

Narrative Cracks: Reconsidering Intentionality in Unreliable Narration in *The Remains of the Day* and *The Moonstone*

Anlatı Çatlakları: *Günden Kalanlar* ve *Aytaşı* Romanlarının Güvenilmez Anlatılarında
Kasıtlılığın Yeniden Düşünülmesi

Sinem Oruç-Kesici*

Middle East Technical University

Abstract

Since Wayne Booth's coinage of the term "unreliable narrator," much critical ink has been spilled over the instances where the reliability of a narrator's account is compromised, though without exploring the effects of the narrator's intentional agency on unreliability. This study introduces the narratorial intent across the three levels of unreliable narration offered by Olson as a factor designating the disposition of a narrator and the gap between the implied reader and the narrator. With a rhetorical narratological approach that is in dialogue with cognitivist/constructivist approaches, the butler-narrators Stevens and Betteredge, from Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day* (1989) and from Wilkie Collins's *The Moonstone* (1868) respectively, will be analyzed in terms of how the difference in their narratorial intent pertains to their being diametrically opposed unreliable narrators. It is claimed that the lack of intrinsic motivation distances Betteredge from the implied reader and makes him an untrustworthy narrator while strong narratorial intent and agency bonds Stevens's audience to his narration and shows him as an unreliable, yet fallible, narrator.

Keywords: *The Moonstone*, *The Remains of the Day*, unreliable narration, rhetorical narratology, narratorial intent, narrative ethics

Öz

Wayne Booth'un "güvenilmez anlatıcı" terimini ortaya atışından bu yana birçok çalışma bir anlatıcının güvenilirliğinden taviz verdiği durumlara odaklansa da anlatıcının anlatıya başlamadaki niyetinin güvenilirliğine olan etkisi pek araştırılmamıştır. Bu çalışma, Olson'un öne sürdüğü ve üç seviyeden oluşan güvenilmez anlatıcı çerçevesi kapsamında anlatıcı niyetini, anlatıcı özellikleri ve anlatıcının ima edilen okuyucu ile ilişkisi üzerinde belirleyici bir etmen olarak ele alır. Anlatıbilimin retorik yaklaşımlarının bilişsel/yapılandırmacı yaklaşımlarla kurduğu diyalog üzerinden, Kazuo Ishiguro'nun *Günden Kalanlar* (1989) ve Wilkie Collins'in *Aytaşı* (1868) romanlarının uşak-anlatıcıları Stevens ve Betteredge, anlatıcı niyetinde yaşadıkları ayrışmanın taban tabana zıt güvenilmez anlatıcılar olarak ortaya çıkmalarındaki etkisi açısından incelenecektir. İçsel motivasyon eksikliği Betteredge'i ima edilen okuyucudan uzaklaştırıp güvenmeye değmez bir anlatıcı konumuna yerleştirirken kuvvetli bir anlatıcı niyeti ve etkinliği, Stevens'ı ima edilen okuyucusuna yaklaştırır ve güvenilmez fakat yanılabilir bir anlatıcı olarak konumlandırır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Aytaşı*, *Günden Kalanlar*, güvenilmez anlatı, retorik anlatı kuramı, anlatıcı niyeti, anlatı etiği

*Res. Asst., Dept of Foreign Language Education, Middle East Technical University

ORCID# 0000-0003-2758-9778; sinem.oruc@metu.edu.tr; <https://doi.org/10.47777/cankujhss>

CUJHSS (ISSN 1309-6761), Special Issue Jan 2024, 42-56. Received Nov 9, 2023; Accepted Jan 1, 2024

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-

NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) 2024 © The Author(s)

Introduction

Among the works of English fiction, the butlers are generally secondary characters who “swell a progress, start a scene or two” (Eliot, 1915); thus, they are seldom on the focus of a fictional work. Kazuo Ishiguro speculates the fictional butlers’ overshadowed place, remarking “I was surprised to find how little there was about servants written by servants, given that a sizable proportion of people in this country were employed in service right up until the Second World War” (Hunnewell, 2008). Ishiguro’s novel *The Remains of the Day* and Wilkie Collins’s *The Moonstone*, then, are rare examples in that they include an account about a servant narrated by that servant. Stevens and Betteredge, the narrators of *The Remains* and *The Moonstone* respectively, share many common points such as their personality traits and view of their profession. Additionally, they both compose an unreliable first-person narrative. However, Stevens’s and Betteredge’s unreliable narrations are diametrically opposed to one another in terms of their narrator characteristics and their closeness to the (implied) reader. I argue that Steven’s unreliability bonds the reader to this fallible character whereas Betteredge’s unreliability estranges him from the implied reader, making him also emerge as an untrustworthy narrator. The reason for their divergence lies in their narratorial intentionality. In other words, the narrator’s intentions and (lack of) motivation when penning the narrative define his/her disposition to unreliability and the distance between the implied reader and the narrator. They are opposite unreliable narrators because Stevens is internally driven to narrate while Betteredge is asked to narrate. With a rhetorical narratological approach, this study explores the effects of authorial intentionality on the levels of the narrator, the implied reader, and the implied author in *The Remains* and *The Moonstone*.

Studies concerning unreliable narration in *The Remains* are more numerous than those concerning unreliable narration in *The Moonstone* probably due to the appealing theoretical backdrop and contemporary publication date of *The Remains*. Among scholarly works on unreliable narration in *The Remains*,¹ Öztapak-Avcı’s “You Never Know Who You’re Addressing” (2015), and Fonioková’s “The Butler’s Suspicious Dignity” (2008) stand out. Öztapak-Avcı argues that Stevens intends to give a coherent account of his identity as a dignified English butler and Lord Darlington as a good person, but he ends up creating the opposite effect on the reader since he “fails to maintain his ‘composure’” in his narrative (p. 57). Similarly, Fonioková argues that Stevens attempts at “self-justification” (p. 93), but the more he struggles to mask his mistakes the more he undermines his own narrative. Studies on narrative unreliability in *The Moonstone* discuss multiple narrators’ unreliability in conjunction with the contemporary issues of Victorian fiction such as colonial discourse² and family dynamics.³ It is safe to state that the previous studies on the narrative structure of *The Remains* and *The Moonstone* have not taken narratorial intentionality and unreliable narration into their focus.

Studies on unreliable narration start off with Booth’s coinage of the term. Booth states that “I have called a narrator reliable when he speaks for or acts in accordance with the norms of the work (which is to say the implied author’s norms), unreliable when he does not” (Booth, 1983, pp. 158-159). His discussion of narratorial unreliability in relation to the implied author’s norms has ignited much critical debate across two strands of narrative theory, which are

¹ Teo (2014), Phelan and Martin (1999), Wall (1994), and Westerman (2004)

² Toprak Sakız (2022)

³ Gruner (1993)

rhetorical and constructivist/cognitivist narratological approaches. The rhetorical approach to unreliability regards it as a text-bound phenomenon, a message “encoded by the implied author for the implied reader to decode” (Shen, 2013). The constructivist/cognitivist approach, on the other hand, focuses on flesh-and-blood readers’ cognitive processes in attributing unreliability to narration. These approaches have come to be regarded as “incompatible yardsticks” (Shen, 2013) because of the difference in their focus. Nünning aims to synthesize rhetorical and constructivist approaches arguing that unreliable narration depends both on the flesh-and-blood reader’s perception/recognition and the textual phenomenon that signals unreliability. In line with this purpose, Nünning (2005) offers these speculative questions to approach unreliable narration comprehensively:

What textual and contextual signals suggest to the reader that the narrator’s reliability may be suspect? How does an implied author (as redefined by Phelan) manage to furnish the narrator’s discourse and the text with clues that allow the critic to recognize an unreliable narrator when he or she sees one? In short: how does one detect a narrator’s unreliability? (pp. 100-101)

Though Nünning mentions the flesh-and-blood reader’s context, he handles their involvement in unreliable narration on a textual basis. Therefore, his approach here is mainly a rhetorical one. Similar to Nünning’s, rhetorical approaches that acknowledge the reader’s involvement in decoding narrator unreliability are chosen for the theoretical backdrop of this study such as Phelan’s theorizations of bonding and estranging types of unreliability and Olson’s schema of fallible and untrustworthy narrators because unreliable narration cannot be “a purely text-internal or synchronic phenomenon” as Zerweck argues (2001, p. 167).

Besides its rhetorical approach, Phelan’s model⁴ estranging and bonding types of unreliability hosts “reader-centered elements” (Nünning 100). Bonding and estranging take place in accordance with the closing or widening of the gap between the narrator and the implied reader. Similarly, Olson’s schema of unreliable narrator characteristics acknowledges the reader involvement in unreliability by taking reader response as the defining criteria of the unreliable narrator’s characteristics. Olson builds on the unreliable narration terms “untrustworthy,” “fallible” and “unreliable,” which Booth employs interchangeably (Shen, 2013), and theorizes that fallible and untrustworthy narrators are different types of unreliable narrators in terms of their characteristics and the response they elicit from readers. Fallible narrators’ unreliability is caused by external factors while untrustworthy narrators are unreliable because of an inherent reason like a personality trait (Olson, 2003, p. 102). Thus, fallible narrators generally elicit the readers’ understanding while untrustworthy narrators are approached with skepticism. In fact, there is room for improvement in Olson’s schema. The disposition and situation of a narrator are intermingled; thus, it could be quite difficult to separate them. More importantly, a hierarchical dualism inheres in the clear-cut separation between the disposition and situation of a narrator. Introducing the narrator’s intentional agency as a yardstick in judging unreliability is expected to breach such a binarism.

⁴ Bonding unreliability yields “the paradoxical result of reducing the interpretive, affective, or ethical distance between the narrator and the authorial audience” (Phelan, 2007, p. 225), which brings the narrator and the implied reader closer. In estranging unreliability, on the other hand, the implied reader realizes that adopting the narrator’s perspective would mean moving far away from the implied author’s norms, which “would be a net loss for the author-audience relationship” (Phelan, 2007, p. 225).

Among the critical debates concerning unreliable narration, two studies stand out with their taking narrator intentionality into their focus. One of them is Pettersson's (2015) "Kinds of Unreliability in Fiction" where he criticizes previous studies for passing by the notion of intentionality without "overtly exploring" it (p. 114). Pettersson identifies three types of unreliable narrators in accordance with the degree of their intentionality arguing, "Fallibility, delusion and deception⁵ and their combinations are better pinpointed when they are viewed along this general scale of intentionality" (p. 125). Pettersson limits the narrator's intentional agency to his/her "knowledge and skills" (p. 114), which are abstract and subjective to figure out. Instead, the scale of intentionality he offers could be revised so that it includes the ends the narrator aims in narrating and his/her motivation in keeping the narrative going. Another study referring to the narrator's intentional agency is Zerweck's "Historicizing Unreliable Narration" (2001). He lists the notion of intentionality among "the minimal conditions and the cultural-historical dependencies of unreliable narration" (p. 155). He argues that intentionality differentiates an unreliable narrator from an unreliable character because unintentionally giving yourself away renders a narrator unreliable. Intentionality may make a narrator emerge as an unreliable person for his/her crimes, but not as an unreliable narrator (p. 157). However, the link between the narrator's intentionality and his/her self-incrimination is not quite definitive because a narrator's revealing his/her crimes accidentally could be intentional on an unconscious level. Zerweck's notion of intentionality can be enlarged to focus on the narrator's agenda in taking up the narrative and survey the diegetic level from which the reader infers the unreliable narration: Who lets the narrative crack? Is it the narrator's own discourse or the implied author's pointing out that reveals unreliability?

Narratives have ways of drawing attention to their unreliability either through the narrator's discourse or the implied author's maneuvers⁶ as Chatman (1990) opines, "A narrative text (like any text) contains within itself, explicitly or implicitly, information about how to read it" (p. 83). A narrator's intentional agency designates the way the cracks of an unreliable narration are shown in the narrative, as unreliable accounts always do crack. The cracks, or clues, of unreliability emerge in the narrator's discourse in the forms of digressions, overt cases of lying, "verbal tics" (Wall, p. 20), and statements of self-sabotage, which are summarized by Nünning as "internal contradictions within the narrator's discourse" (p. 97). Unreliable narration instances which are located outside the narrator's discourse, namely the implied author's revealing, can emerge as mismatching accounts given by multiple narrators and irony that disrupts the unreliable narrator's illusion of having given a coherent account.

The way an unreliable narration is constructed and received depends greatly on the personalized narrator's motivation in narrating, i.e., his/her narrative intentionality. The narrator's intentionality is the key element in determining the unreliable narrator's disposition and its effect on readers. When there is no internally driven intent on the part of the narrator to continue the narration, it is left for the implied author to reveal unreliability. A genuine intent

⁵ According to intentionality, Pettersson (2015) categorizes Stevens as a "self-deluded" narrator (p. 111), but I beg to differ. Stevens' narrative inconsistencies suggest that he is quite aware of his erroneous value scheme, so he is a fallible character.

⁶ It is the implied author again who "furnishes" the narrator's discourse (Nünning, 2005, p. 100). A distinction is made here to distinguish the cases where a narrator reveals his/her own unreliability from the cases where the narrator unreliability is recognized outside the narrator's discourse, i.e., to differentiate unreliable narrators who are aware of their unreliability from those who are not.

to narrate is driven by the need to be understood, which brings about leaving oneself open to readers' scrutiny. Therefore, the narrator's intentional agency has a determining force in each component of the tripartite structure of unreliable narration. This structure consists of "(1) a reader who recognizes a dichotomy between (2) the personalized narrator's perceptions and expressions and (3) those of the implied author (or the textual signals)" (Olson, p. 93). Olson observes that this structure is inherent in both Booth's text-immanent model and Nünning's reader-oriented model concerning unreliable narration.

It can be inferred from the plethora of theories on unreliable narration that have been mentioned so far that the various strands of narrative theory do not have a consensus over unreliable narration in terms of its types, source, and effects. They are not often employed in tandem with each other either despite their commonalities such as the tripartite structure Olson found both in rhetorical narratology and in cognitive/constructivist narratology. Combining theorizations on unreliable narration offered by Phelan, Olson, Nünning, Pettersson and Zerweck with rhetorical narratological focus, this study introduces the narrator intentionality as a determining factor across the three components of narrative unreliability in order to answer the shortcomings of different narratological approaches and to come up with a comprehensive view into unreliable narration, which is indeed a "very slippery and complex topic" (Nünning, 2005, p. 90). In the following section, Stevens's and Betteredge's intentional agency will be surveyed in terms of unreliable narration incidents located either in their perceptions/expressions or those of the implied author. Their narratorial intentionality will next be explored within the scope of the implied reader's reception of unreliability. It is argued that Stevens and Betteredge differentiate into two opposite types of unreliable narrators because of the difference in their intentional agency, which designates the location of their unreliability in the diegetic world and the effect of their unreliability in the implied reader.

Discussion

Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day* and Wilkie Collins's *The Moonstone* are similar in housing a butler/servant as the first-person narrator that gives an account of his day-to-day doings and memories. *The Remains* is comprised of Stevens's, an ageing butler, travelogue/diary entries as he drives across the West Country of Britain in his new employer's Ford. During this trip, Stevens sets out to convey his surroundings and the people he meets on the way; however, his account mainly consists of anecdotes about the heyday of his profession, his relationship with Lord Darlington, his father, and Miss Kenton, or Mrs. Benn. Unlike *The Remains*, *The Moonstone* includes multiple narrative accounts compiled to solve the mystery surrounding the loss of the Moonstone, and one of the narrators is the devoted servant Gabriel Betteredge. Betteredge's narrative, which makes up much of the novel, does a lot more than giving an idea as to the context of the crime: it reveals Betteredge's perspective of his profession and anecdotes about the Verinder family along with his choice of quotations from *Robinson Crusoe*. Stevens's narrative begins with an intrinsic motivation to tell while Betteredge's narrative is commissioned by an authority figure. This difference in their narratorial intent determines Stevens's and Betteredge's disposition and their distance from the implied author.

The first part of the literary analysis of the novels focuses on how unreliability is conveyed in *The Remains* and *The Moonstone*. The questions posited in this section are: "Is it the discourse and maneuvers of the implied author, or is it the narrator's own discourse that gives the narrative unreliability away? Is it the implied author's hand or the narrator himself/herself undoing the reliability of an account?" These questions are related to the

perceptions/expressions of the personalized narrator or those of the implied author, and they make up the second and third components of the tripartite structure offered by Olson (2003). It is argued that if the narrator has intrinsic motivation to narrate like Stevens does, the instances of unreliability are located in the narrator's discourse. A narrator's pointing out his/her own faults makes a narrator emerge as a "fallible" figure. When the narrator is asked to narrate, as in Betteredge's case, unreliable narration is revealed through the implied author's perceptions, expressions, and ploys. The lack of intentional agency renders the unreliable narrator an untrustworthy figure because the unreliability is given away by someone other than him/her. As the title of Phelan's book goes, the act of narration entails "*Somebody Telling Somebody Else*" (2017). This act of sharing between the narrator and narratee is undermined when the narrator lacks intrinsic motivation to keep the narration going. It is the lack of genuine interest, not the lack of reliability, that hinders the transformative and restorative power of engaging in a narration, for both narrators and readers.

Fonioková (2008) argues that there is a narratorial agency in Stevens's agency in drawing attention to his own unreliability "through the incongruities in his tale, Stevens himself provides the reader with signals about the existence of a different version of the story and thus about his narratorial unreliability" (p. 93). In other words, it is through Stevens's pointing out that the implied reader recognizes his unreliability. Stevens's narration is a self-conscious one, and he gives away instances of unreliability in his own discourse through overt instances of unreliability because he intends to, or is intrinsically motivated to, narrate. Through undermining his reliability as a narrator, Stevens aims to express himself under (self)censorship and "to come to terms with his past" (Öztabak-Avcı, 2015, p. 49), and to give coherence to his present and future, and most importantly to gain an insight into life. For it is Stevens's own discourse that reveals his unreliability, he emerges as an unreliable narrator with a fallible disposition in accordance with Olson's definition. To name a few of many instances where Stevens undermines his own narrative reliability, the examples where he refutes a statement he has just made and admits to deceiving people can be mentioned. Throughout Stevens's narrative, the notion of restraint comes up multiple times, and it is associated with dignity especially in the episode where he praises the British countryside for its lack of spectacle unlike foreign landscapes (p. 29). This sense of restraint pertains to Stevens's narrative style since he restricts his writing to a detached, formal register revolving around the same question "*what is a great butler?*" (p. 32, emphasis added). However, this is just a narrative ruse because Stevens reveals more than just giving professional advice for butlers. Between the lines where Stevens seems to discuss the traits of a great butler, he discloses the information about the period when Lord Darlington was flirting with fascist ideologies. Into the seemingly ordinary accounts of his-day-to-day doings, he squeezes in anecdotes that can change the implied reader's view of Lord Darlington such as his hosting people with close affinity to Hitler and his dismissing two Jewish maids from the Darlington Hall. This is in line with Stevens's view that dignity equals repression; he composes his narrative under heavy self-censoring. This censoring process, however, is no heroic endeavor in which he encodes his real ideas under pressure; instead, it helps him convey what he knows without taking any responsibility, which helps him relieve his feelings minus the guilt. If we strike through the first nine words of his statement "Nothing could be less accurate than to suggest that I regret my association with such a gentleman" (pp. 132-133), we will see his real feelings about being Lord Darlington's accomplice, although he cannot bring himself to voice

his shame openly. When it comes to criticizing his role models, this is Stevens's strategy of securing his place. Likewise, he aims to construct his father's image as a great butler through his writing, but he ends up portraying his father as a pitiable man and declining butler to the implied reader, which is his father's image in Stevens's mind. He refutes his statement "my father was indeed the embodiment of 'dignity'" (p. 34) in the very next paragraph, by remarking that his father "lacked various attributes one may normally expect in a great butler" (p. 35). These statements contradict each other because Stevens equates being a great butler with dignity. Stevens cannot process his real ideas concerning his father – maybe out of fear or pain, so he does not have the faculty to access and express his thoughts about him. Stevens's need to censor himself when it comes to voicing his genuine views, especially if it is a negative one concerning his idols, comes up multiple times. Another overt self-refutation can be seen in the way Stevens begins his delivery of the story about the butler who shoots an intruding tiger without disrupting the household peace in an Indian plantation. The exaggerated account is emphasized through Stevens's opening statement "The story was an apparently true one" (p. 36). Stevens too does not believe in this absurd story, though he keeps its delivery as if he fully believes in it. In his self-censorship, Stevens says the exact opposite of what he feels while doing two other "rebellious" things: He portrays how ridiculously high the professional bar which has been set before him is, and he also undermines his father's word, for it was him who told Stevens this story in the first place.

In parallel with self-refutation, Stevens also disrupts the reliability of his account by mentioning the instances where he deceives people. Though off-putting in their nature, Stevens's accounts of lying make him a fallible narrator since Stevens places them in the critical parts of his account as if to say "I'm telling you stories. Trust me" (Winterson, 1987, p. 5). In other words, Stevens informs the implied reader that he is not a reliable narrator by his own hand, as if he needs that to be known. Beside his misdemeanors such as eavesdropping (p. 99) on private conversations and sharing a secret guest's real name in his writing though he made an "off-the-record visit" to the Darlington Hall (p. 143), Stevens the narrator reveals to us implied readers his compromised reliability through disclosing the times he willfully manipulated people. When a chauffeur he met on the way inquires Stevens about Lord Darlington while repairing the Ford, he replies that he has never worked for him (p. 126). This incident triggers him to disclose a recent event in which he lied to one of Mr. Farraday's guests upon her asking whether he had ever worked for Lord Darlington. Stevens admits deceiving Mr. Farraday as well when he explained to him that he had lied to his guest because denying former employers was a custom among British butlers (p. 131). Stevens's tendency to deceive takes a sinister turn in the notorious Moscombe episode where he pretends to be an affluent and influential gentleman in front of the townspeople, only to be seen through for who he really is by Dr. Carlisle (p. 202). What separates this instance from the previous episodes of lying is that it does not occur due to a momentary panic to hide his painful past with Lord Darlington from other people, but Stevens wants to toy with this "simpler" folk and gain their admiration. The distasteful nature of these events aside, Stevens's disclosing them illustrates that he is a narrator who can voice his mistakes. Stevens's sharing the times he deceived people can be accepted as a way of his alerting the implied reader that he might do the same to them via his writing. His overtness makes Stevens a fallible unreliable narrator. Likewise, Pettersson (2015) argues that an unreliable narrator's self-awareness as to his/her mistakes can change the way their fault is perceived:

they [two Banville characters] mainly portray how deceptive and despicable they are as well as the motivations to their deceptions. In this way they exemplify something that has seldom been discussed in terms of unreliability, namely—in part, at least—that characters' frankness about their misdemeanour may override their unreliability. (p. 113)

Stevens is frank in revealing his “horrid deeds” (Pettersson, p. 113). All in all, the reader would not know about these episodes of deception if it were not for Stevens's narration, which renders him a fallible figure. It can also be suggested that Stevens plays his narrative cards so openly that there remains no chance for him to deceive the implied reader anymore. Upon reading about Stevens's dismissing the Jewish girls and his audacity to claim he regrets the incident in the same passage, who would not be riled up at Stevens? Just as he fails in making Miss Kenton and the implied reader believe that Lord Darlington was not an anti-Semite, he fails in making her and the implied reader believe he has not been pretending throughout this incident (p. 162). It can be argued that like his Lord Darlington, Stevens too is a “naïve amateur” (p. 106) in rhetoric as he cannot manipulate the implied reader. As his narrative is about to close, Stevens's statement “You see, I *trusted*. I trusted in his lordship's wisdom” (p. 256) suggests that Stevens is aware of his mistaken value scheme. Therefore, Stevens belongs to the category of fallible narrators because they “do not reliably report on narrative events because they are mistaken about their judgments or perceptions or are biased” (Olson, 2003, p. 101). Revealing his weaknesses and offering an insight into their reasons makes Stevens emerge as a fallible figure of unreliable narration and elicits sympathy from the implied reader despite his mistakes. Instead of drawing the implied reader to his side, Stevens constantly reveals his fallible disposition, and that's how he ends up as a man who has finally made his own mistakes. We see how an unreliable narrator can be untrustworthy in Betteredge's case, who is in fact an expert in rhetoric unlike Stevens.

The difference between Betteredge and Stevens stems from the difference in their intentional agency in taking up their narratives. Stevens narrates the remains of his days though in a covert way. Even if his account is composed under the guise of a handbook for great English butlers (p. 34) or a travelogue, his motivation to narrate is intrinsic and genuine. Betteredge in *The Moonstone*, on the other hand, bears no intrinsic motivation to take up the narrative. Through Mr. Franklin Blake and the family lawyer Mr. Bruff's commissioning him, he starts to pen his memories concerning the loss of the gem. Mr. Franklin says that the reason behind asking various people to share their perspective of the mystery is to put the matter to rest once and for all; nevertheless, Betteredge is not convinced. He questions his relation to this matter remarking though Mr. Blake's and Mr. Bruff's explanation may seem “Very satisfactory to both of them, no doubt. But I failed to see what I myself had to do with it, so far.” (p. 14). Betteredge's lack of motivation infuses his narrative with elusiveness from the beginning to the end, which is clear from the very first sentence he writes down: “In the first part of *Robinson Crusoe*, at page one hundred and twenty-nine, you will find it thus written ...” (p. 13). His disinterestedness is reflected in the gap between *Robinson Crusoe* and the loss of the Indian gem: they are not even remotely connected. Betteredge voices his lack of interest in the matter multiple times. He sits in his room doing nothing for two hours after learning that he “ought to” write (pp. 14-15) about the lost gem. He often digresses from the main topic on purpose: “Still this don't [sic] look much like starting the story of the Diamond – does it? I seem to be wandering off in search of Lord know what, Lord knows where?” (p. 15). Since he is not

intrinsically driven to narrate, Betteredge requires outside support to continue writing, which his daughter Penelope provides. Penelope supervises his writing and gives directions for him to keep the narrative going. Betteredge discloses Penelope's warning that "what I have done so far isn't in the least what I was wanted to do. I am asked to tell the story of the Diamond and, instead of that, I have been telling the story of my own self" (p. 20).

Betteredge's diversions in disclosing the story of the Moonstone and other people's pushing him to narrate indicate the lack of motivation to narrate in his part. As he does not aspire to a personal achievement in narrating like atoning or telling his life story, Betteredge does not let his narrative crack. Instead, he sustains the air of having given a coherent narrative. Since he is basically forced to narrate, there is no intrinsic motivation or an aim to reach through narrating the story of the Moonstone for Betteredge, let alone his anxiety over reciting the account of a mysterious crime. Therefore, his tacit approach in handling sensitive matters reaches a catatonic state around the issue of the Moonstone to the point of never disclosing his genuine thoughts lest he gives away an inconsistency in his account. As stated earlier, an unreliable narrator's disposition changes greatly in accordance with the extent to which his/her discourse lets its inconsistencies show. Where the giveaway of unreliability is located, the narrator's awareness as to his/her own unreliability, and narrator's motivation in participating in the diegetic world designates if the unreliable narrator is fallible or untrustworthy. His elusiveness pushes instances of unreliable narration to the implied author's discourse; Betteredge's unreliability is conveyed outside his discourse through the implied author's maneuvers such as the other characters' comments. Since it is the implied author's ploys that point out narrative unreliability, Betteredge emerges as an untrustworthy narrator.

Olson (2003) argues that "grained behavioral traits or some current self-interest" causes an unreliable narrator to become untrustworthy (p. 102). Likewise, Betteredge is characteristically inclined to hide his genuine thoughts and to manipulate people. His untrustworthiness stems from his calculating every move according to his advantage, especially when he cannot see ahead. Betteredge's self-preservation is apparent in his motto "never to notice what I don't understand" (p. 53). He repeats a similar notion by advising that "In cases where you don't see your way clearly, you hold your tongue" (p. 109). Such statements lead one to wonder about the things he decides to overlook and leave out of his narrative, adding on to his unreliability. Betteredge's untrustworthiness as a narrator reaches its peak when it comes to authority figures since he shapes his thoughts in accordance with those of people in "higher" positions than him. Betteredge calls himself "a blind agent" (p. 469), which reveals his sleek positionality. Besides taking up the same hobbies as Lady Verinder (p. 16), Betteredge adjusts his responses in accordance with upper class people's expectations. Upon hearing that he ought to write about the loss of the Moonstone, he says he agrees, "thinking it always desirable for the sake of peace and quietness to be on the lawyer's side" (p. 13). Though it looks like a minor occurrence, his attitude in Miss Rachel's birthday party is noteworthy. He takes advantage of "being a privileged character" among the guests and makes them finish less popular dishes saying, "Please to change your mind and try it: for I know it will do you good" (p. 81). One cannot help but wonder if Betteredge pulls off the same trick with the implied reader, feeding us ordinary events and quotations from *Robinson Crusoe* while making us overlook his unreliability. In his account, Mr. Franklin Blake makes a reference to Betteredge's "powers of persuasion" (p. 347), which suggests this could indeed be the case.

Like Stevens, Betteredge aims to paint a respectable picture of himself in his narrative. Different from Stevens's narrative though, Betteredge's account is coherent in that his statements do not let his discourse undermine his narrative. It is through the implied author's perceptions and expressions that the implied reader recognizes Betteredge's unreliability. If they are "to read through the 'tone' of authorial intrusions" (Warhol, 1989, p. 29), the implied readers will recognize that he is not that insightful and wise as a character. For example, Betteredge protests at being asked to write about the Moonstone stating he has nothing to do with the incident. However, Mr. Franklin stresses the importance of his involvement saying "Nobody knows as much as you do, Betteredge, about what went on in the house at that time. So you must take the pen in hand, and start the story" (p. 14). The implied author shows that Betteredge can indeed be held accountable and refutes Betteredge's claim via Mr. Franklin's discourse. Likewise, Betteredge praises himself stating, "I am not superstitious ... I am a scholar in my own way" (p. 15). However, the implied author provides multiple instances where Betteredge does not act like "a scholar" due to his lack of insight into human relations. For a long time, he overlooks the change in Miss Rachel's attitude after the Moonstone goes missing though he knows the girl from her infancy. That's why Sergeant Cuff mocks Betteredge saying, "Ah," "you've guessed it at last" (p. 159) when he finally asks if there is something wrong with Miss Rachel.

The implied author undermines Betteredge's narrative and fortifies his untrustworthiness by showing that his lack of insight and failure in providing guidance to others leads to disastrous consequences. When it comes to Mr. Franklin, Betteredge acts erroneously because he cannot approach the boy without being struck blind with admiration. It is revealed in Franklin Blake's account that Betteredge immediately refutes the possibility that it could be him who stole the Moonstone even though there is evidence against Mr. Blake. He does not give any heed to the evidence by claiming that facts could be altered: "'Facts?' he repeated. 'Take a drop more grog, Mr. Franklin, and you'll get over the weakness of believing in facts!'" (p. 364). In addition to the dangerous potential of this statement to misguide, Betteredge fails to suggest a direction for Mr. Franklin in times of need. When Mr. Franklin asks his opinion on the issue of delivering the Moonstone to Miss Rachel, he wants advice on if they should view this subject from the objective or the subjective side, but Betteredge simply stares and does not reply (p. 53). The option of hiding the Moonstone in the quicksand (p. 51) and doing away with this problem altogether is more appealing for him than choosing a side and offering guidance to Mr. Franklin. Betteredge's untrustworthiness is revealed most clearly in the episode where he fails to offer guidance to Rosanna who openly shares with him that she is thinking about ending her life. Betteredge fails in reading her desperate situation and makes insensitive remarks on the girl's mental state (p. 33), who later commits suicide. Betteredge's importance in Rosanna's life is conveyed to the implied reader by the implied author through the girl's opening her heart to him; however, Betteredge cannot realize the impact of his words and his consequent failure in averting Rosanna's death. In other words, though Betteredge does not let his narrative crack, the implied author's hand shatters his narrative. The lack of motivation leads him to give as little clue as possible to the implied reader concerning his unreliability, which leaves revealing the narratorial unreliability to the implied author and makes him an untrustworthy narrator unaware of his unreliability.

Following the discussion of the narrators' intentional agency on the discursive levels of the personalized narrator and the implied author, this section explores the narratorial intent on

the level of the implied reader. Unreliable narration's effects on the gap between the narrator and the implied reader and the latter's consecutive affective response are discussed in terms of the "bonding and estranging" types of unreliable narration offered by Phelan. If the unreliable narrator is internally motivated to narrate, the gap between the narrator and the implied reader is lessened; they bond. Likewise, when the narrator is not hesitant to show his/her weaknesses by revealing their own unreliability, the effect created in the (implied) reader is bonding, and the opposite goes for the estranging types of unreliable narration. In the instances where a narrator is forced to give an account, his/her narrative estranges the implied reader. Namely, the motivation of the unreliable narrator when engaging in the act of narrating, affects the implied reader's response. The focus of this section is on the instances where Stevens and Betteredge disclose their emotions, which will be analyzed in terms of their intentionality's effect on the gap between them as narrators and the implied reader. It is argued that Stevens's narration is a cry for help whereas Betteredge's motivation is to self-preserve amid the disruption caused by the Indian diamond; therefore, the effects they have on the implied reader are contrary.

Phelan (2007) discusses Stevens's account as the example of the bonding unreliable narration claiming that he performs a partial progress towards the norms of the implied author by recognizing the connection between human warmth and bantering at the end of his narrative (p. 225). Speculations as to genuineness of Stevens's "recognition" aside, it can be argued that, rather than this brief moment at the closing of the novel, Stevens's partial progress towards the norm takes place earlier in the instances where he discloses his feelings to the implied reader with less restraint. In such cases, the gap between Stevens and the implied reader narrows, leading them to bond. Teo argues that Stevens "catches himself unawares with emotions" (p. 128) throughout his narrative. In fact, his reaction to and articulation of these emotions change as his narrative progresses. Stevens is overwhelmed with negative emotions when his father passes away and when Miss Kenton says that she will soon leave the Darlington Hall to get married; however, he conveys these incidents under the guise of feeling "triumphant" since he kept his position as a dignified butler (p. 239) during both of those trying instances. Though Stevens states feeling exuberant for not letting his inner feelings take over his duty, he reveals to the implied reader that the opposite is true by inserting the guests' comments on his low mood when these events were taking place: Couple of guests and Lord Darlington ask if he is okay and if he's been crying while his father is in deathbed (pp. 109, 110); similarly, Mr. Cardinal notices Stevens's "downcast mood" on the night when Miss Kenton gets engaged (p. 231). Throughout almost all of his narrative, Stevens can share his innermost feelings with the implied reader only in an inverted way, and his attempt to convey them despite the difficulty bonds him with the implied reader. These inverted ways can be called his "narrative tics," by Wall's coinage of the term, such as bringing up the notion of triumph when he is overcome with negative emotions. Instead of openly stating that he wants, or even needs, to take up the motoring trip, Stevens says that he does not see any reason why he should not do it: "there seems little reason why I should not undertake my motoring trip to the West Country. ... I can see no genuine reason why I should not undertake this trip" (p. 20). Another narrative tic is Stevens's diverting himself when the memories get overwhelming as it can be seen when he calls diving into the memories of his father's last days "a little foolish" (p. 70). Stevens tries to change the subject after he spills the proofs of Lord Darlington's fascism saying, "But I drift" (p. 146). Likewise, right after admitting that his dream of a life with Miss Kenton has become "forever irredeemable," he waves off the matter stating that he has become "unduly

introspective" (p. 189) and externalize the cause of his nostalgic mood by relating it to "the late hour," "the trying nature of the events" and the possibility of meeting "Miss Kenton again after all these years" (p. 189).

The cracks of Stevens's narrative widen with Stevens's narration progressing and his showing feelings more openly, which fortifies his bond with the reader. Stevens's partial progress towards the norm starts with his disclosing feelings – though through such narrative tics, and his bonding with the implied reader is fully realized when Stevens requires no narrative tic to convey his emotions. Early in his narrative, Stevens reveals that when he is pressed by others with insinuations about his emotions, his natural reaction is to "deny immediately and unambiguously" (p. 15). His response to his emotions evolves into embracing and voicing them with less restraint and narrative tics as he narrates. To illustrate, he can bring himself to admit he in fact enjoys reading romances: "I do not mind confessing today – and I see nothing to be ashamed of in this" (p. 177). As a result of this progress, Stevens manages to share his heartbreak when parting with Miss Kenton without resorting to any narrative tic: "their implication [words of Miss Kenton] were such as to provoke a certain degree of sorrow within me. Indeed – why should I not admit it? – at that moment, my heart was breaking" (pp. 251-252). Shortly after this episode, Stevens outpours his heart to a stranger he has met at the pier (p. 256), which indicates that he progressed into acknowledging and sharing his emotions thanks to narrating.

Unlike Stevens, Betteredge creates an estranging effect adding to the gap that exists between him and the implied reader in two ways: by making direct references to the implied reader and revealing nothing as to his inner world emotions-wise. Betteredge addresses the implied reader frequently to evoke a fellow feeling in them, but the effect this creates is the opposite. Betteredge estranges the implied reader when he tells them how they should feel about his narrative. He asks the reader to "keep your temper" (p. 20) in the face of his digressions, and he remarks that the reader should note his efforts in the difficult task of completing the story of the Moonstone: "You will own, I think, that I have got you over the ground this time, without much loitering by the way. Cheer up!" (p. 72). Such playful references stop seeming naïve when one considers Mr. Blake's mentioning Betteredge's power to persuade, so they add onto his unreliability and distance him from the implied reader. Besides, Betteredge's calling out to the implied reader is off-putting due to his conceited attitude; consequently, he misses out on establishing "a companionable feeling" (p. 225) that he intends to have with his audience. Moreover, Betteredge finishes his narrative by saying, "Please to excuse the faults of this composition—my talking so much of myself, and being too familiar, I am afraid, with you." (p. 225). Telling someone "I know all about you" is quite distancing, and this is what takes place between Betteredge and the implied reader as Warhol argues a know-it-all attitude in referring to the implied reader is a "distancing narrative strategy" (p. 23).

Unlike Stevens, who employs narrative tics to convey his feelings, Betteredge does not disclose his emotions at all, so he estranges the implied reader from himself. He portrays outbursts of anger when Sergeant Cuff and Mr. Jennings accuse someone from Lady Verinder's family of stealing the Moonstone (pp. 159, 469), but he shows an unwavering emotional restraint when it comes to issues related to his private life. Betteredge indicates that he draws a strict line between his private and public persona saying, "While the workpeople are in the house, my duty as a servant gets the better of my feelings as a man. When the workpeople are gone, my feelings as a man get the better of my duty as a servant. Very good" (p. 475). Betteredge

maintains this clear-cut separation in his narrative, so the implied reader can access only his public persona. For example, he can give a detailed description of the years when he has served the Verinder family, but he does not disclose his real age saying that he is “somewhere between seventy and eighty years of age – never mind exactly where!” (p. 468). The same evasiveness can be seen in the instances where Betteredge inserts quotations from *Robinson Crusoe* instead of openly voicing his feelings. When he apologizes to Mr. Jennings for doubting him, he does not state his sorrow, shame or whatever he feels and does not put his apology in words; instead, he makes a reference to the novel:

Betteredge’s apology was characteristic of the man.

“Mr. Jennings,” he said, “when you read Robinson Crusoe again (which I strongly recommend you to do), you will find that he never scruples to acknowledge it, when he turns out to have been in the wrong. Please to consider me, sir, as doing what Robinson Crusoe did, on the present occasion.” (p. 500)

As Ezra Jennings states, it is typical of Betteredge to mention Robinson Crusoe in unpleasant circumstances. Betteredge does not explain or justify his attachment to this fictional character, so his references go to waste on the part of the implied reader, who is estranged from the point he is trying to state with references to *Robinson Crusoe*. Unlike Stevens, Betteredge does not progress towards the norms of the implied author and to those of the implied reader, because he makes no move towards the implied reader. The restraint and elusiveness surrounding his narrative lead Betteredge to remain static through the years. In his return, Mr. Franklin Blake finds him on the same spot he left him in the house years ago (p. 334). While “Stevens opens himself up to the illumination of public scrutiny” (Teo, 2014, p. 30) by taking the trip outside the Darlington Hall, Betteredge makes no change in his position, physically and mentally. Stevens puts himself out to the world outside and opens himself up to other narratives to tell them and to be told by them. This mobility pushes his narrative close to the implied reader unlike Betteredge, who closes himself to other narratives.

Like the source of their motivation to narrate, Betteredge and Stevens fall onto opposite sides of unreliable narration. Betteredge is relieved to finish his narrative whereas Stevens is relieved to narrate his life story. Narrating is a natural drive, a need to be understood; it is a shot in the dark to bond with a reader, to come clean, to atone and to heal. Therefore, being an interlocutor of a narrative comes with an ethical responsibility. This unwritten treaty between the narrators and narratees has a very human side as Olson (2003) claims, “When judging narrators as unreliable, readers treat them like new acquaintances” (p. 99). *You see, we trust* narrators, and in the cases where their reliability is compromised, the narrator’s self-awareness and efforts to narrow his/her distance from the reader is enough to make all the difference in their disposition and the reader response. Due to the ethical dimension of sharing a narrative, law terminology is employed frequently when judging unreliable narrators, which is apparent in Halpern’s naming *The Remains* “Stevens’s mitigation” (p. 137). Since narration is an act of putting yourself out there, its genuineness boils down to narrators’ holding themselves accountable, letting their narrative show its cracks, and attempting to bond with the reader. Unlike Betteredge’s keeping his account intact, Stevens’s narrative cracks, and he eventually does the thing he has feared most: Stevens rips his clothes off in public metaphorically. Stevens lets his narrative fall, finally making his own mistake. Since Betteredge never does this, he may be the better butler, but he estranges his readers as an untrustworthy narrator.

Conclusion

A narrator's intentional agency has a definite role in each level of unreliable narration. It affects the narrator's disposition and his/her distance from the implied reader as it inheres in the narrator's perceptions, the implied author's discourse, and the implied reader's recognition of unreliability. That's why, Stevens and Betteredge are quite opposite to one another despite their myriad commonalities. Stevens is internally motivated to share his narrative with an audience; therefore, he can share his unreliability with the implied reader on his own. His genuine intentionality renders him a fallible narrator who moves closer to the implied reader. On the other hand, Betteredge does not seek the restorative effect of sharing a narrative – he avoids writing as much as he can because he is not motivated to narrate. The abundance of self-assertion sentences in Betteredge's narrative indicates his untrustworthiness as a narrator, and his efforts to maintain the narrative coherence estrange the implied reader.

Phelan mentions there is a “diversity of unreliable narrators existing in the wild” (2007, p. 225), which literary critics might miss out on when they are too focused on dissecting literary texts via their own methods. To overcome this, rhetorical and cognitivist/constructivist approaches to unreliability should be employed more in tandem with one other since there are as many unreliable narrations as there are narrators, readers, and authors, thus stories. As Nünning argues, I bring my own referential framework as a reader when judging Stevens's and Betteredge's unreliability in this study. Likewise, future work concerning these narrators is sure to be composed in accordance with their writer's “knowledge, psychological disposition, and system of norms and values” (Nünning, 2005, p. 105). It could be suggested or future studies to build onto this notion and to handle the narrators' intentional agency in relation to the subgenre of the novels, i.e., *The Remains* as Stevens's fictional autobiography and *The Moonstone* as a crime and sensation fiction on the periphery of Victorian novel.

References

- Booth, W. C. (1983). *The rhetoric of fiction*. University of Chicago Press.
- Chatman, S. B. (1990). *Coming to terms: The rhetoric of narrative in fiction and film*. Cornell University Press.
- Collins, W. (2020). *The Moonstone*. Platanus Cultural Publishing.
- Eliot, T. S. (1915). The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock. *Poetry*, 6(3), 130–135. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20570428>.
- Fonioková, Z. (2008). The butler's suspicious dignity: Unreliable narration in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*. *Brno Studies in English*, 32(1), 87–98.
- Gruner, E. R. (1993). Family secrets and the mysteries of *The Moonstone*. *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 21, 127–145.
- Halpern, F. (2018). Closeness through unreliability: Sympathy, empathy, and ethics in narrative communication. *Narrative*, 26(2), 125–145. <https://doi.org/10.1353/nar.2018.0008>.
- Hunnewell, S. (2008). Kazuo Ishiguro, The Art of Fiction No. 196. *The Paris Review*. <https://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/5829/the-art-of-fiction-no-196-kazuo-ishiguro>.

- Ishiguro, K. (1989). *The remains of the day*. Faber and Faber.
- Lanser, S. S. (1981). *The narrative act: Point of view in prose fiction*. Princeton University Press.
- Nünning, A. F. (2005). Reconceptualizing unreliable narration: Synthesizing cognitive and rhetorical approaches. In J. Phelan & P. J. Rabinowitz (Eds.), *A companion to narrative theory* (pp. 89-107). Blackwell.
- Olson, G. (2003). Reconsidering Unreliability: Fallible and Untrustworthy Narrators. *Narrative*, 11(1), 93-109. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20107302>.
- Öztabak-Avcı, E. (2013). An "Ideological Servant"? A Study of the Servant Figure in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*. *Interactions*, 22(1-2), 93-104.
- Öztabak-Avcı, E. (2015). 'You never know who you're addressing': A study of the inscribed 'you' in *The Remains of the Day*. In C. F. Wong and H. Yıldız (Eds.), *Kazuo Ishiguro in a Global Context* (pp. 49-58). Routledge.
- Pettersson, B. (2015). Kinds of unreliability in fiction: Narratorial, Focal, Expository and Combined. In V. Nünning (Ed.), *Unreliable narration and trustworthiness: Intermedial and interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 109-130). De Gruyter.
- Phelan, J. (2005). *Living to tell about it: A rhetoric and ethics of character narration*. Cornell University Press.
- Phelan, J. (2007). Estranging Unreliability, Bonding Unreliability, and the Ethics of "Lolita." *Narrative*, 15(2), 222-238. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30219252>.
- Phelan, J. and Martin, M. P. (1999). The lessons of "Weymouth": Homodiegesis, unreliability, ethics, and *The Remains of the Day*. In D. Herman (Ed.), *Narratologies: New perspectives on narrative analysis* (pp. 88-109). Ohio State University Press.
- Shen, D. (2013). Unreliability. In P. Hühn et al. (Eds.), *living handbook of narratology*. De Gruyter. <https://www-archiv.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/node/66.html>.
- Teo, Y. (2014). *Kazuo Ishiguro and memory*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Toprak Sakız, E. (2022). Peripheries of narration and spatial poetics in Wilkie Collins's *The Moonstone*. *Litera: Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies*, 32(2), 553-571. <https://doi.org/10.26650/LITERA2022-1056402>.
- Wall, K. (1994). *The Remains of the Day* and its challenges to theories of unreliable narration. *The Journal of Narrative Technique*, 24(1), 18-42.
- Warhol, R. R. (1989). *Gendered interventions: Narrative discourse in the Victorian novel*. Rutgers University Press.
- Westerman, M. (2004). Is the butler home? Narrative and the split subject in *The Remains of the Day*. *Mosaic*, 37(3), 157-170. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44030052>.
- Winterson, J. (1987). *The Passion*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Zerweck, B. (2001). Historicizing unreliable narration: Unreliability and cultural discourse in narrative fiction." *Style*, 35(1), 151-176. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/style.35.1.151>.