

Classical and Recent Approaches to Conrad's *Typhoon*:

The Problem of Captain MacWhirr

Gregory HUTCHINSON

(Received September 29, 1990)

Introduction

This paper will attempt to weigh the value of the traditional approach to one of Conrad's most successful works with the value of a more recent approach. As a case in point, I will focus on what amounts to a flat disagreement between F.R. Leavis and William W. Bonney about the basic function of Captain MacWhirr in Conrad's novella¹⁾ *Typhoon*. Leavis, the late Cambridge don, is perhaps the best example of a traditional critic of Conrad, and Bonney, a prolific American scholar, is as clear an example as we are likely to discover of a more modern approach. On the whole, I favor Leavis's reading of *Typhoon* over Bonney's because it strikes me as far more balanced, sensitive, and humane. However, there are certain aspects of Bonney's approach that command respect, and from which Leavis might have profited, if he had been open to influence from such a critic (as he almost certainly was not). I hope to demonstrate that Bonney's exhaustively worked analysis of Captain MacWhirr is far too negative, and that a less detailed study would suffice to dispel some of Bonney's main claims. Leavis is especially helpful for this purpose because of his focus on the humane import of the story. But his extreme economy of statement leaves a lot of room for more specific judgment and interpretation, and I feel an approach like Bonney's, more adroitly employed, would add much to Leavis's treatment of the story. This paper will be divided into three parts: (1) a brief summary of the plot for the benefit of those who have not read the *Typhoon* recently, (2) an analysis of Leavis's view, with an explanation of my basic agreement with his position and where

I feel his approach is too limited, and (3) a more detailed attempt to explain exactly where I disagree with Bonney's judgment of Captain MacWhirr.

The Plot

Captain MacWhirr, who commands the steamship *Nan-Shan*, is faced with well-known signs that his ship is approaching a typhoon. Besides the cargo stowed below, the *Nan-Shan* is transporting two hundred Chinese coolies back to their homes in the province of Fu-chau "after a few years of work in various tropical colonies."²⁾ The Captain has had no experience with real typhoons, and he immediately and resolutely decides to go straight through the storm instead of going around it and running up (or so he reasons) an unexplainable coal bill. MacWhirr is exceedingly literal-minded. In one famous scene illustrating his simplicity, his young chief mate, Jukes, harbors a deep resentment at the ship's switching from the British Union Jack to the Siamese flag (though the owners are, after all, Siamese). Captain MacWhirr has no idea what Jukes is getting at when the mate says something is wrong with the look of the flag. MacWhirr goes so far as to check his International Signal Code book to see if the flag might vary in any way from the standard flag of Siam. When he is sure nothing is amiss he returns to assure Jukes that the flag is fine, but reminds him not to hoist it with the elephant upside-down: "That elephant there stands for something in the nature fo the Union Jack ..." (p. 199). At this point, Jukes despairs of even trying to explain the problem to the Captain. (As an amusing aside to this scene, Jukes had threatened to quit over this enormity, but when the shrewd chief engineer asks him

if he still intends to quit, Jukes has the excuse that it would do not good: "I might as well fling my resignation at the bulkhead" [p. 199].)

In short, MacWhirr is quite incapable of imagining what he has never experienced first-hand, and he disregards as almost mad the "Storm strategy" of his colleague Captain Wilson, who boasted in port of outrunning a typhoon so successfully that he never even saw it in the distance. In the identical spirit, MacWhirr ignores the evidence of the ship's barometer, the instructions on avoiding storms in his navigational book, and the warning of Jukes, who is no coward.

The storm itself comes in two onslaughts, only the first of which is portrayed. Against heavy odds the ship survives, but not without sustaining great damage and undergoing a double trial: (1) Although the men in the engine room and at the helm work tirelessly and heroically, most of the crew merely huddle in a corner. This group includes the incorrigible second mate, a rootless and spiteful shirker, who cowers under the very roof that protects the faithful helmsman. (2) The Chinese coolies in the fore-deck engage in a riot so fierce that when the boatswain's mate first hears the noise from outside their quarters, he assumes he is hearing the howling of the typhoon. In fact, the riot started when the coolies' boxes of possessions were broken open by the violent tossing of the ship and they all made frantic rushes to retrieve their possessions. It continues because the coolies are thrown about by the storm, and their grabs at one another for support create a hopeless inertia of clawing and kicking.

Captain MacWhirr solves these two problems almost at the same time by stubbornly concentrating on the second, to everyone's disgust, since (despite his benighted racial assumptions)³⁾ only he considers the fate of the coolies a major priority. He commands Jukes to take the crew below and stop the riot. Jukes is tempted to the same kind of stunned inaction that Lord Jim exhibited aboard the *Patna* in the novel preceding this novella. His instinct is to resist the order, but he discovers that he cannot because, in his prosaic way, Captain MacWhirr is too strong-willed for him. Jukes in turn rallies the crew (minus the useless second mate, who is both fired and, literally, felled by the Captain). Though outnumbered, the crew succeed in overcoming the coolies and setting up lifelines for the coolies to steady themselves with for the duration of the

storm. This event is the obvious climax of the story.⁴⁾ The crew return to the storm with a new vigor, and the reader no longer doubts that the ship will survive. In terms of the undramatized action, there is still the second, and worse, onslaught of the storm to contend with as well as the problem of redistributing the coolies' money and possessions in the fairest possible way⁵⁾ after the storm. We learn in a letter written by Jukes to his chum that only the Captain (who, characteristically, couldn't even imagine a Chinese mutiny) was willing to allow the coolies on deck at all, and that he astounded everyone by angrily ordering the crew to put away all firearms. His solution was to give the coolies a choice: they could let some Chinese official on shore take everything and settle the matter his own way, or they could accept equal shares of everything the crew had collected from their quarters (aside from odds and ends and change, to be divided among the most badly injured). Of course they agreed to the redistribution, which was probably fairly accurate, since they had all worked for the same period of time. Jukes's comment on this ends the story on a hilariously thematic note: "I think that he got out of it very well for such a stupid man" (p. 287).

Leavis

Leavis sees Captain MacWhirr as "the embodiment of a tradition," whose actions both during and after the storm represent "a triumph of the spirit" unencumbered by any "symbolic portentousness."⁶⁾ As the last-quoted phrase suggests, Leavis sees MacWhirr's ordinariness as above all an aid in the presentation of this theme of human triumph. It may be that Leavis recognizes MacWhirr's limitations as being part of this theme, but the sentence that ought to clarify his view seems too terse to read in this way: "And the qualities which, in a triumph of discipline — a triumph of the spirit — have enabled a handful of ordinary men to impose sanity on a frantic mob are seen unquestionably to be those which took Captain MacWhirr, in contempt of 'Storm strategy,' into the centre of the typhoon." This is very well said. Perhaps anyone reading this comment will feel Leavis's deep appreciation for Conrad's art. The observation also happens to be strictly true and is a good example of Leavis's sparseness of utterance. He often wrote as if too much explication would spoil the work for the reader.⁷⁾

But what exactly does Leavis make of the undeniable fact that the same "qualities" that carried MacWhirr through the crisis put him and his ship in the situation in the first place? Does he interpret MacWhirr's original decision to confront the storm as an example of bravery, pure and simple, or of stubbornness, stupidity, lack of imagination, or some other limitation? And if it is a limitation, is that part of the theme? Is MacWhirr's "contempt of 'Storm strategy' " in itself a heroic virtue, a blind spot, or both? It is impossible to say. All we can be certain of is that Leavis sees the same artistically-convincing personality as deciding to confront the storm and proceeding to triumph over it, and that he adjudges Conrad's final assessment of MacWhirr to be not just positive but profoundly so. As often in reading Leavis, we are left to fill in specific details for ourselves. The good side of this may be that we are in no danger of substituting Leavis's more minute observations for our own.

But even introducing the subject of undue influence may remind those who are familiar with Leavis that in practice his general refusal to indulge in detailed explication has had the opposite effect from fostering independence on the part of the reader. His students, who wrote most of the articles for his famous critical magazine *Scrutiny*, were notorious for adopting his judgments and even his writing style. Today as well, some of them — though they are at least middle-aged and Leavis is dead — take a positively prostrate tone towards his judgments. We see this in the way his former student William Walsh, in a biography of Leavis, accepts his master's most eccentric views as self-evident: "For Leavis, Lawrence was essentially English, Eliot both American and also too much an irritating Francophile."⁸ This is to say (and Walsh accepts it unblinkingly), one advantage D.H. Lawrence had over T.S. Eliot was that Lawrence was English, while Eliot was an American and, worse still, admired French culture and literature. It does not seem to occur to Walsh that foreigners and British agnostics might question Leavis's assumptions about the inferiority of American and French culture to his own. When a critic habitually passes judgments without supplying plentiful detail to support them, he may more than once descend into dogmatism, thereby ensuring that his most enthusiastic followers will be sycophants. Anyone who doubts this is invited to read Walsh's biography in its entirety. Though

he wrote the book after Leavis's death, Queenie Leavis, her husband's main collaborator, was still alive, and the book reads as though Walsh could feel Mrs. Leavis looking over his shoulder. If this sounds like an exaggeration, consider the following description:

But the crown of Mrs. Leavis's critical achievement, if we leave aside her substantial contribution to the collaborative work on Dickens (1970), was her "A Fresh Approach to *Wuthering Heights*," published in 1969 In it we see, as we do indeed in her essays on *Silas Marner* and *Jane Eyre*, a blend of Mrs. Leavis's matured capacities: originality and independence, critical insight, swiftly moving intelligence, wit and tartness, a powerful moral base to the thought, psychological acuity, contemporaneity in attitude and reference, and a plain flowing prose style, a more appealing and accessible medium than her husband's.⁹

One nuance in this litany is that, while courting Mrs. Leavis, Walsh hedges his preference for her prose style over her husband's. Being more explicit would imply something distinctly negative about Leavis, and Walsh can never do this. The whole book is written in this vein, which is the tone of a dictator's official biography.

This is less an aside about Leavis than a corrective to his otherwise excellent guidance in the case of Conrad in general and Captain MacWhirr in particular. We are not given enough detailed analysis to know precisely what Leavis thinks of MacWhirr's culpability in insisting on meeting the typhoon head-on. One has a natural inclination to assume, of course, that Leavis is intelligent enough to see what one feels to be the case oneself. But when we disagree with some other reader, it is rather egoistical to feel certain Leavis is taking our side. There is the same tendency — at once illuminating and vague — in Leavis's comments on the letters which Captain MacWhirr and the fine chief engineer, Solomon Rout, send their wives. MacWhirr's wife is supercilious and indifferent to MacWhirr. She never bothers to read his long, utterly factual letters to their conclusion, and her only worry is that MacWhirr will some day come home to live with her and the children. Though she is financially dependent on her husband, she feels herself to be his social superior and dreads being associated with him. Rout's wife, by contrast, is jolly and loving. She is only kept from joining her husband aboard ship (apparently the prerogative of

a senior officer's wife) by her cheerfully discharged duty of tending her aged mother-in-law. Leavis contrasts the presentation of these domestic backgrounds favorably with the part of *Heart of Darkness* dealing with Kurtz's fiancée:

Consider the accounts of the home backgrounds of MacWhirr and the chief engineer. It is to be noted further that these backgrounds in their contrast with the main theme of the tale afford a far more satisfactory irony (it is, in fact, supremely effective) than that, in *Heart of Darkness*, of the scenes in Brussels.¹⁰

On the one hand, most of this observation seems very just. In context it makes a relevant case for considering *Typhoon* a more concrete and realized work than *Heart of Darkness*, the work most often cited as an example of Conrad's profundity in literary survey textbooks. On the other hand, I would like to know what, exactly, the "supremely effective" irony involves. I assume we are to take MacWhirr's side and contrast his usefulness with his wife's parasitic ingratitude. But I only assume this because I happen to interpret the use of MacWhirr's background in this way. As we shall see, Bonney interprets it quite differently. Furthermore, in what sense is the chief engineer's relationship with his wife — charming though it is — part of the same irony? This is far from clear, unless we agree with Bonney about the use of these backgrounds. And I doubt very strongly that Leavis would agree with Bonney.

Leavis's remarks, then, show a great appreciation of the work — an appreciation that we savor more after exposure to critics like Bonney. In the case of *Typhoon*, Captain MacWhirr emerges as a hero of a prosaic, ordinary sort. The very qualities that lead him to face the coming storm instead of trying to outrun it are the qualities that show so admirably when the storm comes and he is tested by it. Leavis makes this plain. But when we ask what Conrad's intention in having MacWhirr make the faulty decision in the first place was, Leavis remains silent. And the same applies to other details, such as the thematic import of the contrast between MacWhirr's and Solomon Rout's domestic ties.

Bonney

More recent criticism has been explicit about MacWhirr's limitations, though most critics end by conced-

ing his heroic qualities. Jocelyn Baines, for instance, though he agrees that "despite his obtuse stubbornness Captain MacWhirr has qualities which enable him to emerge from his ordeal as an heroic figure,"¹¹ begins by observing plainly:

This lack of imagination and experience, together with a contempt for anything that smacked of old-womanliness which made him ignore the advice on "storm-strategy in Captain Wilson's book," led him to do a very stupid thing. For there is no question that he was wrong to take the *Nan-Shan* straight through the typhoon; he needlessly endangered the ship and the men on her. It is merely ironical that he should have based his action on the admirable dictum that "you don't find everything in books" when in this case he could have found all that he needed to know in a book.¹²

In the same way, Norman Page approves of MacWhirr's talk of "going through it" (i.e., the storm), observing that "at this point in the story his lack of imagination is a positive virtue."¹³ The operative word here is "this": what was presumably a vice (though Page never calls it that), in getting the *Nan-Shan* into the predicament, becomes a virtue once she is in it. Similarly, Francis A. Hubbard, Frederick J. Karl, Adam Gillon, Aaron Fogel, A.M. Daleski, John E. Van Domelen, and the eclectic authority on the novel Walter Allen all in various ways conclude that MacWhirr's deficiency is in some way responsible for the saving of the ship.¹⁴ And in their willingness to elaborate enough to clarify their positions at least on the issues they have raised, these critics show one advantage in approach over Leavis, however inferior most of them may be to Leavis in critical talent and sensibility.

But there is a major exception to this school of thought on *Typhoon*. This is William W. Bonney, who is interesting for two reasons: First, he is a dissenter. For Bonney, MacWhirr is not a heroic figure at all, but an incompetent nullity, who endangers the ship and does nothing at all to save it. Secondly, Bonney's analysis is exhaustive. He leaves no stone unturned, no strings untied. It is observed above how Leavis calls attention to the "supremely effective" irony of the home backgrounds of MacWhirr and the chief engineer, but leaves the relationship between these two backgrounds (and, indeed, why the engineer's

is ironic at all) unexplained. Bonney has a coherent explanation not only for the Captain and chief engineer's relationships to women, but for the bachelor Jukes's as well, though Conrad never gives any hint of developing the latter point.

The crux of Bonney's judgment is that MacWhirr is full of "gross inadequacies" which alone explain his decision to face the typhoon.¹⁵⁾ These include the inability to plan: "Devoid of functional abstract concepts of time and probability, MacWhirr is incapable of acting in terms of future possibilities." Thus, he distrusts his barometer and his navigational manual and adheres to his definition of certitude, which is "as crazily limited as the experience of its formulator, who has only seen 'fine weather.'" ¹⁶⁾ Furthermore, MacWhirr has no deep human ties: he is "unwilling, and thus not able, to recognize the legitimacy of communal tradition and human emotive responses," and therefore (in the famous flag episode) "stifles both Jukes's negative reaction to the silly appearance of the Siamese flag and his early concern for the coolies' welfare and comfort"¹⁷⁾ The upshot, for Bonney, of MacWhirr's inability to connect with other human beings is his cold-hearted wife, the perfect symbol of his routine-bound, incommunicative existence.

At this point, Bonney does something that Leavis fails to do, at least explicitly enough to be understood: he relates the significance of the chief engineer Solomon Rout's happy marriage to the import of MacWhirr's barren one. Rout is part of the community of men. He is a positive force, in touch with the illogical (non-routine, metaphorical, and sexual) elements of his nature. Being the opposite of MacWhirr, Rout has the opposite kind of marriage. And here Bonney goes a step further by noting that Jukes, the chief mate, "has no women whatever in his life." Thus, it is no wonder that Jukes is given to "spontaneous and irrational outbursts."¹⁸⁾ He too is out of touch with the irrational side of his nature.

Bonney even has a place in his reading for the second mate, who represents "one-dimensional rationality coupled with a self-pitying imagination"¹⁹⁾ — which is to say, he combines the vices of MacWhirr and Jukes. But the main focus of Bonney's analysis is the Captain, and his ultimate judgment is that "MacWhirr is scarcely fit for command, and his ship survives the typhoon through no fault of his own."²⁰⁾

While such industry and coherence command respect, Bonney's analysis is almost dishearteningly symbolical. He sees Jungian and mythological analogues that Conrad never adverts to in any of his letters, and very likely never intended. As one of the simpler examples, the good-hearted boatswain's mate discovers the turmoil in the coolie's foredeck quarters because he is docilely (but bravely) looking for a lamp, as demanded by some cowering crew members. This event, for Bonney, "defines a major motif in the novel and directly recalls the paradigm of *sol invictus* in combat with the annihilatory celestial dragon."²¹⁾ In this context, the real hero of the story is seen to be the happily-married Solomon Rout, whose engine room has plenty of light and whose command alone is functioning properly (as Bonney sees it). Of course, Rout's nickname, Sol, is adduced in support of this reading. (Rout's plausible connection with wise King Solomon of the Bible was pointed out earlier in Bonney's study.) And the boatswain's battle in the dark of the coal bin with the crowbar (animated by the lurching ship to the point where it seems not only murderous but malignant) has its analogies in such "chthonic guardians" of the Underworld as Cerberus and Hydra.²²⁾

With all respect to Bonney, this way of reading the story reminds one of Ernest Hemingway's hilarious (and apparently impromptu) remarks about some of his best-known critics:

Professor Carlos Back-up and Professor Charles Fender and Professor Philip Youngerdunger, wearing the serious silks of Princeton and Yale and NYU, feed my collected works into their Symbol Searcher, which is a cross between a Geiger counter and a pinball machine, or maybe they use their economy-sized death-wish indicators, which can also turn up complexes, both certified and uncertified, at the flick of the dial, then they ask me serious symbol-oriented, death-wish-oriented questions for their serious classes in Serious Lit IV, three credits; but because I answer them in baseball terminology, which is a much more exact science than literature, they feel I do not take them seriously.²³⁾

The symbolism may work in some cases, and if it does, perhaps we should take the deconstructionist view that it is the reader who creates the text. However, when the attempt to force everything into the one Procrustean bed

encourages the amputation of vital facts in the work itself, I object. And nothing could be more vital to my reading of this work than MacWhirr's part in saving the ship. Bonney, as quoted above ("... the ship survives the typhoon through no fault of his own"), must discount MacWhirr's role because both his thesis and his symbolic apparatus depend upon MacWhirr representing everything null, benighted (in this respect as well, contrasting with "Old Sol"), and incompetent.

But what, we ask, about MacWhirr's role in quelling the coolies? Surely his orders accomplished that. Yes, Bonney replies, but this was mere time-filling:

The disorder was limited to the virtual prison where the coolies have been confined and has no effect upon the crew, who know nothing about it Moreover, the coolies are not actually pitted against one another in combat, but rather are "fighting for their footing."²⁴⁾

This explanation, among other problems, involves a confusion of times: *When* is the disorder so limited that the crew "know nothing about it"? The answer is: Before MacWhirr gives Jukes the unpopular order to inform them and make them help him put a stop to it. And the order has a definite effect on the crew. Before acting, they were cowering in the dark of the alleyway; afterwards, as already noted, they are paradoxically refreshed. We see that in Jukes's reaction: "When the wash of water rolling on the deck died away for a moment, it seemed to Jukes, yet quivering from his exertions, that in his mad struggle down there he had overcome the wind somehow..." (p.265). The second onslaught will be worse, and the crew are much better prepared for it psychologically than they were for the first. Ironically, we are informed of this at the same time that Conrad shows MacWhirr to be capable of learning after all. He returns to his cabin, consults the very navigational book he railed against before, and concludes, to himself, "The worst was to come, then — and if the books were right, this worst would be very bad" (p.270).

As for Bonney's argument that the coolies "are not actually pitted against each other in combat," this comes very close to conscious half-truth. It is true, as noted earlier, that the coolies are fighting for their balance, but the effect of their fighting is exactly the same as if their motives were malicious. Some of them are seriously hurt.

Jukes describes one in his subsequent letter to his friend: "There was one fellow (amongst others of the badly hurt) who had had his eye all but knocked out" (p.285). Is Bonney suggesting that these injuries — which would have certainly multiplied without the crew's intervention — are less important than they would be if they were inflicted through malice?

In fact, Bonney makes another rather obtuse mistake pertaining to the coolies. As quoted above he claims that MacWhirr "stifles both Jukes's negative reaction to the silly appearance of the Siamese flag and his early concern for the coolies' welfare and comfort" But Jukes is not really concerned with the coolies' comfort when he craftily refers to them as "the passengers." At every juncture of the story, Jukes shows himself to care less for the Chinese than MacWhirr does, and in this scene he is merely trying to convince MacWhirr to dodge the storm. A further irony in this statement is that Bonney, along with Jukes, regards the Siamese flag as "silly," but MacWhirr is more enlightened. He accords it the same respect as the Union Jack. What, after all, is "silly" about an elephant? Surely educated people in 1990 consider it a wonderful creature.

Finally, the biographical evidence suggests that Conrad thought well of MacWhirr. Both Gerard Jean-Aubry and E.H. Visiak, two biographers who had been friends of Conrad's, trace the portayal of Captain MacWhirr to an early master of Conrad's, also named Captain MacWhirr. And Conrad's memories of his old master were not only affectionate but grateful. One recollection is of Conrad's first meeting with MacWhirr. As first mate, before the Captain had boarded ship, Conrad had stowed too much of the cargo below the beams, causing the ship to roll badly for her entire voyage. MacWhirr's only comment was, "That's your one-third above the beams. The only thing that surprises me is that the sticks have stuck to her all this time." Visiak's gloss is, "This was certainly a mild expression of reproach in a ship-master."²⁵⁾ It is no wonder that Jean-Aubry informs us, with absolutely no irony, "This was one man whom Conrad called 'the excellent Captain MacWhirr.'" ²⁶⁾ Of course, it is possible that a novelist might assign the name of a captain he remembered with affection to a character representing unredeemed incompetence. But Conrad had too much discipline and reverence for that kind of joke. And Nor-

man Sherry, the leading authority on Conrad's use of sources, says as much. Besides citing Captain MacWhirr Sherry cites case after case in which Conrad used names from his past in his fiction without changing his attitude toward the bearer of the name. As one example, there is the use of Jim Lingard and his uncle Joshua's surname in the portrayal of Tom Lingard, heroic figure in *Almyer's Folly* and *An Outcast of the Islands*, and hero of *The Rescue*.²⁷⁾

Conclusion

This paper is an attempt to balance the claims of two types of criticism. F.R. Leavis's criticism represents a classical approach to Conrad. He sees Captain MacWhirr as a triumph of ordinary humanity. For Leavis, MacWhirr's imposition of order on the Chinese coolies and subsequent fair treatment of them is emblematic of the tradition of disciplined decency that he represents. I would guess that Leavis regards MacWhirr's obtuseness as thematic: MacWhirr triumphs in spite of it because of the great Merchant Service tradition he represents. The obtuseness thus sets off the value of a humane tradition, since MacWhirr has nothing else to fall back on. However, Leavis is rather too short on detail, and I can only assume that this is his interpretation because it is mine.

William W. Bonney, on the other hand, is detailed to a fault. We never have to assume what he thinks about MacWhirr because he tells us at some length. But I feel he tries too hard to make everything fit his elaborate theory, and in the process he mars the actual story. I have tried to show that his interpretation of MacWhirr as a worthless captain ignores and distorts too many facts. In fairness, though, I think Bonney's use of greater detail is one aspect of his approach that Leavis could have profited from.

Notes

1) Conrad himself might have considered *Typhoon* a short story, since the volume it first appeared in is entitled *Typhoon and Other Stories*. However, it is almost a hundred pages long in the densely-printed edition referred to in this paper and exactly a hundred pages (without the introduction) in the 1925 Medallion Edition published by Gresham; and it functions as a novella

rather than a short story. Conrad would have had no particular reason to bother with such an academic distinction in any case, but I mention it, first, because with the advantage of distance we can see that the novella is one of his *fortes* and, second, to indicate why, according to contemporary practice, I designate it with italics rather than quotation marks. To avoid confusing the reader I have standardized all references to it, using italics regardless of what the original critic used.

2) Conrad, Joseph, *Typhoon*, in *The Portable Conrad*, Morton D. Zabel (ed.) (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1976, 1985), p.195. Subsequent references to this addition will be indicated by bracketed page numbers in the text itself.

3) When Jukes tries to convince the Captain to alter course, he refers to the comfort of "the passengers." This completely baffles MacWhirr. "Passengers?" he wonders. "What passengers?" When Jukes, who is no model of racial enlightenment himself, admits that he means the Chinese coolies, MacWhirr's reply is: "The Chinamen! Why don't you speak plainly? Couldn't tell what you meant. Never heard a lot of coolies spoken of as passengers before. Passengers, indeed! What's come over you?" (p.219). He then rails against the very idea of hauling "a full-powered steamship four points off course to make the Chinamen comfortable" (Ibid.). In fairness, Conrad himself may not have had a firm sense of racial equality, but it is plain enough that he is consciously portraying these simple seamen as in the rear guard of modern reforms. This is, of course, thematic: MacWhirr is not propelled to deal fairly with the coolies through any modern notions but through his traditional sense of fairness and decency.

4) But Norman Page, with Albert Guerard (Page, Norman, *A Conrad Companion* [New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986], p.147), believes that the climax of the story is the point where MacWhirr in his cabin is at first quite shaken by not finding his match-box in its accustomed place but soon finds his towel where it should be and reflects: "She may come out of it yet." There is no real disagreement here. The crew's feeling of uplift after their victory with the coolies is presented as one motif (the conquest of the inner storm), and the assurance of the Captain resonates with it, pointing to a victory over the storm without.

- 5) Cf. Daleski, H.M. *Joseph Conrad: The Way of Dispossession* (London: Faber and Faber, 1977), p.104. Daleski informs us that "Conrad originally conceived *Typhoon* as a short story to be called 'Equitable Division,' which suggests he initially thought of the crux of the tale as Captain MacWhirr's solution to the problem posed by the money that Jukes and his men wrest from the fighting Chinese passengers."
- 6) Leavis, F.R., *The Great Tradition* (ZHarmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1948, 1972), p.214.
- 7) This is more than frivolous surmise. Leavis often complains about "the general tendency in the literary-academic world to-day to substitute ... elucidation for criticism." See, for instance, Leavis, "Approaches to Eliot," *The Common Pursuit* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1952, 1984), p.257. The quoted phrase is taken from that essay. It is based on Leavis's view that elucidation tends to give the unwary reader the sense of arriving when he hasn't even traveled, for secondary material can never be substituted for the act of reading. Thus, as Leavis explains in this essay, a good piece of criticism involves a judgment of the nature and value of the work, some hints about organization, and very little elucidation. This has obvious relevance to his essay on Conrad.
- 8) Walsh, William, *F.R. Leavis* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1980), p.168.
- 9) *Ibid.*, p.116.
- 10) Leavis, *The Great Tradition* p.212.
- 11) Baines, Jocelyn, *Joseph Conrad: A Critical Biography* (London: Wedenfield and Nicolson, 1960, 1987), p.258.
- 12) *Ibid.*, pp.258-59.
- 13) Page, p.147.
- 14) Allen, Walter, *The English Novel* (Hamondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books), 1954, 1984, p.340; Daleski, p.104; Fogel, Aaron, *Coercion to Speak: Conrad's Poetics of Dialogue* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1985), p.4; Gillon, Adam, *Joseph Conrad* (Boston: Twayne Publishers), 1982. p.50; Hubbard, Francis A. *Theories of Action in Conrad* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1984), p.19; Van Domelen, John E., "Conrad and the Power of Rhetoric," in *Critical Essays on Joseph Conrad*, Ted Billy (ed.) (Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1987), p.80. But grouping these opinions together without distinctions is quite unjust. Allen, as befits a generalist, sums up the view that MacWhirr derives his strength and "fidelity" from being "completely unimaginative." Gillon takes exactly the same view: "Captain MacWhirr lacks this quality ['an unusual imagination']" and "it is precisely this shortcoming that is responsible for the safety of the *Nan-Shan*." Van Domelen, in turn, refers to MacWhirr's "almost total lack of imagination." But Fogel focuses on MacWhirr's "Menippean" (or "vulgarly commonsensical") virtues. If MacWhirr is "an ass," as his father says, he has a mule's (i.e., a *literal* ass's) stubborn effectiveness. Hubbard agrees that MacWhirr is unheroic and prosaic, but he stresses Conrad's actual words: MacWhirr has "no pronounced firmness or stupidity." He is not the ass that he is general assumed to be (by his analysts both in and outside the story), but remarkable because of the contrast between his ordinariness and what he actually does.
- 15) Bonney William, W., *Thorns & Arabesques Contexts for Conrad's Fiction* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1980), p.33.
- 16) *Ibid.*, p.36.
- 17) *Ibid.*
- 18) *Ibid.*, p.39.
- 19) *Ibid.*, p.40.
- 20) *Ibid.*, p.41.
- 21) *Ibid.*, p.47.
- 22) *Ibid.*
- 23) Hotchner, A.E., *Papa Hemingway* (London: Granada Publishing Limited, 1955, 1979), p.153.
- 24) Bonney, p.41.
- 25) Visiak, E.H., *The Mirror of Conrad* (London: Wserner Laurie, 1955), p.173.
- 26) Jean-Aubry, Gerard, *The Sea Dreamer: a Definitive Biography of Joseph Conrad* (London: Novella and Company, Ltd. 1957), p.116.
- 27) Sherry, Norman, *Conrad's Eastern World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), p.317.

Works Cited

- Allen, Walter. *The English Novel*. Hamondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1954, 1984.
- Baines, Jocelyn. *Joseph Conrad: A Critical Biography*.

- London: Wedenfield and Nicolson, 1960, 1987.
- Bonney William, W. *Thorns & Arabesques: Contexts for Conrad's Fiction*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1980.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Typhoon*, in *The Portable Conrad*, Morton D. Zabel (ed.). Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1976, 1985.
- Daleski, H.M. *Joseph Conrad: The Way of Dispossession*. London: Faber and Faber, 1977.
- Fogel, Aaron. *Coercion to Speak: Conrad's Poetics of Dialogue*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Gillon, Adam. *Joseph Conrad*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982.
- Hotchner, A.E. *Papa Hemingway*. London: Granada Publishing Limited, 1955, 1979.
- Hubbard, Francis A. *Theories of Action in Conrad*. Ann Arbor: UMIT Research Press, 1984.
- Jean-Aubry, Gerard. *The Sea Dreamer: a Definitive Biography of Joseph Conrad*. London: Novella and Company, Ltd., 1957.
- Leavis, "Approaches to Eliot," *The Common Pursuit*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1952, 1984.
- Leavis, F.R. *The Great Tradition*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1948, 1972.
- Page, Norman. *A Conrad Companion*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.
- Sherry, Norman. *Conrad's Eastern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Van Domelen, John E., "Conrad and the Power of Rhetoric," in *Critical Essays on Joseph Conrad*, Ted Billy (ed.), p.80 Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1987.
- Visiak, E.H. *The Mirror of Conrad*. London: Werner Laurie, 1955.
- Walsh, William. *F.R. Leavis*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1980.
- この論文はジョセフ・コンラッドの中編小説「台風」を論じるものである。
- この小説については、F. R. Leavis氏とWilliam W. Bonney氏の二人批評家の研究が古典的となっているが、この二人は「台風」の主人公Mac Whirr船長について互いに対立する見解を示している。筆者は、F. R. Leavis氏の側に立つものであるが、Bonney氏の見確の方が正当であろうと思われる点を指摘して論じた。

コンラッドの「台風」における マック・ワール船長に関する批評研究

グレゴリー ハッチンソン

(平成2年9月29日受理)