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Abstract

An analysis of three of Robert Louis Stevenson's works, An Inland Voyage (1878), The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde (1886), and Weir of Hermiston (1894) provides the basis for a determination of the "Scottishness" of Stevenson's works. While this "Scottishness" is apparent in the themes presented by Stevenson, it also is included in the linguistic structure of the works. Stevenson writes in a pattern which can be deciphered as Scottish in that it impresses upon the reader the conflicts which the theme represents -- the contradictions, dichotomy and confusion which is a defined cultural element of Stevenson's Scottish background.

The genre of Scottish writers, having been firmly established by such writers as Norman Wilson, Robert Watson, Kurt Wittig, Roderick Watson, Edwin Muir, Karl Miller, Tom Nairn, and Roderick Watson, is identified by linguistic elements which help support the established element of theme. Specifically, these linguistic elements include the use of contrast and counterpoint, juxtaposition and antithesis, paradox and parallelism.

Robert Louis Stevenson's creative thumbprint includes elements that identify him culturally as a Scot.
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I. Stevenson's Creative Thumbprint

Much has been written about what comprises a writer's style, those literary and linguistic devices that become his or her creative thumbprint. A great deal has also been written about the sources of a writer's style, the options from which writers make their literary and linguistic choices. In my research, I wanted to discover if these choices are culturally dictated and if I could demonstrate the connection between culture and style by looking at the work of a particular writer. In order to do so, I looked at the nature of Scottish culture and the relationship between that culture and Scottish literature. I then examined three works by Robert Louis Stevenson to see if his style reflected Scottish literature. Finally, I looked at an English writer, Thomas Hardy, to see if his style contrasted with what I found in Stevenson. On the basis of my research, I have come to the conclusion that Stevenson's writing reflects Scottish culture.

That a strong relationship between style and culture exists has been demonstrated by numerous scholars and can be observed by an examination of the various cultures represented by the English language. Norman Wilson suggests that,

No one thinks of American writing as a part of English literature. In the two hundred years
since their emancipation the Americans have evolved a style of English which has differences in idiom and syntax and is enriched with words and phrases drawn from the polyglot origins of the United States. (7-8)

For example, Mark Twain's writing style reflects his personal American boyhood experiences and early years as a master pilot on the Mississippi River. Twain further reflects the values of a specific sub-culture within the American culture, the South. The Anthology of American Literature, Third Edition includes a description of Twain's contribution to American literature:

Through such works as Huckleberry Finn and Life on the Mississippi Twain shaped the world's view of America and had a profound impact on the development of American writing. His presentation of native American material, his use of the vernacular idiom, his departures from the traditions of nineteenth-century gentility, and his sense of alienation influenced numerous American writers of the twentieth century, among them Ernest Hemingway, who acknowledged their common debt by writing, "All modern American literature comes from one book by Mark Twain called Huckleberry Finn . . . it's the best book
we've had . . . There was nothing before. There has been nothing so good since." (331)

Because a writer uses unique cultural experiences to produce texts, he or she develops an individual style, and the texts themselves then represent the uniqueness of the culture. As John Spencer and Michael J. Gregory suggest in Linguistics and Style, a writer's perception goes beyond literature as such and involves the reader in a relationship between language and cultural patterns: "Literature can be regarded as part of the total patterning of a culture, as a relatively self contained institution of that culture" (59-60). Because writing is not produced in a vacuum, and because it reflects the accumulation of the writer's experience, a writer's background becomes an inherent part of style, for "languages are spoken and written by men and women deeply influenced by their cultural environment" (Enkvist 8).

In A Quantitative Approach to the Style of Jonathan Swift, Louis Milic says that the stylistic features of Jonathan Swift's prose are identified through the recurring features in the works and involve language patternings which include both conscious and unconscious choices. Like Scott, Stevenson uses linguistic patterns that can be traced to his Scottish background:

Even if writing in orthodox English the
Scottish author cannot escape the compulsion of his genes, and his native instincts will inevitably assert themselves. A man who wears a worsted suit—or jeans and T-shirt—is no less a Scot than one who flaunts the kilt. (Wilson 8)

My conclusion that Stevenson's writing represents Scottish cultural patterns involves establishing the criteria for the genre. Culturally Scotland remains separated from England in spite of being a territory of the British Empire. The Scottish people have fought over the centuries to preserve their sense of national identity; it is this struggle that is a recognized part of Scottish heritage. Robert Watson writes in The Literature of Scotland,

Certainly Scotland has expended enough effort over the centuries defending and defining a sense of national identity which has somehow refused to succumb to political or cultural pressures from her larger and more powerful neighbour to the south. The process started at least as long ago as the wars of independence in the early fourteenth century, and Barbour's Bruce and Blind Harry's Wallace did much to define the idea of Scotland to establish an independent-minded and equalitarian outlook as a characteristic part of
the Scottish spirit. (1)

For centuries, Scotland had a culture of its own. When Scotland was absorbed by England, the traditions associated with Scotland remained a powerful cultural force. Yet England has had a definite influence over Scotland, politically, economically and culturally. As a result, the Scottish people are a blend of the two cultures, which does not mean that Scottish culture does not exist. Rather, the various and changing origins of the nation are what produce the often paradoxical Scottish viewpoint. The desire to remain independent of England helps define the Scottish people, for the argument over the issue of allegiance to England rages within the culture and produces a dichotomy within the populace:

... deep down in the heart and mind of many Scotsmen there is a kind of schism arising out of the clash of his conflicting loyalties, and today in Scotland cultural and political life provides abundant evidence that these questions are not merely academic ones. (Wittig 7)

Beyond the division with England, Scotland itself is a fractured country in many ways. Physically split by major mountain chains and chopped into odd shapes by the irregular coastline resulting in sections that are separate from others, independent villages with unique features and
sub-cultures abound. Scotland's physical geography aids the clanish nature of the people, who remain loyal to their local heritage. While the physical geography divides the country, two distinct cultures have developed and appear to contradict each other. However, the regional divisions are not so powerful that the groups do not acknowledge each other, and the division adds to the Scottish mystique.

The Highlanders of the north are a rugged people who live isolated and harsh lives in the country's mountainous regions. Minorities in the country, they cling to the traditions and the Gaelic language of their heritage. Lowlanders are mostly businessmen who inhabit the more cultivated valleys and whose language background includes Scots, a regional variety of British English exclusive to Scotland. Paradoxically, "... everything which the casual visitor most usually associates with Scotland--kilts, bagpipes, mountains and clansmen--stems from [the] Gaelic minority, even if it is usually promoted by Lowland businessmen" (Dresler 8).

The traditions of Highlanders and Lowlanders are distinct and separate. Add the English influence and the national identity is fractured three ways.

Consider also that two separate and distinctive languages, Gaelic and Scots, divide the traditional Scottish consciousness and that "Gaelic and Scots each had its own
With the loss of independence, standard British English became the preferred language used in legal matters and religious ceremonies. Scots became a language considered inferior, and "For more than half a century, it has even by the Scots been considered as the dialect of the vulgar." (Letley 1) Once again the cultural identity is fractured three ways resulting in "Scotsmen [existing] in a state of linguistic uncertainty, so that, . . . [they] feel in one language and think in another" (Muir v).

Scots have amalgamated the distinctly contradictory historical and linguistic background of their culture into a literary tradition that presents "almost a zigzag of contradictions. . . . [and] in the very combination of opposites we have a reflection of the contrast which the Scot shows at every turn" (Smith 4). Hugh MacDiarmid suggests that Scottish sensibility is characteristically extreme and contains opposing tendencies resulting in "the polar twins of the Scottish muse" (Watson 2). Edwin Muir proposes that this predilection to "swing frantically from one extreme to the other without ever reaching rest or resolution" (Watson 3) characterizes the Scottish national psyche.

This predilection is also recognizable in Scottish writers separated by centuries. The writings from Sir
Walter Scott to Muriel Spark reveal the same tendencies to produce paradoxical characters caught in antithetical situations.

Scott wrestled with the absorption of his traditional Scottish heritage by England and, in his natural tendency to seek order, possessing "a mind in a high degree concrete and practical" (Muir 144), he attempted to adhere to the established order of English domination. What he observed, however, was the gradual destruction of the equally valid cultural background of Scottishness, "... the order to which he was most intimately bound by birth, early memory and the compulsion of his imagination. From this inward conflict he never escaped" (Muir 145). Muir's suggestion that Scott "directly or indirectly, ... [worked] out his conflicting allegiances to Scotland and England" (145-146) in his writings is not exclusive to Scott but is true of other Scottish writers as well.

Muriel Spark, twentieth century Scottish writer, acknowledges that she is firmly associated with her culture and that this influence permeates her writing: "Edinburgh where I was born and my father was born has definitely had an effect on my mind, my prose style and my ways of thought" (Bold 14). For Spark, this effect is best explained through use of the word "nevertheless ... the sound was roughly 'niverthelace' and the emphasis was a heartfelt one" that,
she writes, permeates the psyche and education of the Scot. She recalls the frequent use of the word by her teachers and by all grades of society, such as "the ceremonious accumulation of weather forecasts and barometer-readings that pronounce for a fine day, before letting rip on the state: 'Nevertheless, it's raining.'" and suggests that she is "fairly indoctrinated by the habit of thought which calls for this word... I find that much of my literary composition is based on the nevertheless idea" (Kemp 7).

Norman Wilson notes that Scots are no less Scottish when writing in the English language than when writing in Gaelic or Scots, that they will reveal their "racial--or, if you will, genetic and ethnic--characteristics... if only subconsciously," (7) in their writings. Writers of Scottish background who strive to write impeccable British English still reveal their cultural background, for they are "undeniably Scottish in [their] mental processes and philosophical attitudes" (8), which supports Louis Milic's suggestion that recurring subconscious choices in language patternings are affected by cultural heritage. It becomes obvious, then, that "Scots are Scots, as indubitably as the English are English or Americans American. That is a fact of life, self-evident and inescapable" (Wilson 9).

The Scot wrestles with conflicts and opposing viewpoints resulting in,
Scottish literature [that] seeks to make artistic sense of the confusion. Contrast and counterpoint, juxtaposition and antithesis, paradox and parallelism; these artistic techniques permeate Scottish literature because they correspond to a way of life. (Bold 1-2)

When examined further, these artistic techniques correspond to the myriad of observations of other scholars, for each suggests the underlying difficulty presented by Scottish writers: the conflict that has permeated the literature for centuries. Byron noted that Robert Burns' unpublished letters "are full of oaths and obscene songs. What an antithetical mind!" (Bold 3); G. Gregory Smith classified "the Caledonian antisyzygy [as being] a reflection of the contrasts which the Scot shows at every turn" (Bold 3); Hugh MacDiarmid labeled it as "the polar twins of the Scottish muse" (Watson 2).

Bold's observations emphasize what Spark refers to as the "nevertheless idea." All observations can be and are disputed by the Scot, as though all facts contain conflicting information that ultimately coexist and serve to form reality. Certainly Sir Walter Scott, Muriel Spark and Robert Louis Stevenson adhere to this national psyche in their respective writings.

The conflicts that produce this national psyche can be
explained by and are reinforced through the artistic techniques Bold identified. Counterpoint plays off complementary and opposing viewpoints producing a contrasting observation. While outright assertion and flat denial are the clearest forms of antithesis, in a larger structural concept the term may apply to a writer's entire contribution, thus producing an evaluation of what he supports and what he opposes. Building on the conflicting viewpoint, the Scot applies antithesis in order to both deny an observation and assert it, resulting in a basic effect that is the same; the thing has been said in two different ways. The conjoining of contrasting ideas produces the antithetical structure. Paradox is a seemingly self-contradictory or absurd statement which yet is shown to be (sometimes in a surprising way) true. A paradox is a generally agreed upon value or observation that is then an opinion or statement contrary to generally accepted ideas.

Just as Scott before him and Spark after him viewed the world from a Scottish perspective, so, too, did Robert Louis Stevenson. RLS was born and educated in Edinburgh, Scotland: he was a Scotsman and his literature belongs to that genre.

The seeds of conflict began early in Stevenson's life. He suffered from ill health and was required to spend much of his time confined to his bed. In order to entertain the
young Stevenson, his family and his nurse plied him with Scottish folktales of dark, devilish characters. His father told him stories of pirates and thieves and adventurers and folk apprehension of the devil. Many of the stories told him by his Presbyterian nurse embedded her strict religious code upon him, as did his own Calvinist background, the result of which was that "Calvinism marked Stevenson's personality and imagination unequivocally" (Calder 8). Much of Stevenson's fascination with the terror of sin, of the evil that was deep-rooted in the world, stemmed from his religious upbringing. He developed a vivid imagination and was further "affected by currents of the Scottish past and the Scottish character that had flowed around him as he grew up in Edinburgh" (Dresler 253).

As a young Edinburgh University student, he was a member of the Speculative Debate Team, a bawdy group of young men who delighted in disparaging the established order of Victorian society. He often participated in the raucous activities of the group, which prided itself on the use of Scots as a sign of rebellion against the social mores of acceptability and gentility. Even after his disassociation with the group, he continued to use Scots in his frequent and long personal correspondence with his cousin Bob Stevenson and his lifelong friend and adult solicitor, Charles Baxter.
Outwardly he caved in to family pressure and studied law, embarking on a practice following the completion of his education at the University of Edinburgh, but he was not content. Publicly Stevenson appeared to accept the social position of his family; however, he secretly indulged in activities that were decidedly antithetical to the Victorian mores of his family. He "consorted with prostitutes . . . [participated in] curious games . . . with his life-long friend Charles Baxter . . . [that consisted of] practical jokes, irreverence and genteel nose-thumbing at the genteel world" (Daiches 79). Although ostensibly aimed directly at Englishmen, he was revolting against Edinburgh respectability:

The most entertaining and the most obviously Scottish of the games Stevenson and Baxter played together involved nobody but themselves. Under the assumed names of Johnson or Johnstone (Baxter) and Thomson (Stevenson), two Scots-speaking religious hypocrites, they exchanged letters in broad Scots. This kind of role-taking came naturally to both of them, and with Stevenson it was associated with the whole Jekyll-and-Hyde syndrome . . . (Daiches 82)

It was his indulgence in these games with Baxter and his father's discovery of a document written by Stevenson
expounding "Disregard [for] everything our parents taught us" that led to the great crisis with his father that would haunt Stevenson his entire life (Daiches 83).

Beyond the difficulty Stevenson had with his father, the climate in his native Scotland was not hospitable to his physical condition (diagnosed as diseased lungs), and it became no longer possible for him to spend more than an occasional summer month in Scotland. He sought respite from illness in Switzerland, the South of France, the South of England, the Adirondack Mountains in New York State, California, and finally the South Pacific and Samoa. By this time he had abandoned his legal career and began his writing career. As he was often ill, he did much of his writing in bed; however, he was rarely inactive in his endeavors.

His lifestyle became decidedly bohemian and controversial. It embodied "the clearest example of the rebellion against gentility in nineteenth-century Scotland" (Daiches 77). Indulging in what he called "junk," and defined as "doing the most absurd acts for the sake of their absurdity" (78), he, together with cousin Bob and friend Baxter, ridiculed Scottish gentility, the Calvinist doctrine of hard work and, "paradoxically, . . . Scottish language and Scottish identity" (Daiches 78).

Stevenson's writing embody his personal and cultural
background. When I examined three works of Robert Louis Stevenson, *An Inland Voyage* (1878), *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (1886), and *Weir of Hermiston* (1894), I found that the artistic techniques Bold identified exist in Stevenson's writing, supporting my hypothesis that his language patterns and choices stem from his cultural background. Stevenson continually presents material that supports one point of view by contrasting it to what he has previously stated. He crafts his sentence structure to reflect a contrastive view of the world, supporting his observations by presenting information and then disputing it, then returning once more to the point he is making, always working in a circular way: stating, supporting, disputing, then returning to his original idea.

It is not an isolated incident that the techniques can be identified in a short section from each work; rather the techniques are apparent throughout his works.

There are some differences in the three works. They were written at three stages in Stevenson's life: *An Inland Voyage* when he was a young man before his marriage; *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* after his marriage and after he was away from his homeland and his family for a short time; *Weir of Hermiston* when he was unable to return to his homeland and a reconciliation with his father in spite of his desire to do so. Furthermore, his purpose in
writing each work was different: An Inland Voyage is a reflective account of a trip he took in France; The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde is the result of a dream he had one evening in which he explores the dual nature of mankind; Weir of Hermiston (the only one of the three set in Scotland) is a story of the harsh relationship between a father and son, a relationship filled with rifts and judgments as was Stevenson's relationship with his father.

What each work shares is Stevenson's reliance on culturally dictated techniques. They are used for different purposes, and they take different forms as Stevenson crafts each story to lead to different ends, but each work is identifiable by the techniques. They reflect his conflict, dichotomy and confusion.

My original hypothesis was that, through the examination of An Inland Voyage, an early work, The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, a middle work, and Weir of Hermiston, a final work, the frequency of the linguistic devices that are decidedly Scottish would be culled from his language, indicating that cultural background is weakened when not constantly reinforced. This did not prove to be true. Rather, Stevenson's background permeated his writings and, perhaps, became even more important to him as he aged. This further strengthens Milic's and Wilson's suggestions that the choices made by writers involve subconscious levels
Certainly Stevenson's personal history could be used as an explanation for this conclusion. After all, he was forced from his homeland because of ill health and he suffered, no doubt, from homesickness and nostalgia. His final novel, *Weir of Hermiston*, seems to be an attempt to eulogize his heritage. However, since I looked beyond the theme to the subtleties of language use, my hypothesis should still have proven valid. It did not, as we shall see. Instead, the techniques that Stevenson employed in his beginning writings remain with him throughout his writing career, both as his life and his writing themes changed. Stevenson's mercurial personality [and his] . . . most complicated relationship with Scotland and his own Scottishness. . . . [and his] internal division fuel the best of Stevenson's fiction as if he were replaying in psychologically ambiguous terms Walter Scott's own conflict between Unionist stability and Jacobite romance. (Watson 297)

Use of the literary and linguistic devices identified and categorized as Scottish is so strong in Robert Louis Stevenson that his works contain substantial numbers of them. The result is that Stevenson's creative thumbprint not only defines him as an individual writer, it defines him
as a Scot.

Since neither time nor space constraints allow me to examine the entirety of all three texts, it was necessary for me to select areas within each work to examine. In order to avoid criticism that I chose those passages that support my hypothesis and ignored those that did not, thereby invalidating my study, I chose to examine the first and last paragraph in each work as a control mechanism. I then examined a small section within each text to substantiate my observations. Although the middle sections chosen were considered partially on the basis of the techniques used, they reinforce the controlled selection of first and last paragraph and my study does not rely on them solely for validity.
II. An Inland Voyage

As a travelogue of a river trip and one of Stevenson's earlier works, An Inland Voyage reveals his inclination to examine his surroundings and his reaction to those surroundings in a contrasting pattern, examining his observations and reflections from many angles. The book was written following a journey Stevenson made with a friend down a river in France, and in it he reflects upon the places he sees, the people he meets along the way and the association of his experience to his personal life. He contrasts his observations to his past experiences, and he consistently juxtaposes these associations to suggest the conflicts he observes to his life in general through his word choices and his sentence patterning. He oftentimes refutes what he says and negates the direct by being indirect, as we shall see.

Stevenson begins An Inland Voyage:

We made a great stir in the Antwerp Docks. A stevedore and a lot of dock porters took up the two canoes, and ran with them for the slip. A crowd of children followed cheering. The Cigarette went off in a splash and a bubble of small breaking water. Next moment the Arethusa was after her. A steamer was coming down, men on the paddle-box shouted hoarse warnings, the
stevedore and his porters were bawling from the quay. But in a stroke or two the canoes were away out in the middle of the Scheldt, and all steamers, and stevedores, and other 'long-shore vanities were left behind. (1)

The first five sentences in this paragraph develop the activity surrounding the departure, including both observers and participants on the shore and in the river. Stevenson begins with the excitement and reaction of the different observers, then juxtaposes the completion of the launch with the resulting reduction of activity and excitement, contrasting the two segments of the event, the public ("A stevedore and a lot of dock porters . . . A crowd of children . . . men of the paddle-box) and the private ("all steamers, and stevedores, and other 'long-shore vanities were left behind").

While contrasting the two activities, he uses counterpoint to reinforce the complementary but opposing activities on the land and in the river, a technique he employs throughout his observations. The paragraph begins with activity that is inclusive and ends with completion that is singular, contrasting the activity on land to the slower activity in the river, which forecasts Stevenson's book. He crafts his story by moving from land to river, contrasting the lifestyles he observes as well as the activity he participates in during his journey. It is
fitting that he begin in this way.

In the second paragraph, he continues with his observation; however, he begins to develop the reflections he pursues throughout the voyage and the book. While in the first paragraph, he describes the activity in a direct manner, condensing much activity into a short space, in the second paragraph he slows the pace and takes the time to observe his surroundings and his reaction to them as well as the association of his beginning journey to his future life.

The sun shone brightly; the tide was making—four jolly miles an hour; the wind blew steadily, with occasional squalls. For my part, I had never been in a canoe under sail in my life; and my first experiment out in the middle of this big river was not made without some trepidation. What would happen when the wind first caught my little canvas? I suppose it was almost as trying a venture into the regions of the unknown as to publish a first book, or to marry. But my doubts were not of long duration; and in five minutes you will not be surprised to learn that I had tied my sheet. (1)

In his second paragraph, Stevenson continues with his initial observation; however, he broadens his view by reflecting on his venture and associates this activity to his life decisions and his uncertain future, a technique he
pursues throughout the book. He begins with a description of the weather, an important companion on a canoeing trip. His mood is obviously anticipatory; all is right with the world. Interestingly, the final comment of the first sentence could employ Muriel Spark's observation of "nevertheless": "the wind blew steadily, [nevertheless] with occasional squalls." His next sentence begins his reflection as he describes the trepidation he feels at the enormity of the task before him. He reveals his uncertainty in the sentence by using "was not made without some trepidation." The statement is antithetical, for he means that he feels trepidation, but he constructs the message with the conflicting "was not made without." He employs negatives in "had never been" and "was not made without," reinforcing the conflict he feels within himself at the beginning of his voyage by saying the same thing in two different ways. The next sentence is a question: "What would happen when the wind first caught my little canvas?" Use of it reinforces his trepidation because he uses counterpoint to complement his uncertainty and reflection.

Further on in the paragraph he once again constructs a sentence employing negatives as he contrasts his initial trepidation to his expected success: "But my doubts were not of long duration; and in five minutes you will not be surprised to learn . . ." Stevenson employs parallelism with the repetitive pattern of "had never been
... was not made ... were not of ... will not be," which frames the paragraph and reinforces the conflict.

Stevenson's uncertainty is reinforced in the second sentence through the introduction of a question: "What would happen when the wind first caught my little canvas?" His answer is noteworthy, as he compares the journey to the publication of a book or the decision to marry: "I suppose it was almost as trying a venture into the regions of the unknown as to publish a first book, or to marry," two activities he is contemplating. As a fledgling writer, Stevenson is not certain he will be successful in his newly chosen career and he had just recently met the woman he would eventually marry despite the disapproval of his family. Inclusion of these concerns in the very beginning—indeed the second paragraph—underscores his personal conflicts. Stevenson's reflection especially exposes his divided and contradictory allegiance as he juxtaposes his impending journey to his personal life.

The final sentence of the paragraph, "But my doubts were not of long duration; and in five minutes you will not be surprised to learn that I had tied my sheet," once again underscores Stevenson's conflicts as he ends this paragraph having resolved his initial trepidation, but still revealing his conflicts through the use of negatives and the antithetical sentence structure; he says the same thing in two different ways. Further, he frames the paragraph with
the techniques of contrast and parallelism, juxtaposing his initial doubt to the success he enjoys at the completion of his task.

The final paragraph of An Inland Voyage finds Stevenson abandoning his journey to return home and, although the adventure has been cut short, he is grateful for its end and looks forward to rejoining his family in Scotland. He does not, however, leave his adventure behind without a feeling of loss, but instead reflects on it by bringing it into his life, taking it with him to Scotland and melding the adventure into his past, his present, and his future.

And so a letter at Pontoise decided us, and we drew up our keels for the last time out of that river of Oise that had faithfully piloted them, through rain and sunshine, for so long. For so many miles had this fleet and footless beast of burthen charioted out fortunes, that we turned our back upon it with a sense of separation. We had made a long detour out of the world, but now we were back in the familiar places, where life itself makes all the running, and we are carried to meet adventure without a stroke of the paddle. Now we were to return, like the voyager in the play, and see what rearrangements fortune perfected the while in our surroundings; what surprises stood ready made for us at home; and
whither and how far the world had voyaged in our absence. You may paddle all day long; but it is when you come back at nightfall, and look in at the familiar room, that you find Love or Death awaiting you beside the stove; and the most beautiful adventures are not those we go to seek.

(287)

Just as he began his journey leaving behind the world and anticipating the adventures to come, Stevenson reunites with that world in his final paragraph and leaves the journey grateful for it, but anxious to return to his home. He continues his reflection here, anticipating the return and suggesting that the physical journey may be over but realizing the lessons he learned along the way have changed his perspective of home. He drags the journey with him, forever changed by it and grateful for the change.

Beginning the paragraph with a comment that a letter is responsible for his decision to stop the journey, Stevenson uses counterpoint with the first two sentences, juxtaposing the complementary yet opposing views of his journey, for he is resigned to the end of the venture yet feels a loss at the abandonment of it: "that had faithfully piloted them . . . we turned our back upon it with a sense of separation." He continues to reflect on the completion of the journey and suggests his anticipation at the return to his familiar world, and presents the change from the
activity on the river to the solid footings of the "familiar places" on the land. Here once again he contrasts the private to the public, for his journey was a solitary activity, one where he was only an observer to the solid landscape. Now he is returning to land and the continuity it represents, and he wrestles with his reassociation: "We had made a long detour out of the world, but now we were back in the familiar places, where life itself makes all the running, and we are carried to meet adventure without a stroke of the paddle." He returns to land and home, contrasted to the beginning of the story when he separates his connection to the land and home, and he develops the contrast by projecting his activity to the future.

The next sentence employs parallelism as he anticipates his uncertainty at what he will find, realizing that his familiar world has changed, as he has: "what rearrangements . . . what surprises . . . whither and how far the world." He relates his voyage to the anticipated changes he will find and repeats the world voyage to cement the two together.

His final sentence expands his view of the adventure and in his reflection he combines the adventure with his future life even as he employs contrast through the use of the negative ". . . the most beautiful adventure are not those we go to seek," ending his book pleased with the adventure but willing to return to his former life.
III. The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde

Stevenson wrote The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde following a dream he had one night. The tale involves the dual nature of mankind and is fraught with conflict and contradictions. This work differs from An Inland Voyage primarily because it is a work of fiction, not a reflective travelogue. Stevenson's lifestyle has changed also, as he has married against the wishes of his father and he no longer lives in Scotland.

Interestingly, the story is set in London, but . . . the ambience is without a doubt Edinburgh, the Edinburgh of the Old Town's dark wynds and closes, where the turn of a corner could, in Stevenson's day and even now, abruptly leave behind the world of surface respectability, and the lingering shades of Burke and Hare, the grave-robbers, and Deacon Brodie, cabinet maker by day, criminal by night, still flavoured the atmosphere, the town of Stevenson's birth and upbringing. (Calder 12)

Stevenson's conflicting allegiance serve him well.

The story is one of contrast and counterpoint. While Utterson ponders and agonizes over the evidence he encounters, he never reaches a resolution. His concerns do not bear fruit, for he constantly questions what he observes, contrasting everything and looking for further
evidence to validate his growing suspicions. However, he is unable to make a determination as he struggles with these conflicts. Utterson reflects Stevenson's cultural mores.

A careful look at the first paragraph reveals the conflicts:

Mr. Utterson the lawyer was a man of a rugged countenance, that was never lighted by a smile; cold, scanty and embarrassed in discourse; backward in sentiment; lean, long, dusty, dreary, and yet somehow lovable. At friendly meetings, and when the wine was to his taste, something eminently human beaconed from his eye; something indeed which never found its way into his talk, but which spoke not only in these silent symbols of the after-dinner face, but more often and loudly in the acts of his life. He was austere with himself; drank gin when he was alone, to mortify a taste for vintages; and though he enjoyed the theatre, had not crossed the doors of one for twenty years. But he had an approved tolerance for others; sometimes wondering, almost with envy, at the high pressure of spirits involved in their misdeeds; and in any extremity inclined to help rather than to reprove. "I incline to Cain's heresy," he used to say quaintly: "I let my brother go to the devil in
his own way." In this character it was frequently his fortune to be the last reputable acquaintance and the last good influence in the lives of down-going men. And to such as these, so long as they came about his chambers, he never marked a shade of change in his demeanour. (29)

Stevenson begins his description of Mr. Utterson with a contrastive list of his stoic qualities, painting the picture of a dull man with no human softness, and then he adds "yet somehow lovable." The vagueness of what could be "somehow lovable" about a character who is "lean, long, dusty, dreary" is uncertain and contradictory. By juxtaposing Utterson's one redeeming social quality to his other, less endearing but privately reliable ones, Stevenson contributes to his character's description as a trustworthy and believable narrator for this tale of duality and evil.

The second sentence in the paragraph again juxtaposes his positive, nonjudgmental, private qualities to his public, stoic image and Stevenson uses counterpoint to emphasize Utterson's reliability, complementing the description by expanding it: "something eminently human beaconed from his eye; something indeed which never found its way into his talk, but which spoke not only in these silent symbols of the after-dinner face, but more often and loudly in the acts of his life." Just as he did in An Inland Voyage, Stevenson uses the negative "which never
found . . . not only in . . . but more often and loudly" to craft a contrastive portrait, for he extolls Utterson's "yet somehow lovable" qualities against his reliable and uninvolved observations. The complementary description supports both Utterson's public mein ("something eminently human beaconed from his eye; . . . in the acts of his life") and his private ("which never found its way into his talk, but which spoke not only in the silent symbols of the after-dinner face"), and frames the description with the public. Muriel Spark's comments that the Scot is embued with the "nevertheless idea" is especially appropriate here, for "nevertheless" could be substituted for "yet" and added to "but which [nevertheless] spoke," adding to the opposing qualifications of Utterson. These contrastive statements serve to complete the portrait of Utterson as a man who is reliable and trustworthy but who also is human, for Stevenson weaves a tale of the loss of humanity in his character Dr. Jekyll when Jekyll tries to separate the two inherent sides of his humanity, good and evil. By contrasting the controlled and reliable Utterson, who is consistently nonjudgmental and reasonable, to Jekyll, who loses control and eventually his reliability, Stevenson underscores his complex message. The sentence structure he employs supports his purpose.

The third sentence contrasts Utterson's behavior to his pleasure as his predilection for "vintages" and "the
theatre" is juxtaposed by his disavowal of each: "drank gin when he was alone, to mortify a taste for vintages; and though he enjoyed the theatre, had not crossed the doors of one for twenty years." Once again, we could employ "nevertheless" in the construction of the sentence: "and though he enjoyed the theatre, [nevertheless] had not crossed the doors . . . ." Utterson's predilection to be austere with himself supports the Scot's personal conflict, the wrestling with allegiances, pitting the pleasurable against the controllable, suggesting the division Stevenson and his countrymen feel.

The fourth sentence in this paragraph contrasts Utterson's control of himself with his observation of others by juxtaposing his admirable nonjudgmental acceptance of other's inappropriate behaviour to his suppressed desire to experience the same, and then once again returning to his uninvolved and credible character: "But he had an approved tolerance for others; sometimes wondering, almost with envy, at the high pressure of spirits involved in their misdeeds; and in any extremity inclined to help rather than to reprove." The paradox here, of course, is that Utterson has made conscious choices that disallow any question of his acceptability as an upstanding and reliable lawyer and citizen, yet privately he envies activities that he does not actually participate in. Stevenson employs parallelism in this sentence beginning with Utterson's public acceptance,
then introducing his private envy, then returns to his public activity, framing the inappropriate (to Utterson) thoughts with acceptable behavior. The final action, "and in any extremity inclined to help rather than to reprove," juxtaposes the nonjudgmental nature of Utterson to the credible activity he participates in.

Stevenson emphasizes Utterson's nonjudgmental qualities as well as his public mein through the use of parallelism in the sixth sentence: "to be the last reputable acquaintance and the last good influence." The counterpoint of "last good influence" to "last reputable acquaintance" also emphasizes Utterson's public position. The contrast of Utterson's respectability, and therefore his credibility, to his business acquaintances also emphasizes his public mein.

The final sentence, "And to such as these, so long as they came about his chambers, he never marked a shade of change in his demeanour," stresses Utterson's control over his private desires to enjoy public pleasures over that which may compromise his public position. "Nevertheless" could be placed at the beginning of this sentence. Stevenson once again employs antithesis through the construction of "never marked a shade of change" contrasting his behavior in a negative way.

Paradoxically, it is Utterson's strict adherence to the uninvolved public image he projects that leads to his failure to discover the truth about his friend, Dr. Henry
Jekyll, in time to help him. Utterson adheres to his own doctrine, "I incline to Cain's heresy . . . I let my brother go to the devil in his own way" in spite of overwhelming evidence that Jekyll is in trouble and has lost control of his life. Distanced from humanity by remaining aloof, he is only an observer of life, not a participant. His confused position, revealed in the contrasting statements, reveals the Scot's cultural confusion.

Stevenson uses antithesis as he develops the character of Jekyll/Hyde, who epitomizes confusion and conflict. The conflict for Jekyll is that, in trying to separate the two distinctly opposing forces of good and evil, he eventually becomes subrogated for the evil side. Much has been written about Stevenson's development of this character. Certainly his Calvinist background and his Victorian upbringing fuel his view of this division of good and evil. The conflicting allegiance of his culture further supports the opposing viewpoints that are explored richly in the novel.

Stevenson's predilection to state and then refute is especially obvious in this story. His discussion of Jekyll's will is a prime example:

... it provided not only that, in case of the decease of Henry Jekyll, M.D., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S. &c., all his possessions were to pass into the hands of his 'friend and benefactor Edward Hyde'; but that in case of Dr. Jekyll's
'disappearance or unexplained absence for any period exceeding three calendar months,' the said Edward Hyde should step into the said Henry Jekyll's shoes without further delay, and free from any burden or obligation, beyond the payment of a few small sums to the members of the doctor's household. (35)

All possible circumstances are covered by Dr. Henry Jekyll as he attempts to provide financially for his alter-self in case Hyde assumes entire possession of his body. Mentioning the two possible circumstances together, death or disappearance, gives both equal credence and covers either circumstance for the comfortable continuation of Jekyll/Hyde. Since either Jekyll's demise or his disappearance means that the alter-self in the form of Hyde assumes such domination that Jekyll ceases to exist, the message is antithetical, for Jekyll and Hyde are the same character. Stevenson has Jekyll disavow the connection of Hyde to Jekyll by separating them into two distinct characters and, by suggesting that only one can exist, sets up the antithesis, since both good and evil dwell in the same character; they are the same person.

Jekyll's legitimacy, presented through the titles he has earned, "M.D., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S. &C.," are contrasted to Hyde, who is vaguely a "friend and benefactor," an erroneous statement that is antithetical,
since Hyde has no legitimacy without Jekyll. Also, Hyde does not act as Jekyll's benefactor; rather, the opposite is true: Hyde will benefit from Jekyll's death or disappearance. By giving Hyde legitimacy, however erroneously, Jekyll transfers his own legitimacy to him. The juxtaposition of the two titles reinforces this idea.

Further, Hyde is the private side of Jekyll, that side Jekyll secretly wishes he could be; the public Jekyll is the upstanding and dreary doctor, friend to the upstanding and dreary Utterson. By juxtaposing Jekyll's credentials to "'friend and benefactor Edward Hyde,'" Jekyll acknowledges his dependence upon the mysterious character of Hyde and suggests that Hyde is destined to become the public figure. This is antithetical to Jekyll's desire as he struggles to regain control of the two opposing powers. He refers to himself first and places Hyde second, inventing a position for him, and in so doing, he connects the two characters.

Again in the sentence, the juxtaposition of "the said Edward Hyde should step into the said Henry Jekyll's shoes without further delay" repeats the antithetical message of both characters as separate. Jekyll provides for Hyde without any responsibilities, assuring Hyde's financial position, "free from any burden or obligation, beyond the payment of a few small sums." By the end of the passage, Dr. Jekyll is no longer referred to by name, only by title and possession, "the doctor's household"—he's lost his
identity and his legitimacy.

Bringing his tale to a close, Stevenson entitles his final chapter "Henry Jekyll's Full Statement of the Case," providing a full explanation for Utterson by allowing Dr. Jekyll to explain what has happened in his life. The final paragraph has Jekyll struggling to complete his confession before the dominant Mr. Hyde consumes the shared body for eternity. The last half of the paragraph reads,

Half an hour from now, when I shall again and forever reindue that hated personality, I know how I shall sit shuddering and weeping in my chair, or continue, with the most strained and fearstruck ecstasy of listening, to pace up and down this room (my last earthly refuge) and give ear to every sound of menace. Will Hyde die upon the scaffold? or will he find the courage to release himself at the last moment? God knows: I am careless; this is my true hour of death, and what is to follow concerns another than myself. Here, then, as I lay down the pen, and proceed to seal up my confession, I bring the life of that unhappy Henry Jekyll to an end. (97)

Dr. Jekyll's life has been reduced to one-half hour, as he counts the short time left in which to rid himself of the burden he carries alone. By completing his confession, Jekyll writes his own eulogy and symbolically seals his
coffin. The entry is paradoxical, for Jekyll hates that side of himself he has knowingly unleashed and enjoyed until he could no longer control it. And yet the unleashing was in itself an attempt to lose the tight controls of his societal obligations.

Stevenson's final description of Jekyll contrasts to his opening description of Utterson, for here we view a character who has no redeeming social acceptability or place left, a situation that is self-imposed and yet one that Jekyll continues to not quite accept. The loss of control is evident in the description "I shall sit shuddering and weeping . . . with the most strained and fearstruck ecstasy of listening, to pace up and down this room . . . every sound of menace," as Stevenson builds the entrapped and fearful mein surrounding Jekyll. Stevenson juxtaposes Jekyll's expected reaction, but abandons the parallelism he often employs. Failure to construct this description in this way emphasizes the loss of control experienced by the character. The remainder of the paragraph continues to develop Jekyll's loss of control and it is not until the final sentence that control is regained and the sentence employs parallelism: "as I lay down the pen, and proceed to seal up my confession, I bring the life of that unhappy Henry Jekyll to an end."

Mr. Hyde's fate is unknown to Dr. Jekyll, and Jekyll rambles on as he explores that uncertainty, the paradoxical
message being reinforced. Although Jekyll disassociates himself from Hyde, he cannot separate from him: "Will Hyde die upon the scaffold? or will he find the courage to release himself at the last moment? ... this is my true hour of death ... what is to follow concerns another than myself." As Jekyll struggles with his own confession and the realization that his alter-self (Hyde) will destroy him, he contemplates his own destruction, contrasting his final appearance as Jekyll to what will follow, the uncertainty of not knowing what Hyde will do with his earthly body. He states that his death is accomplished with the completion of his confession. His private self no longer exists after he has made public confession. The contrast is further reinforced through the counterpoint of the future action for which he seeks absolution to the current, private action, which is uncertain.
Weir of Hermiston is Stevenson's final novel, unfinished at the time of his death, in which he explores the relationship of a man and his wife, a mother and her son, and a father and his son. Set in Scotland, the story revolves around the Weir family, beginning with the marriage of Adam Weir to Jean Rutherford and then moving to the relationship of Adam and Jean to their only child, Archie. Following the death of Jean, Archie and Adam struggle with their relationship, which is fraught with conflicts. The story parallels Stevenson's life. He and his father were often at odds, and he felt ostracized from his family and his home. He attempted to return to Scotland for a visit prior to writing Weir but was forced to abandon his trip because of his health. He died in Samoa before he finished the novel without having returned to Scotland.

He begins Weir:

The Lord Justice-Clerk was a stranger in that part of the country; but his lady wife was known there from a child, as her race had been before her. The old "riding Rutherfords of Hermiston," of whom she was the last descendant, had been famous men of yore, ill neighbours, ill subjects, and ill husbands to their wives though not their properties. Tales of them were rife for twenty miles about; and their
name was even printed in the page of our Scots histories, not always to their credit. One bit the dust at Flodden; one was hanged at his peel door by James the Fifth; another fell dead in a carouse with Tom Dalyell; while a fourth (and that was Jean's own father) died presiding at a Hell-Fire Club, of which he was the founder. There were many heads shaken in Crossmichael at that judgment, the more so as the man had a villainous reputation among high and low, and both with the godly and the worldly. At that very hour of his demise, he had ten going pleas before the Session, eight of them oppressive. And the same doom extended even to his agents; his grieve, that had been his right hand in many a left-hand business, being cast from his horse one night and drowned in a peat-hag on the Kye-skairs; and his very doer (although lawyers have long spoons) surviving him not long, and dying on a sudden in a bloody flux. (84)

The contrast between "The Lord Justice-Clerk" (Adam Weir) and "his lady wife" (Jean Rutherford), sets up an inherent and basic difference in them: he did not belong, but she did. Although belonging, being a part of the local culture, is an important part of the novel, Stevenson chooses to mention Adam's failure to belong first, emphasizing the lower position this character has in the story. Adam's contrast to Jean and
her desirable position is further strengthened through the use of counterpoint with "as her race had been before her," adding credence to her acceptability through the complementary relationship and thereby cementing "the Lord Justice-Clerk's" position as an outsider. The "lady wife's" legitimacy extends beyond her generation to her forebears, suggesting the strong clanish nature of the Scottish culture. Stevenson uses the two characters' titles rather than their names to begin his story, thereby emphasizing the public recognition and legitimacy.

The second sentence describes Jean's ancestors, developing the image of the renegades they were and setting the scene for the paradoxical situation of the marriage, for "The Lord Justice-Clerk" passes judgment upon people as Jean's family. Parallelism is used to develop the description: "... ill neighbors, ill subjects, and ill husbands," with contrast completing the statement, "to their wives though not their properties."

The next sentence explains the harsh judgment and reinforces reputation. It extends beyond the immediate area to "twenty miles about and their name was even printed in the page of our Scots histories." Using counterpoint through the complementary expansion of their fame, Stevenson develops the description and continues to place Jean to the place of her birth. He reinforces this sense of belonging throughout the paragraph, while at the same time setting up the paradoxical
theme of the story, for Jean's legitimacy is based on longevity and not on respectability.

The juxtaposition of the deaths of each Rutherford to their reputation develops this judgment in the fourth sentence, explaining the untimely and violent deaths of four ancestors and then developing the public judgment of the disreputable lives of the Rutherfords: "There were many heads shaken in Crossmichael at that judgment." Further, parallelism is employed following the public judgment to expand it beyond the immediate area and the limitation of earthly life: "among high and low, and both with the godly and the worldly." Jean's father was a thoroughly despicable character, but he was a known character and therefore had a place in the region.

The remainder of the paragraph connects Jean's father to his compatriots and cements them together in the judgment of their deaths, even the deaths that are not interfered with by society. Even so, a harsh judgment that the dead received just punishment expands the idea of "the godly and the worldly" through the use of counterpoint, by suggesting that the deaths were the result of the association to the Rutherfords. It is an ominous beginning to the tale.

Further on in the novel, Stevenson conveniently provides a personal definition of his Scottish background as he continues to explore the Scottish psyche and the relationships surrounding the Weirs:
Such an unequal intimacy has never been uncommon in Scotland, where the clan spirit survives; where the servant tends to spend her life in the same service, a helpmeet at first, then a tyrant, and at last a pensioner; where, besides, she is not necessarily destitute of the pride of birth, but is, perhaps, like Kirstie, a connection of her master's, and at least knows the legend of her own family, and may count kinship with some illustrious dead. For that is the mark of the Scot of all classes: that he stands in an attitude towards the past unthinkable to Englishmen and remembers and cherishes the memory of his forebears, good or bad; and there burns alive in him a sense of identity with the dead even to the twentieth generation.

(131)

Even before Stevenson mentions Scotland, he utilizes his normal contrastive and antithetical sentence patterning in "has never been uncommon" to reveal what is common practice in Scotland: for servants to feel a connectedness to place and family. Further on in that same sentence he once again uses these techniques, "she is not necessarily destitute of the pride of birth," to support that Kirstie does have legitimacy in her connectedness to family and clan. In his description of the servant's role, Stevenson juxtaposes the changing status of the employee to her employer, using parallelism to
frame the list: "a helpmeet at first, then a tyrant, and at last a pensioner." He juxtaposes the mention of time "helpmeet at first, . . . and at last a pensioner," reversing the repetition as he employs counterpoint to emphasize not only the change in status but the continuity of position for the Scot servant. He then contrasts Kirstie's position of servant to her connection to family and clan with "where, besides, she is not necessarily destitute of the pride of birth, but is, perhaps, like Kirstie, a connection of her master's, and at least knows the legend of her own family, and may count kinship with some illustrious dead." Interestingly, "nevertheless" could be superimposed in this sentence structure, adding to the Scottish viewpoint ("where, [nevertheless], she is not . . . but is, [nevertheless] . . . and at least [nevertheless] knows . . . and may [nevertheless] count). Also, Stevenson uses the word "but" to set up the contrast in this antithetical statement. His purpose is to explain the legitimacy of Kirstie and her position, and in so doing he reveals his cultural struggle with the divided allegiance felt by the Scot. Here the division is between the servant's "illustrious dead" and "the clan spirit." The servant's connection to individual family and to the extended community of the clan underscores the cultural psyche of the Scot, identified by Watson as Stevenson's "internal division."

In the second sentence, Stevenson utilizes these same
techniques but also provides us with a composite picture of his cultural view of Scotland: "For that is the mark of the Scot of all classes: that he stands in an attitude towards the past unthinkable to Englishmen, and remembers and cherishes the memory of his forebears, good or bad; and there burns alive in him a sense of identity with the dead even to the twentieth generation." In his contrast of the Scot's psychological connection to his family and his heritage to the Englishman's "unthinkable attitude," Stevenson supports the notion that the Scot dwells on his culture in an attempt to legitimize it. By contrasting the Scot's painstaking connection to his heritage to the Englishman's apparently "unthinkable" lack of connection, Stevenson explains the paradoxical Scottish view. The Englishman does not need to remember his past; he has a present legitimacy and culture and he is comfortable in his position. It is only the man who has no solid future (or present) who must dwell on the past.

Stevenson provides his own definition of the Scottish psyche that is reinforced in his writing style. Beyond the conscious effort to deal with his conflicts, he structures his sentences to underscore this background. He contrasts the Scottish psyche to the English, suggesting that the Scottish view is universal to the Scot through "For that is the mark of the Scot of all classes." He juxtaposes the Scottish view to the English by beginning with it, then contrasting it to the English using the term "unthinkable" to indicate that the very
idea is unnecessary to the English, then returns to the Scot's view, "and remembers and cherishes the memory of his forebears." He extends the definition and employs counterpoint to clarify the Scot's cultural view of himself, "and there burns alive in him a sense of identity with the dead even to the twentieth generation." He makes his point and then reinforces it by explaining further: "remembers and cherishes the memory of his forebears . . . there burns alive in him a sense of identity with the dead."

The obvious paradox is that Scotland has been conquered by England and is connected to it politically; however, for Stevenson, his historical background—his culture—is separate from England and he explains this separation, which is obvious to him. In reality, Stevenson is oftentimes identified as an English writer; as is obvious in this paragraph, he does not agree. He dwells upon the past when Scots were completely separate from the English, and here he extolls the virtues of the Scottish identification.

*Weir of Hermiston* is Stevenson's unfinished novel. There has been some speculation about how he would have ended it, about the direction he was going. One such suggestion is that The Lord Justice-Clerk would be forced to pronounce the judgment of hanging upon his only son, Archie, thereby ending his own and "his lady-wife's" continuity. Certainly that ending would have been conducive to Stevenson's most complicated relationship with Scotland and with his family.
Stevenson has stated that this connection to the past is what sets the Scot apart from the Englishman. Disruption of that connection through the ending of a lineage would be the ultimate paradox. Of course, because Stevenson did not finish the novel, this ending can be only speculation. His final paragraph does find Archie wrestling with his confusing relationship to Christina Elliott, who, she says "... come of decent people, and I'll have respect' ... and the first sob broke from her like the paroxysm of some mortal sickness" (194). In the final paragraph, Archie struggles to understand the complexity of her outburst, unsure of his position or her emotions:

Archie ran to her. He took the poor child in his arms, and she nestled to his breast as to a mother's, and clasped him in hands that were strong like vices. He felt her whole body shaken by the throes of distress, and had pity upon her beyond speech. Pity, and at the same time a bewildered fear of this explosive engine in his arms, whose works he did not understand, and yet had been tampering with. There arose from before him the curtains of boyhood, and he saw for the first time the ambiguous face of woman as she is. In vain he looked back over the interview; he saw not where he had offended. It seemed unprovoked, a wilful convulsion of brute nature. ... (194)
The first image within the paragraph is of Archie attempting to comfort Christina, but her hold on him is "strong like vices," contrasting the outward weakness of her sobbing collapse to the inner strength within her body. The image also explains the connection that Archie has to her and forecasts the potential degradation the relationship holds for him. The paradoxical situation is that Archie is the weak character; Christina's strength is multi-faceted, not the least of which is physical.

The third sentence reinforces the image of her strength, once again emphasizing her physical strength, "her whole body shaken by the throes of distress." The sentence uses parallelism to develop Archie's passionate feelings: "He felt her whole body . . . and had pity upon her." He moves from feeling her physical, publicly obvious person to his emotional and private feelings for her, contrasting the weaker and less clear emotional to the stronger and obvious physical. The two opposing and yet complementary reactions are then further developed in "Pity, and at the same time a bewildred fear of this explosive engine in his arms . . .," this time reversing the order, contrasting the physical to the emotional.

As Archie struggles with his bewilderment in an attempt to understand Christina, he turns inward and searches his past ("remembers his boyhood") to find a connection to her feelings. The next sentence uses counterpoint to solidify his confusion, "In vain he looked back over the interview; he saw
not where he had offended." The negative "saw not where" underscores the conflict he feels as well as develops the counterpoint of the action to the judgment of the action.

Stevenson's final sentence underscores his conflict, "It seemed unprovoked, a wilful convulsion of brute nature." Archie's confusion is developed as he views the violent reaction of Christina and, through the counterpoint of opposing views, "unprovoked" to "convulsion of brute nature," judges himself, a fitting end to Stevenson's tumultuous life.
V: A Comparison to Thomas Hardy

In order to provide a comparison to another culture to validate my observations regarding Stevenson and his Scottish culture, I have looked at one of Thomas Hardy's novels, *The Hand of Ethelberta: A Comedy in Chapters*. As an English Nineteenth Century writer, Hardy represents his culture in much the same way Stevenson does his. This review is not intended to be an exhaustive study either of Hardy or of the differences between him and Stevenson. Since *Ethelberta* has 47 chapters plus a sequel, and my intention is to set up a recognizable and undisputable pattern to my choices of text, I chose a total of five paragraphs to review and looked at either the first or the last paragraph of selected chapters. Although only a cursory examination of one of his works, there is an obvious difference in style that suggests a different world view. The novel begins:

Young Mrs. Petherwin stepped from the door of an old and well-appointed inn in a Wessex town to take a country walk. By her look and carriage she appeared to belong to that gentle order of society which has no worldly sorrow except when its jewellery gets stolen; but, as a fact not generally known, her claim to distinction was
rather one of brains than of blood. She was the daughter of a gentleman who lived in a large house not his own, and she began life as a baby christened Ethelberta after an infant of title who does not come into the story at all, having merely furnished Ethelberta's mother with a subject of contemplation. She became teacher in a school, was praised by examiners, admired by gentlemen, not admired by gentlewomen, was touched up with accomplishments by masters who were coaxed into painstaking by her many graces, and, entering a mansion as governess to the daughter thereof, was stealthily married by the son. He, a minor like herself, died from a chill caught during the wedding tour, and a few weeks later was followed into the grave by Sir Ralph Petherwin, his unforgiving father, who had bequeathed his wealth to his wife absolutely. (33)

Hardy begins with a description, not of the physical attributes of "Young Mrs. Petherwin," but of her connection to her family and place. There is a correlation between this description and Stevenson's opening paragraph of *Weir of Hermiston* in that way. Like Stevenson, Hardy connects Ethelberta to family and position; however the connection is not hers, but her husband's. The first sentence of the
paragraph sets her in an established place, participating in an appropriate and established activity, "to take a country walk."

His paragraph begins with the connection to place and acceptable activity, then moves to public appearance, comparing it to the private truth (which is not what appearances suggest), and then continues with a description of Ethelberta's talents, and finishes with her husband's family connection. Hardy does not produce a conflicting view of Ethelberta. While there is a contrast between what others believe of her and what actually is the truth, Hardy explains this misconception clearly and without reiteration. Both his sentence and his paragraph structure support the message that Ethelberta may appear differently from what she is, but there is no conflict for her. She does not step outside her cultural boundaries nor does she apparently attempt to.

By presenting her legitimate "claim of distinction" first, "one of brains" and leaving "than of blood" to the second position, Hardy stresses Ethelberta's qualification. Her legitimacy involves her personal achievements and not her background or her culture. The placement of the material supports Hardy's description.

Even Ethelberta's name is not hers; "she began life as a baby christened Ethelberta after an infant of title who does not come into the story at all." As befitting a young
woman of her time, she was groomed to marry as well as her station allowed, and these painstakingly developed virtues are presented by Hardy in place of her connection to place, family, or name, beginning with her name.

Compared to Stevenson's discussion of Jean Rutherford's legitimacy, Ethelberta has none, having achieved her station through "brains [rather] than blood." Her talents were cultivated to help her marry well. Hardy does not contrast Ethelberta to her husband, but reaffirms her conformity and legitimacy through "a minor like herself." When her husband dies and leave her at the mercy of his family, she is without property or heritage or marriage. She is bereft of connection.

Hardy develops Ethelberta's persona by making a statement ("her claim of distinction was rather one of brains than of blood") and then developing it, but not disputing it. The sentence structure also supports Hardy's message. Each bit of information is presented and then built upon, but not reasserted. He does not construct the paragraph to suggest a conflict within the character. While Ethelberta may not be what others decide she is, she does conform to her position and the acceptable view of her, both privately and publicly.

Young Mrs. Petherwin is presented in a direct manner. Even when Hardy constructs a sentence using parallelism,
"She became teacher in a school, was praised by examiners, admired by gentlemen, not admired by gentlewomen, was touched up with accomplishments by master, . . . was stealthily married by the son," the repetition reinforces her public image and ignores completely her private, producing no contrastive view of the character.

The young man she marries is, "a minor like herself," producing no paradoxical view of her born position to her achieved. It is what is expected of her. She does not obtain vast sums of money. Everything is as expected. Hardy presents his information and then moves on. He does not reassert or contrast the information.

Chapter Four begins with,

The last light of a winter day had gone down behind the houses of Sandbourne, and night was shut close over all. Christopher, about eight o'clock, was standing at the end of the pier with his back towards the open sea, whence the waves were pushing to the shore in frills and flounces that were just rendered visible in all their bleak instability by the row of lights along the sides of the jetty, the rapid motion landward of the wavetips producing upon his eye an apparent progress of the pier out to sea. This pier-head was a spot which Christopher enjoyed visiting on
such moaning and sighing nights as the present, when the sportive and variegated throng that haunted the pier on autumn days was no longer there, and he seemed alone with weather and the invincible sea. (58)

Forshadowing the chapter, this description places Christopher as an outsider to the accustomed behavior of others; he is outside on a cold winter's night, an activity he enjoys and participates in frequently. Hardy crafts his description of the sea at odds with both Christopher and the land by beginning with the closeness of the "houses of Sandbourne" and the unity of the evening with them "night was shut close over all." The contrast between this image of humanity and nature is that Christopher is outside it; he is "standing at the end of the pier with his back towards the open sea." Although he is not connected to the house, he is also not connected to the sea. The sentence structure reaffirms this contrast but does not reassert it. There is no conflict.

Christopher is at the end of the pier, looking toward the land and it is because of the "row of lights along the sides of the jetty" that he can see the sea's activity. And yet, the movement produces the appearance of the "apparent progress of the pier out to the sea." This contrast between perspective of movement and actual movement foreshadows the
chapter because Christopher here sees himself standing on a pier that seems to be moving away from the land and a connection to it. As we shall see, this is what he observes at the end of the chapter: his perspective changes as his position changes. It is not antithetical, but, rather, supports Hardy's point.

Hardy develops Christopher's observations by once again building on the description. He completes his description and then moves on.

The final paragraph of Chapter Four reads,

Thus continually beholding her and her companions in the giddy whirl, the night wore on with the musicians, last dances and more last dances being added, till the intentions of the old on the matter were thrice exceeded in the interests of the young. Watching the couples whirl and turn, advance and recede as gently as spirits, knot themselves like house-flies and part again, and lullabied by the faint regular beat of their footsteps to the tune, the players sank into the peculiar mesmeric quiet which comes over impressionable people who play for a great length of time in the midst of such scenes; and at last the only noises that Christopher took cognizance of were those of the exceptional kind, breaking
above the general sea of syllabic talk of those who happened to linger for a moment close to the leafy screen--all coming to his ears like voices from those old times when he had mingled in similar scenes, not as servant but as guest. (63)

Completing the description of the night which began with Christopher contemplating both the sea and the land with his involvement on the land some ways from his original activity, Hardy develops the image of the sea in a different way, relating it to the humanity that surrounds but does not complete Christopher. The paragraph begins with Christopher's observation of the activity at the dance. He is the musician who provides the music, having been summoned by a companion from his past. There is some conflict here between the expectations of the young people in attendance and the desire of the old and between Christopher's former position and his present one. Yet Hardy does not construct his sentences to be contrastive.

In the first sentence, he states the activity that occurs, "last dances and more last dances being added . . . were thrice exceeded," and contrasts the "intentions of the old . . . in the interests of the young," but does not construct the sentence so that the conflict is unexpected or in contrast to the expected. Instead, he states that it is "in the interest of the young" so that the conflict is
resolved for the betterment of the party.

The final sentence uses parallelism to develop the activities and the contrast between the dancers and the players. Although the movements of the dancers is developed first, it is presented from Christopher's observation, beginning with "Watching the couples." The list of activities is then juxtaposed to "the players" reaction to their activity, contrasting the two and using counterpoint, for Hardy plays off complementary and opposing viewpoints to produce the contrasting observation. Christopher begins by observing the activity and ends by concentrating on the sounds that come to him. In so doing, he combines with the scene and compares it to the sea, his earlier activity. The final conflict is presented at the end of the sentence when Christopher recalls the time he participated "not as servant but as guest."

Chapter Nineteen begins with a description of Picotee's feelings for her suitor, Christopher:

Picotee's heart was fitfully glad. She was near the man who had enlarged her capacity from girl's to woman's, a little note or two of young feeling to a whole diapason; and though nearness was perhaps not in itself a great reason for felicity when viewed beside the complete realization of all that a woman can desire in such
circumstances, it was much in comparison with the outer darkness of the previous time. (150)

Here Picotee has found love that, while still in the beginning fitful stages, gladdens her heart and gives her reason for joy. Her feelings are conflicting, but she is not in conflict with them. There is no contrast either within Picotee or within the sentence structure. The paragraph begins with "fitfully glad" which sets up the conflicting emotions. The second sentence then explains the conflict; the relationship is not completely perfect, but it is better than what came before it "the outer darkness of the previous time." The conflict is apparent through the use of the word "though," but it is then resolved by the end of the sentence. Hardy compares but does not contrast the conflicting emotions.

The final two paragraphs of the story deal with a conversation involving relatives of Ethelberta:

"We will endeavour not to trouble her," said Christopher, amused by Picotte's utter dependence now as ever upon her sister, as upon an eternal Providence. "However, it is well to be kin to a coach though you never ride in it. Now, shall we go indoors to your father? You think he will not object?"

"I think he will be very glad," replied
Picotee. "Berta will, I know." (243)

Ethelberta ends up well enough at the end of Hardy's novel and she is able to provide, when necessary, for her family. However, the sister does not enjoy complete connection with her, as indicated by "it is well to be kin to a coach though you never ride in it." Here the possibility exists of some backing, but that is not the normal. The family connection is weak.

Picotee is "dependent" on her sister, "now as ever," which is then reinforced by the final comment, "Berta will, I know." The relationship is clearly defined. There is no conflict within the family or between the public or private view.

When Christopher questions Picotee's father's reaction, he asks, "You think he will not object?", employing a negative that actually expects and requires a positive answer. That answer is affirmed by Picotee's response, "I think he will be glad," expanding it, of course, to Ethelberta. The conflicts are resolved and the sentence structure supports the resolution.

Thomas Hardy develops his story of conflict both between and within the characters but rarely resorts to the contrastive techniques that Robert Louis Stevenson employs extensively. He does occasionally use them. He does not, however, use them as frequently as Stevenson. His style is
different from Stevenson and one element that contributes to the difference is his culture. He does not construct his novels using the same culturally dictated techniques as Robert Louis Stevenson because he does not belong to the same cultural background.

In the final analysis, it is not that Robert Louis Stevenson represents his culture, but, rather, that the Scottish culture defines Stevenson. His style includes those linguistic and thematic choices that have helped shape his view of the world. His expressions and his thought patterns revolve around his culture and are inclusive of it. Certainly each writer also develops an individual style, separate from any other writer and identifiable as unique. Many influences work on a writer during all the stages of that writer's life, affecting both the psyche and the art. Culture is just one.

As already mentioned, my original hypothesis was that Stevenson's cultural techniques would become less evident in his writings as time and place distanced him from his homeland. I did not find evidence to support that hypothesis. Instead, at least for Stevenson, his culturally dictated techniques were more pronounced in his final novel. Of course, Stevenson's personal history can be used to explain this observation. He could not return to his homeland. However, this explanation does not consider all
possibilities.

A stronger suggestion is that all writers remain influenced by background. Writers produce material that represents their own unique view of the world. That view has been influenced by many experiences, not the least of which is cultural background.

Robert Louis Stevenson is, above all, a Scottish writer.
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