

## Tracing Cruelty in *Tarzan of the Apes*

Mona Lisa P. Siacor, Dr. phil.

---

### Abstract

This paper presents a picture of how *cruel* and three derivative words—*cruelty*, *crueler*, *cruelly*—are used within the narrative of the popular American novel *Tarzan of the Apes* by Edgar Rice Burroughs. This investigation is from a perspective that is devoid of journalistic or creative writing jargon. In order to determine who is *cruel* to whom, phrases within the novel's narratives where a *cruel* term is found are cited and gathered. The explicit possessor of cruelty, or the novel's character responsible for it (i.e., the culprit), as well as the object to whom or to which cruelty is directed to (i.e., the victim), are identified. The findings indicate that humans are *crueler* than the African jungle and its inhabitants. Moreover, the Whites are *crueler* than the Blacks. This is contrary to the idea inherent in the novel, as voiced out or acted out by its characters, that the African jungle and its inhabitants, both animals and humans, are cruel.

---

### I. Introduction

Edgar Rice Burroughs, the author of the Tarzan novels, admitted that he would like to be Tarzan, to get away from the cities, “the restrictions of man-made laws, and the inhibitions that society has placed upon us.” Also, he said, “We like to picture ourselves as roaming free, the lords of ourselves and of our world” (Burroughs, “Tarzan Theme”). So he spoke for himself and most likely for many in the world today living after the boom of industrialization in the nineteenth century, and hence, modernization (“modernization”).<sup>1</sup> The perennial popularity of his Tarzan stories may be an indication of this. In the aftermath of the western Enlightenment, the way people live gradually became an area of serious study (“Enlightenment”). The complexity of this study needs many paradigms in order to tackle it (Tang 211).

Whether Burroughs was aware of such paradigms or not, one thing is clear: he wanted to write a story that he should be able to sell (Burroughs, “How I Wrote”). Created in 1911 to 1912, *Tarzan of the Apes*—the first Tarzan novel—consists of 28 chapters. The storyline is this: To castaways Lord and Lady Greystoke of England was born the baby Tarzan in a secluded western African beach that is next to a forest. When the couple died soon after, an ape named Kala rears Tarzan up as part of her ape family. He grows up as a jungle inhabitant, intelligent and nimble, while learning to write by himself. He had no outside contact until, when already an adult, a group of “whites” came. Consequent events eventually led Tarzan out into “civilization.”

The United States of America at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century saw economic ups and downs never experienced before. Burroughs was of a moneyed “white” family background who, in the course of starting his own family, found himself constantly changing jobs until he was about 35 years old (Holtmark, *Edgar Rice* 1, 5).<sup>2</sup> Howard P. Chudacoff has a concise statement regarding this societal crisis:

If middle-class, white American males of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries felt beleaguered, emasculated, and weakened by the social and economic transformations of their society, they had some accessible icons to provide them with

---

<sup>1</sup>That, for many in the academe, the global society is now in the “postmodern” is another point of discussion, for another venue. Specifically, though, it is the societies—mostly the so-called First world—which underwent the first industrializations (in the late 18<sup>th</sup> until the early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries) that are being spoken of as (in the) postmodern.

<sup>2</sup> Burroughs relates in “How I Wrote the Tarzan Books” how he was unsuccessful as a breadwinner until he began to sell his stories. At one point says, “Occasionally it is better to do the wrong thing than the right.”

means to overcome their plight...: Eugen Sandow, Harry Houdini, and Tarzan, who...helped create new images of masculinity for the modern era (Chudacoff).<sup>3</sup>

In *Tarzan of the Apes*, Tarzan is described as a “straight and perfect figure, muscled as the best of the ancient Roman gladiators...with the soft and sinuous curves of a Greek god...and...the fire of life and intelligence” (Burroughs, 1914 152, 153; ch. 13). He straddles classical and modern ideals<sup>4</sup> and his popularity is enduringly enormous be it on print, film, or the stage.<sup>5</sup> For the modern human who is continually bombarded with many kinds of stressors, catering to ideals embodied by Tarzan and other heroes like him is a means of coping.

In this paper, when *civilization* is used it is taken to be situated in the modernity that comes with industrialization, as mentioned above. Prof. Porter in the novel says civilization came about because of “scientific progress.” He argues against Mr. Philander, another character in the novel, who believes that had not Spain conquered the Moors [sic] then we would have been better off today. Prof. Porter’s reason, however, is that the Moors’ religion would have hindered “such civilization as we find today in America and Europe” (Burroughs, 1914 193, 194; ch. 16). Albeit modernity and civilization, per se, have varied qualifications or definitions, the setting here of *civilization* is “today in America and Europe,” which was the modern period—the context and background of the first publication of *Tarzan of the Apes*.<sup>6</sup>

In the novel, Tarzan has a notion that two categories—that of being *civilized* and that of not—are in place. First, he has a notion that to be distinguished as a human one must have clothes at least. He was worried because he had no clothing to indicate that he was a man and neither an ape nor a jungle animal (Burroughs, 1914 95, 151; ch. 8, 13). Second, to be *civilized* one must be able to transcribe thoughts. As he writes a letter to Jane, “he took infinite pleasure in seeing his thoughts expressed in print—in which he was not so uncivilized after all.” Acquiring Jane Porter, so to speak, is his reason for acceding to be *civilized* (Burroughs, 1914 230, 374; ch. 18, 28). He chose to become “civilized” even when he is happier in the jungle (Burroughs, 1914 336; ch. 26).

Halfway into the novel Tarzan feels lucky to be living in a peaceful and secure forest (Burroughs, 1914 217; ch. 17). However, reading up from the novel’s first pages, a reader would

---

<sup>3</sup> Holt and Thompson say that the modern American man’s ideal is one who is both “respectable” and a “rebel” at the same time (427, 437). Interestingly, Burroughs is both (see note 2), and Tarzan as well—he is able to thrive outside of society’s accepted norms and yet his identity as a Clayton ensures his “high” status within it as well.

<sup>4</sup> Holtsmark in “Tarzan and Tradition” shows features of classical Greek and Roman heroic narratives that are present in Tarzan stories. A connection between Tarzan being British and Burroughs being American can be deduced from Kosc’s explanation on the influence that wealthy British hunters in the American West had on wealthy Americans, to which the Burroughses belong.

<sup>5</sup> See, for instance: LOOHAUIS, J. (1999, Jun 13). THE KING OF SWING; WEB SITES take a swing through these tarzan-related web sites: Matt’s tarzan movie site ([www.intrepid.net/jkerr/bunkum/tarzan.htm](http://www.intrepid.net/jkerr/bunkum/tarzan.htm)). A devoted fan rates all of the films, including the lousy and unauthorized ones. plenty of pictures, too. tarzan of the internet ([www.ac.wvu.edu/stephan/Tarzan](http://www.ac.wvu.edu/stephan/Tarzan)). A tarzan portal that links to dozens of other pages and a million pictures. classics at the online literature library: Edgar rice burroughs ([www.literature.org/authors/burroughs-edgar-rice](http://www.literature.org/authors/burroughs-edgar-rice)). read the burroughs novels, and some of his unrelated science fiction. tarzan comic strip’s home page ([www.unitedmedia.com/comics/tarzan](http://www.unitedmedia.com/comics/tarzan)). this home page for the tarzan comic strip (new sunday adventures, classic daily ones) archives a month of adventures. (the strip does not appear in the milwaukee journal sentinel.) disney’s tarzan home page ([disney.go.com/worldsofdisney/tarzan](http://disney.go.com/worldsofdisney/tarzan)). learn about the movie, watch a couple of trailers, and buy a bunch of products that the real tarzan would find. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel* Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/260952142?accountid=35994>. Accessed 11 March 2019.

<sup>6</sup> Holtsmark says that the biases of views in the Tarzan stories are a reflection of legitimized views at that time (*Tarzan and Tradition*, 5). One of these was the discrimination against blacks.

have by then already encountered an abundance of occurrences of words that evoke pain or hurt. There are at least 200 of such different terms within the novel. When counted all together they total about 2,000 occurrences.<sup>7</sup> If the 370 pages of narrative in The Library of America's 2012 edition of the novel is considered, on average there are at least five of such terms per page. What possible relation, one may wonder, do these violence evoking words have with the way Tarzan sees his home, the jungle, which he says is peaceful and secure?

The novel's narrator-voice opens the story with: "I had this story from one who had no business to tell it to me, or to any other" (Burroughs, 1914 7; ch. 1). This *narrator* who "composed" the story, whose thoughts on it came from "the person who passed it on to him," who in turn apparently knew the "thoughts" of the characters in the novel, would have presumably situated himself as among the *civilized*. Regardless of who wrote it down, and regardless that the plot is fictional, it is still "thoughts" that got written down and has become very popular. This connection between the characters' thoughts—which is the narrator's words—and the story being patronized by the modern person as popular and light entertainment speaks of the relative ordinariness of violence in *civilization*. This is subtly reflected within the novel's narratives, which is liberally sprinkled with violence evoking words.

There are four instances in the novel's narratives that explicitly speak of an absence of cruelty.<sup>8</sup> Three of these pertain to Tarzan himself and one to Kala's treatment of him as her adopted "ape-child." If Tarzan is not cruel and the jungle is peaceful and secure, then what are the many cruelty-related words doing in the narrative? There are statements in other parts of the narrative saying that Tarzan and Kala are not exempt from being cruel. For instance, on Tarzan, as well as all humans in general, "he sometimes killed for pleasure" and "for it has remained for man alone among all creatures to kill senselessly and wantonly" (Burroughs, 1914 118; ch. 10). Another instance is on Tarzan's anthropoid community, here comparing it to the African tribe Tarzan encounters: "these people were more wicked than his own apes" (Burroughs, 1914 129; ch. 11). With the numerous usages of terms evoking cruelty, who, then, is *cruel* in the novel?

The term *cruel* itself, which is employed in denying cruelty in Tarzan, will be used in this discussion in preference to the other violence or cruelty related terms present in the novel's narrative. *Cruel*, *cruelty*, *crueler*, and *cruelly* are italicized because this paper does not go into an ontological discussion of cruelty.<sup>9</sup> These four terms are employed in descriptions within the novel that pertain to all characters in the novel: the animals, the humans, the anthropoids (apes), and the jungle itself. This paper aims to present a picture of how *cruel* and its derivative words present are used within the narrative. At the least, it should be determined who/which is *cruel* to whom/what. In order to do this, phrases within the novel's narratives where a *cruel* term are in use are cited and gathered. The instances are grouped depending on which character in the novel

---

<sup>7</sup> Some of these violence related words are: bestial, brutes, brutality, brutishness, deadly, demon, endanger, fearfully, fearsome, ferocious, forced, frighten, hateful, horrible, horrifying, killer, roared, savagery, screaming, terrifying, wounding. At least 261 of such different words can be spotted, these totaling 1,907 times in frequency of appearance within the novel's narrative. In this paper all page references to texts in *Tarzan of the Apes* are the page numbers of the novel's 2012 publication by The Library of America. Statistics on word counts in this paper were done using the Fuchs annotation of the novel. Both publications are based on the original novel form of the A. C. McClurg & Co. 1914 edition (this is stated on page 397 of the printed novel and on the webpage of Fuchs' annotation).

<sup>8</sup> This is tackled further below.

<sup>9</sup> "Humans and Animals – Where does cruelty come from?", an online discussion thread that explored cruelty attributed to animals, touches on many points on this theme and can represent any serious introductory discussion on it. Baron-Cohen gives a scientific explanation on the connection between cruelty and the capacity for empathy in humans. Nixon explores consciousness, which in turn has to do with the question of whether the way humans perceive cruelty can be projected onto animals, that is, if they also perceive cruelty the way humans do (6).

is pertained to as possessing *cruelty* in the context. In instances where the possessor of *cruelty* is an object or an attribute, the character that is implied to be responsible for the *cruelty* is traced and determined. That is, the explicit possessor of *cruelty* and the character responsible for it are identified in these instances. The object to whom or to which *cruelty* is directed to is next identified. This allows for a pattern to be seen in the usage of a *cruelty* term.

As already mentioned, Burroughs wrote *Tarzan of the Apes* with the aim of selling the story (Burroughs, “How I Wrote”). The use of many fright evoking words intensifies the emotiveness of a narration, rendering it sensational. An example is this text: “Before him lay the deep waters of the little lake, behind him certain death; a cruel death beneath tearing claws and rending fangs.” (Burroughs, 1914 62; ch. 5). This description of the situation before Sabor the lion springs onto Tarzan and his playmate by the waterside involves seven mentions of *cruelty* related words: *death* (used twice), *cruel*, *tearing*, *claws*, *rending*, and *fangs*. Interestingly, the horribleness of the situation would not have been less had the sentence finished midway: “Before him lay the deep waters of the little lake, behind him certain death”—where the seven counts of *cruelty* related words is reduced to just one, with *death*<sup>10</sup>. Moreover, these seven terms are used here despite the absence of an explicit concurrent action. After Sabor springs, none of the anticipated actions (*tearing* and *rending*) are narrated to have taken place. Tarzan escapes instead and then he sees Sabor “crouching upon the still form of his little playmate” before it turns away at the arrival of the other apes (Burroughs, 1914 63, 64; ch. 5). The narration simply goes on to say that the playmate lays dead<sup>11</sup> because he was not able to escape Sabor, whereas Tarzan did. Within this sub-plot, the pumping up of cruelty in Sabor is a foil in order to display Tarzan’s superiority. The entire novel, in fact, presents Tarzan as an entity distinct<sup>12</sup> from the rest of the characters—more intelligent, adept, skillful, resourceful, etc. He is never the outcast or the disadvantaged because, like a superhero, he always comes out as the victor.

In a similar way described above, in order to find out whether the presence of the *cruel* term in each of the cited phrases is substantial, the phrase is first indicated and then rewritten by deleting, where possible, the term *cruel*. If the sense of the phrase is lost after the deletion, then the phrase is not rewritten. It is simply copied *in toto*. After establishing who is *cruel* to whom, and of the substantiality of the terms’ usages, a connection between the presence of the violence-evoking terms within the novel and with *civilization* may then be seen.

## II. *Cruel, Cruelty, Crueler, and Cruelly*

The word *cruel* appears 35 times in *Tarzan of the Apes*. Its derivatives *crueler* appear once; *cruelly* and *cruelty* three times each. All in all, *cruel* and its derivatives appear 42 times. They appear in nineteen out of the twenty-eight of the chapters, with the highest frequency of five, in Chapter XI. Out of the 42 counted, 4 are in the following statements that disassociate Kala and Tarzan from cruelty.

On Kala’s treatment of Tarzan, it says, “she was never cruel to him” (Burroughs, 1914 65; ch. 5).

<sup>10</sup> That is, not *death* per se, but with the connotation here of death being the peak, or the extreme point, of a violent event.

<sup>11</sup> The actual manner of death, being absent in the narration, is a matter of assumption. Similarly, nothing is being narrated regarding what Sabor did to the little ape, which opens up the possibility that it may not have been the lion that was directly responsible for its death.

<sup>12</sup> This observation is tackled again further below.

On Tarzan they are:

1. “a joyous laugh...betokened no innate cruelty” (Burroughs, 1914 118; ch. 10).
2. “There could be naught of cruelty...beneath” (Burroughs, 1914 254; ch. 20).
3. “that face could not mask a cruel heart.” (Burroughs, 1914 277; ch. 21).

Though noted here, these four instances above are not included in the discussion-treatment that follows hereafter. They deny the presence of cruelty and therefore belong to a different category from the rest.

For the 38 usages left out of 42, Tables I and II below show which of the story’s characters are *cruel* (or, similarly for *cruelty*, *crueler*, and *cruelly*), together with the particular term’s corresponding number of occurrences or usages. Wherever it applies, the novel’s character-actor who/that is implied as responsible for, or owns, an inanimate object’s *cruelty*—like someone’s teeth or inflicted wounds—is determined (that is, the animate culprit is indicated).

Table I. Number of *Cruel*<sup>13</sup> Occurrences, in Categories Based on Which Jungle Inhabitant Is *Cruel* Attributed To.

Category	Number of Occurrences	To Whom/What Is <i>Cruel</i> Attributed To
1	7	Bolgani (a gorilla), or those of Tarzan’s ape tribe
2	7	Sabor (a female lion)
3	4	The forest itself or any jungle animal, except the ones mentioned in this column
4	1	Numa (a male lion)
5	1	Sheeta (a leopard)

Three distinct groups of categories can be identified from the findings above. The first grouping contains Category 1 only, attributed to the anthropoids. The second grouping contains Categories 2, 4, and 5, attributed to the big cats. The third grouping contains Category 3 only.

In this discussion, the Africans in the novel are referred to as “blacks” for simplicity’s sake, and likewise for the use of the term “whites.” They bear no connotation here, politically or otherwise, but simply for convenience and considering that both these terms are prominent in the novel’s storyline. The “blacks” are implied to be classified together with the jungle in general. For instance, John Clayton protests against being marooned on “an unknown shore to be left to the mercies of savage beasts, and, possibly, still more savage men” (Burroughs, 1914 25; ch. 2). Nevertheless, the “blacks” are classified among the humans in this discussion, as so does Tarzan (Burroughs, 1914 128; ch. 11).

<sup>13</sup> Counting or referring to the term *cruel* in this paper generally implies the inclusion of its derivatives found within *Tarzan of the Apes*—i.e., *cruelty*, *crueler*, and *cruelly*.

Table II. *Cruel* Occurrences Attributed to Either Humans, an Event, or God.

Category	Number of Occurrences	To Whom/What Is <i>Cruel</i> Attributed To
6	8	Blacks
7	8	Whites
8	1	an event (Alice Clayton's death)
9	1	God

Categories 8 and 9 above are in the following texts, respectively:

- John Clayton thought it was cruel when his wife died and left him with a one-year old baby—Tarzan: “which even this cruel blow could scarcely awake to further suffering” (Burroughs, 1914 44; ch. 3).
- Prof. Porter, on the disappearance of Jane, thought of God as being possibly cruel: “God could not have been so cruel as to take my little girl away from me now.” (Burroughs, 1914 232; ch. 18).

An *event* and God, as above, do not belong together nor can they be classified with the other categories. Both are left out from the treatment that follows.<sup>14</sup> A total of six usages (i.e., two here and four pertaining to Kala and Tarzan, above) are now left out—meaning, 36 out of the original 42 occurrences are treated in the discussion-tables that follow.

Table II above shows that the humans (Blacks and Whites) are responsible for sixteen occurrences of *cruel* in all. Table I above shows that the jungle or its animal inhabitants are responsible for twenty occurrences in all. It appears, then, that based on the number of *cruel* usages (and its derivatives), the jungle and not the humans is the bigger threat. That is, the jungle is *crueler* than the humans in the novel.

The four Tables that follow cite all the instances in the novel where a *cruel* term is used, except the six now left out. These listings are according to who/what is responsible for the *cruelty* (or to whom/which it is attributed to). That is, the animate culprits. As already pointed out, these characters are:

- 1.) the anthropoids,
- 2.) the big cats,
- 3.) the jungle and its inhabitants in general, and
- 4.) the humans

Each of the four Tables that follow has seven columns. The headings or the descriptive titles of the columns of these four Tables are the following:

---

<sup>14</sup> The issue of the cruelty of either *death* or *God* lies within the realm of theological-philosophical inquiry, in the realm of ideas, and are not physically inflicted—which is unlike the rest of the categories. Prof. Porter's description of *God* and John Clayton's description of *death* as both cruel can be deleted from the text without affecting the innate gravity of the corresponding tragedies of Jane Porter's disappearance and Alice Clayton's death. The use of *cruel* in both instances is for emotive enhancement of the narrative, and is likewise the case for the many other violence-related or violence-evoking words in the novel. For instance, the terms *savage*, *savages* and *savagery* within the novel can be investigated likewise. Of the 80 counts of these terms, it can be seen that in only five usages are concurrent violent actions present.

Column I. Chronological order of occurrence or usage of a *cruel* term in the novel, albeit grouped here (and so numbered) within the Table only to which the usage belongs—this is based on who/what the alleged culprit is (in Table 1 are seven usages “perpetrated” by the anthropoids; Table 2 are nine usages by the big cats; Table 3 are four usages by the jungle in general; and Table 4 are sixteen usages by humans—making a total of 36 usages). This column allows an easy reference, by Table, to a particular *cruel* usage. However, a usage’s placement within the novel itself is indicated in Column III. As to Table 4, the chronological ordering is disrupted. The *cruel* usages are grouped according to who the perpetrator is, whether a Black or a White. Each of these two groups is further subdivided according to their immediate contexts or according to who/what is involved in the infliction of *cruelty*. This arrangement affords a clear picture regarding culprit-victim connections particularly regarding the humans in the novel.

Column II. The exact phrase in the novel which contains the term *cruel* (or its derivative).

Column III. The chapter and page number in the 2012 The Library of America publication of *Tarzan of the Apes*, where the corresponding phrase in Column II appears on the printed novel.

Column IV. The *cruel* object that appears or is mentioned within the phrase itself.

Column V. The *cruel* character in the novel to whom/which the object indicated to its left (i.e., in Column IV of the same row) is attributed to.

Column VI. The character who/that is being threatened by the *cruelty* in its corresponding phrase’s context.

Column VII. Restatement of the narrative phrase after the *cruel* term is deleted—i.e., whenever its meaning is not lost.

Due to space constraints, only the corresponding Roman numerals of the descriptions above appear in the column headings of the four Tables that follow. The symbol “\*” found with the phrases in Column II (of these four Tables) indicates the absence of concurrent actions. That is, there are phrases where *cruel* is used but there is no mention of a concurrent action that goes with it. There are 18 instances of such—which is half of the 36 that are being treated in the four Tables. This speaks of the extent cruelty is evoked in *Tarzan of the Apes* regardless of whether a cruel act is taking place or not.

Where present, different occurrences of *cruel* that belong to the same context<sup>15</sup> are identified together—indicated by group headers, or bold or double-line row-dividers. These indicate that a single context may have more than one occurrence of *cruel*. Moreover, there are contexts that have multiple *cruel* occurrences but where not all such usages have concurrent actions, like in Table 2 (see the 1<sup>st</sup> occurrence together with the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> occurrences).

Inanimate objects under Column IV of the four Tables are in italics. There are 22 of these. This is more than half (i.e., 61%) of the 36 instances treated here. This speaks of how frequent *cruelty* is attributed to objects that by themselves, per se, are incapable of it.

The Columns VII show the dispensability of the *cruel* terms. Thirty-four out of the 36 usages of *cruel* can be done away with without affecting the sense of the corresponding phrase—the two exceptions being in Table 4 (the 6<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>, indicated by “[none]”).

---

<sup>15</sup> That is, the specific sub-plot or scene.

Tables 1 to 4 follow.

Table 1. The Anthropoids as the Culprits.

I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.
One context with 3 usages, where an outsider anthropoid attacks Tarzan						
1 <sup>st</sup>	against his cruel antagonist	VI, 72	antagonist	Bolgani	Tarzan	against his antagonist
2 <sup>nd</sup>	from his cruel wounds	VI, 76	wounds			from his wounds
3 <sup>rd</sup>	which the cruel jaws had missed		jaws			which the jaws had missed
Three contexts, where <i>cruelty</i> comes from and is directed to a member of Tarzan's ape tribe						
4 <sup>th</sup>	before the cruel fangs could close	XI, 138	fangs	Kerchak	Tarzan	before the fangs could close
5 <sup>th</sup>	has cruelly bitten her	XII, 143	bite	Gunto	Gunto's wife	has bitten her
6 <sup>th</sup>	*a cruel and capricious king	XIX, 236	king	Terkoz	apes of his tribe	a capricious king
7 <sup>th</sup>	*chief who is cruel		chief	tribe leader		chief

Table 1 shows that the anthropoids direct *cruelty* to another anthropoid only (see Column VI; Tarzan is implied to be a member of his own ape-tribe). Of these *cruel* usages, in only one instance is a threat to an ape directly enacted—in the 5<sup>th</sup> occurrence, with the verb “bitten.” Tarzan is threatened in more than half of the occurrences (four out of seven usages, which are the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 4<sup>th</sup>). White-Skin, which is what *Tarzan* means in his adoptive ape tribe's language and so is their name for him (Burroughs, 1914 58; ch.5), considers himself as fully human only after Blacks appear in the scene. By then he is able to acquire clothing through them and so, he believes, he has become “human” like them. When the Porter group appears, he easily identifies himself with them as well (Burroughs, 1914 151, 171; ch. 13, 14).

Table 2. The Big Cats as the Culprits.

I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.
Where a big cat is a threat to Tarzan and his ape tribe						
1 context with 3 usages, where Sabor attacks Tarzan (and his playmate)						
1 <sup>st</sup>	*cruel death beneath tearing claws	V, 62	death	Sabor	Tarzan and his ape playmate	death beneath tearing claws
2 <sup>nd</sup>	there he saw the cruel beast	V, 63	beast			there he saw the beast
3 <sup>rd</sup>	who lay dead beneath cruel Sabor	V, 64	Sabor			who lay dead beneath Sabor
1 context, where Sabor threatens Tarzan's ape tribe						
4 <sup>th</sup>	*held her cruel and mighty ferocity	VIII, 94	ferocity	Sabor	Tarzan's tribe	held her mighty ferocity



Where the big cats threaten a member of their own group						
5 <sup>th</sup>	*those cruel, sharp claws of theirs	IX, 102	<i>claws</i>	big cats	Sabor	those sharp claws of theirs
Three contexts, where the big cats threaten the Porter group						
6 <sup>th</sup>	*cruel fangs tore into her fair flesh	XV, 187	<i>fangs</i>	Sabor (or Jane)	Jane Porter and Esmeralda	fangs tore into her fair flesh
7 <sup>th</sup>	*it had been cruelty a thousand times less justifiable <sup>16</sup>	XV, 188	<i>not to shoot Esmeralda</i>			it had been a thousand times less justifiable
8 <sup>th</sup>	*a fleeting backward glimpse of cruel yellow eyes	XVI, 196	<i>eyes</i>	Numa	Prof. Porter and Mr. Philander	a fleeting backward glimpse of yellow eyes
9 <sup>th</sup>	*or cruel Sheeta	XXIII, 303	Sheeta	Sheeta	D' Arnot	or Sheeta

As hinted above, and will be picked up again below, Tarzan in the novel may be treated as an entity to himself.<sup>17</sup> He is both ape and human, Black and White, of the jungle and of civilization. Here in Table 2, Tarzan is presented as a distinct object to which a threat is directed, with his companion playmate within the sub-plot being identified with him by consequence. However, the threat is practically directed to his ape playmate since Tarzan is anticipated to be able to subdue it anyway. There is a divide here between himself and his “brother” ape. So that in 4<sup>th</sup> usage of *cruel* in Table 2, Tarzan is easily not counted among his ape tribe, who are the victims in this particular sub-plot.

For the sake of comparison, however, one threat is each toward Tarzan, his ape tribe, and a big cat, counted by context (see Column VI of Table 2, the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 5<sup>th</sup> usages). On the other hand, the Porter group (to which D' Arnot belongs) is threatened in three contexts (see usages 6<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> in Table 2, along Column VI).

Moreover, only in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> usages is *cruel* concurrent with an event that is so. So, in seven out of the nine instances, *cruel* does not pertain at all to a concrete action that is happening in the narrative sub-plot.

Table 3. The Jungle in General as the Culprit.

I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.
1 <sup>st</sup>	*by day and by night—fierce, cruel beasts	XII, 141	beasts	jungle animals	other jungle animals	by day and by night—fierce beasts
2 <sup>nd</sup>	*It would be cruelly wicked to leave poor Esmeralda	XVIII, 235	<i>to leave Esmeralda alone</i>	the jungle and its inhabitants	Porters' party	It would be wicked to leave poor Esmeralda

<sup>16</sup> A philosophical discussion on this instance is not accommodated in this paper, yet the idea involved is remarkable. In here, Jane Porter decides that shooting the unconscious Esmeralda point blank is not *cruel*. The shot misses (Burroughs, 1914 192; ch. 15). Jane Porter would rather commit homicide and suicide than deal with a yet impotent threat—a lioness stuck in a window and is rendered immobile.

<sup>17</sup> See also note 19.

I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.
3 <sup>rd</sup>	* enough dead things in the cruel forest as it is		<i>forest</i>			enough dead things in the forest as it is
4 <sup>th</sup>	*cruel teeth that would give her unconsciousness	XX, 255	<i>teeth</i>	some beast	Jane Porter	teeth that would give her unconsciousness

The usage of *cruel* in Table 3 is merely for the sake of descriptions, with no concurrent actions in all of them. In three out of four instances is the jungle perceived as a threat to the group of Prof. Porter.

Table 4. The Humans as the Culprits.

I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.
Blacks being responsible for <i>cruelty</i>						
One context with 4 usages, directed to a Black captive from another tribe						
2 <sup>nd</sup>	cruel brutality of his own kind	XI, 128	<i>brutality</i>	African tribe, or its warriors	an African captive	brutality of his own kind
3 <sup>rd</sup>	as savage and cruel as Sabor	XI, 129	Sabor			as savage as Sabor
4 <sup>th</sup>	target of the cruel lancers		lancers			target of the lancers
5 <sup>th</sup>	loathsomeness of the cruel indignities	XI, 130	<i>indignities</i>			loathsomeness of the indignities
One context, directed to William Clayton						
8 <sup>th</sup>	*the village of the cruel blacks	XIV, 174	blacks	African tribe	W. Cecil Clayton	the village of the blacks
One context with 3 usages, directed to D' Arnot						
12 <sup>th</sup>	fiendishness of their cruel savagery	XXI, 271	<i>savagery</i>	African tribe, or its warriors	D' Arnot	fiendishness of their savagery
14 <sup>th</sup>	the cruel spears	XXI, 273	<i>spears</i>			the spears
16 <sup>th</sup>	* torture of many cruel wounds	XXIII, 293	<i>wounds</i>			torture of many wounds
Whites being responsible for <i>cruelty</i>						
One context with 2 usages, directed to the Blacks by the Belgians						
1 <sup>st</sup>	*cruel and thankless taskmasters	IX, 105	taskmasters	colonizer Belgium	African tribe	thankless taskmasters
13 <sup>th</sup>	*memory of still crueler barbarities	XXI, 271	<i>barbarities</i>			memory of barbarities
Two contexts, where the ships' crew kill one of their own						
6 <sup>th</sup>	no less cruel than Sabor	XIII, 158	Sabor	ship's crew	mutineers' leader	[none]

I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.
11 <sup>th</sup>	more cruel than the beasts	XVII, 217	beasts			[none]
One context, where Tarzan muses over the Porter group						
7 <sup>th</sup>	*as ferocious and cruel as other men	XIV, 171	other men	Porter group	other men (Whites, or those not in the jungle)	as ferocious as other men
Two contexts, where Prof. Porter addresses Mr. Philander in two separate events						
9 <sup>th</sup>	cruel injustice of Professor Porter's insinuation	XVI, 202	<i>injustice</i>	Prof. Porter	Mr. Philander	injustice of Professor Porter's insinuation
10 <sup>th</sup>	take umbrage at the professor's cruel fling	XVI, 205	<i>fling</i>			take umbrage at the professor's fling
One context, where William Clayton speaks hurtfully to Jane Porter						
15 <sup>th</sup>	how cruelly they had cut the girl	XXII, 289	<i>words</i>	W. Cecil Clayton	Jane Porter	how they had cut the girl

Indicated by the "\*" symbols in Column II of Tables 1 to 4 above, it is seen that:

- 1.) of the 7 counts of cruelty attributed to the anthropoids, 2 instances are without concurrent *cruel* actions (i.e., ca. 29%);
- 2.) out of 9 counts attribute to big cats, 7 have without likewise (i.e., ca. 78%);
- 3.) in the same way, 4 out of 4 for the jungle in general (i.e., 100%);
- 4.) and 5 out of 16 for the humans (i.e., ca. 31%).

This information and its implication is easier seen with the help of a table, such as below.

Summary Table: Showing the Counts of *Cruel* Usages Based on Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4, Together With Counts of Usages that Have No Concurrent *Cruel* Actions or With Such.

Table [With the Culprits Indicated]	Total Number of <i>Cruel</i> Usages	Usages Without Concurrent <i>Cruel</i> Actions	Usages With Concurrent <i>Cruel</i> Actions
1 [Anthropoids]	7	2	5
2 [Big Cats]	9	7	2
3 [The Jungle]	4	4	0
4 [Humans]	16	5	11

It is to humans that *cruelty* is mostly attributed to—to their group pertain both the highest number of *cruel* usages (16) and the relatively highest number of these usages with accompanying actions—11 out of 16 (i.e., 69.75% or almost 7 out of 10). Meaning, when *cruelty* is attributed to humans in the novel, then 7 out of 10 of the time there is an accompanying *cruel* action.

This percentage is almost similar with the anthropoids (5 out of 7, or almost 72%). However, almost all of these instances are used to build a climax towards the affirmation that Tarzan is

superior to all inhabitants of the jungle. Out of the five usages that have no “\*” in Table 1 (see its Column I), four are directed to Tarzan. Interestingly, the anthropoids in the novel are projected to be acting in much closer affinity with humans as compared to the other “beasts.” For instance, an anthropoid reared Tarzan from infancy to adulthood.

Significant, however, is the finding that the rest of the jungle, including the big cats, had the minimum of *cruel* actions whenever cruelty is attributed to them along the storyline (0 out of 4; and 2 out of 9, respectively).

Within the grouping of humans, the division into Whites and the Blacks is already noted. This is explicit in the novel, as in: “They were negroes—he is a white man” (Burroughs, 1914 282; ch. 22). Among the Whites, factions exist also. The groups are:

1. The ships’ crews that marooned the Claytons and the Porters belong to one grouping by virtue of their being “offscourings of the sea—unchanged murderers and cutthroats of every race and every nation” (Burroughs, 1914 10; ch. 1).
2. The “white officers of that arch hypocrite, Leopold II of Belgium” (Burroughs, 1914 271; ch. 21), though they appear in flashback accounts only.<sup>18</sup>
3. The Porter group, made up of the Porters’ party and the French soldiers, including D’ Arnot.

Esmeralda, though almost always referred to as the “negress” or as the “black” and is therefore a faction within the Porter group, is nevertheless classified by Tarzan with them (Burroughs, 1914 172; ch. 14). Although Tarzan identifies himself with the Porter group, as already mentioned, the Porter group tends to identify him more with the jungle than with them. Even when Jane Porter argued with Cecil Clayton against this latter idea, she herself has the same tendency (Burroughs, 1914 282, 372, 373; ch. 22, 28). So, as seen both by him and by the Porter group, Tarzan belongs both to the jungle and to *civilization*.<sup>19</sup>

The *cruel* usages in Table 4 are equally divided between Blacks and Whites—as also reflected in Table II (Table II. *Cruel* Occurrences Attributed to Either Humans, an Event, or God). The Blacks’ *cruelty* is directed to either one of them or to the Porter group. The Porter group has *cruelty* directed either to one of theirs or to a non-member, who, in the particular scene, implies anyone harassing them like what the crew does. The Belgians direct theirs to the Blacks. The crew’s direct theirs to one of their own. The 16 usages of *cruel* attributed to humans are grouped into 10 contexts.

---

<sup>18</sup> The Belgians are mentioned in passing only. They do not appear among the action scenes within the novel-narrative, so to speak, and the cruelty pertained to them as directed to the blacks is only within a specific narrative that serves as a descriptive flashback of what the blacks had supposedly experienced from them.

<sup>19</sup> Tarzan is not among the characters that pose as a threat in the four Tables (i.e., he is not in all the Columns IV. and V.). His dual membership does not complicate the question here on who is *cruel*. This dual classification is seen plainly through the Porter group’s eyes, who by themselves are not able to identify the “giant” who keeps rescuing them with the “Tarzan” who writes to them (Burroughs, 1914 359, 360; ch. 27). However, by identifying himself with either of the groups of the Porters, the blacks, or the apes he is as *cruel* as them. By identifying himself as a jungle animal he is non-*cruel*, as only Sheeta among them tortures prey (Burroughs, 1914 128; ch. 11). But he is spoken of as capable of killing for “pleasure” side by side with the three statements denying his *cruelty*. The case of *cruelty* in Tarzan is irreconcilable. Otherwise, killing for pleasure be classified as *non-cruel* so that it can fit Tarzan, but which makes humans *non-cruel* and *cruel* at the same time. This means Tarzan belongs to either any of the groups or to none at all. Another contradiction also is generated with D’ Arnot’s remark, “White man do not kill wantonly” (Burroughs, 1914 328; ch. 25). If this is so, then Whites are not humans.

From the Blacks:

- One context with 4 usages, where they torture a captive Black from another tribe—in Occurrences 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup>;
- One context, where Tarzan thinks of them a threat to William Clayton’s safety—in Occurrence 8<sup>th</sup>;
- One context with 3 usages, where they tortured D’ Arnot—in Occurrences 12<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and 16<sup>th</sup>.

From the Whites:

- One context with 2 usages, where the Belgians direct it to the Blacks—in Occurrences 1<sup>st</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>;
- Two contexts for 2 instances, where a ship’s crews direct it to their member—in Occurrences 6<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>;
- One context, where Tarzan suspects the Porter group as capable of *cruelty* to ‘others,’ who are not of the jungle—in Occurrence 7<sup>th</sup>;
- Two contexts for 2 instances, where Prof. Porter hurts Mr. Philander using speech—in Occurrences 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>;
- One context for the instance that Cecil Clayton speaks hurtfully to Jane Porter—in Occurrence 15<sup>th</sup>.

Looked at it this way, it is seen that the Whites have more contexts of being responsible for *cruelty* compared to the Blacks (i.e., 7 contexts versus 3 contexts). Moreover, when Blacks are cited, their *cruelty* is not directed at all to a member of their group. In the instance where their victim is a Black, he is a captive from another tribe. However, among the White characters, each group directs *cruelty* to a member of its own group or kind, except the Belgians.

### III. Who Is *Crueler*?

Table 4 shows that there are eleven usages in seven contexts that are human-threats with concurrent actions.<sup>20</sup> In contrast, from Tables 1, 2, and 3 altogether only seven usages in four contexts are jungle-threats with concurrent actions.<sup>21</sup> On the other hand, only five usages are human threats without concurrent actions.<sup>22</sup> In contrast is 13 of the jungle’s.<sup>23</sup> Based on these countings, it is the humans who are the bigger threat and not the jungle.

Moreover, in Column I of Table 4, there are six usages without the symbol “\*” that pertain to the Blacks, whereas five pertain to the Whites (again, these indicate *cruel* usages with no accompanying *cruel* actions). However, the Blacks’ usages are only in two contexts: {2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup>} and {12<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>}, in contrast to five of the Whites’: {6<sup>th</sup>}, {11<sup>th</sup>}, {9<sup>th</sup>}, {10<sup>th</sup>}, and {15<sup>th</sup>}. Based on these, it is the Whites who are the bigger threat, and not the Blacks.

Looking from the other perspective, Table X below summarizes the statistics on which characters are being threatened. Characters found in Columns VI of the four Tables above (Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4) are the ones counted, first according to per *cruel* usages, and then next by the context groupings.

<sup>20</sup> Grouped by context using braces, these are the *cruel* instances (as seen in order) in Column I of Table 4: {2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup>}, {12<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>}, {6<sup>th</sup>}, {11<sup>th</sup>}, {9<sup>th</sup>}, {10<sup>th</sup>}, and {15<sup>th</sup>}.

<sup>21</sup> These are, from Table 1: {1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup>}, {4<sup>th</sup>} and {5<sup>th</sup>}; from Table 2: {2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>}; there is none in Table 3.

<sup>22</sup> In Table 4, Occurrences 8<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, 1<sup>st</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> In Table 1: the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>. In Table 2: the 1<sup>st</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 9<sup>th</sup>. In Table 3: the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup>.

Table X. Frequencies That the *Tarzan of the Apes* (1914) Characters Are Threatened, Counted by *Cruel* Usages and Contexts, and Based on Column VI of the Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 Above.

Threatened Character	Number of Usages	Number of Contexts
Anthropoids	4	3
Tarzan	7	3
Big Cats	1	1
Jungle, in general	1	1
Humans, with sub-itemizations:	23	15
(Blacks)	(6)	(2)
(Whites):	(17)	(13)
[Porter group]	[14]	[10]
[Mutineers' leader]	[2]	[2]
[Others, Whites]	[1]	[1]
<i>Total</i>	36	23

The statistics on *cruel* usages and contexts show that it is the humans who are threatened the most, with the Whites more than the Blacks are. Tarzan is threatened more than the anthropoids, big cats, and the jungle in general are.

A clearer picture emerges when the presence of concurrent actions is considered. Table Y below copies the categorizations of Table X, but now with the counts on usages and contexts put under either the presence or absence of concurrent *cruel* actions. The sums of usages and contexts per row reflect the figures in Table X, row by row, except with Tarzan and the Porter group, and by consequence the corresponding summations. These contexts are each counted twice—in Table 2: {1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup>} and Table 4: {12<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and 16<sup>th</sup>}. This happens in both these cases only in all of Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 due to the presence of concurrent actions and the absence of such among the *cruel* usages, which are directed to Tarzan and the Porter group. That is, a count is placed in both Sub-Columns 1b and 2b, thus affecting the sums, as mentioned.

Table Y. The Frequencies That Characters Are Threatened—by Usage, Context, and Action.

Threatened Character	1. With Concurrent Action		2. Without Concurrent Action	
	a. By Usage	b. By Context	a. By Usage	b. By Context
Anthropoids	1	1	3	2
Tarzan	6	3	1	1
Big Cats	0	0	1	1
Jungle, in general	0	0	1	1
Humans, with sub-itemizations:	11	7	12	9
(Blacks)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(1)
(Whites):	(7)	(6)	(10)	(8)
[Porter group]	[5]	[4]	[9]	[7]
[Mutineers' leader]	[2]	[2]	[0]	[0]
[Others, Whites]	[0]	[0]	[1]	[1]
<i>Total</i>	18	11	18	14

In Columns 1 (With Concurrent Action) and 2 (Without Concurrent Action) of Table Y above, it is seen that within the novel *cruel* is used in as many times in instances where there are

concurrent actions as there are in the absence of these (see the Total for both 1a and 2a, which is 18). Any usage-context pair where the frequency for usage is much higher than for context reflects a tendency of the narrative-storyline to use the *cruel* word repeatedly within only one event-narrative (i.e., sub-plot, or scene). This is so, for example, in Tarzan's and the Blacks' cases in Column 1, where the number of usages is at least double than that of the number of contexts.

It is the Whites who are consistently threatened the most (i.e., 7 vs. 4 in Sub-Column 1a; and 10 vs. 2 in Sub-Column 2a), where the Porter group gets the highest points.

The count that is 4 for the Porter group under Sub-Column 1b are these scenes:

- 1.) Cecil Clayton is cruel to Jane by his speech, in Table 4, the 15<sup>th</sup>.
- 2.) Prof. Porter is cruel to Mr. Philander by his speech, in Table 4, the 9<sup>th</sup>.
- 3.) Prof. Porter is cruel to Mr. Philander by his speech, in Table 4, the 10<sup>th</sup>.
- 4.) The Blacks are torturing D' Arnot, in Table 4, the 12<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>.

When a concurrent action is present with the use of *cruel* that threatens one of the Porter group, it is most likely that a member of the group itself is using words to inflict *cruelty* to a fellow member.

The count that is 7 for the Porter group under Column 2b are these scenes:

- 1.) Sabor got stuck in the cabin's window, in Table 2, the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>.
- 2.) Numa slowly trails Prof. Porter and Mr. Philander, in Table 2, the 8<sup>th</sup>.
- 3.) Tarzan thinks Sheeta might attack D' Arnot, in Table 2, the 9<sup>th</sup>.
- 4.) Prof. Porter insists not to leave Esmeralda behind, in Table 3, the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>.
- 5.) Jane Porter anticipates an imaginary attacker, in Table 3, the 4<sup>th</sup>.
- 6.) Tarzan thinks the Blacks might harm Cecil Clayton, in Table 4, the 8<sup>th</sup>.
- 7.) D' Arnot agonizes over his wounds, in Table 4, the 16<sup>th</sup>.

When a concurrent action is absent, most likely it is the forest in general or an inhabitant of it is *spoken* of as *cruel*.

#### IV. Summary of Findings

Through an investigation of the occurrences of the words *cruel*, *cruelty*, *crueler*, and *cruelly* in *Tarzan of the Apes* (1914), the following findings are obtained:

At first glance, it seems that it is the jungle and not the humans that is the bigger threat and is *crueler* in the novel. However, majority of the attributions of *cruelty* are to inanimate objects.<sup>24</sup> Moreover, almost all of the usages of *cruel* can be done away with without affecting the sense of the corresponding phrase as found in the narrative.<sup>25</sup>

It is the humans who are the bigger threat and not the jungle. When *cruelty* is attributed to humans in the novel, more likely than not, there is an accompanying *cruel* action that goes on within the narrative. This is not so where the jungle is concerned. Moreover, it is the Whites who are the bigger threat and not the Blacks. The Whites have more contexts of being responsible for *cruelty* compared to the Blacks. When Blacks are cited, their *cruelty* is generally not directed to a member of their group. However, among the Whites, *cruelty* is directed to a member of their own group or kind.

It is the humans who are threatened the most, with the Whites more than the Blacks are. The Porter group makes up the bulk of the Whites in the storyline. When a concurrent action is present with the use of *cruel* directed against one of them (i.e., the Porter group), it is most likely

<sup>24</sup> That is, 61%. There are 22 out of 36 relevant occurrences.

<sup>25</sup> That is, 94%. This is 34 out of 36 relevant usages.

that a member of the group itself is using words to inflict *cruelty* to a fellow member. However, when a concurrent action is absent, most likely it is the forest in general or an inhabitant of it is *spoken* of as *cruel*.

Tarzan, as an inhabitant of the jungle, is threatened more than the anthropoids, big cats, and the jungle in general are. This feature of the storyline is used, however, to highlight how Tarzan is able to unquestioningly subdue all his antagonists.

## V. Conclusion

*Cruel* and its derivatives are used in describing all characters or their actions in Edgar Rice Burroughs' novel *Tarzan of the Apes*. They are used to state that Tarzan has no *cruelty* inherent in him. They are used in describing objects that are inanimate, or most of the time even when no concurrent action is present to qualify as *cruel*. The Whites, especially the Porter group, see the jungle as threatening the most, attributing *cruelty* to it even when there is no concurrent action. However, where actions are concurrent to the usage, the Porter group is more responsible for *cruelty* than any other character group in the novel. In most these instances it is one of them who is being *cruel* to another of their member, by the use of words. Significantly, almost all of the *cruel* terms are not essential at all in building up the meaning of the phrase where the term is found, within the novel's narrative.

Using many *cruel* or violence related terms to describe the jungle and its inhabitants contradicts Tarzan's perception that his jungle home is peaceful (Burroughs, 1914 217; ch. 17). Tarzan excuses the jungle's violence as a way of life, as a matter of survival. Usually he kills dispassionately, but sometimes for pleasure (Burroughs, 1914 117,118; ch. 10). D' Arnot lauds Tarzan's survival. He tells him, "it is mind, and not muscle, that makes the human animal greater than the mighty beasts of your jungle... Otherwise, ...how long would you have lasted in the savage wilderness?" (Burroughs, 1914 324; ch. 25). All jungle inhabitants are Tarzan's enemies except his ape tribe and Tantor (Burroughs, 1914 103; ch. 9). This is reflected in the many times *cruel* is directed from the jungle inhabitants to Tarzan. The jungle is peaceful for Tarzan and he is "lord" of himself and of his world, as Burroughs puts it ("Tarzan Theme"), because with his "mind" and physical prowess he is able to subdue threats against him. Only Tantor is not afraid of him (Burroughs, 1914 48, 59; ch. 4, 5).

Outside the jungle the facility of the word is important. *Civilization* uses words the way Tarzan uses his mind and his strength to subdue threats. In *civilization*, the "greatest" are those with the best minds such as the novel's characters Prof. Porter and the Claytons, who are intelligent and are good with words (Burroughs, 1914 9, 83, 194; ch. 1, 7, 16 ). Prof. Porter and Cecil Clayton are the only characters in the novel who inflict *cruelty* using words. In the preliminaries, John Clayton (Tarzan's father, Lord Greystoke) as well had earlier dismissed the ship *Fuwalda's* captain with "you are something of an ass" (Burroughs, 1914 18; ch. 1).

The jungle "beasts" are man's enemies, says D' Arnot (Burroughs, 1914 324; ch. 25). In the face of this, *civilized* man's recourse is to *subdue the jungle in the eyes of civilization* by using words, which is the case with the novel *Tarzan of the Apes*. Albeit in reality, the jungle and its inhabitants are impervious to words. In *Tarzan of the Apes*, it is only in words that the jungle is *cruel* to *civilized* man—though this assertion itself is false even within the novel, based on the findings above. This may be seen, therefore, as a case of demonizing an imaginary enemy through propaganda. But since Burroughs' aim was simply to sell a story, in which he was indeed very successful, then looking into propaganda as a matter of popular consumption, so to say, is another consideration.



## Works Cited

- Baron-Cohen, Simon. Interview by Kim Wombles. *An Interview With Simon Baron-Cohen On Zero-Empathy, Autism, And Accountability*. *Science 2.0*. ION Publications LLC. 4 June 2011. Web. 5 Mar. 2019. <[http://www.science20.com/countering\\_tackling\\_woo/interview\\_simon\\_baroncohen\\_zeroe\\_mpathy\\_autism\\_and\\_accountability-79669](http://www.science20.com/countering_tackling_woo/interview_simon_baroncohen_zeroe_mpathy_autism_and_accountability-79669)>.
- Burroughs, Edgar Rice. "How I Wrote the Tarzan Books." *The World Magazine* 27 Oct. 1929: n. pag. *ERBzine*. Web. 5 Mar. 2019. <<http://www.erbzine.com/mag0/0052.html>>.
- . *Tarzan of the Apes*. 1914. Introd. Thomas Mallon. New York: The Library of America, 2012. Print.
- . *Tarzan of the Apes*. Annotated by Kenneth Fuchs. *erblast.com*. David Bruce Bozarth. 2002. Web. 5 Mar. 2019. <<http://www.erblast.com/erbmania/novels/toafuchs.html>>.
- . "The Tarzan Theme." *Writer's Digest* June 1932: n. pag. *ERBzine*. Web. 5 Mar. 2019. <<http://www.erbzine.com/mag0/0058.html>>.
- Chudacoff, Howard P. Review of *Houdini, Tarzan, and the Perfect Man: The White Male Body and the Challenge of Modernity in America*, by John F. Kasson. *The American Historical Review* 107.2 (2002): 563-564. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Mar. 2019. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/532371>>.
- "Enlightenment." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2018. Web. 4 Mar. 2019. <<https://www.britannica.com/event/Enlightenment-European-history>>.
- Holt, Douglas B., and Craig J. Thompson. "Man-of-Action Heroes: The Pursuit of Heroic Masculinity in Everyday Consumption." *Journal of Consumer Research* 31.2 (2004): 425-440. *Researchgate*. Web. 2 Mar. 2019. <[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267922465\\_Man-of-Action\\_Heroes\\_The\\_Pursuit\\_of\\_Heroic\\_Masculinity\\_in\\_Everyday\\_Consumption](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267922465_Man-of-Action_Heroes_The_Pursuit_of_Heroic_Masculinity_in_Everyday_Consumption)>.
- Holtsmark, Erling B. *Edgar Rice Burroughs*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986. Print.
- . *Tarzan and Tradition: Classical Myth in Popular Literature*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1981. Print.
- "Humans and Animals - Where does cruelty come from?" *Tilted Forum Project Discussion Community*. N.p. N.d. Web. 2 Mar. 2019. <<https://www.thetfp.com/tilted-philosophy/30136-humans-animals-where-does-cruelty-come.html>>.
- Kosc, Gregory. *Performing Masculinity and Reconciling Class in the American West: British Gentlemen Hunters and Their Travel Accounts, 1865-1914*. Arlington: The University of Texas at Arlington, 2010. *The University of Texas at Arlington: Research Commons Library*. Web. 2 Mar. 2019. <[https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/5442/Kosc\\_uta\\_2502D\\_11006.pdf?sequence=>](https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/5442/Kosc_uta_2502D_11006.pdf?sequence=>)>.
- "modernization." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2016. Web. 2 Mar. 2019. <<https://www.britannica.com/topic/modernization>>.
- Nixon, Gregory M. "Myth and Mind: The Origin of Human Consciousness in the Discovery of the Sacred." *Journal of Consciousness Exploration & Research* 1.3 (2010):289-337. *PhilPapers*. Web. 2 Mar. 2019 <<http://philpapers.org/archive/NIXMAM>>. [Note: Access through *PhilPapers* affords the pagination count of 1 to 50.]
- Tang, Shiping. "Foundational Paradigms of Social Sciences." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 41.2 (2011):211-249 originally published online 22 January 2010. *SAGE Journals*. Web. 2 Mar. 2019. <[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249678327\\_Foundational\\_Paradigms\\_of\\_Social\\_Sciences](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249678327_Foundational_Paradigms_of_Social_Sciences)>.