

**T.C.
SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI**

**A STYLISTIC APPROACH TO DAVID LODGE'S
PLAYS: *HOME TRUTHS* AND *THE WRITING GAME***

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

**DANIŞMAN
Yard. Doç. Dr. A. GÜLBÜN ONUR**

**HAZIRLAYAN
GÜNAY ALLAHVERDİ**

Konya-2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
ÖZET	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I – David Lodge.....	3
1.1. The Life of David Lodge	3
1.2. His Place in Post-War British Literature	4
CHAPTER II – What is Stylistics?.....	7
2.1. Definition of Stylistics	7
2.2. Significance of Stylistic Approaches to the Literary Works	9
CHAPTER III – Home Truths	13
3.1. A Structuralist Approach to the Author Images	13
3.1.1. Adrian Ludlow	13
3.1.2. Samuel Sharp	21
3.1.3. Fanny Tarrant.....	41
CHAPTER IV – The Writing Game	50
4.1. A Structuralist Approach to the Author Images	50
4.1.1. Leo Rafkin	50
4.1.2. Maude Lockett	56
4.1.3. Penny Sewell.....	61
4.1.4. Simon St Clair.....	64
CONCLUSION	67
WORKS CITED	71

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Gülbün ONUR.

I am also indebted to my family for their endless love, support and encouragement in the preparation of this study. Without their everlasting help this study would not be emerged.

ÖZET

Çağdaş İngiliz edebiyatının önemli yazar ve eleştirmenlerinden biri olan David Lodge, günümüze kadar sadece iki oyun kaleme almıştır. Yazarın ilk oyunu olan *The Writing Game* ilk kez 12 Mayıs 1990 yılında Birmingham Repertuar Tiyatrosu'nda sahnelenmiştir. Yazarın diğer oyunu olan *Home Truths* ise ilk kez 13 Şubat 1998 yılında Birmingham Repertuar Tiyatrosu'nda sahnelenmiştir. Bu çalışma Leech ve Short'un *Biçembilimsel Yaklaşım*'ı önderliğinde, her iki oyunda yazar imgelerinin diyaloglardaki kullandıkları dili analiz etmeyi amaçlar.

Bu çalışma boyunca David Lodge'un hayatı ve savaş sonrası Britanya'daki önemine değinilecektir. *Biçembilimsel Yaklaşım*'ın tanımı ve edebi eserlere *Biçembilimsel Yaklaşım*'ın önemi üzerinde durulacaktır. Dahası *Home Truths* ve *The Writing Game* adlı oyunlar bu yaklaşımla detaylı bir şekilde incelenecektir. Son olarak yazarın dil kullanımı üzerine ayrıntılı bir analiz değerlendirmesi yapıp, sonuç bir yargıya varılacaktır.

ABSTRACT

David Lodge one of the most significant man of letters in contemporary English literature has written two plays until 2011. His first play *The Writing Game* was first performed at the Birmingham Repertory Theatre on 12 May 1990. His second play *Home Truths* was first performed at the Birmingham Repertory Theatre on 13 February 1998. This study is based on a stylistic approach to David Lodge's plays: *Home Truths* and *The Writing Game*, in the light of Leech and Short's categories of stylistic approach. The two plays are analyzed through dialogues which include the author images because they assert that linguistic description and critical interpretation are distinct and complementary.

Throughout this study, the life of David Lodge and his place in post-war Britain are highlighted as a background information. In the following, the scope of stylistics and the significance of stylistic approaches to the literary texts are given in order to understand the plays better. Furthermore, the stylistic approaches to *Home Truths* and *The Writing Game* are explained in detail. As a conclusion, the results obtained through this study are represented and discussed by emphasizing the messages the playwright wants to convey to his reader via his language.

INTRODUCTION

David Lodge one of the most significant man of letters in contemporary English literature has written two plays until 2011. As Lodge states in the introduction part of *Home Truths* (1999) “When writing for the stage (something I have attempted only twice to date) I start with a situation which I have experienced, but which is selected primarily because it lends itself to being enacted (rather than narrated) by a small number of characters, in a few segments of ‘real time’, and in the same place. I am aware that this is a very conservative concept of the theatrical, but as a relative beginner in this form I find it useful to work within the constraints of the well-made play (vii)

His first play *The Writing Game* was first performed at the Birmingham Repertory Theatre on 12 May 1990. As Lodge explains (1999) “In my first, *The Writing Game*, the situation with which I started was a short residential creative writing course, which one of the characters compares to ‘a pressure cooker’. (vii)

His second play *Home Truths* was first performed at the Birmingham Repertory Theatre on 13 February 1998. Lodge says that (1999) “In my new play, *Home Truths*, which also focuses on professional writers, it is the journalistic interview. Two interviews are featured in the play: one provokes another, with unpredictable consequences for all concerned.” (vii)

In this thesis, it is aimed to appreciate both of the plays through stylistic approach. In general aspect, stylistics helps explore the relationship between the language and meaning. Besides, there are so many examples of prose and poetry appreciations studied through stylistic approach. However, not so much attention has been paid to the stylistic analysis of a dramatic text in the twentieth-century. Culperer, Short and Verdonk (1998) suggested one of the reason of it as “the spoken conversation has for many centuries been commonly seen as a debased and unstable form of language, and thus with all their affinities with speech, were liable to be undervalued” (3)

Hence, this study is based on a stylistic approach to David Lodge's plays: *Home Truths* and *The Writing Game*, in the light of Leech and Short's categories of stylistic approach. The two plays are analyzed through dialogues which include the author images because they assert that linguistic description and critical interpretation are distinct and complementary.

Throughout this study, the life of David Lodge and his place in post-war Britain are highlighted as background information. In the following, the scope of stylistics and the significance of stylistic approaches to the literary texts are given in order to understand the plays better. Furthermore, the stylistic approaches to *Home Truths* and *The Writing Game* are explained in detail. As a conclusion, the results obtained through this study are represented and discussed by emphasizing the messages the playwright wants to convey to his reader via his language.

CHAPTER I : DAVID LODGE

1.1. The Life of David Lodge

Born in South London, Lodge was the only child of William Frederick Lodge, a dance band musician, and Rosalie Marie Murphy Lodge, an Irish-Belgian Roman Catholic. Lodge was in London with his parents during the Nazi blitz of 1940, but for most of World War II he and his mother lived in the countryside. At age ten he was enrolled in St. Joseph's Academy, a Catholic grammar school in Blackheath. There Lodge cultivated an intense interest in the Catholic faith, which would later become a cornerstone of his fiction. As part of the first generation of English children to receive free secondary schooling in England, Lodge graduated from St. Joseph's in 1952 and matriculated at University College, London, where he earned a B.A. in English with honors in 1955. After completing two years of national service, he returned to University College to finish his graduate work in English literature, concentrating on Catholic fiction in the years since the Oxford movement.

In 1959 Lodge completed his degree and married Mary Frances Jacob, a fellow English student. The next year he published his first work, *The Picturegoers*. In 1960, Lodge accepted a one-year post teaching literature at the University of Birmingham, and the next year he was appointed to a tenure-track position as assistant lecturer. He rose through the academic ranks becoming Professor of Modern English Literature in 1976. His years at Birmingham were interrupted by a 1969-70 visiting professorship at the University of California, Berkeley. Besides writing satiric reviews for a local repertory company during his early years in Birmingham, Lodge also turned to critical work, publishing *Language of Fiction*, which became one of the most widely read of all contemporary books about the novel. Lodge followed this success with a series of journal articles and books of criticism that established him as one of the most respected literary theorists in England. His books *Graham Greene* (1966) and *Evelyn Waugh* (1971) were written for the Columbia Essays on Modern Writers series. At the suggestion of his friend and fellow academic Malcolm Bradbury, Lodge decided in the early 1960s to write a comic

novel, and in this genre, beginning with *The British Museum Is Falling Down* (1965), Lodge found his true voice. Lodge has received numerous honors for his fiction, including the Hawthornden Prize and *Yorkshire Post* Fiction Prize for *Changing Places*, the Whitbread Book of the Year award for *How Far Can You Go?* (1980), and the Sunday Express Book of the Year award for *Nice Work*. Both *Small World* and *Nice Work* were short-listed for the prestigious Booker Prize. Lodge was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature in 1976. He retired from the University of Birmingham in 1987 to concentrate on writing. He has since continued to produce notable works of criticism and several works for television, including an adaptation of *Nice Work* that aired in 1989 and won the Royal Television Society's award for best drama serial and a Silver Nymph at the 1990 International Television Festival in Monte Carlo.

1.2. His Place in Post-War British Literature

As Martin states (1999) to appraise the overall work of a living writer, especially one as active as David Lodge has continued to be even after four decades, is difficult and risky. Even so, given his considerable accomplishments to date, it seems appropriate to review them, to suggest what other directions his work may take, and to speculate about how he might be regarded in the future. With fifteen novels to date, an equal number of critical works, occasional essays, hundreds of reviews, critical anthologies, several screenplay adaptations, and two professionally produced plays to his credit, David Lodge can look back on a distinguished and varied career. He has contributed singularly to literary and cultural life, especially in Britain but really throughout the English speaking world and even farther, if one considers the broader audience that translation has found for his works.(165)

Lodge's writings have been translated into more than twenty languages, several of which contain a body of criticism and commentary on his work corresponding to that in English. His novels have achieved best-seller status in Italy, France, and Germany. In December 1997 he was recognized by the French Ministry of Culture by being made a Chevalier dans l'Ordre des Arts et Letters at a ceremony at the

Institut Français in London. Most of the several awards given his novels in Britain have been noted, the most recent being the short-listing of *Therapy* for the 1996 Commonwealth Writers Prize.

For over twenty years Lodge's novels have been best-sellers in Britain. Thus the *Guardian* ranked *Nice Work* 29th among its "fastsellers" for 1989, with almost 300,000 paperback copies sold, while in 1992 the Great Britain sales figures for *Paradise News* exceeded those of the latest Colin Dexter release and of every other title published by Penguin that year and came near those for books by Ken Follett and Joanna Trollope. While Lodge's popularity in the U.S. has never approached this level, a source of some concern to him, his books are in steady demand here, as evidenced by several of his titles being stocked regularly by American bookstores of any appreciable size, and not just on the East and West coasts. Where he is known in Great Britain as simply a "popular novelist", the designation of "literary novelist" American critics and readers have given him suggests a more limited though substantial popularity, though this may also reflect differences between the two reading cultures.

Lodge's worldwide reputation seems to have resulted from certain qualities in his writing. It rests, of course, on the supreme wit evident in the hilarious situations of his novels and the energetic pace and telling specificity with which they are narrated, as well as in exchanges between characters. But it rests, too, on his ability not only to write serious fiction but to make serious use of the amusing and absurd materials he develops in his comic novels, to shift at appropriate points in his narratives to a serious, even moral tone.

It is in terms of the broad topics of sex and religion that such concerns have been addressed in his novels, and it is for his treatment of these topics that his fiction is likely to be read in the future – both as a thoughtful sociological record of late twentieth century society and behavior and as a frequently amusing but sometimes deeply moving consideration of human problems hardly unique to our time.

Lodge has said that the ultimate incentive for writing is the chance to “defy death” by leaving behind “some trace of oneself, however slight”. In a time when books and reading face increasing competition from newer forms of entertainment, he has managed to reach a large and loyal audience and to give them a special kind of pleasure and meaning – and there is no evidence of either his productivity or the reading public’s responsiveness to his work letting up. When tradition of every kind, including the literary, is being increasingly ignored or tossed away unthinkingly, Lodge remains a voice, in his creative writing as well as in his criticism, that insists on the indispensability of the past and the need for acknowledging continuity even as society and artistic fashions change. (Martin,1999: 166)

Although he is still negotiating between novel writing and the writing of scripts and plays, there is every indication that each of these activities will be reinforcing and enhancing the others for some time to come. While his legacy is already a rich one, his recent work suggests that it will expand and even find new forms and directions. For those who have found David Lodge entertaining and worthwhile, and for those who will be discovering him in the future, this is good news indeed.(Martin, 1999:167)

CHAPTER II : WHAT IS STYLISTICS?

2.1. Definition of Stylistics

Stylistics focuses on explaining the relation between the structure of language and the artistic function in a written work. In stylistic analyses, linguists affirm a set of linguistic categories and stylistic features which are more or less accepted knowledge to those who have a basic acquaintance with the workings of the language. Almost every writer selects expressions in his/her works and organizes the structures as s/he intends to. That is to say, all writers and all texts have their individual characteristics. Thus, the characteristics of a language in a text will not necessarily be important in another text by the same or a different author (Leech & Short, 1981: 74). Every analysis of style is an attempt to find the artistic principles underlying a writer's choice of language including special linguistic categories. Since all writers have their peculiar way of expressing their thoughts and feelings, all texts, both literary and non-literary, have their authors' own distinctive stylistic features. Hence, all literary works include distinctive qualities; they have distinctive language and distinctive mixtures of words. By nature, the analysis and evaluation of style involve examination of a writer's choice of words, of figures of speech, of his sentences, and of the structure of his paragraphs.

Generally, 'stylistics' is the study of style and 'the linguistic study of different styles is called stylistics' (Chapman, 1973: 13). Stylistics studies markers of a text in the analysis of the style of a writer. Literary texts are mainly the subject matter of stylistic analyses; so, stylistics can be regarded as 'the study of literary discourse from a linguistic orientation' (Widdowson, 1975: 3). Furthermore, stylistics is the study which associates the techniques of linguistics to the interpretation of literary texts. It provides concrete examples with data for the presentation of literary facts. Robey (1982), defines stylistics as 'the branch of literary studies that concentrates on the linguistic form of a text' (54). Besides, it aims at relating the subjects of literary texts with the disciplines of the time and mediates between linguistic aspects and

literary interpretation. Leech & Short (1981) explain this fact as follows: There is a cyclic motion whereby linguistic observation stimulates or modifies literary insight, and whereby literary insight in its turn stimulates further linguistic observation (13).

Stylistic analyses include not only the study of style but also the study of how meanings and effects are created by literary texts. Stylistics, the linguistic study of different styles, tries to describe what use is made of language and it explores how readers interact with the language of mainly literary texts in order to explain how they are affected by texts in the reading process. In many respects, stylistics is text-centered. The objective of most stylistic studies is not simply to describe the formal features of texts for their own sake, but to show their functional significance for the interpretation of the text. H. G. Widdowson (1975) points out that intuition is an important factor in stylistic analysis and 'stylistics' is the study of literary discourse from a linguistic orientation. For him, stylistic analysis mediates between language and literature (78).

Stylistics examines how readers interact with the language of literary texts in order to explain how readers understand, and are affected by texts when they read them and it enables the reader to identify the distinguishing features of a literary text 'and to specify the generic and structural subdivisions of literature' (Bradford, 1997: xi). Bradford explains this aim of stylistics as: Stylistics can tell us how to name the constituent parts of a literary text and enable us to document their operations, but in doing so it must draw upon the terminology and methodology of disciplines which focus upon language in the real world.

The general goal of most stylistic studies is to show the functional significance of formal characteristics of texts for the sake of interpretation and to relate literary effects to linguistic 'causes' in relevance to the whole work (Wales, 1990: 438). There has been a connection between stylistics and literature because the main concern in stylistic analysis is deriving insights about linguistic structure and function in order to understand a literary text. According to Short (2006), the main aim of stylistics is to answer the questions of how readers understand the style of

literary texts and how literary texts affect their mind with a fictional world (2). This combination of text analysis and readers interaction is explained as: In trying to combine text analysis and reader inference stylistics tries hard to be as detailed, systematic and analytically precise as it can in its various forms of analysis, so that the basis for interpretative statements is laid out as clearly as possible for all to see. This general approach is uncomfortable, of course, as it lays the analyst more open to attack than more abstract and less explicit approaches to textual discussion. (Short, 2006: 4)

2.2. Significance of Stylistic Approaches to the Literary Works

The aim of stylistics is not to explain everything in textual analyses or reactions of readers; on the contrary, it involves an ability to explain the intuitive agreement on texts by presenting the relations of texts with personal, social and historical contexts. In the process of understanding a literary or non-literary text, stylistics gives the readers ‘something to do’ when their feelings are not accurate (Short, 2006: 2). It is not wrong to claim that the aim of stylistics is to present objective techniques of description and interpretation by replacing the subjectivity of texts, and thus, they tend to derive a meaning from the context of the stylistic activities.

Stylistics, shortly, helps the reader to develop a set of stylistic tools of their own, which can be applied to any text. According to Short (2006), stylistics, in general, pushes the readers, critics and students to be more analytical in understanding the linguistic structure of texts and interpretation; helps them to think precisely about the linguistic structure of texts and the cognitive processes involved in understanding them (2).

Stylistics is, thus, concerned with relating linguistic facts (linguistic descriptions) to meaning (interpretation) explicitly and in a detailed way to provide evidence for and against particular interpretations of texts. Raymond Chapman (1973) summarizes the aim of stylistic study as: If one value of stylistic study is to be raised above others, it is its value in revealing the rich complexity of language. It

reminds us that in linguistic behavior so many choices intrude between a stimulus and its response that though a scientific stylistician will explain as many choices as he can in terms of situation and context, s/he feels himself in no danger of being left without a residue of the unpredictable large enough to justify a concept of 'free choice' or 'creativity' in language. (242-3)

Leech & Short try to explain stylistics as a way of describing 'what use is made of language' and they focus on stylistic analysis as follows: the explanation of the relation between language and artistic function with certain literary criteria from the texts.

In stylistics there is more than one method of analysis of a literary text; however, in this thesis, the linguistic categories of Leech and Short are used to draw a stylistic outline of the plays. The linguistic categories of Leech and Short (1981: 75) are placed under four general headings and this categorization has the purpose of showing how linguistic analysis can be used in analyzing the literary style of a text.

The first category in Leech and Short's stylistic categorization is the analysis of lexical categories, the focus is on the general choice of words indicating their grammatical relationships since lexical form relates to the meaning and syntactic function of the words in a literary work. Lexical categories include the writer's choice of words and their meanings. The emphasis is on general words such as nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs. The lexical form of language relates to the meaning and the syntactic function of the words. In this category, generally the vocabulary study focuses on whether the vocabulary is simple or complex; formal or colloquial; descriptive or evaluative; whether the text contains idiomatic phrases, and if so, with what kind of dialect; whether there is any use of rare or specialized vocabulary; whether there are compound nouns or suffixes; and to what semantic fields they belong to. The study of nouns indicates whether the nouns are abstract or concrete; whether they occur frequently referring to events, perceptions, moral qualities or social qualities; and what use is made of collective nouns and proper names. In the analysis of adjectives, the main concern is on the frequency of adverbs;

what kinds of attribute adjectives they refer to; whether the adjectives are restrictive or not; and attributive or predicative. As for the study of verbs, the focus is on whether the verbs carry an important meaning in the content; whether they are stative or dynamic; whether they are transitive or intransitive; and factive or non-factive. Finally, in the study of adverbs, the frequency, function and the significant use of adverbs are to be analyzed. Under this category, it is considered that both the choice of words from the language (lexical choice) and grammatical choices in the combination of these words to make up sentences are essential. Moreover, the analysis is based on whether the nouns occurring frequently refer to any kind of perception or meaning or if the verbs, adjectives or adverbs carry an important part of meaning within the plot.

The second category in Leech and Short's stylistic categorization is the analysis of grammatical categories present the general features of sentence structures. In the analysis of grammatical categories; sentence types, sentence complexity, clause types, clause structures, noun phrases and verb phrases are explored. The discussion focuses on the use of sentences: anticipating, asking questions, commands, exclamations, minor sentence types and parenthetical structure. In the study of sentence complexity, the focus is on the complex or simple structure of sentences; the average sentence lengths; dependent and independent clauses; and the importance of complexity in sentences. The grammatical categories are studied in terms of clauses, which are traditionally called participial, gerund and infinitive constructions. While analyzing the clause structure, whether there is anything significant about clause elements; whether there is a special ordering and whether there are special kinds of clause constructions occur are to be answered. The analysis of the use of the noun phrases includes the complexity of the use of nouns, coordination between nouns and listing of adjectives. At last, the study of verb phrases indicates the use of tenses and its significance in the text. Within the grammatical category, certain stylistic features such as syntax that deals with the grouping of the forms into phrases and the arrangement of the phrases are essential.

The third category in Leech and Short's stylistic categorization is the analysis of figures of speech. In this category figures of rhetoric and syntax are included. Simile, irony and metaphor are the basic figures to be examined in a text. As for grammatical and lexical schemes, the focus is on parallelism and repetitions; on whether there are any cases of formal and structural repetition; and on the rhetorical effect of the climaxes and anticlimaxes. In the analysis of phonological schemes, the main concern is about the phonological patterns of rhyme, alliteration, and assonance; the use of vowel and consonant sounds; and interaction of phonological features with meaning. Finally, in the study of tropes, one can observe the violations and departures from the linguistic code; deviant lexical collocations; semantic (symbol, irony, image and simile), syntactic, phonological or graphological deviations.

The last category in Leech and Short's stylistic categorization is the analysis of context and cohesion. As Leech and Short state (1981) 'Under cohesion ways in which one part of a text is linked to another are considered: for example, the ways in which sentences are connected. This is the internal organization of the text. Under context we consider the external relations of a text or a part of a text, seeing it as a discourse presupposing a social relation between its participants (author and reader, character and character, etc.) and a sharing by participants of knowledge and assumptions.' (79) The text is analyzed whether it contains logical or other links between sentences such as coordinating conjunctions, or linking adverbials and it is also studied to determine whether it tends to rely on implicit connections of meaning. Besides, it is examined to find out how cross-reference is made by pronouns (*she, it, they, etc.*) by substitute forms (*do, so, etc.*) or ellipsis and whether there is avoidance of repetition by a descriptive phrase. Finally, it is looked for repetition of words in a text which reinforces the meaning connections. In the context category the focus is on the writer and the reader. In this analysis, it is looked for whether the writer addresses the reader directly or through the words or thoughts of some fictional character. Moreover, addresser-addressee relationship is examined by linguistic clues such as first person pronouns *I, me, my, mine* and it is questioned whether character

words/thoughts are given by direct speech or indirect speech. At last, it is searched for whether there is a significant change of style according to who is supposedly speaking or thinking the words on the page.

CHAPTER III – HOME TRUTHS

3.1. A Structuralist Approach to the Author Images

3.1.1. Adrian Ludlow

A spacious modernised cottage in Sussex. The interior of the ground floor has been modified to make an open-plan living-room with dining area (stage right) and sitting area (stage left) with armchair, sofa, coffee table and chaise-longue. Kitchen off dining area, with door... Furnishings and decor are comfortable, lived-in, not opulent, suggestive of literary and artistic occupants. There are a number of modern ceramic objects – plates, bowls, vases and suchlike – on display, which look as if they are the work of the same person. (Lodge, 1999: 1)

The opening scene of the play shows us that the interior design of the house is comfortable and it also gives us the clue that the people who live in are modern people. Besides, the words ‘literary and artistic’ make us aware that the residents are intellectuals.

ELEANOR, a good-looking woman of about fifty, wearing a dressing-gown over a nightdress, is sitting on the sofa, evidently having finished her breakfast, reading the news section of the Sunday Gazette... (1)

We are introduced to the character ‘Eleanor’ who is having finished her breakfast and reading newspapers on a Sunday morning.

ADRIAN, who is about the same age as ELEANOR, also wearing a dressing-gown over pyjamas, is seated at the table, inspecting various packets of cereals, reading the small print on them carefully. (1)

We are now introduced to Adrian who is a semi-retired author in his fifties. He is married to Eleanor and they have two sons who have flown from the nest. Even though he is a semi-retired author, he is still publishing anthologies but stopped writing fiction. He and Eleanor keep the reason of his giving up writing as a secret until Fanny talks with Eleanor.

Adrian: Did you know that cornflakes are eighty-four per cent carbohydrates, of which eight per cent are sugars? (Lodge,1999: 1)

Adrian attributes a question to Eleanor. He chooses to ask the question in a simple past tense 'Did you..'instead of simple present tense 'Do you...' as if Eleanor had to know the ingredients of cornflakes before. He prepares himself a breakfast, but he tries to choose food with less sugar. He takes care of himself but Eleanor does not mind it at all.

Adrian: All-bran is only forty-six per cent carbohydrates, but eighteen per cent of them are sugars. Is eighteen per cent of forty-six better or worse than eight per cent of eighty-four? (2)

He is still scrutinising the packets and asking questions to his wife, but again receives no reply. He wants his wife to choose one of the cornflakes. We understand that Eleanor is busy with something else.

Adrian: Shredded Wheat seems to be the best bet. Sixty- seven per cent carbohydrates of which less than one per cent are sugars. And no salt. (*Beat*) I suppose that's why it doesn't taste of anything much. (2)

Finally Adrian finds the best thing to eat. He is still talking to himself. He uses the words 'sugar' and 'salt' together. They symbolize their relationship. He says 'Shredded Wheat contains no salt that's why it doesn't taste of anything much.' Negative words such as; no salt, does not, anything much give us that there is lack of

communication between them. Before he utters his last sentence, there is a 'beat sound' which emphasizes this lack of communication better. This was the third time Adrian spoke and got no reply.

Adrian: What are you so engrossed in?

Eleanor: 'Top People's Holiday Reading'.

Adrian: I trust Tony Blair has taken Ivanhoe with him to Tuscany.

Eleanor: He doesn't seem to be a contributor. (2)

Adrian again starts with question and he chooses to ask 'What are you so engrossed in?' instead of 'What are you busy with?'. He thinks that Eleanor is reading something much more interesting and this time he gets the answer but no details are given. He wants to continue the conversation but Eleanor gives short replies as if she is saying 'Do not disturb me.' Adrian is mocking with Eleanor while he is saying that 'I trust Tony Blair has taken Ivanhoe with him to Tuscany.' But Eleanor is serious when she says 'He doesn't seem to be a contributor.' It is notable that she chose to say 'He doesn't seem to be a contributor' instead of 'No, he hasn't taken Ivanhoe with him to Tuscany.' The former reply to Adrian's question is a reckless reply and as if she is saying 'Do not blame Tony Blair.'

Adrian: Anything else of interest in the cultural pages?

Eleanor: A new British film is causing a stir in America. It's about male strippers in Sheffield.

Adrian: I can't see it catching on here. (2)

Adrian wants to discover her interest and again starts with a question but he omits using 'Is there' and starts with 'anything else of...' he wants to ask something interesting for Eleanor not for himself since she is so engrossed in reading the newspaper. While replying, Eleanor omits using 'There is' but 'a new...' it seems

that she does not want to talk or give any details. However, Adrian wants to continue his speech and he comments on the film in a typical negative way by not being able to imagine that the film could be popular in Britain. Again Eleanor does not pay any attention to his answer.

ELEANOR puts down the Gazette Review and picks up the news section of the Sunday Sentinel.

Adrian: What's the front page news?

Eleanor: All boring. Mostly about Diana's holiday with Dodi Fayed.

Adrian: But it was *last* Sunday, too.

Eleanor: It's the ultimate silly season story. One of the tabloids has paid a quarter of a million for pictures of them kissing on his yacht.

Adrian: You could get a quite good Picasso for that. (3)

The name of the newspaper '*Sunday Sentinel*' is deliberately chosen by David Lodge and the word 'sentinel' means 'guard, watch' because the news is about Princess Diana and her private life. Lodge here criticizes the paparazzi media culture. The word '*last*' which is written in italics and the adverb 'too' at the end tell us that they have both read the same story before. Even though they firstly preferred to read cultural pages they could not take themselves away from reading the paparazzi news. Eleanor finds this story 'silly' but she goes on reading the details and learns that one of the newspapers paid lots of money for the picture of Princess Diana and Dodi Fayed's kissing. There is a /u/ sound and it echoes a surprise in Adrian's utterance as he uses the words 'you' 'could' 'good'. After Adrian's getting surprised by this news we see Eleanor's turn taking in her shocking.

ELEANOR's eyes widen as she glances at the foot of the page.

Eleanor: Good God!

Adrian: What's the matter?

Eleanor: I don't believe it.

She drops the news section and searches through the pile of unread newspaper sections. (3)

This is the first time we see that Eleanor is giving a serious reaction with her exclamation. On the contrary it is Adrian's turn to be calm. He asks 'What's the matter?' instead of 'What happened?' as if he does not care or already knows what she is surprised about. However, Eleanor does not respond and continues to be surprised'.

Adrian: What has happened to cause this amazement, he asked himself. Has Jeffrey Archer renounced his peerage? Has Richard Branson travelled on one of his own trains? Has—

Eleanor: It says there's an interview with Sam in the *Sentinel Review*. By Fanny Tarrant.

Adrian: Oh, yes.

Eleanor (looks at him in surprise) You knew about it?

Adrian: Well, sort of.

Eleanor: But we haven't been in touch with Sam for weeks. Months.

Adrian: The Tarrant woman called me up about it. (4)

It is the first time Adrian talks to himself. He is wondering about the things that can surprise Eleanor but in fact he is thinking about people who are rich and popular in England. These people cannot cause amazement for Eleanor but for Adrian they do. However, Eleanor interrupts Adrian's speech and clarifies this amazement's reason. Eleanor says '... there's an interview with Sam in the *Sentinel Review*. By Fanny Tarrant' As we readers we are introduced to new names by Eleanor. We understand that Sam is an important person for her. Here the punctuation mark full stop divides the whole sentence into two by leaving the second part the name alone for an emphasis to attract the attention on Fanny Tarrant.

‘. By Fanny Tarrant’ expresses that Fanny Tarrant is a person who has a notorious significance. At first we assume that Fanny Tarrant is a journalist. David Lodge uses surname ‘tarrant’ and it echoes ‘tyrant’. We may conclude that Fanny Tarrant is a tyrant journalist. In the former dialogues we can see Adrian’s efforts but now Eleanor starts to ask questions and Adrian gives short replies.

Eleanor: What did she want?

Adrian: Background about Sam.

Eleanor: I hope you didn’t give her any.

Adrian: I told her I wouldn’t discuss my oldest friend behind his back.

Eleanor: I should think not, especially with Fanny Tarrant. She eats men like Sam for breakfast. (*She pulls the Sentinel Review from the pile.*)

ADRIAN *looks at a spoonful of Shredded Wheat halfway to his mouth.*

Adrian: Well, there’s not a lot of sugar in Sam.

ELEANOR *riffles through paper.* (5)

Eleanor continues to ask questions. When she says ‘I hope.., I should think not...’ she implies that she does not trust her husband Adrian. The adverb that Eleanor uses ‘especially with’ directs the attention to the harshness of Fanny Tarrant. While Eleanor is saying ‘she eats men like Sam for breakfast’, Lodge puts the sentence into action with the stage direction and Adrian’s aversion to Sam is immediately felt with the sugar image he uses for Sam.

Adrian: Well, he did ask for it, one might say.

Eleanor: You’re not very sympathetic to your best friend.

Adrian: I said ‘oldest friend’.

Eleanor: Who’s your best friend, then?

Adrian (thinks): You are.

Eleanor: Apart from me.

Adrian (thinks): I don't think I've got one. Sadly, it's not a concept that belongs to middle age.

Sound off off a car's tyres on gravel drive. (7)

Eleanor continues reading Sam's interview and thinks that he is going to be shocked when he sees the article. She pities him. However, Adrian thinks that Sam deserved these harsh comments because he asked for it. Eleanor is against his idea and she tells that 'He should show some sympathy to his best friend.' We can assume that Eleanor sees Sam as their or her 'best friend', but Adrian warns her about Sam's being his best friend. To him, Sam is not a best but an oldest friend. Adrian's aversion is again felt by readers. After Adrian's warning, Eleanor asks about his best friend. Adrian's reply is 'You are.'. he does not give this reply immediately, he thinks a while. This answer may improve their communication. Lodge here uses the short and effective answer to give a chance to this couple to improve their communication but as usual Eleanor does not mind at all and she wonders about his other 'best' friends. Adrian again thinks a while, his answer is 'I don't think I've got one.' With these words/this sentence he emphasizes the sentence 'You are.' We can assume that Adrian is crying out Eleanor 'You are the one for me' unfortunately she does not hear him. Adrian's answer consists of two sentences and his second sentence starting with 'Sadly, it's not a concept that belongs to middle age.' means that we could be 'best friends' if he had been younger, but now he cannot find a person to substitute her place. Lodge in the deep meaning of the text very economically with his word choice expresses the inner world of Adrian through his construction of sentences and the sound of Sam's entrance is an interruption for this sensitive atmosphere.

Eleanor: Who can that be?

ADRIAN goes to the window and peers out.

Adrian (calmly): It's Sam.

Eleanor (not believing him): Ha, ha.

Adrian: Is he not the owner of a green Range Rover, registration number SAM 1?

ELEANOR *goes to the window, still holding the newspaper, and looks out. Sound off of a car door slamming shut.*

Eleanor: My God, it *is* Sam.

ELEANOR *makes for the door, stops, turns back and thrusts the newspaper into ADRIAN's hand.*

Eleanor: Here, hide this.

Adrian: Why?

Doorbell chimes off.

Eleanor: He may not have seen it yet. Hide all the newspapers.

Adrian: Where?

Eleanor: Anywhere?

ELEANOR *goes into hall and turns towards front door. ADRIAN looks around, slides paper under cushion on sofa. Sound of ELEANOR unbolting front door and greeting SAM. (8)*

Their speech is interrupted by a car sound. While Eleanor is asking 'Who can that be?' she is in a wonder, but Adrian is calm and he says that 'It's Sam'. Lodge here uses the stage direction 'not believing him' puts emphasis to Eleanor's distrust for Adrian. From the former dialogues we saw her distrust for him and it still continues. When Adrian says 'Is he not the owner of a green Range Rover, registration number SAM 1?' she again does not believe him and goes to the window to see it with her eyes and here graphology is used to mention about Sam's showing off. Eleanor says 'My God, it *is* Sam.' Here we can see her being surprised but the verb '*is*' which is written in italics confirms Adrian's sentence 'It's Sam.' The stage direction is created by her five motion shots which illustrate her panic and the rhythm of the stage direction is also maintained with the /s/ sound and then she wants Adrian to hide the newspaper but Adrian asks 'Why?' she does not wish Sam to see this vicious article about himself. We feel her sympathy for him and with panic she welcomes Sam.

3.1.2. Samuel Sharp

Sam is a screen writer and Hollywood has opened its gates to him. A new author character Sam is included into with an interruption of his showing off style Adrian's and Eleanor's world. David Lodge chooses to give information about him in the middle of Act One since he is being included to their home as an outsider. Although Eleanor is in panic to welcome him, Adrian is so calm. Lodge here uses her sympathy and his antipathy in a well-balanced way.

We are informed about Sam with these two sentences in the stage direction; 'SAM is about the same age as ADRIAN, but shorter, and dresses younger in smart casual clothes. He is carrying a folded copy of the Sunday Sentinel Review.' apart from the words used to describe him we are informed by Adrian's and Eleanor's utterances as well. 'green Range rover, Ralph Lauren Jacket' means that he is a rich man and he likes the extravagant life style. From Fanny Tarrant's point of view Sam finds himself irresistible and he has a complex about his physical appearance.

Such comparative adjectives 'shorter and younger' underline a competition among the oldest friends. They are at the same age, however, Adrian is taller than Sam. On the other hand, Sam dresses younger than Adrian. Although Adrian is a half-retired author, Sam is still producing new scenarios.

Eleanor (to ADRIAN): Adrian, it's Sam.

Adrian (*pretends surprise*): Sam! What brings you here?

Sam: I'm flying to LA this morning, from Gatwick. Thought I'd drop in on my way.

Eleanor: What a lovely surprise. Have you had breakfast?

Sam: As much as I could stomach.

Eleanor: Would you like some coffee?

Sam: Thanks, that would be nice.

Eleanor (*picks up coffee pot*): I'll make a fresh pot.

Sam: No, don't bother. That will do fine. (*Holds up Sentinel Review*)
Have you seen this? (9)

Eleanor and Adrian act well as if they are surprised. Especially, Adrian tries to seem happy to see Sam at their home. Eleanor offers him to have breakfast and then she offers Sam to drink coffee. Eleanor wants to make ‘a fresh pot’ as if she wants to add some refreshment to her life and expresses her excitement. Sam is holding *Sentinel Review* and asks them whether they have seen it or not.

Eleanor: What is it?

Sam: Today’s *Sentinel*. Did you read what that bitch Fanny Tarrant has written about me? (*He sits down on the sofa, feels the newspaper under the cushion, and pulls it out*) I see you have.

Eleanor: I glanced at it.

Sam (to ADRIAN): Did you?

Adrian: Ellie read out some bits to me.

SAM looks reproachfully at ELEANOR. She hands him a cup of coffee.

Eleanor: Just the beginning.

Sam: Well, it doesn’t get any better. (10)

Eleanor pretends not to have any knowledge about *Sentinel Review* but Sam finds it immediately under the cushion. ‘Glance, some bits, just the beginning’ these words imply that they know about the whole story but they do not want to say the truth in order not to hurt Sam. Especially, Eleanor feels sorry about him and Adrian joins this game. When Sam is there, Adrian calls Eleanor as ‘Ellie’ in a more sincere loving tone.

Lodge starts to use parallelism when Sam is included into play. ‘Sam looks reproachfully at Eleanor’ we can assume from this stage direction that he is upset about Eleanor’s reading this article to Adrian. ‘She hands him a cup of coffee.’ However, Eleanor hands him with a cup of coffee as if she is saying that ‘I am sorry.’ So she gives a reaction to his sadness. On the other hand; when Adrian asks about low-sugar marmalade, whereas she cuts his speech and replies that they have run out and Adrian shakes his head reproachfully.

Both men made same movements to different things however only Sam got the reaction from Eleanor. The same parallelism is seen with the images ‘breakfast and coffee’. Before Sam came to their home Adrian was having breakfast and drinking his coffee. Nevertheless, Eleanor did not mind him and she did not even ask him to prepare breakfast or coffee for him. On the contrary when Sam came in she immediately offered him to have breakfast or to drink coffee.

Adrian: How do you feel about it?

Sam: I feel as if I’ve been shat on from a great height by a bilious bird of prey.

Adrian: That’s rather good. Did you just think of it?

Sam: It’s a quotation.

Adrian: Is it? From what?

Sam: From my last series but one.

Adrian: Oh. (10)

Adrian wonders his oldest friend’s feeling about the interview that he has made with Fanny Tarrant. Sam’s reply is very notable since the words ‘shat, bilious, bird of prey’ are suitable for Sam’s style for Fanny Tarrant. Adrian is interested in the poetic side of the utterance but he did not know that this sentence belongs to one of Sam’s latest books. We sense that Adrian is not interested in reading Sam’s works and therefore is unaware of the quotation that he uses.

Sam: That was work. Just because you’ve backed out of the limelight, Adrian, you needn’t feel superior to those of us who still have to hang in there.

Adrian: ‘Hang in there’? I’m afraid your speech has been corrupted by these meetings in Hollywood, Sam.

Sam: I’ve got particularly important one on Tuesday. I hope to God they don’t take the *Sunday Schadenfreude* at the studio.

Adrian: You can be sure someone will send it to them.

Sam: Thanks for cheering me up.

Adrian: It's the world we live in, Sam. Or, rather, the world *you* live in.

Sam: What world is that?

Adrian: A world dominated by the media. The culture of gossip. (12)

The words 'out of limelight, superior, hang in there' show Sam's arrogance. Since Eleanor leaves the stage, these two men are having a sincere conversation. Adrian thinks that Sam's speech is under the influence of Hollywood, in fact he thinks that his soul has been corrupted by that environment. However, Sam sees this kind of life as 'particularly important'. Adrian is talking about realities and these realities do not relieve his feelings Sam. Adrian tries to persuade Sam about these realities but he still insists not to accept them by saying 'What world is that?' Adrian's reply seems as Lodge's criticism for the media.

Sam: The culture of envy, you mean. There are people in this country who simply hate success. If you work hard, make a name, make some money, they'll do everything in their power to do you down.

Adrian: But you *put* yourself in their power, by agreeing to be interviewed by the likes of Fanny Tarrant.

Sam: It's easy to preach when you've never been asked.

Adrian: I have been asked.

Sam (surprised): What, by Fanny Tarrant? (ADRIAN *nods*) When?

Adrian: A few weeks ago.

Sam: And what did you say?

Adrian: I said, no thanks.

Sam: Why did she want to interview you?

Adrian: I'm not a completely forgotten writer, you know.

Sam: Of course not, I didn't mean...

Adrian: *The Hideaway* is a set text at 'A' level. (13)

This speech shows how Sam thinks about media. Adrian thinks very different from him. Sam is shocked when he hears that Fanny Tarrant also wants to interview with Adrian. He has a degrading attitude towards Adrian. The words 'completely, you know' show us Adrian's feelings, he wants to prove that he is not totally

forgotten. Sam is still going on talking with a degrading tone. Adrian stands as if he has to prove himself and he uses these words ‘A text level, hook, oh I see’

Sam: But I doubt if Fanny Tarrant was proposing to hang her interview with you on the *Paragon Book of Cricket Writing*. That was your most recent anthology, wasn't it?

Adrian: No, it was *Wills and Testaments*...I don't know why she wanted to interview me. It was just an aside. She actually called to ask me some questions about *you*.

Sam: I hope you didn't tell her anything.

Adrian: Of course not.

Sam: Well, somebody did. Somebody told her that ... (*Stops*)

Adrian: Wear a toupee? (*SAM looks accusingly at him*) It wasn't me!

Sam: If I could get my hands on her now, I'd strangle the bitch.

Adrian: Why allow yourself to get so angry? That's exactly what she wants. Deny her the satisfaction. Laugh it off.

Sam: You wouldn't say that if you'd read the whole thing.

Adrian: Let me have a look. (14)

Sam does not know about the latest anthology of Adrian. As a boastful character he does not want to believe that Fanny Tarrant wanted to interview Adrian as well. Triple dots show how Adrian's works are unimportant for Sam and this hurts Adrian. With these words ‘why, aside, actually, ‘ we can conclude that he is not sure of himself and ‘*you*’ which is written in italics means that it was Sam who deserved to be interviewed because he is the popular one. However, Sam does not believe Adrian as Eleanor. He accuses him (Adrian) for his speech with Fanny Tarrant about himself. Adrian is in the mood of proving himself as he says ‘Of course not, it wasn't me!’ As mentioned before Sam has physical complex about himself, he does not want anybody to know that he wears a toupee. It is his secret. Sam shows his hatred to Fanny Tarrant again with his such words ‘strangle, bitch’. Adrian tries to calm him down but this is not possible because what is mentioned in the rest of the article.

ADRIAN *takes the paper, which is already folded back at the appropriate page, from SAM and begins to read silently. After a few moments he sniggers.*

Adrian: She's quite witty, isn't she?

Sam: D'you think so?

Adrian (continues to scan article): What's she like?

Sam: Fanciable but frigid. Good legs. I never got a proper look at her tits, she kept her jacket on.

Adrian: I meant, what social type?

Sam: Oh... Essex girl with attitude. Went to Basildon Comprehensive and read English at Cambridge. She calls herself a post-feminist.

Adrian: So she does. (*Reads*) 'Samuel Sharp said, "I never did understand that word." I said it meant that I'd assimilated feminism without being obsessed by it. He said, with a roguish smile, "Oh, then I'm a post-feminist too." I said that the treatment of women in his screenplays made that hard to believe. He bridled somewhat, and said, "What do you mean?" I said that I'd been looking at videos of all his TV films and series, and without exception they all featured scenes in which women were naked and men were clothed. The striptease joint in *The Bottom Line*, the artist's studio in *Brush Stroke*, the operating theatre in *Fever Chart*, the Peeping Tom scene in *Happy Returns*, the rape scene in *Shooting the Rapids*, the slave-market scene in *Dr Livingstone, I Presume.*' (*To SAM*) She certainly did her homework, didn't she?

Sam: She's picking out one tiny component of my work and blowing it up out of all proportion.

Adrian (reads): 'And his latest film, *Darkness*, which he directed himself—' (*To SAM*) Is that wise, directing yourself?

Sam: Who understands my work better?

In the stage direction we see that Adrian 'sniggers' when he reads the rest of the article. This 'sniggering' makes us feel that Adrian gets pleasure from Fanny Tarrant's words and finds her witty. He is wondering about her social type when he asks 'What's she like?' but Sam immediately answers her physical appearance. That gives us clue about his character we understand that he does not mind Fanny Tarrant's thoughts, education etc. But he is interested in her tits, legs and so on. Lodge gives these details to make us believe Fanny Tarrant's words/interview about Sam is realistic. In fact, she wrote the truths but nothing else. Sam is angry because he did not expect to face the realities about himself so clearly. Fanny Tarrant, who calls herself as a post-feminist, catches the scenes in which women are naked and men are clothed. Adrian confirms this with his sentence 'She certainly did her

homework, didn't she? Sam thinks that she is exaggerating in fact we sense that she is not.

ADRIAN stares at SAM for a moment, lost for words, then continues reading aloud.

Adrian: '... there's a long scene in which a young woman walks around her apartment naked, preparing a meal for a man who's fully clothed.'

Sam: But that's because she thinks the guy is blind!

Adrian (reads): ' "But that's because she thinks he's blind!" Samuel Sharp exclaimed. As if that made it all right. I said, "But we know he isn't blind. Doesn't that just intensify the voyeuristic thrill? Isn't it the schoolboy fantasy of being invisible in the girls' locker room? Aren't you exploiting the actors to achieve the end?"'

Sam: You see what I mean. It's sheer undiluted malice.

SAM stretches out his hand for the paper. ADRIAN holds on to it.

Adrian: 'He said, "Actors may have to bare their bums occasionally. I bare my soul every time I put finger to keyboard."' (To SAM) Did you really say that?

Sam (defensively): Possibly. But the rest is a tissue of lies and distortions. I'm going to write a letter to the paper.

Adrian: Write it, by all means, but don't post it.

Sam: Why not?

Adrian: You'll only make yourself look weak.

Sam: I've got to do something.

Adrian (thinks): You could put Fanny Tarrant into your next television series, thinly disguised as a raving nymphomaniac.

Sam: It would never get past the lawyers.

Adrian: You'll just have to grin and bear it, then.

Sam: It would be more effective if the counter-attack came from somebody else...

Pause. SAM looks thoughtfully at ADRIAN. (17)

As Adrian reads the article, we learn Sam's background information. We learn that he likes to use sexual scenes in his films. Although he does not accept the whole interview, we understand that he said some utterances that makes him angry now. He wants to write a letter to the newspaper but Adrian does not like this idea. He

thinks that writing this letter will make Sam seem weak. However, Sam wants to take revenge from Fanny Tarrant. Adrian gives him some ideas, but he does not like them. From the beginning of the play this is first time we see stage direction 'Pause'. This pause means that Sam will want from Adrian a big favor for himself.

Adrian: You want *me* to write a letter to the *Sentinel*?

Sam: No, I've got a better idea. Suppose you agree to be interviewed by Fanny Tarrant...

Adrian: Sounds like a very bad idea to me.

Sam: Remember how we hoaxed that reporter from the local rag in sixty-eight? During the great sit-in?

Adrian: How could I forget? (*Quotes*) 'The Student Revolutionary Council demands appointment of professors by democratically elected committees representing all sections of the university.'

Sam (reminding ADRIAN): 'Including porters, tea-ladies and cleaning staff.'

Adrian: 'We demand student self-assessment instead of exams.'

Sam: 'Double beds for students cohabiting in University residences.'

Adrian: 'Smoking of marijuana to be permitted in tutorials.'

Sam: And he wrote it all down like a lamb and went away and they printed it all over the front page of the *Post*.

They laugh reminiscently.

It seems that Sam is persuading Adrian by remembering old times. Lodge here depicts us 'Flower Children' times in the sixties. These both friends rebelled against university rules and wanted some freedom. However, they have very different life conditions now. Adrian's penny drops after they laugh.

Adrian (penny drops): You're not suggesting that I try to hoax Fanny Tarrant?

Sam: Why not?

Adrian: Pretend to be a wife-beating paedophile drug addict, you mean? And hope she'd be silly enough to print it?

Sam: Well, it needn't be quite as lurid as that.

Adrian: This woman isn't a provincial cub reporter, Sam. It wouldn't work.

Sam (regretfully): No, you're probably right. (He thinks) Hang about... suppose you give her a straight interview, but use the opportunity to write a piss-take profile of *her*, for one of the other papers?

Adrian: What?

Sam: We wouldn't have any trouble placing it. There are lots of people who would like to see Fanny Tarrant taken down a peg or two. I know someone on the *Chronicle* who'd jump at it.

Adrian: Sam— (19)

Adrian thinks to attract Fanny Tarrant's attention you need to be a drug addict or you need to beat your wife. Here it seems that he is not sure of himself/his authorship. Sam's utterances remind us Adrian's sentence 'This is the world we live in.' Sam said that this is the culture of envy and if you make a name, some money, the others will do everything to put you down. Now he is trying to do everything to put Fanny Tarrant down. He himself proves that he is the part of this culture/chain. Sam's word 'take down a peg' for Fanny Tarrant contains aggressivity and violence.

Sam: Turn the tables on the bitch! Interview her when she thinks she's interviewing you! Ding into her background. Find out what makes her tick. Why the envy? Why the malice? Lay it all out. Give her some of her own medicine.

Adrian: Wouldn't she be suspicious if I rang her up and said I'd changed my mind?

Sam: You have no idea how arrogant these people are. They think the whole world is just longing to be interviewed by them.

Adrian: That wasn't the impression I gave her.

Sam: Then we'll get someone else to ring her up for you... your agent! The perfect alibi: you mentioned her invitation casually to him and he talked you into doing it.

Adrian: Of course Geoffrey would love to see my name in the papers again, but—

Sam: There you are! You could do a wonderful piece. Weave in all that stuff about the culture of gossip. You'd enjoy it.

Adrian: There's just one drawback to your scheme. (19)

The things about Fanny Tarrant that Sam says, recall us his character. He wants to expose everything about her in fact we see that he himself creates the envy and the malice and for his purposes he uses Adrian. Adrian is not sure of this idea. Of course it will be good to see his name in the newspapers but he thinks about drawbacks. Sam's utterance at the end is interesting 'You'd enjoy it'. He means that Adrian will enjoy while he is exposing all the things about her. Sam wants Adrian to be the part of this culture of envy.

Sam: What's that?

Adrian: I'd get stitched up by Fanny Tarrant in the process.

Pause.

Sam: Not necessarily.

Adrian: No?

Sam: No... She isn't always bitchy.

Adrian: Isn't she? I thought you couldn't remember whether you'd read her stuff.

Sam: I saw a nice piece by her once, about somebody. Who was it?

Adrian: Mother Teresa?

Sam: God, no, she was vicious about Mother Teresa...

Adrian (surprised): Mother Teresa gave her an interview?

Sam: No, that was one of her Diary columns... She can't bear the thought of somebody being genuinely good and seriously famous.

Adrian: Well, that would leave me in the clear, certainly.

Sam: Look, these people dare not write knocking copy all the time, otherwise nobody would ever speak to them. Ever now and again they do a sympathetic interview just to keep the pot boiling. I bet she's got you lined up as her next Mr Nice Guy.

Adrian: Did you hope to fill that slot yourself?

This seems to be a shrewd guess. (21)

We see that Adrian is convinced by Sam that Fanny Tarrant is a vicious reporter. She is jealous about famous people but now Sam says that she has some

good interviews. Adrian does not believe that because he is well-convinced by him. He is mocking when he says ‘Mother Teresa’. In fact it is interesting that he uses the image of Mother Teresa. He wants to show the difference Mother Teresa is on the good side, Fanny Tarrant is on the bad side. Sam thinks that these kind of reporters sometimes write better things to keep the pot boiling and the next Mr Nice Guy is Adrian for her.

Eleanor (to Adrian): Fanny Tarrant wants to interview *you*?

Adrian: She mentioned it when she rang me up about Sam.

Sam: The idea is—

Eleanor (to Adrian): But why?

Adrian: I don’t know. She was probably just buttering me up.

Sam: The idea is, you see—

Adrian: *Sam*’s idea is—

Sam: The idea is, Adrian agrees to be interviewed in order to write a satirical profile of Fanny Tarrant – unknown to her, of course. (Eleanor looks at Adrian. He shakes his head) I like it more the more I think about it. It could be the start of a whole new genre. The worms turn. The artists fight back. Christ knows it’s time. These young arseholes have had it all their way for too long. Why should we always have to grit our teeth and take it like good sports? Why shouldn’t we hand it out for a change? Artits of the world unite! We have nothing to lose but our Queensberry rules. (22)

Eleanor is shocked when she hears that Fanny Tarrant wants to interview Adrian. Adrian is making the extreme self-criticism of himself while he is saying ‘She was probably just buttering me up.’. this is the first time in the play a character’s speech act is interrupted. Sam cannot start his speech because of Eleanor’s question. Sam is going on talking about his plans in a theatrical way. He is getting excited when the subject is Fanny Tarrant. Sam’s sentences are short and contains excitement. His sentences are provoking Adrian. However, it seems that he exaggerated this subject a lot. When Eleanor hears Sam’s words she understands that Sam is exaggerating and she warns him by saying ‘Don’t be silly, Sam.’. When

it is deeply analyzed it can be seen that Eleanor talks little but with short striking to the point.

Eleanor: Sam, why get so upset? It's only a silly little article, by a silly little journalist.

Sam: But everybody I know will read it. At this very moment sniggers are rising like sacrificial smoke from a thousand breakfast tables all across London and the Home Counties.

SAM picks up a pottery jug.

Sam: This is nice. Did you make it?

Eleanor: Yes.

Sam: Very nice... Is it for sale?

Eleanor: Not to you, Sam. If you like it, have it as a present.

Sam: No way. Would a hundred be fair?

Eleanor: Far too much.

Sam: I'll give you seventy-five. *(He takes out cheque book and writes cheque)*

Eleanor: That's very generous. I am selling the odd piece now, actually. It's very satisfying. (23)

Eleanor tries to calm down Sam but he is in a bad mood because he thinks that everybody will read this article. At the beginning of the play we are informed about Eleanor's being a ceramic artist and this is the first time that we are given an evidence about it. Sam wants to buy a piece from Eleanor, in fact he thinks that he can buy everything with his money. Art for money? Or art for pleasure? This is criticized here. At last, Eleanor sells the odd piece of her work and it means that nobody will understand her odd piece but Sam does with his money.

Sam: Ellie, tell me, am I really such a shit as that bitch makes out?

Eleanor (pretends to take thought): Well...

Sam: All right, so I'm a bit vain. But I have every reason to be. Three BAFTAs, two Royal Television Society Awards, one Emmy, one Silver Nymph—

Eleanor: Silver Nymph?

Sam: From the Monte Carlo Tv Festival, they give you a silver nymph. One Golden Turd from Luxembourg – at least, that’s what it looked like. Here. (*Gives ELEANOR the cheque*)

Eleanor: Thank you, Sam. (24)

When Sam calls Eleanor as ‘Ellie’ we see his sincerity. He trusts her thoughts and that’s why he asks about his personality. She thinks a while and says ‘Well...’ these triple dots imply that Fanny Tarrant somehow has caught the truths.

Sam: And now I’m writing real movies, maybe I’ll win an Oscar.

Eleanor: What’s your film about?

Sam: Florence Nightingale.

Eleanor: What do you know about Florence Nightingale?

Sam: More than the producers, which is the main thing. Actually there is a script already. They want me to do a rewrite.

Eleanor: Will it have a nude scene?

Sam: You may mock, Ellie. But I shall get paid three hundred thousand dollars for a month’s work. And have a house with pool in Beverly Hills to do it in.

Eleanor: Goodness! (24)

Lodge here wants us to see the difference between a good writer and a bad writer. Sam himself confesses that he knows much more than the producers. Eleanor’s suspicion is raised again. Sam starts with flattering himself as always. ‘More’ is a comparative which indicates his self-confidence and the ‘s’ in ‘producers’ includes a plural which emphasizes his own praise. When he ends his sentence with ‘the main thing’ a third praise for himself is accomplished. The main truth comes in the second and third sentence.

Sam: I’m busy *and* lonely. And, well...

Eleanor: What?

Sam: It’s hard to say it, Ellie, but, frankly, it embarrasses me to meet Adrian now. You remember what it was like in the old days. He was writing his novels, I was writing my plays. We used to swap stories about

how our work was going. Now I come here and babble on about my projects and he has sod-all to say in return. It's like serving at tennis to an opponent with no arms.

Eleanor: He doesn't mind. (25)

This dialogue can be likened to a 'confession'. Up to now all we have said about Sam comes out from Sam's own mouth. He confesses that he is lonely, the subordinate clause 'and' which is written in italics emphasizes his loneliness. Triple dots at the end of the sentence means that he has a lot of things which are difficult to mention. In his next utterance he uses four commas which make his speech slower because these are very hard things for Sam to speak about. In this speech we see his longing for the past. He himself summarizes what he has done to Adrian by coming their home. The simile that he uses at the end of his paragraph shows us how he thinks about Adrian and somehow it can be felt that Sam pities Adrian. Eleanor, as if she is in counter attack, supports Adrian by saying 'He doesn't mind.'

Sam: Well, I mind. It makes me seem... boastful.

Eleanor (ironically): Surely not, Sam. (25)

We hear the word 'boastful' from Sam's mouth for the first time and triple dots reinforce his thoughts, it is difficult for him to admit that he is boastful. Eleanor in one sentence replies ironically. The usage of comma after 'Surely not,' emphasizes that or confirms that Sam is a boastful person. In fact, yes he admits that he is boastful but he does nothing to change this situation, so it is his choice to be boastful, to have money, to be celebrity and of course to be lonely. He is conscious about all of these things.

Sam: He's stagnating. You are both stagnating.

Eleanor: No we're not. I have my ceramics. Adrian has his anthologies.
(25)

It seems as if Sam made Eleanor disappointed. She does not have the desire/fancy for Sam like at the beginning of the scene. According to Sam, life style of Adrian and Eleanor is boring. However, Eleanor is against this idea, she shows her objection with her three sentences. Subject pronoun 'we' and the verb 'have' make it more clear that they both have important things to do. Unlike Sam, they have something in their life to keep them busy and together.

Sam: If you married to me, you would be in them, not just reading them.

Eleanor: This morning that doesn't seem such an inviting prospect. (26)

Sam's utterance which is in second conditional form, illustrates his dreams or longings about the past and now. He is dreaming marriage with Eleanor and a busy life such as being in newspapers. Eleanor's reply reminds Sam that this is not possible and the excuse is Fanny Tarrant's article but we know that she implies her marriage with Adrian.

Pause.

Sam: Why has Adrian stopped writing?

Eleanor: He's just stopped writing fiction. Sort of retired from it.

Sam: I don't believe that. Writers don't retire. No one gives it up voluntarily.

Eleanor: He still writes non-fiction.

Sam: You mean those anthologies? That's scissors-and-paste work.

Eleanor: They have introductions.

Sam: Yes, they have introductions. Ellie, for Christ's sake, Adrian Ludlow was the white hope of the English novel once!

Eleanor: Yes, well, that was a long time ago... Sam, I don't like discussing Adrian with you like this, behind his back. (27)

The usage of stage direction 'Pause.' is a way to ask the question 'Why has he stopped writing?'. The punctuation is noteworthy in his sentence. Two commas and an exclamation mark help his words to come out easily. The adverb 'once' at

the end of the sentence means Adrian is not the white hope anymore. Four commas in Eleanor's sentence mean that she hesitates talking and she mentions it with these words ' I don't like discussing Adrian with you like this..'

SAM moves closer to ELEANOR and attempts to put his arm round her waist.

Sam (half-jokingly): If we were lovers it would seem more natural.

ELEANOR gracefully evades his embrace.

Eleanor: Are you trying to get even with Laura?

Sam: Laura's history. It was a mistake from the beginning.

Eleanor: I always thought you were too old for her—

Sam: No, she was too young for me. But you're right. I need a mature woman.

Eleanor: You should have stuck with Georgina.

Sam: Georgina should have stuck with me, you mean. I wonder if it was Georgina told that bitch about my— (*Stops in mid-sentence*)

Eleanor: Toupee? (*SAM looks piqued*) Sorry, Sam. I didn't mean to tease you.

ELEANOR gives SAM a conciliatory kiss on the cheek. He takes hold of her and gives her a kiss on the lips. ELEANOR half-responds, then breaks away.

Eleanor: No, Sam..

Sam: Why not?

Eleanor: You're just using me to salve your wounded ego.

Sam: No I'm not.

Eleanor: No other woman being available on a Sunday morning.

Sam: Ellie, not a day goes by but I don't wish you'd married me instead of Adrian.

Eleanor: Liar.

Sam: It's true.

Eleanor: Adrian asked me, you didn't.

Sam: But he cheated. We didn't believe in marriage in those days, remember?

Eleanor: I try not to.

Sam: We were going to start a commune.

Eleanor: Hah! Some commune it would have been with two writers in it.

Sam: But Adrian saw that secretly you yearned for the old bourgeois certainties. I bet he even went down on his knees, didn't he?

Eleanor (vehemently): Sam, I don't want to talk about it.

The conversation seems to have suddenly taken a turn SAM hadn't anticipated.

Eleanor: You know why. (27-8)

This dialogue between Sam and Eleanor is important since it recalls us their past and regret. Sam's gestures and movements are coherent with his sentence 'If we were lovers..' and second conditional is deliberately put here to emphasize the dreams of Sam about Eleanor. However, he overlooks a point. He behaves how he feels at that moment, he does not care about how Eleanor feels. In this dialogue Eleanor seems a little bit fragile because of Sam's ex relationships. Long dashes in that dialogue help characters to stop. This pause means that they have something to say more but they do not want to continue. Eleanor wonders about Sam's private life. She is asking questions but the answers are very interesting. Sam's megalomania is going on. We see an emotional affair between them. It is seen that Sam does not want to talk about his toupee. When Eleanor hurts his heart, she immediately gives him a kiss. The stage direction 'on the cheek' means that this is not a sexual or desirable but a naive kiss like a child. However, Sam acts bravely and gives her a kiss on the lips. The words 'conciliatory, half-responds, breaks away' in the stage direction show us how Eleanor is fragile and there is something make her stop and we know that something is Adrian.

In the next dialogue between them negative words 'no, not' are repeated nearly ten times. This negativity tells us that Eleanor is married, Sam is their oldest friend so kissing each other is morally wrong. Besides, they talk about the past and Sam is confessing his regret that she did not marry to him but Eleanor accuses Sam that he did not ask her to marry. They were flower children and they did not believe in old bourgeois rules. However, as a woman Eleanor wanted to be proposed marriage. Sam has his own excuses and he was so free that he did not believe in marriage those days. With one sentence she immediately refuses to talk about old days. She is very harsh while she is mentioning this.

Adrian: My sales are not bad, actually. *The Hideaway* is—

Sam: An ‘A’ level set text. Yes, you said. But that’s not going to make you rich, Adrian. Nor is another Paragon Book of Boring Crap. What you need is a telly serial, and a tie-in paperback reissue. I tell you what: I’ll put *The Hideaway* up to the BBC for serialization.

Adrian: They turned it down years ago.

Sam: Yes, but this time *I’d* be offering to do the script.

Adrian: You could have offered before now.

Sam: Well, I suppose I could’ve, but, you know how it is. I’ve been so busy...

Adrian: Sam, you don’t have to try and bribe me. (31)

Adrian’s sentences give us a clue about his confidence. ‘My sales are not bad, actually. *The Hideaway* is—’ the usage of comma means that Adrian has questions in his mind and he has to pause somewhere and the adverb ‘actually’ is used at the end of the sentence instead of at the beginning because it shows us how he is not sure of himself. *The Hideaway* his best known work is written in italics and it functions as a hiding place for him. He always feels himself constrained to remind everybody that it is an ‘A’ level set text. According to Sam, the value of a text is unimportant what important is to be rich by writing telly serials. David Lodge criticizes media culture by utilizing Sam’s words. Are telly serials and ‘A’ level set text equal? Or how can an ‘A’ level set text be unimportant? These are the questions instantly arise on our minds. Lodge shows us how telly serials are popular and how they make their writers very rich. Moreover, it is felt that these telly serials do not have aesthetic values. You just watch and forget. You do not ask, feel, go deep etc. There is no aesthetic pleasure in these serials.

Sam: I must dash, Ellie. Sorry about the juice. (To ADRIAN) I’ll phone Peter Reeves at the *Chronicle* and tell him to get in touch with you. I’ll see myself out. *Ciao*.

SAM goes out.

Eleanor: Do what?

ADRIAN smiles blandly, but does not reply. SAM reappears in the doorway.

Sam (to ADRIAN): The thing is, to find her weak point, her Achilles heel, her guilty secret.

Adrian: Perhaps she hasn't got one.

Sam: Everybody's got one.

Pause. This remark seems to have more implications, or applications, than SAM intended.

Sam (to ELEANOR): Well... 'Bye, Ellie. I'll collect the pot when I get back.

Eleanor: Sam!

Sam: Sorry, must rush.

He goes. Sound of front door slamming. (32)

The subject pronoun 'I' is repeated three times in the first utterance of Sam and that refers to Sam's megalomania which means that he has got what he wants that's why he is in a hurry. After the word 'dash' in the beginning of his speech, the four sentences are uttered to illustrate that he really has to rush. The phrasal verb that he uses at the end 'I'll see myself out explains that he wants nobody to usher him out because he is delighted with Adrian's decision and immediately wants to get away from there. His last word 'Ciao' is an important way of saying goodbye to someone who you expect to see again soon. He chose this word since he knows that he will come back for the news about Fanny Tarrant. Eleanor repeats the question 'Do what?' as if she did not understand that Adrian accepted the idea of Sam, perhaps she wants to hear it from Adrian. When Sam appears again, he shows how he is delighted and wants to degrade Fanny Tarrant with the help of Adrian. The sentence that he utters 'The thing is, to find her weak point, her Achilles heel, her guilty secret.' can be likened to a speech which is being sermonized in front of crowded audience.

The usage of punctuation (three commas) in this sentence helps him to say what he wants one by one and it affects or tries to provoke the listeners especially Adrian. Adrian's reply to this fervent speech is very interesting. With his answer 'Perhaps she hasn't got one' implies that somehow he is convinced about Fanny Tarrant's journalism, whereas Sam's sentence 'Everybody's got one.' is his typical sarcastic tone which wants to find fault in everyone. Indeed, Lodge gives these

details in the stage direction. After everybody hears Sam's utterance, there comes a 'pause'. This pause urges the three of them to think deeply. In the stage direction it says 'This remark seems to have more implications, or applications, than Sam intended.' Word choice is successfully done here. The nouns (remark, implicaiton, applicaiton) and the verbs (seem, intend) are coherent with each other. His utterance hints Adrian and Eleanor. Afterwards, Sam is the first person to talk. He turns to Eleanor and says 'Well...' 'Bye, Ellie. I'll collect the pot when I get back.' The triple dot means he has more to say but he does not go on. The apostrophe omits the word 'good' instead of 'goodbye' he just utters "'Bye, Ellie' he wants at that moment to utter everything shorter, he is in a rush. The last sentence of him is a reference to 'Ciao' and it repeats that 'He will come back.' The apology word 'sorry' is used twice in Sam's sentences. He apologizes from Eleanor that he is leaving and he is conscious of the fact that she will be upset. When he first enters the scene, the door slamming is heard and when he leaves the same slamming is repeated, as he enters and gets out their life with a sound effect is significant. He interferes into their life unexpectedly and disturbs them.

The structuralist approach to Samuel Sharp's authorship assists us to determine his character. When we go deep through with his words, we come across a boastful, selfish man who has complexes within himself. The usage of adjectives in his utterances such as 'famous, busy, perfect' are coherent with his boastful character. Sam is so arrogant that he does not have any questions about himself on his mind. It is just once when we see Sam and Eleanor talking about his personality and he utters the word 'boastful' for himself. Moreover, the subject pronoun 'I' is repeated several times while Sam is speaking. It is a general conception that the subject pronoun 'I' is a reference to being selfish and vain as we see in his character. From the play it is understood that Sam is angry with Fanny Tarrant because he does not agree with her utterances about him in the interview, in other words he cannot bear criticism. It could easily be seen with the usage of adjectives such as 'vicious, weak, guilty' and the verbs such as 'get hands on her, strangle' that he hates her.

Sam's provocation and exaggeration can be seen in the usage of phrasal verbs and idioms as 'turn the tables on the bitch, dig into her background, the artists fight back, etc' It is understood that he desires to take revenge from Fanny Tarrant. The utilization of punctuation is provided by triple dot and commas. Triple dot is repeated fifteen times in Sam's sentences. When it comes after the exclamation 'Oh and well' it gives time to Sam to think about what he is going to say. If it comes at the end, we understand that there is more to say but Sam does not prefer to continue. The usage of comma helps to separate sentences into shorter phases and make us comprehend the deeper meaning clearly while it also functions in his sentences for persuasion.

Generally, second conditional and simple past tense are used when he is talking with Eleanor. This demonstrates us that he is longing for past and he has regrets. It can be concluded that Samuel Sharp character is chosen deliberately to illustrate the differentiation between a good and a bad writer, and this is made by cohesion between his speech and his character. Lodge catches the cohesion ingeniously. While reading, you immediately shape his character in your mind. At last but not least, Sam character is put into the play to criticize hollow Hollywood writers who are given thousands of dollars and houses with swimming pools to write something. For Lodge, such an engaged authorship cannot be considered as successful and free.

3.1.3. Fanny Tarrant

FANNY a good-looking young woman in her late twenties, smartly dressed, carrying a slimline leather briefcase. She speaks with an accent that might be described as 'educated Estuary'. (36)

Fanny Tarrant who is a journalist wants to interview Adrian who she admired in her adolescence so she comes his home with questions such as ‘Why did he stop writing fiction after a successful book *The Hideaway*?’

Fanny: Was that your wife who drove out of the gate as my taxi was trying to get in?

Adrian: In a white Peugeot?

Fanny: Yes.

Adrian: Yes. She’s gone to visit her niece in East Grinstead.

Fanny: Pity. I was hoping to meet her.

Adrian: That was what she wanted to avoid.

Fanny: Oh, why is that?

Adrian: She reads your articles. Won’t you sit down? (ADRIAN *gestures to a chair*. FANNY *sits down*) She particularly remembers the one about that art historian – Sir somebody double-barrelled.

Fanny: Sir Robert Digby-Sisson.

Adrian: That’s the chap. You commented adversely on Lady Digby-Sisson’s fingernails.

Fanny: Does your wife bite her fingernails?

Adrian: No, she just didn’t want to risk appearing in your article in some similarly disparaging aside.

Fanny: It sounds as if she doesn’t approve of your doing this interview.

Adrian: No, she doesn’t.

FANNY *opens her briefcase and takes out a small Sony audio cassette recorder which she places on a coffee table*. (36)

Instead of starting the conversation with ‘Hello/Hi’, Fanny Tarrant immediately asks the question ‘Was that your wife who drove out of the gate as my taxi was trying to get in?’. It can be said that starting with an interrogative form is coherent with her occupation and she can be very specific to the point to get the result. Besides, her question has details in it. She could have asked ‘Was your wife leaving?’ but she preferred to ask it in a specific way. The question ‘that your wife?’ keeps the intention in itself as Fanny asks this question in this way because it could be another woman who was driving out and that would be brilliant news for her

interview, and the next clause ‘as my taxi was trying to getting in’ is uttered as if she does not want to miss even a subtle point.

After she hears that Eleanor has gone to visit her niece, she utters ‘Pity. I was hoping to meet her.’ Her desire to see Eleanor is shown with a direct reaction exhibited in a single emotional word ‘Pity’ and Fanny this time wants to know the reason in a question form ‘Oh, why is that?’. The exclamation ‘Oh’ does not sound that she is surprised a lot and the question ‘why is that?’ seems as if she is seeking something more. Nevertheless, Adrian’s sentence is striking, he utters ‘That’s the chap. You commented adversely on Lady Digby-Sisson’s fingernails.’. First sentence openly states Fanny was interviewing but the second sentence is a harsh criticism on her style because her duty is to comment about Sir Robert Digby-Sisson not about his wife. Furthermore, to comment about his wife’s fingernails is a detailed info which can be counted as an attack for their private life. However, Fanny seems as if she does not care about Adrian’s criticism, she instantly asks ‘Does your wife bite her fingernails?’ as if she wants to catch something secret about her and her last sentence ‘It sounds as if she doesn’t approve of your doing this interview’ signifies the point that Fanny Tarrant as a journalist would not shoulder this criticism but passes the buck to Adrian.

Fanny: You don’t mind if I record the interview?

Adrian: Not at all. As long as you don’t mind my recording it too.

Fanny: By all means. (*She checks that her tape-recorder has a cassette in it and switches it on*) D’you want to set up your tape-recorder?

Adrian (*gestures to hi-fi system*): It’s already on. It has a very sensitive microphone. Voice-activated. I hope yours is as good. I tend to move about when I talk.

Fanny: It’s state-of-the art. Why do you want to record our conversation?

Adrian: To settle any disputes that might arise about what I said.

Fanny: Fair enough. (*She takes a notebook and ballpoint pen out of her briefcase, and looks round the room*) This is nice. Have you been here long?

Adrian: It used to be our weekend retreat, but it was smaller then. When we decided to move out of London, we bought the adjoining cottage and knocked through the party wall.

FANNY *makes shorthand notes on the furnishings etc.* (38)

Fanny is going on her interview carefully. Her sentences are in interrogative forms. The sentence ‘You don’t mind if I record the interview?’ is uttered after she puts the tape-recorder on the table and it means that it does not matter what answer Adrian gives to this question, she will record their conversation. In this dialogue after she speaks, we see her movements by the help of stage directions. Here the stage directions signify that she is diligent about her job and does not want to miss a point.

Fanny: I was brought up as a Catholic, but I haven’t been to church for years.

Adrian: How did you lose your faith?

Fanny: Look, this is going to take a very long time if you keep asking *me* questions.

Adrian (*smiles sweetly*): I’ve got all day.

Beat.

Fanny: All right. So have I. But what about Mrs Ludlow?

Adrian: She won’t be back till this evening. (40)

This dialogue between Fanny and Adrian seems to reflect Lodge’s own ideas about religion because he declares himself as an agnostic-Catholic. His characters Fanny and Adrian are Christians but they do not carry out what religious doctrines tell them. Adrian asks to Fanny ‘How did you lose your faith?’ , his question which is formed in simple past tense shows us that Adrian lost his faith, too, and he wants to find out the deepest secrets of Fanny Tarrant. Her reply ‘Look, this is going to take a very long time if you keep asking *me* questions.’ is a kind of resentment. She starts her sentence with the exclamation ‘Look,’ which means that she does not like being asked questions and the usage of comma after the word ‘Look’ sounds more of a warning to him to collect the attention before everything gets more confused The next sentence that is formed in first conditional demonstrates that she wants to do her own occupation which means asking questions and getting answers. The object pronoun ‘*me*’ which is written in italics emphasizes that Fanny Tarrant is the

journalist and it is her duty to ask questions not Adrian's, so what Adrian does is opposite to the course of interview rules. Adrian's gesture '*smiles sweetly*' means that he will go on asking questions to her and he reinforces it with his sentence 'I've got all day.' This is the second time the '*Beat*' sound is heard in the play. The first one was heard when Adrian and Eleanor were talking. At that time especially Adrian had the attention on the '*Beat*' sound could not let him get the reaction from Eleanor but now the situation has changed and this sound emphasizes Adrian's sentence 'I've got all day.' And it is felt that something strange is going to happen, so this sound seems as if a foreshadowing. At this time Adrian gets a positive reaction from Fanny and she does not oppose to his sentence, she even approves via her sentence 'All right. So have I.' The expression 'So have I' makes us feel that she will go where Adrian takes her and she is not ignoring him as his wife. However, her last sentence 'But what about Mrs Ludlow?' which is again an interrogative form carries a serious tone with the form of address to the name 'Mrs Ludlow'. Instead of saying 'your wife' she prefers to utter the name 'Mrs Ludlow' and it is understood that Eleanor seems to be as an interfering person for them. Finally, Adrian's reply is healing and he says 'She won't be back till this evening.', such a confirmation completes his sentence 'I've got all day.'

Adrian: Yes. But why take so many pictures of the same face?

Fanny: To find the one that tells you most about the subject. People's expressions are always changing, but so subtly and so fast that you don't know what you've captured until you develop the film. That's why photographs are more revealing than real life.

Definite article 'the' is repeated twice in Fanny's long response that comes in two sentences. The first sentence shows that how much she is conscientious at her job as if she wants to do everything ideally. In the second sentence the intensifier 'so' is used two times with emphasis at the beginning & end with 'but' and 'and', her being alert all the time is implied. She means people cannot be trusted with the word 'always'. She summarizes her intention clearly by using the right vocabulary 'find' and 'tell'. One has to capture two vital moments that summarize everything. In real

life one is lost. Fanny's criticism is a bitter one. People are always acting and it is hard to catch the truth.

Adrian: And interviews, are they more revealing than real life?

Fanny: Interviews *are* real life. Mine are, anyway.

Adrian: Oh, come!

Fanny: I invent nothing. That's why I use this. (*She indicates the tape-recorder*)

Adrian: But you won't report *everything* I say, will you? You'll leave out the less interesting bits.

Fanny: Obviously. Otherwise it would be far too long and very boring to read.

Adrian: But you falsify a conversation if you leave out any part of it: the dull bits, the hesitant bits, the repetitions, the silences.

Fanny: There haven't been any silences.

Adrian: There will be.

Pause. (42)

Adrian goes on asking questions and his crucial question comes in stage. He wants Fanny to compare an interview and real life. The verb to be '*are*' in Fanny's reply in italics is like support for her own interviews that they are not more revealing but they are actually real life. The possessive pronoun 'mine' which is uttered at the beginning of her second sentence tries to persuade Adrian that she is a professional and a little bit high-flown. Until this time Fanny has used the conjunction 'That's why' three times which means that she has to explain her sentences. She wants to be considered as innocent while she is uttering 'I invent nothing.' Besides, the demonstrative pronoun 'this' stands as an ellipsis for the tape recorder which is written in the stage direction for her movement. Again she mentions about technology and she thinks that what tape-recorder records is equivalent with the real life. With the sentence 'But you won't report *everything* I say, will you? You'll leave out the less interesting bits.' formed in tag question, Adrian wants Fanny to admit what he asks. The word '*everything*' is written in italics because it refers to real life and real life has everything in it such as 'less interesting bits'. The adverb

‘obviously’ used at the beginning is a reference to the honesty of Fanny because she immediately accepts that she will leave out less interesting bits from the interview. The intensifiers ‘far,too,very’ are utilized to make one understand how Fanny thinks about an interview and the adjectives ‘long,boring’ show that she will cut out some parts of the interview. In Adrian’s sentence ‘But you falsify a conversation if you leave out any part of it:’ zero conditional is used due to explaining a general rule about a conversation and colon (:) is given for an explication. In the explanation part definite article ‘the’ is repeated four times to determine the parts of a conversation. The words ‘dull, hesitant, repetition, silence’ are reference to a real conversation. In Adrian’s sentence comma is used four times in order to give small pauses and it means that real life is not always enjoyable, sometimes it can be boring. Moreover, it has dullness, hesitation, repetition and silence. The structure of Adrian’s sentence is all coherent with his schema about real life and the interview. Fanny opposes his idea by saying ‘There haven’t been any silences.’. she utilizes from present perfect tense here to prove that her interviews are all smooth. However, Adrian’s last sentence which is formed in future tense objects her utterance and it is supported by the stage direction with a ‘*Pause.*’ It is noteworthy to say that Lodge uses a ‘*Pause*’ here to back up Adrian’s idea and we can assume that Adrian sometimes expresses Lodge’s own ideas.

Fanny: All right. I concede the point.

Adrian: What point?

Fanny: That the interview is not pure, unmediated reality.

Adrian: No indeed! It’s a game.

Fanny: A game?

Adrian: A game for two players. The question is, what are the rules, and how does one win? Or lose, as the case may be.

...

Fanny: Actually, I don’t see it as a game. The interview, I mean. I see it as a transaction. A barter. The interviewer gets copy. The interviewee gets publicity. (43)

Fanny starts her sentence with the expression ‘All right.’ which means that the next sentence will include an ‘admission’. Thus, she says ‘I concede the point’, she accepts Adrian’s point but unwillingly. Then she utters ‘That the interview is not pure, unmediated reality.’ The adjectives ‘pure, unmediated’ which are references to reality so she confesses that an interview is artificial. With these two adjectives a contrast between artificial interview and unmediated reality is created. However, Adrian declares interview as a game in this dialogue. In fact, Lodge writes his thoughts about interview in the introduction part of *Home Truths* and he says:

The interview is an inherently dramatic, necessarily dialogic encounter between two people, though it may involve others. It can have many subtexts, and be driven by a variety of motives. It can be a transaction, a seduction, a game, a struggle, a collusion, a confession – or perhaps all these things in turn. (Lodge, 1997:vii)

Hereby, a parallelism can be seen with Adrian’s and Lodge’s ideas. Lodge expresses that an interview can have subtexts and driven by a variety of motives which emphasize Adrian’s idea that you cannot leave out even less interesting bits from an interview. They both suppose that an interview is a game.

The last paragraph, which is uttered by Fanny, is constructed upon six sentences. She starts with the adverb ‘Actually,’ because she will affirm another idea and the comma helps her to gather her ideas systematically. The object pronoun ‘it’ is an ellipsis for the noun ‘the interview’ and it is explained by Fanny in the next sentence ‘The interview, I mean’. Indefinite article ‘a’ is repeated three times since she is in an effort to explain her ideas clearly and she does not want a point to remain unexplained. The verb ‘get’ refers to ‘transaction, barter’. Hence, Fanny Tarrant’s thoughts about an interview reflect Lodge’s own ideas, too. He uses his style very

cleverly that both of the characters think different things but they all project Lodge's own schema.

Fanny: You see, your fiction meant a great deal to me once.

Adrian: Really?

Fanny: I read *The Hideaway* when I was fifteen. It was the first time a modern novel really excited me. I still think it's the best treatment of adolescence in post-war British fiction.

Adrian: Well, thank you. Thank you very much. It's an 'A' level set text, you know. (44)

Finally, Fanny explains why she wants to interview Adrian. Her sentence 'You see, your fiction meant a great deal to me once.' is constructed in simple past tense and the word 'once' emphasizes the utterance related to the past and it means that his fiction does not mean a great deal to her anymore. Her praise 'a great deal' that she uses shows how much pleasure she got from his fiction. Then Fanny states that she read his book *The Hideaway* when she was fifteen. The verb 'excited' is coherent with the expression 'a great deal' in respect to getting pleasure. She uses the adverb 'really' to mention the truth about her feelings. Her next utterance 'I still think it's the best treatment of adolescence in post-war British fiction' is a praise for Adrian and Fanny completing her sentence with post-war British fiction is that *The Hideaway* was the best treatment for Fanny once. The phrases 'modern novel, post-war British fiction' places Adrian's authorship into the highest rank and 'the best treatment of adolescence' refers that how Adrian was successful about writing his book especially on teenagers. Her two sentences come in past tense but the latter one is in present tense which refers to the fact that *The Hideaway* still keeps its place.

This is the first time Adrian hears such a praise, due to that shock he thanks twice and the quantifier 'very much' shows how he is delighted. His next sentence again shows that he is in an effort to prove himself.

While Fanny is interviewing Adrian, he offers her to have sauna together. He claims that after sauna everything will be different. He thinks that there will be no set questions, no disguises. Hence, Fanny accepts it and they have sauna together. Afterwards, Eleanor comes to their home and sees that Adrian is looking Fanny's tattoo and they are wearing bathrobes. She is very surprised and Adrian tries to make her believe that nothing happened. They just had the sauna in the dark. When Adrian and Fanny go to change their clothes, Eleanor pushes the play button of Adrian's cassette player which is still on. She hears that Adrian told about their past which means Fanny has learnt that Eleanor slept both Adrian and Sam. She takes offence and at the same time gets angry so much that after Fanny changes her clothes she all tells the secret of Adrian why he has stopped writing. To learn something new and interesting Fanny leaves their home. At the end of the play Sam, Eleanor and Adrian are waiting for the *Sunday Sentinel* which Adrian has his interview with Fanny. At that time Fanny comes to their home and gives the news that Princess Diana is dead. They all shocked except Sam. With the feeling of pity and fear Fanny apologizes from Adrian, however he does not approve. Fanny says that Diana is dead, now she cannot be criticized anymore and she feels remorse for the piece about Adrian. After she leaves, Adrian and Eleanor are affected by Diana's death and he thinks that all country is in national catharsis.

The character Adrian mostly reflects Lodge's own thoughts and helps him to criticize the relationship like Adrian and Eleanor have. Fanny Tarrant character is put into play to show how vicious the press can be. Furthermore, Eleanor also represents the corruption of relationships in the modern world as she shops behind her husband. The character Sam helps us to differentiate a good writer and a bad writer. All the characters have presented their roles successfully by the use of simple language.

CHAPTER IV – *THE WRITING GAME*

4.1. A Structuralist Approach to the Author Images

4.1.1. Leo Rafkin

LEO is about fifty, American-Jewish, quite handsome in a grizzled, furrowed way. He looks somewhat depressed and apprehensive.

(Lodge, 1991: 1)

Leo Rafkin is an author and at the same time lecturer at a university. He is invited to this barn which is converted to accommodate a short residential course in creative writing. There he will meet other writers and they will be together with amateur writers. He is introduced into the play by the stage direction above. His identity is as an American-Jewish and it can be concluded that British-American authors' argument which is Lodge's usual argument in his plays and novels will be discussed by this character. The adjectives that describe him 'handsome, grizzled' emphasize his being a good-looking man. However, the other adjectives that describe him 'furrowed, depressed, apprehensive' show us that there is something unpleasant related to him. In fact, he seems that he is not delighted being in that barn/course.

Leo (projects voice): So what do you do then, Jeremy?

Jeremy: I usually go to Morocco. I sit in the sun and write poetry.

Leo: You're a poet, huh? As well as running this place?

Jeremy: Well, I have published a slim volume or two... I could show you some of my work if you're interested.

JEREMY takes a slim volume from the bookshelf.

Leo: I don't know anything about poetry. I don't really understand why people go on writing the stuff. Nobody reads it anymore, except other poets. (*Comes to doorway*) I don't mean to be personal.

JEREMY conceals his book behind his back.

Jeremy: Oh, point taken! The audience is minuscule. But I suppose one goes on because one is obsessed with the *music* of language.

Leo: Music?

Jeremy: Sounds, rhythms, cadences.

Leo: Well, you can get those things into prose.

Jeremy: Oh yes, I agree, absolutely. Your short stories - they're just like poems, I always think.

Leo: I hope not.

Jeremy: I mean –

Leo (smiles faintly): Sure, I know what you mean, Jeremy. (3)

Leo instantly starts to ask questions to get to know Jeremy better. When he hears that Jeremy is a poet, he reacts as if he does not believe in him and with a degrading tone he asks 'You're a poet, huh? As well as running this place?', both questions have a degrading tone. It is understood that being a poet is a handicap for running this place or vice versa. Also, the phrase 'this place' shows that Leo Rafkin is not happy with the situation and it seems as if he does not want to be there. Jeremy is happy to meet such an author and he wants to show his published poetry volume to Leo, 'Well, I have published a slim volume or two... I could show you some of my work if you're interested.' The usage of triple dot refers to Jeremy's doubt on how Leo would react. And also, if clause indicates his thoughtfulness that he does not want to bore his guest. On the other hand, Leo's reply which is structured upon four sentences show his rudeness. Three of his sentences begin with the negative form of simple present tense 'I don't...' and the following begins with 'Nobody...'. All of these negative sentences emphasize that he does not want to be there but he behaves as if he is forced to be there.

The sentence 'I don't know anything about poetry.' signifies that he does not want any questions or comments about poetry. He utters this sentence as if he wants to say 'I hate poetry.'. In the second sentence 'I don't really understand why people go on writing the stuff.' the word 'people' is generalized in fact he implies about Jeremy but he chooses to use 'people' to generalize his idea. The word 'the stuff' is a substitution for poetry and it is uttered in a tone as if poetry is not an important genre

for Leo. He claims that nobody reads poems anymore and after the comma he says 'except other poets' and his reaction becomes obvious with his direct short sentence at the start. Leo again generalizes his idea by saying 'other poets' and comma functions to emphasize his negativity and to generalize. His second sentence is a comment on his reaction. He questions the genre (poetry) and with his final word 'stuff' degrades it. At last, he states 'I don't mean to be personal' as if he is saying 'What I said is not related with you Jeremy', however we know that it is vice versa. 'I don't mean to be personal' means 'I don't want to hurt you.' but it is too late after all these words uttered and it is seen from the stage direction that Jeremy conceals his book behind his back. After such a reaction, he does not have encouragement to show his slim volume to Leo.

Jeremy's utterance 'Oh, point taken!' confirms the given stage direction with his concealing book behind his back. He does not agree with Leo's ideas but he avoids showing his book. His second sentence 'The audience is minuscule.' states that he understands Leo's thought which is very general according to Leo poetry appreciations are unimportant. Jeremy continues to defend his point with 'But I suppose one goes on because one is obsessed with the *music* of language.' here the pronoun 'one' is Jeremy himself under the pressure of Leo he omits the 'I' pronoun in his sentence and substitutes it 'one' because he hesitates. The verb 'suppose' is used for his hesitation as well. Instead of 'suppose' he could have used 'think' which sharply shows his ideas. The word '*music*' is written in italics since Jeremy wants to emphasize it. To him, poetry means music in language. When it is deeply analyzed the words 'poetry, music, obsess' indicates that Jeremy is somehow a sensitive/romantic person. He can see and feel the depth in literature which gives him pleasure. On the contrary, Leo displays a harsh personality with his degrading tone. His questioning 'Music?' states as if he has not heard it before, and Jeremy explains it with 'sounds, rhythms, cadences.'. It is understood that Jeremy appreciates sounds, rhythms and cadences in a literary work. On the other hand, Leo objects to his idea by saying 'Well, you can get those things into prose.' Leo calls sounds, rhythms, cadences as 'those things' as if they are trivial for him and as a

prose writer he claims that they can be got through prose. Jeremy is in the mood of accepting everything what he says. When he sees Leo's objection he immediately utters 'Oh, yes, I agree, absolutely. Your short stories – they're just like poems. I always think.' Jeremy is in a slimy manner. He does not want to hurt his guest's feelings and wants to praise him as an author. Leo again objects to his idea and Jeremy wants to explain by saying 'I mean – '. Leo's reply 'Sure, I know what you mean, Jeremy.' shows his self-confidence. The adverb 'sure' refers to himself that he has the capacity of what Jeremy says.

Jeremy: After our founder. Aubrey Wheatcroft.

Leo: Who was he?

Jeremy: A rather idealistic minor poet with a private income. He left all his money to endow this place. He believed that there are untapped reserves of creativity in everyone, which can be released in the right environment.

Leo: You mean, like stone floors and birds in the eaves?

Jeremy: Well, yes, he did specify a rural setting. But the social situation is more important. Bringing together people who want to be writers with people who *are* writers, in an isolated farmhouse, for four or five days. Having them eat together, work together, relax together. Readings, workshops, tutorials, informal discussions. It *has* to have a stimulating effect. It's like a pressure cooker.

A pause, while LEO ponders this metaphor. He puts down his coffee. (9)

For Jeremy, their founder was a rather idealistic minor poet with a private income. The adjective 'idealistic' goes parallel with people who get pleasure from literature/poetry and the adjective 'minor' goes parallel with people who are not scornful but are contended with art. The phrase 'with a private income' indicates that he did not earn much but satisfied with it. As we look at the statement those words are also coherent with Jeremy's current situation. From the founder's features we are introduced to Jeremy's characteristics. Jeremy's last sentence seems to be a criticism for Leo, he says 'He believed that there are untapped reserves of creativity in everyone, which can be released in the right environment.' The phrase 'the reserves of creativity' described as 'untapped' which is coherent with the verb 'release', so

the founder Aubrey Wheatcroft believed in everyone. On the contrary, Leo is very far away from this thought. It is understood from his reply that ‘You mean, like stone floors and birds in the eaves?’ his degrading tone is getting increased. Jeremy’s utterance ‘environment’ finds its answer in Leo’s sentence as ‘stone floors and birds in the eaves’ thus it is understood that according to Leo everyone cannot have creativity for writing, but he utters it in a scornful way. Jeremy does not oppose to what Leo says. For his scornful question as an answer starts with ‘Well, yes, he did specify a rural setting.’ However he knows that Leo did not mention about ‘rural setting’. Jeremy’s utterance ‘social situation’ is a criticism for Leo who seems not to be happy there and also in his sentence ‘Bringing together people who want to be writers with people who *are* writers’ the auxiliary verb ‘*are*’ written in italics is a reference to Leo. Jeremy while stating this sentence ‘Having them eat together, work together, relax together’ as if talks about a ‘commune life’ and the repetitions of word ‘together’ emphasize this and then he says ‘It *has* to have a stimulating effect. It’s like a pressure cooker.’ The modal verb ‘has to’ used as if he himself felt that stimulating effect before. His metaphor ‘pressure cooker’ is so strange that there comes ‘a pause’ and this leads Leo to ponder.

Another significant scene in the play which highlights Leo’s character is analyzed.

Leo: As you probably know, I’m spending six months in England, working on a book.

Maude: No, I didn’t know.

Leo: It was in the *Guardian*.

Maude: Ah. We take *The Times* and the *Independent*.

Leo: I’m on leave from my University. I have a Guggenheim.

Maude (*hint of mockery*): Congratulations.

Leo: I’m writing a novel about the end of World War Two in Europe.

Maude: Ambitious.

Leo: It is. (14)

Leo is a kind of author who wants to be praised. He thinks that he is so famous that everybody has to know/recognize him. His sentences above show his arrogant

side. He starts his sentence with a doubtful tone using ‘probably’ but the next word is ‘know’ which conceals the doubt emphasizes his arrogant side. The usage of comma helps him to regularize what he thinks. However, Maude’s reply shows that she did not have any idea about his book. Leo wants to emphasize his former sentence and utters ‘It was in the Guardian’ the name of the newspaper is written in italics and has the meaning of ‘How could you not see this news?’. Then she tells that she does not read the Guardian but she takes the Times and the Independent. Her sentences indicate that she has a mocking tone because she gives opposite answers to what he says. Leo insists on proving himself and he continues to give information about him, he says ‘I’m on leave from my University. I have a Guggenheim’ the expression ‘on leave’ signifies that he is free. With the stage direction Maude’s gesture ‘hint of mockery’ indicates she does not care about him, his book or his retirement or his award and in fact she does not ask questions she just gives short replies to his statements which indicate her recklessness. Again without Maude’s questions/interest he goes on uttering his sentences as if he wants to show off ‘I’m writing a novel about the end of World War Two in Europe’ he gives info about his current situation. The noun ‘World War Two’ is a reference to his Jewish side and he wants to write about it. Maude’s reply is again very short, she utters ‘Ambitious.’ And nothing more. Her mocking tone continues but Leo does not see it. At last, he confirms the adjective ‘ambitious’ with his words ‘it is’ because he is sure of himself.

Jeremy: He won’t be here for long, anyway. The next day is the last one. Final efforts by the students, then an early dinner and afterwards *they* read from *their* work. It’s a kind of *rite de passage*. It usually turns into a party with everybody getting rather tired and emotional. The course disperses next morning, after breakfast.

Leo: Well, that’s something to look forward to.

Maude: Oh, don’t be such a misery!

Leo (startled): What?

Maude: If you want to go, for God’s sake go! I’d rather teach the whole course myself, than have you moaning and whingeing for the next four days.

A pause.

Leo: I said I'll stay, and I'll stay. (18)

In the above dialogues it is seen that Jeremy is eager to bring together real writers and people who want to be writers. The sentences he utters are coherent with the former sentences he uttered about the founder of this writing course. He is getting pleasure out of all of these events. On the contrary, Leo is not so happy, he says 'Well, that's something to look forward to' Maude shows her reaction to his sentence and utters 'Oh, don't be such a misery!' with this reaction it can be concluded that Maude is not a diffident woman. She can tell her ideas barely and in that case Leo is startled because he does not expect such a reaction from her. Maude replies 'If you want to go, for God's sake go! I'd rather teach the whole course myself, than have you moaning and whingeing for the next four days' Her sentence involves a treat for Leo. The first sentence is harsh for a man like Leo who wants to be praised all the time. The expression 'for God's sake' strengthens her reaction and leaves no open gates. The second sentence is a kind of preference and it indicates that she is a strong woman because she dares to take on her own the whole course. The reflexive pronoun 'myself' is a sign for her being strong that she can do everything on her own and she is in no need of another person. The verbs 'moaning, whingeing' are deliberately chosen for Leo. It seems that Maude sees him as a cry-baby. The stage direction gives 'a pause' then everybody is silent and Leo is trying to digest what he has heard. Finally he says, 'I said I'll stay, and I'll stay' the expression 'I said' means that he is not influenced by Maude's sentences. He expresses his promise twice to emphasize it.

4.1.2. Maude Lockett

Maude Lockett, who is a best-seller writers of nine books, is a good-looking, confident woman in her forties. In the play the stage direction states that she is dressed casually but expensively. The adverbs 'casually and expensively' indicate that she is not an ill-bred woman however she is elegant. Besides, she is married and

has children. So, being married and having children do not shade her successful career.

The amplified voice of HENRY LOCKETT (a middle-aged Oxford don) is heard from the answerphone. The actors on stage speak over his monologue.

Henry's Voice: Oh, hallo, er, this is Henry Lockett for Maude Lockett...

Maude: Henry!

Henry's Voice: Er, Maude, I've lost my, that is to say I can't seem to find my cufflinks, I mean I can't find a pair that match, and, er, there's a College Feast tonight and, er, I should feel rather a prat with odd cufflinks...

Jeremy: You can pick it up and speak to him, you know.

Maude: No, I don't want to. I think this a retrograde step, Jeremy, I come here to get away from domestic concerns. (19)

In the play we have never seen Henry himself, he is in the play just with his voice. He calls for Maude his wife and when he calls he interrupts the speech acts. However, as mentioned in the stage direction the actors on stage speak over his monologue. Here it creates disturbance which is a reference to Maude's life. She is in this barn now because she wants to get away from domestic concerns.

In Henry's speech 'I' is repeated five times that is to say Henry is a self-centered man and does not care about Maude. He does not think that she is in a course and he can disturb her. The subject 'clifflinks' are so trivial reasons to call his wife. The sound 'er' is repeated twice as if he cannot tell where he wants to go. He does not want to seem 'prat' in a 'College Feast', so tiny things are important for Henry to seem intelligent. And also comma is used nine times in his speech. That means he is speaking with pauses as if he cannot his mind while speaking. Then Jeremy utters that Maude can pick up the receiver and speak to him, however, her reply reflects why she comes to that old barn. She says 'No, I don't want to. I think this a retrograde step, Jeremy, I come here to get away from domestic concerns.' Her first sentence explains why she is there indeed. She uses his name 'Jeremy' in the middle of her sentence which refers to her sincerity while she is speaking. The verbs

'come, get away from' contradict each other and this contradiction shows us that Maude wants to take a breath. She prefers getting away from home and comes to this barn. The expressions 'domestic concerns' and 'retrograde step' reflect us how she thinks about her family life. She knows that if she answers the phone, everything will be the same again. She is in this course because she wants to do something professional not domestic.

Maude (*smiles, drinks*): Geronimo, then. I'm glad you decided to stay. I've admired your work for ages.

Leo: Including *Wise Virgins and Other Stories*?

Maude (*evasively*): That was your first book, wasn't it?

Leo: You didn't like it so much when you reviewed it for the *Spectator*.

Maude: Oh, that was a very long time ago. I'm surprised you remember it.

Leo: I remember all my reviews.

Maude: Goodness, I hardly bother to read mine.

Leo: I never believe writers who say that.

MAUDE *looks as if she is going to take offence, but backs off*.

Maude: Well, Henry reads them for me. He only shows me the nice ones.

Leo: My wife – my last wife – only showed me the bad ones. She used to go to the library and photocopy them especially. That's how I saw your review.

Maude (*laughs uncertainly*): I can't imagine I said anything really nasty about *The Wise Virgin*.

Leo: *Wise Virgins*. You said, 'Mr Rafkin polishes his style, the better to see in it the reflection of his own ego.'

Maude: Did I? You know, you really shouldn't attach so much importance to what critics say.

Leo: That's easy for you to say. You're a best-seller. (24)

Maude changes when she drinks alcohol because she seemed unaware of Leo's works in the former speech but now she is saying that 'I've admired your work for ages.' She is inconsistent. She knows that Leo likes to be praised, that's why the

expressions ‘I’m glad, I’ve admired’ are coherent with the situation. The expression ‘for ages’ seems a little bit exaggerated when we look at her former utterances. In fact, the stage direction ‘evasively’ confirms what’s written above and she asks ‘That was your first book, wasn’t it?’ the tag question is used here to be admitted by Leo. Instead of answering in ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ Leo utters ‘You didn’t like it so much when you reviewed it for the *Spectator*’. The object pronouns ‘it’ are repeated twice and seems as if he trivializes his work in front of her. The phrase ‘You didn’t like it so much’ is uttered in a way as if Maude is glorified by him.

Maude’s astonishment is seen from the exclamation that she uses at the beginning of her sentence It is clear from the clause ‘I’m surprised’. The adverb of time ‘ a very long time ago’ is in harmony with the expression ‘for ages’ as if she is following every work of Leo. The verb ‘remember’ indicates that Maude does not remember what she wrote or she just seems like she does. She wants to be seemed as ‘cool’. Leo replies ‘I remember all my reviews.’ The noun ‘all’ involves the good and the bad ones at the same time, and also ‘my reviews’ is a reference to his self-confidence. This time Maude shows her arrogance with the sentence ‘Goodness, I hardly bother to read mine.’ The exclamations such as ‘oh, goodness’ used in her sentences reflect a feminine tone, and the usage of adverb ‘hardly’ which means ‘almost not’ does not seem persuasive and the possessive pronoun ‘mine’ refers to her reviews. Since her sentence is not so persuasive, Leo replies as ‘I never believe writers who say that’ however, in the stage direction it is seen that Maude looks as if she is going to take offence, but backs off. ‘taking offence’ is again a reflection of her feminine approach.

The preposition and object pronoun ‘for me’ in her utterance signifies her acting like a princess ‘Well, Henry reads them for me. He only shows me the nice ones’ and with this sentence she is just showing off. Her husband Henry seems as if a manservant that does everything for his lady. On the contrary, Leo expresses that ‘My wife – my last wife – only showed me the bad ones. She used to go to the library and photocopy them especially. That’s how I saw your review.’ The usages of dashes illustrates he does not want to be misunderstood by Maude that he is still

married. The words ‘last wife, bad ones’ are coherent with each other and it shows that they did not get along well that’s why they got divorced.

Leo: You intrigued me. That photograph on your dust jackets – with the Mona Lisa smile. The amazing number of books you’ve written. The sales figures in the *Bookseller*. Beauty, fertility, and money. An irresistible combination.

Maude: The resistance seems to be all on my side. Goodnight. (*She moves towards the bedroom door.*)

Leo: And then I read the books.

MAUDE *stops, turns.*

Maude: I do hope you’re not going to pay me any insincere compliments.

Leo: Your heroines are all sleeping beauties, aren’t they? Passionate but unfulfilled women, half-longing, half-fearing to be awakened.

Maude: And you thought you would play Prince Charming?

Leo: We could play Beauty and the Beast if you prefer.

Maude: Goodnight. (29)

Leo’s speech is structured upon five sentences. The verb ‘intrigue’ is given at the beginning of his speech and then the reasons why she intrigued him will be explained. The determiner ‘that’ at the beginning of second sentence implies he has a photograph of her in his mind and it also helps us to visualize that photo, too. The clause ‘with the Mona Lisa smile’ is separated by a dash which means that Leo is really affected from that photograph. The Mona Lisa smile indicates blurry and ambiguous smile which impressed Leo profoundly. After he describes the ‘physical appearance’, the turn is now on ‘quantity’ and he mentions it with the expression ‘the amazing number of books’ and the next sentence is about ‘money’ which we can conclude from the expression ‘the sales figures’. His fourth sentence is a summary of this sequence. The word ‘beauty’ is coherent with her physical appearance, the word ‘fertility’ is coherent with her number of books and the last word ‘money’ is parallel with the expression of the sales figures. Therefore, he calls the total of them ‘an irresistible combination’. Maude does not seem to be persuaded by this speech which she calls it ‘the resistance’. And then, Leo utters the striking sentence ‘And then I read the books’ after all these compliments he wants to say that ‘I appreciate your books’ and this makes Maude stop, she utters ‘I do hope you’re not going to

pay me any insincere compliments' here the adjective 'insincere' is used to prevent him to utter a word about her books. Besides, Leo utters 'Your heroines are all sleeping beauties, aren't they? Passionate but unfulfilled women, half-longing, half-fearing to be awakened.' His tag question shows that he knows the truth but he wants Maude to confirm it. The adjectives 'sleeping, passionate, unfulfilled, half-longing, half-fearing' are references for her characters but at the same time they reflect Maude's own character, too.

Maude's reply indicates that she is getting angry 'And you thought you would play Prince Charming?' and her tone is furious at the same time mocking. They both choose their words from fairy tales. The verb 'play' shows the levity and Leo's reply comes 'We could play Beauty and the Beast if you prefer.' He also has a mocking tone and here the verb 'play' refers to Leo's desire to have sex with Maude.

4.1.3. Penny Sewell

She is a young woman, who might be in her late twenties or early thirties. She has big eyes and long fair hair. She wears a simple summer dress and carries a floppy sunhat. She has a transparent sincerity of manner which sometimes seems like naivety, and speaks with a perceptible Welsh accent. (30-1)

Penny Sewell is a young primary school teacher who enrolled this course. The words that describe her 'simple, transparent, sincerity, naivety' show she is the most naive person in that course. Even though she has a writing talent, her tutor Leo does not like what she writes.

Penny: Lights and Shadows. That's the provisional title of the novel.

Leo (frowns): I think I read that one.

LEO reaches for the pile of manuscripts, and shifts through them. He pulls out one.

Leo: You're Penny Sewell, right?

Penny: Yes.

Leo: Yeah. The privilege fell to me. *Lights and Shadows*.

Penny: What do you think of that as a title? Or perhaps you don't think titles are important?

Leo: Oh, I think they're very important – to the writer. I always tell my students back home, the title should remind you what your story is supposed to be *about*. (32)

She uses the word 'provisional' for her novel's title that she can change it in the future so she has a hope to go on writing. But the stage direction for Leo 'frowns' shows how he is prejudiced against amateur writers and his sentence 'Yeah. The privilege fell to me. *Lights and Shadows*.' The choice of words indicate a mocking tone. Penny's question 'What do you think of that as a title?' illustrates that she gives importance to writing even from beginning to end and Leo's reply seems as if Lodge's own thought. In his criticism *Art of Fiction* (1992) it becomes obvious that Lodge wrote the same things which Leo uttered : The title of a novel is part of the text – the first part of it, in fact, that we encounter – and therefore has considerable power to attract and condition the reader's attention. For the novelist, choosing a title may be an important part of the creative process, bringing into sharper focus what the novel is supposed to be about. (193-4)

Penny: Well, *Lights and Shadows* does that for me, I think.

Leo: Yeah, it's OK. It's about the best thing in here. After the title there's a steady decline.

Penny (crestfallen): You don't like it?

Leo: Did you expect me to?

Penny: I didn't know what to expect. I've never shown my work to anyone before. What's wrong with it?

Leo: Well, it isn't very interesting, and the style is derivative.

Penny: Derivative?

Leo: From Virginia Woolf, chiefly.

Penny (submissively): Yes, I do like Virginia Woolf.

Leo (reads): 'Was this all there was, then, all there was to life, her life anyway, she thought, peeling the potatoes at the sink, and looking out

through the kitchen window at the small square of lawn, where the toys abandoned by Ben and Jessica lay scattered like the remnants of some horrible accident, a car crash, touched poignantly by the golden beams of the sun that was setting like an inflamed eye behind the red roofs of the neighbouring houses.' (*Looks up*) If the sun is inflamed, which means red, would the sunbeams be golden?

Penny: No, of course not. How stupid of me.

Leo: It comes from over-using the pathetic fallacy.

Penny: What's that?

Leo: Making the external world reflect metaphorically the emotions of the perceiver.

Penny: Oh.

Leo: Like 'touched poignantly' and 'inflamed eye'.

Penny: But apart from that...

Leo: There isn't much apart from that, is there? The whole chapter is saturated in the pathetic fallacy.

Penny: You don't think I should persevere with it?

Leo: I don't see that it's likely to get any better. Do you?

LEO holds out the manuscript. Pause.

Penny (quietly): No, I'm sure you're right. (33)

Penny as a curious student asks questions to Leo but her facial expressions immediately change when she hears something bad or good because of her naivety, as we see in the stage direction 'crestfallen'. She asks 'You don't like it?' and Leo's scornful reply comes 'Did you expect me to?'. Penny's answer again shows her sincerity and she frankly says 'I didn't know what to expect. I've never shown my work to anyone before. What's wrong with it?' the phrases 'I didn't know, I've never shown, what is wrong' include depressive mode of her.

Leo does not find her work interesting and adds 'the style is derivative' Penny immediately says 'Derivative?' and it means shortly 'from whom?' Leo replies 'From Virginia Woolf, chiefly.' After that her gesture again changes and she instantly accepts that she likes Virginia Woolf. Then Leo reads a part from Penny's novel and catches a subtle logic error and an accusation is made by her over-using the pathetic fallacy. Here he uses a jargon which Penny cannot understand and that's why she asks 'What's that?'. Leo explains to her but she does not seem to

understand. She wants to oppose by saying ‘But apart from that...’ Triple dot implies she has lots of things to say which are interrupted by Leo’s utterance ‘There isn’t much apart from that, is there? The whole chapter is saturated in the pathetic fallacy.’ The phrase ‘the whole chapter’ shows that he is just concentrated on pathetic fallacy that’s why he just sees them. Penny waits for some encouragement ‘You don’t think I should persevere it?’. His last sentence makes her desperate and the stage direction ‘quietly’ emphasizes her despair.

4.1.4. Simon St Clair

SIMON is in his early thirties, dressed in loose, trendy, all-black cotton clothes, and has an expensively style haircut. He is good-looking in a slightly Mephistophelian way.

Simon is another author character of the play. He is also invited to the barn and also knows the avenue before. However, Leo does not like him because years ago Simon interviewed and wrote unpleasant things about him. In the stage direction the words ‘all-black and Mephistophelian’ are coherent with each other and they describe the evil/bad side of Simon. The adjectives ‘loose, trendy, expensively’ indicate that he is a rich man.

SIMON returns to the table. His hand hovers teasingly over the keyboard, fingers moving in the air.

Simon: I daresay it’s only a matter of time before writing is fully automated in the States. (To LEO) Or can you already buy software that actually writes the stuff for you? Like a programme for writing the Great American Novel. What would it be called...? ‘MEGAWRITER’, perhaps.

Leo: Very witty.

Simon: ‘WANKSTAR’ for *Penthouse* stories.

Maude: Shut up, Simon.

Simon: And, of course, for the ever-popular story of Jewish hangups about sex and the Holocaust – ‘SOFTSOAP’.

Leo: You asshole! Have you been reading my manuscript...? (70)

In the stage direction Simon's movements 'hovers teasingly and fingers moving in the air' evoke the thought of his being homosexual. Simon creates tension while the three of them are talking and he annoys Leo by mocking with his American side. He mocks with the great technology of America that even authors do not write their stuff but a programme or a machine does this for them. The words which are written in capital letters emphasize that Simon wants to increase the tension. Hence, the words that described him above 'all-black, Mephistophelian' confirm his bad side that he always wants to annoy others, especially Leo.

Simon: You're very quiet, Leo. What did you think of my story?

LEO drains his glass, snatches bottle from SIMON and pours himself a generous measure. He thrusts the bottle back into SIMON's hand.

Leo: I thought it was horseshit.

Simon: Ah. You wouldn't be a teeny-weeny bit biased, would you?

Leo: I admit that it had a certain documentary interest.

Simon: Yes?

Leo: As a glimpse of the rotting corpse of English literary life.

Simon: A lurid image. How much do you know about English literary life?

Leo: You only have to go to a few publisher's parties, read the book pages in the newspapers, to understand how it works. The log-rolling, the back-scratching, the back-biting.

Simon: Of course, you don't get any of that sort of thing in New York, do you?

Leo: I don't live in New York, It's a bigger country – writers are more spread out. The trouble with England is that it's too damned small. Everybody has his hand in someone else's pocket and his nose in someone else's asshole. And another - (87)

The object pronoun 'you' which is written in italics shows in fact Simon does not care about Leo's thoughts he is just asking to create a tension again. Leo does not answer immediately, the stage directions indicate that he prepares himself for a

debate. Leo shows his anger with word 'horseshit' and Simon's tag question signifies that he is still mocking with Leo. As Bruce K. Martin states this dialogues is based on 'the Anglo-American dimension of the ongoing debate between Leo and Simon' (Martin, 1999: 138) Leo claims that as an author you have to grovel to the publishers and Simon's tag question emphasizes that this is the same in America, too. However, Leo's utterance implies that it can be the same and he finds England too small which refers to their encountering in that barn/course.

Afterwards, Maude has intercourse with Simon, too, which leads Leo into jealousy. However, she expresses she is not sure that Simon really likes women. Then Penny brings her outlines to Leo which he finds 'very good'. Penny utters through the end of the play that the authors live to write which seems Lodge's criticism the world he lives in. At the end Maude finds Leo trying to delete all outlines from his computer and she tries out to stop him. Finally, Leo says that he has a great idea for a play, hence, the characters all realize that they are the pieces of a game.

Lodge in this play creates the author images to project the process of 'writing'. By the help of language used in the play we see that how hard 'the writing' is. The distinguished feature of all authors in the play, they all want to be praised except amateur ones like Penny. Lodge also composes the Anglo-American debate between Leo and Simon which he was inspired from his America years.

CONCLUSION

In the first chapter of this study, the life of David Lodge and his place in post-war British literature are given to fulfill a background information to understand *Home Truths* and *The Writing Game* better. In the second chapter the scope of stylistics is examined and then the significance of stylistic approach to the literary works is stated in the light of Leech and Short's stylistic categorization. When come to the third chapter, the play *Home Truths* is analyzed by employing Leech and Short's categories of stylistic approach based on the important dialogues of the author images. Besides, in the fourth chapter the same approach is obtained in the play *The Writing Game*.

Language is a powerful way to express oneself. Lodge created authors in both of the plays, which we expect them to use the language more professionally, to express his own ideas in a dynamic way. However, it is seen that the authors have no more differences from common/ordinary people. Moreover, Lodge aims voicing by those characters to show this fact accurately. In *Home Truths* when we look at the relationship between Adrian and Sam, the use of language is given directly to underline that there is no true friendship in the twentieth century. There is not even an intellectual battle of words between them which is presented by a direct language but not a redundant one.

Lodge also illustrates that there is no true love while he is composing the relationship between Eleanor and Adrian. This realistic point of view is emphasized by the use of simple language in the play. Despite the fact that Eleanor is not an author, she is put into the play to highlight the author images. In fact, she is the desired one by both of the men and with this situation Lodge attaches the importance to the corruption of relationships in the modern world.

The correlation between the press and the authors is also considered as an important issue in *Home Truths*. In this manner, Fanny Tarrant character is created. According to her, one gets pleasure when s/he reads something vicious about the other in the newspaper and in addition to this one feels sorry. So, feeling both of the emotions existence is in the nature of a man. However, Lodge criticizes this thought with pessimism in his play. Princess Diana's death as a popular figure lays emphasis on this criticism at the end of the play.

Hereby, David Lodge creates a harmony in the play to convey his opinions via author images. The corruption, pessimism and realism are displayed throughout the structuralist approach to the play. In the light of lexical, grammatical, figures of speech and context/cohesion categorizations it is obtained that the language used in the play is plain and comprehensible. Since it is a dramatic text, the stage directions are also taken into account in the analysis. They assist us to visualize the scenes better.

While starting the play *Home Truths*, there is a definition of 'home truths' as a wounding mention of a person's weakness (Shorter Oxford Dictionary). As stated in the definition, the play points out the weaknesses of the authors which is analyzed through a study of language of the major dialogues in the plays.

In *The Writing Game* the practice of writing is scrutinized as as 'game'. A seventieth century barn converted into a writing course opens its gates to the professional and amateur writers. This atmosphere reminds us a 'carnavalesque' atmosphere which leads to a dynamic pattern that differs from *Home Truths*. Therefore, a dynamic tempo is comprehended throughout the play. We are always aware that David Lodge does not want to conceal himself behind the characters he created. As in *Home Truths* the author images are not so much different even though they present themselves as different.

In this play jealousy among writers is harshly criticized. Leo is jealous of Maude because she is a best-seller novelist. Penny who is the most naive character of the play utters her words that seem to reflect Lodge's criticism '...There's a sort of jealousy between you all the time. When Maude did her repeat reading, I was watching you, and during your reading I was watching Maude, and last night when Simon was reading I was watching both of you. I noticed that whenever the rest of us laughed at something in the reading, the other one or two of you looked unhappy. The most you could do was to force a thin smile. It was as if you begrudged each other the tiniest success...' (Lodge, 1999: 112) Hence, the jealousy among them is given by the language directly.

Besides, in both of the plays the language difference between female and male authors is not observed. Both female and male authors use the simple language that we can easily achieve. In fact, in both of the plays female authors trap male authors such as Fanny Tarrant's interview with Sam and Adrian and in return of this they start to take revenge.

The relationships between authors are also criticized since they show us how moral values are corrupted. As a married woman, Maude, has intercourse both with Leo and Simon. Lodge, thus, emphasizes that the author images in the play are far away from 'naivety' because they are different and even dangerous people who create intrigue. Furthermore, again with Penny's utterances Lodge conveys what he wants to say '...It seems to me that writers are a bit like sharks... I read somewhere that sharks never sleep and never stop moving. They have to keep swimming, and eating, otherwise they would get waterlogged and drown. It seems to that writers are like that. They have to keep moving, devouring experience, turning it into writing, or they would cease to be recognized, praised, respected – and that would be death for them. They don't write to live, they live to write...' (Lodge, 1991: 112)

To sum up, language is the essential feature in both of the plays, and the stylistic approach to a dramatic text demonstrates the influence of language and its similarity with everyday interaction. The language the author images use reflect their true intentions, and the structuralist approach helps the reader to find the hidden masks beyond the words. When the reader restricts a drama text only between lines, it is not easy to perceive the real aim of the playwright and also the message s/he wants to give. However, the structuralist approach provides a true understanding for assessing how language is accessed by dramatists to concentrate on the human relationships and how those relationships are shaped by dialogues.

To supply a broader appreciation of Lodge's plays Leech and Short's stylistic categorization is used. Besides, several examples of dialogues taken from the plays are used to illustrate different points and to create daily verbal interaction by the author images. As well as several novels, criticisms and so on David Lodge shows his mastership through *Home Truths* and *The Writing Game* by the help of language.

WORKS CITED

- Aygün, N. (2007). *The Stylistic Analysis Of Harold Pinter's Plays: The Birthday Party, The Homecoming, The Caretaker, Ashes to Ashes, Betrayal*. İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya
- Bergonzi, B. (1995). *David Lodge*. ed. Isobel Armstrong. Writers and Their Work. UK: Plymouth.
- Bradford, R. (1997). *Stylistics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chapman, R. (1973). *Linguistics and Literature: An Introduction to Literary Stylistics*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Culperer, J., Short, M. & Verdonk. (1999) (Eds): *Exploring the Language of Drama*. London: Routledge.
- Geis, M. (1995). *Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge Up.
- Innes, C. (1992). *Modern British Drama. The Twentieth Century*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaya. S. (2009). *Stylistic Analysis of Charles Dickens's Christmas Books*. Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara
- Kelsall. M. (1985). *Studying Drama an Introduction*. London: British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data.
- Leech, G. N. & Short, H.M. (1981). *Style in Fiction*. London: Longman
- Lodge, D. *Language of Fiction: Essays in Criticism and Verbal Analysis of the English Novel*. 1966. London & New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Lodge, D. (1999). *Home Truths: A Play*. Secker & Warburg London

- Lodge, D. (1991). *The Writing Game*. Secker & Warburg London
- Lodge, D. (1992). *The Art of Fiction*. London: Penguin Books.
- Martin, Bruce K. (1999). *David Lodge*. ed. Kinley Roby. *Twayne's English Author Series*. New York: Twayne Publishers
- Robey, D. (1982). *Modern Linguistics and the Language of Literature*. In A. Jefferson and D. Robey .. London,
- Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Novels*. London: Longman
- Short, M. (2006). Designing and Piloting a world-wide-web-based stylistics course. *Rethinking English: Reconciling Literature and Cultural Studies*. Retrieved August 20, 2006 from <http://www.lanc.ac.uk/fass/projects/stylistics/tutors/Paper>
- Semino E. & Short M. (2004). *Corpus Stylistics. Speech, Writing and Thought presentation in a Corpus of English Writing*. London, Routledge.
- Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A Resource book for students*. London, Routledge.
- Toolen, M. (1992). *Language, Text and Context: Essays in Stylistics*. London: Routledge.
- Turner, G. W. (1973). *Stylistics*. Great Britain, Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd. Aylesbury Bucks.
- Wales, K. (1990). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. New York; London, Longman.