

## The Emotional Sub-Text of "The Duel"

YOKO OKUDA

**要旨** 認知心理学者の Keith Oatley によると、西洋の文学作品には "the emotions" を理解しようとする伝統が綿々と流れているにもかかわらず、西洋の文学理論にはアリストテレスのカタルシスを除いてこの伝統への言及がほとんど見られない。"emotion" という英語自体19世紀に入って普及したもので、この関心の広がりには、Schopenhauer や Darwin、William James らの思想の影響が考えられる。

コンラッドの作品中には "emotion" という語がしばしば用いられており、このテーマへの強い関心を裏付けている。A *Set of Six* 中の短篇 "The Duel" (1908) も例外ではないが、それにもかかわらずこの作品中の心理的テーマについては批評家の間で意見が分かれ、Lawrence Graver と Addison Bross は批判的であるのに対して John Stape は評価している。この論文では、"The Duel" 中の心理的要素を、"the emotions" という視点から stylistics などの語りの技巧を含む精読をとおして検討し、コンラッドの主要作品中に一貫して流れている "the emotions" のテーマが、"The Duel" の中にも受け継がれていることを明らかにする。

"It's extraordinary how in one way or another this man has managed to fasten himself on my deeper feelings."

("The Duel" 247)

In his *Emotions: A Brief History*, Keith Oatley writes:

... emotions have preoccupied writers almost from the time writing was invented. In Europe the novel continued the tradition begun by Erasmus and Shakespeare of understanding the emotions that lie beneath the surfaces of social life. Curiously, however, apart from Aristotle's ideas that tragedy induces pity and fear in the audience, and makes for *katharsis* of these emotions. . . , the Western tradition

of literary theory has not much to say about emotions. This defect is not shared by an Indian tradition in which literary art had a didactic and spiritual purpose that would enable the readers to live better lives." (152)<sup>1</sup>

According to Oatley, "emotions" is a comparatively new term in the Western tradition, "scarcely used until 200 years ago" (135): "Before that there were passions, sentiments, feelings, affections. Such words occupied a cluster that included sin, will, grace, soul. By contrast, 'emotions' is a term from literary and scientific clusters that became prevalent only during the nineteenth century" (135).<sup>2</sup> The word "emotion" does not appear in Raymond Williams' *Key Words: A vocabulary of culture and society*, published in 1976. Williams, however, does include the word "psychological," saying that "it indicates what is felt to be an area of the mind. . . , which is primarily that of 'feeling' rather than of 'reason' or 'intellect' or 'knowledge'"; he then goes on to say that "whatever reservations are made about psychology and psychological, from scientific or academic standpoints, the general reference to matters of 'feeling' and 'character' is now predominant" (246-7). In the Eastern tradition, such as Buddhism, born in India, one of the words that corresponds roughly to "feeling" or "emotion" is *dukkha*, the key word in the Four Noble Truths, which is considered to be "the heart of the Buddha's teaching" (Rahula 16). *Dukkha* does not mean just suffering, as is so often translated by scholars; it has a broader range of meaning. (Rahula 16-18)<sup>3</sup>

The word "emotion" occurs frequently in Conrad's works. In *Lord Jim*, Marlow says of the audience at the inquiry, "Whether they knew it or not, the interest that drew them was purely psychological – the expectation of some essential disclosure as to the strength, the power, the horror, of human emotions" (*Lord Jim* 56). In the "Author's Note" to *Under Western Eyes*, Conrad writes that the book is "an attempt to render. . . the psychology of Russia itself," based on his knowledge of the condition of Russia and "the moral and emotional reactions of the Russian temperament" (*Under Western Eyes* vii-viii).<sup>4</sup> Conrad's

interest in human emotions may have been a reflection of his times. Theoretically, he may have been influenced by Schopenhauer's *The World as Will and Representation* (1819/1844)<sup>5</sup>, Darwin's *The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals* (1872), or William James' *The Principles of Psychology* (1890).

Amongst the short stories, a work in which the emotions play an important role is "The Duel," included in *A Set of Six* (1908). Conrad states in the "Author's Note" that in this story he was "trying to capture. . . the Spirit of the Epoch," and that spirit was "almost childlike in its exaltation of sentiment – naively heroic in its faith" (ix). The words "childlike" and "naively" are suggestive of emotional immaturity. While Conrad seems to emphasize the psychological aspect of the story, critics of "The Duel" have been divided in their opinions on this point. Lawrence Graver, in his *Conrad's Short Fiction*, maintains:

Planning to call the tale "The Masters of Europe," Conrad wished to make the exuberant singularity of Feraud and D'Hubert exemplary of the "childlike exaltation of sentiment," the naïve heroism, so characteristic of early nineteenth century France. Putting aside the question of whether such feelings were actually a major element in the *Zeitgeist*, one can still fault Conrad for his banal treatment of the theme and for his failure to develop the more promising of his two subjects. . . . The "secret sharer" motif, handled here with an attempt at comedy, is potentially more interesting than the grandiose "spirit of the age," especially in a writer whose analytical gifts were primarily moral and psychological. (145)

Likewise, Addison Bross contends that "the separate dueling incidents which make up the plot, though they are exciting, do not work together to complicate and develop the psychological and moral conflict beyond its very simple

dimensions at the beginning of the tale" (Carabine 115).

Does Conrad really fail in "The Duel" to exhibit his analytical gifts that are "primarily moral and psychological"? In his article, "Conrad's 'The Duel': A Reconsideration," John Stape argues that "Despite its deficiencies, the story deserves a closer critical reading than it has yet received, for its flaws expose some of Conrad's fundamental psychological preoccupations" (42), and goes on to say that "as the story moves towards its conclusion the duel itself dwindles in importance, and psychological interests increasingly emerge as the focus of Conrad's attention" (41).

In this essay, I wish to demonstrate that Conrad's preoccupations in "The Duel" are primarily moral and psychological, through a close thematic and stylistic examination of the emotionality of the two main characters.

## I

"The Duel" is told by an unpersonified external narrator whose psychological attitude towards the main characters is remote as well as ironical, judging from the fact that he uses a title and the last name to refer to both of them.<sup>6</sup> The story consists of four parts in the course of which five duels take place: the first duel is fought in a private garden in Strasbourg and Feraud is slashed on the arm; the second duel is fought in a field and D'Hubert is wounded on his side; the third duel is fought in Silesia in which both officers are badly wounded and the fight has to be stopped; the fourth duel is fought on horseback outside the town of Lubeck and Feraud is slashed on the forehead; and finally, the fifth and the last duel is fought with pistols in a pine wood somewhere in Provence and D'Hubert wins without firing a single shot. The discourse time allocated to the description of each of these duels, including what happens just before and just after each of them, differs considerably. The first duel is allocated the whole of Part I; the second, the third, and the fourth duels all take place in Part II; no duel as such occurs in Part III, and, finally, the last duel is allocated the whole of Part IV.

According to the narrator, Armand D'Hubert and Gabriel Florian Feraud have

known each other "but slightly" (169) when they meet in Madame de Lionne's salon in Strasbourg. In spite of this fact, by the time he finds Feraud in the salon, D'Hubert has already developed an unconscious prejudice against him. He refers to Feraud in such words as "What a lunatic!" (167) and "His conduct is positively indecent," (168) just because Feraud has been parading the town in his best uniform shortly after fighting a duel. These statements are presented as part of D'Hubert's Direct Speech, and as Direct Speech is generally assumed to be presented "unmediated by the narrator" (Short 289), it suggests that D'Hubert is genuinely prejudiced against him.

Subsequently, the information offered to him by the Alsatian maid that Feraud has in fact gone to pay a visit to Madame de Lionne intensifies D'Hubert's prejudice against him, for he does not believe Feraud to be "specially worthy of attention on the part of a woman with a reputation for sensibility and elegance" (170). It is this prejudice against Feraud, added to his belief that being "attached to the person of the general commanding the division" he is justified in doing so, that emboldens him to follow Feraud to the salon. In his view, passing the general's order to Feraud is an urgent "service matter" (171), and "A uniform is a passport" (171); it is also said that "he clanked and jingled along the street with a martial swagger" (171). The words "A uniform is a passport" and "It was a service matter" are presented as D'Hubert's Free Indirect Thought, and the reference to him as walking in the street "with a martial swagger" belongs to the narrator's Representation of Action.<sup>7</sup> According to Mick Short, Free Indirect Thought suggests that the character is not conscious of what he is thinking (290), and therefore in this scene, D'Hubert might not have been quite aware of his own prejudiced arrogance underlying his behaviour towards Feraud. Myrtle Hooper points out:

... the shift in focalization that occurs from 'D'Hubert could not imagine' to 'Feraud took a view' is important, first it marks D'Hubert's incapacitating inability to grasp Feraud's view of things and hence his own danger; second, because it works to balance narrative sympathy. . . . D'Hubert does not share Feraud's sense of

propriety. For him ordinary etiquette is overridden by the commission he has accepted. . . . (113)

As Feraud holds quite a different view from that of D'Hubert's, it is natural that he should respond to him in a way that D'Hubert has never expected. Not feeling at all guilty of any misbehavior, Feraud's first reaction is said to be that of "astonishing indifference" (172). He remains in fact "perfectly tranquil" (172) until he hears from D'Hubert the general's order that he is to be kept under arrest, and even then all he does is to fall into "profound wonder" (172) as he is so astonished. It is only when Feraud tries and fails "to reconcile the information with his feelings" (174) that "his choler at the injustice of his fate" (174) begins to rise. These changes in Feraud's feelings are presented either from the narrator's representation of his emotional state or through Free Indirect Thought, which indicates, as in D'Hubert's case earlier, that Feraud is not quite conscious of his own shifting emotions.

As Feraud is less articulate than D'Hubert, the only way that Feraud has of explaining his own feelings once his choler is raised is by blaming it on the injustice of fate. What Feraud calls injustice is anything outrageous that he cannot reconcile with the state of his own feelings, and it has nothing to do with reasoning or knowledge. Thus, concerning his duel with a civilian, Feraud has "no clear recollection how the quarrel had originated" (172). What is important for him is not the cause but the fact that his feelings were "outraged" (172). In his view, he himself is always "the outraged party" (172), therefore, the victim of injustice. Futile as it may seem, this is always Feraud's pretext for challenging someone to a duel. He challenges D'Hubert in Strasbourg because he is not "a man to submit tamely to injustice" (173), and chafes "at the systematic injustice of fate" (203) when he finds that he cannot challenge D'Hubert because he has been made an officer of superior rank. Right up to the very last duel, his pretext for challenging D'Hubert to a duel is to justify the state of his own feelings, whether it is anger, envy or boredom, and ironically, it is D'Hubert himself that suggests the word "injustice" to Feraud's simple mind by saying to him, "Of

course, I don't know how far you were justified. . . . And the general himself may not be exactly informed" (174). The examination of the characteristics of Feraud's emotionality helps to explain what Conrad means by saying "I have made it [the pretext] sufficiently convincing by the mere force of its absurdity" in his Author's Note. (viii) The pretext is not based on a rational motivation, it is based on an *emotional* motivation.

In contrast to Feraud, whose dominant emotional characteristics remain more or less the same throughout the story, D'Hubert's emotional characteristics undergo a considerable change. In Part I the arrogance and contempt which D'Hubert exhibits at his first encounter with Feraud, soon gives way to vexation at Feraud's unreasonable defiance (176), and then to disgust at the imminent duel. It is not until he perceives Feraud's "fixity of savage purpose" that his interest is roused so he could throw off his preoccupation with the future and fight back. Even though he wins the duel, once he is back in his own quarters, his dread of "discredit and ridicule" (184) returns, and he ends up becoming "frightfully harassed" (186) by the obvious aspects of his predicament" (196). The narrator tells us that D'Hubert feels harassed because he is "without much imagination, a faculty which helps the process of reflective thought" (186). At this point, D'Hubert, not being reflective enough, is neither aware of "the infinite variety of the human species," as Madame de Lionne is, nor is he aware of "the diversity of opinions," as the surgeon is. He is so sure of his own sentiments that it never occurs to him "that there could be two opinions on the matter" (187).

## II

Out of the remaining four duels, three take place in Part II. Just before the second duel that takes place in "a convenient field," D'Hubert declares, "There's a crazy fellow to whom I must give a lesson" (193). The declaration implies that D'Hubert at this point still believes it possible to escape from the situation he is in by making Feraud realize that it is absurd to fight such a duel. As he is

quite unprepared for Feraud's truculence, he naturally loses.

The third duel fought in Silesia ends in the two officers being "disheveled, their shirts in rags, covered with gore and hardly able to stand" (204). It has the appearance of deadly animosity, because it is a crash between two totally opposing desires: "a rational desire to be done once for all with this worry" (204) on the part of D'Hubert, and "a tremendous exaltation of his pugnacious instincts and the incitement of wounded vanity" (204) on the part of Feraud (204). Neither Feraud nor D'Hubert has changed much since the second duel. D'Hubert may have relinquished the idea of giving Feraud a lesson, but he is still trying to escape from the absurd situation instead of facing up to it.

The fourth duel fought in Lubeck, however, bears a slightly different aspect from the first three duels. D'Hubert accepts the challenge, not because he wants to be done once and for all with the harassing affair, but because he considers that "one absurdity more or less in the development did not matter" (206). He is no longer trying to escape from the situation that Feraud has imposed on him, and has therefore moved a step closer to facing up to it emotionally. Just before this duel, over-tired and depressed from his work as an aide-de-camp, D'Hubert receives a letter from his sister Leonie informing him of her forthcoming marriage; he is to be "ousted from the first place in her thought" (207). This unforeseen event, coming on top of the impending duel offers him the first opportunity for philosophical reflection. He reflects on the possibility of his own death, and starts to write his last will and testament: "he gave himself up to unpleasant reflection; a presentiment that he would never see the scenes of his childhood weighed down the equable spirits of Captain D'Hubert" (207).

The significance of the scene, however, does not only lie in the fact that D'Hubert learns to reflect, pleasant or otherwise, but also in the fact that he learns to repel such unpleasant reflection: "He jumped up, pushing his chair back, yawned elaborately in sign that he didn't care anything for presentiments, and throwing himself on the bed went to sleep" (207). This scene is curiously reminiscent of the following scene in *Victory* in which Lena learns to distinguish between her action and her emotions:



The girl unexpectedly got up from the chair, swaying her supple figure and stretching her arms above her head. . . . She had jumped to her feet to react against the numbness, to discover whether her body would obey her will. It did. She could stand up, and she could move her arms freely. Though not physiologist, she concluded that all that sudden numbness was in her head, not in her limbs. (358-59).

D'Hubert, like Lena, learns not to act under the sway of his negative emotions.

### III

D'Hubert's success in winning the fourth duel was brought about partly because he had learnt to discriminate between his reflections and his action, and partly because Feraud was carried away by his vanity: "For some obscure reason, depending, no doubt, on his psychology, he imagined himself invincible on horseback" (206). Not realizing this, D'Hubert, on the rebound from his previous unpleasant reflection, suddenly becomes contemptuous of Feraud's influence on him: "He didn't care a snap for what that lunatic could do. He had suddenly acquired the conviction that his adversary was utterly powerless to affect his life in any sort of way. . ." (209). The statement "He didn't care a snap for what that lunatic could do" is presented in Free Indirect Thought, which again suggests that the character is not consciously analyzing his own feelings and thoughts. The conviction that Feraud is powerless to affect his life is of course mistaken, and therefore the incident suggests that D'Hubert still has a lot to learn.

The Russian campaign, by expending "all their store of moral energy. . . in resisting the terrific enmity of nature and the crushing sense of irretrievable disaster" seems, at first sight, to put the two officers on an equal footing. However, from the point of view of emotion, it widens their difference as their respective attitude towards Napoleon indicates. While Feraud on one hand characteristically "[accuses] fate of unparalleled perfidy towards the sublime Man

of Destiny" (214), D'Hubert becomes more and more sceptical:

The early buoyancy of his belief in the future was destroyed. If the road of glory led through such unforeseen passages, he asked himself – for he was reflective – whether the guide was altogether trustworthy. It was a patriotic sadness, not unmingled with some personal concern, and quite unlike the unreasoning indignation against men and things nursed by Colonel Feraud. (215)

D'Hubert, who once lacked the faculty of imagination which "helps the process of reflective thought" (186), has by now become quite reflective, and his letter to his sister contains "some philosophical generalities upon the uncertainty of all personal hopes" (216), and, moreover, on this basis, he has learnt to adapt his conduct "to the needs of that desperate time" (217).

By the time of the downfall of the Napoleonic empire, in contrast to Feraud who has remained "irreconcilable" (218) D'Hubert has learnt "resignation," but only to an extent; he finds resignation to be "an easy virtue" (219) provided that he is being taken good care of by his sister. The situation, however, changes drastically as soon as he goes to Paris. On overhearing the two retired officers talking about Feraud in a café, D'Hubert is suddenly seized by "an irrational tenderness towards his old adversary" and, for the first time, he "appreciated emotionally the murderous absurdity their encounter had introduced into his life" (223). This implies that he has accepted the absurd situation that Feraud has imposed on him. However, then he goes on to think, "I fancy it was being left lying in the garden that had exasperated him so against me from the first" (223). The thought is presented directly in quotation marks, so it implies that it is a conscious thought. He is trying to rationalize the "irrational tenderness" that he feels for Feraud. Subsequently, this "irrational tenderness" drives him to commit an impulsive action in which he obtains a private audience from the Minister of Police, Fouché, and makes a plea to exclude Feraud from the operations of the Special Court. D'Hubert admits to his sister that "It had to be done," (230), but he is sceptical as to why it had to be done, for he adds, "But I feel yet as if I

could never forgive the necessity to the man I had to save" (230). In his "A Familiar Preface" to *A Personal Record* (1911), Conrad refers to resignation in the following words:

Resignation, not mystic, not detached, but resignation open-eyed, conscious, and informed by love, is the only one of our feelings for which it is impossible to become a sham.

Not that I think resignation the last word of wisdom. I am too much the creature of my time for that. But I think that the proper wisdom is to will what the gods will, without perhaps being certain what their will is – or even if they have a will of their own. And in this matter of life and art it is not the Why that matters so much to our happiness as the How. (xix)

D'Hubert may have learnt to appreciate the absurd situation imposed on him by Feraud, but he is still concerned with "Why" and not the "How" of the situation, therefore he has not yet learned "the proper wisdom."

#### IV

Part IV of "The Duel" begins with the following words of the narrator on vanity and pride:

No man succeeds in everything he undertakes. In that sense we are all failures. The great point is not to fail in ordering and sustaining the effort of our life. In this matter vanity is what leads us astray. It hurries us into situations from which we must come out damaged; whereas pride is our safeguard, by the reserve it imposes on the choice of our endeavor as much as by the virtue of its sustaining power. (234).

Vanity is one of the dominant emotions that Feraud is vulnerable to. It is "the incitement of wounded vanity" (204) that drives him to the third duel in

Silesia, and it is his vain illusion that he is "invincible on horseback" (206) that makes him jump at the idea of a duel on horseback in the fourth duel that he loses. Similarly, the prospect of the fifth and the last duel with D'Hubert gives him the illusion of his own "marvelous resurrection" (233), which is ironically reminiscent of Fouché's reference to Napoleon's return in the following words: "Luckily one never does begin all over again, really" (228).<sup>7</sup> Prior to the last duel, Feraud says to his seconds, "We must have pistols. He's game for my bag. My eyes are as keen as ever. You should have seen me in Russia picking off the dodging Cossacks with a beastly old infantry musket. I have a natural gift for firearms" (233). However, this claim of having keen eyes is undermined by the narrator's report which precedes it: "General Feraud sat erect, holding the folded newspaper at arm's length in order to make out the small print better" (231). Finally, it is vanity that convinces Feraud that he has shot D'Hubert dead:

The first view of these feet and legs determined a rush of blood to his head. He literally staggered behind his tree, and had to steady himself against it with his hand. The other was lying on the ground, then! On the ground! Perfectly still, too! Exposed! What could it mean? . . . The notion that he had knocked over his adversary at the first shot entered then General Feraud's head. Once there it grew with every second of attentive gazing, overshadowing every other supposition — irresistible, triumphant, ferocious.

"What an ass I was to think I could have missed him," he muttered to himself. "He was exposed *en plein* — the fool! — for quite a couple of seconds."

General Feraud gazed at the motionless limbs, the last vestiges of surprise fading before an unbounded admiration of his own deadly skill with the pistols.

"Turned up his toes! By the god of war, that was a shot!" he exulted mentally. "Got it through the head, no doubt, just where I aimed, staggered behind that tree, rolled over on his back, and died!" (254)

The first two sentences are the narrator's Representation of Action. However, the next five sentences, "The other was lying on the ground, then! On the ground! Perfectly still, too! Exposed! What could it mean?" are narrated from Feraud's point of view using Free Indirect Thought. Then there are two sentences of Representation of Action. This is followed by Feraud's Direct Thought using quotation marks, such as, "What an ass I was to think I could have missed him" and "He was exposed *en plein*—the fool!—for quite a couple of seconds'," and again, "Turned up his toes! By the god of war, that was a shot!. . . Got it through the head, no doubt, just where I aimed, staggered behind that tree, rolled over on his back and died'." The passage attracts the reader's attention stylistically, because it is the only passage in the story in which Feraud's thoughts are presented extensively in Free Indirect Thought and Direct Thought. The reader cannot possibly overlook Feraud's unconscious vanity.<sup>8</sup>

In contrast to Feraud, D'Hubert is presented as exemplifying pride. When Feraud challenges him to the first duel, he answers, "Drop this! I won't fight with you. I won't be made ridiculous," and it is said that immediately after the duel, "He dreaded the discredit and ridicule above everything" (184). He has "pride" (234) which is strong enough to demand "love" (234) and not just "no unsurmountable dislike" (235) from his fiancée, Adèle; he loves her "enough to kill her rather than lose her" (235). However, at the same time, he is so reserved and sceptical that he cannot determine whether the love he holds towards Adèle is reciprocated: "General D'Hubert had become acutely aware of the number of his years, of his wounds, of his many moral imperfections, of his secret unworthiness – and had incidentally learned by experience the meaning of the word funk" (235). It is only when he receives Feraud's challenge to the last duel that D'Hubert learns to overcome his funk. On receiving the challenge, he is at first seized by "a laughing sort of rage" (238), he begins to wonder at "the fury he felt rising in his breast" (239), and subsequently on talking with the Chevalier he becomes aware that it is absolutely impossible for him to take the Chevalier's advice to betray Feraud, and therefore "there's no escape from it" (246). For the first time, he fully accepts the absurd situation that Feraud has

imposed on him, murmuring to himself, "It's a fatality" (246).

Accepting the absurd situation as an inevitable fate involves understanding Feraud's emotional motivation. On returning to his room, D'Hubert experiences what the narrator calls "the full pilgrimage of emotions" (247), in which he faces his own emotions in their full variety and intensity for the first time. During this emotional crisis, he experiences "the instinctive fury of his menaced passion," which turns into "a sentiment of melancholy despair" at the thought of losing her: "That night, General D'Hubert. . . made the full pilgrimage of emotions. Nauseating disgust at the absurdity of the situation, doubt of his own fitness to conduct his existence, and mistrust of his best sentiments. . . – he knew them all in turn" (247). Stylistically, the process of this pilgrimage is presented mostly through the narrator's Representation of Action (including descriptions of internal states) and also D'Hubert's Direct Thought, which suggest that D'Hubert is quite conscious of these thoughts and feelings.

Having tasted "every emotion that life has to give," D'Hubert is made to realize "the tremendous force of a relentless destiny" that Feraud has imposed on him (248), including even "the fear of death and the honourable man's fear of cowardice" (248), and the genuine resignation he arrives at draws out of him "true courage" (248). The narrator tells us: "But if true courage consists in going out to meet an odious danger from which our body, soul, and heart recoil together, General D'Hubert had the opportunity to practice it for the first time in his life" (248).

The emotional change that has taken place in D'Hubert is symbolized by the orange. It so happens that he was given a room at his sister's house with his own entrance through a door in one corner of the orangery. Once he has overcome his fear and cowardice, D'Hubert is no longer concerned with "Why" he has to meet his destiny, but with "How" to cope with it. First of all, he picks the oranges to quench his thirst, which prevents him from recoiling at "an odious danger" (248), and, moreover, revives his "temperamental good-humoured coolness" (249). This action signifies a fundamental change in his attitude. He has finally gained what Conrad in "A Familiar Preface" calls "the proper wisdom"

(xix); he has learned that what counts is not "Why" but "How," and this wisdom is reflected especially in his strategy of using a mirror to keep a watch on both the front and the back. Although D'Hubert wins the last duel, his last words, "It's extraordinary how in one way or another this man has managed to fasten himself on my deeper feelings" (266), as the use of the present perfect tense in the sentence shows, is an acknowledgement of their binding, if absurd and irrational, emotional relationship.

## V

In "The Plot of Conrad's *The Duel*," J. DeLancey Ferguson demonstrates that one of the sources of the plot of "The Duel" is the story that appeared in *Harper's Magazine* for September 1858,<sup>9</sup> but maintains that "the discovery of the source does not affect the artistic validity of the finished work" (389). Included in "the artistic validity of the finished work" is the intense emotional engagement with the fiction that Conrad has created, but not found in the article that appeared in *Harper's Magazine*. This has been achieved not only through Conrad's insight into the workings of human emotions but also through the narrative and stylistic methods that he adopts.

As John Stape suggests, the psychology of emotions as presented in "The Duel" is not without flaws. However, a close reading of it which focuses on the emotional characteristics of the two main characters demonstrates that the emotional theme plays an important role in the story. The courage that D'Hubert arrives at, after he experiences "the full pilgrimage of emotions" (247), may be compared to the discovery that Razumov makes of "that side of our emotional life to which his solitary existence has been a stranger" (*Under Western Eyes* 357-58). They both come to know their emotional selves through love. "The choler at the injustice of his fate" (191) that Feraud feels may be compared to Jim's sense of his having been tried "More than is fair" in the Patna affair (*Lord Jim* 124), and similarly "the incitement of wounded vanity" (204) that Feraud experiences may be compared to Schomberg's "pangs of wounded

vanity” in *Victory* (97). These comparisons may reveal that the emotional theme in “The Duel” is perhaps not so thoroughly explored as in these novels. They, however, demonstrate that it is an important theme in Conrad’s short stories as well as novels.

## Notes

1. For a detailed discussion of the Indian tradition see Keith Oatley, Dacher Kelther, and Jennifer M. Jenkins, *Understanding Emotions*, pp. 110-12.
2. *The Oxford Companion to Emotion and the Affective Sciences* (2009), gives such definitions on the word “emotion” as follows. From philosophical perspective, “the general term ‘the emotions’ is a relatively recent arrival, first gaining prominence in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, long after terms such as fear, shame, and joy. . . were in common use” and its introduction was “an attempt to bundle together states that were supposedly marked by a degree of ‘emotion,’ a metaphorical extension of the original sense of the word, namely agitated motion, or turbulence” (142). From psychological perspectives, “the term ‘emotion’ may be one of the fuzziest concepts in all of the sciences,” and relatively uncontroversial definitions are such as ‘emotions are elicited when something happens that the organism considers to be of relevance, by being directly linked to its sensitivities, needs, goals, values and general well-being,’ and “in most cases emotion-evoking events require the organism to react, which often implies suspending ongoing behavior and engaging in a new course of action” (147-8).
3. “The First Noble Truth (*Dukkha-ariyasacca*) is generally translated by almost all scholars as ‘The Noble Truth of Suffering’, and it is interpreted to mean that life according to Buddhism is nothing but suffering and pain. Both translation and interpretation are highly unsatisfactory and misleading. . . . The Buddha does not deny happiness in life when he says there is suffering. On the contrary he admits different forms of happiness, both material and spiritual, for layman as well as for monks. In the *Auguttara-nikaya*, one of the five original Collections in Pali containing the Buddha’s discourses, there is a list of happinesses (*sukhani*), such as the happiness of family life and the happiness of the life of a recluse, the happiness of sense pleasures and the happiness of renunciation, the happiness of attachment and the happiness of detachment, physical happiness and mental happiness etc. But all these are included in *dukkha*.” (Rahula 16-18)



4. For a more detailed discussion of the theme of emotions, see Yoko Okuda's "The Serpent in the Bush: A Comparative Study of the Emotions in Conrad and Buddhism."

The essay discusses Conrad's perception of the workings of the human emotions in three of his novels, *Lord Jim* (1900), *Under Western Eyes* (1911) and *Victory* (1915), followed by a brief discussion on the similarities between Conrad's view of the emotions and that of Buddhism, and the possibility of Buddhist influence on Conrad through Schopenhauer.

5. In *Thorns & Arabesques: Contexts for Conrad's Fiction*, William W. Bonney writes that "Although it cannot be demonstrated that Conrad studied, say, the Upanishads or the Bhagavadgita, he knew Schopenhauer's writings, as Galsworthy attests: 'Of philosophy he had read a good deal. Schopenhauer used to bring him satisfaction. . . .'; and, as "Schopenhauer discusses at length the philosophies of the Orient in *The World as Will and Idea*," Bonney argues that "from this source alone Conrad could derive a great deal of information concerning both the general outlines of Oriental thought and specific details of Oriental iconography" (9).
6. Mick Short writes that "someone to whom you refer with 'title + last name' would be remote socially, and you would normally refer to those with whom you are close by their first name" (272).
7. In his book, *The Several Lives of Joseph Conrad*, John Stape suggests that Conrad's great-uncle, "[Mikolaj] Bobrowski, who remained blindly loyal to the emperor of the French throughout his life, may be a source for the Napoleon enthusiast Feraud in Conrad's short story 'The Duel'" (5). The suggestion is supported by the application of bird image to both Napoleon and Feraud. In "Autocracy and War" there is a reference to Napoleon as "a sort of vulture," (86) and in "The Duel," Feraud is referred to as "an irritable and staring bird – something like a cross between a parrot and an owl" (210).
8. In her *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan refers to the psychological facet of focalization (point of view) in the following words:

Whereas the perceptual facet has to do with the focalizer's sensory range, the psychological facet concerns his mind and emotions. . . . Knowledge, conjecture, belief, memory – these are some of the terms of cognition.

Conceived of in these terms, the opposition between external and internal focalization becomes that between unrestricted and restricted knowledge. In principle, the external focalizer (or narrator-focalizer) knows everything about the represented world, and when he restricts his knowledge, he does so out of rhetorical considerations. . . . The knowledge of an internal focalizer, on the

other hand, is restricted by definition: being a part of the represented world, he cannot know everything about it.... In its emotive transformation, the 'external/internal' opposition yields 'objective' (neutral, uninvolved) v. 'subjective' (coloured, involved) focalization." (79-80)

9. The text that appeared in *Harper's Magazine* for September 1858 introduces "the story of a duel commencing in 1794 and ending only in 1813" (Delancey Ferguson 385) fought between "a Captain of hussars, Fournier by name" (Delancey Ferguson 385), and "aid-de-camp, Captain Dupont" (Delancey Ferguson 386). The text ends with the following paragraph:

Dupont took deliberate aim at his heart — stopped. "I have your life in my hands," said he. "I give it you on this condition — that if you ever harass me, or provoke me to renew this long fight, I shall have the benefit of two balls before you fire." The conditions were accepted; the fourteen years of duel were ended; Dupont was married; the story is done." (Delancey Ferguson 388)

Delancey Ferguson quotes the text in full in his article.

### Works Cited

- Bross, Addison. "A Set of Six: Variations on a theme." Keith Carabine ed. Joseph Conrad: Critical Assessments III. East Sussex: Helm Information, 1992.
- Conrad, Joseph. "Autocracy and War." *Notes on Life and Letters*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1949.
- . "The Duel." *A Set of Six*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1954.
- . *Lord Jim*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1949.
- . *Mirror of the Sea & A Personal Record*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1949.
- . *Under Western Eyes*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1949.
- . *Victory*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1948.
- DeLancey Ferguson, J. "The Plot of Conrad's *The Duel*." *Modern Language Notes*. 50.6 (June 1935). 385-390.
- Graver, Lawrence. *Conrad's Short Fiction*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.
- Hooper, Myrtle. "The Ethics of Negativity: Conrad's 'The Duel'." *L'Epoque Conradienne* 31 (2001): 107-117.

- Oatley, Keith. *Emotions; A Brief History*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Oatley, Keith, Dacher Keltner, and Jennifer M. Jenkins. *Understanding Emotions*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Okuda, Yoko. "The Serpent in the Bush: A Comparative Study of the Emotions in Conrad and Buddhism." *Tsuda Inquiry* 10 (March, 1989). 119-137.
- Rahula, Walpola. *What the Buddha Taught*. London: Gordon Fraser, 1978.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fictions: Contemporary Poetics*. London & New York: Methuen, 1983.
- Sander, David & Scherer, Klaus R. ed. *The Oxford Companion to Emotion and the Affective Sciences*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Short, Mick. *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Ltd., 1996.
- Stape, John. "Conrad's 'The Duel': A Reconsideration." Keith Carabine ed. *Joseph Conrad: Critical Assessments III*. East Sussex: Helm Information Ltd., 1992.
- . *The Several Lives of Joseph Conrad*. London: William Heinemann, 2007.

(奥田 洋子 おくだ ようこ 跡見学園女子大学教授)