

*People's Democratic Republic of Algeria  
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research  
Amar Thelidji University, Laghouat  
Faculty of Letters and Languages  
Department of English*



**Exploring a Postmodernist  
Characterization of Hegelian Master/Slave  
Dialectics in John Fowles's *The Collector*  
(1963)**

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for  
Master Degree in Civilization and Literature

By:

SEBAA Amel Aicha

Board of Examiners:

- Mr. Mohamed Cherif Seddiki, Chairman
- Mrs. Soumia Bentahar, University of Laghouat, Supervisor
- Mr. Mohamed Naoumi, Examiner

2020/2021

## **Dedication**

*I dedicate my work to my beloved parents for their everlasting encouragement and love.*

*To all my treasured sisters who had my back no matter what.*

*To the most charming baby in the world, my nephew Mohamed.*

*To my dear fiancé for his support and motivation.*

*And to all my friends.*

## **Acknowledgment**

I would like to express my deepest gratitude towards my supervisor, Mrs Bentahar Soumia, for her efforts, patience, and complete understanding along the realization of this dissertation in spite of the pandemic circumstances the world is living.

I would like also to thank my committee: Mr. Mohamed Cherif Seddiki, the chairman, for his flexibility and generous appraisal of the work and Mr. Mohamed Naoumi, the examiner, for correcting my work.

I am really fortunate to have Professor Afkir Mohamed stand with me in my viva as a co supervisor, for his kind comments and offering help.

Lastly I would like to thank all teachers who taught and supported me in my journey.

## Abstract

This dissertation examines postmodern narratives and Hegelian themes of otherness, possession, recognition, and master-slave dialectic using John Fowles's novel *The Collector* as a case study. It seeks to understand how these themes are elaborated throughout the novel. The approach adopted in this study is analytical and close-reading method, which is most appropriate for conducting this topic. First, this study attempts to establish the characters' different worlds through their double perspectives, and presents the problem of class, that is seen in Fowles's theory 'Aristoi and Hoi Polloi', which monitors their ideology and actions. Second, this paper demonstrates that their relationship is what Hegel posits "The struggle for recognition" and the "desire for possession". Finally, it attempts to analyze the dynamics of their power by examining their relationship as a master and a slave. Therefore, *The Collector* proves to be a critique of domination and unequal self/other relationship based on non-mutual recognition. In addition, the engagement in this study that combines literature and philosophy gives us a great insight in people's minds and motives.

**Key words:** Master-slave Dialectic, Self-other consciousness, Struggle for Recognition, Otherness, Possession, Life-and-death battle.

## Résumé

Ce mémoire examine les récits postmodernes et les thèmes hégéliens de l'altérité, de la possession et de la reconnaissance, et la dialectique maître-esclave en utilisant le roman de John Fowles, *The Collector*, comme étude de cas. Cette étude cherche à comprendre comment ces thèmes sont élaborés tout au long du roman. L'approche adoptée dans cette étude est la méthode analytique et la lecture attentive, qui sont les plus appropriées pour conduire ce sujet. Premièrement, notre étude tente d'établir les différents mondes des personnages à travers leurs doubles perspectives, et présente le problème de la classe, qui est vu dans la théorie de Fowles «Aristoi et Hoi Polloi», par la connaissance de leur idéologie et de leurs actions. Deuxièmement, cette étude démontre que la relation entre les personnages est ce que Hegel postule "La lutte pour la reconnaissance" et "le désir de possession". Enfin, ce mémoire tente d'analyser la dynamique de leur pouvoir en examinant la relation de maître à esclave. Par conséquent, *The Collector* se révèle être une critique de la domination et de la relation inégale entre soi et autrui basée sur une reconnaissance non mutuelle. En outre, l'engagement dans cette étude qui combine la littérature et la philosophie nous donne un bon aperçu de l'esprit et des motivations des gens.

**Mots Clés:** Maître-Esclave dialectique, Soi-autrui conscience, Aristoi et Hoi Polloi, lutte pour la reconnaissance, altérité, possession, bataille de vie ou de mort.

## المخلص

تدرس هذه الأطروحة منهجية بحث تخص روايات ما بعد الحداثة بالارتكاز على رواية جون فاولز *The Collector* فيما هو قائم على جدلية السيد و العبد حيث تسعى إلى تحديد كيفية مناسبة لفهم المنهج المتبع من خلال الرواية. إن الهدف من مفهوم هذه الدراسة هو الأسلوب التحليلي و القراءة عن بعد حيث تحاول إنشاء عوالم مختلفة للشخصيات من خلال منظوراتها المختلفة و لإجراء هذا الموضوع اندرجت الدراسة ضمن مفاهيم أساسيين. أولاً : منهج أرسطوي و هوي بولوي الذي يظهر في نظرية فولز لكي يعرض مشكلة الطبقة المزدوجة و النضال من أجل إلا حيث يوضح البحث أن علاقتهما هو ما يفترضه هيجل. ثانياً : تحديد معالم أيديولوجياتهم و أفعالهم و تحليل ديناميكيات قوتهم بواسطة فحص علاقتهما كسيد و عبد. تقدم لنا *The Collector* نقد الهيمنة و العلاقة الغير متكافئة بين الذات و لذلك فإن المشاركة في هذه الدراسة التي تجمع بين الأدب و الفلسفة تعطينا نظرة ثاقبة حول الصراع المتبادل في عقول الناس و دوافعهم.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** جدلية السيد و العبد, الإدراك بالذات و الأخر, النضال من أجل الاعتراف, التملك, معركة الحياة و الموت

# Table of Contents

<b>Dedication.....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>Acknowledgments.....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>Résumé.....</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>المخلص.....</b>	<b>VI</b>
<b>General Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Introduction.....	6
I. 1. Defining Postmodernism.....	7
I.1.2 Postmodernism in Literature.....	8
I.1.3 Postmodern Narrative Techniques and Fiction.....	9
I.2 Postmodern and Philosophical Viewpoints in John Fowles.....	11
I.2.1 John Fowles and Postmodernist Literature.....	12
I.2.2 John Fowles as a Fine Philosopher.....	15
I.2.3 Notion of Freedom in John Fowles.....	16
I.2.4 Theory of <i>The Aristos</i> : Hoi Polloi vs. Aristoi.....	17
I.2.4.1 The Few and the Many.....	17
Conclusion.....	19
<b>Second Chapter: Hegel’s Philosophy as a Theoretical Context.....</b>	<b>20</b>
Introduction.....	20
II.1 Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit.....	21
II.1.2 Hegel’s Standpoint in Philosophy.....	21
II.2 Hegelian Dialectic Speculative Triad: Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis.....	23
II.3 Hegel on Self-Consciousness.....	25

II.4 Hegel's Master-Slave Dialectic: Lordship and Bondage.....	27
II.4.1 Life and Death Struggle as the Struggle for Recognition.....	29
II.4.2 Slave's Coup: Becoming the Master of the Master.....	31
Conclusion.....	32
<b>Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master-Slave Characterization in <i>The Collector</i>.....</b>	<b>33</b>
Introduction.....	33
III.1. One Story Double Narrative: The Postmodernist Narrative Technique in <i>The Collector</i> .....	33
III.1.1 Description and Characterization.....	38
III.1.2 Reliable vs. Unreliable Narrators.....	40
III.2 The Aristos: Aristoi vs. Hoi Polloi characterization in <i>The Collector</i> .....	42
III.2.1 Frederick Clegg as Hoi Polloi Member.....	42
III.2.2 Miranda Grey Representative of the Aristoi.....	44
III.3 Hegelian Characterization in the Novel.....	45
III.3.1 Hegelian Otherness in <i>The Collector</i> .....	45
III.3.2 Possession and Recognition in <i>The Collector</i> .....	46
III.3.3 Master/Slave Dialectic in <i>The Collector</i> .....	48
Conclusion.....	53
<b>General Conclusion.....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Works Cited.....</b>	<b>58</b>

# **General Introduction**

## General Introduction

---

In every situation that we are exposed to society, helps to mold our self-perception. As humans, from the moment we say 'I' we become conscious of ourselves as individuated subjects and conscious of the 'other' as 'non-I'. The Self/Other binary opposition has troubled philosophers for centuries, however, it is agreed that the presence of an 'other' is necessary for the recognition of a 'self'.

The self/other binary opposition dates back to the 18th century, when the German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) explained how 'self-awareness' is linked with the interaction with 'otherness'. Hegel maintained that human relationships are a battle between 'thesis and antithesis' that combat for dominion over each other. Therefore, there are two ways of dealing with a person's otherness, either by embracing it as important to extend our understanding of the 'other', or by refusing it. In this regard, and in order to maintain the existence of the 'self', people engage in a battle to force the 'other' to recognize him/her and understand his/her 'otherness' while withholding reciprocal 'recognition' from the other. This battle resolves when one party chooses submission over death, and therefore, the other party takes the dominating status and becomes 'independent consciousness' that is aware of its own 'self'. The submissive party, in this case, becomes 'dependent' on that 'independent' party to seek awareness of its 'self'.

Postmodernist literature has also discussed this binary. Postmodernist thinkers like Erving Goffman (1959) posited a fragmented 'self' which is unable to stand by itself without the presence of the 'other'. He argued that the presence of 'otherness' plays an important role in the construction of the 'self'. Nevertheless, this interaction between the 'self' and the 'other' sometimes leads to violence and domination. In this sense, power takes control of the relationship between the 'self' and the 'other'. This idea is featured in *The Collector* by John Fowles.

*The Collector* is a postmodern novel published in 1963. It is famous for its double narrative techniques, as well as the themes of 'self' and the 'other', the quest for freedom, and power struggle. Fowles successfully blended double narrative technique as well as novel's circularity in which both characters repeat the same process: Miranda seeks to escape and Clegg locks the doors. The novel is composed of four sections, three told by the captor, Clegg, and one by his captive, Miranda. The novel consists of two characters, only the captor and the captive, and tells the story of the imprisonment of Miranda Grey by madman Frederick Clegg. The

## General Introduction

---

characters are involved in a vicious battle for recognition as Hegel maintains; each seeks to dominate the other's mind, and each wants to be a 'master'. They struggle with each other until one becomes 'for-itself' (Master), the other becomes 'for-other' (Slave).

What is also interesting about the novel is Fowles's critique of the English class system that was established after the Second World War. In his philosophical work *The Aristos: a Self Portrait of Ideas* (1964), John Fowles divides the society into two distinct groups. On the one hand, the 'Few' are characterized as the intellectual upper class elite, and on the other hand, the 'Many' represents the ignorant, uneducated lower class. He portrays this idea in *The Collector* to explore this system and its dangers. Fowles posits that in spite of the miserable life of the 'Many', they should be educated and that the 'Few' should feel responsible toward them. The conception of the novel by Fowles portrays also the theme of 'self' and 'other' in which Clegg and Miranda seem incapable to understand the 'other'. They both expect the 'other' to act according to his/her background, values, and ideology and; hence, their misunderstanding leads to continuous quarrels.

Actually, several researchers have approached *The Collector*. "The Butterfly (D)e(F)fect or Construction of Identity in John Fowles's *The Collector*" is a journal article by Diana Corban (2013) investigates the issue of identity in *The Collector* from the perspective of the collector's mentality using Jean Baudrillard's theory of systems of collecting. Corban claims that Clegg ends up destroying Miranda because she constantly reminds him of his incompetence or 'defect'. In the same manner he pins his butterflies in his cabinet he pins her dead body in a box making Miranda to be the first in his new collection of butterfly-women. Similarly, Christoffel Johannes Van der Berg Magister dissertation entitled *A Study of the Themes of Quest and Self-Knowledge in the Fiction of John Fowles* (1991) examines the contrasting male-female relationships using Fowles novels *The Collector*, *Mantissa*, and *A Maggot*. Van der Berg discusses how the male protagonist's relationship with the female leads him to contrast self-knowledge. Even if he fails to conquer this female heroine, he will emerge as a person with existential authenticity. A different approach to read *The Collector* in feminist terms is Brooke Lenz book *John Fowles: Visionary and Voyeur* (2008). This book reconsiders Fowles's controversial contribution to feminist thought. Lenz combines literary criticism and feminist standpoint theory to analyze the female characters in the fiction of Fowles who are voyeuristically exploited.

## General Introduction

---

Lenz claims that the purpose behind giving voice to his female characters, Fowles aims to show their feelings and experiences in the oppressive dominant systems.

In the light of what we have been said, many studies have been approached *The Collector* in terms of philosophy, and the relationship of the 'self' and identity. Yet they approached it in a different manner. They neglected establishing a relationship between them to study the characters as the 'self' and the 'other' accordingly. They mainly approached the novel in terms of existential philosophy and feminist approach and neglected examining Self/Other as conflicting consciousnesses between characters through Hegelian philosophy of Master-slave Dialectic. In this vein, the main research problem that this dissertation seeks to highlight is the way violent confrontation with otherness helps construct the 'self-consciousness' in *The Collector*.

Therefore, the main objective of this dissertation is to explore the 'self' and the 'other' relationship as 'master' and 'slave' in *The Collector*. It seeks to understand the nature of the two main characters in the novel and to compare the two narratives presented by Clegg and Miranda which serve effectively to contrast each other. Through the double voiced characters, this study will examine their style of writing, the structure, and the content. In addition, this study will discuss how their social classes impact their actions and their psychologies. Moreover, it attempts to read the novel through a Hegelian perspective. In particular, this study will shed light on the problematic interpersonal relationship between Frederick Clegg and Miranda Grey in terms of Hegelian 'struggle for recognition'. As mentioned above, both characters are in a 'battle for recognition' which implies recognizing someone's values and accepting the other's humanity. Nevertheless, both characters are incapable to understand the other's otherness. They continually conflict with each other until one dominates the other, the other, who submits in order to live.

For the purpose at hand, and in order to undertake a proper academic research, a number of research questions can be developed to reflect on the main research problem:

- How is Hegelian Master/Slave dialectic depicted in *The Collector*?
- Why is the relationship between the 'self' and the 'other' a violent one?

## General Introduction

---

- How does the class difference between the characters prevent them from establishing a clear understanding of the ‘other’?
- For what purpose does Fowles depict two contrastive characters and employ double perspectives?

In order to answer the aforementioned questions, a number of hypotheses are suggested as follows:

- In the novel, Miranda represents Hegelian Master Heroine; although she is imprisoned, she is the dominator of the relationship.
- The relationship of the ‘Self’ and the ‘Other’ is always a violent battle between people because they all attempt to be the dominant ‘self’.
- The characters' class differences stem from their belonging to the different groups of the ‘Few’ and the ‘Many’.
- Fowles employs the double voiced characters to give readers a broader angle of understanding the characters’ minds and motives.

This study merits research because it tackles a new sphere of studying the ‘self’ and the ‘other’ relationship as conflicting ‘consciousnesses’ which is depicted through ‘Master-Slave struggle’. John Fowles’s choice of a few numbers of characters whose actions are performed within a very limited space is neither haphazard nor arbitrary; the aim of writing a novel with only two characters and an underground cell is meant to show how human relationships are unequal and confirm that who maintains ‘self-consciousness’ maintains power.

This dissertation is based on an analytical approach and a close-reading method that comprises analyzing and interpreting John Fowles’s main characters in *The Collector* through two main critical lenses: Postmodernist narrative techniques and Hegelian philosophical insights.

Therefore, this work is divided into three chapters. The first chapter, the background chapter, is divided in two parts: Postmodernist literature and Fowles’s Philosophical leanings. First, it defines postmodernism in general and narrative techniques in particular to analyze the characters’ double voices. Second, it introduces Fowles’s postmodern and philosophical insights in which it discusses his literature and his philosophical works

## General Introduction

---

mainly *The Aristos: a Self Portrait in Ideas* (1964) for the sake of analyzing the characters' differences. The second chapter consists of theoretical context. It provides a deductive study of the human consciousness and philosophy of 'self' and the 'other' that is discussed by Friedrich Hegel's *Philosophy of the Mind*. In specific, this chapter attempts to provide information about 'master-slave dialectic' beginning from the first natural stage of 'self-consciousness', 'life-and-death battle for recognition', 'master-slave dialectic', and lastly the 'slave's coup' in order to facilitate the task of analyzing the characters in terms of dominion and power struggle. The third and final chapter analyzes the novel in terms of the variables mentioned in the background and theoretical chapter. In particular, this chapter explores *The Collector* as a postmodern novel to examine the two main characters in terms of their narrative strategies and highlight their differences in their syntax, structure, and content. Moreover, this chapter elaborates Fowles's theory of 'Aristoi' and 'Hoi Polloi', or 'Few' and 'Many', in relation to Clegg and Miranda in which it examines their social struggle. Furthermore, this chapter reads the characters from Hegelian philosophical terms, and establishes the 'master-slave' characterization in the novel. Lastly this chapter concludes with illustrating the winner of the combat of Hegel 'master-slave' for 'recognition'.

**First Chapter:**  
**Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical  
Leanings**

## First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings

---

### Introduction

The 20th century witnessed a great shift that altered the human perception of life. A new generation of scholars like John Barth, Jacques Derrida, and Jean-François Lyotard began reforming against the existing order and sought to develop new reforms in the literature and the philosophy of life. Barth's famous statement 'Literature of exhaustion' held that the British novel was 'exhausted' and a new series of chaos is needed.

This period experienced changes in literature and the novel form in particular. The key concept of Ronald Barthe 'The death of the author' (1967) became a major rule that postmodernist authors were to follow. This produced the 'Nouveau Roman', the 'new novel' or the 'anti-novel' that was first mentioned by Jean-Paul Sartre in an introduction to Nathalie Sarraute work *Portrait d'un inconnu* also known as *Portrait of a Man Unknown* (1948). It was associated with the French Nouveau Roman of the 1950s and '60s. It dismissed the traditional narrative, dispersed with characters' freedom, and neglected the linear comprehensible plot in favor of chaotic narration. In addition, authors and novelists took the movement to their advantage by incorporating the philosophical viewpoints of the century to their novels which gave masterpieces and more complex to comprehend novels.

One of the remarkable icons of the twentieth-century was the English novelist and the philosophy thinker John Robert Fowles (1926-2005). He was influenced by Heraclitus, Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, and others. He exposed in his novels the unjust male and female relationship and was considered as highly feminist, defended women's rights by showing their misery in a male-dominant world. Eventually, after the success he received after publishing his novels; he set a solid ground among the notable English and worldwide writers and thinkers.

This chapter serves as a background chapter of the dissertation. The presented background framework establishes a link between postmodern literature and postmodern philosophy. It sheds light as well on Fowles's own views on postmodern approaches using his established philosophical theory to facilitate the task of analysis in the analytical chapter.

# First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings

---

## I. Defining Postmodernism

Before embarking on the dissertation discussion, a simple definition of postmodernism is needed. Like any other artistic movement, there is no clear date for the beginning of postmodernism. However, it is agreed that it began from the period after the two World Wars until the 1980s when another movement took the lead for wilder artistic concepts. This period experienced changes in many domains like architecture, art, literature, and philosophy. Each one of them claimed a different definition of the general term 'postmodern'.

The term 'postmodernism' first entered the philosophical lexicon with the publication of Jean-François Lyotard book *The Postmodern Condition: a Report of Knowledge* in 1979. With this publication, researchers and authors sought to approach postmodernism in the philosophical goggles. Postmodernist thinkers including the French philosophers of the twentieth century such as Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Jean-François Lyotard, and others developed a kind of skepticism of the general truth, received wisdom from past records, the grand narratives as Lyotard (1979) called it. Therefore, by calling everything into question, they only believed truth they perceived; as Albert Einstein's *Theory of Relativity* in 1905 claims that the truth for one may not be the same for others.

In defining postmodernism in accordance with previous movements, Stuart Sim in his book *The Routledge Companion to Postmodernism* (2001) defines it as:

Postmodernism is to be regarded as a rejection of many, if not most, of the cultural certainties on which life in the West has been structured over the last couple of centuries. It has called into question our commitment to cultural 'progress' . . . as well as the political systems that have underpinned this belief. Postmodernists often refer to the 'Enlightenment project', meaning the liberal humanist ideology that has come to dominate Western culture since the eighteenth century; an ideology that has striven to bring about the emancipation of mankind from economic want and political oppression. (VII)

Postmodernism, thus, rejected the already established doctrines. The prefix 'post' does not necessarily refer to 'after' but rather refers to a rejection of previous movements that were solidified upon certain beliefs. In art, postmodernism refers to the use of techniques such as pastiche, irony, and fragmentation rejecting traditional values in favor of a chaotic concept of art. However, prominent researchers like Irving Howe, Ihab Hassan, and

## First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings

---

others claimed that the term postmodernism shall be related to history. Ihab Hassan responded to the question: “how would this phenomenon let us call it postmodernism relate itself to such earlier modes of change as the turn of the century avant-gardes or the high modernism of the twenties?” he asserted that: “I am not certain that I can wholly satisfy my own questions though I can assay some answers that may help to focus the larger problem. History I take it” (qtd in Farhangpour, Abdulsalami 03). Unquestionably the literary term of ‘postmodernism’ is closely linked with the historical concept ‘postmodern’.

### I.1. Postmodernism in Literature

The emergence of any movement in literature comes by either a continuation to a previous movement or a rejection of it. Postmodernism in literature takes the shape of ambivalence; it neither presents a continuation to a movement, nor stands against another, but it may do both. Linda Hutcheon, one of the major theorists of postmodern fiction in her book entitled *A Poetics of Postmodernism* (2004), states that: “Postmodernism is a contradictory phenomenon, one that uses and abuses, installs and then subverts” (1). Postmodern literature serves as an umbrella that holds several features and characteristics under it. In writing, it gives writers a plurality of genres and techniques. It created a new form of literature that emphasizes the reader’s interpretation of the work rather than the intention of the writer. One of the works that shook the realm of literature is ‘The Theatre of the Absurd’ that was coined by Martin Esslin in 1962. Esslin credited the philosophy of Albert Camus that states that life is inherently without meaning, as illustrated in his work *The Myth of Sisyphus* (1942). This concept is used by many postmodernist writers like Samuel Beckett and Eugène Ionesco who portrays the lack of language communication and numb characters who could not do anything about a certain event or action.

On the level of the text, writers did not depict only marginalized (different ethnic groups) and outcast characters like the LGBTQ<sup>1</sup> but also used multiple and overlapping narrative voices giving equality to all characters to represent themselves in a realistic manner. Moreover, postmodernist writers sought to reject the

---

1. LGBTQ is an initialism for Lesbians, Gays, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer

## First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings

---

outright meaning and celebrated the possibility of a multiplicity of meanings, or the complete lack of the meaning in their works.

### I.2. Postmodern Narratives Techniques and Fiction

Fiction is a genre of literature that portrays the culture and the ideologies of a specific era. Postmodernist fiction embraces the cultural consciousness as well as the prevailing literary and philosophical tendencies. Mikhail Bakhtin claims in his work *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981) that, “the world has become polyglot and the novel actively creates polyglot world- something that is quite opposed to the previous tendencies in all the genres as they used to represent ‘ears of closed and deaf monoglossia’”. He goes further stating, “ in contrast to other major genres, the novel emerged and matured precisely when intense activation of external and internal polyglossia was at its peak of its activity” (qtd. in Bharvad 2). Postmodern fiction with kaleidoscopic plurality involves mass culture and deconstructs the notions of history, society, and literature. By questioning the metanarratives of the aforementioned notions, postmodern fiction finds alternatives in multiple mini-narratives celebrating fragmentation in multiple ways. Hence, this decentered fiction diverges in multiple images generating endless narrative possibilities (Bharvad 2).

John W. Aldridge, in his book entitled *The American Novel and the Way We Live Now* (1983), describes postmodern fiction:

The fiction virtually everything and everyone exists in such a radical state of distortion and aberration that there is no way of determining from which conditions in the real world they have been derived or from what standard of sanity has been nullified. Characters inhabit a dimension of structureless being in which their behavior becomes inexplicably arbitrary and unjudgeable because the fiction itself stands as a metaphor of a derangement that is seemingly without provocation and beyond measurement. ( qtd. in Goisova 17)

Writers used different narrative techniques in writing their fiction. These include unreliable narrators, circularity, double voice, and many others. ‘Unreliable narrators’ was coined by Wayne Booth in *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (1961), which simply means a narrator who tells a story with a lack of credibility. In addition, double

## First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings

---

narrative technique implies giving two versions of the same story usually two different characters as the case of *The Collector*. According to Bridget Baudinet, double narrative, or parallel plot, in which the author link two or more separate narratives linked by a common theme. Moreover, circularity is the most known technique that postmodern writers tend to follow. Instead of ending the novel, it returns back to the beginning once again and tries to shape the same concept in the story, and thus, continues infinitely.

With these techniques, the notion of a stable linear novel has gone forever. When talking about characterization, it is quite agreed that characters in the novel reflect the social and psychological realities of real individuals. Some represent the good, others represent the evilness. Nevertheless, in postmodern characterization, everything is challenged, subverted, and blurred. The character is drained in postmodern fiction. For instance, in her essay entitled “The Character of Character” (1974), Helene Cixous claims that in postmodern literature, the reader cannot find a hero, namely a character whom he can identify with. She defines ‘the death of the hero’ as:

death generally experienced by the reader as a murder, a loss, on which follows the reader’s quick withdrawal of his investment, since he sees nothing more to be done with a text that has no one in it? No one to talk to, to recognize, to identify with. The reader is loath to venture into a place where there is no mirror. (qtd. in Dolaykaya 1004-1005)

Such expression like the death of the hero in postmodernist literature simply suggests the absence of a character to identify with. The postmodern character disintegrates the traditional character whose very being is defined in his relation to define the individual.

On the level of the author/readers relationship in postmodern prose fiction, things changed a lot. The author has no longer the authority over his text as we mentioned earlier about the ‘Death of the Author’. According to John Barth, the reader is no longer the consumer of meaning, or of what the author offers in the text, but rather has the power to produce different and limitless meanings (qtd. in Salami 33). The author in this stance is only a scriptor as Barthe terms. He only writes but never gives an opinion.

### II. John Fowles Postmodern and Philosophical Viewpoints

During the Second World War, Europe was in decline. The deadliest conflict in human history shattered people's hope for a peaceful world. People began to reflect the standards of life were no longer useful, to examine the traditional values, and to reject religious canons. The post war trauma led writers of the late forties, fifties, and sixties to produce texts in the hope they would overcome the aftermath of the war and renovate the remnants of fiction. John Robert Fowles (1926-2005) was among the leading contributors to this discourse. When approaching postmodern literature and philosophy, John Fowles is an example to approach. Fowles, unlike most novelists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, can be considered both a great postmodernist writer and a fine philosopher.

Before tackling his contributions to western postmodern literature, a brief biography is necessary in order to understand his line of thought. John Fowles was born on 31st March 1926 Leigh-on-Sea a London suburb in the county of Essex, England. He had a quite hard time in his childhood. He said, "I have tried to escape ever since". He lived in an oppressive conformist society and his family was intensely conventional. He declared in an interview with *New York Times* that, "No one in my family had any literary interests or skills at all". He also once said. "When I was a young boy my parents were always laughing at 'the fellow who couldn't draw' -- Picasso. Their crassness horrified me" (Lyall).

He attended Bedford school from 1939 to 1947, a preparatory school for university specializing in French and German. Then he served as a lieutenant for two years as part of his compulsory service during the Second World War; however, the war ended before he had to participate in any battle. Fowles felt alienated from his homeland. Richard Boston, an editor in *New York Times* says that Fowles always hankered for exile. Boston quotes Fowles saying, "If you're into English and you want to go into exile, then you live in England. There's nowhere you can feel more alienated from your fellow human beings". Fowles admired the French and the German saying that he did not feel that he was in exile because he was living with people whom he admired. He went further saying that if he was born in 1906 instead of 1926, he would be living abroad "Because I can't stand the English way of life" (Boston).

## First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings

---

After he graduated in 1950, he went to France and worked as a lecturer in English literature at the University of Poitiers where he discovered the French existentialists like Albert Camus and Jean-Paul Sartre whom he admired. He then began his writing career. The publication of his first novel '*The Collector*' (1963) was an immediate success and granted him the opportunity to devote his full time to writing. Besides writing novels, Mr. Fowles used to be an environmentalist, imaginative historian, existential thinker and philosopher. He published several essays in '*Wormholes*' (1998), which include anthology of writing that gathers journal entries, literary essays, religion, and musings on Englishness. He published also *The Aristos: a Self Portrait of Ideas* (1964) a kind of philosophical examination of life in the twentieth-century. In addition, he published *Islands* (1978), *The Tree* (1980), *The Enigma of Stonehenge* (1980), and *A Short History of Lyme Regis* (1982). Moreover he translated several works, such as *Cinderella* (1974), *Ourika* (1977), and Moliere's play *Don Juan* (1981). He won several awards such as the Nobel Prize in 1999. He died in 2005 at the age of 79 at his house in Lyme Regis.

### II.1. John Fowles and Postmodernist Literature

John Fowles is an award-winning post World War II novelist. All of his successful novels, including *The Collector* (1963), *The Magus* (1965), *The French Lieutenant Woman* (1969), *The Ebony Tower* (1974), *Daniel Martin* (1977) *Mantissa* (1982), and *A Maggot* (1985), led several researchers around the world to study his fiction in a postmodern context. Mahmoud Salami in his book entitled *John Fowles's Fiction and the Poetics of Postmodernism* (1992) talks about the difficulties of narrative technique in the fiction of Fowles. He says that it is quite impossible to agree on how to interpret Fowles's complex and fictional structures. The problem is further complicated with identifying the narrative voices Fowles employs, the combination of different voices and tenses within one narrative, and the mixture of fiction and history and how Fowles's peculiar device of multiple endings in some of his novels (13). Dr. Salami states that, "It is obvious that in style and narrative techniques, Fowles is a contemporary writer who violates the rules of narrative tradition" (13). Dr. Salami compares him with the eighteenth-century forbears like Henry Fielding and Laurence Sterne saying that Fowles, "Undermines and problematizes his narrative by shifting the reader's attention away from

## First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings

---

narrative content towards the actual narration or circumstances in which the story is produced” (13). The fiction of Fowles is a combination of freedom, of individuality, and of existentialism. However, his narrative strategies depend on the relationships among the author, the narrator, and the reader in relation to the text. This dependence therefore, constitutes the central questions throughout his novels.

Fowles had a great impact on his readers. He had the ability to get their attention from the beginning up until the end of the novel, troubling them with his circularity of events going round and round until the situation runs out of energy. In addition, he surprises them with unexpected events and peculiar open ending novels in a way that gives more freedom to his audience for interpretation. As much as it frustrated some of his readers, Fowles always felt he did the right thing by leaving the endings of his celebrated novels open-ended. In an interview with *New York Times*, he said that he received a letter from a cancer patient in New York who wanted to believe that Nicholas, the protagonist of *The Magus* was reunited with his girlfriend at the end of the book, which was a point that Mr. Fowles had deliberately left ambiguous. "Yes, of course they were," Mr. Fowles replies (Lyll). However, comparing Mr. Fowles with other contemporary writers, like Alasdair Gray's *Lanark* (1981), where the books are numbered three, one, two, four with a prologue appearing in the last section, or with B.S. Johnson who wrote a story that comes in a box: *The Unfortunate*, he is rather regarded as a traditionalist who writes in the traditional prose fiction.

Mr. Fowles proved to the world that the 'Death of the Novel' is incorrect. He heralded a new trend in the postmodern fiction with the publication of his three novels in the sixties, whether, "it was the disruption of chronology, amalgamation, complexity, ambiguity, or intertextuality a revisitation of history or a focus on the existential freedom of the individual" ("Fowles: life, works" 66). Mr. Fowles fascinated the world by his narrative techniques using different voices and tenses, fact and fiction that Linda Hutcheon terms 'Historiographic Metafiction' in the late 1980s, and mythopoeia. He used unreliable narrators and dismissed the general truth. Readers here face a hard time to differentiate between what is real and what is unreal, fiction and reality. Conradi (1983) says the following about Fowles and his work:

## First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings

---

He [Fowles] writes romances, gothic stories that exploit the ancient erotic sources and opportunities of narrative and whose designs on the reader are palpable; and through which a series of Persecuted Maidens and Princesses *lointaines* are pursued and prompted, like the mystical and psychological truths they embody, to deny the text that closure they seek. In the magical enclosures in which his fictions abound, love is feudalized. He is a paradoxical figure: a didactic and coercive libertarian; an evolutionary socialist profoundly committed to the values of a Romantic individualism, which his existentialism is called upon to validate. (qtd. In Van der Berg 12)

Mr. Fowles had such a unique style in which he incorporated several techniques in constructing his novels. As such, he borrowed some literary works and applied them to his fictions, for instance the play *The Princess Lointaine* by Edmond Rostand (1895) in characterizing his female character Miranda Grey from *The Collector*. This princess is an ideal unattainable woman who comes from a noble and rich family and far distant from the knights who fall in love with her with only descriptions of her and without seeing her. Moreover, he used characters from *The Tempest* by Shakespeare (1610) whose names are Ferdinand, Caliban, and Miranda, he showed the struggle between Miranda and Clegg who named himself Ferdinand and how Miranda sees him, “they should have called you Caliban” (Fowles 62).

Fowles was highly interested in medieval romance. It is shown in his essays, novels, translations, and even interviews. In an interview with Lorna Sage in 1974, he states that many of his preoccupations such as love, problems of freedom, and quest are present in the earliest of Celtic romances. Thus, he was interested in many traditional and medieval stories. With his contemporaneous writing and experiment, he gave much beautiful image that the new generation is now able to access. Loveday (1985) identifies four major themes in the Fowlesian novel: The Few and the Many, the domain, the contrast between the masculine and feminine characters, and the importance of freedom, and how they all intermingle together (03). The major concern of Fowles was in the relationship between both genders. He declared in many occasions that he defended women’s case. When the feminist movement was calling throughout Western world, he published novels, various essays,

## First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings

---

and even theories such as the theory of 'The Garden of Eden' in which he incorporated Adam and Eve to elaborate the gender contrasts and their behaviors.

### II.2. John Fowles as a Fine Philosopher

Not only Mr. Fowles succeeded in his fiction in the postmodern context, he showed the world another Fowles, a person who thinks deeply. In order to understand his novels, readers and scholars should study first his philosophical point of view to decipher what was the message behind writing them. In *Conversations with John Fowles*, he stated: "I'd better say first of all that I'm more interested in poetry and philosophy than I am in a novel". He continued saying that his aims in life, "first of all [I'd] like to be a good poet, then a sound philosopher, then a good novelist. The novel is simply for me a way of expressing my view of life" (Vipond 05).

Fowles's philosophical leaning came as a result of him learning French and German at Oxford. He was exposed to the existential works of Albert Camus and Jean-Paul Sartre. What attracted him says Susana Onega, a professor of English literature, was the idea that there is no God, and what happens in our lives is a matter of chance, or hazard (qtd.in Acheson 2-3). He was highly influenced by the French school of existentialism and learned a lot about the self and how one defines his own existence in this world.

In *Conversations with John Fowles* (1999), Fowles was asked whether he was deeply interested in philosophy, he responded that he admired French school of novelists such as Sartre, de Beauvoir and others. However, he did not share their points of view completely; he was rather interested in their serious view of the writer's function. He went further saying that he felt himself committed to use literature to propagate his view of life. (05)

Fowles's essay "I Write therefore I am" (1964) proposed that writing is a part of his existential view of life and an attempt to make him authentic. He believed that the serious writer has to include both philosophy of life and literature (Vicen 4). The publication of this essay in 1964, which became part of his *Wormholes* collected essays and occasional writings, illustrates that writing for him is a kind of being and his only rescue

## First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings

---

from this disconsolate world. In this essay he said: “I chose ten years ago to be a writer, chose in the existentialist sense of the act of choosing” (Vicen 16).

### II.2.1. Notion of Freedom in John Fowles

John Fowles told James Campbell in 1976: “this is the sort of existential thesis of [my] books that one has to discover one’s [true] feelings” (qtd. in Acheson 3). He invited people through the experiences of his characters to seek freedom and authenticity in their own lives. He was an existential thinker who stamped existentialism in his first three novels. When talking about the notion of freedom this world, Fowles set himself free by taking the position of God. He said:

To be free myself, I must give him, and Tina, and Sarah, even the abominable Mrs. Poulteney their freedoms as well. There is only one good definition of God: the freedom that allows other freedoms to exist. And I must conform to that definition. The novelist is still a god; since he creates . . . what has changed is that we are no longer the gods of Victorian image, omniscient and decreeing, but in the new theological image, with freedom out first principle, not authority (Vincent 12).

Fowles displayed therefore, a kind of tension between freedom and restriction, often shows how some people, or society in general, oppress others, how they use and abuse power on other people as it is shown in *The Collector* and *French Lieutenant’s Woman*. Fowles's views concerning the importance of art and literature echo those of Sartre's. As Fowles asserted, “I am a great believer in freedom . . . I believe the literary process is fundamentally beneficial, both for its artists and its audiences and especially when it widens their concept of freedom” (Vipond 16).

Thomas Docherty in his article entitled “A Constant Reality: The Presentation of Character in the Fiction of John Fowles” (1981) talks about Fowles’s characterization saying that, “the characters in Fowles’ novels are involved in a struggle with extension, a struggle to order and recognize the Other, and such a struggle is of course that of the fictorist in writing. Behind this lies the desire to create ‘free’ characters,

## **First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings**

---

characters who determine their own history” (119). Docherty argues that it is indeed Fowles who arranges and writes the texts, however the effect is with the authorial voice, that is, the characters are the ones who shape and determine their fate. Fowles’s definition of freedom means “the freedom that allows other freedom to exist” (119).

On every occasion, Fowles reveals how his existential thinking is embedded in almost every work he produced. In an interview with Roy Newquist (1999), he claims: “I am interested in the side of existentialism that deals with freedom: the business of whether we do have freedom, whether we do have free will, to what extent you can change your life, choose yourself and the rest of it” (qtd.in Karsli 2). Mahmoud Salami also studied Fowles fiction being the embodiment of freedom, individuality, and existentialism (13).

### **II.2.2. Theory of the Aristos: Hoi Polloi vs. Aristoi**

As above mentioned, in order to understand fully Fowles’s fiction, one should study his theoretical, often philosophical, views that are presented in his non-fiction works. In 1964, he published *The Aristos: a Self Portrait in Ideas* which consists of philosophical aphorisms directed to *The Collector* and *The Magus*. Fowles was inspired by Socrates, Pascal, and by the pre-Socratic Greek philosopher Heraclitus. Emphasizing his philosophy on the bipolarity ‘Few vs. Many, Fowles aimed to present issues such as the conditions of man’s existence in the twentieth century, the meaning of life, and the satisfaction and the frustration of the human being in the society when he states: “My chief concern, in *The Aristos*, is to preserve the freedom of the individual against all those pressures-to-conform that threaten our century”, and that “[f]reedom is inherent in the best art” (*Aristos* 157).

#### **II.2.2.1. The Few and the Many**

In his first novels, Fowles addresses social issues of post-war Britain especially in the sixties. Through his influence on Heraclitus, he observed that Britain was divided into two categories the Few and the Many, the

## First Chapter: Fowlesian Postmodernist and Philosophical Leanings

---

contradiction between ‘Them’ and ‘Us’. Mete in his article entitled “Writing and the Self: John Fowles’s Autobiographical Non-Fiction” (2017) states from *The Aristos* the following quote:

How Heraclitus saw mankind divided into moral and intellectual elite (the aristoi, the good ones, not, this is a later sense, the ones of noble birth) and an unthinking, conforming mass: hoi polloi, the many. Anyone can see how such a distinction plays into the hands of all those subsequent thinkers who have advanced theories of the master-race, the superman, government by the few or by the one, and the rest. (Mete 27)

In this statement, Fowles differentiated between two kinds of people: The Few were the intelligent, the elite, and the good; the Many were the ignorant, the mass who contribute to the restlessness and chaos of the society (hoi polloi). Nevertheless, unlike Heraclitus, Fowles believed that society is determined by some factors like our genes and our environment. For Fowles, says Ferrandiz, the resolution of this conflict lies in the responsibility of The Few and the education of The Many, “unless the Many can be educated out of their false assumption of inferiority and the Few out of their equally false assumption that biological superiority is a state of existence instead of what it really is, a state of responsibility - then we shall never arrive at a more just and happier world” (qtd. in Ferrandiz 1). Here, Fowles determined that humans are born differently, the elite are biologically born intelligent, and the mass born biologically inferior and despicable. This is evident in *The Collector* the mass are not intelligent, nor highly moral, nor artistically gifted. This is the dividing line between humans to makes them in two groups, one small portion that is excellent and intelligent, the other big portion that is despicable and idiotic. The most important about this theory is that, “The dividing line between the few and the many must run through each individual, not between individuals” (qtd. in Vincent 44). In other words, it indicates that there is nobody wholly perfect or imperfect in this world.

### Conclusion

The background framework introduced in this chapter confirms the link between literature and philosophy. Literature is known as an interdisciplinary field that gathers different disciplines like history, psychology, and aesthetics, while philosophy tries to establish the link between them all and dig deeper into the realm of human consciousness. John Fowles, a British contemporary philosopher and novelist contributed greatly to the postmodern world. The publication of his non-fiction and theoretical works help scholars and students to study his fiction properly, serving as a dictionary to the ambiguous novels he wrote. For him, philosophy plays a great role in the artist's view of life. He especially was concerned with the freedom of the individual in this world. Moreover, he introduced the theory of the few and the many and incorporated it in his novel *The Collector*.

**Second Chapter:**  
**Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context**

## Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context

---

### Introduction

Throughout the history of mankind, there has always been a quest for knowing the 'self', its position in this mysterious world, and its interaction with 'other selves'. People found it difficult to understand their 'consciousness' in relation to 'other consciousnesses', how they are related to each other and whether one consciousness controls the other consciousness or is being controlled. In ancient times, philosophers tried to answer the question 'What is the self?' some others went even further questioned 'How the other is distinct from the self?'

The question of the 'self and the other consciousness' troubled western philosophers including Socrates, Plato, Descartes, and many others across Europe. They started a voyage of discovery in the minds of people dismantling every piece in order to arrive at their destination, i.e, the 'self-consciousness'. This latter can be understood as being aware of the existence of the person in this world and of oneself as an entity. Each philosopher tried to arrive at their own destination in this voyage; some linked the 'self' with the personal identity, others linked it with the cognitive development of the mind.

One of the remarkable emblems that emphasized on the 'Self' and the 'Other' is Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831). His famous book *The Phenomenology of Spirit* is regarded as the introduction to his philosophical system of the mind. Hegel posited the encounter between two distinct 'self-consciousness' beings. His dialectics focus mainly on how power operates between the two by using verbal and sometimes physical confrontations which he calls "the struggle to death" ending with one masters the other, the other ends by submitting.

This chapter serves as a theoretical context to this dissertation. It attempts to solidify the backbone of this study. It provides therefore information about the main variables including the 'self' and the 'other consciousness', 'master-slave' dialectic, and the struggle between the 'self' and the 'other' as the 'master and the slave struggle'

## Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context

---

### II.1. Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit

*Phenomenology of Spirit* is the first comprehensive philosophical work published by Hegel in 1807. This book is considered to be the introduction to his philosophical system and a 'voyage of discovery' as Hegel described it to his students. It provides a 'biography of spirit' that deals with the development of 'consciousness' in the context of epistemological, anthropological, and cultural themes of human history. *Phenomenology of Spirit* is the 'science of consciousness' which experiences the logic and the stages of development of 'consciousness' if it is to fully understand itself. He began his journey with a 'natural unscientific consciousness' up to the development of 'consciousness' from lower to higher level until one reaches the 'absolute knowledge'.

The phenomenological method of Hegel is shown in his first three chapters that follow the development of the 'shapes of consciousness'. This book marked a remarkable development of the German Idealism as it focused on topics such as epistemology, history, perception, consciousness, logic, and reason. From this book, Hegel developed his theory of Absolute Idealism and his speculative method of 'Dialectics'.

*The phenomenology of Spirit* gives us an insight of how people go through different stages while developing their 'self-identity'. It examines our 'consciousness' through these twofold events of 'consciousness'. On the first stage, Hegel asserts that humans define themselves in accordance to objects and any stage of human life will be understood through this 'objective self-identity'. On the second stage of development, people discover that although their commitment to a certain endeavor, they cannot find themselves therein, and therefore, they keep moving from one stage to another in hope they could discover their 'self-identity'. However, they keep defining themselves in terms of an object and losing their entire 'self-identity', they then seek a new vocation, a new phase of themselves (Farivar 1-2).

#### II.1.1. Hegel's Standpoint in Philosophy

Hegel (1770-1831) was influenced by ancient Greek idealists (Including Plato and Aristotle. He took advantage from non-European cultures especially the Chinese culture when they suggested that everything is made up of opposites. Hegel, along with Immanuel Kant and Johann Gottlieb Fichte and Friedrich Wilhelm

## Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context

---

Joseph Schelling, established German Idealism. This latter started mainly in the 1780s and ended approximately after Hegel's death. In brief, German Idealism is a philosophical movement that was linked with romanticism and revolutionary politics of the Enlightenment. It treats all major parts of philosophy including metaphysics, logic, epistemology, and aesthetics (Mcquillan).

German Idealism started with Immanuel Kant known as Transcendental Idealism. It was a modest philosophical doctrine. It stated that appearances and things are different in themselves. It argued that objects of human cognition are appearances and not things in themselves (Mcquillan). Hegel, then, presented a radical point of view claiming that things in themselves are a contradiction in terms for a thing; if it is an object, it must be an object of our 'consciousness' (Mcquillan).

Hegel described Kantian Transcendental Idealism by stating: "Kantian thought is true to its principle of subjectivism and of formal thought in that its essence consists in critical idealism" intending it to be "a critical examination of human understanding" (Hyppolite 05). The basis of Kant was merely critical philosophy and had not progressed beyond other notable philosophers like Locke. In his introduction in *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Hegel criticized any philosophy that is only a theory of knowledge. Jean Hyppolite describes Hegel's Phenomenology as: "The Phenomenology is not a nomenology or ontology but it remains, nonetheless, knowledge of the absolute. For what else is there to be know if only the absolute is true, or only the true is the absolute" (04). Hegel thus, transformed Transcendental Idealism to Absolute Idealism. He asserted that in order for the 'consciousness' (or subject) to be aware of the world (or object), there must be sense of identity of thought and being. If not, the subject cannot access object, and we cannot have any sense certainty of our knowledge of the world (Mcquillan). According to *Britannica*, Absolute Idealism is based upon three premises:

1. That the chief datum of philosophy is the human self and its self-consciousness.
2. That the world as a whole is spiritual through and through—that it is, in fact, something like a cosmic self.
3. That, in both the self and the world, it is not primarily the intellectual element that counts but, rather, the volitional and the moral. (Stroll, et al)

## Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context

---

Hegel, according to Avrum Stroll, added one crucial corollary to the Absolute Idealism that the Absolute is a crucial universal entity which is not static but takes a crucial development through time. He called this development as 'the dialectical process'. Hegel, says Stroll: "accomplished two things: he indicated that reason itself is not eternal but historical, and he thereby gave new meaning and relevance to the changing conditions of human society in history". Absolute Idealism thus attempted to show the unity using speculative philosophical method based upon logic, philosophy of nature, and philosophy of the mind. More precisely, absolute idealists focused upon understanding the 'self', 'self-consciousness', and the spiritual world.

Several thinkers and researchers were fascinated by the Hegelian philosophical system. Jean Hyppolite interpreted the *Phenomenology of Spirit* as a Bildungsroman that follows the development of its protagonist, Spirit, through the life of 'consciousness', he states in his *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, "The phenomenology, then, is the itinerary of the soul which rises to spirit through the intermediary of consciousness" (11). In addition, Martin Heidegger considers phenomenology of Hegel as a "System of Science" (09-10) that Hegel aimed to develop in his intellectual journey. Moreover, Karl Marx acknowledged Hegel as "That mighty thinker" in his preface to his *Magnum Opus 'Capital'* 1867. Vladimir Lenin also made reference to Hegel stating that no one can understand 'Das Capital' without "having thoroughly studied and understood the whole of Hegel's Logic" (qtd. in Mckenna 155). Other existentialist philosophers like Maurice Merleau-Ponty mentioned Hegel in his collected essays *Sense and Non-Sence* (1948). He commented: "All the great philosophical ideas of the past century, the philosophies of Marx and Nietzsche, phenomenology, German existentialism, and psychoanalysis had their beginnings in Hegel" (qtd. in Stern 18).

### II.2. Hegelian Dialectic Triad: Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis

Before embarking on the Hegelian speculative triad, a simple definition of Dialectics provided by *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* is needed. Dialectics in philosophy is considered as a philosophical method which involves contradictory process between opposing parties. Nineteenth-century German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel used this philosophical method differently from other prominent philosophers i.e. Socrates, Plato, Sartre, and others. Whereas the opposing parties of the philosophy of Plato were actual persons, the opposing parties of Hegel were 'consciousnesses'. Hegel acknowledged that his

## Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context

---

dialectic method was a part of Plato's philosophy; however, he criticized the dialectics of Plato arguing that it deals only with limited amount of knowledge and that it is bond to skepticism or nothingness. Their argument goes as follows:

The logic of a traditional 'reductio ad absurdum'<sup>2</sup> argument, if the premises of an argument lead to a contradiction, we must conclude that the premises are false which leaves us with no premises or with nothing. We must then wait around for new premises to spring up arbitrarily from somewhere else, and then see whether those new premises put us back into nothingness or emptiness once again, if they, too, lead to a contradiction. Because Hegel believed that reason necessarily generates contradictions, as we will see, he thought new premises will indeed produce further contradictions. (Maybee)

Hegel criticized the dialectic of Plato stating that it cannot go beyond arbitrariness and generates only approximate truths. He said that, "the skepticism that ends up with the bare abstraction of nothingness or emptiness cannot get any further from there, but must wait to see whether something new comes along and what it is, in order to throw it too into the same empty abyss." (qtd. in Maybee)

The Dialectical method troubled the mind of Hegel for many years. It governed all his books of his philosophical system: *The Philosophy of Spirit* (1807), *The Science of Logic* (1812), *The Philosophy of Nature: Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences* (1830). It is also the core element of his *Phenomenology of Mind* (1807).

Ma.Z.G, in his article 'Hegel's Eurocentric Triads of Dialectics', described Hegelian triadic dialectic as follows: an idea or movement comes at the initial stage called 'thesis' (or being) gives rise to the opposition due to its imperfection and this opposition is the second stage called 'antithesis' (or nothing). 'Antithesis' struggles with the thesis until some solution reaches beyond them and that is the third stage 'synthesis' (or becoming). This latter recognizes their respective values and tries to preserve their merits. 'Synthesis' then changes to become the first stage of a new triad if the solution turns out to be unsatisfactory. The 'synthesis' will become a new 'thesis' and a new 'thesis' will be around again to take the dialectic to a higher level (03). Precisely

---

<sup>2</sup> Reductio ad absurdum is a method proves the falsity of a premise by showing absurdity or contradiction (Merriam-webster)

## Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context

---

speaking, this kind of dialectic was described by Hegel as one of the three laws of dialectics as 'The Negation of the Negation'<sup>3</sup>.

The ultimate goal of Hegel of the idealistic dialectic is to create a logical connection between three categories. These later begin with 'in-itself' as the thesis an intellectual proposition being negated with 'out-of-itself' as the antithesis, and the final 'in-and-for-itself' as the synthesis reconciling the conflict between the two parties and form a new thesis that will start a new triadic process. The principal of this triadic relied on such argument that the 'pure being' and 'pure nothing' are somewhat the same. The truth, claimed Hegel, is neither being nor nothing but that being moves into nothing and nothing moves into being. They are unseparated from each other and each vanishes in its opposite and melts in the other (qtd. in Ma 3).

### II.3. Hegel on Self-Consciousness

The Phenomenology of Hegel aims to portray the journey of 'consciousness' from 'sense-certainty', the first stage, to 'Absolute Knowledge'. He started his *Phenomenology of Mind* by asserting that the 'Other' self is the only adequate mirror of one's own 'self'. In his *Philosophy of Mind*, Hegel asserts in the introduction that:

The knowledge of mind is the highest and the hardest just because it is the most 'concrete' of sciences. The significance of that absolute commandment, 'Know Thyself' whether we look at it in itself or under the historical circumstances of its first utterance is not to promote mere self-knowledge in respect of the particular capacities, character, propensities, and foibles of the single self. (62)

Here, Hegel maintains that 'self-knowledge' of a person cannot be achieved with only introspection of oneself especially in his feelings, his propensities, and his foibles. However, the knowledge of oneself is achieved through relationships with others. Hegel moves on in his discussion to consider this basic thesis: Man is the Mind. Thus, Man is the Universe. He states:

If we consider the mind more closely, we find that its primary and simplest determination is the 'I'. The 'I' is something perfectly simple, universal. When we say 'I' we mean, to be sure, an individual; but

---

<sup>3</sup> The concept of negation in Hegelian philosophy corresponds to the concept of contradiction. It means a variety of differences and oppositions in relations.

## Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context

---

since everyone is 'I', when we say 'I' we say something quite universal. The universality of the 'I' enables it to abstract from everything, even from its life. (qtd. in Berenson 78)

This statement is also mentioned in the *Phenomenology* when Hegel stresses that 'self-consciousness' is a mere element of the Absolute Mind, "an I which is 'We', and a We which is an I" or as he called it "Mind overcoming the other" (227).

Hegel's account of 'self-consciousness' is quite different from the ideas that Rene Descartes and John Paul Sartre hold. In the theory of Descartes, that of the 'Cartesian Self' and the 'Cartesian Other', Sartre discussed this idea saying that the individual subject can always be 'conscious' of other objects other than itself, take itself as its object and thus become 'self-conscious' ("Freedom of Self-Consciousness" 73). Nevertheless, Hegel believed that 'self-consciousness' can only shine through social conflict or as a 'life-and-death battle' and not as an abstract form like Sartre maintained. For Hegel, consciousness consists of two aspects:

For consciousness is, on the one hand, consciousness of the object, and on the other, consciousness of itself; consciousness of what for it is the True, and consciousness of its knowledge of the truth. Since both are for the same consciousness, this consciousness is itself their comparison; it is for this same consciousness to know whether its knowledge of the object corresponds to the object or not. The object, it is true, seems only to be for consciousness in the way that consciousness knows it; it seems that consciousness cannot, as it were, get behind the object as it exists for consciousness so as to examine what the object is in itself, and hence, too, cannot test its own knowledge by that standard. But the distinction between the in-itself and knowledge is already present in the very fact that consciousness knows an object at all. (54)

The section of Hegel of 'Self-consciousness' can be briefly summarized as follows: the subject, who is aware of himself as a 'sense-certainty' can outdo its subjectivity and thus be aware of his/her self objectively as truth. 'Self-consciousness thus, "to be understood as reflection out of the world of sense, and it is the very moment of returning from otherness" (Perez 02). Perez continues arguing that 'self-consciousness' begins with the trial of the 'consciousness' to consider itself as an object. This first moment breaks its unity resulting in a double entity, that is, an observing one and an observed one. However, they both coincide with each other for that

## Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context

---

'consciousness' tries to control itself. The second moment comes when the 'self-consciousness' posits itself as "the movement in which this antithesis is removed, and the identity of itself with itself comes explicitly for it" (Perez 02)

Another crucial element in 'self-consciousness' is as Hegel in his *Phenomenology* discussed: "Self-consciousness is Desire in general" (105). This desire, according to Hegel, can only be fulfilled with the reflection of 'self-consciousness' into itself so that it can achieve its 'true certainty' and become truth. This activity is to be successfully undertaken with nothing but with an 'independent other'. This latter, as Hegel maintains, must carry out the 'negation of itself in itself'. 'Self-consciousness', thus, gets objectivity only with 'another self-consciousness' in whose desire is a "Desire for Recognition as an objective or true self-consciousness" (Perez 2).

Alexandre Kojève points out in his *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel* (1969) that humans from the very moment they say 'I' they become aware of themselves. What drives them to say so is the 'Desire'. This desire is based on the delimitation between the 'I' and the 'non-I'. Therefore, self-consciousness' desire is to be recognized by the other and by its 'Self' opposed to the others. Kojève hence arrives at this result: "the human 'I' is the 'I' of a 'Desire' of Desire" (5). Therefore, the 'I' of 'Desire' achieves its satisfaction by negating the non-I. Kojève explains Hegel's statement by differentiating two kinds of desires: a 'human desire' and an 'animal desire'. He states that 'human desire', or as he labeled it "anthropogenetic Desire" produces a free and historical individual who is 'conscious' of his own individuality. Hence human desire, or 'anthropogenetic Desire' is different from 'animal Desire' who desires the basic things of life merely living. Thus, Kojève states, the relationship between man's desire and woman's desire, for example, desire is human only if it seeks recognition, and animal if it wants to "possess" or "to assimilate" (6).

### II.4. Hegel's Master-Slave Dialectic: Lordship and Bondage

The account of the master-slave dialectic, by Hegel, comes from chapter IV of the section 'Independence and Dependence of Self-consciousness: Lordship and Bondage' of *Phenomenology of Spirit*. He begins his chapter by demonstrating first how 'consciousness' is brought to the level of 'self-consciousness' through the interaction between two consciousnesses. He then outlines the theory of 'self-consciousness' through

## Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context

---

illustrating a mythical relationship between the 'master' (or lord), and the 'slave' (or bondsman); and how both of them need 'recognition' from the other to survive as individuals. His statement: "Self-consciousness exists in and for itself when, and by the fact that, it so exists for another; that is, it exists only in being acknowledged" (Hegel 111). Hegel means that the understanding of who the person is always involve the presence and the understanding of the 'other'. That is, the 'consciousness of oneself' is constructed from the outside, namely from the outside of 'the other being', as he stated in *Phenomenology* that 'self-consciousness' is faced by 'another distinct self-consciousness' that has come out of 'itself'. He continues arguing by saying that the previous statement has a twofold significance; on the one hand, it loses itself, for it finds itself as another being. On the other hand, it supersedes the other since he is not an essential individual, nor a rival, but sees its own self in the eyes of that other (111).

To see the value of Hegelian dialectic with its application in literature, Leitch considered these helpful observations:

[Hegel's master-slave dialectic] provides a memorable and persuasive model for understanding the complex dynamics of intersubjective relationships. Selfhood is a social product that individuals crave; identity has to be constructed through contentious interaction with and relation to others; this process makes us dependent on others, and thus inclined to resent and fear them; and such dependence involves forms of psychological and social power that are distinct from physical force or the power afforded by superior wealth. Whenever modern literary theorists and critics have been interested in questions of identity and of the self's confrontation with the other (however understood), Hegel's famous account of the master-slave dialectic has hovered in the background. (qtd. in Lee 31)

In this statement, Leitch observed that identity has to be constructed through interaction with others. Hence this interaction makes us 'dependent on other people'. Such dependence is based on a power-based relationship with the 'independent other', and as a result, results a 'master-slave' relationship.

### II.4.1. Life and Death Struggle as the Struggle for Recognition

This is the scene Hegel described about the lord and bondsman relationship. There are two figures a master and a slave, not actual individuals, but two kinds of distinct self-consciousness. Therefore we have a master self-consciousness, and a slave self-consciousness. Hegel wants to explain the relationship between the two and the dialectics between them, that is, how they interact interdependently. He argues that both modes of consciousness, i.e. 'self and the other', "have not revealed themselves to each other as existing purely for themselves" (Hegel 106) as 'self-consciousness'. They are both aware of their own existence, own self, but not aware of the other. Hence in the course of recognition, they first need to recognize the existence of the other as an object other than itself, then they seek recognition from each other; however, the task of recognition might be dangerous. In the course of recognition, they could be annihilated. That means, when they turn to each other for recognition, they have to go through negation. In a humble language, the 'consciousness' of the individual has to 'go out of itself and negate itself' to meet the 'consciousness of the other', a "threatening other who can disavow the self" (Harding 05). They both seek recognition from the 'other' threatening their identity for there must be one winning 'self' who is 'recognized by the other'. Hegel discusses this idea in the *Phenomenology of Spirit*:

The lord relates himself immediately to the bondsman through a being that is independent, for it is just this which holds the bondsman in bondage; it is his chain from which he could not break free in the struggle, thus providing himself to be dependent, to possess his independence in thinghood. But the lord is the power over the thing, for he proved in the struggle since he is the power over this thing and this again is the power over the other. (115)

An example of this maybe in the family members, a girl does not grow her 'self-consciousness' entirely by herself, but mirrors herself in the image of her mother, a more knowledgeable other. Therefore, her 'self-understanding' becomes 'dependent' on her mother. In this example the little girl is the slave and her mother is the master. Hence, the little girl needs more 'recognition' from her mother than her mother needs 'recognition' from her daughter. If the girl does not have a mother, or a more knowledgeable other, she eventually will not

## Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context

---

develop 'self-consciousness', nor 'self-identity'. This is because 'self-consciousness' cannot grow 'out of itself' without the presence of the 'other'.

Every relationship is based on inequality, there is always someone standing on top position and the other is at the bottom position, a 'master' and a 'slave'. Hegel states that before reaching this stage, they both enter into a "Battle to the death" and "Each seeks the death of the other" (113). In this sense, we are not talking about the actual 'death of the other', but the defeat of the self-consciousness of the 'other', the elimination of the other as a rival. This struggle that both parties force each other to the extreme is to gain "an existence of their own" (Hegel 114). The result of this encounter is that one is independent and becomes "For itself", the other is dependent on the other and becomes "For other" (Hegel 115).

The 'bondsmen' becomes 'dependent' on the 'lord' for he/she knows that the 'lord' views him/her as a mere object rather than a subject, or a thinking being. The 'lord' independently negates the 'otherness of the other' since this 'other' does not appear as a 'conscious subject' to him. In this position, the 'lord' enjoys his dominant status. On the bottom line, the 'bondsmen' continuously tries to reflect his status as a subordinate 'other' for the 'lord'. For instance, in each conversation there is always a struggle to be heard between two parties. When one party speaks, the other is silenced. Hence, the silenced party is not 'recognized'. Hegel argues that if both parties do not risk their lives, they cannot arrive at the status of 'self-consciousness'. He states in his *Phenomenology of Spirit*, "The individual who has not risked his life may, to be sure, be acknowledged as a person. But he has not attained the truth of such acknowledgement as an independent self-consciousness" (113). Nevertheless, when they risk their lives, they should not die. For, if one of the two parties should die, 'self-consciousness' fails to achieve. Doug Frame in his website *Frame Publishing* gave an explanation of the 'master and slave struggle for recognition'. He states that some people value freedom over life and others value life over freedom. Consequently, the self-consciousness who values freedom over life becomes the 'master', and the 'other self-conscious individual' who values life over freedom becomes the 'slave' who eventually submits to the 'master' to survive. Therefore, both parties tend to avoid death by agreement. The 'master' rises since he does not fear death, and the vanquished accepts his enslavement in order to survive.

## Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context

---

Subsequently, the 'lord' no longer enjoys his dominant position; therefore, he negates his own 'otherness', "it must supersede this otherness of itself" (Hegel 111) through the 'bondsmanship' when turning him into an unessential object to his own 'self-consciousness'. He also has to deny the 'recognition of the bondsman' as an equal 'consciousness' to himself. Nonetheless, the bondsman starts to enjoy his position in labor, transforming objects that enable him to claim a "mind of his own" (111)

### II.4.2. Slave's Coup: Becoming the Master of the Master

At the end of the fight, the two become alienated from each other by means of power. "The master produces another self-identity by seeing himself in contrast to the slave, than the slave produces by seeing himself in contrast to the master" (Bornedal 06) that means, the 'master' sets himself in opposition to a vanquished, 'dependent being'. In contrast, the 'slave' sets himself in opposition to a victorious, 'independent being'. Hegel speaks of them as "they exist as two opposed shapes of consciousness; one is the independent consciousness whose essential nature is to be for itself, the other is dependent consciousness whose essential nature is simply to live or to be for another. The former is lord, the other is bondsman" (Hegel 115). Since 'self-consciousness' is nothing without the presence of the 'other', the 'lord' is a 'lord' only with the presence of the 'bondsmanship', and the 'bondsmanship' is a 'bondsmanship's only when he 'recognizes' himself in the eyes of his 'master'. Henceforth as Hegel stated the 'master' can no longer be sure of his own truth for he relates himself to a being that is 'dependent on him', thus he cannot find 'recognition from his slave', and therefore, he neither 'seeks recognition', nor compete with a 'defeated being'. According to Mohammed Kamal, the 'master' keeps the 'slave' as his mediator between 'Being' and 'himself', and this mediation is created by the labor of the 'slave'. The 'slave', hence, "becomes the power of negativity in the labor which transforms being into a world desired by the master and for the master" (462). The 'master' becomes idle, does nothing and gets everything. In contrast the 'slave' produces everything but gets nothing in return.

After the battle, the 'master' enjoying his position, he starts to dehumanize the 'slave' and reduces him to a thing. The slave, however, starts to look forward to becoming a 'master' himself. He then starts working on his 'self-consciousness'. He, says Hegel: "has experienced the fear of death, the absolute lord" (117). Likewise, the 'slave' starts working on himself. Hegel described the state of the 'slave' as follows: "We are in the

## **Second Chapter: Hegel's Philosophy as a Theoretical Context**

---

presence of self-consciousness in a new shape, a consciousness which, as the infinitude of consciousness of as its own pure movement, is aware of itself as an essential being, a being which thinks or is a free self-conscious" (120). Peter Bornedal in his article: "Hegel's Master-Slave Dialectics" argues that if the 'slave' is a composer, he starts working on his piece; if he is a painter, he starts working on his painting etc. The 'master', on the contrary, produces nothing and only consumes. He may listen to the piece that his 'slave' produced, or buys the painting. Therefore, as Hegel claimed that the 'slave' dominates the thinghood more thoroughly than the 'master', and thus he creates his own world, in contrast to the 'master' (118).

As a result, the 'slave' organizes his coup to attack the master. Jean Hyppolite stated: "the truth of the master reveals that he is the slave of the slave and that the slave is revealed to be the master of the master" (172).

### **Conclusion**

The theoretical context provided in this chapter establishes a link between notions of 'self and the other consciousness', 'speculative triadic dialectic', and 'master' and 'slave' 'struggle to the death'. Hegel focused on people's minds and studied their 'consciousness' in relation to interactions with others asserting that 'self-consciousness' can only shine and exists as an 'independent self' in this world through an 'other'. However, this interaction leads to quarrels and a battle to the death showing that every relationship is based on inequality with someone standing on top position controls the other who stands at the bottom position.

**Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian  
Reading of Master-Slave Characterization in  
*The Collector***

## **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

### **Introduction**

The Collector is a psychological thriller novel written by the English author John Fowles in 1963 in his literary debut. It is known for the themes of freedom and power struggle. It focuses mainly on the ‘Self’ and the ‘Other’ which are depicted through his main characters Frederick Clegg and Miranda Grey whose freedom is taken away. It shows also the cruelty and depravity in human beings. It was adapted into film in 1965 which received many awards like Cannes Film Festival in 1965, The Academy Award known as The Oscars in 1966, and Sant Jordi Awards in 1966.

Fowles was motivated to write the novel after two events happened in England. First, he attended Bela Bartok’s opera Duke Bluebeard’s Castle. The opera, like *The Collector*, is about imprisoning a girl in an underground cell by a madman. The opera’s theme resembles the novel in the theme of violence and male domination. Second, he was inspired by a London case in the 1950s of a young man who kidnapped a girl and imprisoned her in an air-raid shelter for three months. Similarly, the novel is about domination, subjugation, and violence where both characters struggle to maintain power over the other.

This current chapter, therefore, serves as an analytical chapter. It attempts to analyze the novel through the discussed variables mentioned in the background and the theoretical chapter. This chapter will discuss first postmodern double narrative technique and Fowlesian theory of the ‘Few’ and the ‘Many’ through his female and male characters emphasizing on the theme of self and otherness. Moreover, this study is an endeavor to read the novel through Hegelian perspective, discussing first their battle for recognition, then ‘master’ and ‘slave’ dialectic, and last ‘slave’s coup’ to be the ‘master’.

### **III.1. One Story Double Narrative: The Postmodernist Narrative Technique in *The Collector***

From the point of view of the narrative technique, the novel is astonishing because this novel is all about depicting what is real and what is an illusion through different perspectives. It starts when Frederick Clegg who is a withdrawn clerk wins a large sum of money in the Football pool. He decides to abduct Miranda Grey, a young beautiful art student. While he prepares for his crime, he tries to convince himself that he is not mad, and

### Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in *The Collector*

---

all the dreams about marrying Miranda, are something normal (04). Clegg's winning the money makes his plan easier. He imprisons her in a hideous cellar of a countryside house where there is little movement on the outside. What the reader is presented with are two narratives, one by Clegg's narrative with opening and ending the novel and one by his captive Miranda by means of a diary she kept. Concisely, she keeps writing until she becomes too sick to continue. Barry Olshen reports that Fowles's first version he submitted to the publisher was different from the new one. The sections of the novels were organized differently as the two last sections were embedded in the first one so that readers would have knowledge of Miranda's death before her section begins; yet, Fowles changed the sections' placement to preserve suspense (qtd. in Nodelman 334). Fowles's main purpose behind separating the sections is to correspond to feelings of confinement presented by Miranda as readers experienced it in Clegg's.

It is by virtue of this narrative technique Jens Pollheide states that Fowles achieves an opposition of the two points of view resulting in the respective motives and goals that can be seen as the determining factors for the specific ways in which those narratives are structured (24). The reader experiences multiple feelings when reading the novel and believes it was written by two distinct authors rather than one. The novel is first told through Clegg's account, when the first chapter ends, the readers expect a continuation of events in the second chapter. However, the second chapter starts telling the story again through Miranda's diary that is different greatly from that of Clegg in terms of vocabulary, syntax, and narration; then Clegg takes chapter three and four and tells us the continuation of section one. In doing so, Fowles gives his readers a great insight into the mind and the motivation of his collector, Clegg. As regards to Fowles's use of this narrative technique, Barry Olshen states:

The story [*The Collector*] is quite simple. All but the final details are related in the first part, that is, the first 120 pages, of the novel. Its subtlety and its extraordinary portraiture, however, arise almost entirely from the complexity of the narrative technique. Fowles allows his antagonists to tell their own stories, thus achieving a double perspective on the otherwise straightforward sequence of events. (qtd in Lee 18)

### **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

Clegg starts the novel by telling us about Miranda and events from his childhood and personal life which had a great impact on his current consciousness. He starts telling us how his father died in an accident due to alcohol and how he was left to his aunt to raise him whose household was no ordinary and lived a quiet time in a non-conformist family together with his handicapped cousin whom he secretly abhorred. Clegg's aunt's non-conformist influence created in his mind a separate and radical ideology to that of the society. Non-conformists, according to Jenny Kimbro, "were even restricted from many spheres of public life such as public education and social benefits", so Clegg was raised in a restricted environment that was separate from the realm of the society. Moreover, Clegg tells us a detailed account of him watching Miranda from afar, preparing every single detail for his crime, and the major events that happen between both of them until she passes away.

At the level of the structure of their narration, Miranda's narration is dated day-by-day from the seventh day of her imprisonment. Each event is written in the present tense, not organized as she has no ability to see outside her cell. She recalls Robinson Crusoe's method, "A Fortnight today. I have marked the days on the side of the screen, like Robinson Crusoe" (159). Moreover, she writes a detailed account of everything, sometimes she takes us back to her past as she recounts events that happened between her and her art instructor, G. P, then she tells us about what Caliban, or Clegg, did and her plans of escaping. When the events overwhelm her, she skips dates and uses fragments and incomplete sentences until she runs out of energy. She writes her final sentence, "God do not let me die. Do not let me die" (279). In contrast, Clegg's narration is written after all the events that happened from their first encounter until her death. In the first pages, he talks about his dreams about doing things she admires, stories to talk with her, and even marries her. He says, "That was never until what I'll explain later" (4). His account consists of composing the novel's structure which gives the readers a broader angle of what is happening, unlike Miranda who does not see or hear anyone beside Clegg when she states that the only one person in her world is Caliban (148).

In terms of their writing style, we can make the distinction between educated vs. ignorant. While Miranda's account is flawless, writes in proper and profound English, Clegg finds difficulty in uttering the words. Loveday comments Clegg's narration saying that he makes frequent mistakes of syntax, and short

### Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector

---

expression, for example, words like “as they say”, “as you may say”, “good riddance”, “la-di-da” for upper-class dialectic, “the diseased” for died, “the other thing” for anything he could not say it directly (14). Clegg also uses euphemism like “the great beyond” for death, “to put out” for murder. Further, Clegg blends his talk with his inner monologue contrary to narrating Miranda’s speech; he always marks it with quotation marks as a direct speech. In contrast, Miranda’s talk is written in indirect speech. She writes in a dramatized dialogue as if she is writing a play:

M. Tell me some more about your family.

C. Nothing more to tell. That’d interest you.

M. That’s not an answer.

C. It’s like I said.

M. As I said.

C. I used to be told I was good at English. That was before I knew you.

M. It doesn’t matter. (115)

What is typical about Caliban’s language is his use of clichés and old-fashioned dialect as if he spent all his life with people over fifty. An instance in the novel shows the difference of language usage, “At lunch-time today he said, I called in with regard to those records they’ve placed on order. I said, why don’t you just say, ‘I asked about those records you ordered’” (102).

Fowles gives his readers a sense that they are also entrapped in the basement. Katherine Tarbox in her dissertation entitled *A Critical Study of the Novels of John Fowles* (1986) says, “The story itself is a kind of imprisonment because it has no plot” (51). The beginning in this novel resembles its end. Miranda is doomed from the first time Clegg saw her and decided to make her his ‘guest’. Tarbox says also, “the movement of the book is circular rather than linear. The same things happen again until the situation runs out of energy. The plot, then, is not progressive, but entropic” (52). Clegg himself demonstrates the novel’s circularity, “It was like a

### Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector

---

joke mousetrap I once saw, the mouse just went on and things moved, it couldn't ever turn back, but just on and on into cleverer and cleverer traps until the end" (296). Moreover, he repeats the same plan after abandoning the idea of committing suicide after Miranda's death and starts to think of abducting Marian who works at Woolworth market as he tells us that this time it won't be for the sake of love but to compare them. He threatens from the beginning that he will take control from the beginning (304). This continuous movement of confinement is shown by the repetitive circular narrative. Hence, the whole story is about Miranda seeking freedom and Clegg locking the doors. In addition, Kathrine Tarbox notes that since this narrative technique mirrors the theme of freedom, the reader's freedom is entrapped like the captive's freedom. The reader, like Miranda, is alone (58). Furthermore, Peter Wolfe argues that Miranda's kidnapping at first and dying at the end is alike. In both instances she was unable to breathe and half conscious due to chloroform at first and pneumonia at the end (qtd. in Lee 17).

Moreover, they differ also in the notion of time. On the one hand, Clegg's time is stagnated. He does not complain waiting for Miranda for hours for example and lives day by day without planning his future. On the other hand, Miranda's time is flowing. She feels an urgent need for her future and wants to return to her normal life as soon as possible. In this regard, she constructs a suitable ending that she will be released in a month. Their notion of time is also shown in their everyday activities. Miranda stays alone for the most part of the day, she cannot see daylight and can only go outside her cell when she takes shower. Nevertheless, Clegg's schedule is quite varied than her. He prepares her three meals, goes shopping, looks after his collection, or simply rests. From a distance, Clegg lives a normal life while Miranda lives the horror of the day and the mystery of the future.

In terms of content, Clegg's account is very technical. He is very careful with every movement he does compared to Miranda's account who focuses on her emotional dilemma of being torn apart between hating him and feeling sorry for him. For example when she gives him *The Catcher in the Rye* to read she tells him that he resembles Holden Caulfield saying that, "He doesn't fit anywhere and you don't" (219). She resembles him also with *The Old Man and the Sea* saying, "You get on the back of everything vital, everything trying to be

## **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

honest and free, and you bear it down” (220). However, she sometimes sympathizes with him saying that she can never cure his illness because she is his disease (265).

Clegg’s escapist phrase after each mad action: “I don’t know why”. His maniacal mind drives him to do things out of ordinary; he did not plan thoroughly for kidnapping her; it came out unexpectedly as he says (15). His account resembles that of a defendant, he justifies his actions to deny his culpability. Even when she falls sick and dies he justifies that she did not seem to be weaker than she looked (283) and it all came unexpectedly (120, 283), he claims twice that her death is not his fault. Eventually, his account seems to be addressed to the audience to sympathize with him and to prove his innocence.

Clegg’s narration revolves on the description of Miranda and seldom about his childhood. From the first line in the novel he starts talking about her. He rarely talks and gives clear statements. Miranda’s diary, however, contains reflections on past experiences with the people she loved. A large part of her diary dedicated to G.P, or George Paston. She meticulously remembers small details about the conversations she had with G. P and his group friends. Further, she writes in her diary to her sister Minny. As she does so, Miranda narrates from the seventh day of her imprisonment in hope she could have evidence when she escapes. However, some days she tells Minny in her diary that she is talking to herself out of despair. She says: “No noise until I make it. So I feel near death. Buried. No outside noises to help me be living at all. Often I put on a record. Not to hear music, but to hear something” (174). She has some strange illusion of being deaf, so she makes noises to prove she is not. Miranda compares herself with the Japanese girl police found in the ashes of Hiroshima where everything was dead; she then kept singing to her doll. Hence, Clegg’s section is a mere description of events, while Miranda’s diary is a reflection of events.

### **III.1.1 Description and Characterization**

As above mentioned, the whole story revolves around description and reflection. Caliban, or Clegg, focuses on describing Miranda in detail, yet he neglects caring or talking about her personality:

I watched the back of her head and her hair in a long pigtail. It was very pale, silky, like Burnet cocoons. All in one pigtail coming down almost to her waist, sometimes in front, sometimes at the back.

### Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector

---

Sometimes she wore it up. Only once, before she came to be my guest here, did I have the privilege to see her with it loose, and it took my breath away it was so beautiful, like a mermaid.(5)

He describes her physically only as if he is describing a refined butterfly and a mermaid like he said. On the part of Miranda, her description of him is not very detailed. She often uses criticism and irony. She describes him as “uneducated trying to be educated” (128). She mentions Clegg’s looks as:

He’s six feet. Eight or nine inches more than me. Skinny, so he looks taller than he is. Gangly. Hands too big, a nasty fleshy white and pink. Not a man’s hands. Adam’s apple too big, wrists too big, chin much too big, underlip bitten in, edges of nostrils red. Adenoids. He’s got one of those funny in between voices, uneducated trying to be educated. It keeps on letting him down. His whole face is too long. Dull black hair. It waves and recedes, it’s coarse. Stiff. Always in place. He always wears a sports coat and flannels and a pinned tie. Even cuff-links. (78)

Nearing the end of section one, Clegg promises Miranda to set her free, which of course he does not. After the dinner, he proposes to her and when she declines, he obliges her to stay with him. His description changes from being a passive observer to a butterfly collector. He does not describe her as a human being, and acts as a hunter who caught something unique. He says: “I had the same feeling I did when I had watched an imago emerge, and then to have to kill it . . . I mean, the beauty confuses you, you don’t know what you want to do anymore, what you should do” (53)

Caliban likes to describe Miranda as one of his refined butterflies, he says: “Seeing her always made me feel like I was catching a rarity, going up to it very careful, heart-in mouth as they say. A pale clouded yellow, for instance. I always thought of her like that, I mean words like elusive and sporadic, and very refined -- not like the other ones” (3). He always describes her with admiration even when she ridicules him; Miranda is always the treasure he collected. He says, “She couldn’t do ugly things. She was too beautiful” (66). However, he lost all his respect for her at the end of the section when she desperately tried all ways to escape and ended by seducing him. He says: “I never respected her again” (106). He even tells her that he used to respect her because he thought she was above what she did (113). In addition, when Miranda catches pneumonia and

## **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

eventually passes away, Caliban then describes her as something unimportant. He tells us how awful she looked when she died with her open mouth and her eyes were staring as if she wanted to have a look at the window one last time. He did not show any sentiment when he verified she was not breathing, just closed her eyes, shot her mouth, and made himself a cup of tea (295). After her death, he objectifies her to a state of a thing, moving from “mermaid” (3) to “the deceased” (305).

Another description between the captor and the captive is their perspectives of the house. While Caliban admires and feels proud of his house, Miranda ridicules his choice of decoration, for her, the lounge that he calls is a beautiful room and bigger than the others with its unique style that an architect wouldn't think of doing it in a thousand years. However, all the beauty of the house is massacred by the furniture (134). Clegg's description is minimalist. He does not give us a detailed description of his house except being far from human sight. What is important to him is to prepare it to reunite with Miranda.

Miranda's description of the house involves an artist's eyes. She gives a detailed account of the structure of the house as well as the furniture. She says, “The pictures! You wouldn't believe me if I described the awfulness of the pictures. He told me some firm did all the furniture choosing and decorating. They must have got rid of all the junk they could find in their store-rooms” (133). Her description also revolves around the eyes of the upper middle class' eyes.

Furthermore, in terms of energy between the narrators, we discover that while Miranda is the cheerful type and full of energy, Clegg represents the state of nothingness as Miranda describes him in page 134 as a zinc white being so lifeless. In another passage she states that he is not human, rather he is an empty space disguised as a human (240). Her description of her life and her dreams are full of energy, even when she fails in her escape attempts, she never loses hope. Contrary to Clegg whose passiveness overwhelms her, he does not want to learn and to change. Thus, he becomes static, unable to move.

### **III.1.2. Reliable vs. Unreliable Narrators**

John Fowles alters the traditional characterization that is divided between villain and heroine, and thus, makes them ‘grey’ or blurred. If one should approach the novel in terms of characters' intricacies, both

### **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

characters in this novel appear to be in a battle of reliability. Clegg has in his favor his supremely reliable narration; he may lie to everyone but not to his own book. However, Miranda misinterprets almost everything she views, and sometimes lies to us when for instance she says, “I am cheating. I didn’t say all these things, but I’m going to write what I want to say as well as what I did” (141). In another passage she says, “you write what you want to hear. It’s funny. You don’t do that when you draw yourself. No temptation to cheat” (269). Her loneliness drives her to imagine things out of despair and create stories never happened. Clegg was right when he told us multiple times “she never understood”. Nevertheless, Miranda’s diary tells a detailed description that Clegg skipped. For instance, when she orders him to buy her things, she describes everything in detail although she still undermines him she says that’s the only one they had, so no credit to his taste (137). Moreover, she narrates events that Clegg did not feel the need to report which gives the readers a great insight of what happened clearly.

Her description of Clegg is not the only factor to let readers imagine the real Clegg for she only describes him out of hatred. Clegg says she did not depict the real him when she drew the portrait, “She didn’t bother so much about a nice likeness as what she called my inner character, so sometimes she made my nose so pointed it would have pricked you and my mouth all thin and unpleasant. I mean more than it really is, because I know I’m no beauty” (80).

While he is called ugly all throughout the novel, this passage shows how emotions alter the way one sees a thing. Her hatred drives her to describe herself as a beauty locked at a beast’s castle.

In the story, as Nodelman suggests, readers after they read Clegg and Miranda’s narrations naturally will admire Miranda for being more than the hateful Clegg can see. Since Clegg turns to be a psychopath, his perception of Miranda causes her so much pain without even making efforts to understand her. In this regard, readers might sympathize with Miranda and trust her recounting the events. That is why so many readers accept her version instead of Clegg’s. Nevertheless, if we dig deeper in their narrations, Clegg’s part only recounts his obsession with her; one of the surprises in her part, is that she rarely thinks of it, Clegg says after he read her diary that she never loved him, she only thought of herself and the other man all the time (286). Since it is about

## **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

the other man, G. P, more than it is about Clegg, Miranda's narration is completely a different story. Hence, it is no more trustworthy one (Nodelman 334- 336)

### **III.2. The Aristos: Aristoi vs. Hoi Polloi characterization in *The Collector***

As it was mentioned in the background chapter, Fowles wrote *The Aristos: a Self Portrait of Ideas* (1964) designed mainly to his first novel *The Collector* (1963) when he found out British intellectuals treat the novel as mere crime fiction. He confirms that "it was really a serious novel dealing with important philosophical questions about authentic and inauthentic existence" (qtd. in Etter 21). In an interview with Fowles, he says that through the painful confrontation between Clegg and Miranda, he aims to "illuminate the invidious consequences of these gross social inequalities so characteristic of Western Society" and "To show that our world is sick" (qtd. in Lee 20). He intends to portray the danger of upper and lower classes and intellectual division through his main characters who belong to different classes. Through his protagonist Clegg, Fowles examines the uneducated mass that contributes to the hardships of society. Furthermore, Fowles wants to put an end to glamorizing characters like Clegg found in other novels.

#### **III.2.1. Frederick Clegg as Hoi Polloi Member**

Frederick Clegg is the immediate representative of the 'Many' in the novel despite his wealth. He is, as G. P calls, "The new people" (221). Miranda tries to teach him multiple things, for instance, she gives him *The Catcher in the Rye* and tries to explain art appreciation, however, he seems helpless, and he only reads the novel to please her. Miranda feels exhausted with his ignorance and baldness saying that she can't stand stupid people like him and the 'Few' like the doctors, the teachers, and the artists have to carry it all (220). At this instance, Miranda differentiates between her class and the so-called "New People" class.

During her first days of imprisonment, she tells Clegg multiple times that she doesn't mind meeting people with different classes and that she hates people who see themselves above the sky. She even hated the upper class of her parents who live a luxury life speaking the right accent, going to golf clubs, and operas. However, when she sees a personification of the 'Many', it drives her to think of her language as a 'Queen's

### Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector

---

language' while he speaks the language of the street. Clegg recounts that she used to humiliate him for his bad English saying that he blurs it every time he speaks (69).

Nevertheless, Clegg is not completely fooled and aware of their class distinction but rather keeps his observations to himself. An instance of this is when Miranda uses irony and sarcasm believing that he does not get it, however, it is not the case for he says everything he feels in his inner monologue:

She often went on about how she hated class distinction, but she never took me in. It's the way people speak that gives them away, not what they say. You only had to see her dainty ways to see how she was brought up. She wasn't la-di-da, like many, but it was there all the same. You could see it when she got sarcastic and impatient with me because I couldn't explain myself or I did things wrong. Stop thinking about class, she'd say. Like a rich man telling a poor man to stop thinking about money. (39)

Clegg grows his class inferiority when other people look at him, he explains how he feels them staring at him weirdly and ordering him to go back from where he belongs (8). After winning the money and sending his family to Australia, he could not leave his miserable status seeing that people treated him as before. He loathes the environment he lives in, "London is all arranged for the people who can act like public schoolboys, and you don't get anywhere if you don't have the manner born and the right la-di-da voice—I mean rich people's London, the West End, of course" (9). The only real person Clegg can feel at ease without any class inequality is Miranda, "[I] didn't have any class feeling" (13). He tries to convince himself about Miranda, "She wasn't la-di-da, like many" (38); and eventually becomes as G.P criticizes the petit-bourgeois who dominate the society with their sudden wealth and contribute with the hardships of the intellectual elite.

Another passage in the novel Fowles refers to *The Tempest* by Shakespeare. During their first encounter, Frederick Clegg introduces himself as Ferdinand instead of his first name. When she does not believe him, he shows her his id and he says, "She wasn't to know F stood for Frederick. I've always liked Ferdinand; it's funny, even before I knew her. There's something foreign and distinguished about it. Uncle Dick used to me it sometimes, joking. Lord Ferdinand Clegg, Marquis of Bugs, he used to say" (37). It is unclear whether Clegg was familiar with Shakespearean lovebirds Ferdinand and Miranda and wanted to have a similar love story as

### **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

them. However, his lack of education suggests that he never read any of Shakespeare's works when she tells him, "Come, thou tortoise!" he responds between brackets, "A literary quotation, I think it was" (77).

#### **III.2.2. Miranda Grey Representative of the Aristoi**

Miranda's being part of the elite allows her to quote from Shakespeare in cleverness. She tells him one day, "Ferdinand, they should have called you Caliban" (62, 137). However, his ignorance prohibits him from getting the points she was referring to. By calling him Caliban, she enhances the class distinction between them and drags him down to his working class where he belongs instead of treating him in equality. She says directly that he is not being her 'Class' (129). In this line of thought, Miranda thinks of her confrontation with Clegg as a battle between the 'Few' and the 'Many', "It's a battle between Caliban and myself. He is the New people and I am the Few" (249). She redundantly talks about her hatred towards the new people with their vulgarity imitating the bourgeoisie mode of living, she says that the 'Few' have to preserve civilized values and carry out the 'Many's calibanity'. This idea was discussed by Fowles in *The Aristos*, "The dividing line between the few and the many must run through each individual, not between individuals" (qtd. in Vincent 44).

Moreover, she consciously views herself as part of the 'Few' when showing her abhorrence of the uneducated and ignorance for instance. Her position leads her to think of herself as superior to him when she states, "I'm so superior to him. I know this sounds wickedly conceited. But I am. And so it's Ladymont and Boadicea and noblesse oblige all over again. I feel I've got to show him how decent human beings live and behave" (137). Therefore, most of the dialogues between the two are like a lesson between a teacher and a learner and every time she tries to teach him something, he baldly responds with "I see". This passage shows the intention of Fowles behind writing the novel, he states in *The Aristos*, "The biological Few" and "The biological Many" which means that all humans are not born equal, but are born with equal human rights. The 'Many' despite their miserable life should be educated out of their sense of inferiority, and the 'Few' should be educated to bear responsibility for having biological advantage (qtd. in Vincen 45). In an interview with Roman Singh, Fowles also discussed this idea arguing that society should limit the injustices that oppress the 'Many' and enable the 'Few' to live authentically (qtd. in Lee 21). Moreover Olshen notes that Clegg's tyranny and

## **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

Miranda's repetitive attempts to educate her oppressor points to the need to create a society in which the 'Many' will be tolerant of the 'Few' and the 'Few' will feel responsible for the education of the 'Many' (21).

Nevertheless, Miranda sometimes sympathizes with him stating that he is a victim of a miserable Nonconformist world and a social class below the ashes; therefore, she understands his way of acting and his maniacal behavior. Fowles even mentioned this idea in *The Aristos* when he stated, "Clegg, the kidnapper, committed the evil; but I tried to show that his evil was largely, perhaps wholly, the result of a bad education, a mean environment, being orphaned: all factors over which he has no control. In short, I tried to establish the virtual innocence of the Many. Miranda, the girl he imprisoned, had very little more control than Clegg over what she was" (qtd. in Nodelman 339). Here, Fowles suggests that both characters collect values from their two separate worlds. They are both innocent and inexperienced as they meet someone from the other world and expect him/her to have the same values.

### **III.3. Hegelian Characterization in the Novel**

#### **III.3.1. Hegelian Otherness in the Collector**

The above mentioned comparisons between the characters entail a shift in point of view and study it further philosophically with the idea of otherness. A number of contrasts between the two that leads to their continuous quarrels come as the result of their failure to understand the otherness of the 'other'. Their impossibility to understand each other comes from a number of dualities: 'Few' vs. 'Many', educated vs. ignorant, 'independent consciousness' vs. 'dependent consciousness', and 'master vs. slave'.

As might be surmised, Miranda is quite beyond Clegg's understanding, as such, never becomes real for him. At the same time, Miranda is limited to understand his bipolarity, her own ideas of class, educational background, and art appreciation limits her to get a proper understanding of Clegg. An instance of their clashing viewpoints, their discussion of the H-Bomb, Clegg only cites people's impotence in the world, he does not make serious statements, just cliché after cliché. Miranda notices what Clegg can hardly be expected to comprehend, she then tries unsuccessfully to explain her position by introducing a militaristic American surgeon into her argument, Clegg vaguely responds, "I thought we were talking about the H-bomb" (143).

### **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

According to Lee, Clegg's valid points, and Miranda's acting upon feelings despite powerlessness, drives them to a dead-end, as such, they fail to make any compromises (23). Miranda is exasperated with Clegg, she then writes the whole discussion in her journal in hope he would say something else.

#### **III.3.2. Possession and Recognition in the Collector**

As it was mentioned in the theoretical chapter, and central to *The Collector* is the question of 'possession' and 'recognition'. One may ask why Clegg kidnaps Miranda. What does he want from her? The answer may be easily found in the title 'Collector'. The antagonist from the first line of the novel can be seen as obsessed with watching Miranda as a voyeur and wants to possess her as one of his butterflies, "Seeing her always made me feel like I was catching a rarity" (3). His description of Miranda always seems like he is describing a unique butterfly, using words like "Pale Clouded Yellow" (3), "Mermaid" (3), and "Specimen" (39).

Miranda does not take long to find out that he only wants to possess her saying that, "Now you have collected me" (42). She redundantly asks him why he keeps her locked inside, nevertheless, she never receives a good answer, he only says that he can do anything she wants, "Except let me fly away", says Miranda (43). She even compares herself and sympathizes with butterflies as "Fellow victims" (54, 127). His obsession with her made her think of all collectors as "worst animals of all" (129). Significantly, he admits that he only wants to possess her when he said that having her was enough and nothing else was needed doing (101). At first, Clegg wants to have what he does not have: money, property, and then he shift his desire to something alive, someone to love him and appreciate his collection.

Clegg's 'possession and desire for control' is what Hegel discussed in his *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807) when he discussed this idea "Self-consciousness is Desire in general" (105). Alexandre Kojève in his *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel* (1969), a detailed explanation of Hegelian dialectic, explains Hegel's statement by saying that 'self consciousness' is the 'I' of desire (5). He distinguishes two kinds of desire, a 'human desire' and 'animal desire'. He says, "For man to be truly human, for him to be essentially and really different from an animal, his human Desire must actually win out over his animal Desire" (6). By 'animal

### Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector

---

desire' he means that it is the desire to possess and eat. The 'desire for possession' can be either a human or animal. Seungjae Lee says that it can be human if it seeks recognition from the other party (39). However, if it does not seek 'recognition', it is plain 'animal desire for possession'.

Clegg, as a personification of the 'animal desire', seeks 'possession' as his primary impulse, "Having her was enough. Nothing needed doing. I just wanted to have her, and safe at last" (101). Everything he wants to do is to stare at her when she is near the fire, or waits for hours behind her door and not even complaining, or leaving for more than six hours to London and back just to buy things she wants, "It's like living in the Arabian Nights. Being the favorite in the Harem. But the one perfume you really want is freedom" (227-228) Miranda declares. In addition, Fowles, in his portrait of ideas *The Aristos*, also discussed the 'desire for possession' in Marxist terms. Clegg as a product of his environment grows with dominant values specifically those of capitalism and masculinity. His turning of living and free things to be something he possesses is what Fowles stated, "tendency of any capitalist society [which] is to turn all experiences and relationships into objects" (qtd. in Lee 21). Clegg sees Miranda as something to be possessed. Moreover, Olshen in his book entitled *John Fowles* (1978) explains Clegg's 'desire for possession', "Perhaps the most wretched thing about Clegg is that he confuses love with his desire for possession . . . the fundamental significance of *The Collector* is in its depiction of the drive for possession" (29). However, as the events progress throughout the novel, the motives of Clegg shift from only 'possession', to something bigger.

We may take a closer look at Miranda's narrative to decipher Clegg's complex nature. Miranda falls in the dilemma of thinking of him on the one hand as a rapist, a collector who wants to dominate and control her, and on the other hand as "Prince Charming" (254) believing that inside him is a noble person who can be turned into someone better, "We'll make you into someone really modern. Someone really interesting to meet" (87). Yet she turns back to see him as dominator, "He's a collector. That's the great dead thing in him" (171). Miranda's failure to understand Clegg's nature drives her to make mistakes that ruined their balance. She then accepts her failure to understand him. She notices that she will never be set free, "I'll never escape. It drives me mad" (254).

## **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

From Clegg's point of view, we discover his passive personality. He is so insecure with himself because he is not aware of his actions and thinks that if there were more people like him, the world would be better (8). He believes that kidnapping Miranda is something quite fascinating, "I can only say that evening I was very happy, as I said, and it was more like I had done something very daring, like climbing Everest or doing something in enemy territory" (27-28). He is unconscious of the crime he did, only then to blame her for not understanding, "she never understood" (28). His way of seeking 'human desire', that is, seeking 'recognition', is by giving her things she asks and wants, "Of course you can have drawing materials, I said. You only had to ask anyhow. And a gramophone. Any records you want. Books. The same with food. I told you, you need only ask. Anything like that" (47). *The Collector* is a disturbing novel because Clegg is not a violent captor. Although he uses force, he simply wants to 'gain recognition' and respect from her. Before entering her room, he announces himself and waits for ten minutes to get dressed, he buys her dresses and jewelry, cleans for her, cooks for her, and gets her anything she needs.

If we apply Hegelian question of 'recognition', Alexandre Kojève explains that, "Desire directed toward a natural object is human only to the extent that it is 'mediated' by the desire of another directed towards the same object: it is human to desire what others desire, because they desire it" (qtd. in Lee 49). The desire of Clegg, in this sense, is 'human desire' that is to be recognized as a decent human. When he buys her Gramophone he says, "She liked it and so me for buying it" (48). Therefore, an uneducated clerk shifts his desire to correspond with her desire because she desires it. If we return to our question of why he kidnaps Miranda and what he wants from her is simply to 'possess' her and 'gain recognition' from her, "I want you to get to know me" (35). He shifts his desire from objects, butterflies, to other natural subjects, Miranda, and tries to correspond with her just for the sake to be with her. Hence, his desire for recognition supersedes his desire for possession for he does everything he is told just for the sake to be recognized as a gentleman.

### **III.3.3 Master/Slave Dialectic in *The Collector***

As it was mentioned in the theoretical chapter, Hegel maintains a mythical relationship between a 'master' and a 'slave', or 'lord' and 'bondsmen' that is built after they 'struggle for recognition' and gain "an

### **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

existence of their own” (Hegel 114). Since both characters are incapable of gaining mutual ‘recognition’, their relationship is based on inequality and both of them seek to be the ‘master’ and dominate the ‘other’. Readers at first glance view Clegg as the ‘master’ who kidnaps Miranda and controls her; however, we can take a step backward to see the big image. Hegelian ‘master-slave’ characterization can be applied to Miranda Grey as the ‘master’ and Clegg as the ‘slave’ who will supersede her to be a ‘master’ himself.

Prior to Hegel’s ideas of recognition, Miranda knows that she is superior to him, “He is absolutely inferior to me in all ways. His one superiority is his ability to keep me here. That’s the only power he has. He can’t behave or think or speak or do anything better than I can” (238). Therefore, the motive of Clegg for kidnapping is to gain ‘recognition’ from her, that means, he already knows Miranda’s place is far above him and he tries to climb it up to be nearly at the same place as hers. He knows that Miranda is everything; if she leaves him, he gets nothing in return (271). Clegg is conscious that he is the one ‘dependent’ on her. We may say, then, that Clegg in this instance recognizes Miranda’s superiority. Yet Miranda does not recognize Clegg for he may be useless and does not fulfill her ‘need for recognition’. Precisely speaking, as Hegel maintains, the bondsman becomes dependent on his lord for he knows that he is a mere ‘object’ rather than a ‘thinking subject’. The lord, Miranda in this story, negates the ‘otherness of her bondsman’ for he is not a ‘conscious subject’ to her.

From their first encounter, Miranda prepares her defensive and dominant status. She starts interrogating him and when she recognizes his face she once saw in the papers, he fabricates a story which she notices cleverly. From this point, she puts him on a defensive attack until he accepts to release her in a month. At this instance he acknowledges her dominant status, “She always seemed to get me on the defensive” (34). She manages to manipulate him psychologically; his lack of knowledge and his difficulty of uttering his desire and needs make him imprisoned in his own mental prison. That is why he could not oppose her.

Miranda forces him to be in the ‘slave’ position by using her knowledge. She can manipulate him and he accepts willingly even if she tells him that Michelangelo's David is a frying pan, he accepts it because his

### Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector

---

'master' says so. He does everything he is told and does not even complain, he says, "I knew she was looking at me, but I wouldn't look at her . . . I was wax in her hands" (71).

In this same line of thought, Miranda starts dehumanizing Clegg to a thing, "I'm thinking of you as an object, not as a person" (70). For her, Clegg is not even a human; when she tries to draw him a portrait, she tells him that he is featureless and he has nothing interesting to depict. If we compare her description to G.P and Clegg, the former is described as chivalrous and knightly who knows better and teaches her, the latter is described as "Caliban" in Shakespeare, "Beast" in *Beauty and the Beast*, "Caulfield" in *The Catcher in the Rye*, and every beastly literary character rather than a human neglecting his individuality.

Furthermore, the power of Miranda lies also in her beauty. Even if she treats him awfully or acts exactly as he despises, he subconsciously excuses her actions as he sees her as a personification of perfection, "She was too beautiful" (66). The syntax of this salient quote describes the 'Truth' of her inability to do ugly things. It can be interpreted as the feeling of inferiority Clegg holds, for he already knows he is not good looking and that he does not have what girls look for (Gradefixer). Therefore, Miranda takes this to her benefit and uses verbal strength to deprecate Clegg, lowers his self-esteem, and hence, his inner confidence and power.

As events progress in the novel, Miranda starts enjoying her position being the 'master', she no longer finds 'recognition' needed from a being that is 'dependent' on her; hence, she neither seeks 'recognition' nor competes with a defeated being. She then becomes idle and just orders Clegg to buy her refined things such as gramophone, radio tapes, perfumes, Chinese pencils... etc. Clegg, on the bottom line, starts to look forward to becoming the one controller of the situation. He notices her bossing around; he says, "She [His aunt] never bossed me half as much as you do" (198). Hegel states that we are spectating the birth of 'self-consciousness' in a new shape, becomes aware of its 'self-consciousness' as a free 'self-conscious' and has experienced the fear of death (Hegel 117, 120).

After she attempts to seduce him, as a last attempt to escape, things drastically changes. Clegg realizes that he is a doll in her hands. One of Miranda's previous ploys to get what she wants is to go on hunger strike, sometimes she starves for three days and sometimes for five days straight. An instance when she orders him to

### **Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector**

---

buy her things, she threatens him that she is going on a hunger strike again, he tells her she can have her drawing materials and anything she wants, she just needs to ask. Even when she wanted fresh air, he replied, “It’s too dangerous . . . and in the end I gave in” (47). He could give her anything she wants fearing she would starve to death, “I was dead scared she’d go off on a hunger strike, so I didn’t insist” (75). Nevertheless, when Clegg takes the control over the situation, he leaves her to starve alone claiming that she is a “common street woman” (113) who no longer needs respect, he tells us that he had a chicken and champagne but he did not take her any supper and poured the rest of the drink down the sink (114).

To constitute the reality of ‘Self’, Hegel maintains, each individual should risk his/ her life to find an ‘other’ who can confirm his reality and ‘recognize his authority’. Clegg, hence, risks his life being caught by the police just to meet someone beyond his imagination. His inferiority complex drives him to lock her in the basement just to exercise his authorial attitude. When buying her expensive errands, for example, he attempts to overcome their class difference and makes her depend on him financially.

After Clegg changes his attitude with her, she begins to lower her guards and starts to lose her position, “He’s changed. He frightens me now” (264). She notices the coldness between them and starts to become desperate of her loneliness that she asks him to come down and visit her sometimes; this makes him strengthening his power status. Another crucial element of Clegg’s gaining domination is by the use of violence. After he realizes that he cannot reach ‘recognition’ through respect and good deeds, he switches to violence. As a declaration of his ‘Slave’s Coup’ he chloroforms her and takes pictures; her best pictures, according to him, were with her face cut off (118). That means, it is his turn to objectify her and dehumanizes her. The pictures, for Clegg, are better than her because they did not talk back to him as Miranda does. He recounts us how strong he feels after gaining confidence:

I felt happy, I can’t explain, I saw I was weak before, now I was paying her back for all the things she said and thought about me. I walked about upstairs, I went and looked at her room, it made me really laugh to think of her down there, she was the one who was going to stay below in all senses and even if

### Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in The Collector

---

it wasn't what she deserved in the beginning she had it so that she did now. I had real reasons to teach her what was what. (114)

Clegg's imprisonment of Miranda at first was to gain 'recognition' from her higher value, but since she fell from that status, her imprisonment turns out to be meaningless. Clegg's love for 'possession' and 'recognition' turns to be hatred and selfishness denying her individuality. As a result, Clegg's master domination comes into the scene, "You forget who's boss. I could just forget you. Nobody'd know" (116). In addition, Miranda's physical weakness leads him to realize his strength. While she catches pneumonia and suffers in bed, he gathers his power to take control and tells her that he is the one who gives order from now on (117). This idea is discussed by Hyppolite, saying that the truth of the slave is revealed to be the master of the master (172).

The last pages reveal Clegg's intention of kidnapping another girl who belongs to the same class as his. He threatens from the beginning to show her who the boss is. We can summarize the novel in terms of the Hegelian Speculative triad of a 'thesis, antithesis, and synthesis'. As discussed in the theoretical chapter, their first encounter shall be the first phase, which is the 'Thesis'. They both develop the 'sense-certainty' of the 'I'. At this stage, both are in a natural stage of perception, they both live a separate life. When he imprisons her, their first perception of each other is ironic in which both try to dominate from the beginning, which leads to second phase 'Antithesis'. It is in this phase that it establishes the relationship between master and slave. After various violent confrontations between the two, the third phase will rise, that is, 'Synthesis'. The 'slave' in this phase will discover his independent 'self-consciousness', as in the case of Clegg. The slave feels unattached from his 'master' and eventually will start to rebel. In the end, we spectate the birth of a new thesis to form a new dialectic triad in which Clegg repeats the same process and in his new story, he will become the 'master' from the beginning.

## Third Chapter: Postmodern and Hegelian Reading of Master/Slave Characterization in *The Collector*

---

### Conclusion

*The Collector* is a Postmodern and Hegelian novel par excellence. On the one hand, Fowles cleverly implied the double narration technique to emphasize the theme of the 'self and the other' as portrayed in his two radically different characters. With this, he opened a debate to discuss their reliability. Fowles's purpose for writing the novel, as it was mentioned in his philosophical work *The Aristos*, is to discuss English class system after the Second World War. He divided two genres of people, first the 'Few' who are the elite in the society as characterized in Miranda, and second the 'Many', the uneducated mass who contribute with the hardships and chaos in the society as seen in Clegg.

On the other hand, this novel can be seen as a Hegelian novel for it discusses the intricacies between two radically different characters. In this novel, both characters fight viciously to dominate the platform; Miranda at first dominates Clegg psychologically and disparages him in all aspects to keep her 'master' status. After the culmination of events, Clegg starts to build his own independent 'self-consciousness' neglecting her and dehumanizing her to the status of an 'object'. Being the 'master' leads him to gather courage and plans to kidnap another girl after Miranda's death. This leads us to study further Hegelian 'triadic dialectics' to the novel and to show: today's slave may be tomorrow's master.

## **General Conclusion**

### General Conclusion

The Self/Other binary opposition has troubled philosophers and researchers for centuries. On a simplest level, the 'self' is considered to be aware of the existence of oneself as a different entity from an 'other'. Friedrich Hegel claims that since people live in a social context, and interact with others; one cannot grow his/her 'self-consciousness' without the presence of an 'other'. Postmodernists have also discussed this idea saying that the 'Self' is fragmented and can only stand with the presence of an 'other'

The main argument of this study is how violent confrontation with otherness helps constructing 'self-consciousness' in *The Collector* by John Fowles. This research has come to the conclusion that this violent battle occurs when the conflicting parts seek to construct an 'existence of their own' and gain 'recognition' and 'dominion' through the interaction with an 'other'. Therefore, interpreting the novel using Hegelian ideas in *The Collector* permits the studying of the 'Self' and the 'Other' as conflicting consciousnesses, and hence, resulting in 'Master' and 'Slave' dialectics to surface the narrative. In his *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Hegel demonstrates how the presence of the 'other' is vital for the construction of the 'self'. However, it is driven by domination and power.

The background chapter confirmed the link between literature and philosophy in relation to John Fowles's postmodern and philosophical works chief among them is *The Aristos*. It is argued in the first chapter that postmodernism has witnessed the shift of meaning. The author has no longer the authority over his text, and readers are no more consumers of meaning. Ronald Barthe's famous statement "The death of the author" has become a major trend that postmodernist novelists deem too irresistible to dismiss. Therefore, they created narrative techniques, chief among them, were double narrative technique and circularity.

John Fowles was among the earliest postmodernists who gave their characters the freedom to choose their fates. Mahmoud Salami declares that it is quite impossible to agree on how to interpret the fiction of Fowles, with his complex narrative technique, that mixes past and present tenses within one narrative (13). John Fowles, besides his narrative skills, his philosophical works have proved also his competency. The publication of *The Aristos: a Self Portrait in Ideas*, a year after he published *The Collector*, constitutes his philosophical viewpoints that he inherited from the pre-Socratic Greek philosopher, Heraclitus. This book

## General Conclusion

---

tackles social issues of post-war Britain and observed that society is divided into two dual opposite the 'Few' as the intellectual elite, and the 'Many' as the ignorant mass, the contradiction between 'Them' and 'Us'.

Since this research studies philosophy through a literary lens, the theoretical chapter assumed that the knowledge of oneself is achieved through relationships with others. However, 'self-consciousness' can only shine through social conflict with others, or as Hegel calls 'life-and-death struggle'. Hegel begins his journey of discovery of the mind with a natural unscientific consciousness that is 'sense-certainty', up to the development of 'self-consciousness' from lower to higher level until one reaches 'absolute knowledge'. In the first stage, he asserts that humans define themselves in accordance with objects and any stage of human life will be understood through this objective 'self-identity'. In the second stage of development, people discover that despite their commitment to a certain endeavor, they cannot find themselves therein, and therefore, they keep moving from one stage to another in the hope they can discover their 'self-identity'. Nevertheless, they notice that they define themselves in terms of an object; therefore, they seek a new vocation, an 'other conscious being'.

Hegel then asserts that in order for a 'self' to be fully aware of its 'self' as an individuated subject, it must undergo a 'battle to the death' with an 'other'. Since the understanding of who the person is always involves the presence and the understanding of the 'other', each 'consciousness' attempts to claim a 'self-existence' and independence through 'negation' or objectification of the other. In this sense, either this 'self' loses itself, for it finds itself in another being, or it supersedes the 'other' since it is unessential and does not fulfill the need for recognition, the 'self', then, sees itself as superior in the eyes of the 'other' (Hegel 111).

After the life-and-death battle, one rises to become the 'Master', the other becomes the 'Slave'. Doug Frame (2014) explains that some people value freedom over life and others value life over freedom. Consequently, the 'self-conscious' person who values freedom over life becomes the 'master', the other 'self-conscious' individual; seems to appreciate life more, he/she ends up being the 'slave' who pursues survival as a means of fight from a submission imposed by the presence of a 'master'.

Nevertheless, the story does not end here. After the battle, the 'master' enjoys his privileged position while he starts inferiorizing the 'slave' and reducing him to a thing. The 'slave', however, starts to look forward

## General Conclusion

---

to becoming a 'master' himself. He then starts working on his 'self-consciousness'. As a result, the 'slave' organizes his coup and attacks the 'master'. Hegel asserts that in this stage we witness the experience of the birth of a new 'self-consciousness' which has experienced the fear of death by the absolute 'Lord' (117, 120).

The novel is a postmodern and Hegelian novel par excellence. The analytical chapter proved that Miranda is a Hegelian heroine who is conscious of her superiority from the start. The relationship between characters at first is what Hegel calls "the battle to the death" for recognition. Both characters desire to be recognized by the 'other'. At the surface level, the desire of Clegg for 'recognition' takes precedence over his desire for 'possession'. It is apparent that Clegg kidnaps Miranda out of his collector mentality. All he wants from her is to possess her as one of his refined butterflies and to be recognized by her. Miranda, on the other hand, feels the urge to make Clegg understand the unfairness of the situation. Therefore, both strive to make themselves understood by each other. Their incomprehensibility leads them to constitute power-based relationship. Thus, they both enter a 'life-and-death battle' for 'recognition'. Miranda asserts from the beginning how she is superior to him in all ways and how his only power is to keep her locked inside (*The Collector* 137, 238). She then begins to inferiorize him to a state of an object rather than a thinking subject. Clegg, on the other hand, is already familiar with her power. His motive behind kidnapping her is to gain recognition, which means, he already knows her superiority. Clegg, as Hegel maintains, shifts his animal desire of possessing and collecting to seeking recognition, a human desire, and fighting for it. He then alters his own desire to correspond with his master. Nevertheless, after the culmination of events, Clegg begins to realize his actual power and starts to organize his 'Slave-coup'. At last, he discovers that she is the one 'dependent' on him and if he leaves her alone, no one would ever know.

Hence, all instances in the novel are a kind of verbal struggle between Miranda and Clegg. This dissertation also achieved the main problem: The violent relationship between them helped Clegg to establish a clear understanding of his 'self-consciousness'. He grows his 'self-awareness' through several confrontations with Miranda and shifts his desire from seeking 'recognition' to becoming a 'master'.

In addition, we found that the main obstacle of establishing a clear understanding of the 'other' between characters is their belonging to different social groups 'Few/Many', or 'Aristoi/ Hoi Polloi', in Fowles's

## General Conclusion

---

philosophical book *The Aristos*. John Fowles intends to portray the danger of upper and lower classes and intellectual division through his main characters who belong to different classes. On the one hand, Frederick Clegg is the representative of 'Hoi Polloi'. Despite his new wealth, people still assume he is part of the 'Many' due to his accent and attitude. Clegg suffers from an intense sense of class inferiority, and thus, he kidnaps a member of the 'Few' in order to be understood and be part of them. On the other hand, Miranda as part of the intelligent 'Few' redundantly talks about her hatred towards the new people, the 'Many', with their vulgarity imitating the bourgeoisie mode of living. She believes that the 'Few' have to preserve civilized values and carry out the 'Many's calibanity' (220). Both characters are driven by their social class, and hence, they cannot establish a clear understanding of the 'other'; Miranda expects him to act according to her values and ideals, and Clegg seeks comprehension rather than prejudice.

Since we have employed the 'dialectic' method in order to explain the relationship between the characters, it seems unavoidable to approach their narrative. This dissertation successfully employed the postmodern double narrative technique in order to examine the intricacies and differences between characters. It serves to intensify the problem of 'otherness' among two radically different selves and leads us to study their binary qualities: evil vs. good, 'few' vs. 'many', educated vs. ignorant, 'master' vs. 'slave', and so forth. Fowles challenges traditional characterization, where each character speaks for itself and no character speaks for the author. Therefore the same story is told differently by two narrators. By reading one account, and then the next, readers notice the changes in the structure and syntax and believe it was written by two distinct authors. The two characters differ greatly in terms of their background, values, social class, and ideology. Thus, their way of narrating events depend on their own perspective of the situation. In the end, we arrive at a confusing version that leads us to question who the reliable narrator is and who should we believe. Hence, Fowles offers his readers a plurality of interpretations.

*The Collector* is considered as a personification of power struggle between two distinct selves, rather than a mere crime fiction. John Fowles successfully depicted this struggle through only two characters and a small cellar. This novel permits us to approach it philosophically, that is, from Hegelian perspective, and consider it as a critique of 'master' and 'slave' domination and subjection.

## **Works Cited**

## Works Cited

- “Freedom of Self-Consciousness: Stoicism, Skepticism, and the Unhappy Consciousness”. University of California Press, 2010
- “John Fowles: his Life, Works and Postmodern Turn to the Novel”. Pp. 66. Accessed 15 March 2020.
- Acheson, James. *John Fowles*. Red Globe Press, 1998.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Baudinet, Bridget. “Parallel Plot and Nonlinear Narrative”. Storyboard That, <[storyboardthat.com/articles/e/nonlinear-plots](http://storyboardthat.com/articles/e/nonlinear-plots)>. Accessed 23 June 2020.
- Berenson, Frances. “Hegel on Others and the Self”. *Philosophy*, vol.57, no.219, p.78. *JSTOR*, <[jstor.org/stable/4619540](http://jstor.org/stable/4619540)>. Accessed 10 June 2020.
- Bharvad, Rajeshbai.K. *Narrative Strategies in Postmodern Fiction*. 2016. University of Baroda, PhD dissertation.
- Bornedal, Peter. “Hegel’s Master-Slave Dialectics”. American University of Beirut. *Academia*, <[academia.edu/2494539/Hegels\\_Master\\_Slave\\_Dialectics](http://academia.edu/2494539/Hegels_Master_Slave_Dialectics)>. Accessed 15 May 2020
- Boston, Richard. “John Fowles, Alone but not Lonely”. *The New York Times*, 1969, <[nytimes.com/books/98/05/31/specials/fowles-alone.html#:~:text=By%20RICHARD%20BOSTON,from%20your%20fellow%20human%20beings](http://nytimes.com/books/98/05/31/specials/fowles-alone.html#:~:text=By%20RICHARD%20BOSTON,from%20your%20fellow%20human%20beings)>
- Docherty, Thomas. “A Constant Reality: The Presentation of Character in the Fiction of John Fowles”. *Jstor*, Vol.14, No.2, winter 1981, pp.119, DOI: 10.2307/1344848.
- Dolaykaya, Muruvvet Mira Pinar. “Characterization in Postmodern Novel: Analysis of John Fowles’ Mantissa in the Context of Postmodern Character”. *Researchgate*, Vol.57.2, Dec. 2017, pp.1004-1005, DOI: 10.1501/Dtcfder\_0000001548. Accessed 15 January 2020.
- Etter, Julie-Anne. *Form and Idea in the Fiction and Non-Fiction of John Fowles*. Dec 1985. University of Rhodes, Master Dissertation.

- Farhangpour, Yasaman, and Atefeh Abdolsalami. "The Philosophy of Postmodernism, its Scholars and its Impact on Art". *Researchgate*, 15 December 2016, pp.03, <researchgate.net/publication/330971771\_The\_Philosophy\_of\_Postmodernism\_Its\_Scholars\_and\_Its\_Impact\_on\_Art.> Accessed 10 March 2020.
- Farivar, Sahand. *The Unhappy Consciousness in Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit: a Secular Reading*. The University of Guelph, 2018.
- Ferrandiz, Juan Miguel Asin. "The Few vs. The Many in John Fowles' The Collector". *Mexicodocuments*, <vdocuments.mx/the-few-vs-the-many-in-john-fowles-the-collector.html>, Accessed 12 Feb 2020.
- Fowles, John. *The Collector*. Little, Brown and Company, 1963.
- Frame, Doug. "Hegel's Master/Slave Dialectic". *Framepublishing*, 4 June 2014, <framepublishing.com/2014/06/04/hegels-masterslave-dialectic/>
- G. Ma, Z. "Hegel's Eurocentric Triads of Dialectics and its Transformation to Kelly's Planetary Paradigm". *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, vol.5, no. 38314, 2018, p. 1-3. *ResearchGate*, <DOI:10.9734/ARJASS/2018/38314>. Accessed, 15 May 2020.
- GradeFixer. *Power and Control: Clegg vs Miranda*. 2018, <gradesfixer.com/free-essay-examples/who-has-more-power-in-the-collector-clegg-or-miranda/>. Accessed 20 July 2020.
- Hegel, Georg W. Friedrich. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans by Miller, A.V and J.N. Findlay, Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Hegel, Georg.W. Friedrich. *Hegel's Philosophy of Mind*, edited by Anthony Uyl. Trans by the Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1894.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. Routledge, 2003.
- Hypolite, Jean. *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans By Cherniak, Samuel and John Heckman, Northwestern university press. 1974.
- Kamal, Muhammad. "Master-Slave Relationships in Hegel's Dialectic". *Hegel Summer School*, 24 May 2004, <home.pacific.net.au/~andy/seminars/master-slave.htm>

- Keenan, Dennis King. *Hegel and Contemporary Continental Philosophy*. State University of New York Press, 2004.
- Kimbro, Jenny. "Postmodernism and Existentialism in "The Collector" by John Fowles". *Wordpress*,  
 <jonnykimbro.wordpress.com/2012/12/11/postmodernism-existentialism-in-the-collector-by-john-fowles/>
- Kojeve, Alexandre. *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans by James Nichols, Cornell University Press, 1969.
- Lee, Seungjae. *Otherness, Recognition and Power: The Hegelian Themes in John Fowles's The Collector*. 1999. Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Master Dissertation.
- Loveday, Simon. *The Romances of John Fowles*. Palgrave Macmillan, 1985.
- Lyall, Sara. "John Fowles, 79, British Postmodernist who Tested Novel's Conventions, Dies". *The New York Times*, 1999,  
 <nytimes.com/2005/11/08/books/john-fowles-79-british-postmodernist-who-tested-novels-conventions.html>
- Maybee, Julie E. "Hegel's Dialectic". *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, winter 2019,  
 <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/hegel-dialectics/>. Accessed 10 May 2020.
- McKenna, Tony. "Hegelian Dialectics". *Critique: Journal of Socialist Theory*, Vol.39, No.1, published 13 Jan 2011, p.155. *ResearchGate*,  
 <DOI: 10.1080/03017605.2011.537458>. Accessed 11 June 2020.
- Mcquillan, Collin. "German Idealism". *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, University of Tennessee Knoxville,  
 <iep.utm.edu/germidea>. Accessed 5 May 2020.
- Mete, Bariş "Writing and te Self: John Fowles Autobiographical Non-Fiction". *Selçuk University Journal of Faculty of Letters*, 2017.
- Nodelman, Perry. "John Fowles's Variations in 'The Collector'". *Contemporary Literature*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 1987, pp. 334-336. *JSTOR*,  
 <DOI: 10.2307/1208625>. Accessed, 12 July 2020.

Olshen, Barry N. *John Fowles*. Michigan University, 1978.

Perez, Guillermo Ruiz. "Self-Consciousness and the Constitution of the Subject from Hegel to Lacan". National Distance Education University, winter 2017, published August 2017. *ResearchGate*, <[researchgate.net/publication/319311173\\_SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS\\_AND\\_THE\\_CONSTITUTION\\_OF\\_THE\\_SUBJECT\\_FROM\\_HEGEL\\_TO\\_LACAN](https://researchgate.net/publication/319311173_SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS_AND_THE_CONSTITUTION_OF_THE_SUBJECT_FROM_HEGEL_TO_LACAN)>

Pollheide, Jens. *Postmodernist Narrative Strategies in the Novels of John Fowles*. 2003. University of Bielefeld, Phd Dissertation.

Salami, Mohamed. *John Fowles Fiction and the Poetics of Postmodernism*. Associated University Press, 1992.

Sim, Stuart. *The Routledge Companion to Postmodernism*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2001.

Stephen Houlgate. *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit: A Reader's Guide*. Bloomsbury Academic. 2013.

Stern, Robert. *An Introduction to Modern European Philosophy*, edited by Jenny Teicham and Graham white, Macmillan publishers, 1995.

Stroll, Avrum, et al. "The Idealism of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel". *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Encyclopaedia Britannica, inc, Published 16 June 2017, <[britannica.com/topic/Western-philosophy/The-19th-century#ref8872](https://britannica.com/topic/Western-philosophy/The-19th-century#ref8872)> Accessed 9 June 2020

Tarbox, Katherine M. *A Critical Study of the Novels of John Fowles*. 1986. University of New Hampshire, Phd Dissertation.

Turnbull, Nick. "The Problematological Foundation of Reason in Postmodernity", 2010 <[cairn.info/revue-internationale-de-philosophie-2010-1.htm](https:// Cairn.info/revue-internationale-de-philosophie-2010-1.htm)>. Accessed 22 April 2020.

Veronika Goišová .Postmodern Features in Monty Python's Flying *Circus*. Olomouc, 2014.

Vincen, Martin. "The Notion of Freedom in John Fowles' Novels. *ISSUU*, published 2 Dec 2012, <[issuu.com/phusick/docs/john-fowles](https://issuu.com/phusick/docs/john-fowles)>. Accessed 10 May 2020.