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INTRODUCTION

Opening this presentation with definitions is all the more risky as the theme of this conference is the role of language in world peace and that all the world violence has been the result of the arbitrary feature of human language. This is the reason why I will simply mention that the imperialist romance genre is that literary genre in which western imagination has constructed the non-western as the other to the western, that postcolonial reaction to such a literature has deconstructed it into a violent language in a way that seems to demonstrate that the former and the latter are in dialogue for the construction of models.

The imperialist romance, which novels like Kipling’s *Kim* (1901) and Forster’s *A Passage to India* (1924), both set in India, and particularly, Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*, may be said to represent, use language to construct a divide between the colonizer and the colonized in a way that has triggered off various and very often violent reactions. The rhetoric of empire in the three writers’ novels is undoubtedly different. Each of them reacted differently to the imperial issues of their times, though the questions they raise are still more than topical. As one of the greatest singers of the “White Man’s burden” to bring light to backward people, Kipling shares most of imperial assumptions veiled in his poetic representation of India. Conrad’s colonial heritage accounts for the so-called “achievement and decline” and the ambivalent darkness of his major texts that turn victory into defeat and vice versa. As for Forster, his satirical reconstruction of imperial discourse does not forcibly lead to a positive construction of non-western people’s values and significantly enough, recalls Conrad’s ambiguous ironic formulations of the blurring frontiers between light and darkness, good and evil, civilized and uncivilized, so many oppositions revealing paradoxes stemming from the arbitrariness of any language and particularly, western language.

As a matter of fact, Conrad suffers more of the difficulty of constructing meaning out of biographical chaos, all the more so as his experience of languages is nightmarish due to the paradoxical opposition between his status as a Master of English and his so-called inappropriate oral practice of it, and the current oppositions of English to Polish, his native
language, French which is his first adoption language, one of the languages in which he constructs his various identities. It may be seen why language issues enable an adoption associated with a borrowed identity in permanent conflict with an inner self. Because of English, Conrad’s use of irony enables him to remain in the dark and to come to terms with the epistemological, political and ideological questions that cannot be answered, or at least, that cannot be easily answered. The result of such self-divisions is, in *Heart of Darkness* at least, the awareness of conflicts outside and inside that go beyond those impressions which have undoubtedly led to the writing of novels like Evelyn Waugh’s *A Handful of Dust*, Tayeb Salih’s *Season of Migration to the North* (1969), Roy Arundhati’s *The God of Small Things* (1997), Timm Uwe’s *The Snake Tree* (1990) and particularly most of the first African novels like Laye CAMARA’s *The African Child*, and Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart*. It is widely accepted that such texts would never be the same without *Heart of Darkness*, mainly because the self-conscious gaps of *Heart of Darkness* are invitations, Benita Parry believes, to postcolonial rewritings of the text. These are so many reasons to assert that never intertextuality has been given better illustration in its definition of literary works in dialogue for the sake of both new meaning and significance.

The comparative reading of *Heart of Darkness* and *Things Fall Apart* shows how the rhetoric of imperial power may be turned into a violent language of peace in both the imperialist romance genre and the African novel in English. Conrad and Achebe do not have the same experience of English. The former is not from a former British colony like Achebe, but he does certainly know more than the latter, the impact of foreign occupation on a sensitive young mind in progress. In any case, the two novels deal with the first contacts between Europeans and Africans in, at first sight, such a different way that the verbal violence of the former does not differ much from the poetic evocation of how things fall apart in Achebe’s novel. Both treatments are controversial in many ways, in the formulation of different traditions, their narrative strategies, reactions to challenges and also, in what may be considered as decisive language concessions for individual or universal peace.

I. THE PROBLEMS

In both *Heart of Darkness* and *Things Fall Apart* language meaning and significance play a very important role in masking or revealing not only violence but also the open or underlying quest for peace. One thing is that the two writers’ relationship with English both relates them to the international community and questions their self-identification in the newly acquired
language. Conrad’s experience is the best illustration of the difficulties the two writers had to cope with. He did not learn English at school but as a sailor in the British navy, which undoubtedly means that he was rather exposed to the practical and clear-cut use of the language. He mainly taught himself English grammar and lexis on board, and this explains his painful relationship with the language. At least, he complained about the difficulties he had to write in his language. “L’Anglais m’est toujours une langue étrangère”1, he confessed in 1907, after the publication of most of his masterpieces.

In fact, many other major modernist writers in English can be considered, in George Steiner’s word, “extraterritorial”2, which does not mean whatsoever that the English language was an obstacle to Conrad’s creative expression which is, behind his recurrent tendency to exaggerate, a violent exercise in terms of form and contents. It may even be assumed that the sense of estrangement from his adoptive language played a very important role in his creative expression. “We would do well to consider the possibility that Conrad wrote his masterpieces because rather than in spite of the English language”(GREANEY, 1), but not forcibly for the reasons of superiority of English over Polish and French as F.R. Leavis (28) believes. Conrad’s (language) foreignness is very telling in the simplification of his name and it also gives a particular emphasis to his collaboration with Ford Madox Hueffer who is himself another extraterritorial writer from immigration descent. Their different command of English provided materials and made both of them play up the other’s foreignness for various purposes and perhaps at their own expenses, though Ford did not have the same conflicting reaction to his cultural heritage.

Linguistic barriers are then very important in Conrad’s literary production, which surprisingly does not seem to be the case with Achebe, perhaps because the latter does not obviously need English for his living as it may seem to be Conrad’s case. Neither do Achebe’s texts reflect dismay and doubt, or a yearning for the personal and artistic security behind many Conradian novels. In this respect, biographical echoes which may be associated with Marlow/Kurtz or Marlow/Chief Accountant relationships in Heart of Darkness recall the relationships between Conrad and his romantic father on the one hand and his pragmatic uncle Bobrowski on the other. Though such identifications are restrictive of the multi-faceted significance of the paradoxical quest for peace through violence, they confirm language barriers which cannot be reduced to silence and which are strong enough to turn darkness into light. Moreover, the supposed conflict between Conrad the man and Conrad the artist, indirectly, the conflict
between power-relationships marked by hysteria or self-pity and the central business of writing, finds its importance in the difficulty of coming to terms with language issues. Conrad who agonizes in his letters contrasts with Conrad the novelist who is bold enough to face the forces of darkness. The estrangement provides in any case the necessary resources for a fiction whose main features are antinomy, opposition, paradoxical representations of human dreams and nightmares at once. Conrad's is the immense conflicting possibilities of language in social, textual and ideological environments. His hatred of writing as may be seen in his letters seems to account for the emphasis on the textual spoken word which is both destructive of the language medium and very paradoxical if his oral practice is taken into account. The focus on the spoken makes then his text "silently efface itself" (Greaney, 2), a phenomenon which is justified by conflicting meanings and various communities of speakers. The "linguistic utopia" associated with the idealized speech communities structures Conrad's fiction and recalls in a way African oral tradition or informal conversation where statements are not always taken at face value. This contrasts, of course, with what Conrad's narrator in Heart of Darkness associates with sailors' discourse, a "speech genre" that does not accommodate the perversion of authentic storytelling as Heart of Darkness does. Conrad's fiction signals then right and turns left if the apparent lack of coherence of his narrators and various intrusions, which degenerate the discourse, are taken into account.

In clearer terms, so many items justify the suspicion of language in Conrad's fiction, a suspicion to which may be added philosophical, epistemological, ideological narrative issues which both novels question. As an example, the repetitive opposition between good and evil turns the "Exterminate all the brutes" (HD, 118) imperative into a necessity if man is to experience what may be called a conscious peace of mind. However, such assumption makes the divide between the civilized and the non-civilized, light and darkness a recurrent problematic in the two texts. In both of them, the brute in man is undoubtedly what Kurtz perceives as being the horror and such a sudden consciousness of the gap between construction of light and the manifestation of truth is a destructive awareness of the real nature of man, regardless of historical circumstances. Behind the mask of race, philosophical and other societal visions, the two texts represent black people as primitive and in many ways backward, and white people as the group who is enlightened enough to perceive the underlying darkness in the world, theirs and others'.
If *Heart of Darkness* is very telling about the somewhat differences between Western idealistic visions and the horrible reality of human experience, *Things Fall Apart* does not undermine the image of the Dark Continent. Or at least, the “implied” Achebe’s borrowed language and identity do not reduce prejudices and misrepresentations. Achebe’s statement in “The Role of the Writer in a new Nation” that African “societies were not mindless but frequently had a philosophy of great depth, value and beauty, that they had poetry and above all, they had dignity” is itself a very problematic idea. In fact, “frequently” does not mean “always”, which justifies the crimes and other forms of violence, which no human society should ever tolerate. Moreover, the account of why things fall apart is nothing but an opposition between light and darkness in deed and in any human language. The murder of Ijemefuna, the lot of twins and all those who are denied a decent burial due to their illness (swelling), their birth (the outcasts) or their weakness or strength of character (those who commit suicide) are opposed to the language of peace, brotherhood and equality before a loving God. All of which is well expressed in a poetic language which promises a future maturity of the race. The white man who defeats the “Evil Forest” in *Things Fall Apart*, defeats superstitions, brings light, and above all, gives a trophy to the one who masters the other’s language. In this particular instance, the two texts have the same contradicting impulses.

On the other hand, that Marlow is a racist imperialist is attenuated by literary theory which rather questions his status as a praiseworthy narrator and infers that he allows a role playing that may have helped Conrad himself be accepted in the Great Tradition. In fact, his complex psychological make-up together with an even quality of his texts seem to result from and to be intensified by his paradoxical relationships with languages. What Meyer calls the “roots of those reiterated themes of rescue and betrayal “ (Meyer, 4) seem to hide obsessions and a desire of therapeutic repetitions of criminal deeds and in this respect, the recurrence of cannibalism intended to appease a feeling of guilt seems to construct a consciousness haunted by the past. “In view of the insistent recurrence of the subject in his writings” Dr Meyer says, “the conclusion that cannibalism (and kindred practices) contained some personal significance might seem justified” (MEYER, 169). That characters resort to actual or symbolical versions of cannibalisms, sexual or other, is another motif of similar differences at work.

There are hints of loose sexuality and also cannibalism in the two novels. *Heart of Darkness* refers to them as part of “the unspeakable” where *Things Fall Apart* unconvincingly tries to
correct the former’s blurring perspectives. To tell the truth, Achebe’s text hides many examples of cannibalism and loose sexuality. To sacrifice human beings not in the way that monotheist religions recall, to bring the heads of war-defeated victims at home and again to throw away those who are ill are, despite their symbolic possible significance in Achebe’s text and context, ominous indications of cannibalism. In this respect, the reason why “those sons of wild animals have dared to murder a daughter of Umofia” (TFA,11) has much significance. An alert decoding of this statement shows that English language does no: satisfactory translate what many African languages would consider as actual cannibalism. The subsequent use of two young people as compensation currency is not at variance with the horrible perspective interwoven in the fabric of the text. True enough, such war practices are not less condemnable than Kurtz’s decorating of his house with human skulls in Heart of Darkness. Nevertheless, one of the most important problems is that Kurtz perceives the horror in the violent fulfilment of wild passions, which is not the case of Okonkwo and his community if the elegiac language of Things Fall Apart is taken into account. If anything a group of people is inclined towards doing is worthy of respect by another as Ruth Benedict strangely asserts in Patterns of Culture⁴, this should not mean whatsoever the inexistence of hierarchy of human and moral practices if the necessary move from evil to good is taken into account.

To better show the ambivalent aspect of the issues raised, Conrad’s text uses what may be seen as a method and which is illustrated in the very often quoted passage, “the meaning of an episode was not inside like a kernel but outside, enveloping the tale which brought it out only as a glow brings out a haze (...)”(HD, 48) and which implies that the narrative does not hide anything but projects meaning from the inside, which makes J.H. MILLER (quoted by Muriel Moutet (17) say that “The darkness is in principle invisible and remains invisible. All that can be said is that the halo gives the spectator indirect knowledge that darkness is there”.

Kurzt is inside the heart of darkness and has a heart of darkness in quest of light while the destructive interior/exterior unreality darkens his civilizing dreams. As for Marlow’s listeners, they are outside and have disturbing perspectives that impose a meaning to the former’s experience of the appealing horror. They have incompatible experiences. Marlow can understand because he is atypical:

“Celui qui est dehors ne peut avoir l’intuition de l’horreur” que s’il est lui-même marginal, atypique comme l’est Marlow, que s’il ne participe en quelque sorte à un système idéologique que de son plein gré, en percevant les limites » (Moutet, 18).
Marlow can consequently lie to tell the truth, he can pretend and believe he never lies. In *Heart of Darkness*, there is an attempt to reconcile theoretical impossibilities, which makes of the opposition between violence and peace a recurrent reality. In this respect, Kurtz’s report is also “the exposition of a method” where “altruistic sentiment” goes against “Exterminate all the brutes!” (HD, 118). Truth is then not in the narrative but around the narrative. In Conrad’s *The Secret Agent* for example, the police and the political power both protect against and cause modern barbarism. In other words, meaning cannot be found in the words of *Heart of Darkness*. Even the marginalization of females and non European voices only confirm the mounting suspicion of language and utopian self-projections of various forms of storytelling, and consequently, and this turns *Heart of Darkness* into a very ambivalent and precocious modernist text.

II. REACTIONS
The issues raised by the intertextual readings of the two novels are the effects of their use of foreign language on the one hand, and the difficulties to come to terms with racial differences and experience. Even though their respective narrative strategies share a common concern with how to tell a story full of violence, their perspectives highlight in the final analysis the misleading gap between meaning and significance. This accounts for the use of the mask together with other techniques that emphasize paradoxes and relativity.

The narration of *Heart of Darkness* is particularly marked by the use of Marlow as a “double” to Kurtz and with a mature voice, which gives also outstanding verbal echoes to Conrad’s *Lord Jim* (1900) and allows Conrad and the main protagonist to remain in the dark on the one hand and “The inner truth [to be] hidden- Luckily” on the other. Such a device attenuates the violence in words, gestures and thoughts and expresses a paradoxical quest for peace in a dialogic language environment where meaning is not taken for granted. Additionally, the delayed decoding technique, together with irony and a sense of affection characteristic of the first Marlow narrations in “Youth”, *Heart of Darkness* and *Lord Jim*, also testifies to the existence of a double meaning which generally, to tell the truth, any human verbal or non verbal construction is made of. According to Ian Watt, such a central feature of the narration and which Conrad may be one of the first to use in modernist literature, also attenuates physical crisis and stresses the multi-faceted meanings of episodes. Delayed decoding also reflects hidden autobiographical materials and consciousness of the dual
meaning of experience recalled and whose meaning and significance impact on the form of the text in the way violence and peace are two words expressing the same contradictions.

It may be relevant to remark that in his previous texts, Conrad does not seem to hide anything, even though *Almayer's Folly* (1895) and *An Outcast of the Islands* (1896) are metaphors of gloomy language imprisonment hidden in rhetoric. In *Heart of Darkness*, the difficulties of making words rescue meaning are not the effects of undisciplined experience, as Michael GREANY affirms in *Conrad, Language, And Narrative*, but the complexities of the raised issues explain the intertextual ties with many other texts. The dark formulation of the title and the use of the narrator's strategic lies as framing references at the beginning and the end of the text enable him not to mind the lack of restraint, Kurtz's major defect, and to take his African tale to its most extreme conclusions. The heads that decorate Kurtz's house may then peacefully reflect lack of restraint, such lack is first and foremost anticipated in the rhetoric of the text and emanates also from the "company's offices" in the "whited sepulchre" (Brussels) which is not named in the text. Consequently, the narrator's emphasised duty is discursive first, which makes Marlow the double look "like an emissary of light, something like a lower sort of apostle ( )". His language sets a blurring frontier between language and reality as the lexical choice ('enemies', 'criminals' 'rebels' implies double meaninglessness to the savages' perception and absurd in Marlow's. Language is here disengaged from reality to attenuate violence but also to raise the indignation of the other to the European. The question may be asked to know to what purpose Marlow lies to the brick-maker and to the Intended. The former makes him perceive a void between him and his narrative and the latter helps him construct truth and lies at once, and to be bold enough to face his psychological illness. This is what makes him accept to see himself in the mad Kurtz, though in a more than absurd way, realize that apparently dissimilar things amount to the same reality. Therefore, the obvious contradiction within the same discourse, the altered perception of truth also obliterates the apparent differences between the civilized and the savage to such a point that evolution does never make of the former an improved version of the latter. Marlow's questionable belief in the unbridgeable differences between "them and us" does not prevent the epiphanic confirmation of their resemblance when language barriers are removed. The undermining of primary discourses in the two novels confirms Walter Benjamin remark (qtd, by Greaney (71) that "there is no document of civilization which is not a document of barbarism".
If Achebe is right to assert that *Heart of Darkness* dehumanizes Africa, his voice does not sound like an articulate construction of a different state of mind that favours mutual understanding, i.e., peace without violence of a kind. Moreover peoples and cultures always go through periods of alternating violence and peace which arbitrary language formulates endlessly. Greaney is right to remark that, at all events, Achebe’s “humanitarian decency is no substitute for articulate opposition to empire and the racism that nourishes it” (p.71). Conrad’s novel, modernist in many ways, referring to multiple traditions and historical experiences, exposing different “I”- so many features characteristic of discourse, cannot be reduced to first impressions in permanent conflict with inferiority complex. Achebe’s itself is the blending of so many traditions that justify a bold representation of the somewhat same reality in a way that presents Africa as a dark continent. The point is that man needs violence to get peace and always makes peace turn into violence. This seems to be the law of the universe; this is the most permanent feature of human language, which constructs significance from dialogic oppositions. Moreover, Conrad’s narrator does not seem to endorse, as Said believes in *Culture and Imperialism*, the Eurocentric worldview as being the norm. The Africans noiselessness, when they howl and shriek, is the best illustration of both uttered language barrier and violent quest for peace in deeds and perceptions, in fact, for the peace of the mind from both sides. As a result, the denegation of their howling, shrinking and jabbering as language only reflects misunderstanding of the other.

Misunderstanding of the other often leads to his perception as a monkey, a species so far below man’s auto-constructed status. Important enough, such act of status reduction cannot be Conrad’s if Marlow’s incoherent narration is once again taken into account, which does not invalidate the statement that we are always the “monkey” to somebody. The Harlequin’s attitude, who confesses that he does not “understand the dialect of this tribe” (*HD*, 137) is a recognition of languages differences and not the relegation of non-European languages to the status of what Robert Hampson calls “pre-verbal, pre-syntactic sound”5 (qtd by Greaney, 71). *Heart of Darkness* is then the subtle recognition of cultural and linguistic differences, not always with prejudices and misconceptions as Achebe’s reaction seems to demonstrate.

On the other hand, there is Achebe’s very debatable understanding of Kurtz’s psychological or even moral disintegration, as may be reflected in his physical degradation. Such disintegration seems to be, once again, the result of epiphany, the awareness of the awful attribute of truth, the pitiful truth of man’s violent destiny in total disharmony with his aspirations. And this amounts to a myth that does never come true unless there is no
knowledge. In *Philosophy of the Unconsciousness*, Hartman demonstrates that knowledge is always associated with unhappiness. Kurtz realizes the gap between desire, which is shaped by experience and knowledge, and possibilities whereas the reader may be surprised by the gap between his voice and real presence. In both cases, great expectations and dreams often result in frustrations. Nevertheless and whatever the world, it always allows the dream of eternal presence. The resulting instability reproduces the features of language, unstable in the sense that Kurtz’s voice is more a hypothesis than a reality.

III. CONCESSIONS

The intertextual study of *Heart of Darkness* and *Things Fall Apart* shows that to tell a story does consist in both telling the story of one’s language and culture and making aspirations ensure peace of mind and turn into nightmares. Language, which is the first factor of integration in a community, is here associated with violence against oneself and against the other, in both cases for the sake of peace. In this context, consciousness is figured out as a set of contradictions: language makes the individual feel like another to another; violence is the prerequisite of peace and vice versa. The dream to return to the mother’s womb never comes true. In such contexts, it might be suggested that a common universal language may reduce violence and increase peace. However, linguists will assert that Common Universal Language does not lead to the elimination of the brute, which undoubtedly makes of man another to his other due to factors related to experience, culture and traditions; and that neither does the understanding of the other’s language end mutual mimicry, violent in essence though a strong factor of peace. Finally, that language arbitrary quality guarantees peace but also mutual conflicting discourses. In any case, linguists may also take it for granted that keeping existing languages to preserve cultures and support inter-communities jokes, which is characteristic of most African cultural areas may reduce world violence, that is to say world peace as the latter will have an impact on the common universal language.

In a paper read at the Moscow Africanists’ Conference in May 08, Dr Abdul Aziz Diop\(^6\) quotes an acquaintance who asserts that Saudi Arabia is the only country where a Black person may be looked in the eyes and called “Abd”, that is to say, in George Lakoof’s “Frames” perspective, “slave, inhuman, worthy of nothing, deserving of every physical abuse, owned, liable to be sold”, without punitive consequences. He consequently asks the following questions: “When does prejudice turn into discrimination? When does prejudice remain idle?
When do people who are not otherwise prejudiced discriminate? Better yes, how come some people display neither prejudice nor discrimination? How do our worldview, prejudice and discrimination shape our political philosophy and diplomatic approaches? (p.12)

In the light of the two texts full of discriminating prejudices, any answer that does not take into account the alien perspective of the “implied” writers and readers finds it difficult to grasp the recurrent concern for peace behind the more or less violent language. Conrad constructs his “real national identity” as both the equivalent of Western historical light but he is not mindless of the historical oppression which allows identification with the oriental speech communities to which he actually belongs. This is where the voiceless savage violence of Africans and women recall both personal and universal horror in opposition to peaceful aspirations and once again, vice versa. If Things Fall Apart is also torn between playing roles and expressing common features with Heart of Darkness, Achebe does not construct an influential model for the international community. The best illustration of his apparent imitation of a role model provided by recent western culture seems to be found in his masterpiece Anthills of the Savannah, where ideological fascination turns into women empowerment that destroys a social equilibrium grounded in gender differences. Here is, in African terms, an abdication to a model intended to be accepted as fundamental change, a change that favours exclusively the so-called western frame of mind. The framing references of Conrad’s text are, as already mentioned, more open to possibilities. Such possibilities accentuate man’s tragic consciousness to see his dreams turn into nightmares more often than not. In the final analysis, telling a story grounded in hallucinating experience has a false cathartic effect if Hartman’s assertion is taken into account. Shakespeare’s statement in Midsummer Night Dream that man is a fool if he goes to tell his dream? shows all the multifaceted relevance and paradoxical aspect of the language of peace. Therefore, consciousness emphasizes the gaps between ideals and lacks, it is then the privilege of those whose language is flexible enough to go beyond immediate surroundings. The silence of Achebe’s text in this area accounts for prejudices and much more language-biased construction of the other to the western.

CONCLUSION

Heart of Darkness and Things Fall Apart are undoubtedly woks in dialogue and construct relevant language issues on more score than one. Undoubtedly, the appealing textual
indeterminacy of the former is opposed to the latter’s more than explicit authorial intention to restore African ancient dignity and pride, and to expose the falsehood of imperial discourse. In other words, borrowed English language is the weapon against racist constructions but also the powerful non-Western means of conquering peace, though violently. Marlow realizes that language is an important rhetorical weapon though truth cannot be easily found out, which makes in any case exterritorial practitioners conquer a peace of a kind and acquire a new status in their new language community where apparently they free themselves from the imperialist’s discourse and the negative voice of colonialism. In this respect, whether humanitarian protests against the empire serve the purposes of “the impotent liberal conscience of imperialism” (Greaney, 67) or not, the textual dynamics of Heart of Darkness privileges mutual understanding based on western values, which does not mean anything if language is not taken into account. True enough, the implied meaning of such understanding privileges the former at the moral expense of the other, but it does confirm the impact of what many critics of Heart of Darkness associate with “The horror! The horror” at the end Kurtz’s traumatic experience which redeems Western and human acknowledged savagery. Heart of Darkness disturbs because it exposes the reader to barbarism and prevents any denunciation of the horror and “for good or evil mine (Marlow’s) is the speech that cannot be silenced” (HD, 97). Language becomes unspeakable when it tries to disguise violence, which it always does, to make the critic go where Marlow fears to, or where the narrator of Things Fall Apart masks truth in poetic justice. In both cases, gaps make readers reinvent Kurtz and Okonkwo’s communities out of violence for personal peace. The answers to the issues raised in the two novels require intertextual language complicity for world peace.

Notes


He said to Henley: ‘Look here. I write with such difficulty: my intimate, automatic less expressed thoughts are in Polish; when I express myself with care I do it in French. When I write, I think in French and then translate the words of my thoughts into English. This is an impossible process for one desiring to make a living by writing in the English language…’.

2. George Steiner, Extraterritorial: Papers on Literature and the Language Literature, London: Faber and Faber, 1972, pp. 3-11 (qtd by GREANEY, 1)


5. Hampson, Robert, "Heart of Darkness" and "The Speech that cannot be silenced", *English* 39, Spring 1990, pp. 17-18

6. Associate Professor of Linguistics and Head of the Department of English and Modern Languages, Delaware State University, Dover. (Forthcoming Publication)

7. "I have had a most rare vision. I have had a dream past the wit of man to say what dream it was. *Man is but an ass if he go about t'expound this dream.* Methought I was—there is no man can tell what. Methought I was, and methought I had—but man is but a patched fool if he will offer to say what methought I had. The eye of man hath not heard, the ear of man hath not seen, man's hand is not able to taste, his tongue to conceive, nor his heart to report what my dream was. I will get *Peter Quince to write a ballad of this dream*. It shall be called ‘*Bottom's Dream*, because it hath no bottom’. (MSND)
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