


LORD JIM: BETWEEN SHAME AND GUILT

Marek Pacukiewicz

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9420-1107>

(University of Silesia, Poland)

Abstract: Trying to classify the cultural patterns of behaviour, modern anthropology offers the distinction between “shame cultures” (which rely on external sanctions for good behaviour) and “guilt cultures” (which internalize the conviction of sin). Correspondingly, shame and guilt create specific ethos and therefore could be treated as factors indicating cultural meaning and function of the notion of honour in different cultural contexts. The article is an attempt to analyse the role of guilt and shame phenomena in the creation of Joseph Conrad’s *Lord Jim*.

Keywords: Joseph Conrad, *Lord Jim*, shame, guilt, narcissism

1

Beginning with the notion of cultural pattern understood by Franz Boas’ pupils as the configuration of cultural traits which differ from one another in particular contexts, and further developed by Lévi-Strauss’ concept of binary oppositions common to all people but fitted to different realities, cultural anthropology is founded on the fundamental idea of common factors which are the substance of different cultures receiving particular forms. Shame and guilt could be treated as the exemplification of such factors.

The biological background of shame (psychologically conditioned complex of somatic symptoms) and its extra-biological dimensions is taken into consideration both from the contextual and universal perspective by anthropological research. Therefore, shame regulates the transformation of physiology in culture¹ and becomes an indicator of the common knowledge of rules significant to a particular community

¹ See Jurij Łotman, “O semiotyce pojęć ‘wstyd’ i ‘strach’ w mechanizmie kultury (tezy),” trans. Jerzy Faryno, in *Semiotyka kultury*, eds. Elżbieta Janus and Maria Renata Mayenowa (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1975), p. 203.

within culture.² Ruth Benedict has distinguished between the cultures relying on shame and the cultures relying on guilt:

A society that inculcates absolute standards of morality and relies on men's developing a conscience is a guilt culture by definition, but man in such a society may [...] suffer in addition from shame when he accuses himself of *gaucheries* which are in no way sins. [...] In a culture where shame is a major sanction, people are chagrined about acts which we expect people to feel guilty about. This chagrin can be very intense and cannot be relieved, as guilt can be, by confession and atonement.³

The type of social community is paired with this double ethos:

True shame cultures rely on external sanctions for good behavior, not, as true guilt cultures do, on an internalized conviction of sin. Shame is reaction to other people's criticism. A man is shamed either by being openly ridiculed and rejected or by fantasizing to himself that he has been made ridiculous. In either case it is a potent sanction. But it requires an audience or at least a man's fantasy of an audience. Guilt does not.⁴

In the context drawn by Benedict two aspects of shame should be stressed. Firstly, shame cultures are axiologically homogenic.⁵ Similar way of rationing can be observed in Łotman when he distinguishes between the cultural effect of shame and the cultural effect of fear: the first one effects "from the inside" of social group and creates social bond, the second one is applied from the outside.⁶ Then, it comes as no surprise that shame is strongly related to honour (in Greek culture there is the same word for shame and honour – *aidos* – and for Aristotle honour is a kind of fear of shame). Secondly, both rational and emotional factors are important in creating the sense of shame. As a man's ability to imagine its effect on the structure of culture, shame requires a general knowledge of context, which is not distanced as a sign of personal involvement.⁷

Western culture is historically developed from the notion of shame, and the importance of the sense of honour is a sufficient proof in this case. But the attitude of Western societies to shame also changes historically. Ewa Kosowska notices a peculiar contemporary "enantiodynamia" within the cultural phenomenon of shame, which is no more a positively ranked feature, but something which could be perceived as a negative boundary of human being. Therefore, referring to Erich Fromm's categories of negative and positive freedom, Kosowska points out to the "freedom from shame" and the "freedom to shame." The first one is a kind of freedom from nature, but also from any cultural norm (it is close to Freud's concept of culture as the "origin

² See Eugeniusz Jaworski, "Wstyd jako kategoria typologiczna," in *Wstyd w kulturze. Zarys problematyki*, ed. Ewa Kosowska (Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 1998), p. 41.

³ Ruth Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword. Patterns of Japanese Culture* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1947), pp. 222-223.

⁴ Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum*, p. 223.

⁵ See Jaworski, *Wstyd jako kategoria typologiczna*, p. 46.

⁶ See Łotman, "O semiotyce pojęć," p. 203.

⁷ See Jaworski, *Wstyd jako kategoria typologiczna*, p. 44.

of discontents”); the second means an approval for the value of cultural attempt to create common standards for safe coexistence.⁸

Recapitulating this general characteristics of cultural function of shame I would like to indicate four main features of shame, which would be helpful in further analysis of the significance of the notion in *Lord Jim*: 1. shame is always a kind of “inner regulator”⁹ of an individual within structure of values and norms of particular culture; 2. shame is a tool for consolidating social group; 3. shame is a sign of personal – both rational and emotional – involvement; 4. nevertheless (or maybe therefore) shame should be considered as a positive rather than negative feature.

2

In the important sketch entitled “Five Interpretations of *Lord Jim*,” Stefan Zabierowski discusses various approaches to the novel which he classifies five types of interpretation: biographical, genetic (national), psychological, ethical and aesthetic approaches. For Zabierowski writing about *Lord Jim* every circle of interpretation is important within the hermeneutic perspective: only syncretic interpretation that would combine all these methods is able to give justice to the true value of this masterpiece.¹⁰ To summarize, for the hermeneutic approach both sources of inspiration are equally important. These are cultural context and literary tradition. Thus, the interpretation of the “guilt and shame problem” in *Lord Jim* should be inspired by all these circles of interpretation.

Ian Watt’s famous interpretation of *Lord Jim* seems crucial for the problem. Watt points out that *Lord Jim* – through Jim’s trial – is the narration of guilt and shame. The critic offers a psychological interpretation, suggesting that Jim’s shame is the effect of the failure to live up to his ego-ideal. He does not see his transgression as guilt, but more as a personal underachievement: “From the very beginning Jim puzzles and annoys Marlow largely because he apparently feels no guilt at having transgressed the mariner’s code.”¹¹

According to Zdzisław Najder’s interpretation of *Lord Jim* as a “romantic tragedy of honour,” Joanna Skolik proposes the interpretation closer to the context of Polish and European heritage of Joseph Conrad. Analysing the ideal of fidelity in Conrad’s work, Skolik finds in the novel “...a conflict between ethics and psychology” which is visible in the narrative structure “...in the juxtaposition of different attitudes,

⁸ See Ewa Kosowska, “Wstyd. Konotacje antropologiczne,” in *Wstyd w kulturze*, p. 61.

⁹ Kosowska, “Wstyd,” p. 58.

¹⁰ Stefan Zabierowski, *Conrad w perspektywie odbioru. Szkice* (Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Morskie, 1979), p. 8.

¹¹ Ian Watt, *Conrad in the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley–Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979), p. 343.

values, and viewpoints.”¹² In the interpretation Jim’s fidelity to Romantic vision of the world with its notion of honour is emphasized. Therefore, the opposition between shame and guilt is maintained: “The concept of honour cannot be separated from the concept of shame (the concept of guilt can): so Jim realises that he has lost his face, he feels ashamed; though in the very beginning of inquiry Jim does not admit his guilt.”¹³

Both interpretations articulate the sense of shame in Jim’s attitude to Patna’s incident and the world in general. Nevertheless, in the juxtaposition of shame and guilt there are two competing contexts visible: social mariner’s code and Romantic viewpoint focused on an individual.

Michael Greaney’s interpretation of Jim’s shame is built more on the esthetic aspects of the novel: embarrassment is “...part of the experience of reading *Lord Jim*” building the structure of novel, however is not easy to define (in the novel Greaney finds half-a-dozen near-synonyms).¹⁴ Nonetheless, he upholds the opposition between guilt as moral culpability and shame as personal failure. But Greaney is also very unequivocal about Jim’s attitude, stating that in Jim’s case shame is “...nothing more than a form of narcissistic self-pity.”¹⁵ This opinion gives us a very interesting trail for further interpretation of the novel in the context of modernity as a kind of culture of narcissism.

The term was coined by Christopher Lasch for the description of American society transformation process in the second half of 20th century, but I think it can be extended to Western modernity in general. Lasch claims that “for the narcissist, the world is a mirror”¹⁶, but “Narcissus drowns in his own reflection, never understanding that it is a reflection. The point of the story is not that Narcissus falls in love with himself but since he fails to recognize his own reflection he lacks any conception of the difference between himself and his surroundings.”¹⁷ In my opinion this perspective describes Jim’s case very well: he perceives the world as a potential chance for self-realising, which undermines his sense of common ethos.

Jim’s narcissism manifests itself in talkativeness bringing to mind Foucauldian “anthropological sleep” of “humanity”: “Jim’s experience and the conflict intentions and acts are for him just a pretext for never-ending interpretations of his own existential situation. [...] the efficiency of Jim’s rhetoric is a way of transforming reality by detailed and subtle interpretations of his existence in a very broad, universal sense as a kind of ‘human’ fate.”¹⁸ In narcissistic manner Jim refers “all knowledge back to the

¹² Joanna Skolik, *The Ideal of Fidelity in Conrad’s Works* (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2009), p. 62.

¹³ Skolik, *The Ideal of Fidelity*, p. 66.

¹⁴ Michael Greaney, “‘Lord Jim’ and Embarrassment,” *The Conradian* 25, no. 1 (Spring 2000), p. 2.

¹⁵ Greaney, “‘Lord Jim’ and Embarrassment,” p. 3.

¹⁶ Christopher Lasch, *Culture of Narcissism. American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations* (New York–London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991), p. 10.

¹⁷ Lasch, *Culture of Narcissism*, p. 241.

¹⁸ Marek Pacukiewicz, “Conrad’s Uncovering ‘Homo Duplex’ Camouflage,” in *Camouflage. Secrecy and Exposure in Cultural and Literary Studies*, eds. Wojciech Kalaga, Marcin Mazurek and Marcin Sarnek (Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2014), pp. 132-133.

truths of man himself,"¹⁹ becoming "homo duplex" figure of ambivalent episteme of modern humanism transgressing the borders between man and the world, and transforming man in a kind of *copula mundi* of this new world.

Greaney points out parallel transitions both within the structure of the novel and within the cultural context surrounding it. The "structural embarrassment" takes us to "the limits of the narratable": "For all its undeniable narrative virtuosity, the novel retains a certain awkwardness of construction, seen chiefly in its notorious broken-backed structure. There is something rather clumsy and indecisive in the way the text continually announces and then postpones its own ending"²⁰. Despite this, "break" in *Lord Jim* (i.a. on two "halves," Marlow's oral yarn continued in letter) is not a sign of authorial incompetence, but "deeply symptomatic of its place in cultural history," therefore the novel "provides a record of cultural moment when realism was being hived off into the dialectically opposed realms of highbrow Modernism and the populist, mass culture."²¹

I think aesthetic diagnosis should be accompanied by the analysis of creation of the new world in which, perhaps, shame and guilt mingle and are confused because of the new "humanly" narcissistic perspective cutting short the relation between man and his world.

3

Instead of wondering whether *Lord Jim* is a shame-novel or a guilt-novel, I would rather like to trace some subtle but meaningful tensions and inversions between these two notions and cultural patterns accompanying them through Marlow's narration.

Seemingly it is shame which dominates the novel. There are many psychophysical signs proving it, like notorious blushing of the main character: "Red faces are everywhere in *Lord Jim*."²² Very often Marlow gives us detailed description of Jim's embarrassment, just as if he deliberately wanted to convince us that Jim is deeply ashamed: he attends inquiry with "burning cheeks" (17)²³; meeting Marlow for the first time, when he realizes that words "wretched cur" were not thrown at him, "The red of his fair, sunburnt complexion deepened suddenly under the down of his cheeks, invaded his forehead, spread to the roots of his curly hair. His ears became intensely crimson, and even the clear blue of his eyes was darkened many shades by the rush of blood to his head" (46). Despite noticing these signs of shame, Marlow interprets

¹⁹ Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of Human Sciences* (London–New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 373.

²⁰ Greaney, "'Lord Jim' and Embarrassment," p. 10.

²¹ Greaney, "'Lord Jim' and Embarrassment," p. 11.

²² Greaney, "'Lord Jim' and Embarrassment," p. 7.

²³ All quotations from edition: Joseph Conrad, *Lord Jim. An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds, Sources, Essays in Criticism*, eds. Norman Sherry and Thomas Moser (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1968).

Jim's attitude differently: "he made so much of his disgrace while it is the guilt alone that matters" (107). It is striking that this opinion is not consistent with Jim's feelings: "Was ever there any one so shamefully tried?" (64), he asks himself, but we shall remember Marlow's commentary expressed shortly thereafter: "he managed wonderfully to convey the brooding rancour of his mind into the bare recital of events" (65). That is why the question I would ask here is whether Jim's embarrassment could be interpreted as manifestation of shame at all.

Let us return to the two blush-situations recalled in two of the above quotations. During the inquiry Jim's cheeks burn, but the narrator puts it also in another, more euphemistic, way, describing the atmosphere of the hearing: "Outside the court the sun blazed – within was the wind of great punkahs that made you shiver, the shame that made you burn, the attentive eyes whose glance stabbed" (18). Obviously, all is focused on Jim, but there is a strong impression of some impersonal force which could intoxicate *you* during the inquiry (and there are two nautical assessors with red faces). We can suppose then that Jim's case is not his private shame, but also it is potentially the shame for the whole community of seamen. On the contrary, when Jim blushes during the incident with a yellow dog, "looking forward to the hammering he was going to give" Marlow, he was probably looking for "rehabilitation, appeasement," and maybe expected some kind of "relief" from "this chance of a row" (46). Paradoxically, shame is reduced here only to one person – Jim who does not care for common matter; moreover, he is looking for some redemption, but this fact is – according to Ruth Benedict cited above – specific rather to the guilt, not to the shame culture, where *chagrin* cannot be relieved by confession and atonement. And this is rather a confession that Marlow presumed Jim was expecting from him: "Didn't I tell you he confessed himself before me as though I had the power to bind and loose? He burrowed deep, deep, in the hope of my absolution, which would have been of no good to him" (59-60).

It is interesting to compare Jim's embarrassment with shame declared by other characters of the novel, especially Marlow and Stein. The former admits: "I couldn't stand poor Captain Brierly; I tell with shame" (37); and Stein, worrying about Jim, is irritated with Marlow's and his own inactivity: "It was a shame, he said. There we were sitting and talking like two boys, instead of putting our heads together to find something practical – a practical remedy – for the evil – for the great evil – he repeated, with a humorous and indulgent smile" (131). Of course, it can be said that common sense and irony can be detected in these words, but in my opinion they mark the sense of loyalty to community and a kind of fraternity.

Moreover, when shame is strongly connected with social emotions (as it was specified above), knowledge overwhelms social emotions which is the case with Jim. At the very beginning of the novel, Jim is characterized through the rescue operation at the sea during his stay on a training-ship: "He knew what to think of it. Seen dispassionately, it seemed contemptible. He could detect no trace of emotion in himself, and the final effect of a staggering event was that, unnoticed and apart from the noisy crowd of boys, he exulted with fresh certitude in his avidity for adventure, and in

a sense of many sided courage” (7). Here we see Jim, distanced from the community of seamen, his passivity being compensated with imagination.

Eventually, we cannot find in Jim’s attitude any of the above mentioned traits of cultural shame: shame is only for *his* disgrace, it is also narcissistically focused on the individual and not connected with the ethos of social group, but rather with the imagination of an isolated ego-self; we do not find any emotional bond between him and the outside world, and this is the reason why Jim is ashamed of his shame and finds his shame a trace of his weakness.

In Jim’s dealing with his transgression we can also observe a very specific inversion between shame and guilt. Jim feels shame as blot on the escutcheon, but he believes that he can reach relief through atonement, redeeming the guilt. Although he thinks of the inquiry contemptuously, he submits to the sentence; nevertheless, “no man ever understands quite his artful dodges to escape from the grim shadow of self-knowledge” (49), comments Marlow.

“This is a disgrace,” (42) judges Brierly (whose suicide committed shortly thereafter proves his disappointment with the façade of his own ego, incompatible with ideal ethos). “He was guilty,” (92) simply states Marlow. Jim is ashamed of disgrace which undermines his public esteem. To put it another way: Jim’s shame is just a simple reaction to the inquiry, which he treats as the way of paying the debt through the law; but his inner sense is telling him that his transgression was just an accident with no impact on his character, his very self, even during the stay at Patusan, would argue that Patna’s incident “proved nothing” (186). He seems to be ethically self-sufficient in a narcissistic way: “But I knew the truth, and I would live it down – alone, with myself” (80-81). That is why he expects the world will see in him the man, not the fact, and is ashamed by the common opinion proved by dramatic events on the Patusan that the Patna incident is “a disgrace to human nature” (117). However, Jim’s remedy is the escape and total isolation from the cultural context surrounding him.

4

Patusan is Jim’s ideal chance, but we shall remember that this is a kind of expansion of “light holiday literature” (4) which determined his vision of honour and heroism. That is why we can observe a structural discontinuity within the novel: “Jim’s romantic dreams of heroism, which were exposed as the stuff of naïve escapist fantasy in the first part of the novel, are spectacularly fulfilled in the second.”²⁴ That is why the second part reminds “the schoolboy adventure fiction.”²⁵ Patusan seems to be the projection of Jim’s imagery, as if it has never existed.

The cross-cultural encounters in *Lord Jim* are broadly analysed by scholars who prove that Conrad has consciously constructed narration “of a complex conjuncture

²⁴ Greaney, “‘Lord Jim’ and Embarrassment,” p. 10.

²⁵ Greaney, “‘Lord Jim’ and Embarrassment,” p. 10.

of radically divergent cultural categories,” and “produces a colonialist discourse but works to problematise that discourse both through objectifying it and through acknowledging the existence of other histories and other cultures.”²⁶ That is way “This is not simply a cross-cultural encounter between Europeans and indigenes; neither European culture nor indigenous culture is simple and homogenous.”²⁷ This experience undermines Jim’s identity: “In the crossing of cultures that leaves Jim suspended between two incongruous cultural contexts, the absence of his own ‘proper’ name marks a difficulty of affiliation which no additional title can resolve.”²⁸ As Christopher GoGwilt puts it, the absence of Jim’s “proper” name and the ambiguity of Marlow’s “one of us” build “a succession of inadequate frames of reference to designate Jim’s affiliation to a larger community.”²⁹

Yet, it is essential that for Jim Patusan and its people are a kind of cultural vacuum, a blank space for the construct of his ideal of character, meaning for him just as much as it underpins his ego. Just because “He appeared like a creature not only of another kind but of another essence” (140), Patusan is for Jim “a chance he had been dreaming of” (141), “the land he was destined to fill with the fame of his virtues” (149), and “that is why he seemed to love the land and the people with a sort of fierce egoism, with a contemptuous tenderness” (152). It is just the lack of significant context (or the lack of Jim’s awareness of its importance) what makes a room for a “universal” idea: “His loneliness added to his stature. There was nothing within sight to compare him with” (166).

Probably it can be said that Jim has brought to its limit the enlightenment notion of the universal nature of man, which he has been taught by his father, “the good old parson”: “Virtue is one all over the world, and there is only one faith, one conceivable conduct of life, one manner of dying” (207). “The point, however, is that of all mankind Jim had no dealings but with himself” (206), and it effected in construction of the artificial world out of this exotic land. But such “exalted egoism,” “pitiless wedding with shadowy ideal of conduct” (253) causes definitive catastrophe: “He had retreated from one world, for a small matter of an impulsive jump, and now the other, the work of his own hands, had fallen in ruins upon his head” (248).

Nevertheless, cultural difference and resemblance still defines axiological horizon of Jim’s cosmos at Patusan. That is why Marlow perceives Dain Waris as a kind of a shadow casted by Jim: “He had not Jim’s racial prestige and the reputation of invincible, supernatural power. He was not the visible, tangible incarnation of unflinching truth and of unflinching victory. Beloved, trusted, and admired as he was, he was still one of *them*, while Jim was one of *us*” (220). On the contrary, when Gentleman Brown seeks the cultural bond of similarities: “common blood,” “common experience,” “common guilt” (235) – Jim responses to this call of white man. Paradoxically,

²⁶ Robert Hampson, *Cross-cultural Encounters in Joseph Conrad’s Malay Fiction* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2000), pp. 144-145.

²⁷ Hampson, *Cross-cultural Encounters*, p. 144.

²⁸ Christopher GoGwilt, *The Invention of the West. Joseph Conrad and Double-Mapping of Europe and Empire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), p. 89.

²⁹ GoGwilt, *The Invention of the West*.

it is Brown who sees through Jim's deceptive sense of community: "You have been white once, for all your tall talk of this being your own people and you being one with them. Are you?" (232). That is why for Brown he was "fraud" (209), just like for Jewel, a deserted fiancé, "he was false" (213).

Jim was dependent on the context he has ignored: "I must stick to their belief in me to feel safe and to-to'... he cast about for a word, seemed to look for it on the sea... 'to keep in touch with'... his voice sank suddenly to a murmur... 'with those whom, perhaps, I shall never see any more'" (203). So the land and the people, even his beloved Jewel, are nothing but mirror subordinated to his image of ideal ego. Objectified and equated with reflection, they are still distant: "I've got to look only at the face of the first man that comes along to regain my confidence. They can't be made to understand what is going on in me. What of that?," claims Jim. That is why he becomes a very isolated man, or, as Brown harshly puts it, "confounded, immaculate, don't-you-touch-me sort of fellow" (234).

This specific, symbiotic but still ethnocentric relation with the other depends on a complex shift between different perspectives, which is something more than just seeing one with someone else's eyes. It resembles the great paradigm and at the same time the paradox of modern European anthropology, which for Eduardo Viveiros de Castro is a kind of anthropophagy: in Jim's attitude to Patusan we find the same "cannibal internalization of the other as condition of the externalization of the self, a self that sees itself."³⁰ Within the structure of narration of *Lord Jim* the interchangeable perspective between shame and guilt from the first part of the novel corresponds to the shift between the self and the other in the second part of it. Just like shame is a kind of disguise for downplayed guilt, Patusan becomes the incarnation of self-realised ego-ideal. In both cases ignoring context makes the triumph of the individual possible, but eventually it effects in isolation.

5

Although *Lord Jim* is being a novel very cautious in reassuming human nature and even critical towards absolutizing any idea of conduct, still, it addresses values "authentic, verifiable, acceptable."³¹ Conrad is not interested in analysing pure ideas, he rather explores borders upon which cultural patterns of behaviour collide with different, usually liminal, contexts. And there is one more shift of perspective, the authorial one, between Poland and England, which also specifies the dynamics of relation between shame and guilt in the novel.

Conrad was a "homo duplex" placed between Poland and England, the sea and literature, highly aware of the cultural impact of tradition on the formation of every

³⁰ Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *Cannibal Metaphysics*, transl. and ed. Peter Skafish (Minneapolis: Univocal Publishing, 2014), p. 176. Although perspectivism could be great inspiration for Conrad studies, it could be only mentioned here.

³¹ Zabierowski, *Conrad w perspektywie odbioru*, pp. 123-124.

single individual. Of course, it does not make *Lord Jim* a “Polish” novel, but we can find in the text some typical Polish dilemmas on the conflicting patterns of behaviour to choose from or the problematic relation between guilt, shame, and honour. We have to remember that Conrad formally represented the non-existent nation (because of the “crime of partition”). During the 19th century, an individual belonging to Polish tradition had to obey foreign law which in certain cases would not be adequate to the inner sense of moral or ethic conduct. It would result in the shifts between guilt and shame: transgression would have not been perceived as guilt, and subordination to the law would have been shameful. There were situations when the only point of reference in moral evaluation of behaviour was not the imposed social order introduced by foreign authorities, but the inner sense of honour.

And there is nothing unusual that during the Second World War we deal with the “experience of identification with the title character of *Lord Jim*.”³² The novel proposed the model of morality focused on an individual, but when in *Lord Jim* the ethos is conducted due to ignoring the context, during the Warsaw Uprising the ethos was in play despite the circumstances. When the contemporary, democratic Western culture has downplayed the shame as the cultural sanction having changed it into legal prohibitions,³³ the two of the above mentioned historical moments of Polish tradition have preserved the dynamics of shame. Conrad, referring to this dynamic model and its complicated conditioning, stated a question, making us answering it. That is why he is “one of us.”³⁴

WORKS CITED

- Benedict, Ruth. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword. Patterns of Japanese Culture*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1947.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Lord Jim. An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds, Sources, Essays in Criticism*. Edited by Norman Sherry and Thomas Moser. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1968.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of Human Sciences*. London–New York: Routledge, 2002.
- GoGwilt, Christopher. *The Invention of the West. Joseph Conrad and Double-Mapping of Europe and Empire*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.
- Greaney, Michael. “‘Lord Jim’ and Embarrassment.” *The Conradian* 25, no. 1 (Spring 2000).
- Hampson, Robert. *Cross-cultural Encounters in Joseph Conrad’s Malay Fiction*. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2000.
- Lasch, Christopher. *Culture of Narcissism. American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations*. New York–London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991.
- Łotman, Jurij. *O semiotyce pojęć „wstyd” i „strach” w mechanizmie kultury (tezy)*. Translated by Jerzy Faryno. In *Semiotyka kultury*. Edited by Elżbieta Janus and Maria Renata Mayenowa. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1975.

³² Stefan Zabierowski, “‘He Was One of Us.’ The Polish Reception of the Work of Joseph Conrad Korzeniowski,” *Yearbook of Conrad Studies (Poland)* 10 (2015), p. 179.

³³ Jaworski, *Wstyd jako kategoria typologiczna*, p. 50.

³⁴ Jaworski, *Wstyd jako kategoria typologiczna*, p. 189.

-
- Pacukiewicz, Marek, "Conrad's Uncovering 'Homo Duplex' Camouflage." In *Camouflage. Secrecy and Exposure in Cultural and Literary Studies*. Edited by Wojciech Kalaga, Marcin Mazurek, and Marcin Sarnek. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2014.
- Skolik, Joanna. *The Ideal of Fidelity in Conrad's Works*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2009.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. *Cannibal Metaphysics*. Translated and edited by Peter Skafish. Minneapolis: Univocal Publishing, 2014.
- Watt, Ian. *Conrad in the Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley–Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979.
- Wstyd w kulturze. Zarys problematyki*. Edited by Ewa Kosowska. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 1998.
- Zabierowski, Stefan. *Conrad w perspektywie odbioru. Szkice*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Morskie, 1979.
- . "'He Was One of Us.' The Polish Reception of the Work of Joseph Conrad Korzeniowski." *Yearbook of Conrad Studies (Poland)* 10 (2015).