

OPEN ACCESS



# International Journal of English and Literature

April-June 2022  
ISSN: 2141-2626  
DOI: 10.5897/IJEL  
[www.academicjournals.org](http://www.academicjournals.org)



**ACADEMIC  
JOURNALS**  
expand your knowledge

## ABOUT IJEL

**The International Journal of English and Literature** is published monthly (one volume per year) by Academic Journals.

**The International Journal of English and Literature (IJEL)** is an open access journal that provides rapid publication (monthly) of articles in all areas of the subject such as African literatures, literature appreciation, cultural studies, literary styles etc.

The Journal welcomes the submission of manuscripts that meet the general criteria of significance and scientific excellence. Papers will be published shortly after acceptance. All articles published in IJEL are peer-reviewed.

### Contact Us

**Editorial Office:** [ijel@academicjournals.org](mailto:ijel@academicjournals.org)

**Help Desk:** [helpdesk@academicjournals.org](mailto:helpdesk@academicjournals.org)

**Website:** <http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/IJEL>

**Submit manuscript online** <http://ms.academicjournals.me/>.

## **Editors**

### **Dr. Nemati Azadeh**

*Department of Teaching, Jahrom Branch,  
Islamic Azad University,  
Jahrom,  
Iran.*

### **Prof. C.J. Odhiambo**

*Department of Literature, Theatre and Film Studies.  
Moi University. P.O.Box 3900  
Eldoret 30100,  
Kenya.*

### **Dr. Mrudula Lakkaraju**

*Geethanjali College of Engineering and Technology,  
Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, +  
India.*

### **Dr. Miguel Fernández**

*Chicago State University, ED 215  
9501 South King Drive  
Chicago,  
USA.*

### **Dr. Sunil Mishra**

*Dronacharya College Of Engineering,  
Gurgaon(Hr)123506,  
India.*

### **Dr. Farid Parvaneh**

*Department of English Language and Literature,  
Islamic Azad University,  
Qom Branch,  
Iran.*

### **Dr. Arezou Zalipour**

*School of Language Studies and Linguistics,  
Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities,  
National University of Malaysia (UKM)  
Banda Baru Bangi, 46300 Bangi  
Selangor, Darul Ehsan.  
Malaysia.*

## Editorial Board

**Dr. Kevin Moore**

154A Hicks Street, 3F  
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201  
(917) 202-4565  
(718) 595-5758.  
USA.

**Dr. Shweta Garg**

School of Humanities and Social Sciences  
IIT Mandi, Mandi  
Himachal Pradesh,  
India.

**Dr. Mohammed I. Mahameed**

Department of English Language  
and Literature,  
Faculty of Arts,  
Tafila Technical University,  
Tafila-Jordan.

**Dr. Yildiz Turgut**

Department of School of Teaching and Learning  
University of Florida,  
USA.

**Dr. Jitendra Kumar Mishra**

English Communications and Soft Skills,  
Faculty of Science and Technology,  
The ICFAI University Tripura.  
India.

**Dr. Patil Anand Balu**

202 Pratiksha, Survey No 96/97,  
Plot No 217, Nr Bhimsen Joshi Park,  
Right Bhusari Colony, Kothrud,  
Pune, State: Maharashtra,  
India 411038.

**Dr. Ream Fathi Fares Odettallah**

Department of English Language and Literature,  
Jordan University/Amman,  
Jordan.

**Dr. Parul Mishra**

Department of English,  
Banasthali Vidyapeeth University,  
India.

**Dr. Dare Owolabi**

Department of English and Literary Studies,  
Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti,  
Nigeria.

**Dr. Ahmed ElShiekh**

Department of Translation and Linguistics,  
Zarqa Private University,  
Jordan.

**Prof. B. Abirami**

Sri Krishna College of Technology,  
Coimbatore,  
India.

**Dr. Vahid Nowrozi**

Department of publication and Centre Sanjeshetakmili, and  
Translator in Corporate Social Responsibility Development  
Centre  
Tehran,  
Iran.

**Dr. Juan José Varela**

Fernando III El Santo 7-8th,  
Santiago de Compostela 15706,  
Spain.

**Dr. Amir El-Said Ebrahim Al-Azab**

Bossat Karim El-Deen-Sherbin-Mansoura.  
Egypt.

**Dr. Maya Khemlani David**

Faculty of Languages and Linguistics  
University of Malaya.  
50603 Kuala Lumpur,  
Malaysia.

**Dr. Kanwar Dinesh Singh**

Government PG College, affiliated to HP University,  
Post Box # 5, G.P.O. SHIMLA:  
171001 HP India.

**Dr. Ruzbeh Babae**

Department of English language and literature,  
University of Putra,  
Malaysia.

**Dr. Sindkhedkar**

P.S.G.V.P's Mandal's A.S.C College, Shahada 425409,  
India.

**Dr. Lakshmi**

Department of English,  
Veltech Technical University ,  
Avadi, Chennai-54.  
India.

## Table of Content

<b>Ian McEwan's Solar and Helon Habila's Oil on Water: A comparative ecocritical study</b> Abiodun Oluwasola Fakemi	13
<b>Playing cat and dreaming butterfly – Skepticism of Montaigne and Zhuangzi</b> Chen YANG	25

*Full Length Research Paper*

# **Ian McEwan's *Solar* and Helon Habila's *Oil on Water*: A comparative ecocritical study**

**Abiodun Oluwasola Fakemi**

English Department, School of Humanities, University of Buckingham, United Kingdom.

Received 19 February, 2022; Accepted 4 April, 2022

**This study juxtaposes Ian McEwan's *Solar* and Helon Habila's *Oil on Water* to illustrate their areas of convergence and divergence concerning their portrayal of ecological discourse. Attention is paid, to how McEwan and Habila deploy characterisation (particularly of the main characters and female characters) to bring to the fore the overwhelming influence of socio-political and economic issues on ecological or environmental crises in the societies portrayed in the two narratives. The aesthetic and socio-political dimensions of ecocriticism are deployed in this study. In the same vein, the interplay of the socio-political and ethical dimensions has been investigated as well. Habila depicts women as victims of circumstances and females as representatives of problems in the postcolonial context while McEwan portrays them as a bad influence who inadvertently prevent men from saving the planet. Ironically, the same women are projected as objects to be used and discarded (in the same manner the natural world is exploited). In addition, *Solar* illustrates climate change issues and their effects on the planet though with an undertone of sociocentrism while *Oil* concentrates on the environmental vis-à-vis economic and social crises in the Niger Delta. It is also ascertained that what makes both texts invaluable for this study is the political and economic ties between the two major countries they are set in, as one is the former coloniser of the other. Significantly, both narratives are not apocalyptic.**

**Key words:** Aesthetic dimension, socio-political dimension, resource curse, national allegories, sociocentrism, ecocentrism.

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Their utopian dream becomes a dystopian reality**

The development observed in developed nations comes with a great price: sourcing raw materials which crude oil is a major factor, and while it gives the energy needed, it poses an existential challenge to the future of humanity. One other means to develop a nation is by engaging in deforestation. Africa is home to the raw materials needed

for development. It has crude oil and forests to get timbers. However, the focus of this study is on British and Nigerian societies, drawing inferences from petrol fiction and the climate crisis which necessitates finding alternative sources of energy with the emission of greenhouse gases in mind. These are issues foregrounded in the two primary texts: Ian McEwan's *Solar* and Helon Habila's *Oil on Water* (Habila, 2011; McEwan, 2010). Premise on this,

E-mail: [a.o.fakemi@keele.ac.uk](mailto:a.o.fakemi@keele.ac.uk).

Author(s) agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

both postcolonial ecocriticism and dimensions of ecocriticism are deployed for analysis.

The research questions set out to be answered by this study are: how is neo-colonialism affecting not just the people but also the environment? To what extent is *Oil on Water* postcolonial ecocritical writing? How accurate has the study demonstrated the hypocrisy of the West towards Africa with the juxtaposition of the two novels? The English and the Nigerian societies share common grounds. There would not have been a country called Nigeria without the British government, based on the history of colonialism, though the connection began earlier during the pre-Nigeria/slavery era. There has been a paradigm shift in the contemporary postcolonial literary discourse in Africa. The focus is shifted from what Europe had done during the colonial era to how the same Europe continues to control Africa's economy- neo-colonialism, a new form of colonialism. This exploitative nature of the bilateral relationship between the first world and the third world countries has a profound impact on the flora, fauna and aquatic world of all parties involved. This is what *Oil on Water* portrays.

Aside from the socio-political and economic connections between the settings of the novels, they have also been written in the same century and both works portray ecological issues more realistically than the apocalyptic writings of the 'calamitists', as McEwan coins it.<sup>1</sup> Unlike some fictional works that suggest a world already destroyed by flood, ice or one already plummeted by atomic bombs, *Solar* and *Oil* illustrate nineteenth and twentieth centuries' societal issues which contribute to climate problems.

It is ascertained in this study that there is hypocrisy in the approaches of the British government towards the climate change discourse. Juxtaposing McEwan's and Habila's narratives justifies this position: the same government that is concerned about the emission of greenhouse gasses to the atmosphere and demands that physicists in the United Kingdom find sources of clean energy as portrayed in *Solar*, is busy, by proxy, causing oil spillage in the Niger Delta of Nigeria and damaging the environment as depicted in *Oil on Water*. Buell (1995) calls this 'environmental doublethink' and 'split consciousness.' He explains that though citizens of developed nations desire greenery in their surroundings, and often ignore warnings about the toxic waste, they are 'relieved when the incinerator gets built in the less affluent and politically weaker county fifty miles downwind'.<sup>2</sup> And the local agencies that have made these nefarious acts against the ordinary people and the environment possible are the Nigerian government and

the militants.

The gap this study fills is that although many critical works have already been written on ecological issues in the west and the Niger Delta, none has demonstrated in comparison the various socio-political, economic and ecocritical problems that pervade the two societies. This study also brings to the fore a more realistic perspective on climate problems beyond the apocalyptic consciousness created by the 'calamitists.'

## SYNOPSIS OF THE NOVELS

The narrative, *Solar*, begins with the central character - Michael Beard's marital life, introducing him and his destined-to-end marriage with Patrice. Prof. Beard is a one-time winner of the prestigious Nobel Laureate Award for his discovery in Physics entitled: 'Beard-Einstein Conflation.' He achieves this at a youthful age and lives on past glory. He is portrayed as a failure in both his profession and marital life after two decades of being unproductive in his career and has had four divorces. He is also the embodiment of controversy on gender discourse and climate change. He is satirised extensively and can be seen as a man of multiple dimensions: a flirt, a cuckold, a climate denier turned climate change advocate, irresponsible, a cheat, a subject of ridicule, a buffoon, a coward, full of himself, ignorant, arrogant, an unrepentant misogynist, etc.

Beard has been married five times. His last marriage, with Patrice, a beautiful younger woman, becomes calamitous and it is the beginning of his end. Patrice discovers that Beard has an affair with his colleague, and she is sad about it. She begins seeing Tarpin, a builder who helps them with some construction work at home as a payback. She does this without any remorse and tells Beard about her escapade. This is the first stage of failure of Beard's fifth marriage. Surprisingly, he becomes more fascinated with Patrice after learning of her infidelity.

It is too late; there is no way to remedy what has been destroyed. Beard cannot believe that he is a cuckold. Patrice is seeing another man- Aldous, a post-doctoral researcher at the Centre that Beard heads after she left Tarpin for being violent. Tarpin threatens Aldous for taking Patrice from him. Beard gets back from a journey one day to find Aldous in his house. In the same scene, Aldous accidentally dies in his house, having slipped and hit his head against the wall. Beard capitalises on Tarpin's threat, which Aldous relates with him while they talk before his death. He will not be responsible for Aldous' death and then he places one of the tools Tarpin forgets in his house close to the lifeless body of Aldous. He sneaks out of the house since Patrice, his wife, is not around to witness it. Being that Patrice is aware of Tarpin's threat, she testifies against Tarpin. Tarpin is arrested for the crime and sent to jail for seven years.

Beard claims ownership of Aldous' patent which was to

<sup>1</sup> Mick Brown, 'Ian McEwan Interview: Warming to the Topic of Climate Change', *The Telegraph*, (2010) <<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/books/7412584/Ian-McEwan-interview-warming-to-the-topic-of-climate-change.html>> [accessed 5 October 2021].

<sup>2</sup> Lawrence Buell, *The Environmental Imagination, Thoreau, Nature Writing and the Formation of American Culture*, (London, Harvard University Press, 1995), p.4.

create solar energy and this does not end well for him. He chooses a partner to work with him on the project in South America. Tarpin takes his pound of flesh from Beard who inadvertently sends him to prison for an offence he did not commit. He destroys the solar panels of the project Beard hopes would help him to become an accomplished physicist once again.

*Oil on Water* depicts the lives of the people of the Niger Delta and their struggle for survival during the most critical period of Nigerian history. It was not the discovery of oil in Oloibiri in 1956 but the challenges associated with the lack of good management of it that makes oil a 'resource curse'. It gives the nation wealth but takes away peace and tranquillity from the people of the Delta region. Rufus, one of the two journalists contracted by Mr Floode to help find the militant group that kidnaps his wife, Isabel Floode, is the narrator. They are not the first to be sent on such a mission as later revealed. The journalists who last attempted were killed, and this makes it a daunting enterprise for both Zaq, an older journalist, and the young Rufus. Despite the thriller-like plot, it is an 'elaborate investigation of the ways the oil production has negatively affected the region's environment and population.'<sup>3</sup>

During their journey to the jetty in search of Isabela and her abductors (a group of militants headed by Professor), both Zaq and Rufus meet other characters whose lives also inform the outcome of the narrative. For instance, they meet a boatman, Tamuno and his son, Michael. Tamuno serves as their tour guide on his boat as he takes them everywhere without expecting any financial gain other than for them to take his son, Michael, to the city. He wants Michael to have an education and a bright future but he is sure that it is a pipe dream in their present locality because many young boys end up joining the militants, only to be eventually killed by the Nigerian soldiers or die by fire during pipeline vandalism. We can read hopelessness in Tamuno's request. (Feldner, 2018: pp. 35-37).

Zaq and Rufus, his former student, also meet Chief Ibiram. He narrates to them how they end up living in a small village compared with the paradise they once occupied. He tells them how his people are considering selling their ancestral lands because oil has been discovered there and for the money promised by the oil company. However, Chief Ibiram's uncle is the Chief of Yellow Island and his insistence on not selling the land in the village he heads leads to his arrest by the Nigerian military and the eventually concealed death – he was killed in their cell but not without coercing him to sign the contract that gives away the whole village to an oil company.

They meet Doctor Dagogo -Mark in a camp for the Nigerian soldiers and where they keep their prisoners.

The Major in charge of the camp sees any straying youth as a militant, the same way he arrests Tamuno and Michael and calls them militants. First thing in the morning, he instructs his boys to file them outside and bathe them with petrol in mockery of their cry for the ownership of the oil. Doctor Dagogo narrates his ordeal in a village where he was posted to replace a retired doctor. He tells them how oil is discovered and the people are jubilant. Their lifestyle changes in a euphoric manner that they attach so much to the 'orange light' produced by the flares at night. (p.91) Within two years, things turn bad for them as their river water becomes toxic and livestock and humans begin to die. Their utopian dream becomes a dystopian reality. Despite medical research evidence sent to the oil companies and the government, nothing is done to help the people.

At the end of the narrative, Zaq does not make it back to the city because he suffers from a terminal illness – dengue fever. He prefers to die and be buried in Irikefe, the village where there are priests and worshippers of water. Rufus locates Isabela, who escapes with the help of her former driver, Salomon and they are hopeful of her return to Port Harcourt but their journey is cut short by the Professor's boys, his semi-skilled soldiers. Isabela and Salomon are to be taken back to their camp and as they need to be sure that Chief Ibiram will not reveal their hideout to the soldiers, they are going to take Michael with them. Rufus, instead, volunteers to follow them. Rufus meets the Professor who sends him to Mr Floode on the ransom to pay and when. Then, Salomon is killed by the militants.

## RELEVANT LITERATURE REVIEWS

David Malcolm's *Understanding Ian McEwan*, though published before *Solar*, provides an invaluable backdrop to the writings of McEwan and one can identify McEwan as one who experiments with writing and who sometimes adheres to the conventional style of writing of his time. He is also known for representing gender issues in his work as he is convinced that the present world order is patriarchal. McEwan has written a few works before he wrote *Solar*, and the emergence of this work shows his interest in the prevalent ecological crisis in the world. Other critics have critiqued his works more closely.

Firstly, 'A Dirty Hero's Fight for Clean Energy: Satire, Allegory, and Risk Narrative in Ian McEwan's *Solar*' by Evi Zemanek considers the novel a 'risk narrative' (Zemanek, 2012).<sup>4</sup> He argues that it may be difficult to read ecocriticism into it without considering the events in it as allegories. This is because the private life of Michael Beard, the protagonist, overwhelms the ecological

<sup>3</sup> Maximilian Feldner, 'Representing the Neo-colonial Destruction of the Niger Delta: Helon Habila's *Oil on Water*', in *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 54 (2018), 515–527, (p. 515).

<sup>4</sup> Evi Zemanek, 'A Dirty Hero's Fight for Clean Energy: Satire, Allegory, and Risk Narrative in Ian McEwan's *Solar*', *European Journal of Literature, Culture and the Environment*, 3 (2012), pp. 51-60, (p.51).



concerns in it. He also points out that McEwan does not depict a dystopian society like many other ecocritical works. Zemanek submits: 'Praised as "the first climate-novel by an author of world-class," the novel's quality indeed depends on its allegorical concept, which solves a great problem of representation when one decides against dramatizing hurricanes and floods.'<sup>5</sup> In this critical work, he relies on discourse analysis and allegorical interpretation to make certain assertions. He explains that risk and fiction have an affinity. While the former relates to the 'lack of secure knowledge and speculation', the latter exists in the realm of probability instead of reality.<sup>6</sup>

Zemanek's use of a metaphor such as what he calls 'risk narrative' though limiting and self-imposing, is useful to the course of this study. He has simply critiqued *Solar* as Astrid Bracke expected. Bracke's (2019) position on reading environmental discourse into certain works which do not explicitly discuss it, is also salient in this study. Seeing beyond the surface is central to this study as it intends to illustrate beyond the life of Michael Beard in tandem with ecocritical focus, it will consider, for instance, how women are depicted in the novel and their impact on the struggle to find a solution to the global problems and at the same time enumerate metaphor of marriage – the union a society needs vis-à-vis the union between humans and non-humans. So, beyond Zemanek's two risk management propositions, this study will emphasise women and marriage and their connection to ecocritical discourse.

Lastly, on *Solar*, Ilany Kogan explores the narrative from a psychoanalytic perspective. In his article entitled: 'Ian McEwan's *Solar* Through a Psychological Lens',<sup>7</sup> he illustrates the causes of certain effects in Michael Beard's life alongside the lives of other characters like his mother. One would have thought that Kogan would begin his exploration with Michael Beard, instead, he picks his mother, Angela Beard. He makes a very assertive point about her psychological well-being that hinges on her promiscuous lifestyle. She tells young Michael, at age seventeen, in what seems like a confession on her deathbed, that she had a series of affairs in the last eleven years and that is the only reason she has not been sad with her life. Kogan puts it this way: 'Angela used promiscuity to flee depression and fragmentation, trying in this way to save her precarious psychic existence.'<sup>8</sup>

He suggests also that the lives of Michael's parents affect his life. His mother withdraws her love from her husband and becomes a maniac who then tries to live on by having a series of affairs and that his father who is traumatized from the experience of war and who decides to have a life of tranquil and works as a local solicitor. He

concentrates on his car and roses during the weekend. He is unable to love his wife and son and according to Kogan (2012), impacts Michael as he is unable to have a stable love life and afraid to be a father. This study needs to illustrate the impact of Michael's mother on his life.

On *Oil on Water*, Helon Habila does not have the same literary recognition because of the comparative length of McEwan's writing career. He does not have a monograph written on his works yet. He began writing with a short story collection (Prison Stories 2000) which won the Caine Prize in 2001) just as in the case of McEwan and then published his first novel *Waiting for an Angel* (2004). His second novel, *Measuring Time*, came five years before he wrote *Oil on Water*, his third novel, in 2010, the *Chibok Girls* (2017) and lastly, *The Traveller* (2019). It is important to bear this in mind as we consider the various critical work *Oil*.

To begin with, 'Exploring Ideational Metafunction in Helon Habila's *Oil on Water*: A re-evaluation and redefinition of African Women's Personality and Identity through Literature' by Léonard A. Koussouhon explores the narrative using one of the linguistic approaches to literary texts. Koussouhon's focus is on how Habila portrays women in the novel, and he does so by deploying ideation metafunction theory, one that shows how 'transitivity analysis of a fictional text explores how the authorial ideology is encoded therein. This function construes human experience through language, by making sense of "reality".'<sup>9</sup> He considers 'womanism,' an African American concept of feminism, a more subtle type that rather considers the important and complementary roles of both men and women in society than viewing the sexes as at war.

Although Koussouhon (2015) uses quantitative analysis to generate his results, he brings to the fore a similar outcome one would have arrived at should the qualitative method had been used. Like Zemanek and Bracke, he uses language to derive his positions on *Oil* and illustrates extensively, the relationship between men and women in Africa. He concentrates on the equitable treatment of women by men which makes his work more of a feminist study rather than an ecofeminist analysis. In this study, however, women are not just considered for the inequality that pervades African society but put alongside nature.

Moving on, 'Literary Militancy and Helon Habila's *Oil on Water*' by Sule Emmanuel Egya<sup>10</sup> analyses the novel from an ecocritical stance. To Egya, a tripartite system of ruination is responsible for the literary militancy in the

<sup>5</sup> Zemanek, p.52.

<sup>6</sup> Zemanek, p.53.

<sup>7</sup> Ilany Kogan, 'Ian McEwan's *Solar* Through a Psychoanalytic Lens', *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 60 (2012), 1299–1313 <DOI:10.1177/0003065112465470> [accessed 20 October 2021].

<sup>8</sup> Kogan, p.1300.

<sup>9</sup> Léonard A. Koussouhon, 'Exploring Ideational Metafunction in Helon Habila's *Oil on Water*: A re-evaluation and redefinition of African Women's Personality and Identity through Literature', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 4 (2015) 129-136 < <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v4n.5p.129>> [accessed 20 September 2021], (p.130)

<sup>10</sup> Sule Emmanuel Egya, 'Literary Militancy and Helon Habila's *Oil on Water*', *Research in African Literatures*, 48 (2017), 94–104 <<https://doi.org/10.2979/reseafri.48.4.07>> [accessed 25 October 2021].

Niger Delta Literature and as depicted in *Oil on Water*. These individual bodies – ‘the multinational oil corporations, the federal soldiers and the local militias who call themselves militants’ - are responsible for the emerging consciousness in literature.<sup>11</sup> ‘Literary militancy emerges as a discourse force to confront this system of ruination, condemning the aforementioned agents of destruction.’ He prefers to use the term militancy rather than the common one, ‘literary activism’ because, according to him, it better ‘captures the sense of potential force and aggression in what I see as the metaphorical belligerence deployed by the writers.’<sup>12</sup>

These writers who have devoted their imagination to the emancipation of the people of the south-south/Niger Delta have been projecting how the multinational oil corporations in collaboration with the insensitive Nigerian government have been despoiling the region as they go ahead with their oil drilling. They have denied the people access to their means of livelihood, which is primarily fishing, with oil spillage, which has killed the animals in their waters. To resist this inhumane treatment from the government, an agitating civil movement rose to challenge them but with the force being used by the government instead of doing the right thing, radical militancy began, and they are also causing as much damage to the environment as do the oil corporations. Egya (2017) considers these three agents of destruction dangerous to the peace and tranquillity the people of this region deserve.

Senayan Olaoluwa’s ‘Dislocating Anthropocene: The City and Oil in Helon Habila’s *Oil on Water*’ (Senayan, 2020)<sup>13</sup> illustrates the events in the Niger Delta region with an important term in ecocriticism: the Anthropocene. From this paper, one can understand that the ‘Anthropocene marks the geological period of the pre-eminence and critical influence of the Anthropos, of the human being, which begins to mix with and in some cases perhaps even takes precedence over natural transformations.’<sup>14</sup> What this implies is that unlike the previous transformation the planet had experienced which was associated with nature changing course, this age of change is not natural but caused by human technology. He offers also that the understanding of the Anthropocene should enable humans to have the ethical defence which should have been used to leverage the survival of the natural world and its inhabitants but as this ethical stance is jettisoned, the world is beginning to experience the consequences.

Olaoluwa considers cities as metaphors in his analysis of *Oil on Water* and the Anthropocene. There is a need for oil in cities and other urban areas and this has led us to the ‘modern world’s catastrophic addiction to fossil

fuels.’<sup>15</sup> Oil is needed in the economic engine that propels the development of these cities and notably, decisions about the lives of the people in the rural areas are determined there. However, the people in the rural areas have also decided to migrate to the cities and in this case, Port Harcourt, which is coveted by Chief Ibiram and the old man that asks Zaq and Rufus to take his son Michael along with them. They believe that the city will provide a better life for them and hence should move there. Unfortunately, this invariably means that the city will consume their former local habitat completely. It is one of the effects of the Anthropocene. Lastly, Olaoluwa considers the local dwellers who have remained and are not able to survive because they have no means of surviving:

*We empathize with a group of rural dwellers whose predicament has been worsened by the overwhelming impact of fossil fuel energy-motivated exploration and conflict. The abundance of crude oil means the ubiquity of exploration that includes prospecting, gas flares, ubiquitous pipelines for which humans are violently dislocated for their installation, to say nothing of the pollution and contamination that leave an entire community drifting on stilts.*<sup>16</sup>

The next critical exploration of *Oil on Water* is ‘Rape of a Nation: An Eco-critical Reading of Helon Habila’s *Oil on Water*’ by Solomon Adedokun Edebor.<sup>17</sup> Like Olaoluwa has done with his work as discussed above, Edebor also concentrates on the exploitative nature of the modern economy dominated by a few people in the world and determining the fate of many others. He points out that what Habila has done with *Oil on Water* is to raise the level of consciousness of the masses to the prevalent damage being done to the planet. The Niger Delta struggle has been fuelled by the tripartite system of ruination noted in previous paragraphs, Edebor (2017) asserts that Habila fails to proffer any tangible solution.

The last critical work on *Oil on Water* is a broader spectrum deployed by Maximilian Feldner in ‘Representing the neocolonial destruction of the Niger Delta: Helon Habila’s *Oil on Water*.’<sup>18</sup> To Feldner (2018), although Nigeria is officially declared independent, the current economic and socio-political situations prove that it is undergoing a recurrence of colonialism in a disguised form. He exposes every effort of the far North to continue to make Africa underdeveloped with different policies and their engagements with the people. The idea of giving aid to African countries is a projection of a primitive world

<sup>11</sup> Egya, p.95.

<sup>12</sup> Egya, p.94.

<sup>13</sup> Olaoluwa, Senayan, ‘Dislocating Anthropocene: The City and Oil in Helon Habila’s *Oil on Water*’, *ISLE*, 27 (2020), pp. 234-267.

<sup>14</sup> Senayan, p.234.

<sup>15</sup> Senayan, p.239.

<sup>16</sup> Senayan, p.241.

<sup>17</sup> Solomon Adedokun Edebor, ‘Rape of a Nation: An Eco-critical Reading of Helon Habila’s *Oil on Water*’, *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 6 (2017), 41-49 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.18533/journal.v6i9.983>> [Accessed 12 September 2021].

<sup>18</sup> Maximilian Feldner, ‘Representing the Neocolonial Destruction of the Niger Delta: Helon Habila’s *Oil on Water* (2011)’, in *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 54 (2018), pp. 515 - 527.

that needs help to survive, and this undermines the true situation which is that the western world has continued to exploit Africa's natural resources, just as they have done during the colonial era. He also elaborates on how militancy in the region caused by the neglect of the government has contributed to the menace confronting the people, as Edebor highlights. Feldner (2018), however, does not think that Habila needs to proffer solutions as Edebor raised:

*However, it is questionable whether the novel actually aims to provide viable answers for Nigeria's troubled state. Rather, Habila uses his fiction to debate the political efficacy of writing, providing "reflections on the uncertainties of how writing could ever help to remediate the Niger Delta" (Medovoi, 2014: 23).<sup>19</sup>*

Egya, Olaoluwa, Feldner and Edebor take the discourse deeply into postcolonial ecocritical concern. Egya illustrations on the tripartite system of ruination will be deployed in the analysis of *Oil* in this study though to cover another perspective on it. Oluwaoluwa uses Anthropocene to discuss megacities like Port Harcourt and Lagos and the role they play in deplorable conditions in the rural areas of the Niger Delta. For Feldner, despite the declaration of independence for Nigeria, it remains dependent economically and this he said is caused by the new form of colonialism. Lastly, Edebor's position on *Oil* is not different from the other three. They are simply concentrating on how both humans and nature are exploited by the world powers. This study is designed to trace the source of this tripartite system, which seems a motif in the pre-colonial period. It will establish beyond doubt that exploitation in neo-colonialism is a product of slavery. Also, it deploys socio-political, ethical and aesthetic dimensions in its analysis and *Oil* has not arguably been approached in this manner.

## METHODOLOGY

In this study, qualitative analysis is deployed, and data are sourced from the existing body of works in ecocriticism, and secondary materials on the primary texts, most of which are available in both physical and online libraries. Considering the focus of the study, which is to juxtapose the two primary texts, a simultaneous comparison is done – both are referenced together. In the same vein, this study also illustrates not just the subject of both texts but also their forms and this also contributes to the findings.

## THEORETICAL ANGLE AND ANALYSIS

As an ecocritical study, aesthetic dimension ecocritics critique a text with the intent of discovering ways in which it creatively becomes useful in redefining, ecologically, the model of humanity and human culture. The focus of the aesthetic dimension critics will not only be on how a

text was written but also how the aesthetics of the text have helped to instil ecological consciousness in the readers. In this regard, *Solar* and *Oil* were written by two social commentators, and they have shown how an ecocritical narrative should be and what it should be about. To begin with, McEwan's and Habila's novels have complex plot structures, and it is, for this reason, *The New York Times Book Review* describes the former as 'the clockmaker of novelists, piecing together the cogs and wheels of his plot with unerring meticulousness' (Heller, 2005).<sup>20</sup> More significantly, the narrative points of view of the narratives set the tone and the resolutions in the two novels. McEwan's omniscient narrator points towards global issues while Habila's work depicts specificity – a region in Africa's most populous nation. i.e., one deals with global warming and the other deals with a specific environmental crisis.

McEwan deploys a third-person omniscient point of view. This type of narrator is perceived as one that 'knows everything that needs to be known about the agents, actions, and events, and has privileged access to the characters' thoughts, feelings, and motives.'<sup>21</sup> The character of Michael Beard can easily be understood because his inner and outer attributes are narrated through the lens of the all-knowing narrator. M.H Abram opines that an intrusive narrator passes judgement on the characters, which can be subjective.

Instances in *Solar* demonstrate the position maintained above and this enhances the reader's judgements of each character starting with Beard to Patrice, Aldous, Tarpin, and all the characters present at the fjord. For instance, when Beard contemplates the crisis that has just befallen his fifth marriage, the narrator reveals:

He needed to cease needing her, but desire was not like that. He wanted to want her. One sultry night he lay uncovered on the bed and tried to masturbate himself towards freedom. ...and his fantasy was continually interrupted by Tarpin, who like some ignorant stagehand with ladder and bucket, kept wandering onto the set. (McEwan, 2010: 7)

The omniscient narrator brings the secret life of Beard to the fore. He thinks of a way to pleasure himself on the island of loneliness Patrice maroons him on and each time he attempts to do anything of interest to him, he thinks of Tarpin, the man being used to replace him. Evidence of his perturbed state of mind is present here: 'What impressed him was his ability to think of nothing else. When he was reading a book, when he was giving a talk, he was thinking of her, or of her and Tarpin'. (*Solar*, 8) It does not take the narrator long before judgments are passed on all Beard's actions, leaving the readers with little or nothing to ponder on.

<sup>20</sup> Zoe Heller, 'Saturday': One Day in the Life', *The New York Times Book Review* (2005) <<https://www.nytimes.com/2005/03/20/books/review/saturday-one-day-in-the-life.html>> [Accessed 4 October 2021].

<sup>21</sup> M.H Abrams and Geoffrey Galt Harpham, *Glossary of Literary Terms*, 10th edn (Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2012), p. 301.

<sup>21</sup> Abrams and Harpham, p. 302.

<sup>19</sup> Feldner, p.520.

Further on characterisation, Brown (2010) interviewed McEwan and aside from Brown's personal view on it, McEwan suggests that *Solar* is particularly about climate change and some human players have not reached a consensus on it. The 'deniers' who say that man-made global warming is a myth; the 'sceptic' who wants to see data before believing; the 'warners' who keep raising concerns and lastly the 'calamitists' who project an apocalyptic world. McEwan describes himself as a warner because he feels the data available are enough to be concerned about.

In the above interview, he identifies four 'players' whose positions matter in what happens to the planet in the present time and the future. Where does Beard fall among these four categories? Is he an outright denier? Or is he a sceptic who will change his mind with the right data? Or like his maker (McEwan), is he a warner? And last but not least, is he a calamitist? The omniscient narrator reveals that Beard is a sceptic. He is aware of the data available about climate change:

And of course, he knew that a molecule of carbon dioxide absorbed energy in the infrared range, and that humankind was putting these molecules into the atmosphere in significant quantity. But he himself had other things to think about. And he was unimpressed by some of the wild commentary that suggested the world was in 'peril'. (McEwan, 2010: 15)

However, in another instance, he is portrayed as a denier as he believes that global warming is 'another beast' created by some people to scare others. 'He also distrusted anyone who routinely referred to "the planet" as proof of thinking big' (McEwan, 2010: 18). This reads like saying he does not believe there is any danger looming over the planet that people should be worried about and hence, he is in denier.

Having considered Beard's characterisation through the lens of the omniscient narrator in *Solar* and its implication on ecocritical discourse, it is pertinent to focus attention on the narrative style employed by Habila in *Oil*. As earlier pointed out, *Oil* is written in the first-person narrative point of view. Abrams and Harpharm (2012) suggest that this narrative style is subjective and limiting: 'This mode, insofar as it is consistently carried out, limits the matter of the narrative to what the first-person narrator knows, experiences, infers, or finds out by talking to other characters.'<sup>22</sup> For *Oil*, Rufus is the narrator, and one may suggest why Habila chose him as the narrator. Rufus is a 'son of the soil.' This implies that he has first-hand information about the central idea of the narrative, which is the impact of the despoliation of the Niger Delta region on both humans and the natural world. Arguably, this style proves to be effective because through what is revealed by the narrator, sympathy for the people of the region is garnered. Also, the natural world is for once given attention and finally, *Oil's* activism performs dual functions - being ecocentric and socio-

centric. While Beard needs to travel to the fjord to see for himself, the glacier melting, Rufus does not need to go so far. He is born into the environmental crisis in the Delta. The opening of the narrative sets up expectations that we are about to read what could be an autobiography, though it is fiction. Rufus narrates: 'I am walking down a familiar path, with incidents neatly labelled and dated.' (*Oil*, p. 1.) He understands the terrain. He is himself the evidence of the effect of the 'resource curse' on his people and he has witnessed the rage and beauty of the natural world. The reader sympathises with Rufus and his people – his father loses his job and ends up buying crude oil in the black market to resell. He sets up the entire village on fire one day and ends up in the prison but not without already making his daughter Boma's body, half-burnt, leaving a scar that scares men away from her. She is a victim of the exploitation of the Delta by international oil corporations.

Rufus tries to give a vivid picture of the state of the waters and landscape within the jetty. He recounts: 'Over the black, expressionless water there were no birds or fishes or other sea creatures – we were alone.' (*Oil*, 10) He reveals that he writes down what he witnesses in other places they have been to: 'I sat against the wall, and while Zaq fiddled absently with Chief Ibiram's radio I wrote down all that I had witnessed since we left Irikefe yesterday: the abandoned village and the hopeless landscape, the gas flares that always burned in the distance.'<sup>(24)</sup> Essentially, his experiential narrative serves as a revelation of the political, economic and social struggle of the people in the region. And this crusade is adequately received by readers because it reads like an autobiography, as readers are drawn closer to the narrator rather than the writer. It is also suggestive of the fact that Habila, being a northerner, needs to deploy an insider like Rufus to tell the Niger Delta's story. Indeed, it proves to be a valid way to write to convince your audience of what you believe. Readers sympathise with the people of the dystopian setting Rufus paints and readers are likely to be carried away by this sentiment.

Discussing the narrative style of *Oil* further, in Chinweizu's work, *Toward the Decolonisation of African Literature* (1980), he posits that Povey claims that many African novelists are so close to the event they narrate, and this makes their works lack 'artistic distance which is the basis of the writer's art.'<sup>(Chinweizu and Ihechukwu, 1980)<sup>23</sup></sup>. The study argues that the same plot can be narrated differently and therefore this should not be a critical concern. In *Oil*, we find that Habila tries to exercise this 'artistic distance' by creating a narrator in Rufus. Secondly, the plot of the narrative could be rewritten in another way, but would it achieve the same level of impact this style will have on its audience? The creation of Rufus is a deliberate and thoughtful option for

<sup>22</sup> Abrams and Harpharm, p. 302.

<sup>23</sup> Chinweizu, Onwuchekwa Jenie and Ihechukwu Madubi, *Toward the Decolonisation of African Literature* (Enugu: ABIC Books & Equip.Ltd, 1980), p. 115.

Habila. Again, his narrator balances the subject, which is to bring to the fore the frustration of the people and the natural world. Rufus gives both parties voices to air their plights.

What is ironic in *Solar* is that though there is an omniscient narrator, the narrative centres on an individual and despite *Oil* being narrated from an individual perspective, it relates to issues about the people. This position is elucidated by Fredric Jameson in his 'Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism.' As a critic of the Marxist political position, he asserts: *All third-world texts are necessarily, I want to argue, allegorical, and in a very specific way: they are to be read as what I will call national allegories, even when, or perhaps I should say, particularly when their forms develop out of predominantly western machineries of representation, such as the novel.*<sup>24</sup>

Jameson (1986) suggests here that work like Habila's *Oil* should be read as an allegory – one which says more than it explicitly reveals. The situation should be read alongside it and makes a close juxtaposition with the reality within its social context. He suggests further:

Third-world texts, even those which are seemingly private and invested with a properly libidinal dynamic necessarily project a political dimension in the form of national allegory: the story of the private individual destiny is always an allegory of the embattled situation of the public third-world culture and society.<sup>25</sup>

Jameson's exposition implies that Rufus, being the narrator and a major victim of the resource curse, is a symbol of everyone living in the Niger Delta region. *Oil* does explore activism for humans and the natural course. Its portrayal of the collective rather than individualist struggle against the government forces is evidence of African inclusivity and this encompasses all humans and other animals gracing the continent. In its explicit form, Rufus gives room for other characters to share their collective experiences – one reason for this is that the narrative takes the reader from one place to another, showing them what happens to the people that either once lived there or are living there in perpetual horror of what could befall them in the hands of either the militants or the insensitive Nigeria soldiers. On the other hand, delving into Rufus and Zaq's personal lives, we may be tempted to think that their experiences are personal. Unfortunately, there is no difference between their lives and those of their compatriots. They have all been affected by corruption in their government. Hence, they are allegorical elements in this national allegory, *Oil on Water*.

In *Solar*, however, the situation is different. Beard is individualistic. Jameson prefers *situation consciousness* to the more used *materialistic* west to refer to the prevalent socio-economic realities of the capitalist

society. He airs his frustration:

*It strikes me that we Americans, we masters of the world, are in something of that very same position. The view from the top is epistemologically crippling and reduces its subjects to the illusions of a host of fragmented subjectivities, to the poverty of the individual experience of isolated monads, to dying individual bodies without collective pasts or futures bereft of any possibility of grasping the social totality. This placeless individuality, this structural idealism which affords us the luxury of the Sartrean blink, offers a welcome escape from the "nightmare of history," but at the same time it condemns our culture to psychologism and the "projections" of private subjectivity.*<sup>26</sup>

Hence, rather than illustrating a collective consciousness of the people in the west, McEwan portrays the life of an individual whose subjective view about global warming cannot proffer tangible solutions to the problems confronting the planet. The inability to be open to other possibilities is another plaguing psychological torment in western society.

McEwan's and Habila's choices have proven critically useful in the central idea they project to their audience. As much as we may pretend not to know that context/culture plays a vital role in the production of any literary work, there will always be a need to make a comparison between texts written in and about different societies. An African worldview largely influences the subject or trajectory of *Oil* while western modernism plays the same role in *Solar*. Jameson concludes: 'And it is this, finally, which must account for the allegorical nature of third-world culture, where the telling of the individual story and the individual experience cannot but ultimately involve the whole laborious telling of the experience of the collectivity itself.'<sup>27</sup>

'Individualism' and 'national allegory' observed above in both primary texts could be applied to the women's representation of African women in *African Oil* and Western women in *Solar*. This time, we are considering the characterisation of women as deployed by Habila and McEwan. However, what is more sacrosanct to this study is how the characterisation of the women in these novels influences ecocritical concerns in them. In *Solar*, the female characters include Patrice (his fifth wife), Beard's mother (Angela), Maisie (his first wife), Mellissa (his last wife), Aldous' mother, and Darlene (his hidden lover). One character is central to all of them – Michael Beard. The character of Michael Beard encompasses two different but linked personalities: young Michael and older Michael. Angela had the first impact on the life of young Michael and later Maisie Farmer. Others seem to have shared in his later life when he has reached his self-imposed career climax. There is no way these female

<sup>24</sup> Fredric Jameson, 'Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism', *Social Text*, 15 (1986), pp. 65-88, (p. 69).

<sup>25</sup> Jameson, p. 69.

<sup>26</sup> Jameson, p. 85.

<sup>27</sup> Jameson, p. 86.

characters can be discussed in isolation - the narrator entwines them with Michael at various stages of his life.

To begin with, Angela is portrayed as a liberal feminist - as with others like her, marriage is important but must exist as an equal institution. So, Angela remains with Henry Beard, Michael's father, despite his unfaithfulness. The narrative reveals that the marriage remains loveless. 'Early in the marriage, for reasons that remained private, she withdrew her love from him. She lived for her son and her legacy was clear: a fat man who restlessly craved the attention of beautiful women who could cook'. (McEwan, 2010: 194) She needs to make herself happy and the only way she can achieve that is to revenge for what her husband had done. She feels she needs to sleep with as many men as possible and hence has seventeen lovers in the space of eleven years. And while all these are happening, Michael never takes notice of it. 'Young Michael registered no outward hostilities or silent tensions in the house, but then, he was neither observant nor sensitive.' (McEwan, 2010: 195) Angela regrets her actions. Although Michael feels there is no offence committed by her because he feels his mother shows him all the love in the world, she understands the psychological implication of her actions on him. In the latter part of the narrative, we see how he blames his mother for his obesity.

Angela, as it will be observed about Maisie and other female characters, is an archetype of First-world women whose social construct dominated by men's hegemonic nature has made to think individually and independently. Although there have been mentions of Maisie's name before when she is first fully described, she is depicted as a 'dirty girl.' What makes her dirty? Nothing is stated as the reason for such a qualification. She remains faithful to Michael throughout their relationship. Her marriage to Michael fails because Michael is not ready to make sacrifices - he does not understand that he needs to consider his partner in whatever he does. He is rather overwhelmed by his career. His unavailability to do some house chores and unspoken hatred for Maisie's menstruation lead to the end of his first marriage.

Michael Beard's parents' marriage and his first are in contrast. While Angela has a cause to stay in the marriage but finds joy with other men, Maisie does not have the same patience and reason to stay in the marriage. Fast forward to his marriage with Patrice: she acts exactly like Michael's mother. She remains in the marriage and has her affairs outside just like his other three wives after Maisie. This should help to illustrate marriage as a metaphor. There is an emphasis on the individual despite the understanding that marriage is not about one person. It is about self-gratification, and it keeps ruining the unions. Michael is concerned about what gives him joy regardless of how it affects the people in his life. Marriage is not that different from human relationships with nonhumans as projected in *Solar*. It is about human satisfaction regardless of the state of the natural world. As Aldous preaches to Beard, oil and coal

have served us enough and we need to change the sources of energy or earth be damned. Men's sexuality can be akin to humans' never-ending exploration of the planet's natural resources.

The only reason humans are conscious of doing something different is when they realise that they are in danger. Michael wants to explore - makes Maisie subject to him and is not ready to change. Unlike environmentalists of the world who are warning the capitalists of the world about their exploration, having realised that humans have extorted the natural world beyond what it can bear any longer, Michael Beard, like the deniers of global warming, remains unrepentant before he meets Melissa. Her pregnancy changes many things about his life and makes him more responsible, though he begins a secret affair with Darlene.

In *Oil on Water*, women are portrayed differently. They lack the voice and the relative opportunities women in the west have. The female characters who are more relevant to this discourse are Rufus' mother, Koko, Boma, Gloria, Isabel, and Gloria. Contrary to *Solar's* depictions of the women identified as being connected by one man, women in *Oil* are not connected by a man but are connected by one factor - being Nigerian citizens or a victim like Isabel. Many things are attached to either being a citizen of a former colony or being an African woman. More significant is the life of Boma. She provokes unsolicited pity from readers because she is a victim of the 'resource curse.' Men do not find her attractive because she is half burnt by the same oil that should have been a blessing to her and her family. And the only man who is bold enough to make her happy leaves her eventually because he is also affected by the same 'resource curse.' Gloria could have as well lost her life in the crossfire between the militants who take her away from Irikefe and the soldiers on their way.

Two other women whose characterisations also have significance to the plot development of the narrative are Isabel and Koko. James, like Michael, is going to file a divorce with his wife, Isabel, to marry Koko, his driver's fiancée. Isabel wants to save her marriage and rushes down to Nigeria and to the Niger Delta where James works. She becomes a victim of the problem created by her country because the oil company polluting the region and not doing the right thing in the region comes from her country. Hence, Isabel becomes a target to the militants as they believe that the oil company will pay them whatever amount of money they demand. For Koko, she seeks a better life that Salomon, her fiancé cannot offer her. Salomon is a graduate and since he has no job, he becomes a driver to earn a living. What he earns cannot guarantee a relatively good life for himself and the family he intends to have. They are all victims of the corruption going on in the country.

Women's representation in the two narratives has significance to this study. In *Solar*, depicting women as femme fatale is an indictment and it portends the wrong approach to the struggle to find clean energy. The

capitalist or materialistic consciousness does not encourage men and women to be ecocentric in actions. They are seemingly too busy to be preoccupied with the climate crisis – women are as busy with their businesses as men. Unlike women's portrayal in *Solar*, their counterparts in Nigeria are still forcefully subjected to all forms of unpleasant situations in *Oil*. Women are at the mercy of men and the outcome of many things is determined by men. It suffices to suggest that this 'hardship' keeps women in Africa close to the natural world and hence, as the environment is subjected to devastation, women share from it. Hence, Boma, Koko, Rufus' mother, Gloria are victims of circumstances.

Having highlighted the place of women and its importance to this study using the context of the Global south women and Nigerian women, *Solar* discusses global warming and finding a solution to the planet that is in peril. Through Michael, the central issue is brought to the fore – we see how seriously the government in the UK takes the issue of climate change by asking physicists to come up with proposals on how to create green energy, we also see glaciers melting away as Michael and others visit the fjord in Oslo, Norway; we learn the causes of the climate change via Aldous' knowledge as he tells of the danger in continuous use of oil and coal, which when used, causes greenhouse gasses to the atmosphere and we also learn the extent to which the science regarding this issue is politicised.

We learn how certain scientists feel that the planet is not in trouble and that those who raise the alarm do so for political reasons. That is why Evi Zemanek in 'A Dirty Hero's Fight for Clean Energy: Satire, Allegory, and Risk Narrative in Ian McEwan's *Solar*' calls the narrative a 'risk narrative.' He explains his position:

On the other hand, it is a global risk with side effects on humanity that are difficult to calculate. Some of these consequences are already perceptible, but many others still belong to the realm of anticipation, which necessarily requires imagination. Thus, there is a special affinity between risk and fiction: the former rests on a lack of secure knowledge and speculation, the latter, for the most part, stages the probable instead of the real.<sup>28</sup>

It is suggestive that Zemanek prefers to see *Solar* as a speculative novel whose central idea is based on probability. What he fails to realise is that there is scientific evidence that proves that the ice is melting caused by an increase in the temperature of the earth. Fiction is essentially a verisimilitude of reality and hence, caution must be taken in pushing aside the warnings fictional works deliver about societies. In the words of Michael Beard:

*Here's the good news. The UN estimates that already a*

*third of a million people a year are dying from climate change. Even as we speak, the inhabitants of the island of Carteret in the South Pacific are being evacuated because the oceans are warming and expanding and rising. Malarial mosquitoes are advancing northwards across Europe... Toby, listen. It's a catastrophe. Relax!* (McEwan, 2010: 216)

The above excerpt is not some fictional speculation, but facts included in a work of fiction. As an article in *The Guardian* suggests:

*This year has provided bitter evidence that even current levels of warming are disastrous, with astounding floods in Germany and China, Hades-like fires from Canada to California to Greece and rain, rather than snow, falling for the first time at the summit of a rapidly melting Greenland. "No amount of global warming can be considered safe and people are already dying from climate change," said Amanda Maycock, an expert in climate dynamics at the University of Leeds (Oliver, 2021).<sup>29</sup>*

Zemanek's perspective cannot be faulted outright because fiction is believed to belong to the realm of probability while history is said to be factual. However, for social critics, *Solar* should be taken as a work that not only evinces the dynamics of human society but one which also demonstrates humans' lapses regarding the global issue – climate change.

*Oil on Water* is a fictional work that focuses on environmental problems in the Niger Delta. If considered an allegory, it can be seen as a representation of socio-political and economic problems in all third-world oil-producing countries. As Jameson suggests, third-world texts are more national allegories than western texts that focus on individual lives. Therefore, *Oil* relates to prevalent issues in these various countries. However, in proper context, *Oil* depicts the devastation caused by oil drilling in the region and its effects on the people. Unlike *Solar* whose setting is not said to be experiencing the acute effect of climate change, the setting in *Oil* is already plagued by different inhospitable conditions.

Another obvious difference between the two texts is that while the government of one is proactive in finding a solution to the global problems as demonstrated in *Solar*, the government in *Oil* is reductive about the suffering of the people in the region. Ironically, it is the same government in *Solar* that is proactive in its country that is largely responsible for the devastation in the regions portrayed in *Oil*. Nixon (2011) captures this irony in this way:

<sup>28</sup> Evi Zemanek, 'A Dirty Hero's Fight for Clean Energy: Satire, Allegory, and Risk Narrative in Ian McEwan's *Solar*', *European Journal of Literature Culture and Environment*, (2012), 51 – 60, <10.37536/ECOZONA.2012.3.1.450>, [Accessed:12/09/2021].

<sup>29</sup> Oliver Milman, Andrew Witherspoon, Rita Liu, and Alvin Chang, 'Climate Disaster is Here', *The Guardian*, 14 October 2021, <<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/ng-interactive/2021/oct/14/climate-change-happening-now-stats-graphs-maps-cop26>> [Accessed on 17/10/2021].

*In the mid-90s, when flaring from Nigeria's oil fields was pumping 12 million tons of methane and 35 million tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere annually, it was argued by some that this was the single greatest contributor worldwide to climate change. (In this one regard at least, the oil corporations did not discriminate.) Given this backdrop, the irony was not lost on the Ogoni that Shell was winning awards in Europe for environmentally sensitive conduct north-south greenwashing, par excellence.*<sup>30</sup>

Lastly, while *Solar* focuses on sociocentrism, i.e., explores social issues more than its preoccupation with climate change, *Oil* heavily remonstrates on condition of the natural world in the region and relates to a social issue – hence it is both socio-centric and ecocentric. *Solar* exemplifies the challenges between building a career and having a successful marital life. Beard is caught in between the two and one is constantly influencing the other. But in *Oil*, the condition of waters and villages and the lives of the people living in the region are discussed. Irikefe is an example as is Abiram's uncle, and their former village is taken over by the oil company by coercion and manipulation. It is noteworthy to also discuss how Dr Dabobo relates the happenings in the village that is lured by the 'orange fire' that burns every night. 'Orange fire' is another nomenclature for 'resource curse'. As the Doctor narrates, it is the fire that releases the flare into the atmosphere, and they are enticed by news of how people who accepted the fire have collected billions of naira. They desire a better life and hence, they clamour for the 'orange fire', which they get and bear the brunt. It brings all sorts of sicknesses to the village and people begin to die.

## Conclusion

This study has enumerated the explicit and implicit relevance of both *Solar* and *Oil* in ecocritical discourse which is pivotal to the significance of this work. It has been illustrated that other than the colonial history shared by the setting of the two primary texts, there seems to also be a connection in terms of their socio-political, economic and environmental standpoints. The two narratives are not apocalyptic in focus – they explore more realistic issues in contemporary societies. On the contrary, while *Solar* considers a universal issue of climate change, *Oil* focuses on the experiences of a group of people in connection with oil. Also, McEwan's work depicts the climate change issues from a sociocentric perspective while Habi's work is a 'national allegory.' One other salient issue is hypocrisy or what is tagged 'double thinking'. The government of England in *Solar* is proactive in sourcing for alternative energy, but it

is inferred in *Oil* that, by proxy, they rather connive with the Nigerian government to cause more threats to the lives of creatures in the Delta region. Women in the two societies are not portrayed the same way: they are femme fatale in *Solar* while *Oil* projects them as victims, just like the natural world.

## CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

## REFERENCES

- Abrams MH, Harpham GG (2012). *Glossary of Literary Terms*, 10th edition. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Bracke A (2019). 'Science and Climate Crisis', *The Cambridge Companion to Ian McEwan* (Cambridge University Press), pp.45-59. <<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108648516.004>> [accessed 10 October 2021].
- Brown M (2010). 'Ian McEwan Interview: Warming to the Topic of Climate Change. The Telegraph. <<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/books/7412584/Ian-McEwan-interview-warming-to-the-topic-of-climate-change.html>> [accessed 5 October 2021].
- Buell L (1995). *The Environmental Imagination, Thoreau, Nature Writing and the Formation of American Culture*, London, Harvard University Press.
- Chinweizu OJ, Ihechukwu M (1980). *Toward the Decolonisation of African Literature*. Enugu: ABIC Books and Equipment Limited.
- Edebor SA (2017). 'Rape of a Nation: An Eco-critical Reading of Helon Habila's *Oil on Water*'. *Journal of Arts and Humanities* 6:41-49. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.18533/journal.v6i9.983>> [Accessed 12 September 2021].
- Egya SE (2017). *Literary Militancy and Helon Habila's Oil on Water. Research in African Literatures* 48:94-104. <<https://doi.org/10.2979/reseafriite.48.4.07>> [accessed 25 October 2021].
- Feldner M (2018). 'Representing the Neo-colonial Destruction of the Niger Delta: Helon Habila's *Oil on Water*'. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 54:515-527.
- Habila H (2000). *Prison Stories: A Collection of Short Stories* [s]. Epik Books.
- Habila H (2004). *Waiting for an Angel*. WW Norton & Company.
- Habila H (2011). *Oil on Water*. London: Penguin Books.
- Habila H (2017). *The Chibok Girls: The Boko Haram Kidnappings & Islamic Militancy in Nigeria*. Penguin UK.
- Habila H (2019). *Travellers*. Penguin UK.
- Heller Z (2005). *Saturday: One Day in the Life*. The New York Times Book Review. <<https://www.nytimes.com/2005/03/20/books/review/saturday-one-day-in-the-life.html>> [Accessed 4 October 2021].
- Jameson F (1986). *Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism*. *Social Text* 15:65-88.
- Kogan I (2012). *Ian McEwan's Solar Through a Psychoanalytic Lens. Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 60:1299-1313. <DOI:10.1177/0003065112465470> [accessed 20 October 2021].
- Koussouhon LA (2015). *Exploring Ideational Metafunction in Helon Habila's Oil on Water: A re-evaluation and redefinition of African Women's Personality and Identity through Literature. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 4:129-136. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.5p.129>> [accessed 20 September 2021].
- McEwan I (2010). *Solar*. London: Penguin Random House.
- Medovoi L (2014). 'Remediation as Pharmakon.' *Comparative Literature* 66(1):15-24.
- Nixon R (2011). *Slow Violence and Environmentalist of the Poor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

<sup>30</sup> Rob Nixon, *Slow Violence and Environmentalist of the Poor* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011), p. 113.



- Oliver M, Witherspoon A, Liu R, Chang A (2021). Climate Disaster is Here. The Guardian, 14 October 2021. <<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/ng-interactive/2021/oct/14/climate-change-happening-now-stats-graphs-maps-cop26>> [Accessed on 17/10/2021].
- Senayan O (2020). Dislocating Anthropocene: The City and Oil in Helon Habila's *Oil on Water*, *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, p. 27.
- Zemanek E (2012). A Dirty Hero's Fight for Clean Energy: Satire, Allegory, and Risk Narrative in Ian McEwan's *Solar*. *European Journal of Literature, Culture and the Environment* 3:51-60.

*Review*

# **Playing cat and dreaming butterfly – Skepticism of Montaigne and Zhuangzi**

**Chen YANG**

Department of English and Related Literature, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of York, United Kingdom.

Received 5 November, 2021; Accepted 11 May, 2022

**Many scholars refer to Montaigne and Zhuangzi as “skeptics” because of their opinions on ethics, religion and language. Therefore, a detailed study on their philosophical thinking is conducted in terms of the four branches of modern skepticism: ethical skepticism, linguistic skepticism, epistemological skepticism and sensory skepticism. Then, in order to determine whether Montaigne and Zhuangzi treat skepticism as an instrument or belief, the intentions of their writing are explored. Finally, it raises questions on the legibility of comparative study and cross-cultural study and gives justifications.**

**Key words:** Comparative literature, philosophy, skepticism.

## **INTRODUCTION**

This paper investigates the skeptical thinking of two great writers - the ancient Chinese author, Zhuangzi, and the sixteenth-century philosopher, Michel de Montaigne - and compares them in terms of skepticism. The study also traces the debate on the epistemological basis of skepticism and states the reason and justification. Besides, since the era of structuralism and post-structuralism in the 1960s, scholars tend to question the legitimacy of comparing works from different cultures and eras. This study refutes those doubts and argues that the significance of comparative literature is to prove the universality of human civilizations.

### **Montaigne and Zhuangzi's fundamental sceptical thinking**

Skepticism is a branch of philosophy that doubts knowledge, truth, and sense. It can also mean a skeptical

attitude towards assertion or truth. The former is called philosophical skepticism, which originated from the Greek "skepticos," meaning "reflective and thoughtful" (Gove and Merriam-Webster, 1993, p.401). There are four major classifications of philosophical skepticism. Sensory skepticism is skepticism of a particular kind of knowledge derived from the senses. Ethical skepticism is the belief that there are no moral truths. Epistemological skepticism is skepticism about the possibility of knowledge in general. Finally, linguistic skepticism believes that language is inadequate for expressing specific facts about reality (Audi, 2003, p.74). To begin with, Montaigne fiercely criticized the knowledge derived from our senses. He argued that we have no access to physical objects other than through our sensory experiences, which are not physical. Our sensory experiences have no objective description, so our conclusions are not deductive. Therefore, our sense is the only ground we have, but it can be false and uncertain. "The uncertainty of our

E-mail: [cyang65-c@my.cityu.edu.hk](mailto:cyang65-c@my.cityu.edu.hk). Tel: 852-46405584.

Author(s) agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

senses makes everything they produce uncertain" (Montaigne, 2003, p.472). Due to this uncertainty, we cannot even be "sure enough about whether snow is white" (Montaigne, 2003, p.473). Then he begins to doubt the possibility of our sense like Descartes about whether we see it or not. "Most people often ask, 'How does this happen?' 'What they should say is: 'But does it happen?'" (Montaigne, 2003, p.955). Unlike Montaigne's radical doubt, Zhuangzi seldom discusses sense and doubts its possibility and reality. He only uses relativism to show that the knowledge generated by our sense is not a fixed answer. "There is nothing in the world bigger than the tip of an autumn hair, and Mount Tai is tiny" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.19), and he also pointed our limitation of sense by analogy. "The morning mushroom knows nothing of twilight and dawn; the summer cicada knows nothing of spring and autumn" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.30).

In ethical skepticism, both doubt their societies' moral truths and use relativism as the weapon to achieve that. As Ryle puts it, "there can be false coins only where there are coins made of the proper materials by the proper authorities" (Ryle, 1954, p.2). If there is no such proper coin, then there is no consistent false. Montaigne uses examples of different customs in the new continent or primitive society, such as cannibalism, to show that every moral truth of human society is relative and there is no right or wrong. He sums up in a famous sentence, "What am I to make of a virtue that I saw in credit yesterday, that will be discredited tomorrow, and that becomes a crime on the other side of the river? What of a truth bounded by these mountains and is a falsehood to the world that lives beyond?" (Montaigne, 2003, p.531). On the other hand, in the chapter "Discussion on Making Things All Equal," Zhuangzi lists different living habits of Monkey, deer, and fish and concludes: "The way I see it, the rules of benevolence and righteousness and the path of right and wrong are all hopelessly snarled and jumbled. How could I know anything about such discriminations?" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.509). However, both Montaigne and Zhuangzi advocate a specific kind of moral standard which will be in this study.

Montaigne questions reason itself in epistemological skepticism and thus "shake the barriers and last fences of knowledge" (Montaigne, 2003, p.509). He uses many examples to muse on "how free and vague an instrument human reason is" (Montaigne, 2003, p.955). Moreover, Montaigne also questions whether philosophers extend the scope of the reason so infinitely that "they exercise their judgment even in inanity and nonbeing" (Montaigne, 2003, p.963). Montaigne also asserts that "the knowledge of causes belongs only to Him who has the guidance of things, not to us who have only the enduring of them" (Montaigne, 2003, p.955). We cannot use reason to prove or disprove the essence of God or our origin. Therefore, Montaigne concluded that "the end and beginning of knowledge are equal in stupidity" (Montaigne, 2003, p.494). Zhuangzi, however, tries to

use logic that one thing comes out of another, and one thing depends on another to prove that "heaven and earth are one attribute; the ten thousand things are one horse" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.40). "For this reason, whether you point to a little stalk or a great pillar.... The way makes them all into one" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.41).

In this aspect, they have many similar expressions. For instance, Montaigne questions, "why do we not consider the possibility that our thinking, our acting, maybe another sort of dreaming, and our waking as another sort of sleep" (Montaigne, 2003, p.548)? Zhuangzi also doubts whether we know the difference between dreams and reality. "While he is dreaming, he does not know it is a dream, and in his dream, he may even try to interpret a dream. Only after he wakes does he know it was a dream. And someday there will be a great awakening when we know that this all a great dream." However, Zhuangzi believes that he knows the secular world is a dream, while Montaigne thinks we have no access to the actual answer, so we should not abandon the secular life. Harold Bloom summarizes Montaigne's philosophy in one sentence: "when I play with my cat, who knows if I am not a pastime to her more than she is to me" (Bloom, 1994, p.172)? Confidentially, the most famous parable in Zhuangzi is the dreaming butterfly. Zhuangzi "did not know if he was Chuang Chou who had dreamt that he was a butterfly or a butterfly dreaming he was Chuang Chou" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.49). They both questioned our knowledge of other minds. Everything we believe about what is occurring in the inner lives of others seems to be doubtful because of this argument: whatever is observed in their behaviors does not entail anything about their minds. They could be pretending, and we have no way to verify it. However, Montaigne leaves it open while Zhuangzi asserts that "between Chuang Chou and a butterfly, there must be some distinction!" it is a moderate epistemological skepticism: there is something wrong in our mind that prevents us from reaching knowledge, but sages can overcome the difficulty.

As far as linguistic skepticism is concerned, they both regard language as a defective instrument. Montaigne points out the inner contradiction in the logic of speech. For example, whether the statement "I lie" is a truth or a lie. Montaigne agreed with Pyrrhonian philosophers that general conception could not be expressed in "any manner of language," "for they would need a new language" (Montaigne, 2003, p.476). So he refused to "combine the divine power under the laws of our speech." Zhuangzi's opinion on language is very similar to Montaigne's: "the Great Way is not named; Great Discriminations are not spoken" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.46). Since the truth cannot be spoken, Zhuangzi thinks, "words exist because of meaning; once you have gotten the meaning, you can forget the words" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.302). His opinion follows the Tao Te Ching that "One who knows does not speak; one who speaks does not know." (Laozi, 2001, p.23), But Bo Juyi points out this

paradox: "these words, I am told, was spoken by Laozi. If we believe that he was the one who knew, how did he come to write a book of five thousand words?" (Chinese poems, 2005, p.91) Hui Tzu also tells Zhuangzi: "Your words are useless!" However, Zhuangzi answers: "A man has to understand the useless before you can talk to him about the useful" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.299). Then Zhuangzi uses an analogy of digging all the earth around the man then his feet becoming useless to show that language is an instrument to eliminate the moral standard of the secular world.

### From scepticism to worldview

After briefly analyzing Montaigne and Zhuangzi's skeptical thinking, it is important to discuss its relation to their worldview, belief, and opinions. Due to space limitations only select some crucial topics could be selected. There was a long-lasting, three-cornered civil war between the Catholic League, the Protestants, and the Royalists in Montaigne's time. Montaigne refused to take a side in any of them. Similarly, Zhuangzi lived in the spring and autumn period (BCE 770- 221), chaotic and full of wars. It was also the time of Hundred Schools of Thoughts when the debate trend was prevalent. Facing thousands of people fighting and dying for their religious beliefs, Montaigne thinks that "the divine never touches human life without upsetting order in which man is most at home" (Montaigne, 2003, p.952). Due to his skepticism of man's ability to achieve truth, he wishes people to be humble and tolerant of others' beliefs. "Let them appear as probable, not be affirmed" (Montaigne, 2003, p.960). When he lives in a town where the local officers of the Inquisition accused women of being witches and burned them, he remarks that "It is putting a very high price on one's conjectures to have a man roasted alive because of them." (Montaigne, 2003, p.962) Montaigne also criticizes people's blinded belief in the mainstream that "the best touchstone of truth is the multitude of believers." (Montaigne, 2003, p.957) Similarly, Zhuangzi criticizes ignorant individuals who "sweat and labouring to the end of his days and never seeing his knowing accomplishment, utterly exhausting himself and never knowing where to look for rest" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.38).

Furthermore, because of man's illusory claims to knowledge, Montaigne questions whether we could know about the afterlife, or one step further, we can live after death or not. So, he is doubtful about the eternal beatitude, and we should not "hope to stride further than our legs can reach" because of "our impoverished nature." Moreover, He also questions the Christian doctrine of reward and punishment. "Upon what foundation of their justice can the gods take notice of or reward man after his death and virtuous actions, since it was themselves that put them in the way and mind to do them?" (Montaigne, 2003, p.511). While the "gods" in this

sentence are pagan, nothing prevents us from applying these thoughts to the Judeo-Christian God. Therefore, Montaigne's sincerity on religious matters is doubtful. Montaigne's belief in God is similar to Zhuangzi's belief in Dao, albeit Zhuangzi is much more faithful than Montaigne. Zhuangzi's Dao is a natural law, eternal peace, and exalted status. It cannot be found in secular life. Living in a world full of chaos and debates, Zhuangzi criticizes every kind of doctrine and wants to escape from this chaotic world and free himself from the strain imposed by the country and moral standards. He uses skepticism to prove that right and wrong are relative, and the standard of measuring keeps changing, so we can only achieve the status of Dao when we give up the secular life (Liu and Zheng, 1987, p.4). That is why Watson says the central theme of the Zhuangzi might be summed up in a single word: freedom (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.3). As Sartre put it, "What first appears evident is that human reality can detach itself from the world – in questioning, in systematic doubt, in skeptical doubt, in the epoch, etc. -only if by nature it has the possibility of self-detachment." (Sartre, 1956, p.3) Zhuangzi wants to live like the giant bird P'eng in the chapter "Free and Easy Wandering," freely wandering in the sky.

Therefore, the rule that Zhuangzi uses to measure everything in the world is whether it violates the nature of freedom. Xunzi perfectly concluded that "Zhuangzi was blinded by Nature and was insensible to men" (Xunzi, 1988, p.29). It is why Zhuangzi often criticizes the moral standards of Confucians and Mohists. The hilarious joke in his book is that one day Confucius' best disciple Yan Hui comes to Confucius and says, "I am improving because I have forgotten benevolence and righteousness!" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.90) He also objects to every kind of political system and refuses to be the prime minister when the king of Chu invites him. (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.187) On Zhuangzi's account, "political and social institutions serve only to impose suffering on man. This is because the natures of different things are not identical, and each thing has its likings." Therefore, he advocates the status of primitive society, which is similar to Montaigne's opinion that "a thousand little woman in their village have lived a more equable, sweeter and more consistent life than Cicero" (Montaigne, 2003, p.437).

Compared to Zhuangzi's desire to get close to nature, Montaigne thinks that we cannot understand the truth of nature, and it is a vain pursuit to achieve the nature standard of perfection. It is quite a sharp contrast which is very important to understand their different skeptical attitude: negative and positive. Although Montaigne laughs at science's "false and borrowed beauty" (Montaigne, 2003, p.487), he advocates improving science for its practical utility to make man live more comfortably. "The proper task of the scientist is to discover among the "many works of nature" those things that are "suited to the conservation of our health" (Montaigne, 2003, p.745). Why did Montaigne emphasize

conserving our health so deeply? It is related to his understanding of nature which is quite different to Zhuangzi. For Montaigne, nature is "the most fixed and universal" (Montaigne, 2003, p.564). The most fixed instinct of animals is to preserve themselves, so the only true natural law is the law of self-preservation. However, Zhuangzi draws an opposite conclusion that we should neglect our physical well-being and treat death as a normal process of nature. He even "pounded on a tub and sang" when his wife dead. His best friend Hui Tzu could not help but say, "this is going too far" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.192).

### **Influence and significance of Montaigne and Zhuangzi's skepticism**

Both Montaigne and Zhuangzi shape the spirit of their cultures and sow the seeds for the future. Montaigne destroyed the spiritual domination of medieval philosophical philosophy, resulting in a philosophical revolution of empiricism in modern times. His criticism of human cognitive abilities and emphasis on rationality is crucial for us to reflect on the renaissance (Lu, 2003, p.81). Pico's famous article "Oration of the Dignity of the Man" was published in 1496, seen as the "Manifesto of the Renaissance." Montaigne's "Apology for Raymond Sebond" was written to refute his hubris. Zhuangzi's skepticism is based on his theory of evolution that all species are naturally evolved through variation in forms and that each form or species is adapted to its place and environment (Hu, 1963, p.39). Like Montaigne, his argument that "Heaven and earth were born when I was, and the ten thousand things are one with me" (Montaigne, 2003, p.43) greatly eliminated anthropocentrism and changed Chinese people's attitude towards nature. Moreover, his story of transforming himself into a butterfly influenced Zhang Zai's argument that "All people are my brothers and sisters and all things are my companions" and Wang Yongming's thought of "benevolence of all things forming one body" (Yan, 2014, p.32). Montaigne's greatest achievement for modern society is that he tries to use skepticism to propagate the modern bourgeois – the isolated individual, wholly caught up in the private pursuit of physical pleasure, unconcerned with politics so long as the government provides him with the security of life and property that constitute the precondition of that pursuit. In order to liberate humanity from tyranny in the name of religion and morality, Montaigne advocates what Pascal regarded as "a shocking indifference to these most serious matters" (Pascal, 1999, p.47) or, in Montaigne's own words, "wandering at nothing" (Montaigne, 2003, p.473). Therefore, the liberty, prosperity, and comfort we enjoy as citizens of a liberal, commercial society are derived from Montaigne and his successors, including Bacon, Hobbes, and Locke, who "put their earthly well-being ahead of pretensions to

divinity" (Sedley, 1998, p.48). In contrast, the most valuable significance of Zhuangzi's skepticism is his transformation and evaluation of secular life. The parable of P'eng and little quail in *Free and Easy Wondering* shows the difference between "big" and "little," secular and ideal (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.31). The story of Carpenter Shih in "the World of Men" revalued the definition of the useful and useless tree to express the opposition to being a tool and having commercial value. Last but not least, skepticism has its own value. Because Sceptic's demand for absolute justification could not be met, it is a "bloodless victory" in epistemology (Ayer, 1990, p.39). Our reward for taking skepticism so seriously is that we could distinguish the different levels at which our claims to knowledge stand. In this way, we understand the dimensions of our language and so of the world we describe. Moreover, since dogmatists firmly believe something, skepticism becomes the weapon to prevent institutions from persecuting people for believing things that are "known" to be mistaken and wicked (Musgrave, 1993, p.37). Therefore, skepticism helps to restore the peace of the world. As Russell puts it, "the opinion for which people are willing to fight and persecute all belong to one of the three classes which this skepticism condemns" (Russell, 2004, p.63).

### **Skepticism as an instrument or belief**

At this point, every casual reader will start to ask: Is skepticism merely an instrument? There is a long-lasting debate about whether skeptics truly believe what they say and apply it to real life. For example, as Hume puts it, skeptical arguments "admit of no refutation but produce no conviction" (Hume, 2000, p.29). There is no practical purpose at all. In another book, he asserts that "it is certain that no man ever met with any such absurd creature as the complete skeptic" (Hume, 2008, p.73). Russell made up a funny story about the famous ancient Greek skeptic Pyrrho who pays little attention to his comfort or safety. One day Pyrrho saw his teacher Anaxarchus dropping into a hole, but he just walked away without helping him because he thought there was no sufficient ground for thinking he would do any good by pulling him out. Also, Pyrrho could live up to the 80s because his disciples always saved him from danger (Russell, 2004, p.76).

Except for this tradition, some words of Montaigne and Zhuangzi indeed give evidence that they use skepticism as an instrument. Charles Sainte-Beuve suggests that Montaigne's seeming skepticism is "in reality a new form of dogmatism" because he assumes that the universe is unintelligible for human beings, opposite to ancient philosophers' assumption that the universe is intelligible (Sainte-Beuve, 2000, p.28). Though Montaigne disparages presumption as a "malady" and says that "from presumption all sin" (Montaigne, 2003, p.437), he

sets a presumption for himself and reached a dogmatic conclusion. Besides, when he says truth must have one fact that we cannot reach, it is contradictory because he holds both skeptical and Catholic beliefs. Zhuangzi, similar to Montaigne, has also been doubted fiercely for his unfavorable attitude to Confucians and Mohists, which is not supposed to have on a skeptic who advocates suspending judgments. Furthermore, when facing skeptical questions, Zhuangzi often holds a backup principle often seen in logicians and draws a dogmatic conclusion. For example, in the famous story "The Joys of Fishes," Hui Shi asks Zhuangzi: "You are not a fish – How do you know what fish enjoy" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.189). Second-order skepticism concerns beliefs or knowledge about such beliefs or knowledge (Audi, 2003, p.39). To ask how a statement is known to be true is to ask what grounds there are for accepting it. There is a distinction between asking what grounds there are for accepting a given statement and asking what grounds a particular person has for it (Ayer, 1990, p.12). The latter is a personal experience. However, Zhuangzi's answer is: "You asked me how I know what fish enjoy – so you already knew I knew it when you asked the question. I knew it by standing here besides the Hao." Zhuangzi uses the surface meaning of the question and treated it as an infallibility claim about knowledge: "if you know you cannot be wrong" (Audi, 2003, p.34). "How do you know" is commonly meant as a challenge to prove that one knows deductively, not as a request to specify a source or a ground of the knowledge. Therefore, simply saying "I know it by standing here beside the Hao" seems very dogmatic.

Therefore, Schwitzgebel concludes that Zhuangzi's skepticism is "therapeutic" and rhetorical, more with the desire to evoke particular reactions in the reader than as an expression of his heartfelt beliefs (Schwitzgebel, 1996, p.41). Moreover, in Limbrick's account, Montaigne's skepticism is reduced to merely an "instrument" to protect the realm of God because he puts it beyond the range of revealed knowledge with complete certainty and beyond the range of reason's challenge (Limbrick, 1997, p.57). However, many scholars also uphold their belief firmly that Montaigne and Zhuangzi are skeptics. For example, Chad Hansen argues that Zhuangzi is sincere in defending radical skepticism and relativism regarding evaluative judgments. Zhuangzi's opinions on Confucians or politics are natural for him "as it is for birds to sing in trees" (Hansen, 1983, p.72). By this fascinating analogy, Hansen solves this problem, at least from a poetic point of view. Allinson (1989), on the other hand, tries to solve it by categorizing Zhuangzi's relativistic and nonrelativistic statements into two different parts, which echoes Zhuangzi's dichotomy of "unawakened" and "awakened" people (Allison, 2003, p.64). He says that Zhuangzi meant to employ different strategies for different people. However, Zhuangzi became a pragmatist instead of a skeptic in this sense. For Montaigne, scholars often try to

prove that his Catholicism is based on his prevalent skepticism. Since the real world is mutable, it is easy for Montaigne to assume that God is immutable and beyond our knowledge. Moreover, as mentioned in the last section, Montaigne did not live in a world where people could freely choose their religious beliefs, so we have sufficient background to suggest that some of his words were written because of political correctness, especially considering his noble social status. Some of his passages in Essays were written for royals; for instance, his most famous essay, "Apology for Raymond Sebond," was written for Margaret of Valois, wife of Henry IV of France (Montaigne, 2003, p.508). This long-lasting debate seems to have no end because each side has sufficient evidence to support them. However, this study tries to give opinion that allows harmoniously between different and even contradictory opinions.

### **Speaking for Montaigne and Zhuangzi: take their words less seriously**

This section tries to defend Montaigne and Zhuangzi through the investigation of their opinions about the relationship between author, book, and reader. It is hard to find anyone in history that discusses himself so deeply and thoroughly as Montaigne does, not even Aurelius or Goethe. He emphasizes in the Preface that "I am myself the matter of my book" (Montaigne, 2003, p.2). His writing about himself always changes his mind "many times (sometimes I do deliberately), having undertaken as exercise and sport to maintain an opinion contrary to my own, my mind, applying itself and turning in that direction, attaches me to it so firmly that I can no longer find the reason for my former opinion, and I abandon it" (Montaigne, 2003, p.517). Moreover, he is not only the author and material of this book but also is the reader himself. Every time he reads his own words, it seemed to him like "a stranger" (Montaigne, 2003, p.293). He admitted that "I have no more made my book than my book has made me" (Montaigne, 2003, p.517). Therefore, Bloom says Montaigne is the best instance to prove that "the book is the man, the man is the book" (Bloom, 1995, p.271), and I want to make a blasphemous analogy which Montaigne certainly would refuse. The relationship between author, reader, and book for Montaigne is very similar to God, Jesus, and Holy Spirit. It is not derived from thin air because Montaigne says, "a book consubstantial with its author," and the word "consubstantial" refers to the Son and the Father's consubstantiality he certainly knew as a Catholic. We can still be sure that a person named Montaigne and a book named Essays, but we cannot separate them apart because the book had become "an integral part of my life" (Montaigne, 2003, p.504). We can even push this analogy further by considering immortality. Montaigne foretells that "everyone recognizes me in the book and

my book in me," and there is his "essence" in his book (Montaigne, 2003, p.667). As long as the book exists, Montaigne will still live and achieve a sense of immortality. The Essays become the spokesman of Montaigne after his death, but it does not act thoroughly on behalf of Montaigne because it acquired a degree of autonomy outside the control of its author and became "a separate body" (Hoffman, 2000, p.93). Montaigne is fully aware of it and says, "an able reader often discovers in other men's writings perfections beyond those that the author put in or perceived and lends them richer meanings and aspects" (Montaigne, 2003, p.93). These words echo Gadamer's thinking three hundred years later that "the meaning of a text goes beyond its author" (Gadamer, 1990, p.59).

To the "able readers," Montaigne "opens up" himself and lets them "enjoy it more at their ease and make it more supple and manageable for them" (Montaigne, 2003, p.511). Montaigne did not want people to label him and debate who he was but wanted them to suspend judgments and enjoy this journey. He even warned that "I would willingly come back from the other world to give the lie to any man who portrayed me other than I was, even if it were to honor me." So maybe these scholars mentioned above want to make the dead come back to life. It is a demanding job to read Montaigne's book that "they need a good swimmer for a reader" so that the depth and weight of his book will not "sink him and drown him" (Montaigne, 2003, p.812). On the other hand, Zhuangzi does not have such a special relationship with his book. Nevertheless, just like Roland Barthes, Zhuangzi did whatever he could to undermine the authority of authorship. The book "Zhuangzi" is not written by a single person, and it takes quite a long time for it to become the one we read today. As a result, there are many discontinuities in thoughts, narratives, and linguistic features. Moreover, he always puts his words in others' mouths, such as Confucius, and more than half of the Inner Chapters are false quotations (Schwitzgebel, 1996, p.32). Besides, there are many words in Zhuangzi that can be understood as metaphors to sneer at scholars and resist fixed interpretations. In the first chapter, "free and easy wandering," Zhuangzi claims that the story of Kun is recorded in a book called the Universal Harmony, which is to poke fun at the philosophers of other schools who cite ancient texts to prove their assertions (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.21). Moreover, there is an implicit comparison here between readers and small birds. Like them, we judge the tale by comparing it with our capacities and find it implausible. Being little creatures in size (or wisdom), we cannot understand great things like the giant bird Peng (or great thinker Zhuangzi). Zhuangzi hopes that we do not take our views too seriously and realize our limited perspectives. He undermines his credibility by telling such a tale and frustrates the reader's own natural inclination to interpret the book as expressing the true opinions of its author.

Therefore, Zhuangzi casts doubt on the credibility of all three players in any work of philosophy: reader, author, and author's opponent (Schwitzgebel, 1996, p.29).

Furthermore, in the Wheelwright Pian's story, he sees duke reading a book and asks Duke "whose words are in it," and after knowing these words are from sages who were dead, he concludes that "what you are reading there is nothing but the chaff and dregs of the men of the old!" (Zhuangzi, p.152) It tells that explicit rules and statements cannot convey whatever the duke seeks in the book he is reading. Since the duke's book is words of sages, we may say that if it is the book Zhuangzi, scholars are like the duke vainly seeking Zhuangzi's thinking. Zhuangzi tells us not to take his words seriously in a plainer way at the end of the book. In the final pages, he concludes his language style that "he believed that world was drowned in turbidness and that is was impossible to address it in sober language, so he used 'goblet words' to pour out endless changes, 'repeated words' to give a ring of truth, and 'imputed words' to impart greater breadth" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.373). He apologizes for his exaggerated words and radical opinions, since these are all means to achieve a peaceful state of mind. In short, Montaigne and Zhuangzi try to persuade us not to take them seriously and suspend judgments by different means. Montaigne used the trinity of author, book, and reader and the theory that the meaning of a book is beyond the author's reach. Zhuangzi undermined his authorship because there is no single author at all and told parables to undermine the credibility of his words. For most students, it is the perfect time to draw a conclusion and end this boring topic. However, it is not the end of my argument.

### Reflection of my previous arguments

At the beginning of Cervantes's famous novel, Don Quixote of La Mancha read too many books about chivalric romances, and then he got mad and imagined himself as a knight. Similarly, I also read too many books about skepticism and became a skeptic instead. Looking at my previous passage, I start to doubt myself. First, how could I use a concept in modern philosophy to analyze ancient thinking? In Hadot's *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, he pointed out the difference between our understanding of philosophy in ancient times and the modern world. He says ancient philosophy aims not to construct a system of thinking but to put their thinking into "living praxis" (Hadot, 1995, p.87). As Montaigne lived in the 16th century before Descartes, his skeptical thinking is very different from the concept of philosophical skepticism today, and he had no idea about it. In the first section, when the study uses four categories of philosophical skepticism to study Montaigne and Zhuangzi's skepticism, it seems clear and reasonable, yet it must generate some misunderstanding in this

transformation of knowledge. We may break up their thinking and add some modern theories to it. For Zhuangzi, the situation is much trickier. It is popular and reasonable to use modern disciplines to study the ancient Chinese world. However, Qian Mu argued that all modern disciplines, such as Psychology, Archaeology, and Philosophy, did not exist in ancient China (Qian, 1984, p.81). Moreover, Fu Sinian writes a long letter to Hu Shih in which he says there is no such thing called philosophy in China after Hu Shih published "The An Outline of the History of Chinese Thought" (Wang, 2014, p.93). Moreover, Liang Qichao also says that the word "philosophy" is not suitable to describe Chinese philosophy, and the word "Daoshu" is better, albeit he still used "philosophy" in his title (Liang, 2012, p.88). Therefore, when we use modern disciplines to analyze Zhuangzi's thinking, we overwrite the history, and it results in the "falsehood of inverting meanings" (Wang, 2014, p.39).

Furthermore, how can this study compare two characters from different cultures and historical backgrounds? Montaigne was born in the 16th century, and Zhuangzi lived in the 4th century BCE. They do not know each other. Besides, they are from two completely different cultures that did not have any significant cultural communication until the 17th century. For example, Foucault thinks that Chinese culture is a heterotopia with a different logical system that westerners could not understand (Foucault, 1973, p.182). In China, there is also such kind of expressions. Du Yaquan says China is a civilization of silence, and the West is a civilization of movement (Du, 1985, p.23). Therefore, how can this study cross this huge gap and compare Montaigne and Zhuangzi without justifying the reasoning basis? Here is the answer to these doubts. Modern theories and concepts indeed help us see the things that have not been realized in ancient Chinese history and gain a new understanding of them. For example, Fei Xiaotong used the concept of Compassion Fatigue to study Chinese rural society and opened a new page in social science. However, we should also try to rebuild the "real shape" of the ancient world, however difficult it may be. I want to stand at the same level as the ancient people we study (Chen, 1980, p.3). It is similar to Gadamer's concept of "the fusion of horizons" (Gadamer, 1990, p.88). Besides, the opposite of the Orient and the Occident often serves to understand "self," and this dichotomy is largely invented. As Edward Said argues, "we must take seriously Vico's great observation that men make their history, that what they can know is what they have made and extend it to geography" (Said, 1978, p.92). He then concluded that Orient and Occident as both geographical and cultural entities are "man-made." "Therefore, as much as the west itself, the Orient is an idea that has a history and a tradition of thought, imagery and vocabulary that have been given it reality and presence" (Said, 1978, p.92). For example, Montaigne himself used China to

show "how ampler and more varied the world is than the ancients, or we understand" (Montaigne, 2003, p.802). They indeed lack historical and cultural connections and have many differences, but "this lack of genetic relations, of mutual influences, stimulates a whole series of practical and theoretical perplexities of great interest" (Guillen, 1993, p.93). Please allow me to end this section with Qian Zhongshu's words: "the mind is similar in the East and West; the philosophy is comparable in the South and North. We should cite books enormously all around the world in order to draw out their inter-relationships" (Qian, 1986, p.1).

## CONCLUSION

Zhuangzi once says that "the fish trap exists because of the fish; once you get the fish, you can forget the trap" (Zhuangzi, 1968, p.302). Similarly, Sextus Empiricus, one of the earliest Pyrrhonian skeptics known to Montaigne, used the metaphor of using a ladder to reach a higher place and kicking it away. Ludwig Wittgenstein uses this metaphor and says that "He must, so to speak, throw away the ladder after he has climbed up it. He must transcend these propositions, and then he will see the world aright" (Wittgenstein and dos Santos, 1994, p.129). This study follows their paths, analyzing Montaigne and Zhuangzi's skeptical thinking and discussing scholars' doubts about their skepticism, and giving answers to these doubts. This study also discussed the moral and epistemological basis for studying the ancient world from a modern perspective and comparing different cultures.

## CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

## REFERENCES

- Allinson RE (1989). *Chuang-Tzu for spiritual transformation: An analysis of the inner chapters*. SUNY Press.
- Audi R (2003). *Epistemology: a contemporary introduction to the theory of knowledge* (2nd edition). Routledge.
- Ayer AJ (1990). *The problem of knowledge*. Penguin.
- Bloom H (1994). *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages*. Riverhead Books. [https://books.google.com.hk/books?id=\\_-QzKinSsz0C](https://books.google.com.hk/books?id=_-QzKinSsz0C)
- Bloom H (1995). *The Western canon: the books and school of the ages* (1st Riverhead edition). Riverhead Books.
- Chen Y (1980). Review Report of Feng Youlan's "History of Chinese Philosophy" Volume 1. Shanghai Ancient Books Publishing House.
- Chinese poems (2005). (A. Waley, Trans.; Volume 31). Psychology Press.
- Du Y (1985). *Quiet Civilization and Dynamic Civilization*. China Social Sciences Press.
- Foucault M (1973). *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. 1966. New York: Vintage.
- Gadamer HG (1990). *Truth and method* (J. W. a. D. G. Marshall, Trans.; 2nd edition). Crossroad.
- Gove PB, Merriam-Webster I (1993). *Webster's third new international*



- dictionary of the English language, unabridged: Merriam-Webster.
- Guillen C (1993). *The challenge of comparative literature*. Harvard University Press.
- Hadot P (1995). *Philosophy as a way of life: spiritual exercises from Socrates to Foucault*. Blackwell.
- Hu S (1963). *The development of the logical method in ancient China*. Paragon Book Reprint Corp.
- Hume D (2000). *A treatise of human nature*. Oxford University Press.
- Hume D (2008). *An inquiry concerning human understanding*. Oxford University Press.
- Laozi (2001). *Tao Te Ching* (D. C. Lau, Trans.). Chinese University Press.
- Liang Q (2012). *Liang Qichao on Confucian Philosophy* (1st edition). Commercial Press.
- Limbrick E (1977). Was Montaigne really a pyrrhonian? *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance* 39(1):67-80.
- Liu X, Zheng W (1987). *Zhuangzi's Philosophy and Its Evolution/Chinese Social Sciences Doctoral Dissertation Library*. China Social Sciences Press.
- Montaigne M (2003). *The complete works: essays, travel journal, letters* (D. M. Frame, Trans.). Everyman's Library.
- Musgrave A (1993). *Common sense, science, and skepticism: a historical introduction to the theory of knowledge*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pascal B (1999). *Pensées and other writings*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Qian M (1984). *Academic Discussion on Modern China*. Dongda Book Company.
- Qian Z (1986). Tan Yilu (Supplementary Edition ed.). Chung Hwa Book Company (Hong Kong) Company Limited.
- Russell B (2004). *Skeptical essays*. Psychology Press.
- Ryle G (1954). *Dilemmas: the Tarner lectures 1953*. Cambridge University Press.
- Said E (1978). *Introduction to Orientalism*. pp. 1-28.
- Sainte-Beuve CA (2000). *What is a Classic?* Hayes Barton Press.
- Sartre JP (1956). *Being and nothingness, an essay in phenomenological ontology* (Special abridged edition). Citadel Press.
- Schwitzgebel E (1996). Zhuangzi's attitude toward language and his skepticism. *Essays on Skepticism, Relativism, and Ethics in the Zhuangzi* pp. 68-96.
- Sedley DL (1998). *Sublimity and skepticism in Montaigne*. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* pp. 1079-1092.
- Wang F (2014). *Stubborn Bass: Reflections on Some Historical Thinking Ways* (First Edition). Yunchen Culture Industry Company, Limited.
- Wittgenstein L, dos Santos LHL (1994). *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*. Edusp.
- Xunzi (1988). *Xunzi: a translation and study of the complete works* (J. Knoblock, Trans.; Volume 3). Stanford University Press.
- Yan X (2014). The aesthetics of Zhuangzi's skepticism and its meaning. *Journal of Pursuing* pp.4-16.
- Zhuangzi (1968). *The complete works of Chuang Tzu* (B. Watson, Trans.). Columbia University Press.

**Related Journals:**

