

Jennifer Beckford

ENG202: Global Literature II: NLSB

Professor Crawford Locke

November 9, 2021

Response # 7

The word “metamorphosis” connotes a process or at least the moment of change, but Kafka’s story does not portray that moment. Gregor’s simply wakes up as the bug. How would the story change if Kafka had shown the audience the process of transformation? Why didn’t he show the metamorphosis?

If Kafka had shown the audience the process of his transformation from a human into a bug he would have felt worse than how he was actually feeling. It also would have changed the image he wanted to portray. Therefore he showed only the “metamorphosis.” I believe the process would reveal his true feelings and makes him more vulnerable in his adulthood. He hid beneath the bug. The transformation would show the audience his emotional state, knowing he did not resolve his childhood issue with his parents. There was no normalcy in his childhood so he displaced his innermost thoughts underneath the bug.

He was feeling worthless and had an inferiority complex due to the fact of how his dad abused him. He felt less than a human so that was his way of displaying his inner being. Especially, knowing his mother did not defend him as an innocent child. He felt incompetent and insecure with himself. Kafka realized he was not in a good place mentally and was having a difficult time accepting what had happened to him as a child. It must have been a struggle for Kafka to resolve his feeling mainly because his dad never gave any recognition during his childhood or even as an adult. It is a possibility his dad did not know how to give affection, guidance, or love. Children need their parent’s reassurance in order to gain confidence as they grow. If Kafka’s father had a balance between loving him and disciplining him he would have

not felt less than a bug. Here Gregor's expressed how he felt it, I would assume he felt better transforming into a bug "he would climb up the still and propped in the armchair, lean against the window, apparently lost in some sort of reverie of how liberating he'd always found it to gaze outside" (Pg. 1010).

Virginia Woolf chose to fictionalize a sister for Shakespeare, of all possible writers. Why is Shakespeare the most effective choice for Woolf's argument?

The name Shakespeare would capture her audience and both Woolf and Shakespeare were British writers that influenced the world in a magnificent way. Knowing Woolf was an advocate for women so, why not associate her name with another prominent name as women also. Woolf's intention was to advance her feminist arguments by fictionalizing with a sister for Shakespeare. During that era women, writers were not respected as the men writer, in were not equal.

I would suppose Woolf fashioned Shakespeare to show that women can be equally talented to Shakespeare himself and that women have the same capabilities to succeed in society. Shakespeare inspired Woolf but she despised how women were displayed in his plays. When Shakespeare said, "women cannot write the play of Shakespeare" (Pg. 1111) this statement was disheartened. Woolf immediately fictionalized a sister since it was hard for a woman to write a play during the Shakespeare era. Therefore, she challenges the name also "what would have happened had Shakespeare had a wonderfully gifted sister" (Pg. 1111). I think it was a clever decision by Woolf to fictionalize a sister for Shakespeare. She captured her audience and continued advocating equality for women she was demanding respect for females.