# A SARTREAN READING OF JOHN FOWLES'S THE *COLLECTOR* AND *THE FRENCH LIEUTENANT'S WOMAN*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

OF MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ZEHRA KARSLİ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN

ENGLISH LITERATURE

JULY 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Prof. Dr. Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak Avcı (METU, ELIT) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı (METU, ELIT) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kırca (Çankaya Uni., TINS) _____

**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

Name, Last Name : Zehra Karsli

Signature :

## ABSTRACT

A SARTREAN READING OF JOHN FOWLES'S *THE COLLECTOR* AND *THE FRENCH LIEUTEANT'S WOMAN*

Karsli, Zehra

MA., Department of English Literature

Supervisor : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı

July 2019, 163 pages

This thesis is an attempt to explore how John Fowles's protagonists in his two novels *The Collector* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman* experience Sartrean existentialism and their striving for freedom and authenticity. This study aims at the portrayal of these characters as inauthentic according to the themes and concepts of Sartrean existentialism along with Fowles's view of the acclaimed ideology. The study purposes to draw the similarities and differences between Sartrean and Fowlesian understanding of freedom and authenticity and by doing so, to analyze how these notions are reflected in the characterization of the protagonists in these novels.



**Keywords:** Existentialism, John Fowles, authenticity

# ÖZ

JOHN FOWLES'UN *KOLEKSİYONCU* VE *FRANSIZ TEĞMENİN KADINI*'NIN SARTRECA OKUNMASI

Karsli, Zehra

MA., İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı

Temmuz 2019, 163 sayfa

Bu tez John Fowles'un *Koleksiyoncu* ve *Fransız Teğmen'in Kadını* adlı romanlarında geçen ana karakterlerin Sartreca varoluşçuluğu nasıl deneyimlediklerini, ve sahihlik ve özgürlük için çabalarını inceleme çalışması yapmaktadır. Bu çalışma, Sartreca varoluşçuluk kavram ve unsurlar ve Fowles'un da bu ideolojiye ilişkin görüşlerine göre bu karakterlerin sahih olmadıklarının tasvirini amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma, Fowles ve Sartre'ın özgürlük ve sahihlik kavramlarına ilişkin anlayışlarının benzerlik ve farklılıklarını göstermek ve böylelikle bu görüşlerin, romanlardaki ana karakterlerin tasvirinde nasıl yansıtıldığını incelemeyi hedeflemektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Varoluşçuluk, John Fowles, sahihlik

To My Parents

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı, for her endless support, care, guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insight in the whole process of the production of this thesis. The benefits I got from Nil Korkut Naykı's careful observations, wise decisions and personal experiences played great part in conducting a successful study.

I also would like thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak Avcı and Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kırca for their guidance and support during the process of writing this thesis and in the thesis defence.

My father, Adnan Karsli and my mother, Selma Karsli have been the most important encouragement for me during this difficult task and without their support; I would not have completed this thesis.

I am also greatly indebted to Uğur Yolak who has always stood by me in my time of distress and who has endless faith in me.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an attempt to explore how John Fowles's protagonists in his two novels *The Collector* (1963) and *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1969) experience Sartrean existentialism and their striving for freedom and authenticity. This study aims at the portrayal of these characters as *inauthentic* according to the themes and concepts of Sartrean existentialism along with Fowles's view of the acclaimed ideology. The study purposes to draw the similarities and differences between Sartrean and Fowlesian understanding of freedom and authenticity and by doing so, to analyze how these notions are reflected in the characterization of the protagonists in these novels.

Existentialism is an ideology and movement which draws attention to the individual's existence. It has dealt with issues such as freedom, the freedom of choice and the individual's search for meaning in a meaningless world. Starting from Søren Kierkegaard (1813-1855) and reaching its peak with Jean Paul Sartre (1905-1980), there have been many philosophers of this mode of thinking. Existentialism strives to remind and urge the individual who has been chained by so many limiting norms and notions to ask questions about his existence and freedom in the world.

In the second half of the 19th century and in the 20th century, with new developments in science and in consequence of the two world wars along with the subsequent conflicts that the world faced, the individual began to lose his grip on the beliefs that provided an anchor and a ground to base his existence upon. Earlier, people had God to adhere their being to and justify their actions. Apart from God and faith, society also proved an anchorage for people to sustain their being and go for their survival. However, with the two world wars that caused a breakdown in the seemingly solid and stable structures, the idea of faith in a

divine entity and the progress of society towards civilization began to fade. In this world which had been wrecked and rebuilt after two world wars, the faith that people had began to disappear and society proved to be dispersed; the individual had nothing but himself to rely on. With the faith lost and the emergence of the new world, existentialism found its way as a novel and popular way of thinking.

John Fowles (1926-2005) was always a major literary figure in English Literature beginning with the first publication of *The Collector* in 1963. His works have been studied with regard to various themes and issues. The reason why this research aims to analyze John Fowles' works in terms of existentialism and authenticity is that Fowles himself is much concerned with existence and his works have been largely influenced by his time's prevailing notions of existentialism. On every occasion, he has asserted his interest in existentialism as a philosophy and how his works relate a part of it. In *The Aristos*, the book that encompasses his philosophy, Fowles asserts that:

> The best existentialism tries to re-establish in the individual a sense of his own uniqueness, a knowledge of the value of anxiety as an antidote to intellectual complacency (petrifaction), and a realization of the need he has to learn to choose and control his own life. (102)

Having placed existentialism in the spectrum of self creation, Fowles, in an interview with Roy Newquist (1999), 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" (42).

Having noted this aspect of Fowles, Salami (1992) states that: "Fowles's fiction can be called the embodiment of freedom, individuality, and existentialism" (13). McSweeney, also (1981) comments on the importance of existentialism in Fowles's works by noting that: "The principal thematic concerns of Fowles's fiction may be called existential" (307). For Olshen (1998), Fowles's works comprise themes such as "the individual ... struggling to achieve a measure of self-realization amidst the undirected or misdirected masses", "the use and abuse of power", and the "freedom to choose and change" (33).

In alignment with these notions, there have been a number of studies to analyze John Fowles's ideas of existentialism and the authenticity of the characters in his two well-known novels, *The French Lieutenant's Woman* and *The Collector*. In her dissertation, Eva Petranova carried out a very extensive reading of Fowles's *The Collector* in terms of existentialism in 2015 and also Jódar presented a new look on the novels in 2006. Eva Petranova (2015) brings forth a new and alternative perspective in dealing with John Fowles and existentialism. In her dissertation titled *Existentialism in the Works of John Fowles* (2015), by delving in both the fictions and the nonfictions of the writer, Petranova discusses how the ideas of the author concerning existentialism are reflected in his works. She discusses the notions of "being" and "having" as conferred in Fowles's *The Aristos* and their effects on the prose of Fowles. Having positioned Clegg and Miranda in the spectrum of personality regarding their tendencies for "to be" and "to have", Petronova studies how these propensities affect their journey into authenticity. She elaborates on the actions of Clegg that denote his obsession with "having" and Miranda's struggle "to be", which she fails to achieve.

Jódar also carries out a similar study to Petranova and he focuses on the Camus's idea of the absurd; not authenticity. In the article, Jódar presents an extensive reading of *The Collector* and the problematic character of the novel: Frederick Clegg and explores the extent of existentialism that can be applicable in the personality of Clegg and how Clegg in his quest for authenticity and a unique personality evolves into the Camusian absurd man. These two studies differ from this work. While Petranova's study is limited to the analysis of Sartrean understanding of the acclaimed ideology in terms of "being" and "having", and Jódar's study is limited to the Camusian absurd, this study is a detailed analysis of both Sartrean and Fowlesian understanding of existentialism and how freedom and authenticity are reflected in the portrayal of the characters in both *The French Lieutenant's Woman* and *The Collector*.

Katherine Tarbox is another scholar who has inspired many others to pursue their studies on John Fowles. In her much-cited work *A Critical Study of*

*the Novels of John Fowles* (1986), she provides an extensive study that dissects and analyzes Fowles's novels in terms of their themes, prominent ideas, prevailing philosophy and an examination of their major characters. In *The Collector* chapter, she focuses on the two different narratives; one belonging to Clegg and the other belonging to Miranda, and draws conclusions about the progress of these characters based on their narratives and personalities. By pointing out the most prominent straits, she rivets the attention to their authenticity, one of the main concerns of the novel. However, she does not take Fowles's understanding of freedom and authenticity into consideration and she solely dwells on the Sartrean understanding, unlike this study which aims to bring these two together.

The literary studies related to John Fowles are not limited to his first novel *The Collector*. *The French Lieutenant's Woman* has been written about and scrutinized by many scholars as well. In his much-cited book *Fowles's French Lieutenant's Woman* (2007), William Stephenson conducts an extensive study on the novel by focusing on its language, setting, inspiration and narrative techniques. According to Stephenson, in the novel, Fowles relates "consistent concerns" of his such as "man's relation to nature, the class and social hierarchy, sex and gender roles, authorship and the creative process, the power of unexplained mystery, existentialism and postmodernism" (7). For Stephenson, the novel can be summarized in one sentence: "It is a postmodernist development of the existential blueprint of Fowles's earlier novels" (ibid). Stephenson even claims: "Fowles used the novel's 1860s setting to comment on 1960s issues, such as the problem of whether the individual can, or ought to break free of social convention in order to form their own identity" (8). However, unlike this study, Stephenson does not provide a detailed analysis of Sartrean Existentialism and how it is reflected in Fowles's works though he focuses on many other aspects of the novel.

Having thus been studied in many aspects, *The French Lieutenant's Woman* and *The Collector* have been chosen for this analysis due to their richness in content and being open to new interpretations in each and every understanding

of the era. Additionally, these novels have been chosen in relation to the study of authenticity since existential thinking can be quite clearly traced in Fowles's narration and characterization. In these novels, Fowles accentuates various concepts of Sartrean thinking such as freedom, identity, existence, anguish, abandonment, bad faith and authenticity. To illustrate, in his essay *Notes on an Unfinished Novel* (1969), to emphasize the existentialist concerns of *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, Fowles states:

> My two previous novels were both based on more or less disguised existentialist premises. I want this one [The French Lieutenant's Woman] to be no exception; and so I am trying to show an existentialist awareness before it was chronologically possible. Kierkegaard was, of course, totally unknown to the British and American Victorians; but it has always seemed to me that the Victorian Age especially from 1850 on was highly existentialist in its personal dilemmas. One can almost invert the reality and say that Camus and Sartre have been trying to lead us, in their fashion, to a Victorian seriousness of purpose and moral sensitivity. (140)

What this study aims at is analyzing the main characters of *The Collector* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman* and demonstrating their struggle towards the attainment of a unique, authentic self and to decide whether they can achieve full authenticity in their attempts. While doing so, the study aims to make a comparison of Sartrean and Fowlesian understanding of freedom and authenticity and to analyze to what extent the protagonists of these two novels reflect Fowles's idea of freedom.

*The Collector*, the first novel of Fowles to be analyzed, is a story that embodies crime, the psychology of a perpetrator and its victim, and the striving of the individual for independence and freedom. It tells the story of Frederick Clegg, the perpetrator, and Miranda Grey, the victim. Clegg is a man with an unhealthy and psychotic frame of mind, and he stalks and kidnaps an innocent, young, aspiring artist Miranda after he wins money by chance from the pools. The story is narrated through two narrative perspectives. It starts with Clegg's narration about his life, how he got lucky and had money from the pools, his problematic background and the process of the kidnapping. This narrative provides the reader with an insight into the mind of a mentally unstable individual. Clegg furnishes

his narration with details about how he initially got the idea of abducting someone and how he schemed and planned accordingly.

The second chapter is Miranda's narration, written during her confinement in the form of a diary, and recounts her struggle for freedom and self-preservation. However, the novel ends with Miranda's death. She dies after she gets pneumonia during her imprisonment and the reader beholds Clegg as he ruminates on plotting a second criminal adventure in the same strain. In the novel, both of the characters are in a struggle to find their unique identity and authenticity. What this study purposes at is to draw the level of their achievement on their way to becoming authentic individuals.

The other novel that will be analyzed in relation to existentialism is *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. The novel is set in 1867 Victorian England and Fowles conveys the feelings of the Victorian frame of mind, the structure of the society and the manners. However, Fowles makes various uses of the techniques that place the novel in the existentialist spectrum. The novel concerns the self-quest of two members of the Victorian society at the time: Charles Smithson and Sarah Woodruff. Charles is a middle-aged bachelor pursuing his interest in science as an amateur paleontologist. He is engaged to a very conventional Victorian woman, Ernestina. The marriage prospects of this couple are distorted when Sarah, an outcast woman who has been allegedly in a relationship out of wedlock and thus isolated by the society, comes into their life. The novel focuses on the relationship of Sarah and Charles and how they struggle to find their freedom and unique identities in a Victorian setting. Exploring Sarah and Charles's enigmatic relationship, the book proposes two endings regarding the final state of the character in their search for authenticity, leaving the end to the reader to choose freely.

This study is a detailed analysis of the aforementioned novels, *The Collector* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, in terms of the Sartrean understanding of authenticity and to what extent Fowles's stance agrees with Sartre's opinions as seen in the novels. The first chapter provides an overview of Existentialism. Starting with Søren Kierkegaard, the father of this ideology, the

chapter probes into the most prominent figures of existentialism, especially focusing on Sartre and his notions of freedom and authenticity. It also presents an overview of Fowles's opinions and views concerning existentialism and the achievement of freedom and an authentic self.

Sartrean authenticity is a complex term that comprises various aspects. Authenticity suggests the ability to reach a clearer understanding of oneself. To do this, the individual should break his ties with the deep-rooted social norms and values and the faith in a divine entity. According to Sartre, once a man is rid of the conditions that have played a role in shaping and molding him, he can transcend his present identity and become an authentic individual. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that there is total freedom for Sartre and there is nothing and should be nothing to hinder a man's progress towards authenticity. Even though Sartrean authenticity dictates the idea of complete and total freedom, Fowles seems to bring a new understanding to Sartrean authenticity. Fowles believes that there is no complete freedom, only *relative* or *limited freedom* and complete freedom is not realistic since one comes into the world as already situated in circumstances that he has no control over. Therefore, according to Fowles, the conditions in which an individual dwells sometimes play a deterministic role in his achievement of free identity. That is, unlike Sartre, Fowles seems to believe that the forces over which human beings have no control hold a greater importance with regard to the attainment of freedom since these forces already the limit the individual's freedom. This approach of Fowles is also reflected in the portrayal of the main characters in the *The Collector* and *The French Lieutenant Woman.*

With clear definitions of authenticity and the individual's progress about how to achieve it as presented in the first chapter, the second chapter deals with *The Collector* by dwelling on the two characters, Clegg and Miranda and their struggle for authenticity. The chapter traces the backgrounds and the behaviors of these characters on their way to trying to become authentic individuals. The chapter aims to portray them as *inauthentic* in Sartrean terms and emphasizes that they are in authentic because they cannot overcome their restraints.

The third chapter is a detailed analysis of *The French Lieutenant Woman.* As in the case of the main characters of *The Collector*, the third chapter concentrates on Sarah and Charles, the protagonists and the analysis provides an answer regarding their achievement of unique selves in the process of which they fail. The chapter traces their attempts to create their own unique selves and demonstrates their failure in the attainment of authenticity due to their limitedness in various aspects.

The Conclusion presents a summary of the findings and discusses what further research could be carried out in relation to these works. All in all, this study is an attempt to provide an overview of existentialism focusing on Sartre and Fowles's notions of the acclaimed ideology. This thesis aims to trace the concepts of existentialism in John Fowles's *The Collector* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman* and analyze to what extent Fowles's ideas of existentialism are reflected in his portrayal of the main characters. The purpose of this study is to draw the main characters from *The Collector* and *The French Lieutenant Woman* as *inauthentic* by demonstrating that they fail to attain their individuality and unique selves with every step of existential authenticity in Sartrean terms, thereby adhering to the Fowles's idea that complete freedom is not always attainable and the circumstances in which an individual is situated play a very important role in determining an individual's success in this aspect.

# CHAPTER 2

## WHAT IS EXISTENTIALISM?

Existentialism is suggested to be an intellectual movement rather than a philosophical one by some scholars as it lacks one distinct philosophical definition. However, throughout the current of 19th and 20th century philosophy, it is possible to pick out some distinct problems that existentialism addresses which can help its clarification in general. 19th century philosophers such as Søren Kierkegaard and Friedrich Nietzsche can be considered as the precursors of Existentialism even though neither of them claimed to be an existentialist. However, the ideology became identified more fully with Heidegger, Sartre and Camus in the later century.

In his famous play *No Exit* (1944), Jean Paul Sartre writes: "You are-your life, nothing else" (26). This quotation sheds much light upon the respective controversial subject: existentialism. Walter Kauffman defines existentialism as "the refusal to belong to any school of thought, the repudiation of the adequacy of any body of beliefs whatever, and especially of systems, and a marked dissatisfaction with traditional philosophy as superficial, academic and remote from life" (12). Why this refusal and dissatisfaction occurred is the key question.

The reasons for the appearance of Existentialism are various. First of all, the deficient nature of rationalist thinking in the West led the way to existentialism as rationalist thinkers could no longer satisfactorily defend the existence of an absolute truth and that made their philosophy invalid, futile speculation. In addition to that, along with the radical changes of 19th century induced by wars, people lost their belief in a divine entity. Such a fundamental change in the epistemology altered the worldview of people as well. If there were no God, the deep-seated ideologies of the previous centuries had no meaning at all. People felt lost with the disappearance of God. Not only faith lost its sway

over people, but also because of the wars, the fundamental structures of society went through a shift that caused the people to lose their trust in progress and civilizations. With the experiences of imminent dangers and constant struggle for survival, the seemingly stable and solid components and pillars of society lost their meaning. Along with wars and loss of faith, the scientific discoveries also led the people to reconsider their position in a given society, world and even universe. Science opened up the eyes of the individuals to their fleeting natures and not so divine existence. Therefore, what the society underwent was an irreversible metamorphosis and the individual was alone within this new world that was bereft of faith.

The change in the understanding of the world caused an alteration in the understanding of society and its norms as well. Existentialism urged man who was deprived of deep-rooted ideas and ideologies, to search for his own meaning. With this search, man would be the centre and question his existence as the first signified (Tan, 2017). In order to set a core for the purpose of the study, this chapter will provide an overview of the key existentialist thinkers and especially focus on Sartrean existentialism and its emphasis on authenticity since *The Collector* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman* bear the traces of an existentialist mode of thinking in no small measure. Moreover, it will elaborate on the ideas of John Fowles concerning Existentialism and freedom, and these will be discussed along with the Sartrean Existentialism.

## 2.1 AN OVERVIEW OF EXISTENTIAL THOUGHT

### 2.1.1 A Christian Understanding of Existentialism: Søren Kierkegaard

By focusing on the individual and his freedom to choose what he is, Søren Kierkegaard shows himself to be the father of existentialism. Like all the existentialists, Kierkegaard deals with the self and the questions of freedom. For him, being a self necessitates the embracing of freedom. To achieve total freedom, the individual needs to choose for himself and the choices made in that way

express what that individual is (fixed aspects of his personality) and what is open to him as possibilities (what else he can be). For Kierkegaard, the subjective truth is very important as it is the way through which an individual can reach his authentic self. In his *The Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (1846), he elaborates on this idea:

> To be a particular individual is world-historically absolutely nothing, infinitely nothing — and yet, this is the only true and highest significance of a human being, so much higher as to make every other significance illusory….If initially my human nature is merely an abstract something, it is at any rate the task which life sets me to become subjective, the uncertainty of death comes more and more to interpenetrate my subjectivity dialectically. (…) All knowledge about reality is possibility. The only reality to which an existing individual may have a relation that is more than cognitive, is his own reality, the fact that he exists; this reality constitutes his absolute interest. (264)

For Kierkegaard, to be an individual means to be in quest for subjective truth. He condemns the Hegelian notion of objective, universal reality as it is each and every truth-seeking person's duty to set aside the perceptions of masses concerning the truth and create his own unique one. In Hegelian idea, the truth is considered to be all comprehensive, objectively certain and absolute. This objective certainty, according to Kierkegaard, has no power to transform the subject as an individual. In *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (1846), Kierkegaard claims that:

> Truth itself is transformed into a desideratum [something wanted] and everything is placed in the process of becoming, because the empirical object is not finished, and the existing knowing spirit is itself in the process of becoming. Thus, truth is an approximating whose beginning cannot be established absolutely, because there is no conclusion that has retroactive power. (189)

Asserting the continuum of the truth, Kierkegaard concerns himself with the subject's relation to itself and rivets the attention to the problem of subjectivity.

In his work *Fear and Trembling* (1843) Kierkegaard states that "to exist" meant to realize oneself through "self-commitment" to the choices one makes as a "free subjective individual" (72). To achieve this end, he directs his philosophy away from the Hegelian idea of the objective understanding of existence towards

the ancient Socratic question of how to live one's life. The answer to that question is highly personal, thus subjective, as the truth cannot be reached through the opinions of the masses. In *The Crowd is Untruth* (1859), he claims:

> There is a view of life which holds that where the crowd is, the truth is also, that it is a need in truth itself, that it must have the crowd on its side. There is another view of life; which holds that wherever the crowd is, there is untruth, so that, for a moment to carry the matter out to its farthest conclusion, even if every individual possessed the truth in private, yet if they came together into a crowd (so that "the crowd" received any decisive, voting, noisy, audible importance), untruth would at once be let in. (109-20)

Unlike many other existential thinkers, Kierkegaard was deeply religious and he connected his view of subjectivity with Christianity. In *Fear and Trembling*, he asserts that to be a Christian, one must be an individual first. The traditional perception of faith as an objective concept was one of the fundamental things that he condemned since he believed that the linking of faith to any objective certainty or truth could not be achieved. Achieving faith through reason or objectivity was against the foundation of faith. According to him, faith can only be attained through personal choices that an individual makes in his life. These choices have paradoxes and elements of absurdity at their core (70-76). However, a "truth-seeking individual" can see through them. As put in *Søren Kierkegaard's Journals and Papers* (1967): "When the believer has faith, the absurd is not the absurd—faith transforms it, but in every weak moment it is again more or less absurd to him. The passion of faith is the only thing which masters the absurd" (7).

To be a true Christian is a choice and it can be accomplished through subjectivity and that poses the potential of the individual to accept faith passionately. In *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (1846), he claims: "Christianity is spirit, spirit is inwardness, inwardness is subjectivity, subjectivity is essentially passion, and in its maximum an infinite, personal, passionate interest in one's eternal happiness" (33).

Even though Kierkegaard's philosophy has many differences compared to the other later existentialist thinkers due to the religious nature of his philosophy,

he addresses some common themes which make him the father of existentialism. His focus on the authentic individual, his choices, and the untruth of the masses, subjectivity and subjective truth can be considered to be paving the way for modern existential thinking.

### 2.1.2 The Death of God: Friedrich Nietzsche

Another important figure for existentialism is the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900). Many scholars such as Karl Jaspers, Eugene Fink, Walter Kaufmann, Bernd Magnus and Robert Solomon have advocated Nietzsche as an existential thinker. In *Living with Nietzsche* (2003), Robert Solomon claims that Nietzsche is best interpreted as an existentialist thinker as his view of freedom is very much in line with Kierkegaard and Sartre's existentialism (181).

What makes Nietzsche such an overwhelming figure can be attributed to his descriptions of "nihilism". In consideration of the 19$^{th}$ century era when the readings of the Bible became dubious and the natural sciences and Darwinism came onto the stage, Nietzsche strived to demonstrate the death of God; that is, the absence of any theistic anchorage for the moral sense of living. Thus, he undertook to find a way for people to live without reliance on a divine being. However, the way that people lived and the morals that the Christian God posed created a kind of complicity. The Christian God dictated a life-denying stand as a model of morality. Thus, what Nietzsche did firstly was the elimination of god for the basis of morality. Even though Nietzsche was not the first philosopher who broke the ties between a Supreme Being and ethics, he was the first thinker who grounded his definition of morality on the famous motto "the will to power"; a motto that defies all shapes of authority.

Nietzsche attacks Christian morality as it preaches the kind of life in which all passions and human instincts are suppressed and what is left is not an individual but a slave. In his famous work *The Antichrist* (1895), he claims:

> Anything a theologian thinks is true must be false: this is practically a criterion of truth. His most basic instinct of self-preservation does not allow any scrap of reality to be honoured or even expressed. Wherever the influence of theologians is felt, value judgments are turned on their heads and the concepts of "true" and "false" are necessarily inverted: whatever hurts life the most is called "true", and whatever improves, increases, affirms, justifies life or makes it triumph is called "false". (8)

Nietzsche promotes a life in which all individuals can live up to their potentials, flourishing and realizing their existence. So, according to *The Antichrist* (1895), an individual who does not create his morality but depends on the dictates of a society or a religion is nothing but "an animal", conforming to the universal principles of morality and choosing a normative life (10-19).

In the absence of God, all values and truths must be created by people rather than accepting the handed down sets of morality. Nietzsche believed that an outside agency which supposedly has control over the lives of the individuals was not a comforting experience; it was overwhelming. The space left with the disappearance of God can be filled with the individual's aspiration to be himself, to be true to his own values, to live life to the full, to realize all his potential. Nietzsche thought that that is the way all morality and ethics should head towards with no concern for others and others' values. In *The Gay Science* (1882), he claims we can

> become who we are - human beings who are new, unique ... who give themselves laws, who create themselves! To that end we must become the best students and discoverers of everything lawful and necessary in the world: we must become physicists in order to become creators in this sense ... So, long live physics! And even more so that which compels us to turn to physics - our honesty! (335)

Another concept that Nietzsche pioneers is "Übermensch", introduced in his 1883 book *Also Sprach Zarathustra" ("Thus Spoke Zarathustra").* According to Nietzsche: "Man is a rope, fastened between animal and Übermensch – a rope over an abyss" (4). Thus, the ultimate goal of each and every individual is to become an overman; in Nietzsche's words: "Man is something that shall be overcome" (ibid).

Generally translated as "overman", "superman", "superhuman", Übermensch as described by Zarathustra in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (1883) refers to a person who is above and beyond pleasure, suffering and keen to risk all to overcome his nature. An overman is someone who is capable of creating his own values independently of others' notions of morality and ethics, thus defying the herd instincts and swarm intelligence. He is a free spirit living life to the full in the light of his own values (26-28). In the Prologue to *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Nietzsche describes the overman: "Behold, I teach you the overman! The overman is the meaning of the earth. Let your will say: The overman shall be the meaning of the earth!" (13)

What Nietzsche means by "the meaning of the earth" is that the struggle to overcome human nature is the real meaning of life. Overman is about "overcoming"; overcoming the life that is lived according to the rules set by common man and seeking a new way of life that is based upon total freedom and with no reliance upon God, who is dead. It is about overcoming the cowardice in man on their way to becoming an overman.

The fact that Nietzsche promotes a life which is not based on a divine entity is a token of existentialism. As a promoter of individualism and freedom, Nietzsche desires man to create their own values and defy the morality set by others and God. He wants man to be true to his nature, his own ideas and morals. All these make Nietzsche an existential thinker who still influences the understanding of modern philosophy.

### 2.1.3 Understanding *Dasein*: Martin Heidegger

One other important figure in understanding existentialism is Martin Heidegger. In his famous book *Being and Time* (1927) he sheds much light upon his conception of human existence. Traditional western philosophy assumed that anything that exists should be regarded as a substance that remains unvarying through change and that is the notion that Heidegger challenges in all his works. In *Being and Time*, he describes human existence as *Dasein*, which defies

traditional perception. While attempting to identify the "essential structures" of human existence, he makes use of our everyday life. Following that thought, Guignon (2004) comments that to "be a human is to be an *unfolding event* or *happening* that is so thoroughly enmeshed in a shared world that there is no way to draw a sharp line between either self and world or self and others" (120). Regarding the problem of what Dasein is, Heidegger suggests another attitude:

> Dasein always understands itself in terms of its existence – in terms of a possibility of itself: to be itself or not itself. Dasein has either chosen these possibilities itself, or got itself into them, or grown up in them already. Only the particular Dasein decides its existence, whether it does so by taking hold or by neglecting. The question of existence never gets straightened out except through existing itself. The understanding of oneself which leads along this way we call "existential." (33)

Briefly, the understanding of existence can be achieved by living our lives and attaining authentic selves. One of the main characterizations of Dasein is that it is not a thing but an event: the realization of life as a whole. Heidegger claims that its being is at issue for it. This means that we are beings that we care about; we are concerned about where our lives are going. Thus, we always take a stand in our lives. Heidegger points his attention to this stand when he says: "It is peculiar to this entity that with and through its being (i.e. the stand it takes) this being (i.e. its life in the world) is disclosed to it. Understanding of being is itself a definite characteristic of Dasein's being" (33).

In *Being and Time*, in order to achieve that sort of understanding, Heidegger advocates the idea of human existence as a happening with structural dimensions. One of these dimensions is *thrownness* (172). We do not choose to be in this world. We are simply thrown in to it:

> It is not the case that man "is" and then has, by way of an extra, a relationship-of Being toward the "world" – a world with which he provides himself occasionally. Dasein is never 'proximally' an entity which is, so to speak, free from Being-in, but which sometimes has the inclination to take up a "relationship" towards the world. Taking up relationships toward the world is possible only because Dasein, as Being-in-the-world, is as it is. (184)

What Heidegger implies is that we are ensnared in a world which situates us with certain possibilities to choose from and this world is unique for Dasein and Dasein interprets itself in relation to this world.

Another component of our lives is *projection.* Dasein is constantly projected into the future. That makes us "ahead of ourselves" and "outside of ourselves". We are always moving toward the realization of our lives. Heidegger calls this projection "being toward the death" or "being toward the end" (145). Thus, what defines us as beings is not the sum of all that we have experienced so far but also the possibilities that are open to us through our projection. In other words, we are what we make of ourselves and Dasein is defined by our actions and choices.

According to Heidegger, in the process of becoming ourselves, we are not alone but one with the whole world. There is no distinction that draws a sharp line between the self and the world and the self and the others. Through the public world, we realize ourselves and this means that we are not the center, either. Therefore, as Guignon (2004) claims: "We are also 'They' or the 'one' (das man)" (123).

Apart from focusing on the definition of Dasein, Heidegger also focuses on what makes Dasein "an authentic self". Guignon (2004) asserts:

> The conception of Dasein as an authentic self is distinguished from the concrete mode of existence Dasein achieves when it actually realizes this potentiality and becomes authentic, an existential mode Heidegger calls "authentic being-one's Self". The authentic Self is said to be a potentiality or "ability to be" whereas authentic being one's Self is a possibility, a specific and personal way of giving shape to one's own authentic Self. (124)

Thus, being a Self is an accomplishment and Selfhood is something that we need to achieve rather than something we have readily handed down to us.

The last aspect of Dasein is "understanding". According to Heidegger, understanding is a "self-projective being towards its own ability to-be" (236). This conception is a sort of summary of Heidegger's notion of being. Firstly, we have a life before us and with each and every action of us and then we take a stand on a kind of life we want to lead. With the projection of our existence, we become

*futural*. Finally, to be able to understand ourselves as self projecting beings makes us "self-constituting" and "self-making". Thus, "The essence of Dasein is existence" (171). Hence, it is possible to conclude that Heidegger is one of the exceptional philosophers regarding existentialism. He deals with the main concepts of existentialism such as freedom to choose a stand in life, constituting one own's self and authenticity.

### 2.1.4 Facing Absurdity: Albert Camus

Another important figure in the understanding of existentialism is the French thinker and writer Albert Camus, who is best known for his literary pieces such as *The Stranger* (1942) and *The Plague* (1947).

Camus's philosophy centers itself around the idea of man in his specific existential state and its *absurdity*. His work which gives the best frame of his philosophy, *The Myth of Sisyphus* (1942), is based on the Greek Myth of Sisyphus. Camus uses Sisyphus allegorically to represent humankind and the *absurd* condition of it. Originally, Sisyphus is punished by the god Pluto to roll a rock from the bottom to the top of a hill, and this action never ceases as the rock falls back and Sisyphus has to roll it up again and again in a fruitless manner. Camus uses this allegory to refer to the meaninglessness of life. This futile and hollow action suggests a nihilistic existence and the only solution to get rid of it is suicide. Camus problematizes the question of existence: whether one should go on living or simply commit suicide. He follows this idea thus: "There is but one truly serious philosophical problem, and that is suicide. Judging whether life is or is not worth living amounts to answering the fundamental question of philosophy. All the rest—comes afterwards" (1).

The inner dilemma which leads man to consider life as worth living or not, constitutes the main theoretical predicament in Camus's principles and to discover that his existence is pointless; it is absurd. The absurd comes with the realization of death and the irrationality of the world: "At this point of his effort man stands face to face with the irrational. He feels within him his longing for happiness and

for reason. The absurd is born of this confrontation between the human need and the unreasonable silence of the world" (28).

Even though existence itself has no meaning, Camus considers suicide as an action to be avoided. For him, life, despite lacking any significance and being *absurd*, should be considered as a challenge and its incongruity should not lead one to deem suicide as a way out because:

> The real effort is to stay there, rather, in so far as that is possible, and to examine closely the odd vegetation of those distant regions. Tenacity and acumen are privileged spectators of this inhuman show in which absurdity, hope, and death carry on their dialogue. The mind can then analyze the figures of that elementary yet subtle dance before illustrating them and reliving them itself. (4)

"Staying there" connotes the idea of keeping oneself alive as opposed to suicide as one can only comprehend something after having witnessed it. Considering the idea that Sisyphus symbolizes all mankind and its futile endeavors, Camus urges mankind to find solace in the sorrow of existence and he says: "One must imagine Sisyphus happy" (24). Sisyphus is at the bottom of the hill collecting all his strength to roll the rock up the hill. No matter how many times the rock falls and Sisyphus has to repeat the action, Sisyphus must be content as Camus says:

> I see that man going back down with a heavy yet measured step toward the torment of which he will never know the end. That hour like a breathing-space which returns as surely as his suffering, that is the hour of consciousness. At each of those moments when he leaves the heights and gradually sinks toward the lairs of the gods, he is superior to his fate. He is stronger than his rock! (23)

Camus envisages Sisyphus as happy and higher than his fate since Sisyphus is one who has come to terms with his punishment and gives in to it. In this way, he evades his punishment and his fate maker. What Camus purposes to advocate here is that we, the modern man, should do the same thing. We should try to craft our own fate and hate the fate maker:

> If this myth is tragic, that is because its hero is conscious. Where would his torture be, indeed, if at every step the hope of succeeding upheld him? The workman of today works everyday in his life at the same tasks, and his fate is no less absurd. But it is tragic only at the rare moments when it becomes conscious. Sisyphus, proletarian of the gods, powerless and rebellious,

> knows the whole extent of his wretched condition: it is what he thinks of during his descent. The lucidity that was to constitute his torture at the same time crowns his victory. There is no fate that cannot be surmounted by scorn. (23)

*Scorn* is the key expression. All fates can be eluded with the help of contempt for them and their makers. However, that is what makes life sustainable. Camus even observes that "there is no sun without shadow and there is no happiness without absurdity" (24). For him, "Happiness and the absurd are two sons of the same earth. They are inseparable. It would be a mistake to say that happiness necessarily springs from absurd discovery. It happens as well that the feeling of the absurd springs from happiness" (ibid). This mode of thinking opens up a new path for mankind as it insists on a life style that is godless. God is driven out of existence since it conveys to life dissatisfaction and a preference for futile suffering (ibid). Without god and its complications, man is free to be his own fate maker. Thus, Sisyphus also can be happy with his fate because "This universe henceforth without a master seems to him [Sisyphus] neither sterile nor futile. Each atom of that stone, each mineral flake of that night filled mountain, in itself forms a world. The struggle itself toward the heights is enough to fill a man's heart" (ibid).

In conclusion, Camus's philosophy, focusing on the absurdity of existence, urges man to create his own life and shape it as he wishes. The fact that being is absurd should not lead man to consider suicide as the natural outcome of such an existence. Instead, it should guide him to find his own meaning in this meaningless way of life.

## 2.2 JEAN-PAUL SARTRE AND AUTHENTICITY

The most prolific figure of existentialism is the French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre. The well-known maxim of Sartre - "existence precedes essence"- constitutes his main idea of existentialism. In a defense of his philosophy, *Existentialism is a Humanism* (1946), Sartre writes:

> What do we mean by saying that existence precedes essence? We mean that man first of all exists, encounters himself, surges up in the world – and defines himself afterwards. If man as the existentialist sees him is not definable, it is because to begin with he is nothing. He will not be anything until later, and then he will be what he makes of himself. Thus, there is no human nature, because there is no God to have a conception of it. (3)

In traditional philosophy, the case was of a much different nature. The concept of existence was considered to be connected with the notion of essence and the former was merely a manifestation of the latter. To illustrate, according to Aristotelian thinking, essence precedes existence and it is identified with the substance or substantial form. Essence is considered to make what a thing is. In *Posterior Analytics* (1850), Aristotle claims:

> How will you prove what a thing is? For it is necessary for anyone who knows what a man or anything else is to know too that it is (for of that which is not, no one knows what it is) ...we say it is necessary that everything that a thing is should be proved through demonstration, unless it is its substance. But being is not the substance of anything; for what is is not a genus. Therefore there will be a demonstration that it is. (152)

This mode of thinking has been sustained for a long time as the classical thought of existence until Sartre. In the existentialist sense, the essence is created by the individual after his existence. First, man exists in the world and then he creates himself. As Sartre puts it in his *Existentialism is a Humanism* (1946):

> Man simply is. Not that he is simply what he conceives himself to be, but he is what he wills, and as he conceives himself after already existing—as he wills to be after that leap towards existence. Man is nothing else but that which he makes of himself. That is the first principle of existentialism. (3)

Having no priori essence before his existence, man is obliged to create his own meaning and purpose in life. As life has no meaning, the individual who strives for it creates it on his own. By creating his own meaning, he crafts himself. In the process of creating himself, there are many phases that an individual is supposed to pass through to achieve his unique individuality, such as *abandonment*, *anguish*, *bad faith*, *facticity* and *transcendence*. Once an individual who accepts his essence as emerging from existence thrives in these endeavors, he can reach for *authenticity* which is the ultimate goal of existence in Sartrean thinking.

### 2.2.1 Abandonment

Abandonment is the state of forlornness. There is nothing for man to base his life upon in the case of abandonment. Man is left to himself with no external sources to give meaning to his life and thus, he is, as the word suggests, abandoned.

Throughout history, people have used certain guiding structures and institutions to base their existence upon. Religion has been one of them. By providing solid structures, religion has enabled men to assume that everything that exists has a purpose and place in the cosmos. However, for Sartrean existentialist thinking, the system of religion is bound to collapse under its scrutinizing eyes. In his defensive work, *Existentialism is a Humanism* (1946), Sartre comments that: "And when we speak of 'abandonment' – a favorite word of Heidegger – we only mean to say that God does not exist, and that it is necessary to draw the consequences of his absence right to the end" (5).

An inquisitive mind has the capability to find how arbitrary the seemingly solid structures of religion are and how they cannot form an objective truth as they claim to do. For if indeed existence precedes essence, one will never be able to explain one's action by reference to a given and specific human nature; in other words, there is no determinism – "man is free, man is freedom" (ibid). Also, if God does not exist, there are no values or commands that can legitimize people's behavior. Seeing through the deficiencies of the guiding structures like religion, man is left to himself, having solely his own self to rely upon. There are no predetermined sets of values, morality or a predetermined framework serving him, and that is why man is bound to decide his own purpose and meaning in life. Thus, in Sartrean terms, man is "condemned to be free" (5). This notion is what creates the notion of *abandonment*:

> Thus we have neither behind us, nor before us in a luminous realm of values, any means of justification or excuse. – We are left alone, without excuse. That is what I mean when I say that man is condemned to be free. Condemned, because he did not create himself, yet is nevertheless at liberty, and from the moment that he is thrown into this world he is responsible for everything he does. (5)

With this, Sartre equals the notion of abandonment with that of having the whole responsibility of one's lot. In the past, people had various means to base their existence upon such as religion, society and the common sets of rules. These institutions provided man with a guide concerning how to live life and the identity of the individuals was shaped after the fashion of these institutions. People relied on religion and the socially accepted virtues and norms to exist in the world. The question of freedom was in no way associated with creating one's self without applying for these sources. However, with the emergence of existentialism; religion, society, all set norms and values proved to be no longer the means of anchorage to sustain one's identity. For Sartre, whatever man does, there is nothing to justify him but himself. Therefore, as Sartre puts it, we decide our being.

### 2.2.2 Anguish

Once man feels abandoned in all senses, having no basis to base his existence and actions upon, what he feels is dread and grief and that is how "anguish" in the Sartrean sense comes into being. Tan explains anguish as "a consequence of the dread of the nothingness of human existence and the meaninglessness of it" (4). Anguish, the recognition of being nothing is a liberating force as man realizes that he is free and his actions constitute him.

Even though the word connotes a negative idea on its own, anguish is a cathartic force for the individual. In *Being and Nothingness* (1943), Jean-Paul Sartre states: "it is in anguish that man gets the consciousness of his freedom" (29). Thus, it is plausible to infer that anguish is the awareness of individual freedom. Sartre goes on: "Anguish is the mode of being of freedom as consciousness of being; it is in anguish that freedom is, in its being, in question for itself" (ibid). Even though anguish is the outcome of abandonment, Sartre claims that reality exists in action: "Man is nothing else but what he purposes, he

exists only in so far as he realizes himself; he is therefore nothing else but the sum of his actions, nothing else but what his life is" (7).

This conception gives man full responsibility of his life as his deeds decide his character. There are no excuses, no social conditions to be accounted for in one's actions since "we have neither behind us, nor before us in a luminous realm of values, any means of justification or excuse. – We are left alone, without excuse" (5). In other words; "In life, man commits himself, draws his own portrait and there is nothing but that portrait" (11). This portrait, be it good or bad, solely belongs to the individual; in its shaping only the individual is accountable and thus this kind of responsibility brings about a weighty sense of anguish. In *Being and Nothingness* (1943), he asserts:

> I must be without remorse or regrets as I am without excuse; for from the instant of my upsurge into being, I carry the weight of the world by myself alone without help, engaged in a world for which I bear the whole responsibility without being able, whatever I do, to tear myself away from this responsibility for an instant. (576)

As Sartre puts it, man is stripped of all means to unburden himself and thus it is inevitable to feel the anguish as a lonely and free individual. Moreover, the anguish that Sartre elaborates on is not limited to the grief and distress when one faces his freedom and the fact that he is accountable for his actions and deeds. It also entails the idea that when one chooses for oneself, he also chooses for others. This kind of responsibility weighs down on man and creates a more intense form of Sartrean anguish. In *Existentialism is a Humanism*, Sartre puts that:

> If, moreover, existence precedes essence and we will to exist at the same time as we fashion our image, that image is valid for all and for the entire epoch in which we find ourselves. (…) Our responsibility is thus much greater than we had supposed, for it concerns mankind as a whole. I am thus responsible for myself and for all men, and I am creating a certain image of man as I would have him to be. In fashioning myself I fashion man. (4)

Therefore, if an individual shapes both himself and the society along with it, that can only mean more responsibility on the individual's shoulders. In *Being and Nothingness* (1943), he even suggests that "It is certain that we cannot escape

anguish, for we are anguish" (67). Nathan Oaklander (1996) summarizes anguish as follows:

> In anguish I am conscious that the decisions I make in the future are of the utmost importance to me now, since I am that future person, and yet now I am powerless to affect my future. Anguish with respect to the future involves the realization that, because of my radical freedom (that is, the spontaneity of consciousness), I have no more control over my future than I have over your future. In anguish I apprehend my freedom as being the possible destroyer in the present and in the future of what I am. (13)

As man is free to choose, the dread that stems from the choices that he may make lead him towards a kind of dread. As no one can be sure of the correctness of their choices, the act of choosing becomes one of a yoke that one carries around one's neck. As choosing means anguish, one might expect a man who has embraced freedom to avoid making choices. However, according to Sartre in *Existentialism is a Humanism*, this anguish induced by such responsibility should not hinder man from taking action since

> It [existentialism] defines man by his action; nor as a pessimistic description of man, for no doctrine is more optimistic, the destiny of man is placed within himself. Nor is it an attempt to discourage man from action since it tells him that there is no hope except in his action, and that the one thing which permits him to have life is the deed. (8)

Thus, what Sartre believes is that if a man is enchained and engulfed within this anguish, he cannot move towards higher achievements and thus giving way to passivism and refraining from the freedom that one has been both bestowed with and condemned to is like living in *bad faith.*

### 2.2.3 Bad Faith

Another concept that emerges with the question of freedom is *bad faith*. Bad faith occurs when one encounters the abandonment and the anguish of freedom it entails. Once man is conscious of his freedom, the angst that he feels may lead him to turn to other sources to justify his actions. Therefore, according to Sartrean thinking, man lives in bad faith provided that he aims to rationalize his

existence through religion, society, norms and values that hold sway over the existence of man on earth.

In *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre refers to "bad faith" as the opposite of "authenticity", that is, "inauthenticity" (*mauvaise foie)*. According to Tan:

> "Bad faith" is also called "self-deception" and it refers to one's failure to follow his or her own essence. In Being and Nothingness, Sartre presents the notion of bad faith. According to him, the concept of "bad faith" consists of the individual consciousness possessing a false notion of self. For him, if it is said that a person owns the signs of bad faith, it means that he lies to himself somehow. That is, it implies self-deception. (8)

This lying brings the individual closer to acting in conformity with the others and turn his back on authenticity and freedom to choose for himself. Sartre claims: "The goal of bad faith is to put oneself out of reach; it is an escape" (89). What Sartre claims is that bad faith is an escape from the truth, reality, responsibility and autonomous action.

Bad faith is often linked to the concept of lying. However, lying has two facets herein. If a person lies to another one consciously by keeping the truth to himself he is just a liar. Nevertheless, if one lies to oneself and thus sugarcoats the truth, then it means that that person is in bad faith as he tries to deceive himself, not especially the others. In *Being and Nothingness*, he follows this idea as follows:

> One does not undergo his bad faith; one is not infected with it; it is not a state. But consciousness affects itself with bad faith. There must be an original intention and a project of bad faith; this project implies a comprehension of bad faith as such fundamentally and a pre-reflective apprehension of consciousness as affecting itself with bad faith. That is, the one we lie to and the one who lies are one and the same person, and that means that I as a deceiver am aware of the fact that is hidden from me as the deceived, and also that I must know the truth clearly in order to mask and obscure it more carefully, and this happens through a single project and the duality of the lie is not present here. (72)

Therefore, living in bad faith is a self-conscious act on one's part. One sees the truth but still denies it. The realization of freedom may prove too weighty to bear upon and thus man gravitates towards a lie that can alleviate this sense of responsibility that the freedom brings about. Even though bad faith can be termed

as lying to oneself and attributing all to external sources, it can be understood better through its relation to authenticity.

### 2.2.4 Authenticity

> This above all – to thine own self be true,
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.
> (*Hamlet*, II.iii.77-9)

In his various works, Sartre argues that the virtue that constitutes his philosophy is *authenticity.* He points out many examples of authentic and inauthentic modes of living with no clear explanation about the clear-cut definition of authenticity. Still, it is possible to come up with an understanding of authenticity with the help of two fundamental concepts: "transcendence" and "facticity."

In his book *Sartre on Authenticity* (2011), Weberman elaborates on Sartrean authenticity. He claims that "Our transcendence [synonymous here with freedom] consists in the human capacity to negate or to question the way things are [ourselves included], to envision the way things are not but might be and to act on that knowledge. It is the capacity to discern possibilities that account for our freedom" (880). What Weberman means by transcendence is that it is a sort of seeing the possibilities in existence of the things and having a glimpse of what they can turn into other than their present beings. Weberman follows this strain of thought as follows:

> Sartre captures this idea with his phrase that we are what we are not and we are not what we are. In other words, unlike things such as rocks and inkwells which are fully identical with themselves, human beings are non-self-coincident. We are not (only) what we are, i.e. the sum-total of our past and present attributes but we are (also) what we are not (yet), i.e. the sum-total of our future possibilities". (880-881)

What can be inferred from this is that an individual can choose to be whatever he wants and he is free to do that. There is nothing hindering his progress towards

higher goals, and as there are many possibilities, man can create himself to be a completely new person no matter what the initial ground he has been standing on.

What accompanies transcendence is facticity. "Facticity" is limitedness. Even though human beings are completely free in their actions and thoughts, they are situated in circumstances which are beyond their capacity to alter. They are restricted by their past, bodies and their beings for others. No matter what they do, they cannot change the past and the events that have led to the present. They are also constrained within their bodies which have no power to transcend the material world like a divine being. In *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre describes the body as "an inert presence as a passive object among other objects" (100). Additionally, though man has some power upon how others view him, he cannot control it completely. It constitutes his being in a certain aspect. It may even define his future actions. That is why, according to Weberman (2011), Sartre argues that:

> Human beings are composed of two aspects: on the one hand, their freedom to surpass what is, and, on the other hand, the factical constraints on their freedom which derive from their past, their bodies and their image in the eyes of others. (881)

The bad faith which has been explained afore in a brief manner and which Sartre identifies as one of the milestones of his philosophy denotes the idea of a type of self-deception based upon the dilemma between *transcendence* and *facticity*. In *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre clarifies this impasse in this way:

> The basic concept which is thus engendered utilizes the double property of the human being, who is at once a facticity and a transcendence. These two aspects of human reality are and ought to be capable of a valid coordination. But bad faith does not wish either to coordinate them or to surmount them in a synthesis. Bad faith seeks to affirm facticity as being transcendence and transcendence as being facticity. (79)

Thus, it is the job of an individual to maintain a harmony between his situatedness and his freedom to achieve authenticity. In his book, *Anti-Semite and Jew* (1946), Sartre claims that "Man may be defined as a being having freedom within the limits of a situation [and] … authenticity … consists in having a true and lucid consciousness of the situation, in assuming the responsibilities and risks

that it involves, in claiming (*revendiquer*) it in pride or humiliation, sometimes in horror and hate" (90).

Sartre's view of authenticity is discussed in many of his books, especially in *Being and Nothingness.* The most prominent aspect that arises in this work is the question of being. For Sartre, the being of human beings comprises everything that it is and it is not. This is where the concept of *nonbeing* emerges and the theme and the relationship between *being and nonbeing* can be traced all through Sartre's philosophy on existence and identity.

For Sartre, beings cannot be comprehended unless accompanied by *nothingness,* as he states in *Being and Nothingness:*

> It is within being qua being that non-being must arise, and within non-being that being must spring up; and this relation cannot be a fact, a natural law, but an upsurge of the being which is its own nothingness of being. (140)

He makes being and nonbeing inseparable components of human existence, and the nature of human beings hinges on the correlation between *being* and *nothingness.* Following this idea, Sartre makes a division of being: "being-in-itself" and "being-for-itself". In the book titled *Humanism of the Other* (2005), Emmanuel Lévinas observes that: "The Sartrean self is not a concrete self-in-the-world but rather the reflective consciousness of that self-in-the-world as a meaning projected by its own reflective consciousness" (17). This consciousness is not limited with mental implication but also endorses the physical aspects of human beings. The two of them combined have the traces of *facticity*; that is, they are not privy to the freedom that is shaped by consciousness but the factors that are beyond the capacity of human beings to control. According to Sartre, there are things over which the individuals have no power. These are birth place, body, and other people's perceptions. These things cannot be changed and therefore, they are the limits of an individual. Therefore, what matters is that an individual achieves transcendence, shackling the limitations imposed on him by his own facticity in the world.

"Being-in-itself" is a term that connotes the idea of being as facticity. It signifies a lack of consciousness and an incapability of making choices. That is

why, in *Being and Nothingness,* Sartre terms this kind of being as pure being: "The (being) in-itself has nothing secret; it is solid (*massif*)" (22). Therefore, "being-in-itself" simply refers to objects which just exist. They have no subjectivity and lack consciousness. They are not aware of their existence or value.

On the other hand, "being-for-itself" encompasses the solidness of "being-in-itself" united with "nothingness". Human beings are aware of themselves and their existence. They are cognizant of the objective and factical aspects of their being, in addition to its subjective and conscious facets. The fusion of "being-in-itself" and "nothingness" enables the idea that the state of being embodies both being and non-being. Thus, it is plausible to conclude that human beings can have "being" (being-in-itself) to the extent that their lives can be ascertained by their facticity which includes their past, physical aspects, the family they are born into etc. However, this *being* also has another component adhering to it; it entails the state of *non-being;* in other words, the absence of all kinds of determinism caused by facticity. Hence, the result turns out to be that even though man is situated in certain aspects, he is free to designate his essence, allot meaning to his existence, and shape his life and future through the choices he makes with his consciousness.

As stated earlier, these two aspects of being; "in-itself" and "for-itself" correspond to two important concepts: "facticity" and "transcendence". While facticity indicates the situatedness of human beings, transcendence points out that this situatedness can be surpassed through individuals' choices. People can be more than what they are positioned to be. Facticity cannot be an obstacle in man's endeavor to be free and exercise his freedom. Man accommodates *consciousness* in his nature, and freedom is one of the indispensable components of this consciousness. In *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre puts it this way:

> Consciousness is consciousness of something. This means that transcendence is the constitutive structure of consciousness; that is that consciousness emerges supported by a being which is not itself. (17)

What Sartre means is that consciousness is born out of something which is not consciousness itself. It reveals itself as already existent and free from

consciousness. Thus, in Sartrean terms, consciousness turns out to be something ethereal; that is, nothingness. As it is nothing, it is separated from the object by being something other than it. Thus, consciousness is aloof from any solid existence or essence. In consequence, man in his consciousness questions his being and existence which lead him to ponder on his own nothingness:

> Nothingness takes on a kind of borrowed being. In itself it is not, but it gets its efficacy concretely from Being. Nothingness can annihilate itself only on the foundation of being; if nothingness can be given, it is neither before nor after being, nor in a general way outside of being. Nothingness lies coiled in the heart of being-like a worm. (45)

For Sartre "Man is the being through whom nothingness comes to the world" (47). Since it is a kind of "negation" and "annihilation", the being of man is separated from it (ibid). With the emergence of nothingness, man's freedom comes into question. It is viable to observe that nothingness in the shape of a "worm" is a very important part of human nature as it constitutes man's freedom. Nothingness represents a lack of everything. Thus, it is man's lot to create everything in the absence of it. This creation provides man with the preference for freedom. In his essay, *Existentialism is a Humanism*, Sartre states that "man is condemned to be free: condemned, because he did not create himself, yet nonetheless free, because once cast into the world, he is responsible for everything he does" (29). This is not a choice but an obligation. Each and every man is free no matter if he is aware of it or not. Man creates his own meaning and essence through the choices he makes and thus projects himself to the future.

Being "condemned to be free", man has a life to live and a death to die in his own way. With these rights, man has nothing to rely upon but himself. This brings about the full responsibility that man has to carry on his shoulders. There is no one or no institution that can share this burden with him. He should bear the encumbrance all by himself and he has nothing and no one to blame. Since "existence precedes essence", he needs to create values with the help of which he can maintain his existence (3).

This inescapability of freedom does not propose that man can do whatever he wants. On the contrary, the choices a man makes should be weighed out with

responsibility. Man is responsible for his decisions. Even when he is not choosing, he chooses. Even when he chooses to ignore his freedom, he chooses. As a consequence, this freedom becomes a part of man's nature which cannot be avoided. Sartre articulates his view of freedom in *Being and Nothingness* as follows:

> I am condemned to exist forever beyond my essence, beyond the causes and motives of my act. I am condemned to be free. This means that no limits to my freedom can be found except freedom itself or, if you prefer, that we are not free to cease being free. (461-62)

However, this freedom is not recognized by all men as they give into fear to bear full responsibility and attempt to blame the other for the outcome of his choices. That is why, Sartre claims that "Human reality may be defined as a being such that in its being its freedom is at stake because human reality perpetually tries to refuse to recognize its freedom" (ibid). Hence, freedom coincides with nothingness which has a transcendent implication in it: "Freedom is precisely the nothingness which is made-to-be at the heart of man and which forces human-reality to make itself instead of to be. Man cannot be sometimes slave and sometimes free; he is wholly and forever free or he is not free at all" (463).

Here again, the idea of freedom presages the responsibility accompanying it. Being "wholly and forever free", man bears the full burden of his actions. Thus, the possibility of authentic life emerges. Man needs to recognize the inevitability of freedom and its outcomes so that he can call himself an authentic individual.

When an individual once recognizes the fact that he is free, he begins to choose for himself. Nevertheless, he has no guidelines to fall back on throughout this choosing process. So, how come can he know about the outcomes of his choices? This uncertainty caused by freedom leads him to have doubts about the future, which becomes uncertain in turn. If he chooses one action instead of the other, consequences can be worse. This possibility always exists. However, in existentialism, since man's existential situation does not provide him with any recommendation or direction, the choices he makes play an important part in crafting him. In this course, man creates himself through the choices he makes no matter how ignorant he is about the outcomes of a certain choice.

This is where the complexity with authenticity arises. Man has to accept his state of freedom, act with the realization of it and accept anguish as the natural outcome. In addition to anguish, he has to come to terms with abandonment and avoid bad faith. He should not give vent to despair, which results from the things he cannot change as a result of facticity. He should break away from anguish which he finds himself in. This anguish may occur due to the fact that while he is choosing for himself, he also chooses for mankind. In *Existentialism is a Humanism*, Sartre states that:

> Our responsibility is thus much greater than we had supposed, for it concerns mankind as a whole. (…) I am thus responsible for myself and for all men, and I am creating a certain image of man as I would have him to be. In fashioning myself I fashion man. (4)

With all the responsibility weighing down on his shoulders, man may have the tendency to throw his responsibility on to something outside of his choice. He may manifest a dependence on a divine entity, or indicate his upbringing, environment or family so that they can have a share in his choices. However, this will point out his being in bad faith. Thus, it is solely his responsibility to be in charge of his actions and life if he wants to achieve authenticity.

Once a man achieves freedom by evading the pitfalls of bad faith, he becomes an authentic individual. When one is rid of bad faith and bears the full responsibility of his actions, he can be authentic. As Tan summarizes: "One can achieve authentic existence only by realizing one's possibilities and constituting one's own values and meaning in life" (7). Therefore, as man is free, it depends on him to craft himself into an authentic individual. This thought is aligning with Sartre's following opinion:

> The existentialist says that the coward makes himself cowardly, the hero makes himself heroic; and that there is always a possibility for the coward to give up cowardice and for the hero to stop being a hero. What counts is the total commitment. (43)

For Sartre "What is at the very heart and centre of existentialism, is the absolute character of the free commitment" (47). Thus, achieving authenticity is a self-realizing and self-committing process. As man is free, he creates himself anew with every choice he makes.

All the terms and concepts of existentialism discussed here are closely connected to Fowles's fiction. In his novels, John Fowles has characters who struggle with anguish, bad faith and they try to achieve authenticity. In *The Collector*, Frederick Clegg and Miranda aim at being unique and free in their own way. In *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, Sarah and Charles are in struggle against the forces against their freedom and authenticity. Both of these novels embrace Sartre's understanding of existentialism and that is why, it is worthwhile to analyze those characters in terms of existential authenticity. In the analysis, what this study purposes at drawing is an attempt to depict the personality of these characters as *inauthentic* in Sartrean terms. The reason why these characters fail at the attainment of a unique self can be traced in Fowles's understanding of the acclaimed ideology. Fowles himself has been quite immersed with Existentialism and this concern of his has been reflected in his works. Additionally, Fowles has brought a new approach to Sartrean existentialism in which he refutes some ideas of Sartre and the idea concerning the attainment of an authentic self. Therefore, in order to demonstrate both the differences and similarities between Sartre's and Fowles's understanding of this ideology, the next section presents an overview of existentialism in Fowlesian terms.

## 2.3 JOHN FOWLES AND EXISTENTIALISM

In an interview with Daniel Halpern in 1971, John Fowles emphasizes his interest in freedom and choice by claiming:

> Freedom, yes. How you achieve freedom. That obsesses me. All my books are about that. The question is, is there free will? Can we choose freely? Can we act freely? Can we choose? How do we do it?" (Halpern, 25)

Fowles was greatly influenced by Existentialism and reflected it in his works. He is concerned with various existential themes such as freedom, identity, existence and how to be an authentic individual. These are the main themes that he explores in his works of fiction and nonfiction. The book which encompasses his notions of existentialism is *The Aristos*, published in 1964. In the book, he formulates his

own philosophy, which is quite close at heart to Sartrean existentialism. In *The Aristos*, he defines existentialism as "the revolt of the individual against all those systems of thought, theories of psychology, and social and political pressures that attempt to rob him of his individuality" (123). Having placed existentialism in the spectrum of "revolt" and rebellion against social norms, Fowles sees it as "a realization of the need he has to learn to choose and control his life" (ibid).

The control over one's life is what brings one to an achievement of a unique self. When man chooses for himself and acts on it, he asserts his independence, and thus reaches for authenticity. Therefore, what Fowles aims to uphold is that man is responsible for all of his actions and this is the only way that can carry man towards the attainment of a free self. For Fowles, a true existentialist "has by his belief to judge every situation on its merits, to assess his motives anew before every situation and only then to choose" (124).

Apart from independence and freedom, Fowles focuses on another aspect of Sartrean existentialism that relates to the existence of God. He defines God as "a situation. Not a power, or a being, or an influence. Not a 'he' or a 'she', but an 'it'. Not entity or non-entity, but the situation in which there can be both entity and non-entity" (25). For Fowles, the question of God is another problem that man has to overcome in order to attain a unique self:

> Because people cannot understand that what is not can influence what is, they maintain God is and does. Our ignorance of "God" and its motives will always remain infinite. To ask "What is God?" is as futile as to ask "When does infinity begin and end?". Existence is ultimately or potentially knowable; "God" is infinitely unknowable. The most we shall ever learn is why existence is as it is; why it requires such laws and such constituents to continue. We shall never learn ultimately why it is. (ibid)

As the problem of the existence of God is an unsolvable issue, Fowles believes that instead of wasting energy to prove what cannot be proved, man should focus on freedom: "Freedom of will is the highest human good; and it is impossible to have both that freedom and an intervening divinity. We, because we are a form of matter, are contingent; and this terrifying contingency allows our freedom" (16). What Fowles aims to assert is that focusing too much on the existence of a divine entity is a limit to one's freedom. As man is situated within a body and a world;

this dependency allows his freedom. This freedom entails one's resistance to believe in an intervening God and other social norms. Freedom is only attained when an individual is rid of the fetters that chain him down to his oblique sense of the world. To bring forward the sense of individualism, Fowles claims as follows:

> To most people, it is a pleasure to conform and a pleasure to belong; existentialism is conspicuously unsuited to political or social subversion, since it is incapable of organized dogmatic resistance or formulations of resistance. It is capable only of one man's resistance; one personal expression of view; such as this book [*The Aristos*]. (103-104)

As elaborated above, Sartrean existentialism and Fowles's view of freedom have strong resemblances. Both of them indicate attempts at achieving a free, authentic individual, and they demonstrate the ways to accomplish that end. However, despite these resemblances, Sartrean understanding of existentialism differs from Fowles's understanding in various aspects. The first difference lies in the division of all humanity into two separate groups. Maintaining the individual's resistance to obey and surrender to the conventions of organized society, Fowles divides this society which he calls "most people" into two: the Few and the Many, after the fashion of the Greek philosopher Heraclitus. "The Few" or "the aristo" (aristos in plural) means "the intellectually elite and the good ones" while "the Many" or "hoi polloi", is the "unthinking, conforming mass" (9). It denotes and supports the idea that the majority of mankind is not highly intelligent, gifted or moral while there exists a small group of people who aspire to the good things in life, especially freedom.

For Fowles, even though there is no clear-cut division between these groups of people, "The Few" is different from the mass in terms of intelligence, morality and freedom while "the Many" conforms and acts in a single body (9-10). This notion differs from the Sartrean understanding as for Sartre, each and every individual can achieve the ultimate goal of existence, which is authenticity, no matter what his conditions are and who he is. Sartre does not make a differentiation among human beings concerning their attainment of freedom. However, for Fowles, not everyone can achieve a sense of freedom since the majority of the human beings are not capable of growth. Thus, what is valid for

everyone in the Sartrean understanding is denied to the general public by Fowles as he sees the attainment of a real and unique self as belonging to a higher intelligence, not the common man. Even though there is a division between men concerning their intelligence and conformity, Fowles also asserts that the division between the Few and the Many is not as definite and clear-cut as it seems. He voices this idea in *The Aristos* by claiming "the dividing line between the Few and the Many must run through each individual, not between the individuals" (9). Therefore, one can partially belong to the Few and partially to the Many at the same time. Therefore, Fowles claims that "We are all sometimes of the Many" (211). Acheson sees this division of forces as:

> The Few and The Many running through each individual rather than existing as opposing forces, thus suggesting that this unresolved tension between the real and the ideal is part of what it means to be human, anchored in reality yet inevitably yearning for more. (144)

Thus, the idea of Few and Many lose the definite edge and turn into a more augmented and blended notion. One's total aim is to belong to the Few; however, in the process one cannot avoid falling back on the Many. This division evolves into a continuum on which the position of an individual fluctuates between the Few and the Many and the higher goal is to get closer to the Few and avoid the pitfalls of being one of the Many.

From this division between the elite and the mass arises one of the most prominent existential notions of Fowles: "having" and "being". In *The Aristos*, John Fowles talks about the obsession of the modern age: having. For Fowles, this craze to "have" something all the time is a token of derangement and unfreedom. He claims that "Having, not being, governs our time" (124) and in addition to that, "It is the possessor who is always the possessed. Our mania for collecting not only objects worth money but experiences (…) finally make[s] us poor in all but the economic sense" (128). Fowles defines this collector mentality in the form of "having" as:

> the inability to conceive of pleasure except as being in some way connected with getting (…) An experience is now something that has to be possessed as an object bought can be possessed; and even other human

> beings, husbands, wives, mistresses, lovers, children, friends, come to be possessed or unpossessed objects (ibid).

The Many is the group who is always after "having" something in order to assert his existence while the Few focuses on "being". "Being" is the process of freedom, attaining the knowledge of the self and becoming a unique individual. However, with "having", one cannot transcend one's situatedness and gets stuck in a vicious circle of repetition. Thus, once again for Fowles, belonging to the general mass and common man decides one's attempts at a higher level of understanding of existence.

Another difference posed by Fowles against Sartrean existentialism lies in the understanding of free will. According to Sartre, we possess free will and even though we are situated in certain circumstances that we cannot alter and which constitute facticity, by using our free will, we can transcend our limitations and achieve authenticity. However, for Fowles, free will is a problematic issue since he does not take its existence for granted. For Fowles, there is a limitation posed on our free will and in *The Aristos,* he states that as follows:

> It may turn out finally that indeed we do not, in some evolutionary or biological sense, possess any free will. All our "free" choices may be finally attributable to some conditioning over which we have no control. Even if we could establish the contrary – total free will – we are still limited, since to be completely free we should need an absolutely free field of choice as well as the freedom to choose in it. (70)

What Fowles tries to assert is that despite the belief in free will, the individuals do not possess complete and unadulterated free will and they are not completely free to choose as they are situated in circumstances that we cannot alter. The limitedness is a remainder of Sartrean facticity which, according to Sartre, can be transcended. However, Fowles believes that these limitations hold a greater sway on the individual and his free will as he comments that:

> We are in fact confined to the courses of action available, perceivable and feasible to us. I cannot choose whether to be a woman or not because I was born a male; and so on. Yet there remains the fact that we all have experiences of situations when we *feel* (and more importantly, an outside observer can feel) we choose freely. We, perhaps, are almost certainly machines; but we are machines so complex that they have developed a

> relative freedom to choose. We are in a prison cell, but it is, or can be made to become, a comparatively spacious one; and inside it we can become relatively free. (ibid)

Unlike Sartre, Fowles believes that there are things we cannot choose and therefore, we are limited in situations that cannot be surmounted. This understanding betokens the idea of determinism. In other words, the choices one makes depend upon the circumstances. However, there is a sense of free will that individuals experience and Fowles terms it as "relative freedom" since even this freedom does not suggest the idea of complete free will.

Despite its negating nature, Fowles asserts that there is still purpose in "relative freedom". He states that:

> If we are only relatively free, then it must be so that we shall evolve a grater relative freedom. This freedom is something that has to be gained: both by the individual in his own lifetime, and by the species during its long history. (72)

According to Fowles, the "greater relative freedom" can be gained by "greater intelligence and greater knowledge, both of self and life. In practical social terms, it requires a higher general standard of education and a different kind of education. Above all it requires social equality. Freedom of will is strictly related to the freedom of living condition" (ibid). Hence, it is possible to conclude that Fowles places a greater emphasis on the social conditions and the freedom involved within in relation to the identification of free will and freedom to choose. Even though Sartre believes that things that we have no control over cannot affect the fact that we have complete freedom, Fowles seems suspicious this idea by placing the situatedness at a higher level of importance and points that "Freedom of will in a world without freedom is like a fish in a world without water. It cannot exist because it cannot use itself" (83). Kerry McSweeny comments that:

> Fowles is concerned to show the necessity for an individual to understand the ways in which he has been shaped by his class background and to transcend the limitations imposed upon his selfhood by class consciousness. (107)

Thus, what shape Fowlesian freedom are the situations that one is placed in. At the end of *The Aristos*, Fowles puts forward the characteristics of the "ideal man",

which is at heart quite similar to the authentic individual in Sartrean terms (211). As in the case of the authentic man, the "ideal man" does not belong and he "will avoid membership. There can be no organization to which he fully belongs; no country, no class, no church, no political party" (ibid). The "ideal man" or "the aristo" is also aware of "the necessity of his suffering, his isolation and his death" like the authentic individual (212). He also knows that "all religious and political creeds are *faute de mieux;* are utilities" (ibid). However, "the ideal man" differs from the Sartrean authentic individual since for Fowles, in order to be "the aristo", one has to "accept one's limited freedom, to accept one's isolation, to accept this responsibility, to learn one's particular powers, and then with them to humanize the whole" (213). "Limited freedom" is the key concept at the core of this definition. Unlike the Sartrean authentic individual who is deemed to have unlimited freedom, Fowles emphasizes once again the limited aspects of our beings and freedom. The idea of the Few and the Many can be more comprehensible in that aspect as well. While it is possible to get closer to the Few, for Fowles, once can never be completely one of the Few as the Many plays a huge role in the attainment of freedom and unique identity.

To conclude, even though Sartrean existentialism and Fowlesian understanding of the acclaimed philosophy have strong resemblances, they also differ in their perception of freedom. While Sartre grants the individual total freedom and therefore urges man to transcend any kinds of limitations posed on him, Fowles emphasizes the limits to our freedom and the idea that human beings may not in fact have free will.

Therefore, in addition to the notions and phases of Sartrean existentialism and authenticity, this study will focus on *The Collector* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman* in terms of Fowles's notions of freedom by studying the notions of the Few and the Many along with the concepts of "being" and "having". The study aims to portray the characters in these novels as *inauthentic* both in the Sartrean and Fowlesian terms of freedom and authenticity and in doing so, it aims to depict the Fowlesian idea of the nonexistence of free will since the circumstances and the conditions one is situated within play an essential role in

deciding one's fate towards authenticity or inauthenticity. Since for Fowles, individuals are restricted from the very beginning of their existence, their achievement of authentic identities depends on these limits. Therefore, the study intends to demonstrate the traits that make the characters in these novels inauthentic and problematize the attainment of freedom in limited conditions and situations to convey the idea that the characters cannot achieve authenticity due to the limitations posed in their existence.

# CHAPTER 3

## *THE COLLECTOR* AND AUTHENTICITY

*The Collector* (1963) has been a major commercial success of John Fowles since its publication, and as David Punter (2013) puts it, "it is a book which has ever since excited a great deal of critical and political debate" (62). The book also stands out as the first novel of the acclaimed author, John Fowles. Syhama Bagchee (1980) claims that:

> Speaking about *The Collector* a few months after its publication, John Fowles commented that he was "shocked" to find British "intellectual" periodicals treating the novel as mere crime fiction. He explained that it was really a serious novel dealing with important philosophical questions about authentic and inauthentic existence. (219)

*The Collector* revolves around a story of abduction and murder. It is a disquieting account of an unstable man Frederick Clegg, who abducts a young woman, Miranda, and keeps her caged in the basement of his home. However, the story is not only interlinked with a crime and its outcomes. Seungjae Lee (2005) in his study of *The Collector* comments on the genre of the novel by stating that: "At first glance, *The Collector* is a crime fiction or a thriller, but easy classification might be inappropriate" (3). Additionally, Fowles himself is against the idea of the novel being viewed as mere crime fiction. In an interview with Rowland Mockridge (1963), Fowles claims: "I don't want it taken as a thriller and reviewed in crime columns. It's symbolic, it's an allegory" (21). Therefore, it is possible to assume that there is more to *The Collector* than just a crime story. Wolfe (1979) classifies the novel as "a fantasy told in precise, realistic details" (52).

The novel has a macabre aspect, which can also explain the interest by the public. According to Katherine Tarbox (1987), "The feeling of confinement is what thrilled the millions of readers who bought this novel" (52). However, the novel does not only consist of the relation of a crime as Tarbox furthers her point:

"But like Hitchcock and Poe and James and Hawthorne, Fowles treats many serious subjects beneath the thrills, subjects which come to light through his delicate handling of the double point of view" (ibid). Thus, the richness of content, other themes and theories can be observed in the novel as sewn within the novel.

In his "Preface" to the *The Aristos* (1964), the book that encompasses his attitude towards life and philosophy, John Fowles states that his purpose in *The Collector* was to "attempt to analyze through a parable some of the results of what he sees as a 'confrontation' between 'the Few and the Many' (10). Following a similar strain of division, Pamela Cooper in her study *The Fictions of John Fowles: Power, Creativity, Femininity* (1991) classifies *The Collector* as "the clash between a socially entrenched, wealthy middle class and an underprivileged but upwardly mobile working or lower middle class, dubbed 'the New People' in the book" (21). *The Collector* swirls around the story of two quite striking and dissimilar characters: Frederick Clegg and Miranda Grey. In his work *John Fowles* (1979), Peter Wolfe comments on the relationship between these characters: "It [*The Collector*] features two people who have nothing in common and nothing to say to each other" (79). Clegg stands out as a member of the Many while Miranda seems to represent the Few.

The novel is narrated from two different perspectives. Being divided into four parts, it begins with the first person narration of Clegg, and the second part is constituted of Miranda's diary. The novel ends with Clegg's recounting once again. Therefore, the narration of the novel stands out as well as its theme. In his book *John Fowles's Fiction And The Poetics of Postmodernism* (1992), Salami observes that

> The most remarkable narrative feature of *The Collector* is its presentation of a multiplicity of texts. (…) The creators of these different texts are two alternative first-person narrators: Clegg and Miranda who are both given the roles of two surrogate authors who construct their own character. The novel begins with Clegg's narrative told in the first person and ends also with Clegg's narration of Miranda's death. Contained within Clegg's narrative is Miranda's diary also written in the first-person. This dual structure in which one narrative is contained within the other mirrors the novel's theme of imprisonment and foregrounds the struggle of the

> feminine character to obtain her freedom as a human being and as the creator of her own text. (46)

In that sense, the freedom of the reader in terms of interpretation comes onto the stage. Being the essential issue of the novel, the concept of freedom is observed to be reflected in the narrative technique. Katherine Tarbox points out this feature of the novel as follows:

> Fowles carefully maneuvers the reader into a dialectic within himself. The only standards of judgment for all the confusions in the book are within that reader. In this sense, the narrative technique mirrors the theme of freedom. The reader's freedom is counterpoised against Miranda's lack of freedom, and the arguments he carries on within himself parallel Miranda's thinking in her cell. The reader, like Miranda, is alone. (77)

Noting the narrative technique of the novel as a contribution to the main theme, the book encompasses Miranda and Clegg's endeavors towards a unique and independent identity. Peter Wolfe (1979) considers Frederick Clegg as "one of the modern literature's best portrayals of a weak man" (51). Clegg, also called Ferdinand as a reference to *The Tempest,* is a lower-middle class clerk who gets the chance to escape from this life by means of winning on the pools. He has a problematic background and childhood. In the first chapter of the novel, he talks about his parents and their death. He mentions the sudden death of his father in a car accident when he was only two and how his mother left him with his Aunt Annie, Uncle Dick and cousin Mable and went off, never to be seen again. This tragic beginning in life has brought about an unusual upbringing which has led him to solitude. He has been guided and channeled by his Uncle Dick, whom Clegg loves to the point of adoration and that kind of esteem for his uncle has been the reason why he has suffered intensely after his decease. Secluded within a small circle, Clegg, with the demise of his mentor, finds himself quite incapable of forming strong bonds or casual relationships. He has no emotional attachment to his friends at the clergy and calls himself "the lone wolf" (12). He judges himself to be an entomologist collecting butterflies after the fashion of his uncle and this devotion to the compilation constitutes his sole occupation and interest.

Miranda, on the other hand, is an art student who belongs to upper class. She is surrounded by friends and family members. Having been granted a remarkable scholarship, she has high aspirations in life and there are people she looks up to. She spends her days with her mentor George Paston, who is also an artist. The tragic turn in her life occurs when she is kidnapped by Clegg, whom she does not know at all. She is locked up in the basement of a house that Clegg has bought specifically for that reason. The second part of the novel consists of her diary relating the circumstances of her confinement. She tries to grasp the reasons for her confinement and the life she has led before. As she has a lot of time to think, her ruminations provide an insight into her frame of mind concerning society, art, and the people she is surrounded with as the confinement provides her with an opportunity to go through her notions of achieving a unique identity. The novel ends with Miranda's death by pneumonia stemming from a cold she catches and she dies. However, Miranda's death does not prove to be the end of Clegg's story. He decides to abduct another girl similar to Miranda and goes on with his vicious circle.

The story, along with many themes, is closely interwoven with many aspects of existentialism. The shadow of existentialist thinking can be traced throughout the narration of the characters and the main theme of the novel. Katherine Tarbox (1986) claims that:

> The contrasts Fowles makes between the two characters, then, define their attitudes toward life: Clegg is given to destruction, Miranda to creation. The ways in which Fowles compares them, however, mitigate this polarity and draw them together in one common flaw--their lack of existential freedom. (…) Un-freedom, in all its many manifestations, is the great evil in this novel. (62-3)

Both of these characters go through the phases of Sartrean existentialism. In the portrayal of the characters, it is also possible to trace the notions of Fowles in regard to the achievement of an authentic self and freedom. The aim of this chapter is to explore the way Sartrean existentialism and Fowles's opinions about this ideology affect the whole opus and the meaning of *The Collector* by focusing on the two main characters and analyzing their behavior on their way to trying to

become authentic individuals. This study purposes at drawing them as *inauthentic* on their journey to the attainment of unique personalities by demonstrating that they cannot overcome various limitations imposed over them. Clegg with a criminal mind lives through a new understanding of himself which is completely opposite of authenticity while Miranda, an aspiring artist, cannot achieve authenticity due to her physical confinement and her incapability to further her progress.

## 3.1 FREDERICK CLEGG AND AUTHENTICITY

Pamela Cooper (1991) puts that "Frederick or Ferdinand Clegg who is the collector of the title is a banal sort of madman" and "notably the undereducated and psychologically disturbed male protagonist" (31, 48). He is an individual isolated from the society who is desperately in need of having connection with people. After winning the pools, he decides to move to London where he buys a country house. He refurbishes it with the necessary cautions against the possible escape of Miranda, whom he does not know closely but through an obsession of stalking her. Later on, he kidnaps and holds her as his captive till her death from pneumonia. With the early lines of his narration, his personality begins to unfold.

The first theme of Sartrean existentialism, which is *abandonment,* can be traced in the actions and the speeches of Clegg. Abandonment, as mentioned earlier, denotes the idea of having the whole responsibility for one's actions. There are no predetermined codes or values and thus, man is left to himself. Having no priori force to rely upon concerning life and whatever happens to an individual, man is alone with his decisions and their outcomes. This creates the notion of abandonment. Clegg experiences this desertion throughout his life. He starts his narrative with some information about his childhood and upbringing. His father died in a car accident when he was two and he is abandoned by his own mother at the time when he needed him most. Thus, he was raised by a cold and rigid aunt and he forms the one and only healthy relationship of his life with his Uncle Dick. He defines the times they had together as "the best" he has ever had.

He even comments that “He was as good a father to me” and “I would have given him the best rods and tackle and anything else he wanted” (12). Nevertheless, as Clegg puts it: “But it was not to be” (ibid).

With the demise of the uncle, he finds himself abandoned once again in every sense of the word. He experiences abandonment both in a physical and a psychological sense. Now, he has no one to rely upon or no one to express his feelings or ideas to as he is bereft of forging deep attachments with anyone. He demonstrates a sense of disgust and despise towards the people around him. The people he works with and the clubmen in Rates stir abhorrence and repulsion in him as he feels detached from them in almost every sense:

> Old Tom and Crutchley, who were in Rates with me, and some of the girls clubbed together and did a big one and they were always going at me to join in, but I stayed the lone wolf. I never liked old Tom or Crutchley. Old Tom is slimy, always going on about local government and buttering up to Mr. Williams, the Borough Treasurer. Crutchley’s got a dirty mind and he is a sadist, he never let an opportunity go of making fun of my interest, especially if there were girls around. “Fred’s looking tired—he’s been having a dirty week-end with a Cabbage White,” he used to say, and, “Who was that Painted Lady I saw you with last night?” Old Tom would snigger, and Jane, Crutchley’s girl from Sanitation, she was always in our office, would giggle. (12)

The language that Clegg uses sheds light on his view of other people. Even though the people of the club have urged him to “join in” with them and tried to reconcile him to their group, he prefers to stay alone and he even professes delight in this by boasting of being “the lone wolf” (12). After the confirmation of winning the pools, he calls the clergy office and quits his job. As people now know that he is wealthy, one Mr. Williams makes a business offer but he finds it quite out of line: “He even suggested I might invest in the Council 5% Loan! Some of them at Town Hall lose all sense of proportion” (12).

Clegg fends people off with no clear reason. He wants no one to be near him or be in good terms with him. To increase his sense of abandonment and loneliness, after winning a large amount of money, he sends his aunt and cousin to Australia on a sea-cruise on his aunt’s request. In his workplace, even a simple business counsel is enough to get on his nerves. He is abandoned in every sense:

he is abandoned both physically and emotionally, enhancing his sense of forlornness. Therefore, even though this first abandonment he experiences has not been of his choice, he chooses to be alone and forlorn later on.

Getting wealthy provides him with an opportunity to be in places he has never been before. He mentions going to the "posh restaurants" and a hotel incident; however, he is bothered by the demeanor and the attitude of people (14). He does not have the sense of belongingness and he can never get rid of his sense of being unwanted or undeserving. There is a contradiction in his feelings at that point. On the one hand he delights in being "the lone wolf"; on the other hand, he feels like nobody wants him. Thus, his self-conscious nature prevails on his statements:

> We could see straight away at the hotel that of course they were respectful on the surface, but that was all, they really despised us for having all that money and not knowing what to do with it. They still treated me behind the scenes for what I was—a clerk. It was no good throwing money around. As soon as we spoke or did something we gave the game away. You could see them saying, don't kid us, we know what you are, why don't you go back where you came from. (14)

The detachment, the isolation and feelings of being an outcast overwhelm him. He believes that he senses others' judgment of him. He feels naked and separated from society:

> I remember a night we (aunt, cousin and him) went out and had supper at a posh restaurant. It was on a list the pools people gave us. It was good food, we ate it but I didn't hardly taste it because of the way people looked at us and the way the slimy foreign waiters and everybody treated us, and how everything in the room seemed to look down at us because we weren't brought up their way. (ibid)

Here, the reader beholds a young man who has no connection with the members of the society and who feels self-conscious all the time. He is bricked in every corner and he has nobody but himself to fall back on. In relation to this attitude of Clegg, Wolfe (1979) comments: "He [Clegg] lacks the self-acceptance, intelligence, and information to have a human relationship" (57). Thus, it becomes impossible for him to have a normal contact with the others and this deepens his sense of solitude and isolation.

In addition to the physical isolation and detachment from the morals and norms of society, the Sartrean sense of abandonment is mostly concerned with the loss of belief in a deity, namely the belief that God does not exist. Clegg expresses his opinion relating to God in many incidents. The first time he talks about religion is to mention certain points of his upbringing:

> If you are on the grab and immoral like most nowadays, I suppose you can have a good time with a lot of money when it comes to you. But I may say I have never been like that, I was never once punished at school. Aunt Annie is a Nonconformist, she never forced me to go to chapel or such like. (13)

Instead of a very religious environment, Clegg grows up with the notion of a more emancipated notion of religion. He has not been restricted by his aunt or others. Here, what Clegg means to assert is that even though he has not been brought up in a religious environment, he is not "immoral like most nowadays". In his godless state, he professes to have proper morals without depending on an external force. This strain of thought indicates Clegg's view of religion and morality and how they are not linked in his mind. As he holds himself separate from the others, he does not have any scruples concerning the aftermath of his actions: mentioning his "conscience". He goes on about his relation with his aunt in the following manner:

> Aunt Annie let me smoke cigarettes after a lot of rows when I came out of army, but she never liked it. Even with all that money, she had to keep on saying spending it was against her principles. But Mabel went at her behind the scenes, I heard her doing it one day, and anyway I said it was my money and my conscience, she was welcome to all she wanted and none if she didn't. (ibid)

The fact that he emphasizes his own conscience as the responsible agent without any referrals to religious concerns gives vent to the notion of *abandonment* with only himself to judge. One more incident which helps the revelation of his opinion of God or religion occurs during a conversation with Miranda. Clegg remarks:

> Sometimes she's come out of blue with funny questions.
> "Do you believe in God?" was one.
> Not much, I answered.
> "It must be yes or no."
> I don't think about it. Don't see that it matters. (58)

As the conversation unfolds, Miranda gets a glimpse of his psychological state and claims:

> You want to lean on me. I can feel it. I expect it is your mother. You're looking for your mother.
> I don't believe in all that stuff.
> We'd never be any good together. We both want to lean.
> You could lean on me financially. (59-60)

In the first part, Clegg finds Miranda's question "funny". Believing in God is not a serious issue for him and he states his opinion by responding that it does not matter. As for leaning on someone for support, Clegg again refuses the need for such a tendency. He neither leans on Miranda nor wants her to lean on him emotionally. He can only provide financial support for her. Even in this case, he refuses dependency and this increases his sense of abandonment.

The next time he mentions God and religion which come at the end of the novel, he makes his faithlessness much clearer. In the last part, after the narration of Miranda, Clegg relates what has happened after her death. He gives clear details about her sickness which has eventually led to her demise. He takes the dead body and tries to perform the rituals concerning death. However, he gets stuck at one point:

> When it was dark I got her dead body and carried it down to the cellar. I know you're meant to wash dead bodies, but I didn't like to, it didn't seem right, so I put her on the bed and combed out her hair and cut a lock. I tried to arrange her face so it had a smile but I couldn't. Anyway she looked very peaceful. Then I knelt and said a prayer, the only one I knew was Our Father, so I said some of that and God rest her soul, not that I believe in religion, but it seemed right. Then I went upstairs. (274)

Here is a man who has no scruples about his actions and who does not define himself by the codes and virtues of a specific religion. He is clear-cut about the nonexistence of God. He just says the prayer and wishes her soul peace out of pure habit. God and religion carry no weight with him. In existentialism, the theme of abandonment entails the idea of getting rid of any kind of reliance on a divine entity. The individual who has severed his ties and has no hopes or expectations regarding the interference of a god can sense abandonment in his choices and attitudes towards life. Clegg, who has no scruples in relation to the

existence of a god experiences one aspect of abandonment which is about the concerns of a religion.

At this point, another theme surfaces: the psychological analysis of Clegg. Mahima Singh (2015), claims that: "A sociopath like Ferdinand Clegg lives in a fictional world of his own, he unnerves the reader with his sense of morality and justice" (12). Labeled as a sociopath by such critics, Clegg proves to be one indeed with his attitudes towards the others. As Clegg is not a "normal" individual with healthy tendencies, the actions that he commits in cold-blood indicate certain psychological problems such as lack of remorse or regret even in the case a tragic event. This lack of emotion and cold detachment can also be analyzed in terms of the psychological state that Clegg lives in. With the problematic background and upbringing, Clegg has failed to form healthy relationships and thus experiences. Consequently, the lack of sorrow and compunction and the absence of regret can be observed in his self-justifying personality. To quote Wolfe: "Because he [Clegg] is asocial, his realm has no society and no politics" (62).

With the death of Miranda, one could suppose that he would feel guilty or even torture himself mentally for her. However, he assumes a pose of coolheadedness and imperturbability which is entailed by his problematic relationship with the society:

> I wanted what money couldn't buy. If I really had got a nasty mind I would not have gone to all the trouble I did, I would have just visited the women you read about on the boards in Paddington and Soho and done what I wanted. You can't buy happiness. I must have heard Aunt Annie say that a hundred times. Ha ha, I always thought, just let's have a try first. Well, I had my try. (277)

Clegg does not feel the burden of his actions and their outcomes. According to Olshen (1978): "He [Clegg] is fundamentally not responsible for his actions. The possessor is himself possessed; he is as much the victim as the victimizer" (22). Thus, he does not feel responsible and like a spoiled child, he has simply done something because he wanted to. Despite the fact that Clegg claims that he did whatever he wanted and the outcome may not turn out be as he supposed it would be, he holds no grudges towards anyone:

> Because what it is, it's luck. It's like the pools—worse, there aren't even good teams and bad teams and likely draws. You can't ever tell how it will turn out. Just A versus B, C versus D, and nobody knows what A and B and C and D are. That's why I never believed in God. I think we are just insects, we live a bit and then die and that's the lot. There's no mercy in things. There's not even a Great Beyond. There's nothing. (ibid)

Clegg makes his point very clear. There is no God or religion to condemn him. There is no certainty in life and there is no afterlife. He even compares people to animals with only death as the sole surest thing. However, his thoughts and flings fluctuate concerning his relation to God. He does not believe in a god simply because he does not see "that it matters" (58). However, with Miranda's death, he performs religious rites out of custom: "Then I knelt and said a prayer, the only one I knew was Our Father, so I said some of that and God rest her soul, not that I believe in religion, but it seemed right" (274). Acheson comments that:

> He [Clegg] accepts the basic existential principle that he lives in a world bereft of God; yet he clings, inauthentically, to the forms of religion, lacking the initiative and ability to forge any but most selfish value system of his own. (17)

Clegg does not have a consistent opinion of God. The reader beholds him both as faithless and also performing the rituals of religion such as praying after Miranda's death. With all his actions and attitude towards life, Clegg can be observed to experience *existential abandonment* in every sense as he lacks any predetermined sets of values and he is not dependent on a deity. Given his upbringing and way of life, it seems inevitable for him to feel abandoned as he lacks the means and the frame of mind, the capacity to facilitate a more functional way of living.

Another concept that is interlinked with existentialism is anguish. Anguish coexists with abandonment. When an individual experiences the pangs of abandonment, there emerges a new sensation along with it. Being destitute of all the grounds that he can rest his existence upon, man has nothing to do but feel the anguish of this new state of lonesomeness. He does not know what to do with his freedom. Having no God or no religion to rely upon, man begins to feel the meaninglessness of life and how futile his existence is. This dread of nothingness

leads to suffering and distress. In the case of Clegg, things are different as feelings and thoughts fluctuate throughout his actions. At first, he professes himself to be godless and tries to justify his actions within the limits of his comprehension. After the death of Miranda, he ruminates for awhile about the course of action he needs to take concerning the dead body of the girl and he strikes upon an idea: "It was then I got the idea. It kept on coming back, this feeling that she was lucky to be done with it all, no more worries, no more hiding, no more things you want to be and won't ever be. But finished the lot" (276).

This is the first instance Clegg demonstrates his feelings towards the futility of existence. The end of life seems to be riddance of all "worries" for him and that is why he feels happy for Miranda and aspires to her death. Thus, he ponders on suicide which is the result of anguish that accompanies *abandonment*. "All I [Clegg] had to do was kill myself. (…) I would be out of it" (ibid). He finds life hollow and pointless. Clegg sees through the absurdity and ludicrousness of survival and wants to put an end to it.

Along with abandonment and anguish, another concept comes into being in the attainment of authenticity: bad faith. Bad faith occurs when an individual tries to evade the responsibility of his actions. That is the reason why man tries to base the consequences of his actions on a different source than himself. He does not want to be in charge of the outcomes of the events.

Throughout the novel, Clegg lives in *bad faith*. He does not acknowledge the consequences of his actions and he believes that things just happen to him. He continues his existence with fatalism as if things have been destined in that way and he unceasingly connects events with coincidence, thereby justifying all his actions. In the first part, he describes how he stalks Miranda in order to kidnap her and keep her as his prisoner. However, he does not divulge in being himself the sole agent of this action; instead he claims: "I went into that coffee-bar, suddenly, I don't know why, I was drawn in by something else, against my will almost" (17). He utters these sentences when he pursues Miranda around the town and to the places she goes. Later on, when the idea of kidnapping her gets clearer in his head, he declares: "I took a risk, perhaps I wanted to give fate a chance to stop

me. (…) I mean I felt I was swept on, like down rapids, I might hit something, I might get through" (27).

Being a fatalist, he urges fate and he acts like even though he is the one who is consciously pursuing Miranda, whatever happens as a consequence is not in his power. He feels like the puppet of another supremacy or authority. The next step for him to kidnap Miranda is securing a place to keep her locked in. With this idea on his mind, he finds a house in the countryside. When he arrives there, he forgets his motivation:

> I still say I didn't go down there with the intention of seeing whether there was anywhere to have a secret guest. I can't really say what intention I had. I just don't know. What you do blurs over what you did before. (20)

He follows Miranda wherever she goes; he buys a house where he can imprison her; but Clegg still does not believe himself to be the one responsible for that. He never refrains from feeling under control. Even when he begins to redecorate the house to suit his purposes as a warder, he does not take full responsibility: "All this time I never thought it was serious. I know that must sound very strange, but it was so. I used to say, of course, I'll never do it, this is only pretending" (24).

Avoiding the admittance of his urges and the seriousness of his intention, he accomplishes what he purposes to do. He kidnaps Miranda. At the beginning of her imprisonment, she continuously asks questions about her being held as a prisoner. In a conversation about the purpose of her captivity, Clegg finds the solution to blame another party for his own behavior:

> I said I'm only obeying orders. "Orders" she said. "Whose orders?" I can't tell you. (…) I tried to think of someone. I don't know why, the only name I could think of she might know was Mr. Singleton. (…) Mr. Singleton's orders, I said. She looked really amazed, so I went on quick. I'm not meant to tell you, I said. He'd kill me if he knew. (…) You mean Mr. Singleton ordered you to kidnap me. I nodded. (34)

After all the planning, scheming and preparation, Clegg is incapable of coming clean about his motivation to kidnap Miranda. He invents stories for his behavior. The same strain of behavior keeps repeating itself whenever he does not want to acknowledge a certain kind of behavior of his, which may aver a distorted image of him to others.

One night, obeying Miranda's whims, he takes her upstairs from the cellar where he keeps her. They have some coffee and play cards. After a while, Clegg opens up about his feelings and proposes to Miranda. She rejects even the idea of it but after some consideration, she reconciles to the idea as her sole escape from being a detainee. They strike up an argument and Miranda tries to escape and reach out to the sound of the car passing by. Clegg, feeling frustrated beyond measure and thinking of the possible courses of action that Miranda may take, chloroforms her and gets her back down to the cellar. There, he undresses her and takes some inappropriate pictures of her. Later on, he claims:

> I never slept that night, I got in such a state. There were times I thought I would go down and give her the pad again and take other photos, it was as bad as that. I am not really that sort and I was only like it that night because of all that happened and the strain I was under. Also the champagne had a bad effect on me. And everything she said. It was what they call a culmination of circumstances. (87)
> (…)
> I know most men would only have thought of taking an unfair advantage and there were plenty of opportunities. I could have used the pad. Done what I liked, but I am not that sort, definitely not that sort at all. (95)

Here is a man who finds the consolation of the abominable acts that he has performed by accusing the circumstances, alcohol and his prisoner but himself. He lacks the courage to admit to his atrocity and tries to justify himself in the eyes of the others by claiming that he is not that sort of person; he has been led to it even though he cannot explain what has led him.

When Miranda finally gets ill and she asks for his help, he believes that it is a trap and she tries to frame her. That is the reason why he refuses to trust in her and considers the illness as a pretence to get away and escape from him. However, throughout the narration concerning Miranda's illness, he is concerned with justifying himself: "It was not my fault. How was I to know she was iller that she looked? She just looked like she had a cold" (110). He follows the same strain of thought and behavior: "What I am trying to say is that it all came unexpected. I know what I did the next day was a mistake, but up to that day I thought I was acting for the best and within my rights" (113). When he fully recognizes the seriousness of her illness and confirms himself the possibility that she may have

got pneumonia, his behavior does not flutter: "I wasn't to know she was really ill. It was spilt milk; it was done and there was an end to it" (267).

From the beginning of the kidnap to the culmination that ends with Miranda's death, never even once does Clegg take the responsibility on himself for whatever has happened. Foster, in his work *Understanding John Fowles* (1994) comments on this behavior of Clegg as someone "stuck in the juvenile pattern of blaming others" (26). It was either a whim or fate or something unknown that has driven him to take the measures that he has and the fact that things have ended good or bad was of the same thing to him as he was not the one to blame during this entire quagmire. As Acheson says "Clegg seeks only to excuse his behavior. A typically inauthentic character, he claims to have acted at the prompting of forces beyond his control" (17). These are clear examples of his state of living in *bad faith.*

Clegg does not feel the encumbrance of his actions; he always proposes a justification on his own behalf. He begins his validation of the kidnap by stating its hazard, how it happened by chance as if he is not the one with all the preparations made in advance: "What I am trying to say is that having her as my guest happened suddenly, it wasn't something I planned the moment the money came" (16). As for the van he buys, he claims:

> I thought if I got a van I wouldn't always have to be taking Aunt Annie and Mabel around when they came back. I didn't buy it for the reason I did use it for. The whole idea was sudden, like a stroke of genius almost. (17)

Starting from the inception of the idea in his mind to its realization and even to Miranda's death and afterwards, Clegg finds a way to fend off his part in the crime and the eventual murder. There are cases when he comprehends how his actions are wrong and his understanding of the world is defective. Despite this, he does not strive for bettering himself. Instead of facing up to the facts that shape his personality and life in order to make amends, he seeks to find pretexts and excuses to cover up the flaws. One way to do this, he brings forward his educational background and how insufficient it is. In this issue, Miranda confronts him and says that:

> Why do you keep on using these stupid words - nasty, nice, proper, right? Why are you so worried about what's proper? You're like a little old maid who thinks marriage is dirty and everything except cups of weak tea in a stuffy old room is dirty. Why do you take all the life out of life? Why do you kill all the beauty? (76)

To this, Clegg's his reaction becomes defensive and he claims: "I never had your advantages. That's why" (ibid). However, Miranda believes that he can change if he wills so and she urges him as follows:

> You can change, you're young, you've got money. You can learn. And what have you done? You've had a little dream, the sort of dream I suppose little boys have and masturbate about, and you fall over yourself being nice to me so that you won't have to admit to yourself that the whole business of my being here is nasty, nasty, nasty. (ibid)

To this, Clegg answers in the same defensive mode once again. He says: "I understand, I said. I'm not educated" (ibid). This can be the first time that Clegg faces the truth about himself. He has the money, the means to become who he wants to be. He is free. However, what he does with this new freedom is to steal one of it. He falls back upon his inadequate education and the problematic childhood as an excuse for all that he commits:

> "You have money—as a matter of fact, you aren't stupid, you could become whatever you liked. Only you've got to shake off the past. You've got to kill your aunt and the house you lived in and the people you lived with. You've got to be a new human being." She sort of pushed out her face at me, as if it was something easy I could do, but wouldn't. (76)

Achieving "a new being" is not "easy" for him. He implies that if it were that simple, he would do it. Therefore, never taking full responsibility on himself and pushing *bad faith* to its extreme, he gets further away from achieving *authenticity*. He deems that the external forces quite beyond his control have molded him into the person he is now and he does not believe in change or betterment of himself. In an argument with Miranda, he accuses his loneliness as the reason for his strange behavior:

> I'm sorry I'm so suspicious, I said. It's just that you're all I've got that makes life worth living (…) I said if you went, I'd do myself in (…) You think I'm mad because of what I've done, I am not mad. It's just, well,

> I've got no one else. There's never been anyone but you I've ever wanted to know. (51-52)

Unceasingly, Clegg falls back on bad faith, blaming all but himself in his actions. This attitude of him poses a barrier in his development to a better self.

Two concepts that come into sight with the Sartrean concept of bad faith and authenticity are "transcendence" and "facticity". Transcendence is the state of overcoming the circumstances and going beyond one's own capacity. Facticity, on the other hand is limitedness; being situated with no will or intention of one's own. Past actions, birth conditions, and physical boundaries feel like they cannot be surpassed, and that is why humans feel obtruded even when they are free. With transcendence, it is possible to go beyond these fixed and constant factors and create a genuine self. In this harmony lies the path to authenticity.

Clegg is an individual who consistently falls back on facticity. As he cannot pass beyond his limitedness, Clegg is stuck in a world with no prospect of development on his side. He cannot achieve transcendence even though his circumstances change with winning in the pools, which transfers him from a lower-middle class clerk to a highly affluent person. Clegg is situated in certain afflictions concerning his birth and bringing up. Losing his parents, being obliged to live with close relatives who are problematic in themselves, lacking decent education are the factors that bind and border him. However, after getting rich, if he wills it, he can go beyond all these and create a new person. Instead of this, he chooses to captivate an innocent young woman and humors his tendencies that spring up from his being restricted prior to it. Thus, he falls in *bad faith* all the time, having no ground to base his action upon, lacking the courage or vision to better himself and the need to become someone quite new.

Frederick Clegg, with all his deeds and statements, has been through all the existential concepts and themes except for transcendence. However, the path to authenticity lies in overcoming these obstacles and in the creation of a new self. As discussed in the first chapter, in Sartrean authenticity, man has to accept his state of freedom, act with the realization of it and accept anguish as the natural outcome. In addition to anguish, he has to come to terms with abandonment and

avoid bad faith. He should not give vent to despair, which results from the things he cannot change as a result of facticity. He should break away from the anguish which he finds himself in. This is exactly what Clegg cannot achieve. He cannot refrain from falling into the pits of bad faith, yielding to abandonment and facticity, with no clear vision or chance of achieving a true, free and independent self.

Another subject that needs attention is John Fowles's perception of existentialism reflected in his novels. As discussed in the previous chapter, the existentialist views of John Fowles can be traced through his famous work *The Aristos* (1964) and how these opinions encompass various themes in his novels. One of the themes that stand out in Fowles's study is his division of society into two groups: the Few and the Many. It is reasonable to claim that readers can follow the theme of the Few and the Many in the personality of the characters. In *The Collector*, Frederick Clegg is positioned as one of the Many and the innocent kidnapped female represents the Few. This positioning is a good start to scrutinize the *inauthenticity* of Clegg who lives in the clutches of ordinariness.

In *The Aristos* (1964), John Fowles talks about the craze of the modern age: "having". For him, the impulse to collect denotes a kind of sickness and atrocity since having more denotes the idea of being more enslaved by the things you possess. That is why collecting is a dehumanizing process as it denies the meanings, freedoms and attributions of a subject and reduces it to the position of a sheer object. Simon Loveday in his book *The Romances of John Fowles* (1985) also writes: "As its title implies, *The Collector* is dominated by the theme of having, possessing, or in short collecting" (24). Frederick Clegg is a butterfly collector who metamorphoses into a collector of human beings. Not only does he deny Miranda her freedom, but he also dehumanizes her with his use of language. Barry Olshen (1978) claims that: "The voyeur observes her [Miranda] as he would a butterfly, reducing her free and vital nature in his mind's eye to the status of an object, a 'specimen' in a collection. This life-destroying power of the collector, this objectification of another human being, is manifest from the beginning in the

language of Clegg's narrative" (17). Additionally, Loveday (1985) comments on the kind of collector mentality that Fowles aims to project. He notes that:

> [Fowles] regards the collector mentality as a major evil. By making Clegg a collector of butterflies Fowles brings out the special paradox of collecting. The collector seeks to possess things of value; yet the value of what he seeks resides precisely in the fact that it was free (in the sense of unpossessed) and alive. In the things the collector covets, what can be possessed is not what is valuable: what is valuable cannot be possessed. (10)

On the first page of his narration, Clegg tries to attest to his obsession and admiration of Miranda. However, he does not see her as a woman but as a "specimen":

> Seeing her always made me feel like I was catching a rarity, going up to it careful, heart-in-mouth as they say. A Pale Clouded Yellow (a kind of butterfly), for instance. I always thought of her like that, I mean words like elusive and sporadic, and very refined-not like the other ones, even the pretty ones. More for the real connoisseur. (9)

In this brief passage, he resembles Miranda to a butterfly, "a rarity" (ibid). He does not conceive of her as a free individual but something to be caught and had. During his schemes of watching and kidnapping her, he gets everything ready: the house, the cellar and all other preparations. When he is finally good to go, he starts his stern watching:

> It [kidnapping Miranda] finally after ten days later happened as it sometimes does with butterflies. I mean you go to a place where you know you may see something rare and you don't, but the next time not looking for it, you see it on a flower right in front of you, handed to (the perpetrator) on a plate, as they say. (26)

This time, this "rare" thing he wants to have is not butterflies but Miranda. When he eventually kidnaps and locks her down in the cellar, his first feelings are those of joy and mirth. He even likens his accomplishment of capturing her to "something daring like climbing Everest or doing something in enemy territory. (…) It was like catching the Mazarine Blue again or Queen of Spain Fritillary" (31). Not even once does he think about the human aspects of Miranda. For him, she is just an object to have. Even Miranda realizes what she stands for in Clegg's eye: "Now you've collected me. (…) Literally. You have pinned me in this little

room and you can come and gloat over me" (44). Later on, she comments: "I know what I am to him. A butterfly he has always wanted to catch" (123). However, this whole collecting mind is an abomination for her as she says: "They (the collectors) are anti-life, anti-art, anti-everything" (ibid). B. Woodcock (1984) asserts that: "It was not an accident that Fowles made Clegg a collector of butterflies: the ancient Greeks used the same word for butterfly and soul" (96). Miranda represents a new specimen for Clegg, not only as a butterfly but also as a "soul".

Whenever Miranda uses her own free will and asserts it, Clegg shows apathy towards her. In one case, Miranda attempts to escape and before she can, she is caught by Clegg. Miranda says: "He had something (a hammer?) in his hand, peculiar wide eyes, I'm sure he was going to attack me" (203). With this incident, Miranda is bolted back in the cellar and when Clegg brings her food, he does not speak with her as if he holds a grudge. Thus, Miranda feels as follows:

> I am one in a row of specimens. It's when I try to flutter out of line that he hates me. I'm meant to be dead, pinned, always the same, always beautiful. He knows that part of my beauty is being alive, but it's the dead me he wants. He wants me living-but-dead. I felt it terribly strong today. That my being alive and changing and having a separate mind and having moods and all that was becoming a nuisance. (ibid)

This thought of Miranda is echoed once again in Woodcock's claim about the relationship between butterflies and soul; representing people. Woodcock states that: "Collectors do not like the butterflies which are alive. Therefore, Clegg cannot make the ideal correspond with reality" (ibid). This is exactly what Miranda perceives. Induced by the collector mentality, Clegg does not want her to act with autonomy. He wants her to be still, immobile or only bending to his wishes. Thus, Miranda comprehends the frame of mind Clegg possesses. According to Wolfe (1979), the collector mentality is one of the most important aspects of Clegg's personality that doom him to *inauthenticity.* He states:

> Clegg squanders his potential [to be authentic] because he cannot rise above his mania for collecting. The book's title encompasses him; to blot out the collector in him would leave nothing. His possessions possess him. (66)

In his book *Point of View, Fiction and Film: Focus on John Fowles* (1991), Charles Garard supports this idea that Clegg is a collector and he remains one as "he cannot deal with life until he has destroyed it" (51). Also, Campbell (1983) follows this strain of thought concerning Clegg:

> Clegg is morally blind, not because he couldn't see or because he couldn't evaluate what he does see, but because he denies Miranda a moral right. He won't, he refuses to see her as a conscious subject who is constituted as a subject of her world; instead she is, for him, only an object in his. (49)

This mental state of collecting serves to underpin Clegg's attitude towards life. By his attempts to trap and label reality, be it butterfly collection or realizing a fantasy in the shape of abducting an individual, Clegg seals off the living quality in the subjects that are pinned down and labeled by him. Additionally, this obsession of collection indicates another aspect of his character. He is one of the Many as he seeks fulfillment and recognition not in the achievement of a free self. He uses "having, possessing" as a substitute for an authentic and real life experience. Clegg is an individual who has grown up bereft of the intimacy of family and friends. As he has not led a normal and functional life, he refers to other sources to furnish him with satisfaction or achievement. Throughout the book, he acknowledges no other desire but "to have" something. It begins with butterflies and ends with the collection of human beings. Even Miranda sees this in him and she proclaims:

> I could scream abuse at him all day long; he wouldn't mind at all. It's me he wants, my look, my outside; not my emotions or my mind or my soul or even my body. Not anything human. He's a collector. That's the great dead thing in him. (161)

In *The Aristos,* Fowles puts forward that money and authority can alter and even corrupt "ordinary people" (the Many) as they lack the capacity to handle these assets with their full responsibility. Fowles claims that "Money is potentiality: is control of, and access to, hazard; is freedom to choose; is power" (125). This is exactly what happens in Clegg's case. When he gets the means and the money to do whatever he wants, he uses it as a destructive force upon others, especially "the Few". What causes Miranda's death is the ignoble and base worldview of Clegg

and being unthinking and conforming, Clegg is ignorant and incapable of using the money that can serve his interests best. The money in his hands becomes a dangerous instrument that can only bring ruin with it.

In the analysis of Clegg, the reader beholds a man who is capable of performing an abominable act in the form of kidnapping an innocent person and causing her death. This man has also no consciousness or common sense to reprimand him for these actions he has taken and their outcomes. Therefore, in a Sartrean sense, Clegg is irretrievably inauthentic since he unceasingly falls back upon the circumstances that have rendered his personality as it is. He emphasizes lack of education, isolation and lacking the means as a child for a better future and uses all these excuses to coat the wrongs and crimes he commits. Hence, Clegg cannot go beyond his present state of mind and circumstances. Here another subject that needs attention appears. For Sartre, man is a concept that can be overcome and circumstances can be surmounted. However, for Fowles the limitations termed as facticity in Sartrean ideology may have a bigger role in deciding one's fate. Fowles does not believe that all limits that have been posed on an individual can be overcome as all individuals are born into circumstances that they have not had a say about. Clegg, a character who lacks a healthy, functional family, education and social background, cannot achieve total freedom due to these restrictions. He is not free and he cannot be free. A unique individuality is unreachable for him. He can achieve a sense of "relative freedom" in Fowlesian terms; but even this can be unattainable for such a man as Clegg. In *The Aristos*, Fowles states that:

> 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 had no control. (10)

Therefore, Fowles has created a character in the form of Clegg who has these ideas of Fowles relating to freedom. A unique individuality is not within reach for each and every individual. The things we cannot control prevail most of the time over one's attempts and endeavors to create one's self. Hence, to quote Eva Petronova (2015), as: "Captor's [Clegg's] personality is incapable of change and

growth", Clegg cannot go beyond his limitedness (36). He cannot shake the feeling that his class and deficient education have rendered him much more inferior than he needs to be. In the end, he turns out to be the true embodiment of *inauthenticity*.

To conclude, Fowles portrays Clegg as a character who has a problematic approach to life. He cannot evolve himself into a better individual as he lacks the capacity to do so. He experiences abandonment and anguish in his relation to God and society. However, the outcome of these feelings is not fruitful on his journey to authenticity since he unceasingly lives in bad faith and cannot overcome or transcend the limitedness of his situation. According to Acheson, in the personality of Clegg, Fowles aims to convey the idea that "with a good education, a better environment and a happier family background, the kidnapper might have been quite different" (18). What Fowles suggests here is facticity in the Sartrean self which should be transcended so as to achieve authenticity. However, Clegg cannot transcend, namely go beyond his situatedness. Unlike Sartre who believes that all the circumstances that one is situated in can be transcended, Fowles affirms that the conditions that one lives in decide the final stage of one's achievement of authenticity. Therefore, in Clegg, Fowles depicts a man who has a problematic background and a limited means to better himself. The consequences of these limitations and facticity bring forth a personality which is devoid of the capability to achieve a sensible and unique individuality. According to Acheson, Clegg, "clearly one of the Many", is "doomed to a life of warped lower middle class conventionality" and he "lacks the power to change – the power to reach a clearer understanding of himself and to steer himself in the direction of freedom" (7). Here the facticity of Clegg becomes the most prominent issue as what makes him inauthentic and keeps him that way are the limitations he has been obliged to live with. Acheson once again emphasizes this feature of Clegg by stating that:

> If he were a member of the Few, the moral, intellectual and cultural élite that Fowles describes in The Aristos, Clegg would have the opportunity to become existentially authentic because he would have the intelligence and self-awareness to enable him to do so. Irretrievably one of the Many, the unintelligent, uncultured mass, he has the innocence of a man who lacks what it takes to triumph over his background. (11)

It can be understood that, Clegg cannot manage to belong to the Few and he gets stuck with the Many due to many limitations posed on him by his background, education and narrow worldview. According to Sartre, it can be concluded that Clegg, with the attainment of money, is presented with the chance to go beyond his limited self and life. He also should strive for a better self and surpass his limitations. Still, he cannot achieve this transcendence as he lacks the courage, motivation and will to become *authentic*. This idea is a reminder of Fowles's understanding of freedom. While according to Sartre, Clegg should and can surpass his limitations, Fowles seems to insinuate that the limitations are not so easily surpassed and one cannot be completely free. Based on Fowles's understanding of freedom, Clegg is relatively free. There are many restrictions for him in life and it is not possible to be completely free. In conclusion, as depicted in the novel, far from being authentic and possessing the capability to go beyond these forces, Clegg turns out to be the embodiment of inauthenticity.

## 3.2 MIRANDA GREY AND AUTHENTICITY

Miranda is the victim of the story: the innocent art student kidnapped by Clegg. The second part of the narration consists of her diary which is kept secret during her captivity. The diary provides the reader with an opportunity to see the psyche of a captured woman and through a series of flashbacks, she delves into reflections regarding her past and they are endowed with Miranda's life, school, friends, especially her mentor, George Paston, who is a great painter for her. Even though her struggle ends with her demise, throughout the novel she attempts to achieve authenticity, which she fails at.

Pamela Cooper, the author of *The Fictions of John Fowles: Power, Creativity, Femininity* (1991) claims that "The novel's ambiguities and tensions focus sharply in its portrayal of Miranda" (45). Despite Fowles's portrayal of Miranda in an interview in *Conversations with John Fowles* (1999) as "an existentialist heroine…groping for her own authenticity," Miranda cannot achieve authenticity just like Clegg (8). According to Cooper (1991), "Miranda never

attains full maturity or completely realizes her selfhood in the book" (45). This observation is supported by Fowles since in the interview Fowles also asserts that "Her [Miranda] tragedy is that she will never live to achieve authenticity. Her triumph is that one day she would have done so" (8). This idea connotes an endeavor towards freedom cut short and terse with her death. This section aims to analyze Miranda through the themes of existentialism and focus on her actions and statements that bring her closer to inauthenticity.

Abandonment and anguish can be observed in Miranda's actions as well as Clegg's. Unlike Clegg, the free Miranda is not a socially abandoned person. She talks about her friends, parents and her school days. Far from being isolated, she is surrounded by people and she functions in the society. That is why, in the physical sense, she claims: "Everything in my life seemed fine" (119). Nevertheless, the captured Miranda feels abandoned in every sense. The things she used to have and the people she communicated with are no more present to her as she is walled up in a cellar all alone. She seeks companionship and mentions it all through her diary: "I don't seem to have any energy, any will. I'm constipated in all ways" (125). However, the most startling aspect of *abandonment* she experiences is in her relation to God. After the shock of the abduction, Miranda begins to relate a series of events with many references to her pre-captive life. During her ruminations, she talks about her changed behavior towards God:

> I've been sitting here and thinking about God. I don't think I believe in God anymore. It is not only me, I think of all the millions who must have lived like this in the war. The Anne Franks. And back through history. What I feel I *know* now is that God doesn't intervene. He lets us suffer. If you pray for liberty then you may get relief just because you pray, or because things happen anyhow which bring you liberty. But God can't hear. There is nothing human like hearing or seeing or pitying or helping about him. I mean perhaps God has created the world and the fundamental laws of matter and evolution. But he can't care about the individuals. He's planned it so some individuals are happy, some sad, some lucky, some not. Who is sad, who is not, he doesn't know, and he doesn't care. So he doesn't exist, really. (222-223)

This long passage is also a route to Miranda's mindset. Being kept as a captive, she feels intense suffering and loneliness. This affliction makes her think about the divine entity and its existence. She claims that she doesn't "believe in God anymore" since a God who is indifferent to the sufferings of his subjects cannot exist in real sense. The material existence may be validated or believed in; however, the spiritual existence that Miranda alludes to cannot be true. This strain of thought can be the result of her captivity. As she does not have freedom and she loses hope in terms of salvation, she questions the existence of God and deems him functionless. She furthers her speech in the same strain:

> These last few days, I've felt Godless. I've felt cleaner, less muddled, and less blind. I still believe in a God. But he is so remote, so cold, so mathematical. I see that we have to live as if there is no God. Prayer and worship and singing hymns- all silly and useless. (223)

It is important to note the unusual captivity of Miranda while talking about her sense of abandonment and anguish. The reader does not behold a character in her usual way of life. Miranda is one that has been detached from a normal and regular life. She is the captive of an unstable man who is platonically in love with her. This could be interpreted as a test or a moment of crisis for the development of her character and the way she copes with that crisis may determine her future endeavors towards the attainment of freedom. Miranda is a victim with no help intervening to save her. Therefore, God evolves into a concept for her. Still, this material existence represents no meaning as she feels forsaken, forgotten and uncared for. This state disproves God's existence, and her opinion concerning an external force is shaped by excluding it as the power to control the lives of the individuals since she proposes "to live as if there is no God". This idea is reminiscent of Sartre as what Miranda does is "see through the deficiencies of guiding structures like religion" (5). Miranda's perception of God concerning its existence and nonexistence can be traced in the Sartrean way of thinking in *Existentialism is a Humanism*:

> Even if God existed that would make no difference from its point of view. Not that we believe God does exist, but we think that the real problem is not that of His existence; what man needs is to find himself again and to

> understand that nothing can save him from himself, not even a valid proof of the existence of God. (11)

Through this crisis, Miranda gets a glimpse behind the veil by comprehending the futility of insisting on the presence of a deity and proposing a self-made life.

The more she spends time with Clegg and down in the cellar, the more restless and irritable she grows. She ponders upon her loneliness and possible death: "Oh God, I'm so lonely, so utterly alone" (256). With loneliness and the imminent sense of illness which is the cause of her eventual death, she cannot shake the feeling of death: "If I die, no one will ever know" (257). Being clustered and cut out from the world, Miranda experiences the pangs of abandonment intensely. She feels forsaken by God and deprived of warm human companionship: "I'm so far from everything. From normality. From light. From what I want to be" (131).

The *anguish* that Miranda undergoes is not only a direct result of abandonment; it also projects to the future. She ruminates about what the future holds for her. She dreams of being free and lives the torment of what the future holds for her: "I've spent most of the day thinking. About me. What will happen to me? I've never felt the mystery of the future so much as here. What will happen? What will happen?" (142) Even though she is a captive, she ruminates on the future, if there is one for her. She does not know the real aim and intention of Clegg. The possibilities regarding the future create anxiety in her and thus she ponders in that way. Thinking of the possibility of escape, she realizes how deficient her comprehension of Clegg is: "So incomprehensible. What does he want? What is to be?" (151). This perplexing mode of living creates an inevitable *anguish* in her. She has no idea about what Clegg wants to do to her and failing to understand Clegg, she suffers from existential anguish, the ambiguity of the future and what to do in that vague mode of existence.

In addition to abandonment and anguish, Miranda also experiences *facticity*. Facticity constitutes her limitedness. Here, Miranda is limited only in the physical sense. Her mind is free. She even says: "He [Clegg] is the one in prison; in his own hateful narrow present world" (212). Thus, relying on the intelligence

that can overcome the limitedness, Miranda hopes to change and transcend her present condition and mode of thinking. After the first shock of her kidnap, she is thankful for being spared her life and claims: "I was grateful to be alive. I am a terrible coward, I don't want to die. I love life so passionately, I never knew how much I wanted to live before. If I get out of this, I shall never be the same" (118). Thus begins Miranda's fruitless endeavor to overcome her limits and change into a better self and she claims: "[I am] far from what I want to be" (131). As the days pass, she contemplates what the future might be like after her release from bondage:

> When I get away. What shall I do? I want to marry, I want to have children, I want to prove to myself that all marriages needn't be like D and M's. (…)But then I want to use my feelings about life. I don't want to use my skill vainly, for its own sake. But I want to make beauty. (142)

The confinement does not reach her higher consciousness. Physically, she is confined; however, her mind is free during her confinement. She wants to go beyond; she aims to disprove the common perceptions of the marriage concept; and most importantly, she intends to make good use of her abilities. While mulling over marriage, she also reconsiders her thoughts and feelings concerning her mother. The hatred she feels towards her mother transforms itself into an understanding as Miranda says: "I think and think down here. I understand things I haven't really thought about before" (ibid). She states:

> I've never really thought of M (mother) objectively before, as another person. She's always been my mother I've hated or been ashamed of. (…) I've never given her enough sympathy. I haven't given her this last year (since I left home) one half of the consideration I've given the beastly creature upstairs just this last week. I feel that I could overwhelm her with love now. (ibid)

Holding onto these thoughts, Miranda achieves her first transcendental act in her attitude towards her life as the confinement has provided her with a sense to understand and appreciate her mother whom she has not valued before. According to Wolfe (1979), Miranda "develops in spite of her handicaps. (…) Seeing her mother clearly for the first time, she comes to know and love her" (71).

Miranda does not only experience illumination in her attitude towards others; but also, her thoughts concerning herself begin to change: "I'm growing up so quickly down here. Like a mushroom" (156). The growth brings about a new mode of thinking on her part. She begins to associate herself with a certain group of society; she believes she belongs to them:

> But this is what I feel these days. That I belong to a sort of band of people who have to stand against all the rest. I don't know who they are—famous men, dead and living, who've fought for the right things and created and painted in the right way, and unfamous people I know who don't lie about things, who try not to be lazy, who try to be human and intelligent. (208)

Detaching herself from the main bulk of society and regrouping with the "elite", Miranda purposes to stand aloof as an individual:

> I can't stand stupid people like Caliban, with their great deadweight of pettiness and selfishness and meanness of every kind. And the few have to carry it all. The doctors and the teachers and the artists—not that they haven't their traitors, but what hope there is, is with them—with us. Because I'm one of them. I'm one of them. I feel it and I've tried to prove it. (…) In this situation [her captivity] I'm a representative. (206)

"The few" mentioned within this brief passage is an allusion to the Fowlesian concept of "the Few". Miranda sees herself belonging to these people and she believes she acts as "a representative" of them. Apart from classifying herself as a group of species who have higher aspirations, during her imprisonment, even her musical taste undergoes a drastic change as now she tries to see behind the veil: "I always used to think Bach was a bore. Now he overwhelms me, he is so human, so full of moods and gentleness and wonderful tunes and things so simple-deep" (240). As she thinks of Bach, she goes back over her approach towards life:

> All this business, it's bound up with my bossy attitude to life. I've always known where I'm going, how I want things to happen. And they have happened as I have wanted, and I have taken it for granted that they have because I know where I'm going. But I have been lucky in all sorts of things. I've always tried to happen to life; but it's time I let life happen to me. (ibid)

It can be concluded that the captive life provides her with a sense of need to change her perspective on life. To quote Wolfe (1979), "This quietism [the new attitude towards life] brings self-knowledge, showing her the difference between

solitude and loneliness" (71). Therefore, she aspires to let things happen to her instead of trying to control everything; of course firstly if she is set free. In a sense, she attempts at adopting new perspectives and visions about how to live her life once she is set free. With this, she gets a clearer glimpse of what she wants with George Paston whom Miranda constantly abbreviates as G.P[1].: "I shall go and have an *affaire* with him. (…) I want the adventure, the risk of marrying him. I'm so sick of being young. Inexperienced. Clever at knowing but not at living" (247). Miranda recognizes the far cry of having a new life. Once she is free, she aims to do all the things that she has ever held qualms about. She wants to "live". So, her acknowledgment of her new sense surfaces: "It's like the day you realize dolls are dolls. I pick up my old self and I see it's silly. A toy I've played with too often" (ibid). When she looks at her reflection in the mirror, she can see the change more clearly:

> But everything is different. I looked in the mirror today and I could see it in my eyes. They look much older and younger. It sounds impossible in words. But that's exactly it. I am older and younger. I am older because I have learnt, I am younger because a lot of me consisted of things older people had taught me. All the mud of their stale ideas on the shoe of me. The new shoe of me. (248)

Miranda believes that she has rid herself of the shackles that have been weighing her down. The old teachings and dictates have been cleared away and the path to her true and "real" self has been laid open. She deems that now she has grasped the wisdom that she has always wanted. Therefore, even though limited in the physical sense and lacking the means to free herself from oppression, Miranda struggles to liberate her mind and prevail over her previous self. The previous self was dependent on the opinions of others. She is ready to get rid of the ideas that have been incepted in her through the others. That is what she means when she says for her new self, "new shoe". The question is whether she will be able to live through these statements and realize them with the new perspectives she has acquired during her captivity.

[1] As Miranda abbreviates George Paston as G.P., G.P. will be used hereafter.

Despite being an art student, believing herself to be a member of the Few and all these efforts to have a new self with new ideals, even Miranda fails to achieve *authenticity*. Despite her aspirations, the main reason for her to be stuck with the Many and their lot is that she is quite incapable of forming her own tastes, ideas and notions: the crucial point concerning *bad faith.* During her studies as a student, she had been spending most of her time with the painter G.P. and she looks up to him as she looks up to a deity. Almost all of her ideas are shaped after his fashion. Thus, she lacks her own domination on her life.

During her imprisonment, to beguile herself and pass the time, she continues with her art and drawing. However, she needs the gaze of someone; this someone is not an ordinary person for her. She needs G. P. and his gaze: "When I draw, I always think of someone like G. P. at my shoulder" (124). Later on, she gives details about how G. P. has had the power to transform her and her worldview: "Because he has changed me more than anything or anybody. More than London, more than the Slade" (143). She realizes that this change brings her one more step closer to becoming a person like him: "How many times have I disagreed with him? And then a week later with someone else I find I'm arguing as he would argue. Judging people by his standards" (143). Miranda blends with G. P. and thus she loses all that belongs to her. Everything she says or does or thinks has a shade of G. P. in it. She is no longer a free subject who can think and act as she does: she is on her way to becoming one with another. When she begins to think and write with her own ideas, as if to excuse herself, she claims: "All this is my own thinking. I need to see G. P. He would tell me the names of ten books where it's all said much better" (150).

In order to emphasize the change that she has been through and she means to attain, she makes a list of things that G. P. has altered in her. The list consists of the ways that can enable an individual to achieve authenticity and live a true life. Still, the list is not Miranda's; it is G. P.'s and his worldview:

> I must have always wanted to believe in those things; I did believe in them in a vague sort of way, before I met him. But he's *made* me believe them; it's the thought of *him* that makes me feel guilty when I break the rules. If

> he's made me believe them, that means he's made a large part of the new me. (145)

Miranda is aware of how her personality has been shaped after G.P. He has been more than a mentor for her. She adopts his characteristics and thereby loses her real self. She admits losing her authenticity and becoming an individual just like G. P. Through his medium and instruction, she feels the need to transform herself. Whenever she does not behave in the way he would normally approve, she feels remorse. Thus, she relies on him for her development. When she contemplates her escape and meeting with G. P., she declares: "I mean I could love him in the other way, his way, now" (156). This statement manifests how far away from originality she is and how she tries to perceive this dependency as her original self. Even though she talks about "the new shoe", namely a new self, Miranda is still captivated in her thoughts. The enlightenment she experiences remains in theory as she is still chained to her old self. While talking about a new self, what she really means is her being well-adjusted in G.P.'s mode of thinking and way of life. Therefore, the closer she believes she gets to her original and unique self, the more she drifts away in her endeavors as the new self is just a shade of her mentor.

Miranda's ideas about life and art seem borrowed from G. P. Most of the time, she appropriates G. P.'s voice in her judgments of others and herself. She has picked up G.P.'s expressions along with his ideas like the word "fey":

> He's chipped off all (well, some of, anyway) my silliness, my stupid fussy frilly ideas about life and art, and modern art. My feyness. I've never been the same since he told me how he hated fey women. I even learnt the word from him. (143)

Thus, she bases her resolution concerning her art and personality on his view: "I must not be 'fey'" (132). Pamela Cooper (1991) comments on this behavior of Miranda as follows:

> Miranda never adopts a personal perspective of her own on G. P.'s opinions; she is basically unquestioning of his views on life and art, and her commitment to G.P. makes her more his passive mouthpiece than a creative and independent reworker of his intellectual or artistic products. (39)

The new self that Miranda wants to have is not original but an imitation of G.P. As Cooper asserts:

> Something of an erotic worshipper herself, Miranda believes in G.P. as the embodiment of right values and their symbolic equivalent, good aesthetic judgment. (…) Thus, Miranda's diary records a Clegg-like capacity for idealization and fantasy which converts even the violence of G. P. into beatitude. (45)

Even though she lacks a deity in her life, with the existence of G. P., Miranda has found a new one: "He is the only person I know who always seems to mean what he says when he talks about art. If one day you found he didn't, it would be like a blasphemy" (160). Seeing G. P. as a God persists to the end of her narration. When she cannot bear the agony of imprisonment and the impending sense of her doom, Miranda asserts: "I've been lying on the bed with G.P.'s picture beside me. Holding the frame in one hand. Like a crucifix" (254). Thus, Miranda, the young woman captivated and isolated from her natural environment, in her attempts to create a new self, in fact does the opposite. The confinement that she is in plays a huge role in this failure. However, during her reflections about her life, she still builds her existence and her very essence on the virtues and doctrines of someone else. That is why, rather than achieving an authentic self, she finds herself in a newer but not different form of dependency that has an idol and a God in it: G.P.

The other kind of behavior that causes Miranda's *inauthenticity* and eventual death is the fact that she cannot face the reality and the seriousness of her situation. Thus she cannot shake the sense of anguish. Anguish is born out of the state of nothingness when an individual perceives the futility of life and how meaningless his existence is in the big picture. Miranda lives in a fantasy and an illusion to cope with the present circumstance. Confined, alone and hopeless, she divulges in daydreaming and ruminations about G. P. and her life in pre-confinement. At the beginning of her diary, she talks about how unreal the present situation is for her: "I wake up and for a moment I think I'm at home or at Caroline's. Then it hits me" (119).

To make the best of the circumstances, she lives through flashbacks in her life and these memories sustain her life and energy in the cellar:

> I know I also feel happy because I've not been here for most of the day. I've been mainly thinking about G. P. In his world. Not this one here. I remembered so much. (…) I gorged myself on memories. This makes the world seem so real, so living, so beautiful. Even the sordid parts of it. (145)

Remembering, reminiscing, and writing them down take up most of her time. When the harsh truth of the reality breaks upon her consciousness, she cannot help but escape to her dreamland where she is still with G. P. and leads a normal life. She owns the effect of such an escape psychology: "Writing here is a sort of drug. It's the only thing I look forward to" (165). The more she reminisces, the more she realizes the change within her. However, she is not sure of anything as things have lost their reality for her; she feels the dubious sordidness of the ground she has been living on:

> Everything's changing. I keep on thinking of him [G. P.] (…) I'm growing up so quickly down here. Like a mushroom. Or is it that I've lost my sense of balance? Perhaps it's all a dream. I jab myself with the pencil. But perhaps that's a dream, too. (156)

Getting away from reality is a problematic issue in the growth of an individual as on his way to achieving an authentic self, an individual needs to face the reality, the facticity and the anguish and break away from them. What Miranda does is lose herself and her own essence in the face of anguish. The cellar where she is kept can be considered a symbol of her facticity; that is, limitedness for the present. However, she can transcend it through her attempts to obtain her freedom and unadulterated self. Instead, she chooses to indulge herself in the past, losing the sense of reality and obliterating the chance of *authenticity*.

This state of sustaining her life through memories does not last long as she begins to lose her sense of subjectivity and even doubts her sanity: "I'm going mad cooped up in here" (61) and later on when she realizes how she has changed during her imprisonment, she says: "I suddenly realized that I was going mad too" (127). In another instance, she asserts: "I felt I was going mad last night" (157). With these realizations about her sanity and state of health, Miranda seeks

companionship, even of Clegg. Thus, she prefers dependency on an individual once again, another signature of her bad faith and incapability to cope with abandonment*:* "Sometimes I feel so lonely, so sick of my own thoughts, that I let him [Clegg]. I want him to stay. That's what prison does" (132). On another day, she writes in her diary: "Ridiculous, I wanted him to come. I often want him to come. I'm as lonely as that" (210). The loneliness that she is immersed in troubles her beyond measure: "I write in this terrible nightlike silence as if I feel normal. But I am not. I am so sick, so frightened, so alone. The solitude is unbearable. Every time the door opens I want to rush at it and out" (123). Along with her sanity, she is also unsure of her own senses:

> Nobody who has not lived in a dungeon could understand how absolute the silence down here is. No noise unless 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. I have a strange illusion quite often. I think I've become deaf. I have to make a little noise to prove I'm not. I clear my throat to show myself that everything's quite normal. (164)

Getting lonelier and more isolated, Miranda loses the sense of how serious her condition is. Her passionate need for humanity initiates her dependency on Clegg. As through G. P., she also changes through Clegg:

> I hate the way I have changed. I accept too much. To begin with, I thought I must force myself to be matter-of-fact, not let his abnormality take control of the situation. But he might have planned it. He is getting me to behave exactly as he wants. (…) I am so lonely. (…) He can make me depend on him. (129)

With this realization, she even begins to believe that they have a connection:

> It's weird. Uncanny. But there is a sort of relationship between us. (…)It's partly because I'm so lonely (…) I loathe him. (…)Perhaps it's just knowledge. Just knowing a lot about him. And knowing someone automatically makes you feel close to him. (139-40)

The tragedy in her situation is that Clegg is the only one in her world now and she is vitally dependent on him. Instead of putting effort for her escape, Miranda captivates herself and attaches her existence and sustainment to the existence of

Clegg. Thus, she proves herself dependent on an individual once again. In her free life, she has G. P. and she endures her captive life through Clegg's presence.

Apart from daydreaming and the tendency to escape the present and the reality through reminiscing of the past and forming new dependencies, there is another trait that Miranda has which leads to her inauthenticity. *The Collector* is a novel filled with allusions to many other texts. To illustrate, it heavily depends on Shakespeare's *The Tempest* such as in the choice of the names of the characters (Ferdinand, Miranda) for instance; Miranda calls Clegg Caliban just like in *The Tempest*, and Clegg's real name is Frederick but he chooses to call himself Ferdinand. However, the crucial point is that Miranda likens herself to literary characters and lives through these identifications to facilitate her survival. She has a tendency to identify her state of being with the heroines of literature. James Acheson in his introduction to the various essays on John Fowles (1998) asserts:

> Fowles makes use of various kinds of fiction to reveal when his characters are existentially inauthentic. In *The Collector*, Miranda writes herself in imagination into the fairytale Beauty and the Beast. She hopes that, like the Beast, Clegg will eventually have pity on her and let her go, though in doing so she is misleading herself about what the future holds. Here Fowles suggests that we must not ally ourselves too closely with the works of literature because they can delude us into thinking that everything will turn out for the best, when in fact the outcomes of our actions are often harsh and cruel. (3)

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the more Miranda gives vent to her imagination and identification with literary characters, the more she loses the sense of reality and goes astray in her endeavors to become *authentic*. One of the crucial points of existentialism is the acceptance of reality as it is, which Miranda fails to achieve through her constant referrals to literary characters (through identifications). There are many examples of this behavior of hers and all of them reflect her incapability of coping with the veracity of her confinement. While she is reading *Emma* by Jane Austen, she exclaims:

> I am Emma Woodhouse. I feel for her, of her and in her. I have a different sort of snobbism, but I understand her snobbism. Her priggishness. I admire it. I know she does wrong things, she tries to organize other people's lives, she can't see Mr. Knightley is a man in a million. She's temporarily silly, yet all the time one knows she's basically intelligent,

> alive. Creative, determined to set the highest standards. A real human being. Her faults are my faults: her virtues I must make my virtues. (157)

G. P. is not the only person that she admires and grants permission to in the shaping of her life. In her view of the world and the others, she turns to G.P. so as to shape her identity and in her confinement; she turns to literary characters in order to escape the dreary condition she is in. Thus, she avoids acknowledging the truth that she faces. From here emerges the sense of her immaturity. Seungjae Lee in her thesis *Hegelian Themes in John Fowles's Collector* (2005) asserts:

> Her [Miranda's] inauthenticity - her insistence on fictionalizing her situation rather than facing up to its brute reality - leads not to the happy outcome she fantasizes about, but instead to a dissatisfying existential impasse. (54)

Taking on the personality of a fictional character, she aims to outline her virtues based on her. David Punter, in his essay "Gothic and Neo-Gothic in Fowles's *The Collector*" (2013), claims that:

> Miranda is more conscious of the temptation to adopt the role of Jane Austen's Emma, with her constant misunderstanding of what other people might want, her own narcissistic desire to see in others only a set of reflections of herself. (73)

This adds up to her illusion of her own identity and the others. Even though what she looks up to in *Emma* is the sense of her authenticity, instead of forming her own true and unique self, she falls into dependence on others once again and this strengthens the sense of *inauthenticity* within her. Eva Petranova, in her dissertation *Existentialism in the Works of John Fowles* (2015) claims that: "Comparing her life circumstances to *Emma*, likening the male characters of the work to those of her life again, she [Miranda] becomes more and more inauthentic" (41):

> Emma. The business of being between inexperienced girl and experienced woman and the awful problem of the man. Caliban is Mr. Elton. Piers is Frank Churchill. But is G.P. Mr. Knightley? Of course G.P. has lived a life and has views that would make Mr. Knightley turn in his grave. But Mr. Knightley could never have been a phoney. Because he was a hater of pretence, selfishness, snobbism. And they both have the one man's name I really can't stand. George. Perhaps there's a moral in that. (218-219)

Miranda is quite comfortable with her identifications and she can find parallels between the fictional characters and the real people of her life. In addition to this, after an incident when she gives Clegg *The Catcher in the Rye*, Clegg mentions his dislike of the book and Miranda tries to justify herself on her choice of the book: "I gave you that book to read because I thought you would feel identified with him. He doesn't fit anywhere and you don't" (205). Therefore, Miranda uses literature as a convention to base her personality upon; not only hers but also Clegg's. Jens Pollheide, in her thesis, *Postmodernist Narrative Strategies in the Novels of John Fowles* (2003), states that;

> After all, the reader of Fowles' novels has got used to the fact that a too great indulgence in identifying with characters from other novels is a form of behavior that belies a fundamental trait of character: that of living too much by preconceived ideas, instead of one's own standards - in short, of becoming inauthentic. This is true for Miranda as well, since she is living too much in the realm of the fiction with which she surrounds herself. (40)

Hence, Miranda strips everyone including her very self of originality believing that they match with a character within the realm of literature and living in a self-made fantasy world.

During her confinement, Miranda feels the urge to ponder upon the existence of God. However, she is befuddled as her opinions concerning a supreme being fluctuate. All this adds up to her *inauthentic* self. There is an incident narrated by Clegg in the first part of the novel. The conversation is about God. Miranda asks Clegg about his opinions upon the existence of God and Clegg's answer is perfunctory: "Not much. (…) I don't think about it. Don't see that it matters" (58). When Clegg directs the same question to Miranda, Miranda is concise: "Of course I do. I'm a human being" (ibid). However, later on, the reader gets a different opinion about Miranda's faith as she is vascillating. At the beginning of her confinement, she finds herself praying and questioning:

> I don't know if I believe in God. I prayed to him furiously in the van when I thought I was going to die (that's a proof against, I can hear G.P. saying). But praying makes things easier. (119)

Praying becomes a habit of her captive life. In her diary, she recounts the miserable hours that she spends alone and as a comfort, she turns to a God she does not believe in:

> Every night I do something I haven't done for years. I lie and pray. I don't kneel, I know God despises kneelers. I lie and ask him to comfort M and D and Minny, and Caroline who must feel so guilty and everyone else, even the ones it would do good to suffer for me (or for anyone else). Like Piers and Antoinette. I ask him to help this misery who has me under his power. I ask him to help me. Not to let me be raped or abused and murdered. I ask him for light. (119)

She conforms to the idea of praying for help in her dreadful condition. However, she does not believe in the power of prayers or in the existence of God. Prior to her death, she declares: "Prayer and worship and singing hymns—all silly and useless" (223). Moreover, she continues this idea: "It's no good trusting vaguely in your luck, in Providence or God's being kind to you. You have to act and fight for yourself" (ibid). Here lies an impasse in her personality. Miranda's opinions of God fluctuate throughout the novel. As at certain points, she acknowledges the existence of God and at others disclaims its existence, her inauthenticity becomes more pronounced. One part of her yearns for reassurance and help provided by God while the other part completely denies the existence of assistance and believes herself to be the only one she can depend on. As she suffers from severe pangs of existential crisis, she cannot hold onto that thought for long as she falls into bad faith and anguish once again: "It's obvious, it stares you in the face. There *must* be a God and he can't know anything about us" (223). This fluctuation is not a favorable act in endeavors to become authentic as it creates hypocrisy and bad faith for the individual since it brings dependency and losing the control of one's actions. When her anguish deepens and she cannot find a way out of her confinement as Clegg gets irritable day by day, Miranda accuses God as the reason for her suffering:

> I hate God. I hate whatever made this world, I hate whatever made the human race, made men like Caliban possible and situations like this possible. If there is a God he's a great loathsome spider in the darkness. He cannot be good. (…)God is impotent. He can't love us. He hates us because he can't love us. (…) Oh God if there is a God. (255)

Accusing a divine entity for what befalls her is a sign of *bad faith*, on which she oscillates. Therefore, she experiences *anguish* intensely. Now, she is totally alone and disillusioned. She no longer hopes for escape and she despairs for her life. The notion of God holds no sway over her. Even if he exists, he holds no meaning for Miranda as she is forsaken in an appalling circumstance beyond her comprehension. Thus, her anguish emerges with full force:

> I've not only never felt like this before, I never imagined it possible. More than hatred, more than despair. You can't hate what you cannot touch, I can't even feel what most people think of as despair. It's beyond despair. It's as if I can't feel any more. I see, but I can't feel. (…) I hate beyond hate. (…) I'm so frightened. (…) Oh God I'm so lonely, so utterly alone. I can't write. (255-256)

Her writings get short and brief after these exclamations since her illness gets worse and her *anguish* and despair deepens:

> It wasn't necessary. It's all pain, and it buys nothing. Gives birth to nothing. All in vain. All wasted. (…) The older the world becomes, the more obvious it is. (…) More and more suffering for more and more. And more and more in vain. It's as if the lights have fused. I'm here in the black truth. (255)

The anguish Miranda experiences concerning the pain, the dubious state of God, being helpless and vulnerable, takes control of all her thoughts and she cannot help but give in to woe. She cannot shake the vehemence of her *anguish* and get rid of it. Filled to the very brim with agony and distress, she dies after a while. Thus, she remains incomplete in the authentic sense as Acheson in his work *John Fowles* (1998) argues: "It is a measure of her inauthenticity that she is unable to face up to the true nature of her predicament" (11). Lacking the courage and the power to face the reality, she prepares her own doom.

Another aspect of her character that has been criticized and condemned is the class consciousness that Miranda feels the urge to emphasize. Acheson (1998) argues that "Miranda is initially an unquestioning product of her class and background" (11). As Fowles observes in his "Preface" to *The Aristos*:

> Miranda had very little control than Clegg of what she was: she had well-to-do parents, good educational opportunity, inherited aptitude and

> intelligence. That does not mean she was perfect. Far from it – she was arrogant in her ideas, a prig, a liberal – humanist snob. (10)

Initially, she believes that she is grouped with a higher and more intelligent class; "a sort of band of people who have to stand against all the rest" (208). Repeatedly, she claims her connection claiming: "I'm one of them. I feel it and I've tried to prove it" (206). However, she realizes her delusion gradually: "I'm vain. I'm not one of them. I *want* to be one of them, and that's not the same thing" (209). Miranda realizes the difference between the Few and the Many. Despite her primary conviction of being sided with the Few, now she apprehends that she is in fact one of the Many. She can see that all she does is try to be someone like G.P and achieve a sense of a unique self. She can see that the desire and the attainment of authenticity are quite different things. She possesses the desire but she cannot go beyond her facticity and dependence on others. Acheson comments that:

> Miranda is Clegg's captive, and in that sense is not free; she is free to write, draw or paint whatever she likes, but in existential terms, she does not enjoy the large measure of freedom that goes with having a clear understanding of who and what she is. (6)

Therefore, not knowing herself in a clearer manner and molding her individuality based upon her principles, Miranda fails to achieve freedom. That is why, she can be considered as inauthentic.

As Cooper (1991) observes, the novel focuses on Miranda's "incompleteness": "Despite her creative efforts, Miranda remains a potential artist as well as a potential existentialist – always learning without achieving. (…) She remains a protégée without ever becoming a competitor" (45-6). In Miranda, it is possible to behold a character who has the aspirations and enthusiasm to be an original and authentic individual, but who has failed due to her incapability to cope with the reality. Jódar (2006) states that Miranda cannot succeed in attaining a unique self as "Until the very end, she retains hope in salvation, in a new life, without ever accepting her own tragedy" (54). Therefore, Miranda fails to obtain a free and authentic self. However, in the analysis of Miranda, there is a factor that should be focused on. Unlike Clegg, Miranda is not free. While Clegg is restricted in certain aspects, Miranda is also restricted in relation her physical freedom. She

is free in her mind; however, she is physically confined. Miranda possesses what Clegg lacks such as family, friends and education. She has the possibility of getting rid of her dependency on others that bring her closer to bad faith and crafting her unique self. However, being confined in a basement does not help this progress. Once again, the idea of limitedness comes onto the stage. In a Sartrean sense, one expects Miranda to set aside her confinement and be an authentic individual. However, the captivity over which she has no control is what seals her fate. As Fowles comments, she is a "free force in a world of tied forces" (211). These "tied forces" decide her fate. Therefore, at heart this idea gets closer to Fowles's idea concerning the attainment of total freedom. For Fowles, there is no total freedom, but only "limited freedom", and the individuals can be free in a limited sense at best. According to Fowles, there are forces that we cannot change or take under control, and they play a very significant role in determining the success of an individual in the attainment of an authentic self. Miranda is limited in Fowlesian terms. She has to sustain her being within "tied forces" and therefore, it is not possible for her to be free. If she were free, she would have a chance to test her change and her new self. However, she is not set free and she dies as a captive both in soul and body.

All in all, Miranda, the captive, is a woman who has failed to achieve authenticity. During her confinement, the reader sees her fluctuating and shifting her opinions unceasingly. She lives in bad faith concerning her opinions regarding God. She wants to sustain her faith but she is in-between related to his existence. There are instances when she disclaims and dethrones God and others where she is recognizant of his power and anticipates his intervention. As for G.P., who constitutes the quintessence of her personality, she depends on him too much and loses herself in the process. She no longer preserves a unique and distinctive self. She has molded her attitudes towards life and existence based on what he believes the truth is. Thus, she lacks ascendancy on her life and she gets more inauthentic.

Living in a fantasy does not alleviate this sense. Instead of facing up to the dire truth and reality that surrounds her; she chooses to plunge into a dreamland and a fictitious world. While doing this, she professes her incapability to confront

her situation. Even though her confinement may play a major role in deciding the final say in her attempts, all these stances and approaches to life confirm that she cannot succeed in achieving an authentic self and she dies as an inauthentic figure.

To conclude, *The Collector* is a novel in which it is possible to observe the ideas of existentialism and Fowles's views concerning this line of thinking. Both Clegg and Miranda wish to have free and authentic selves. They experience Sartrean abandonment, anguish and bad faith. However, they cannot fully achieve authenticity. They fail because of various limitations posed on them that they cannot overcome. According to Sartre, Clegg should go beyond his past, educational and family background and finally be authentic. However, he cannot do this. According to Fowles, these limitations on Clegg are not easy to surpass and they can even be insurmountable. Miranda's case is similar to Clegg. She also fails to form an authentic personality because of her limitedness which is her confinement and constant reliance on others, thus bad faith. In the portrayal of these characters, Fowles demonstrates how his idea of freedom differs from Sartre and how limitations prove to be the determinant of one's attainment of freedom and authenticity. The same kind of portrayal is also traceable in the characterization of the protagonists in *The French Lieutenant's Woman*.

# CHAPTER 4

## *THE FRENCH LIEUTENANT'S WOMAN* AND AUTHENTICITY

> 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 (…) what has changed is that we are no longer the gods of the Victorian image, omniscient and decreeing; but in the new theological image, with freedom our first principle, not authority. (Fowles, 97)

Thus speaks the narrator of *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1969), a sort of narrator who exists and aims to blur his existence at the same time. To quote Warburton (2004), it is "a first-person novel about the creative process, disguised as a third person Victorian romance" (294). The narrator undercuts the all seeing and all knowing narrator of the Victorian era and introduces one that is primed to give freedom to his characters and the reader. According to William Stephenson (2007), the narrator:

> imitates the omniscience of Victorian narrators when he adopts an all-knowing and all-seeing vantage point. At other times, though, he refuses to enter the consciousness of the main characters on the ground that they have, and deserve, existential freedom. (18)

Stephenson furthers this notion by noting that the novel is "a mixture of romance and realism by using a historical setting seen from the perspective of a contemporary narrator" (3). To facilitate the confirmation of his point, the narrator terminates the novel with two different courses of action. The reader is free to choose whichever is closer to the understanding of the novel and each end pictures a dissimilar progress of the characters on their way to freedom and authenticity.

*The French Lieutenant's Woman* is set in the Victorian era in the 1860s and moves around the choices and wishes of two characters that are chained to living in a highly conventional circle of England. In the novel, Fowles makes use of many historical developments of the given epoch to demonstrate the changes

that the society has been going through. That is why, from the very beginning of the novel to the end, there are various allusions to the ideas and principles of Karl Marx and Charles Darwin who have impinged the society and the individuals' way of thinking. According to Brian Finney (2013): "Fowles dramatizes the ways in which all these major historical markers (Karl Marx and Charles Darwin) affect the lives and the thoughts of the main characters in the novel" (90). Finney furthers his argument by claiming that the characters are "products of their conflicted era, either as its victims, or in the attempted rebellion against it" (ibid). In *Notes on an Unfinished Novel* (1969), Fowles even claims that what he aimed for in the novel was "to show an existentialist awareness before it was chronologically possible" (140). Having noted the existentialist aspect of the novel, it is possible to deduce that the novel deals with the questions of freedom and thus authenticity: the two major themes that the novel is richly endowed with.

The plot of the novel is closer at heart to the characteristics of an archetypal romance in which two lovers meet, separate and meet once again. Charles Smithson is a nobleman who aspires to science and wishes to be a scientist. Despite being engaged to Ernestina Freeman, the daughter of an affluent retailer, Charles falls in love with Sarah Woodruff, an outcast who is called as "poor Tragedy" (9). There are rumors concerning the events that have reduced Sarah to the state of the "French Lieutenant's whore" (175). Allegedly, Sarah has fallen in love with a French sailor named Varguennes, which has turned out to be the medium of her falling from grace as the society believes her to have lost her virginity and thus innocence to the sailor. Sarah and Charles meet by chance, and this meeting proves to be the first of the many subsequent ones. They fall in love and Charles breaks his engagement to be with Sarah. However, Sarah goes away and cannot be found, and Charles, as his efforts attest to be unfruitful, goes to America. When Sarah is eventually found, he comes back to England so to renew their old affections. The novel has two endings. In the first one, the lovers reunite and Charles learns about the existence of their baby. In the second ending, they come together but Sarah rejects Charles and they go their separate ways.

Both Charles and Sarah strive for their freedom in a clustered society. On their way to achieving their authenticity, they go through many trials that are suggestive of Sartrean existentialism. Lee, in her study *Existentialism and Darwinism in The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1977) asserts that:

> The novel is a presentation of the consciously willed life of Sarah Woodruff, the outsider, the outcast. It is also an examination of Charles Smithson's attempt to progress towards initiation, his quest to affirm his own free will as opposed to resigning himself to the dictates of conventional society. (14)

Rothblatt (1972), noting the existentialist concern of the novel, also comments that:

> The novel describes the crashing absurdity that comes into the life of its protagonist as one by one the institutions that give support and meaning to him fall away. The hero becomes an anti-hero who must pick his way through unforeseen disappointments, somehow finding purpose in his experiences. (353)

Within this light, this chapter follows a line of analysis similar to that of *The Collector* and aims to analyze Charles Smithson's and Sarah Woodruff's attempts to gain their independence and genuine selves by focusing on their behavior and way of thinking. The study intends to picture them as inauthentic with reference to their failure to achieve authenticity both in Sartrean and Fowlesian sense.

## 4.1 CHARLES SMITHSON AND AUTHENTICITY

Charles Smithson is the son of a baronet and considering himself belonging to the *elite*, he feels his ascendency affirmed over the others in terms of his social class. He is well educated and has reached a level of self-awareness. Throughout the novel, he acknowledges himself as "a highly intellectual being, one of the fittest and endowed with total free-will" (190). Before the unfolding of his personality through his statements and deeds, the narrator provides the reader with an insight into Charles's position and straits of his character:

> Laziness, I am afraid, Charles's distinguishing trait. Like many of his contemporaries he sensed that the earlier-self-responsibility of the century was turning into self-importance. […] You will see that Charles set his

> sights high. Intelligent idlers always have, in order to justify their idleness to their intelligence. He had, in short, all the Byronic ennui with neither of the Byronic outlets: genius and adultery. (17)

Despite being pictured as "lazy" and an "intelligent idler" by the narrator, Charles is a character who has had the advantages of his social class. According to Fawkner (1984), Charles "starts the novel as a 'gentleman' but we are immediately reminded he is also a 'Darwinist' as well. And this is his dilemma to start with" (79). He has travelled a lot and "rubbed away" many Victorian expectations in terms of morality and rectitude (18). Belonging to the noblesse, having lots of time in his hands, he beguiles himself as an amateur scientist in the studies of paleontology. He collects sample "fossil sea-urchins", ruminates on Darwin extensively and calls himself a "Darwinist". Despite these aspirations, William Stephenson states that Charles "is allegedly reading Darwin in a typically Victorian fashion. Darwin, too, is depicted as restricted by the conceptual horizon of his age" (63). Therefore, according to the narrator, "he had not really understood Darwin" (50).

Possessing sufficient income and with the prospect of enriching his circumstances, he is engaged to an exceptionally conventional woman Ernestina Freeman who is the embodiment of Victorian values and thinking. However, throughout his engagement, he falters in his thoughts concerning the impending nuptials. The narrator points to Charles's uncertainty by an example from the day that he and Ernestina are engaged. According to the narrator, Charles "was not quite sure which planet he had just landed on, but sincerely hoped the natives were friendly" (83). Only when Charles meets Sarah, the outcast, the pariah and grasps the future possibilities through her medium, does he perceive his fault and takes upon himself to pursue his freedom with Sarah. There lies Charles's quest for authenticity; in choosing Sarah over Ernestina, he also shows his attitude towards the rigid principles of the Victorian age and prefers to be with a more emancipated woman. Thus the novel progresses as Charles initiates his attempts towards his unique being. However, as there are two endings, the result of this advance of Charles depends on the one that is chosen by the reader.

The foremost subject that can be drawn in the actions and speeches of Charles is abandonment. Abandonment is the state of forlornness. Lacking the intervention of a supreme being, the individual has only himself to rely upon in his choices. This means being rid of the conventions of society as well. Charles Smithson experiences abandonment in a religious sense. At the beginning of the novel, the narrator presents the reader with some background information concerning Charles and there the issue of Charles's faith in a divine entity is enlightened:

> Charles saw what stood behind the seductive appeal of the Oxford Movement-Roman Catholicism propria terra. (…) When he returned to London, he fingered and skimmed his way through a dozen religious theories of the time, but emerged in the clear a healthy agnostic. What little God he managed to derive from existence, he found in Nature, not in the Bible. (15-16)

Thus, in the person of Charles, it is possible to see a man who does not refer to God in his struggles and as an "agnostic", the problem is not even a crucial one for him. Being attentive to Darwin and his writings, he is aware of the futility of existence and this is beyond the perception of his era: "If new species can come into being, old species often have to make way for them. Personal extinction Charles was aware of" (51).

The subject of abandonment also entails the breaking of the social dictates and norms. When an individual infringes the conventions of the society he is situated in, he needs to form his own values and live with their guidance. The breach of predetermined sets of values, morality or an encoded framework serves man in his expedition for authenticity. Charles is an individual who has the capability to see beyond the confining nature of the Victorian period. Attempting his best at avoiding the pitfalls of the conventional lifestyle, he sets himself above the common man in that sense:

> It was a fixed article of Charles's creed that he was not like the great majority of his peers and contemporaries. That was why he had travelled so much; he found English society too hidebound, English solemnity too solemn, English thought too moralistic, English religion too bigoted. (129-30)

Charles feels himself not as one of the Many; but one of the chosen Few. He is not content with the scruples of the society. He sees hypocrisy and too much conventionality in it. That is why, by travelling, he has strived to loosen the ties he has held. In another instance, the narrator once again sheds light upon Charles's relationship with the society:

> He had a whiff of corollary nausea for his own time: its stifling propriety, its worship not only of the literal machine in transport and manufacturing but of the far more terrible machine now erecting in social convention. (150)

With this strain of thought, he believes himself to be stripped of the common banality of the age and ultimately to be a free man:

> Unlit Lyme was the ordinary mass of mankind, most evidently sunk in immemorial sleep; while Charles the naturally selected (the adverb carries both its senses) was pure intellect, walking awake, free as a god, one with the unslumbering stars and understanding all. (163)

The phrases such as "walking awake" and "free as a god" connote Charles's position as a man who has seen through the triteness of the time period and indicates a man above his contemporaries since "After all, he was not a moth infatuated by a candle; he was a highly intelligent being, one of the fittest, and endowed with total free will" (190). Therefore, he holds himself as one of the Few, not one of the Many. Believing to possess freewill and to be bereft of the conventions and values of the age, Charles experiences *abandonment* in a true sense. He knows that he is responsible for his actions and he is the one to take a leap of faith if he wants to gain his total freedom. He knows that "Man's free will was not in danger. If one had to change to survive, (…) then at least one was granted a choice of methods" (299). With this faith in freedom, he nods affirmatively when Dr. Grogan, another Darwinist character in the novel quoting Virgil: "We make our destinies by our choice of gods" (152).

Apart from seeing the deficient nature of the society and lacking faith in a divine entity, through his reading of Darwin, Charles's perception of existence also alters. He begins to make out the misleading notions that his age holds as truths:

> He saw that all life was parallel: that evolution was not vertical, ascending to a perfection, but horizontal. Time was the great fallacy; existence was without history, was always now, was always this being caught in the same fiendish machine. All those painted screens erected by man to shut reality-history, religion, duty, social position, all were illusions, mere opium fantasies. (207)

Charles is a man adept at seeing life as it is. He is enlightened. He knows how the social structures, religion and all other beliefs held sacred are gilded for the common man. This awareness is not without its price. Charles pays the price for it by remaining outside of the social concerns and thus he stands alone bereft of all institutional fallacies. He sees himself as one of the Few, not belonging to the majority. Therefore, by his attitude to the society and religion, it is possible to deduce that on his way to authenticity what Charles experiences primarily is abandonment.

As discussed earlier, abandonment entails anguish. Anguish is the anxiety of an individual when he discovers his freedom. Once a man knows for a fact that he is completely free, what to do with this freedom creates apprehension. It can be recounted as the man's ephemeral insignificance in an ever-enduring world his wish to transcend it. According to the narrator in the novel, existential anguish and anxiety are "the realization that one is free and the realization that being free is a situation of terror" (344). With the pangs of abandonment, Charles also experiences anguish in many occasions. However, he feels anguish in terms of both his choice of a bride and if had he chosen a different path, what would have happened. After his meeting with Sarah, he begins to detect the deficiencies and the tendencies he condemns in the person of his betrothed Ernestina: "In this vital matter of the woman with whom he had elected to share his life, had he not been only too conventional? Instead of doing the most intelligent thing had he not done the most obvious?" (130)

Thus begins his self-questioning and he feels the terror and the remorse of his choices. They generate anguish in him as he wishes to go beyond the limits, achieve his freedom and shackle the fetters of conventionality. His ruminations follow in the same strain: he terms himself as "a brilliant man trapped, a Byron

tamed" (ibid). Meeting with Sarah opens up his eyes to vast amount of possibilities he could have chosen instead of marrying a very conventional Victorian woman: "She [Sarah] made him aware of a deprivation. His future had always seemed to him of vast potential; and now suddenly it was a fixed voyage to a known place" (ibid). Charles is aware of the limitations that his impending nuptials pose on him and he is also quite conscious of his freedom and what the future might hold. This awareness sets the sense of agony and sorrow in motion. Thus, he experiences a kind of anguish that pertains to his future and what is in store for him.

The notion of freedom enlightens Charles. He sees the paths wide open before him, he is sensitive to the options he has and their outcomes. Thus, in his consciousness, Charles experiences the paroxysms of agony and the terror it accompanies. When he confronts his alternatives in terms of a woman, he feels this deeply. He is in love with Sarah, the woman who showed him life's possibilities; he can go with her or keep his word to Ernestina and be trapped in the chains of Victorian values. Accordingly, he contemplates upon his choices as follows:

> But above all it seemed to set Charles a choice; and while one part of him hated having to choose (…) another part of him felt intolerably excited by the proximity of the moment of choice. He had not the benefit of existentialist terminology; but what he felt was really a very clear case of the anxiety of freedom. (343-44)

Charles experiences the availability of having an option and how one decision can affect his entire life. Deciding is the main source of distress for him. One path leads to freedom and the other one signifies being caged, and enslaved in the society that he wholeheartedly condemns. These ruminations persist all along even after he makes up his mind to be with Sarah. Close to the end of the novel, he breaks his engagement and follows Sarah. Their encounter culminates in sexual intercourse. This is a fatal step for both of them as it proves Sarah's relation of having slept with the French Lieutenant wrong and Charles experiences a new kind of enlightened perception of his situation. To clear his mind he leaves Sarah

and goes to a church. Once there, he momentarily experiences a conflict within himself and questions his choices:

> My poor Charles, search your heart—you thought when you came to this city, did you not, to prove to yourself you were not yet in the prison of your future. But escape is not one act, my friend. It is no more achieved by that than you could reach Jerusalem from here by one small step. Each day, Charles, each hour, it has to be taken again. Each minute the nail waits to be hammered in. You know your choice. You stay in prison, what your time calls duty, honor, self-respect, and you are comfortably safe. Or you are free and crucified. Your only companions the stones, the thorns, the turning backs; the silence of cities, and their hate. (365)

There are two paths before him and he is aware which one will bring freedom and which one will bind him for eternity. He has to choose. This decision making process is an agonizing process for him. He will either choose liberty, so bear the cross of it or he will marry Ernestina and be a Victorian man all through his life. Living through this dilemma is one part of the existential anguish that Charles experiences.

In existential epistemology, when a man senses his freedom, this realization urges him to act. He feels encumbered to change his present condition. He suffers from the need to achieve his new self with the newly-found independence. This constitutes another form of anguish and Charles undergoes this sentiment, as well. After his meetings with Sarah, he experiences a new kind of awakening and a force within himself that thrusts him forward:

> But he knew only too well that he was awake. He kept saying to himself, I must do something, I must act. And a kind of anger at his weakness swept over him- a wild determination to make some gesture that would show he was more than an ammonite stranded in a drought, that he could strike out against the dark clouds that enveloped him. (210)

Charles, rather than being a traditional fossil and nobody, wants to do something. If he does not, he will regret it till the day he dies. This is sheer anguish for him. He is free as long as he acts, as long as he wants to be. That is why, following abandonment, it is possible to conclude that Charles goes through the anguish of freedom. One is free, and what to do with this freedom, how one is situated and how to overcome it, being torn between decisions and feeling himself desiring to

act are parts of this state of anxiety. As a man aspiring to his own unique self, on his way to authenticity, Charles gets familiar with these themes of existentialism.

To conclude, Charles goes through the main steps of existentialism. He experiences abandonment in relation to religion and social conventions. He undergoes existential anguish; the terror of one's freedom. However, he falters at a certain point. Even though Charles begins to get a glimpse of the other world which is freedom, he cannot achieve authenticity. Despite experiencing abandonment and anguish regarding his choices, Charles is a character who fails to attain authentic individuality mainly due to his constant reliance on *bad faith*. Throughout the novel, the reader beholds Charles falling into bad faith quite often. Rather than accepting his share in the choice of his actions and their inevitable consequences, he strives to find another agent to lay the blame on.

At the beginning of the novel, the reader is informed about the engagement of Charles and Ernestina. Even though they seem to be a happy couple, Charles's intention of marriage does not derive from his passion for Ernestina. The narrator comments on behalf of Charles: "Everything became simple. He loved Ernestina" (82). However, the truth lies deep down in Charles's heart. He wants to marry because Ernestina points to a kind of "sensitive place" in his "innermost soul" (81). Despite professing to love Ernestina, Charles wants to marry her because of

> his feeling that he was growing like his uncle at Winsyatt, that life was passing him by, that he was being, as in so many other things, over fastidious, selfish … and worse. He had not travelled abroad those last two years; and he had realized that previously travelling had been a substitute for not having a wife. (ibid)

This is the first instance of bad faith that Charles undergoes. He deceives himself about his love for Ernestina and the motivation he holds for the marriage is far from being acknowledged even by himself. With this background to a seemingly happy prospect of marriage, it is not surprising to see him regret his somewhat hasty decision.

This self deception pervades throughout the novel. He does not deceive himself regarding only his relationship with Ernestina. He deceives himself with respect to his relationship with Sarah as well. Earlier in the novel, Charles has two

chance meetings with Sarah in a secluded place during his scientific excursions; and they arrange a third one due to Sarah's insistence. This last meeting proves to be the one when Sarah lays bare her soul and takes Charles into her confidence relating to him her fall from grace. Charles tries to reconcile her to the idea of leaving the place she lives in and moving somewhere else. He tries to console her in her affliction. On his way back home after the meeting, Charles questions himself about why he has agreed to meet her in the first place. He is scared of being detected by others because "he had run an absurd risk" and he does not want to be the one to be accused because of interfering in the affairs of an outcast (189):

> And how should he have blamed himself very deeply? From the outset his motives had been of the purest; he had cured her of her madness; and if something impure had for a moment threatened to infiltrate his defences; it had been but mint sauce to the wholesome lamb. (…) If he had not been sure of that latter safeguard, would he ever have risked himself in such dangerous waters? (189-90)

What Charles does is deceive himself. He does not wish to acknowledge the main reason why he meets her. Instead of admitting his attraction to Sarah, he holds his mission holy as he tries to "cure her of her madness". This is a clear example of how Charles's mind works. According to him, he is not to blame since he is the embodiment of freedom. However, he does not even concede his motivation of meeting her with this "total free will". He does not admit that he meets Sarah because he wants to; instead he deems this meeting as a duty of him to help an outcast, a mad woman.

Charles feels the pressure of keeping these meetings with Sarah to himself. He knows for a fact that the meetings are dangerous for him and seeing Sarah clandestinely increases the peril he is in. His fear turns into reality. Sarah is seen leaving the meeting-place which has a reputation of being a lovers' nest. Thus, she is dismissed by her employer, Mrs. Poultney who is a highly religious and conventional woman. With her discharge, Sarah disappears and the whole town gets anxious about her. Only Charles knows where she is as she sends a note to him of her whereabouts. All these secrets bear heavy on Charles. That is why he

feels that "He must talk to someone. He must lay bare his soul" (210). Accordingly, he visits Dr. Grogan, a man Charles feels closer as he is well-read and also a Darwinist. During his visit, Charles begins to relate the circumstances of his meeting with Sarah and he falls into bad faith once again. When he finishes recounting, he blames Sarah for everything, picturing himself as a victim: "In other words, I have been led by the nose" (225). When the doctor confronts him by stating that Charles is "half in-love with her", he refuses vehemently (ibid). When Dr. Grogan urges Charles to be honest and says: "Know thyself", Charles awakens (226). However, instead of admitting the truth, he acts in bad faith once again. He begins to blame his life and charges his youth as the responsible agent for him to wish to marry as deep down he does not want to. He claims: "I am not made for marriage. My misfortune is to have realized it too late" (ibid). Thus he bares his soul:

> Oh my dear Grogan, if you knew the mess my life was in … the waste of it … the uselessness of it. I have no moral purpose, no real sense of duty to anything. It seems only a few months ago that I was twenty-one- full of hopes… all disappointed. And now to get entangled in this miserable business… (ibid)

Charles avoids admitting his attraction to Sarah. He has met her several times because of this interest in her and now he is aware of the fact that he cannot marry Ernestina. Instead of it, there is always something for him to censure, and to accuse. He blames his sense of being trapped by the approaching marriage and he sees himself "like a man possessed against his will- against all that is better in his character" (227). Thus, he wants to evade and defy the share he holds in his relationship with Sarah.

Living in bad faith extends into Charles's vision of God in a similar manner. Through the end of the novel, he has a sexual encounter with Sarah and this marks his future proceedings. He finds out that Sarah is a virgin contrary to the story she had told concerning her affair with Varguennes, the French Lieutenant. When Charles proposes marriage, Sarah rejects him. This breaks the illusion that has haunted him in the image of Sarah as now he sees himself as "the dupe of her imaginings" (361). With this awakening, what he does is contradict

his previous perceptions of god and religion as an agnostic; he goes to church "to seek sanctuary" (360). Once in the church:

> Charles seated himself halfway down the main aisle and stared through the roodscreen at the crucifix over the altar. Then he got to his knees and whispered the Lord's prayer, his rigid hands clenched over the prayer-ledge in front of him. (…) He began to compose a special prayer for his circumstances: Forgive me, O Lord, for my selfishness. Forgive me for breaking Thy laws. Forgive me my dissatisfaction with myself, forgive me my lack of faith in Thy wisdom and charity. Forgive and advise me, O Lord in my travail … (361)

Charles, who believes in Darwinian thought and who holds himself above the others as a member of the Few by his sense of transcending god and religion, acts in bad faith and prays to Christian God to help him in his time of trial. As his views regarding god and religion fluctuate, Charles loses his sense of abandonment. This kind of behavior is similar to the one Miranda in *The Collector* has been through. Her opinions regarding religion and the idea of a deity fluctuate during her confinement and therefore, she lives in constant bad faith. What Charles goes through is analogous to Miranda's situation. To account for this bizarre behavior, the narrator follows Charles's state of mind concerning his faith and the act of praying:

> Deep in his heart Charles did not want to be an agnostic. Because he had never needed faith, he had quite happily learnt to do without it; and his reason, his knowledge of Lyell and Darwin, had told him he was right to do without its dogma. Yet he was, not weeping for Sarah, but for his inability to speak to God. (362-63)

Being in church changes many of his perceptions, and the narrator defines the clash of these new thoughts with the older ones as "a dialogue between his better self and his worse self" or "between him and the spread-eagled figure in the church's end" (363). The conflicting dialogue proves to be one which surfaces Charles's state of bad faith concerning his attitude to and affiliation with Sarah. He begins to assert himself once again: "I did not do it. I was led to do it" (363). Thus he denies all his attraction to Sarah in the first place and accuses her of luring him: "I was deceived" (ibid). When his better self points out that it was he who had the choice of doing all these actions, Charles breaks: "I admit these

things. I have sinned. But I was fallen into her snare" (364). Therefore, despite being aware of his part, Charles goes on blaming Sarah and it is not that he cannot help but live in *bad faith*; rather, he can help but he chooses to live in *bad faith.*

Another instance of his praying occurs when he fails to find Sarah at the hotel after sending her a letter and a gift following their sexual intercourse. After the intercourse, he writes a letter to Sarah and entrusts it to his man-servant Sam, who intentionally does not deliver the letter out of spite for Charles and when Sarah does not hear from him, she leaves the town. Charles does all he can to find her and during these endeavors, when his first attempts fail, he falls back on God and bad faith once again: "He did something that night he had not done for many years. He knelt by his bed and prayed: and the substance of his prayer was that he would find her; if he searched for the rest of his life, he would find her" (405).

All through the novel, Charles always falls back on religion or blames Sarah for the things that befall him. Thus, he cannot get rid of the sense of living in bad faith. He holds himself as having no share in the events that have transpired. He regards himself as duped and led by the forces that he cannot prevail upon. The more he tries to justify his actions by putting the blame on others, the further he gets away from achieving freedom and authenticity. This kind of behavior is a reminiscent of Clegg in *The Collector*. Clegg, who is also a victim of bad faith, never admits to his share in the events and he blames other parties to justify his action and just like Clegg, Charles loses his authentic self by his denial of responsibility and constant justifications.

As for "facticity" and "transcendence", there arises the major discrepancy between Sartrean authenticity and Fowles's views about existentialism. For Sartre, facticity is something to be transcended so that an individual can have complete freedom. However, Fowles does not believe this to be possible as the forces that one cannot change have a greater sway on an individual. For Fowles, one can never be rid of the limitations he has been brought up in. Therefore, the idea of complete freedom is problematized. Charles is an individual who is stuck in this facticity since it is possible to observe Charles as restricted in many aspects. The first limitation that he experiences is the mentality of the Victorian

man. He is not limited in a material or financial sense. He is not constrained because of social class since he belongs to the gentlefolk. He is not inhibited because of his educational background or lack of a worldview. What limits Charles is his too conventional outlook on life. As Klerk (1987) says: "Charles is a thoroughly conventional man of his period" (52). The narrator provides an insight into the mentality of Charles: "He told himself he was too pampered, too spoiled by civilization, ever to inhabit nature again; and that made him sad, in a not unpleasant bittersweet sort of way. After all, he was a Victorian" (68). This small passage is a sort of warning for the reader about the expectations relating Charles's future. No matter what he does and thinks, he cannot shake the Victorian frame of mind.

Another occasion which demonstrates the situated frame of mind and position of Charles occurs relating to his feelings about his choice of a woman to marry. Nothing is the same for him after his meetings with Sarah. He is now aware of another kind of woman who is very different from the Victorian female figure. While it creates anguish, it also poses how limited he is in the present situation:

> He felt fatally disabused of his own intelligence. It had let him down in his choice of a life partner; for like so many Victorian, and perhaps more recent, men Charles was to live all his life under the influence of the ideal. There are some men who are consoled by the idea that there are women less attractive than their wives; and others who are haunted by the knowledge that there are more attractive. Charles now saw only too well which category he belonged to. (227)

Charles is a man who is torn between two dissimilar worldviews. On the outside he lives a comfortable life and he seems to feel at ease with the Victorian expectations of a gentleman. However, deep inside, he lives with the dream of other possible routes in life, freedom and a need of alleviation. Katherine Tarbox (1986) claims that:

> On one hand, he [Charles] is content to see his life as a story, a familiar plot, a neat Victorian novel, in fact. He decides to choose a wife, not because he has any of the higher yearnings associated with marriage, but because it is "time" to plug a wife into his plot. The woman he chooses is certain to play out the rest of the drama neatly. Yet even as he seeks comfort in this safe

> predictability, he experiences deep longings for a life that is based more on contingency. (82-3)

A man living through this dilemma grasps lots of chances to realize this "contingency", a life open to many possibilities and freedoms. However, rather than achieving authenticity and being an independent individual, Charles remains inauthentic. He cannot unburden himself of the many characteristics that form him as a Victorian gentleman. He has aspirations to go beyond. However, the Victorian frame of mind dooms him in his each and every attempt since he cannot get rid of the ambiguous existence he dwells in.

Unlike most of the Victorians, as a believer in Darwin, Charles sees himself beyond his age and its understanding. He holds no faith in religion and he professes himself aloof from the men of his generation. All these feelings create a sense of *abandonment* on his part which may be fruitful for him in his quest for individuality. Nevertheless, he contradicts his sense of being a man of the future because of his choice of scientific pursuit. Unlike many Victorian gentleman, he is fascinated by the fossils of sea-urchins and delights in being "a born amateur" in this scientific pursuit (47). However, according to Jens Pollheide, in her thesis *Postmodernist Narrative Strategies in the Novels of John Fowles* (2003), Charles is torn:

> by his own embodiment of different doctrines: while he is a professed follower of Darwin, and thus regards progress and evolution as fundamental concepts of a scientific world-view which he is inclined to adopt, he is also interested in paleontology, a science that by definition is concerned with the already-dead. (81)

Thus, rather than doing a future-oriented scientific study, the fact that Charles chooses to explore the past is an indicator of the duality in his judgments and a predicament of his still-strong ties with the past and its importance.

Being interested in paleontology also causes another important notion that leads to inauthenticity. As mentioned earlier in the chapter about *The Collector*, the theme of "having" and "being", in Fowlesian terms, is an obsession of the modern age and the collector mentality obliterates the freedom and the meanings of a subject and shrinks it into the position of sheer object. In *The Collector*,

Clegg suffers from his obsession of collecting butterflies and later on, women. This collector mentality obliterates his progress towards a better and unique self. It can be deduced that similar to Clegg, Charles also has a collector mentality due to this interest in paleontology. In his strolls for the search of fossils, he ruminates on nature and feels the inadequacy of his generation towards the appreciation of nature and feels sad. The narrator steps in and explains the frame of mind that Charles has:

> We couldn't expect him to see what we are only just beginning- and with so much more knowledge and the lessons of existential philosophy at our disposal- to realize ourselves: that the desire to hold and the desire to enjoy are mutually destructive. His statement to himself should have been, "I possess this now, and I am happy" instead of what it so Victorianly was: "I cannot possess this forever, and therefore am sad". (69)

Thus, Charles suffers from the craze for "having" and not "being". The fact that he collects things from the past and feels the incapability of owning nature is an indicator of his collector mentality which is strongly linked with the inauthentic mode of existence. Loveday (1985) notes this attitude of Charles as follows: "Charles, (…) enjoys collecting and classifying fossils…Science for Fowles, is an extension of the same device: by classifying things under headings we possess them, yet we miss what is most valuable in them, their individual essence" (5). Being concerned with collecting and classifying the long-dead organism indicates Charles's frame of mind that mainly deals with the idea of possessing, which brings forward a character that gets stuck in the process of "having" something and cannot see beyond. Thus, he forfeits his chance of "being".

Another point concerning the collector mentality that Charles suffers from can be drawn in his treatment of women. Charles has two women in his life. Each of them serves a different purpose for him. To begin with, he is engaged to Ernestina due to selfish reasons on his part. The love he professes to have is superficial as the main motivation that lies behind his decision to marry is quite singular:

> What she [Ernestina] did not know was that she had touched an increasingly sensitive place in Charles's innermost soul; his feeling that he was growing like his uncle at Winsyatt, that life was passing him by, that he was being, as

> in so many other things, overfastidious, lazy, selfish ... and worse. He had not traveled abroad those last two years; and he had realized that previously traveling had been a substitute for not having a wife. (81)

Ernestina is there to fill a void that Charles experiences. This void has nothing to do with love or passion. Charles is a man who is dependent on certain things to validate his own existence, and Ernestina serves him as a substitute to cover up the patch that he feels. Not only Ernestina but also Sarah is welcomed into Charles's life for self-centered reasons. For him, Sarah is the embodiment of all that he aspires to achieve: freedom as she reminded him of:

> some emotion, some possibility she symbolized. She made him aware of a deprivation. His future had always seemed to him of vast potential; and now suddenly it was a fixed voyage to a known place. She had reminded him of that. (130)

While Ernestina binds him to the conventional life style that pampers and cajoles him as a divine masculine in the Victorian world, Sarah represents other possibilities in life that can be attainable if desired and pursued. Sarah is a tool for him to obtain these other possibilities.

As a person who is torn in-between, Charles intends to use Sarah as a means to his own ends on his way to authenticity and thus, he demonstrates the collector mentality that objectifies women and demotes them to mere objects to be manipulated. This way, the two women who constitute Charles's life are delegated to a position which can be beneficial only for him. Even Dr. Grogan, who is his mentor in many ways, identifies this trait of Charles and warns him about it: "I would have had you think twice before you embroiled that innocent girl in your pursuit of self-knowledge" (398). Acheson (1998) comments that:

> It is irrational that Charles makes a Christ-like figure of a woman he had formerly feared was a fatal temptress, and cowardly in that he assumes that freedom is only bearable if there is someone with whom he can share the attendant anxiety. (43)

Charles desires Sarah as the freedom he longs for is not easy to be endured completely alone. He needs company in his anguish of freedom.

However, freedom, a self-explanatory word, does in fact oppose this idea of dependency on others. If a person seeks to be free, he needs to be mentally

suitable to be alone. The company he desires can only entail more unfreedom. Therefore, Charles, proving his dependency on Ernestina and Sarah respectively, gets further away from achieving his individuality. The fact that he uses women as a means for his own ends and the collector mentality that lies behind it represent the degree of inauthenticity that Charles embodies in his conventional frame of mind.

The most important characteristic that brings Charles to closer to an inauthentic individual is that even though in his heart he condemns the conventional lifestyle of the Victorians, their sets of values and morals, the outward facet of his behavior is quite the contrary. Thus, he cannot escape the conventionality that bounds him to his present status. Conradi (1985) describes Charles as:

> the conventional hero, a somewhat passive and futile leisured gentleman, an amateur paleontologist who lives with no larger ambition than inheriting a baronetcy from his uncle and marrying the daughter of a very rich draper. (43)

Most of the time, he enjoys this conformity and the sense of duty to the society and his class. In one of his excursions for collecting sea-urchins, he ruminates about presenting them to Ernestina and this idea of gift-giving reminds him of his obligations as a future husband: "The increased weight on his back made it a labour as well as a gift. Duty, agreeable conformity to the epoch's current, raised its stern head" (51). This sense of duty and responsibility does not weigh him down; on the contrary, he cherishes it; an act in discordance with the beliefs he holds. Even though he feels "exalted superiority, intellectual distance above the rest of their [Charles and Dr. Grogan's] fellow creatures", Charles is enthralled by the traditional life he leads (163). He feels himself bound to his duty as an engaged man and he is content with the attention bestowed on him. When his fiancée Ernestina fusses on him, he cannot help but feel delighted:

> He was happy to be adulated, fussed over, consulted, deferred to. What man is not? But he had had years of very free bachelorhood, and in his fashion was also a horrid, spoilt child. It was still strange to him to find that his mornings were not his own; that the plans of an afternoon might have to be

> sacrificed to some whim of Tina's. Of course he had duty to back him up; husbands were expected to do such things, therefore he must do them. (113)

The sense of duty prevails and overshadows his other concerns. As a future husband, he feels the need to conform and be faithful to whatever is expected of him. According to Tarbox, Charles "abhors meeting the petty demands of Ernestine's schedule, but another part of him feels safe in routine" (86). The same feeling reigns in his heart and mind when he is called to another town by his uncle. He presumes that the reason of his being called is because of the inheritance he will receive with the wedding. Thus he holds a happy prospect on his way to his uncle. The sense of duty bears on him as the future heir and he delights in it:

> Charles felt himself truly entering upon his inheritance. It seemed to explain all his previous idling through life, his dallying with religion, with science with travel; he had been waiting for this moment… his call to the throne, so to speak. (…) Immense duties, the preservation of this peace and order, lay ahead as they had lain ahead of so many young men of his family in the past. Duty- this was his real wife. (198)

Even though in his speeches he denounces the society and how it works, Charles in his deeds is in total uniform with the proceedings of his era. Instead of relying on more independent notions and realizing himself, "duty" lures him as it has lured other gentlemen before him. The abandonment he believes that he experiences in his relation to the general thoughts and public feelings is tinged with hypocrisy. Rokotnitz (2014) claims that:

> Charles could decide that, despite the shortcomings inherent in marrying Ernestina, domesticity might provide protection - a staving off of the empty spaces. That life would not be an authentic yet arduous journey; it would be comfortable, affluent, and filled with family. (346)

That is why, instead of being an authentic individual, Charles falls happily into the clutches of conventionality as it brings comfort with it.

In another occasion that relates to his qualms about the appropriateness of informing Ernestina of his encounters with Sarah, he gives vent to his sense of duty once again as a typical Victorian man. He does not want Ernestina to know the context and the content of his meetings with Sarah and that is why, he decides

to leave her in the dark. However, the way that he justifies this behavior of his is rich with the components of his inauthenticity:

> He had even recontemplated revealing what had passed between himself and Miss Woodruff to Ernestina; but alas, he foresaw only too vividly that she might put foolish female questions, questions he could not truthfully answer without moving into dangerous waters. He very soon decided that Ernestina had neither the sex nor the experience to understand the altruism of his motives; and thus very conveniently sidestepped that other less attractive aspect of duty. (165)

In this brief passage, it is possible to observe how Charles tries to dupe both himself and Ernestina about his intentions. As a man possessing the characteristics of his era, the first thing he assumes is the inferiority of the intelligence of women. Even though he professes to be one of the elect, his view of women is too conventional. He does not want to be baffled with "foolish female questions". Besides, he considers Ernestina a simpleton who has no chance to understand his intentions and thus insults her intelligence. Instead, he deems it his duty to keep the matter in secret. However, what he does is misinterpret his motivations. He does not want to acknowledge his love for Sarah and he strives to cover it with the pretence of "duty". As a result, having "duty" to back him up, he becomes more conventional in his deeds and once again he falls in bad faith and gets all the more inauthentic.

The shadow of conventionality can also be glimpsed in Charles's consciousness of class distinction as well. He is content with belonging with the few, the elite, the aristocracy, having been granted an easy life by birth. Whenever an incident challenges his status as a member of the higher class, he experiences an agonizing personal dilemma. He experiences this challenge with his man-servant Sam. The narrator points out that the help of the new generation is quite different from the previous ones:

> Of course to us any Cockney servant called Sam evokes immediately the immortal Weller; and it was certainly from that background that this Sam had emerged. But thirty years had passed since Pickwick Papers first coruscated into the world. Sam's love of the equine was not really very deep. He was more like some modern working-class man who thinks a keen knowledge of cars a sign of his social progress. (42)

The new type of man-servants represented by Sam is not one of an absent-minded figure; rather kind of a "very fair example of a snob" since:

> He had a very sharp sense of clothes style - quite as sharp as a 'mod' of the 1960s; and he spent most of his wages on keeping in fashion. And he showed another mark of this new class in his struggle to command the language. (43)

With these assets, Sam does not only fulfill the role of a servant for Charles but also serves as a companion. However, in their relationship, which includes a tinge of affection, Charles also gets frustrated in case his authority is questioned or rejected. He does not want to admit the change and the metamorphoses of the new social classes. He expects the same old obedience that his fore-fathers had from their servants. This is the reason why he generally undermines Sam and his intelligence. That is why, his knots with conventionality get only stronger. Charles sees Sam as:

> too young to be a good manservant and besides, absentminded, contentious, vain, fancying himself sharp; too fond of drolling and idling, leaning with a straw-haulm or sprig of parsley cocked in the corner of his mouth; of playing the horse fancier or of catching sparrows under a sieve when he was being bawled for upstairs. (42)

He even likens Sam to "Sancho Panza" as a man with lesser intelligence (44). Apart from this, through the end of the novel, the reader beholds Charles as a frustrated man due to the treatment he receives from Sam. After Charles breaks off his engagement with Ernestina, Sam plucks up his courage and announces his wish to leave his service. The case is a simple one and Sam does not act in a disrespecting manner. However, instead of granting his wish, Charles insists on keeping Sam and their dialogue is one of a disquieting quality for Charles as it comes fairly unexpected and unsuitable from a man-servant:

> "I shall very probably go abroad."
> "Then I 'ave to beg to hadvise you, sir, that I won't be haccompanin' you."
> Charles jumped up. "How dare you address me in that damned impertinent manner! Take yourself off!"
> Sam was now the enraged bantam.
> "Not 'fore you've 'eard me out. I'm not comin' back to Hexeter. I'm leavin' your hemploy!"
> "Sam!" It was a shout of rage.

"As I hought to 'ave done—"
"Go to the devil!" (390-91)

Charles fails to recognize the change that his era has been experiencing for a while in terms of social classes. He lacks the vision to indentify the revolutions in social classes and that is why with this incident, he wakes up to a new kind of revelation. He regards this attitude of Sam as "his first taste of the real thorn-and-stone treatment" (ibid). Being pretty conventional in his treatment of the servants, he does not expect any rebellion or the exclamation of an assertion of will from them.

The same kind of awareness of class distinction is observable in Charles's reaction to Ernestina's father, who offers Charles a business deal. Even though Charles claims to be "one of the fittest", he is still bound to the strict views of his forefathers' idea of a gentleman. He believes that a gentleman cannot do a job like Ernestina's father, Mr. Freeman, who owns and runs many shops in drapery business. Despite calling himself a "Darwinist", Charles cannot understand the need for change and the adaptation of his social class. Here, Mr. Freeman chooses to enlighten Charles:

> You will never get me to agree that we are all descended from monkeys. I find that notion blasphemous. But I thought much on some of the things you said during our little disagreement. I would have you repeat what you said, what was it, about the purpose of this theory of evolution. A species must change ... ?
> In order to survive. It must adapt itself to changes in the environment.
> Just so. Now that I can believe. I am twenty years older than you. Moreover, I have spent my life in a situation where if one does not—and very smartly—change oneself to meet the taste of the day, then one does not survive. One goes bankrupt. Times are changing, you know. This is a great age of progress. And progress is like a lively horse. Either one rides it, or it rides one. Heaven forbid I should suggest that being a gentleman is an insufficient pursuit in life. That it can never be. But this is an age of doing, great doing, Charles. You may say these things do not concern you—are beneath you. But ask yourself whether they ought to concern you. (290)

Charles who deems himself aloof and "an amateur scientist" fails to grasp the change in the social classes and he is overwhelmed when he confronts the bare truth concerning the future of him and his class. He begins to perceive the

sturdiness of Darwinian theory: "The abstract idea of evolution was entrancing; but its practice seemed (as) fraught with ostentations vulgarity" (291). Considering himself a "victim of evolution", Charles clings more eagerly to the conventions of his life as a gentleman and he even finds the idea of going to business repulsive (290). Thus, he rejects it since: "(…) he was a gentleman and gentlemen cannot go into trade" (290). According to Peter Wolfe, the author of *John Fowles: Magus and Moralist* (1979):

> His prospective father-in-law, Mr. Freeman, makes him test the Darwinian principle that survival depends on adaptation when he offers him a partnership in his huge store…Charles rejects Mr. Freeman's offer because a gentleman does not work. Belonging to a class that knows nothing of work, he is both untrained and unfit for work. His resisting a job reflects an inability to shake free from the social class and to change with the times. (142)

Charles cannot overcome his sense of belonging to a higher class and thus he fails to put into practice what he professes to believe in theory. This situation creates an inconsistency in his personality and he gets closer in heart to inauthenticity.

The same kind of attitude can be observed in his relationship with Sarah. From the very beginning of their encounters and the following intimacy, Charles does not want to risk being seen with Sarah as she is an outcast and he believes himself to be high above her. The fact that he wants to keep the matter in the dark is an indication of his being too conscious of his status and caring about the judgment of the others. After their initial meetings, Charles oscillates between his decision to keep Ernestina in the dark as to his interaction with Sarah or to inform her and the others about the content and the aim of their meetings. However, he decides against it fearing their judgment and further interrogation by them:

> He had—or so he believed—fully intended, when he called to escort the ladies down Broad Street to the Assembly Rooms, to tell them of his meeting— though of course on the strict understanding that they must speak to no one about Sarah's wanderings over Ware Commons. But somehow the moment had not seemed opportune. (…) but if Sarah was not mentioned, it was rather more because he had begun to feel that he had allowed himself to become far too deeply engaged in conversation with her—no, he had lost all sense of proportion. He had been very foolish, allowing a misplaced chivalry to blind his common sense; and the worst of it was that it was all now deucedly difficult to explain to Ernestina. (128)

What Charles experiences is fear and anguish in the strictest sense. He cannot open up about Sarah as he is concerned that it may reveal his feelings towards the woman and he indicts the circumstances as of being inopportune. With this, he begins to blame Ernestina for the possibility of jealousy and a lack of understanding:

> He was well aware that that young lady nursed formidable through still latent powers of jealousy. At worst, she would find his behavior incomprehensible and be angry with him; at best, she would only tease him - but it was a poor 'at best'. He did not want to be teased on this subject. (128-9)

Deciding to keep Sarah a secret, Charles commences to view their interaction as one that may incur danger to him, his prospective marriage and his status in the society. In the next meeting that occurs, Charles feels self-conscious as being a conventional man at heart; he does not want to jeopardize himself. When Sarah says, "I ask but one hour of your time", he feels the danger approach and he wants to fend it off: "It must certainly be that we do not continue to risk" (146). However, one more time, he agrees to meet with her and this time he learns the true circumstances that have degraded Sarah in the eyes of the society though he immediately regrets his decision: "He should have taken a firmer line, should have left earlier, should have handed back the tests, should have suggested - no, commanded - other solutions to her despair" (147). On his way home, he carries on his ruminations regarding the appropriateness of his decision:

> He knew he was about to engage in the forbidden, or rather the forbidden was about to engage in him. The farther he moved from her, in time and distance, the more clearly he saw the folly of his behavior. It was as if, when she was before him, he had become blind: had not seen her for what she was, a woman most patently dangerous. (ibid)

This doubt on Charles's part indicates an aspect in his character. On the one hand, he considers himself one of the Few and enlightened, but on the other hand, he is still concerned with what the people might think of his behavior in relation to his meetings with an outcast woman. To quote Cynthia Lee (1977), Charles "accepts

the Victorian predilection for wanting to hide things, to deny reality" (26). Initially, he sees his position fit for interfering with the circumstances of Sarah:

> He had been frank enough to admit to himself that it contained, besides the impropriety, an element of pleasure; but now he detected a clear element of duty. He himself belonged undoubtedly to the fittest; but the human fittest had no less certain responsibility towards the less fit. (165)

However, his vision of duty towards Sarah, who is a "less fit", is stained with the progress of their intimacy and Sarah's wish to tell him about her falling from grace. Due to this interest on Sarah's part, Charles is scared of what might befall him. He deems this interaction as "forbidden" and Sarah as "a woman most patently dangerous". Therefore, in their next meeting, Charles feels the urge to warn Sarah about the secrecy of their meeting as he wants to assure himself that he is safe from others' censure and criticism that may be incurred from his interaction with Sarah and he claims: "There will of course be no necessity to speak of our meetings" (183). Later on, he wants to ensure his safety for a second time: "We must never meet alone again" (187). Within this vicious circle, it is possible to observe the more dominant traits of Charles, which are highly conventional and hypocritical in nature. Fawkner (1984) observes that:

> To a certain extent he is aware of male chauvinism and the more obvious forms of the suppression of women in his time. Yet his attitude to Sarah frequently reveals a complete ignorance of how he is himself part of the vast apparatus of masculine aggression and dominance. (87-88)

The way he treats Sarah is a token of that understanding. Even though he strives to convince himself that he is there to help Sarah as he is responsible for the less fortunate, he is still bound to the prejudices and the dread of the condemnation of the society.

Another theme that can be tracked in the process of Charles's inauthentic personality is the use of identification. In terms of inauthenticity emerging from identification, as quoted previously, James Acheson (2013) states that "Fowles makes use of various kinds of fiction to reveal when his characters are existentially inauthentic" (3). This claim validates itself in relation to Charles. Just like Miranda in *The Collector* makes various allusions to literary characters and

identifies herself with some of them, Charles also refers to literature and other literary characters in the process of defining and understanding the events as well as the people around him.

The first instance of referral to a literary text occurs during Charles's excursions of his scientific pursuit: collecting sea-urchin fossils. To reckon the moment memorable and noteworthy in itself, he falls back on classical literature: "He tried to remember a line from Homer that would make it a classical moment" (49). As a man lacking the encouragement from others to pursue his scientific ambitions, Charles's only resource for support is himself. He needs an anchor that will claim his ambition convincing and his pursuit outstanding. He feels that the application of some ancient and noble work of literature can achieve this sense of achievement on his part. Thus, he relies on his memory to reminisce a line from Homer. The more Charles uses literary referrals and identifications, the further he gets away from authenticity as he begins to lose the sense of reality and authentic personality. In another scene that portrays a meeting of Charles and Sarah, Charles proposes to her some solutions to overcome her shame and build up a new and better life. When Sarah feels overwhelmed by the offer and tries to show her gratitude, Charles, once again uses literature as a means of defining and understanding the situation: "But there came on him a fleeting memory of Catullus: "Whenever I see you, sound fails, my tongue falters, thin fire steals through my limbs, an inner roar, and darkness shrouds my ears and eyes" (251). However, according to William Stephenson (2007):

> Charles's love is thoroughly historicized by means of the quotation itself. He is citing a classical poem to describe amorous emotion, or the symptoms of insanity, the way only a man of his education, and therefore his social class, could have done in 1867. Charles cannot escape the texts he has read, the social system permitting them to be read together, and the Victorian ideology behind that system. (39)

What Stephenson aims to emphasize is that Charles cannot shake the way he has been educated and brought up. He is a Victorian man with all of its assets. That is the reason why in most of the dilemmas Charles faces, he falls back on literature to describe his condition and the circumstances that envelop him. The referrals

that he chooses are generally heroic and prominent. However, he knows that he cannot achieve their integrity. On one occasion that follows his decision to be with Sarah instead of Ernestina, Charles cannot bear to be alone with his thoughts and secrets, and that is why he consults the Darwinian doctor Dr. Grogan about the right thing to do. Nevertheless, he regrets having conferred with him and experiences a deep anxiety:

> Why had he allowed Grogan to judge her for him? Because he was more concerned to save appearances than his own soul. Because he had no more free will than an ammonite. Because he was a Pontius Pilate, a worse than he, not only condoning the crucifixion but encouraging, nay, even causing (…) the events that now led to its execution. (23)

Pontius Pilate is a figure related to the crucifixion of Jesus and mentioned in the Bible. He is known as a person who disregards his conscience and failed to recognize the truth of Jesus. Charles feels aligned in destiny with Pilate as he knows the truth of Sarah's circumstances but also becomes the agent to bring doom to her. The example of Pilate is also another allusion to Christianity that Charles professes disbelief in. Therefore, his inauthentic state continues.

Another instance that turns Charles to literature and literary characters occurs after the business partnership offer by his father-in-law to be. As Charles envisions himself as a gentleman who can have nothing to do with business, he is appalled by the offer and he feels victimized by the whirling changes that his era has been going through. Lacking originality, he likens himself to one of the most prolific figures of history: Jesus Christ: "Charles felt himself, under the first impact of this attractive comparison, like Jesus of Nazareth tempted by Satan" (290). He considers himself an elevated figure, and Mr. Freeman is the one who tries to seduce him out of the righteous path of the gentlefolk. Therefore, as Charles is deficient in coping with the veracity of his situation, he at times identifies himself as a victim through his referrals to historic figures and at times elevates his torn-in-between situation to the level of a deity. With these, he falls short of achieving a real sense of his self and thus fails to attain authenticity.

Even though Charles feels abandonment and the anguish of freedom, which are two important aspects of authenticity, he gets stuck within a phase that

brings him closer to a type of character who is conventional at heart. According to Sartre, to achieve authenticity, one must transcend the society and the conditions he lives in. Once he achieves this, he cannot be chained down; he becomes the embodiment of freedom. However, in the character of Charles, the reader beholds a man who is stuck in the vicious circle of Victorian life. No matter what he does or says, one part of him belongs to the background he has been brought up in. With all his aspirations to overcome his present situatedness as a Victorian gentleman and striving for more freedom, Charles preserves his Victorian self throughout the novel. He falls in bad faith whenever he does not want to take responsibility for his actions; his thoughts about religion and God are unclear even to himself. Despite envisioning himself a man of the future, he acts in accordance with the expectations of the society and he fears their opinions. He takes certain steps towards changing his life, and this is what Fowles terms "relative freedom". Charles is not completely free as the Victorian self cannot be eradicated from him. He is "relatively free" as he still possesses some control over his choices and the direction he wishes to take. Accordingly, Acheson comments that: "Although he has believed himself to be free, he has in fact been subject to forces beyond his control" (44). These are his upbringing, background and the Victorian society he resides in. Therefore, Charles on his way to an authentic self emerges as one who is still too conventional to be free. As the novel has two endings, Charles's progress can be examined in both of the finales to have the final and prevailing opinion about his voyage towards a unique identity.

## 4.2 SARAH WOODRUFF AND AUTHENTICITY

"I am a doubly dishonored woman. By circumstances. And by choice…" (Fowles, 176). Thus defines herself Sarah, the most enigmatic character of the novel since the narrator does not provide as much insight into her soul and her thoughts as he does into the other characters. As opposed to Charles, Sarah's thoughts are almost never divulged upon and the only implication and insinuations as to what passes in her mind can be deduced from her actions.

According to Lenz (2008), Sarah "challenges her fellow characters and readers alike to contemplate her consciousness, particularly in order to comprehend her generally incomprehensible actions" (101). The first mention of Sarah in the novel occurs in the second chapter where the two newly engaged young lovers, Ernestina and Charles, wander around the bay of the little town Lyme. During their stroll, they come across a desolate female figure standing out and staring at the sea. Being unfamiliar with the town and its local residents, Charles inquires about the identity of the "dark shape" (9). Ernestina provides the foremost knowledge concerning Sarah by defining her as "poor Tragedy" who is "The French Lieutenant's … Woman" and "a little mad" (ibid).

Later on, more information concerning the identity of Sarah is presented through the medium of other characters. The vicar of the town provides the basic frame of the identity of Sarah. In their conversation with Mrs. Poulteney, who wishes to do charity and is looking for a suitable person to bestow it upon, the vicar suggests the employment of Sarah Woodruff who "was trained to be a governess" and whose father, deceased now, was "a farmer merely, but a man of excellent principles and highly respected in that neighborhood" and who "most wisely provided the girl with a better education than one would expect" (33). With this primary information, the vicar proceeds to mention the facts that have condemned Sarah into her present condition as the outcast who relies on the kindness of strangers. Having fallen in love with a French Lieutenant who was accommodated in the house where she used to work as a governess, Sarah is implied to have sexual intercourse with him out of wedlock. When the lieutenant left Sarah to go to France, Sarah left her employment as a governess and is believed to be waiting for the return of the French Lieutenant ever since. After telling the tragic story that shapes the life of Sarah, the vicar feels the urge to comment on the present situation of the woman who has been through such a trial:

> Miss Woodruff is not insane. Far from it. She is perfectly able to perform any duties that may be given to her. But she suffers from grace attacks of melancholia. They are doubtless partly attributable to remorse. But also, I fear, to her fixed delusion that the lieutenant is an honorable man and will one day return to her. For that reason she may be frequently seen haunting

> the sea approaches to our town. (…) Not to put too fine a point upon it, madam, she is slightly crazed. (35-36)

Both the vicar and Ernestina point out a mental derangement on Sarah's part, which indicates the view of the townspeople regarding her and her present situation. She is thought to be "mad" and "crazed" due to the loss and abandonment of her lover. When Mrs. Poulteney employs Sarah in her household after hearing out her story and calls for her, she believes that in Sarah's character she observes "too visible sorrow, which showed she was a sinner" (37).

As there are not many scenes in which Sarah expresses her own thoughts and emotions, the narrator interferes in places to talk about the motivations behind Sarah's actions. In one case, the narrator points out the reason why Sarah accepts the employment of Mrs. Poulteney: "There were two very simple reasons. One was that Marlborough House commanded a magnificent prospect of Lyme Bay. The other was even simpler. She had exactly seven pence in the world" (38). Thus is situated Sarah from the very beginning of the novel. Through the speeches of others, the reader is provided with the story of Sarah and the reason for her being an outcast. However, after meeting with Charles, Sarah's life finds a new path and other facts regarding her and her circumstances are revealed. Even though the analysis of Sarah's mind in terms of her progress into authenticity poses an intricacy due to her little voice in the narration, this chapter aims to analyze Sarah in terms of existentialist themes and purposes to portray her inauthenticity despite her visible endeavors to achieve a unique self.

The first theme of existentialism that can be traced in the personality of Sarah is abandonment. Being the state of forlornness, abandonment entails a breach of all the social conventions and norms that one is situated in. This breach can be stretched to the views regarding religion, traditions and the expectations of a given society. Sarah goes through abandonment in every aspect. First of all, she is an outcast. Her father deceased, she does not have any relatives and or close friends that she can turn to. Being completely alone, and with the story that encourages people to view her as a deranged and wicked woman, Sarah embodies the image of a pariah. During one of the secret meetings with Charles, Sarah gives

vent to her feelings regarding her sense of desolateness. She feels the severe pangs of solitude: “I feel cast on a desert island, imprisoned, condemned, and I know not what crime it is for” (142). Sarah is desperate and she possesses no anchor to hold on to. Lenz comments that in the town she dwells in, “Sarah cannot occupy a position ... [as a ] virginal white ... Instead, she occupies the marginal, exotic, and dangerous space of the scarlet woman” (111).

As the story unfolds, the narrator offers more and more information about Sarah. Despite being pictured as a “crazed” woman, the narrator aims to prove the contrary when he claims:

> Sarah was intelligent. (…) She had some sort of psychological equivalent of the experienced horse-dealer’s skill - the ability to know almost at the first glance the good horse from the bad one; or as if, jumping a century, she was born with a computer at her heart. (53)

Here rises another aspect of her *abandonment*. As she is “intelligent”, the possibility of having an equal match in marriage within the context of Victorian values is a problem in her situation:

> Given the veneer of a lady, she was made the perfect victim of a caste society. Her father had forced her out of her own class, but could not raise her to the next. To the young men of the one she had left she had become too select to marry; to those of the one she aspired to, she remained too banal. (54)

Endowed with such assets, the narrator points out the unfeasibility of a marriage prospect on the horizon:

> She was too striking a girl not to have had suitors, in spite of the lack of a dowry of any kind. But always then had her first and innate curse come into operation; she saw through the too confident pretendants. She saw their meanness, their condescensions, their charities, their stupidities. Thus she appeared inescapably doomed to the one fate nature had so clearly spent millions of years in evolving her to avoid: spinsterhood. (55)

Sarah is not only bereft of a functional family, parents, friends and loved ones, she is also denuded of a marriage that may suit her both in terms of social class and educational background. Thus, she is destined to be deserted as she has no clear value to hold onto. According to Sneha Kar Chaudhuri (2012): “Sarah is victimized in a class - divided provincial society for her poverty” (3).

Sarah also experiences *abandonment* in a sense that relates to her attachment to the conventions and expectations of the society. The adventure with the lieutenant is a clear indication of it. Being well aware of the judgment of the people, she decides to set aside whatever values the society attaches to any formality of love or affection. She meets Varguennes the lieutenant when she is a governess and the affection that she holds for him leads her to break free of the conventions of Victorian morals. Relating to the circumstances of her meeting with the lieutenant at an improper inn, she asserts that "In such circumstances I know a … a respectable woman would have left at once" (174). However, she does not leave. In justification of herself, when she tells Charles about Varguennes and what has occurred between them, she maintains that "I believed I owed it to myself to appear mistress of my destiny. I had run away to this man" (ibid). By loosening the ties with the society, Sarah experiences all aspects of *abandonment*. She dares the outcomes of her actions in a very strict society. Being well aware of the condemnation and denunciation of the society towards her, she does not flinch from censure. She even admits that her shame is what keeps her alive as she does not repent what she has done:

> I knew no other way to break out of what I was. If I had left that room, returned to Mrs. Talbot's [the lady of the house she governesses] and resumed my former existence, I know that by now I should be truly dead… and by my own hand. (…) I have a freedom they cannot understand. No insult, no blame can touch me. Because I have set myself beyond the pale. I am nothing, I am hardly human any more. I am the French Lieutenant's Whore. (176)

Sarah ventures the scorn of the society as she aims to attain a kind of freedom which is unapproachable by the others. Due to this resistance on her part, she needs to cut loose the bonds that attach her to the values of the others. The affair with the lieutenant affords her this chance. Therefore, she turns into a woman who is abandoned by the society, who has diminished their conventions and who is "the mistress" of her own destiny and even for Charles, Sarah manifests "a wild, abandoned woman" (177). Even though the story of the lieutenant involves falsity regarding the sexual intercourse that condemns Sarah in the eyes of the society,

according to Tibor Toth (2011), this falsehood and the refabrication of the past story is necessary for Sarah to achieve a sense of freedom:

> Since Sarah challenges her existence in the present with an imaginary interpretation of her past, the "outer-imposed" concept of any past is undermined. This manipulation is important for her as the past could oblige her to give up her status as a free woman and false dictates could turn her into a Tess-like victim. Thus she is granted the freedom to ignore social ties and expectations and she consciously assumes the invisible "scarlet letter", which in the inverted logic of the novel becomes the source of her integrity, dignity and results in her self-conscious acts of freedom. In more pedestrian terms she understands too well that being bad can help her be different from other women of her social standing. (76)

Being a pariah helps Sarah disentangle herself from the common lot of women. She willingly and consciously isolates herself from the dictates of the society as it is the only way she could attain her independence. Another theme that stems from abandonment is the denunciation of the institutionalized religion and the faith in a supreme being. Although Sarah is not granted her own speech concerning her state of faith, the narrator enlightens the reader:

> But she had no theology, as she saw through people, she saw the follies, the vulgar stained glass, the narrow literalness of the Victorian church. She saw that there was suffering; and she prayed that it would end. I cannot say what she might have been in our age; in a much earlier one I believe she would have been either a saint or an emperor's mistress. Not because of religiosity on the one hand, or sexuality on the other, but because of that fused rare power that was her essence - understanding and emotion. (58-9)

What Sarah possesses is empathy and a different perspective on the events that revolve around her. She does not believe in Christianity or any other religion as she lacks faith. She is intelligent enough to glimpse the idiocies of the church behind its veils. The reader is not informed whether she is an atheist or a deist; however what matters is that she is far from the hypocrisy of the religion that constitutes the essence of the epoch. Therefore, Sarah is presented as a woman who is abandoned by the people, the norms of the public, family, friends; she is also a derelict even in the sense of religion.

What follows the state of abandonment is the sense of anguish. Although we do not know how she herself feels in most cases and despite the fact that Sarah

preserves a calm outlook, she experiences severe pangs of despair and anguish in her detached mode of life. During one of their secret meetings with Charles, she gives vent to her emotions and mentions the wretchedness of her appalling circumstances and isolation. She believes that only Charles can understand her and contemplates him as her only resource:

> You are kind, you understand what is beyond the understanding of any in Lyme. (…) Two days ago I was nearly overcome by madness. I felt I had to see you, to speak to you. I know where you stay. I would have come to ask for you. (144-45)

Sarah believes that desolation is what induces her to dwell on such actions on her part. She proceeds: "It is that … I do not know how to say it, I seem driven by despair to contemplate these dreadful things. They fill me with horror at myself. I do not know where to turn, what to do, I have no one who can" (145).

The woman who is seen to wander lonely in the forests and who holds no communication with anyone does in fact go through a kind of anguish that nobody comprehends. She experiences difficulties in her decision-making process as she has no one to rely on and no willed destination on the horizon. She represents a mode of ambiguity in herself as she is anxious about what course to take in life with the realization of the freedom that she achieves through her suffering. Since the speech granted to her is limited by the narrator, this sole instance of anguish can be understood to pervade the soul and mood of Sarah.

Even though Sarah experiences abandonment and anguish of freedom which, are fundamental steps for the attainment of authenticity, she remains as an inauthentic individual throughout the novel. The first strain of her inauthenticity lies in her constant fall into bad faith. Bad faith indicates a mode of self-deceit where an individual blames another party for the decisions he takes and their outcomes. In the chapter which provides the most enlightening passage into Sarah's life and mode of thinking, the reader beholds Sarah accusing external circumstances for the state that she lives in. When she relates the details of the love affair with the lieutenant, she only partially condemns herself. For her, the biggest part of the blame lies on her upbringing and the people she works for. The education she has received which has elevated her above her rate but which fails

to grant her a higher position than a governess is what tempts her in the first place. When Charles claims to understand her, she protests:

> You cannot, Mr. Smithson. Because you are not a woman. Because you are not a woman who was born to be a farmer's wife but educated to be something … better. (…) You were not born a woman with a natural respect, a love of intelligence, beauty, learning … I don't know how to say it, I have no right to desire these things, but my heart craves them and I cannot believe it is all vanity … (170)

Torn between two classes, neither of which she can belong to, Sarah feels the impossibility of having what the others have. Being a governess in a household that can never belong to her kindles all these feelings:

> And you were not ever a governess, Mr. Smithson, a young woman without children paid to look after children. You cannot know the sweeter they are the more intolerable the pain is. You must not think I speak of mere envy. (…) But to live each day in scenes of domestic happiness, the closest spectator of a happy marriage, home, adorable children. (…) It came to seem to me as if I were allowed to live in paradise, but forbidden to enjoy it. (170)

Sarah blames the situations and the conditions of her life for the actions she has taken. She believes that she is entitled to have more; however, she cannot reach for them since they are beyond her. Being a governess limits her prospects. Even though she has been brought up in a lower class family, the education she has received has opened her eyes to future possibilities. That is why; she is not content with what she has. Additionally, the classical idea of marriage of marriage and kids betokens conformity to the Victorian values and way of life. Despite her higher aspirations to "a love of intelligence, beauty, learning", according to Sneha Kar Chaudhuri, Sarah "essentially harbours the average middle-class dream of happy domesticity" (67). With the despair of these circumstances, Sarah explains why the solicitations of the lieutenant become so attractive to her:

> He made me believe that his whole happiness depended on my accompanying him when he left – more than that, that my happiness depended on it as well. He had found much about me. How my father died in a lunatic asylum. How I was without means, without close relatives. How for many years I had felt myself in some mysterious way condemned – and I knew not why – to solitude. (171)

The presence of Varguennes enlightens a new path for her. She blames him and the lady of the household for what she has done. She is well aware of this even after she understands the true nature of the lieutenant who has no intention to marry her but who is a deceiver. For her reason of following this man, she claims: "I told myself that if I had not suffered such unendurable loneliness in the past I shouldn't have been so blind. Thus I blamed my circumstances for my situation" (174). This is how Sarah explains herself regarding the reason for her following a man which brings doom to her. She feels despair because of her loneliness, because of the prospects that she may have with her education; not only working as a governess but also the possibility of having a house and being the lady of it. Therefore, Sarah deems that the despondency of all these situations has mounted up to her falling from grace. With the attempt to escape from the blame and charging the external factors for her isolation, Sarah cannot escape but fall into the snares of bad faith.

There is also another aspect of the bad faith she experiences. Despite the narrator's claim that Sarah does not believe in a religion, there are instances that prove the contrary and create a kind of hypocrisy and ambiguity in her personality. The first time that leads the reader to have assumptions about Sarah's faith occurs during her employment in Mrs. Poulteney's household where:

> There was the mandatory double visit to church on Sundays; and there was also a daily morning service—a hymn, a lesson, and prayers—over which the old lady pompously presided. (57)

During these services, she asks Sarah to read passages from the bible which turn the servants into "genuinely attentive and sometimes positively religious faces" (58). The reason for this kind of manifestation of piety is attributed to Sarah's voice which was "sincere". (ibid)

Even on one occasion, the narrator relates the intensity of the feelings that emanate from Sarah's voice by stating that "One day she came to the passage Eli, Eli, lama, sabachthane me; and as she read the words she faltered and was silent. Mrs. Poulteney turned to look at her, and realized Sarah's face was streaming with tears" (ibid). Therefore, it is possible to deduce that these tears are from religious

piety on Sarah's part. Also, this assumption gets strengthened with the narrator's statement that "Mrs. Poulteney believed in a God that had never existed; and Sarah knew a God that did" (ibid). This assertion belongs to the narrator who has an insight into Sarah's mind. Even though the narrator may not be reliable in that sense, with such assertions and incidents, the reader can sense the ambiguity of Sarah's faith and observe Sarah still living in bad faith despite the narrator's claim to the opposite.

One other incident that pertains to bad faith in the religious sense occurs right after Sarah's dispatch from Mrs. Poulteney's household. She has been observed wandering around a wooded area called Ware Commons where she has been forbidden to stroll by Mrs. Poulteney. Ware Commons is known as a place of lovers. Generally young lovers secretly meet and wander there and thus according to the Victorian society, it is a place of sin and wickedness. The reason why she is not desired to walk there is explained by the narrator:

> Some said that after midnight more reeling than dancing took place; and the more draconian claimed that there was very little of either, but a great deal of something else. (90)

These are the assumptions relating to the fame of this place which is enough "to evoke Sodom and Gomorrah in Mrs. Poulteney's face" (89). Thus, despite the warnings, when Sarah is seen to meander there, Mrs. Poulteney decides to dismiss her and does this in a harsh manner: "You will depart this house at your earliest convenience tomorrow morning" (246). What Sarah does is accept the situation:

> Sarah did not answer. She watched a few more moments (…) then turned and went to her room. She went to her mirror, but did not look at herself; she slowly covered her face with her hands, and then very slowly raised her eyes from the fingers. What she saw she could not bear. Two moments later she was kneeling by her bed and weeping silently into the worn cover. She should rather have prayed? But she believed she was praying. (247)

Such are the incidents that bring Sarah closer to religion and acts of faith despite her ability to see beyond them. This kind of attitude strengthens the bad faith that she lives in. When she is desperate, immersed in grief and despair, Sarah turns to a God she does not believe in according to the narrator. This behavior points out a

weakness in her personality that seeks to share and even attribute the sorrow to another agency. Seeking the help and intervention of a supreme being and praying for this are other aspects of bad faith for Sarah. This tendency of Sarah is a reminder of the ambivalence that Miranda has in terms of religious faith in *The Collector*. In her time of crisis, Miranda also turns to a God she professes disbelief in. Both Sarah and Miranda seem to cling to the idea of a deity despite their emancipated notions regarding religion.

Bad faith has two components to be clarified on the way to authenticity: facticity and transcendence. When an individual does not blame the unchangeable circumstances called facticity that shape his life but chooses to transcend them, he can avoid blaming the external forces and thus evade bad faith. Sarah experiences facticity in terms of educational and social background. The path to authenticity lies in the overthrowing of this facticity. However, Sarah cannot pass beyond the situations and the conditions she has been brought up within. Therefore, it is inevitable for her to get closer to the inauthentic mode of living. The fact that Sarah fails to achieve authenticity due to her facticity is a reminder of Fowles's idea of freedom. According to Fowles, the forces that cannot be altered have the biggest role in relation to the attainment of freedom. Sarah, with many limitations imposed on her, fails in her endeavors to be a unique individual since her circumstances do not allow her to transcend her present conditions.

The first frontier that limits Sarah is her social class. She is the daughter of "a farmer merely" (33). That is why, it is possible to assume that the conditions of her upbringing are quite different from the one that Ernestina, Charles fiancée has. In addition to meager financial circumstances, Sarah is also restricted in terms of family relations. She does not have close relatives; however, the situation gets worse when her sole companion, her father goes mad and is committed to an asylum where he dies eventually. Therefore, Sarah is reduced to a state of conundrum amplified by financial setbacks and her state of loneliness. Furthermore, the narrator comments on her education which he describes as the second "curse of her life", the first being her insightful nature (54). Although her father has been limited financially and socially, he desires his daughter to go

beyond the boundaries that attach her to the poor life she leads. The narrator comments:

> It was not a very great education, no better than could be got in a third-rate young ladies' seminary in Exeter, where she had learned during the day and paid for her learning during the evening— and sometimes well into the night—by darning and other menial tasks. She did not get on well with the other pupils. They looked down on her; and she looked up through them. (54)

This is the life of Sarah, who feels herself destined for better things in life but who is condemned to the available which are poor in themselves. She has trained herself beyond the comprehension and the grasp of her previous conditions; however, she has not settled in the next one yet. She lives in a purgatory, torn between her social class and her higher aspirations. According to Kwong Yin-tze: "By an education which has raised her above a low birth which does not give her the requisite status for marriage into Charles' class, she has become one of society's victims" (176).

Being situated in meager conditions, Sarah has been limited all through her life. Since she has not been provided with a healthy and functional family and the necessary background, she has always remained one step back in the experiences of a usual lifestyle. One thing that stands out is the observation that the narrator provides. He reveals a point about Sarah's life: the fact that she lacks real-life experience. She has no friends and no one to turn to. She cannot socialize as others do since her position as a governess does not allow that. With this shortfall of knowledge regarding the incidents of life, Sarah relies on her books to patch the voids:

> Thus it had come about that she had read far more fiction, and far more poetry, those two sanctuaries of the lonely, than most of her kind. They served as a substitute for experience. Without realizing it she judged people as much by the standards of Walter Scott and Jane Austen as by any empirically arrived at; seeing those around her as fictional characters, and making poetic judgments on them. (54)

What Sarah does is what anyone could do in her circumstances. As she does not possess the means to enlarge her own society and experience novelties, she immerses herself in literature. However, a problem arises at this point. She cannot

form her own judgment. She heavily depends upon the views of the writers she has read as the only means to get a glimpse of a real life with actions. Thus, she lacks a unique worldview; the morality and the values she holds dear are just remanufactures of written texts. Therefore, she gets further away from the concept of an individual who has authenticity to create himself from the scratch. The last sentence is also significant at conveying the idea Sarah embraces about the people around her. As she lives in a fictional world, the people she lives with everyday are just fissures of it. For her, they are "fictional characters" and the judgment she makes are "poetic". Acheson comments that even in relation to Varguennes who has proved to be her fall, Sarah has been mistaken due to her constant reliance on literature and lack of experience: "Sarah misjudges Varguennes because she is at first existentially inauthentic: she trusts, mistakenly, not to her own feelings about him, but to the feelings that her reading has engendered within her" (36). With these exclamations on, it is possible glimpse the untruth she resides in. These two ideas indicate how detached she is from the real life and how it processes. They lead her to be reckoned more inauthentic eventually.

The incident with the lieutenant Varguennes is another indication of Sarah's incapability to form her own individual identity. Through the end of the novel, Sarah reveals the facts concerning the love affair which castrates her from the society. People in the town presume that following the lieutenant, Sarah has yielded her virginity, thus innocence to the man and this eventually proves to be her ruin. She gets isolated and called names all around the town. However, by means of the increased intimacy with Charles, she opens up the truth about the affair. She confesses that she has never held sexual intercourse with him and relates the real encounter with Varguennes:

> When I went to where I told in Weymouth … I was still some way from the door … I saw him come out. With a woman. The kind of woman one cannot mistake. […] I drew into a doorway. When they had gone, I walked away. (158)

The whole story that relates to her affair with Varguennes is imbued with a lie. She does not have intercourse with him and then gets abandoned. On the contrary, she goes to meet the lieutenant and seeing him with another woman, decides not

to be with him and leaves the place. However, she lives her life as if she has lost her grace and innocence, condemned in the eyes of the people and deprived of a functional, normal life. This way, she gets the attention of the people and people speak of her. In her normal circumstances, she does not attract anyone's attention or concern. However, to make herself stand out, she turns to the fabrication of such a story. With the story of the lieutenant, what Sarah does is create a balloon in which she can dwell safely and soundly. People refrain from contacting with her and Sarah mistakenly believes that is where her freedom lies. According to Lisa Fletcher (2003):

> Sarah neither gets vocational opportunities nor respect due to her humble background. In a society rife with class and economic divisions, her personal merits go virtually unrecognized because she is forced to become a governess, a kind of surplus woman. Any ambition on her part to rise higher is immoral, indicating her dissatisfaction with her position in society. Her desire for a happy married life with a gentleman is transgressive in a class hierarchy categorizing talented but economically bankrupt women as 'surplus' maidens. (58)

This can be the reason why Sarah feels the urge to fabricate a story regarding her love and marriage prospects. She knows that she does not fit in the class she lives in and having higher aspirations does not help a woman to achieve freedom since she is socially limited. Being aware of her circumstances, after laying her soul bare to Charles during one of their crucial meetings, she exclaims:

> What has kept me alive is my shame, my knowing that I am truly not like other women. I shall never have children, a husband, and those innocent happinesses they have. And they will never understand the reason for my crime. (176)

Sarah believes that she has attained her invulnerable state with her "crime". She willingly gets herself denounced and condemned by the common people with the help of a lie. Before the reputed affair with Varguennes, she is just like other women with the possibility of marriage and kids; however, the alleged liaison with a man out of wedlock becomes a milestone in her life. She becomes alienated, and she deems this condemnation a sort of freedom. What is essential and related to authenticity at this level of thought is that Sarah does not achieve her freedom through a series of actions which prove her to be an authentic

individual. She wishes to be different and she aims to achieve this through a lie. She even claims: “If I leave here, I leave my shame. Then I am lost” (181). This shows a kind of incapability on Sarah’s part to choose well and choose for herself. She is not free just because she has denounced the convictions of a delusional Victorian society. She misinterprets the reproach that encircles her life. What she believes to be freedom is merely the state of being shunned by others and not for a legitimate, plausible cause but because of a dishonest assertion of her. That is why, Sarah cannot be seen as an authentic person who has seen through the deceits of a given society and who chooses to be free of them; instead, Sarah is spurned and avoided because she deceives the others and herself. She manipulates the story of Varguennes as a shield for herself and this way, she gets the chance of having little contact with the people of the town.

This state of deceit stretches itself to her relationship with Charles. What intrigues Charles about Sarah at the very beginning of their intimacy is her isolation. Charles is interested in Sarah because of the censure that the society applies in her case. The more he deals with the purpose of bettering her conditions and alleviating her distress, the more entrenched he finds himself relating to her. This interest of Charles grows into love and he even breaks off his engagement with Ernestina for the sake of being with Sarah. However, what stands out in this relationship is Sarah’s manipulation of Charles for her own ends. While Charles uses Sarah for his own freedom, Sarah also does the same. She arouses pity and compassion in Charles and then uses her new state as a way of escape both from him and the town. There are many instances in which she pleads to Charles for help and sympathy addressing her distress. When she wishes to be honest with Charles and talk to him about her present conditions, she states: “Would I have … thrown myself on your mercy in this way if I were not desperate?” (143) Thus invoked, Charles wishes to do all he can to help her out and thus desires her to enlighten him about all she has been through. Once again, Sarah appeals to Charles’s better self: “I beg you. I am not *yet* mad. But unless I am helped, I shall be” (144). Eventually, Charles with this beseeching of Sarah cannot help but get

too much involved in her affairs and falls in love with her despite the initial purpose of assisting a person in need.

With such a turn of events, it does not take too long for Charles to discover the truth of Sarah's story regarding the lieutenant. When Sarah leaves the town after her dismissal from Mrs. Poulteney's household, she leaves the little town and goes to London where she stays for a while after informing Charles about the hotel she is staying in. When Charles visits Sarah at the hotel and desires to talk to her, the proprietress informs him:

> Oh the poor young lady, sir, she was a-coming downstairs the day before yesterday morning and she slipped, sir. She's turned her ankle something horrible. Swole up big as a marrow. I wanted to ask the doctor, sir, but she won't hear of it. (346-47)

Hearing these bad news, Charles is rendered to choose between delaying the meeting or going up to her rooms. However, he ends up going to her room and unable to resist the long tension, they make love. This event proves to be one of decisive incidents in their lives since it shows the level of cunning on Sarah's part as she consciously plans the seduction of Charles:

> Sarah was seated by the fire in a chair facing the door, her feet on a stool, with both them and her legs covered by a red Welsh blanket. The green merino shawl was round her shoulders … Her hair was loose and fell over her green shoulders. (271)

Following a short and casual conversation between them, Sarah initiates her plans of seduction. She pretends to be crying which betokens innocent sexual innuendo for Charles:

> And it was while she made little dabbing motions with a handkerchief that he was overcome with a violent sexual desire; a lust a thousand times greater than anything he had felt in the prostitute's room. Her defenseless weeping was perhaps the breach through which the knowledge sprang – but suddenly he comprehended why her face haunted him. Why he felt this terrible need to see her again: it was to possess her, to melt into her, to burn, to burn into ashes on that body and in those eyes. (272)

Sarah accomplishes her plan of having Charles all to herself. She knows that Charles will realize the lie she has told him. For Charles, to find out that Sarah is a virgin contrary to her claims before and the story of the lieutenant is totally

fiction, fraud, and nothing but the fabrication of a lonely woman lead him to panic. The realization invokes horror in him:

> He had forced a virgin. […] She had not given herself to Varguennes. She had lied. All her conduct, all her motives in Lyme Regis had been based on a lie. But for what purpose. Why? Why? Why? Blackmail! To put him totally in her power! (357)

What Charles comprehends is that from the very beginning, Sarah has been suffering willingly, not because of any disgrace. She has been dishonest about her affair and Charles can see that she has put herself on his mercy as an act of a scheme of hers. Like she has manipulated the story of Varguennes to build a wall around her to distance herself from the rest of the people, she uses Charles for other purposes. Even the injury of the ankle is a lie to evoke compassion in him: "She had no limp. There was no strained ankle" (358). With these, Sarah feels that she owes an explanation to Charles and thus she proceeds:

> Yes. I have deceived you. I shall not trouble you again. (…) You have given me the consolation of believing that in another world, another age, another life, I might have been your wife. You have given me the strength to go on living ... in the here and now. … What duped you was my loneliness. A resentment, an envy, I don't know. I don't know … Do not ask me to explain what I have done. I cannot explain it. It is not to be explained. (ibid)

What can be inferred from the way Sarah acts is that she has a tendency to use the men in her life as a means for her own ends. First Varguennes and then Charles serve her as anchors to hold onto in her times of crisis and she even falters at naming her actions as she cannot "explain" what she has done. The seduction of Charles can also be deemed as inauthentic behavior on Sarah's part as it designates a sort of predilection which she cannot overcome by herself. She wishes to leave the town and her suffering. However, she lacks the means and the courage. Thus, Charles proves to be the perfect anchor for her. She pleads to Charles, appeals to him and wins him over; all for her own redemption. According to Rosemary Laughlin (2013): "Sarah is obsessed by possession . . . Once she is sure of her possession of Charles in the sexual consummation of his passion, she discards him by disappearing" (86). As a lonely woman, she is in need of strength

and she is not competent enough to collect her might and go on living on her own. She requires the existence, even the sympathy and pity of a man to grasp what she believes to be her freedom. Therefore, to quote Elizabeth Rankin (1975), Sarah is "a manipulator and, as such, is not to be trusted -- not as a human being, and certainly not as a representative of moral truth" (206). As she depends on other people for power, freedom and the strength to live on, Sarah gets more inauthentic. This dependency detracts her from forming her own authentic personality which does not rely on the validation, confirmation, pity and kindness of others.

From the manipulation of men in her life, the idea of "having" as opposed to "being" emerges. Sarah is in pursuit of having Charles to herself as she depends on him to have what she wants in life. As she loses her sense of freedom by attributing freedom to the possession of a man, Sarah suffers from the greatest evil which is "having". Since she believes that her future and her prospects are connected with seducing Charles, she does not pursue the ideal course of action which is "being". To quote Kwong Yin-tze:

> By romanticizing and dehumanizing Charles as a symbol, Sarah seems to have committed the ultimate existentialist sin: she mistakes having for being, and pursues possession in place of experience. (178)

Chaudhuri also notes this aspect of Sarah concerning her obsession with Charles by observing that "she simply wants to possess him both sexually and emotionally" (68). Therefore, being more concerned with "having" and possessing, Sarah gets closer to an identity which is very far away from being authentic. Additionally, this same idea of possession is also traceable in the character of Charles who is into collecting fossils. He prefers "having" just like Sarah and these two characters meet in their interest of collector mentality.

All in all, despite the fact that Sarah is a character who poses challenge to analysis as she is limited in speech and acts in the novel, the narration of the others and the restricted amount of information provided by her occasionally serve as a beacon to comprehend her personality. Sarah struggles with loneliness and estrangement from the society. However, it is possible to hold her as an

inauthentic character as she falls into bad faith quite often by blaming her background, education, and social status for the demeaning conditions she has to live in. She does so as they form her facticity and she is limited in her endeavors due to these factors. Also, what she believes to be freedom is a misinterpretation of her since being shunned by the company of the others does not provide her with a chance to enrich her life and alter her situation. Additionally, she oscillates between a state of faithlessness and acts of faith. As she cannot form her own judgment lacking real-life experience, she depends on the books to evaluate the people and the incidents around her. Moreover, she can be observed to manipulate the two men in her life. She uses Varguennes adding a pitch of lie to the story to get herself alienated, and she uses Charles and his feelings as a means to escape the people and the circumstances she dwells in. All these acts of Sarah move her further away from forming a unique and self-dependent personality and she ends up being an example of an inauthentic individual in the Sartrean sense. However, as in the case of Charles, the final state of her authenticity depends on the interpretation of the two endings of the novel.

### 4.3 THE TWO ENDINGS OF *THE FRECH LIEUTENANT'S WOMAN*

The narrative and the story line of *The French Lieutenant's Woman* get even more complicated by the narrator's choice of having "open" endings. Unlike most narratives which have traditional strains, *The French Lieutenant's Woman* does not provide the reader with one simple, clear-cut ending. Rather, within the novel, there are two endings (even three)[2] which convey the notion of possibilities concerning the courses of action. The narrative does not insinuate at the unrealized possibilities; on the contrary, it narrates them in full. This usage of dual endings facilitates one of the main themes of the novel which is freedom.

The first ending revolves around the ruminations of Charles regarding the future after he leaves Sarah and returns to Ernestina, how they get married and live happily ever after. This is just the imagination of Charles and it turns out to

[2] The first one is an unrealized ending. It is the imagination of Charles.

be an unrealized ending. In the other two endings, Sarah and Charles get separated. However, Charles finds Sarah and they are reunited. In the last ending, Sarah does not wish to be with Charles after the reunion and they get separated. In that sense, the other two endings have different implications with reference to the progress and the development of the characters. According to Stephenson, while the first ending brings Sarah and Charles together, the second ending "by contrast, gives the protagonists existential freedom, but keeps them apart" (22). Elizabeth D. Rankin (1973) observes that the second ending plays a crucial role in understanding the novel as "without this ending - or with this ending undercut or made anti-climatic by a subsequent ending - there would be no perfect exemplar of existential freedom in the novel and hence that concept would remain hazy throughout" (205). Salami (1992) also notes this dual ending of the novel as a milestone of the novel by stating that:

> The novel's open-endedness is a form of freedom to Charles as well as to the reader, a factor that undermines the authority in the narrative. This still life at the end of the novel reflects the free ending, the incompleteness of the texts, and the deferment of their meanings. (134)

Thus, it can be concluded that as the novel has two endings, both of them have a different idea to convey. According to Stephenson: "*The French Lieutenant's* Woman ends twice, and thereby refuses to end at all, thus announcing its evolution beyond the closed conclusions of Victorian fiction and the open endings of modernist novels" (25).

In the last chapter, the reader beholds Charles and Sarah as the novel projects into a time where Charles leaves Ernestina for good and desires to be with Sarah. However, his schemes regarding his union with her are thwarted when he rushes back to Sarah and realizes that she is not to be found; she is gone. Overcome with despair, he returns to London secretly hoping that Sarah will come back to him. He solemnly swears to himself to find her no matter how long it takes as his future happiness depends on it.

The reader beholds Charles as a changed man almost two years later after the disappearance of Sarah. He has travelled a lot and is now residing in America and still looking for Sarah until one day he really locates her. He returns to

London to have Sarah back. When he realizes that she is living with Christina Rossetti and Dante Gabriel Rossetti, a sort of confrontation occurs between Charles and Sarah where Charles claims Sarah back. The first ending unites them blessed with a child Charles has not been aware of before and the second ending severs their ties for good and each goes their separate ways. This context proves to be fruitful in understanding the final state of Charles and Sarah on their way to authenticity.

To begin with, in both endings, Charles cannot ward off his inauthentic nature despite his struggles. After finding out that Sarah is gone and all search for her is futile, Charles is surmounted by despair. During all his travels, he lives with a shadow of possibilities; a life with Sarah. The affair turns into an obsession of his. He still lives fettered down:

> When he had his great vision of himself freed from his age, his ancestry and class and country, he had not realized how much the freedom was embodied in Sarah; the assumption of a shared exile. He no longer much believed in that freedom; he felt he had merely changed traps or prisons. (430-31)

The new state he is in, feeling himself an "outcast, the not like other men", Charles is conscious of being in a new bondage (ibid). He is restless, always thinking of Sarah and he occasionally cannot refrain from feeling regret on account of his breaking up with Ernestina in search of a pariah:

> From time to time the sight of some newly-wed couple would remind him of Ernestina. He would search his soul then. Did he envy them or pity them? He found that there at least he had few regrets. (ibid)

Thus, it is conceivable that Charles has qualms about the action he has taken towards freedom and he still clings to the idea of Sarah: "Sometimes, in some cathedral or art gallery, he would for a moment dream Sarah beside him" (432). According to Lee (1977):

> What the narrator implies is that for him freedom is still embodied in Sarah, for he is unable to attain it without her some two years later. Charles is not able to grasp the notion either that his connection of the concept of freedom with Sarah may be false or that there may be another type of freedom. At this point in the novel, Charles is just as helplessly

> adrift as he was when we first encountered him squiring Ernestina about at the beginning of the novel. (58)

Therefore, rather than forming a unique identity, Charles oscillates between his decisions, haunted by imagination. These acts of his demonstrate his inauthentic personality. The fixation about Sarah is what interrupts his travelling. When he is informed of her location, he immediately returns to England in hopes of seeing her and having her back. Here his Victorian self emerges once again. That is why, on his way to the house where he is informed that Sarah lives, he is "embarrassedly conscious of being a gentleman about to call on a superior form of servant" (443). Charles still thinks with his Victorian frame of mind, deeply anchored in social classes and their respective roles. Therefore, he terms Sarah as "a superior form of servant" while he himself is the "gentleman".

This thought still prevails when he gets into the house. Once he feels assured of the superiority of the house and the possible employment of Sarah there, his Victorian self shudders one more time: "He saw nothing; but only the folly of his own assumption that fallen women must continue falling- for had he not come to arrest the law of gravity?" (445) He is expecting to find Sarah in an even more desperate and meager conditions which is the typical Victorian frame of mind. He also half-heartedly thinks that Sarah may have become a prostitute. Having limited views concerning the status of women in Victorian society, Charles does not ruminate that there are other positions for women to exist besides marriage or prostitution. Still, Charles does hope to find Sarah as a governess there and the fact that she is not is incomprehensible to him, as his conventional disposition assumes the worst. He even regards Sarah as "a fallen woman" and he, the knight, to save the damsel in distress. When he discovers that Sarah lives with Gabriel Rossetti as his "amanuensis, his assistant", he gets more baffled:

> He had come to raise her from penury, from some crabbed post in a crabbed house. In full armour, ready to slay the dragon - and now the damsel had broken all the rules. No chains, no sobs, no beseeching hands. He was the man who appears at a formal soiree under the impression it was to be a fancy dress ball. (448)

This passage of thought shows the traditional way of thinking Charles preserves despite his travels and supposed enlightened nature. He still sees everything through gaze of a Victorian man. He is there to save Sarah from whatever conditions she dwells in. However, the respectable household shatters this Victorian gentleman's views. Consequently, unable to free himself of traditional thoughts and conventional expectations, Charles can be deemed as inauthentic.

Another sort of inauthenticity occurs in the person of Charles after his pleadings to Sarah to come back to him. Despite his beseeching, Sarah rejects him and Charles runs out of reasons to convince Sarah. At that time, once again, his Victorian patriarchal thoughts come to the surface. To induce Sarah in marriage, he claims: "But you cannot reject the purpose for which woman was brought into creation. And for what? I say nothing against Mr. … and his circle. But you cannot place serving them above the natural law" (454). According to Lynch, this behavior is crucial as "Charles appeals to Victorian convention as an immutable force of nature" and this emphasizes his inauthentic state (67).

The faithless and Darwinian Charles speaks in a way only a "too" Victorian gentleman can. He degrades the women into a role, cut out by the society. What he calls "natural law" is the submission of the female to the male. Charles falls into bad faith afresh; this time refuting all he professes to hold dear such as his Darwinian and elite self. The anguish of rejection induces him to believe in an afterlife again despite the fact that the reader remembers him as being "one of the Few": "A day will come when you shall be called to account for what you have done to me. And if there is justice in heaven – your punishment shall outlast eternity" (457).

With these recurrences and references to god and religion, Charles shows himself to be still residing in bad faith, which has been an essential part of his behavior from the very beginning. In the first ending of the novel, Sarah, after these exclamations of Charles, shows Lalage, their daughter, to him and they are united after all their sufferings. Deep in his heart, Charles expresses her happiness by referring to God and destiny again by stating that: "It had been in God's hands, in His forgiveness of their sins" (462). By attributing their reunion to the will and

might of God, Charles once again manifests his inauthenticity. In relation to this behavior of Charles, Acheson comments that:

> He denies his own freedom and assigns his responsibility for his reunion with Sarah and Lalage to a benevolent Providence. In existentialist terms, Charles is behaving inauthentically - he is behaving as though he were subject to the will of God. (…) In so doing, Charles denies himself the status of existential hero. (45)

However, in the second ending, the narrator leaves Charles's fate and his final state of authenticity as a mystery. After the confrontation, there is no Lalage as in the first ending. The second ending sets Sarah and Charles apart as Sarah does not want to be his wife, and Charles leaves the house. The narrator gives hope to the reader concerning Charles's new condition. As there is no Sarah for him anymore, Charles may be susceptible to commit suicide. However, the narrator refutes this idea: "Charles now begins to pace, a man behind the invisible gun-carriage on which rests his own corpse. He walks towards an imminent, self-given death? I think not" (470). Following this, the narrator makes it a point of suspense for the reader as he does not provide a clear cut fate for Charles; the possibilities are there for him. He can live on as an inauthentic man or he can achieve his unique identity:

> He has at last found an atom of faith in himself, a true uniqueness, on which to build; has already begun, though he would still bitterly deny it, though there are tears in his eyes to support his denial, to realize that life, however advantageously Sarah may in some ways seem to fit the role of Sphinx, is not a symbol, is not one riddle and one failure to guess it, is not to inhabit one face alone or to be given up after one losing throw of the dice; but is to be, however inadequately, emptily, hopelessly into the city's iron heart, endured. And out again, upon the unplumb'd, salt, estranging sea. (ibid)

While the first ending depicts Charles as a thoroughly inauthentic man, the second one does not provide a clear-cut resolution about Charles. It leaves Charles alone. Despite his constant reliance on Sarah in his search for a better and more authentic way of life, he is discarded by her. His future is ambiguous. The reader is not provided with an idea whether he will succeed in achieving authenticity or go on wandering in his Victorian way of thinking. However, since there is always a

possibility, Acheson states that: "Charles may ultimately escape his Victorian 'prison' – duty, honor and conventionality – and after much soul-searching, may finally attain to existential authenticity" (47).

Besides Charles, Sarah cannot be considered to differ from him in many aspects. Being rid of the Lyme and the people from there, Sarah flees to another life in the city of London. The reader finds out that she dwells in a household belonging to Christina Rossetti and Dante Gabriel Rossetti. Despite her attempts to be situated in the Victorian mode of life and thinking, it is possible to conclude that Sarah moves from one seclusion to another. In the first part, she relies on Charles for her survival. After her decision to move to London, now she resides by depending on two artistic figures to sustain her. According to Chaudhuri :

> Despite showing such resistance to Victorian gender stereotyping, the end she achieves is not quite revolutionary and emancipatory. She does not turn out to be a social leader/activist for the cause of feminism, but remains a fetishistic model for a voluptuous artistic group and depends on them economically and professionally. (68)

Sarah, who has always been an enigmatic character throughout the novel, seems to have failed in her endeavors in the attainment of an authentic mode of living. Charles Scruggs (1985) also comments that: "Sarah has become a predator, preying upon others so that she may survive and evolve" (109). Residing in an artist house does not help in increasing her freedom or independence. Contrarily, it emphasizes her dependence. Scruggs furthers this opinion of his by claiming that "Her role in the extended family of artists is already socialized, a form of adaptation rather than an act of rebellion, and as such she is no longer one of 'the elect', but a conformist" (110). This idea of dependence on an artist is a reminder of the behavior of Miranda in *The Collector*. Just like Sarah, Miranda also relies on the existence and guidance of an artist, G.P. whom she aspires to in her artistic pursuits and freedom. Therefore, these two women who wish to achieve freedom in the presence of artists in fact do the opposite and they increase their dependency.

In the first ending, after the solicitations of Charles, Sarah presents their baby and in that ending the reader grasps the idea that Charles and Sarah are

going to form a family and Sarah will get what she has wanted from the very beginning. According to Charles Scruggs (1985):

> When she accepts Charles in the first ending, it would be easy to define her within the context of a Victorian cliche or a combination of several Victorian clichés: Fallen Woman redeemed by True Love or Woman finds True Self in marriage. (102)

In the first ending, there is no further discussion relating to Sarah's search for identity and the breaking away from the norms of Victorian life. Hence, it can be concluded that once the first ending is taken into consideration, Sarah remains an inauthentic figure just like Charles. Scruggs also notes that in the first ending:

> The novel becomes a Victorian novel and Sarah, a Victorian heroine. For when Sarah accepts Charles after he has accused her of gratuitous cruelty, she responds to him in part from a Victorian sense of Duty, not in its narrower meaning of blind devotion to form, but in its more generous application—the sense of obligation to an individual to whom she owes so much. (109)

In the second ending, the future prospect is ambiguous as in the case of Charles. After she rejects Charles, Sarah remains in the household of the Rosettis. However, her future does not seem to be one filled with independent and free prospects. As she sustains her reliance on others, her next step in self creation is problematized once again. To quote Scruggs again:

> The Sarah of the second ending, however, seems in the process of shedding "human relationships," not restoring them. She is free to choose but is crippled not by society's laws but by her own imagination. Whereas Charles can now 'give' without the fear of compromising his integrity, Sarah is locked within the walls of the self, a prison. (112)

All in all, by providing two separate endings for the novel, Fowles aims to free the reader to choose what he thinks the best for the given context. Charles and Sarah have sustained their inauthentic existence all through the novel by their constant referrals to bad faith and being situated in the Victorian context. To begin with, Charles, who has not been limited in many aspects which may endanger his freedom and authentic self, has been situated and restricted due to his Victorian frame of mind. He has aspirations to science and he holds himself as one of the Few. However, as the narrator points out: "After all, he was a Victorian" (80). No

matter what kinds of steps he takes towards achieving an authentic self, he cannot throw away the fetters that make him a Victorian. In the first ending, he falls into the comfortable and safe conformity and believes himself to be in the hands of God, which makes him completely inauthentic. In the second ending, there is a chance that he may take a leap of faith and transcend his limited view and dependency on another person. Therefore, in the second ending, his final state is ambiguous, but suggesting little hope.

As for Sarah, she has been an enigmatic character all along. She is inscrutable and she is not given much speech. However, Sarah, unlike Charles, has been limited all her life as the narrator points circumstances regarding her upbringing and education. She is a poor woman with no one to hold onto as her family. She has been educated to be something beyond her meager conditions. However, the Victorian society does not allow her to move beyond her limited prospects. Therefore, having the agility and the intelligence of the Few, she is stuck with the Many. Hence, she depends on the men who come to her life as if they are the means of her salvation and transcendence as she is poor, intelligent and most importantly a woman in a confined society. This notion betokens her dependence on others for survival. In the two endings, the reader finds her in the household of two famous artists. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that her dependency on others continues since being a woman in a Victorian society cannot provide her with a completely free existence. In relation to this new situation, Chaudhuri argues that "The relative impersonality she achieves in love is not reflected in her economic or cultural attitudes because she still needs the patronage of a male dominated artistic group" and she also comments that Sarah and women like her are "confronted with a realization of their aspirations and the simultaneous inability to materialize them in an age not ripe enough for complete female emancipation" (69-70).

To conclude, in Sartrean terms, both Charles and Sarah act in an inauthentic manner. However, the fact that for Fowles, complete freedom is not easily attainable can explain this inauthentic mode of these characters. They are limited, situated in Victorian England. This constitutes their facticity, which

according to Sartre should be and can be transcended to achieve authenticity and which according to Fowles is very hard to overcome as facticity is what shapes the actions and the prospects of the individuals. As Fowles problematizes freedom in terms of the conditions one lives in, his characters reflect the same notion. They are restricted in many ways and these limitations cannot be transcended completely. Therefore, they remain inauthentic despite showing some worthwhile interest in freedom and authenticity.

# CHAPTER 5

## CONCLUSION

This study has been an attempt to examine how the Sartrean understanding of existentialism can be traced in the portrayal of the protagonists of John Fowles's *The Collector* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. In doing so, the study aims to show to what extent the notions and phases of Sartrean existentialism play an important role in the achievement of authenticity. In the study, it has been argued that Fowles's ideas concerning existentialism and authenticity are also reflected in his characterization.

Chapter 1 discussed how existentialism as a school of thought emerged. In doing so, major existentialists and their views were discussed. As the focus of the study is Sartre and Fowles's understanding of existentialism, the chapter provided a detailed analysis of their understanding of freedom and authenticity. By doing so, the chapter aimed to show the correlations and differences between their understandings of the acclaimed school of thought. It was argued that even though most of Fowles and Sartre's views concord with each other, there are some arguments that Fowles presents against the Sartrean understanding. According to Sartre, the ultimate goal of man is to be authentic and in the attainment of an authentic self, there are some phases that an individual goes through. Firstly, for Sartre, the norms of the society and religion have no importance and thus, the individual is alone to create his own values by himself. This creates the idea of abandonment since the individual has no institution or norm to base his decisions on. For Sartre, what abandonment entails is anguish. Anguish is the state of feeling forlorn as the individual is set free to choose and thus form his identity. This choosing process is a difficult one and thus the individual feels anguish. According to Sartre, if a man cannot free himself from this sense of anguish, he may fall into bad faith. Bad faith connotes the idea of an individual's deception of

himself. When one lacks the courage to take responsibility for one's choices and actions, one blames other sources for the outcomes of one's decisions. Only when an individual takes full responsibility of one's actions, can he achieve authenticity. Bad faith consists of two concepts: facticity and transcendence. Facticity means limitedness as the individuals have limits that they cannot change such as birthplace, their bodies and how others perceive them. What the individual needs to do is go beyond these limits and not fall into bad faith. When one does that, one can be an authentic figure.

While Sartrean understanding conveys the idea of complete freedom, Fowles seems to disagree with Sartre in this aspect. Fowles argues that facticity or limitations play a more crucial role in the attainment of freedom and an authentic self. According to Fowles, total freedom is not attainable because of the limitations that an individual cannot overcome. For Fowles, there is "relative freedom" since the forces that one cannot choose or alter play a deterministic role and limits one's freedom.

Chapter 2 has presented a detailed analysis of the main characters of *The Collector*: Clegg and Miranda with respect to Sartrean and Fowlesian existentialism. The study makes a comprehensive analysis of the characters background, their actions and behavior. Firstly, the characterization of Clegg is studied. Clegg is an individual with a poor educational and family background and with a criminal mind. He experiences abandonment, anguish and bad faith in many occasions. However, he cannot achieve authenticity. The reason for his failure can be attributed to Fowles's understanding of freedom. For Fowles, facticity or limitedness are crucial in determining one's attainment of authentic self. Clegg is limited in many respects; he is poor, he has no parents and he is a loner. He cannot overcome these obstacles that he has been born into. Therefore, he cannot achieve authenticity. Miranda, on the other hand, is an individual who has a higher chance of attaining her free self. Unlike Clegg, she is educated; she is surrounded by people. Nevertheless, Miranda also fails, just like Clegg. She fails in achieving an authentic self because of her constant referrals to bad faith. Most

importantly, she fails because she is limited. She is confined by Clegg and she has no sense of freedom. This confinement and her constant reliance on others in shaping her personality and tastes decide her fate in regard to her achievement of an authentic self. She is closer at heart to being free, in contrast to Clegg. However, as she cannot go beyond or alter her confinement and her dependence on other sources, she can never realize her full potential and she dies as an inauthentic figure.

Chapter 3 has presented the progress of Charles and Sarah in *The French Lieutenant's Woman* with regard to their attainment of free selves. Starting with Charles, the study focuses on the behavior of these characters and traces the concepts of Sartrean existentialism. Charles is a Victorian man with some enlightened notions. He feels separate from the common man as he is educated and interested in science. Throughout the novel, Charles strives to achieve his freedom. He goes through an ordeal after meeting Sarah. He experiences abandonment and the anguish of his choices. However, he cannot shake the feeling of being a Victorian. Even though Charles is not limited in many aspects such as family and education and he is aware of his freedom, he cannot fully achieve authenticity. His limitation is his Victorian frame of mind. In each and every step he takes towards freedom, he carries his Victorian self with him and therefore, he cannot be authentic. In the case of Sarah, the situation is more complex. Sarah is presented as an enigma. She has higher aspirations, and she wants to be free in the cloistered Victorian society. Nevertheless, just like Charles, she is limited. Her limitation is not her adherence to Victorian values. Her limitations are financial, educational and family background. She cannot overcome these hindrances and therefore, she lives with her facticity. She always relies on others to sustain herself and she cannot achieve an authentic, free self.

In these novels, the protagonists fail to achieve authenticity because of facticity or limitations, which they cannot change. For Sartre, an individual needs to transcend the limitations and avoid falling into bad faith. However, Fowles claims that the limitations cannot be easily transcended and therefore, there is no

such thing as complete freedom. This is what he reflects in his portrayal of these characters. Clegg is a character who is chained to his past and upbringing. They are not easy to break off with. He is chained to his position in the society and he does not have the chance or the mentality to go beyond them. Due to his status, he is relatively free. The external forces mould him and make him do most of the things he does.

Fowles poses Miranda's limitation as her confinement and constant falls into bad faith. She is physically limited and therefore, she lacks the means to claim her freedom. She also depends on other characters such as G.P. and even Clegg. She has formulated a life based on the thoughts and tastes of G.P. and people like him. Her thoughts in relation to God also fluctuate all through her confinement. Therefore, it can be concluded that she is not free to form a new self and emerge anew as an authentic figure.

In the case of Sarah and Charles, Fowles places these characters in a Victorian context and this is the ultimate limitation for them. Charles, despite believing to be select, cannot divest himself of his Victorian frame of mind. Though he aspires to be a scientist and an intellectual, most of his behaviors are shaped after the fashion of Victorian norms and values. In a clustered society like Victorian England, he fails to attain a completely free self. He is relatively free just like Clegg and Miranda though their limitations differ from each other. On the other hand, Sarah suffers because of the Victorian society that does not allow freedom for women. Her facticity comprises of her background and gender and she cannot surpass them. In a society that does not give room for liberty, She can only manage to have limited freedom and just like other characters, she dwells in relative freedom and poses herself as *inauthentic*.

In the portrayal of these characters, Fowles has drawn some similarities. For instance, both Miranda and Charles are the educated and the enlightened ones and despite their refusal of a divine entity, they pray and fall back on religion. Their thoughts regarding God fluctuate all the time. Another similarity can be found in the interest of collecting things. Clegg, a criminal, is a collector of

butterflies and Charles is a collector of fossils. This theme of collecting and the collector mentality are reminders of Fowles's idea regarding "having". For Fowles, the craze of "having" limits the progress of an individual towards the attainment of freedom. One other similarity can be traced in the literary references and identifications of Miranda and Charles. Being educated, both of them constantly refer to literary texts and sometimes identify themselves with the literary characters, and this in turn increases their inauthenticity since they cannot form an original, unadulterated self. This idea, once again, is a reminder of how they can only be "relatively" free.

All in all, in the novels of John Fowles, it is possible to observe his interest in existentialism. In the portrayal of his characters, he focuses on their freedom and authentic self. He also employs various existentialist themes such as abandonment, anguish, bad faith and facticity. Along with these notions, he reflects his ideas concerning the acclaimed ideology. In the portrayal of the main characters of *The Collector* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, he problematizes the idea of attaining complete freedom. For Fowles, facticity is a determinant factor and this idea differs from the Sartrean understanding that dictates absolute freedom. Even though Fowles's characters experience Sartrean existentialism, he portrays them as unable to achieve full authenticity because of various limitations. Consequently, what Fowles tries to imply is that there is no total freedom for individuals. Authenticity is not fully accessible. There can only be "relative freedom" for individuals and likewise for his characters.

In the process of this study, various subjects that can be of value in further studies have come to the surface. One of them can be related to the narrator of *The French Lieutenant's Woman.* In the novel, the narrator interferes with the plot and the speeches of the characters most of the time and therefore, the freedom of the characters becomes questionable in relation to the narrator's stand in the narration of the novel. Another study can be related to the position of women in the society and their struggle for freedom.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Acheson, James. *John Fowles*. New York: St. Martin's, 1998.

Adam, Ian, Patrick Brantlinger and Sheldon Rothblatt. "The French Lieutenant's Woman: A Discussion". *Victorian Studies* 15, No.3, 1972, pp. 339-356.

Aristotle. *Posterior Analytics*. Translated by Jonathan Barnes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Bagchee, Syhamal. "'The Collector': The Paradoxical Imagination of John Fowles." *Journal of Modern Literature,* vol. 8, no. 2, 1980, pp. 219–234

Camus, Albert. *The Myth of Sisyphus, and Other Essays*. London: H. Hamilton, 1965.

Campbell, Robert. "Moral Sense and the Collector: The Novels of John Fowles". *Critical Quarterly,* 25.1, 1983, pp. 45-53.

Chaudhuri, Sneha Kar. "The Contradictions of a Victorian Romance in John Fowles's The French Lieutenant's Woman". *Appropriations,* Volume 8, 201., pp.339-356.

Conradi, Peter. *John Fowles*. New York: Methuen, 1985.

Cooper, Pamela. *The Fictions of John Fowles: Power, Creativity, Femininity*. Canada: University of Ottawa Press, 1991.

Fawkner, Harold William. *The Timescapes of John Fowles*. Rutherford: Fairleigh-Dickinson UP, 1984.

Finney, Brian. *The French Lieutenant's Woman as Historical Fiction.* Macmillan Education UK, 2013.

Fletcher, Lisa. “Reclaiming Forbidden Romance: John Fowles’s The French Lieutenant’s Woman and A.S. Byatt’s Possession: A Romance”. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Gender Studies* 7.1 & 2, 2003, pp. 26-42.

Foster, Thomas C. *Understanding John Fowles*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.

Fowles, John. *The Aristos*. Vintage Classics, 2001.

Fowles, John. *The Collector*. Vintage Classics, 2004.

Fowles, John. *The French Lieutenant’s Woman,* Vintage Classics. 2004.

Fowles, John. “Notes on the Unfinished Novel”. *Afterwords: Novelists on Their Novels*, edited by T. McCormack. New York: Harper, 1969. Pp. 60-61.

Garard, Charles. *Point of View in Fiction and Film: Focus on John Fowles*, Frankfurt: Lang, 1991.

Guignon, Charles. *The Existentialists: Critical Essays On Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Heidegger, And Sartre.* Lanham, Maryland : Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004.

Halpern, Daniel. “A Sort of Exile in Ryme Legis”. *Conversations with John Fowles,* edited by Vipond, L Dianne University Press of Mississippi, Jackson, 1999, pp. 14-25.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2010.

Howard V. Hong, Edna H. Hong, and Gregor Malantschuk, editors. *Søren Kierkegaard's Journals and Papers*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967.

Jódar, Andrés Romero. "A Stranger in a Strange Land": An Existentialist Reading of Fredrick Clegg in "The Collector" by John Fowles." *Atlantis*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2006, pp. 45–55.

Kaufmann, Walter. *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.

Kierkegaard, Søren, C. S. Evans, and Sylvia Walsh. *Fear and Trembling.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Kierkegaard, Søren, Alastair Hannay, and Søren Kierkegaard. *The Concluding Unscientific Postscript to the Philosophical Crumbs*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Klerk, Hannelie. *Intertextuality in John Fowles's The French Lieutenant's Woman,* Master's Thesis, Rand Afrikaans University, 1987.

Kwong Yin-tze, Charles. *Towards Wholeness: The Existential Fiction of John Fowles.* Open Dissertation Press, 2007.

Laughlin, Rosemary. "Faces of Power in the Novels of John Fowles". *Critique* 13, No. 13, 1972, pp. 71-88.

Lee B.A, Seungjae. *Otherness, Recognition And Power: The Hegelian Themes In John Fowles's The Collector.* MA Thesis, The University of Georgia. 1999.

Lee, Cynthia. *Existentialism and Darwinism in The French Lieutenant's Woman*. MA Thesis, North Texas State University, 1977.

Lenz, Brooke. *John Fowles: Visionary and Voyeur*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008.

Lévinas, Emmanuel. *Humanism of the Other*. University of Illinois Press, 2003.

Loveday, Simon. *The Romances of John Fowles*. London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's, 1985.

Lynch, P. Richard. “Freedoms in *The French Lieutenant’s Woman*”. *Twentieth Century Literature*, Vol. 48, No. 1, 2002, pp. 50-76.

McSweeney, Kerry. “John Fowles's Variations in The Ebony Tower”. *Journal of Modern Literature* 8. 1980-1981, pp. 303-324.

Mockridge, Rowland. *Smell of Success Makes Him Nervous.* New York World Telegram, 1963.

Newquist, Roy. “John Fowles”. *Conversations with John Fowles,* edited by Vipond, L Dianne University Press of Mississippi, Jackson, 1999, pp. 1-8.

Nietzsche, Friedrich W. *The Anti-Christ*. Auckland, N.Z.: Floating Press, 2010.

Nietzsche, Friedrich W. *The Gay Science; with a Prelude in Rhymes and an Appendix of Songs.* New York :Vintage Books, 1974.

Nietzsche, Friedrich W. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for All and None*, edited by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Modern Library, 1995.

Oaklander, L. Nathan. *Existentialist Philosophy: An Introduction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1996.

Olshen, Barry N. *John Fowles -Modern Literature Monographs*. New York: Ungar, 1978.

Onega, Susana. *Form and Meaning in the Novels of John Fowles*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1989.

Palmer, William J. “John Fowles and the Crickets”. *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 31, no. 1, 1985, pp. 2-13.

Petranova, Eva. *Existentialism in the Works of John Fowles.* PhD dissertation, Jihočeská Univerzita v Českých Budějovicích, 2015.

Punter, D. “Gothic and Neo-Gothic in Fowles's “The Collector”. *John Fowles: New Casebook.* Edited by James Acheson, London: Palgrave Macmillan. 2013, pp. 62-76.

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

Rankin, Elizabeth. “Cryptic Coloration in The French Lieutenant’s Woman”. *Journal of Narrative Technique* 3, 1975, pp.193-207.

Rokotnitz, Naomi. “Passionate Reciprocity”: Love, Existentialism, and Bodily Knowledge in The French Lieutenant’s Woman". *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas*, vol. 12 no. 2, 2014, pp. 331-354

Salami, Mahmoud, *John Fowles' Fiction and the Poetics of Post-modernism*, Associated University Presses, 1992.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *No Exit, and Three Other Plays*. New York: Vintage Books, 1955.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Existentialism and Humanism*, translated by Philip Mairet, Methuen, 1948.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. New York: Washington Square Press, 1966.

Sartre Jeane, *Foucault and Historical Reason, Toward an Existentialist Theory of History*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, USA, 1997.

Scruggs, Charles. “The Two Endings of The French Lieutenant’s Woman”. *Modern Fiction Studies* 31, 1985, pp. 95-113.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*, edited by George Richard Hibbard, Oxford UP, 2008.

Singh, Mahima. “Diversion/ Perversion: Reading The Pervert In The Bell Jar And The Collector”. *Impact Journals* Vol. 3, Issue 7, 2015, pp. 7-14.

Solomon, Robert C. *Living with Nietzsche: What the Great “immoralist” Has to Teach Us*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Stephenson, William. *Fowles’s The French Lieutenant’s Woman*. Continuum Publishing. 2007.

Tan, Tijen. *Existentialism And Samuel Beckett’s Two Plays: Endgame And Happy Days*. Master Thesis, METU, 2007.

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

Tarbox, Katherine. *The Art of John Fowles*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988.

Toth, Tibor. “Ambiguity in *The French Lieutenant’s Woman*”. *Eger Journal of English Studies* Vol. 11, 2011, pp.67-81.

Warburton, Eilee. *John Fowles: A Life in Two Worlds*. London: Jonathan Cape, 2004.

Weberman, D. *Sartre on the Authenticity, Required if My Choices are to be Truly Mine.* Filozofia 66, 2011, No 9, p. 879

Wolfe, Peter. *John Fowles, Magus and Moralist*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1979.

Woodcock, Bruce. *Male Mythologies: John Fowles and Masculinity*. Brighton, U. K.: Harvester; Totowa, N. J.: Barnes & Noble, 1984.

Vipond, L Dianne editor. *Conversations with John Fowles*. University Press of Mississippi, Jackson, 1999, pp.134-48.

# APPENDICES

## A. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu tez John Fowles'un Koleksiyoncu ve Fransız Teğmen'in Kadını adlı romanlarında geçen ana karakterlerin Sartreca varoluşçuluğu nasıl deneyimlediklerini, ve sahihlik ve özgürlük için çabalarını inceleme çalışması yapmaktadır. Bu çalışma, Sartreca varoluşçuluk kavram ve unsurlar ve Fowles'un da bu ideolojiye ilişkin görüşlerine göre bu karakterlerin sahih olmadıklarının tasvirini amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma, Fowles ve Sartre'ın özgürlük ve sahihlik kavramlarına ilişkin anlayışlarının benzerlik ve farklılıklarını göstermek ve böylelikle bu görüşlerin, romanlardaki ana karakterlerin tasvirinde nasıl yansıtıldığını incelemeyi hedeflemektedir.

Yapılan bu çalışmada, Sartre açısından varoluşçuluk felsefesini ve sahihlik kavramlarını daha bütünleyici şekilde incelemek amacıyla, bu felsefenin önde gelen isimleri olan Soren Kierkegaard, Frederick Nietzsche, Martin Heidegger ve Albert Camus detaylı şekilde incelenmiştir. Kierkegaard, genellikle ateizm ile ilişkilendirilen varoluşçuluk akımına dini bir yaklaşım getirmektedir. Kierkegaard'a göre herkes için geçerli olan bir doğru olamaz ve doğruluk sübjektif bir olgudur. Bu sebeple birey kendisi için doğru olanı aramalı ve bu şekilde özgür olmalıdır. Nietzsche ise ateist bir bakış açısı getirmektedir. Dinin, tanrının ve toplumsal değerlerin olmadığı bir ortamda, bireyi kendi değerlerini oluşturmaya teşvik eder. Heidegger de Nietzsche gibi bireyin özgürlüğünü vurgular ve kendi değerlerini kendisinin yaratması gerektiğine belirtir. Camus is genellikle "absurd" kavramı ile tanınmaktadır. Camus için hayatın bir anlamı yoktur ve bireyin kendisi hayata anlam vermeli ve yaşamına devam etmelidir.

Özetle, bu şekilde isimlerin varoluşçuluk ve özgürlük kavramlarını nasıl değerlendirdikleri ele alınmış ve görüşleri genel çerçevede tartışılmıştır. Bu isimlerden sonra, tezin ana konusu olan Jean-Paul Sartre'a geçilmiştir. Sartre'ın

çeşitli kitapları incelenerek özgürlük ve sahihlik kavramları üzerine durulmuştur. Sartre'a göre, bireyler özgürdür ve bu özgürlüklerinin farkında değildir. Öncelikli olarak bireyin özgürlüğünün farkına varması gerekmektedir. Bir birey, içinde yaşadığı dünyada özgür olduğu hissine varırsa, kendi değerlerini oluşturmaya ve daha özgün bir birey olmaya çalışacaktır. Daha özgün bir benlik için çaba ise sahihliğe giden en önemli yoldur.

Sartre'ın sahihlik kavramı üzerine yapılan araştırma ve incelemelerde, kişinin sahih olmasını sağlayan 4 ana unsur belirlenmiştir. Bunlar, "terk etme", "keder", "aldatma" ve "olgusal gerçeklik-aşkınlık" kavramlarıdır. Sartre'a göre, sahih bir birey olabilmek için, kişi öncelikle toplumun koyduğu değer yargıları, gelenekler ve dini inanç gibi kısıtlayıcı ve şekillendirici değerlerden sıyrılması gerekmektedir. Bu değerlerden uzaklaşan birey "terk etme-edilme" hislerini deneyimler. Varlığının temelini oluşturan hiçbir olgu ve normu kabul etmeyen birey artık yalnızdır ve kendi değerlerini kendisinin oluşturması gerekmektedir. Bu yalnızlık hissi beraberinde birey için "keder" oluşturmaktadır. Kendi değerlerini oluşturmaya başlayan bireyin, doğru seçimler yapıp yapmadığı konusunda ve sadece kendi istek ve dileklerine göre bir karakter oluşturmasında endişe ve acı hissetmesi doğal olarak görülmektedir. Fakat Sartre bu noktanın bir dönüm noktası olduğunu düşünür. Şayet bir birey, bütün varolan değer ve unsurlardan kendisini korur ve de seçimlerinin endişe ve kederini yaşarsa, o zaman bu bireyin sahihlik yolunda doğru yönde ilerlediği söylenebilir. Bu aşamada, Sartre diğer bir adım olan "aldatma" unsurunu vurgular. Bireyin tek başına kararlar alması ve varlığını dayandıracak değerlerinin olmaması sonucunda, yaptığı bütün hareketlerin sorumluluğunu üstlenmesi gerekmektedir. Sorumluluğu kabuk etmek yerine, başka olguları suçlayan birey "aldatma" hissine düşmüş bulunmaktadır.

Sartre'a göre, hareketlerinin sonuçlarını kabullenmeyen ve ortaya çıkan sonuçlar için toplumu, aileyi, şartları vb. diğer dışsal olguları suçlayan kişi sadece kendi kandırmaktadır. Bu kendini kandırma ve aldatma hissi kişinin sahih olmasının önündeki en büyük engeldir. Sahih olmayı dileyen birey, hareketlerini bütün sonuçlarını kabullenmeli ve başka hiçbir değeri suçlu ya da sorumlu

bulmamalıdır. Sartre bu olguların açıklanmasından sonra dikkati iki noktaya çekmektedir. Bunlardan biri "olgusal gerçeklik" ve diğeri ise "aşkınlık" olarak tanımlanır. Olgusal gerçeklik, kişinin hayattaki sınırları anlamına gelmektedir. BU sınırlar, kişinin üzerinde kontrolü bulunmayan ve doğuştan gelen sınırlardır. Sartre'a göre, doğum yeri, doğulan vücut ve başkalarının bireyi nasıl gördüğü kişinin kontrolünde değildir ve bu yüzden onun sınırlarını, yani olgusal gerçekliklerini göstermektedir. Bu sınırlar, her ne kadar kontrol dışı olsa da "aşkınlık" olarak tabir edilen unsura göre ötesine geçilmesi ve aşılması gereken durumlardır. Eğer bir birey, içerisine doğduğu, sınırları, engelleri geçer ve bunu yaparken başka olguları suçlamayıp kendini aldatmaz ise sahih olması mümkündür. Bu şekilde, kişi gerçek anlamda "tamamen özgür" olma ayrıcalığına ulaşabilir.

Sartre'ın bu bakış açısı ve argümanları birçok yazar tarafından benimsenmiş ve yorumlanmıştır. Bunlardan birisi ise 21. yy İngiliz Edebiyatı'nın önde gelen isimlerinden John Fowles'dır. Fowles'ın kendi felsefi görüşlerini belirttiği kitap olan Aristos'ta Satre'ın ortaya koyduğu görüşlere yorum ve eleştiriler mevcuttur. Fowles, varoluşçuluk akımının kendisinin ilgisini yoğun bir şekilde çekmesinin yanı sıra, eserlerinde de bu etkilerin görülebileceğini belirtmiştir. Sartre'a göre mevcut ve ulaşılabilir olan "tamamen özgürlük" kavramını eleştirel biçimde ele almıştır. Fowles'a göre, bireyin "tamamen özgür" olması mümkün değildir. Sartre'ın "olgusal gerçeklik" olarak tartıştığı sınır ve engellerin, sahihlik yolunda çok daha büyük bir ol oynadığını ve de özgürlüğün sadece "nisbi" ve de sınırlı olabileceğini değerlendirmiştir. Kişinin üzerinde herhangi bir kontrolü bulunmayan doğum yeri, görünüş, doğulan aile gibi şartların özgürlüğü engellediği ve de bunların aşılamayacağını vurgulamıştır. Fowles'a göre, bir bireyin sahih olmasının önündeki engellerden biri de düşünce yapısına ilişkindir. Sahip olmayı, var olmanın önüne koyan bireyler Fowles'a göre sahihliğe ulaşamaz. Kısaca, Fowles için tam anlamıyla sahih bir benlik mümkün değildir. Bireyin birçok engeli bulunmaktadır ve bu engeller kısmi olarak aşılabildiğinden birey de kısmi olarak özgür ve sahih olabilmektedir. Bunlara ek olarak, Fowles toplumun iki ayrıldığını düşünmektedir. Fowles'a göre seçilmiş bir

grup mevcut olup bu grup toplumun geri kalanından daha zeki, ahlaklı ve mantıklı hareket etmektedir. Toplumun, bu seçilmişler dışında geriye kalan kısmı ise genellikle cahil ve bilinçsiz insanlardan oluşmaktadır. Bu iki grup Fowles için büyük önem teşkil etmektedir. Fowles'a göre, özgür ve sahih olmak isteyen birey azınlık ve seçilmişlerden biri olmak için çabalamalıdır. Kendisini eğitmeli, özgürlüğünün ve sınırlarının farkına varmalı ve yaşamını anlamlı kılmalıdır. Şayet bir birey bunları yapmazsa düşünmeyen, sorgulamayan ve cahilce varlığına devam eden çoğunluğa ait olur. Fowles, her iki grup arasında her ne kadar böylesine bir ayrım yapsa da, bireylerin aslında tek bir gruba ait olamayacağını da belirtir. Sahihlik ve özgürlük yolunda, birey hem seçilmişlere özgü hareketlerde bulunabilir hem de bazı zamanlarda sıradan toplumun yaptığı şeyleri de yapabilir. Buradaki önemli nokta, bireyim tüm çabasını seçkin olma yönünde harcaması ve olabildiğince kendisini sıradanlaştıran hareketlerden kaçınmasıdır.

Bu tez çalışmasında, Sartre'ın felsefesi ve Fowles'ın bu ideolojiye ilişkin yorumları arasındaki benzerlik ve farklılıklar kapsamlı bir biçimde tartışılmıştır. Ortaya çıkan bu görüşler doğrultusunda Fowles'ın Koleksiyoncu ve Fransız Teğmenin Kadını adlı romanları çalışma konusu yapılmıştır. Bu romanlardaki ana karakterler hem Sartre hem de Fowles'ın sahihlik ve özgürlük kavramlarına göre incelenmiş ve bu karakterlerin nasıl Fowles'ın "nisbi özgürlük" fikrini yansıttığı tartışılmıştır. Yapılan incelemede Fowles'un özgürlük, seçkinlik gibi konulara ait düşünceleri de ön planda tutularak karakterlerin gelişimi üzerinde durulmuştur. Çalışma, Sartre ve Fowles açısından her iki romandaki karakterlerin sahih olmadıklarını göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Koleksiyoncu, Fowles'ın ilk romanıdır ve kısa süre içerisinde best-seller olmayı başarmıştır. Kitap, bir kelebek koleksiyoncusu ve kaçırıp zindana kapattığı bir sanat öğrencisi etrafında şekillenmektedir. Frederick Clegg, sorunlu bir çocukluğu olan, aile kavramını yaşayamamış, eğitim yönünden zayıf ve birçok psikozdan muzdarip bir gençtir. Tüm bunlara ek olarak, asosyal ve takıntıları bulunan Clegg, toto sayesinde yüksek miktarda paraya sahip olur. Sahip olduğu paranın verdiği güç ve cesaret ile masum bir sanat öğrencisi olan Miranda'yı kaçırır ve satın aldığı evin mahzeninde tutsak eder. Kitabın ilk kısmı, Clegg'in

nasıl bir ruh hali içinde olduğunu, neden Miranda'yı kaçırdığını ve psikozlarını kendi ağzından anlattığı bir bölümken kitabın ikinci kısmı Miranda'nın tutsaklık boyunca tuttuğu günlükten oluşmaktadır. Kitabın son kısmı tekrar Clegg tarafından anlatılmaktadır.

Clegg, problemli bir geçmiş ve düşünce yapısı olan bir birey olarak Sartre'ın sahihlik olgusuna yaklaşamamaktadır ve bunun sebebi ise sürekli kendisini aldatması ve özgür ya da sahi bir benliğe ulaşma çabasının bulunmamasıdır. Clegg, Sartre'ın ilk bahsettiği olgu olan terk etme-edilmeyi deneyimlemektedir. Topluma göre kendi değer yargılarını oluşturmayan Clegg, aynı zamanda din ve Tanrı inancı ile ilgili de özgür bir tavır takınmaktadır. Birçok durumda, toplumun kendisinden beklediği davranışları sergilememekte ve de hep dışta kalma hissini yaşamaktadır. Clegg için genellikle başkaları önemsiz olduğu için arkadaş çevresi de bulunmamaktadır. Kendi yalnızlığı içerisinde, zihninde oluşturduğu değerler ile yaşadığı için Clegg, aslında toplum bütününün sağlıklı sayılabilecek bir bireyi olarak hareket etmemektedir. Ailesiz, arkadaşsız, toplumun değer yargılarından uzak olan Clegg, Sartre'ın bahsini ettiği terk edilme hissini deneyimlemektedir. Bu terk edilme hissine karşı, Clegg keder olgusunu pek yaşamamaktadır. Kendi değerlerini kendi oluşturan biri olarak, karalarının doğrultusunda endişe duyması beklenirken, Clegg endişe duymaktansa yapmak istediği şeyi yapıp sonrasında kendini aldatmayı daha kolay bulmaktadır. Kitap boyunca, hiçbir suçu üzerine alınmayan Clegg, daima sonuçların kendisi dışında bir güç yüzünden olduğunu belirtmektedir. Miranda'yı kaçırması onun için bir kader, olması gereken bir şeymiş gibi hareket edip, ölümünün sorumluğunu dahi üstlenmemektedir. Örneğin, Miranda Clegg'in kendisini kaçırmaktansa sahip olduğu para ile bambaşka bir birey olup istediği şekilde yaşayabileceğini belirttiğinde, Clegg kendisinin eğitimsiz olduğunu ve bu durumda elinden bir şey gelmediğini söyleyip durmaktadır. Her ne kadar Miranda ondaki sorunları görüp belirtse de Clegg için bu sorunları düzeltmek kolay bir şey değildir. Kendisini her fırsatta cahil olarak gördüğü için yaptığı hareketleri de bu cahilliğin bir sonucu olarak ele almaktadır. Her koşulda, kendi geçmişini suçlu görerek kendisini aldatan Clegg için yeni bir birey olmak ve bu bireyi özgün kılmak mümkün

değildir. Bu sebeplerden dolayı, Clegg Sartre felsefesine göre sahih olmayan bir birey olarak ön plana çıkmaktadır.

Clegg'in sahih olmaması, Fowles'ın da görüşlerini yansıtmaktadır. Fowles'a göre, fonksiyonel bir ailesi, eğitimi, çevresi ve düşünce yapısı bulunmayan Clegg'in bu koşulları aşıp tamamen özgür olması beklenemez. Sahih olabilmesi için çabasının bulunmaması da bu durumu güçlendirmektedir. Clegg, sıradan bir birey olup, hayatta nelerin başarılabileceğini ve yapılabileceğini öngöremeyen ve özgürlüğünün farkında olmayan bir bireydir. Attığı her adım geçmişinin gölgesinde kalıp kendi sınırlarını aşamamaktadır. Bu sebeple, Clegg hiçbir zaman sahihliğe ulaşamayacaktır. Koleksiyoncu olması onu sahihlikten uzaklaştıran etmenlerden biridir. Fowles'a göre bir şeye sahip olma duygusu deneyimle duygusunu azaltır. Clegg ise koleksiyoncu düşünce yapısına sahip olarak gelişmeyi ve ilerlemeyi değil, sadece sahip olmayı dilemektedir. Kelebek toplayarak başladığı koleksiyonuna kadınlar ile devam etmesi de bunun bir göstergesidir.

Clegg'i sahihlikten uzaklaştıran diğer bir unsur ise Tanrı inancı noktasında görüşlerindeki tutarsız olmaktadır. Her ne kadar Tanrı inancını benimsemediğini başta belirtse de, belirli durumlarda Clegg'in dini ritüeller gerçekleştirdiği görülmktedir. Örneğin, Miranda'nın ölümü ile beraber dua edip, bedenini yıkaması ve dini usullere göre gömmesi buna işarettir. Kendi düşünceleri içerisinde tutarsızlık yaşayan Clegg bu sebeple sahihlikten bir adım daha uzaklaşmaktadır.

Miranda ise genç, güzel ve hayata karşı idealleri bulunan bir sanat öğrencisidir. Tüm bu hayaller Clegg tarafından kaçırılınca son bulmaktadır. Miranda, Clegg'in aksine, fonksiyonel bir aileye, çevreye ve eğitime sahiptir. Dünya görüşü çok geniş olup özgürlüğünün farkında olan bir birey olarak yaşamaktadır. Bunlara rağmen, Miranda da sahihliğe ulaşamamaktadır. Bunun en büyük sebebi, Clegg'de olduğu gibi kendisini kandırmaya ve başkalarının değerlerine ve zevklerine göre kendi karakterini şekillendirmeye eğiliminin bulunmasıdır. Özgür halinde iken, tüm hayat görüşü ve sanat zevki, mentoru olan George Paston'ın görüşlerine göre şekillenmiştir. Hiçbir zaman kendi görüşünü ön

plana almayan Miranda, orijinal bir benlik oluşturmaktan yoksundur. Tutsaklığı süresince her defasında, tüm bakış açısının aslında kendisinin değil G.P. tarafından şekillendiğini ve esas amacının onun takdirini kazanmak olduğunu sıklıkla ifade etmektedir. Clegg tarafından tutsak edilmesi ise bu durumu daha da artırmıştır. Durmaksızın kendini aldatan ve öz benliğini başkalarının değerlerinin üzerine kuran Miranda, sahihliğe ulaşamadan ölmektedir.

Miranda'yı sahihlikten uzaklaştıran diğer bir olgu ise tıpkı Clegg gibi değişen ve çelişen Tanrı inancına sahip olmasıdır. Kitabın başında, ilk olarak inançlı olduğunu belirtip daha sonra bir Tanrı'nın olamayacağını ifade eden Miranda, hastalığı sırasında da sık sık Tanrı'ya dua edip yardım istemektedir. BU tutarsızlık, onun özgün bir benlikten ne kadar uzak olduğunu ve sahih olmadığı gösteren önemli etkenlerden biridir. Fowles'a göre, Miranda sahih olma potansiyeline sahip olmasına rağmen, yine içinde bulunduğu engeller ve kısıtlamalar yüzünden asla kendi benliğine ulaşamamaktadır. Fowles'un bahsettiği seçilmiş kişilerden olmayı dileyen ve çoğunlukla öyle olduğunu da düşünen Miranda her ne kadar davranışlarında Clegg'den bambaşka bir yolda olduğunu gösterse de, kendisini sınırlayan olguların kurbanı olarak ön plana çıkmaktadır. Bu olgu, "nisbi özgürlük" kavramını hatırlatıcı niteliktedir. Miranda, kısıtlı ve engellenmiş bir şekilde varlığını sürdürürken tamamen bağımsız olması beklenemez. Bu yüzden, Fowles'a göre Clegg ve Miranda sadece kısmi şekilde özgür olduklarından ve de içlerinde bulundukları engellemeleri aşamadıklarından sahih değillerdir.

Bu çalışma sırasında incelenen diğer bir roman Fransız Teğmenin Kadını'dır. Viktorya döneminde geçen roman, arketipik bir romans niteliğindedir. Kitabın ana karakterleri Charles ve Sarah, tıpkı Clegg ve Miranda gibi sahihlik ve özgürlük gibi kavramlar çerçevesinde incelenmiştir. Charles, eğitimli, zengin ve çağına göre çok geniş olan bir aristokrasi üyesidir ve yaşıtlarında beklenildiği gibi sosyal statüsüne uygun olarak Ernestina adlı zengin bir tüccarın kızı ile nişanlıdır. Charles'ın hayatı Sarah ile karşılaşmasından sonra tamamen değişir ve okuyucu Charles'ın sahihliğe giden gelişimini gözlemleyebilmektedir. Sarah ise, kasaba tarafından dışlanmış ve çoğunluk tarafından kendisine kötü lakaplar takılan bir

kadındır. Charles'ın aksine, Sarah enigma niteliğindedir. Söyledikleri, motivasyonu ve yaptıkları sınırlı bir şekilde iletilmiştir. Charles ile buluşmasından sonra Sarah da değişime uğramaktadır. Kitap, postmodern özelliklere sahip olduğundan iki ayrı sonla bitmektedir. Bu iki ayrı son da her iki karakterin gelişimini ayrı ayrı betimlemektedir.

Charles, çağının ötesinde bir bilince sahiptir. Kendisini "agnostik" olarak nitelendiren Charles, bilime duyduğu merak ile fosiller toplayıp inceleyen, amatör bir bilim adamıdır. Nişanlı olduğu Ernestina ile birlikte mutlu bir gelecek hayali kurarken, Sarah ile karşılaştıktan sonra yaptığı seçimleri sorgulamaya başlar. Öncelikli olarak, Viktorya dönemi değer yargılarını reddeden ve Tanrı inancı ile din konusuna agnostik yaklaşan Charles, terk edilme hissini gerçek anlamda yaşamaktadır. Kendi değerlerini kendi oluşturmak isteyen ve bu yüzden toplumun normlarına eleştirel bakan Charles için seçimlerinin endişe ve kederini yaşaması kaçınılmaz olmaktadır. İlk endişesi Ernestina ile olan evlilik. Aydın görüşe sahip olduğuna inanırken yaptığı bu klişe davranış Charles'ın zihnini çok meşgul eder. Charles için Enestina ile evlilik Viktorya dönemi değerlerine ait olgulara uymak anlamına gelmektedir. Bu yüzden endişeler içinde yaşamaya başlayan Charles, Sarah ile beraber kendisini geleneksel değerlere yaklaştıran bu evlilik bağından kurtulmayı amaçlar ve böylelikle sahihliğe yolculuğu başlar. Fakat Charles sahih benliğine ulaşamamaktadır. Bunun en büyük sebebi ise kendisini kandırması, aldatması ve de içinde bulunduğu toplumun düşünce yapısından kurtulamamasıdır.

Sarah'a âşık olduktan sonra, Charles kendi motivasyonunu görememektedir. Sarah ile her buluşmasını, ona olan davranış şeklini ve söylemlerini durmaksızın başka kaynaklara atfetmektedir. Örneğin, Sarah'ın dolaştığı yerlere kasıtlı bir şekilde ve onu görmek için gitmesine karşın, Sarah'ın kendisini bu yola ittiğini beyan etmektedir. Kendi sorumluluğunu kabul etmemekte direnen Charles, sonrasında yaşananlar için de Sarah'ı sorumlu tutup kendisinin masum olduğunu düşünmektedir. Sarah ile ilk cinsel deneyimleri sonrasında, Sarah'ın herkesi kandırdığını, aslında günah işlemiş bir kadın olmayıp bakire olduğunu fark ettiğinde, kendisini bir kurbanmış gibi hissetmektedir.

Bunun üzerine kiliseye giden Charles, orada dualar edip, kaderini ve Sarah'ı suçlar. Bu tipik bir kendini kandırma ve sorumluluktan kurtulma çabasıdır. Fakat, Charles'ın sahih bir karakter olamamasındaki en büyük sebep Viktorya dönemi düşünce yapısından bir türlü kurtulamamasıdır. Örneğin, Charles'ın kadınlara yaklaşımı tamamen kendi çağının geleneklerinin yansımasıdır. Charles için Ernestina, kendisini rahatlatacak, mutlu edecek ve kaprisleri ile ilgilenecek bir kadın rolündedir. Bu rol, Charles'ı içten içe mutlu ve huzurlu kılmaktadır. Öte yandan Sarah ise elde edemediği özgürlüğü simgelemektedir. Sarah'ın peşinden giderken esas ulaşmak istediği Sarah'ın sahip olduğu bağımsızlık ve önü açık bir gelecek vaadinin peşinden sürüklenmektedir. Bu iki kadın da Charles için belirli bir amaca hizmet ediyor olup, onu daha da Viktorya dönemi değerlerine yaklaştırmaktadır.

Bunlara ek olarak, Charles, sosyal statüsünün de fazlasıyla farkında olan bir bireydir. Aristokrasi ait olmanın verdiği rahatlık ve dokunulmaz ile hareket eden Charles, bu durumu tehdit eden herhangi bir şeyde huzursuz ve gelenekselci davranmaktadır. Ernestina'nın babası Charles'a ticaret alanında iş teklifinde bulunduğunda bu davranış net olarak gözlemlenebilmektedir. Sosyal statüsü gereği Charles için bu teklif kendisini aşağılayıcı niteliktedir. Aristokrasinin çalışmaması Viktorya döneminin özelliklerinden biridir ve Charles bu düşünce yapısından kurtulamamıştır. Bir diğer unsur ise, hizmetçisine olan davranış biçimidir. Hizmetçisinden gelen hiçbir itirazı kabullenmeyen ve bunu saygısızlık olarak gören Charles aslında tipik bir Viktorya erkeği olarak ön plana çıkmaktadır.

Dönemin özelliklerine bu kadar bağlı olan Charles için sahih benlik ulaşılabilir değildir; fakat kitabın iki sonu olduğu için Charles'ın gelişimi her iki sonuca göre ayrı ayrı değerlendirilebilir. Sarah ise kitabtaki anlaşılması en üçlü karakterdir. Hakkında dolaşan bir dedikodu sebebiyle toplumdan dışlanmıştır. Mürebbiye olarak çalıştığı eve yaralı olarak gelen ve kendisinin tedavi ettiği bir Fransız Teğmen'e âşık olduğu, onunla evlilik dışı ilişkiye girdiği ve hala o teğmeni beklediği söylenen Sarah, yalnız ve kimsesizdir. Charles'ın aksine, fakir bir aileden gelmiş ve orta seviyede bir eğitim almıştır. Bu eğitim sayesinde

mürebbiyelik yapmış ve bahsi geçen olayları yaşamıştır. Fakat Sarah Viktorya dönemi kadar gelenekselci bir toplum içerisinde toplumun beklentileri dışında yaşayarak Charles'ın dikkatini çekmiştir. Sarah, sosyal statüsü nedeniyle tam anlamıyla terk edilme hissini yaşamaktadır. Toplumdan dışlanmış, yalnız ve kendi değerlerine göre yaşayan bir kadın olarak sıklıkla keder ve endişe de yaşamaktadır. Charles ile buluşmalarında bundan sıkça bahsedip gelecek endişesi yaşadığını beyan etmektedir. Yine de, bunlara rağmen, Sarah da tıpkı Charles gibi sahih bir karakter değildir. Bunun ilk sebebi Sarah'ın hem kendisini hem de etrafındakileri kandırma ve kullanma eğilimidir. Charles, Sarah için bir kurtarıcı rolündedir ve Sarah Charles'ın kendisine olan ilgisini bu yönde kullanır. Öte yandan, teğmen ile ilişkisine dair herkes tarafından anlatılan hikayenin aslında yalan olduğu ve kendisi tarafından uydurulduğu gerçeği ön plana çıkmaktadır. Sarah, böyle bir hikâyeyi yaygınlaştırarak özgür ve toplumdan uzak olduğu yanılgısına düşse de bu yalan aslında sadece kendisinin manipüle yeteneğini göstermektedir. Kendisini aldatma dışında, Charles gibi Sarah da geleneksel yaklaşımlara sahip olduğu için sahihliğe yaklaşamamaktadır. Viktorya değerlerinden biri olan evlilik ve çocuk isteğinin çok ön planda olması, var olmak için bir erkeğe ihtiyaç duyası bu eğiliminin örneklerindendir.

Kitap iki sona sahip olduğu için, bu karakterlerin gelişimi her iki sonda da farklılık göstermektedir. İlk sonda, Charles ve Sarah ayrılırlar ve Charles, Sarah'ı bir süreliğine bulamaz. Uzun zaman sonra, Sarah'ın nerde olduğunu bulan Charles, onun peşinden gider ve sarah'ın dönemin ünlü sanatçılarından Gabriel Rosetti ve Christina Rosetti'nin evinde yaşadığını öğrenir. Bu bir araya geliş ile Charles bir bebeklerinin olduğunu öğrenir ve Sarah ile mutlu bir evlilik hayatı yaşayacaklarının iması vardır ve bu son ile her ikisi de geleneksel bakış açılarına göre hareket ederek sahih olamamaktadır. İkinci sonda ise, kendisini bulmasından sonra Sarah Charles'ı reddeder ve ayrılırlar. Bu son ile beraber Charles ve Sarah'ın gelecekleri ve sahihlik durumları bir muamma oluştursa da her ikisinin de sahih olamadıklarını varsaymak mümkündür.

Sarah ve Charles'ın özgürlük ve sahihlik yolunda önlerindeki en büyük engel içinde yaşadıkları toplum ve düşünce yapısıdır. Bu fikir Fowles'ın "nisbi

özgürlük" fikrinin bir hatırlatıcısıdır. Karakterler tamamen özgür olamamkta ve bunun sebebi ise içinde bulundukları kısıtlamalar ve engellerdir. Charles'ın engeli Viktorya düşünce yapısı ve toplum, Sarah'ın engelini de oluşturup onu bir kadın olarak başkalarına bağımlı yaşamaya itmektedir. Bu nedenle, bu karakterler Sartre felsefesine göre sahih değillerdir çünkü Fowles için tamamen özgürlük ulaşılabilir bir şey değildir.

Bu çalışmada, her iki romanının da ana karakterleri incelenmiş ve onların sahihlik yolundaki engelleri Fowles'un özgürlük bakış açısına göre yorumlanmıştır. Bu karakterlerin, Sartre ve Fowles anlayışına göre ne tamamen özgür ne de sahih oldukları tartışılmıştır.

## B. TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

**ENSTİTÜ /** INSTITUTE

**Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

**Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Social Sciences ■

**Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

**Enformatik Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

**Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

**YAZARIN /** AUTHOR

**Soyadı** / Surname : Karsli
**Adı** / Name : Zehra
**Bölümü** / Department : İngiliz Edebiyatı / English Literature

**TEZİN ADI /** TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English) :
John Fowles'un *Koleksiyoncu* ve *Fransız Teğmenin Kadını*'nın Sartreca Okunması / A Sartrean Reading of John Fowles's *The Collector* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman*

**TEZİN TÜRÜ /** DEGREE**:** **Yüksek Lisans** / Master ■ **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☐
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years. *** ■
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. ***** ☐

***** *Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.*
*A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.*

**Yazarın imzası** / Signature **Tarih** / Date