A BAKHTINIAN ANALYSIS OF THE PROTAGONISTS' ETHICAL DILEMMA IN JOSEPH CONRAD'S *UNDER WESTERN EYES* AND *THE END OF THE TETHER*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

NERGİS ÜNAL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

JANUARY 2020

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Yaşar Kondakçı
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

Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz	(METU, ELIT)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı	(METU, ELIT)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Selen Aktari Sevgi	(Başkent Uni., ACL)	_____

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 : Nergis Ünal

Signature :

ABSTRACT

A BAKHTINIAN ANALYSIS OF THE PROTAGONISTS' ETHICAL DILEMMA IN JOSEPH CONRAD'S *UNDER WESTERN EYES* AND *THE END OF THE TETHER*

Ünal, Nergis

MA., Department of English Literature

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı

January 2020, 135 pages

Conrad's *Under Western Eyes* and *The End of the Tether* dramatize the protagonists' ethical dilemmas by showing how a character can be "moral" and yet "immoral" at the same time. By looking at the ethical dilemmas presented in the two works, to what extent the protagonists, namely Razumov and Captain Whalley, can be claimed to have good morals is studied through the ethical perspective of the Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin. The analysis is made through three main points Bakhtin elaborates on in his *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*: particularity in relation to the protagonist, plurality of value judgments, and the place of empathy and love in the assessment of a character. Making use of the Bakhtinian ethical perspective, this study maintains the argument that Razumov and Captain Whalley cannot be considered to be totally immoral despite the wrongdoings they have committed.

Keywords: Joseph Conrad, ethics, Bakhtin, Razumov, Whalley

ÖZ

JOSEPH CONRAD'IN *UNDER WESTERN EYES* VE *THE END OF THE TETHER* ESERLERİNDEKİ BAŞ KARAKTERLERİN ETİK İKİLEMLERİNİN BAKHTİNSEL İNCELEMESİ

Ünal, Nergis

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü

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

Ocak 2020, 135 sayfa

Conrad'ın *Under Western Eyes* ve *The End of the Tether* eserleri baş karakterlerin etik ikilemlerini sunmakta ve bunu yaparken de karakterlerin aynı anda ahlaka hem uygun hem de uygunsuz davranabileceğini göstermektedir. İki esere konu olan etik ikilemlere bakarak, baş karakterler Razumov ve Kaptan Whalley'nin ne derece iyi ahlaka sahip olduklarının iddia edilebileceği Rus düşünür Mikhail Bakhtin'in etik bakış açısı ile çalışılmıştır. İnceleme Bakhtin'in *Toward a Philosophy of the Act* eserinde detaylandırdığı üç ana konu üzerinden yapılmıştır: baş karaktere yönelik özellik, değer yargılarının çokluğu, ve bir karakterin değerlendirilmesinde empati ve sevginin yeri. Bakhtinsel etik bakış açısını kullanarak bu çalışma Razumov ve Kaptan Whalley'nin yapmış oldukları yanlışlara rağmen tam olarak ahlaka aykırı görülemeyeceği savını ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Joseph Conrad, etik, Bakhtin, Razumov, Whalley

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı for all the insight and encouragement with which she has provided me throughout my journey. This study would not have been possible without her scrupulous assessment, willingness and comments as food for thought.

I would like to thank the other professors in my thesis committee Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz and Assist. Prof. Dr. Selen Aktari Sevgi for their insightful observations and suggestions for improvement.

I would like to extend my thanks to dear Prof. Riccardo Ambrosini for his suggestions and inspiration in defining my path. I am indebted to him for making me admire academic research once again.

I also owe a great debt of gratitude to Robert West. His assistance in editing my work is gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, I would like to thank my family, especially my dearest sister Bernis, whose love and support are with me in whatever I pursue. I owe it all to you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Joseph Conrad is a writer with a philosophy. The fact that he contemplated the meaning of life and the place of ethics in it is one of the prominent characteristics of his novels, which deal with some profound questions of life. The way he interweaves his ethical views into his writing makes it worth analyzing his works in detail over and over again. The ethical dilemmas he presents make the readers of different times address weighty issues in his works through new perspectives, hence making the Conrad corpus speak to new audiences that belong to different time periods.

The basis of Conrad's ethical point of view is very well stated in his famous quotation in "A Familiar Preface" to *A Personal Record*:

> Those who read me know my conviction that the world, the temporal world, rests on a few very simple ideas; so simple that they must be as old as the hills. It rests notably, among others, on the idea of Fidelity. (xxi)

As also pointed out by Berthoud, "simple" refers to "fundamental" here (17). Conrad states that he regards the virtue of fidelity as a principal element of life, and an analysis of the reason why "fidelity" is so important for him will be a worthy effort.

Conrad's interest in the idea of fidelity has two dimensions: one is related to his national background and the other is related to his personal background. The national aspect is based on the partition of Poland by Prussia, Russia and Austria in the 18th century. Following this event, many patriots including literary writers devoted themselves to liberating the country from foreign rule:

> There were of course Poles who appeared to have reconciled themselves to the situation. But the majority seem to have differed merely as to the best means of freeing themselves from foreign domination and once again becoming an independent nation. (Baines 7)

In this regard, Zdzislaw Najder directs attention to Conrad's Polish background, claiming that the theme of fidelity was a common theme in Polish literature starting from the early nineteenth century after the loss of Polish independence (Najder 13, 203). The writers felt the obligation to fulfill their national duties by showing fidelity to their country through their works. Hence, according to Najder, it was not specific to Conrad to utilize this concept in literary works (13). Nevertheless, Conrad makes a very different point in the "Author's Note" to *Under Western Eyes*:

> My greatest anxiety was in being able to strike and sustain the note of scrupulous impartiality. The obligation of absolute fairness was imposed on me historically and hereditarily, by the peculiar experience of race and family, in addition to my primary conviction that truth alone is the justification of any fiction which makes the least claim to the quality of art or may hope to take its place in the culture of men and women of its time. I had never been called before to a greater effort of detachment – detachment from all passions, prejudices, and even from personal memories. (281)

Trying to be a fair and objective author while creating his work is the "primary conviction" of Conrad. This endeavor gives us an indication of his ethical understanding, and we can say that his ethics is inseparable from his aesthetics. As for the importance of "fidelity" in particular, there is something that makes this concept special for Conrad. Concerning the issues ranging from his disapproval of the political practices of his time to the loss of his parents and to the frustration he felt about religion, Conrad faced many dilemmas in his life. His biggest dilemma, however, was most probably concerning his choice to be a citizen of another country and to write in a foreign language. He was severely

criticized because of his choice by the critics of his time, being accused of showing infidelity to his own nation (Najder 12, 102, 171). After a British journalist, Robert Lynd, attacked Conrad for not writing in his mother tongue, Conrad wrote *A Personal Record* in reply (Najder 102-103; Ambrosini 42-43). He tried to explain how he saw the issue from his own perspective. He experienced several dilemmas such as whether he was supposed to stay and be loyal to his country or leave it for his ambitions. He went through the internal questioning of whether he would be committing infidelity if he wrote his works in English. Apparently for Conrad himself, he did not commit such a misdeed. The English language had a special place for Conrad. In *A Personal Record* he defines English as:

> the speech of my secret choice, of my future, of long friendships, of the deepest affections, of hours of toil and hours of ease, and of solitary hours too, of books read, of thoughts pursued, of remembered emotions—of my very dreams! (136)

For him, writing in English was a natural act that turned his authorship into an unforced process. In "Author's Note" in *A Personal Record*, he claims to have felt that English "had always been an inherent part of myself. English was for me neither a matter of choice nor adoption" (vii). He also adds that "if I had not written in English I would not have written at all" (viii). The English language is presented as the mediator of the experiences he accumulated and the natural trigger for him to write. In the face of criticism, he defends himself showing fidelity to his choice. From another point of view, his dilemma might have occurred because "fidelity to his vision was not compatible with fidelity to his community", as Berthoud maintains (19). He wanted to be away from the disciplined school life and see the world he read about in the many works of sea and travel. Perhaps, leaving his country was a better option for him to become, eventually, the person he was. Depending on the perspective it is analyzed from, it would be acceptable to say that Conrad was both faithful and unfaithful in his life, perhaps just like some of the characters he created. This

being the case, it seems obvious that the idea of fidelity haunted him for the rest of his life, and thus, it keeps occurring as a main theme in his works. But is it possible to distinguish his characters as faithful or unfaithful, so moral or immoral, as a result of the acts they commit?

This study is interested in some of these ethical questions in Joseph Conrad's *Under Western Eyes* (1911) and *The End of the Tether* (1902). By looking at the ethical dilemmas presented in the two works, to what extent the main character in each work, respectively Razumov and Captain Whalley, can be accepted to have good morals will be analyzed through the ethical perspective of the Russian philosopher Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, who was mainly influential in literary theory, linguistics, ethics and aesthetics.

The reason why the stated two works are chosen is that in both works the moral dilemma is dramatized by showing how a character can be "moral" and yet "immoral" at the same time. Razumov in *Under Western Eyes* oscillates between whether to help Haldin or to think about his own future. Captain Whalley in *The End of the Tether* faces the dilemma of whether to be honest to the ship's owner and the passengers or to be faithful to his daughter. Both novels demonstrate striking ethical complexities making the readers wish to resolve them. Human nature is full of contradictions, and one needs to consider several aspects to make a judgment. What seems acceptable in certain contexts may not be so in others. Conrad, for this reason, believes that we live in "a world where no explanation is final" (*A Personal Record* 35) and, in line with his critical nature, points a finger at the difficulty of resolving ethical complexities:

> It would take too long to explain the intimate alliance of contradictions in human nature which makes love itself wear at times the desperate shape of betrayal. And perhaps there is no possible explanation. (*A Personal Record* 36)

Conrad addresses this challenge in his works in general, but it is especially seen in the two works this study aims to analyze.

Under Western Eyes narrates the story of Razumov, a successful university student, whose life is irreversibly devastated. One day, when Razumov arrives in his place, he finds Haldin, a revolutionary fellow student, in his rooms. Haldin has just murdered a state minister and asks for Razumov's help to escape the country. Within the shock he experiences, Razumov says he will help him. However, after considering his situation, his future and the relationship between himself and Haldin, he decides to give Haldin up to state officials, and Haldin is eventually executed. As Russia is ruled under autocracy at the time according to the novel, Razumov becomes a suspect and is sent to Geneva as a state spy. There, he pretends to be a revolutionist and a comrade of Haldin. As Haldin has told him before, Razumov meets Haldin's sister there and falls in love with her. Suffering through his dilemma of whether to tell Natalia the truth, Razumov resolves to confess. When she learns the truth, Natalia leaves Razumov and Geneva. Razumov finally redeems himself by choosing to be faithful to himself.

Similarly, *The End of the Tether* presents the dilemma an old, retired captain faces. Captain Whalley makes himself employed as the captain of a ship by not telling the whole truth about his financial situation. As he is desperately in need of money to support his daughter in Australia, he continues to navigate the ship even though he starts to lose his eyesight. Putting the lives of the people on board in danger, Whalley sets off for his final journey on the ship. The employer of the ship needs money for his gambling obsession, so, in order to get the insurance money, he deflects the ship by placing scraps of iron close to the compass. Thinking that he has lost everything, Whalley decides to kill himself by placing the pieces of iron into his pockets and drowning with the ship.

The dilemmas Razumov and Captain Whalley experience lead them to behave in a questionable way, but whether their acts can be regarded as "wrong" is to be determined. Both characters live for their own principles and ambitions. As Conrad states in "A Familiar Preface" to *A Personal Record*,

"you can't . . . condemn a man for taking care of his own integrity. It is his clear duty" (xx). Both Razumov and Captain Whalley perform the duty of taking care of their integrity by acting according to their principles and trying to achieve their ambitions. While assessing a character from such a point of view, it is also important to take into consideration the extent of the deeds. Not everything would be acceptable in any condition, and of course Conrad has a say on that, too: "[A]ll ambitions are lawful except those which climb upward on the miseries or credulities of mankind" (xx). In accordance with Conrad's ethical-based aesthetics, we need to be fair when putting our ambitions into practice. No ambition should harm anyone. The two novels chosen for this study provide the ethical complexity which is made up of dilemmas and which results in actions that are not easy to be categorized in terms of morality.

An attempt to analyze the ethical dilemmas in Conrad's works brings us to the field of ethics. Moral philosophy has strived, since the Ancient Greeks, to answer some basic questions about human nature, the good life, and how one is to act in this world. In the field of ethics there are various theories, but one can generally talk about three main approaches, which are virtue theory, deontology and consequentialism. As these theories prove insufficient for this study, Bakhtin's ethical perspective will be used as the criterion.

Coming into existence through ancient Greek philosophers' contributions, especially Aristotle's *The Nicomachean Ethics*, virtue theory depends on the virtues or the traits of a character and investigates the virtues which make one a good person. According to this theory, the main purpose of a person is to lead a fulfilling and happy life as a decent character upholding certain virtues such as "courage, temperance, fairness, truthfulness, generosity and friendship" (Hughes 79-80). However, virtue theory has some shortcomings. It presents the difficulty to determine what the virtues, as well as their limits, should be (Rachels and Rachels 188). Determining the virtues that lead to an admirable life is difficult, but also creating a frame to follow overlooks the particular situation of an individual. Can the virtues be the same

for everyone? Is fulfilling the virtue of not stealing, for instance, enough? How can we evaluate the character of the person if he has not yet stolen but has been tempted to steal a few times? Another issue that Rachels and Rachels point out is that in some cases the assessment of action rather than character becomes the question (187). There might be a questionable deed committed by a decent person. Would that deed totally change how that person is believed to be? Does an action always reflect one's character? If not, how can we determine whether that person is morally upright or not? Virtue theory seems insufficient to answer these questions. Therefore, it should be best regarded as "part of an overall theory of ethics rather than as a complete theory in itself" (Rachels and Rachels 189).

According to the second approach, deontology, there are some pre-determined rules that one has to follow. One's actions are right or wrong regardless of their consequences. Deontology rests on the principles of reason and duty. It requires "each individual to derive his or her duties from Reason" and to obey a universal rule (Hammersley and Traianou 21). The most prominent figure of this theory is Immanuel Kant, so the theory is sometimes referred to as Kantian ethics as well. Kant wants to find an answer to "What maxims or fundamental principles could be adopted by a plurality of agents without assuming anything specific about the agents' desires or their social relations?" (O'Neill 177). He believes that a fundamental principle would be wrong if it cannot be a universal principle. However, Kantian ethics is criticized due to the abstract nature of the fundamental principles and because the principles may conflict with each other (O'Neill 182). There is not a sound basis as to how a person should follow the principles or how these principles guide one's decisions. The principles can also clash, for example, in a situation where one has to decide to be honest and tell his friend's place to a person with a gun. In addition, according to theories of duty or principle such as deontology a person can behave like "a perfectly programmed computer" and lead a moral life because such theories pay little or no attention to character (Pence 256-

257). They do not focus on the person as an individual. Hence, deontology undermines such important aspects as personality and the agent's feelings and ideas about his actions.

Another main approach in this discussion is consequentalism, which proposes to focus on the consequences of an act while deciding whether it is moral or not. According to consequentialist theory, one should decide how to behave considering "what will produce the best outcome . . . for people in general or for all those who might be affected by the action" (Hammersley and Traianou 22). Utilitarianism is the most well known version of consequentialism, and it justifies deeds that create happiness for the largest number of people; nothing else matters. But of course, consequentialist theory, just like utilitarianism, does not prove a broad enough context for the discussion of ethical dilemmas as it brings along some questionable ideas. One of these ideas is whether one can perform a dreadful deed such as murder or theft as long as it claims to have the best consequences or not. There are definitely other concerns, in addition to consequences, to take into consideration while determining what is good or bad. Another drawback of this theory could be that "equal concern" for everyone "places too great [a] demand on us" and "disrupts our personal relationships" (Rachels and Rachels 107). We cannot find a reasonable answer to these questions from a utilitarian aspect. For instance, can a person be considered a hero if he lets his child lead a meager life because he donates almost all his money so that third world country children who suffer from malnutrition can be saved? From a utilitarian perspective, he could be appreciated for his charity work and be regarded to lead a morally unacceptable life if he brings up his child within a certain standard while other children are dying. However, "[w]e are all deeply partial where our family and friends are concerned [because w]e love them and we go to great lengths to help them" (Rachels and Rachels 108). Our child is special for us, so depriving him of a life that we can provide cannot be accepted as

ethical by any means. As a result, from a consequentialist point of view, it would be very difficult to determine the morality of certain deeds.

We need to decide whether an act should be evaluated according to the character of the agent as virtue theory suggests, according to its conformity to some pre-determined rules as deontology necessitates, or according to the extent of the benefits it serves as consequentialism demands. Or maybe there is another aspect we need to take into consideration. The approaches to ethical questions and the responses that have been provided are considerable in number, and there are still questions that remain unanswerable. The question of how we can determine if one is faithful or not is significant and is not easy to answer. Unlike the already existing philosophies, Bakhtinian ethics provides us with more flexibility to analyze Conradian characters in terms of morality, so it can be a useful tool of analysis in this study.

Bakhtin is not satisfied with existing philosophical approaches due to their disregard of the uniqueness of individuals and the rigid rules they try to apply. He states that:

> philosophy, which ought to resolve ultimate problems . . . fails to speak of what it ought to speak. Even though its propositions have certain validity, they are incapable of determining an answerable act/deed and the world in which it is actually and answerably performed once and only once. (*Act* 19)

He observes a gap within existing philosophical understandings which try to give meaning to our actions and to the world. In order to overcome this problem, he presents his alternative approach. In fact, Bakhtin is primarily a philosopher and a theorist who also wrote on the philosophy of art and literature. Although he is not widely studied with regard to his ethical formulations, they are quite subtle, and they underlie his literary philosophy.

Bakhtin's main criterion in his ethical discussion is the idea of responsibility, which he calls "answerability". The concept first appears in one of his early essays "Art and Answerability". Bakhtin's idea of "answerability"

is developed, and his ethical views are mainly presented in another early philosophical essay published many years after it was written: *Toward a Philosophy of the Act* (1919-1921), which will be used as the main analytical perspective in this study.

In "Art and Answerability", Bakhtin makes an introduction to the meaning and importance of "answerability". In the essay, the main point that Bakhtin makes is that creating a whole, or forming a real unity, necessitates "answerability". When art and life unite "only in space and time", the bond is only "mechanic, external" (1). In such a case, neither art nor life feels the responsibility to answer for one another "[f]or it is certainly easier to create without answering for life, and easier to live without any consideration for art" (2). If art ignores life and is ignored by life, it does not have any importance (2). What makes both realms meaningful is "the unity of my answerability" (2). If I feel the responsibility, I can make a whole from parts. Thus, by "answerability" Bakhtin refers to individual responsibility to make a connection between art and life, and accordingly, he refers to individual responsibility one has in terms of one's acts.

Bakhtinian ethics differs from the traditional understanding of ethics in that Bakhtin claims not to place actions or people in a category. What he values is the real responsibility of the person. Theoretical laws, in fact, would diminish the validity of personal responsibility. Although Bakhtin condemns sticking merely to theory, he does not banish theory altogether, either:

> "[A]n answerable deed . . . must not oppose itself to theory and thought, but must incorporate them into itself as necessary moments that are wholly answerable." (*Act* 56)

He maintains that culturally accepted facts and our objective reality should not be disregarded, nor should they be distorted to meet our subjective requirements. The knowledge and experience of "historical mankind" should be brought into correspondence with the unique subject, which will increase

the importance of both and they will both "glow with the light of actual value" (*Act* 47). The necessary aspects of theory should be considered, and a decision should be made after going through judgment. This is the point where "answerability" starts to become an indispensible part of Bakhtinian ethics. As there is not a pre-set content of what one ought to do at a specific occasion – otherwise this approach would not present much difference from Kantian ethics –, the performer of the act is the only one who is responsible for his own deed. Bakhtinian ethical theory leaves the decision-making process to the subject himself. The subject will evaluate the situation, consider the objective reality and finally acknowledge his decision. This is the only way one can prove the uniqueness of his being and can own the sole responsibility of his act. Bakhtin's stress on "answerability" shows parallelism with what Conrad states in his *A Personal Record*: "[N]either at sea nor ashore have I ever lost the sense of responsibility" (111). Both Bakhtin and Conrad emphasize the importance of responsibility one needs to have for one's acts.

Making use of the Bakhtinian ethical perspective, this study puts forward the argument that Razumov and Captain Whalley cannot be regarded as totally immoral despite the wrongdoings they have committed. Razumov accepts to help Haldin escape but reports him to the authorities later on. In addition, he pretends to be a revolutionist in Geneva claiming that he has been a comrade of Haldin's. He deceives Natalia and the revolutionary circle there as he conceals his real identity as a state spy. Similar to Razumov's wrong doings, Whalley deceives his employer to get the position as a captain which he desperately needs. Moreover, he starts to lose his eyesight during their journey; however, he does not tell it to anybody and risks the lives of the people on board. The misdeeds of the two characters cannot be the reason for condemning them harshly. This is because their personal responsibility will be evaluated within their own uniqueness. In terms of ethical discussions, the protagonists in the two novels will be evaluated as one would evaluate a real person in real life.

In order to develop this argument, this study will, in the second chapter, clarify Bakhtin's ethical perspective by elaborating on *Toward a Philosophy of the Act* and its most important concept, "answerability". The theoretical discussion will focus on three aspects of answerability: particularity, plurality, and empathy and love. In the third chapter, the criteria derived from Bakhtin's ethical understanding will be applied to the novel *Under Western Eyes*. The main character Razumov will be evaluated in terms of his ethical dilemmas and to what extent he can be seen as faithful within this framework will be discussed. The fourth chapter will apply Bakhtinian ethics to the novel *The End of the Tether*. The protagonist Captain Whalley will be analyzed regarding to what extent he can be accepted as a moral character. The fifth chapter will present a conclusion of the study.

CHAPTER 2

BAKHTINIAN UNDERSTANDING OF ETHICS

2.1 *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*

Bakhtin takes his place in ethical discussions with his endeavor to make "a new definition of the human subject" (Holquist xx). He brings a new outlook on how to make an ethical evaluation of an individual. The work that mainly states his ethical views is *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*. In this work, Bakhtin makes one point his main concern, and that is the responsibility people need to have for their actions within their once-occurrent life[1]. Bakhtin uses the terms "answerability" for responsibility and "Being-as-event"[2] for moments of life experienced only once. According to Bakhtin, the world is made up of both "given" and "yet-to-be-achieved" elements (*Act* 32). The "given" side of the world is what is presented to us without our choice, and "yet-to-be-achieved" refers to what we need to take initiative for and perform as our choice. The purpose of this distinction is to analyze whether we accept what is given to us and become a part of the together-moving crowd, or discover our true self. The given life presents alternatives to the person; however, instead of just accepting whatever is given and leading a passive life, one needs to make choices and act upon them. "What makes us whole . . . is a response" to the given (Emerson 412). For Bakhtin, "to *be* in life, to be *actually*, is to *act*, is to be unindifferent toward the once-occurrent whole" (*Act* 42). Everyone has a moral obligation to

[1] "Once-occurrent life" is a Bakhtinian concept which refers to the moments of life that are lived only once and that are not possible to be repeated. The fact that no moment can be represented just like its first occurrence makes every event worthy of analysis.

[2] The Bakhtinian term "Being-as-Event" –also referred to as only "Being" – stands for the eventfulness of being. For Bakhtin, existence is seen as an event. It is active, is becoming and is not finished yet.

be an active participant in Being-as-event. As long as one takes full responsibility for one's actions, we can talk about an event; otherwise, there will not be much to elaborate on.

Bakhtin calls the outline of his ethical philosophy "architectonics" instead of a set of principles, a system or a structure that would usually be used by theoretical philosophies. Architectonics refers to "the general aspects of particular acts" (Morson and Emerson 22). It creates a whole bringing the parts together like architecture, but "architecture suggests the creation of static structures. The matter of architectonics is active in the sense that it is always in process" (Holquist xxiii). There is an "invisible relation" between the parts of Bakhtinian architectonics, and they have "a relation to *other* things" (Holquist xxiv). That is the reason why this system is active. The reason why Bakhtin does not prefer to use terms such as system, for instance, is "not only their inaccuracy, their artificiality, and their predictability" but also the fact that they do not "necessarily contain any human beings" (Morson and Emerson 22).

> It is this concrete architectonic of the actual world of the performed act that moral philosophy has to describe, that is, not the abstract scheme but the concrete plan or design of the world of a unitary and once-occurrent act or deed, the basic concrete moments of its construction and their mutual disposition. (*Act* 54)

The theoretical laws would be abstract entities for him as they would be pre-determined. What should be taken into consideration is the unique participation of the subject in the "Being-as-event" through his answerable deeds[3]. Within Bakhtin's architectonic world, "Being-as-event" stands for an act, or existence in general terms, that takes place within a specific time and place. The act is in process; it is not complete or finished. While from a theoretical perspective the

[3] This idea seems to have common characteristics with existentialism in terms of taking responsibility for one's actions and being independent in doing so. This similarity deserves further analysis, but it is beyond the scope of this study.

time and space of one's life are not of significance within unitary time and space, within the Bakhtinian understanding of ethics, they attain "a unitary center of value", and thus, actual time and space are transformed into "a unique . . . individuality" (*Act* 59). This aspect of "Being-as-event" indicates its relation to answerability. One is responsible for the act one has performed within existence as event.

Within Bakhtin's architectonics, there are certain criteria that are necessary for the "Being-as-event" to sustain its unity. The notion of answerability presents itself through three important elements which can be grouped under the headings of "particularity", "plurality", and "empathy and love".

2. 1. 1 Particularity

One of the striking points Bakhtin makes in his *Toward a Philosophy of the Act* is the importance he gives to the uniqueness of the individual. One's own personal differences are the touch of humanness in his acts, and they are what distinguish him from the others. According to Bakhtin "[m]an-in-general does not exist; *I* exist and a particular concrete *other* exists" (*Act* 47). We cannot generalize human beings. A person exists along with his particulars, and he is different from others. A person in the Bakhtinian world of ethics is unique because he makes his decisions not depending on an existing rule or tradition, but on his own judgment. These particulars are what make one act in the way one does. As a result, one needs to be evaluated in terms of one's own particulars.

> The world in which a performed act orients itself on the basis of its once-occurrent participation in Being – that is the specific subject of moral philosophy. Yet the act or deed does not know that world as an entity of determinate content; the performed act has to do only with one single person and one single object, where, moreover, this person and this object are given to it in

> individual emotional-volitional tones. This is a world of proper names, a world of *these* objects and of particular dates of life. (*Act* 53)

It is not always meaningful for the universal validity of a performed act to be applied to each and every person. That is why Bakhtin presents an opposition to the inflexibility of the theoretical approaches of philosophy. Such theories are valid for everyone regardless of the unique context they are found in at a specific place and at a specific time. According to many philosophical approaches, what determines the ethical value of an act is whether it follows certain *a priori*, pre-determined, rules. However, this abstract formulation cannot be acceptable for Bakhtin.

> Any kind of *practical* orientation of my life within the theoretical world is impossible: it is impossible to live in it, impossible to perform answerable deeds. In that world I am unnecessary; I am essentially and fundamentally non-existent in it. (*Act* 9)

For an individual to prove his existence in the world, he needs to be accepted in his own uniqueness – his own background, the particulars of his culture, and his own point of view. However, if the determinants of whether an act is ethical or not are theorized and universalized, it means that the uniqueness of the person is overlooked. Such a situation would be the exact opposite of Bakhtinian understanding as the universal rules one needs to follow undermine the particularity of the person and his situation. "The truth . . . of the event is not the truth that is self-identical and self-equivalent in its content . . ., but is the rightful and unique position of every participant" (*Act* 46). The validity of an act depends on the personal point of view it is regarded by, not on its universal sense. It is not possible to talk about the universality of the correct way of acting (*Act* 47-48). My knowledge of the object is what makes me act in that particular way; it "*answerably obligates me*" (*Act* 49). I act in my uniqueness as a response to the obligation that is imposed on me by my

knowledge of the object. There are no pre-determined criteria that lead me to do so. This is how I own my act. If one cannot own his act, he cannot be responsible for it.

> [I]f I ceased to be unique, then this moment of my not-being could never become a moment of my consciousness . . . –it would simply not exist for me. (*Act* 16)

One's singularity is an essential aspect in the evaluation of the deed one performs. Several features such as one's background, relations, and current state of his country would lead to different assessments for exactly the same deed done by two different people. The action would occur once in time with characteristics unique to its subject. That is the reason why no one can be equally judged in the face of the same deed, which once more displays the inadequacy of other existing theories. To live "from my unique place in Being", however, should not denote that "I live only for my own sake. For it is only from my unique place that *self-sacrifice* is possible, that is, the answerable centrality of myself can be a *self-sacrificing* centrality" (*Act* 48). Due to one's principles, one might need to forgo some expected behaviors while a universally accepted rule would demand him not to do so. This is what is called self-sacrifice. It is one of the main qualities that makes one a unique and an answerable member of "Being". At the same time, the particularity of a person is exactly what confirms the active participation of the subject:

> I-for-myself constitute the center from which my performed act and my self-activity of affirming and acknowledging any value come forth or issue, for that is the only point where I participate answerably in once-occurrent Being; it is the center of operations, the head-quarters of the commander-in-chief directing my possibilities and my ought . . . . It is only from my own unique place in Being that I *can* be and *must* be active. (*Act* 60)

In relation to one's particularity, Bakhtin introduces three terms, namely "non-alibi in Being", "emotional-volitional tone" and "acknowledgement" (or "signature"). According to Bakhtin, as a unique participant in Being, one has to take responsibility for one's actions. A person cannot find an excuse for what he does. He cannot justify his deed stating that a theory or rule expected him to act in a particular way. Similarly, no one else can substitute for the subject. Another person cannot be responsible for what one has done. This is called his "non-alibi". If one decides to present no alibi for one's actions, it means one is aware of the fact that there is no *a priori*, or external, criterion for one's action. "Non-alibi in Being" keeps the idea of responsibility alive. In fact, Morson and Emerson define "non-alibi" as the inevitability of responsibility that needs to be existent constantly rather than appearing only at "a few important moments" or as "a matter of big decisions" (17). Thus, "non-alibi" must be a character trait that displays itself in a person at all times.

Within his "oughtness", "the attitude or position I ought to take" (*Act* 18), a person needs to choose a stance and enact his decision. The point of view he takes while doing so is his "emotional-volitional tone" in Bakhtinian terms. According to the Bakhtinian concept of answerability, the "actively intonated consciousness always affords some choice in how we respond to the world as given to us" (Juzwik 551). As an indicator of the attitude of the person, "emotional-volitional tone" is a subjective aspect of the "Being-as-event". The "tone" shows itself when one sifts through cultural values or objective reality and becomes ready to make a final judgment. "Tone" is an element that makes one responsible for one's deeds. Emerson makes this term more tangible through the distinction Bakhtin points out, in *Toward a Philosophy of the Act,* between culture and life. Culture stands for "form" which is made up of "something imposed or contemplated passively, as an accumulation of beautifully-shaped events, as a set of accomplishments that could exist autonomously, without an answerable author" while life is a "raw

and shapeless *content* [of] everyday actions [. . . which] feels obscure, unordered, unmeasurable" (Emerson 411). Thus, there is a gap between the two realms. However, they "need one another badly" because the "I" that stands for myself needs to be "disciplined" like culture and "must make of itself a *form*. But the forms of an individual life are much more complicated than the forms of culture" (412). "Tone" is the blending device between culture and life. It is "the moment constituted by my self-activity in a lived-experience – the experiencing of an experience as *mine*" (Act 36).

Being aware of his "non-alibi" and having his "emotional-volitional tone", the subject is ready to "acknowledge" the event. For Bakhtin,

> it is not the content of an obligation that obligates me, but my signature below it – the fact that at one time I acknowledged or undersigned the given acknowledgement. And what compelled me to sign at the moment of undersigning was not the content of the given performed act or deed. (*Act* 38)

Whether a pre-determined rule tells one what to do or whether its content seems appropriate for the particularity of the person is not what makes him perform the action. "Theoreticism concerns itself solely with the content of the act, which is only one aspect of action" (Morson and Emerson 16). The act of "undersigning" is a combination of the content, particularity of the person, his "emotional-volitional tone" and the "oughtness". It is one's own "decision to undertake an obligation" (*Act* 38). If a person becomes satisfied with following the rules only, he cannot own the answerability of his deeds. Theory might present one with an example; however, it is the person's "acknowledgement" that will create his action and his commitment to it.

> [T]he answerable act is, after all, the actualization of a decision – inescapably, irremediably, and irrevocably. (*Act* 28)

Once the agent decides and acts in his emotional-volitional tone, he "signs" the act. As a result of his "signature", the person owns and takes responsibility for

his own action, which makes it an absolutely individual deed. The responsible deed cannot be undone, and the agent will experience its consequences. Emerson claims that Bakhtin is only interested in one important part of an act: "once it *has* happened to me, am I willing to sign it? My signature on an act . . . means only that I acknowledge it as existing and that I will not withdraw into fantasy, utopia, or denial in the face of it. I agree to participate in it" (415).

"Acknowledgement" incorporates active participation; that is, not having an alibi in Being. For Bakhtin, being indifferent to the unitary and once-occurrent life means being passive. To be a part of the unique "Being", one needs to act; one needs to display one's own moral obligation. Otherwise, a person will be pretending to be somebody he is not (*Act* 42). He will be content with complying with the rules given, living in a generalized world, and his life will be like "a rough draft of a possible actualization or an unsigned document that does not obligate anyone to do anything" (*Act* 44). Bakhtin calls such people "pretenders":

> One has to develop humility to the point of participating in person and being answerable in person. In attempting to understand our whole life as secret representation and every act we perform – as a ritual act, we turn into impostors or pretenders. (*Act* 52)

Responsible performers of the act, however, perform their moral obligation as to being a responsible individual together with their "non-alibi in Being", "emotional-volitional tone" and "acknowledgement". The evaluation of the deeds of this active participant in life will be like the evaluation of his "*confession*, in the sense of an individual and once-occurrent accounting to oneself for one's own actions" (*Act* 53).

2. 1. 2 Plurality

"Particularity" in Bakhtin's unique world brings along "plurality" with itself. Each individual with his unique being, his unique stance and his unique answerability creates a plurality within this unitary "Being-as-event". That is how each agent forms the wholeness of existence, and Bakhtin values the perception of the object in its active involvement in this whole (Holquist xxiv). After all, "we are all unique, but we are never alone" (Holquist xxvi). Individuals live a life surrounded by other people. "Thus Bakhtin describes a relational, participatory understanding of moral personhood . . . with the individual's capacity for good and harm, through responsive acts of language" (Juzwik 537). However much isolated people may try to be, they will eventually need others to sustain their wholeness. Even though the coexistence of plurality and unity might sound obscure at first, it gains clarity once the value centers and their relationship to one another are explained.

According to Bakhtin, "myself" and "the other"[4] are the two value centers that life is based on. As the uniqueness of an individual is emphasized frequently, my own center that makes up "myself" is "the sole center from which my deed issues or comes forth: I *come upon* this world, inasmuch as I *come forth* or issue from within myself in my performed act or deed of seeing, of thinking, of practical doing" (*Act* 57). With respect to the unique position of the subject, all the other relations "gain a value-center around which they arrange themselves into a certain stable, concrete architectonic whole, and this *possible* unity becomes *actual* uniqueness" (*Act* 57). These centers are primarily different from yet at the same time indispensable to each other, and once-occurrent moments of "Being" revolve around them (*Act* 46, 54, 74):

[4] In its historical succession, the "self" and "other" relation appears in the studies of Emmanuel Levinas as well. While Bakhtin places the "self" in the center and regards it as the ever-developing point of reference, Levinas places the "other" in that position. The approaches of both critics show similarities and differences; however, such an analysis is beyond the scope of this study.

> [The] basic moments [in the world of a unitary and once-occurrent act or deed] are I-for-myself, the other-for-me, and I-for-the-other. All the values of actual life and culture are arranged around the basic architectonic points of the actual world of the performed act or deed . . . . All spatial-temporal values and all sense-content values are drawn toward and concentrated around these central emotional-volitional moments: I, the other, and I-for-the-other. (*Act* 54)

In this sense, it is necessary to understand the relationship between these value centers. "I-for-myself" refers to what I see and think about myself, "I-for-the-other" is how I am perceived by the other, and "the-other-for-me" is the evaluation of the other through my point of view. Morson and Emerson introduce "surroundings" and "field of vision" in connection with value centers:

> A neutral third person observing "me," and describing my perspective as scientifically as possible, would see my surroundings but not my field of vision. For I inevitably see each object and person in my own emotional-volitional field, that is, in a "field of vision" unique to me. (23)

It is clear that each value center is lacking in terms of its own surroundings and the other's field of vision. Holquist makes a very clear explanation of the phenomenon:

> [T]hat I can see things you cannot, and you can see things that I cannot, is that our excess of seeing is defined by a lack of seeing: my excess is your lack, and vice versa. If we wish to overcome this lack, we try to see what is there *together*. We must share each other's excess in order to overcome our mutual lack". (xxvi)

Thus, each individual needs the other to complete himself and to contribute to the wholeness of "Being":

> Life knows two value-centers that are fundamentally and essentially different, yet are correlated with each other: myself and the other; and it is around these centers that all of the concrete moments of Being are distributed and arranged. One and the same object (identical in its content) is a moment of Being that presents itself differently from the valuative standpoint when correlated with me or when correlated with another. (*Act* 74)

These value centers are accepted as the basis since events occur and develop around them. An object of the same content is judged differently from my perspective and from the perspective of the other in the emotional-volitional sense of the actual world. The same event reveals itself in one way to me and in another way to the other.

To illustrate value centers, Bakhtin provides examples. There will be a difference when one evaluates the death of a person one finds dear and that of a person he does not know (*Act* 49). Similarly, the response a person gives when he sees a picture of the destruction of a person he loves will be different from his reaction upon seeing a picture of the destruction of a stranger (*Act* 62). In both cases, there are two objects and one value center, but the value center takes different fields of vision. The objects are exactly the same in terms of their content; however, they are observed through different emotional-volitional tones depending on their relationship with the subject. Thus, the two instances of death have a different meaning for the subject. "For a disembodied, detached (non-participating) *subiectum*[5], all deaths may be equal. No one, however, lives in a world in which all human beings are –with respect to value– equally mortal" (*Act* 48).

The same conclusion can be reached when there are different value centers. For instance, two different people, thus two different value centers, would evaluate the same object differently presenting two different fields of vision. As Bakhtin puts forward, the evaluation of the object "is itself only a

[5] "Subiectum" is the very word Bakhtin uses in *Toward the Philosophy of the Act* to refer to "subject".

moment in the entire concrete architectonic as a whole, and the position of this abstract moment is different when the value-centers of seeing are different" (*Act* 62).

The different feelings one has regarding the same content in different contexts or the different feelings two different value centers have concerning the same object are the indicators that no object can be evaluated in the same way. "[O]ne would be behaving irresponsibly and immorally if one reacted the same way in both instances" (Morson and Emerson 20). This shows that every individual's standpoint regarding an object is and should be different.

This distinction between different value centers can be seen in ethical dilemmas as well. It is difficult to reach a definite conclusion regarding an ethical dilemma as different people will be evaluating the same deed from different perspectives. Similarly, a person can act the way he does because some people are more valuable for him than the others.

The existence of different points of view, "does not disrupt the world's unity of meaning, but, rather, raises it to the level of a unique event" (*Act* 74). The existence of different views enriches the subject. "That I, from my unique place in Being, simply see and know another, that I do not forget him, that for me, too, he exists—that is something only I can do for him at the given moment in all of Being: that is the deed which makes his being more complete" (*Act* 42). The perspective of a person is forfeited by other points of view, and thus, the subject enters into a world of constant evaluation. The person will constantly weigh his own perception and others'. Before he acts, he will think of whether there is a point that he has missed or of which he is not aware. As Emerson explains, the steps to be taken toward the formation of an enriched individual are quite clear. The other places temporary images on us; we give a subjective character to these images by mixing them inside with our own point of view and finally act upon them; reflections of our act are enriched by other outsiders and this sequence continues to go on in this way (408-409).

Eventually, "we continually do others the favor of fixing their identity, at least for the present, by bestowing an image on it" (Emerson 410).

This process enriches the wholeness of "Being-as-event" through "doubt":

> the emotional-volitional picture of the world, presents itself to me in one way, whereas to someone in another way. Or perhaps we have to recognize doubt as constituting a quite distinctive value. It is precisely doubt that forms the basis of our life as effective deed-performing, and it does so without coming into contradiction with theoretical cognition. This value of doubt does not contradict in any way the unitary and unique truth [*pravda*]: it is precisely this unitary and unique truth of the world that demands doubt. (*Act* 45)

Doubt does not impoverish "Being" or demolish the truth, but rather the truth demands doubt as a result of the variety of value centers (*Act* 45). This being said, it is important to note that plurality of the different value centers does not lead to relativism, according to which ethical judgments can vary depending on the point of view. Not everything can be regarded as ethical. According to Blackburn, the only universal rule of relativism is the fact that everybody needs rules, but there are different truths, hence rules, for different people (17-20). Although relativism might sound similar to Bakhtinian ethics in terms of the appreciation of human diversity, it does not necessitate answerability, nor does it leave the subject unfinalized. According to relativism, one side could state that something is acceptable from its perspective, yet so could the other side for just the opposite. Thanks to the plurality aspect of Bakhtinian ethics, the evaluation of acts is not finalized in a one-sided way. Rather, it provides each side with the possibility of understanding the situation. In the Bakhtinian perspective, the existence of different value centers does not lead to confusion or a final conclusion that is so complex that it turns into an unsolvable knot. "On the contrary, we arrive at a view that makes us continually and personally responsible for our actions and for assessing our moral responses" (Morson and

Emerson 20). Through this approach, Bakhtin is trying to create a democratic platform in which we will listen to everybody, receive all the existing perspectives and make a final judgment based on each and every view we have. The different perspectives we receive will expand our perception of our own self. Each perspective can create new points to think about which will give us more responsibility to pay attention to our deeds and our moral judgments. This process will repeat itself upon every instance of communication with others, placing us in the position of unfinalized individuals.

The endeavor to create a democratic atmosphere is one of the new ideas Bakhtin brings to the field of ethics, and it will help to create a new understanding. The communication between the self and the other provides a significant dialogue of different voices, and this dialogue should be accepted as a means of developing the self, not as a threat to shy away from. In this respect, the other is a "'crucial character' in the dialogic formation of the self" (Nealon 132). One learns about others' ideas through one's active participation in "Being", and this interaction leads to learning about not only others but also one's own self. "Like Odysseus, the Bakhtinian subject returns home from experience each time and finds itself changed and enriched, more open to its own possibilities as it travels through different worlds of otherness" (Nealon 138). That is the way our answerable participation in this world is kept active and we contribute to the concept of the "unfinalized" individual.

The world Bakhtin proposes is perceived through "a value-governed" experience (*Act* 61). That is why the singularity of individuals plays such an important role within this world. The position of an event will be evaluated from the standpoint of the individual, or the "value center" of the individual as Bakhtin calls it. The world of "once-occurrent Being" is made up around different centers of value; however, "[t]his will not be a biased, subjective distortion of seeing, for the architectonic of seeing does not affect the content/sense aspect of the event" (*Act* 62). On the contrary, the subject and the others will reveal themselves and will learn about each other through this

variety of responses. That is the point where Bakhtinian ethics "succeeds in enriching the subject even when it [the subject] fails" (Nealon 146). In this way, the characters become redeeming characters.

2. 1. 3 Empathy and Love

The dimensions of ethical analysis in this study have focused on real life so far. As Bakhtin believes in democracy and tolerance to a plurality of perspectives, he thinks that they should exist in literature as well. Many of his notions on life and ethics have reflected upon his literary views as well as on the process of creating a character and how it is created. Just as a person is the "other" for us in real life, the reader and even the author are the "other" for the character in a novel. As the "other", the reader will be able to evaluate the character, and the author will have a role in determining the reader's response. In this way, different points of view from different readers will be provided through time, and the literary work will be enriched. According to Bakhtin, great works are the ones that have a potential allowing for "interaction from countless diverse and unforeseeable standpoints" (Morson and Emerson 4). If a work of literature invites such an interaction, the reader will respond to it through empathy and love.

In his *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*, Bakhtin makes a distinction between "culture" and "the never-repeatable uniqueness of actually lived and experienced life" likening the two realms to "a two-faced Janus", which looks in "two opposite directions" (2). Culture as a "theoretical or aesthetic" (2) entity tries to complete and finalize life through representations. In fact, life flows and acts happen only once. Life cannot be represented exactly as it is. We cannot actually reach life in its actual form through culture, and it is difficult for us to appreciate the uniqueness of life because culture does not let us do so. As Bakhtin states, these two worlds, namely culture and life, do not "interpenetrate" or "intercommunicate" (3, 20).

Looking at culture, Bakhtin claims that "aesthetic being is closer to the actual unity of Being-as-life than the theoretical world is. That is why the temptation of aestheticism is so persuasive" (*Act* 18). The aesthetic world "is closer than any of the abstract cultural worlds (taken in isolation) to the unitary and unique world of the performed act. An analysis of this world should help us to come closer to an understanding of the architectonic structure of the actual world-as-event" (*Act* 61). The world of art is close to real life in that it has an architectonic unity because it "is arranged around a concrete value-center, which is seen and loved and thought" (*Act* 61). This world offers a character, hence a value center, that is life-like, and it is possible to experience in real life the acts committed by this character. The character's life manifests an architectonic as it reflects the character's answerability. It is the audience that evaluates this character through empathy. Thus, what will combine culture and life is the reader. A person can build a bridge between culture and life through his "answerable deed" (*Act* 17-18) of making an evaluation of a product of culture. When the reader analyzes a character of the aesthetic world with willingness and attention to detail, he follows one way of contributing to the "unity of Being". Bakhtin names this evaluative process "aesthetic activity", "aesthetic seeing" or "aesthetic contemplation" in *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*. "The world of aesthetic seeing . . . is not the actual world in which I live, although its content-aspect is inserted into a living *subiectum*" (*Act* 14). Bakhtin makes it clear that the world of the character in a work of art is not real life; however, the character is a "living character" because he deserves respect and needs to be evaluated just as a real person in real life is evaluated. For Bakhtin, the object of evaluation is a "real, actual, thinking human being" (*Act* 6). In fact, Bakhtin believes that anything that is associated with the human being "must become human" (*Act* 61). In this sense, for the ethical discussion in this study, the empathy and love analysis will be actualized from the reader's side by analyzing the character as one would analyze a real person.

According to Bakhtinian understanding, when analyzing a character in a novel, for instance, the reader first needs to "objectify" the character, which means he must place the object of evaluation outside himself, separate it from himself and make the evaluation by returning to himself (*Act* 14). Only through "this returned-into-itself consciousness" can one comprehend the character from inside, and thus, can "[shape] it aesthetically as a unitary, whole, and qualitatively distinctive individuality" (*Act* 14). The reader should not lose his own identity, but should preserve it by constituting the borderline between himself and the character. He should be able to clarify his relationship to the character. Once the character is objectified, the process of empathizing starts. Bakhtin explains empathy as "seeing [the character] from inside in its own essence" (*Act* 14). In this sense, the aesthetic life, therefore the character, gains meaning thanks to the reader:

> [Aesthetic moments] have meaning and are actualized by the empathizer, who is situated *outside* the bounds of that individuality [the character], by way of shaping and objectifying the blind matter obtained through empathizing (*Act* 15).

When one makes an evaluation from his value center, trying to understand the object's feelings, thoughts and experiences is a process that automatically develops. Although it might be difficult to empathize with the object at certain times, it is a necessary element of evaluation. The empathy and love we feel for the object are especially important for Bakhtin, who prioritizes the individuality of the object and the democratic platform created to assess it. Empathy and love in real life show similarities with empathy and love in the world of art. Throughout the evaluative process of a character in a novel, the reader becomes "the other" for the character. He enters into the text by maintaining his place outside and by respecting the character, as a result of which "something new and enriching" emerges (Morson and Emerson 11). The character is intermingled into real life through the empathy and love shown by

the reader, and thus, it gains meaning. Its being is enriched through the value center of the reader.

Bakhtinian understanding suggests that it is not possible for a human being to lead a "theoretical" existence offered by systematic moral philosophies, "for ethics is not a matter of rules" (Morson and Emerson 7); however, "in Bakhtin's view one can indeed live "aesthetically" (Morson and Emerson 12). When a reader analyzes a novel, for instance, he enters into the aesthetic world and ends up finding himself within aesthetic activity by observing the character from outside.

Bakhtin differentiates between two types of empathy. According to him, one should not perform "pure empathizing" in which one loses his unique place in Being-as-event; on the contrary, a person needs to empathize with the object "actively" so that he does not lose himself and his place (*Act* 15). Pure empathizing, according to Bakhtin, means that there will be just one individual instead of two, which will lead to "an impoverishment of Being" (*Act* 16). After one manages to get into the other's world, he needs to come back to his own value center. He needs to recognize the boundaries of himself and the other. Active empathizing becomes a cornerstone for the object's deed to be answerable because its life only gains meaning as long as it is analyzed by the reader (*Act* 15). Thus, the reader has an important duty in this process. Just as one empathizes with one's object in real life, as "the other", the reader needs to perform the act of giving meaning to a character in a novel through his active empathizing. With this act, the reader will also be fulfilling the ultimate purpose –to be an active participant in "the unitary Being" and to contribute to its wholeness:

> Empathizing actualizes something that did not exist either in the object of empathizing or in myself prior to the act of empathizing, and through this actualized something Being-as-event is enriched (that is, it does not remain equal to itself) (*Act* 15).

Bakhtin's concept of active empathizing is to understand one's object and to be able to see it in its own particularity. It is essential for one to keep in mind that one's object cannot be evaluated as if it had the same conditions as one's own self or as another object's. In aesthetic seeing, the object exists in the world of art, not in the real world. It is a product of the cultural realm, and the reader as "the other" needs to connect it with real life in order to enrich its meaning. But how is that possible? Bakhtin provides a striking answer to that: through love.

Emerson defines Bakhtin's concept of love as "a concentration of attention that enriches the beloved over time with extraordinary individuated responses" (408). The character under evaluation might have a totally positive reputation in the work of art, but even if it has a negative representation, "it is upon him that my *interested* attention is riveted in aesthetic seeing, and everything that constitutes the best respect to content is disposed around him" (*Act* 61-62). The reader is willing to focus on the details of the life of the character and to engage in it to understand the wholeness of its act. Thus, the character "is man as a lovingly affirmed concrete actuality" (*Act* 63) and becomes of utmost importance for the empathizer. It is a "living" character.

Aesthetic seeing necessitates love to perform its act:

> Lovelessness, indifference, will never be able to generate sufficient power to slow down and *linger intently* over an object, to hold and sculpt every detail and particular in it, however minute. Only love is capable of being aesthetically productive. (*Act* 64)

We want to maintain the multitude of value centers; we do not want "the unitary Being" to be impoverished. Through love, one can find the way to achieve this purpose because "[i]n my emotional-volitional consciousness the other is in his *own* place, insofar as I love him as *another*, and not as myself" (*Act* 46). The love one directs to his object will mean different things for the two as there are two different value centers:

> I love another, but cannot love myself; the other loves me, but does not love himself. Each one is right in his own place, and he is right answerably, not subjectively. From my own unique place only I-for-myself constitute an *I*, whereas all others are *others* for me (in the emotional-volitional sense of this world). (*Act* 46)

This function of love helps remind each person that "[e]ach one is right in his own place, and he is right answerably, not subjectively" (*Act* 46). The rightness of a person depends on his particularity and answerability. The observer needs to practice "objective" love that is "un-self-interested" (*Act* 64). Otherwise, subjectivity would occur, and this would lead to relativism, which Bakhtin does not favor at all. Similarly, in aesthetic seeing, the reader must evaluate the character without any personal gain in mind. Objectifying the character and respecting its boundaries should be his priority.

For Bakhtin, the human being is of ultimate value. Hence, while making a value-judgment about a character in the aesthetic world, just like evaluating a person in the real world, one should not regard values such as good and bad, or in parallel with this study, faithful and unfaithful as the ultimate values. As Bakhtin states, aesthetic seeing

> does not erase the boundary between good and evil, beauty and ugliness, truth and falsehood. Aesthetic seeing knows all these distinctions and finds them in the world contemplated, but these distinctions are not drawn out of it and placed above it as ultimate criteria, as the principle of viewing and forming what is seen; they remain within that world as constituent moments of its architectonic and are all equally encompassed by an all-accepting loving affirmation of the human being. (*Act* 63-4)

In this sense, it is not difficult to see why Bakhtin finds it meaningless to apply a systematic process or a logical implementation of certain rules in his architectonic. For him, values still provide a point of view; however, throughout the making of a value-judgment one needs to consider the human value as the main criterion rather than the individual's conformity to other values. In aesthetic seeing, you intend to put the literary character under

scrutiny and analyze him in every detail because you see him as a real human being. You respect his peculiarity and his borders, and you want to contribute to his existence by enriching his identity. You know this would not be possible if there were no reader to do so. "[Aesthetic moments] have meaning and are actualized by the empathizer, who is situated *outside* the bounds of that individuality, by way of shaping and objectifying the blind matter obtained through empathizing" (*Act* 15). The empathizer – the reader within the context of this study – realizes aesthetic activity by focusing his/her attention on the object – the literary character – and evaluating the character within its own particulars. "In aesthetic seeing you love a human being not because he is good, but, rather, a human being is good because you love him" (*Act* 62). This is the very point where Bakhtin implies the superiority of art over life. In real life, we love a human being because he is suitable to us – he has the same point of view as we do, so we can act together. We love him because he can provide some advantage to us. However, in the aesthetic world we perform active and objective empathizing without putting the character in the same situation as ours or without expecting anything for our self-interest. This is the success of art.

2. 2 Tools of Analysis

The aim of this study is to analyze the main characters in *Under Western Eyes* and *The End of the Tether* in terms of the ethical dilemmas they experience. While the analysis is being made, a two phased study will be implemented: within the scope of the works and through the reader's perspective.

Within the scope of the works, firstly the aspect of particularity will be studied. Within what specific situations the main character exists will be stated. The protagonist's value centers will be clarified through the Bakhtinian concepts of "I-for-myself" and "others-for-me". The analysis of the two value centers will help build up the character's particulars. It will mainly contribute

to the discussion in terms of how the particular situation of the main character influences the decisions he takes, and if we can label him as immoral despite the disputable deeds he performs. When the acts of the protagonists are evaluated, Bakhtinian concepts of "given", "yet-to-achieve", "oughtness", "signature", "non-alibi" and "emotional-volitional tone" will be referred to in order to clarify how an event obligates the protagonist within his particular situation.

Secondly, the plurality aspect will be analyzed. The main character will be observed through the eyes of the other characters and the narrator – as an "other" for the protagonist – . How the main character is seen through the others' value centers will be evaluated through the Bakhtinian concept of "I-for-others" and the perspective will be compared with "I-for-myself" and "others-for-me". For this process, some principal characters to which the protagonist feels closer will be chosen. Whether the rest of the characters give the protagonist the right to be an individual or not is not considered critical for this study. The narrator will also be analyzed to recognize how the other characters and the narrator see the main character. To what extent they contribute to the protagonist's particularity, and whether they let him live, or they finalize him will be critical in this respect. Bakhtin maintains that the living character should be unfinalized. In this respect, to what extent the main character is unfinalized will be studied. The analysis will focus on how plurality helps the reader to determine whether the protagonist has good morals or not. This process will determine to what extent the protagonist stands for good morals in terms of Bakhtinian ethical understanding.

When it comes to the reader's perspective, it will represent the aesthetic activity in Bakhtinian architectonics. The protagonists will be evaluated through empathy and love. How the narrator helps to determine the reader's view, whether the particularity and plurality aspects label the character and make him complete, and whether or not they leave the reader with question marks in mind will be the questions to be answered. How empathy and love

contribute their share through the reader will be presented through the analysis. The protagonists will be analyzed just as a real human being is evaluated in real life. Empathy and love toward the characters in the novels evaluated in this study will be demonstrated by the reader. The reader's response will be determined by the characters and the narrator. While empathy will support the idea that each individual should be evaluated within his own uniqueness, the active love the reader shows will contribute to the evaluation of the main character in detail without damaging his diversity, which will add to the value of the character and its place in the literary world. Through this analysis, the study aims to answer the question to what extent the main characters can be regarded as representatives of good morals. In the next chapter, the ethical dilemma of the protagonist will be analyzed through Bakhtin's ethical understanding. Bakhtinian perspective of particularity, plurality, and empathy and love will be applied to the analysis.

CHAPTER 3

A BAKHTINIAN VIEW OF FIDELITY IN *UNDER WESTERN EYES*

3. 1 Particularity in Relation to the Protagonist

In this section, Bakhtin's notion that every individual should be evaluated within his own particulars will be applied to Razumov, the protagonist of *Under Western Eyes*. The emphasis will be on how Razumov's uniqueness influences the decisions he makes within his ethical dilemma. For this analysis, Bakhtin's concepts of "given", "yet-to-achieve", "oughtness", "signature", "non-alibi" and "emotional-volitional tone" will be used to elaborate on the subject matter. Razumov will be put under scrutiny concerning to what degree he can be regarded as faithful, and eventually it will be observed that he cannot be labeled as totally unfaithful from a Bakhtinian perspective.

> Yes, of course, I will go. You must give me precise directions, and for the rest – depend on me." (*UWE* 16)

These are the very words after which Razumov's suffering starts. Razumov's solitary life is interrupted by an unexpected visitor: Victor Victorovitch Haldin, a revolutionary fellow student of Razumov's at university. Haldin murders a state minister due to his so-called unfair practices. Haldin's confession of his murder and his request for Razumov to help him escape leave Razumov confused and shocked. In panic and confusion, he says he will help him; however, he later on decides to report Haldin to the authorities. What Bakhtin regards as an answerable deed is when the act is "signed" by the performer without an "alibi". In other words, the subject realizes his act without presenting anybody or anything to blame. He is faced

with his "oughtness" – what he ought to do – and by assuming his stance, or as Bakhtin calls it, his "emotional-volitional tone", he acknowledges his act. Razumov's confession to the state authorities is the act he "signs" without an "alibi". He does not blame another person or any universally accepted rule. He chooses to do so all by himself, and his "emotional-volitional tone" is made up of his self-interest in his future and the confusion he is experiencing at the time. All these aspects make Razumov responsible for his decision, and indeed he suffers for it throughout the rest of the novel. However, the moment of taking the decision to give Haldin up is the climactic moment of the process. Although giving up a fellow student, especially after assuring him that you will help him, cannot be accepted as ethical or virtuous in general terms, can what Razumov did be regarded unquestionably as betrayal? Most readings of the novel assume that Razumov betrayed Haldin. A reading through the Bakhtinian ethical perspective, however, leads us to claim that Razumov's act cannot be completely seen as betrayal. We cannot assert that Razumov is totally unfaithful because firstly we need to remember that, according to Bakhtinian understanding, everyone should be evaluated within the particular situation in which they are found. In this respect, it is of importance to analyze Razumov's uniqueness. The particulars that belong to Razumov can be classified into three aspects: his lack of family, his Russian identity and not having a close relationship with Haldin.

The protagonist of *Under Western Eyes*, Razumov, is a third-year student studying philosophy at St. Petersburg University. He calls himself "after the Russian custom, Cyril son of Isidor – Kirylo Sidorovitch – Razumov" (*UWE* 3). It is stated in the explanatory notes of the novel that the name is "carefully chosen" as it carries the meaning of "'son of reason' in Russian" (*UWE* 285). He is aptly named as, in accordance with the particulars he lives through, he tries to act within the reasonable. He is focused on his future, so his studies make up the central part of his life. He has set his heart on being a professor one day. Therefore, he is very careful with his life. He listens

to people “intelligently”, but “just changes the subject” when he feels something might endanger his future (*UWE* 5). He is a silent character with “a strong nature” and “reserve power” and is seldom seen among people, proving he has no strong social relations with anyone (*UWE* 5). He always tries not to be caught in anything that might spoil his future.

Razumov is known to be the son of an Archpriest and is under the protection of a nobleman. However, Razumov’s good looks make it difficult to believe he comes from a comparatively modest background. That is why it is asserted that “Mr. Razumov was the son of an Archpriest’s pretty daughter – which, of course, would put a different complexion on the matter. This theory also rendered intelligible the protection of the distinguished nobleman” (*UWE* 5). Razumov is devoid of any family ties, “for the daughter of the Archpriest had long been dead” (*UWE* 8), and he is financially supported by Prince K—, a Russian nobleman who is Razumov’s illegitimate father. However, the connections Razumov has with people in general are very vague and the narrator makes this vagueness stronger through his deliberate choice of words. For instance, for Prince K—, the narrator prefers to use the expression “his protector” (*UWE* 9), making the limited relation between father and son more distant. The Prince calls Razumov “Mr. Razumov”. Even the attorney who transmits the Prince’s financial support to Razumov is “obscure” (*UWE* 9). All this careful choice of words strengthens the sense of the protagonist’s loneliness and lack of familial support. Razumov has met the Prince only once in his lifetime. At that moment, the nobleman’s hand, extended for Razumov to shake, was “passive” (*UWE* 10), but still he thought that the hand gave him a “distinct pressure . . . like a secret sign” (*UWE* 10) and that the man pressed his hand “as no other man had pressed it” (*UWE* 30). Even such little signs of closeness create substantial feelings in Razumov. “The emotion of it was terrible. Razumov’s heart seemed to leap into his throat” (*UWE* 10). Until that meeting, the man was for him just an “aristocratic personage” who provided for him an allowance; however, upon that face-to-face contact, “[t]he young

man's ears burned like fire; his sight was dim. 'That man!' Razumov was saying to himself. 'He!'" (*UWE* 10) The moment Razumov receives an indication of interest from the Prince, he unveils how hungry he is for parental closeness.

The hunger for a sense of belonging is a big component of what makes Razumov who he is. "He was lonely in the world as a man swimming in the deep sea. The word Razumov was the mere label of a solitary individuality. There were no Razumovs belonging to him anywhere" (*UWE* 8). Razumov tries to survive in his estrangement and self-alienation. His isolation, caused by lack of family and combined with the illegitimacy of his birth, makes up the "given" in Razumov's life in Bakhtinian terms. He had no choice over his familial background; it is all inherited. The feeling that lack of family creates in Razumov makes him vulnerable in the face of decisions. "Officially and in fact without a family . . . no home influences had shaped his opinions or his feelings" (*UWE* 8). He is presented as a solitary student without family circumstances. He has never experienced the warmth of home. "Others had fathers, mothers, brothers, relations, connections, friends to move heaven and earth on their behalf – he had no one" (*UWE* 16). The question here is how he can "move heaven" without anyone behind him. He cannot take independent decisions without fear or cannot think of expressing himself freely without hesitation. The fact that he cannot move the heavens due to his lack of family is the basis that under-lies his decisions since he would probably act rather differently if he were supported by a family. He acts the way he does because he knows there is no one to defend him if he is found guilty by the state.

In addition to Razumov's lack of family, another important aspect that makes up his particular situation is his Russian identity. As a result of the solitude he experiences due to not having familial ties, Razumov needs an affiliation to which he can direct his sense of belonging, and he embraces his country as a replacement. Russia constitutes a mother figure for Razumov.

"His closest parentage was defined in the statement that he was Russian" (*UWE* 8). He is shaped not by a family, but by his country.

At the time these events happen, Russia, in the novel, is claimed to be under autocratic rule. The narrator presents a Western view of the regime and states that individuals do not have the liberty to express their opinions or talk freely about politics. In this country, "an opinion may be a legal crime visited by death or sometimes by a fate worse than mere death" (UWE 5). People's rights of political thought and practice are suppressed, and autocracy never leaves them alone. The narrator asserts that "[w]henever two Russians come together, the shadow of autocracy is with them, tinging their thoughts, their views, their most intimate feelings, their private life, their public utterances – haunting the secret of their silences" (*UWE* 80). The negative influence of autocracy is further stressed by Natalia, Haldin's sister living in Geneva. In her opinion, "there are no institutions" but "only a handful of cruel – perhaps blind – officials against a nation" (*UWE* 99). She believes that legality does not function in Russia and that "the absolutist lies must be uprooted" (*UWE* 99). Natalia adds that "[r]eform is impossible" in the country (*UWE* 99), and what revolutionary success means is "[h]opes grotesquely betrayed, ideas caricatured" (*UWE* 100). According to Mrs. Haldin – Haldin and Natalia's mother, living in Geneva with her daughter – both education and religion are corrupted and "[t]here is neither peace nor rest in Russia for one but in the grave" (*UWE* 77).

Students in particular stay away from political discussions in order to ensure the safety of their future within this "period of mental and political unrest" (*UWE* 8). There are claimed to be two main ideological tendencies, namely autocracy and revolution, which create turmoil within the country. Razumov regards revolutionists as "violent enthusiasts" (*UWE* 45). According to him, they are like a "sterile" "volcanic eruption" that leads to "the ruin of the fertile ground"; they are "a miserable incumbrance of space, holding no power, possessing no will, having nothing to give" (*UWE* 26). Revolutionists believe

that autocracy has to be discontinued because the authorities do not provide liberty for the citizens and they try to "[uproot] the tender plant" (*UWE* 14). There is no way for the new generation to lead themselves in the direction they want. On the contrary, they have to act the way the state permits them to do. From their own point of view, the revolutionists want to change this system. Nevertheless, Razumov does not approve of what revolutionists do since they are "[f]anatical lovers of liberty . . . . Liberty that means nothing precise. Liberty in whose name crimes are committed" (*UWE* 37).

Razumov loves his country although he is "in conflict with himself" (*UWE* 25). He can see the negative effects of both ideologies, but as a matter of his personality, he tries to stay away from any kind of dispute "as a good-natured man may shrink from taking definite sides in a violent family quarrel" (*UWE* 8). He unfortunately has a soft spot. He can be "easily swayed by argument and authority" (*UWE* 4). He feels closer to authority, thus to autocracy, because for him the state means solid ground. It is a "throne", a "seat of power" (*UWE* 26) that can provide him a future. By leading a life approved by the state, he can apply for the silver medal that is offered by the Ministry of Education. The prize will be "a solid beginning" in his life as it might give him the chance to be a university professor, to be "an honoured name", and thus, to be "a somebody" in society (*UWE* 11). However, he very well knows that even if he won the competition, "[h]is success would matter to no one" (*UWE* 9). That is why Razumov tries to make up for his lack of family by sustaining a connection with Russia. He is aware of the fact that he would not have any meaning in life if it were not for his country: "Russia *can't* disown me. She cannot!" . . . "I am *it*" (*UWE* 154).

Razumov leads his life with what is "given" to him. He has no family and he is Russian. The fact that he has no one to support him and that he lives in autocratic Russia does not leave him much space to make independent decisions. He says: "I am just a man . . . with a mind . . . My tradition is historical. What have I to look back to but that national past . . . ?" (*UWE* 45)

His acts might be regarded as free will; however, he acts mainly in accordance with state policy. He does not have the strength or courage to do something that would be inconsistent with state rule. He is just a man fulfilling the needs of everyday life and leading a silent existence until one day Haldin intrudes into his life unexpectedly.

On the day Razumov is so eager to work on the prize essay for the silver medal, he is shocked to see Haldin in his room. Being a revolutionist, Haldin has just murdered Minister de P ––, one of the prominent names of autocracy, and he asks for Razumov's help to escape the country. Razumov, for his mind's sake as well as his security, has always kept his life clean and clear. Despite his lack of attachment to the ideology Haldin represents, he is now expected to make a decision between loyalty to the state and loyalty to a fellow student. Thus, Haldin's arrival creates a case of "oughtness", a moment of "yet-to-achieve" for Razumov. Before Haldin's appearance, Razumov does not possess "a clear sense of identity or direction" (Hollander 6). Hollander builds a connection between Razumov and Russia in the way the country is represented in Conrad's essay "Autocracy and War" as an isolated country with a lack of definite history. She asserts that "Razumov reflects Conrad's understanding of Russia itself as rootless and directionless" as the limits of Razumov's character show parallelism to the limits of Russian politics (Hollander 8). Razumov needs to decide what he ought to do. He leads his life within the pre-determined system of autocracy without familial roots by pursuing ceratin ideals. However, this system sustains an order for Razumov to follow. He works for an ideal and stays away from close connections with people, which in a way makes it easier for him to proceed without chaos. Different from acting within the "given" life he has, now he needs to make a decision as Haldin's appearance "obligates" him "to act in a certain way" (*Act* 49) and enforces responsibility on Razumov. He cannot follow an orderly pattern now. He is face to face with an unknown potential to change his life. Eventually, the unexpected arrival disturbs the laboriously sustained existence

of Razumov and leads him into chaos. This situation brings up Bakhtin's problem concerning the contemporary man:

> Contemporary man feels sure of himself, feels well-off and clear-headed, where he is himself essentially and fundamentally not present in the autonomous world of a domain of culture and its immanent law of creation. But he feels unsure of himself, feels destitute and deficient in understanding, where he has to do with himself, where he is the center from which answerable acts or deeds issue, in actual and once-occurrent life. That is, we act confidently only when we do so not as ourselves, but as those possessed by the immanent necessity of the meaning of some domain culture. (*Act* 20 - 21)

Within the culture and laws of the autocratic state, Razumov experiences a kind of security and a sense of belongingness, and these feelings create the self-confidence in him to work on his future. Even though the safety and affiliation he feels are illusory, he is at least "clear-headed". Nevertheless, with Haldin's intrusion, Razumov is made to take an active decision. Haldin's request creates an opportunity of "yet-to-achieve" for Razumov. This is the moment at which "he has to do with himself". However, now he does not have the certainty and confidence he has previously felt in his everyday life. He does not know what to do. He is shocked, perplexed, agitated – as he is worried his future might be in danger – and even angry. All he can think is: "There goes my silver medal!" (*UWE* 12)

Having agreed to help Haldin, Razumov goes to see Ziemianitch as Haldin has demanded. Ziemianitch is "a sort of town peasant" who owns "a small number of sledges and horses for hire" (*UWE* 13). The peasant is supposed to provide for Haldin a safe way out of the country. Thinking that it is best to get rid of Haldin, Razumov arrives at Ziemianitch's place. However, when he finds the peasant drunk, he loses control and beats him roughly. He realizes that he has lost the chance to talk to Ziemianitch in a rational way. Drowned in anxieties of losing his future, Razumov is in a mental state of suffering. He is so devastated that it is not surprising he sees the phantom of

Haldin on the way back home. Eventually, he decides to seek help from Prince K — and gives Haldin up to the authorities. By confessing to the state, Razumov proves to have made his decision and "signed" his act. What has led to this decision is his loneliness, his Russian existence under autocracy and his distant relation to Haldin. These facts are what constitute Razumov's particularity in Bakhtinian terms. He has made a mental judgment by asking himself whether he should help Haldin. He has still gone to Ziemianitch with the hope of getting rid of this bad luck. However, by deciding to confess, he does his best under the circumstances in which he is found.

After his confession to the state, Razumov meets the guardians of autocracy and starts to realize the true nature of the regime. The official that interrogates him, General T —, has no "sign of emotion on his face" but shows signs of "careless cruelty" (*UWE* 33) with a "cruel smile" (*UWE* 35) as described in the narrator's words. The incarnated version of the regime signals to Razumov that Russia does not offer the safety he needs for his future. He starts to have a strong dislike for the official, and thus, for the state. Razumov's "loathing for the man was intense" (*UWE* 33), and he calls the man an "imbecile" (*UWE* 34), "grotesque", "terrible" (*UWE* 36) and "infernal" (*UWE* 42). The general does not want to release Razumov as he suspects there are things Razumov is not telling him. He believes that Haldin did not choose Razumov without a reason. Thus, even before Razumov starts relating the details of the case, he is identified as a suspect by the state. As the number of questions and the amount of time Razumov spends in the general's home increase, "Razumov felt the danger in the air. The merciless suspicion of despotism had spoken openly at last. Sudden fear sealed Razumov's lips" (*UWE* 36). His realization is illustrated at another moment in the novel when Razumov "caught for an instant in the air, like a vivid detail in a dissolving view of two heads, the eyes of General T— and of Privy-Councillor Mikulin [another state official] side by side fixed upon him" (*UWE* 222). Razumov has never truly sided with either the autocrats or the revolutionaries. However, the

autocrats are now to be detested especially because they suspect everyone without exception. They destroy not only their enemies but their supporters too just as is represented through Mikulin's death. "It seems that the savage despotism . . . does not limit its diet exclusively to the bodies of its enemies. It devours its friends and servants as well" (*UWE* 225). Autocracy does not exhibit sympathy for anyone. This fact is of importance if the reader is to understand the effect of Razumov's particular situation on his decisions because whatever Razumov does after Haldin's arrival, the reader knows that he will be punished by the state. The murderer of the minister chooses to hide in Razumov's room, and Razumov allows him to stay there for several hours. Even if he had told Haldin to leave, he could still be on the state's blacklist. Under autocratic rule, he would suffer whatever he did. Still, Russia has great importance for him. Razumov and his country go hand in hand and cannot be put under scrutiny separately because to him, his country is what serves as his closest relation.

That is why Razumov is really frustrated to see the true face of autocracy. He is questioned by the authority he trusts, but it does not treat him as he expects. While he is in General T —'s room, he wants to be seen as "a loyal subject to the Russian state" (Long 499); however, he cannot receive the response he expects. He wants the state to see his loyalty to his country. He asserts: "I think like a Russian – I think faithfully" (*UWE* 66). He believes that being a revolutionist, Haldin is different from him. For Razumov, Haldin is a "[slave] of some French or German thought – devil knows what foreign notions" (*UWE* 66). He calls him a "mongrel" (*UWE* 66). He does not think that Haldin could be seen as being as faithful as himself to Russia, nor that Haldin is as Russian as he is. Therefore, he wants the state not to suspect him because of such a person. However, Haldin has an "organic" connection to Russia (Long 502) that confines the Russian spirit within it, which Razumov has not been able to acquire. Haldin honors Ziemianitch as "[a] bright spirit! A hardy soul! . . . a fellow!" (*UWE* 13) and as "the bright Russian soul" (*UWE*

23) whereas “a drunken brute” (*UWE* 44, 259) is how Razumov describes the sledge driver (Long 502). Haldin’s fervent feelings for Russia are what differentiates him from Razumov. Haldin has a tradition of land and, most importantly, of a loving family, which makes it possible for him, unlike Razumov, to storm the heavens against state rule.

The stress Razumov experiences in General T –’s room is just a part of how this autocratic rule makes him feel. The magnitude of the pressure of autocracy on Razumov can be understood from his strange physical manifestations. He loses control or displays irrationality whenever he feels endangered. Biting his lip “till blood came” (*UWE* 21) upon hearing that Ziemianitch is drunk, beating Ziemianitch “in fury” with “violent movements” (*UWE* 22), seeing Haldin’s phantom two times (*UWE* 22, 23, 63), talking nonsense to Haldin after he gets back home (*UWE* 44), not being able to focus on his studies again (UWE 53) and waking up many times at night “with a heavy shiver” (UWE 50) all indicate how Razumov deals with the crisis under the pressure of autocracy. What the state regime is doing to Razumov is taking his happiness away. He looks in the mirror and meets “the most unhappy eyes he had ever seen” (*UWE* 51). Haldin’s unexpected arrival has dragged him into mental chaos and placed him outside his definition of happiness. For him, “[l]ooking forward was happiness – that’s all – nothing more . . . . And to escape the dangers of existence, to live without fear, was also happiness” (*UWE* 51). Right now, he has neither anything to look forward to nor a life without fear.

During the meeting in the general’s home, both Prince K — and General T — have confirmed that nothing will happen to threaten Razumov’s future, but after the general’s expressions of suspicion and the police search of his rooms, Razumov understands that merely revealing the place of the criminal is not enough to satisfy autocracy. He asks himself: “[W]hat security have I against something – some destructive horror – walking in upon me as I sit here?” (*UWE* 58) He realizes that the authorities will not leave him alone,

and at that moment "[i]t seemed to Razumov that the floor was moving slightly" (*UWE* 36). He is helpless as he knows that in the whole world he has nowhere to go. Having seen the true face of autocratic rule, Razumov knows he will be unable to avoid political involvement and has been forced to assume a role which is the very antithesis of what he has wanted all his life. Councillor Mikulin, tells him that "[he] will be arrested before long" (*UWE* 228) and sends him off to be a state spy in Geneva. In this way, Razumov is forced to leave his hometown and all his dreams. Russia is no longer the safe mother figure for Razumov. This is what he sees now: "The hard ground of Russia, inanimate, cold, inert, like a sullen and tragic mother hiding her face under a winding-sheet – his native soil! – his very own – without a fireside, without a heart!" (*UWE* 24)

Now he is aware that he will never be able to get rid of state surveillance. After all, he has only his future, and that future is based on the opportunities his country offers, yet how can he realize that future? The regime is full of "suspicion", "anger" and "ruthlessness" (*UWE* 62) as the narrator puts it. There is nothing Razumov can do against the system. Therefore, it would be fair to state that his particularity of living under Russian autocracy is Razumov's mischance. Whatever he does, he cannot win. If he had directly told Haldin to leave, he would still be under suspicion merely because of being approached for help by a revolutionist. Thus, it is not "weakness" not to have told him to go away as Razumov realizes when he questions himself (*UWE* 15). If he had helped him escape, the state would still learn about it and he would be labeled a traitor. Now that he has kept Haldin in his place for several hours, even though he has confessed to the authorities the revolutionist's plan to escape, he cannot make clear his connection with the man and will be severely punished. There is no way out for Razumov, but the same situation would be very different for a non-Russian. As the narrator maintains,

> [i]t is unthinkable that any young Englishman should find himself in Razumov's situation. This being so it would be a vain

> enterprise to imagine what he would think. The only safe surmise to make is that he would not think as Mr. Razumov thought at this crisis of fate. He would not have a hereditary and personal knowledge of the means by which a historical autocracy represses ideas, guards its power, and defends its existence. By an act of mental extravagance he might imagine himself arbitrarily thrown into prison, but it would never occur to him unless he were delirious (and perhaps not even then) that he could be beaten with whips as a practical measure either of investigation or of punishment. (*UWE* 19)

Finally, from a Bakhtinian perspective, Razumov's act cannot be seen as betrayal because his relationship with Haldin is not close enough for Razumov to help him in such a risky situation. They attend the same university and "met from time to time at gatherings in other students' houses" (*UWE* 11). That is all. Razumov cannot understand why Haldin has chosen him to take refuge with as the two have "never been intimate" (*UWE* 11). Based on this reasoning, Haldin's request challenges "the rational, legalistic notion of responsibility", so it will be illogical to claim that Razumov betrays Haldin (Rizzuto 94). Although Razumov learns that Haldin has always spoken highly of him and expressed his appreciation of him to his comrades, Razumov does not have such strong feelings for his friend, nor has he ever spoken about him in that way. That is why Razumov is so surprised to find him in his room one day asking for something that will ruin his future:

> "But pardon me Victor Victorovitch. We know each other so little. … I don't see why you …"
> "Confidence," said Haldin.
> This word sealed Razumov's lips as if a hand had been clapped on his mouth. His brain seethed with arguments. (*UWE* 14)

As Bakhtin suggests, every individual is unique and different. That is why one's "love of me sounds emotionally in an entirely different way to me . . . than the same love of me sounds to him, and it obligates him and me to entirely different things" (*Act* 46). The feelings we have for a person will never be the

same from his perspective, and the same feelings will lead us to act differently. The idea of being friends can make Haldin trust Razumov with something very serious while Razumov does not have the same concept of friendship. On the contrary, he has almost always kept his distance from others so as not to be involved in anything potentially dangerous.

Razumov is angry (*UWE* 14), is filled with "indignation" (*UWE* 15) and even wants to "kill [Haldin]" (*UWE* 24) because "[h]is solitary and laborious existence had been destroyed – the only thing he could call his own on this earth. By what right? He asked himself furiously. In what name?" (UWE 61) He cannot find any reason for Haldin's intruding into his life in such a way: "'What can the prejudice of the world reproach me with? Have I provoked his confidence? No! Have I by a single word, look, or gesture given him reason to suppose that I accepted his trust in me? No!'" (*UWE* 28) He does not value revolutionists at all, and Haldin is no exception. Through Haldin's act, Razumov's private life tends to intermingle with public life, and this does not make Razumov any happier. Confidence requires closeness in feeling and viewpoints; however, "it does not require bilateral agreement" (Hepburn 289). Razumov cannot see this side of the concept because he has mainly refrained from social interaction. He is only concerned with his own future, which will be maintained through his solitude. Haldin's trust in him is one sided, which is called by Hepburn "unsolicited confidence" (290). Haldin has not asked for Razumov's approval for his confidence. This is why Razumov is so vexed at Haldin's decision. Now his peaceful existence is at risk, and all this will lead to his eventual ruin. Razumov continues to question the crisis Haldin has created: "[A]m I, who love my country – who have nothing but that to love and put my faith in – am I to have my future, perhaps my usefulness, ruined by this sanguinary fanatic?" (*UWE* 26) And he repeats almost the same rhetorical question trying to find an answer to whether he should let his future be destroyed: "Am I to let my intelligence . . . be robbed of the only thing it has to

go upon at the will of violent enthusiasts?" (*UWE* 45) Razumov cannot let it happen.

What makes Razumov's action justifiable is his still questioning himself about the morality of what he has done. According to what culture – as part of theory – teaches us to do, one should help a friend. Similarly, Razumov's story creates a test of following theory through this commonly accepted value of helping friends. However, Razumov cannot rely solely on theory here. Bakhtin suggests that theory should not be totally banished (*Act* 56), and Razumov does not totally disregard the idea of helping a friend as he goes through a process of thinking of what he should do over and over again. Razumov weighs Haldin's assertion of confidence in him and his implication that they understand each other, but theory by itself is not enough for the "ought-to-be" (Act 4). Razumov does not see their relationship in the way Haldin does and in order not to risk his future, he reports Haldin to the authorities. Razumov takes both theory and his particularity into consideration and makes the best decision he can. From this perspective, it cannot be right to judge him as unfaithful as the reader finds Razumov right in his statement that the two men are not close enough.

For Bakhtin, an act is one "performed by the one thinking" (*Act* 4) – "the one thinking actively" (*Act* 58). Razumov, as a man of thought, also ponders whether his own act of giving Haldin up can be regarded as betrayal.

> "Betray. A great word. What is betrayal? They talk of a man betraying his country, his friends, his sweetheart. There must be a moral bond first. All a man can betray is his conscience. And how is my conscience engaged here; by what bond of common faith, of common conviction, am I obliged to let that fanatical idiot drag me down with him? (*UWE* 28)

Razumov is asking himself the question of whether he has betrayed his conscience or not. Although he tries to justify himself by pointing out the absence of a moral bond between himself and Haldin, he cannot provide an

answer to his question. Nevertheless, when analyzed from a Bakhtinian perspective, Razumov cannot be seen as totally unfaithful. Yes, he has promised to help Haldin. On the other hand, Razumov has had no other option but report him to the authorities. He does not have a family to support him whatever he does. He is a student living under an autocratic regime, which does not allow enough freedom to its citizens. Besides, his relationship with Haldin does not enclose a solid moral bond, nor enough closeness. When these three circumstances are taken into consideration, it is understandable that Razumov needs to think about his future and about the fact that he has to survive.

3. 2 The Plurality of Value Judgments

Haldin's intrusion into Razumov's life brings along the reality Razumov is only then able to see: "Life is a public thing" (*UWE* 40). Razumov realizes that he is not alone but is connected to others even though he has tried his best to stay away from social interactions. Although the novel focuses on the protagonist, one of whose dominant traits is his loneliness, it is a work that emphasizes the importance of social relationships, which is demonstrated through the negative consequences of their absence as a common inclination in Conrad (Pettersson 153). The tragedy Razumov has experienced partly depends on the clash between Razumov's own conception of himself and how he is seen by others. In addition, the perspective of others becomes important while evaluating Razumov's acts after his arrival in Geneva. In this sense, Bakhtin's concept of "I-for-myself" can be applied to Razumov's own perception of himself, while "others-for-me" refers to what Razumov thinks of others, and "I-for-others" can stand for what others think about Razumov.

The main ethical concern for this study is whether it is possible to reach the truth about Razumov's status concerning loyalty. According to Bakhtin, the uniqueness of individuals can be fully revealed through "participative" experiencing of the events (*Act* 13). One-sided judgments cannot fully reflect

what ought to be. “[T]here are as many different worlds of the event as there are individual centers of answerability” (*Act* 45). We need to listen to all the perspectives, and then make a judgment because the truth “is the rightful and unique position of every participant” (*Act* 46). In parallel with this claim, in this section Razumov will be ethically evaluated by taking into consideration the perspectives of Haldin, Natalia and the narrator. By looking at each character’s point of view, the clash between the value centers will be revealed. This clash will show us that the writer maintains an ambivalent attitude toward the protagonist and lets the reader make the final decision. Because the plurality aspect makes it impossible to make a clear-cut judgment about Razumov’s faithfulness, in conclusion, it will be pointed out that Razumov cannot be claimed to be totally unfaithful.

From the beginning, the reader can see that Razumov’s attitude toward Haldin does not match how he is interpreted by others. Razumov thinks that Haldin’s choice of him to take refuge with “was an unwise display of confidence” because Haldin did not know anything of Razumov’s opinions or the particular situation but implemented “what his illusions suggested” (*UWE* 268). Haldin’s statements about Razumov, on the other hand, seem to suggest that from his own point of view Haldin has enough reasons to trust Razumov.

Haldin has just murdered a minister of state. He wants Razumov to help him “vanish” and he believes that it is not a “great matter” (*UWE* 15). He believes that Razumov has “enough heart” to understand the reason for the murder and adds that Razumov’s “reserve has always fascinated” him (UWE 12). In the light of his perception, Haldin even promises Razumov that he will not confess anything about Razumov’s involvement even if he is arrested (*UWE* 14). In addition, he claims that Razumov does not have any family ties, and thus, he has no one to be tortured or interrogated after him. Haldin misses two points with his demand: Razumov is not as he thinks him to be, and autocracy brings misery to everyone. Razumov does not have a family, yes, but this is the very reason why he cannot undertake a risky action. There is no one

to support or protect him when he is found guilty by the state. While lack of family is one of the reasons why Razumov hold himslef reserved and silent, Haldin interprets Razumov's lack of family as a reason to help a revolutionist who has committed murder. While Razumov does not voice his opinions among people or get involved in political discussions in order to avoid any danger to his future, for Haldin Razumov's silence is a sign of trustworthiness. For Haldin, it contributes to Razumov's strong character in a way that "[h]e does not throw his soul to the winds" (*UWE* 12), and it makes him "cool as a cucumber. A regular Englishman" (*UWE* 16). Therefore, Razumov's silence following Haldin's confession does not surprise Haldin. "I understand your silence. . . . I cannot expect you with your frigid English manner to embrace me" (*UWE* 12). He trusts Razumov's judgment so much that he expresses his admiration for him at every opportunity during their short conversation in Razumov's rooms. "You are a man of few words, but I haven't met anybody who dared to doubt the generosity of your sentiments" (*UWE* 12).

At the time of Haldin's confession in his rooms, Razumov expresses his anger and disapproval of what Haldin has done with a rebuke, and Haldin understands he has been wrong to think Razumov will understand him:

> "What were we to do together till midnight? Sit here opposite each other and think of your – your – shambles?"
> [. . .]
> "I see how it is, Razumov – brother. You are a magnanimous soul, but my action is abhorrent to you – alas . . ."
> [. . .]
> "And even my person, too, is loathsome to you perhaps". (*UWE* 46)

Haldin realizes that he does not know Razumov as well as he had initially thought. Razumov-for-Haldin, which represents Bakhtin's "I-for-others", indicates to the reader that Razumov has formed a misleading identity in the mind of his fellow student. Despite the misleading identity Razumov has

created in Haldin, this is the moment when the reader finds Razumov right in his defense that he does not have intimacy with Haldin.

Haldin's opinions of Razumov come to light through other characters as well. While enquiring about Razumov's knowledge of Haldin's arrest, a fellow student, Kostia, who offers Razumov money to escape abroad, tells Razumov that they "heard Haldin speak of [him] on certain occasions" (*UWE* 60). He claims: "Haldin had been often heard expressing a warm appreciation of your character" (*UWE* 55). Similarly, even the people from the university sense a closeness between Razumov and Haldin. "What infuriated him most was to feel that the 'thinkers' of the University were evidently connecting him with Haldin – as a sort of confidant in the background apparently. A mysterious connection!" (*UWE* 61) Considering the impressions of others, Haldin's positive approach to Razumov does not seem to be one sided. Razumov cannot make sense of how others can get the notion that he is close to a revolutionist while he thinks that he is abstaining from anything that might create suspicion. From the perspective of the university circle, Razumov has "a reputation of profundity", and he is "worthy of being trusted with forbidden opinions" (*UWE* 5). When looked at from their point of view, it might not be so surprising that a fellow student trusts Razumov with his "forbidden" deed. In addition, the fellow students reflect their sympathy for Razumov through their ideas of him. Despite Razumov's intention to have a reserved nature, "[h]e was liked also for his amiability and for his quiet readiness to oblige his comrades even at the cost of personal convenience. . . . He was always accessible, and there was nothing secret or reserved in his life" (*UWE* 5). The conflicting statements bring some questions to the reader's mind: How can Razumov lead his hardworking student life without any "social relations" apart from appearing at "some professor's informal reception" at times (*UWE* 5) and "oblige his comrades even at the cost of personal inconvenience" at the same time? How can he stay away from people in fear of losing his future and also remain "always accessible"? And how can he keep silent about his political ideas and

have “nothing secret or reserved in his life”? The fellow students’ opinions present a discordance with what Razumov has tried to maintain about himself. This shows us that Razumov is not aware of his existence as a whole. The reader needs others to understand Razumov, and Razumov himself needs others’ views of him in order to complete the lacking parts of his own perspective. “An event can be described only participatively” (*Act* 32) because the same event or thought has “different emotional-volitional colorations in different consciousnesses” (*Act* 34). Razumov believes that he is a dependable Russian citizen that works hard and stays away from any possible political involvement. He is positive that his country will provide for him the future for which he is striving because he has not done anything wrong. However, it is obvious that Razumov is not aware of the image he has created in the eyes of other people. He does not know that the university circle sees him as close to Haldin and to revolutionary ideals. This is a deficiency in his wholeness in Bakhtinian terms.

In addition to the university circle, Haldin’s opinions of Razumov are also revealed by Haldin’s sister in Geneva: Natalia Haldin. Haldin writes letters to her, expressing his appreciation of and trust in Razumov. In his letters, he makes such references to Razumov as being one of the “[u]nstained, lofty and solitary existences” (*UWE* 100). Haldin’s positive references to Razumov are mentioned by Natalia several times in the novel and are the reason why she builds such strong confidence in Razumov even before she sees him. This prevents her from really understanding Razumov. Natalia’s unreturned confidence in Razumov is the other instance that disappoints Razumov after Haldin’s case. He says to Natalia: “And you have done it in the same way, too, in which he ruined me: by forcing upon me your confidence” (*UWE* 263).

Following his confession to the state authorities, Razumov is sent by Councillor Mikulin to Geneva as a state spy in order to collect information about the Russian revolutionists living there and report everything to the state. By this means, Razumov meets many people including Haldin’s sister Natalia,

their mother Mrs. Haldin and the narrator of the story as a friend of the Haldins'. Razumov needs to introduce himself as the activist friend of Haldin and gain the acceptance of the revolutionist circle that lives in Château Borel in Geneva's Russian quarter.

In contrast with his life in St. Petersburg, he needs to be in constant contact with people in Geneva. However, this networking is far away from socializing or building real relationships with people as Razumov carries a forced identity on him. Hence, in Bakhtinian terms, it is a "given" world to him which never makes him happy. A "given" world is constructed by theory and pre-set rules. "In that world we would find ourselves to be determined, predetermined, bygone, and finished, that is, essentially not living" (*Act* 9). Razumov is just a "pretender" as a state spy in Geneva, trying to fulfill the requirements of a state he does not feel he belongs to. All he does is to lie to the revolutionists and tell them that he performed the assassination together with Haldin. In order not to create doubts, he gives such details as if he had helped Haldin that night and he himself had been lucky not to have been caught (*UWE* 189-190). When he hears the words of praise, "You have done a great deed" (*UWE* 174), he continues his life full of lies by remaining silent. He feels disturbed whenever a remark is made about Haldin. In general, he behaves strangely under the stress he is experiencing. He shouts at people without any reasonable explanation (*UWE* 137, 198) and displays "unexpectedly profound emotion" (*UWE* 138) or incomprehensible physical manifestations such as "throw[ing] himself back violently" (*UWE* 141). Lying cannot be seen as acceptable behavior, but it should be remembered that Razumov is living a fake life there. The guilty conscience he has for what he has done to Haldin, the lack of courage to meet Natalia and the unclear obligation he feels toward his country all turn his life there into an unbearable experience: "The choking fumes of falsehood had taken him by the throat – the thought of being condemned to struggle on and on in that tainted atmosphere without the hope of ever renewing his strength by a breath of fresh air" (*UWE* 198).

Obviously, after Haldin's death, Natalia and Mrs. Haldin are in great sorrow, and they are looking forward to meeting Haldin's "friend" as they think he can shed some light on Haldin's last hours before his arrest and death. Upon meeting Razumov, Natalia says to him: "[I]t is in you that we can find all that is left of [Haldin's] generous soul" (*UWE* 254). The Haldins, just like the revolutionist circle, believe that Razumov is a revolutionist and that he is a heroic figure because of his brave stand against autocracy. They have no idea he has been sent there as a spy. Natalia has already built up "exalted trust" in Razumov (*UWE* 257) thanks to Haldin's positive references in his letters to "a friend". As she has seen Haldin's life from his perspective through his letters, she believes that Razumov is the trustworthy comrade that has supported Haldin in his fight against the authority.

> "[D]irectly I heard that you were here in Geneva, Kirylo Sidorovitch, I felt that you were the only person who could assist me . . ."
> [. . .]
> "Who more fit than you?" (*UWE* 252)

In addition to this confidence already built up through her brother, Natalia has expressed her own observations of Razumov since their first encounter. She believes that "[h]is appearance is not ordinary" (*UWE* 125) and that "he seems to be a man who suffered more from his thoughts than evil fortune" (*UWE* 124). All these impressions suggest that Natalia's ideas of Razumov strengthen Haldin's references and most probably make Razumov more sympathetic to Natalia. As she gets to know Razumov, Natalia believes that Haldin was right to trust his friend because Razumov is an extraordinary person, and the fact that he has a brooding nature proves that he is someone who lives for a cause. She wants to talk to him as soon as possible and wants to uncover all the mystery he seems to be holding. Upon mentioning Haldin's name, Natalia interprets the expression on Razumov's face through her lack of correct judgment thus: "[H]e is a man of deep feeling – it is impossible to doubt it.

You should have seen his face. . . . Their friendship must have been the very brotherhood of souls!" (*UWE* 127) In fact, all this time, and before meeting Natalia, Razumov has been suffering deeply for what he has done to Haldin. He knows that in Geneva he will meet Haldin's sister, for whom Haldin said: "She has the most trustful eyes of any human being that ever walked this earth" (*UWE* 17). He experiences the anxiety of how to deal with his false identity before such a person of no deception. His feelings for her, which were evoked even before meeting her, add to his distress. Besides, he needs to fulfill his duty to the state. Thus, he knows that he should not let his emotions direct him. He behaves as if what Natalia thinks of him were true. By keeping silent, he lets her believe that he was Haldin's comrade. Natalia wants to understand things about Haldin, but Razumov is not open enough and "[h]is silence became impressive" (*UWE* 257). However, he is never comfortable and his evasive answers to her questions finally lead him to a dead end that he cannot take anymore. Natalia realizes he is not being totally honest. "I have waited for you anxiously. But now that you have been moved to come to us in your kindness, you alarm me. You speak obscurely. It seems as if you were keeping something from me" (*UWE* 257-258). As she was greatly under the influence of her brother's references, "she was unable to see the truth struggling on his lips", and she eventually adds: "You are concealing something from me" (*UWE* 259). "I-for-others", in the case of Razumov-for-Natalia, transforms from a high level of confidence to doubts and a desperate heartbreak. Now he is experiencing his second dilemma: Should he be faithful to Russia, or should he follow his feelings toward Natalia? He chooses the latter and confesses the truth. Pressing his "denunciatory finger to his breast with force", he tells: "It ends here – on this very spot" (*UWE* 260).

Razumov's suffering in front of Natalia due to the lie he is living is described in great detail by the narrator. The description is lifelike enough to show the reader that the narrator has become really familiar with the protagonist after reading his diary. Razumov is "trembling in every limb"

(*UWE* 260) with his "colorless lips" (*UWE* 259). Upon his arrival at the Haldins', the narrator points out that Razumov's appearance has changed greatly due to his suffering. He "would have hesitated to recognize that face" (*UWE* 248) "pale, full of unexpressed suffering" (*UWE* 251). Razumov's speech reflects the difficulty he has been going through as well. "He spoke with difficulty" (*UWE* 248). His nonsensical answers to Natalia and his sudden, meaningless rebukes – when, for instance, he hears about Natalia's reference to Sophia Antonovna's remarks on himself as friendly – make the narrator "very much frightened" and lead him to think "[t]his man is deranged" (*UWE* 257). The details the narrator presents help the reader visualize the distress and agony Razumov is in. However, the Razumov-for-the narrator aspect of "plurality" is not easy to deal with because despite the seeming familiarity the narrator tries to create, he does not fully understand Razumov. While he seems to suggest Razumov's despair through his physical looks and reactions, he can also think that Razumov is "deranged". Just as the narrator suggests several times throughout the novel that he does not understand the Russian character, he does not really understand the pain Razumov is going through. The narrator never, throughout the novel, implies to the reader that Razumov is in so much distress due to his unique situation and that we should try to understand his strange reactions. That is why the reader cannot fully trust the narrator's judgments while evaluating Razumov's ethical dilemma. The "I-for-others" aspect does not suggest clarity but hesitation in taking sides with the narrator in terms of the question of ethics. The narrator does not fully condemn Razumov, but he definitely has an ambivalent attitude, and he does not help the reader to make a clear judgment.

The narrator, as a teacher of languages, is translating Razumov's diary into English and narrating Razumov's story to the reader. However, from the very beginning, instead of creating a stance radiating confidence to the reader, he chooses to build his trustworthiness on shaky ground. He uses language, thus words, to tell Razumov's story, but he maintains that words are "the great

foes of reality" (*UWE* 3) and that "the exhibition of naked truth" is not gracious enough due to "the imperfection of language" (*UWE* 216). Together with his claim that he is "strong in the sincerity of [his] purpose", he admits he has "no talent" but that he has "limitations" in terms of writing (*UWE* 75). These initial statements create a feeling of mistrust in the reader, and the narrator's further attitude toward Razumov builds on this distrust. The narrator implies that Razumov is an "imbecile" (*UWE* 4) for leaving such a personal record behind, but at the same time he states that words must have a "soothing power" (*UWE* 4). He promises that he "would not try . . . to invent anything", but adds details of Madame de S –, a revolutionist in Geneva, which he heard from his professor friend at Lausanne University "to make what I have to say presently of Mr. Razumov's presence in Geneva a little more credible" (*UWE* 121). Witnessing his equivocal expressions and his negative reflection on the protagonist, the reader hesitates about trusting the narrator. By going in and out of the story, adding to the story more than the diary tells and creating a confusing viewpoint by switching frequently between his perspective and that of Razumov, the narrator definitely creates a "dizzying effect" (Erdinast-Vulcan 102).

The narrator also separates himself from the Russian mentality by frequently reminding the reader that he is a Westerner and that he "has no comprehension of the Russian character" (*UWE* 3). According to him, with his Western "wisdom" (*UWE* 104) or "different conditions of Western thought" (*UWE* 19), he could never understand "Russian simplicity" (*UWE* 78) and vice versa. For him, "this is not a story of the West" (*UWE* 212), and "[u]nidentified with anyone in this narrative where the aspects of honor and shame are remote from the ideas of the Western world, and taking [his] stand on the ground of common humanity" (*UWE* 216), he claims that he is listening to the other characters and their stories "without comment . . . unrolling their Eastern logic under [his] Western eyes" (*UWE* 279) just as the title of the novel suggests. He is trying to build a closer connection with the Western reader at whom he is

aiming. He acts as the reader's "substitute" in the novel, reflecting the western confusion (Hepburn 284). He behaves as if he does not know some details such as Razumov's duty as a spy in Geneva and tries to create a sense of innocence and reliability. He puts himself in the same place with the reader, creating an "us" and "them" platform where he can feel supported and free from guilt. However, it does not work the way he expects because the reader cannot be on his side due to his lack in understanding Razumov. His ambiguous statements on Razumov's character, his pretense of not knowing some of the details and his feelings for Natalia all signal to the reader that he cannot be fully trusted.

Although the narrator keeps saying he is different from the Russians, some of his remarks are as passionate as if he were one of them. For instance, he describes revolutionists just as Razumov does: "A fellow student, surely – some imbecile victim of revolutionary propaganda, some foolish slave of foreign, subversive ideals" (*UWE* 190). The Russian neighborhood in Geneva is for him "the center of revolutionary plots . . . house of folly, of blindness, of villainy and crime" (*UWE* 183). Similarly, he refers to Mr de P –'s "ruthless persecution of the very hope of liberty itself" (*UWE* 6) just as Haldin would. This attitude asserts "an implicit justification of the assassination" (Erdinast-Vulcan 102), notwithstanding the narrator's so-called impartiality. Similarly, the narrator can easily make an inaccurate claim that "Councillor Mikulin was a good-natured man and wished no harm to anyone" (*UWE* 225). Thus, the narrator's reliability is under some suspicion.

Another point that debilitates the narrator's trustworthiness is his feelings for Natalia. They start their encounter through the narrator's private tutoring of her on literature. He states that he finds her beautiful by referring to her beautiful grey eyes and her beauty in general: "that extremely charming and essentially admirable young girl" (*UWE* 135). In time, however, he becomes aware "notwithstanding [his] years, how attractive physically her personality could be to a man capable of appreciating in a woman something else than the mere grace of femininity" (*UWE* 76). As their friendship

advances, his feelings become more intense and he does not abstain from confessing them to the reader: "I am not ashamed of the warmth of my regard for Miss Haldin" (*UWE* 121). On one occasion, he even thinks of the possibility of whether Natalia could be "permissible for an old man" and confesses "I lingered over my thoughts [about Natalia] more than I should have done" (*UWE* 234). When Natalia's mother dies in a heartbroken way as she thinks Natalia has not been totally honest to her about Razumov's true identity, the narrator expresses his anger with Mrs. Haldin due to "the obstinacy of her mute distrust of her daughter" (*UWE* 273). However, the narrator has never openly expressed his feelings to Natalia herself because he is aware that Natalia and Razumov have feelings for each other. He can see that the Haldin issue has

> draw[n] them to each other fatally. . . . It was manifest that they must have been thinking of each other for a long time before they met. She had the letter from that beloved brother kindling her imagination by the severe praise attached to that one name; and for him to see that exceptional girl was enough. (*UWE* 254)

The narrator is certain that the two will definitely be attracted to one another.

After confessing to Natalia, Razumov thinks that he is "washed clean" (*UWE* 262). By not fulfilling his duty to the state, he knows he is betraying his country; however, the state has already betrayed him by taking his future away from him. He is so much trapped in his forced identity in Geneva that he is about to lose his mind, but "he had no place to fly to" (*UWE* 150). He is just a "pretender" there. He does not act through his independent consciousness but through the false image forced upon him. In order to be able to report to the state, he builds up fake relations with the revolutionists and tells more and more lies each day. As the narrator indicates, he is only "the puppet of his past" (*UWE* 266). Nothing he does there reflects his own identity. By following his feelings toward Natalia, he chooses to be faithful to himself and ends the meaningless pretense. In the face of Natalia's innocence, he cannot stop

confessing to her: "[T]he truth shining in you drew the truth out of me" (*UWE* 265). When the Bakhtinian "I-for-myself" perspective is considered, Razumov believes he has gotten rid of the guilt he has been carrying all this time. He is clean now from his own perspective. This confession is definitely a positive improvement concerning to what extent we can see him as faithful; however, it does not make him completely clean. As Bakhtin states, "I act; i.e., perform acts, with my whole life" (*Act* 3). Razumov's confession cannot be enough by itself to see him free of guilt, but it should be a part of the evaluation process together with all his particularity. However, his confession certainly leads the reader to sympathize with him.

Following the confession to Natalia, Razumov goes and confesses the truth to the revolutionists as well. He expresses how he feels after the confession thus: "[T]oday I made myself free from falsehood, from remorse – independent of every single human being on this earth" (*UWE* 270). Again "I-for-myself" indicates being clean of guilt; however, the way both of the confessions are perceived is different for the other characters. While the "I-for-myself" perspective of Razumov indicates that he has done the right thing by abandoning the pretentious image forced upon him and by confessing to Natalia, Natalia feels devastated. She only says to the narrator: "It is impossible to be more unhappy" (*UWE* 261). She does not say anything to Razumov at all and leaves Geneva soon after. The revolutionists are highly disturbed by the confession as well. One of them, Nikita, shows his reaction by bursting Razumov's eardrums. Razumov's telling of the truth is not welcomed by these characters. They do not think that Razumov is "washed clean". On the contrary, Razumov becomes the betrayer in their eyes – a person who is least expected to be the betrayer. The clash between "I-for-myself" and "I-for-others" reveals itself through the narrator as well. The narrator demands that Razumov leave the Haldins' right after his confession: "Don't you understand that your presence is intolerable – even to me? If there's any sense of shame in you …" (*UWE* 260). He even calls Razumov "the betrayer" (*UWE* 278) some

time after his confession. Even though he has read Razumov's diary beforehand, he shows the reader that he cannot understand Razumov at all. He does not show any effort to do so, either. He does not feel the need at least to confess to the reader that it must be very difficult for Razumov. The contrast between Razumov's and the narrator's value judgment directs the reader to the Bakhtinian idea of plurality. There can be different perspectives on the same object; however, this does not denote anything negative. It only enriches the object, leaving him not finalized but open to discussion. The conflicting perspectives of Natalia and the narrator show that it is not easy to state whether Razumov is faithful or just the opposite. The plurality of the perspectives leaves the reader with a lack of definite opinions.

Among the two characters so far, the perspective provided by the narrator is the more complicated. On the one hand, he describes Razumov positively pointing out his "air of intelligence", "distinction", being "quite above the average" and of a "studious" nature (*UWE* 132), and his "unselfish and humane" quality (*UWE* 136) together with his being "very good-looking" (*UWE* 233). He also keeps Razumov's suffering vivid by his detailed descriptions such as of Razumov's face which looks "older than his age" (*UWE* 134), his "unrefreshed, motionless stare" lost in "disastrous thoughts" (*UWE* 135), his "enigmatical" (*UWE* 143) appearance in "agonizing hesitation" (*UWE* 144) and "his wounded spirit" (*UWE* 183). On the other hand, though, he claims Razumov to have a negative and mysterious side in him that the narrator cannot really explain such as "something consciously evil" in his eyes (*UWE* 248) or "something else [existing] under his scorn and impatience" that he "could not tell" (*UWE* 145). Similarly, he believes on one occasion that Razumov "would have dismissed me rudely to mind my own business" if the narrator had asked him where he lived (*UWE* 235). All these examples prove that the narrator does not fully understand Razumov. Still, his opinions cannot be disregarded.

In accordance with the Bakhtinian understanding of ethics, all voices should be heard and the democratic atmosphere that is created as a result will help the audience make a fairer decision on Razumov as an ethical character. From Haldin, Natalia and the narrator's perspective, Razumov seems to be a trustworthy person. Even though he is not aware of it, he gives others the message that he is dependable. Natalia has previously built confidence in Razumov thanks to Haldin's letters, and when she meets him and gets to know him, her feelings do not change. The Razumov-for-Natalia perspective maintains Natalia's trust in Razumov. When Razumov ironically admits to Madame de S – during their conversation: "I have the gift of inspiring confidence" (*UWE* 162), he also implies that he still cannot believe how he could invoke such confidence in Haldin to take refuge at his place. According to Razumov-for-himself, Haldin and the revolution are nothing he can support. That is why he has always kept his distance from them. However, he discovers Razumov-for-Haldin is different from his own value judgment. Haldin has confidence in him. Moreover, Razumov is surprised to learn that his school circle supports Haldin's trust in him as well. When the narrator tells him that Haldin referred to him as a friend, he scornfully cries "in a low, exasperated tone": "What could he have written of me?" (*UWE* 140) He still cannot believe Haldin has had such intense feelings for him. The importance of others reveals itself here as their perspective completes the lacking parts in Razumov's view of his own self. Razumov is enriched thanks to the views of "I-for-others". Bakhtin's plurality concept shows parallelism with Conrad's attitude in the novel as the writer intends to create an ambiguous attitude toward Razumov and leave the decision to the reader. The fact that he does not take sides with the protagonist is sustained through the clash between Razumov's identity for himself and his identity for the others, which results in the fact that the reader cannot claim Razumov is totally faithful or unfaithful. The question – whether Razumov has betrayed Haldin – cannot receive a definite answer. According to Razumov's value center, he has not betrayed Haldin because he believes they

have not had a close relationship, and he has never done anything to invoke Haldin's confidence. In order to secure his future, the best idea he could think of was reporting Haldin to the authorities. From Haldin's perspective, however, he has been a confidential friend and he has had an understanding of the revolutionary cause. Giving Haldin up to the state makes Razumov a betrayer in Haldin's eyes and indirectly in those of Natalia and the narrator.

3. 3 The Place of Empathy and Love in the Assessment of the Protagonist

In accordance with the Bakhtinian idea that a literary character is a living figure, a "real, actual, thinking human being" (*Act* 6), Razumov can be evaluated just as a real human being is in real life. Outgrowing the limits the author creates for him and declaring his freedom, Razumov makes this analysis more meaningful with his statement: "I am not a young man in a novel" (*UWE* 137).

In this section, Razumov is analyzed within his own particulars because the reader, as the "other" to the protagonist, performs this artistic activity through Bakhtin's idea of "active and objective empathizing" and by respecting the value center and the limits of the character. The approach the reader applies to this practice is "love" or as Emerson defines it, "a concentration of attention that enriches" (408) the character in the sense that the reader helps the character to gain its wholeness. What the reader is doing is to "linger intently over an object, to hold and sculpt every detail and particular in it, however minute. Only love is capable of being aesthetically productive" (*Act* 64). Eventually, the reader is doing it in an "un-self-interested" (*Act* 64) way without thinking of any personal gain. The purpose of the analysis in this section is to explain that Razumov cannot be regarded as totally unfaithful because the reader sympathizes with him thanks to his particulars, certain narrative devices, his confession to Natalia and the revolutionists, his fulfilling of his answerability and the perspective of some minor characters.

The novel presents many reasons for the reader to empathize with and love Razumov. To begin with, his particular situation, from the very beginning, prepares the reader to feel sympathy for the protagonist. He is a student but not just an ordinary one. He studies philosophy and is a very "promising" student (*UWE* 5, 9). He is a man of thought, working his way into academia. He is "a man of ideas" (*UWE* 61). His laborious efforts and concentration on his studies are the result of his thinking of no harm to anyone but only of focusing on his future. Undeservingly, he lives under an autocratic regime that does not provide freedom of expression. He needs to make up for this lack of expression. Therefore, he turns to writing not only in St. Petersburg for his prize essay and his poem but also in Geneva through his diary in order to be heard and understood. He is "clear eyed" (*UWE* 253), which means he has more insight that makes him different from others, more sensitive and more vulnerable. He has a decent character highly appreciated in his university surroundings. The coexistence of profundity, reason, trustworthiness and good looks in one person presents him as a hero-like figure that would be admired by many people in real life. The fact that he lacks a family discloses the sufferings he has experienced both financially and in terms of loneliness; however, just as the narrator indicates, his personal qualities "accorded badly with such humble origin" (*UWE* 5) as if indicating that he does not belong where he is. This increases the level of sympathy in the reader as it reveals a lacking side in an almost perfect character, making the reader feel closer to him. Probably, the most prominent reason for sympathy is the tragedy Razumov experiences due to Haldin's intrusion in his life. It was totally unexpected, and there was nothing he could do. It was pure fatality:

> Fatality enters your rooms while your landlady's back is turned; you come home and find it in possession bearing a man's name, clothed in flesh [. . .]. You welcome the crazy fate. [. . .] You cannot shake it off any more. It will cling to you for ever. Neither halter nor bullet can give you back the freedom of your life and the sanity of your thought . . . (*UWE* 62)

The intrusion is both an incidence of fate and a turning point in Razumov's life as things will never be the same again because "the dark prestige of the Haldin mystery fell on him, clung to him like a poisoned robe it was impossible to fling off. He suffered from it exceedingly" (*UWE* 220). The reader thinks he is right in his claim that the two are not intimate and in his rebellion against fate as no one deserves such a destruction of his life. This makes him just a "helpless prey" (*UWE* 37), and he also realizes that "the feeling that his moral personality was at the mercy of those lawless forces was so strong" (*UWE* 58).

After his confession to the state leading to Haldin's arrest and execution, Razumov is given a position as a state spy in Geneva. However, the reader does not learn about his status until the final chapter of the novel. That the author conceals Razumov's position as a spy also contributes to his being sympathized with by the reader (Hampson 177). Conrad experiments with the time order and goes back and forth in time as a narrative device. Until the reader reaches the fourth chapter, he does not know the motive behind Razumov's arrival in Geneva although he has spent quite some time among the revolutionist circle there. If it were revealed as early as the moment of his arrival, it would definitely not create the same effect.

Another reason why the reader sympathizes with Razumov is the fact that he confesses to Natalia and the revolutionists even after the letter from a revolutionist student is revealed. The letter states that Ziemianitch was responsible for Haldin's death, and Razumov is cleared of any suspicion. "Nothing could touch him now; in the eyes of the revolutionists there was now no shadow of his past" (*UWE* 250). However, Razumov chooses not to continue with his false image. Sophia Antonovna tells the narrator how she feels about Razumov's confession:

> [H]ow many of them would deliver themselves up deliberately to perdition (as he himself says in that book) rather than go on living secretly debased in their own eyes? . . . he was safe when he did it. It was just when he believed himself safe and more – infinitely more – when the possibility of being loved by that

> admirable girl first dawned upon him, that he discovered that his bitterest railings, the worst wickedness, the devil work of his hate and pride, could never cover up the ignominy of the existence before him. There is character in such a discovery." (*UWE* 278)

Razumov exhibits an exemplary act of honesty through his voluntary confessions after the letter is revealed. That takes real strength of character and courage in his situation. When the story is considered from the beginning, it is clear that he has performed wrongdoings. Although Razumov and Haldin are not intimate, Razumov tells Haldin that he will help him. Razumov makes the fellow student Kostia steal his father's money just to give the impression that he is escaping the country. In addition, he deceives Natalia and the revolutionists in Geneva by lying and pretending to have been a comrade to Haldin. However, despite these wrongdoings, the reader sympathizes with him because he is not evil. As Conrad states in "Author's Note" to *Under Western Eyes*, "Razumov is treated sympathetically. Why should he not be? . . . I don't think that in his distractions he is ever monstrous" (282). What makes Razumov commit wrong deeds is mainly the fact that he cannot decide what to do. One mistake leads to another and when the pile reaches quite a considerable amount, he concludes that he needs to put an end to it.

One aspect that reveals the moral integrity in Razumov is that he admits and suffers the consequences of his acts. He makes his decisions himself, and he does not present alibis for his mistakes. Hence, he fulfills the "answerability" aspect of Bakhtinian ethics. Razumov, after Haldin's confession to him, is vexed as he does not know "the consequences of [his] actions" (*UWE* 58), but he is ready to undertake them. After confessing to Natalia, he writes in his diary: "I am in the depths of anguish, but there is air to breathe at last – air! . . . I suffer horribly, but I am not in despair. . . . I am independent – and therefore perdition is my lot" (*UWE* 265). He takes responsibility for his deeds.

What Razumov does not possess is an evil nature, but that evilness is represented through the terrifying revolutionist Nikita Necator, "the very pseudonym of murder" (*UWE* 196). After Razumov confesses to the revolutionists, the hideous executor, who is revealed toward the end of the novel to be a spy himself, bursts Razumov's eardrums, leaving him deaf. Following this act of violence, Razumov does not hear an approaching tramcar and is hit by it, being left with a serious injury. Now he is "a hopeless cripple, and stone deaf" (*UWE* 274). Such conduct is highly disturbing and shocking for the reader as well. The price Razumov has to pay is too heavy. He loses his future, the woman he loves and his health. After all this tragedy, he decides to settle in the south of Russia and live there for the rest of his life. Tekla, who is a former revolutionist and the present female assistant of Madame de S –, leaves her current position and volunteers to look after Razumov "as long as she lives" (*UWE* 274), and the revolutionists pay him a visit from time to time. "Tekla's devotion and the revolutionaries' visits to him testify to his partial reintegration to society" (Pettersson 161). The developments at the end of the novel, such as Tekla's finding "work to do after her own heart" (*UWE* 272) and Razumov's gaining a social circle, create a positive atmosphere and contribute to the sympathy of the reader. Although it would not have been surprising if Razumov had been killed, as Razumov himself expected "to be torn to pieces" (*UWE* 269), "[a]llowing Razumov to survive creates a break in the revenge cycle" (Hollander 13), and this contributes to Conrad's purpose of not giving a moral lesson in the story and Bakhtin's view of not finalizing the character but enriching him. Razumov will not be the same again. He is enriched through what he has heard from the value centers of others and through his sufferings. Within the novel, the decision is left to the reader and it is hard to take sides, but there is definitely room for empathy and love.

Though they are not the main concern of this study, the ideas of members of the revolutionist circle in Geneva are also worth mentioning as they add to the reader's sympaty. The person Razumov is supposed to work

closely with in Geneva is Peter Ivanovitch, who is a revolutionary feminist and a writer "masked by the dark blue glasses" (*UWE* 151). He is sarcastically addressed with such titles as "Europe's greatest feminist" (*UWE* 151) or "the noble arch-priest of Revolution" (*UWE* 155). As the revolutionary circle in Geneva represents corruption, the members of the group are all dark characters. The other revolutionist Razumov meets is Madame de S –, who is also called Eleanor Maximova. She is "the intriguing wife of a now dead and forgotten diplomat" (*UWE* 93) and the current partner of Peter Ivanovitch. Razumov thinks that she looks like a "corpse", an "ancient, painted mummy with unfathomable eyes" (*UWE* 59) who radiates "ghastly vivacity" (*UWE* 165). Razumov assumes that Peter Ivanovitch is with her because of her "millions" (*UWE* 159). The other revolutionary Razumov gets to know is Sophia Antonovna, whom he has met in Zurich before. Although these characters, except for Sophia Antonovna, are not good in nature and Razumov does not feel close to any of them, Razumov is welcomed with respect and admiration by the revolutionists. Peter Ivanovitch regards Razumov as an "extraordinary", "a marked personality" (*UWE* 151) that "inspires hopes and a little wonder as to what [he] may mean". Peter Ivanovitch trusts Razumov and sees him as "one of us" (*UWE* 153, 154). For Madame de S –, Razumov is "different from the other types of revolutionist members" (*UWE* 161). Sophia Antonovna thinks that Razumov is "a man of character" (*UWE* 183) and that he can be "very valuable" for the revolutionists (*UWE* 179). These three characters are not close to Razumov; however, even they have positive remarks about Razumov. They have a kind of confidence in him. Most importantly, despite running away from their state and the fact that they "can never live above suspicion, nor can they ever trust one another" (Hepburn 292), the revolutionists confide in Razumov. They "*don't suspect Razumov enough*" (Hepburn 292) because they believe that his approach is sincere and his silence indicates his loyalty. There is also Tekla. She is attracted by Razumov's "humane manner" (*UWE* 172) and she tells him: "You looked as if one could trust you" (*UWE* 171).

Tekla is a good character in the story. She strives for the good of the people. For instance, she warns Razumov about protecting Natalia from Peter Ivanovitch's influence. The fact that Tekla sees the trustful nature in Razumov echoes Haldin and Natalia's views. Although Razumov has met her in the later years of his life, he wins her good opinion. The positive opinions of these minor characters also contribute to the reader's sympathy toward Razumov.

We cannot expect a character, either in a work of art or in real life, to be spotlessly clean. As long as one does not harbor evil in one's self, there should always be a reason for us to be able to forgive that person at some point. Natalia tells Razumov in their final conversation right before Razumov makes his confession:

> Revolutionist and reactionary, victim and executioner, betrayer and betrayed, they shall all be pitied together . . . Pitied and forgotten; for without that there can be no union and love. (*UWE* 259)

As the reader loves his object as "another not as [one's own self]" (*Act* 46) and by respecting his particulars, Razumov is loved for all his mistakes. Accordingly, he is forgiven due to his outweighing decency. "In aesthetic seeing you love a human being not because he is good, but, rather, a human being is good because you love him" (*Act* 62). Literary appreciation is what makes art successful. The reader loves Razumov not because he is free of guilt. He is not accepted as totally unfaithful because he is not an evil character.

It can be argued that reader response becomes an important issue within the novel (Hepburn 283). Through the devices of an unreliable narrator and the protagonist's diary, Conrad is creating space for the reader to take responsibility. When the reader is recounted the story without reference to Razumov's diary, especially in the last chapter, there emerges a distance between the reader and Razumov, indicating the protagonist's "openness to ethics" (Hollander 11). Razumov needs to be evaluated in ethical terms. He needs the reader to interpret and give meaning to him. In this way, the reader

will have fulfilled, in aesthetic seeing, his responsibility of building a bridge between art and real life, and thus to intermingle the character into real life. For Bakhtin, the author's knowing his characters fully leads to "consummating" or "framing" them (Erdinast-Vulcan 98). What Conrad is doing is granting freedom to the character and leaving an opportunity for the character to develop and continue the enrichment of his unique existence in "Being-as-event". The reader and the author are both "other" for the character. As the "other", the reader evaluates the character and the author has a role in shaping the reader's response. In this sense, several occasions for the reader's response allow the reader to forgive Razumov's wrongdoings. After all, by not creating Razumov as a character with perfect morals, Conrad is demonstrating what Erdinast-Vulcan calls "the peculiar resistance of good literature to political correctness" because "a good story like *Under Western Eyes* does not need to have virtuous characters or yield a good moral in order to be ethically effective" (99).

CHAPTER 4

A BAKHTINIAN ASSESSMENT OF THE MORAL DILEMMA IN *THE END OF THE TETHER*

4. 1 Particularity in Relation to the Protagonist

In this section, Captain Harry Whalley, the protagonist of *The End of the Tether* will be put under scrutiny in accordance with Bakhtin's notion that every individual should be evaluated within his own particulars. The emphasis will be on how Captain Whalley's unique situation influences the decisions he makes within his ethical dilemma. For this analysis, Bakhtin's concepts of "given", "yet-to-achieve", "oughtness", "signature", "non-alibi" and "emotional-volitional tone" will be used to elaborate on the subject matter. To what degree Whalley can be regarded as faithful will be the main concern of the analysis, and eventually it will be observed that he cannot be claimed to be totally unfaithful.

As a retired captain of famous ships, the sixty-seven year old Captain Whalley, whose work record is full of success and distinction, leads a satisfactory life. He lives through little financial means and feels lonely after the death of his wife and the marriage of his daughter, Ivy, who has moved to Australia. Nevertheless, he is not in a spirit of pessimism. He has his ship the *Fair Maid* to keep himself busy and he keeps his strong love for his daughter alive. One day he receives a letter from Ivy asking for £200 to open a boarding house in Australia. This letter changes Whalley's life in a considerable way. In order to pay Ivy the amount she has asked for and to leave her a modest fortune, Whalley decides to sell the *Fair Maid*.

One day, after selling his ship, Whalley meets the master-attendant of the port, Captain Ned Eliott, with whom he has been good friends. Eliott

mentions a ship, the *Sofala*, and its "mutinous" (*EOT*[6] 133) owner, Massy, who is always in need of money due to his gambling addiction. His financial problems and his attitude towards his crew have become too much to be tolerated at the port. Upon hearing of Massy's need of a partner, Whalley wants to take the opportunity. He thinks this might be his only chance. He needs the money and he might not get another job due to his old age. Whalley does not really have any choice but to accept this job, and by doing so, he invests in the ship for three months. Because of his love for his daughter, he decides to put up with Massy.

The *Sofala* is on her journey and is heading with its native passengers towards its first destination, Batu Beru. The days pass with Massy's rebellious attitude and insults to his crew. He accuses Captain Whalley of not investing more in the ship and finds excuses about his performance as well. The ship is not in good condition. Even before starting the voyage, she has foreshadowed her doom. "[W]ithout the hiss of steam, the clangs of iron in her breast—lies there as cold and still and pulseless as a corpse" (*EOT* 139). The boilers are not sound as there are leaks. Massy has not been able to replace them as he has spent the money on gambling. In addition, the *Sofala*'s route is full of reefs, and it requires great attention to pilot the ship. One time the *Sofala* gets off track in the river and, after terrifying efforts to save her, loses twelve hours to get back on her route.

Whalley, as the captain of the ship, is accompanied by a Malay assistant: the "faithful Serang[7], whom [Whalley] had brought over from his last ship to keep the captain's watch" (*EOT* 109). The Serang helps Whalley in his watch and obeys his directions. The two are very close and thanks to the Serang's faithful nature, he is always "at [Whalley's] elbow" (*EOT* 143).

[6] The novel *The End of the Tether* will be referred to in this way when it is cited within the rest of the study.

[7] As indicated in the notes to *The End of the Tether*, Serang is an Anglo-Indian term for a native boatswain of an East-Indian crew.

Towards the end of the contract and their final voyage together, Whalley starts to lose his eyesight. He does not tell anyone about it, and by deciding to go on navigating the ship, he commits the wrongdoing of putting the life of the crew in danger in order to remain faithful to his daughter. Nevertheless, this decision brings an ethical dilemma: while maintaining his loyalty to Ivy, he is being unfaithful to the ship and its owner.

Massy has asked Whalley a few times to invest more money in the ship, but, as he cannot get any money from Whalley to pay for the expenses of the ship and to satisfy his thirst for gambling, Massy is in great distress. He hates the ship. Consequently, he comes up with a plan to make the ship sink and get the insurance money. The only thing his mind is busy with is that "[h]e wished her at the bottom of the sea, and the insurance money in his pocket" (*EOT* 207). Finally, he goes to the storeroom and "squatting before the scrap-heap, [begins] to pack his pockets with pieces of iron" (*EOT* 208). His plan is to deflect the ship from her course by placing pieces of iron close to the compass. His obsession with money is at such a destructive level that he does not consider the risk he thus creates for the life of the crew. Massy succeeds in his purpose. The *Sofala* hits the reefs and they all know that she cannot be refloated and that "[s]he will be gone in five minutes" (*EOT* 214). Massy confesses that he has done this. Massy indicated before that he understood Whalley was losing his eyesight by telling Whalley that he had not looked well recently. It was just an implication then, but at the time of the impact he claims that he is already aware of it. He shouts at Whalley: "You blind devil! It's you that drove me to it" (*EOT* 214).

At the end, the *Sofala* starts to sink and Whalley decides to go down with her by placing Massy's scrap iron into his own pocket. The fact that he realizes he does not have anything left leaves him no other choice.

In this section, the effect of Captain Whalley's particular situation on the decision he makes will be analyzed in detail. His particulars will be studied

in three aspects: the financial difficulty Whalley experiences, his love for his daughter and his blindness.

Captain Whalley is an experienced retired sailor who has spent fifty years at sea, forty of which have passed in the East. His success has made him "honorably known to a generation of shipowners and merchants in all the ports from Bombay clear over to where the East merges into the West upon the coast of the two Americas" (*EOT* 110). He "served famous firms", "sailed famous ships", "made famous passages, had been the pioneer of new routes and new trades" in the South Seas and "had seen the sun rise on unchartered islands" (*EOT* 110). His career peaked in working on "the *Condor*, a famous clipper in her day" (*EOT* 110), and he has eventually bought a small sailing ship for himself, – the *Fair Maid*, and has professionally been the captain of the *Sofala* for the last three years. Thus, he has learnt the routes in the East very well. Due to his achievements, men have respected him and "would have nodded appreciatively at the mention of his name" (*EOT* 116). He has been called "Dare-devil Harry Whalley" (*EOT* 110, 115, 116), and "[n]othing could rob him of this kind of fame" (*EOT* 111).

Within all the glory, though, there are some misfortunes that he has experienced as well. He has lost more than an ample competence in the crash of the notorious Travancore and Deccan Banking Corporation, whose downfall had shaken the East like an earthquake (*EOT* 111). His financial loss has definitely placed him in difficulty; however, he has not been ashamed of it as even financial experts have lost money to the same cause. "The only difference between him and them was that he had lost his all" (*EOT* 111). All he has been left with is his ship the *Fair Maid*, which he has purchased "to play with" (*EOT* 112), "to occupy his loneliness" (*EOT* 114). He has been feeling lonely after his wife's death and the move of his daughter, Ivy, to Australia after her marriage. He has been able to continue his life thanks to the *Fair Maid*, and he "introduced her to his acquaintances in various ports as 'my last command'" (*EOT* 112). It has been his pastime and his only possession to hold on to.

After losing all his money as a result of the bank failure, Whalley has found it more difficult to lead his life. In addition, in one of her letters, Ivy has written about her husband that "[h]e will never walk again", and "[f]or the first time in his life Captain Whalley was a bit staggered" (*EOT* 115). Following this discovery, Whalley starts to be even more careful with his money. He loves Ivy very much, and as he believes that his daughter depends only on him now, he wants to try his best to send her some money whenever he can. "He suffered greatly from the smallness of remittances he was able to send his daughter. Meantime he had given up good cigars, and even in the matter of inferior cheroots limited himself to six a day" (*EOT* 116). He reduces his expenses and has to make do with "a scant allowance of gilt" (*EOT* 115). As if that is not enough, Ivy asks for £200 to open a boarding house, and this places Whalley in a dead end. He decides to sell the *Fair Maid*.

As Whalley has "no ship" and "no home" now (*EOT* 118-119), he starts to stay in a "modest bedroom" in a hotel (*EOT* 120). After selling his ship, he begins "a radically new view of existence" (*EOT* 121). His loneliness takes the place of his pastime, and he starts to feel alienated within his life. "Captain Whalley, substantial and dignified, left well-nigh alone in the vast hotel by each light-hearted skurry, felt more and more like a stranded tourist with no aim in view, like a forlorn traveler without a home" (*EOT* 121). The fact that he does not have money and that his beloved daughter is in financial difficulty make up the "given" in Whalley's life in Bakhtinian terms. Both of the situations are presently neither desired nor within his control. However, he does not yield to the conditions, but decides to find a job. Thus, looking for work is the decision he makes as his "yet-to-achieve". He strives to make things better both for himself and mainly for his daughter. There is a difficulty he is experiencing and what he ought to do in the face of his situation, his "oughtness", is realized through his determination. He decides to take action because he knows he ought to do something despite his old age.

Whalley is old now, but that does not prevent him from being full of life. In his cabin in the ship, he has a "big bookcase" full of books (*EOT* 112), his wife's Bible (*EOT* 113), a piano (*EOT* 113), canaries he feeds (*EOT* 113), "big carbon photographs of his daughter, her husband, and two fat-legged babies —his grandchildren—" that he dusts and an "oil painting of his wife" that he brushes "with a plummet" (*EOT* 113). He is doing alright within his loneliness and financial difficulty. He has not come to the end of his tether yet.

Although he is willing to do any kind of job, he knows he is not young anymore. He believes that people "would not take him seriously; or else if he succeeded in impressing them, he would maybe obtain their pity", which he does not prefer at all (*EOT* 122). He has looked for a vacant position for a while, but there has been nothing. Even if there were, he would be too out-of-date. His experience "would be looked upon as an archaic curiosity of the Eastern waters, a screed traced in obsolete words—in a half-forgotten language" (*EOT* 122). Despite all these thoughts, however, Whalley is determined to find a job. He knows he needs to survive and provide financial means for Ivy.

As for his love for his daughter, it can be seen that Whalley is so fond of her. Ivy is so dear to him that he does not approve of her choice of husband. Whalley does not think his son-in-law is suitable for his daughter. Although the reader does not witness Ivy's fondness of her father at all, Whalley keeps showing excessive affection to her, which creates doubt in the reader as to whether Whalley is making reasonable decisions.

Whalley's responses indicate his obsessive love for Ivy. Upon receiving the letter from Ivy asking for the money, for instance, he has become "appalled, and remained stock-still at the cabin door with the paper trembling between his fingers" (*EOT* 116-117). The letter changes Whalley's life in a considerable way. He is shocked in the face of Ivy's request not only because he does not have the means to provide the amount she has asked for but also because he does not approve of the idea of a boarding house. He has been a

respected sailor all his life. Besides, his father, "Colonel Whalley (retired) of the H. E. I. Company's service", has "very slender means besides his pension", but has some "distinguished connections" (*EOT* 115). He thinks of his father and how much respect they have received from people. "He could remember as a boy how frequently waiters at the inns, country tradesmen and small people of that sort, used to 'My lord' him (*EOT* 115). Whalley does not find the idea of a boarding house suitable for a member of his family due to its "derogatory nature" (*EOT* 119). Landladies of boarding houses "were said to be rapacious, unscrupulous, untruthful" (*EOT* 119). Whalley has not been able to sleep that night, nor has he had breakfast (*EOT* 117). Following the difficult thinking process, he decides to sell the *Fair Maid*. He receives £700 for it and sends £200 to Ivy. The remaining £500, which is "Ivy's money" (*EOT* 137, 175), has been "put away safely" (*EOT* 120). He almost obsessively repeats the idea that the money belongs to Ivy.

Having been a responsible and hardworking sailor all his life, it is difficult for Whalley to stay idle. "From the feeling of loneliness, of inward emptiness,—and of loss too" he thinks of going to his daughter, but cannot take the initiative (*EOT* 121). This also awakens in the reader a suspicion concerning the close relationship between the father and daughter. The reason why Whalley cannot find the courage to go to his daughter is not stated clearly; however, his hesitation indicates that they are not as close as Whalley thinks and that Whalley's love for her is one-sided.

Whalley knows he cannot survive much longer without earning money. He keeps asking himself "What next?" (*EOT* 121) He needs to support Ivy, and he does not want to "break into his five hundred pounds for personal expenses" (*EOT* 123). He strongly desires to keep Ivy's money intact. He is aware that Ivy's boarding house business "could not be much of a gold-mine from the first start", "[b]ut what work? He was ready to lay hold of anything in an honest way so that it came quickly to his hand" (*EOT* 123). He has been haunted by the question: "But what sort of work?" (*EOT* 123) Finally, Massy's ship

provides him the means he needs. The decision to work on the *Sofala* does not prove to be easy at all. Whalley clearly knows that he has to put up with a bothersome owner. In addition, to place his money in safety, he makes his condition clear in the agreement: "[T]he whole five hundred to be paid back to [Ivy] integrally within three months. Integrally. Every penny. He was not to lose any of her money whatever else had to go—a little dignity—some of his self-respect" (*EOT* 139). Together with sustaining the security of his daughter's money, he has accepted "Massy's stupidly cunning paragraphs against his incompetence, his dishonesty, his drunkenness, for the sake of other stringent stipulations. At the end of three years he was at liberty to withdraw from the partnership, taking his money with him" (*EOT* 175). For him it has been just an agreement that will benefit both sides: "You want a captain—I want a ship. That's enough" (*EOT* 139).

Whalley's love for his daughter makes him go through a lot of difficulty. After he has started to lose his sight, he finds himself in mental suffering as he does not know what to do. On the one hand there is his daughter; on the other hand there are the people on board. He thinks of confessing the truth; however, he knows that Massy will hunt him and "stick to the money for a year" (*EOT* 194). Not having spared any money for himself, Whalley knows that he cannot survive for a year. Whalley does not know the ship will hit the reef, but even right before it, he thinks of whether or not to confess his blindness. The stress he experiences is expressed through the fact that his limbs are trembling:

> Should he stop the engines at once and give himself away? A gust of irresolution swayed all sorts of bizarre notions in his mind. The unusual had come, and he was not fit to deal with it. In this passage of inexpressible anguish he saw her face—the face of a young girl—with an amazing strength of illusion. No, he must not give himself away after having gone so far for her sake. (*EOT* 212)

Again his feeling of loyalty to his daughter overcomes his hesitations. He does not want to lose the opportunity to see her again and to feel the satisfaction of his fulfilled responsibilities. Thus, he commits his answerable act of keeping on with his pretension.

Whalley's blindness is another aspect that makes up his particulars. As the *Sofala* gets close to Batu Beru, bad luck starts to show itself again, and Whalley begins to lose his eyesight, but he does not tell anybody about it. The compass room, for instance, looks like "a dim spot of light in an infinity of shapeless shadow" (*EOT* 212). Out of the night over the river, "[a] glimmer here and there was all he could see" (*EOT* 203). The Serang is his eyes now, and Whalley depends on him for their route. The Serang informs him about the weather and any potential dangers or threats, and Whalley directs him as to what should be done. Whalley's blindness commences before the voyage ends – so before the agreement is finalized. It is totally out of his control. One of the crew members, Sterne, observes Whalley very closely in the hope of finding fault with him because Sterne wants to take over Whalley's position and be the captain of the ship. As a result of his "watchful observation", "one day he [makes] his discovery" (*EOT* 156). Of course, this makes him very happy as "he could not have hoped for a greater stroke of luck" (*EOT* 160) in achieving his ambition. Once the ship arrives in Batu Beru, all the native passengers get off, and Sterne relates his discovery to Mr Van Wyk, who, as "an ex-naval officer who . . . had thrown away the promise of a brilliant career to become the pioneer of tobacco-planting on that remote part of the coast, had learned to like Captain Whalley. The appearance of the new skipper had attracted his attention" (*EOT* 179). Van Wyk is "the only white man residing there . . . a retired young sailor, with whom [Whalley] had become friendly in the course of many voyages" (*EOT* 110). As Whalley and Van Wyk are friends, Van Wyk does not believe Sterne. He wants to learn for himself what is going on, so he invites Whalley to dinner. Whalley confesses his affliction to him: "I am going blind" (*EOT* 194). It appears as a shock to Van Wyk. "[A] cold shudder [runs]

down Mr Van Wyk's back" (*EOT* 195), and he asks Whalley: "And you had that courage?" (*EOT* 194) Van Wyk questions Whalley's situation further as he needs to clarify things in his mind. "What is it like – like a mist – like …" (*EOT* 197), and Whalley describes how he experiences it thus:

> "It is as if the light were ebbing out of the world. Have you ever watched the ebbing sea on an open stretch of sands withdrawing farther and farther away from you? It is like this—only there will be no flood to follow. Never. It is as if the sun were growing smaller, the stars going out one by one. There can't be many left that I can see by this. But I haven't had the courage to look of late . . ."
> [. . .]
> "I can get about alone yet." (*EOT* 197)

Van Wyk knows that "to voluntarily cease venturing, doing, enduring, for his child's sake, would have been exactly like plucking his warm love for her out of his living heart. Something too monstrous, too impossible, even to conceive" (*EOT* 197). He is aware of the fact that Whalley cannot stop working as the captain no matter how inappropriate it sounds. "Circumstances have forced him into a role for which his body now disqualifies him" (Kerr 37). His financial situation and his love for his daughter have made him take up working despite his old age; however, now his eyes are failing him, making his duty inappropriate. Van Wyk offers to help him by providing Whalley with his insurance policy; however, Whalley points out the unseaworthiness of the ship and that the policy would prove invalid if the situation of the ship were realized. Van Wyk is determined to support him in his cause:

> "We shall share the guilt, then."
> "Nothing could make mine less," said Captain Whalley. (*EOT* 196)

Whalley feels the conscious guilt of what he has been doing. He has deceived everyone, including Van Wyk.

> "I began to tamper with it in my pride. You begin to see a lot of things when you are going blind. I could not be frank with an old chum even. I was not frank with Massy—no, not altogether. I knew he took me for a wealthy sailor fool, and I let him. I wanted to keep up my importance—because there was poor Ivy away there—my daughter." (*EOT* 194)

He has not been totally honest with Eliott and Massy. By continuing to captain the ship despite his lack of sight, he has put the lives of the passengers and the crew in danger. Indirectly, he has deceived Van Wyk as Van Wyk would have trusted Whalley with his cargo. Whalley expresses his sorrow in this way to Van Wyk: "'I have even deceived you. If it had not been for that word 'esteem'. These are not the words for me. I would have lied to you. Haven't I lied to you? Weren't you going to trust your property on board this very trip?'" (*EOT* 195)

Although Whalley has been suffering for what he has done, the reader is well aware of the fact that his pretense cannot be regarded as innocent, albeit still understandable. As Bakhtin maintains, when "the destruction and completely justified disgrace of a person I love" (*Act* 62) is evaluated, what the reader presents is the "loving affirmation of the human being" (*Act* 63-64). Being the protagonist under analysis, and having received the sympathy of the reader, Whalley's wrongdoing is justified as his act is the result of his "entire life" (*Act* 3) which is made up of his particulars. His financial difficulty and his endeavor to overcome it in spite of his old age, his love for Ivy and his blindness as total mischance have their share in his decision to continue with his duty.

Now "the *Sofala* was leaving Batu Beru for Pangu, the next place of call" (*EOT* 203). Whalley continues to captain the ship through his "dimmed eyes" (*EOT* 207). The native passengers have left the ship and there is only the crew. Still, Whalley puts the life of the people on board at risk. He makes the decision not to tell anybody about his secret and to continue commanding the ship. This is his "signature" – the decision he makes as his answerable act. He

does not present any "alibi" while making this decision. Van Wyk supports him in his cause, but Whalley does not put this forward in support of his decision. His resolution is determined only by himself. The point of view that leads him toward his decision is his "emotional-volitional tone", and his tone is his love for his daughter.

Although making his decision does not take a long time, Whalley definitely experiences a dilemma as to whether he should confess his blindness. This is the moment when he faces the problem Bakhtin mentions about the "contemporary man". Contemporary man "feels unsure of himself, feels destitute and deficient in understanding, where he has to do with himself, where he is the center from which answerable acts or deeds issue" (*Act* 20-21). Whalley has always supported his daughter during their years together, even when Ivy is away in Australia. All throughout these years, he has been "sure of himself" and "clear-headed" in all his endeavors as he has acted according to the "domain of culture" (*Act* 20). A father should look after his daughter. However, besides this universal common sense, there is now a fact. He has lost his eyesight, and he has to make a decision as to whether or not he should still continue to work and risk the people's life to sustain his loyalty to his daughter.

Whalley, however, thinks not of the stain he will get on his reputation but of Ivy's money. He realizes that it is gone. "He was indeed at the end of his tether" (*EOT* 215). He is now totally blind as well.

> But after all, for Ivy he had carried his point, walking in his darkness to the very verge of a crime. God had not listened to his prayers. The light had finished ebbing out of the world; not a glimmer. It was a dark waste; but it was unseemly that a Whalley who had gone so far to carry a point should continue to live. He must pay the price. (*EOT* 215)

He decides that there is no reason for him to continue to live. He has lost everything, most importantly his chance to maintain his fatherly duty to his daughter. While all the crew members leave the ship, also asking him to join

them, he believes that he needs to pay for what he has done. He puts all the pieces of iron into his own pockets and disappears into the black sea together with the *Sofala*.

After the disaster, the case goes to court, and "[t]he inquiry had exonerated everybody from all blame. The loss of the ship was put down to an unusual set of the current" (*EOT* 216). As a result, Massy receives the insurance money, and he cannot tell Whalley's secret to anyone in order not to lose the money. Thus, Whalley's name remains free from stain. Besides, Ivy receives the £500, which has been protected diligently by her father. At the end, Whalley dies but his will is actualized. This is the positive end Conrad provides for Whalley.

What makes Whalley gain sympathy and moral integrity in the eyes of the reader is his sense of answerability in Bakhtinian terms. He admits his wrongdoings and suffers the consequences. In his confession to Van Wyk, Whalley points out that he is suffering due to misleading Massy to employ him and that he feels uncomfortable owing to his pretense. He has hidden the truth from everyone so far; however, he has been in an internal process of thinking things through. He has not felt comfortable with it at all. When he decides to commit suicide, he decides to compensate for what he has done: "it was unseemly that a Whalley who had gone so far to carry a point should continue to live. He must pay the price" (*EOT* 216). He takes responsibility for his actions, and he is willing to pay the price.

Just as in *Under Western Eyes*, in *The End of the Tether* Conrad narrates the ethical dilemma of a morally tolerable character. As a writer, Conrad "thought of civilized and morally tolerable human life as a dangerous walk on a thin crust of barely cooled lava which at any moment might break and let the unwary sink into fiery depths" (Bertrand Russel qtd in McGrath 43). The fall to Russel's "fiery depths" is represented through Haldin's intrusion into Razumov's life in *Under Western Eyes*, and through the mischance Whalley experiences in *The End of the Tether*. The reader admires Whalley for

his success record and his endurance, for his physical vitality and for his devotion to his daughter, but we also feel sorry for him owing to his bad luck in losing all his money and becoming blind. There is nothing he can do against the bankruptcy and his blindness. "He is not remotely to blame for any of this bad luck, and is in fact an exemplary human being" (McGrath 43). In addition, despite his old age and lack of financial means, he painstakingly strives to take care of his daughter. Just like Razumov, Whalley proves that he is a decent person. His affection toward his daughter adds to his positive traits such as his sense of responsibility, his hardworking nature and his glorious career; however, he commits a wrong act: he risks the lives of people by trying to navigate the ship despite his blindness. In fact, we are aware that the motive behind Whalley's guilt is his love for Ivy, but still we cannot overlook his "failure of moral response" (Graver 392). Razumov is being unfaithful to Natalia by pretending to be Haldin's comrade, but he is being faithful to himself with his confessions. Similarly, even though Whalley is being faithful to his daughter, he is being unfaithful to the crew of the ship. In this way, Whalley commits a wrongdoing, and this is not likely to be overlooked although Whalley has been a person with a sense of morality all his life. Otherwise, it would lead to an understanding that one can do anything for the love of one's children, and then we would be engaging in relativism, which Bakhtin does not favor at all. As readers we can only understand Whalley's difficult situation and should take his particulars into consideration. The reader knows that Whalley is in real financial difficulty and he wants to support his daughter. He is not alone while steering the ship. He has an experienced assistant that knows the routes. These facts help the reader understand Whalley's unique situation and regard his misdeed only as "morally tolerable". "Conrad's text prohibits us from arriving at a definitive conclusion about Whalley's character" (Billy 194). Whalley's particular situation is what leads him to act the way he does and creates difficulty for the reader in reaching an exact judgment about his character. As is the case in *Under Western Eyes*,

Conrad does not take sides with the characters and wants the reader to make the decision. Whalley's particulars lead the reader not to make harsh judgments but eventually to conclude that, overall, Whalley cannot be seen as totally immoral.

4. 2 The Plurality of Value Judgments

As the Bakhtinian ethical truth requires the participation of every point of view (*Act* 46), analysis of *The End of the Tether* will also allow room for participative judgment. The text includes "multiple conflicted narrative perspectives" (Mulry 18) which provide a sense of Whalley as though "his sense of self shifts and the manifestations of who he is are both reinforced and undercut by perception of others" (Mulry 22). This makes it difficult to have a clear idea of what kind of a character Whalley is, but then again, this is Conrad's purpose. The characters Captain Whalley is close to are his daughter Ivy, the faithful Serang and the friend in Batu Beru – Van Wyk. In this section, the ethical dilemma of Whalley will be analyzed through his relationship with Ivy and the Serang, and the valuative perspective of Van Wyk. In this sense, the Bakhtinian emotional-volutional position one takes in relation to the values one recognizes will be the main focus. "I-for-myself" can be applied to Whalley's own perception of himself, "others-for-me" refers to what Whalley thinks of others, and "I-for-others" can stand for what others think about Whalley. By looking at these perspectives, to what extent Whalley can be considered to be a moral character will be studied. Finally, that Whalley cannot be seen as totally immoral will be presented as the conclusion. The analysis of different value centers will be disclosed focusing on the characters one by one, thus presenting the "others-for-me" and "I-for-others" respectively for each character.

To start with, Whalley's daughter, Ivy, is very important in the story as Whalley commits his misdeed for the love of her. Understanding the relationship between them is of utmost importance for the moral analysis of the

protagonist. Ivy-for-Whalley is a precious and a thoughtful daughter. Whalley has named his daughter Ivy "because of the sound of the word, and obscurely fascinated by a vague association of ideas. She had twined herself tightly round his heart, and he intended her to cling close to her father as to a tower of strength" (*EOT* 114). Of course, he wished to maintain this close relationship with her all their life. After the loss of his beloved wife, Ivy has been even more valuable for him. "[S]he was the own child of a clever mother", and he believes that she perceives his financial difficulty and has the courage to speak out, showing "all the qualities which had made her mother a woman of such excellent counsel" (*EOT* 114). For Whalley, Ivy is all that is left from his wife; she is "[b]one of my bone, flesh of my flesh; the very image of my poor wife" (*EOT* 190).

Out of all this love, he probably cannot see anyone good enough for her, but he particularly does not like his son-in-law. As if the fact that Ivy has married and moved far away from her father to Australia is not enough, according to the father, her husband is not a good match for her. Whalley associates him with "failure" (*EOT* 115). He is definitely not happy with her choice of husband. However, when he learns that Ivy's husband has become bound to "an invalid's bath-chair" and that "[h]e will never walk again", Whalley becomes upset (*EOT* 115). Realizing that she is dependent on him more than ever, Whalley keeps Ivy at the center of his life, so all his decisions are based on her. From now on, she will have "a hard struggle for bread" (*EOT* 219). That is the reason why Whalley cares about Ivy in each and every decision he takes. For instance, when he explains to Van Wyk why he has to keep working for the indecent Massy, he points out:

> [M]y life—my work, is necessary, not for myself alone. I can't choose." . . . He paused, turned the glass before him right round . . . "I have an only child—a daughter."
> The ample downward sweep of his arm over the table seemed to suggest a small girl at a vast distance. "I hope to see her once more before I die. Meantime it's enough to know that she has

> me sound and solid, thank God. You can't understand how one feels.
> [. . .]
> Again he paused, then pronounced stoically the words, "She has a hard struggle." (*EOT* 189-190)

Whalley works "out of necessity" because "it is his duty to his daughter to keep working, and for her he does it gladly" (McGrath 44). As she is in the center of his life now, throughout the novel, we witness a wholly devoted father figure.

When Ivy sends her father a letter and asks for £200 to open a boarding house, Whalley does not even think twice but sells his ship, the only possession he has, he sends her the money although he is not happy with the idea of a boarding house at all. For him, it was a degrading occupation as it holds some "suspicions" as to the nature of the women running such a place; it is "unseemly that a Whalley should lay herself open" (*EOT* 119). He would rather she became a "seamstress" (*EOT* 120). As his father was also a respectable person, he believes he and his daughter hold an aristocratic air. He cannot associate Ivy with the image: "The granddaughter of Colonel Whalley, the landlady of a boarding-house! Pooh!" (*EOT* 120)

Despite all the care and importance Whalley gives Ivy, "I-for-others", so Whalley-for-Ivy, indicates that she does not respond to him with the same enthusiasm. This creates the urge to have a deeper look into the father-daughter relationship. Whalley "places blind trust in Ivy's love for him" (Billy 196). He assumes that, just like her mother, "she understood him without many words" " (*EOT* 115), "[h]e was confident she shared his feelings", and "he trusted her judgment" (*EOT* 115). Nevertheless, she does not give the impression to the reader that her father gets. When she gets married and is about to leave home, Whalley reminds her that all he has is for her and her children and that he expects her to be open to him whenever she writes him; however, "She [answers] him by an almost imperceptible movement of her head" (*EOT* 114-115). When, at the end of the novel, she receives her father's letter, "[h]er eyes

were dry: no cry of sorrow or whisper of thanks went up to heaven from her lips" (*EOT* 219). She does not seem to be affected much by her father's death:

> The blow had come softened by the spaces of the earth, by the years of absence. There had been whole days when she had not thought of him at all—had no time. But she had loved him, she felt she had loved him, after all. (*EOT* 219)

Despite the fact that the love between father and daughter is stated at the beginning of the novel through their good memories together of when Ivy was a child, the strength of the relationship does not reveal itself in the rest of the text. It seems to be mostly a "one-way" attachment, and it is mainly based on money (Billy 196-197). Whalley sees himself "[n]ot a bad investment for the poor woman this solid carcass of her father" (*EOT* 116). He sees himself as an investment for his daughter. Similarly, "[h]e would have been shocked if she had taken it into her head to thank him in so many words, but he found it perfectly natural that she should tell him she needed two hundred pounds" (*EOT* 116). If it is shocking for Whalley to hear his daughter thank him for the money he has sent, this creates questions in the mind of the reader. In this sense, the "vacant love" between father and daughter leads to the perception of Ivy as one who is "appropriately named for her stifling, strangling effect on her father" (Mulry 26). In addition, despite the claimed closeness between them, Whalley "never told her of his difficulties" (*EOT* 116). The lack of openness and sincerity in this relationship does not provide consistency with what is asserted by Whalley. Thus, the "I-for-myself" for Whalley is a devoted father having a strong and loving relationship with his daughter whereas Whalley-for-Ivy is a financial provider whose difficulties and sufferings are not cared about. The clash between the two views of value centers naturally exalts Whalley in the eyes of the reader since he continues to be a committed father even though he does not know Ivy's perspective of him.

Whalley is obsessed with the idea that he can still provide money for Ivy, even while he is about to die (Billy 202). Of course, Ivy is his daughter,

and the validity of his loyalty to her has deeper roots. "[V]alidity is conditioned *not* by its content . . . but its being *correlated* with the unique place of a participant. It is from this unique place that all values and any other human being with all his values can be acknowledged" (*Act* 48). The validity or the truth of love between Whalley and Ivy does not depend on the action of providing money but on the unique status of Ivy. Whalley can only evaluate matters by taking the fact that she is his daughter into consideration. For a "detached (non-participating)" individual (*Act* 48), Whalley's devotion can be regarded as too much or undeserved, but from his emotional-volitional point of view, anything he does for her is justifiable because she is his daughter. This evaluation prevents us from seeing Whalley as a figure who has done wrong.

As for the Serang, he is the faithful assistant of Whalley. He is "an elderly, alert, little Malay, with a very dark skin" (*EOT* 148), and he "interestingly disrupts the paradigms of age by being both wrinkled and childlike" (Kerr 42). He is known to Whalley as he has worked for him on the *Fair Maid* until it was sold. The Serang-for-Whalley is a loyal assistant.

> Paid off from the Fair Maid . . ., he had hung, in his faded blue suit and floppy gray hat, about the doors of the Harbor Office, till one day, seeing Captain Whalley coming along to get a crew for the *Sofala*, he had put himself quietly in the way, with his bare feet in the dust and an upward mute glance. The eyes of his old commander had fallen on him favorably . . . and in less than half an hour the white men in the "Ofiss" had written his name on a document as Serang of the fire-ship *Sofala*. (*EOT* 148)

As the Serang has been a faithful employee, Whalley wants to continue working with him, and as he trusts Whalley, he accepts the offer. Being a close assistant to the captain is certainly not easy for the Serang. "He had swept the decks of ships, had tended their helms, had minded their stores, had risen at last to be a Serang" (*EOT* 148). He is an experienced boatswain. Although he might not be the best at knowing the routes, he is good enough to be trusted to keep the captain's watch. As he follows Whalley closely and obeys any order

the captain utters, Whalley and the Serang are likened to "a whale with an inseparable pilot-fish" (*EOT* 162).

The Whalley-for-the Serang perspective does not have the depth the other characters' value centers have. Despite the Serang's faithful closeness to the captain, he cannot discern Whalley's blindness. In fact, there seems to be a defect in their relationship. Whalley does not prove to have made the best decision by bringing the Serang with him as the Serang's ignorance of Whalley's blindness exposes his inefficiency as a captain's dependable assistant. The narrator foreshadows this defect through the words he uses to describe the two. He refers to them as "an old giant attended by a wizened pigmy" (*EOT* 143). Instead of creating a positive connotation with his use of words, the narrator uses expressions that imply Whalley's unreasonable choice.

After Whalley realizes the dimness in his eyes, he totally depends on the Serang concerning the routes. The little naval officer performs everything Whalley asks him to do, but he does not have the insight to notice that something is wrong with Whalley. In this respect, the whale and pilot-fish metaphor used for Whalley and his Serang has important implications: "[T]he word pilot awakened the idea of trust, of dependence, the idea of welcome, clear-eyed help brought to the seaman groping for the land in the dark" (*EOT* 162). Just like a pilot-fish guides a whale, the Serang helps Whalley find his way within the mist, and Whalley trusts the Serang,

> A pilot sees better than a stranger, because his local knowledge, like a sharper vision, completes the shapes of things hurriedly glimpsed; penetrates the veils of mist spread over the land . . . . He recognizes because he already knows. It is not to his far-reaching eye but to his more extensive knowledge that the pilot looks for certitude; . . . the justification of the trust deposited in his hands, . . . [t]he pilot's knowledge brings relief and certitude to the commander of a ship. (*EOT* 162)

This quotation shows us the narrative technique used to delay information. As readers, because we have not been told about Whalley's blindness yet, we think

that there is nothing wrong. As the Serang is good at routes, Whalley depends on him, and the two are so close to each other all the time. However, with the protagonist's revelation of his dimmed sight, we realize that Whalley trusts not the Serang's knowledge, but his ability to see. Now the Serang is Whalley's eyes. It is he who navigates the ship and makes sure it is safe, and this brings about the question: "[I]f the Serang's job is to look after the ship as if the captain were not on deck, what is the captain's job?" (Kerr 42) Of course, through Whalley's secret the captain's job has become limited to physically being there and verbally directing the Serang as Whalley is only "reduced to a kind of figurehead" on the bridge of the Sofala (Kerr 41).

Even though Whalley makes a faulty choice by commanding the ship while being blind, the presence of the Serang lessens the weight of his fault to some extent. At least, the captain is not leading the ship alone. As the Serang does not speak about his ideas and feelings, we do not receive any information about Whalley from the Serang's mouth. Thus, there is not a clear Whalley-for-the Serang image, but there are some implications we get. The Serang must have a positive view of the captain as he has accepted Whalley's offer to keep his watch by putting "himself quietly in the way" (*EOT* 148). He follows Whalley's directions without hindering any, which indicates that he takes his job seriously and regards his captain as a responsible figure. However, Whalley has brought him to this ship by deceiving his employer, which is not known by the Serang. In addition, when Whalley's blindness is considered, which is again not known by the Serang, Whalley commits an act of moral irresponsibility. In the light of this information, despite the fact that we cannot disregard Whalley's wrongdoing, we can maintain that he cannot be seen as totally immoral because he is a father figure who is pushing his limits in order to be of some help to his financially suffering daughter.

Finally, Van Wyk, the only white man in Batu Beru, who left a bright career as a naval officer to become a tobacco-planter, receives his letters and newspapers through the *Sofala*. "Though he considered himself a hermit . . ., he

liked to know what went on in the world" (*EOT* 181). For this reason, the *Sofala's* visits have turned into a form of excitement as his news provider. Van Wyk-for-Whalley is a good friend.

Whalley-for-Van Wyk is "an uncommon old sailor" who "was like a delicate refinement of an upright character" (*EOT* 188). Van Wyk is just fascinated by Whalley's "dignity of manner", "humble position", "serenity of temper", "profound wisdom" and "noble character" (*EOT* 188). The age difference between them does not create a problem; on the contrary, it provides "another bond between them" (*EOT* 188). They can always have their own opinions of things and share those opinions "amicably" (*EOT* 187) as they walk out together. Overall, Van Wyk "had learned to like [Whalley] very much" (*EOT* 190), and his love is reciprocated. Whalley thinks highly of Van Wyk: "You have treated me most—most humanely, my dear Mr. Van Wyk, from the very first" (*EOT* 189).

Van Wyk himself is a "fastidious, clever, slightly skeptical" person who is "accustomed to the best society" and "possessed a latent warmth of feeling and a capacity for sympathy" (*EOT* 181). For the last almost three years now, Whalley and Van Wyk have developed a friendship in which they both love and trust each other.

When the *Sofala* arrives in Batu Beru, Sterne does not lose any time and communicates to Van Wyk his suspicions about Whalley's going blind. Upon hearing this, Van Wyk's "equanimity" is disturbed (*EOT* 181). He does not want to believe Sterne: "I would rather doubt your word. But I shall certainly speak to him of this" (*EOT* 179). Van Wyk wants to find out about the situation himself, so inviting Whalley to dinner, he remarks: "I've noticed of late that you are not quite yourself, old friend" (*EOT* 191). Whalley confesses the truth and tells him that he is going blind. Van Wyk is shocked to hear that and asks Whalley in his terror: "And you had that courage?" (*EOT* 191).

"A cold shudder ran down Mr. Van Wyk's back" upon realizing that Whalley has been risking the life of the people on the ship, and Van Wyk

thinks that "[i]t's incredible" (*EOT* 195). For a little while he is in shock and does not know what to say; however, as he calms down and is able to think clearly, he realizes that, for Whalley

> whose whole life had been conditioned by action, there could exist no other expression for all the emotions; that, to voluntarily cease venturing, doing, enduring, for his child's sake, would have been exactly like plucking his warm love for her out of his living heart. (*EOT* 195)

One cannot expect Whalley not to fight for his daughter. It would certainly be "[s]omething too monstrous, too impossible, even to conceive" (*EOT* 195). Therefore, Van Wyk realizes that Whalley will continue to command the ship no matter what. He offers to give his floating policy for the ship; however, Whalley maintains that the ship is not fit to sail, and the policy would prove invalid if it were noticed (*EOT* 195-196). Van Wyk really wants to help Whalley and tells him that they will share the guilt then, but Whalley responds: "Nothing could make mine less" (*EOT* 196).

After his encounter with Whalley, Van Wyk talks to Sterne as he is now sure of Sterne's "coveting the command of the *Sofala*" (*EOT* 193). Van Wyk asks Sterne to let Whalley finish his last voyage, and then, he tells him his intention of making a financial agreement in terms of the ship and making him the captain of the ship: "I'll be . . . in a position to look after *your* interests" (*EOT* 199). He's trying to keep Sterne away from Whalley so that Whalley can complete the term of his duty and that his secret is not revealed.

Although Van Wyk shudders at the idea when he hears the truth from Whalley's mouth, he supports him in his cause. Van Wyk's positive attitude toward Whalley after learning the truth contributes to the sympathy the reader feels for Whalley. This brings to mind Bakhtin's idea that what makes someone love a person is not the person's goodness, but that the person is good because he is loved by the other (*Act* 62). As Van Wyk loves his friend and knows his commitment to his daughter, he sympathizes with him and wants to

help. What Whalley has done is definitely wrong; however, the favorable opinions of a decent character help the reader not to condemn Whalley harshly as immoral.

The multiple perspectives presented by Ivy, the Serang and Van Wyk indicate to the reader that it is not easy to have a clear-cut description of Whalley's character. He is both devoted and full of unreliable judgments; he is both responsible and morally irresponsible; he is both admirable and impotent; he is both faithful and unfaithful. When looked at through Ivy's value center, Whalley is very devoted. From the Serang's perspective, he is a responsible captain who keeps a close watch on the ship's safety, asking the Serang frequently about the weather and the route. From Van Wyk's point of view, he is the "benevolent sage, full of years and wisdom, with a heroic career behind him, unspoilt by his successes and unembittered by his reverses" (Kerr 36-37). Overall, he is not an evil character, and he tries his best to remain faithful to his daughter – the main motivation behind his endeavors. However, he exhibits some unreliable judgments and moral irresponsibility, such as being a character "who cheats his employer, endangers his crew, and goes down with his ship for the sake of an Australian boarding-house" (Kerr 37); he is physically not competent to perform his job any more due to his blindness; and he is unfaithful to himself, his employer, and the crew by keeping his blindness a secret and still continuing to captain the ship. The different view points of the characters provide the unique position of every participant necessary for a Bakhtinian ethical evaluation. In this way the protagonist's existence is enriched. He gains different meanings, and a democratic atmosphere is created where the other characters' opinions of him are expressed.

When Whalley and Razumov are compared in terms of plurality, it can be seen that there are both similarities and differences. Natalia from *Under Western Eyes* and the Serang from *The End of the Tether* both have a silent presence in the novels. They come to the foreground with the trust they feel for the protagonist. Razumov is unaware of Haldin's perspective of him, and thus,

he is enriched when he learns Haldin's point of view. Similarly, Whalley is not aware of how Ivy sees him. However, Whalley never gets to learn his daughter's value judgment. The clash between the points of view of Whalley and Ivy reveals an uncertainty as to whether Whalley is doing the right thing by dedicating himself so much to his daughter's benefit. This uncertainty is expressed through the ambivalence of the narrator in *Under Western Eyes*. The narrator's own words show inconsistency, which also prevents the reader from completely trusting him. In both novels, Conrad maintains his conflicted presence, avoids taking sides and leaves the decision to the reader.

4. 3 The Place of Empathy and Love in the Assessment of the Protagonist

Bakhtin requires literature to reflect real life issues such as tolerance of different perspectives and democracy. Thus, ethical concerns can be evaluated in a literary work just as they are dealt with in real life, and the characters in a literary work can be analyzed as if they were characters from real life. The reader as the "other" to the literary character will evaluate his object with interest and in detail. "This is the way in which a living consciousness becomes a cultural consciousness and a cultural consciousness becomes embodied in a living consciousness" (*Act* 35). In other words, the reader empathizes actively and objectively with the character by respecting its limits and its particular situation, and thus, the aesthetic activity of analyzing a literary character performed by the reader fulfills the connection Bakhtin demands: the bridge between the aesthetic world and real life.

In this sense, the character will be analyzed via "objective aesthetic love" (*Act* 64), which requires lingering over the character with interest in every detail and with love. In this way, the literary character will be incorporated into real life through its interpretation, which will later be even further enlarged through interpretations by other readers. After the aesthetic activity, as neither the character nor the reader will remain the same, Being-as-

event will be enriched and the superiority of the aesthetic activity will be shown through the representation of the character.

In this section, the protagonist of *The End of the Tether*, Captain Whalley will be analyzed through the reader's loving interest. It will be shown that the reader sympathizes with Whalley because of certain factors. Among these factors are Whalley's personal background, his physical features and his being "economical with the truth". The value judgments of two evil characters will be analyzed as another factor as well. The direction of reader response through two narrative techniques will be presented as the final factor that leads to the sympathy of the reader.

There are several reasons why the reader sympathizes with Whalley. To start with, just as Razumov is not an ordinary person, Whalley is not just an ordinary retired captain. He has been a captain who has sailed famous ships, made famous passages and been the pioneer of new routes and new trades. "His fame remained writ, not very large but plain enough, on the Admiralty charts. Was there not somewhere between Australia and China a Whalley Island and a Condor Reef?" (*EOT* 110) There is even a passage that has been named after him, 'Malotu or Whalley Passage', which is an "advantageous route, first, discovered in 1850 by Captain Whalley in the ship *Condor*" (*EOT* 110). His fifty-year-career is full of achievements and honorable work. "He had never lost a ship or consented to a shady transaction" (*EOT* 111), and has always stayed away from any kind of business that has seemed to be "an undignified trial of wits at best" (*EOT* 119). He is an example of a successful and an ethical character, which leads the reader to respect him from the very beginning.

In addition, he has characteristics that make the reader sympathize with him. For one thing, he is a person who is happy with his life. "[H]e was at home in life, taking a genuine pleasure in its feelings and its possessions; in the dignity of his reputation and his wealth, in his love for his daughter" (*EOT* 112). Although he does not possess much, he leads a contented life with

whatever he has and reflects his life energy throughout his surroundings. He has a sense of responsibility as he rises at five every day (*EOT* 112), is a tidy person (*EOT* 201), reads the Bible (*EOT* 113) and possesses a faithful nature. He has decorated his cabin according to "his simple ideal of comfort at sea" (EOT 112). He lovingly keeps an oil painting of his deceased wife and three carbon photographs of his daughter, her husband – even though he does not like him – and their children (*EOT* 113, 121), and he dusts them after breakfast. He has canaries that he feeds (*EOT* 112), a piano that he bought together with his wife (*EOT* 113) and a big book case. He is a great reader (*EOT* 112). All these details distinguish him from his environment and make him a lovable character.

Another trait of Whalley that gains the sympathy of the reader is how he looks. He is sixty seven-years old; however, his physical appearance is full of "vitality" and "bodily vigor" (*EOT* 190). His lively and robust look gives the impression that he has not suffered the burden of life or that the years have not really changed him.

> With age he had put on flesh a little, had increased his girth like an old tree presenting no symptoms of decay; and even the opulent, lustrous ripple of white hairs upon his chest seemed an attribute of unquenchable vitality and vigor. (*EOT* 122)

There is not even a "single betraying fold or line of care" that disfigures "the reposeful modeling of his face" (*EOT* 122). When the Serang and Whalley stand next to each other, although they are both old, the Serang appears "slight and shrunken like a withered brown leaf blown by a chance wind under the mighty shadow of the other" (*EOT* 144). Whalley's description as glamorous and full-of-life makes him look almost like a hero. He is even likened to a "presumptuous Titan" (*EOT* 197), "blinded Samson" (*EOT* 197) and "a pilgrim" "with a great white beard" (*EOT* 118). Together with his authoritative voice, he has "a grand air which would have suited an old and glorious

admiral" (*EOT* 119). The impression he gives to his surroundings is considerably distinguishing. He is "dignified" (*EOT* 151) with a "truly aristocratic temperament" (*EOT* 119) and with "his aristocratic heart of hearts" (*EOT* 120). His wears "an ancient Panama hat", and his linen clothes are "always of immaculate whiteness" (*EOT* 123). Within his dignified air and spotless attire, "[i]t was impossible to connect such a fine presence and this unruffled aspect with the belittling troubles of poverty" (*EOT* 123). Like Razumov, Whalley is indeed depicted as if he belongs to a better position in life due to his ethical virtue and the halo he has. Both characters are depicted as distinguished figures in terms of the positive impression they give.

In spite of all his past reputation and his good looks, Whalley is presented as lacking in certain points as well, which makes the reader sympathize with him. For instance, "not above twice a year, he had to use a thick cudgel-like stick on account of a stiffness in the hip – a slight touch of rheumatism, he supposed" (*EOT* 112-113), and although the stick accompanies Whalley "with a self-confident sound" (*EOT* 123) and the narrator likens it to "a weapon" (*EOT* 118) in parallel with the captain's dignified appearance, a walking stick is claimed to be "a presage of evil" in the East (*EOT* 140). The writer adds this information most probably to foreshadow the adversities he will go through. Whalley has a grand air, "but he became lost like a straw in the eddy of a brook" (*EOT* 119). Despite the light he radiates, there is a fact to be accepted: Whalley is forlorn within his suffering due to lack of money. In addition, as he has gotten older and more experienced, things have changed, too. Now "his early experiences meant nothing whatever to the new generations of seamen" (*EOT* 111). He cannot easily find a job. All these points that indicate the deficiencies in Whalley's life move Whalley from a heroic position closer to human beings and lead the reader to sympathize more with him. Similarly, Razumov's lack of family and lack of financial resources are what remove him from his heroic image closer to the reader.

In regard to the subjects mentioned above, we – as readers – feel sad that Whalley feels the need to hide the truth about his lack of wealth at the time of applying for the job and, toward the end of the journey, about his blindness. In the former case, we are aware that he has no other choice. He is desperately in need of money and getting the position as the captain of the *Sofala* may be his one and only chance. In order to get the job, Whalley has "never *said* anything misleading" (*EOT* 139) but has concealed part of the truth. "What would have been the good of telling [Eliott]—any more than of blurting the whole tale to that man Massy? Five hundred pounds ready to invest. Let him make the best of that. Let him wonder" (*EOT* 175). He has not told either Eliott or Massy that he does not have any money other than the £500 he is considering investing in the *Sofala*. However, he feels uneasy for having hidden the truth. He has not intended to deceive anyone, but he has had no other choice. "Was there a choice? He seemed already to have lost something of himself; to have given up to a hungry specter something of his truth and dignity in order to live. But his life was necessary. Let poverty do its worst in exacting its toll of humiliation" (*EOT* 139). He takes his answerable decision and leaves the reader with the fact that he, at least, has not told a lie or otherwise twisted reality. He is not a "miser" as Massy thinks, but he is "only poor" (*EOT* 152).Although his employer, Massy, accuses him of following an evil plan, we know that it is not the case at all.

As for his blindness, Whalley keeps it secret because he knows he will be fired and be left without any money if he chooses to confess. Although we know that what he has done is wrong, we empathize with and understand him. In both cases, Whalley shows himself to have "deceived" (*EOT* 194) others out of despair, but we know that he is not an evil character. As a result of both wrongdoings, he suffers. He pays for what he has done. Actually, the price he pays is so heavy that we cannot stop feeling sorry for Whalley. Making Ivy's lack of financial support and her boarding house an issue, an obsession for himself, Whalley decides to commit suicide. He has been a morally upright

personality all his life. Still, he takes responsibility for what he has done and punishes himself in the harshest way by taking his own life. In fact his own perception of humans in general can be applied to himself. He believes that

> a disposition for good existed in every man, even if the world were not a very happy place as a whole. In the wisdom of men he had not so much confidence. The disposition had to be helped up pretty sharply sometimes, he admitted. They might be silly, wrongheaded, unhappy; but naturally evil—no. There was at bottom a complete harmlessness at least. (*EOT* 187)

Indeed, Whalley does not have much confidence in his wisdom as he is totally blinded by his obsession with supporting his daughter. He has shown instances of being silly, wrongheaded and unhappy; however, he is not an evil character at all.

While the evil nature that Razumov lacks is represented by Nikita, the one Whalley does not possess is represented through Massy and Sterne, both of whom make the reader sympathize even further with Whalley. Massy, the chief engineer and the owner of the *Sofala*, bought the ship after winning "the second prize in the Manilla lottery" (*EOT* 133). With the ambition of winning another big prize, he has been buying lots of tickets for each draw and spending all his money on the lottery. The habit had become such a mania that "all the earnings of the ship went that way" (*EOT* 173). As a result of being always tight with money, he is always angry with everything and everybody, cursing, roaring abuse and threatening people.

> It was his craze to quarrel with his captains. . . . He seemed to think he was no owner unless he was kicking somebody out in the morning and having a row with the new man in the evening. What was wanted from him was a master with a couple of hundred or so to take an interest in the ship on proper conditions. (*EOT* 135)

He hates all his sailors, he resents the money he pays to his crew, and he hates the *Sofala*. "[I]t seemed to him that he had been for years the prey of a band of parasites" (*EOT* 142). He only puts up with the ship and the crew "because of the necessary manual labor of the ship which must be done. He had to struggle and plan and scheme to keep the *Sofala* afloat" (*EOT* 142).

Not different from the other crew members, Whalley is on Massy's hate list. Massy "had never hated anyone so much as that old man" (*EOT* 175). He likens Whalley to "a gorged vulture" and tells Whalley that he terrifies him (*EOT* 152). The anger and grudge he feels toward the captain are so great that he utters such harsh sentences as "You have made me curse the day I was born" and "You make my blood run cold" (*EOT* 152). As a means of letting his rage out, he keeps threatening Whalley and trying to find his faults. "But remember it has another six weeks to run yet. There's time for me to dismiss you before the three years are out. You will do yet something that will give me the chance to dismiss you" (*EOT* 152).

Massy is so desperate to find faults with Whalley that he resents Whalley and the Serang's attention to duty (*EOT* 144). He even tells the captain that he hates Whalley for not drinking because otherwise he could dismiss him (*EOT* 150). He accuses him of

> leaving everything to that Serang. Why! I've seen you letting that old fool of a Malay take bearings for you [. . .]
> [. . .]
> "Take care. I may yet dismiss you and freeze your money for a year. I may . . ." (*EOT* 151)

What has awakened Massy's hatred toward Whalley is the fact that Whalley did not accept Massy's demand for £600 but paid him instead £500 for the agreement. Massy has never believed Whalley had no more money than the £500, and that is why he has always bullied Whalley to make him give up in the end and get more money for his lottery mania. He wants Whalley to extend the agreement when it finishes:

> "So you still say you must go?"
> "I must indeed."
> "And you couldn't at least leave the money for a term of years?"
> "Impossible."
> "Can't trust it with me without your care, eh?"
> Captain Whalley remained silent. Massy sighed deeply over the back of the chair.
> "It would just do to save me," he said in a tremulous voice.
> "I've saved you once." (*EOT* 210)

All the demands Massy makes are to meet his financial need. The only thing he thinks of is to receive, in one way or another, more money. However, he is rejected by Whalley each and every time as the captain truly does not have any more money. "And when Massy learned that [Whalley] meant to leave him at the end of the time, to leave him confronted with the problem of boilers, his dislike blazed up secretly into hate" (*EOT* 176). Thus, his ambition to get money and his fury intermingle into a vicious cycle.

Nobody can be claimed to have a positive impression of Massy. The master attendant at the port, Captain Eliott, tells him they are not happy with his attitude. One of the crew members, Sterne, an evil character himself, thinks Massy is "[u]nmanly! A vicious man! Bad! Bad! A brute! A brute without a spark of anything human about him", and Sterne cannot bargain with Massy to take Whalley's place because talking to Massy "was like going into a tiger's den with a piece of raw meat in your hand" (*EOT* 166). Van Wyk expresses his dislike of him, believes he is not "estimable or trustworthy" (*EOT* 184) and thinks he is "a contemptible idiot" (*EOT* 182). Jack, the second engineer to the *Sofala*, calls Massy a "devil" (*EOT* 202) even though Massy surprisingly classifies him as faithful. Almost all the characters point out their dislike of him. When this is the case, it is not likely for the reader to either trust Massy's judgments or find him right. Although he has a point when he asserts that Whalley has deceived him into the agreement by not telling the whole truth, the reader cannot sympathize with him but instead sympathizes with Whalley because Massy is not innocent in his intentions: he needs the money for

gambling. Even when it is he that devises the plan to sink the *Sofala*, he still thinks of putting the blame on Whalley for the shipwreck until the last minute.

Despite the aggressive attitude and the bad words Whalley receives, he always remains calm and silent; however, even that infuriates Massy. Whalley does not like his employer, but his expressions are nothing like Massy's. That he does not approve of Massy's attitude and would not like "to stand in his shoes" (*EOT* 139) is almost his only reflections about Massy. In spite of all the negative treatment he receives, Whalley still believes that "[m]en were not evil, after all" (*EOT* 139). He still looks at Massy in a mild way, not criticizing or being harsh: "On the whole, men were not bad—they were only silly or unhappy" (*EOT* 140). Whalley is well-meaning towards someone with no pure intentions, and he assumes that he is not evil. Through his assumption, Whalley seems "naïve" while Massy is "not only evil but also *lucky*" (McGrath 44). While a good person suffers several misfortunes and has to put up with an evil character, a bad one can win the second prize in the lottery and make things work in some way. This is another point which contributes to the ethical concern of the novel. The evil character functions as a foil to the good character and emphasizes the better qualities of the good one. As it provides depth to the novel in terms of ethical concerns, the character of Massy is "central to Conrad's moral proposition" (McGrath 44). One aspect that helps the reader sympathize with and love the protagonist is the fact that Whalley suffers due to Massy's attitude.

Similarly, the other evil character in the novel, Sterne, contributes to the sympathy the reader feels for Whalley. Although Massy scorns him and treats him as if he has no value just as he does to other members of the crew, "there had been something between them – . . . something profound and subtle and incalculable, like an unexpressed understanding, a secret mistrust, or some sort of fear" (*EOT* 140). Sterne mainly stands out with his fickle personality. He talks to the people who have authority assuming a humble and praising attitude while he can express his dislike of them behind their back. He does so to

Massy. In addition, when Van Wyk tells Sterne, in order to keep him away from revealing Whalley's secret, that he will get a share in the ship and make him the captain, Sterne starts to praise Van Wyk and even Whalley, and refers to Van Wyk as "speaking to you as my new employer now" (*EOT* 199-200). However, his behaving that way to Massy does not benefit him much. "All his attempts to enter into confidential relations with his owner had led of late to nothing better than these dark threats of dismissal" (*EOT* 155). Still he goes on acting the same way.

> A chap in business I know (well up in the world he is now) used to tell me that this was the proper way. "Always push on to the front," he would say. 'Keep yourself well before your boss. Interfere whenever you get a chance. Show him what you know. Worry him into seeing you. (*EOT* 155)

The reference he gives indicates what sort of a mindset he has. He only thinks about his purpose, and he can do anything for it. When one day Massy asks him what he is after, he replies directly in one word: "Promotion" (*EOT* 154). Sterne is obsessed with the idea of taking Whalley's place, in line with "his perennial hope to rise" (*EOT* 156). He is a "sneak" as Massy calls him (*EOT* 154, 177), is "so instinctively disloyal" (*EOT* 155) and is always alert in order to find "an opening to get on" (*EOT* 155). On the *Sofala*, his target of observation is Whalley as he wants to be the captain in his place. He watches Whalley very closely. Thus, he is the first, and for a while the only, person to notice Whalley's blindness. Sterne is eager to get what he wants and is on constant watch of Whalley.

> [I]t was a great advantage to have an old man for captain: the sort of man besides who in the nature of things was likely to give up the job before long from one cause or another. Sterne was greatly chagrined, however, to notice that he did not seem anyway near being past his work yet. (*EOT* 156)

He starts to get impatient with no development in his case. That is why he is so surprised and happy upon realizing Whalley's loss of eyesight. "Great heavens! Could it be that?" (*EOT* 156) Clearly, "if his chance to get on rested on the discovery of 'something wrong,' he could not have hoped for a greater stroke of luck" (*EOT* 160). His discovery certainly shocks him. He cannot eat after watching Whalley eat. He thinks it is "an awful sight" (*EOT* 163). The effect this discovery has created on him is described in an ironical way hinting at Sterne's character:

> Sterne's discovery was made. It was repugnant to his imagination, shocking to his ideas of honesty, shocking to his conception of mankind. This enormity affected one's outlook on what was possible in this world: it was as if for instance the sun had turned blue, throwing a new and sinister light on men and nature. (*EOT* 163)

The description creates a smile on the reader's face while reading this part. Sterne's sense of honesty is claimed to be shattered as if he were a decent man.

The final aspect that builds up empathy and leads the reader to appreciate Whalley is the two narrative techniques applied by the author. Firstly, some information is delayed. That Whalley has pretended to have more money than he really has while making the agreement to work on the ship is revealed to the reader only towards the end of the book, when Whalley confesses to Van Wyk: "I knew he took me for a wealthy sailor fool, and I let him" (*EOT* 194). Similarly, the reader does not know that Whalley is going blind. Sterne claims to realize it; however, the reader does not have confidence in him. When the whale and the pilot fish metaphor is mentioned, the narrator hints at Whalley's blindness as if he does not know about it himself either. The narrator states that a pilot fish sees better than a stranger not due to his sharp vision but due to his extensive knowledge, and then, he asks: "[The Serang] was made to stick to the skipper as though he were of some use – as the pilot-fish, they say, is to the whale. But how – it was very marked – how? A pilot-

fish – a pilot – a … But if not superior knowledge then …" (*EOT* 162) The narrator acts as if he is sharing the reader's naivete and delays the knowledge. The reader learns about Whalley's blindness when he confesses to Van Wyk toward the end of the novel. Both of these incidents are the wrongdoings of Whalley and both of them are revealed late in the novel. Also, while Whalley's positive aspects – his old success, his physical vitality, his determination and fearlessness and his moral integrity – are presented to the reader's notice for about four fifths of the novel, we learn what he has done wrong only in the last fifth of the story (Graver 393). This is the way the author shows sufficient reason for Whalley's responsibility for his wrongdoings, but it also contributes to the reader's sympathy for the protagonist. Ultimately, the reader deals with the admirable side of the character for a longer period. Both these narrative strategies shape the reader's response.

Delaying the moment of revealing a piece of information is one narrative strategy that is used in *Under Western Eyes* as well. The fact that the letter explaining that the so-called murderer of Haldin was Ziemianitch, which would free Razumov from guilt, is not revealed as soon as Sophia Antonovna receives it. Different from Whalley's case, Razumov's confession creates a more powerful impact with the delayed revelation. As the novel is getting closer to the end, justifications of Razumov's wrongdoings succeed each other, creating a bigger impact. Similarly, the fact that Razumov went to Geneva as a state spy is not announced earlier, which contributes to the sympathy the reader feels for him. Thus, for both Razumov and Whalley the reader is exposed to a longer period of sympathy compared to the shorter periods of wrongdoings.

All the above-mentioned points lead the reader to empathize with Whalley aesthetically and feel sympathy for him. The reader evaluates Whalley in every detail possible and the author has a role in shaping the reader's response. Conrad does not favor one character over the others in a clear cut way. He wants the reader to make the decision. As he presents the main character with both positive characteristics and wrongdoings, it is difficult to

consider Whalley as totally moral or totally immoral. Thus, the author achieves what he aims to do: creating space for the reader to take responsibility. In this section, the aesthetic seeing is realized by the reader with a focus on Whalley's background, his physical appearance, his closer position to people in general and his preference not to reveal the whole truth in two instances. In addition, the two evil characters in the story and how reader response is guided through certain narrative techniques are evaluated as they are factors that prove to add to the reader's empathy and love. From a Bakhtinian perspective, Whalley is evaluated considering as many details as possible within his own limits. The reader analyzes the protagonist, being aware of the protagonist's limits and his particular position. The evaluation of Whalley's background, his physical traits and his closeness to us provide us with a positive reference. They build up a decent character that makes us ready to love him. The fact that Whalley is economical with the truth on his job application and concerning his blindness creates in the reader some doubt. However, this doubt "does not contradict in any way the unitary and unique truth" (*Act* 45). The readers empathize with and love Whalley because they can understand him. These two wrongdoings depend on the fact that Whalley has no other choice in supporting his daughter. Massy and Sterne contribute to the sympathy the reader feels for Whalley because although they have a point – Massy is angry with Whalley due to his pretense, and Sterne is the first person (and the only one until the very end) to realize Whalley's blindness – their evil natures prevent the reader from taking sides with them. Finally, the narrative technique of delay mainly leads us to redeem the protagonist. All the evaluations in this section reveal both positive and lacking points in Whalley's character. Some instances create moments of doubt, but overall we understand Whalley's reason to act the way he does and we have a positive idea of him. Overall, as a character of moral integrity, Whalley does not need to be morally stainless in order to be appreciated. Together with his mistakes, he is still sympathized with the reader and he cannot be regarded as totally immoral.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This study aims to deal with the ethical questions presented in Joseph Conrad's *Under Western Eyes* and *The End of the Tether*. To what extent Razumov and Captain Whalley can be claimed to have good morals is studied by looking at the ethical dilemmas presented in the two works through the ethical perspective of the Russian philosopher Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin. The analysis is made through three main points Bakhtin elaborates on in his *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*: particularity, plurality, and empathy and love. Making use of the Bakhtinian ethical perspective, this study maintains the argument that Razumov and Captain Whalley cannot be considered to be totally immoral despite the wrongdoings they have committed.

As it is a prerequisite for a Bakhtinian understanding of ethics, both Razumov and Whalley need to be analyzed according to their unique particulars. The particulars refer to the characters' background information, their personal traits and the particular situation they are found in. Both Razumov and Whalley commit a main wrong act. Razumov, despite saying "yes" to Haldin's request to help him escape, gives him up to the state officials. Similarly, Whalley continues to captain the ship despite his blindness, risking the lives of the people on board. Both characters' misdeeds originate from an instance of fatality. They cannot be blamed for the occurrence of the events – namely, Haldin's arrival and Whalley's blindness. Eventually, they take a decision and the decision leads to complications. This study aims to analyze to what extent the particular situations of the protagonists influence their decisions.

To start with Razumov, it can be claimed that his particulars are made up of three aspects: his lack of a family, his Russian identity and his obscure

relationship with Haldin. Due to not having any familial ties, Razumov yearns so much for a sense of belonging that he expresses his sensitivity in response to any little affection he receives from people. He cannot dare to take risky actions because he knows there is no one to protect or support him if he is found guilty or even merely suspected. His Russian identity adds to his hesitation since there is autocratic rule and people are not totally free to express their opinions. Autocracy does not provide much space for personal freedom, but Razumov stands closer to the state as he wants to follow the steps of his future career through the path the state provides. As he does not have a family, he needs an affiliation to which he can direct his sense of belonging, and that is his country – Russia. Haldin's arrival is totally unexpected and shocking for Razumov. As he cannot help him owing to the reasons stated above, he thinks of the closeness of his relation to Haldin. The reader finds him right in thinking that he does not have any other option but report Haldin to the authorities because he does not have any family to stand by him, and he lives in autocratic Russia, which destroys even its loyalists. However, there is something Razumov overlooks. Confidence does not have to be mutual. Even though he cannot give meaning to Haldin's confidence in him, Haldin believes that Razumov has an understanding of revolutionary ideals and that the state will not suspect Razumov. However, there is something Haldin cannot see either. Razumov is not as he thinks him to be, nor does autocracy have mercy for anyone. The lack of communication between the two characters creates different value judgments for each and different perspectives obligate people to do different things as Bakhtin maintains. That is why it is not easy to arrive at a definite conclusion about people. The reader understands Razumov's particulars and justifies his wrongdoing. He cannot be condemned for being a betrayer of a schoolfellow because we cannot disregard his particular situation. When looked from Razumov's perspective, he does not have any other option, so we cannot see the act as betrayal, and Razumov cannot be labeled as totally unfaithful.

Similarly, Whalley's decision to keep on navigating the ship definitely puts people at risk, and this cannot be overlooked. His wrongdoing is different from Razumov's in that Whalley endangers the lives of many people. However, the motive behind his misdeed is a father's commitment to his daughter. As Whalley knows Ivy is in financial difficulty, he does his best to support her despite his old age and lack of financial resources.

Another aspect to consider is plurality. The plurality of value judgments presents the reader with multi-colored characters, which leaves the reader in a difficulty in making definite decisions. This goes parallel with Conrad's approach as well. The reader makes the final decision without a clear sense of the writer's preference for specific characters. The plurality aspect works differently in the two novels. In *Under Western Eyes*, plurality reveals the fact that there is a clash between the viewpoints of the protagonist and of other people. In *The End of the Tether*, it mainly leads the reader to question the rationality of Whalley's deeds. After learning others' views of himself, Razumov is enriched in a Bakhtinian sense. He achieves the completion of the lacking parts of his own view of himself. He realizes that "life is a public thing" (*UWE* 40). Razumov learns that however much one tries to stay away from others, one cannot avoid being a part of society; building communication with others, one can have a complete value judgment and can act in a more reasonable way. On the other hand, Whalley cannot maintain the wholeness of his perspective. He does not learn the views of Ivy and the Serang about him. Whalley does not develop as a character as Razumov does because Whalley does not suffer the lack of his value judgment. As readers, we do not know what would happen if Whalley were able to learn how Ivy sees him and if the Serang were able to discern Whalley's blindness. Among the people around Whalley, only Van Wyk proves to really understand and care about him. Van Wyk is the only character who expresses his ideas of Whalley. Van Wyk lets him live and does not finalize him by telling him what he should do. He listens to Whalley as Whalley tells him about the ethical dilemma he is going through.

Knowing that it would be "monstrous" (*EOT* 195) to stop Whalley from captaining the ship for his daughter's sake, Van Wyk only tries to show his support by offering him his insurance policy. Considering how differently the concept of plurality functions in the two novels, *Under Western Eyes* proves to be a more complex novel than *The End of the Tether* in terms of the question of morality.

While almost all the characters believe that Razumov is a trustworthy person, he has difficulty in realizing and understanding this fact. He blames Haldin and Natalia for having confidence in him. The narrator has a very critical role in terms of plurality because as he provides conflicting explanations about Razumov, we cannot trust him. His ambivalence in terms of the words he uses, his narrative technique, his Western stance and his feelings for Natalia makes him an unreliable character. The narrator's moving in and out of the story and adding more than what Razumov's diary presents especially make the reader responsible for taking action to analyze Razumov in terms of ethical concerns. Bakhtin's aesthetic seeing aims to bring the literary character into real life by analyzing him in detail. Accordingly, just as Razumov needs to hear others' value judgments, the readers of *Under Western Eyes* need other characters' perspectives to understand Razumov.

When we turn to Whalley, it is clear that he cannot be claimed to be reasonable in his decisions because he does not receive a positive response from Ivy or the Serang. Despite his total devotion to his daughter, Ivy does not seem to love her father as much as he loves her. Although Whalley trusts her judgments and believes that she understands him without even talking and that they share common feelings, Ivy responds to him apathetically with just an obscure nod or lack of tears upon hearing of Whalley's death. The father-daughter relationship does not seem to be as strong as Whalley thinks and the love seems to be one-sided. Ivy's expectation from her father seems to be only financial. She does not know or try to understand Whalley's problems. Similarly, despite Whalley's confidence in his assistant and their connection to

each other from their work on the previous ship, the Serang cannot realize that Whalley is going blind. While the reader wants to justify Whalley for his excessive devotion to his daughter and his trust in his assistant in navigating the ship through his blindness, there occurs some doubt as to whether Whalley is making correct judgments. In this way, it is not difficult to see that toward both Razumov and Whalley the writer has an obscure attitude by presenting both positive and lacking sides of their personalities. That is why we cannot claim the protagonists are totally moral or immoral.

When looked at from the aspect of empathy and love, both characters are found sympathetic by the reader despite their wrongdoings mainly because they are not evil characters and they show answerability for their acts, suffering the consequences of what they have done. Both Razumov and Whalley are analyzed as people are evaluated in real life in accordance with Bakhtin's understanding. The reader performs active and objective empathizing, evaluating the character in his own particulars in as much detail as possible without expecting anything for her own benefit from the analysis.

Neither of the characters is ordinary. They have a respectable school and career background. Together with their moral decency and good physical appearance, they create a hero-like image for the reader. The fatality they experience puts them in the place of "helpless prey" (*UWE* 37). Both characters are acceptable in terms of morality when compared to the evil characters in the novels. Razumov still confesses although any suspicion over him was cleared because he cannot tolerate the fake life he is leading. He suffers the consequences of his deed. He has lost his future, the woman he loves and his health. Similarly, Whalley commits suicide because he knows that from his perspective he cannot carry the weight of not being able to fulfil his responsibility for his daughter.

Both Razumov and Whalley are brought to real life through this analysis, and a bridge between the literary world and real life is built. We do not meet spotless characters in the good stories of Conrad because in real life

people are not totally moral or totally evil either. We definitely sympathize with Razumov and Whalley and by evaluating them we contribute to their value. By being commented on by many readers, the characters gain the wholeness Bakhtin desires them to have. Their lacking points are revealed, they are discussed and the characters are made more complete each time. By being talked about in different places and in different time periods, the characters are deemed to become immortal in a way.

This analysis brings us to Bakhtin's idea of "great time" as a suggestion for further research. Just as Bakhtin emphasizes the never ending nature of the contribution of different value judgments, or as he stresses the eventfulness of Being, he also sees the world as everlasting, and he calls the active process of this expansion "great time". In a few pages in *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*, we see Bakhtin implying the notion of "great time"; however, he does not name it at this point. For Bakhtin, "time is not a line, but a complex form of a rotating body" (Shepherd 49). Like a ball of yarn that gets bigger with several threads being rolled over, one gets enriched with the presence of the past, with the dialogues he has over time, and with the potential he has for the future. Everything remains active, and thus unforgotten in "great time". As Bakhtin's famous quotation puts it: "Nothing is absolutely dead: every meaning will have its homecoming festival. The problem of great time." (*Speech* 170).

The characters presented in the novels chosen for this study enter into "great time" thanks to the moral profundity they illustrate. They continue to be evaluated by readers of various periods. The novels, for this reason, contribute to the world of literature, and thus achieve the eventual purpose. "Great time" provides a unique perspective in the evaluation of life and specifically of literary texts because "in great time nothing loses its significance. . . . [N]othing dies, but everything is renewed. With every new step forward our previous steps acquire a new, additional meaning" (Bakhtin qtd. in Shepherd 33-4). Thus, with each new evaluation, works with such potential gain more insight and significance. This is how great works of great writers exceed their

time, even their writer, and become immortal. Through the unfinalized conclusion they offer, they contribute to the world of literature. They provide discussions enriched by the past, which enables them to flourish in the future:

> Works break the bounds of their time, they live in the centuries, that is to say, in great time; furthermore, they often (in the case of great works, always) live a more intense and fuller life than in their own present moment. (Bakhtin qtd. in Shepherd 33)

To conclude, Razumov and Captain Whalley, having entered "great time", prove to be ethically decent characters. As they take full responsibility for their actions and suffer the consequences of their acts, it is not difficult to see that these characters are not evil. In this study, Razumov and Captain Whalley are evaluated by showing respect to their particular situation. Their particulars have great importance that cannot be overlooked as they lead the protagonists to act the way they do. The different value judgments presented by the other characters and the narrator are taken into consideration in order to sustain the democratic platform Bakhtin demands. Furthermore, the reader's empathy and love for the protagonists are expressed in accordance with the reader response, which becomes possible through the protagonists themselves, the other characters and the narrator. These three aspects of Bakhtinian ethical understanding are used in the study to analyze the ethical dilemmas the protagonists go through, and as a result of such an analysis, it is concluded that neither Razumov nor Captain Whalley can be seen as totally immoral. They do not need to be perfectly guilt-free. On the contrary, the reader loves them even with their mistakes, and it is this love that will maintain the continuity of the Conrad corpus and allow it to speak to new audiences of different times.

REFERENCES

Ambrosini, Richard. "A Memoir 'in the shape of a novel': Making the 'still voice' of Conrad's Polish Past Resonate in *A Personal Record*." *Joseph Conrad's Authorial Self: Polish and Other*, edited by Wieslaw Krajka, vol. 27 of *Conrad: Eastern and Western Perspectives*. 27 vols. to date. 1992- . Maria Curie-Sklodowska U, Columbia UP, 2008. pp. 37-55.

Baines, Jocelyn. *Joseph Conrad: A Critical Biography*. McGraw Hill, 1960.

Bakhtin, M. M. *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*. Translated and notes by V. Liapunov, edited by V. Liapunov and M. Holquist, U of Texas P, 1993.

--- . "Art And Answerability." *Art And Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, edited by Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov, U of Texas P, 1990, pp. 1-3.

--- . *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. U of Texas P, 1986.

Berthoud, Jacques. *Joseph Conrad: The Major Phase*. Cambridge UP, 1978.

Billy, Ted. *A Wilderness of Words: Closure and Disclosure in Conrad's Fiction*. Texas Tech UP, 1997.

Blackburn, Simon. *Ethics: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford UP, 2001.

Conrad, Joseph. *A Personal Record: Some Reminiscences*. Cosimo Classics, 2005.

--- . *The End of the Tether*. *Heart of Darkness and Other Stories*, Wordsworth Classics, 1999, pp. 109-219.

--- . *Under Western Eyes*. Oxford UP, 2008.

Emerson, Caryl. "Bakhtin at 100: Art, Ethics, and the Architectonic Self." *The Centennial Review*, vol. 39, no. 3, 1995, pp. 397-418. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/23739353.

Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphne. "The Conradian Subject-in-Process: The Question of Ethics in *Under Western Eyes*." *The Conradian*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2011, pp. 95-105. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/23264511.

Hammersley, Martyn, and Anna Traianou. *Ethics in Qualitative Research: Controversies and Contexts*. Sage, 2012.

Hampson, Robert. *Joseph Conrad: Betrayal and Identity*. St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Hepburn, Allan. "Above Suspicion: Audience and Deception in *Under Western Eyes*." *Studies in the Novel* 24.3 (1992): 282-297. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/29532873.

Hollander, Rachel. "Thinking Otherwise: Ethics and Politics in Joseph Conrad's *Under Western Eyes*." *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 38, no. 3, 2015, pp. 1-19. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/jmodelite.38.3.1.

Holquist, Michael. "Introduction: The Architectonics of Answerability." *Art and Answerability*, edited by Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov, U of Texas P, 1990, pp. ix-xlix.

Hughes, Gerard J. *Aristotle: On Ethics*. Routledge, 2001.

Juzwik, Mary. "Towards an Ethics of Answerability: Reconsidering Dialogism in Sociocultural Literary Research." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 55, no. 3, 2004, pp. 536-567. *Research Gate*, doi: 10.2307/4140698.

Kerr, Douglas. "Conrad and the 'Three Ages of Man': 'Youth,' 'The Shadow-Line', 'The End of the Tether'." *The Conradian*, vol. 23, no. 2, 1998, pp. 27-44. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20874136.

Long, Andrew. "The Secret Policeman's Couch: Informing, Confession, and Interpellation in Conrad's 'Under Western Eyes'." *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 35, no. 4, 2003, pp. 490-509. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/29533601.

McGrath, Patrick. "Conrad's 'The End of the Tether'." *The Conradian*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2007, pp. 43-46. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20873611.

Morson, Gary Saul, and Caryl Emerson. *Rethinking Bakhtin: Extensions and Challenges*. Northwestern UP, 1989.

Mulry, David. "Untethered: Conrad's Narrative Modernity in 'The End of the Tether'." *The Conradian*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2008, pp. 18-29. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20873639.

Najder, Zdzislaw. *Conrad in Perspective: Essays on Art and Fidelity*. Cambridge UP, 1997.

Nealon, Jeffrey T. "The Ethics of Dialogue: Bakhtin and Levinas." *College English*, vol. 59, no. 2, 1997, pp. 129-148. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/378545.

O'Neill, Onora. "Kantian Ethics." *A Companion to Ethics*, edited by Peter Singer, Blackwell Publishing, 1993.

Pence, Greg. "Virtue Theory." *A Companion to Ethics*, edited by Peter Singer, Blackwell Publishing, 1993.

Pettersson, Torsten. *Consciousness and Time: A Study in the Philosophy and Narrative Technique of Joseph Conrad*. Åbo Akademi, 1982.

Rachels, James, and Stuart Rachels. *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*. 5th ed., McGraw Hill, 2007.

Rizzuto, Nicole. "Ethical Limits and Confession in Conrad's 'Under Western Eyes' and 'Poland Revisited'" *Twentieth Century Literature*, vol. 59, no. 1, 2013, pp. 79-103. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/24247111.

Shepherd, David. "A Feeling for History? Bakhtin and 'The Problem of Great Time." *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 84, no. 1, 2006, pp. 32-51. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/4214214.

A. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

JOSEPH CONRAD'IN *UNDER WESTERN EYES* VE *THE END OF THE TETHER* ESERLERİNDEKİ BAŞ KARAKTERLERİN ETİK İKİLEMLERİNİN BAKHTİNSEL İNCELEMESİ

Joseph Conrad eserlerinde hayata dair derin meseleleri ve ahlakın hayatın içindeki yerini ele alır. Romanlarının öne çıkan özelliklerinden bir tanesi onun etik anlayışının estetik anlayışından ayrılamayacağını göstermesidir. Ahlak anlayışını ele alma şekli eserlerinin detaylı bir şekilde tekrar tekrar incelenmesini değer hale getirmiştir. Conrad'ın etik bakış açısı *A Personal Record* eserindeki önsözünde belirttiği meşhur ifadesinde yer alır:

> Beni okuyanlar dünyanın, geçici dünyanın, birkaç temel fikre dayandığı inancımı bilirler; o kadar temeldirler ki muhtemelen tepeler kadar eskidirler. Diğerlerinin yanında özellikle Sadakat fikrine dayanır. (my trans.; xxi)

Conrad'ın sadakat fikrine ilgisi ulusal ve kişisel durumuna dayanmak üzere iki yönlüdür. Ulusal yönü Polonya'nın 18. yüzyılda Prusya, Rusya ve Avusturya tarafından bölünmesine dayanır. Bu bağlamda Zdzislaw Najder sadakat kavramının Polonya'nın bağımsızlığını kaybetmesinn ardından Leh edebiyatında yaygın bir konu olduğunu ve bu kavramın kullanımının sadece Conrad'a özgü olmadığını ileri sürse de (Najder 13, 203), Conrad *Under Western Eyes*'ın yazarın notu kısmında farklı bir iddiada bulunur. Tarihsel ve kalıtsal olarak edindiği adalet duygusunun kendisi icin cok önemli olduğunu belirtir ve eserini yaratırken olabildiğince adil ve nesnel olmaya calıştığını ileri sürer (*UWE* 281). Bu çaba bize ahlakı ve özellikle de sadakati Conrad için özel yapan birşeyler olduğunu gösterir. Conrad döneminin siyasi görüşlerini reddinden ebeveynlerini kaybetmesine ve dine karşı hissettiği hayal kırıklığına kadar birçok ikilem yaşamıştır. Fakat muhtemelen en büyük ikilemi başka bir ülkenin vatandaşı olmayı seçmesi ve eserlerini yabancı bir dilde yazması

nedeniyle yaşamıştır. Be nedenden dolayı ağır şekilde eleştirilmiş, ulusuna sadakatsizlikle suçlanmıştır. Eleştirilere cevaben *A Personal Record*'u yazmış ve suçlamaları kabul etmediğini gerekçeleriyle belirtmesine rağmen yarattığı karakterler gibi Conrad da hayatında hem sadık hem de sadakatsiz olmuştur. Sadakat konusu ona hayatı boyunca eşlik etmiş ve eserlerinde ana konu olarak ortaya çıkmaya devam etmiştir. Peki Conrad'ın karakterlerini davranışları sonucunda sadık veya sadakatsiz, ya da ahlaka uygun veya uygunsuz, olarak ayırt etmek mümkün müdür?

Bu çalışma Joseph Conrad'ın *Under Western Eyes* (1911) ve *The End of the Tether* (1902) adlı eserlerindeki ahlaki soruları değerlendirerek ana karakterler Razumov ve Kaptan Whalley'nin ne ölçüde ahlaka uygun olduklarını Rus düşünür Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin'in etik bakış açısı üzerinden incelemektedir. Analiz Bakhtin'in *Toward a Philosophy of the Act* eserinde detaylandırdığı üç ana konu üzerinden yapılmıştır: baş karaktere özgü özellikler, değer yargılarının çokluğu, ve bir karakterin değerlendirilmesinde empati ve sevginin yeri. Bakhtinsel etik bakış açısını kullanarak bu çalışma Razumov ve Kaptan Whalley'nin yapmış oldukları yanlışlara rağmen tam olarak ahlaka aykırı görülemeyeceği savını ortaya koymaktadır.

Belirtilen iki romanın seçilmesinin nedeni her iki eserde de bir karakterin ahlaka hem uygun hem de uygunsuz davrandığını göstererek ahlaki ikilemin işlenmesidir. *Under Western Eyes* başarılı bir üniversite öğrencisi olan Razumov'un hayatının geri dönüşü olmayan bir şekilde mahvolmasını anlatır. Bir gün Razumov eve geldiğinde odasında üniversite arkadaşı Haldin'i bulur. Haldin devrimci bakış açısına sahiptir ve bir bakanı öldürmüştür. Razumov'dan kaçması için kendisine yardım etmesini ister. Yaşadığı şokla Razumov ona yardım edeceğini söyler fakat geleceğini ve Haldin ile ilişkisini düşündükten sonra onu yetkililere ihbar eder. Haldin sonuç olarak öldürülür. Romana göre o dönemde Rusya otokrasi ile yönetilmektedir. Razumov bir şüpheli haline gelir ve devlet tarafından Cenevre'ye casus olarak gönderilir. Orada Razumov Haldin'in devrimci bir arkadaşı rolünü üslenir. Haldin'in kendisine daha önce

söylediği gibi orada Haldin'in kızkardeşi Natalia ile karşılaşır ve ona âşık olur. Natalia'ya gerçeği söyleyip söylememe ikilemi içinde acı çekerken itiraf etmeye karar verir. Gerçeği öğrenince Natalia Razumov'u ve Cenevre'yi terk eder. Razumov sonunda kendisine sadık olmayı seçerek kendisini ızdıraptan kurtarır. Gerçeği oradaki devrimcilere de itiraf eder ve içlerinden bir tanesi Razumov'un kulak zarlarını patlatarak onu sağır bırakır. Yoldan geçen tramvayı duymadığı için çarpışma sonucu yürüyemez hale gelir. Cenevre'deki devrimci çevrede yardımcı olarak çalışan Tekla hayatının sonuna kadar Razumov'a bakmaya karar verir ve beraber Rusya'ya dönerler.

Benzer şekilde *The End of the Tether* yaşlı, emekli olmuş bir kaptanın yaşadığı ikilemi konu alır. Çok başarılı bir kaptanlık geçmişine sahip olan Whalley maddi sıkıntı yaşadığını bildiren kızı için elinde kalan son varlığı gemisini satar ve maddi durumu hakkında tüm gerçeği açıklamayarak bir gemide kaptanlık işini elde eder. Avusturalya'daki kızına destek olabilmek için paraya çok ihtiyacı olan Whalley görme yetisini kaybetmeye başlamasına rağmen gemiyi kullanmaya devam eder. Gemideki insanların hayatını tehlikeye atarak son yolculuğuna da çıkar. Geminin sahibinin kumar takıntısı nedeniyle paraya ihtiyacı vardır, bu yüzden sigorta parasını alabilmek için pusulanın yakınına hurda demir parçaları yerleştirerek gemiyi rotasından çıkartır. Herşeyini kaybettiğini düşünen Whalley demir parçalarını cebine yerleştirip kendini gemiyle berarber batarak öldürmeye karar verir.

Bu eserlerdeki etik ikilemleri inceleme çabası bizi etik felsefesi alanına götürmektedir. Antik Yunan'dan itibaren insan doğası, iyi yaşam ve bu dünyada nasıl davranılması gerektiğine yönelik bazı temel sorular cevaplanmaya çalışılmıştır. Ahlak felsefesi bu sorulara cevaben birçok teori üretmiştir fakat üç teori temel yaklaşım olarak bahsedilebilir. Bunlar erdem teorisi, deontoloji ve sonuççuluktur. Bu teoriler bu çalışma için yeterince esneklik sağlamadığından Bakhtin'in etik anlayışı kriter olarak kullanılacaktır.

Erdem teorisi Yunan filozofların katkıları ile başlamış ve özellikle Aristoteles'in *The Nicomachean Ethics* adlı eserinde geliştirilmiştir. Bu teori

bir insanın sahip olması gereken erdemler üzerine odaklıdır ve bir insanı iyi yapan erdemleri araştırır. Bir insanın asıl amacı cesaret, ölçülülük, adalet, dürüstlük, cömertlik ve arkadaşlık (Hughes 79-80) gibi değerlere sahip olarak tatmin edici ve mutlu bir hayat yaşamaktır. Bununla birlikte, erdem teorisi bazı açılardan yetersiz kalır. Erdemlerin ne olduğunu ve sınırlarını belirleme (Rachels and Rachels 188) bunlardan ikisidir. Ayrıca bu teori bireyin özel durumunu göz ardı etmektedir. Erdemler herkes için aynı olamaz. Yanlış bir davranışta bulunmamış fakat girişimde bulunmuş bir birey veya genel anlamda iyi ahlaki değerlere sahip fakat bir kez yanlış bir eylemde bulunan bir birey nasıl değerlendirilebilir gibi sorular cevapsız kalmaktadır. Bu nedenle, erdem teorisinin bütün bir yaklaşım olarak görülmektense bir etik teorisinin parçası olarak kabul edilmesi daha uygundur (Rachels and Rachels 189).

İkinci yaklaşım olan deontolojiye göre daha önceden belirlenmiş ve bireyin uyması gereken bazı kurallar vardır. Bir insanın eylemleri sonuçları göz önüne alınmaksızın doğru veya yanlış kabul edilir. Akıl ve görev sorumluluğu gibi kavramlara odaklı olan bu yaklaşımın öne çıkan temsilcisi Immanuel Kant'tır. Kant bir ilkenin evrensel olması gerektiğini savunur fakat bu yaklaşım temel ilkelerin soyut doğası ve birbirleriyle çelişme olasılıkları nedeniyle eleştirilmektedir (O'Neill 182). Bir bireyin bu ilkeleri nasıl takip edeceğine dair güçlü bir esas yoktur. Bu çalışma için en önemli eksikliği de erdem teorisi gibi kişiye bir birey olarak odaklanmıyor olmasıdır. İnsanın kişiliği, eylemi hakkındaki duyguları ve fikirleri gibi çok önemli unsurlar göz ardı edilmektedir.

Diğer bir temel yaklaşım sonuççuluktur. Bu teoriye göre bir eylemin ahlaki olup olmadığına eylemin sonuçlarına bakarak karar verilir. Sonuççuluğun en bilinen çeşidi faydacılıktır. Faydacılığa göre en fazla sayıda insan için mutluluk sağlayan eylemler doğru olanlardır. Bu yaklaşım kötü kabul edilebilecek bir eylemin uygulanması çoğunluk için olumlu sonuç yaratacak olsa bile bu eylem kabul edilebilir midir gibi bazı tartışmaya açık sorular yaratmaktadır. Teorinin diğer bir eksikliği de herkes için aynı derecede

endişe duymamızın kişisel ilişkilerimize zarar verip vermeyeceği gibi belirsizliklere cevap sağlayamamasıdır (Rachels and Rachels 107). Bu nedenle sonuççu yaklaşım açısından bakıldığında belirli eylemlerin ahlaki değerini belirlemek oldukça zordur.

Bir insanın sadık olup olmadığı ya da ahlaki açıdan faziletli olup olmadığı cevaplaması güç bir sorudur. Varolan felsefik teorilerden farklı olarak Bakhtinsel etik anlayışı bize Conrad'ın karakterlerini incelemek için daha fazla esneklik sağlamaktadır. Bu nedenle bu çalışmanın analizi için uygun bir araç olabilir.

Bakhtin varolan felsefik yaklaşımların bireyin yegâneliğini göz ardı ettiklerini ve katı kurallara sahip olduklarını düşünmektedir. Bakhtin'e göre felsefe konuşması gerekeni konuşmada başarısızdır ve sorumluluk alınacak bir eylemi belirleme konusunda yetersizdir (*Act* 19). Kendi sunduğu alternatifte Bakhtin esas ölçütünü "answerability" olarak adlandırdığı sorumluluk fikri olarak belirtir. "Answerability" kavramından ilk olarak ilk makalelerinden olan "Art and Answerability"de bahsedilmektedir. Bu terim bireyin yapmış olduğu eylem için aldığı sorumluluğa karşılık gelir. Aynı zamanda sanat ve hayat arasında kurulması gereken bağlantı da bu sorumluluğun bir parçasıdır.

Bakhtin'in etik anlayışını detaylandıran eseri *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*'tir. Bu eserde Bakhtin hayatın anlarının bir kerelik olduğuna vurgu yapar. Hayatı "once-occurrent life" olarak adlandırır. Yapılan eylemleri ve zamanı geri dödürmek mümkün değildir. Hayat ve dolayısıyla var olma eylemi aktiftir ve olaylarla doludur. Bakhtin var olmayı "Being-as-event" olarak adlandırır; kimi zaman sadece "Being" olarak da ifade eder. Geri alınması mümkün olmayan ve aktif olan hayatta uyguladığımız her eylemden sorumlu olduğumuzu belirtir. Eylemlerimiz her zaman bir süreç içerisindedir; tamamlanmamıştır. Karşımıza çıkan bir durum bize bir karar verme fırsatı sunar. İnsan kendisine halihazırda verilmiş olan düzen – "given" – ile yetinmeyi de tercih edebilir, bir insiyatif alıp yapması gerekeni – "oughtness" – yaparak hayatına farklı bir yön verecek bir karar de verebilir – "yet-to-

achieve". Bize verilen hayat – "given" – bizin seçimimiz olmadan bize sunulmuştur fakat "yet-to-achieve" bizim kendimizin bir karar alıp uygulaması gerekeni ifade eder. Bu ayrımın yapılmasındaki amaç bireyin kendisine verilenle yetinip o şekilde hareket eden grubun bir parçası olmayı mı kabul edeceği yoksa kendini mi bulacağını incelemektir. Bakhtin kendisine verilenle yetinen bireyleri yapar gibi görünen – "pretender" – olarak adlandırır. Bizi tamamlayacak olan şey bize verilene karşı vereceğimiz cevaptır. Herkesin ahlaki anlamda "Event-as-Being"de aktif katılımcı olma gerekliliği vardır. Bir birey uyguladığı eylemlerin tam sorumluluğunu alırsa Bakhtinsel anlamda bir eylemde bulunmuş olur.

"Being-as-event"in bütünlüğünü sağlayabilmesi ve ahlaki açıdan değerlendirilebilmesi için bazı ölçütler vardır. Bunlardan ilki bireye ait özel durumun – "particularity" – dikkate alınmasıdır. Bakhtinin etik anlayışında yer alan en önemli konulardan bir tanesi bireyin yegâneliğidir. Bir insanın kişisel farklılıkları onun eylemlerindeki insani dokunuşlardır ve onu diğerlerinden ayıran özelliklerdir. Bakhtine gore insanları genelleyemeyiz. Her birey kendi özellikleriyle vardır ve diğerlerinden farklıdır. Bakhtin'in ahlak dünyasında bir birey eşsizdir çünkü kararlarını var olan bir kurala gore değil kendi yargısının sonucunda verir. Sonuç olarak birey kendi özel durumu içinde değerlendirilmelidir. Eğer bir birey eşsiz olmayı bırakırsa yaşamıyor demektir; geçen an o kişi için var olmamıştır (*Act* 16). Birey yaptığı eylem için bir bahane bulmamalı ve onun tüm sorumluluğunu almalıdır.

Aynı eylem karşısında farklı bireyler aynı şekilde değerlendirilemezler. Bireyin eşsizliği uyguladığı eylemin değerlendirilmesinde çok önemli bir rol oynar. Eşsizliği oluşturan unsurlar geçmiş durumu, kültürünün özellikleri ve kendi bakış açısı gibi öğelerdir. Bireyin her hareketinde ve kararında tüm hayatı bulunur (*Act* 16). Başka bir deyişle, kişinin eylemleri kendisine ait özelliklerden bağımsız değildir.

Ahlaki değerlendirme için gerekli olan ikinci ölçüt bakış açılarının çokluğudur. Bakhtin'e göre ben ve diğeri olmak üzere iki değer merkezi vardır.

Birey kendi merkezinden sadece sınırlı bir görüş açısına sahiptir. Kendisini tamamlayabilmesi için diğerlerinin bakış açılarını da duymaya ihtiyacı vardır. Bu iki değer merkezi birey kendisini nasıl görüyor, birey diğerlerini nasıl görüyor ve diğerleri bireyi nasıl görüyor şeklinde üç bakış açısı oluşturur. Buna göre, aynı içeriğe sahip bir durum farklı bakış açıları tarafından farklı değerlendirilir. İki insan aynı olayı farklı değerlendireceği gibi bir insan iki farklı kişinin başına gelen aynı olayı da kişilere bağlı olarak farklı değerlendirecektir. Bir insanın eyleminin veya kararının nedeni bazı insanların onun için diğerlerinden daha değerli olması olabilir. Bu nedenle ahlaki yargılara varmak zordur. Bakhtin en doğru kararın verilebilmesi için demokratik ortamın sağlanması gerektiğini ve tüm bakış açılarının dinlenmesi gerektiğini savunur.

Bu anlamda üçüncü ölçüt de empati ve sevgidir. Estetik bağlamda Bakhtin sanat ve hayat arasında bir bağlantı kurulması gerektiğini ileri sürer ve estetik dünyanın gerçek dünyaya teorik dünyadan daha yakın olduğunu belirtir. Bir sanat eserindeki bir karakterin değerlendirmesi de gerçek hayatta insanları değerlendirdiğimiz gibi yapılabilir çünkü Bakhtin için insan ile ilşkilendirilen her şey insani olmalıdır (*Act* 61). Bu durumda sanat ve hayatı sorumlu davranışıyla birleştirecek olan okuyucudur (*Act* 17-18) ve karakteri nesnel bir şekilde değerlendirmelidir. Bakhtin empatiyi "karakteri kendi özü içinde görmek" (my trans.; *Act* 14) şeklinde tanımlar. Okuyucu karakter için "diğer" konumundadır. Karakter kendi özellikleri içinde değerlendirilmeli, okuyucu karakterin sınırlarına saygı göstermeli, kendisi için bir kazanç beklememeli ve onu anlamlandırarak zenginleşmesine katkıda bulunmalıdır. Bunu Bakhtin'in önerdiği üzere "sevgi" ile yapabilir. Sevgi karakterin üzerine eğilmek ve onu ne kadar küçük olursa olsun tüm detaylarıyla incelemek demektir; sadece sevgi estetik açıdan üretken olabilir (*Act* 64).

Bakhtin'in etik bakış açısının önşartı olduğu üzere, Razumov ve Whalley kendilerine özgü özelliklerine göre inceleneceklerdir. Özellikler karakterlerin arka plan bilgisi, kişisel özellikleri ve bulundukları özel durumu

ifade etmektedir. Razumov ve Whalley esasen yanlış bir eylemde bulunurlar. Haldin'in kaçmasına yardım etme isteğine "evet" demesine rağmen Razumov onu devlet yetkililerine bildirir. Benzer şekilde Whalley görme yetisini kaybetmesine rağmen gemideki insanların hayatlarını tehlikeye atarak geminin kaptanlığını yapmaya devam eder. Her iki karakterin kabahati elde olmayan bir falaket sonucudur. Karakterler Haldin'in ortaya çıkması ve Whalley'in âmâ olmasından dolayı suçlanamazlar. Nihayetinde bir karar alırlar ve bu karar güçlüklere yol açar. Bu çalışma ana karakterlerin özel durumlarının kararlarını ne derece etkilediğini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

İnceleme yapılan ilk konu karakterlerin özel durumlarıdır. Razumov'un özel durumu üç yönden oluşur: bir ailesisnin olmaması, Rus kimliği ve Haldin ile belirsiz olan ilişkisi. Hiçbir ailevi bağı bulunmadığı için Razumov o kadar aidiyet duygusu hasreti çekmektedir ki insanlardan gördüğü her küçük yakınlığa karşı hassasiyetini belirtir. Riskli adımlar atmaya çekinir çünkü suçlu bulunması veya sadece şüphelenilmesi durumunda bile onu koruyacak veya destekleyecek birisinin olmadığını bilir. Rus kimliği tereddütünü artırır çünkü Rusya'da otokratik yönetim mevcuttur ve insanlar fikirlerini açıklama konusunda tam özgür değillerdir. Otokrasi kişisel özgürlük için fazla alan sağlamaz, fakat Razumov devlete daha yakın bir duruş sergilemektedir çünkü ileride akademisyen olmak istemektedir ve kariyerini devletin sağlayacağı yol aracılığıyla gerçekleştirecektir. Bir ailesi olmadığı için, aidiyet duygusunu yönlendirebileceği bir bağlantıya ihtiyacı vardır ve o bağlantıyı da da ülkesi oluşturur. Haldin'in ortaya çıkışı Razumov için tamamen beklenmedik ve şok edicidir. Razumov yukarıda belirtilen nedenlerden dolayı ona yardım edemeyeceği için, Haldin ile ilişkisinin yakınlığını düşünür. Haldin Razumov'a güvendiği için onu seçtiğini belirtse de okuyucu Razumov'un Haldin'i yetkililere bildirmekten başka seçeneğinin olmadığını düşünmesi konusunda haklı bulur çünkü onun yanında duracak bir ailesi yoktur ve kendine sadık olanları bile yok eden otokratik Rusya'da yaşamaktadır. Bununla birlikte, Razumov'un göz ardı ettiği bir husus vardır. Güven karşılıklı olmak

durumunda değildir. Haldin'in kendisine olan güvenini anlamlandıramasa da Haldin onun devrimci idealleri anladığını ve devletin ondan şüphelenmeyeceğini düşünür. Fakat Haldin'in göremediği bir şey de vardır. Razumov düşündüğü gibi devrimci fikirlere anlayışı veya sempatisi olan biri değildir ve otokrasi kimseye merhamet göstermez. İki karakter arasındaki iletişim eksikliği ikisinin aynı konu üzerine farklı bakış açıları yaratmasına neden olmuştur. Bakhtin'in belirttiği gibi, farklı görüşler insanları farklı kararlara koşullandırır. Bu nedenle insanlar hakkında kesin sonuçlara varmak kolay değildir. Okuyucu Razumov'un özel durumunu anlamakta ve hatalarını gerekçeleyebilmektedir. Razumov bir okul arkadaşına ihanet eden kişi olarak kınanamaz çünkü özel durumu göz ardı edilemez ve Haldin ile aralarında böyle bir riski almaya yardımcı olacak bir yakınlık yoktur. Razumov'un perspektifinden bakıldığında, Razumov'un başka bir seçeneği yoktur. Bu nedenle onun davranışı bir ihanet olarak görülemez ve Razumov tamamıyla sadakatsiz olarak adlandırılamaz.

Benzer şekilde, Whalley'nin özel durumu da üç unsurdan oluşur: Whalley'nin yaşadığı maddi zorluk, kızına olan sevgisi ve görme yetisini kaybetmesi. Whalley bankada bulunan parasını bankanın iflas etmesi sonucu kaybeder. Kendini asgari şartlarda geçindirecek kadar bir hayat sürdürmektedir. Bir gün kızının Avusturalya'da bir misafirhane açmak için babasından istediği parayı sağlayabilmek için gemisini satar ve çalışmak için bir iş bulur. Tüm ek masraflarını kesmistir, bir otelin gösterişsiz bir odasında kalmaktadır ve odaklandığı tek şey Ivy'ye para yetiştirebilmektir. Kızını o kadar sevmektedir ki sattığı gemiden geriye kalanı da kızı için ayırdığını birçok kez belirtir. Kendisi de maddi sıkıntı çekmesine rağmen o paradan tek bir cent dahi harcamak istemez. Whalley kızına aşırı derecede ilgi gösterir fakat Ivy'nin babasına olan cevapları kısıtlı ve sevgi gösterisinden uzaktır. Babasının ölüm haberini aldığında dahi Ivy ağlamaz. Bu duygusuzluk baba-kız ilişkisinin Whalley'nin belirttiği gibi olma konusunda şüpheler uyandırmakta ve Whalley'nin hatasını anlamamızı zorlaştırmaktadır. Whalley'nin görme yetisini

kaybetmesine rağmen gemiyi kullanmaya devam etmesi insanları tehlikeye atmaktadır ve bu hiçe sayılamaz. Onun hatası Razumov'unkinden birçok insanın hayatını tehlikeye atması bakımından ayrılır. Fakat onun hatasının arkasındaki gerekçe bir babanın kızına olan bağlılığıdır. Whalley kızının maddi sıkıntısını desteklemek için elinden gelenin en iyisini yapmaya çalışmaktadır.

Romanlardaki etik analiz adına dikkate alınması gereken bir diğer husus bakış açısı çokluğudur. Değer yargılarının çokluğu okuyucuya çok renkli karakterler sunar ve bu da okuyucunun belirli bir karara varmasını zorlaştırır. Bu, Conrad'ın yaklaşımı ile de örtüşmektedir. Okuyucu son kararı yazarın belirli karakterlere yakınlığını hissetmeden vermektedir. İncelemenin bakış açısı çokluğu yönü iki romanda kendini farklı şekilde göstermektedir. *Under Western Eyes*'da bakış açısı çokluğu ana karakter ile diğer karakterler arasında bir uyuşmazlık olduğunu göstermektedir. *The End of the Tether*'da ise bakış açısı çokluğu okuyucuyu Whalley'nin kararlarının ne kadar mantıklı olduğunu sorgulamaya yöneltir. Diğerlerinin kendisi hakkında fikirlerini öğrendikten sonra Razumov Bakhtinsel açıdan zenginleşir. Kendisi hakkında kendi görüşünde bulunan eksikleri tamamlamayı başarmıştır. Hayatın toplumsal bir şey olduğunu anlamıştır (*UWE* 40). Razumov bir insanın her ne kadar diğerlerinden uzak kalmaya çalışırsa çalışsın toplumun bir parçası olmayı engelleyemediğini görmüştür; bir insan diğerleriyle iletişim kurarak tam bir bakış açısı elde edebilir ve daha makul davranabilir. Diğer bir yandan, Whalley bakış açısını tamamlayamaz. Ivy ve Serang'ın onun hakkında ne düşündüklerini öğrenemez. Whalley Razumov gibi bir gelişim gösterememektedir çünkü acı çekmesinin nedeni eksik bakış açısı değildir. Whalley'nin çevresindeki insanlardan sadece Van Wyk Whalley'yi gerçekten anladığını ve önemsediğini ortaya koyar. Van Wyk Whalley hakkında fikirlerini belirten tek karakterdir. Van Wyk Whalley'nin ne yapması gerektiğini söyleyerek onu sonlandırmıyor ve yaşamasına izin veriyor. Whalley içinde bulunduğu ikilemi anlattığında onu dinliyor. Kızının uğruna gemiyi kullanmayı bırakmasını söylemenin "korkunç" (my trans.; *EOT* 195) olacağını

bildiği için Van Wyk ona sigorta poliçesini sunarak sadece desteğini göstermeye çalışıyor. Bakış açısı çokluğunun iki eserde işlevini nasıl yerine getirdiği göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, ahlak konusu açışından *Under Western Eyes*'ın *The End of the Tether*'dan daha karmaşık bir eser olduğu görülmektedir.

Neredeyse tüm karakterler Razumov'un güvenilir bir insan olduğunu düşünürken, kendisi o şekilde görüldüğü gerçeğini fark etme ve anlama konusunda zorlanmaktadır. Kendisine güvendikleri için Haldin ve Natalia'yı suçlar. Anlatıcı bakış açısı çokluğu konusunda hassas bir role sahiptir çünkü Razumov hakkında birbiriyle çelişen açıklamalar yaptığı için okuyucu ona güvenemez. Kullandığı kelimeler, anlatım tekniği, Batılı duruşu ve Natalia'ya olan hisleri konularındaki müphemliği onu güvenilmez bir anlatıcı yapmaktadır. Anlatıcının hikâyeye girip çıkması ve Razumov'un günlüğünün sunduğundan daha fazlasını eklemesi okuyucuyu Razumov'u etik konular açısından incelemek için özellikle sorumlu hale getirmektedir. Bakhtin'in estetik değerlendirme fikri edebi karakteri detaylı şekilde inceleme sonucu gerçek hayata kazandırmayı amaçlar. Buna uygun olarak, Razumov'un kendisini tamamlayabilmesi için diğer karakterlerin bakış açısını duymaya ihtiyacı olduğu gibi *Under Western Eyes* okuyucularının da Razumov'u anlamak için diğer karakterlerin bakış açılarına ihtiyacı vardır.

Whalley'ye baktığımızda, onun kararlarında makul olduğunun iddia edilemeyeceği aşikârdır çünkü Ivy veya Serang'dan olumlu bir cevap almaz. Kızına olan tam bağlılığına rağmen, Ivy babasını onun kızını sevdiği kadar sevmiyor görünmektedir. Whalley kızının muhakemesine güvenmesine, kızının onu konuşmadan bile anladığına ve ortak hislere sahip olduklarına inanmasına rağmen Ivy onu kayıtsız şekilde sadece belirsiz bir baş sallama ile veya Whalley'nin ölümünü duyduğunda gözyaşı dökmemesi şeklinde karşılık vermektedir. Baba-kız ilişkisi Whalley'nin düşündüğü kadar güçlü olmayıp sevgi tek taraflı gibi görünmektedir. Ivy'nin babasından beklentileri sadece maddi gibi görünmektedir. Ivy Whalley'nin sorunlarını bilmiyor ve anlamaya

çalışmıyor. Benzer şekilde, Whalley'nin yardımcısına olan güveni ve aralarındaki bir önceki gemide beraber çalışmalarından kaynaklı bağa rağmen Serang Whalley'nin görme yetisini kaybettiğini fark edememektedir. Okuyucu Whalley'nin kızına aşırı bağlılığını ve yardımcısına âmâlığı nedeniyle gemiyi yönetme konusunda güvenini anlamak istese de Whalley'nin doğru yargılarda bulunup bulunmadığı konusunda şüpheleri oluşmaktadır. Bu anlamda, yazarın Razumov ve Whalley'nin kişiliklerindeki hem olumlu hem de eksik yönleri göstererek onlara karşı belirsiz bir tutum sergilediğini görmek zor değildir. Bu nedenle ana karakterlerin tam olarak ahlaka uygun veya uygunsuz olduğunu söyleyemeyiz.

Empati ve sevgi açısından bakıldığında, her iki karakter de hatalarına rağmen okuyucunun sempatisini kazanmaktadır. Bunun ana nedeni ana karakterlerin kötü olmamaları ve yaptıklarının sonuçlarına katlanarak davranışlarının sorumluluklarını almalarıdır. Razumov ve Whalley gerçek hayatta insanların değerlendirildiği gibi ve Bakhtin'in etik anlayışına uygun olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Okuyucu analizden hiçbir beklenti gözetmeksizin karakterleri kendi özellikleri içinde mümkün olduğunca detaylı bir şekilde değerlendirerek aktif ve nesnel empati kurmuştur.

Razumov ve Whalley'nin ikisi de sıradan karakterler değildir. Sırasıyla kayda değer bir akademi ve kariyer deneyimleri vardır. Ahlaki uygunlukları ve olumlu dış görünüşleri ile okuyucuya kahramansı bir imaj çizerler. Yaşadıkları felaket onları "çaresiz bir kurban" (my trans.; *UWE* 37) konumuna sokmuştur. İki karakter de iki romandaki kötü karakterlerle kıyaslandığında ahlaki açıdan kabul edilebilir karakterlerdir. Razumov üzerindeki şüphe kalkmasına rağmen yine de itirafta bulunur çünkü sürdürdüğü sahte hayata tahammül edemez. Yaptığının sonucunda acı çeker. Gelecegini, sevdiği kadını ve sağlığını kaybeder. Benzer şekilde, Whalley intihar eder çünkü kendi bakış açısından bakıldığında kızına karşı sorumluluğunu yerine getirememe yükünü taşıyamaz.

Bu analizle Razumov ve Whalley gerçek hayata kazandırılmıştır ve edebi hayatla gerçek hayat arasında bir köprü kurulmuştur. Conrad'ın iyi

hikâyelerinde kusursuz karakterlere rastlamayız çünkü gerçek hayatta da insanlar tamamıyla ahlaka uygun veya uygunsuz değillerdir. Okuyucu Razumov ve Whalley'ye sempati duyar ve onları değerlendirerek onların değerlerine katkıda bulunur. Birçok okur tarafından üzerlerine yorum yapılıyor ve karakterler Bakhtin'in sahip olmalarını istediği bütünlüğü kazanıyorlar. Eksik olan yönleri ortaya çıkarılıyor, üzerine tartışılıyor ve her seferinde daha eksiksiz hale geliyorlar. Farklı mekân ve zamanlarda konuşularak karakterler bir nevi ölümsüzleşiyorlar.

Bu analiz bizi Bakhtin'in "great time" fikrine götürüyor. Bakhtin farklı bakış açılarının hiç bitmeyen katkısını veya "Varlığın hareketliliğini" vuguladığı gibi dünyayı da ebedi görür ve bu genişlemenin aktif sürecini "great time" olarak adlandırır. *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*'in birkaç sayfasında Bakhtin'in bu kavramı ima ettiğini görürüz fakat adını henüz koymaz. Bakhtin için zaman çizgisel bir olgu değil dönen, karmaşık bir yapıdır (Shepherd 49). Bir yumağın birçok ipin üzerine sarılmasıyla giderek büyüdüğü gibi insan da geçmişin varlığı, zaman içinde kurduğu diyaloglar ve geleceğe dair potansiyeli ile zenginleşir. "Great time"da herşey aktif ve unutulmaz kalır.

Bu çalışma için seçilen romanlardaki karakterler gösterdikleri ahlaki derinlik sayesinde "great time"a girerler. Farklı dönem okuyucuları tarafından değerlendirilmeye devam ederler. Bu nedenle romanlar edebiyat dünyasına katkıda bulunur ve dolayısıyla nihai amaca ulaşırlar. "Great time" hayatın ve özellikle de edebi metinlerin değerlendirilmesine eşsiz bir bakış açısı sağlar çünkü "great time"da hiçbir şey önemini kaybetmez.

Sonuç olarak, Razumov ve Kaptan Whalley "great time"a da girerek ahlaki açıdan kabul edilebilir olduklarını kanıtlarlar. Yaptıkları için tam sorumluluk aldıkları ve yaptıklarının sonucunda acı çektikleri için bu karakterlerin kötü olmadıkları aşikârdır. Bu çalışmada Razumov ve Kaptan Whalley özel durumlarına saygı gösterilerek değerlendirilmişlerdir. Özel durumları onları kararlarına yönelttiği için göz ardı edilemez ve büyük öneme sahiptir. Diğer karakterler ve anlatıcı tarafından sunulan farklı bakış açıları

Bakhtin'in beklediği demokratik ortamı oluşturmak için dikkate alınmıştır. Ana karakterlerin kendisi, diğer karakterler ve anlatıcı sayesinde oluşan okuyucunun ana karakterlere duyduğu sempati ve sevgisi okur odaklılığa uygun şekilde ifade edilmiştir. Bakhtinsel etik anlayışının bu üç yönü ana karakterlerin deneyimlediği etik ikilemlerin incelenmesinde kullanılmış ve bu incelemenin sonucunda Razumov ve Kaptan Whalley'nin tam anlamıyla ahlaka uygunsuz olmadıkları sonucuna varılmıştır. Karakterlerin tamamen suçsuz olmaları gerekmemektedir. Bilakis, okuyucu onları hatalarına rağmen sevmektedir ve Conrad eserlerinin devamlılığını ve farklı dönemlerden yeni okuyuculara ulaşmasını sağlayacak olan bu sevgidir.

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 : Ünal
Adı / Name : Nergis
Bölümü / Department : İngiliz Edebiyatı

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English) :

A Bakhtinian Analysis of the Protagonists' Ethical Dilemma in Joseph Conrad's *Under Western Eyes* and *The End of the Tether*

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 ...……