motives” is, sadly, the enemy of “exactitude” and “the very soul of discipline.” This corresponds to Leggatt’s words: “Do you think that if I had not been pretty fierce with them [the crew] I should have got the men to do anything? Not it!” (276) Thus the narrator begins to feel the need of getting rid of “the kindest of motives” and being a tyrant (though this is in a sense terrible).

But at this point he cannot become resolute; on the contrary, he is still timid and excessively cares about what his men think of him:

My action might have made me appear eccentric. Goodness only knew how [my first mate] would “account” for my conduct, and what the whole ship thought of that informality of their new captain. I was vexed with myself. (249)

The narrator cares too much about how other people think of him and thus is irresolute; in this respect, he resembles the skipper of the *Sephora*: “perhaps I should have sympathized with [the captain of the *Sephora*] if I had been able to detach my mental vision from [Leggatt]” (269). Indeed, at the beginning of the story, the narrator has more in common with the skipper of the

*Sephora* than with Leggatt. But he feels it necessary to get rid of his irresolute attitude.

It is just when the nervous, irresolute, self-conscious new captain (the narrator) is “vexed with [himself]” to see the sign of the disorder of his ship that Leggatt appears:

“My name’s Leggatt.”

The voice was calm and *resolute*. A good voice. *The self-possession* of that man had somehow induced a corresponding state in myself. (251, emphasis added)

Leggatt has the very thing which the narrator is afraid he lacks: resolution and “a strong soul”(251). As soon as the narrator senses this, he begins to regard Leggatt as his “double”(252): “It was, in the night, as though I had been faced by my own reflection in the depth of a sombre and immense mirror”(253). What he sees in Leggatt is his conception of a resolute commander. Thus it is no wonder that the narrator wants to regard Leggatt as his “double.” Whether Leggatt really resembles him or not does not matter: “[Leggatt] was not a bit like me, really”(257).

In this respect, the “monologue” narrative form of this short story — the point of view is limited to this new captain’s — is important. The idea that Leggatt is his “double” reflects only the narrator’s desires and subjectivity.

Thus the narrator decides to keep Leggatt on his ship, hoping that Leggatt’s “self-possession...[induces] a corresponding state in [him].” But, in contrast to his hope, to identify Leggatt with himself does not make the narrator resolute; on the contrary, the narrator becomes even more insecure than before:

I was not wholly alone with my command; for there was that stranger [Leggatt] in my cabin. ...[I]t’s to no commander’s advantage to be suspected of ludicrous eccentricities. ... But all unconscious alertness had abandoned me. ... I felt that I was appearing an irresolute commander to those people who were watching me more or less critically. (277- 78)

If the narrator is to become resolute, then it is *he himself*, of course, that must act resolutely; it is of no use for him to keep a resolute person near himself and regard him as a “double.”

It is not until the narrator notices this simple fact that he is able to become resolute:

I felt suddenly ashamed of myself. ...[M]y hesitation in letting that man [Leggatt] swim away from my ship’s side has been a mere sham sentiment, a sort of cowardice. (284)

At this point he notices for the first time that he himself must be determined to act in a resolute way, instead of identifying himself with Leggatt.

Then the narrator makes his ship approach the shore to a dangerous extent and lets Leggatt swim away: “It was now a matter of conscience to shave the land as close as possible...[M]y heart flew into my mouth at the nearness of the land on the bow. Under any other circumstances I would not have held on a minute longer”(291). Why does he have to make his ship go so near the shore, though it does not seem necessary because Leggatt is a very good swimmer?

It is, I think, in part because he has to distinguish himself from the skipper of the *Sephora*, who holds the principle of peace-at-any-price — the principle of conceding anything to avoid trouble.<sup>65</sup> Before making his ship approach the shore, the narrator realizes, “all my future, the only future for which I was fit, would perhaps go irretrievably to pieces in any mishap to my first command”(287). In *The Mirror of the Sea*, Conrad writes how shocking a stranding is to a captain:

[When a ship strands,] there remains with her commander a distinct sense of loss, a flavour in the mouth of the real, abiding danger that lurks in all the forms of human existence. ... It’s the captain who puts the ship ashore[.]<sup>66</sup>

According to Conrad, the experience of being stranded is bitter especially to the “commander,” because he is the most responsible person whatever happens to the

ship.

Thus, the narrator hopes here that the very act of taking this risk distinguishes and differentiates him from the skipper of the *Sephora*. But this also means that, from this time, he becomes a Leggatt, a resolute but tyrannical commander. When he proposes to take his ship as near the land as possible, his first mate reasonably and rightly opposes him ("Bless my soul! Do you mean, sir, in the dark amongst the lot of all them islands and reefs and shoals?"(286)), but the narrator stubbornly does what he wants, only for Leggatt's and his own sake. When he orders one of his men to open the quarter-deck ports (to let Leggatt go through them), the man asks why, but the narrator only answers: "The only reason you need concern yourself about is because I tell you to do so"(287). When the crew find their ship dangerously near land, the first mate cries to the narrator in despair, but the narrator responds to him in a decisive and tyrannical way:

I caught his arm as he was raising it to batter his poor devoted head, and shook it violently. ... I hadn't let go the mate's arm and went on shaking it. "Ready about, do you hear? You go forward" — shake — "and stop there" — shake — "and hold your noise" — shake — "and see these head sheets properly overhauled" — shake, shake — shake. And all the time I dared not look towards the land lest my heart should fail me. I released my grip at last and he ran forward as if fleeing for dear life. (293)

All these acts show to us that the narrator has in effect become a Leggatt, a resolute tyrant. Terribly enough, it would not be impossible for him to commit the same crime as Leggatt's. Thus it is no wonder that at last the narrator says that Leggatt takes punishment as if he were his second self.

But, at the same time, the sentence in the passage above, "I dared not look towards the land lest my heart should fail me," shows that the narrator himself is actually scared. To use the words of George Orwell's "Shooting an Elephant," the narrator is "wear[ing] a mask," feeling the need of "appear[ing] resolute, to

know his own mind and do definite things."<sup>7)</sup> Or, to use Captain Brierly's phrase in *Lord Jim*, the problem is "to show" — not *keep* or *have* — "a stiff upper lip."<sup>8)</sup> The narrator is actually not courageous, so to speak, from the bottom of his heart.

For him, to give orders one after another in this way is a form of self-defense. When he senses that the first mate is curious about his state of mind, he defends himself by quickly giving him an order:

There was a sort of curiosity in his eye that I did not like.... I knew the man meant to have a good look at me. ... I did not give him time to open his lips [and quickly gave him an order]. ... I felt the need of asserting myself without loss of time. That sneering young cub got taken down a peg or two on that occasion. (265)

The narrator feels "the need of asserting [himself] without loss of time" because he is afraid of his men. Taking this into consideration, his becoming a tyrant at the end of the story can be seen as ambiguous: has he become a "courageous" and able commander, as he hopes to be, or a "cowardly" tyrant who tries to protect himself by wearing a mask? Doesn't his "tyranny" at the end of the story actually derive from his cowardice and his intention of self-defense?

### III

While he is hiding Leggatt in his cabin, the narrator thinks, "[Leggatt is] as dependent on my action as my own personality" (266). This seems to me a key phrase of this short story. Most of us think that personality controls and forms action, but the narrator thinks that his own personality is changeable, dependent on his action — that action controls and forms personality.

Viewed thus, the narrator's "shav[ing] the land as close as possible" is an action by which he tries to "save" both Leggatt and his own personality. That is to say, by this bold action he tries not only to save Leggatt but also to make his own personality resolute, because he thinks that his own personality is as dependent on his

action as Leggatt's safety.

What is of interest here is the fact that the narrator consciously forms himself into a tyrant, believing that action can change personality, not that personality is given by nature. At the beginning the narrator is timid and kind, but then begins to feel it necessary to be severe on his men, in order to maintain the order of the organization needed for a sailing ship (which is in a sense always in emergency). But what the narrator does in order to make himself stubborn at the end of the story is far from doing his best to his ship as a commander; on the contrary, he puts his men and ship into unnecessary danger only for his own and Leggatt's sake — and this is undoubtedly a kind of tyranny.

Yet strangely — but as he has hoped — he is obeyed by his men solemnly at the end of the story: "all the hands stood...waiting for my order"(295). Though it seems to defy our good sense, people often do obey a severe tyrant rather than a lenient commander. As Sigmund Freud in "Group Psychology and the Analysis of Ego"(1921) says about "The uncanny and coercive characteristics of group formations":

The leader of the group is...the dreaded primal father; the group...wishes to be governed by unrestricted force; it has an extreme passion for authority; ...it has a thirst for obedience.<sup>69</sup>

Thus, in a sense terribly, a commander may find it necessary to be tyrannical even if it is at first against his own inclination (as the narrator does).

But, though on the one hand he considers he must be a stubborn commander, on the other hand he seems in a way to feel guilt over his command. He says that Leggatt is going "to take his punishment" "as though he were [his] second self"(295) — that is to say, he feels that *he* (the narrator himself) has to take punishment for his guilt, that he *shares* guilt with Leggatt, who, as a consequence of his "fierceness" as a commander, has committed a murder. Perhaps there still remains "the kindest of motives" in his mind, and there is a conflict — if an unconscious conflict — between this "kind motives" and his fierceness at the end of the story.

#### IV

It may be useful here to make a comparison of Conrad's treatment of this topic with that of a contemporary — or preceding — sea-story writer. Frederick Marryat, one of the major figures in this popular genre, expresses his idea of "good" and "bad" captains in *Peter Simple* (1834), a novel which tells of a young naval officer's growth. The "bad" example is Captain Hawkins, a character in the novel who torments Peter Simple, his first lieutenant and the narrator-protagonist of the novel.

When Peter first meets him, he seems "kind and civil"(436)<sup>70</sup>; but the sailors have heard that "occasionally, [his] marks of cloven foot [appear]" (437). The first occasion when his "marks of cloven foot" appear is the scene in which he hands Peter a self-made order-book:

[Hawkins to Peter:] "...a captain is in a very responsible situation, and if any accident occurs he is held amenable. I therefore have framed a few orders of my own for the interior discipline of the vessel, which may probably save me harmless, in case of being *hauled over the coals*.... [This is] only to guard against any mischance, of which the *onus* may fall upon myself." (437-38)

A "bad" kind of captain is excessively afraid of being accused, and that shows his cowardice. This reminds us of the Captain of the *Sephora*, who is "afraid...of what the law would do to him" (259). It is this kind of captains that the narrator of "The Secret Sharer" finally tries to distinguish and differentiate himself from.

In contrast to Captain Hawkins, Peter Simple is confident of himself: "I can do my duty, and why should I fear anything?"(439) Thus the novel tells us that having a confidence in his own competence and not afraid of anything is characteristic of a "good" seaman.

Hawkins' cowardice is more clearly revealed when a battle takes place: he cannot give any order during the battle, being scared. Then his men begin to despise and disobey him. Peter expresses his antipathy to Hawkins and his general idea of "good" commanders:

...[T]here is hardly any degree of severity which a captain may not exert towards his seamen, provided they are confident of, or he has proved to them, his courage; but if there be a doubt, or a confirmation to the contrary, all discipline is destroyed by contempt, and the ship's company mutiny.... There is an old saying, that all tyrants are cowards; that tyranny is in itself a species of meanness, I acknowledge; but still the saying ought to be modified. If it is asserted that all mean tyrants are cowards, I agree; but I have known in the service most special tyrants, who were not cowards: their tyranny was excessive, but there was no meanness in their dispositions. ...[A]lthough tyrants, the men forgave them. (458)

If sailors feel that their commander does not have "courage," "all discipline is destroyed by contempt, and the ship's company mutiny" — this idea is what drives the narrator of "The Secret Sharer" into a bold action and tyranny at the end of the story. Peter's idea that tyranny is allowed when it is based on "courage" and resolution is what the narrator of "The Secret Sharer" finally holds to. Thus it can be said that, as the story of "The Secret Sharer" proceeds toward the end, the narrator's way of thinking gets closer to the idea described above by Peter Simple.

But the narrator of "The Secret Sharer" at the beginning has had "kind motives" and cared about his men; he has had a sense of guilt even about being in a position of a commander; his humane feelings have cast doubts on the "exactitude" of the hierarchical authority of a sailing ship. Besides, even after making himself a tyrant, the trace of a sense of guilt remains in his mind and he feels that he shares guilt with Leggatt.

Thus what can in a way be seen in Conrad's short story is the conflict and dilemma between humane feelings and the severe organization of a sailing ship. Both Conrad and Marryat, we might say, are struggling to express the complexities of a social organization which has to be strong enough to withstand constant threats of danger at sea; but Conrad is more skeptical than Marryat. While Peter Simple says that "there is

hardly any degree of severity which a captain may not exert towards his seamen" when his "tyranny" is based on "courage," the narrator of "The Secret Sharer" does not take such an idea for granted — though he finally decides to hold to it.

Conrad's attitude toward Marryat in his essay titled "Tales of the Sea" is complex, but Conrad in a way seems to feel that he, as a self-conscious modern individual, cannot share Marryat's simplicity any more:

[Marryat's] morality is honourable and conventional. There is cruelty in his fun.... [The characters in Marryat's novels] do not belong to life; they belong exclusively to the Service. ...[T]here is a truth in them, the truth of their time; a headlong, reckless audacity, an intimacy with violence, an unthinking fearlessness[.]<sup>(11)</sup>

Describing how Marryat's works supported his contemporary "conservative" ideas, Patrick Brantlinger in *Rule of Darkness* says: "Marryat's novels...are picaresque narrations of one adventure after another which subordinate both emotion and character to action. ... The character who survives many scrapes winds up with no character at all, in the sense of complex, deeply rooted personal identity. ...[A]dventure initiation stories...jettison psychological complexity and maturation alike."<sup>(12)</sup> Thus Marryat's works tend to accept contemporary dominant ideas easily, because his characters do not doubt or reflect upon such ideas deeply. On the other hand, in "The Secret Sharer," the precise description of the narrator's psychology and his sense of guilt as a commander serves to cast some doubts on the severe hierarchical authority. What we can see — or what interests us — in this short story is, I think, the dilemma and the contradiction between the narrator's personal feelings and the severity of his role — the problems of the self-conscious modern individual within a highly hierarchical and exacting organization.

## Notes

- (1) Joseph Conrad, "The Secret Sharer," in Cedric Watts ed., *Typhoon and Other Tales* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986). All subsequent references to "The Secret Sharer" are to this edition.
- (2) Douglas Hewitt, *Conrad: A Reassessment* (London: Bowes and Bowes, 1952), 73, 77.
- (3) In Conrad's *The Shadow-Line*, the narrator-protagonist, who has just been appointed captain, thinks: "I was already the man in command. My sensations could not be like those of any other man on board. In that community I stood, like a king in his country, in a class all by myself. I mean an hereditary king, not a mere elected head of a state. I was brought there to rule by an agency as remote from the people and as inscrutable almost to them as the Grace of God." (Joseph Conrad, *The Shadow-Line* (London: Gresham, 1925), 62.)
- (4) R. W. Stallman has applied a simple evaluation to Leggatt: "[Douglas Hewitt] argues that Leggatt is...a failure. [But I think] He is a success in saving the *Sephora*...[and] in saving the captain-narrator, by serving him as a model." (R. W. Stallman, ed., *The Art of Joseph Conrad: A Critical Symposium*; Michigan State UP, 1960; p.285.) But this kind of "success/failure" evaluation seems too simple. I think the point is that we cannot apply a simple evaluation to Leggatt's case; he is *both* a terrible murderer *and* a man who has saved his ship. The important point is that Leggatt's case indicates to the narrator that a commander sometimes has to be confronted with such a difficulty and a dilemma as Leggatt has gone through.
- (5) Another reason may be that the narrator finds it necessary to "test" or "try" his competence as a captain by attempting this feat, because he has been worried that he is "untried as yet by a position of the fullest responsibility" (245).
- (6) Joseph Conrad, *The Mirror of the Sea* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988), 69-70.
- (7) George Orwell, *Shooting an Elephant* (New York: Harcourt, 1950), 8.
- (8) Joseph Conrad, *Lord Jim* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983), 68.
- (9) *The Major Works of Sigmund Freud* (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1947), 689. Translation by James Strachey. We might be dubious about what Freud says here; but we can at least see that Freud's passage expresses the same fear of anarchy and thirst for authority as the narrator's in "The Secret Sharer." In other words, in Freud's passage, we can see the way of thinking of Conrad's contemporaries.
- (10) Frederick Marryat, *Peter Simple* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1907). All subsequent references to *Peter Simple* are to this edition.
- (11) Joseph Conrad, *Notes on Life and Letters* (London: Gresham, 1925), 54.
- (12) Patrick Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988), 50.