OTHERNESS, RECOGNITION AND POWER:

THE HEGELIAN THEMES IN JOHN FOWLES'S *THE COLLECTOR*

by

SEUNGJAE LEE

(Under the Direction of Ronald Bogue)

ABSTRACT

This study explores the problematic interpersonal relationship between the two main characters, the captor Clegg and the captive Miranda, in John Fowles's *The Collector*, drawing upon Hegel's ideas of otherness, recognition and power in his master-slave dialectic. First, it presents the problem of otherness that takes place in the unexpected encounter of the two sharply contrasting characters, with an emphasis on their mutual incomprehensibility. Second, it demonstrates that their relationship is characterized by what Hegel calls "the struggle for recognition." Finally, it examines the dynamics of their power relationship by analyzing their relationship in terms of a struggle between master and slave. It concludes that as an objective approach to the two characters, the Hegelian reading of *The Collector* allows us to see the novel as a critique of domination, that is, as an analysis of the necessary failure of self-other relationships based on non-mutual recognition and power, rather than as a case-study of male abnormal behavior or as a parable about the triumph of evil over good.

INDEX WORDS: Bluebeard, double narration, collector mentality, Hegel's master-slave dialectic, otherness, recognition, power

OTHERNESS, RECOGNITION AND POWER:

THE HEGELIAN THEMES IN JOHN FOWLES'S THE COLLECTOR

by

SEUNGJAE LEE

B.A., Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Korea, 1999

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTERS OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2005

OTHERNESS, RECOGNTION AND POWER:

THE HEGELIAN THEMES IN JOHN FOWLES'S *THE COLLECTOR*

by

SEUNGJAE LEE

Major Professor:	Ronald Bogue
Committee:	Karim Traore
	Masaki Mori

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2005

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Jong Soo Lee and Jeong Soon Kim.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There have been a number of people without whom this thesis could not have been completed. Most of all, I wish to record my thanks to my major professor, Dr. Ronald Bogue, for his constant encouragement and assistance during this long production. I also would like to thank my committee members: Dr. Karim Traore for his flexibility with me and his kind encouragement; and Dr. Masaki Mori for his generous appraisal of this work.

I am also grateful to my colleagues, Paulo Oneto and Letitia Guran, who remained encouraging and full of useful suggestions. My gratitude also goes to the supervisor of the Korean program, Dr. Hyangsoon Yi, for her continued support for my Korean teaching during my graduate studies. I also wish to thank those who worked with me in the Korean program, Soo Jung Chang and Jiyoung Daniel for their love and friendship. Finally, as always, my family have been there, providing all sorts of tangible and intangible support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Throughout our lives we encounter otherness as something that is not-us, since otherness appears to imply something being other-than-us. In other words, since our lives involve social interactions with various people having different backgrounds, values, norms, and ideals, we should experience the qualities that are different from our own. Thus, how to deal with otherness is indeed an important matter that should not be overlooked. The dimensions of otherness are very extensive: age, ethnicity, race, gender, class, educational background, religious beliefs, and so forth. On the simplest level, there are two ways of dealing with otherness; that is, when we encounter a person's otherness, we can avoid it as unacceptable or acknowledge it as necessary to extend our understanding of the other and its world. In the post-modern paradigm, however, the idea of diversity has been more favored than ever, so now it seems quite natural to acknowledge otherness as a necessary part of our living in the world. However, the process of recognizing the otherness of the other is not always successful. Indeed, we know that in this world, there are innumerable conflicts between individuals, sexes, classes, groups, societies, and nations. And some conflicts lead to violence, domination, and subjection.

Here, then, let us suppose a literary world depicting an extreme situation of conflict that might happen somewhere in the real world: two human beings encounter each other and are put side by side in an underground cell remote from the world. There is no escape unless one wins over the other. They are markedly different in their values, norms, and ideals, and they are completely incapable of understanding each other. There is contrast after contrast in every

aspect. So, what will happen next? What should they do in order to survive, that is, to escape from the situation? Will they use violence? Or is there any room for compromise?

Such an extreme situation is hard to imagine, but in fact the English novelist John Fowles delves into just such a life-and-death struggle in his novel *The Collector*. Published as his literary debut in 1963, *The Collector* is a story of the abduction and imprisonment of Miranda Grey by Frederic Clegg. The book has two major characters only, the kidnapper/captor Frederick Clegg and his victim/captive Miranda Grey. The story of the novel can be summarized as follows. A lower-middle-class worker, Frederick Clegg, starts watching a beautiful art student, Miranda Grey, entering and leaving her house, across the street from the town hall in which he works. He then falls in love with her. But he knows well that his love is unrealistic because of their class difference. Thus, she becomes no more than the object of his fantasy. Clegg hates his job and the other workers there. His only delight is in collecting rare butterflies. He is an amateur lepidopterist, sometimes attending the local "Bug Section" meetings. Obsessed with watching Miranda as a voyeur, Clegg starts keeping an "observation diary" about her as he does when engaged in butterfly collecting. Thinking of her as a "rarity," Clegg turns his attention from rare butterflies to Miranda. Meanwhile, he comes to win a great deal of money in a football pool, which he has been playing weekly for the previous five years. It is his sudden wealth that incites him finally to turn his secret fantasy into a concrete reality. He buys a secluded house and fits out the cellar to accommodate Miranda; then he kidnaps the girl and holds her as his prisoner. Clegg's plans to prevent Miranda from escaping are so carefully designed that Miranda fails in all her attempts to escape. Increasingly desperate, Miranda tries to kill him with an axe. She injures him, but he is able to prevent her from escaping. Miranda's final attempt is to seduce him because she thinks sex is what he wants, but unexpectedly he is

unable to respond, feeling humiliated instead. From that point on, Clegg gradually shifts from admiring her to despising her. Finally she catches a cold which turns to pneumonia, and since to go for medical help would mean discovery, he doses her with useless patent medicines and sits by helplessly while she dies. As the novel ends, Clegg is thinking about how he will have to do things somewhat differently when he abducts a more suitable girl, someone similar to him socially. He then plans to abduct another girl working in a small local store.

At first glance, *The Collector* is a crime fiction or a thriller, but easy classification might be inappropriate, which Fowles himself made clear in an interview: "I don't want it taken as a thriller and reviewed in the crime columns" (Mockridge 21). Obviously, what Clegg does is a serious crime, and the situation is completely unfair to Miranda. But *The Collector*'s primary concern is the relationship between Clegg and Miranda, and Fowles portrays them from a neutral point of view. As Olshen suggests, the strength of the novel lies in Fowles's "imaginative psychological portraits" of the two protagonists, in which readers can look at "their intense physical and psychological power struggle" (16). In this regard, *The Collector* is better seen as a psychological novel that explores the minds of two people and their power relationship.

The Collector was an immediate success. Not often is a book with a thesis a best-seller, but *The Collector* became one. Ever since its publication, *The Collector* has attracted both readers and critics alike. The fact that it has been taken seriously by literary scholarship testifies to its literary quality (Olshen 15). Reviews were generally favorable, but judgments ranged from "a first rate novel" to a "pretentious potboiler" (Hicks 19). The book was more popular in the United States than in England, and by 1971, U.S. sales had exceeded 1 million. With its popularity in the U.S. the book was adapted for a movie, directed by William Wyler for Columbia Pictures in 1965, and John Fowles himself came to Hollywood to participate in the

adaptation process. Fowles was able to become a full-time writer after the sale of the film rights. But the result was not very satisfactory in Fowles's judgment, even though the screenwriters and William Wyler received Academy Award Nominations. Fowles was not pleased with the film, which he has described as "just passable. It ought to have been made as we originally intended to make it. That is, as a small, cheap-budget, black-and-white movie" (Aubrey 93-94). In Europe, *The Collector* was adapted for the stage first in 1966 by France Roche as *L'Obéséde* at the Théâtre des Variêtês in Paris. In 1971 in London, Jeremy Young staged an English adaptation of the novel at the King's Head Theatre Club. Focusing on the contrasting language and psychology of the two characters, the English version has been regarded as the most effective adaptation for the stage.

According to Fowles, *The Collector* was not the first novel he intended to publish. At the age of thirty-seven, he had begun writing *The Magus,* his first work, but he was soon convinced that a small-scale book would be more marketable, and he thought it important to prove that he could write well enough to get published. His draft of *The Collector* was influenced by two events. First, Fowles attended a performance of Béla Bartók's opera *Bluebeard's Castle.* Like *The Collector*, the opera is a story of women imprisoned by a man who has dreamed of being isolated with an attractive but unapproachable female. Bartók's opera is a modern adaptation of the Bluebeard theme that has frequently appeared in literature and other forms of art since the medieval age (Grace 247). The Bluebeard theme is usually situated in the discussion of male violence against women and its relation to male sexuality. In Fowles's words in an interview, "I went to see the first performance [in the 1950s] in London of Bartók's opera, *Bluebeard's Castle*. It wasn't a very good performance, but the thing that struck me was the symbolism of the man imprisoning women underground" (McNally 219). Second, an actual incident led to his

conception of *The Collector*. About a year after the performance, Fowles read an account in a local newspaper of a young man who captured a girl and imprisoned her for over three months in an air-raid shelter outside London. As for this incident, Fowles said that "There were many peculiar features about this case that fascinated me" (Newquist 219).

Fowles's conception of the novel can also be attributed to its period of composition. As Thomas Foster comments, the late 1950s and early 1960s saw a considerable number of sociopathic protagonists and antiheroes in fiction and drama, from the small-time hustlers and petty criminals of the American Beat writers through the "angry young men" of British novels and plays. Foster lists as the principal works of the "angry young men" John Fowles's *The Collector*, Allan Sillitoe's *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* and Anthony Burgess's *Clockwork Orange* (21). All three novels revolve around protagonists with seriously distorted views of right and wrong and thus point to a breakdown of the ethical, spiritual, and cultural systems in the society they portray. If one considers the influences and its period of composition, *The Collector* is not so much a peculiar work standing alone in the tradition of literature as a rich application of the traditional Bluebeard theme to twentieth-century modern society and culture.

Fowles was also himself an amateur lepidopterist like Clegg, so he was able to provide the novel with credible details concerning butterfly collecting. Finally, his favorite play, *The Tempest* by Shakespeare, influenced the draft of the novel. *The collector* makes use of a number of literary parallels and allusions, but among the most conspicuous references are those to *The Tempest*. The name "Miranda" comes from the play, as does the name "Ferdinand" (Clegg calls himself Ferdinand). And throughout the novel Miranda compares her kidnapper to Caliban, a misshapen monster in the play.

One may approach *The Collector* in various ways, and indeed it has been widely discussed from a number of points of view. But this fact suggests the difficulty of writing about *The Collector*. William Palmer notes in his introduction to the Fowles special issue of *Modern Fiction Studies* (1985) that it contains no article on *The Collector* because Fowles's first novel has been "so oft-analyzed" that critics "seem hard pressed to say anything new about it" (11).

I am convinced, however, that the novel deserves to be re-read with care and discrimination. Syhamal Bagchee suggests in his recent article "*The Collector*: The Paradoxical Imagination of John Fowles" that *The Collector* is "popular mainly with critics who like novels with pronounced thematic and moralistic content." Such critics, he continues, "classify the book variously as a class novel, or a novel about good and evil, light and darkness, life and death, or creative impulse and destructive mentality" (219). Given the novel's sharply delineated contrasting characters and double narrative technique, *The Collector* supports such thematic white-versus-black readings in which Miranda represents goodness, beauty, and high morality, and Clegg evil, ugliness, and immorality. Yet, I believe that this clear-cut thematic and moralistic view of the novel is difficult to reconcile with the overall impression of the novel, for such a moralistic reading downplays certain dynamics working in the interpersonal relationship between the two protagonists. *The Collector* is a drama that is much more complex than a clash of opposites.

Central to the conception of this thesis is a brief remark of Linda Hutcheon's on Fowles's characters. According to Hutcheon, Fowles's novels are "tricky" since Fowles's characters can be both "tyrants and liberators," "masters and slaves." And what drives the relationships between characters is "power." She continues that most of the significant relationships depicted in Fowles's work "involve some sort of power struggle," for Fowles is "at once suspicious of and

fascinated by the efforts of individuals to control and influence each other" (vii). Her reference to "masters and slaves" puts one immediately in mind of Hegel's master-slave dialectic and suggests that a focus on the dynamics of the self-other relationship may be an effective way of reading *The Collector*.

In his chapter on autonomy and dependence in his *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Hegel describes self-other relationships as being characterized by fear, desire, violence, domination, and subjection. According to Hegel, the encounter of two human beings or self-consciousnesses is essentially a battle to the death. The battle is characterized by the struggle for recognition; each self-consciousness tries to force the other to recognize his point of view while withholding reciprocal recognition from the other. This violent struggle ends when one participant chooses submission and life over death, thereby establishing the relationship between master and slave. I believe that his master-slave dialectic can be brought to bear on the analogies of many destructive personal or group relationships. For instance, from the question of whose definition of a peace agreement will prevail, or whose understanding of racial superiority will be accepted, to questions of personal identity in love relationships, individual freedom and peer pressure, and debates about the role of God in human affairs, Hegel appears to claim that all human encounters brings with them a continual battle of thesis and antithesis which compete for dominion over each other.

This study is an attempt to read *The Collector* in Hegelian terms. In brief, Hegel's idea of "the struggle for recognition" in self-other relationships will be applied to the relationship between Clegg and Miranda. But this thesis is not a commentary on Hegel's dialectic. In a strict sense, Clegg and Miranda indeed represent a complete failure of the Hegelian dialectic; that is, they hardly change or develop until the end of the novel. Moreover, in the novel there is in fact

neither master nor slave, so it is hard to establish who the master or slave is. As Hutcheon remarks, the protagonists can be both. Thus, this thesis employs Hegel's dialectic in so far as it can account for how the self encounters and understands the other, why misunderstanding happens between the self and the other, and thus why violence, domination, and subjection ensue.

My initial goal in this thesis is to contrast and compare the two worlds represented by Clegg and Miranda. The most outstanding feature of *The Collector* is probably the double narration of the same story. Fowles structures his novel by incorporating two narrative voices, Clegg's and Miranda's, which serve effectively to contrast each other. The book is told first from Clegg's point of view and then from Miranda's. To examine the narrative structure is vital to understanding the novel's themes. In order to contrast and compare the two characters, I will also briefly discuss the literary allusions Fowles makes to *The Tempest*, *The Catcher in the Rye* by J.D. Sanlinger, and *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* by Alan Sillitoe.

I will then look at the problematic relationship between the contrasting characters in terms of the Hegelian dialectic. As mentioned above, the nature of their relationship is characterized by Hegel's struggle for recognition. Recognition implies the acceptance of the other according to the other's humanity, or at least according to the other's perception of itself; however, both Clegg and Miranda are incapable of recognizing each other. They continually misread each other. Mutual understanding is impossible. Wishing to be the master, they then enter an intense power battle in which they try to dominate each other physically, intellectually, morally, and aesthetically by imposing their will on the other.

CHAPTER 2

NARRATIVE AND OTHERNESS:

THE TWO DIFFERENT NARRATORS

The Collector is an exercise in point of view. Fowles's approach in *The Collector* is to tell the same story from two radically different viewpoints, that of the kidnapper Clegg and that of his victim Miranda. The novel is divided into four parts. The first part is told from the retrospective first-person perspective of Clegg, the second part from the immediate first-person perspective of Miranda by means of a diary, and the last two parts from Clegg's perspective again.[1] Fowles's double narrative technique in *The Collector* is a quite effective means of presenting the themes of the novel. First of all, the fact that Clegg's narrative encloses Miranda's is highly appropriate to foregrounding the novel's themes of imprisonment and isolation. Though Clegg's account makes up less than half the book by quantity (136 pages to 157 of Miranda's), its position allows it to dominate: there are three Clegg parts to Miranda's one, and hers (part two) is contained by his (parts one, three, and four). This containing or "the claustrophobic effect" (Loveday 14) allows the reader to feel a sense of fear and isolation in the same way as Miranda would feel in her underground cell.[2] Moreover, this effect is increased by

[1] In fact, in his interview with Fowles in 1977 Barry Olshen reported that the use of Clegg's story to frame Miranda's was an afterthought and came as a recommendation from Fowles's editor: "The author had originally submitted the two accounts in sequence, thereby neglecting the element of suspense arising from delaying the presentation of the details of the final moments" (Olshen 20).

[2] Simmons Loveday further argues that this effect is "markedly increased by the sharply focused monotony which characterizes Clegg's narrative. Apart from a few background details about his childhood and adolescence he has no interests and no topics outside Miranda" (14). As regards *The Collector*'s one-room setting, Olshen aligns *The Collector* with the work of Fowles's theatrical contemporaries, Harold Pinter, Samuel Beckett, and Eugene Ionesco, since *The Collector* and the absurdist works are "restricted to an imprisoning one-room setting" (24).

the claustrophobic direction of the plot: from a suburb to a single isolated house, from the house to a bolted cellar and from the cellar, finally, to a coffin. This containing of one narrative within the other identifies Clegg's strategies for controlling Miranda as not just physical but linguistic as well.

A more subtle effect of containment is achieved by the novel's use of circularity and repetition. Interestingly, Clegg himself illustrates this: "It was like a joke mousetrap I once saw, the mouse just went on and things moved, it couldn't ever turn back, but just on and on into cleverer and cleverer traps until the end" (296). Miranda makes continuous ploys in attempts to escape, but invariably Clegg blocks them. Throughout the novel the characters repeat this pattern until the two of them are exhausted.[3] In addition, the end of the novel resembles its beginnings; that is, it begins with Clegg planning to catch Miranda and ends with him preying on another victim, Marian. Moreover, as Peter Wolfe argues, Miranda's first moment as Clegg's prisoner (Miranda is captured by Clegg with a rag soaked in chloroform, so she is half-conscious and unable to breathe) is similar to her last, when she cannot breathe and is half-conscious due to pneumonia.[4]

The strange shape of *The Collector* might be a surprise for first-time readers. When part one ends, instead of the expected continuation of Clegg's story, readers suddenly find themselves reading again about the events that Clegg has already described, but now as seen by Miranda.

---

[3] In light of the fact that Fowles is often called an existentialist writer (Aubrey 85-86), the hopelessness of Miranda's repetitive escape attempts recalls Camus's *Myth of Sysyphus*, in which the mythic character is condemned forever to roll a stone up a hill. Likewise, Miranda's isolation leads to alienation, first from Clegg, then from God ("we have to live as if there is no God" [205]), and eventually even from herself ("I hate myself" [242]). Her efforts to escape eventually lead to despair and absurdity when she sends Clegg to London for the day and spends hours digging out a single stone, only to find a much larger stone behind it. In the context of existentialist thought, therefore, whether she survives or not is less important than her resolve to continue the struggle.

[4] Peter Wolfe further points out that the novel's circularity means that "both Miranda and Clegg live in an enclosed circle" (62-65).

With Miranda's part readers are immediately aware of a radical departure in perspective and style. The events beginning with her capture and ending with her loss of consciousness are retold from her viewpoint, with, of course, changes of emphasis, deletions, and additions. And Clegg takes over again in the last two parts, which consist of only a few pages about her illness and death. Specifically, Miranda can only describe her dying up to the point at which she is too weak to continue writing, so from there on Clegg must take over again. "If Fowles had presented just Clegg's account," notes Perry Nodelman, "he would have written the entertaining thriller" (333). Obviously, Clegg's parts achieve what readers expect of a thriller, a fiction consisting of a series of horrifying events; however, through Miranda's narrative readers gain a more objective and inclusive perspective on the events and their meaning, with a balanced overall picture. The fact that readers can compare the two characters' narrations allows them to consider the novel not as a crime thriller but rather as a complex psychological drama deliberately structured to contrast the two characters and their worlds.[5] As regards Fowles's use of the double narrative technique in *The Collector*, Barry Olshen writes,

> The story [*The Collector*] is quite simple. All but the final details are related in the first part, that is, the first 120 pages, of the novel. Its subtlety and its extraordinary portraiture, however, arise almost entirely from the complexity of the narrative technique. Fowles allows his antagonists to tell their own stories, thus achieving a double perspective on the otherwise straightforward sequence of events. (20)

To be sure, the novel's strength and uniqueness come from its double narrative structure; however, this is also what makes the novel's real meaning often ambiguous and tentative. By

[5] Katherine Tarbox comments that Fowles's use of the double narration best serves to "contrast their psychological states" (45).

reading one account, and then the other, we arrive at a confused version of the same story. Are we to believe Clegg's or Miranda's account? Neither of the parts is correct, but they are not incorrect either. Accordingly, Fowels's use of the double narration offers us a freedom of interpretation; thus, in reading *The Collector* the reader's role should be emphasized. It is only the reader who can see the whole picture and trace the meanings that lie behind the presentation of the same events. With the full story the reader is allowed to make decisions and judgments that the two characters themselves cannot make. As for the reader's freedom of interpretation, Katherine Tarbox writes,

> Fowles carefully maneuvers the reader into a dialectic within himself. The only standards of judgment for all the confusions in this book are within the reader. In this sense the narrative technique mirrors the theme of freedom. The reader's freedom is counterposed against Miranda's lack of freedom, and the arguments he carries on within himself parallel Miranda's thinking in her cell. The reader, like Miranda, is alone. (58)

With their freedom of interpretation, however, readers may then face a problem when they decide whether or not Miranda and Clegg are reliable narrators, and thus as Mahmoud Salami points out, in reading *The Collector*, readers face "the difficulty of judging the reliability of Clegg and Miranda as first-person narrators" (51). Miranda may not be a reliable narrator, since she is positioned in a claustrophobic situation, deprived of freedom by force; she says, "I write in this terrible nightlike silence as if I feel normal. But I'm not. I'm so sick, so frightened, so alone" (132). Clegg, by contrast, in a sense can be seen as an authoritative narrator since he is in control of all the circumstances. Because he is the captor his telling incorporates more information than does Miranda's, with a fuller understanding of the background and events, and

a more complete explanation of motives of the perpetrator. He mentions several times that he is not mad: "Of course, I am not mad" (10, 52, 69, etc.). But when considering his mental states, readers can scarcely consider him as a reliable narrator.[6] A madman's self-affirmation of "I am not mad" echoes E. A. Poe's "The Tell-Tale Heart," a short story representing "a classic example of an unreliable narrator" (Real 3). In the story Poe's narrator insists on the fact that he is not mad, but the reader knows that the person must be out of his mind, and it is for this reason that he commits murder. Likewise, from the beginning of his account, Clegg makes great efforts to prove that he is normal, while confessing to his having kidnapped Miranda at the same time. However, readers soon come to realize that Clegg is attempting to excuse his kidnapping by referring to Miranda as "his guest" (4). Clegg states that "I'm not different, I can prove it" (10) and even praises himself: "it's some crude animal thing I was born without. [. . .] If more people were like me, in my opinion, the world would be better" (8). Only once does he admit that he is an unreliable madman: "I thought I was going mad, I kept on looking in the mirror and trying to see it in my face. I had this horrible idea, I was mad, everyone else could see it, only I couldn't" (297).

The seduction scene, which may be regarded as the climax of the novel, shows that Clegg and Miranda have different views of what actually happened between them, making it difficult for readers to construct a true account of the incident. Clegg says that

> She did something really shocking. I could hardly believe my eyes, she stood back a step and unfastened her housecoat and she had nothing on beneath. She was stark. I didn't give no more than a quick look, she just stood there, smiling and waiting, you could feel it, for me to make a move. She put up her arms and

[6] Striking is Robert Huftaker's observation that "A significant number of both favorable and unfavorable reviews tend to sympathize with Clegg and reproach Fowles for allegedly favoring Miranda" (76).

> began to undo her hair. It was deliberate provoking, standing there naked in the shadows and firelight. [. . .] She came up and began to take off my coat, then it was my tie, and she undid my shirt buttons. (105)

In Miranda's version, however, Clegg first tries to escape,

> but he couldn't, so he stood by his desk, half turned, while I knelt half-naked by the fire and let my hair down, just to make it quite obvious. In the end I had to go up to him and bring him back to the fire. I made him undo my hands, he was like someone in a trance, and then I undressed him and I undressed myself. (260)

In Clegg's text, there is nothing about his untying Miranda's hands, nor that he runs away from her and she has to approach him and bring him back to the fire. Another difference is that while Miranda says that she undressed him first, Clegg claims that she was already naked near the fire before she came and undressed him. The reader cannot know whether Clegg considered "half-naked" as "naked" with his male fantasy, or whether Miranda was really naked but said "half-naked" out of shame.

Though from a moral point of view it is clear that Clegg is an insane kidnapper, and Miranda is an innocent victim, the question of whose account is correct is ultimately not the most rewarding issue to pursue. Sometimes Clegg's account sounds more convincing, sometimes Miranda's does. Thus, it seems more appropriate to focus on how both narrations complement and illuminate each other. As Shamal Bagchee argues,

> The curious thing about the novel is that in spite of the immeasurable spiritual gulf between Miranda and Clegg their narrations rhetorically illuminate each other. Together they present a complex drama of conflict, tension, clash of personalities, as well as intimate insights and unexpected emotional reactions. It

> is not enough to read Clegg's narration as raw data for the psychological case of a madman. (222)

Thus, the double narration works as a mirror in which each narration reflects the other. Readers can gain more information about Clegg through Miranda's account, than through Clegg's. For example, Clegg's appearance and character are introduced through Miranda's detailed description: "He is six feet. Eight or nine inches more than me. Skinny, so he looks taller than he is. Gangly. Hands too big, a nasty fleshy white and pink. Not a man's hands. Adam's apple too big, wrists too big, chin much too big, underlip bitten in, edges of nostrils red. Adenoids. He's got one of those funny in-between voices, uneducated trying to be educated" (128). Likewise, Miranda's appearance is revealed through Clegg's description: "I watched the back of her head and her hair in a long pigtail. It was very pale, silky, like Burnet cocoons. All in one pigtail coming down almost to her waist, sometimes in front, sometimes at the back. Sometimes she wore it up" (3). Clegg also describes Miranda's changing moods and behavior patterns very accurately, and with greater precision than does Miranda herself:

> She had moods that changed so quick that I often got left behind. She likes to get me stumbling after her, sometimes she would call me Caliban, sometimes Ferdinand. Sometimes she would be nasty and cutting. She would sneer at me and mimic me and make me desperate and ask me questions I couldn't answer. Then other times she would be really sympathetic. (67)

Though perceptive readers can see even from the first page of the novel that Clegg is abnormal, and he will eventually kidnap Miranda whom he is spying on, it does not mean that Fowles will speak for Miranda and against Clegg with a black-and-white point of view. The strength of the novel, according to Tarbox, lies in "the ambiguous nature of both characters,"

which is achieved by Fowles's neutral position in dealing with Clegg and Miranda. "It is not uncommon in a novel," says Tarbox, "that no character speaks for the author. But Fowles has created such a complete illusion of autonomy for his characters that they seem to have no author" (55).[7] Tarbox's view here may be related to Fowles's general theory of the novel: "The true function of the novel, beyond the quiet proper one of pure entertainment, is heuristic, not didactic; not instruction, but suggestion; not teaching the reader, but helping the reader teach himself" (Chevalier 54-55). Often called an existentialist writer,[8] Fowles here seems to stress the creative dimension of the reading process. Specifically, he seems to argue that readers need to be authentic during the reading process, that they should participate in building or creating the novel's meaning in their own terms, and that the novel should promote discovery by the individual reader.[9] In this sense, *The Collector* aptly exemplifies Fowles's theory of the novel. Fowles presents both good and bad qualities of each narrator. If there is a suggestion of any lesson in the book, readers must find it for themselves. Fowles's determination to muddle both characters and issues by using the double narrations allows various interpretations, and readers are free to make their own interpretation of the novel.

---

[7] Although I concur with Tarbox's argument about the author's mentality, the author's relation to his characters remains a troublesome issue. In one statement, Fowles offers a clear-cut evaluation of Miranda and Clegg: "The girl [Miranda] represents good humanity, hope for the future, intelligence and love. The young man [Clegg] represents the opposites—the affluent society in a world where children eat earth they're so hungry. The generous versus the mean" (qtd. in Aubrey 90). Yet Fowles also comments that "she [Miranda] was arrogant in her ideas, a prig, a liberal-humanist snob, like so many university students" (*The Aristos* 10)

[8] "Fowles's interest in French existentialism dates from his undergraduate years at Oxford. He was particularly attracted to the existentialists' views on authenticity and personal freedom" (Acheson 6).

[9] Fowles believes that the novel genre involves a two-way communication, a cooperative activity, between the reader and the novelist. In *The Aristos*, Fowles writes that "To be an artist is not to be a member of a secret society; it is not an activity inscrutably forbidden to the majority of mankind" (149). In the preface of *The Magus*, he says that "its [*The Magus*'s] meaning is whatever reaction it provokes in the reader, and so far as I am concerned there is no given 'right' reaction" (9).

The Double Narration and the Two Conflicting Worlds

The most obvious purpose of Fowles's double narration is to contrast the two narrators and their perceptions of the situation. In terms of style, for example, the difference between the two can be described as educated versus ignorant. Whereas Miranda writes fluently and profoundly, with considerable knowledge of literature and modern art, Clegg handles words with difficulty, makes frequent errors of syntax, and generally uses a short, flat, and pedestrian style (Loveday 14).[10] Clegg often resorts to clichés ("as they say," "as you might say," it was not to be," "it all came unexpectedly," "good riddance"), generalizations ("if people were like me, they would do the same," "on the grab like most nowadays"), and euphemisms ("woman of the streets" for prostitute, "artistic" for obscene, "passed away" for died, "the diseased").

At the level of the structure of each narration, the opposition can be defined as one of spontaneous versus contrived. This is of course implied in the fact that while Miranda's account takes the form of a diary, that is, something written day by day, Clegg's takes the form of a memoir, that is, something written some time after the events it recounts have taken place.[11] The spontaneity of Miranda's narration is evident in a number of ways. Each entry is dated and much of her diary is written in the present or present perfect tense. It is similar to an interior monologue, which is reminiscent of a stream-of-consciousness technique. Miranda's diary lacks a clear overall structure, for it is day-to-day in nature and she is under captivity, not knowing at

[10] However, Loveday also comments that in Clegg's writing, "there is a suggestion of grandeur in the precision and wonder of the last five lines which directly awakens the reader's sympathy" (13). By "the last five lines,"Loveday means those of the first paragraph of the novel: "All in one pigtail coming down almost to her waist, sometimes in front, sometimes at the back. Sometimes she wore it up. Only once, before she came to be my guest here, did I have the privilege to see her with it loose, and it took my breath away it was so beautiful, like a mermaid" (3). As regards Clegg's style, John Neary argues that Clegg is "heroic, that here is an irony beneath the irony," and that at this level, Clegg is "downright poetic in his verbal simplicity, a kind of natural Hemingway, who wages a linguistic war against Miranda's verbal pretensions" (48, 52).

[11] David Walker comments that "the contrast between the spontaneous and authentic present and the cold and distanced past is one which Fowles returns to frequently in his later works" (56).

all what is happening outside her underground cell. She has no large-scale plan, no organizational design larger than that of the day's telling. This lack of structure is common to the journal and epistolary narrative.[12] In addition, when the immediacy of the events overwhelms her, her diary is often incomplete and fragmentary (for instance, from 12 November to 18 November). By contrast, Clegg's account provides the frame of the novel. Undated throughout, it is written in the past tense, which demonstrates that he composes his account after all things have happened—most importantly, after Miranda's death.[13] Unlike Miranda, Clegg has in his mind the entire sequence of events, from first seeing her, through her captivity and death. For this reason, the episodes in Clegg's account tend to be more comprehensive, more organized, and more linear than those in Miranda; they bear the marks of deliberate, albeit unskillful, composition.

Though Clegg's account sometimes looks like a candid confession with his extreme simplistic style, his account is obviously full of excuses and euphemisms designed to persuade the reader to sympathize with him and understand his motives. A considerable part of Clegg's narrative is devoted to rationalizing or justifying his actions, and especially to denying his culpability. Eventually, however, we come to realize that Clegg does not fully understand what he is doing. He frequently suggests that the plot was unpremeditated and that the events occurred by chance rather than by choice. For example, "What I'm trying to say," claims Clegg

---

[12] James Acheson notes Fowles's interest in Daniel Defoe and compares Miranda's diary to that of Robinson Crusoe: "Fowles has said that 'for the surface "feel" of the book' he went to 'that supreme master of the fake biography, Defoe.' Interestingly, Miranda's narrative, though reminiscent of a number of Defoe's fictions, has most in common with *Robinson Crusoe*, his tale of a sailor marooned on a desert island. Miranda describes both her captor and her underground cell in Defoe-like detail (her diary puts us in mind of the journal Crusoe keeps), and she disrupts the surface realism of the early part of her account in an effort to persuade herself, as Crusoe does, that, thanks to Providence, everything will work out for the best" (11).

[13] Loveday provides an explanation of when Clegg actually writes it: "Given the decisive break after Chapter 3 and the affectionate, almost elegiac mood of much of the writing that immediately precedes that break, is to imagine Clegg writing it during Miranda's last illness" (21).

after kidnapping Miranda, "is that having her as my guest happened suddenly, it wasn't something I planned the moment the money came" (11). He goes on to say that "All this time I never thought it was serious. [. . .] In my opinion a lot of people who many seem happy now would do what I did or similar things if they had the money and the time" (20). Miranda's death, Clegg twice claims, "came unexpectedly" (120, 283) and "it was not my fault. How was I to know she was iller than she looked?" (283). Thus, Clegg's narrative seems to be addressed to an audience witnessing a trial. He seeks to prove his innocence by adopting the posture of a defendant pleading his case.

At the level of content, the opposition of the two narratives may be defined as open versus closed. Miranda's attitude is usually open and often self-critical. Miranda's openness to experience makes her diary cover a wide range of events and memories, backward into the past and forward into "the mystery of the future" (150). Her topics include her life goals and her social and aesthetic values. More importantly, her diary frequently offers memories of remarks by G. P. (George Paston), who gradually is revealed to be a middle-aged painter and mentor whom Miranda admires: "I know I also feel happy because I've been not here for most of the day. I've been mainly thinking about G. P."(154). By contrast, the range of Clegg's interests is limited to the things related to Miranda and his butterfly collection. And as pointed out above, he continues to write as if on trial; that is, his attitude is constantly defensive and self-justifying. Therefore, unlike Miranda who grows through her writing process, Clegg remains the same until the end of the novel; in Miranda's words, he is "the one imprisoned in a cellar" (62), "the one in prison; in his own hateful narrow present world" (228).

The most remarkable feature of the double narration involves the ways in which Fowles's ideas about society, the Few and the Many, the class struggle between the middle class and the

lower class, and his philosophy of life and art are all conveyed through the two narrators. In an interview Fowles said that through the painful confrontation between Clegg and Miranda he intended to "illuminate the invidious consequences of these gross social inequalities so characteristic of Western Society" and thus "to show that our world is sick" (Mockridge 21). Specifically, Fowles regarded the novel as an illustration of the conflict between "the Few and the Many" (10),[14] the intelligent and the stupid, a distinction which he explains at length in *The Aristos*. *The Collector*, then, is not simply a story of the personal clash between Clegg and Miranda. Though the novel deals with what happens between the two characters in an isolated cellar, with its social implications its meaning can be extended to the realm of society. In the preface to *The Aristos*, Fowles explains the book as a "parable" dealing with class and inequality, the conflict between his own problematic categories, "the Few and the Many" (10). As an art student, Miranda is one of the Few ("I'm one of the Few" [220, 249]), for she is intelligent, cultivated, and creative. By contrast, as a low-wage worker, Clegg is one of the Many, for he is ignorant, uneducated, and uncreative. In the course of the novel each side in the conflict becomes identified with the social class of its representative—the Few with Miranda's upper middle class, the Many with Clegg's lower middle class. If we follow this line of interpretation, *The Collector* may be viewed as a reflection on class conflict,[15] which Clegg also perceives. Clegg suffers from an acute sense of class inferiority: "There was always class between us" (39). In the same way, Miranda also thinks of her battle with Clegg as the conflict of the Few and the

[14] "The Many" is also called "the New People" in *The Collector*. In the novel, the term "The Few and the Many" is first mentioned by G.P., Miranda's mentor before she is imprisoned (220). G. P. defines "the Many" as "the New People," petit-bourgeois who are uncreative and unauthentic but try to dominate society by means of their sudden wealth. Miranda's negative view of "the Many" is entirely influenced by G. P. (249)

[15] Olshen contends that *The Collector* may be interpreted in social terms, but "it ought not to be too narrowly restricted to a matter of British class conflict or even to that between the artist and the philistine. However naturally these interpretations arise from Fowles's realistic evocation of place and period, I think they represent far too limited an approach to the novel" (27).

Many: "It's a battle between Caliban and myself. He is the New People and I am the Few" (249).

Let us further look at the authorial design of *The Collector*. Fowles's comments on the book often sound didactic, echoing the tenets of French naturalism in the late 19th century and Marxism. In an interview with Raman Singh, Fowels argues that society should try to limit or reduce the injustices that oppress the Many and try to enable the Few to live authentically (183).[16] And in *The Aristos*, Fowles argues that Clegg should be seen as a product of his time, historically shaped by accelerating consumer capitalism and the seedy reality of the acquisitive society of the late 1950s: "Clegg, the kidnapper, committed the evil; but I tried to show that his evil was largely, perhaps wholly, the result of a bad education, a mean environment, being orphaned: all factors over which he has no control" (10). Fowles describes the conflict between Clegg and Miranda as "a biological problem with the human race, that is the enormous variety of intelligence and culture that our societies and of course genetics bring about" (8). If we adopt Fowles's view, we can then readily describe Clegg's character in Marxist terms. Clegg is a product of his environment, reproducing its dominant values, specifically, those of capitalism, masculinity, and neo-fascism. And his turning of living things into objects to be possessed can be equated with what Fowles identifies as the "tendency of any capitalist society [which] is to turn all experiences and relationships into objects" (*The Aristos* 164). In *The Collector,* Clegg regards Miranda as an object to be possessed. Miranda explicitly draws the analogy between Clegg's butterflies and herself: "I am one in a row of specimens. It's when I try to flutter out of

[16] Olshen notes that "Clegg's tyranny and Miranda's abortive attempts to educate her oppressor point to the need to create a society in which the Many will be tolerant of the Few and the Few will feel responsible for the education and betterment of the Many. If there is a positive morality that emerges from *The Collector*, it is surely this, an idea which forms a central thesis of *The Aristos*"(27). However, this does not mean that Fowles sides with the Few; he says that "I tried to establish the virtual innocence of the Many" (*The Aristos* 10).

line that he hates me. I'm meant to be dead, pinned, always the same, always beautiful. He knows that part of my beauty is being alive, but it's the dead me he wants. He wants me living-but-dead" (217-18). In Fowles's view, then, Clegg's shift in attention from rare butterflies to Miranda is a reflection of the tendency of any capitalist society. When Miranda says "I'm his disease" (265), we may say that the disease is that of capitalist society as well as Clegg.

The Literary Allusions and the Theme of Otherness

In that the double narration entails shifts in point of view, the technique also serves to intensify the novel's theme of otherness.[17] As might be surmised from the preceding discussion, a number of the contrasts between Clegg and Miranda concern the problem of otherness. Both characters fail to understand the other's otherness, which leads to tragic consequences. Clegg sees her in light of his plans, his desires, his fantasies, and his needs. Miranda is quite beyond Clegg's understanding and, as such, never becomes completely real for him. At the same time, Miranda can understand Clegg only slightly. Of course, her limited understanding of him is in part a function of his madness, but it also has to do with her own preconceived ideas of class, art, and educational background. Clegg and Miranda's H-bomb discussion (139-44) offers a particularly telling instance of their clashing viewpoints. Faced with the H-bomb question, Clegg only cites the individual's impotence in the face of social injustice—a powerlessness he understands better than Miranda. But she understands what Clegg can hardly be expected to comprehend: the importance of feeling and acting upon one's feelings. Miranda then tries unsuccessfully to explain her position by introducing the militaristic-but-honest American sergeant into her argument, which Clegg squelches with, "I thought we were talking about the H-bomb" (143). Both of them are making valid points: Clegg about individual powerlessness and

[17] My idea of using the term "otherness" in writing this chapter is indebted to Thomas Foster's "*The Collector*: Otherness, Obsession, and Isolation."

Miranda about acting upon feelings in spite of powerlessness. They fail to make any compromises, and Miranda instead starts shaming Clegg. In response to her ridicule, he then decides to donate some money to "the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament" (142), although later it is revealed that Clegg had not actually made such a donation. After the discussion ends, Miranda identifies herself with Major Barbara, the Idealistic character in George Bernard Shaw's *Major Barbara* (1905). Unlike Clegg, both Miranda and Major Barbara can indulge their interests in social improvement because they come from wealthy, safe backgrounds. Here, obviously, we see the influence of Miranda's class consciousness on her thinking.

A similar situation takes place when Miranda starts talking about art, a discussion which proceeds in Clegg's account as follows:

> "Do you know anything about art?" she said. Nothing you'd call knowledge.
>
> "I knew you didn't. You wouldn't imprison an innocent person if you did."
>
> I don't see the connection, I said. She closed the book. "Tell me about yourself. Tell me what you do in your free time." I'm an entomologist. I collect butterflies. (42).

As an art student Miranda's view of art contrasts with that of Clegg, who thinks of collecting as art. More important, Miranda's received idea here is that those who know about art should behave correctly and nicely. And Clegg does not see "the connection." Throughout the novel, each of their texts deals in the preconceived values and attitudes of their classes and in the platitudes that enshrine them. Both are imprisoned in their values, norms, and ideals. Therefore, they cannot reach each other through argument, fits of pique, appeals to reason, or sexual enticement.

The impossibility of the two characters' understanding each other stems from a number of dual opposites: the Many versus the Few, lower class versus upper class, poorly educated versus well educated, uncreative versus creative, and mad versus sane, with these dichotomies turning their relationship into an extreme instance of the problem of otherness.[18] That problem of otherness, especially as manifest in the problem of mutual incomprehensibility, is articulated in an especially effective fashion through the use of a number of literary allusions.[19] The most salient allusion is to Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611). To compare *The Collector* to *The Tempest* will be helpful to see that the mutual incomprehensibility of the two characters in the novel stems from their essential difference in origin, class, ideals, and educational background. In *The Tempest* Miranda is the daughter of the exiled magician Prospero, and both of them live on a remote island. Caliban also lives on the island. Miranda in *The Collector* very often compares her kidnapper to Caliban, the half-human offspring of the witch Sycorax, who would like to have sexual relations with Miranda; if he were allowed to, he would people the island with his offspring. Caliban once tries to rape Miranda but fails. In *The Collector*, at the beginning of her captivity Miranda is naturally afraid of being raped by Clegg, and perhaps this is the main reason she calls him Caliban.[20] Or her calling him Caliban may be based on

---

[18] Most critics agree that both Clegg and Miranda refuse to try to unite these dichotomies, though Thomas Foster sees Miranda favorably as "a heroine who attempts to unite these dual opposites, while for Ferdinand [Clegg] they remain hopelessly separated." He continues that "numerous Fowlesian pairs will have their difficulties, and some may fail, but none is as deadly as this twosome" (33).

[19] The literary works used in *The Collector* are as follows: Thomas Hardy's *Far from the Madding Crowd*, William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and *Romeo and Juliet*, George Bernad Shaw's *Major Barbara*, J. D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*, Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, Jane Austen's *Emma* and *Sense and Sensibility*, Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations,* Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, *The Arabian Nights Entertainments*, Anne Frank's *Diary of a Young Girl*, Alan Sillitoe's *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, Dante Alighieri's *Divine Comedy*, and John Braine's *Room on the Top*.

[20] In her first diary entry, Miranda writes that "his eyes are mad. Grey with a grey lost light in them. To begin with I watched him all the time. I thought it must be sex, if I turned my back I did it where he couldn't sprint at me, and I listened. I had to know exactly where he was in the room" (124).

Miranda's class consciousness as is suggested in Miranda's diary where Caliban is first mentioned. There she writes that "I'm so superior to him. I know this sounds wickedly conceited, but I am. I have to give a name. I'm going to call him Caliban" (137). However, Caliban also stands for a lack of education and civilization. The following is the episode in Clegg's account in which Miranda calls him Caliban for the first time:

> She went and got a book of pictures by Cézanne. "There," she said, pointing to a coloured one of a plate of apple. "He's not only saying everything there is about the apples, but everything about all apples and all form and colour." I take your word for it, I said. All your pictures are nice, I said. She just looked at me. "Ferdinand," she said, "They should have called you Caliban." (61-62)

Miranda's main criticism of Clegg is his lack of knowledge about and sensitivity to art. As a student of art and a maker of drawings, her values sharply contrast with those of Clegg, who thinks of collecting dead things as art. Miranda sees in his butterfly collection a deadening tendency: "He's a collector. That's the great dead thing in him" (171). As a collector Clegg can judge art only in terms of its representationalism, or photographic realism. Miranda sees him as insensitive when he comments that all of her pictures are "nice," and hence she turns him into Caliban. Instead of using his first name "Frederick," Clegg calls himself "Ferdinand," the shipwrecked sailor who falls in love with Miranda in *The Tempest*. But he seems unaware of the significance of his having come to call himself Ferdinand, which demonstrates that he has not read *The Tempest*. Miranda, on the other hand, has read the play so that it is nonsense for her to call him by the name of Miranda's lover. In this regard, her nickname for Clegg, Caliban, demonstrates her educational privilege. Clegg provides the following account of their first meeting scene, in which he introduces himself to Miranda as Ferdinand:

> "What's your name?" she said. Clegg, I answered. "Your first name?" Ferdinand. She gave me a quick sharp look. "That's not true," she said. I remembered I had my wallet in my coat with my initials in gold I'd bought and I showed it. She wasn't to know F stood for Frederick. I've always liked Ferdinand, it's funny, even before I knew her. There's something foreign and distinguished about it. [. . .] It's just a coincidence, I said. "I suppose people call you Ferdie. Or Fred." Always Ferdinand. "Look Ferdinand, I don't know what you see in me. I don't know why you're in love with me." (37)

Here Miranda resists calling Clegg Ferdinand. Clegg's playing the role of the noble character of Ferdinand can never come true, for Miranda shapes Clegg to her preconceived notion of the monster Caliban that she has gotten from her reading of *The Tempest*. Yet the fact that Miranda judges Clegg by her literary standards reveals that she too is in the world of romance; specifically, Clegg does not say that he loves her, but Miranda concludes hastily that "I don't know why you're in love with me." In this sense, both are imprisoned in the fictional world, but unlike the fictional world of *The Tempest,* theirs is one in which their love can never come true.

The mutual incomprehensibility of the two is also revealed when they discuss J. D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951). As to parallels between Holden Caulfield and Clegg one may mention their difficulties in communicating with other people and their sexual problem: in order to have their first sexual experiences both of them go to a prostitute, which leads to an obvious failure because of the boys' extreme nervousness. But whereas Holden aims at honesty and therefore voices his protest against the insincerity of the adult world, Clegg does not see any parallels between Salinger's protagonist and himself. Thus, Miranda's attempt to educate and cure Clegg by means of the book does not work at all. She wants him to identify with Holden

("You're Holden Caulfield" [219]) so that he can construct "some sort of reality in his life" (220). But what Clegg says instead is that "It's not realistic. Going to a posh school and his parents having money. He wouldn't behave like that. In my opinion" (220).

Fowles's emphasis on their class difference is illustrated by Alan Sillitoe's novel *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, which was first published in 1958, i.e. just five years before *The Collector*. As a member of the working class, Sillitoes's protagonist Arthur Seaton is a rebellious and self-centered bike factory worker, who Miranda thinks is "disgusting": "I think *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* is disgusting. I think Arthur Seaton is disgusting. [. . .] He's mean, narrow, selfish, brutal. He wants to attack the society" (248). She then identifies Clegg with him: "It shocked me too because of Caliban. I see there's something of Arthur Seaton in him, only in him it's turned upside down. I mean, he has that hate of other things and other people outside of his own type. He has that selfishness" (249). Miranda's lack of sympathy for Sillitoe's protagonist is largely class based, since she cannot imagine her way into Arthur's world. She thus categorizes the two, Clegg and Arthur, as New People, deriding the working class: "The New People destroy themselves because they're so stupid. They can never keep the intelligent ones with them" (249).

To summarize, the novel's double narration effectively serves to contrast the two protagonists. We have seen a number of contrasts between Clegg and Miranda: the Many versus the Few, lower class versus upper class, poorly educated versus well educated, uncreative versus creative, narrow-minded versus open-minded, and mad versus sane. These dual opposites then form the problem of otherness, of mutual incomprehensibility, which is well illustrated through the novel's use of literary allusions. The issues presented in this chapter will be further discussed in the next chapter, but my focus will be on the nature of their relationship.

CHAPTER 3

POSSESSION AND RECOGNITION

Because of its sharply delineated contrasting characters and two isolated narratives, *The Collector* may encourage clear-cut thematic readings in which, as we have seen in the previous chapter, Clegg and Miranda can be taken to represent a number of dual opposites: evil versus good, mad versus sane, perverse versus innocent, lower class versus upper class, poorly educated versus well educated, uncreative versus creative, and so forth. However, a clearer understanding of *The Collector* requires special attention to the intricacy of the drama that unfolds in the novel; that is, the novel also presents many elements that contradict well-established clear-cut thematic patterns.[1] As Tamás Tukacs points out, it is not easy to decide "which of Clegg or Miranda is or has gone mad in the story" (246).[2] As briefly mentioned in Chapter 2, it is also hard to decide who the reliable narrator is. Miranda's account often appears to be more unreliable than Clegg's. Miranda confesses in her diary that her account of conversations with Clegg is not altogether accurate: "I'm cheating. I didn't say all these things—but I'm going to write what I want to say as well as what I did" (141).[3] Moreover, Miranda often contradicts herself. Repeatedly, one can

---

[1] Katherine Tarbox notes that "*The Collector* is not a parable about the triumph of evil over good; no such categories exist in this book" (56). Likewise, Syhamal Bagchee remarks that *The Collector* is, "above and beyond such obvious moral categorization, about two *extraordinary* characters. They are not mere allegorical representations of good and evil, life and death, or any other antithetical set of terms. [. . .] [*The Collector*] is a drama that is much more complex than a clash of opposites" (222). For a detailed discussion of why *The Collector* defies clear-cut thematic description, see Bagchee's article "*The Collector*: The Paradoxical Imagination of John Fowles."

[2] Tukacs continues to say that "While the concept of madness is firmly placed in the system of ideas in the beginning, signifying the opposite of sanity, by the end of the novel this notion also become relativised. [. . .] This relativisation prevents Miranda from interpreting Clegg simply as a madman" (246).

[3] Tarbox sees Clegg's narrative as more reliable than Miranda's: "Clegg has in his favor his supremely reliable narration; he may lie to everyone else but he does not lie to his diary. Miranda misinterprets much of what she sees, both in her life and in her imprisonment, because of obsessive intellectualizing" (42).

find her saying one thing but doing another. She argues vociferously in favor of pacifism, but is nevertheless prepared to hit Clegg with an axe. The discrepancy is not lost on her kidnapper: "I thought pacifists didn't believe in hurting people." Miranda's response is that "I just shrugged and lit a cigarette. I was trembling" (149).

Much of the intricacy of the drama undoubtedly comes from the fact that Clegg is not an ordinary evil character.[4] As a kidnapper or jailer, Clegg is expected to play the role of a villain, but instead he is cast in the role of, in Miranda's words, "Prince Charming" (254). For this reason it takes Miranda a long time to get rid of her successive stereotyped views of him as a rapist, an extortionist, or a psychotic. Miranda often admits to an uneasy sense of admiration for him, and this baffles her: "A strange thing. He fascinates me," while saying that "I feel the deepest contempt and loathing for him" (121); she calls him "Caliban," while appreciating his self-control and innocence: "He has tremendous self-control. [. . .] There is a tremendous innocence. It rules him. He must protect it" (260).

To sum up, the thematic black-versus-black view of *The Collector* is difficult to reconcile with the overall impression created by the intricacy of the drama. In this chapter, therefore, I will endeavor to take an objective view of the two characters, focusing on their relationship rather than on their division. In examining their relationship, I will take up Hegel's conception of self-other relationships as "the struggle for recognition" in his master-slave dialectic. As a description of what happens when two self-consciousnesses confront each other, Hegel's master-slave dialectic provides a useful model for understanding the dynamics of self-other relationships. However, the aim of this chapter is not primarily to draw the analogy between *The Collector* and Hegel's dialectic, but to suggest that Hegel's view of human relationships can help

[4] Jeff Rackham comments on Clegg's ambiguous character, writing: "The chilling intensity of the story arises from the ambiguous response to him which Miranda and the reader share" (91).

broaden our understanding of *The Collector* and of the relationship between Clegg and Miranda in particular.

Hegel's Master-Slave Dialectic

Hegel's account of the master-slave dialectic comes in Chapter IV "Independence and Dependence of Self-consciousness" in his *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807). Hegel's discussion begins by questioning how a human being comes to consciousness of himself as a self, that is, to self-consciousness. According to Terry Pinkard, the master-slave dialectic is "part of Hegel's attempt to answer a dilemma that has preoccupied philosophers including Plato, Descartes, and Fichte: 'how is it possible to be certain that what we think we know is actually true?'" (46). It is beyond the scope of the present study to explain the complex preliminary steps involved in this question, so I shall move directly to Hegel's answer to the question. Hegel's argument culminates in the following conclusion: any attempt to fix the truth of one's own self-consciousness demands an other. To put it another way, the reality of self (which Hegel calls "self-certainty") requires recognition by another self-consciousness. In Hegel's words, "Self-consciousness exists in and for itself when, and by the fact that, it so exists for another; that is, it exists only in being acknowledged" (630).

To constitute the reality of self, then, each individual should risk his life to find an other who can confirm his reality as authoritative. "For the individual who has not risked his life for recognition," according to Hegel, "may well be recognized as a person," but "his own self-certainty still has no truth" (632). According to Hegel, however, the encounter of two individuals is essentially "a battle to the death"; in other words, the counterposed individuals do not take their fundamental dependence on the other kindly, thereby confronting each other. They have so much at stake that their relationships are a constant source of strife, such that they, in

Hegel's words, "prove themselves and each other through a life-and-death struggle" (632). This struggle is a continual battle of thesis and antithesis in which the two compete for dominion over each other. Here power enters the discussion, as Hegel claims that each individual tries to force the other to recognize him while withholding reciprocal recognition from the other. After all, each individual experiences the struggle for recognition, but the truth of that experience gives rise to another experience: that of relations of inequality in recognition—the experience of mastery and servitude.

To see the historical value of Hegel's dialectic with its range of applications for literature, we might consider the following helpful observation:

> [Hegel's master-slave dialectic] provides a memorable and persuasive model for understanding the complex dynamics of intersubjective relationships. Selfhood is a social product that individuals crave; identity has to be constructed through contentious interaction with and relation to others; this process makes us dependent on others, and thus inclined to resent and fear them; and such dependence involves forms of psychological and social power that are distinct from physical force or the power afforded by superior wealth. Whenever modern literary theorists and critics have been interested in questions of identity and of the self's confrontation with the other (however understood), Hegel's famous account of the master-slave dialectic has hovered in the background. (Leitch 627-28)

Hegel's dialectic is especially well encapsulated in the above statement that "identity has to be constructed through contentious interaction with and relation to others." Thus, we may consider Hegel's dialectic in a twofold manner: first, as a means of understanding the formation of

identity, and second, as a way of conceiving of self-other or group relationships, especially those formed by confrontation.

Before embarking on a Hegelian approach to *The Collector*, we must make a few preliminary observations. As is often noted, possession is a prominent concern in *The Collector*, the title itself referring to this concept; by contrast, Hegel's dialectic does not concern issues associated with possession. More exactly, in Hegel possession is the complete antithesis of recognition. Given this fact, it seems necessary to start out by discussing how the theme of possession is presented in *The Collector*. Only afterwards can we consider how Hegel's idea of recognition can be properly situated and employed in our discussion of the novel.

The Desire for Possession Versus the Desire for Recognition

Central to *The Collector* is the question of why Clegg kidnaps Miranda. This issue must be fully answered since it serves as the key to other important questions, such as why he keeps holding her, what he wants from her, and what she has to do to be released. The answer, it would seem, may be found without great difficulty after reading the first few pages of the novel, if one keeps in mind that its title is *The Collector*. There is general agreement that Clegg kidnaps Miranda because he wants to possess and control her as he would his butterflies. It is then no wonder that the issue of possession occupies the central place in the novel. "As its title implies," according to Simon Loveday, "*The Collector* is dominated by the theme of having, possessing, or in short collecting" (22).

The Collector portrays in considerable detail Clegg's possessiveness and its tragic influences on his victim. From the very beginning, Clegg reveals himself to have the mind-set of a collector. Obsessed with watching Miranda as a voyeur, Clegg starts keeping an "observation diary" (3) about her as he does when engaged in butterfly collecting. This attitude of Clegg's,

according to James Aubrey, "finally leads him to regard Miranda as he would a beautiful butterfly, as an object from which he may derive pleasurable control" (87). Clegg's description of Miranda reveals that he observes her as he would butterflies, reducing her to the status of an object, a "specimen" in a collection; he compares her hair to "Burnet cocoons" and spying on her to the experience of "catching a rarity," like "a Pale Clouded Yellow" and "a Queen of Spain Fritillary" (3).[5]

His daydreams about Miranda mark the initial point of his idea of abduction. When he watches Miranda entering and leaving her house, he begins to fantasize about how wonderful he would be if he were with Miranda:

> I used to have daydreams about her, I used to think of stories where I met her, did things she admired, married her and all that. Nothing nasty. She drew pictures and looked after my collection (in my dreams). It was always she loving me and my collection, drawing and coloring them; working together in a beautiful modern house. (4)[6]

Clegg's narrative also reveals him as a man who is unable to separate his dream world from reality:

> That was the day I first gave myself the dream that came true. It began where she was being attacked by a man and I ran up and rescued her. Then somehow I was

[5] Barry Olshen points out that "The details of butterfly collecting are rendered accurately, perhaps from Fowles's first-hand knowledge of the hobby as a boy" (18).

[6] Clegg's fantasies can be seen as an echo of Fowles's own: in his essay "Hardy and the Hag," Fowles writes,

> Though I gained the outward theme of *The Collector* from a bizarre real-life incident in the 1950s, similar fantasies had haunted my adolescence-not, let me quickly say, with the cruelties and criminalities of the book, but very much more along the lines of the Hardy tryst. That is, I dreamed isolating situations with girls reality did not permit me isolation with: the desert island, the aircrash with two survivors, the stopped lift, the rescue from a fate worse than death. [. . .] all the desperate remedies of the romantic novelette; but also, more valuably, countless variations of the chance meeting in more realistic contexts. (38)

> the man that attacked her [. . .] [and] kept her captive in a nice way. Gradually she came to know me and like me and the dream grew into the one about our living in a nice modern house, married, with kids and everything. (14)

This passage demonstrates that Clegg is a true dreamer who wants to live his dreams, and who fantasizes and imagines different worlds with Miranda. Here he imagines himself as the ideal hero who rescues Miranda from danger. He simultaneously becomes the attacker and the rescuer of Miranda. He is the rescuer in the sense that he will take her to live with him in "a nice modern house," marry her, and produce "nice" children.

But Clegg is well aware of the fact that his dream is unrealistic: "Of course, I am not mad, I knew it was just a dream" (4). Clegg believes that the class distinction between him and Miranda is the reason he cannot be with Miranda (7-8). He suffers from an acute sense of class inferiority, which often leads him to criticize his society, rich people in London, and his former co-workers. At a respectable hotel Clegg believes that the other patrons looked down on him. He explains: "You could see them saying, don't kid us, we know what you are, why don't you go back where you came from." He then claims that "London is all arranged for the people who can act like public schoolboys, and you don't get anywhere if you don't have the manner born and the right la-di-da voice—I mean rich people's London, the West End, of course" (9).

Working as a minor functionary in Town Hall, Clegg finds his life suddenly changed when he strikes it rich in a football pool. This sudden wealth enables him to quit his job and send his family to Australia. He is now totally on his own, thus freeing himself for the indulgence of his interest in butterfly collecting. But his new-found wealth does not affect others' treatment of him: he says that "They still treated me behind the scenes for what I was—a clerk. It was no good throwing money around" (8). Unsatisfied, Clegg instead attempts to

compensate for his social inadequacy through his wealth, for he recognizes that "Money is power" (20). At this point, Clegg undergoes a significant change. Miranda, who has existed only in his dreams, now turns into a real person who can be his equal: "It was all over in five seconds, she was back with the young man, but hearing her voice turned her from a sort of dream person to a real one. [. . .] I didn't have any class feeling" (13). Then, Clegg comes up with the idea of abduction, believing that he can possess and control Miranda as he would his butterflies. To be sure, if Clegg were not a collector, the abduction idea would probably never have occurred to him. "This whole idea," says Clegg, "was sudden, like a stroke of genius almost" (12).

Clegg is certainly one of what Miranda and G. P criticize as "the Many," petit-bourgeois who are uncreative and unauthentic but try to dominate society by means of their sudden wealth. With a fortune in his hands Clegg turns out to be a self-contradictory man. Contrary to his assertion that he is indifferent to money (18), he eagerly takes advantage of money to participate in high society and culture, that is, he tries to escape from his ideological social class by using his money.[7] For example, he says: "another thing I began to do was read the classy newspaper, for the same reason I went to the National Gallery and the Tate Gallery. [. . .] I went so as I could talk to [Miranda], so I wouldn't seem ignorant" (15).

The fortune in his hands gradually gives him leisure to inflate his fantasies and power to actualize them. Clegg then starts carrying out his kidnapping plans. He buys a van and an old, secluded cottage with a secret cellar, renovates and decorates the place, and outfits it with clothes, books, and other things he imagines will please Miranda. He then secures the place

[7] In his *The Aristos*, Fowles writes that "Money is potentiality: is control of, and access to, hazard; is freedom to choose; is power" (125). In *The Collector*, Clegg's character defines the potential evils of such power. That is, he is from a lower class background, but with the fortune in his hands he is allowed access to, in Fowles's words, society's "money paradise." What happens to Clegg is what Fowles believes happens to the upper class in society: "Having, not being, governs [their] time" (124).

against her escape "with diabolical precision" (Olshen 18). When he returns to London, Clegg watches Miranda for ten days. Then, as she is walking home alone from a movie, he captures her, using a rag soaked in chloroform that he uses for his butterflies, ties her up in his van, takes her to his house, and locks her in the basement room.

As is his custom, he tries to avoid responsibility by taking a passive view of his role. The whole time he is buying and outfitting his isolated house for the kidnapping, he denies that he is serious about his plans. He attempts to deny that his act is unusual, arguing that many people would do what he did if they had the money and time, that only poverty keeps them in line. His justification of kidnapping is that "In my opinion a lot of people who may seem happy now would do what I did or similar things if they had the money and the time. I mean, to give way to what they pretend not they shouldn't. Power corrupts, a teacher I had always said. And Money is power" (20).

Miranda is not slow to see Clegg's abduction of her as an extension of his collecting activity. When Clegg introduces himself as a butterfly collector, Miranda immediately replies, "Now you've collected me" (42).[8] Believing that she is no more than an object captured by the collector, Miranda frequently draws the analogy between herself and Clegg's butterflies:

---

[8] Perry Nodelman observes that Miranda also possesses a collector mentality:

> Fowles calls attention to the similarities between Clegg and Miranda by making them collectors. Clegg collects butterflies; Miranda speaks of "all the horrid people who wouldn't give me money when I was collecting." Both collect in the service of their aspiration for something better than ugly, normal reality—he for beauty, she to make the world a better place. Miranda may also be the symbolic sort of collector that Clegg is; although she claims, "I coundn't ever be a Toinett. A collector of men," she often speaks of men as objects she has collected: "I began to feel he was mine, that I knew all about him. And I hated it when he went off to Italy like that, without telling me. Not because I was seriously in love with him, but because he was vaguely mine and didn't get permission from me." (339)

Katherine Tarbox makes a similar observation: "Ultimately both Miranda and Clegg are collectors. Clegg slips people into categories—the public school types, the la-di-da types, the slimy types—as does Miranda. Her long invective against Calibanity, about the battle between the Few and the Many, the New People and the established people, is a superb piece of collecting, because it puts people into categories without regard for their individuality" (54).

"Aren't you going to show me my fellow-victims?" (54). Observing Clegg's treasures, with their "little wings stretched out all at the same angle," Miranda identifies with them: "poor dead butterflies, my fellow-victims" (127). Her hatred of Clegg and his collector mentality leads her to blame collectors in general: "Collectors are the worst animals of all. They're anti-life, anti-art, anti-everything" (129). Perhaps most significantly, Clegg himself confesses that possessing Miranda is precisely what he wants: "What she never understood was that with me it was having. Having her was enough. Nothing needed doing. I just wanted to have her and safe at last" (101).

It is then quite clear that Clegg's abduction of Miranda stems from his collector mentality, and what he wants accordingly is to possess and control her. Thus, it would not be an overstatement to claim that as a collector of butterflies Clegg is essentially a defective character dominated by a possessive impulse,[9] which possibly allows us to read him as a case-study of abnormal behavior.[10] "What [Clegg] needs is," according to Salami, "only to dominate Miranda" (62). Similar are Loveday's remarks on Clegg's collector mentality and its relation to his behavior: "The desire to possess and control dominates his behavior" (24). Further, Olshen comments on Clegg's desire for possession and its important position in discussing the novel: "Perhaps the most wretched thing about Clegg is that he confuses love with his desire for

---

[9] Loveday argues that in *The Collector* Fowles "regards the collector mentality as a major evil. By making Clegg a collector of butterflies Fowles brings out the special paradox of collecting. The collector seeks to possess things of value; yet the value of what he seeks resides precisely in the fact that it was free (in the sense of unpossessed) and alive. In the things the collector covets, what can be possessed is not what is valuable: what is valuable cannot be possessed" (24).

[10] Bruce Woodcock sees Clegg as "a case-study of male behavior in general":

> *The Collector* is a 'casebook' in a number of ways. It set a pattern for the later fiction by presenting a central male character as a case-study of particular forms of masculine behavior. [. . .] Clegg is a case-study of male behavior in general: he is symptomatic of the male idealization of women and of the way male power both feeds on and enforces itself through such idealization. More problematically, the novel is a casebook of Fowles's own latent contradictions about the whole subject and his declared fascination for it, since, partly by virtue of its very narrative strategies, the book invites an almost voyeuristic interest from the reader. It is a point which suggests that Fowles himself is a kind of Bluebeard, parading fantasies of power whose 'appeal' is thoroughly ambiguous. (27-28).

possession. [. . .] The fundamental significance of *The Collector* is in its depiction of the drive for possession" (29).[11]

Let us then briefly see how Hegel might conceive of the desire for possession. In his *Phenomenology*, Hegel does not discuss the desire for possession, so we must explore its position in Hegel by comparing it to the desire for recognition.[12] In order to further this discussion, it is helpful to refer to Alexandre Kojève's reading of Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, an influential reading well-known particularly for its detailed exposition of Hegel's master-slave dialectic.[13] Of special value in Kojève's reading of Hegel is his attempt to explain Hegel's notion of recognition in terms of desire. The key to approaching Kojève's version of Hegel lies in his rendering of Hegel's "self-consciousness" as "the I of desire" (5, 6, 38-40), an equation which indicates that Kojève understands self-consciousness as desire. With this in mind, we can see how Kojève re-writes Hegel's central argument that self-consciousness requires recognition by another self-consciousness: "Human Desire must be directed toward another Desire. [. . .] All human Desire is, finally, the Desire for recognition" (6). From this perspective, though Kojève does not coin the term "the desire for possession," we can draw the conclusion that as far as human desire is concerned, the desire for recognition takes precedence over the desire for possession.[14] The latter desire is what Kojève calls "animal desire," because

---

[11] Mahmoud Salami makes a similar point: "The most important aspect of Clegg's 'love' is the concept of possession. By making Clegg a collector of butterflies, Fowles demonstrates the special paradox of collecting in the name of love" (61).

[12] Hegel offers a discussion of desire in Chapter III in his *Phenomenology*, but no mention of desire is made in his account of the master-slave dialectic.

[13] According to Kojève, the master-slave dialectic is "the key to Hegel." Kojeve's assertion is that "in having discovered the notion of recognition, Hegel found himself in possession of the key idea of his whole philosophy" (35). Indeed, it was Kojève who rendered Hegel's "Lordship and Bondage" as "master and slave" (Boucher 3).

[14] In his article "Hegel, Kojève and Lacan: The Metamorphoses of Dialectics," Radostin Kaloianov writes: "Identification and the desire for recognition have an indisputable priority over possession, over need and the demand for love related to it, with regard to their significance for the formation for the subject" (18).

it does not demand recognition by another's desire.[15]

Given that Clegg seeks possession, and his desire to possess acts as the primary impulse of his behavior, one may say that he is an anti-Hegelian figure. For him to be a Hegelian figure, which means "to be truly human" in Kojève's terms (6, 7), he should go beyond the possession-based life, realizing that his human reality or self-certainty[16] can be attained only when his value[17] is recognized by others, namely only through external affirmation of his reality. From this perspective, it is plain enough that his present way of life to fulfill his desire for possession will finally bring frustration to the structure of his existence.

Of course, it is far from my intention to challenge the significance of the theme of possession in understanding *The Collector* by taking Hegel's position. Nor is my intention in mentioning Hegel to stress that Clegg is a faulty, not-truly-human character. Rather, my intention is to point out that the approach based on the theme of possession, whatever its merits, has its limitations and to suggest thereby that Hegel's view can serve to illuminate what such an approach may downplay. The major drawback of the approach based on the theme of possession is that it does not fully explain Clegg's motives for kidnapping Miranda. Although Clegg clearly states that "Having her was enough," this may be a false statement. If his real aim is to possess and control Miranda, he should be satisfied with his present situation, in which he already has

---

[15] According to Kojève, there are two kinds of desire, animal and human desire. He makes a clear distinction between them, arguing that "For man to be truly human, for him to be essentially and really different from an animal, his human Desire must actually win out over his animal Desire" (6). By animal desire what Kojève means "a biological reality" (4). The desire to possess and eat, for example, an apple is what he calls animal desire. Then, the desire for possession can be either animal or human, according to the desired object. The desire to possess a person can be called human desire if it aims to gain recognition. This issue will be further discussed later when the issue of power comes into focus.

[16] Man should struggle for recognition in order to attain, in Hegel's words, "the certainty of self" (623, 624), which is, in Kojève's words, "the human reality" (6-10).

[17] Kojève writes that the desire for recognition is "to desire that the value that I am or that I 'represent' be the value desired by the other: I want him to 'recognize' my value as his value. I want him to 'recognize' me as an autonomous value" (7).

full authority over her existence and control of her surroundings.[18] Throughout the novel, however, Clegg remains completely unsatisfied, which demonstrates that he wants something more than mere possession of and control over Miranda.

A close look at Miranda's narrative will make it clear that simply to possess or control Miranda is not what Clegg seeks. As the novel progresses, we learn that Miranda becomes more and more baffled by Clegg's ambiguous nature. He is inhibited, passive, denying, utterly lacking in self-awareness, and nearly inarticulate. Miranda especially struggles with his inability to articulate what he wants from her. For her, therefore, Clegg remains an enigma to be solved: she says to Clegg, "You're just like a Chinese box" (100), and later she writes, "he has some secret" (256). Unfortunately, however, she does not ferret out his secret until the end. She therefore feels confused about deciding how to behave and how to treat him so that he might eventually release her. She frequently asks herself what he wants, which demonstrates that her efforts to penetrate Clegg's mentality are not successful ("What does he want?" [159], "What did he want to do with me then?"[206], "What is he?" [238, 261], and "What does he want?" [262]).

It is important to note that what Miranda so readily accepts as truth is not the truth, which readers may already know from Clegg's narrative. But she assumes persistently that Clegg wants to secure his possession and control over her, so she finally comes to convince herself that "He must want me physically" (256). As a last desperate attempt to gain freedom, Miranda tries to seduce him, but her effort brings tragic consequences. Clegg is unable to respond, feeling humiliated instead. His actual secret is far from what she imagines: he says of her seduction attempt that "It was almost like she was stupid, plain stupid" (109). From this point on, Clegg gradually shifts from admiring her to despising her: "All I did later was because of that night. [. .

[18] Miranda says that "He becomes the norm" (201); subsequently, she realizes that for her to get freedom, she has no choice but to obey Clegg's directions (201, 251, 255, 257).

.] It was no good, she had killed all the romance, she had made herself like any other woman, I didn't respect her any more, there was nothing left to respect" (109-110). Miranda actually dies of physical contact and the end of love: she catches the cold that kills her when she kisses Clegg, and dies of it because he no longer finds her worthy of his care. Thus, her death can be seen as the price of her misrecognition of Clegg. By her seduction attempt, according to Perry Nodelman, Miranda "becomes for Clegg a symbol of the corruption of an ideal [. . . .] Miranda is now evil; he must dispose of her, and replace her with a new ideal" (342). What Clegg says at the end of the story is at odds with his earlier statement that "Having her was enough": "I wanted what money couldn't buy. [. . .] You can't buy happiness" (299).

Insofar as the possession issue is concerned, therefore, it seems more convincing to say that for Clegg abduction (possession) and imprisonment (control) are not his ends but the means of achieving his ends. In this regard, Clegg's collector mentality-based answer to the question of why Clegg kidnaps Miranda needs to be reconsidered. In Clegg's case, two different questions are at stake: what leads him to kidnap her, and what he seeks by kidnapping her. As for the first question, we seem to have already found the answer—his fantasies, collector mentality, and money. As for the second question, however, much still remains to be explored.

Seeking Human Reality: The Struggle for Recognition

Clegg may be, as Thomas Foster says, "the most bizarrely passive kidnapper in literature" (22). Clegg claims that his kidnapping of Miranda "happened suddenly" (11) against his "will": "I don't know why, like I was drawn in by something else, against my will almost" (13). His unusual passivity as a kidnapper is what makes Miranda more confused and frightened than anything else. Miranda observes that Clegg does not do anything but just stand and watch her: "He stands. He's the most tremendous stander-around I've ever met. Always with that I'm-

sorry expression on his face. [. . .] So incomprehensible" (171). Her fear of Clegg's passivity is well illustrated in Clegg's narrative: "In the end I said, are you frightened? She didn't say anything, she just nodded. But what have I done? I asked. 'Nothing. That's why I'm frightened.' I don't understand. She looked down. 'I'm waiting for you to do something'" (71). Miranda's "disgust with Clegg," according to Foster, "sometimes stems from his refusal to act strong, particularly in the light of his role as her jailer" (23).

Clegg does not cast himself in the role of an ordinary villain predisposed to hurting powerless people. At the beginning of her captivity, Miranda is afraid that Clegg may exercise violence over her, but seeing her being frightened, Clegg says, "Don't be alarmed, I'm not going to hurt you" (25). In fact, as far as violence is involved, Miranda exercises it more than Clegg does, about which Bagchee claims that "In fact, it is amazing how much trouble from Miranda he is willing to put up with" (225). Money is also not what Clegg seeks: he claims that "Money was no object" (18). When awakening, Miranda says to Clegg, "I don't know who you think I am. If you think I'm somebody rich's daughter and you're going to get a huge ransom, you've got a shock coming." Clegg replies immediately that "I know who you are. It's not money" (29).

Clegg's passivity extends into the sexual arena as well. Unexpectedly, he has no intention of having sexual relations with Miranda. According to Foster, "any manifestation of female sexuality disgusts Clegg" (23).[19] He is indeed proud of his self-discipline and has a high

[19] Foster goes on to argue that "Clegg cannot mention sex except as 'the other thing,' although there are many other things in his narrative which he refers to as 'the other thing' as well. His one sexual experience, an assignation with a prostitute, turns out to be unsuccessful; typically, he chalks his impotence up to her being 'horrible'" (20). Clegg's sexuality is indeed a much debated issue. Foster sees Clegg's sexual inadequacy as "a result of his hatred of women. He deeply resents his absconding mother, saying that, even if she is alive, he does not want to meet her. He dislikes his Aunt and Mabel and resents being stuck with them" (24). Similarly, Olshen notes that Clegg is "not only imaginatively impotent but sexually impotent as well" (19). By contrast, Bagchee contends that "Although critics make much of Clegg's sexual inadequacy in [the seduction] scene—interpreting it as a symbol of his spiritual state—Clegg may not really be impotent, but simply unable to function sexually during the attempted seduction by Miranda" (227).

opinion of his own worth. He says that "I never had anything to do with women. I never thought about women much before Miranda. [. . .] It's some crude animal thing I was born without. And I'm glad I was, if more people were like me, in my opinion, the world would be better" (8). Clegg is thus proud of not being sexually aggressive and of not raping Miranda. He certainly accepts her warnings not to use sexual violence against her since he would lose all her respect. He is also proud of his past school days: he says that he was never once punished at school and got all As in English at college (7). Clegg's sense of high self-worth is also suggested in the way he criticizes the man dating Miranda: he calls him "a loud noisy public-school type who had a sports car" (4) and later claims that "I'm not the crude pushing sort, I never have been, I always had higher aspirations" (9).

Readers may view Clegg with a certain fascination, but they are not likely to be won over to his point of view. A considerable part of his narrative is devoted to rationalizing or justifying his actions, and especially to denying his culpability, until we come to realize that he does not fully understand what he is doing and therefore is not fully accountable for his actions. He frequently suggests that the plot was unpremeditated, that the events occurred by chance not by choice. About the purchasing of the cottage, he claims: "I didn't go down there with the intention of seeing whether there was anywhere to have a secret guest. I can't really say what intention I had. I just don't know" (20). Clegg's defensiveness and lack of self-awareness are also well suggested in his cautious mood of expression. "His telling is," according to Tarbox, "a masterwork of self-delusion and self-effacement" (43). For example, he says that "What I'm trying to say is that having her as my guest happened suddenly, it wasn't something I planned" (11).[20] The key phrase here is "having her as my guest," which indicates Clegg's ironical use of

[20] "What I'm trying to say is" is Clegg's usual phrase to justify his actions. He concludes his first section with the same expression: "What I am trying to say is that all came unexpected" (125).

euphemism, especially when readers know that Miranda is not his guest but a prisoner and a victim of his evil.

Although he often speaks of his own worth with confidence, Clegg is indeed blind to his own nature and behavior. Because he is so lacking in self-awareness, he proves to be a very poor observer of himself. He is unconscious of what he is doing, and even with his major act, the kidnapping, he says that he is driven by a force which he cannot control. In this regard, one may postulate that he is constructed as a lost, self-contradictory man with mixed desire and a split subjectivity. His discourse is filled with contradictions: he feels he has a strong will (20), but he is indeed disappointed and "drawn on against [his] will" (13); he wants to buy a modern house, but he finally buys a seventeenth-century, secluded cottage (20).[21] According to Mahmoud Salami, Clegg "suffers from schizophrenia," thereby having difficulty "constructing his subjectivity" (53). Salami goes on to argue that "some of the difficulties Clegg faces in constructing his subjectivity" are revealed from the first sentence of the novel ("When she was home from her boarding-school I used to see her almost everyday sometimes" [3]): "Grammatically speaking, the sentence crumbles towards the end. This structurally ungrammatical sentence echoes Clegg's fragmented self, bad education and social background" (53).[22]

Clegg's problematic subjectivity is aptly marked by his passive means of social intercourse. He fails to form any friendships with his colleagues at work. However, in celebration of his football pool winning, he decides to give five hundred pounds to his former co-

[21] For a more extensive discussion of the contradictory nature of Clegg's discourse, see Tukacs's "Readings and Misreadings in John Fowles's *The Collector*."

[22] Salami's article "*The Collector*: Narrative and Imprisonment" offers a detailed discussion of Clegg's language and its relationship to his subjectivity. The key to his arguments is that "Clegg's subjectivity is inscribed in the linguistic peculiarities of the narrative discourse he deploys" (53).

workers. But when he gives them the money, he says of their thank-you notes, "You could see they thought I was mean" (7). This observation is typical of him: he professes to be satisfied with himself but projects his insecurities and neuroses onto others' views of him. In other words, he sees himself through others, and this passive nature reflects his identity crisis. He never claims to be worried that he may be mad, suggesting, instead, that it is others who treat him like a madman. As briefly discussed earlier, the early part of Clegg's narrative is invested with his dissatisfaction with his society and its way of treating him. According to Foster, Clegg "sees himself as a victim, the world as the aggressor. [. . .] He permits himself to see the world as the source of his trouble, his own self-disgust mirrored (and thereby disguised) in another's eyes" (22).[23]

The disparity between Clegg's high opinion of himself and others' low opinion of him suggests his need to be socially accepted or to shore up his threatened identity. To borrow Hegel's terms, Clegg is not yet "a truly self-conscious being," and thus his "self-certainty still has no truth" (632). If possible, however, we must reassess Clegg's critical attitude toward the world, drawing on Hegel's assertion that "the self should negate its own otherness" (632). Hegel's dialectic works through the negation of otherness, so in this perspective Clegg's critical attitude may be viewed as an attempt to regain his self-consciousness by negating the otherness inscribed in him. Specifically, in his encounters with others, Clegg has lost some of his "ownness," or better, something has been added to his own self-image, namely the others' definitions of who he is. For Clegg, who is highly proud of himself, this added otherness

[23] Much in his past can support his view: raised by his aunt and for a short time his uncle, Clegg had surrogate parents. His father died while driving drunk when he was two, and shortly after that his mother ran off, leaving him with his Aunt Annie and her wheelchair-bound daughter, Mabel. "It is remarkable," according to Olshen, "that Clegg's tale still manages to evoke some sympathy in us, as we gain insight into the private hell in which he suffers. He is fundamentally not responsible for his actions. The possessor is himself possessed; he is as much the victim as the victimizer" (22).

therefore is a disturbing aspect that has to be negated, which means that his own conception of himself is something that must be recovered. In Hegel's dialectic, however, the negation of otherness has value only when it serves to establish self-certainty, leading one to form a new self-image. In this sense, Clegg's success in constructing his subjectivity depends on his ability to incorporate otherness into a new self-image. But it seems hard to claim that Clegg is successful in doing so, for his social interaction do not seem to help him construct a proper image for himself. Indeed, we see that he is more and more determined to live in total isolation, further separating himself from "normal" (10) society. It may be true that he is perceptive concerning social problems, and that he has an acute sense of social illness, but, as Foster points out, it seems more accurate to say that he is "stuck in the juvenile pattern of blaming others" (26). In Willi Real's words, "Clegg's seemingly acute ability to see the world around him does not help him with his view of himself" (5).

Judging from the Hegelian view, we see clearly that Clegg's isolated situation and indulgence in butterflies will lead him to face serious problems in constructing his subjectivity. With this consideration in mind, let us now revisit the question of why Clegg turns his attention from butterflies to Miranda. At first sight, his observation of Miranda reflects his inhuman way of looking at people—his psychopathic collector mentality, through which he views human beings as objects to be collected. His descriptions of the events leading up to his abduction of Miranda show that he does not differentiate his capture of her from collecting a rare butterfly. From the Hegelian angle, however, we may say that at this point Clegg's character undergoes a drastic change: he turns his attention from dead objects to a concrete living reality. In other words, while watching Miranda, he suddenly loses his interest in butterflies, which demonstrates that he now desires a human being, not dead objects anymore. Viewed in the Hegelian light,

then, Clegg's sudden transition of attention can be understood as a reflection of his immediate perception that money, dead butterflies, and Miranda in his daydreams cannot help him construct his reality, that they cannot provide objective certainty for his reality, and that he therefore needs another self-consciousness. As Hegel says, human reality is not sufficient if it is not recognized by another self-consciousness. Man needs external affirmation of his reality: "If [man] is to be fully at home this reality must reflect back to him what he is" (Taylor 152).

It is important to note that at the center of his fantasies about Miranda resides his desire for recognition—though he reveals it only once, I believe that it is a significant statement; he fantasizes about how Miranda would like him if only she knew him: "If she's with me, she'll see my good points, she'll understand. There was always the idea she would understand. [. . .] I can't ever get to know her in the ordinary way but if she's with me, she'll see my good points, she'll understand" (14). At some very deep, repressed level, Clegg seems to know something is terribly wrong with him: "I was really peculiar those days. [. . .] I wanted to give fate a chance to stop me." However, he finally decides to "take a risk" (23). According to him, the kidnapping is "the first wicked thing [he] has ever done" (129).

Let us then re-write the answer to the question of why Clegg kidnaps Miranda: he kidnaps Miranda because he wants to gain recognition from her. His kidnapping of Miranda, I believe, is not so much to fulfill his desire for possession as to fulfill his desire for recognition. When Miranda asks him the reason for the kidnapping, he twice claims that "I want you to get to know me" (35, 37). And he writes about his intention of imprisoning Miranda that "I thought it would be better if she was cut off from the outside world, she'd have to think about me more" (41). The fact that Clegg's desire is no longer directed toward dead objects but toward another desire is clearly observed in his sudden depreciation of his butterflies: "I mean having her real

made other things seem nasty" (36); in response to Miranda's claim that "Now you've collected me" (42), he says that "If you asked me to stop collecting butterflies, I'd do it. I'd do anything you asked me" (43).

Miranda does not feel the need to respond to Clegg because, in her words, the situation is "so unfair" (135). Deeply dejected, Clegg then says, "I don't expect you to understand me. I don't expect you to love me like most people, I just want you to try and understand me as much as you can and like me a little if you can." But Miranda still "doesn't move" (45). She then tries to explain to Clegg the deadly nature of the kidnapping and the unfairness of the situation (45-46). Here, however, Clegg finds her sharper than "normal people." He is somewhat confused by her unwillingness to be his "guest," and embarrassed by his inadvertent declaration of love, he agrees to let her go in one month. He attributes her resentment to the difference in their social background: "There was always class between us" (39).

Clegg's way of gaining recognition from Miranda is quite simple: he tries to please and impress Miranda by providing for her immediate needs, giving her everything she wants to have. His intention is to make her recognize that he is indeed a good-natured man who does not intend to harm or rape her but who can make her happy. He tells Miranda, "Of course you can have drawing materials, I said. You only had to ask anyhow. And a gramophone. And any records you want. Books. The same with food. I told you you need only ask. Anything like that" (47). Miranda also recognizes his efforts to please her: "He wants desperately to please me. [. . .] I can ask for anything. Except for freedom."[24] But Clegg's plans to impress Miranda do not greatly

[24] In Miranda's descriptions of Clegg's efforts to impress her, there are occasional displays of humor that can be found in comedy—overly fastidious, obsessive, or purely mechanical behavior in comedy. In the second week of her captivity, for example, appears the following note:

> Incident, Today at lunch I wanted the Worcester sauce. He hardly ever forgets to bring anything I might want. But no Worcester sauce. So he gets up, goes out, undoes the padlock holding the door open, locks the door, gets the sauce in the outer cellar, unlocks the door, re-padlocks it, comes back. And then looks surprised when I laugh. (147)

affect her initial view of him as a madman. She believes that Clegg must be out of his mind: "But that's what madmen must be like" (124). At this point, we see her saying to Clegg, "You need a doctor" (51).

Clegg buys Miranda a Mozart record and thinks, "She liked it and so me for buying it" (48). In fact, as James Aubrey points out, "Clegg fails to understand his relations with Miranda except in terms of things" (87). However, given Kojève's view in his *Hegel* that "Desire directed toward a natural object is human only to the extent that it is 'mediated' by the Desire of another directed towards the same object: it is human to desire what others desire, because they desire it" (6), Clegg's desire to buy objects Miranda wants can be regarded as human desire—the desire to be recognized: by desiring that which Miranda desires, he can make her recognize that his human value is the same as hers. In this sense, we can also regard Clegg's attempts to show her his butterflies, photographs, and house decoration as reflections of his desire for recognition.

When Clegg shows Miranda his collection of butterflies, Miranda tells him that he thinks like "a scientist" rather than "an artist," someone who "collects," "classifies things," and then "forgets about things." About Miranda's harsh criticism of his butterfly collection Clegg writes, "I was really very disappointed, I thought all her talk was very silly. What difference would a dozen specimens make to a species?" (55). Clegg tries to impress her with the decoration of the house: "I thought a lot about how I would like her to see my house and all the furnishings!" (47). Contrary to his expectations, however, Miranda reacts negatively:

> "How old is [the house]?" She spoke as if she didn't hear me. There's a stone says 1621 over the door. "This is the wrong-coloured carpet. You ought to have rush matting or something. And those pictures—horrible!" She moved along the

---

But "The humorous moments of the novel," claims Olshen, "rather than providing 'comic relief' from the situation, augment the feelings of anxiety and menace" (24).

> landing to see them. Cunning. They cost enough, I said. "It's not money you go by." I can't say how strange it was, us standing there. Her making criticism like a typical woman. (52)

Miranda smashes his furniture and china duck.[25] Feeling humiliated, Clegg then tries to show her his collection of photographs, but the result is the same. Miranda notices a deadening tendency in his photographs as she does in his butterflies:

> I had some pictures of the woods behind the house, and some of the sea coming over the wall at Seaford, really nice ones, I enlarged them myself. I put them out on the table where she could see them. She looked at them, she didn't say anything. They're not much, I said. I haven't been doing it long. "There're dead," She gave me a funny look sideways. "Not these particularly. All photos. When you draw something it lives and when you photograph it it dies." (55)

However, Miranda seems to realize that humiliating Clegg or making him feel inferior is not a good way for her to reach her goal—release from captivity. All of a sudden, she tells Clegg, "It's funny, I should be shivering with fear. But I felt safe with you." Clegg thus maintains his hope of being understood by her: "It was suddenly as I always hoped, we were getting to know each other, she was beginning to see me for what I really was" (53). In her diary at this point, however, she writes that "I'm so superior to him. I've got to show him how decent human beings live and behave. [. . .] I have to give him a name. I'm going to call him Caliban" (137). Clegg does not perceive that her occasional kindness is indeed, in Miranda's words, designed "to win him over with kindness" and therefore to "outwit him" (130).

---

[25] In fact, we must not forget that Clegg's house was decorated by professional decorators. Tarbox notes that "Miranda's shallowness surfaces in her petulant breaking up of Clegg's house: the act is far more histrionic than sincere" (52).

Miranda is definitely a more positive character than Clegg. At least she tries to understand him, which is different from Clegg who never tries to understand her. He neglects the fact that her mood swings might have something to do with her being held against her will. Of course, if he understood her, he could not cage her as he does. However, rather than dismiss Clegg altogether, Miranda is sometimes willing to concede that he has his good points: she sees that he differs from Shakespeare's Caliban in his exercise of sexual self-restraint, and she marvels at his apparently boundless generosity. "It's like having a perpetual Christmas Day," she says in acknowledgement of the clothes, books and other presents he brings her, "and not even having to thank Santa Claus" (180). It is worth noting that she feels under no obligation to thank her kidnapper for the gifts: she neglects to do so partly because he is holding her by force, but also because she believes him to be her social and intellectual inferior, undeserving of courtesy. She is in a sense careless of his feelings, arrogantly assuming that he has none: she says that "I could scream abuse at him all day long; he wouldn't mind at all" (171).

Clegg thus strives in vain to make himself understood by Miranda. His goal seems to be an impossible reality. However, we know that he will not release her until he can convince her of his good intentions in keeping her prisoner, for he "values Miranda almost more than his own life" (Bagchee 226). Miranda does not think she has to understand Clegg. Nor does she think she has to be understood by him. She has only one goal, which is to make him understand the absurdity of the whole situation, the seriousness of his crime. She thus struggles for freedom rather than for recognition. She writes that "I must must must escape. I spend hours and hours today thinking about it" (175).[26] She uses several ploys in her attempts to escape. She feigns

[26] Although she disdains Clegg and considers herself superior to him, she sometimes feels sorry for him. She understands that Clegg will suffer when she escapes because she is all that gives his life meaning. She writes: "I felt sorry for Caliban this evening. He will suffer when I am gone. There will be nothing left. He'll be alone with all

appendicitis, but Clegg only pretends to leave, and he sees her recover immediately. She tries to slip a message into the outgoing mail that he says he will send to her parents, but he finds it. When he goes to London, she asks for a number of articles that will be difficult to find, so that she will have time to try to dig her way out with a nail she has found, but that effort also is futile. No action that she takes produces any result. Every encounter between her and Clegg ends the same way—with her seeking freedom and him locking the door. It is not too much to say that the remainder of the story basically deals with her repeated attempts to secure her release and his desperate attempts to satisfy her.

In many cases, Miranda tries to refuse to be involved with Clegg, instead thinking of G. P., the painter and mentor she admires: "I've been not here for most of the day. I've been mainly thinking about G. P. In his world, not this one here. I remembered so much. I would have liked to write it all down. I gorged myself on memories. This world makes that world seems so real, so living, so beautiful. Even the sordid parts of it" (154). Thus, Miranda journeys back to her past to seek knowledge and understanding of herself through her relationship with G. P. G. P. is a dialectic for Miranda; that is, she undergoes a drastic change by reconstructing what G. P said. She says that "Everything's changing. I keep on thinking of him: of things he said and I said, and how neither of us really understood what the other meant" (165). She lists various ways he has changed her thinking (152-153), most of which involved precepts about how to live an authentic, committed life.[27] Then she characterizes G. P. by telling of a time that he met her aunt

---

his sex neurosis and his class neurosis and his uselessness and his emptiness. He's asked for it. I'm not really sorry. But I'm not absolutely unsorry" (209).

[27] In fact, Miranda's growth is a much debated issue. Perry Nodelman notes:

> What has stifled debate is the idea that being "collected" and held captive changes Miranda, for the better; most commentators agree with Miranda's conviction that "the person I was and would have stayed if this hadn't happened was not the person I now want to be" (261). [. . .] In fact, Fowles says not that Miranda has changed yet, but only that she has the potential for change. [. . .] She remains throughout what Walter Allen once described her to be: "a stereotype of a stereotype,

and found her so lacking in discernment and sincerity that he made Miranda feel compelled to choose between him and her aunt. Miranda seems to choose his way of seeing, and he subsequently offers some harsh but honest criticism of her drawing, which seems to help her to become more self-aware and discriminating. Miranda says that G. P. is "one of the Few." Her aunt—and Clegg—are implicitly among "the Many" (163), who lack creativity and authenticity. Indeed, Miranda associates Clegg's shortcomings with "the blindness, deadness, out-of-dateness, stodginess and, yes, sheer jealous malice of the great bulk of England" (172).

However, Miranda's growth through her memories of G. P. does not last long. She spends most of her time "talking to [herself]" (134) or remembering G. P, while further detaching herself from Clegg. She thus finds herself in the existentialist position of having to rely entirely on her own resources. In this way of life, however, she often feels unable to sustain her subjectivity, seeing herself losing her sense of human reality. She becomes so lonely that she actually hopes he will come down and visit: she writes that "Sometimes I feel so lonely, so sick of my own thoughts, that I let him [Clegg]. I want to him to stay. That's what prison does" (139); "Ridiculous. I wanted him to come. I often want him to come. I'm as lonely as that" (226). Thus, she encounters problems in constructing her reality: "I have a strange illusion quite often. I think I've become deaf. I have to make a little noise to prove I'm not. I clear my throat to show myself that everything's quite normal" (174); "Something I have been doing a lot these last days. Staring at myself in the mirror. Sometimes I don't seem real to myself, it suddenly

---

of the contemporary middle class girl of some education as we meet her on Sunday morning in *Observer"* (333).

However, according to Carol Barnum, "While Clegg remains unchanged by his experience, the captive Miranda undergoes a transforming experience that leads her on the quest for self-knowledge Clegg is unable to take. The tragedy is not so much in Clegg's lack of growth as it is in the futility of Miranda's growth in view of the fact that she can never apply in the real world the lessons learned in her quest" (40).

seems that it isn't my reflection only a foot or two away. I have to look aside. I look all over my face, at my eyes, I try to see what my eyes say. What I am" (242).

This is what is tragic in her situation: she has to admit that Clegg is now the only real person in her world and that she is fundamentally dependent on him. As Hegel asserts, human reality arises only out of a struggle with another self-consciousness so that no individual can avoid engaging in a struggle for recognition to construct his human reality. This view of Hegel is directly applicable to Miranda's case. Her inauthenticity—her insistence on fictionalizing her situation rather than facing up to its brute reality—leads not to the happy outcome she fantasizes about, but instead to a dissatisfying existential impasse.

Her intense need for humanity finally drives her into a relationship with Clegg that she neither welcomes nor understands. About two weeks into her imprisonment, Miranda writes:

> It's weird. Uncanny. But there is a sort of relationship between us. [. . .] It can't be friendship, I loath him [. . .] Perhaps it's just knowledge. Just knowing a lot about him. And knowing someone automatically makes you feel close to him. [. . .] He sits by the door and I read in my chair, and we're like two people who've been married years. [. . .] The only real person in my world is Caliban. It can't be understood. It just is. (148)

Later, Miranda illustrates their interdependent relationship, writing:

> It was funny, we sat in silence facing each other and I had a feeling I've had once or twice before, of the most peculiar closeness to him—not love or attraction or sympathy in any way. But linked destiny. Like being shipwrecked on an island—a raft—together. In every way not wanting to be together. But together. (200)

At this point, Miranda's character undergoes a significant change: she decides to engage in the struggle for recognition with Clegg. Her way of making herself understood to Clegg is to educate him, as it were, to teach him art and civilized behavior. Her efforts to educate Clegg, I believe, represent her desire for recognition, because her education of Clegg is ultimately designed to help her gain her freedom, by making him see her as a free human being, not as an object to be possessed or as an idealized figure to be admired. She tells Clegg in one of their dialogues, "I try to teach you" (224) and later writes, "I feel a responsibility towards him that I don't really understand. I so often hate him, I think I ought to forever hate him. Yet I don't always. My pity wins, and I do want to help him. I think of people I could introduce him to. He could go to Caroline's psychiatrist friend" (229). Miranda tries to alter Clegg's personality or "Calibanity" by inculcating aesthetic and intellectual values in him, since she thinks that Clegg's lack of knowledge about and sensitivity to art are associated with his act of abducting and imprisoning her. In their conversation about art, we find these words: "'Do you know anything about art?' she said. 'Nothing you'd call knowledge. I knew you didn't. You wouldn't imprison an innocent person if you did'" (42).

With respect to the nature of man, Hegel seems to take the position that man is selfish. As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, Hegel sees the encounter of two individuals as essentially "a battle to the death," because each tries to force the other to recognize him while withholding reciprocal recognition from the other. This Hegelian offers an illuminating perspective on the relationship between Clegg and Miranda. The division between Clegg and Miranda cannot be bridged, for they are incapable of understanding the otherness of the other. Thus, they sharply confront each other, forming a perverse relationship, namely a power-based relationship characterized by domination, subjection, and violence. As Miranda characterizes

her relationship with Clegg as "a battle between Caliban and myself" (249), their relationship requires an intense struggle in which both attempt to win over the other. Many critics have attempted to read their relationship as a battle or power struggle. "Fowles," according to Loveday, "views the relationship between the Many (Clegg) and the Few (Miranda) in *The Collector* one of literally murderous struggle" (23). *The Collector* is, according to Michael Thorpe, "a painful confrontation between Clegg and Miranda" (14). Tarbox sees their relationship as "battles of ideas," writing that they are "engaged in a no-nonsense life-and-death struggle" (42). And Bruce Woodcock writes that their relationship "has the nature of a battle or power struggle in which she is the subjected victim" (36). In the following chapter, I will then explore their power relationship.

CHAPTER 4

THE POWER STRUGGLE

In discussing the theme of power in *The Collector*, we may start by considering the novel as a modern adaptation of the Bluebeard theme.[1] Overt references to the tale do not appear in *The Collector*, but Fowles says in an interview in 1974, "I've always been interested in the Bluebeard syndrome, and really, *The Collector* was simply embodying it in one particular case" (Campbell 457). Furthermore, according to Fowles, the direct inspiration for the novel was a performance of Béla Bartók's opera *Bluebeard's Castle*: "I went to see the first performance [in the 1950s] in London of Bartók's opera, *Bluebeard's Castle*. It wasn't a very good performance, but the thing that struck me was the symbolism of the man imprisoning women underground" (Newquist 219).[2]

The blatant and immoral exercise of power and control by Clegg has been helpfully discussed by most commentators of the novel. Given the novel's clear authorial design, however, it is no wonder that *The Collector* is usually discussed from the Bluebeard perspective, with a focus on the theme of the abuse of male power over an innocent woman. In this view, Clegg is a

---

[1] The Bluebeard tale can be summarized briefly as follows: a wealthy, powerful man brings his young bride to his castle and forbids her to open a certain door; when she insists on knowing what lies beyond the door, dire consequences ensue. When she finally opens the door she sees his butchered wives, and in her horror drops the key in the blood. Because the blood has indelibly marked the key, Bluebeard immediately realizes that she has transgressed, and he condemns her to death. The Bluebeard story, according to Harriet Mowshowitz, "has a historical basis in the life of one Gilles de Rais, a fifteenth-century feudal lord executed for murder, sodomy, and witchcraft in 1440" (8). Sherrill Grace observes that the story can be traced "in European folk ballads and the opening-of-a-forbidden-door motif bears striking resemblance to basic elements in the *Arabian Night*" (248). Grace does note, however, "it was not until 1679 that it [the Bluebeard story] received its clearest codification in Charles Perrault's *Histoires ou Contes du temps passé*" (249).

[2] For a detailed discussion of how the Bluebeard theme is used in *The Collector* and *Bluebeard's castle*, see Grace's "Courting Bluebeard with Bartók, Atwood, and Fowles: Modern Treatment of the Bluebeard theme."

version of Bluebeard and his attitude toward Miranda is a typical example of male violence against women. In his article "Bluebeard and the Voyeurs: *The Collector*," Bruce Woodcock remarks that Clegg is "symptomatic of the male idealization of women and of the way male power both feeds on and enforces itself through such idealization. [. . .] Clegg is the prototype of masculinity" (27-28). To read Clegg's character as a version of Bluebeard, however, does not mean that the approach based on the Bluebeard theme is limited in scope, for the theme itself is rich enough to cover the issues of gender ideology, sexual politics, and class conflict.[3] *The Collector* is not a mere repetition of the Bluebeard tale, for Fowles uses the tale to make complex comments on twentieth-century society, politics, and psychology.

Another well-known fairy story, *Beauty and the Beast*, is also often seen as relevant for understanding *The Collector*. But that fairy story does not differ greatly from the Bluebeard tale, since it also takes up the theme of male idealization of and power over women. *The Collector* contains some overt references to *Beauty and the Beast*. As part of her attempts to make Clegg let her go, Miranda tells Clegg a fairy tale—a version of *Beauty and the Beast*, in which "a very ugly monster" is transformed into a handsome prince the moment he gives his captive princess her freedom. The tale hurts Clegg's feelings, however, because he sees that Miranda is trying to outwit him, and that despite his efforts to please her, he is still no more than a beast in her eyes (199-200). The novel's engagement with power and idealization is further seen in its portrayal of Miranda as *la princesse lointaine*, the beautiful captive in the tower. Miranda, according to Pamela Cooper, is "Fowles's first fictional embodiment of the *princesse lointaine*, the idealized and erotically desirable woman who inhabits the Edenic enclosure, and whose elusiveness

[3] Grace notes that "As a story of a power struggle between opposing social forces or groups, it [the Bluebeard story] provides the basis for what Fowles calls 'the opposition of the Few and the Many'" (247).

usually reflects its numinous mystery" (20).[4] In the novel, however, Miranda is demystified partly through the environment which houses her and partly through the obscene impulses of Clegg, for the novel depicts her systematic abuse by Clegg. The motif of *la princesse lointaine* operates most strongly when Miranda remembers that she was once designated by G. P. as "'*une*' *princesse lointaine*" (188). The fact that she identifies with the captive princess reflects that she wishes to have a prince figure who can save her. In her mind, of course, G. P. plays such a role. Both *Beauty and the Beast* and *la princesse lointaine* are analogous to each other in that they present an innocent woman who is captured in an isolated place and who is eventually rescued by a prince figure. In the present case, however, Clegg unwittingly inverts the romance pattern from the outset by locking Miranda not in a mansion or tower but, instead, in an underground cellar. He dreams of playing the gallant prince role by rescuing her from an attacker ("It [my dream] began where she was being attacked by a man and I ran up and rescued her" [14]), but in fact he plays the role of the attacker. One moment he delights in buying nice things that Miranda requests, the next he thwarts another escape attempt. He fails to see that one cannot be the agent of salvation as well as the agent of distress. In this regard, *The Collector* can be understood as "the reverse of romance whereby the hero should release the heroine from captivity" (Lindsay 13) or as "the perverted form of romance and fairy tale" (Olshen 25). This parody-romance aspect is pointed up by Fowles's epigraph, *que fors aux ne le sot riens nee* (which nobody but this pair knew),[5] which is taken from a thirteenth-century French romance, *La Chastelaine de Vergi.*

---

[4] For a fuller discussion of this issue, see Ishrat Lindbald's "'*La bonne vaux*,' '*la princesse lointaine*'—Two Motifs in the Novels of John Fowles."

[5] Translation by Fowles in a letter to Leon Higdon, published in "The Epigraph to John Fowles's *The Collector*," *Modern Fiction Studies* 32 (1986): 570.

The Jungian archetypal approach to *The Collector* is also widely accepted as a useful way of reading the novel. According to James Aubrey, "The most favored model for understanding Fowles's characters is Jungian psychology" (144). Similar are Carol Barnum's remarks on the usefulness of Jungian psychology in understanding Clegg's character: "The archetypal approach to Clegg allows us to locate the core of his personality" (73). But the archetypal approach may be not so much a new way of reading the novel as an extended version of the Bluebeard theme-based approach, because it is based on the male-versus-female dichotomy. As a portrayal of the age-old battle of sexual politics, the Bluebeard story is a rich tale because, depending on the reader's point of view, it has something to say to men and women. For male readers, "the story projects problems with the *anima*" (Grace 247); for female readers, Bluebeard "embodies the deathlike, ferocious aspects of the *animus* in his most diabolical form" (Newquist 218). Given that the *anima*, a projection of the male concept of the female onto a woman, reflects the male's own mental makeup, it can be a problem if a male pursues such fantasy-projections unrealistically or obsessively. Such a "disease," however, would be in Bluebeard, so it seems highly probable to say that Clegg is an *anima* type.[6]

Although *The Collector* is clearly a version of the Bluebeard tale, as an extension of Chapter 3 this chapter will approach the theme of power from a Hegelian point of view, rather than from the perspective of the Bluebeard theme. Hegel sees power as an essential force that drives self-other relationships, whereas the Bluebeard theme suggests that power is a particular

[6] As a systematic study of the quest for psychological wholeness in Fowles's work, Carol Barnum's book *The Fictions of John Fowles: A Myth for our Time* discerns the quest motif in each of Fowles's novels and explores each using the framework of Jungian psychology. According to Barnum, *The Collector* is "an inverted quest" (39), G. P. is "a Jungian *animus* figure for Miranda" (45), Clegg's problem can be seen as "a fixation on Miranda as *anima*" (45), and the cellar is "a demonic parody of Eden, the lowest end of the scale on which the representations of the Edenic archetype might be arranged" (48).

force that exists in male ideology.[7] It is, however, far from my intention to downplay the important role of the Bluebeard theme in discussing the novel. My point is simply that Fowles's imagination in *The Collector* is more paradoxical than antithetical.[8] The main weakness of readings based on the Bluebeard theme is that they tend to problematize only Clegg's character, limiting the power issue to the problem of male ideology with a set of antithetical terms such as male versus female, victimizer versus victim, and perverse versus innocent. A closer look at the text, however, will reveal that in its treatment of power the novel defies antithetical categorization.

The Parallels between Clegg, G. P. and Miranda

In her early diary entry, Miranda rightly identifies power as the major force governing her relationship with Clegg: "Power. It's become so real" (123). "Power" has long been a familiar word in the discussion of *The Collector*. The novel is, as Thomas Foster puts, "a study of power: its acquisition, its misuse, its corrupting influence" (33). But the power issue, however frequently and helpfully discussed, deserves to be further explored, especially with a focus on the other two main characters, Miranda and G. P.—although our knowledge of G. P. is based entirely on Miranda's admiring account of him. It is important to note that Miranda and her mentor G. P., as well as Clegg, indulge in power play. It is through G. P. that the novel sets up its most striking irony and complexity. As G. P. adds another dimension to the relationship

[7] My remarks on Hegel's view of power may be limited in scope, because they are based on the power struggle between two self-consciousnesses before the master-slave relationship is set up. In fact, Hegel's master-slave dialectic, though originally not based on gender, race, or class difference, has been widely applied to the issues of gender, race, and class. For example, George Bataille's "Death and Sensuality" applies Hegel's dialectic to erotic violation. Jessica Benjamin's "Master and Slave: the Bond of Love" uses Hegel's dialectic to examine gender ideology in Rauline Réage's *Story of O*. A classic application of Hegel's dialectic to race issues can be found in Frantz Fanon's work, for example, *Black Skin, White Masks*. It goes without saying that Marx applied Hegel's dialectic to class struggle. To be sure, Hegel's dialectic can be read as an analysis of the necessary failure of a social structure premised upon domination because the final victor is the slave.

between Clegg and Miranda, the novel becomes more and more complicated. Miranda is placed between Clegg and G. P., who are in every possible way different from each other; however, in committing herself to the artist-mentor, Miranda is unwittingly choosing one collector over another, for both Clegg and G. P., according to Pamela Cooper,

> exploit and try to control women. [. . .] [They] are identical in their male perception of the desired woman as actual or potential victim. G. P. is as adept at psychological violence as his apparent opposite, Clegg. [. . .] What corrupts G. P. is his enjoyment of power. In spite of his avowedly ascetic lifestyle, he exercises considerable power in his role as a mentor. He overwhelms Miranda, and his process of instructing her—for which he makes himself responsible after making sure she deserves to be taught—includes playing fairly merciless games with her heart. (40-42)

Likewise, Woodcock notes a connection between Clegg and G. P. "through their desire to excise power over Miranda," saying that "Unwittingly, Miranda provides in G. P. a mirror image for Clegg, another man whom she admires but who the reader can see as a version of Clegg, another *man*" (36, emphasis in original). G. P. uses his intelligence to hurt people and get pleasure out of outwitting others and in being rude and unpredictable in his behavior (160-61, 175-79). When Miranda recounts taking her friend Piers and Antoinette to meet G. P., she describes how he drove them out of his house in anger. As Miranda turned to go back, Antoinette warned, "Darling, he'll murder you" (178). Yet, Miranda excuses G. P.'s manners at the end of this entry in her diary because basically "he was sweet" (179). Although G. P. has some valid opinions on art and morality, there is a degree of calculated shrewdness in his way of expressing them. For

---

[8] "The world of *The Collector*," Shyamal Bagchee says, "is rather like the tragically absurd world portrayed by Kafka and Beckett. This absurdist nihilism makes it difficult to make any simple moral deduction from the events in the novel" (224).

example, Miranda tells of a time when G. P. met her aunt Caroline and found her so lacking in discernment and sincerity that he made Miranda feel compelled to choose between him and her aunt: "I had to choose. Caroline's way, or his" (161). Miranda seems to choose his way of seeing, and he subsequently offers some harsh criticism of her drawing, in Miranda's words, "as if [she] knew nothing about art" (163).[9] Finally, Miranda breaks with her aunt over her failure to appreciate art (164).

In spite of Miranda's complaints that Clegg is constantly trying to force her to change her nature (124, 134), it is Miranda herself who tries harder to change Clegg's personality. As discussed in Chapter 3, one of the main tasks Miranda sets during her captivity is to educate Clegg. She thus attempts to inculcate aesthetic and intellectual values in Clegg. She seems determined to educate him because he is so inferior to her: "I'm so superior to him," she tells herself (137). Like G. P.'s education of her, her education of Clegg takes on the character of a power play. Here, language and knowledge are linked with power—which may well echo Foucault's view of the relationship between knowledge and power, or in literature, for example, this view expressed in Eugène Ionesco's drama *The Lesson*, where a professor exploits language and knowledge in an extreme way to overwhelm his pupil. Miranda continually taunts Clegg about his poor taste, his way of speaking, his cultural ignorance, and his lack of education. Miranda's criticism of Clegg's language is incisive: Clegg writes that "She was always

[9] In fact, however, G. P.'s character is a much debated issue. Many attempts have been made to connect G. P. to Prospero in *The Tempest*. According to Simmons Loveday, "[T]he role of mentor and father-figure played by Prospero in *The Tempest* is filled in *The Collector* by the artist G. P." (15). However, some critics see the novel as an anti-romance which refuses to incorporate any equivalent of Prospero at all. Barry Olshen (26) and Peter Conradi (37-38) provide examples of these opposing views. In addition, Miranda's memories of a relationship with G. P., in James Aubrey's view, "reinforce her snobbish tendencies" (12), while, in James Archeson's view, they "help her to arrive at a clearer understanding of herself. [. . .] His influence on her view of herself is positive and enlarging" (13). Further, according to Robert Huftaker, "G. P. is the spokesman for many of Fowles's own idea. G. P.'s principles of art, morality, and life are accepted by Miranda, and they give her an inner strength all through the crisis and prevent her from giving in to the wishes of Clegg" (80).

criticizing my way of speaking. One day I remember she said, 'You know how rain takes the colour out of everything? That's what you do to the English language. You blur it every time you open your mouth.' That is just one sample of many, of the way she treated me" (69). At the same point in Miranda's narrative, we see that "He's got one of those funny inbetween voices, uneducated trying to be educated" (128). Further, when Miranda tries to tell him about the subtleties obtained by a modern painter, she says that "There . . . he's not only saying everything there is about the apples, but everything about all apples and all form and colour" (62). But these kinds of insights are in no way meaningful to Clegg. Miranda's critical observations about art, according to Tarbox, are "pat, full of cant, and clever academics. They are formulas, art-school catchphrases" (53). Thus, Miranda's intention is not so much to educate Clegg as to humiliate him, to assert her superiority over him, or to show off her erudition, her borrowed ideas.

It is important to note that most of her ideas about life, art, and morality are borrowed from G. P. She is too much dominated by G. P. in every possible way; frequently, she judges people and experience in terms of his point of view. Her credo, or manifesto (134-35), is completely G. P.-inspired, as is her thinking about class distinctions in society. By appropriating G. P.'s voice, she begins to believe that she is superior to other people; she says: "Remembering things G. P. has said to me, and other people. Knowing I am rather a special person. Knowing I am beginning to understand life much better than most people of my age" (154). As she herself admits, she has picked up not only G. P.'s ideas, but also his expressions: for example, the word "fey" (200). She realizes that she has taken to "judging people by his standards" and "arguing as he would argue" (151). Of G. P.'s influence on Miranda, Palmer says that "Miranda never adopts a personal perspective of her own on G. P.'s opinions; she is basically unquestioning of his views on life and art, and her commitment to G. P. makes her more his passive mouthpiece

than a creative and independent reworker of his intellectual or artistic products" (39). When G. P. sees her drawing, he says that "It's not living art. [. . .] You're using a camera. You're photographing here. That's all" (169). She uses nearly the same language and pattern when she criticizes Clegg's photography collection: "They're dead. Not these particularly. All photos. When you draw something it lives and when you photograph it it dies" (55).

Thus, Mirnada's conduct toward Clegg, as well as her opinions of him, are borrowed from G. P. To use James Aubrey's words, "Miranda's behavior toward Clegg is modeled on G. P.'s behavior toward her" (91). Here lies the intricacy of the power relations that unfold in the novel. Just as G. P. did to her, so Miranda tries to dominate Clegg intellectually, morally, and aesthetically, which means that Miranda is playing a G. P. to Clegg. In this regard, Miranda is a version of G. P.; however, as demonstrated earlier, G. P. is a version of Clegg. Then, can we say that Miranda is a version of Clegg? Significantly, Perry Nodelman comments on the analogy between Miranda and Clegg, writing,

> Miranda's obsession with G. P. strangely parallels Clegg's obsession with her. By offering these counterpointed relationships, Fowles forces us to consider their similarities and differences, and leads us to a startling conclusion: not only is Miranda's diary a variation of Clegg's narrative, but Miranda is herself a variation of Clegg—a version of the same character. [. . .] The apparent difference in their attitudes hides a surprising amount of similarity. The parallels between Clegg and Miranda are the most intriguing feature of the novel: why did Fowles make the victim so much like the victimizer? (339)[10]

[10] Nodelman's "John Fowles's variations in *The Collector*" approaches *The Collector* by focusing on the analogies between Clegg and Miranda; according to Nodelman,

> They are both obsessed by ideas of beauty. They both think themselves superior to others, to other members of their class and especially to their family members, because their taste is more refined;

The complexity of the relationships between the three characters—although there is no actual encounter between Clegg and G. P., but I assume that they are connected through Miranda[11]—leads us to readjust our view of the novel and of its treatment of power in particular. The novel may suggest male ideology and power in Clegg; however, given that the three characters appear as parallels in their exercise of power over the other, it seems more appropriate to say that the novel explores power as a major force that governs self-other relationships, rather than as a particular male ideology.[12] Also, the fact that Miranda exercises power over Clegg by playing the role of G. P. suggests that the novel considers power not as a static force that resides in an individual but as a dynamic force that is produced through interactions with others—in Miranda's case, through her imaginary interaction with G. P. Neither Clegg nor Miranda is

---

> and they both use their conviction of superiority to justify callousness. They both hate dirt and are uncomfortable about bodily functions. They both think sex is disgusting, and justify their disgust with the philosophical conviction that bodily lust is corrupting. [. . .] What Clegg wants from Miranda is what Miranda wants from G. P.: spiritual love. [. . .] Both collect in the service of their aspirations for something better than ugly, normal reality—he for beauty, she to make the world a better place. (338-342)

Pamela Cooper also points out the parallel between Clegg's idealization of Miranda and her idealization of G. P.: "As a narrator, she is not only intellectually and artistically dependent on G. P; in her idealization of him, she too partakes in certain ways of the creative dubiety of Clegg himself. Some of the novel's darkness is thus generated by Miranda" (41).

[11] Nodelman remarks on the relationships between the three characters in terms of power:

> Indeed, Clegg seems to have picked up some pointers from G. P.'s behavior as Miranda records it in her diary; Miranda loved G. P. because he was better than she, someone who could and did teach her; and having learned that student-teacher relationship from G. P., she then thought of Clegg as someone she could teach herself as G. P. had taught her—someone to whom she felt superior rather than inferior. Clegg then learns to seek someone with the same relationship to himself as Miranda had with G. P. and believed Clegg had with her: someone inferior to himself, a woman he can teach. He will teach her how to please him—as, perhaps, G. P. taught Miranda, and as she unconsciously wants Clegg to learn from her. In the class-ridden world of *The Collector*, desire is always associated with the need for power. (343).

[12] But this is not to suggest that *The Collector* cannot be read as a study of male ideology. Woodcock's account of Clegg's character deserves our full attention:

> Clegg embodies the classic schizophrenia of the male psyche which has institutionalized itself in sexual ideology by being perversely projected onto and superimposed upon women. Clegg is both Caliban and Ferdinand, the monster and the prince, the two polar opposites of the male spectrum. The classic male view of women as madonnas to be worshipped and whores to be reviled always did say more about men than it ever could about women since it is precisely patriarchal ideology which invents and imposes the categorization. (28)

predisposed to exercising power. Rather, they produce power through the process of affecting each other. More importantly, the general condition of the novel's world—there is no escape, so one of them must win over the other to end their confrontation—makes it necessary for them to produce power, to engage the desire to be the master of their relationship.

Masters and Slaves

In the previous chapter, I tried to demonstrate that the relationship between Clegg and Miranda is characterized by what Hegel calls "the struggle for recognition." I will now turn to the result of their struggle for recognition, again, drawing upon Hegel's master-slave dialectic. According to Hegel, the struggle for recognition between two individuals leads them to form a master-slave relationship. Here, however, one may ask the question of why it is necessary for them to experience a master-slave relationship? In other words, why are they supposed to fail in establishing mutual recognition? What blocks mutual recognition? The transition from the struggle for recognition to the master-slave relationship is probably one of the most debated issues in Hegel's master-slave dialectic.[13] The transition caused by one-sided recognition may be thought of as contradictory because Hegel's account of the master-slave dialectic starts with the idea of genuine reciprocity ("They recognize themselves as mutually recognizing one

[13] For example, Sartre believes in neither the possibility of reciprocity in recognition nor the necessity of the experience of mastery and servitude; in Sartre's view, the idea of mutual recognition is "a tragic farce, an example of lack and impossibility in the human condition" (qtd. in Gibson 33). But it does not mean that Sartre does not recognize the importance of the existence of others or of understanding the otherness of life. In fact, Sartre's idea of the "gaze" was much influenced by Hegel's master-slave dialectic (*Being and Nothingness* 252-302). In his "The Existence of Others," what Sartre mainly criticizes in Hegel's master-slave dialectic is the assumption that our existence is fundamentally dependent on others. By contrast, Fanon believes in the possibility of mutual recognition; in Fanon's view, the ultimate goal of the Hegelian system is mutual recognition; thus, in his *Black Skin, White Masks*, he explores the possibility of mutual recognition between Black and White, drawing on Hegel's dialectic. "Since the Black man is a former slave," Fanon writes at the beginning of the book, "we will turn to Hegel" (50). However, he later finds that Hegel's dialectic does not fully account for the unequal relationship between Black and White, because from the outset, the possibility of mutual recognition between them is blocked by color difference. This is, according to Fanon, "a form of recognition that Hegel's had not envisioned" (69). Since freedom, Fanon continues, "given by the White," recognition is only possible "if the Black man becomes White, or at least extremely light-skinned, but definitely unlike the 'real negro'" (70).

another" [631]), but this idea does not come to fruition in the master-slave dialectic; it only begins its journey, and it is the failure to attain reciprocity that drives the dialectic on. Hegel writes about how the master-slave relationship is set up as follows:

> Since to begin with they are unequal and opposed, and their reflection into a unity has not yet been achieved, they exist as two opposed shapes of consciousness; one is the independent consciousness whose essential nature is to be for itself, the other is the dependent consciousness whose essential nature is simply to live or to be for another. The former is lord, the other is bondsman. (633)

Kojève's version is more assertive:

> It does the man of the Fight no good to kill his adversary. He must overcome him "dialectically." That is, he must leave him life and consciousness, and destroy only his autonomy. In other words, he must enslave him. [. . .] The struggle ends when one of the two gives up his desire for recognition and surrenders to the other; the vanquished one recognizes the victor as his "master" and becomes his "slave." (15)

Whether Hegel's master-slave dialectic aims at mutual recognition or not, it is apparent that it deals with inequality and non-mutual recognition, assuming mutual recognition as an impossible reality—the master-slave dialectic ends with the slave's victory that is not recognized by the master—and that it attributes the failure of mutual recognition to the problem of human nature.[14] In this regard, one may say that Hegel in his master-slave dialectic presents quite a

[14] Kojève writes that "To begin with, the man who wants to be recognized by another in no sense wants to recognize him in turn. If he succeeds, then, the recognition will not be mutual and reciprocal: he will be recognized but will not recognize the one who recognizes him" (10). Indeed, Kojève offers a detailed discussion of why two self-consciousnesses are supposed to fail in achieving mutual recognition (10-14); briefly, however, it seems no doubt that in Kojeve's view, mutual recognition is blocked by human nature itself, rather than by race, class, and gender differences. But given that race, class, and gender influence the formation of human nature, the question of what blocks mutual recognition can be answered in various ways with issues related to race, class, and gender.

bleak view of human nature and relationships.[15] But it is an undeniable fact that not all human relationships are based on mutual recognition. Indeed, there is always a possibility in self-other or group relationships that one plays an active role and the other a submissive role, that is, sometimes one party dominates, sometimes the other.

Let us then turn to Clegg and Miranda. Who is the master of their relationship? In other words, who plays the dominant role? Without knowing Hegel's master-slave dialectic, readers easily recognize that Clegg and Miranda form a master-slave relationship. As the captor, Clegg plays the master's role. He has control over Miranda and her environment. As Clegg's captive, Miranda plays the slave's role. Her life is dependent on Clegg. At the surface level, this is true, but we must not forget that *The Collector* defies easy black-and-white description. Let us briefly recall Hutcheon's remarks on Fowles's characters, cited earlier but worth repeating here; according to Hutcheon, Fowles's novels are "tricky" because Fowles's characters "can be both tyrants and liberators, masters and slaves" (vii). The main characteristic of the relationship between Clegg and Miranda is that the power position between them is not fixed until the end. This is mainly due to the fact that both think they can control each other. In other words, Clegg believes that he is the master; the same is true of Miranda. My aim is to explore their desire to be the master, rather than to establish who the master or slave is.

It may be natural to begin our discussion of the power situation of the Clegg-Miranda relationship by assuming that Clegg is the master of their relationship; however, let us take the opposite path and assume that Miranda is the master. In fact, from the Hegelian perspective, Miranda may be the master. Hegel defines the struggle for recognition as a process through

[15] However, many scholars of Hegel have pointed out that Hegel's description of human relationships in the *Phenomenology* contradicts his theory of Right and Duty in the *Philosophy of Right*. According to Muhammad Kamal, "Hegel's interpretation of rights and duty stresses 'mutual recognition' and gives no indication to the conflictual situation" (6).

which, as H. D. Kainz explains, "individuals develop a sense of identity and self-determination through relationships with more dominant individuals" (98). This means that recognition has value only when it is given by an individual who is more than equal to me. It is important to note that Clegg is well aware of the fact that Miranda is superior to him. Specifically, he recognizes her preciousness and uniqueness. As discussed in Chapter 3, Clegg kidnaps Miranda because he wants to gain recognition from her, which suggests that he already recognizes Miranda's value for him. Clegg believes that to have a woman like Miranda would entitle him to society's approval for manly behavior. Thus, Clegg's sense of worth is dependent on Miranda; he tells Miranda, "It's just that you're all I've got that makes life worth living" (51). We may say, then, that in the beginning stage of their relationship, Miranda is in power, in the master's position. Specifically, Miranda's value is recognized by Clegg, but his value is not. This is precisely what Hegel's "master-slave relationship" means—one-sided recognition.[16]

Let us look closely at the initial power situation of their relationship. Both Clegg and Miranda share conceptions of differences between classes. For Clegg, Miranda's "educated" voice and her being "refined" (6) mark her superiority; he says, "She often went on about how she hated class distinction, but she never took me in. It's the way people speak that gives them away, not what they say. You only had to see her dainty ways to see how she was brought up. [. . .] Stop thinking about class, she'd say. Like a rich man telling a poor man to stop thinking about money" (39). Miranda shares Clegg's perception of her superiority to him; she says, "He knows I would always be 'above' him. [. . .] I'm so superior to him. I know this sounds wickedly conceited. But I'm. I feel I've got to show him how decent human beings live and

[16] However, for Miranda Clegg's recognition of her value may be meaningless or unsatisfactory, because it is from a person who is not like her in status. This issue will be further discussed later when the issue of the master's victory comes into focus.

behave" (137). She blames Clegg on the basis of class; she sees him as "a victim of a miserable nonconformist suburban world and a miserable social class, the horrid timid copycatting genteel inbetween class" (171-72), and she attaches the same significance to his speech. As observed earlier, she continually tries to attack him for his inarticulate speech whenever she needs to assert her superiority over him. When Miranda recognizes Clegg as the person whose picture was in the paper when he won the pool, he felt "all hot and bothered" (31). To escape the embarrassing situation, Clegg tells Miranda that Mr. Singleton, a friend of Miranda's father, ordered him to kidnap her. After a few questions about Mr. Singleton, however, Miranda notices that Clegg is fabricating a false story. From this point on, Miranda harshly puts Clegg on the defensive, so he finally agrees to let her go in one month. Miranda's dominant position in her relationship with Clegg is especially well encapsulated in Clegg's brief remarks on how Miranda makes him feel: "She always seemed to get me on the defensive. In my dreams it was always the other way round. [. . .] I was wax in her hands" (34).

But it is indeed hard to say that Miranda is in the master's position because the range of her control of Clegg is obviously limited; that is, she can control him only psychologically. As the captor, Clegg controls her physically and economically. At one point, "You want to lean on me," Miranda tells him, "I expect it's your mother. You're looking for your mother." Clegg suggests to her "You could lean on me financially," to which she retorts "And you on me for everything else? God forbid" (60). Again, then, who is the master? It seems that at the physical level, Clegg is the master and Miranda the slave, but at the psychological level, Miranda is the master and Clegg the slave. At this point, then, it seems necessary to go back to Hegel to see how he might think of the master who dominates the other psychologically, but who is dominated by the other physically; according to Hegel, though the bondsman may possess "his

independence in thinghood," since "the lord is the power over the thing and this again is the power over the other, it follows that he holds the other in subjection" (633). It seems that Hegel in his master-slave dialectic does not fully account for the range of the master's domination over the slave. However, we may draw the conclusion from the above that the master must gain not only recognition by the slave—the psychological level—but also control over the slave's existence, possessions, and surroundings—the physical level. When judged from this perspective, both Clegg and Miranda are neither masters nor slaves, or, to put it another way, they are both masters and slaves. Then, let us say, they are *quasi*-masters or *quasi*-slaves. Here lies the irony of their relationship. To be sure, Clegg and Miranda form a master-slave relationship, in that their relationship is not based on equality and mutual recognition. As the novel progresses, however, the master-slave dichotomy becomes blurred; that is, there are a number of situations in which readers may feel confused about who is really dominating in their relationship. It is still true, however, that they remain in a master-slave relationship until the end. The rest of the story is marked by its vivid portrayals of their desire for mastery over the other. For them, to be the master means that they attain their goals. What Clegg needs in order to be the master is recognition, and what Miranda needs is physical freedom.[17]

Clegg believes that he is a good-natured man, better than his class and therefore good enough to deserve Miranda; he says, "I knew my love was worthy of her" (27). He also believes that he is the master of Miranda because he possesses her. Possession and power are in his terms the same. About his abduction of Miranda, Clegg says that "It was more like it had done

[17] In the previous chapter, I argued that Miranda's struggle for physical freedom can be rendered as her struggle for recognition, since in order to gain freedom, she must make Clegg understand the unfairness of the situation and the value of her free will. In this sense, Clegg's recognition of Miranda's value does not mean that she has full recognition from him. Viewed in this light, Clegg is closer to the master than Miranda; Clegg needs recognition, but Miranda needs both recognition and physical freedom.

something very daring, like climbing Everest or doing something in enemy territory. My feelings were very happy because my intentions were of the best" (27-28). Reading about his own abduction of Miranda in "the tripe papers," Clegg says that "They all said she was pretty. There were photos. If she was ugly it would all have been two lines on the back page. I sat in the van on the road verge on the way back and read all the papers said. It gave me a feeling of power, I don't know why" (41). Thus, Clegg associates his possession of Miranda with power. The social implications of his possession of Miranda arise when he reads the newspapers. Ironically, however, they serve to inflate his sense of power, confirming his own value as a possessor of such a high-valued girl. Clegg does not allow Miranda to read any newspapers; according to Clegg, he learned about keeping prisoners from reading by studying *Secrets of the Gestapo*.[18] Against his use of the book, Miranda sees herself as Anne Frank. She describes her struggle with Clegg as "the war" between the Gestapo and Anne Frank (239).[19]

However, Clegg's way of treating Miranda is far from the Gestapo's way of treating prisoners. In his relationship with Miranda, Clegg is defensive and sullen rather than assertive and confident, and even his behavior is respectful toward her. For him, Miranda is "too beautiful" to approach (66). Clegg's love of Miranda can be conceived of as a version of courtly love in which a man loves a woman because she is better than, i.e., purer than, he—worthy of worship because she is beyond mere animal passion, so that his desire for her lifts him too above

---

[18] However, it would be inappropriate to equate Clegg with the Gestapo; rather, in his remarks on *Secrets of the Gestapo*, we can read his desire for recognition: he says, "I never let her see papers. I never let her have a radio or television. It happened one day before ever she came I was reading a book called *Secrets of the Gestapo* [. . . .] I didn't want to break her down as the Gestapo wanted to break their prisoners down. But I thought it would be better if she was cut off from outside world, she'd have to think about me more" (41).

[19] Thomas Foster observes that "The Nazi connection leads to a growing strain of existentialism in Miranda's thinking. Miranda's experience of victimization and rebellion leads her to conclusions very similar to theirs. She begins to think there is no God or that God may exist but be completely indifferent to human fates, and finally she decides that 'we have to live as if there is no God'" (36).

the animal. Clegg's fantasies of marriage to her are completely free of sex: they are partners in life, in butterfly collecting, in art, but not in bed. Clegg believes that Miranda will at some point accept and understand him: "She'll see my good points" (14). Thus, he is not impatient. He just stands and watches her. But this is in fact his way of exercising power over Miranda, a shrewd psychological game in which he is not in haste to achieve what he wants but simply waits until Miranda throws up her hands. In this perspective, Clegg's case suggests that the selfless idealism of love can be a form of power. This is not lost on Miranda: "Always with that I'm-sorry expression on his face, which I begin to realize is actually contentment. The sheer joy of having me under his power, of being able to spend all and every day staring at me" (171).

Clegg's passive way of exercising power acts on Miranda's subjectivity. In spite of her firm resolution that "I don't sell myself to him" (180), Miranda feels that she is changing under his influence. Miranda can get whatever she wants in the material line simply by ordering it from him; she says of the situation that, aside from being deprived of her freedom, "in everything else I am mistress. I realize that he encourages it" (146). Indeed, every demand Miranda makes, every errand she causes him to run, serves to ratify his vision of her as dependent upon him. And she becomes so lonely that she actually hopes for him to come down and visit sometimes, again strengthening his position as the holder of power. Miranda complains that "He makes me change, [. . .] I hate the way I have changed. I accept too much. To begin with I thought I must force myself to be matter-of-fact, not let his abnormality take control of the situation. But he might have planned it. He's getting me to behave exactly as he wants" (136).

Miranda resists Clegg's control in various ways. Above all, her diary helps sustain her subjectivity and freedom. Her reminiscence of G. P. is part of her resistance to Clegg's growing influence on her. As we have seen earlier, Miranda constantly tries to make him feel inferior by

using her knowledge about art and philosophy. Her aggressiveness can also be a grave threat to Clegg, as he shows when he objects to her using obscenity early in their relationship, and she responds by screaming obscenities at him, driving him out of the cellar (33-36). In a sense, Miranda's class itself constitutes a threat, as both her father's career as a doctor and what Clegg calls her mother's "la-di-da voice" (9) symbolize. Miranda can manipulate and easily outwit Clegg. In most cases, he cannot keep up with her in conversation or understand her ideas. Yet, Miranda may be as shallow as Clegg in her own way. She tells Clegg, "Do you know I'm a Buddhist? I hate anything that takes life. Even insects' lives." Clegg shrewdly counters, "You ate the chicken" (42).

With each successive escape attempt Miranda alienates and embitters Clegg the more. But Clegg remains unchanged. In an early entry in her diary, Miranda speaks of the "other side" of Clegg's character, the violent, cruel side of his personality (149). Curiously enough, however, Clegg seldom displays this side; and Miranda herself admits soon after making the above comment that Clegg has "tremendous self-control. [. . .] The most unwolf like" (153). However, Miranda takes advantage of an incident in which she finds Clegg's hidden desire to kiss her during their walk through the garden, an incident that affects the power situation of their relationship; Clegg writes:

> Suddenly she said, "Couldn't we go for a walk? On parole?" She came right up close to me, a thing she usually avoided and held out her wrists. She'd taken to wearing her hair long, tied up with a dark blue ribbon that was one of the things she wrote down for me to buy. Her hair was always beautiful. [. . .] I really would have liked to take her in my arms and kiss her, as a matter of fact I was trembling. (62-63)

Immediately after they come back to the cellar, Miranda puts Clegg on the defensive by saying that "You wanted to kiss me out there, didn't you?" (64); confused and embarrassed, Clegg simply repeats several times, "I'm sorry, It won't happen again" (64-65). He then says, inadvertently, "I love you" and Miranda's comment on his words is "They were quite hopeless. He said it as he might have said, I have cancer" (200). Clegg has been proud of not being sexually aggressive and of not raping Miranda, but through this incident Clegg descends to a would-be rapist in Miranda's eyes. Clegg complains about Miranda's misunderstanding of him: "I never had any nasty desire to take advantage of the situation, I was always perfectly respectful towards her. [. . .] What other men might have done, if they'd had her in their power" (63). Through this incident, Miranda regains her psychological control over Clegg.

The Other as an Object: The Master's Desire

At the heart of the power struggle between Clegg and Miranda resides a problematic view of the other that recalls the Hegelian master's view of the slave. The Hegelian master "first destroys [the slave's] autonomy" (Kojève 15) and then attempts to prove that the slave is "[a] product of his own intentions and wills" (Selzer 107). Through this process, "the slave is reduced [by the master] to the status of a thing" (Holt 304). The master's way of looking at the slave leads to the problematic relation of the self to the other, the "I" to the "you" in which "I" treats the "you" as an object, ignoring the free will of the "you." In brief, the "I" dehumanizes and refuses to individuate the "you." Miranda's desire to be the master—the desire to gain freedom—leads her to perform the same operation on Clegg. Her view of Clegg, especially after she regains her psychological control over him, reveals that she tries to dehumanize Clegg, neglecting his individuality. When she tries to draw Clegg properly, she says that "You're very difficult to get. You're so featureless. Everything's nondescript. I'm thinking of you as an

object, not as a person" (70). Miranda's telling of *Beauty and the Beast* to Clegg also shows that she sees him as an object (or a beast). Further examples: "He's not human; he's an empty space disguised as a human" (240), "You're not a human being. You're just a dirty little masturbating worm" (116), and "I kissed the beast" (248).[20] Miranda also constantly shapes Clegg according to her own preconceived notions; thus, Clegg enters her narrative not as a real person but as various literary characters: "Caliban," "Seaton" in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* by Alan Sillitoe, and "Caulfield" in *The Catcher in the Rye* by J. D. Salinger.

As for the problematic view of the other, however, there is much more to say about Clegg. He is a collector of butteries who imposes stasis and a kind of living death on organic creatures. In this respect, Clegg's way of treating butterflies bears on the analogy of the Hegelian master's way of treating the slave. Specifically, the desire to dehumanize and objectify the other parallels the desire to possess things of value—yet the value of collected objects indeed resides precisely in the fact that they stay free and alive. Clegg's fantasies about Miranda are basically possessive. Although it is true that his behavior toward her is mostly respectful, his case suggests that he is unable to individuate and humanize Miranda. It is important to note that Clegg has captured only his image of Miranda; as Robert Campbell says, "He won't, refuses, to see her as a conscious subject who is constituted as a subject of her world; instead she is, for him, only an object in his" (52). That Clegg presents Miranda in his narrative as a butterfly is a clear example of his perception of her as an object, not as a free subject. His interest is in the passive image of Miranda, an object which is his imagined version of her rather than a genuine version of her as a free subject. Clegg says that "The truth was she couldn't do ugly things. She was too beautiful"

[20] However, many opposite cases are also observable; for example, Miranda says, "At least he is a human being" (236). There are indeed many contradictory elements in Miranda's text; for example, she hates Clegg and yet, on a few occasions, feels "the most peculiar closeness to him" (111). Salami sees Miranda's text as representing "the split in her subjectivity" (63).

(66). But Miranda does many ugly things in the book: she vomits, menstruates, gets dirty, fills her buckets, and so forth. She is full of animal life, but Clegg sees only the glow of the façade, the dream girl. Therefore, whenever Miranda demonstrates that she is autonomous and challenges his fantasies, he tries to make her passive, turning her back into a controllable image.

A significant turning point in their relationship comes at the end of a month's captivity, the day Clegg promises to release Miranda. Miranda dresses up for what she hopes will be their last dinner. She looks so beautiful that Clegg has difficulty responding except with clichés and confusion. Their following conversations show how much they are suspicious of each other and how difficult it is for them to reach mutual understanding.

> "What are you going to do when I've gone?" I don't think about it, I said. "Will you want to go on seeing me?" Of course I will. "You're definitely going to come and live in London? We'll make you into someone really modern. Someone really interesting to meet." You'd be ashamed of me with all your friends. It was all unreal. I knew she was pretending just like I was. I had a headache. It was all going wrong. [. . .] It seems the moment. Anyway, I couldn't stand it any longer. Please marry, I said. There was a silence. "Marriage means love," she said. I don't expect anything that you don't want. You can do what you like, study art, etcetera. You can have your own bedroom and lock it every night, I said. "But that's horrible. It's inhuman! We'll never understand each other. We don't have the same sort of heart." I've got a heart, for all that, I said. (88-89)

Thus, Clegg requires as a precondition for release that Miranda should marry him. But he probably knew that she would not accept his marriage proposal. He uses her denial as a pretext

to keep her prisoner. When she refuses and rashly gives her reasons, he finally withdraws his offer of release. She then tries to dash away, setting the house on fire with a burning log in the hearth, but he intercepts and overpowers her and takes her, chloroformed, down to her cell. There as she lies unconscious, he partially undresses her and takes a number of photographs.[21] It is clear from what each writes that both perceive this to be a turning point. Clegg writes that "Things were never the same again, in spite of all that happened. Somehow it proved we could never come together, she could never understand me" (92); Miranda writes that "There is a great rift between us now. It can never be bridged" (238).

At this point Clegg's character undergoes a significant change. The change of his attitude toward Miranda is especially well illustrated in the following episode written by Clegg a few days after the release day's incident:

> She hardly spoke, if she did it was always sharp and sarcastic, she was so bad-tempered there was no staying with her. [. . .] I brought in a plate of perfectly nice baked beans on toast and she just picked it up and hurled it straight at me. I felt like giving her a good clip over the earhole. About this time I was fed up with the whole thing, there didn't seem any point in it, I tried everything, but she would keep on holding that evening against me. It was like we had reached a dead end. (94).

[21] According to William Palmer, "Collecting, photography, and pornography—in Fowles's novel all three motifs represent different kinds of killing, and all are different types of perversion of the life-art relationship" (40). In Woodcock's argument, "[Clegg]'s obsessive need to take photographs of Miranda [. . . .] is a form of self-desire enacted through the use of another and a feature of male desire itself" (32). However, we need to remember that this is the first time Clegg takes photographs of Miranda. Clegg does it once more after he refuses Miranda's seduction. Thus, Clegg's photographic violence takes place only when he feels that Miranda misunderstands him. In this regard, it seems more appropriate to say that Clegg's desire to gain recognition from Miranda takes precedence over his desire to take photographs of her. In this regard, it is hard to say that Clegg is obsessed with taking photographs of Miranda.

From this point on, Clegg progressively becomes antagonistic and indifferent to Miranda. He seems to perceive the impossibility of gaining recognition from her. Also, he seems to realize that his passive way of treating Miranda will not work for his goal. As a declaration of his domination over Miranda, his photographic "rape" marks the initial point of his violence over Miranda.[22] Clegg's photographic violence indicates that he is starting to realize what to do in order to be her master; according to Kojève, "if the master is not a brute, he will never be satisfied and the master eventually reaches an essentially tragic impasse" (qtd. in Gibson 36). Recollecting what happened on the release day, Clegg, for the first time, declares to himself that he is the master: "It was like I'd showed who was really the master" (91).

Miranda's diary entries at this point are full of anger: "I prostituted myself to Caliban. [. . .] His vile cowardice. His selfishness. His Calibanity. Outrage" (236). However, Miranda does not allow Clegg to take the master's position. She again confirms to herself that she is superior to Clegg, declaring another battle: "From now on we are enemies. He is absolutely inferior to me in all ways. His one superiority is his ability to keep me here. That's the only power he has. [. . .] Freeze him to death" (237-238). Miranda starts a hunger strike; extremely worried, Clegg tries to apologize and writes a letter to her.[23] As Hegel says, in order to be the master it is not good to kill the other.[24] Knowing that Clegg can never let her go because his crime would be

---

[22] But Clegg did not try to rape her, of which Miranda says that "Of all the things he might have done, but hadn't. His chivalry. And I accept that. I have been lucky. But I even find it frightening that he didn't do anything. What is he?" (238).

[23] In Clegg's letter to Miranda, we may feel that at some very deep level, he knows something is wrong with him; of course, he never openly admits it. He writes in the letter, "I am sorry, I dare say you think now you cannot forgive me. I did say I would not ever use force unless obliged. I think you will admit you did oblige me by what you did. [. . .] I showed every respect I could under the circumstances. Please give me the credit for not going as far as some might in the same. Yours sincerely, etc." (92).

[24] Kojève argues that "If one of the adversaries remains alive but kills the other, he can no longer be recognized by the other; the man who has been defeated and killed does not recognize the victory of the conqueror. Therefore, it does the man of the fight no good to kill his adversary" (15). At one point, Clegg says that "I didn't want to kill her, that was the last thing I wanted" (39).

found out, Miranda nevertheless devises schemes by which he will set her free, only to have her hopes dashed time after time. When she finds a nail near the door and decides to dig out a stone that may lead to the outside, she says that "It seems a tremendous victory" (203). But she soon finds a much larger stone behind it. Increasingly desperate, she says that "I can't get any relief from drawing or playing records or reading. [. . .] I spend hours lying on the bed thinking about how to escape. Endless" (250). Miranda tries to kill Clegg with an axe he has left out when he is escorting her to take a bath upstairs. She injures him, but he manages to keep her from escaping. Miranda admits that "violence and force are wrong" (243), but not because she thinks they are essentially bad, but because she does not want to lose her superiority over Clegg: "If I use violence I descend to his level" (245). But her physical assault with the axe greatly affects the change in Clegg; he becomes extremely distrustful of her. When Clegg shows up before Miranda the next morning, she feels pity for him and thus tries to take care of his injury, but he immediately backs away, saying "What's the game now?" (98).

The Failed Dialectic

According to Hegel, freedom cannot be obtained without taking a risk: "It is only through staking one's life that freedom is won" (632). For Hegel, freedom means to secure self-certainty. But self-certainty requires recognition by another self-consciousness, and again recognition requires a life-and-death struggle. Thus, freedom cannot be easily obtained. It requires risking one's life. For her freedom, Miranda decides to take, in her words, "a terrible risk" (255). Having failed in all kinds of escape attempts, she finally reaches the conclusion that Clegg "must want me physically." She continues that "I've come to a tremendous decision today. I've imagined being in bed with him. [. . .] I'd take the risk" (255). To be sure, Miranda decides to

act in this particular way in the hope of gaining freedom. Here, however, we should ask the question of why she believes that her seduction of Clegg would lead him to let her go. She explains: "It's useless just kissing him. I've got to give him such a tremendous shock that he'll have to release me. Because you can't very well imprison someone who's given herself to you. I shall be in his power. [. . .] I'm not acting like the girl of his dreams I was. [. . .] [But] I'd let him have me" (255-57). Here, interestingly, Miranda's account introduces a strong element of sadomasochism into her relationship with Clegg; she wants to attack Clegg's sexual timidity and moral restraint. She wants to inflict pain on the other, while she also wants to be in his power—the desire for submission.[25] However, it seems hard to see her decision to seduce Clegg as her voluntary submission, because her present mind is dictated by her survival instinct.

In her decision to seduce Clegg, Miranda is, again, much influenced by G. P. While calculating her risks in trying to seduce Clegg, Miranda recalls an episode with G. P. in which he confessed to being in love with her, saying that women have "the power of mystery" (233). This episode reveals that G. P. is in fact dominated by Miranda's power of mystery. Miranda uses this power of mystery by compulsively visiting G. P.'s apartment, and one day he finally drives Miranda out of the apartment, saying that he wants to break off their relationship. Miranda is flattered but agrees that doing so would probably be for the best. She savors the drama of it: "I'd won the game. [. . .] Of course, I looked sad. But I didn't really feel sad. Or it was a sadness that didn't hurt. I rather enjoyed it. [. . .] The romance of it, the mystery of it" (233).

---

[25] Some critics have pointed out that there is a sadomasochistic fantasy in the relationship between Miranda and G. P. (Foster 35; Palmer 41; Bagchee 230); however, no attempt has been made to see if there are sadomasochistic elements in the Clegg-Miranda relationship. Yet, if they can be both masters and slaves, and Miranda plays a G. P. to Clegg, I believe that *The Collector* can be re-interpreted in terms of sadomasochism. Also, it seems highly possible to use Hegel's master-slave dialectic to discuss sadomasochistic elements in *The Collector*, because, according to Jessica Benjamin, "Sadomasochistic fantasy replicates quite faithfully the themes of the master-slave relationship. Here subjection takes the form of transgressing against the other's body, violating his physical boundaries. The act of violation of the body becomes a way of representing the struggle to the death for recognition" (211).

What Miranda wants to use in her seduction of Clegg is her power of mystery as a woman. Just before she seduces him, Miranda exclaims to herself, "The power of women! I've never felt so full of mysterious power. [. . .] We're so weak physically, so helpless with things. Still, even today. But we're stronger than they [men] are. We can stand their cruelty. They can't stand ours" (258). Miranda succeeds in undressing the two of them, but Clegg proves to be unresponsive, and she makes matters worse by insisting that "sex is just an activity. It's not dirty, it's just two people playing with each other's bodies. Like dancing. Like a game" (107).[26] The results, as both realize, are dismal: in Miranda's words, "We've been naked in front of each other [. . . .] we *can't* be further apart" (108; emphasis in original); in Clegg's words, "She made me look a proper fool. I felt she was despising me, I was a freak. [. . .] I never respected her again. She killed all the romance, she had made herself like any other woman. All I did later was because of that night" (108-109). It is clear from the different emphasis given to the episode in the two accounts—over eight pages in Clegg's version as opposed to under three in Miranda's—that Miranda has no real idea how disastrous a mistake she has made. What she has forfeited is not so much Clegg's love as something far more serious—his respect. By offending his sexual timidity and moral restraint, she has lowered herself to the level of the prostitute and the category of the whore; however, this is precisely not what Clegg wanted. Clegg keeps her prisoner because of her high value, and he seeks recognition from such a high-valued girl. Thus, for Clegg his imprisonment of her becomes meaningless. His enterprise of constructing a proper self-image through Miranda comes to an end at this point. As a result he feels quite justified in

[26] Tarbox observes that Clegg's refusal of Miranda's seduction parallels her refusal of G. P.'s seduction: "Clegg scrupulously avoids any sexual contact with Miranda [. . . .] Miranda shies away from sex with G. P. in much the same way. Both characters blush furiously in front of their beloveds, betokening an obsolete Victorian reticence. [. . .] When G. P. does become tainted with sex (after Toinette), Miranda says of their relationship, 'It was never the same'—virtually the same words Clegg uses after his sexual misadventure with Miranda" (50-51).

asking her to pose for photographs—"You took your clothes off, you asked for it. Not you got it" (117). Then, he takes photographs of her nude until he has "no more bulbs left" (118). When he develops the pictures that night, Clegg says that "The best ones were with her face cut off" (118). As the culmination of Clegg's dehumanizing impulse, this suggests that Clegg's love turns into hatred, and that he now completely denies Miranda's individuality. Miranda desperately asks Clegg to let her go, but Clegg declares to Miranda that he is the master: "You're forgetting who's the boss" (116). As the culmination of the impossibility of their mutual recognition, Miranda's failed seduction attempt leads Clegg to dominate Miranda not only physically but also psychologically.

One must not underestimate the significance of Miranda's seduction attempt. Miranda did not believe that her seduction attempt would change Clegg and thus lead him to set her free, but she nevertheless risks it. From this perspective, Miranda's risking her life rather than enduring bondage permits us to see her as a Hegelian heroine. Significantly, her seduction attempt marks the culmination of her struggle for recognition. She knows that Clegg sees her only in the light of his idealized version of her, and that he is unable to respond to new ideas because of his static tendency. Her seduction of Clegg is designed to animate him and to make him recognize that she is an ordinary human being with free will, not a princess who has to be worshiped. In other words, Miranda's conviction in trying to seduce Clegg is that if he sees her correctly, he will release her. In this sense, the risk Miranda takes is not abstract or symbolical but a very real one. Specifically, her risk is to change his unrealistic view of her and thus to lead him into the realm of reality.

Also, her seduction attempt allows us to see her as an existentialist heroine. Like Clegg's, her idea of love is free of sex: "Sex doesn't matter. Love does" (257). Her daydreams

about G. P. also show that she seeks spiritual love: “There isn’t much sex, it’s just our living together. In rather romantic surroundings [. . . .] white cottages” (253). Given this fact, her decision to seduce Clegg must be quite a brave and original one. Her seduction attempt suggests that she thinks whether she escapes or not is less important than her determination to continue the struggle; she says, “I must act now” (257). This is completely different from Clegg’s static tendency. In her seduction of Clegg, Miranda sees her act as more significant: “I’ve done for the first time in my life something original. Something hardly anyone else can have done. I steeled myself when we were naked. I learnt what ‘to steel oneself’ meant” (262). Soon after the seduction attempt, Miranda perceives the change in Clegg: “He actually said I was ‘forgetting who was boss.’ He’s changed. He frightens me now” (264); but she is nevertheless determined to continue her struggle: “I know I’m going to escape. I feel it. I can’t explain it. Caliban can never win against me” (267). Miranda’s resolve to continue to act leads her to see even her abduction in a new and positive light: “I would not want this not to have happened. Because if I escape I shall be a completely different and I think better person” (270).

Miranda catches a cold from kissing Clegg during her attempted seduction. This cold finally proves fatal. Miranda becomes too weak to resist Clegg, and he accordingly gains full control of Miranda. Clegg is now completely controlled by his desire for power. He is unaware of the seriousness of her illness, instead believing that she is pretending her illness as is her custom. Clegg again tries to make her recognize his position as the master; when Miranda asks Clegg to call a doctor, he tells her, “You forget who’s boss. From now on I give the orders. [. . .] I’m going to teach you a lesson” (116-17). Clegg becomes possessed with the illusion that he wins Miranda’s love by subjugating her; thus, he falls in love with her again, hoping that his love will be returned; he writes, “I was just like in love with her all over again. And another thing, all

those days I used to think, well, she'll be getting over it a long time, she'll need me, it will be very nice when she has turned the corner" (292).

From the Hegelian perspective, the victory that Clegg assumes is, or must be, a hollow one. Hegel remarks on the hollowness of the master's victory and the reversal of the master-slave relationship, writing,

> [. . .] just where the master has effectively achieved lordship, he really finds that something has come about quite different from an independent consciousness. It is not an independent, but rather a dependent consciousness that he has achieved. He is, therefore, not certain of *being-for-self* as the truth of himself. On the contrary, his truth is in reality the unessential consciousness and its unessential action. The truth of the independent consciousness is accordingly the servile consciousness of the bondsman. (634)

The master's access to his own selfhood is mediated through his relationship to the slave. However, the master finds that the slave is a dependent consciousness—the master has destroyed his autonomy—rather than an independent consciousness, so the master is "not certain of *being-for-self* as the truth of himself." To make this clearer, it is helpful to see Kojève's version; the reason the master is not certain of his self-certainty after his victory, according to Kojève, is that "he is recognized by someone whom he does not recognize" (19). As a result, the recognition achieved by the master is meaningless, and his victory is a hollow one. Recognition has value only when it is freely given, when it comes from someone who is like us in status, not from someone who is reduced to the status of an object and a means. The slave, however, can change himself through work and become the author of his own destiny because there is nothing fixed in him. The final victor is, therefore, the slave. Jean Hyppolite pithily summarizes the lesson of

the master-slave dialectic: "The truth of the master reveals that he is the slave, and that the slave is revealed to be the master of the master" (172).

However, we would go too far to say that Clegg is a Hegelian master who becomes a slave, and that Miranda is a Hegelian slave who becomes a master. Also, it is difficult to say that if Miranda recognized Clegg as her master, she would become his master: it is natural enough for her to refuse to recognize Clegg. Moreover, it is also hard to say that Clegg is a Hegelian master. The requirement of the Hegelian master is that the slave must consider him as such, accepting his superiority over him. However, Miranda never accepts Clegg as her master or as her superior until her death. Her diary entries in the last few days before her death are invested with her hatred of Clegg and her negation of his position as her master: "I can't kill myself, I'm too angry with him" (272), "I will escape. I will not give in" (273), and "He's not human. He won't beat me. I won't be broken by him" (274).[27] *The Collector* does not cover all the issues in Hegel's master-slave dialectic; it starts with the encounter of two different selves and ends halfway through the power struggle between them. In the world of *The Collector*, therefore, there is neither master nor slave, but instead an intensification of the desire to be a master. [28]

Hegel's account of the ironic reversal of the master-slave relationship allows us to see *The Collector* as a critique of domination, more specifically, a critique of the master's mentality represented by Clegg and Miranda alike. As we have seen so far, they treat each other in much the same way that the Hegelian master treats the slave, so that, as Hegel expects, they produce no

---

[27] As for Miranda's tenacious sprit during her last a few days of life, James Acheson comments that "With a clearer idea of who she is, Miranda is near to achieving existential authenticity. [. . .] Like Anne Frank, she dies before her time; she suffers physical defeat on the brink of psychological triumph" (14). However, according to Clegg, Miranda finally forgives him: "The last thing she said was, 'I forgive you'" (286).

[28] G. P. and Miranda are also neither masters nor slaves. Though G. P. appears to dominate in his relationship with Miranda, he in fact suffers from Miranda's power of mystery, and Miranda shrewdly uses such a power to dominate G. P. For a discussion of why G. P. is psychologically dominated by Miranda, see Tarbox, pp. 50-53.

result. What Hegel teaches them is that behaving as a master can have no ultimate value for them; to use Kojève's well-known phrase, "The man who behaves as a Master will never be satisfied" (20).

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The Collector's strength and uniqueness come from its double narrative structure. Fowles structures the novel by incorporating two narrative voices, Clegg's and Miranda's, which serve at first hand to contrast each other; that is, the novel's double narration serves to intensify the problem of otherness that happens in the relationship between the two radically different selves, leading us to see them as representing a number of dual opposites: evil versus good, mad versus sane, perverse versus innocent, lower class (the Many) versus upper class (the Few), poorly educated versus well educated, uncreative versus creative, and so forth. The novel's double narrative structure, however, is also what makes the novel's real meaning often ambiguous and tentative; the novel provides within its seemingly straightforward antithetical framework many complex elements that contradict antithetical description. Fowles blurs both characters and issues, and no character speaks for the author. Thus, by reading one account, and then the other, we arrive at a confused version of the same story, left uninformed as to who the reliable narrator is. As a result, the two isolated narratives of *The Collector* offer its readers a freedom of interpretation.

The Collector describes a Hegelian world, but one that may be called an incomplete or failed version of Hegel's master-slave dialectic. Both Clegg and Miranda hardly change and develop until the end of the novel, so it is not easy to discuss how they progresse by means of a series of confrontations between opposing elements, or how they dialectically overcome each confrontation by the operation of what Hegel calls *Aufhebung*. Yet, *The Collector* is obviously a

Hegelian novel because it embodies quite faithfully Hegel's view of self-other relationships by presenting in considerable detail the problem of otherness, the failure of mutual recognition, and the intense power struggle for recognition.

The Hegelian reading of *The Collector* permits us to readjust our view of the figure of Clegg. One of the main challenges of this study is to read Clegg not as an abnormal character dominated by a possessive impulse but as a Hegelian character who seeks recognition, that is, someone whose desire for recognition takes precedence over his desire for possession. This view of Clegg allows us to read *The Collector* not simply as a case-study of abnormal behavior or of male ideology and power, but rather as a complex psychological drama embodying Hegel's conception of self-other relationships as "the struggle for recognition." At the surface level, it is apparent that Clegg's abduction of Miranda stems from his collector mentality, and that he wants to possess and control her by keeping her prisoner. However, if we carefully tackle the question of what he really wants, paying attention to his unusual passive way of treating Miranda and to her continual misreading of him, we can see that for Clegg, abduction (possession) and imprisonment are not his ends but the means of achieving his ends. What he seeks is recognition from Miranda, but he never articulates that fact to her. Miranda thus fails to detect Clegg's intention of imprisoning her from the beginning to the end, instead becoming more and more baffled by his ambiguous nature. Miranda spends most of her time with her memories of G. P., but she soon actively engages in the struggle for recognition with Clegg, because she feels the need to make Clegg understand the unfairness of the situation and the importance of her free will. But both strive in vain to make themselves understood by each other. Their mutual incomprehensibility leads them to form a power-based relationship in which each tries to win over the other.

The Collector considers power as a dynamic force that drives self-other relationships, rather than as a static force that exists in male ideology, a fact that is clearly revealed in its portrayals of Clegg, Miranda, and G. P. as versions of one another. These three characters can be both master and slaves in that, whether physically or psychologically, they exercise power over the other while being dominated by the other. The power struggle between Clegg and Miranda bears a clear resemblance to what Hegel describe as the power struggle between two individuals who wants to be the master. The power struggle between Clegg and Miranda has both physical and psychological dimensions. At the physical level, Clegg is the master and Miranda the slave, but at the psychological level, Miranda is the master, and Clegg is the slave. Clegg engages in the power struggle by means of silence, whereas Miranda does so by means of education. The culmination of their mutual incomprehensibility comes when Miranda tries to seduce Clegg. Though her seduction attempt ends in dismal failure because that is precisely not what Clegg has wanted, the risk Miranda takes allows us to see her as a Hegelian heroine who risks her life for recognition. Her seduction attempt marks the endpoint of their relationship.

Fowles regards *The Collector* as an illustration of the conflict between "the Few and the Many," which leads us to see the novel as a class novel. To be sure, Fowles gives each character a different social status: Clegg is working-class whereas Miranda is upper-middle class. However, notwithstanding its authorial design, I believe that the novel should not be too narrowly restricted to a matter of British class conflict: Clegg, emotionally stunted by being effectively an orphan, cut off from his colleagues at work, and without friends, can hardly be taken as a legitimate representative of his (or any) class. Also, it should be mentioned that Clegg's sole social outlet is with the "Bugs" section of the local naturalist group where he discusses his butterfly collecting. According to Loveday, Miranda's categorization of Clegg as

the Many is “utterly unworkable”; Loveday continues, “the whole category ‘New people’ (the Many) is a phony one” (24). In my judgment, the problem of their relationship is their inability to see beyond the blinds of class distinctions.

One of the surprises of Miranda’s narrative is how rarely she thinks of Clegg, for as Clegg rightly says at the end, her diary “shows she never loved me, she only thought of herself and the other man all the time” (303). Since it is about the “other man,” G. P., more than it is about Clegg, Miranda’s narration is a completely different story. Miranda misinterprets much of what she sees, both in her life and in her imprisonment, because of her obsessive intellectualizing. Her playing the role of G. P to Clegg suggests that intellectual domination over the other can be a form of violence that is as deadly as physical violence. Miranda seems to know that G. P. cultivates a rude insularity and that he can be unnecessarily cruel toward people he does not like, but she is nevertheless unquestioning of his views on life and art. Miranda’s blindness toward G. P. is due, at least partly, to her easy predisposition toward aestheticism. It is also possible to say that Miranda is so extraordinarily under G. P.’s intellectual influence mainly because she is predisposed towards such domination. Also, her playing with the idea of G. P. is so complete that one must question the accuracy of her final realization that she loves him; one must ask whether her realization is motivated by love or simple loneliness and deprivation.

Despite Clegg and Miranda’s physical proximity, there is no bridge to span the separation between them. Clegg assumes that Miranda is more or less satisfied. He is therefore surprised at Miranda’s ceaseless attempts at escape and at the energy and sometimes the violence of her efforts. In his opinion, it is she who does not understand him, not the other way around. However, Miranda is not a free character and therefore her supposed love for Clegg will never become real. Clegg wants to be sure that his love for Miranda will be freely returned; but he

fails to understand that this is impossible because he controls her free will. He misunderstands the difference between love that can be obtained by force—like his—and love that is offered freely.[1]

Since we have employed the "dialectic" method to explain the relationship between Clegg and Miranda, it seems unavoidable to seek the possibility of their progress—although they hardly change and develop. Neither Miranda nor Clegg can grow because they can do nothing but confirm for each other what they believe to be true already. At one point, Miranda exclaims to Clegg, "You're the one imprisoned in a cellar" (59). This is quite a correct assessment of Clegg's character. Clegg is unable to grow because he is stuck in his fixed self. However, one needs to pay attention to what Miranda says: "He is mad. I am his madness" (131) and "I could never cure him. Because I'm his disease" (265). This suggests that the object and the subject become one and the same: Miranda should interpret herself, and the same is true of Clegg. In other words, to gain recognition from Miranda, Clegg should interpret himself, and to gain freedom, Miranda should interpret herself. This fact again recalls Hegel's dialectic. Hegel calls the process of the encounter of two individuals "dialectic" because each changes and develops by influencing the other, that is, by being mixed up each in the other. The Hegelian process of dialectic—which Hegel presents in the chapter just before his master-slave dialectic—is based on undifferentiating between "I" and "you." The self first thinks of the other in terms of the self; that is, each self has a model of himself that he uses to interpret the behavior of the other. While thinking of each other, however, each has lost some of its ownness, something has been added to

[1] Loveday remarks that "Clegg is also caught up in the paradox of the lover as defined in Sartre's *L'Etre et le Néant*. The lover wants to assure himself that his love will be freely returned, but this is impossible, for if he controls the free will of the other then the love will be assured but not freely given, and if he does not control that free will he cannot be sure of being loved at all. Love is like free will, which by definition cannot be submitted to the will of another. You cannot collect people; and if you succeed in doing so, then what you have got will not in any worthwhile sense be a person" (25).

its own self-image, namely, the other's definition of who one is. This added otherness, according to Hegel, should be negated: "the self should negate its own otherness" (630). However, the existence of otherness in each self implies that there are already two selves, and hence two others. Thus, the two self-consciousnesses are like mirrors of each other. Each mirror reflects the other; but it also reflects the other reflecting itself; it reflects the other reflecting itself reflecting the other. This goes on and on and it produces both frenzy and paralysis. In the end, the two self-consciousnesses need to learn how to cooperate. In other words, they should overcome each other "dialectically."

As in Hegel's dialectic, in *The Collector*, the image of unity between self and other is conveyed through the mirror symbol. Miranda's reflection of herself in the mirror reveals that her identity is mixed up with Clegg's, and thus that she is being dissembled; she writes,

> I hate myself. He wants me to hate myself so much that I destroy myself. [. . .] Something I have been doing a lot these last days. Staring at myself in the mirror. Sometimes I don't seem real to myself, it suddenly seems that it isn't my reflection only a foot or two away. I have to look aside. I look all over my face, at my eyes, I try to see what my eyes say. What I am. Why I'm here. (242)

Clegg examines himself in the mirror as Miranda does. When Miranda draws Clegg's picture and finds him "featureless," Clegg "looked in the mirror upstairs," and "couldn't see what she meant" (59). As regards the mirror symbol, Salami comments that "Miranda is seen as the mirror: through her Clegg sees his 'self'; he only sees his reflection and he forgets about her" (61). Clegg's self-examination does not lead to revelation; instead he discounts his madness. Ironically, he often insists, "I know what I am" (103), but he knows neither himself nor Miranda: he does not see Miranda as herself. And that is why she pities him: "I pity you for what you are

and I pity you for not seeing what I am" (108). The whole sight element conveyed through the image of the mirror is, however, not fully developed in *The Collector*, because the novel is basically concerned with how Clegg and Miranda are unable to overcome each other dialectically. *The Collector* presents an extreme case of mutual incomprehensibility, so what we can only say is that each knows neither him/herself nor the other. Clegg is incapable of understanding that Miranda's refusal of recognizing him is because he holds her by force. Though it is undeniable that Miranda is a more positive character than Clegg, she is also incapable of understanding her nature; as Fowles says, "She is arrogant in her ideas, a prig, a liberal-humanist snob [. . . .]" (*The Aristos* 10). The possibility of their unity is implied in what William Palmer says: "the tragedy of *The Collector* exists in the lack of communication between the worlds of the central characters" (34).

In a sense, however, Clegg grows. The Clegg who decides to undertake an "experiment" with an "ordinary common shop-girl" (304) at the end of the novel is essentially not the same person as the Clegg at its beginning. Thinking about the shop-girl, Clegg says that "This time it won't be love. [. . .] I ought to get someone who would respect me more. Someone ordinary I could teach" (304). Clegg's realization here is a quite bitter one that reflects Miranda's domineering treatment of him and how he desperately wants recognition by someone. However, Clegg does not really grow. Though he says that kidnapping the shop-girl is "just an idea," readers know that he will kidnap her (and perhaps many others after her). His problem is that he still does not realize from his past experience that his way of seeking recognition and love will not work. He is still a Hegelian master; he says, "Of course, I would make it clear from the start, who's boss and what I expect" (305). If he seeks recognition by behaving as a master, he will forever be unsatisfied. As I briefly discussed in Chapter 3, whether Miranda grows or not is a

much debated issue. As in Miranda's conviction that "the person I was and would have stayed if this hadn't happened was not the person I now want to be" (270), it is true that Clegg's treatment of her does teach her to be a better person than she was. But whether she really grows or not, given her situation, she cannot do anything about it, which means that her growing up is futile; she learns to understands herself and her life, when, in effect, that life has come to a standstill.

Miranda forgives her jailer; so must we. In a sense, Clegg is a victim of power. His army time reinforced his impression that people like him merely obey orders issued by people from Miranda's class, and his work experience has been the same, showing him that he is a very small cog in a very large government wheel. Also, there cannot be any blame for Miranda. She is just twenty years old. Although I have attempted to approach the two characters from an objective point of view, it is still true that she is an innocent victim. For her, the encounter with Clegg must be an unnecessary one.

Miranda has lost her life, and Clegg has lost everything that made life worthwhile. Their encounter is an absolutely fruitless one. "*The Collector*," Fowles says, "is a sort of cold-blooded book" (Campbell 456). In Ronald Binns's words, "*The Collector* is such a tragic and bleakly pessimistic novel" (322). It is true that *The Collector* presents a quite bleak view of human relationships; it describes a Hegelian world in an extreme way, so in its world there are only the problem of otherness, the failure of mutual understanding, and a life-and-death power struggle. However, Fowles believes that "the true function of the novel [. . .] is heuristic, not didactic; not instruction, but suggestion; not teaching the reader, but helping the reader teach himself" (Chevalier 54-55), so if there is a suggestion of any lesson in *The Collector*, readers must find it for themselves. In Hegel's master-slave dialectic, although its world is a bleak one, there is a lesson that must not be overlooked; as Hyppolite says, "The truth of the master reveals that he is

the slave, and that the slave is revealed to be the master of the master" (172). The Hegel-inspired reading of *The Collector* allows us to see the novel in a positive way; that is, from the Hegelian perspective, the novel is a critique of domination, an analysis of the necessary failure of self-other relationships based on non-mutual recognition and power. In this perspective, *The Collector* is a heuristic novel that reminds its readers of the importance of understanding otherness as a necessary part of living in the world.

WORKS CITED

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

Bagchee, Syhamal. "*The Collector*: The Paradoxical Imagination of John Fowles." *Journal of Modern Literature* 8 (1980-81): 219-34.

Barnum, Carol M. *The Fiction of John Fowles: A Myth for Our time*. Greenwood, Fla.: Penkevill Publishing, 1998.

Benjamin, Jessica. "The Bonds of Love." *Hegel's Dialectic of Desire and Recognition*. Ed. John O'Neill. Albany: State University of New York, 1996. 209-22.

Binns, Ronald. "John Fowles: Radical Romancer." *Critical Quarterly* 15 (1973): 317-34.

Boucher, Geoff. "History and Desire in Kojève." *Legacy of Hegel Seminar*. 20 Nov. 1998. 4 Apr. 2004 <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/txt/kojeve-s.htm>.

Campbell, James. "An Interview with John Fowles." *Contemporary Literature* 17 (1976): 455-69.

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

Chevalier, Jean-Louis, ed. *Études sur The French Lieutenant's Woman de John Fowles*. Caen, France: Centre Régional de Documentation Pédagogique, 1977.

Conradi, Peter. *John Fowles*. Comtemporary Writers Ser. 1. London; New York: Methuen, 1982.

Cooper, Palmer. *The Fictions of John Fowles*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1991.

Evans, Dylan. *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. London; New York: Routledge, 1996.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks. New York*: Grove Press, 1967.

Fowles, John. *The Aristos: A Self-Portrait in Ideas*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1964.

---. *The Collector.* Boston: Little, Brown, 1963.

---. "Hardy and the Hag." *Thomas Hardy After Fifty years*. Ed. John Butler. N. J.: Rowman and Little field, 1997. 28-42.

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

Hegel, H. W. F. "The Master-Slave Dialectic." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Vincent B. Leitch. New York: Norton, 2001. 630-36.

Gibson, Nigel. "Dialectical Impasses: Turning the Table on Hegel and the Black." *Parallax* 8.2 (2002): 30-45.

Grace, Sherrill E. "Courting Bluebeard with Bartók, Atwood, and Fowles: Modern Treatment of the Bluebeard Theme." *Journal of Modern Literature* 11 (1984): 245-62.

Hicks, Granville. "A Caliban with Butterflies." *Saturday Review* 27 July 1963: 19-20.

Higdon, Leon. "The Epigraph to John Fowles's *The Collector*." *Modern Fiction Studies* 32 (1986): 568-72.

Holt, Jenny. "The Negotiation of Power Relations in Gerard Manley Hopkins' 'The Wreck of the Deutschland' and Sonnets about Working-class Men." *Victorian Poetry* 38.2 (2000): 299-318.

Huffaker, Robert. *John Fowles*. Twayne's English authors Ser. 292. Boston: Twayne, 1980.

Hutcheon, Linda. Forward. *The Fictions of John Fowles*. By Pamela Cooper. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1991.

Hyppolite, Jean. *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Sprit.* Trans. Samuel Cherniak and John Heckman. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974.

Kainz, H. D. *Hegel's Phenomenology*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1976.

Kaloianov, Radostin. "Hegel, Kojève, and Lacan: The Metamorphoses of Dialectics." N. d. 10 November 2004 <http://www.academyanalyticarts.org/kalo.html>.

Kamal, Muhammad. "Master-Slave Relationship in Hegel's Dialectic." *Hegel Summer School* 2004. 24 May 2004. 10 November 2004 <http://home.pacific.net.au/~andy/seminars/master-slave.htm>.

Kojève, Alexandre. *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel*. Trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. New York: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Leitch, Vincent. Ed. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: Norton, 2001.

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

Mockridge, Rowland. "Smell of Success Makes Him Nervous." *New York World Telegram* 19 September 1963: 21.

Mowshowitz, Harriet. "Bluebeard and French Literature." Diss. U of Michigan, 1970.

Newquist, Roy. "John Fowles." *Counterpoint*. New York: Ran McNally, 1964. 217-25.

Nodelman, Perry. "John Fowles's Variations in *The Collector*." *Contemporary Literature* 28 (1987): 332-46.

O'Neill, John, ed. *Hegel's Dialectic of Desire and Recognition: Texts and Commentary*. SUNY Series in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

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

Palmer, William J. *The Fiction of John Fowles: Tradition, Art, and the Loneliness of Selfhood*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1974.

---, "John Fowles and the Crickets." *Modern Fiction Studies* 31.1 (1985): 11-13.

Pifer, Ellen, ed. *Critical Essays on John Fowles*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1986.

Pinkard, Terry. *Hegel's Phenomenology: The Sociality of Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Rackham, Jeff. *John Fowles: The Existential Labyrinth*. New York: Scribner's, 1979.

Real, Willi. "Teaching John Fowles's *The Collector* in Form 11." N. d. 21 January 2004 <http://www.heliweb.de/telic/realwil.htm>.

Salami, Mahmoud. *John Fowles's Fiction and the Poetics of Postmodernism*. London; Cranbury, N. J.: Associated University Presses, 1992.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness*. Trans. Hazel E. Barnes. New York: Washington Square Books, 1966.

---, "The Existence of Others." *Hegel's Dialectic of Desire and Recognition*. Ed. John O'Neill. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996. 87-100.

Selzer, Linda. "Master-Slave Dialectics in Charles Johnson's *The Education of Mingo*." *African American Review* 37.1 (2003): 105-14.

Singh, Raman K. "An Encounter with John Fowles." *Journal of Modern Literature* 8 (1980): 181-201.

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

Taylor, Charles. *Hegel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Thorpe, Michael. *John Fowles*. Writers and Their Work. Windsor, U. K.: Profile Books, 1982.

Tukacs, Tamás. “Close, But Not Touching: Readings and Misreadings in John Fowles’s *The Collector*.” *The Anachronist* (2000): 228-49.

Walker, David. “Remorse, Responsibility, and Moral Dilemmas in Fowles’s Fiction.” *Critical essays on John Fowles*. Ed. Ellen Pifer. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1986. 54-76.

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

Wolfe, Peter. *John Fowles: Magus and Moralist*. 2nd ed. London: Associated University Presses, 1976.