

Where Angels Fear to Tread: Levinas'ın "Etik İlgisellik" ve Layder'in "Önlenemeyen Arzu" Bakış Açısıyla

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Dilek Tüfekçi Can

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8067-6032>

Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Necatibey Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Balıkesir – TÜRKİYE

Makale Geçmişi

Geliş: 02.03.2020

Kabul: 10.09.2020

On-line Yayın: 30.09.2020

Anahtar Kelimeler

E. M. Forster

Emanuel Levinas

Derek Layder

Etik İlgisellik

Önlenemeyen Arzu

Araştırma Makalesi

DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/JASSS.41983>

Öz

Meleklerin Uğramadığı Yer (1905) adıyla E. M. Forster tarafından yazılan ilk roman iki farklı kültür ve toplum arasında geçer. Forster bilinçli bir biçimde insanoğlunun tinselliği üzerinde tanınmayan yerlerin ve değerlerin etkisini ortaya koyabilmek adına hem Sawston, İngiltere'den hem de Monteriano, İtalya'dan ele aldığı karakterleri birbirleriyle karşılaştırır. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışmanın amacı romandaki hem kadın hem de erkek karakterlerin Edward dönemi toplumunun yerleşmiş kültürel normlar ve sosyal kodlarını Emanuel Levinas'ın "etik ilgisellik" ve Derek Layder'in "önlenemeyen arzu", ve bunların yanı sıra diğer kuramcıların bakış açılarıyla incelemektir. Bu çalışmada bir taraftan Levinas'ın "etik ilgisellik" ile birlikte "duyarlılık", "öznellik" ve "yakınlık" gibi kavramları irdelenirken diğer taraftan Layder'in "önlenemeyen arzu" kavramını da mimetik kurama uygun olarak incelenmektedir. Levinas açısından, ötekiliğe öznellik bütün karakterlerin aynı romanda olduğu gibi kendi etik ilgisellikleri aracılığıyla diğerleriyle etkileşim kurması anlamına gelir. Levinas'ın bakış açısına göre, Forster çoğunlukla benliğin önyansıtma yerini göz önünde bulundurarak karakterleri arasındaki yakınlık kavramını, daha çok tinsel ve duygusal yakınlık kavramları olarak ele alır. Bunu yapabilmek için Forster farklı ülkeler, milletler ve sınıfları ele alır. Levinas'tan farklı olarak bu çalışma aynı zamanda Layder'in bakış açısıyla karakterlerin içsel zihinsel yaşamları ve rasyonel düşünceleri içinde yer alan "önlenemeyen arzu" kavramındaki gizemi ortaya çıkarır. Çalışma hem kadın hem de erkek karakterlerin, bir dereceye kadar, kendi etik ilgisellikleri doğrultusunda davrandıklarını ve kontrol edilemeyen arzuları ile başa çıkmaya çalıştıkları sonucuna varmıştır.

Atf Bilgisi / Reference Information

Tüfekçi Can, D. (2020). *Where Angels Fear to Tread: Through the Lenses of Levinasian "Ethical Relatedness" and Layderian "Uncontrollable Desire"*. *Jass Studies-The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, Number: 81, Autumn, p. 213-231.

Where Angels Fear to Tread: Through the Lenses of Levinasian “Ethical Relatedness” and Layderian “Uncontrollable Desire” *

Asst. Prof. Dr. Dilek Tüfekçi Can

Balikesir University, Necatibey Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching,
Balikesir – TURKEY

Article History

Submitted: 02.03.2020

Accepted: 10.09.2020

Published Online: 30.09.2020

Key Words

E. M. Forster

Emmanuel Levinas

Derek Layder

Ethical Relatedness

Uncontrollable Desire

Research Article

* This study is a reviewed and revised version of an unpublished PhD dissertation on the novels of E. M. Forster, which is to be submitted to **Istanbul Aydın University**, English Language and Literature program in order to fulfil the requirements of a graduate student.

DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/JASSS.41983>

Abstract

The first novel written by E. M. Forster entitled *Where Angels Fear to Tread* (1905) revolves around two distinctive cultures and societies. Forster deliberately juxtaposes the characters both from Sawston, England, and Monteriano, Italy to expose the effect of unfamiliar settings and values on the spirituality of the human beings. The aim of this study is to examine the perceptions and manners of female and male characters to the established cultural norms and societal codes of the Edwardian society through the lenses of Emmanuel Levinas’s “ethical relatedness” and Derek Layder’s “uncontrollable desire”, including the perspectives of many other scholars. This study attempts, on the one hand, to explore Levinasian “ethical relatedness” with its concepts such as “sensibility”, “subjectivity” and “proximity”, on the other, discovers Layderian “uncontrollable desire” in conformity with mimetic theory. In Levinasian terms, subjectivity to otherness indicates that all the characters interact with the other by means of their own ethical relatedness as is the case in the novel. In regard to Levinas’s notion, Forster also provides proximity among his characters mostly, spiritual and emotional proximity by considering the prereflective locus of the self. In order to do this, Forster employs distant countries, nations and classes. Apart from Levinas, this study also unveils the secrecy of “uncontrollable desire” in the inner mental life and rational thought of the characters through the Layderian perspective. The study concludes that both male and female characters, somewhat, behave in conformity with their own ethical relatedness and try to control their uncontrollable desire.

INTRODUCTION

Edward Morgan Forster (1879-1970), English novelist, short story writer, essayist, librettist, and last of all, social and literary critic, wrote his first novel entitled *“Where Angels Fear to Tread”* (1905) at the age of twenty-six. His first novel indicates that he has an inborn capacity for writing as an author since his writing technique in terms of its freshness and directness plays a significant role in dealing with even the slightest and the most monotonous scenes in his novel. *“Where Angels Fear to Tread”* (WAF), the title of which quotes Alexander Pope’s *“An Essay on Criticism”*, that is, “For fools rush in where angels fear to tread”, employs the theme of disillusionment, which is one of the commonest characteristics of the Edwardian period as the people were not satisfied with the customs, mores and ethics of the society in which they were living.

“Where Angels Fear to Tread” presents suburban Sawston with its repressive and conservative society. In the novel, the Edwardian people, who are in the throes of conventional society, are presented with their overwhelming characteristics such as having an incentive for finding solutions to their problems. In order to overcome their endless troubles and overall disillusionment, they find journey as a salvation, or in some sense, as a remedy. In other words, the Edwardian people consciously revolt against the established values and customs of the society, and they prefer travelling for their salvation in search of more liberty and freedom. Likewise, Forster presents *“Where Angels Fear to Tread”* as an example of the cynicism of the contemporary society and he offers journey as a remedy for the so-called salvation.

In the novel, Forster seamlessly weaves the story of the characters both from Sawston, England, and Monteriano, Italy to expose the effect of unfamiliar settings and values on the spirituality of the human being. He intentionally makes his characters encounter with “the other” in a particular place. Moreover, he prefers using the settings such as England and Italy, where the national and cultural disparities are vividly presented. Furthermore, he presents Italian culture as a binary opposition to British culture for the sake of portraying the cultural and social differences between the British and Italian nations. According to Sehgal, *“The English characters are born into a way of life based on hypocrisy and petty morality”* (1973: 71-72) and are all shocked by the extroverted Italian temperament in the novel. Besides, in his first novel, Forster also has been inclined to display how the British with their “Baedekers” (guidebooks) are motivated to explore Italy, the most favourite destinations at that time, as it is commonly famous for its art, culture, tradition, monuments, antique museums and paintings. Sehgal explains the English myth of Italy with these words: Italy *“affords an escape from realities of daily life [in Britain] into a life embodying fable and fact, concrete existence and romance, necessity and imagination”* (1973: 69-70) with its art, culture, tradition, monuments, antique museums and paintings.

“Where Angels Fear to Tread” reveals the “rebellions against the passive acceptance of family values” (Hall, 1958: 80) in the Edwardian period from the perspective of both Italian and English characters. In the introduction part, the attitudes of English and Italian characters along with their inherited weaknesses are presented and in the final part, the significance of this experiential knowledge of Italy on the English characters is uncovered both ethically and emotionally. What is apparent is that the inherited values of the English characters clash with those of the indigenous Italian culture in the novel. Forster exposes gender-conscious, class-conscious and race-conscious characters by juxtaposing two different cultures in his novel. The juxtaposition of two diverse cultures reveals that Forster deliberately brings them together in order to give a more identifiable aspects of Edwardian period. The novel itself includes no remarkable incidents rather it focuses on the characters and their confrontation with a *novel culture* that is completely dissimilar to that of their own. Forster elaborately creates his characters’ identity with their psychological, cultural and sociological dimensions by emphasizing their weaknesses and defects as common human beings. Moreover, he generally employs stereotypically

masculine and feminine characters who are commonly leading their lives in accordance with the societal and cultural codes and norms of the Edwardian society, which are strict, evangelical and authoritative.

Forster as an "advocate of reason, intelligence, culture, tolerance and civilization against barbarity and provincialism" explicitly "speaks out against the manners and morals of the British middle-class in his novels" (Sugate, 2012: 36). As a noteworthy writer, he is generally interested in human beings and their actual lives and selves. He creates his characters by developing their thoughts and feelings and also by following the 19th century conventional style in writing his novels, as Edwards puts it: "[Forster] does not attempt to persuade us [readers] that they are real, merely that they might be: he suggests that they behave in ways familiar to real people. He also suggests that we may learn something from the way they behave: he feels free to comment on the moral or psychological implications of their behaviour" (2002: 93). More explicitly, Forster creates his characters by developing their thoughts and feelings and also by following the 19th century conventional style in writing his novels.

"Where Angels Fear to Tread" revolves around the Herriton family. Mrs. Herriton, an aristocrat and orthodox woman, brings up her son Charles Herriton with the customs of the Victorian society. Charles Herriton, "a formidable, arrogant, orthodoxy and cold man", belongs to "artificial, materialistic middle class" (Sugate, 2012: 73). Nevertheless, Charles marries Lilia, a girl who belongs to lower class, even though his mother resists against their marriage. Charles as a decisive man shows no empathy to his mother's desires and he resolves to travel to get rid of his disillusionment, as is the case in the Edwardian period. In his adventurous travel what he expects is to reach salvation but, his expectation turns out to be a total disaster. He dies in his journey immediately after the birth of his daughter, Irma.

In the following years of her husband's death, nothing has become the same for Lilia as a female character in the Edwardian society. With the death of her husband, the disastrous years for Lilia as a young widow with a baby arrive and she vulnerably tries to endure the dominant roles of the Herritons about her life. For instance, she is not allowed to choose her own house for herself; one is taken for her and she is always criticized for not being able to manage it properly, because "She was a bad housekeeper, always in the throes of some domestic crisis, which Mrs. Herriton, who kept her servants for years, had to step across and adjust" (WAFT, 5). Remarkably, in this period, keeping a house was mainly regarded as women's primary responsibility as well as supervising servants for household chores. Then, with the proposal of her brother-in-law Philip and approval of her mother-in-law Mrs. Herriton, Lilia's journey from Sawston to Italy commences at the age of thirty-three with the accompany of a chaperon, Miss Caroline Abbott, who is ten years younger than her. Only under these circumstances, it becomes possible for her to visit Italy. However, in Italy, she falls in love with an Italian boy named Gino and then intends to get married. When the Herritons are informed about her marriage, they make many attempts to prevent it, but in vain. The Herritons attempt to prevent Lilia's marriage not only with the intention of sustaining their social and cultural stability in their own socio-cultural settings but also protecting their national heritage as they think that their heritage is "in the face of a foreign threat" (Sehgal, 1973: 79). However, Lilia marries and contemplates having a baby, but particularly a baby boy, because if she has a baby boy, she anticipates that "... he [Gino] will be different" (WAFT, 28). At a time when Lilia loses her hope and becomes ill, she dies in childbirth desperately. Mrs. Herriton, who is endowed with a patriarchal role identity, sends both Philip and his sister Harriet to bring back the baby in order to save their family name. Regrettably, Harriet, who is incompetent in adjusting herself to the conditions of Monteriano, attempts to kidnap the baby of Gino and Lilia and becomes the one who is responsible for the death of the baby in the carriage accident, which brings about chaos, disorder and sorrow. In "Culture and Anarchy", Matthew Arnold reveals that one of the sources of 'anarchy' is that "an Englishman's heaven-born privilege of doing as he likes" ([1869], 1970: 105). Similarly, Harriet has done

what she and her mother like to do irrespective of what the others think, even the legal father. Then, it becomes rather discernible that Harriet's chaotic manners cause her to be mentally unstable at the end of the novel.

Shockingly enough, the novel ends with the all-time friendship of Charles and Gino with some references to homosexuality, which is not the subject of this paper. The English characters are depicted as the ones who have remarkably changed because of their interactions with "the other" culture in Monteriano while returning to Sawston on the train. According to Frederick Williams, "in *Where Angels Fear to Tread* the Tuscan city of Monteriano had cast its spell over its English visitors, the silly, love-starved Lilia, the conventional Caroline, and the stuffy, confused Philip, causing them all to act in surprising ways" (2005: 179). Indeed, the characters who interact with "the other" commonly transform from their stereotypical Edwardian manners into someone more sociable, tolerant and lovely.

Unambiguously, the characters, in some way or other, are constrained because of the established and coded behaviour patterns of the Edwardian society. In the novel, Lilia is presented as a character whose thoughts and behaviour are more independent to some degree when compared to the others. For instance, Lilia who is trapped in the Sawstonian society as a widow has never resigned herself to her fate. Instead of accepting the Sawstonian social pressure including the Herritons, she decides not to be a victim of the society. With a fierce determination, she decides to change her life by travelling firstly and marrying secondly. Buoyantly, she succeeds in transforming her desperate situation into a pleasant one a little bit. In the novel, her decision on marrying Gino can be considered as a major change not only in her life but also in that of the others. At the very beginning, she seems as if she feels generally satisfied with her marriage rather than resentful in Italy. But after a while, everything turns upside down and she is faced with the reality, a reality which makes her phantasmagorical Italian marriage a complete disaster.

After giving a brief explanation about the novel, it is of great significance to reveal the utmost purpose of this paper. Notably, this study analyses the characters in "*Where Angels Fear to Tread*" by comparing and contrasting the notions of Emmanuel Levinas (1906-1995), a French philosopher, notable for his works related to existentialism, with those of Derek Layder (1948 -), a social scientist, renowned for his contributions to modern social theory. With these concerns in mind, this study attempts to unveil the manners and perceptions of female and male characters in "*Where Angels Fear to Tread*" in regard to Levinasian "Ethical Relatedness" and Layderian "Uncontrollable Desire" by also referring to the works of other scholars.

"WHERE ANGELS FEAR TO TREAD": THROUGH THE LENSES OF LEVINASIAN ETHICAL RELATEDNESS AND LAYDERIAN UNCONTROLLABLE DESIRE

Forster emphasizes a Levinasian perception of "infinite responsibility to otherness" in his novel entitled "*Where Angels Fear to Tread*", as revealed by Goodlad: "As a novelist for whom the encounter with otherness is primary, Forster is quite possibly Levinas's most astute literary precursor" (2006: 325). By inviting "a Levinasian perception of infinite responsibility to otherness", Forster "strives to preserve a fragile web of relationships" (Goodlad, 2006: 328) in his novel. Since the former statement requires a more comprehensible explanation, it is vital to briefly explain Levinas's contribution to identity criticism. Emmanuel Levinas theorizes the phenomenology of *ethical relatedness* and, uses the terms such as "sensitivity", "subjectivity", and "proximity" in "*Otherwise than Being: or Beyond Essence*" (1998) in order to elucidate his model on *selfhood*.

In his aforementioned work, Levinas's phenomenological analysis for contextualizing the selfhood and ethics, in a sense *ethical self*, commonly deals with a constitutive connection between subjectivity and sensitivity. Levinas states that sensitivity, which "*is the subject's subjectivity*" is related to

"its subjection to everything, its susceptibility, its vulnerability" (1998: 14). In other words, sensibility, openness to the world in which an individual is living, is generally associated with an individual's receptive skills. Yet, this does not mean that, in Levinasian terms, s/he is just receiving the information about any source of information giver, including the world itself. Indeed, in Levinasian terms, sensibility is more than having an ability to experience deep feelings.

In the novel, considering how the characters are endowed with the concept of *sensibility*, that is, a concept used in the general sense of ability to experience and understand deep feelings, helps appreciate the Levinasian perception of infinite responsibility to otherness. Among the characters, Mrs. Herriton is the one who has the utmost sensibility. In other words, Mrs. Herriton's emotive state, namely her sensibility, reveal that Lilia's marriage is going to be a failure at the very beginning of the novel: "*Neither Perfetta, nor Gino, nor Lilia herself knew the true reason of all the misery that followed. To the end he thought that kindness and a little attention would be enough to set things straight. His wife was a very ordinary woman, and why should her ideas differ from his own? No one realized that more than personalities were engaged; that the struggle was national; that generations of ancestors, good, bad, or indifferent, forbade the Latin man to be chivalrous to the northern woman, the northern woman to forgive the Latin man. All this might have been foreseen: Mrs. Herriton foresaw it from the first*" (WAFT, 41). As the quotation suggests, Mrs. Herriton's intuition about Lilia's marriage reveals that something unusual is going to happen. Indeed, she is the one who perceives that Lilia's marriage will be fiasco at the end.

As the quote above implies, Mrs. Herriton is the one whose sensibility informs that Lilia's marriage is going to be a failure. She feels intuitively the result of Lilia's marriage at the very beginning of the novel. Nevertheless, whatever the cost is, Lilia prefers a devastating marriage with an Italian man who is much younger than herself. Lilia, neither has a sense of subjectivity, in Levinasian terms, nor listens to her feminine intuition, is subjected to vulnerability at the end. As narrated above in the novel, Lilia does not see her own subjectivity. It is not perceptible for Lilia that not only the personal relations between the couples but also the cultural, social and national differences destroy their marriage. Mrs. Herriton is the only one who foresees that this marriage will be a fiasco. In other words, the sensibility of Mrs. Herriton makes her recognize intuitively what is going to happen.

Yet again, compared to the sensibility of Mrs. Herriton with that of Lilia about the issue of her marriage with an Italian man, it is inappropriate to state that Lilia's sensibility is much higher than that of Mrs. Herriton. Because Lilia fails in appreciating and responding to complex influences about her own life. For instance, she never understands or, most probably, she is likely to pretend not to apprehend that Gino has married her only for her money. In the novel, the situation of Lilia in Monteriano with her husband is narrated in the following quotation, which overtly reveals how far she is in reaching sensibility for her own life: "*The advance of regret can be so gradual that it is impossible to say 'yesterday I was happy, today I am not.'*" At no one moment did Lilia realize that her marriage was a failure; yet during the summer and autumn she became as unhappy as it was possible for her nature to be. She had no unkind treatment, and few unkind words, from her husband. He simply left her alone" (WAFT, 35). Lilia's desperate situation mainly stems from her own understanding of the world, that is, a sense which lacks sensibility.

In Levinasian perception, the concept of sensibility reveals that Lilia's subjectivity is completely related to her subjection to love and belongingness in her life. Her susceptibility and vulnerability stem from her unendurable enthusiasm for loving and belonging. Indeed, all she wants is to love and to be loved, additionally, to retain a feeling of belongingness in this world. In Sawston, she has never had a feeling of belongingness to her husband's family, the Herritons, as they are upper-middle class. Similarly, in Monteriano, she has hardly experienced belongingness because of her class distinction and cultural gap with her new husband. Thus, a critical stance uncovers that Lilia's susceptibility and

vulnerability are to do with her hunger for love and being loved. She yearns for meeting the demands of her own desires, which also reflect her subjectivity. Yet again, in Levinasian terms, Lilia's sensibility, namely her openness to the world in which she is living, particularly in Italy, is restricted to her receptive skills. Apart from her receptive skills, she gets the information from *the other*, mostly from Gino himself. However, that does not mean that her receptive skills are open to new interpretations and appreciations. Still, her sensitivity is not strong enough to appreciate Gino's real intentions about her.

Rather than simply suggesting the reception skills of an individual through the use of perceptual experience, Levinas presupposes that the *ethical self* can reveal itself on the condition that it encounters with *the other*, an irreducible relation and an indispensable condition for any individual. The encounter with the other particularly in the form of face-to-face is heavily dealt with the other's proximity, which leads to heteronomy of the other. In "*Where Angels Fear to Tread*", Mrs. Herriton is generally compared with *the other*, in the forms of Lilia and Caroline. The ethical self of Mrs. Herriton is only able to show itself when she is contrasted with the other, who are completely different from her in respect to age, attitude and manner. Only then the difference among the characters do appear.

In Levinasian terms, Mrs. Herriton is Mrs. Herriton because not only her perceptual experience but also her confrontation with *the others* have a somewhat equal responsibility in shaping her own subjectivity. Namely, her subjectivity depends upon the others whose attitudes and manners are in interaction with her as well. More explicitly, Mrs. Herriton's ethical self is revealed when Lilia makes some mistakes in terms of Edwardian standards such as falling in love with a man named Mr. Kingcroft, a man from the lower class and then, marrying an Italian man Gino, similarly, from the lower class. More elaborately, these are the ones which will never and ever be accepted by Mrs. Herriton as a plutocrat, who is profoundly dependent on the mores of the Edwardian society. Moreover, even if she is a widow just like Lilia herself, there is no indication, even the slightest one in the novel that she has thought of marrying a man. Her utmost aim is only to protect her family name at the expense of dedicating the lives of her daughter-in-law and grandson. According to Goodlad, "[...] it is not only the stalwart materfamilias who attests to ethical dysfunction, but also the younger, more congenial women with whom she is contrasted" (2006: 313). Precisely, her existence with her actual identity depends on the existence of the others such as Lilia and Caroline.

As for Layder, what he strongly believes is that, an enjoyable and satisfying life heavily depends upon the individual's ability in translating her/his "wishes, hopes, desires and needs into reality" (2004: 1). To him, this necessitates an individual to be able to "*manage and deal with other people*" so that they naturally provide one with the things one needs most such as "*love, companionship, attention, care, a sense of purpose, feelings of elation and joy and so on*" (2004: 2). In order to do this, an individual is required to appreciate other people's moods, attitudes and preferences and then, take action on the information s/he has gained to make his/her own needs and desires fit effectively to the those of "others". A Layderian notion of "other" is somewhat alike to that of Levinasian, particularly its relationship with the ethical self, which can reveal itself on the condition that it encounters with the other.

Apart from Layderian basic perspectives on how to lead a satisfying life as an individual by considering the others' emotional needs and desires, Silvan Tomkins, as a founding theorist of basic emotions, compares and contrasts *primary emotions* with *secondary emotions*. To her, whereas the former one, which includes surprise, interest, joy, rage, fear, disgust, and anguish, "are genetically built into the human brain by natural selection", the latter one, namely the secondary emotions, such as "guilt, shame, embarrassment, empathy", are regarded as "culturally determined" ones (cited in LeDoux, 2015: 120). Correspondingly, in "*Where Angels Fear to Tread*", Forster is much more concerned with the secondary emotions of the characters than the primary ones. It means that he endows his characters

with the emotions which are "culturally determined" rather than "genetically inherited". If so, then, addressing the question of what "culture" is undoubtedly gives us some insights about the "culturally determined emotions". According to Raymond Williams, culture is a "[...] *particular way of life which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art and learning, but also in institutions and ordinary behaviour. The analysis of culture [...] is the clarification of the meanings and values implicit and explicit in a particular way of life, a particular culture*" (1965, 57-58). Williams also makes a distinction between culture and society with an emphasis on "culture as a standard of excellence" and "culture as a whole way of life". While Williams suggests a general definition on the culture by connecting it to the society, T. S. Eliot gives more explicit examples on what culture is in his review entitled *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*: "[...] *all the characteristic activities and interests of a people. Derby Day, Henley Regatta, Cowes, the 12th of August, a cup final, the dog races, the pin table, the dartboard, Wensleydale cheese, boiled cabbage cut into sections, beetroot in vinegar, 19th Century Gothic churches, the music of Elgar*" (1948: 298). Both of these definitions by Williams and Eliot highlight the general characteristics of culture with their connection to way of life.

Similar to T. S. Eliot's definition, Roland Barthes explicitly states that the concept of culture extends beyond the library, opera and theatre to include everyday life: "*The whole of France is steeped in this anonymous ideology: our press, our films, our theatre, our pulp literature, our rituals, our Justice, our diplomacy, our conversations, our remarks about the weather, a murder trial, a touching wedding, the cooking we dream of, the garments we wear, everything in everyday life is dependent on the representation which the bourgeoisie has and makes us have of the relations between men and the world*" (1972: 140). The definition of Barthes on culture explicitly attempts to demarcate the borders of culture by exemplifying a number of social occasions.

As known, the characters in "*Where Angels Fear to Tread*" are presented as real like characters whose manners, reactions, hopes, desires, troubles and so on are reflections of actual men and women. More explicitly, they lead their lives in a culture, where the demarcations of which is carefully drawn by the scholars such as Williams, Eliot and Barthes above. Thus, the characters in the novel are commonly endowed with the "culturally determined emotions", the roots of which are founded in the doctrines of mimetic theory. In regard to mimetic theory, the characters are ordinarily viewed as the *prototypes of actual human beings*, whose manners are meaningful in particular settings and whose inner selves are subjected to culturally determined emotions. Accordingly, the characters are assumed to be the prototypes of actual human beings namely, the representatives of life-like characters, who are influenced by the other factors such as family, friends, relatives, education, ethnicity, work, class, gender, politics and history in a socio-cultural structure. Similarly, the characters, who lead their lives in a particular socio-cultural setting in the novel, are influenced by the society as none of them can be said to be "outside" of the society, namely each one is "inside" the society. It is also evident that the characters are not able to stand completely apart from the mores of Edwardian society even if they attempt to retain a certain amount of independence.

In a particular society, for the welfare of an individual, one of the most important things is to provide the individual with the requisite conditions in order to meet the demands of emotional needs and desires. Yet, meeting the demands of the individual is heavily based on the tension between psychological reality and social reality. Derek Layder in his work entitled "*Modern Social Theory: Key Debates and New Directions*" (1997) argues about the tension between *psychological reality* and *social reality* by referring to the duality of "separateness" and "relatedness". Explicitly, this tension indicates the in-betweenness of the individual who is leading a life of his/her own and having a dependent or over-dependent life on others.

In the novel, Lilia has experienced the duality mentioned by Layder in her life, namely she is

stuck between “separateness” and “relatedness” in her new life in Monteriano. For instance, when Lilia suggests her husband Gino that “Let’s have plenty of men – and make them bring their womankind. I mean to have real English tea-parties” (WAFT, 28), a cultural occasion she adopted in Sawston. Gino replies that “There is my aunt and husband; but I thought you did not want to receive my relatives” and adds “But you would be right, [...] They [the relatives] are not for you. Many of them are in trade, and even we are little more; you should have gentlefolk and nobility for your friends” (WAFT, 28), a cultural prejudgment he is exposed to in Monteriano. Specifically, what Gino expects from her is to become acquainted with the people who are belonging to the respected families of the higher social class. Similarly, Lilia, a class-conscious character, as an additional note, who was also a member of the lower-class before her marriage with Charles, unceasingly interrogates her new husband’s acquaintances: “But besides your families I must have other people here. Your friends have wives and sisters, haven’t they?” and asks another question to him, “Well, who are the principal here? Who leads society?” (WAFT, 28). All these statements on inquiring about the people of Monteriano imply that Lilia hungers for satisfying her psychological needs, as itemized in Maslow’s *hierarchy of needs*, such as *belongingness and love needs* which include intimate relationships and friends; *esteem needs* such as prestige and feeling of accomplishment.

Sooner or later, Lilia comprehends that the replies of Gino never satisfy her demands, eventually she goes further and further and, asks whether the men he was talking to in the afternoon are from the lower class or not. Paradoxically enough, Gino is unable to recollect the names of his low-class friends. At the end of this interaction, the narrator gives the reader an insight about what she has felt about the situation she is involved in: “Lilia gathered somehow from this conversation that Continental society was not the go-as-you-please thing she had expected. Indeed, she could not see where the continental society was. Italy is such a delighted place to live in if you happen to be a man” (WAFT, 29). Actually, let alone satisfying her own psychological needs from the other people in Monteriano, Lilia is unable to satisfy her need of belongingness and love from Gino because of his manners which shows masculine superiority.

As indicated in this setting, where Lilia wants to meet with the Italian high-class people, she experiences the tension between psychological reality and social reality, both of which refers to the concepts of “separateness” and “relatedness”, suggested by Layder (1997). In other words, Lilia’s *psychological reality* requires that she constantly wants to get to know the higher-class Italians whereas her *social reality* implicates that she is involved in a marriage where such encounters are almost impossible because of her husband’s social position, that is a low-class man. Thus, such an in-betweenness also shows that “separateness” mainly stems from the Italian socio-cultural structure due to her “relatedness” to British socio-cultural structure. Thus, Lilia’s neither *belongingness and love needs*, nor *esteem needs* are satisfied in this situation because of the incongruence of *psychological reality* and *social reality*, as proposed by Layder (1997) himself.

As has already been revealed, the Layderian notions on *psychological reality* and *social reality* are associated with the duality of “separateness” and “relatedness”. The self, which is not just a body with a brain inserted in, have an *inner mental life* which is rich with emotions; and functional in feeding the behaviour (Layder, 1997). Indeed, even if the individuals are donated with emotions, they commonly calculate the pros and cons of their actions before they do anything cognitively. Yet again, it does not mean that they are separated from their feelings, motivations, instincts and emotions. Namely, the individuals use both cognitive and affective skills to appreciate the things happening around them, Furthermore, it would not be wrong to assert the idea that every type of attempt which exclude emotion and motivation from *rational thought* creates chaos for the individuals who are interacting with each other in a social structure. Yet, both emotional and rational side never gives an individual complete

freedom of action because of continual need of controlling self.

On the issues of *inner mental life* and *rational thought* emphasized by Layder (1997), the following illustration provides how inner mental life and rational thought of Philip work together in order to give a meaning to the things he has experienced in his life. In his second trip to Italy, when he is there to 'rescue' the baby, at the opera scene, Philip has experienced a revival of interest in himself and his aesthetic views rather than his pre-determined mission: "*As for Philip, he forgot himself as well as his mission. He was not even an enthusiastic visitor. For he had been in this place always. It was his home*" (WAFT, 75). Furthermore, on the next day, when Philip is asked what he plans to do about the baby, he claims that he is able to understand the situations of all the interested parties. He eventually expresses how his inner mental life and rational thought are completely in conflict with each other and how they are forced to reach a concession: "*Some people are born not to do things. I'm one of them; I never did anything at school or at the Bar. I came out to stop Lilia's marriage, and it was too late. I came out intending to get the baby, and I shall return an 'honourable failure'. I never expect anything to happen now, and so I am never disappointed. You would be surprised to know what my great events are. Going to the theatre yesterday, talking to you now - I don't suppose I shall ever meet anything greater. I seem fated to pass through the world without colliding with it or moving it - and I'm sure I can't tell you whether the fate's good or evil. I don't die - I don't fall in love. And if other people die or fall in love they always do it when I'm just not there. You [Miss Caroline Abbott] are quite right; life to me is just a spectacle, which - thank God, and thank Italy, and thank you - is now more beautiful and heartening than it has ever been before*" (WAFT, 96). In this quotation, Forster deliberately unveils the conflict between inner mental life and rational thought. Philip seems to be in a dilemma whether to carry out his mission on taking the baby or not because he believes that such as a situation is completely related to the interested parties.

The basic psychological needs such as love and respect, acceptance and approval are all indispensable parts of an individual's health, happiness and mental state, according to Layder (1997). He also states that the emotions such as *self-love*, *self-acceptance* and *self-approval* make a meaning if they are reciprocal in an interaction. Because these emotions are generally considered as social needs which can be supplied by close members such as lovers, friends, family, colleagues firstly, and then distant members of the society. To him, since every individual in the society are dependent on each other, the mutual exchanges among the individuals play crucial roles for the social interaction, which requires a *give and take*. Thus, being an individual necessitates to be partly in control of the interaction in order to make it a successful one. In a broader sense, *personal control* gives support to the self in shaping an individual's feelings and desires. Namely, personal control, which helps "reduce the uncertainty and unpredictability" (Layder, 1997: 15), is crucial for the maintenance of the self in social interaction.

As Layder puts it, being "*'out-of-control', or not having enough control in certain areas, can seriously damage personal relationships*" and can also prevent individuals "*from leading satisfying and fulfilling lives*" (1997: 13). For instance, from the "outside", the conversation on rescuing the baby from the hands of his father metaphorically between Philip and Harriet in Italy seems rather logical at first sight as they have been there to complete their mission, namely "*to get the baby back, and for nothing else*" (WAFT, 64) and "*to get the baby out of Monteriano*" (WAFT, 67) in order to save their family names. However, a closer inspection unveils their misdeed, which turns out to be a murder more than a failure. While carrying out her mission, Harriet's decision on kidnapping the baby leads to a domestic chaos because of the confusion between her mind and emotion. After the carriage crash, "*Harriet still screamed like a maniac, 'I stole it. I stole it! I stole it! It slipped out of my arms!'*" (WAFT, 104). According to Gordon, "*the British fear of voice in 'Where Angels Fear to Tread' is a fear of its power to subvert other, presumably more humanistic values imagined to be the repository of the western logocentric family*" (1985: 317). At last, it becomes apparent that Harriet has been completely out of control while she is carrying out her mission. In other words, "... she

had yielded to a grotesque temptation" (WAFT, 105), for kidnapping the baby, which shows her *uncontrollable desire* and her unpleasant or offensive behaviour. According to Layderian notion, Harriet's losing control increases the *uncertainty* and *unpredictability* in her life. According to his explanation, Harriet's becoming out of control while insisting on taking the baby firstly damages herself, and then her personal relationship with the others, which also make it a matter of question whether she will be able to lead a satisfying and fulfilling life after she has committed a crime. The question remains unanswered in the novel. Yet, not only the attitudes of Harriet but also those of Philip lead to tragedy. To Simon, "... Philip, who has not taken his mission seriously, and Harriet, who has taken it far too seriously, are both responsible for this catastrophe" (1985: 205). Because both of them are unable to balance their self-control.

On the issue of "out-of-control", Gino can hardly be said to a man who is at ease in controlling himself. In his statement, Watson emphasizes the cruelty of Gino who has difficulty in controlling himself: "[...] the meddling benevolence of English visitors to Italy ends in disaster and the death of an infant; the hero, Philip Herriton, conscientiously returns to the Italian father to tell the news, and the Italian, acting on a sudden impulse, twists his broken arm till he screams" (2003: 629). Gino's becoming out-of-control can be expected as he has lost his infant. But what is not expected is that he shows his violence to the one who brings the news to him. As seen, Gino changes intensely in the course of the novel. Simon explains his gradual change with these words: "... the natural comic man, Gino; although he is emotionally insensitive during much of the story, sometimes unconsciously cruel, he becomes a gentler and more sympathetic figure by the end" (1985: 207). Indeed, Gino is a dynamic character rather than a static one throughout the novel.

As far as social criticism is concerned, Layderian *personal control* is commonly to do with how to "reduce the uncertainty and unpredictability" in social interaction. In contrast to Layder, Levinas explains the subjectivity of the others with the possibility of intentionality whose connections are not embedded in a foundation. Levinas proposes that "Before thinking or receiving objects, the subject is steeped in it" (1998: 124) in his work "Discovering Existence with Husserl" (1949-1967), which can be best understood with the reference of John Drabinski. To Drabinski, Levinasian sensibility is "not an aspect of intentionality" but rather it is "the very possibility of intentionality – the nonintentional [...] the origin without apriori and without foundation" (2001: 151). Thus, ethical subject is, in some sense, *prereflective locus of the self*. Levinas clarifies the concomitant relationship between sensibility and subjectivity. To him, *sensibility*, as a constituent part of the "subjectivity of the subject" shapes the initial contours of subjectivity. As for subjectivity, Krueger also explains what Levinas explicitly means by it, "the locus or place of contact where self and world, interiority and exteriority, meet and interpenetrate" (2008: 606). In other words, Levinasian subjectivity has nothing to do with the intentional structures of consciousness or with the level of personal consciousness rather it deals with the prereflective level of the animate body.

More justifiably, the proposal of Levinas, which is stated previously about "Before thinking or receiving objects, the subject is steeped in it", indicates that characters react in conformity with the prereflective locus of the self. On this issue, the relationship between Philip and Miss Caroline Abbot exemplifies how the subjectivity functions in the train scene at the end of the novel. Mr. Herriton assumes that he has instantly fallen in love with Miss Caroline Abbot. According to Levinasian sensibility, which is related to the subjectivity of the subject, Mr. Philip Herriton is the subject while Mr. Abbot is the object. Namely, before thinking about the object (Miss Abbott), the subject (Mr. Herriton) knows that the subject (Mr. Herriton) has spent a lot of time thinking or learning about the object (Miss Abbott). Because, "He [Philip] had known Miss Abbott for years, and had never had much opinion about her one way or the other. She was good, quiet, dull, and amiable, and young only because she was twenty-three..." (WAFT, 13). As the extraction suggests, Philip's sensibility on Miss Abbott is "not an aspect of intentionality" because of the fact that Philip's ethical self is under the strong influence of his

prereflective locus while returning to Sawston from Monteriano in the train. His prereflective locus reminds him of her youth and her personality, but nothing else. In reality, Caroline is not the one Philip intends to get married with. However, Philip's sensibility is related to his "nonintentionality", which neither has a "piori" nor "foundation", as emphasized by Levinas. Unpredictably, his nonintentionality turns out to be an intentional result. Without knowing that Caroline is in love with Gino, Philip attempts to propose marriage to her. The question is how Philip's ethical self is activated. Most probably, the answer is through his prereflective locus, which is inherent in his sensibility, within a number of ethical relatedness.

With the aim of explaining what Levinas means, Judith Butler in her work entitled *Giving an Account of Oneself* reveals how the self is shaped with these words: "... Levinas makes clear that, before we can speak about a self who is capable of choice, we must first consider how that self is formed. This formation takes place, in his words, "outside of being [essence]" (2005: 85-86). Indeed, the sphere in which the subject is said to emerge is "preontological" in the sense that the phenomenal world of persons and things becomes available only after a self has been formed as an effect of a primary impingement.

As far as ethical relatedness is concerned, it can be asserted that for the English, Italy becomes a place where the visitors need to break down all the barriers to get to know the city with its cafés, opera houses, vivid streets and outgoing and cheerful Italians. However, Lilia, Philip and Caroline all experience varying degrees of success in learning how to connect in Italy. At the end of the novel, both Philip and Caroline become much more aware of themselves than they were at the very beginning of the novel. Their conversion from ignorance to self-consciousness is apparent in every aspect. On the train from Monteriano to England, Philip recognizes that his relations with the people around him are incomplete and he experiences discontentment. Because "*Self-consciousness is always driven, quite literally, by an alterity that has become internal, a set of enigmatic signifiers that pulse through us in ways that make us permanently and partially foreign to ourselves*" (Butler, 2005: 98). Accordingly, what Philip recognizes is his partial foreignness to himself. Like Philip, Caroline also experiences real sadness. On their way back, Philip, who realizes that he is in love with her, thinks that Caroline is unhappy and hopeless because of the unstated love she suffered for him. Unfortunately, it turns out to be a complete mistake for him as Caroline reveals that she is in love with not him, but Gino and she gives an excuse by saying that, "*Tell me I'm a fool or worse – that he's [Gino] a cad. Say all you said when Lilia fell in love with him. That's the help I want. I dare tell you this because I like you- and because you're without passion; you look on life as a spectacle; you don't enter it; you only find it funny or beautiful. So I can trust you to cure me*" (WAFT, 115). As seen, Philip's sensitivity is far from conceiving the things around himself. He neither comprehends his partial foreignness to himself nor her unrequited love.

It is also significant to reveal that Philip has a low sense of sensibility. He neither recognizes his own situation nor that of Caroline. His senses are far from appreciating what Caroline thinks and feels. He even does not understand that she is in love not with him, but conversely, that she loves someone else, which indicates that both his *inner mental life* and *rational thought* are in conflict with each other, as emphasized by Layder. Yet again, it is important to note that Philip has never found Caroline as an attractive young lady, as indicated in the novel, "*there was nothing in her appearance or manner to suggest the fire of youth*" (WAFT, 13). Frederick Toates explains how an individual becomes (un)attractive to another one with these words in his work entitled "*How Sexual Desire Works: The Enigmatic Urge*", "*[a]rousal induced by physical exertion, humour, or exposure to erotic stimulation tends to make an attractive partner still more attractive but an unattractive partner still more unattractive*" (2014: 169). From the very beginning of the novel till the end, Caroline has been a rather "dull" girl for Philip. Thus, neither Philip nor Caroline has had such feelings of sexual arousal towards each other, as proposed in Frederick's explanation. However, in the novel, Philip is not presented as a failure as well, he tries to understand

the whole world from his own perspective. His love, which he thinks mutual, helps him grow his solitary. Then, he learns what real life is with all its grief and joy even if he is unable to connect and idealize it with his own life. Precisely, Philip is the one who treats everyone near him humanely.

Levinasian philosophy commonly revolves around the ethical body interacting with other bodily subjects. More explicitly, its main concern with how the body should live its ethics is considered as *ethical relatedness*. Ethical relatedness encompasses a wide variety of issues and activities such as eating and drinking, which can also be regarded as metaphysical enjoyment and nourishment, from basic to much more complicated ones. Even if these activities are not emphasized too much neither philosophically nor historically, they sustain the ethical body. Moreover, Levinas's concept of ethical relatedness, a philosophy which indicates the ethical body interacting with other bodily subjects, reveals how the body lives or should live its ethics. In other words, our bodies act prereflectively, and know how to act and make a link with the outer world. As Dewey suggests, "*we walk and read aloud, we get off and on street cars, we dress and undress, and do a thousand useful acts without thinking about them*" (1922/ 1988: 124) because all these universal qualities enable our bodies to display an adaptive and affective intelligent that make individuals do these things for themselves.

As for Levinasian ethical relatedness, Caroline's interacting with other bodily subjects, namely Philip himself, indicates how she should live in accordance with the ethical standards. For instance, Lilia's utterance on her love of Gino namely, "*That I love him [Gino]*" reveals that how her ethical body reacts prereflectively. In other words, she knows how to act. Accordingly, Caroline makes a link with the outer world by crying as she knows that she has fallen in love with him, and it is impossible for her to reunion with him as she is leaving from Monteriano: "*Her body was shaken with sobs, and lest there should be any doubt she cried between the sobs for Gino! Gino! Gino!*" (WAFT, 115). Furthermore, her prereflective knowledge also suggests that Philip is going to say the same things to her when Lilia has fallen in love with Gino. Then she cries, "*I love him, I'm not ashamed of it. I love him, and I'm going to Sawston, and if I mayn't speak about him to you sometimes, I shall die*" (WAFT, 115). Goodlad clarifies the paradoxical relationship of the characters whose affective expressions and ethical relations are somewhat knotty: "*In Where Angels Fear to Tread, Forster's multi-faceted crossings - between Northern and Southern, male and female, Protestant and Catholic, heteronormative and queer, upper-class and déclassé - expose the troubling disjunctions between affective expressions of care (affiliation) and the ethical relations to which they only sometimes give rise (epistemological adequacy and normative response)*" (2006: 311). Indeed, the characters who are representative of different social status are presented in context where their affective states and ethical relations are in conflict with each other.

In the novel, the characters exist inside the society, and the society where the characters live commonly resides in the characters as well. Therefore, the Sawstonians exist in the Sawston society, and interchangeably, the Sawston society where the characters live generally resides in the characters. That means that both characters and society are under the strong influence of the place where the Sawstonian culture exists. Womack explains the relationship between characters and places as such: "*In Where Angels Fear to Tread the characters of Lilia, Caroline, and Philip become triangulated by the Herriton family's regressive social ideology. Each character's liberating voyage to Italy results in his or her rediscovery of the qualities of friendship and aesthetic experience unavailable in Sawston's priggish environs*" (2000: 133). Specifically, the English characters who are exposed to a foreign culture are affected deeply by the newly discovered meanings such as friendship and aestheticism, which are deficient in the snuffy atmosphere of English culture.

The characters, who are presented with their unique characteristics, are mainly the products of their own society or vice versa. For instance, the way the unique members of the Herritons responses to the event of Lilia's marriage imply similarities as they are the "insiders" of the same society and are

heavily dependent on the social norms of Edwardian society. In other words, all the members of the family have reacted against the marriage of Lilia with a man whose race and class are not compatible with theirs. In fact, according to Womack, Lilia is "[...] an interloper that they [the Herritons] tolerate in deference to Charles's memory and because of their feelings of responsibility for Charles and Lilia's daughter Irma" (Womack, 2000: 134). As inferred from the illustration, the *collective identity* makes the individuals give similar reactions to the same incident in a particular situation.

Unlike collective identity, "*Personal identity is always caught up in, and constantly emerges from, this tension between fitting in with society and other people (especially those with whom we are intimate) and wanting to follow our own desires, hopes and wishes*" (Layder, 2004: 2). To Levinas, personal identity is a formation of human subjectivity, which emerges from an individual's sensibility, namely from his/her precognitive bodily openness to the world. Phenomenologically, interiority (inner world) and exteriority (social world) are the integral parts of an individual. Levinas considers that subjectivity emerges from individual's prereflective and affective engagement with the social world. For instance, Lilia's interiority and exteriority reveal what type of a personal identity she is donated with. She is presented as a female who is also caught between accommodating herself to the Edwardian society and running after for her personal desires, hopes and wishes. According to Schwarz, Lilia is the one who is "*attracted and aroused by the primitive energy of Gino, the young Italian son of a dentist, who, by English standards, lacks culture and civilization*" (1983: 628). At last, she finds herself choosing her way of life in pursuit of her own desires, hopes and wishes. Only then does she decide to get married with Gino.

On the other hand, Gino's prereflective engagement is revealed as "[...] Gino is a discernibly Carpenterian figure: the embodiment of an affective, even nurturing masculinity, and one through which the enticements of class difference are magnified by the supplementary eroticism of 'Southernness'" (Goodlad, 2006: 315). Gino's affective engagement is presented when he shares his thoughts with her wife Lilia about living in the same house with his family: "Gino was quite willing too, for he was an affectionate youth who liked a large home-circle, and he told it as a pleasant bit of news to Lilia, who did not attempt to conceal her horror" (WAFT, 26). Another exemplar about Gino's affective engagement with his family can be given: "*His father complained that prosperity was already corrupting him and making him unsympathetic and hard; his mother cried; his sisters accused him of blocking their social advance. He was apologetic, and even cringing, until they turned on Lilia. Then he turned on them, saying that they could not understand, much less associate with, the English lady who was his wife; that there should be one master in that house – himself*" (WAFT, 27). As inferred, Gino's prereflective engagement and affective engagement have to do with only his subjectivity, in Levinasian terms, the concept of which emerges from Gino's own sensibility and his precognitive openness to the world itself. Thus, Gino's personal identity is formed through his thoughts, that is, either fitting into the society or following the desires of his own.

Layder unambiguously unearths the fact that an individual's competency in establishing satisfying personal relationships in a society is the result of his/her endeavour. Specifically, "Being able to participate competently, smoothly and satisfyingly in personal relationships and in social life generally is a skilled accomplishment and requires a great deal of effort, energy and ingenuity" (Layder, 2004: 2). Among the English characters, Caroline as a young girl is the one who accommodates herself to the newly encountered social norms and codes of Monteriano straightforwardly. Indeed, Caroline, as a "charming" and "sober" (WAFT, 5) girl is generally competent in forming her relationship with *the other* because of the fact that she gives too much energy and effort in order to establish strong and satisfying personal relationships. For instance, it is her own identity which prevents Philip and Gino from harming each other physically and spiritually in the scene where the baby accidentally dies. Since Caroline treats everyone compassionately, she seems as if she has the most potential in establishing strong personal relationships.

In the novel, Lilia is presented as a young woman who is flexible and endurable. One of most significant aspects about her character is that she changes emotionally and rationally in the course of time. It is apparent that she evolves from an independent woman into an altruistic one throughout the novel. Lilia, after reaching certain phases of life, has experienced some key passages such as getting married, having a child, witnessing her couple's death, and living through critical illness, all of which entail alterations or adjustments in her actual self. Nevertheless, the process of change requires a kind of struggle in her life. For instance, after her husband's death, her struggle for being a single mother for her daughter results in disruptive crises such as difficulty in setting the house chores and managing the servants.

Apart from sensibility and subjectivity, Levinas also puts his views on proximity in *"Otherwise than Being: or Beyond Essence"*. Levinas, just like sensibility, thinks that proximity is not a cognitive process, namely, it is not *"the identity of an ego endowed with knowledge"* (1998: 83). In other words, Levinasian concept of proximity is a human phenomenon and a lived space that denotes the distinctive feature of human interrelatedness rather than a physical distance or a static space. For instance, in the novel, the proximity among all characters are not arbitrary. Forster places each of the character rather idiosyncratic features, all of which signify their interrelatedness. Specifically, each one arranges his/her proximity to each other in order to continue his/her interrelatedness in his/her interactions. The interrelatedness of the characters never indicates a physical or a static distance, as suggested by Levinas, that is, the characters are all endowed with distinctive interrelatedness. Unambiguously, the bond between them indicates a kind of spiritual, cultural and social infrastructure, whose interrelatedness also stem from prereflective locus of the self historically. For instance, the catastrophe in the novel mainly stems from the concept of proximity among the characters. Because, with the news of a new-born baby whose mother has died in giving birth, the Herritons are all alerted by the possibility of defining their status as a relative for the new-born baby. Because they think that both Irma, who is from Charles Herriton and Lilia Herriton, and the nameless infant, who is from Gino Carella and Lilia Carella, are siblings. As seen, the Levinasian proximity suggests not the physical distance but the distance which is rooted in the interrelatedness.

As for the proximity between Caroline and Philip, it is important to suggest that the intimate relationship between them is mistaken particularly by Philip himself. Proximity in the sense of distinctive feature of human interrelatedness is presented through Philip who endeavours to understand the whole world from his own perspective as *"a self-conscious, disengaged man who has difficulty feeling"* (Schwarz, 1983: 629). For instance, Philip is mistaken in appreciating the proximity between himself and Caroline. His assuming that Caroline is in love with him is the result of his inconsistency and incompetency in arranging the proximity between the individuals, which also indicates his lack of sensibility, as has already been proposed. Alan Wilde explains Philip's proximity in his relationship with these words: *"He [Philip] is focusing once again on the surface of things and over-idealizing his love for woman as once he did his love for Italy. Furthermore, he resigns himself too easily to his defeat, as if defeat were in truth what he desired. His love is unreal precisely because it lacks sexual passion, or, more generally, vitality and body; it is a weak and intellectual passion"* (1961: 215). As inferred, Philip is presented as a man who shows empathy for a woman who refuses his love. Because he thinks that maintaining a sexual affair and relationship with a woman is not a success but a failure, particularly because of his homosexual desire.

The concept of empathy, as a high-level cognitive activity which is explained by developmental psychology and cognitive science, has two approaches, one is *"Theory Theory"* and the other one is *"Simulation Theory"* of empathy. Apart from these, Levinas asserts the idea that emphatic awareness of others is a phenomenon inserted into an individual's bodily subjectivity. The basic question is: how an

individual pass from an immediate awareness of interiority into an emphatic awareness of others, namely exteriority? It can best be explained by Meltzoff's words: "[...] exteroception (perception of others) and proprioception (perception of self) speak the same language by birth" (2005: 72), which means that they function together in order to make a unified form of *emphatic awareness*. According to Levinasian explanation, emphatic awareness of others is related to an individual's subjectivity. For instance, in the scene, where Caroline and Philip are arguing about whether Philip is able to persuade Gino to take the baby or not, Caroline asks very crucial questions: "Do you want the child to stop his father, who loves him and will bring him up badly, or do you want him to come to Sawston, where no one loves him, but where he will be brought up well?" (WAF, 95). As seen, these questions are the exemplars of Meltzoff's exteroception and proprioception, two of which indicate emphatic awareness of Caroline herself.

Another illustration for emphatic awareness, the scene, where Gino's wife Lilia lies ill and she is about to give a birth, can also be given. In this scene, Gino's main concern was not about her wife but about what the sex of his new-born baby. He worries secondarily about her. "Gino was distracted. She [Lilia] knew why: he wanted a son. He could talk and think of nothing else. His one desire was to become the father of a man like himself; and it held him with a grip he only partially understood, for it was the first great desire, the first great passion of his life. Falling in love was a mere physical triviality beside this divine hope of immortality: 'I continue'" (WAF, 42). More explicitly, what he wants most is to maintain his lineage with a new-born baby boy rather than to continue his life with his English wife.

As the remarks above that are germane to the discussion suggest that ethical maturity is pertinent to subjectivity. An individual's encounter, in this case Gino's encounter, with his new-born baby, does not mean that he is reaching a strong ethical maturity. Because an individual's experiential encounter with *human otherness* is a requisite but not an adequate condition for reaching a vigorous ethical maturity. Gallagher attempts to explain this encounter as: "Perceptual access to the other person's contextualized bodily movements, gestures, and facial expressions, and so forth does give us a partial sense of what is going on with them, what they mean and what they feel. This, together with our interactions with others in pragmatic and social contexts, where those contexts and situations enrich our understanding even further, gives us a relatively stable, but still relatively elemental understanding of them" (2007: 363). Remarkably, Gino's ethical maturity coincides with the death of his wife, apparently, in the scene where he tries to bath his son. Moreover, Gino reaches ethical maturity after he has learned how to care for a baby after his wife's death and how it becomes almost impossible to leave him to the hands of the Herritons. Briefly, as indicated by Meltzoff (2005), reaching ethical maturity requires some experience about exteroceptive and proprioceptive skills.

Levinasian subjectivity arises from an individual's embodiment and the worldly relatedness of his/her embodiment. It also explores that sensibility involves "breakup of identity", which is indeed related to the "subject's subjectivity" and also leads to "broken" subjectivity" and last, results in "a defeat of the ego's identity" (1998: 14-15). For instance, Gino Carella, who represents the best qualities of Italians, is a character with the spirits of enthusiasm, amusement and honesty. Moreover, to Wilde, "Gino functions primarily as the human embodiment of Forster's primitivistic ideal" (1961: 210). On hearing his son's death, Gino felt completely overwhelmed by feelings of anger. Moreover, his attempted murder of Philip and his continual torment of him indicate not only his primitivistic but also his conventional masculine and insane manner. Furthermore, even if his behaviour to Philip can be reasonable, and to some degree, "natural" as he has lost his beloved one along with his hope and future, that does not mean that he is not cruel, violent and brutal. Basically, the scene where Gino tortures Philip on hearing that his baby is dead reveals breakup of identity, as Gino thinks the baby is the one which makes a connection between his embodiment and worldly relatedness. When he is faced with the reality, he shows the signs of anger and frustration, all of which results in "a defeat of the ego's

identity”.

In her essay entitled “Happy Objects”, Sara Ahmed states the importance of familial relationship in order to lead a more secure life by emphasizing that, “[T]he family is the main social structure for organizing relations of attachment and (ideally) rendering them as secure as possible. Secure attachment relations are important to an enduring sense of contentment, thus to happiness” (2010: 35). Similarly, In “*The Theory and Technique of Family Therapy*” (1979), Charles P. Barnard and Ramon Garrido argue the significance of family in providing emotional and psychological separation of the self. According to Barnard and Corrales, the family is divided into two, one is *functional*, and the second one is *dysfunctional*. Whereas in functional families, individual members are able to think, act and feel for themselves and thus, they change into completely realized selves, in dysfunctional families, family members develop pseudo selves which is fostered by a sense of anxiety. Additionally, in dysfunctional families, individuals commonly unable to maintain stability between their inner feelings and outward behaviour (1979: 85-87). Forster in this work attempts to emphasize the role of the family in the Edwardian period in regard to identity formation process of the individuals by unveiling dysfunctional Herriton family. Womack clarifies that “[...] Mrs. Herriton preserves her family’s rigid sense of morality and virtue, the process of triangulation determines the nature of many of the novel’s human relationships. Family members - under the scornful gaze of Mrs. Herriton, the defacto protector of the family’s value system - maintain their interpersonal equilibrium by covertly scapegoating each other for subscribing to values that conflict with the narrow and lofty social standards of Sawston” (2000: 130). This quote directly shows that how the members of the Herritons are unable to sustain a stable identity between their inner self and outer self because of their being under the constant surveillance of Mrs. Herriton.

Forster, in his novel, shows his humanist philosophy through Lilia, Caroline and Philip, who explore a new sense of identity particularly in Monteriano. Italy, without doubt, provide them with a stress-free social atmosphere along with overenthusiastic and vociferous Italians, whose manners suggest cordiality. In the novel, the confrontation of three characters with the Italians enhances their understandings of the origins of different cultural norms and societal codes.

CONCLUSION

This study, on the one hand, explores Levinasian “ethical relatedness” with its concepts such as “sensibility”, “subjectivity” and “proximity”, on the other, discovers Layderian “uncontrollable desire” in E. M. Forster’s novel entitled “*Where Angels Fear to Tread*”. In Levinasian terms, subjectivity to otherness indicates that all the characters interact with each other through their own cultural codes as is the case in the novel. Precisely, the lives of the English characters are affected by the Italian mores throughout the novel. However, the Italians are also affected by their interactions with the others, namely the English. For instance, Gino’s transforming from a young man into an adult and from a disinterested husband to a loving and caring father reveals how his ethical self is under the strong influence of the others. In Levinasian terms, Forster also provides proximity among his characters mostly, spiritual and emotional proximity by considering the prereflective locus of the self. In order to do this, Forster employs distant countries, nations and classes. Because he believes the importance of places in shaping the identities, and thus, he consciously highlights the distinctive qualities of Italy and England.

In conclusion, Forster presents how the English middle-class bourgeois is in conflict with the lower class because of their ethical relatedness in the novel. Furthermore, Forster’s creating his characters in accordance with the views of mimetic theory simply suggests that each character has their own emotional needs and desires, as revealed by Layder himself. Accordingly, appreciating an individual means much more than getting some clues about his/her intentions and reflections, particularly about their “uncontrollable desire”. Rather, “uncontrollable desire” unveils the secrecy in

the *inner mental life* and *rational thought* of the characters. Moreover, Forsterian way of creating characters has to do with Layderian criticism in respect to their portrayal as characters whose *self-love*, *self-acceptance* and *self-approval* are interacted reciprocally. Furthermore, the notion of Layder on "out-of-control" gives an insight on how the characters are able to react against the things they do not favour. Besides, Layderian approach definitely makes a clear distinction between being an *outsider* and *insider* in dealing with the perspectives of the characters.

Last but not least, the study concludes that both male and female characters, somewhat, behave inconformity with their own ethical relatedness and try to control their "uncontrollable desire". Nearly all of the characters in the Edwardian society appear to satisfy their needs, wishes and desires, which are commonly accepted as appropriate by the others in the society. However, the poor Lilia and her husband Charles resist the mores of the society by marrying someone from the lower class. It is thought-provoking that two of the characters die in the novel. Specifically, it is a not coincidence that both Lilia and Charles die either at the very beginning or at the end of the novel. Because they both challenge the cultural norms and codes of the society by their choice of marriage; at first, Charles marries Lilia a girl from the lower class, and then Lilia marries Gino a boy from the lower-class. By marrying someone from the lower class, they show their disapproval of cultural norms and societal codes of the Edwardian society. They rebel against the established norms and in return, not only did they pay it with their lives, they also sacrificed their own children.

REFERENCES

- Arnold, M. (1970). *Culture and Anarchy*. (Ed.). J. Dover Wilson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [1869].
- Barnard, C. P., & Corrales, R. G. (1979). *The Theory and Technique of Family Therapy*. Charles C. Thomas Pub Ltd.
- Butler, J. P. (2005). *Giving An Account of Oneself*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Drabinski, J. (2001). *Sensibility and Singularity: The Problem of Phenomenology in Levinas*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Edwards, M. (2002). *E. M. Forster: The Novels*. London: Palgrave.
- Eliot, T. S. (1948). *Notes towards the Definition of Culture*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Forster, E. M. (1993). *Where Angels Fear to Tread* (1st pub. 1905 by William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh, London). USA: Dover Thrift Editions.
- Gallagher, S. (2007). Simulation Trouble. *Social Neuroscience*, 2(3/4), 353–365.
- Goodlad, L. M. E. (2006). Where Liberals Fear to Tread: E. M. Forster's Queer Internationalism and the Ethics of Care. *A Forum on Fiction*, 39(3), 307-336.
- Gordon, J. B. (1985). The Third Cheer: "Voice" in Forster. *Twentieth Century Literature*, 31(2/3), 315-328.
- Hall, J. (1958). Forster's Family Reunions. *EHL*, 25(1), 60-78.
- Krueger, J. W. (2008). Levinasian Reflections on Somaticity and the Ethical Self. *Inquiry*, 51(6), 603-626.
- Layder, D. (1997). *Modern Social Theory: Key Debates and New Directions*. London: University College London Press.
- Layder, D. (2004). *Social and Personal Identity: Understanding your Self*. London: Sage.
- LeDoux, J. (2015). *Anxious: Using the Brain to Understand and Treat Fear and Anxiety*. New York: Penguin.
- Levinas, E. (1998). *Discovering Existence with Husserl*, (Trans.). R. Cohen & M. Smith. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Meltzoff, A. (2005). "Imitation and other minds: The "like me" hypothesis", in S. Hurley & N. Chater (Eds.), *Perspectives on Imitation: From Neuroscience to Social Science*, (pp. 55–78). Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Sara, A. (2010). Happy Objects. in Greg, M. & and G. Seigworth (Eds.). *The Affect Theory Reader*. (29-51). Durham: Duke UP.
- Schwarz, D. R. (1983). The Originality of E. M. Forster. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 29(4), 623-641.
- Sehgal, R. P. (1973). *The function of multi-national characters, alien settings and diverse mores in E. M. Forster's three international novels: "Where Angels Fear to Tread" (1905), "A Room with a View", (1908), and "A Passage to India", (1924)*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Ottawa, Canada.
- Simon, R. K. (1985). E. M. Forster's Critique of Laughter and the Comic: The First Three Novels as Dialectic. *Twentieth Century Literature*, 31(2/3), 199-220.
- Sugate, A. S. (2012). *The Novels of E. M. Forster: A thematic Study*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.
- Toates F. (2014). *How Sexual Desire Works: The Enigmatic Urge*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Watson, G. (2003). Forever Forster: Edward Morgan Forster (1879-1970). *The Hudson Review*, 55(4), 626-632.
- Wilde, A. (1961). The Aesthetic View of Life: Where Angels Fear to Tread. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 7, 207-216.
- Williams, F. (2005). E. M. Forster's Alexandrian Quartet. *Hermathena*, (179), 165-193.
- Williams, R. (1965). *The Long Revolution*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Womack, K. (2000). A Passage to Italy: Narrating the Family in Crisis in E. M. Forster's "Where Angels Fear to Tread". *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature*, 129-144.

