The Narrator's Reliability and Professional Norms in *The Remains of the Day*[1]

Shinya Morikawa

Introduction

The narrator of Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day* (1989) has been well known for his unreliable narration. Stevens, an old English butler, looks back on his professional career, but the reader soon recognizes that Stevens' narration is highly deceptive. The reader witnesses, for instance, Stevens suppressing his emotions, justifying his merciless behaviour toward his former colleagues in the name of professionalism, and, above all, claiming to be a great butler, which he is not at least by his criteria of a great butler. Beneath the façade of the careful, self-possessed narrator the reader descries a vulnerable man disquieted by emotional disturbances, misconceived ideas about the political scope of his profession, and misguided idealism. In short, Stevens' narration invites a doubt about his reliability to creep into the reader's mind.

It is only a small step from this doubt to the conclusion that Stevens is consistently unreliable throughout his narrative. However, this conclusion has been challenged in the field of narratology for the last twenty years. Kathleen Wall is the first narratologist who questions the typical

---

classification of Stevens' overall narration as unreliable. Adam Parkes, Amit Marcus, and James Phelan and Mary Patricia Martin all corroborate the validity of the question Wall raises by identifying Stevens' narrative oscillation between reliability and unreliability. What they claim in common, though their main arguments point to different aspects of the narration, is that Stevens cannot be assumed to be constantly unreliable throughout his narration but rather should be considered to be a narrator moving back and forth in the spectrum of reliability.

While the present paper is predicated on their arguments, its focus is slightly different: it aims to relate Stevens' reliability shifts with his shifts between the conflicting professional norms either of which he has to take in his narrative: that is to say, idealism and fatalism. These two norms are salient in his narrative, although they have hardly been discussed collectively in the previous studies of the novel in question.[2] To discuss these norms collectively will illuminate Stevens' philosophical turmoil behind his reliability oscillation. This paper conclusively argues, thus, that the narrator's alternate commitment to either of these two professional beliefs correlates with his oscillation between the two poles of reliability and unreliability in his narrative.

1. The IA, Norms and the Narrator's Reliability

The notion of a narrator's reliability dates back to Wayne C. Booth's definition of it with the use of the concept of the Implied Author (referred to as the IA hereafter), an image of the author implied by a given text,

---

[2] For the detailed discussion of Stevens' idealism, see Morikawa 47–73. Fatalism has frequently been referred to in the discussions of *Never Let Me Go*. See Morikawa 238–55; Nagara 9–11; Shonaka 172; Sim 81; and Wong 83.

distinguishable (or supposed to be distinguished ethically) from the real flesh-and-blood author. According to Booth, the IA incorporates his or her norm of values into the text in one way or another. If the narrator's norm corresponds to the IA's norm, the narrator can be called reliable. On the other hand, when the IA's norm and the narrator's are at odds with each other in the text, the narrator is viewed as unreliable (*Rhetoric* 158–59). As Booth's definition shows, a narrator's reliability was originally judged in terms of its relation to the IA's norm. The sheer abstractness of the concept of the IA and his or her norm, however, led subsequent narratologists to turn their attention from the IA to the text itself or the reader's premises to elucidate the mechanism of a narrator's reliability.

In her introduction to the narratological studies of a narrator's unreliability, Dan Shen groups the ongoing approaches to unreliability into two camps: "a rhetorical approach" that regards a narrator's unreliability as deriving from the "textual property encoded by" the IA and "a constructivist/cognitive approach" that takes a narrator's unreliability to be perceived only by readers based on their embedded presumptions ("Unreliability," par. 5). Ansgar Nünning, an advocate for the latter approach, initially argued that a narrator's unreliability "results from the discrepancy between the value system and intentions of the narrator and the norms and state of knowledge of the reader" ("Deconstructing" 107). In one of his more recent essays, nevertheless, Nünning synthesizes the rhetorical and cognitive approaches with a more balanced consideration of the IA, the reader, and a textual phenomenon ("Reconceptualizing" 99–105), conceding that the IA is more actively engaged in the integration of "signs and signals" of a narrator's unreliability into a text than he formerly presumed ("Reconceptualizing" 102). In narratology, therefore, the arguments about reliability have come full circle, reintroducing the IA as the essential part of the discussion of a narrator's reliability.

The present paper, based on the narratological premise that the IA's norm is somehow built into a literary text, will shed new light not only on the relationship between the IA's predominant norm and the narrator's opposing professional norms—the norms implied by *The Remains of the Day*—but also on the relationship between the narrator's shifts in reliability and his philosophical oscillations by making these three points (the numbers corresponding to the subsections):

(3.1.) the unreliable narrator is committed to idealism as his professional norm;

(3.2.) when the same narrator becomes more reliable, he turns temporarily to fatalism as the alternative professional norm, which, given the increase of his reliability, can be taken to represent the predominant norm of the IA; and

(3.3.) Stevens' philosophical shifts from idealism to fatalism and then back to idealism correspond to his shifts between unreliability and reliability.

To make these points I would like, first of all, to take a brief look at the previous studies on Stevens' narration to see what they offer on his oscillations between reliability and unreliability.

2. A Consensus about Stevens' (Un)reliability

Stevens' unreliable narration in *The Remains of the Day* has been one of the most frequently addressed topics in Ishiguro studies.[3] David Lodge argues that Stevens' narration makes the narrator unreliable as it is shot through with "devious self-justification and special pleading" along with

---

[3]   For a concise guide to the narratological studies of *The Remains of the Day*, see Sim 120–24.

"the suppression and evasion of the truth, about himself and others" (155). Commenting on Stevens' misleading lies (at Moscombe, for instance, Stevens speaks and acts as if he were a gentleman of some sort who was once acquainted with former prime ministers), Waddick Doyle asserts that they make Stevens "an untrustworthy narrator" (74). Both Lodge and Doyle focus on Stevens' constant evasions about his emotion and his identity.

There was a turning point, however, in the narratological studies of *The Remains of the Day* when Wall challenged the typical view that Stevens is a consistently unreliable narrator.[4] Wall proclaims that Stevens' narration questions the traditional definition of unreliable narration by deconstructing the distinction between reliability and unreliability through the internal variation of the degree of (un)reliability in his narration. While pointing to narrative discrepancies, contradictions, and durational imbalance (23–34), Wall observes "a subtle change in the degree of unreliability" (34) in the second half of Stevens' narration where the narrator becomes increasingly introspective. Wall argues that towards the end Stevens manages more successfully to evaluate "his motives" and "the consequences of his behaviour," which results in the closing of the "ironic distance" between the IA and the narrator, as well as between the narrator and the reader (37). Thus, according to Wall, unlike a consistently unreliable narrator who sticks to his or her beliefs or interpretations throughout the text, Stevens is malleable to the constant revaluation of his principles, which helps to turn him into a more reliable narrator (37).

Marcus, Phelan and Martin, and Parkes all back up Wall's argument. Marcus notes Stevens' "oscillation between reliability and unreliability"

---

4   Another example of this typical view can be found in a passing reference Booth makes to Stevens' "consistently dubious voice" ("Resurrection" 78).

(134). Phelan and Martin highlight "the movement of Stevens' narration from underreporting back to reliable reporting" when, on hearing Miss Kenton's true feelings, the narrator confesses that his heart is breaking (98). Parkes argues that what marks Stevens out from other classic unreliable narrators is that he "himself acknowledges his unreliability as a narrator,"[5] thereby calling him a "reliably unreliable" narrator (39). All of them declare Stevens' unreliability inconsistent, and Wall and Phelan and Martin in particular insist that towards the end Stevens becomes a more reliable narrator.[6]

3. The Narrator's Two Norms: Idealism and Fatalism

The previous studies as mentioned above have shown that the narrator of *The Remains of the Day* changes from an unreliable narrator into a subtly more reliable one. In this section, it will be shown that the narrator turns back into an unreliable narrator at the very end of his narration and that behind this change in reliability on the narrator's part there lie the narrator's shifts between his commitment to idealism and that to fatalism. Stevens considered by critics to be unreliable in the early part of his narration is committed to professional idealism. Of course, Stevens believes in his own idealism at this early stage but, as his narrative

---

[5]   An example of this acknowledgement that Parkes cites is Stevens' confession that he may have confused Miss Kenton's words with Lord Darlington's.

[6]   Nünning goes too much further, it seems to me, when he maintains that, as his narration "depict[s], in a very truthful way, [his] illusions and self-deceptions," Stevens is "ultimately *not* at all *unreliable*" ("Unreliable" 59; italics added).

progresses, his idealism is gradually undermined when he in turn becomes more reliable as a narrator. Indeed, the narrator, getting more reliable towards the end of his narration, denies his own idealism and instead embraces a more fatalistic view of his profession. From this philosophical shift involving the increase of the narrator's reliability, a hypothesis can be assumed that fatalism constitutes the IA's norm. This hypothesis is confirmed by some professional readers' reserved responses to Stevens' ultimate replacement of fatalism by idealism at the end of his narration. When Stevens incorporates idealism back into his perspective on his profession, his reliability as the narrator immediately decreases in the eyes of these readers. Therefore, I will conclude that the narrator's philosophical shifts between idealism and fatalism correlate closely with his fluctuations between unreliability and reliability.

3.1. The Unreliable Narrator's Norm

We will start this subsection with the assumption that Stevens is basically an unreliable narrator in the early part of his narration as we have seen some narratologists argue. What we do in this section is to consider what professional norm the *unreliable* narrator is committed to in this early part of his narration. Stevens' "fundamental value, the foundation of [his] world-view" is, according to Marcus (143), dignity which Doyle calls "that repository of value" (71) and which forms part of his definition of a great butler. In the early part of his narration, Stevens defines dignity as "a butler's ability not to abandon the professional being he inhabits" (43)[7] and using a sartorial metaphor—"They wear their professionalism as a decent gentleman will wear his suit" (44)—provides examples of the embodiment

---

[7]   Hereafter the pages referred to in the parentheses, unless otherwise specified, are all from *The Remains of the Day*.

of dignity through the stories of an English butler in India and of his own father, Stevens senior. For Stevens, "emotional restraint" is everything dignity stands for (44). Stevens' ideas of professionalism and dignity presuppose an ideal condition in which one should be in total control of everything concerning his profession, especially his emotion. These ideas are "by and large the beliefs" Stevens claims he "still hold[s] today" (34). But this does not mean that Stevens assumes dignity to be inherent only in few butlers of exceptional talent; on the contrary, he contends that dignity is "something one can meaningfully *strive* for throughout one's career" (34; italics added).

It should be noted here that Stevens regards his view of dignity as deriving from the highly idealistic tendency of his own generation. Stevens repeatedly claims that he belonged to an "idealistic generation" (120, 122) who "tended to concern [themselves] much more with the *moral* status of an employer" (120; italics in original) than with the titles and history of houses the previous generations had been preoccupied. According to Stevens, the morality of a master one serves is another condition that determines the greatness of a butler. Indeed, Stevens points to the moral greatness of Lord Darlington he served for more than thirty years: "I for one will never doubt that a desire to see 'justice in this world' lay at the heart of all his actions" (76). Thus, expounding on the necessity of the moral status of an employer one serves if one aims to be a great butler, Stevens does refer time after time to "a deep sense of moral duty" (64), "the *moral* status of an employer" (120; italics in original), "the moral worth of one's employer" (121), the "indisputable moral stature" (123), and "a gentleman of great moral stature" (132). Another condition that makes greatness of a butler is, according to Stevens, a butler's application of his own talents "to serving a great gentleman—and through the latter, to serving humanity" 123). Using a "wheel" metaphor, Stevens recalls that many ambitious people

from his generation tried to work as close to the hub of the political wheel as possible (122). The hub lies, says Stevens, in great houses of gentlemen of moral stature with the authority of deciding on great political affairs. Stevens takes immense pride in the fact that "one has had the privilege of practicing one's profession at the very fulcrum of great affairs" (147). Stevens' emphasis on butlers' mission of "furthering the progress of humanity" (120) is persisting. A couple of pages later he stresses that his idealistic generation was concerned with "*to what end*" their skills were employed (122; italics in original) and that "each of us harboured the desire to make our small contribution to the creation of a better world" (122). For young Stevens, "such 'idealistic' motivations [. . .] have played a large part in [his] own career" and therefore he "moved quite rapidly from employer to employer during [his] early career" to seek such an employment as satisfies the conditions of a great butler (122). Stevens' nostalgic memories of his generation's idealism not surprisingly led him to condemn those members of his profession as "the most mediocre" who "express[ed] such scepticism" about his generation's idealism as "just high-flown talk with no grounding in reality" (147). Stevens is confident that his own career proves "very clearly how wrong such people are" (147). Stevens' strong identification with the idealism of his generation frames his concept of what a great butler is.

It can be said from the narrator's exuberant endorsement of professional idealism that the unreliable narrator's professional norm in the first half of his narration consists in idealism. This does not mean, of course, that idealism in itself makes the narrator unreliable. What makes the narrator unreliable in the early part of his narration should be attributed, as done by such critics as Lodge and Doyle, to Stevens' self-deception and logical contradictions. Nevertheless, it is worth noting his professional stance at this point because the very stance changes in his narrative. The

worldview from which the unreliable narrator talks about himself and his own view of his profession is constituted by idealism.

3.2. Inferring the IA's Norm

Having identified the unreliable narrator's professional norm as idealism, the second step we are going to take is to infer the IA's norm, which, according to Booth's definition of a narrator's unreliability, must be at odds with the unreliable narrator's norm of idealism. Stevens' shift from unreliability to reliability towards the end of his narration that narratologists like Wall and Phelan and Martin observe is, in this respect, of utmost relevance to our inference: the fact that Stevens becomes more reliable as a narrator suggests the possibility that his norm may be approaching the IA's. Indeed, this is exactly what happens in the narrative as we shall see below.

Towards the end of his narration, Stevens sets out to reflect disparagingly on his generation's idealistic view of butlership, a sudden change of his attitude which occurs immediately after he encounters Harry Smith, one of the villagers at Moscombe where Stevens stopped on his way to Cornwall. At the table in the Taylors' house, Smith, a champion for postbellum democracy, fires back to Stevens' statement that "dignity" is the indispensable quality of gentlemen (195) with the argument that "Dignity's something every man and woman in this country can *strive* for and get" (195; italics added). Here appears a more democratic version of idealist—it must not be a mere coincidence that the names of Stevens and Smith contain alliteration—for the word *strive* is reminiscent of Stevens' earlier idealistic remark on dignity. Later alone in his room, however, Stevens lambasts Smith's idealism—the assertion that ordinary people are able to contribute to political opinions. According to Stevens, this version of Smith's idealism is "far too idealistic" and even "unrealistic." Stevens

instead thinks to himself that "*life being what it is*, how can ordinary people truly be expected to have 'strong opinions' on all manner of things" (204; italics added). This defeatist remark sounds so far from his earlier idealistic ones on his profession though expressed in a different context. Here Stevens adopts exactly the same skepticism he saw in the mediocre who criticized his generation's idealism.

In fact, Stevens' skepticism ricochets off Smith's idealism and then back to his own generation's idealism: "Mr Harry Smith's words tonight remind me very much of the sort of misguided idealism which beset significant sections of our generation throughout the twenties and thirties" (209). It is noteworthy that Stevens calls his generational idealism "misguided," despite his earlier identification with the same idealism especially in the context of defining what a great butler is. Now Stevens underlines the meaninglessness of "forever reappraising his employer and scrutinizing the latter's *motives*, analysing the implications of his *views*" (210; italics added). But it is Stevens himself who professed the professional indispensability of the moral status of a master one serves if one aims to be a great butler: he said earlier that he had no doubt that "a desire to see 'justice in this world'"—in other words, an altruistic *motive*—had driven Lord Darlington's political actions. Now Stevens even denounces those butlers who "went from one employer to the next, forever dissatisfied" with their position (210), despite the fact that it is exactly what Stevens did in his early career. In short, Stevens' critical reflection on Smith's idealism prompts him to challenge his own generational idealism. It is true that, logically speaking, Stevens contradicts his own former arguments for idealism, a contradiction which seems to make him more unreliable, but in terms of philosophical self-reflection Stevens is turning into a more reliable narrator because he is undergoing a critical stage where he confronts and accepts the stark reality of the untenability of his own professional norm,

idealism.

　His increasing uncertainty in his long-abiding commitment to idealism is reaching an extreme point where he adopts an entirely different attitude about his profession, when he says: "The hard *reality* is, surely, that for the likes of you and me, there is little choice other than to leave our fate, ultimately, in the hands of those great gentlemen at the hub of this world who employ our services" (257; italics added). Here Stevens goes beyond his doubt of idealism towards taking the more fatalistic view that butlers' fate is entirely at the mercy of the political decisions their masters make. To connect a butler's fate with political contingencies seems to be too grandiose an interpretation of his own profession, surely; nevertheless, the philosophical change from idealism to fatalism is significant, for this change in his professional attitudes correlates with the shift in the degree of the narrator's reliability. For instance, when Stevens postpones his fatalistic reflection on Smith's adamant idealism for many pages, he is very explicit about his own delay. In Wall's view, Stevens' repeated references to his postponement (168, 172, 189, 190)—leading up to his fatalistic remark above—suggest not merely self-consciousness on the narrator's part but also his increasing ability to "to judge the implications of the individual situations" (Wall 34). In the development of the narrator's introspective ability in his narrative, Wall argues, the reader witnesses "a subtle change in the degree of unreliability" (Wall 34). Seen in this narrative context, the change in the degree of Stevens' unreliability, or rather the gradual increase of his reliability, runs parallel with the shift in his attitudes about his profession from idealism to fatalism.

　Booth's contention that a narrator is reliable when his or her norm corresponds to the IA's helps us to hypothesize that the increase of Stevens' reliability suggests that Stevens' norm is in increasing accordance with the IA's norm. Considering the steadily more reliable narrator's

adoption of fatalism, fatalism presumably constitutes the IA's norm. Indeed, Stevens' apparent adoption of the IA's predominant norm of fatalism comes right after the narrator's debilitating confrontation with the hard reality. Immediately before his fatalistic statement, Stevens fails to control his emotion (the control of which is essential to a great butler) and pulls off his professional "suit" not just by making an emotional confession to a total stranger (an ex-butler) about his inability to "even say I made my own mistake" (256) but also by framing a rhetorical question to himself —"what dignity is there in that?" (256). It is evident that the IA whose dominant idea of profession is constituted by fatalism forces Stevens to admit publicly his failure to live up to his original ideal of dignity and then fatalistically recapitulate his professional life. Stevens as a narrator is forced to do so by the IA's fatalistic assumption about professional and even human condition. Thus, when the narrator's norm approaches the IA's fatalistic norm, the narrator's reliability unsurprisingly increases, as such narratologists as Wall and Phelan and Martin point out.

3.3. Stevens' Idealism Strikes Back

However, it is too early at this stage to conclude that Stevens ends up being a mere fatalist who has turned into a more reliable narrator. Indeed, the remark that follows his fatalistic statement about his profession implies that Stevens has not actually entirely relinquished idealism in favour of fatalism:

> Surely it is enough that the likes of you and me at least *try* to make a small contribution count for something true and worthy. And if some of us are prepared to sacrifice much in life in order to pursue such aspirations, surely that is in itself, whatever the outcome, cause for pride and contentment. (257; italics in original; underlines added)

In this passage Stevens convinces himself that he at least tried to make a professional contribution which was "true and worthy," an attempt itself he also believes is worthy of "pride and contentment" irrespective of its outcome. In short, Stevens is re-emphasizing a positive aspect of his idealism. But how a reader responds to his sudden emphasis on idealism depends on to what degree the reader can accept its ethical implications. Marcus argues that, although Stevens achieves a certain degree of self-realization about his failure to become a great butler, the remark above indicates his conviction that, if "his motives were good," the outcome did not matter to him (Marcus 136). Thus, Marcus concludes that "we may doubt whether and to what extent Stevens convinces himself" (Marcus 136). If the narrator cannot convince himself, how can he convince the reader? Stevens' "pride and contentment" is, indeed, ethically dubious, given his partial involvement in Lord Darlington's ultimate political decline. For example, Stevens forgets the implications of his earlier claim that the silver at Darlington Hall contributed in part to the lessening of the political tension between Lord Halifax and Herr Ribbentrop (144): in fact, the contribution, if taken to be so, turned out to be a prompt for Lord Darlington's brief commitment to German Fascism. That is why, to Marcus, Stevens' idealistic remark that he has at least tried to make a "true and worthy" contribution is too naïve and accordingly unreliable. Therefore, Stevens' resorting to idealism at this stage signals to the reader that he is turning back into an unreliable narrator.

At the very end of his narrative Stevens takes up idealism again. Stevens' professional idealism manifests itself in the bathetic recognition that 'in bantering lies the key to human warmth' (258). Seeing a group of people at the pier cheering to the turning on of the light, the narrator imagines that the quick building of "such warmth among" strangers "has more to do with this skill of bantering" (257). With this imagination he

determines to practice bantering more earnestly for the sake of pleasing his present master, Mr Farraday, than ever. Some actual readers claim that the IA doubts the reasonableness of Stevens' professional determination. Brian W. Shaffer argues that Ishiguro (who we are given to believe is meant to be the IA) "undoubtedly" is "ironic" here; for "Stevens's new resolution clearly can provide no new solution" (Shaffer 87). By the same token, Parkes maintains that the "renewed pursuit of the old red herring of bantering" fails to diminish "a certain chilly distance" between the narrator and the reader (Parkes 39–40). Wall is not so explicit as Shaffer and Parkes are, but she implies Stevens' irremediable obsession with his professional idealism when she remarks: "he may never recognize the extent to which his insistence on professionalism has shaped his life" (Wall 37). These critics' detached observations reinforce our conjecture that Stevens' conviction that human warmth can be built with the skill of bantering—his retrieval of his old, though scaled-down, idealism—belies his sense of discernment, as well as his reliability as a narrator. The critics' reservations about Stevens' retrieval of the idealistic motivation for his profession suggests that the narrator's reliability decreases again—the decrease of his reliability inevitably stipulated by the narrator's retrieval of idealism being at variance with the IA's fatalism.

To sum up the arguments presented in this whole section, the reader's judgment of Stevens' reliability is tied not only to the way the narrator talks about himself but also to the commitment he makes to the two conflicting ideas of his profession, idealism and fatalism. When he endorses idealism, he is regarded generally as an unreliable narrator, but when he adopts fatalism as an alternative norm, he becomes increasingly reliable in the eyes of some professional readers obviously due to his philosophical alignment with the IA's fatalistic norm. However, when the narrator tries to regain his idealism at the very end of his narrative, as critics note, his

reliability drops and the credible distance between the narrator and the reader widens again. All these analyses suggest that the narrator's alternate commitment to either of these two conflicting professional norms, or his moving back and forth between fatalism and idealism, correlates with the narrator's oscillations between reliability and unreliability.

Conclusion

We have seen the narratologists reaching the consensus on Stevens' (un)reliability. They argue that Stevens changes from an unreliable narrator to a more reliable narrator towards the end of his narration and then back to an unreliable one at the very end again. This paper does not refute these constant changes in the narrator's reliability itself, but it has shown that these reliability shifts recognizable in his narration are tightly linked to Stevens' shifts between his two professional yet exclusive norms, idealism and fatalism. The IA manipulates the reader into suspecting that Stevens becomes more reliable when he adopts the IA's fatalistic view on profession, while the same norm of the IA's prompts the reader to grow rather suspicious about the narrator' reliability when the latter tries to regain his professional idealism, which is at variance with the IA's fatalistic norm. Of course, as the narratologists demonstrate, Stevens' oscillation between reliability and unreliability is recognizable without any consideration of his opposing professional norms. But what I have shown above is that these two kinds of oscillations—between idealism and fatalism and between unreliability and reliability—cannot occur without any narrative echoes to each other.

The reader is not aware at first of the IA and his norm when the narrator is growing unreliable, for the readerly attention is entirely focused on the narrator' unreliability. However, when Stevens becomes more

reliable towards the end and adopts fatalism, though briefly, as his professional norm at the expense of his idealism, the reader suddenly becomes aware of the existence of the IA and his norm as well. Thence the reader goes on with the IA in his or her mind to the end of the text. Once this relationship between the reader and the IA is established in the narrative context, the reader's *sympathy* for the narrator seems to be maintained, according to Phelan, even though the reader is beginning to cast doubt on the narrator's reliability again. Phelan contends that Stevens' final recognition that human warmth is something worthy of pursuing brings about the emotional bonding between the narrator and the reader. Thus, Phelan calls Stevens' unreliability "bonding unreliability." In Phelan's view, Stevens' recognition, though narratologically it gives the reader a renewed doubt about the narrator's reliability, lends itself to narrowing the affective "distance between the narrator and the authorial audience" ("Estranging Unreliability, Bonding Unreliability" 223–25). But how can sympathy for the narrator be aroused in the reader when at the same time the reader grows doubtful about the narrator's reliability? Presumably, there must be two standards functioning separately and simultaneously in the reader's mind: the standard of reliability and the standard of sympathy. This is, however, a subject matter beyond the scope of this paper, and it will be necessary to explore it more dynamically in order to analyze the reader's complicated responses to Stevens' unique narration.

Works Cited

Booth, Wayne C. "Resurrection of the Implied Author: Why Bother?" Ed. James Phelan and Peter J Rabinowitz. *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. 2005. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008. 75–88. Print.

–––. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Print.

Doyle, Waddick. "Being an Other to Oneself: First Person Narration in Kasuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*." Ed. Evelyne Labbé. *L'Altérité dans la littérature et la culture du monde anglophone*. Le Mans: Presses de l'Université du Maine, 1993. 70–76. Print.

Ishiguro, Kazuo. *The Remains of the Day*. 1989. London: Faber, 1990. Print.

Lodge, David. *The Art of Fiction*. London: Penguin, 1992. Print.

Marcus, Amit. "Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*: The Discourse of Self-Deception." *Partial Answers* 4.1 (2006): 129–50. Print.

Morikawa, Shinya. "Kazuo Ishiguro and His View of Life: Idealism, Nostalgia, Fatalism." Diss. University of Tokyo, 2015. Print.

Nagara, Hiromi. "Kazuo Ishiguro sakuhin ni okeru kodomo no yakuwari [The Roles Played by Children in Kazuo Ishiguro's Novels]." *Kobe Studies in English* 27 (2013): 1-18. Print.

Nünning, Ansgar. "Deconstructing and Reconceptualizing the Implied Author: The Resurrection of an Anthropomorphized Passepartout or the Obituary of a Critical Phantom?" *Anglistik. Organ des Verbandes Deutscher Anglisten* 8 (1997): 95–116. Print.

---. "Reconceptualizing Unreliable Narration: Synthesizing Cognitive and Rhetorical Approaches." Ed. James Phelan and P. J. Rabinowitz. *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. 2005. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005. 89–107. Print.

---. "Unreliable, Compared to What? Towards a Cognitive Theory of Unreliable Narration: Prolegomena and Hypotheses". Ed. Walter Grünzweig and Andreas Solbach. *Transcending Boundaries: Narratology in Context*. Tübingen: Narr, 1999. Print.

Parkes, Adam. *Kazuo Ishiguro's* The Remains of the Day: *A Reader's Guide*. New York: Continuum, 2001. Print.

Phelan, James. "Estranging Unreliability, Bonding Unreliability, and the Ethics of *Lolita*." *Narrative* 15.2 (2007): 222–38. Print.

Phelan, James, and Mary Patricia Martin. "The Lessons of 'Weymouth': Homodiegesis, Unreliability, Ethics, and *The Remains of the Day*." Ed. David Herman. *Narratologies: New Perspectives on Narrative Analysis*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1999. 88–109. Print.

Shaffer, Brian W. *Understanding Kazuo Ishiguro*. Columbia: the U of South

Carolina P, 1998. Print.

Shen, Dan. "Unreliability." *The Living Handbook of Narratology*. Ed. Peter Hühn et all. Hamburg University, 31 Dec. 2013. Web. 22 Jan. 2016.

Shonaka, Takayuki. *Kazuo Ishiguro—Nihon to Igirisu no hazama kara* [*Kazuo Ishiguro: From between Japan and Britain*]. Yokohama: Shunpusha, 2011. Print.

Sim, Wai-chew. *Kazuo Ishiguro*. London: Routledge, 2010. Print.

Wall, Kathleen. "*The Remains of the Day* and Its Challenges to Theories of Unreliable Narration." *Journal of Narrative Technique* 24.1 (1994): 18‒42. Print.

Wong, Cynthia F. *Kazuo Ishiguro*. 2nd ed. Tavistock: Northcote House, 2005. Print.