

Charles University in Prague
Faculty of Education

BACHELOR THESIS

2014

Barbora Dlasková

Charles University in Prague
Faculty of Education

Department of English Language and Education



Philosophical Perspective in John Fowles' The Collector

Author: Barbora Dlasková

Study subjects: English – Social Sciences (AJ-ZSV)

Supervisor: PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D.

Prague 2014

I hereby declare that this bachelor thesis is completely my own work and that no other sources were used in the preparation of the thesis than those listed on the work's cited page.

Prague, June 2014

Barbora Dlasková

ABSTRAKT

Bakalářská práce se zabývá knihou *Sběratel*, napsané britským spisovatelem Johnem Fowlesem. Pohled na knihu je z filosofické perspektivy, zejména z pohledu Existencialismu. Teoretická část poskytuje přehled filosofických postojů a témat, které jsou následně rozebrány v části praktické. Praktická část se soustředí na hlavní postavy románu, Mirandu Grey a Ferdinanda Clegga a jejich odlišné životní postoje. Miranda je vnímána jako hrdinka Existencialismu, připravená na autentický život a Ferdinand jako představitel Nihilismu.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA: John Fowles, Sběratel, thriller, filosofie, Existencialismus, autentičnost, společenské vrstvy, Nihilismus, Bůh, svoboda, individualita, zpředmětnění, vztah Já - Ty a Já - Ono.

ABSTRACT

The present bachelor thesis deals with the book *The Collector* written by John Fowles. The thesis considers the novel from the philosophical perspective, especially from the Existentialist point of view. The theoretical part provides an overview of the philosophical themes which are subsequently applied in the practical part. The practical part focuses on the two main characters, Miranda Grey and Ferdinand Clegg, and their opposite life attitudes. Miranda is perceived as an Existential-heroine ready for an authentic life whereas Ferdinand represents Nihilism.

KEY WORDS: John Fowles, The Collector, thriller, philosophy, Existentialism, authenticity, social stratification, Nihilism, God, freedom, individuality, objectification, I-Thou relation and I-It relation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D. He deserves special recognition for his kindness, patience, competent remarks and suggestions. I would also like to thank my family for their support throughout the studies. Furthermore, my gratitude goes to my friends for their motivation and helpful advice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. GENRE MIXTURE.....	8
3. EXISTENTIALISM.....	13
3.1. AUTHENTICITY.....	15
3.2. NO GOD IN EXISTENTIALISM.....	16
3.3. FATALISM, NIHILISM AND EXISTENTIALISM.....	17
3.4. BUBER’S PHILOSOPHY OF I-THOU AND I- IT	18
3.5. LOGICAL POSITIVISM VS. EXISTENTIALISM	19
5. EXISTENTIALISM AND MIRANDA VS. FERDINAND	22
5.1. MIRANDA, FERDINAND AND GOD.....	25
5.2. CRITICISM OF LOGICAL POSITIVISM.....	28
5.3. AUTHENTICITY IN THE STORY.....	29
5.4. PHILOSOPHY OF I AND THOU AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FERDINAND AND MIRANDA	32
6. CONCLUSION	36
7. BIBLIOGRAPHY	37

1. INTRODUCTION

The present thesis focuses on philosophical themes that occur in the story of John Fowles' *The Collector*. The book was written in the early 1960s and it was the first book written by John Fowles. Fowles felt the need to express his ideas about life and society which he further explains in his later book, *Aristos*. Fowles himself pointed out that he had much deeper intentions with the book and he did not want it to be treated as a thriller. The movie which came out in 1965, two years after the book was published, supported thriller aspects as well (Eriksson 122), omitting some dialogues between the characters, presumably to catch the eyes of an audience. The thesis deals mainly with the dialogues between the two main characters, Ferdinand Clegg and Miranda Grey, and their different life attitudes.

The thesis has two main parts – the theoretical part and the practical part. The aim of the theoretical part is to provide an overview of philosophical themes which will be subsequently applied in the practical part. The major philosophical stream we are going to deal with is Existentialism. Doctrines such as Fatalism and Nihilism, Logical Positivism and Philosophy of I and Thou are considered in relation to Existentialism. The practical part presents concrete situations from the story, which involve or reflect these philosophical schools. Quotations from the book serve as the supportive textual evidence. The first chapter, Genre Mixture, shows the variety of different interpretations of *The Collector*.

2. GENRE MIXTURE

Fowles' *The Collector* is a kind of a suspense story. What Fowles claims is that people need contrast to their safe lives in order to live happily and appreciate their everyday lives (Eriksson 121). However, there were several cases of serial killers who got inspired by *The Collector*, namely Leonard Lake, Christopher Wilder, Charles Ng and Robert Bardella were responsible for kidnapping, torturing, raping and killing people and they all admitted they had been motivated by the story of *The Collector* (Newton). Hardly can we say that these people would not have done anything bad if they had not read *The Collector*. Nevertheless, we may be sure that reading the book had an impact on their later actions.

The Collector is a tragedy, since the story is very depressive and in the end we are confronted with an unwished-for death of the victim. There is even no hope for any better as Ferdinand appears to be incorrigible. He cannot take full responsibility for Miranda's death and, what is more, there is an open ending – Ferdinand tracking another girl. This fact might make readers shocked and disappointed, especially those who desire Miranda's escape and Ferdinand's punishment. There have been responses to the book saying that the story is without plot and the action stands still, without any conclusion (Eriksson 125). It is partly true because the novel consists mostly of dialogues between the two characters and their thinking or writing for themselves, and readers do not receive any final resolution.

Fowles does not specify the genre of *The Collector* but was annoyed when the book was treated as a thriller (Eriksson 122). Surely, Fowles wants to leave freedom for the readers to find as many possible interpretations as they could. We can say that it is a mixture of genres such as the thriller, romantic story, sociological novel and psychological novel which overlap and raise the book high above ordinary thrillers.

The Collector is in part a psychological novel as we can study the characters and their acting from a psychological perspective. Ferdinand has a dual personality. He seems to be quite gentle and innocent when he is not disturbed but gets angry and dangerous with every Miranda's attempt to escape. His "innocence" is horrifying and makes him unpredictable.

Deep down in him, side by side with the beastliness, the sourness, there is a tremendous innocence. It rules him. He must protect it. (Fowles 242)

He was beastly. Sarcastic. He actually said I was 'forgetting who was boss. He's changed. He frightens me now. (Fowles 245)

Miranda is trying to understand him but she fails. She changes due to her self-discovering whereas Ferdinand does not show any signs of progress at all. Miranda knows about his mental instability, pities him and wants to help him, but all her efforts are in vain.

Fowles became inspired by Carl Gustav Jung's theory of psyche and his study of subconsciousness which we can observe especially in Miranda's and Ferdinand's dreams. Both characters are psychologically quite complex, especially Ferdinand, who tells us about his awful childhood being an abandoned child. The "beast" which is hidden in him seems to be a result of his psychological trauma.

A romantic story about one-sided love from Ferdinand is another interpretation of *The Collector*, which depicts Ferdinand as a desperate lover whose only aim in life is to make Miranda love him. His obsession is not real love but rather a hunger for possessing somebody. As we can see, Ferdinand does not like women but loves his image of Miranda whom he thinks to be a perfect girl, completely different from the rest. He is bitterly disappointed when he recognizes that she is not like the Miranda he dreamt of.

The sheer joy of having me under his power, of being able to spend all and every day staring at me. He doesn't care what I say or how I feel – my feelings are meaningless to him - it's the fact that he's got me... It's me he wants, my look, my outside; not my emotions or my mind or my soul or even my body. Not anything human. He's a collector. That's the great dead thing in him. (Fowles 161)

Miranda can feel that Ferdinand is not really satisfied with her when she speaks her mind since the only quality he appreciates in her is her appearance. Ferdinand needs only her body without her soul.

Another alternative interpretation is that of a sociological novel (or a social problem novel) because there is a striking class distinction which creates an insurmountable obstacle between the two characters. Fowles himself claims that his aim is to point out the problem of social stratification and unfairness wrapped in arrogance and jealousy (Fowles, *Aristos* 11).

The most usual interpretation of *The Collector* is – regardless of Fowles' displeasure – a thriller. Thriller features in the story include narrative patterns, which were taken from modern thriller (Eriksson 123) and detective fiction (Eriksson 127), the theme of desire for freedom and unattainable woman (Eriksson 126), the mood of suspension and excitement, the two main characters standing in opposition - a victim and a kidnapper and effect on readers

who get the impression of anticipation and identification with one of the characters (usually the victim). The readers are likely to identify with Miranda. However, while exploring the responses to the book, we come across opinions that readers may also identify with Ferdinand. In his study on *The Collector*, Brooke Lenz writes: “both characters, Miranda and Ferdinand, elicit readers’ sympathy, if not for their response to their socioeconomical circumstances, then at least for the frustrations and anxieties inherent to those situations” (Lenz 52).

There are a few more attributes one can link to *The Collector*. These attributes are psychological, sociological, sexual, and existential. Psychological and sociological aspects were already mentioned. Dealing with sexual aspect of the story, we focus on Ferdinand. Ferdinand is an impotent voyeur and has his specific way of getting sexually aroused. There are two situations which prove his impotency, one of them is his unsuccessful visit to a prostitute and the second when Miranda is trying to seduce him. His general attitude towards women is rather despising. His statement at the beginning of the book indicates that he finds sexuality as something nasty and therefore he likes his “purity”.

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.) (Fowles 13)

Sexual aspect in the novel is by some critics perceived as a cheap way of how to attract readers. One of them is Eriksson who writes that seduction, pornography, impotence and sadism are incorporated in the novel as common features of popular fiction, and Bruce Woodcock underlines this by saying that “the book unlocks a male fantasy which has had general currency at least since de Sade” (Eriksson 135-136). Nevertheless, sexuality is not incorporated in the novel only to make it more popular, but it has special importance since Ferdinand, in contrast to Miranda, finds sexuality, and human nature in general, nasty and vulgar. Paradoxically, he looks for satisfaction in deviating forms such as pornography, voyeurism and taking photographs of defenceless Miranda.

The last thriller-type we are going to deal with is an existential thriller. It is mainly the Existential theme that is running throughout the story and that is the most obvious philosophical bias of the book. Miranda is balancing on the thin line between life and death. Existential question is involved mainly in Miranda’s diary as Miranda symbolizes an Existential heroine going through the process of self-reflection, wondering about life and

death. Ferdinand, on the contrary, does not think much about life. The two characters are completely different in their attitudes towards life and this difference is essential for our analysis. Miranda represents life, energy, art, intelligence, beauty and creativity whereas Ferdinand symbolizes fatalism, nihilism, sadness, shallowness, passivity and pedantry.

The novel is often misunderstood in terms of highlighting only its thriller features, leaving out other more important aspects of various different social sciences. In this thesis, we will primarily focus on its philosophical aspect.

THEORETICAL PART

3. EXISTENTIALISM

What is the difference between to be and to exist? How do we exist? What is the purpose of our lives? These are a few of questions Existentialism deals with. Existentialism, in contrast to other philosophies, was spread mainly in forms of literature which triggered out its popularity among intellectuals and common people as well. Individual Existentialists' ideas about life differ and only few of them call themselves Existentialists.

Existentialism flourished in the 1940s and 1950s but already some philosophers of the 19th century, such as Søren Kierkegaard, with his anxiety as the dizziness of freedom, and Friedrich Nietzsche, with his statement that "God is dead", are seen as its forerunners.

Existentialism was a reaction to the war. Philosophy felt the need to find out a new direction because the old philosophical idea, the Enlightenment's idea of human progress and rationalization, had failed. Rationalization and objectification, on the contrary, were found dangerous as dreads that happened during the World Wars and especially during the later one were well-organised and rationalized and people were treated as mere numbers. Millions of people died during the Holocaust and a question arose – WHY?

It appeared that much of evil is in human hands and that there is no God who would intervene in order to stop the dreads caused by people. There were two different branches of Existentialist philosophy: Christian and atheist. Christian Existentialism was represented by Karl Jaspers and Gabriel Marcel, the atheist branch by Jean-Paul Sartre, Martin Heidegger and French Existentialists (Sartre 13), by whom Fowles got inspired and sympathized with. The difference between these two groups was naturally caused by the belief in the presence of God. For the Christians, there was God - a great creator, who made human for his own purpose so a person was determined by God who stood behind everything. For atheists, there was no God and no purpose of human life except the existence of human itself. There was nothing like human nature because there was no God who would have specify it.

Since human being possesses free will, they are absolutely free in creating themselves all their lives and are finished only after death (Sartre 16). There is a difference between the being of a chair, which is created to sit on and will not change so we can name the qualities of this chair, and a person who can easily change and there is no purpose why he/she is here until one knows the purpose. This fact may make people feel absolutely desperate and redundant.

The shared and most essential idea among atheist Existentialists is that “human existence precedes its essence”. So the most important for us is living. Heidegger calls such an existence human reality (Sartre 15), “Dasein” strictly speaking. Human reality carries subjective responsibility for life. It is not only responsibility for one’s own life but also for all the others because we chose the best way and so we silently tell the others that they should follow us (Sartre 17). There is not any force from outside but it is everyone’s own burden. We can change ourselves and also the world. Everybody is a little piece that has to decide for oneself and thus contributes to the big patchwork of humankind.

Heidegger adds that, on the one hand, we are free but, on the other hand, we are thrown into the world and cannot decide where, when and if we want to be born or not. People have to find their way in which to deal with their situation (Petříček, 5:27). Obviously, the aim of life is to deal with one’s situation, no matter if the situation is good or bad. Also when person opts for being passive and does not participate, it is still his/her choice. The last option which cannot be taken back – suicide – is considered to be the last remains of the free will and expresses the feeling that life is futile and not worthy of living.

It might seem that Existentialism is quite a pessimistic philosophy saying that human life is without any sense since the end, death, is the only certainty and there is not any purpose that would be known by everyone. Life then seems to be of no importance. Religion might be more satisfying for many people as it gives an answer to the questions why we are here and what happens after death. The purpose of life is clearly determined from outside. However, philosophy provides only ideas but not dogmas. Sartre praises Existentialism saying that the Existentialism provides us with greater freedom and is the most optimistic stream of philosophy (Sartre 38). An individual is responsible and there is no way of invoking fate or bad conditions. It is the individual who develops, acts and responds to one’s situation. Person can also choose if he/she wants to live an authentic or inauthentic life. Authentic life is more risky since people act independently on the others and actively create themselves, whereas people living inauthentic life chose the most common way which is prepared for them by the others.

3.1. AUTHENTICITY

First of all, we focus on Sartre's statement "man is condemned to be free" which will then bring us to the authenticity and the authentic way of life. We can perceive a negative connotation in this assertion - no way to escape this obligation. Being free means there is nothing that leads us and nothing we can rely on except oneself. We are free but unwillingly.

This is only human privilege because other forms of being, such as a tiger, a stone or a book, are not aware of themselves as individualities and their essence is determined by nature or by human who made them for some purpose. The same situation would be for a person if there was a god who would determine him/her and give people their nature. Yet, according to atheist Existentialists, there is no god and thus humankind is the only example of being thrown into infinite freedom.

Sartre calls people's existence Being-for-itself whereas that of other beings is called Being-in-itself (Harle). Human beings have to take care of their lives and they are insecure and changeable whereas existence of other beings, Being-in-itself, means a secure, stable existence where there is not any other option.

Naturally, Existentialism has to deal with the question of morality and how people, Beings-for-itself, can know what is good or bad when there is no god which would provide them with a pattern for good life. Existentialists' response is very close to Kant's categorical imperative which says "Act only in accordance with that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law" (Kant 73). Kant uses the word "maxim" meaning one's own principle in terms of one's best consciousness. An example is: I do not say swear words because I do not want these words to be used universally among people in everyday speech. Kant shifts the whole burden on people and emphasizes one's responsibility for the universal law. Existentialists think quite the same. A person has to decide about every action he/she does and is fully responsible for it. Every time we opt, it is only for the one best option and thus we tell the others that we are aware of our choosing for the best possible option so the others may follow us. We have double responsibility – for us and for the others.

Heidegger, trying to detect what authentic life means, writes that authentic means my own. Authentic self is the self that is mine, whereas the inauthentic self is not mine but is theirs. So we are partly ourselves and partly theirs – influenced by society (Wheeler). The question of authenticity is to what extent I act according to myself and according to the

others. As it was mentioned before, we can follow the others and it is also the easiest way of life. However, we are rejecting the attractiveness of our life which lies in a free will and the freedom we have.

Authenticity does not mean being isolated from the others, neither being rebels and do only what one wants for the moment. An authentic being is well aware of one's finiteness and creates actively his/her own life in order not to be trapped in a mass and then be manipulated, which might be often difficult.

3.2. NO GOD IN EXISTENTIALISM

As Fowles identifies himself with the atheist branch, we will primarily deal with atheist Existentialism. We have to mention again that the key atheist Existentialists write in order to react to World War II and the dreads which were brought with it. Existentialist philosophers who were atheists felt that there was no God and human is completely free in what he/she does. As there is no God there is also not any absolute truth or moral. The way of how to survive in this absurd world is to accept that and find our subjective way of life. People are condemned to freedom and there is no chance for invoking bad conditions as people have to actively live and create these conditions actively. Jose Ortega Gasset made the statement 'Yo soy yo y mi circunstancia' (I am myself and my circumstances) (Walker), which means that we have to deal with our situation and carry on. The final stage we can reach through authentic living is finding oneself which can be compared to finding God in terms of theist stream of Existentialism.

Kierkegaard, the father of Christian Existentialism, puts forward the relationship between human and God. He illustrates it on Abraham's case when Abraham is resolved to sacrifice his son when hearing God's demand to do so. This absurd act is like a jump into the darkness, breaking all kinds of social and natural laws. As we can see, in the centre stands a lonely man who has to select from the two variants which might be completely unreasonable and absurd. Kierkegaard sees Abraham as the true Christian who truthfully loves and believes in God. The relationship between a person and God is nothing one can express by words and understand by sense. It is very intimate and mysterious relationship which can be reached only through love.

3.3. FATALISM, NIHILISM AND EXISTENTIALISM

In Existentialism, we learn that human being is responsible for his/her acting and there is no place for relying on fate which could not be controlled. The aim of every individual is to learn how to deal with one's situation and live authentically.

Fatalism and nihilism are pessimistic philosophical doctrines. The first one is a belief in inescapable fate that determines the results of all action. Fatalism is pessimistic because it resigns on active attitude, saying that although people are given free will, they are hopeless because all the actions end up according to fate. Some people are favored by good luck and some are not since fate is unfair. The one's success is perceived as a matter of fate just as one's failure.

Nihilism is even more negative as it does not believe in anything. Existentialism can easily lead to Nihilism since the world seems to be absurd for both streams. The stage when one finds the absurdity of life is crucial. Usually people need to experience despair in order to find themselves hopeless and thus recognize the absurdity. This state of mind brings them to choose whether to continue their lives or whether their life is in vain and not worthy of living. Existentialism encourages people to face the absurdity and care for life because every individual can find his/her subjective aim whereas Nihilism does not really offer any positive solution and has rather a destroying effect, which is resignation on one's life.

Camus, like the other Existentialists, was convinced that Nihilism was the most vexing problem of the twentieth century (Pratt). Apparently, many people after the World War II fell into Nihilism since the War brought a lot of sadness as millions of lives were meaninglessly brought to an end. There was not much optimism because although the World War II was finished in Europe there was a Vietnam War going on and world superpowers, the USA and USSR, still competed to gain the supremacy over the world.

3.4. BUBER'S PHILOSOPHY OF I-THOU AND I-IT

Although Martin Buber (1878 – 1965) is often characterised as an Existentialist, he denies it, claiming that while Existentialists consider human isolated from the world around and focus on an individual human being that has to deal with one's life completely on his/her own, for Buber it is essential to include a person in the world and in relation to others. Buber calls himself a "philosophical anthropologist" (Scott). Philosophical anthropology deals with human existence and the crucial question is "What is human being?"

Buber answers this question that a person is the being that faces some other being (Scott). Another being is vital for a person. A man relates to the others in two possible ways. These ways are *I-Thou* and *I-It* relations, which are called two basic modes of existence. Both modes are equally important but we have to choose one of them for our interaction. One would say that *Thou* refers to people and *It* refers to things but it is not that easy. It is upon us which relation we chose and create. We can relate to others as if they were mere objects and treat them accordingly. *It* is for us a predictable and stable object fixed in time and space, which we already know from our experience and we can make use of it. In contrast, we cannot manipulate with *Thou* since it is of a different polarity and there is a relation between us and a dialogue emerges there. *Thou* cannot be organized, classified and arranged in order since it is in a dynamic living process. *Thou* does not need to be only people as we can also relate to things, plants and animals via the dialogical *I-Thou* link. (Scott)

When we speak about two different relations there is a difference between the *I* in *I-It* relation and the *I* in the *I-Thou* relation. The *I* of *I-It* becomes conscious of itself as a subject that relates to objects and can use them, whereas in *I-Thou* relation *I* perceives itself as a subjectivity that appears by entering the relationship with other subjectivities. (Scott) These two relations can take turns so the *I-Though* relation can naturally change into *I-it* relation and the other way round. It might remind us of Immanuel Kant's moral principle which warns us against objectification of other people: "Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of another, always at the same time as an end and never simply as a means" (Kamerling). We know that this claim is unrealizable as we are not capable of taking everybody as an individuality since we use the others for their function. When we go to a restaurant we can hardly perceive a waitress as an individuality but rather as

somebody who serves us dinner. However, only through the *I-Thou* relation we can fulfil our existence and reach God. Buber points out that human self-actualization is dependent on our approach to the others. Through *I-Thou* relations, *I* and *Thou* become true whole beings and develop as whole beings. (Scott) Buber's idea is very similar to Sartre's "Existentialism is Humanism" as both philosophers, Buber and Sartre, urge people to be good to the others and try to understand each other.

3.5. LOGICAL POSITIVISM VS. EXISTENTIALISM

Logical Positivism is rooted in the Era of Enlightenment when two philosophical methods, Rationalism and Empiricism, overlapped and combined. Rationalism is persuaded that our rational mind is the only source of knowledge whereas Empiricism put emphasis on human experience provided by senses.

Auguste Comte (1798-1857), French mathematician and a father of sociology, is the founder of Positivism, which he applied in sociology. Positivism is a method claiming that people are able to discover natural rules, apply them further on and thus make progress. According to him, every society comes through three levels of progress. The oldest cultures follow religion, in the second philosophical stage people get over religion and are trying to understand the world by making philosophical speculations without hard facts and proves. The third, and for him the most perfect one, is to believe in rational knowledge and look for logic in everything. There is no place for mystery and contingency in the third stage.

Mathematics was a suitable instrument for Positivism since mathematics is capable of rewriting the world through signs and symbols. The main disadvantage of Positivism was inescapable simplifying and omitting things which cannot be transcribed into mathematical signs. In the 1950s-1960s Positivism was criticised for its objectification of everything, people included. Gabriel Marcel, a great Christian Existentialist, had personal experience as his job during World War I was collecting found bodies and announcing the death of family members to their families. He could feel the sadness of these families and listened to life-stories of these dead people and that gave him the idea that objectification and rationalization try to keep distance and thus hide reality.

Logical Positivism and Existentialism calls Walter Cerf “the two most antagonistic schools in contemporary Western philosophy” (Cerf). Existentialism stands for Humanism and is in opposition to Logical Positivism and Scientism. Existentialism is persuaded scientific objectification, classification and manipulation of all things is wrong. Christian Existentialism looks for the secret of God and Atheist Existentialism calls the world absurd and happening in the world random so there is no place for natural rules which would be behind everything.

PRACTICAL PART

5. EXISTENTIALISM AND MIRANDA VS. FERDINAND

Life for Ferdinand does not have any extra value. He lives aimlessly, only because he was born. Ferdinand's attitude towards life is as follows: "I think we're just insects, we live a bit and then die and that's the lot" (Fowles 277). Ferdinand seems to be unaware of the different kinds of being. Yet, human existence is different from the being of an ant. Human beings are gifted with freedom and thus humans have to create their lives actively. Insects do not have such freedom so their life is more simple. Therefore, Ferdinand dehumanizes himself denying his freedom and engagement in his life. In Sartre's terms, he is Being-in-itself rather than Being-for-itself (Harle).

Ferdinand's life stance has developed since his childhood. Ferdinand's father died and his mother left him so he was brought up by his Nonconformist aunt Annie whom he did not like much. The only person Ferdinand liked was his uncle Dick, who died when Ferdinand was a teenager. The calmness which accompanies his speaking about deaths of his family-members is disturbing. Ferdinand does not express any emotions and the structure of his sentences about death is very simple. These sentences are similar to one another. "My father was killed driving. I was two. That was in 1937" (Fowles 11) ... "Uncle Dick died when I was fifteen. That was 1950" (Fowles 11). Ferdinand keeps a completely calm mind, although his uncle Dick was his only soul mate. It appears that he has reconciled himself with death easily already as a youngster and it makes us feel uncomfortable. Our uneasiness arises when we learn about Ferdinand's suggestion of euthanasia for his handicapped niece Mabel: "I think people like Mabel should be put out painlessly..." (Fowles 16). He employs the same "coolness" when he discovers that Miranda is dead. "Well, I shut her mouth up and got the eyelids down. I didn't know what to do then, I went and made myself a cup of tea." (Fowles 274) His statements about death are horrifying and show his apathy which is far from humanity. Ferdinand behaves like he were an animal who does not think about death at all.

In the course of the story, Ferdinand does not speak about any friends. Presumably, he has been isolated for all his life and thus he is used to his loneliness. He describes himself as "the lone wolf" (Fowles 12) and he does not seem to miss social contact. Especially when kidnapping Miranda, he appreciates being without friends and family. Ferdinand's lacking of social contacts since his childhood leads to his self-centredness and misunderstanding the others. He is sure about himself being always right and it makes him arrogant. He does not

obey any social or moral rules as he knows that life is of no importance since death is inescapable. He is an example of an absurd, lonely and desperate man in Camusian terms, similar to Sisyphus rolling a rock to the top again and again, for whole his life without any sense (Romero-Jódar 48). Ferdinand shows the pessimistic face of Existentialism which leads to Nihilism.

In Ferdinand's case, Nihilism is combined with Fatalism. Permanently evoking on coincidence he justifies all of his sins, including kidnapping Miranda and stalking another girl after Miranda's death. He never takes responsibility for his action and rather tries to rationalize all of his deeds.

I took a risk, perhaps I wanted to give fate a chance to stop me. (Fowles 27)

What I am trying to say is that it all came unexpected. (Fowles 263)

Another thing that morning in Lewes, it was a real coincidence, I was just driving to the flower-shop when a girl in an overall crossed the crossing... (Fowles 281)

Existentialism does not really care about fate and coincidence since humans cannot influence it. Life is absurd and people have to struggle and overcome their destiny. We are there only to live which ideally should not lead to indifference. One has to bear in mind Sartre's important idea which promotes Existentialism as the most optimistic philosophy, saying that we are completely free (Sartre 38).

In *The Collector*, there are two different perceptions of freedom which are represented by the two protagonists. Miranda is deprived of her physical freedom but appears to be much freer in her mind than Ferdinand. Miranda escapes from reality to her imagination and memories. She is creative and much more open-minded. In contrast, Ferdinand is physically free but he is limited in his mind. "He doesn't believe in any other world but the one he lives in and sees. He's the one in prison; in his own hateful narrow present world." (Fowles 212)

The fact that Miranda is deprived of her physical freedom makes her love her life even more than before. She is interested in the world and does not find life as meaningless and absurd. Miranda is full of vital energy and hates everything which is "anti-life". She hates violence claiming that she is a Buddhist which proves that she is not really able to accept death as the final stage of human existence but rather sees life-time as a circle. Buddhism serves her mainly as an inspiration for her own moral principles. We can see that she does not do exactly what she believes in because she eats meat and despises herself for it. However,

her awareness of her weakness makes Miranda sympathetic to the readers. The opposite is Ferdinand who never admits any of his failures.

Miranda is an embodiment of humanity and morality as she has her own moral principles which she tries to follow. The scene with an axe and having Ferdinand at her mercy makes her a morally better being. She does not even regret not killing him. On the contrary, she regrets hurting him and thus breaking her principles and falling down to Ferdinand's anti-human level. She undergoes a process of self-reflection as she has enough time to evaluate herself and her life which brings her to a positive change. She is prepared to live a better life when she is free again. Therefore she never gives up. When Miranda recognizes that she is dying, she tries to make Ferdinand devote some money to poor children to have the feeling that her life was not totally in vain.

Because if I escape I shall be a completely different and I think better person. Because if I don't escape, if something dreadful happened, I shall still know that the person I was and would have stayed if this hadn't happened was not the person I now want to be. (Fowles 251)

According to Eriksson, the main existential problem of the novel is whether to act or not to act (Eriksson 145) which corresponds with the question of free will and unavoidable duty of making choice in the philosophy of Existentialism. Everyone has to make decisions. There are a few such situations including Ferdinand's kidnapping Miranda and his decision that he will never let her go, or Miranda's brave attempts to escape (giving Ferdinand a push and running away, digging a tunnel, leaving a note in the letter for her parents and the seduction scene) escalating in the scene with an axe when Miranda has the only chance to kill Ferdinand but she is not able to do it. Miranda is skating on thin ice as she can never predict the consequences of her failed attempts. The last essential "act-or-not-to-act scene" is when Ferdinand hesitates whether to save Miranda's life by taking her to see a doctor and thus losing her, or letting her die.

The story is full of existential absurdity and unfairness. We cannot predict what will happen next since Ferdinand is completely unstable. Miranda is trapped in an absurd situation where she cannot find any reasonable solution. The end, Miranda's death, is a symbolic expression for the only certainty in one's life.

5.1. MIRANDA, FERDINAND AND GOD

It is clear enough that Ferdinand does not believe in anything transcendental. His striking apathy does not allow him to believe. He has never wondered about anything that may transcend his existence. He is drowned in the absurd world and does not try to find any purpose of his life. His only goal is having Miranda so his life is for him fulfilled. There is an interesting dialogue between the two characters which proves Ferdinand's shallowness and Miranda's arrogance.

'Do you believe in God?' was one. Not much, I answered. 'It must be yes or no.' I don't think about it. Don't see that it matters. 'You are the one imprisoned in a cellar,' she said. Do you believe, I asked. 'Of course I do. I'm a human being.' (Fowles 58-59)

Later on, it appears that Miranda was lying to Ferdinand, presumably in order to make Ferdinand feel embarrassed and to show her superiority. She can feel the danger of Nihilism and indifference which is presented by Ferdinand. Miranda is much more complex in terms of faith as she is not stable in her belief and changes her attitude towards God.

Before being kidnapped, she was presumably an atheist and she never followed any religion. Her misfortune and fear brought her to thinking about God rather than believing. She makes her own principles according to her best belief. She claims that she is a Buddhist. We do not know to what extent she really is a Buddhist but there are moral principles she shares with Buddhism such as loving-kindness to all beings, the principle of non-violence and self-recognition, which she is unconsciously going through. Miranda confesses that she prays only when she needs it. Understandably, she does it in the situations of absolute hopelessness when she cannot do anything else. As she says, she prays primarily for her feeling better.

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

Miranda tries to find the reason of all the disasters in the world. She searches for a supernatural power that would be the trigger. She is used to a "cause-effect" pattern and for a long time she does not consider the absurdity of life. She finds a solution in Deism, a rationalized form of Christianity, which perceives God as a watchmaker who made us and the world and left us alone. This deistic idea of God is shared by Fowles, who in his book *Aristos*

writes that if he were the righteous God, the smartest thing would be to disappear and leave people to rule themselves, as it is not possible to be fair to everybody (Fowles, *Aristos* 21). Miranda is gradually realizing that she is alone, which is supposed to be a big step towards authenticity and self-recognition.

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

These last few days I've felt Godless. I've felt cleaner, less muddled, less blind. I still believe in a God. But he's so remote, so cold, so mathematical. I see that we have to live as if there is no God. Prayer and worship and singing hymns – all silly and useless. (Fowles 222-223)

She feels totally independent when she recognizes that God will not help her. Suddenly, she is resolved to fight for her freedom. As she chooses positive words such as “cleaner, less muddled and less blind” (Fowles 223), feeling Godless has apparently a positive effect on her. She breaks her principle of non-violence and justifies it by her strongest wish – to survive. She can feel the absurdity of the world which is made by God who is deaf. She imagines God as a scientist or mathematician who does not care about people and who keeps distance from them. At this point, Miranda personally hates all scientists and mathematicians, God included.

I'm trying to explain why I'm breaking with my principles (about never committing violence). It is still my principle, but I see you have to break principles sometimes to survive. It's no good trusting vaguely in your luck, in Providence or God's being kind to you. You have to act and fight for yourself. The sky is absolutely empty. Beautifully pure and empty... There must be God and he can't know anything about us. (Fowles 223)

She knows that she has to rely only on herself because there is nobody who could help her. Her assumption that there is no God leads to hatred. She finds the absurdity of this world frustrating and compares God to “a great loathsome spider in the darkness” (Fowles 255) and then presumably to Ferdinand when saying that “God is impotent. He can’t love us” (Fowles 255)

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

Despite her hatred, she continues talking to God. There is a paradox in her monologue when she says that there is no God, and immediately in the following sentence she pleads God again. In the end, she is hopeless and knows that the only one who could help her is God.

No pity. No God. I don’t mind for myself any more. But oh God the beastliness of it all. (Fowles 258)...Oh God oh God do not let me die. God do not let me die. Do not let me die. (Fowles 260)

For Miranda, God is an ignorant mathematician who cannot establish any relationship with people since God does not care for them. One can find similarities with Ferdinand who feeds her and provides her with material things but does not give her any other necessities for life. He is cold and does not express emotions. He is also not capable of establishing a relationship with Miranda as he treats her as an object.

Miranda, unlike Ferdinand, is wondering about God which brings her to authenticity and recognition of her freedom and thus thinking of God is for her more beneficial than simple believing. We can direct her pleading God to Ferdinand who appears to have similar qualities as the God-mathematician which Miranda despises.

5.2. CRITICISM OF LOGICAL POSITIVISM

Fowles mediates his opinion on Positivism through Miranda, who stands against Logical Positivism, science and objectification. Miranda sees scientists as people who can see things only as objects and cannot appreciate them as they are.

‘I hate scientists,’ she said. ‘I hate people who collect things, and classify things and give them names and then forget all about them. That’s what people are always doing in art. They call a painter an impressionist or a cubist or something and then they put him in a drawer and don’t see him as a living individual painter any more. But I can see they are beautifully arranged.’(Fowles 55)

Clegg is a punctual man who does what is required. He loves having things in order and unexpected situations confuse him. His narration gives us an impression that he likes to be prepared and that is the reason why he often uses clichés and empty phrases. He is not creative at all while Miranda is the opposite. Their discussion about art shows their attitude not only to arts but also to life. Miranda paints only the essence of things to let them “live” and argues that photographs and records are deadening.

‘They’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.’ It’s like a record, I said. ‘Yes. All dry and dead.’ (Fowles 55)

However, Ferdinand is happier with dead things as they cannot change and thus they are completely under his control. Ferdinand’s hobbies allow him to freeze time and save the objects as they are. Photographs, dead butterflies and dead women are all meaningless deaths, only for Ferdinand’s pleasure and completely in his possession.

Ferdinand symbolizes Positivism, rationalization and objectification whereas Miranda embodies Humanism and spontaneity. The title of the book, *The Collector*, is a metaphor for Ferdinand. Butterflies symbolize all the beauty, including the beautiful Miranda full of life and desperately longing to be free and fly away. B. Woodcock considers: “It was not an accident that Fowles made Clegg a collector of butterflies: the ancient Greeks used the same word for butterfly and soul. Collectors do not like the butterflies which are alive. Therefore,

Clegg cannot make the ideal he created correspond with reality.” (Hneusheva 24) Both characters are well aware of the analogy between Miranda and butterflies.

‘Aren’t you going to show me my fellow-victims?’ Of course I wanted nothing better. I pulled out one or two of the most attractive drawers – members of the same genus drawers, nothing serious, just for show, really. (Fowles 54)

Ferdinand sees Miranda as his greatest exhibit. Miranda remembers her tutor G.P. criticising art collectors for their arrogance and now she can understand his point.

I know what I am to him. A butterfly he has always wanted to catch. I remember (the very first time I met him) G.P. saying that collectors were the worst animals of all. He meant art collectors, of course. I didn’t really understand, I thought he was just trying to shock Caroline – and me. But of course, he is right. They’re anti-life, anti-art, anti-everything. (Fowles 123)

Existentialism, hand in hand with Humanism, stands against Logical Positivism and Scientism. Miranda embodies Humanism whereas Ferdinand stands for Scientism. Ferdinand cannot see beings in their wholeness but he tends to see only parts of them and thus he makes objects of those who surround him. When he catches butterflies he can see only its beauty and cannot think of its wholeness and unity with nature. His narrow-mindedness rules him and thus he also cannot believe in God as he has no rational proof of God’s existence.

5.3. AUTHENTICITY IN THE STORY

John Fowles puts a great emphasis on the theme of Existential authenticity. Authenticity and conformity are, in terms of Existentialism, modes of life one can decide for. In Fowles’ preface to *Aristos*, Fowles encourages people to be authentic and resist conformist pressures, which attack people from everywhere. He thinks that people of his time (1960s) are the laziest in terms of making their own opinions. (Fowles, *Aristos* 7-8) According to him, democracy is a misleading term which appears to promise freedom to individuals but it is not like that in reality. Western democratic societies use brainwashing in order to make people behave sheep-like (Vipond 71). People are easily manipulated as they rather choose conformity with society to avoid the responsibility.

In *Aristos*, Fowles writes about his inspiration which he found in Heraclitus, who distinguished two groups in society. One group consists of *aristoi*, intellectuals who carry morality, and the rest are common people, *hoi polloi*, which follow rules and adapt easily. (Fowles, *Aristos* 9) Democracy is nominally the reign of the mass, *hoi polloi*, which are considered to be intellectually immature. However, Fowles' opinion about authenticity and inauthenticity is different, giving the individuals a chance to get out of their "class". Each of us is to some extent authentic and to some extent inauthentic, and there is not a strict line between the two groups of people but it is a question of every individuality (Fowles, *Aristos* 10). Fowles does not make any determining groups which should limit individualities since his mission is to emphasize a freedom of every individual. However, he does not deny that there is a certain social stratification and people have unequal conditions for life.

Fowles diverges from other Existentialists who do not want to take coincidence and environment into consideration when evaluating human beings. One is born and cannot influence where, when and if he/she wants to be born or not. Fowles describes Ferdinand as a victim of bad social and biological conditions. He does not really blame Ferdinand for his ignorance and arrogance. What Fowles emphasizes is the inequality among people and ignorance that is from both sides, from The Few and from The Many.

Ferdinand appears to be rather inauthentic being for all his life. Ferdinand was seen as a good boy who was rather standing quietly in the corner and this has never really changed. He finds life absurd and does not find any purpose in it. Since he lives aimlessly, he does not respect anyone and anything. He commits the crime out of his ignorance and egotism. Although he does whatever he wants he is not an authentic being since his egotistic decisions are good only for him. Neither the Golden rule, which says that "treat others how you wish to be treated" (Flew 134) nor Kant's similar categorical imperative, "act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law without contradiction" (Kant 30), can be applied to his behaviour. He is absolutely self-centred and does not take responsibility either for other people or for himself. His using fate as an excuse is a sign of his inauthenticity as well. He cannot react spontaneously and thus he becomes confused very easily. He is rather silent but when he speaks he often uses clichés. He foolishly follows the norms and passively does things copying others.

Then I knelt and said a prayer, the only one I knew was Our Father, so I said some of that and God rest her soul, not that I believe in religion, but it seemed right. Then I went upstairs. (Fowles 274)

In the beginning, Miranda is not really authentic either. She represents her upper class and looks down on Ferdinand, so she blindly follows a given stereotypical division of people. As she wants to show her superior position, she appears to be egotistic, not letting Ferdinand have his own opinion. Being an artist, she thinks that she understands art more than Ferdinand. She does not admit that her thoughts are mostly taken from her tutor G.P. There are moments when Miranda learns about Ferdinand and finds him quite “innocent” when she discovers his awful past.

I feel the sadness of his life, too, terribly. And of those of his miserable aunt and his cousin and their relatives in Australia. ... People who would never see, feel, dance, draw, cry at music, feel the world, the west wind. Never be any real sense. Just those free words, said and meant. I love you. They were quite hopeless. He said it as he might have said, I have cancer. His fairy story. (Fowles 187-188)

Fowles writes that Miranda knows that she is a member of the élite and fails to accept the faults of “The Many”. She is trying to understand Ferdinand but she is not really patient and she keeps patronising him which does not really help her. (Acheson 13)

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

Her essential step towards authenticity is when she has a chance to kill Ferdinand but she does not do it as she cannot dehumanize herself and step down on Ferdinand's level. Miranda's aim is to revolt against the conformist society as she feels she has a potential to show other people the right way of life. She gradually becomes an authentic being as she recognizes that she is the only one who can change her life. From the beginning till the end, she is actively engaged in her life and struggles. She undergoes a process of self-discovery and knows that when she gets out, she will be a different being.

The division of society into The Few and The Many is one of the main issues of the story. Miranda represents The Few whereas Ferdinand stands for The Many. Speaking about The Many, there appears a term “New People” which corresponds to the class of inauthentic consumers in capitalistic society. New People are described as people not really thinking

about life but buying and consuming things. The symbolic indicator of New People is the possession of a car and a television. G.P. defines the New People as “poor people” because they are oriented only on material things and their souls become devastated.

He said, the New People are still the poor people. Theirs is the new form of poverty. The others hadn't any money and these haven't any soul. ... I know he's wrong somewhere (he was exaggerating). One must be on the Left. Every decent person I've ever met has been anti-Tory. But I see what he feels, I mean I feel it myself more and more, this awful deadweight of the fat little New People on everything. Corrupting everything. Vulgarizing everything. Raping the countryside, as D says in his squire moods. Everything mass-produced. Mass-everything. (Fowles 207-208)

Ferdinand is one of the New People. As he wins money which he cannot handle he becomes “powerful” and misuse the money in his way. Money corrupts New People.

5.4. PHILOSOPHY OF I AND THOU AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FERDINAND AND MIRANDA

John Fowles created complex characters in order to show the impact of social background on Miranda's and Ferdinand's psyches and behaviour. Ferdinand's childhood certainly had an impact on him as he is not capable of making any kind of a reciprocated *I-Thou* relationship throughout the story. He searches for a mother who would provide him with a feeling of security and absolute love and whom he could lean on. This is a type of a special and very deep relationship since mother is the only person who loves her child just because it was born. The child is a part of her before birth and the situation does not change much afterwards, when the child learns to be an individual being. As Fromm writes, the child is loved by its mother unconditionally (Fromm 43). “You want to lean on me. I can feel it. I expect it's your mother. You're looking for your mother.”(Fowles 59) Miranda discovers this Ferdinand's intention soon and tries to explain Ferdinand that partnership which involves love is different from maternal love, that love must come from both sides, like a dialogue, it must be *I-Thou* relationship.

Ferdinand thinks that he loves Miranda but it is rather his obsession for having her. He admires Miranda's appearance and speech but he cannot appreciate anything else. Ferdinand

even does not know Miranda when he kidnaps her. His world is limited only to the *I-it* relation where he treats the other one as an object. He does not understand what love means and thinks that when he provides Miranda with material things she will grow to love him.

Ferdinand makes a ridiculous generalization about women, saying that they are vulgar and not worthy of respect. In fact, he is afraid of real women. He is convinced about Miranda being different since he makes an idealized absurd image of Miranda who would be happy to become Ferdinand's wife. He comments on Miranda saying that "she was not like some woman you don't respect so you don't care what you do, you respected her and you had to be very careful."(Fowles 38)

The situation changes after Miranda tries to seduce Ferdinand. Ferdinand becomes angry and condemns her to be the same as any other woman which he considers to be not worthy of respect. "She was like all women, she had a one-track mind. I never respected her again." (Fowles 102-103)

Hatred toward women may be the cause of Ferdinand's impotence. Fromm writes that sexual problems such as impotence and frigidity are often results of psychological fear of the opposite sex. People cannot be spontaneous and get rid of their psychological barriers and thus they cannot get sexually aroused. (Fromm 87)

Ferdinand has no chance of revealing his own subjectivity since he is never confronted with another subjectivity. His approach to others is always the scientific *I-it* relation. He is worried when he has to react spontaneously and is more satisfied having things stable and classified. He is afraid of unpredictable situations. His reason for kidnapping Miranda is simply a desire for possession.

Miranda perceives Ferdinand not as a man but as her kidnapper. She naturally cannot respect him. Her treating him as if he was a subordinate person is understandable. However, after some time, she realizes that it does not help her to get out of her confinement.

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.' Later she said, 'You are not ugly, but your face has all sorts of ugly habits. (Fowles 58)

She tries to encourage Ferdinand to start to live a new life and forget the past, but all her efforts are in vain. There is a kind of relationship between Miranda and Clegg which is

triggered only by their loneliness and need of social contact. She knows that she can start a relationship only when she can respect and admire the other person.

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. (Fowles 187)

There is never the *I-Thou* relationship between the two characters since Ferdinand adores Miranda only as an object and Miranda treats Ferdinand in the same way. As Buber says: “Love does not cling to the *I* in such a way as to have the *Thou* only for its ‘content,’ its object; but love is between *I* and *Thou*. The man who does not know this, with his very being know this, does not know love; even though he ascribes to it the feelings he lives through, experiences, enjoys, and expresses.” (Buber 14-15) Ferdinand does not know love for his self-centredness. He believes that there is nobody who could understand him so he has to struggle alone. He never thinks of the opposite option which is trying to understand others.

When Miranda thinks of Ferdinand's treating her as an object, it reminds her of her relationship with Donald. In the *I-Thou* relationship one cannot say that he/she possesses another. So when she says “he is mine” she treated him as an object as well.

The same thing happened when I was lameducking Donald last spring. 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. (Fowles 138)

It shows that Miranda undergoes a self-reflection so the isolation has partly a positive effect on her personality. Despite her wretched situation, she tries to understand Ferdinand and tries to find reasons for his desperate action. She tries to find *Thou* in him. She pities him and finds out that he is a product of miserable social and familial conditions.

Ferdinand's hobbies, collecting butterflies and taking photographs, speak for his perception of the world through *I-it* relation as well. Ferdinand likes to feel control over the world. As he has never been taken seriously and people have not respected him since his childhood, he has a hidden desire for power. He collects butterflies which involves killing them. He does not respect life at all. He sees everything through a prism of the collector. Miranda does painting because it provides her with freedom and it also gives life to the

objects she is painting. Ferdinand takes photographs which only freezes time but he does not bring any higher value to the objects which he photographs since he takes pictures only to “have” the objects, without any artistic intention. The *I-Thou* relation is not static in time and once the thing becomes fixed and experienced, the relation changes into *I-it* relation. Miranda does not try to fix the things she paints but tries to pin down only essences of the things which may live through her paintings.

6. CONCLUSION

The Collector can be interpreted as an Existentialist thriller or an Existential novel since the Existential theme is running throughout the story. The main characters, Miranda Grey and Ferdinand Clegg, present opposite life stances and different philosophical schools.

Both characters know that the world is absurd but each of them opts for a different life attitude. Miranda's existence is in Sartre's terms *Being-for-itself* (Hartle) as she is interested in her life and cares for the world. Her loneliness brings her to realize that she loves her life and thus she has to fight for her freedom. There is neither God nor fate which would help her. She never gives up and struggles till the end. That makes her the Existential heroine.

Ferdinand is trapped in the absurdity of his life and does not engage in creating his life himself. His aimless existence is *Being-in-itself* (Hartle). He relies on fate and coincidence and avoids taking responsibility for his deeds. Therefore he is not an authentic being and is supposed to be an Existential anti-hero. He is oriented towards material world and he is not able to think of anything transcendental. As he is a collector, his scientific approach mirrors also in his perception of the world. He represents Logical Positivism, Scientism and objectification. Ferdinand relates to the world through *I-it* relation (Buber) which means that he perceives himself as a subject and all his surroundings as objects which he can use, classify and manipulate with.

Ferdinand's shallowness is partly caused by his social and familial conditions. However, Existentialism does not take one's background into account as everyone has a chance to change his/her life. Fowles agrees on the division of society into The Few and the Many but points out that the division line between authentic and inauthentic existence lies inside every individual (Fowles, *Aristos* 10).

The story shows the two possible ways of dealing with one's life, which is absurd. Miranda embodies the positive side of Existentialism whereas Ferdinand presents the negative one.

7. BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRINTS:

Acheson, James. (1998) *John Fowles*. London: Macmillan Press LTD.

Eriksson, Bo H. T. (1995) *The "Structuring Forces" of Detection: The Cases of C.P. Snow and John Fowles*. Uppsala: Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia.

Fowles, John. (2004) *The Collector*. London: Vintage

Fowles, John. (2007) *Aristos*. Zlín: Kniha Zlín.

Fromm, Erich. (2008) *Umění milovat*. Praha: Český klub, nakladatelství Josefa Šimona.

Newton, Michael. (2013) *Writing Thrillers*. Ohio: Writer's Digest Books.

Solomon, Robert C. (2001) *Phenomenology and Existentialism*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. (2004) *Existencialismus je humanismus*. Praha: Nakladatelství Vyšehrad.

EBOOKS:

Lenz, Brooke. (2008) *John Fowles: Visionary and Voyeur*. New York: Radopi.

Mary, J. Gregor, ed. (1996) *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newton, Michael. (2013) *Writing Thrillers*. Ohio: Writer's Digest Books.

Vipond, L. Dianne. (1999) *Conversations with John Fowles*. Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi.

INTERNET SOURCES:

Buber, Martin. I and Thou. 28th June 2014.

<[http://www.tjdonovanart.com/Martin%20Buber%20%20I%20And%20Thou%20\(c1923%20127P\).pdf](http://www.tjdonovanart.com/Martin%20Buber%20%20I%20And%20Thou%20(c1923%20127P).pdf)>

Cerf, Walter. Logical Positivism and Existentialism. 15th June 2014.

<<http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/185565?uid=3737856&uid=2&uid=4&sid=21104233261737>>

Dylan's review. (2013) *The Collector* by John Fowles. 20th June 2014.

<<https://www.goodreads.com/review/show/515476142>>

Harle, Rob. (1999) "Man is condemned to be free". 13th June 2014.

<<http://www.nimbinaustralia.com/zenwatt/condemnedtobefree.html>>

Hneusheva, Christine. *Psychology in the Novels by John Fowles*. 24th June 2014.

<http://www.academia.edu/1609419/Psychology_in_the_Novels_by_John_Fowles>

Pratt, Alan. *Nihilism*, *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 10th June 2014.

<<http://www.iep.utm.edu/nihilism/>>

Sandbrook, Dominink. *Sixties Britain*. 14th June 2014.

<<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/sixties-britain/>>

Seungjae, Lee. (2005) *Otherness, Recognition and Power: The Hegelian Theme in John Fowles's The Collector*. 14th June 2014.

<https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/lee_seungjae_200512_ma.pdf>

Kamerling, Garth. Kant: The Moral Order. 18th June 2014.

<<http://www.philosophypages.com/hy/5i.htm>>

Scott, Sarah. *Martin Buber (1878—1965)*, *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 10th June 2014. <<http://www.iep.utm.edu/buber/>>

Storm, Heter. *Sartre's Political Philosophy*, *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 10th June 2014. <<http://www.iep.utm.edu/sartre-p/>>

Walker, Bill. Kierkegaard, Derrida, and Zizek: Toward a Christian Existentialism Beyond Postmodernism. 10th June 2014.

<http://www.academia.edu/412264/Kierkegaard_Derrida_and_Zizek_Toward_a_Christian_Existentialism_Beyond_Postmodernism>

Wheeler, Michael. (2013) *Martin Heidegger*, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.). 16th June 2014.

<<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2013/entries/heidegger/>>

Petříček, Miroslav. (21.3.2014) Mluvící hlavy FF UK k maturitě. Filozofická fakulta
Univerzity Karlovy v Praze. 10th May 2014.

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l0ILGf416OE>>