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Introduction

In contemporary literary theory, Joseph Conrad has been a frequent subject of new historical and postcolonial studies. Due to the settings and the characters in his works, as well as the fact that the stories take place in Africa and the East, postcolonial critics have investigated his novels, *Heart of Darkness* and *Lord Jim* in particular, from a postcolonial perspective, and have tried to unveil hidden angles, and enhance the understanding of his works by applying terminology specific to the field. They have been very successful in doing so. For instance, Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* refers to a passage from *Heart of Darkness* when he discusses modern imperialism (4). Chinua Achebe in “An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*” has a more critical tone. He sees *Heart of Darkness* as the “desire – one might say, the need – in Western psychology to set Africa up as a foil to Europe, as a place of negations at once remote and yet vaguely familiar, in comparison with which Europe’s own state of spiritual grace will be manifest” (2).

However, the application of mythological or Jungian criticism can be equally fruitful especially in relation to Conrad’s other, more enigmatic works, such as “The Secret Sharer.” Arguably, a postcolonial approach may not be as rewarding with “The Secret Sharer” as it is with *Heart of Darkness*, due to the brevity of the story and the characterisation contained within. Therefore, this paper intends to carry out a Jungian reading of Conrad’s novella, “The Secret Sharer”.

Conrad’s significance in the canon of English literature is evident to anyone who has even a slight acquaintance with his novels. Not only is he skilful in expressing his ideas authentically in a language other than his mother tongue, but also his style in exploring and discovering the hidden parts of the human psyche under the guise of physical sea voyages is equally extraordinary. The latter may be somewhat attributable to his being an author of the fin de siècle, given that new theories of psychology had been, or were being formed at the time. Another issue that should not be ignored is his interest in inspecting far-flung places, which seems to parallel a desire to explore the human personality in its more extended reaches. To Europeans, the East and Africa represented the mysterious and the unknown. Due to this fact, as well as his personal experience in sailing the far seas, Conrad used these unfamiliar places as his setting in a number of works such as *Heart of Darkness*, *Lord Jim*, and “The Secret Sharer”, etc., to shed light on the mysterious
and unknown depths of human personality. Likewise, Conrad’s obsession with
the idea of ego and alter-ego, and with the discovery of the self (from a Jungian
outlook), is reflected in his characters and characterisation, the evidence for
which will be provided below. Thus, the Jungian school of psychology, Analytical
Psychology, and the terms and ideas adapted from it, will form the bedrock of this
paper, and new light will hopefully be shed on the dark realms of the human psyche
in Conrad’s masterpiece.

**The Secret Sharer: An Internal Journey**

After reading “The Secret Sharer,” some questions may occur to the reader, the
most important of which revolves around why the narrator (the unnamed captain
of the unnamed ship) allows Leggatt to come aboard the ship; why the captain
does not give Leggat up to the law after discovering that the latter has committed a
murder; why the captain takes the risk of hiding Leggat; and why the captain puts
his career and the ship under his command at stake for Leggatt’s sake.

Earlier, it was mentioned that the self was one of Conrad’s concerns. Eric
Tretheway, in his article on *Heart of Darkness*, argues that Conrad never ceased
to “worry throughout his career, […] of the possibility of shaping a ‘substantial’,
coherent self” (qtd. in Peters 61). Other commentators have also looked at Conrad’s
conception of the self. For example, influenced by Jungian psychology, John G.
Peters states that “Guérard saw the search for self as essentially an introspective
endeavour” (ibid). Likewise, Ian Watt states that it was not easy for Conrad to
choose the title for his story; he considered different titles such as “The Second
Self”, “The Secret Self”, “The Other Self”, and it was his agent who finally decided
on the title “The Secret Sharer” (128). All these titles clearly show that Conrad’s
mind was obsessed with the issue of the self. But what exactly is the self?

The self was one of the points on which Jung and Freud diverged. Generally
speaking, classical Freudian psychology rejects the idea of an absolute thing like the
self, and in this school of thought “the experience of psychic forces is understood
in terms of individual forces and powers (such as the sexual drive) which can, in
principle, be guided and directed by the ego”. On the other hand, Jung claims that
“the idea of the unknown self…is not under the control of the ego in any way, but
[...] is itself the ultimate, controlling power within (or around) the psyche” (Cox
166). Jung’s most important contribution is the ultimate archetype of unity and
totality which is the self. It is the internal tendency to create a balance among the
different and opposite aspects of the psyche. Jung believes: “if the unconscious
can be recognised as a co-determining factor along with consciousness, and if we
can live in such a way that conscious and unconscious demands are taken into
account as far as possible, then the centre of gravity of the total personality shifts
its position. It is no longer in the ego, which is merely the centre of consciousness,
but in the hypothetical point between conscious and unconscious. This new centre might be called the self" (in Storr 19).

In the first half of life, the ego tries to be identical with the self, and has the power of the self at its own mercy for its development. At this time, the ego might be inflated with the unreal sense of power, like that which is seen in young people. On the other hand, if the relation between the ego and the self is interrupted, estrangement and depression may occur. The self will develop after many years of trial and error, addressing internal opposites and contrasts. It is necessary for the development of the self that the other personality systems are advanced. Therefore, the archetype of the self will not manifest until the person becomes middle-aged. At this time the self strives to replace the ego in the centre of the unconscious, and seat itself between consciousness and the unconscious. However, not all are able to realise their true self. In mythology and literature, the hero is usually depicted as being on a quest through which he tries to find his true self. Commonly, he will meet different people and situations during this quest which are, in one way or another, symbols of various aspects of his own personality. For instance, he usually fights devils (his shadow), meets different women (his anima), solves riddles, and finally reaches (or not) what he is after—perfection. The venture is not successful unless he manages to render the diverse and negating forces into an equilibrium. Thus, the perfection he is looking for is finding his own self. It is no easy job and no one but the hero is expected to achieve it. And in some cases, the hero may also not attain perfection.

Although at the literal level it can simply be said that the ‘sharer’ in the title refers to Leggatt, since the captain saves him from water and hides him in his cabin—in other words, shares his room and clothes him—the title carries deeper meaning, with the feeling of sharing going beyond the surface level, related to something inside the captain. This is due to the significant role that characters and characterisation play for Conrad. Peters argues that Conrad uses other characters in relation to the protagonist (the self) to forge a self-other relationship through which the self is explored. In order to do this, Conrad uses two kinds of other: the other-unlike-self, and the other-like-self. As Peters explains, “Both are important because both help to define the self. The other-like-self defines what the self is; the other-unlike-self defines what the self is not” (64). They both help knowledge of the self to be obtained: “Whereas the relationship between self and other-unlike-self is one of dissimilarity, that between self and other-like-self is one of similarity, as the other-like-self confirms shared communal characteristics” (68-9). Therefore, it can be concluded that in “The Secret Sharer”, this relationship is of the self and other-like-self variety, which will be explained below.

As the narrator himself explains, he has been appointed to the command of the ship for two weeks, and does not know much about his ship nor its crew and, as a matter of fact, is the only stranger on board: “My position was that of the only stranger on board. I mention this because it has some bearing on what is to
follow. But what I felt most was my being a stranger to the ship; and if all the
truth must be told, I was somewhat of a stranger to myself” (“The Secret Sharer”
26). The last sentence is significant because it shows that the captain is in a state
of unrest. The fact that he does not know himself is so unbearable that it leaves
him sleepless. Watt argues that the tense psychological state of the captain is “a
plausible reason for his letting the exhausted crew turn in, and deciding that he
alone will keep watch on deck that night” (129). Likewise, J.I.M. Stewart points
out that it is the captain’s “strangeness” that makes him sleepless, and that “he
decides—very unconventionally—to set no anchor watch, and himself to remain
on deck during the earlier part of the night” (233). Thus, it is clear that the captain
is obsessed with the notion of knowing himself, which is, in Jungian terms, the key
to reaching the self and achieving mental order. The captain is appointed to the
command of the ship of his own self, as it were, with the archetypal ‘homeward’
sea journey being the quest to reach wholeness. This is not a physical and material
voyage, but a spiritual one.

The captain is looking for his self desperately. He confesses that his
strangeness, which was the cause of his sleeplessness, “had prompted that
unconventional arrangement,” as if he “had expected in those solitary hours of
the night to get on terms with the ship” (“The Secret Sharer” 21) of which he
knew nothing, full of men of whom he knew even less. It illustrates that he is
trying to make a connection between the known and unknown parts of his psyche.
As a result, a rope-ladder is left hanging over the side of the ship. Although he
becomes angry with the carelessness of his crew, he soon remembers: “I had
myself peremptorily dismissed my officers from duty, and by my own act had
prevented the anchor-watch being formally set and things properly attended to”
(28). It can be inferred that he has been consciously or unconsciously seeking a
way to make contact with his unknown part and, fittingly, the ladder becomes the
connector through which the captain meets Leggatt. The ladder, symbolically, can
be regarded as the mediator between the sea and the ship. The sea is an archetype of
the unconscious—especially the darkness that clings to it—and it is as significant as
the fact that the captain encounters Leggatt when there is no one else on the deck of
the ship. Albert Guérard believes that Conrad’s three works (“The Secret Sharer”,
Heart of Darkness and The Shadow Line) belong to “the first and best symbolist
masterpieces in English fiction” (14), and they all belong to the archetypal category
of the night journey. Guérard goes on to say that the night journey in “The Secret
Sharer” is undertaken in a rather more “unusually conscious” fashion (16). Thus it
would be in a symbolic sense, as well as in actual fact, that the captain first appears
at the starting point of a long journey. Indeed, the story’s opening and closing
scenes happen at night. And again, it is from the vast, dark sea that Leggatt, by
means of the rope-ladder, goes on board the ship.

The ship, therefore, can be taken to represent the consciousness of the captain.
The comparison of the size of the sea with the ship is related to the psychological
fact that the unconscious is much larger than those parts which belong to the realm of consciousness, which is why getting to know the unconscious is a key factor in reaching stability in life, and for the process of individuation to be fulfilled in a successful way. The captain has put his own soul under question, and starts a journey to discover the farthest sea of his self. The hesitating, undetermined captain in the beginning of the story turns into the self-confident commander by the end; as a matter of fact this voyage is a journey from innocence (we learn that he is the second youngest person on the ship, though his youth might symbolise the immaturity of his soul) to experience. But how does the captain go about reaching such an experience? As the young captain confronts his new surroundings and his untested role as captain, he questions his knowledge of the self. However, after communicating with Leggatt, he identifies with him and starts learning something of his own self. Peters argues that this is identification with the other-like-self: the captain feels that he has something in common with Leggatt and that is the reason why he lets him on the ship. If this was not the case, his allowing Leggatt, whom he sees for the first time and in that condition, to come on board the ship would be inexplicable. This leads to another significant archetype widely used by Jung, the shadow.

Jung believes that people will come across their shadows in dreams, reveries and even literature, but the important question is whether they consciously become aware of it. He points out that this process is not easy. “The shadow is usually the first archetype to be encountered during analysis” (Storr 87). What Jung means by the shadow is the negative side of the personality, the collection of all unpleasant qualities that man likes to hide, “together with the insufficiently developed functions and the contents of the personal unconscious” (“The Personal and the Collective Unconscious” 66). The shadow shows the unknown and little-known qualities of the ego, aspects that mainly belong to the personal sphere. However, it can also consist of “collective factors that stem from a source outside the individual’s personal life (“Approaching the Unconscious” 74). It is a difficult and painful task to face our less admirable qualities. But, as Barbara Hannah states, it would be “easy to do so, were it not for the fact that everything which falls into the unconscious becomes contaminated with other contents” (15). Hannah gives the example of the personal unconscious becoming contaminated with the collective shadow, with ‘collective’ referring to all psychic contents which belong to many people at the same time and are not peculiar to one individual. As long as one is aware of one’s personal shadow, it is attached to one’s ego like a real shadow to the body. However, Hannah states if one does not become aware of it, it falls into the unconscious, and can no longer be distinguished from the unconscious and especially from the collective shadow, which may even cause people to “fall into the error of regarding their personal shadow as the devil himself” (16).

The shadow is composed of those emotions and attitudes that we cannot adopt in ourselves. The shadow is usually the opposite of our persona, and contains
all characteristics which are not acceptable by our persona, whether favourable or
unfavourable. Sometimes, though not often, an individual feels compelled to live out
the worse side of his nature and to repress his better side. In such cases the
shadow appears as a positive figure in his dreams. But to a person who lives out
his natural emotions and feelings, the shadow may appear as a cold and negative
intellectual. It then personifies poisonous judgments and negative thoughts that
have been held back (Von Franz 182) Thus, it can be said that the shadow functions
as the opposite of the ego and the persona, including those qualities that one hates
very much in other people. Joseph Henderson in Man and His Symbols quotes
from Jung that the shadow which is cast by our conscious mind carries the hidden,
repressed and undesirable aspects of our personality (110). However this darkness
is not just the simple converse of the conscious ego. Like the ego, that has some
unwanted and destructive attitudes, the shadow contains some good, normal
instincts and creative impulses. Despite the fact that the shadow and the ego are
apart from each other, they are bound together in the same way as thought and
feeling.

However, Jung uses the term “the battle for deliverance” in order to refer to
the conflict between the shadow and the ego: “In the struggle for the primitive
man to achieve consciousness, this conflict is expressed by the contest between
the archetypal hero and the cosmic powers of evil, personified by dragons and
other monsters” (Henderson 110). Thus in myths and legends, the hero would fight
dragons, demons and negative forces of his own self, but personified and projected
onto evil creatures. But as we move forward to more recent and modern literature,
no more can one trace the dragons and demons. Instead, the evil creatures are
substituted with human characters, and even the single man becomes the battlefield
of different forces. The shadow is also supposed to be responsible for slips of the
tongue and other mistakes. Through these mistakes, the feelings and motives which
the conscious self disowns are revealed. Projection is the process which usually
takes place when the shadow is met, or in Jung’s words whenever people see their
own unconscious tendencies in other people. “Examinations of those attributes
which a man most condemns in other people (greed, intolerance, disregard for
others, etc) usually shows that, unacknowledged, he himself possesses them”
(Storr 87). In other words it is the part that man rejects and therefore does not allow
to manifest. In Jung’s opinion, dreams are the cause for one becoming familiar with
different aspects of one’s personality which were previously shunned for various
reasons. This is what Jung calls “the realisation of the shadow” (“The Structure
and Dynamics of the Psyche” 208). In dreams the shadow is projected onto a person
from the same sex, such as when a man dreams of a ferocious murderer or when a
woman sees a prostitute in her dreams.

Jung observed that his patients denied their shadow. He believed that one should
find a way to come to terms with one’s shadow: man’s psychic and physical health
depended on this. However, the acceptance of the shadow requires that many
ideals be pushed away because, according to Jung, in many cases these ideals and desires are too ambitious. “Everyone carries a shadow, and the less it is embodied in the individual’s conscious life, the blacker and denser it is. If an inferiority is conscious, one always has a chance to correct it” (Psychology and Religion 131). Jung argued that the repression and denial of the shadow make the unconscious stronger, therefore whenever something from the unconscious enters the realm of the consciousness, the unconscious assumes great power. Even though Jung makes the point that confessing and making conscious the repressed tendencies and less desirable aspects of personality does not rid us of them, it reduces the shadow’s violent effects: “The shadow becomes hostile only when he is ignored or misunderstood” (Von Franz 182). An instance of this can be the behaviour of the people whom we consider civil, during riots and chaotic situations. The captain says, “And then you speaking to me so quietly—as if you had expected me—made me hold on” (“The Secret Sharer” 25). The captain is unconsciously looking for himself, which parallels Guérard’s statement that in this story, the night journey takes place in a rather conscious way. In order to do so, the captain must see his shadow and let his shadow return to the surface. Therefore he sends all the crew away, and leaves the ladder unrolled on the side of the ship as if he is expecting someone, which in fact he is. He wants his shadow to be brought into the “consciousness” of the ship. However, it is not going to be easy and he feels worried and frightened at first. Later, Leggatt narrates the story of how he got to the ship and “met a little longer” (37), which also suggests the captain has started a conscious journey.

“Mystery” is the term attributed to Leggatt. The captain says, “I only climbed on the spare spar and leaned over the rail as far as I could, to bring my eyes nearer to that mystery floating alongside” (“The Secret Sharer” 29). He goes on to call Leggatt a “being appearing as if he had risen from the bottom of the sea” (ibid). Therefore, it can be said that this mysterious being from the depths of the sea is the shadow personality of the captain who has been swimming in the unconscious (the sea), but is suddenly brought to consciousness by the captain himself. On one level it can be said that Leggatt is a person with whom the captain identifies, and sees qualities in the former which he himself lacks. After Leggatt introduces himself, the captain says, “[his] voice was calm and resolute. A good voice. The self-possession of that man had somehow induced a corresponding state in myself” (“The Secret Sharer” 30). In reply to Leggatt’s question of whether “I am to let go the ladder and go on swimming till I sink from exhaustion, or to come on board here” (ibid), the narrator begins contemplating. Not allowing Leggatt to come on the ship and to let him sink resembles absolute repression. The captain has to decide whether he should turn a blind eye to his shadow, like many people do, or whether he should communicate with it. Nevertheless, there is something in Leggatt’s voice that the captain cannot ignore: “I felt this was no mere formula of desperate speech, but a real alternative in the view of a strong soul. I should have gathered from this that he was young; indeed, it is only the young who are ever confronted by such clear issues. But at the time it was pure intuition on my part. A
mysterious communication was established already between us two—in the face of that silent, darkened tropical sea. I was young too, young enough to make no comment” (ibid).

From this excerpt, one realises that the captain makes a comparison between Leggatt and himself; he views Leggatt as a strong soul unlike himself, which renders him incapable of having a strong influence on the crew of his ship. Although he is the captain of the ship, his actions make him far from one. On the other hand, Leggatt, who is in bad shape and has no command at all, looks resolute to him. What is interesting is that he concludes that the strength of Leggatt’s soul arises from its youth; yet conversely, he finally states that his own inability to govern the ship is due to his own young age. The point which he considers a source of power in Leggatt becomes a weakness in him. The captain's youth is reflected in his immaturity and inexperience, while Leggatt’s youth can be associated with untapped potential, which can be very helpful, if released in a controlled fashion. The mysterious sense of communication emerges because the captain sees some unused parts of himself in Leggatt, and through identification with him, he gradually becomes a self-possessed person.

As soon as Leggatt gets on board, the captain gives him one of his own sleeping-suits. “In a moment he had concealed his damp body in a sleeping-suit of the same grey-stripe pattern as the one I was wearing and followed me like my double on the poop,” as well as remarking that his “sleeping-suit was just right for his size” (“The Secret Sharer” 30). It is from this moment that he begins to frequently refer to the stranger as “my double”, “my other self”, “the secret sharer of my life”, “the unsuspected sharer of my cabin” and “my second self”, and very rarely just as Leggatt. The captain obviously feels some sense of similarity between himself and Leggatt. By dressing Leggatt with his sleeping-suit, they become identical in terms of physical appearance too, and it is almost impossible to distinguish one from the other. The grey colour of the suits represents the area where black and white mix, or the area where the conscious and the unconscious meet. It can be said, therefore, that Leggatt, who comes from the darkness of the sea, is the shadow and the secret self, while the captain represents the ego. In addition, the adjective that describes the suit as associated with night, adds to the dream-like effect of their meeting and supports the fact that this is an encounter with one’s dark self. Moreover, when the captain sees Leggatt in his own sleeping-suit on the ship, his initial negative impression of Leggatt’s appearance as a headless corpse changes:

He had rather regular features; a good mouth; light eyes under somewhat heavy, dark eyebrows; a smooth, square forehead; no growth on his cheeks; a small, brown moustache, and a well-shaped, round chin. His expression was concentrated, meditative, under the inspecting light of the lamp I held up to his face; such as a man thinking hard in solitude might wear (“The Secret Sharer” 30).
Obviously the captain has started a conscious exploration of his self. He has put Leggatt under "the inspecting light" of his curiosity to know his self, and by so doing, he realises that there are some positive aspects in one's shadow as well. What the captain does is in contrast to the common way of dealing with the problem of the shadow. Most simply deny its existence, since "the awareness of one's shadow brings guilt and tension and forces upon us a difficult psychological and spiritual task" (Sanford 58). The rejection and denial of the shadow is not the solution, and it even makes the situation worse, as one then loses contact with the positive aspects of one's shadow.

The scene where the two start a serious conversation for the first time is very telling. Leggatt's story begins with a sympathy borne out of the narrator's identification with him. Even before Leggatt really starts to tell the story of how he killed a man, the captain jumps to the conclusion, "'Fit of temper,' I suggested, confidently" ("The Secret Sharer" 31). This rationalisation might signify that the captain has had similar intentions in the past. More evidence to support this idea comes a few lines later, when the narrator states, "He appealed to me as if our experiences had been identical as our clothes" (ibid). Therefore, the physical similarity between the two (the surface level) is completed by their psychic resemblance (the deeper level). From this moment on, the captain's true journey begins, and little by little he reaches perfection.

The idea of the relationship between the self and other-like-self, discussed above, and the narrator's emphasis on how they resemble each other, can be clearly seen in different parts of the story, to the extent that in some parts it seems as though the captain is looking in a mirror. One clear example is when Leggatt finishes his story: "He rested a hand on the end of the skylight to steady himself with, and all that time did not stir a limb, so far as I could see....One of my hands, too, rested on the end of the skylight: neither did I stir a limb, so far as I knew. We stood less than a foot from each other" ("The Secret Sharer" 32). The parallelism between the words and the picture depicted here portrays a man who is looking at his reflection in the mirror. Mirrors are generally taken to be symbols of the unconscious. It is a well known motif in many films as well. The hero looks at the mirror, and the image in the mirror talks to him. Sometimes his reflection gives him advice, tries to persuade him to do something, or simply causes him to remember something and so on. In another part of the story, the captain says, "we, the two strangers in the ship, faced each other in identical attitudes" ("The Secret Sharer" 37). In this sense, Leggatt can be called the captain's mirror image. Another interpretation might be that the narrator has identified with Leggatt so much that he becomes one with him and tries to imitate whatever he does, so that he might be able to have the same strength of personality as the latter.

The structure of the captain's cabin is of great importance too. The only place for Leggatt to hide is in this cabin. The form of the cabin is very significant—or rather, symbolic—and it explains the layout of the captain's stateroom and the
possibility for concealment. The cabin is in the form of the capital letter ‘L’. The shape of the letter is important, since if one enters on either side of the letter, one will not have a view of the whole room. Another thing about the room is that the door opens into the short part of the letter, which shows there is a resemblance between the structure of the psyche and the cabin. In psychology, the psyche mainly consists of the two parts, the conscious and the unconscious. The latter, which is hidden from the conscious part, is considerably larger than the former. Likewise, the part of the cabin which is not seen at first glance if someone opens the door is the vertical side of the letter ‘L’. Leggatt is happy with the shape of the room as the captain explains: “The mysterious arrival had discovered the advantage of this particular shape” (“The Secret Sharer” 33). As a matter of fact, the captain has concealed his shadow from the eyes of the public.

Another key concept coined by Jung is “individuation”. He uses this term to refer to a process through which someone becomes a psychological ‘in-dividual’, which means, a separate, indivisible unity or ‘whole’. And he states that unlike the general assumption that considers consciousness the totality of the psychological individual, “knowledge of the phenomena that can only be explained on the hypothesis of unconscious psychic processes makes it doubtful whether the ego and its contents are in fact identical with the “whole” (qtd. in Storr 212). After considering many people and their dreams, Jung found that dreams are more or less relevant to the life of the dreamer, and dreams are also a part of the psychology of the person involved. Jung states that dreams seem to follow an arrangement or pattern: if a person does not watch them carefully, he will be unaware of these patterns, but if he looks at them closely over a period of years and studies them, he will notice certain patterns which appear, disappear and reappear frequently. If one is vigilant of these dreams, one will see that they occur frequently and, at the same time, they change slowly but perceptibly (Von Franz 161). He believed that the changes would be faster if the dreamer’s conscious attitude was influenced by appropriate interpretation of the dreams and their symbolic contents. Thus, our dream life creates a meandering pattern in which individual strands or tendencies become visible, then vanish, then return. Watching this regulating or directing tendency at work—which creates a slow, imperceptible process of psychic growth—is the process of individuation (ibid). In other words, when a person starts exploring those angles of his own self that differentiate him from another, and becomes psychologically mature, we say that individuation has taken place. This is a self-recognition process through which a person consciously discovers various aspects of himself, both desirable and undesirable. However, this is not an easy task. This self-recognition requires extraordinary courage and honesty but is absolutely essential if one is to become a well-balanced individual. Jung theorises that neuroses are the results of the person’s failure to confront and to accept some archetypal components of his unconscious (Guerin et al. 179). That is why in literature and mythology, as mentioned earlier, a hero needs to attempt to undertake this task even though he might fail.
The narrator of “The Secret Sharer” starts the process of individuation as soon as he meets Leggatt. He becomes aware that the mind is not a single-sided entity. Somewhere in the middle of the story, after thinking a lot about the circumstance he is in, the captain says, “I felt dual more than ever” (39). It can be inferred from his statement that he has already had some sense of being a double, a feeling reinforced after meeting Leggatt. However, what he says is ironically opposite to the comment he makes in the early parts of the story:

I rejoiced in the great security of the sea as compared with the unrest of the land, in my choice of that untempted life presenting no disquieting problems, invested with an elementary moral beauty by the absolute straightforwardness of its appeal and by the singleness of its purpose (28).

As a matter of fact, later in the story he is forced into experiencing something beyond “the singleness of purpose”, and this leads him to set the role of a real captain for himself. He does not act like a captain in the eyes of his crew early in the story, but it is after understanding and using his hidden abilities that he is able to give his first particular order on board the ship.

Another similarity between the young captain and Leggatt is that “[t]hey both create a buffer to protect themselves from their feelings of excruciating loneliness in a hostile world” (Schwartz 106). In fact, they eventually find the closeness of a captain-mate relationship. The captain’s inability to communicate with his mates parallels Leggatt’s lack of a relationship with Archbold. The captain might have become the Archbold of his ship had he not met and forged a proper relationship with Leggatt.

One more point that links the narrator to Leggatt is that he sees that the latter remains the master of his fate and soul, although his condition is critical. The captain knows that he must stand by Leggatt, and watch him with resolve. The story concerns his struggle to do so—another reason why he does not give Leggatt up to the law. Peters believes that by doing so the captain “achieves some knowledge of himself” (80). By the time Leggatt leaves the ship, the young captain has learnt a lot from this experience; he learns he can, as Peters states, “command his ship and crew effectively, respond appropriately to danger, and make moral judgments based upon his own conscience...Each of these abilities directly results from his interaction with his other-self” or in Said’s terms, he has taken full possession of himself, “by seeing an image of himself in another person [and] can ascertain his own identity” (qtd. in Peters 70). Nevertheless, a question might be raised here: Why does the captain let Leggatt leave the ship if his presence is so inspiring for him? Before answering this question, there are some points that need to be considered.

There have been debates regarding Leggatt’s character. For example, Daniel Curly argues that Leggatt must not be considered a “murderous ruffian”, but rather
he must be looked at as what the story itself clearly suggests him to be: "the ideal conception of himself that the captain has set up for himself secretly" (qtd. in Peters 177). Among the various interpretations, however, Peters finds Lawrence Graver's assessment the most accurate: "Just as there is adequate evidence to deny Leggatt's villainy, so there is proof to smudge his status as an ideal figure... One thing can be said with certainty about Leggatt: he is neither higher nor lower, only different" (ibid). Graver's observation, as opposed to Curly's which rationalizes the murder committed by Leggatt, is in relation to Jung's statement that the shadow is wrongly believed to merely be the container of unwanted, negative and unfavourable desires. Although repression and rejection is not the key to reach the self, neither is total liberation of the shadow. Leggatt is the shadowy figure of this story and represents the captain's personality at "a repressed and hitherto unacknowledged level—what in himself must be kept hidden from the world, but at the same time reckoned with and done justice to if some psychic integration is to be achieved" (Stewart 237). Therefore, the captain, despite the fact that he discovers he owes his self-discovery to Leggatt, and as a result does not give him up to Archbold, does not let him take control of his personality. In other words, it seems that Leggatt represents the captain's own potential for evil, ("He appealed to me as if our experiences had been identical as our clothes") which must be expurgated before he can become morally, as well as psychologically, whole. The captain understands that it would be a sham sentiment to sacrifice his future by indefinitely harbouring Leggatt. Therefore, he understands that he is unable to go on like this, and although it is Leggatt who says he wants to leave, the captain resists only slightly because it is his will too. Once Leggatt leaves, the young captain is again alone, but with added knowledge of himself through his communion with his shadow.

**Conclusion**

Earlier in this paper, one of the questions raised related to the reason why the captain puts his career and the ship under his command at stake for Leggatt. The captain, in order to make sure that Leggatt gets safely to the land, takes the ship so close to shore that it scares all the crew on his ship. As mentioned earlier, the captain cannot allow Leggatt to stay on the ship any longer, and knows that the shadow must not take control of his self; therefore, he decides to send him to the land in order to make sure that he can live. The land, contrary to the sea, is an archetype of consciousness. The narrator knows that the shadow must not be drowned in the unconscious, as he has learned and acquired many things from him.

Even though the captain states "I hardly thought of my other self, now gone from the ship", the captain still thinks about him. In fact the story he narrates clearly shows that he has not forgotten Leggatt. As a result, we can draw the conclusion that the idea of total repression, which is rejected by Jung, does not occur in relation to the captain and Leggatt, with the latter becoming a part of the captain's
consciousness. In addition, what the captain does at the end of the story works as a test of character for him. He has to prove to himself that he has grown into the role of captain; he needs to assert himself in the role of command. As a matter of fact, the climax of the story happens very close to the ending, when the reader decides whether or not the captain has passed his journey from innocence to experience. Although he confesses what he does is very dangerous, "I realised suddenly that all my future, the only future for which I was fit, would perhaps go irretrievably to pieces in any mishap to my first command" ("The Secret Sharer" 54), the captain is aware that this is a critical moment and he must step up and take action.

In conclusion, a comparison between the beginning and the ending of the story shows that the captain does indeed go through a journey of self discovery. The captain who was a stranger even to himself at the beginning, is now the only man on board who makes critical decisions and this did not happen through a series of physical events and coping with real storms. Rather, he reaches maturity through knowing his own being. Although Leggatt departs "a free man, a proud swimmer striking out for a new destiny", it is not Leggatt alone who has obtained his freedom. The captain has passed his test, his ship is really his own and he has found his true self.
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