Quest and Conquest in the Fiction of David Lodge

Inaugural-Dissertation

zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der

Philosophischen Fakultät II

der

Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg

Vorgelegt von

Ramona-Mihaela Sava

aus Petrosani/Rumänien

Würzburg

2006

Erstgutachter: Prof. Dr. Dr. h. c. Rüdiger Ahrens, OBE

Zweitgutachter: Prof. Dr. Stephan Kohl

Tag des Kolloquiums: 05.07.2006

Acknowledgements

Above all I would like to express my deepest thanks to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Dr. h. c. Rüdiger Ahrens, OBE, whose guidance, support and encouragement greatly contributed to the completion of my dissertation. I am also indebted to the other members of my PhD thesis board, Prof. Dr. Stephan Kohl and Prof. Dr. Winfried Kreutzer.

Further thanks are due to my fiancé, whose patience and loyalty accompanied me along these years. Last but not least, I want to thank my family for their unconditioned love and confidence.

Table of contents

1. Introduction

1.1. David Lodge- an overview

Author of a considerable number of novels and works of literary criticism, David Lodge has attracted a lot of attention from critics. Born in London in 1935, he taught in the English Department of the University of Birmingham from 1960 until 1987. He then retired in order to become a full-time writer, but still lives in that city.

David Lodge has written the novels *The Picturegoers* (1960); *Ginger, You're Barmy* (1962); *The British Museum Is Falling Down* (1965); *Out of the Shelter* (1970); *Changing Places. A Tale of Two Campuses* (1975); *How Far Can You Go?* (1980); *Small World. An Academic Romance* (1984); *Nice Work* (1988); *Paradise News* (1991); *Therapy* (1996); *Thinks...* (2001); and *Author, Author* (2004). His work also includes two theatre plays, namely *The Writing Game*, produced at the Birmingham Repertory Theatre in 1990, and *Home Truths*, which he transformed into a novella in 1999. Nevertheless, Lodge is not only a talented creative writer, but also a significant literary critic. His critical works comprise *Language of Fiction* (1966), *The Novelist at the Crossroads* (1971), *The Modes of Modern Writing* (1977), *Working with Structuralism* (1981), *Write On* (1986), *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism* (1990), *The Art of Fiction* (1992), *The Practice of Writing* (1996), and *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays* (2002). He equally edited the anthology of literary theory *Modern Criticism and Theory* (1988). The complexity of his work, situated somewhere between tradition and innovation, has made Lodge an author "hard to classify."[1]

Critics have focused on several aspects of his literary creation: some have tried to make connections between Lodge's life and his novels, considering them autobiographical to a certain extent; others have traced the influence of the author's theoretical preoccupations on his creative writing. Realism is a further topic dealt with, Lodge's novels being written in a traditional realistic mode, but, at the same time, containing experimental features in the form of self-consciousness and self-reflexivity, metafiction and intertextuality, parody and pastiche. In this context issues such as narrative techniques, narrator and point of view need special attention.

---

[1] Bárbara Arizti, *Textuality as Striptease: the Discourse of Intimacy in David Lodge's "Changing Places" and "Small World"*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2002, p. 25.

Besides critics have been concerned with the problem of the narrative sub-genres in Lodge's fiction. If they have raised the question whether he has written Catholic novels or not, he is undoubtedly a master of the university novel, culminating in the presentation of a global campus. Other critics of Lodge have focused on the genre of the romance and, consequently, on the quest-motif, to which they have applied a mythological approach.

1.1.1. Biographical approaches

One of the main concerns of the critics is that of approaching Lodge's fiction from a biographical perspective tracing events taken from the author's own life and treated in his novels. Thus, the first four novels (*The Picturegoers*, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, *Out of the Shelter*) "contain settings and topics drawn from his own experience. These include South London Suburbia; the academic world, particularly university English departments; Catholicism; and the attractions of the American way of life."[2] Taking into consideration Lodge's educational formation after the Second World War, it is not surprising that his novels "offer a thoughtful and often detailed reflection on British life during this period" as they "seem particularly driven by autobiographical concerns."[3] His later novels are not totally free from such elements either; for instance, *Changing Places* is based on his trip to Berkeley as a visiting professor.[4] Drawing on familiar places and experiences gives Lodge the possibility of making accurate descriptions of the British and American life in a realistic way because "he seems at ease picturing worlds he knows at first hand."[5]

1.1.2. Between fiction and criticism

Another topic of interest for Lodge's critics is the double nature of his work: he has written both literary criticism and fiction. This 'schizophrenic attitude'[6] is seen as a

---

[2] Bernard Bergonzi, *David Lodge*, Plymouth: Nortcote House, 1995, p. 1.
[3] Bruce K. Martin, *David Lodge*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1999, p. 2.
[4] Cf. Bernard Bergonzi, *David Lodge*, p. 17 and Bruce K. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
[5] Bárbara Arizti, *op.cit.*, p. 15.
[6] Cf. Ingrid Pfandl-Buchegger, *David Lodge als Literaturkritiker, Theoretiker und Romanautor*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1993, p. 4.

specifically Anglo-Saxon phenomenon.[7] Interestingly enough, there is a continuos development in both aspects of his work:

> the interrelation between fiction and criticism has taken an active part in this. Both, in their own right, explore the potentialities of literary writing. Formalist and structuralist criticism make accessible certain qualities in the text which the novelist may henceforth use more consciously.[8]

The critic's work with literary theory has consequences on the creative writer and, as a result, different theories are discussed in the novels conferring them a metafictional quality. Therefore, the search for an appropriate fiction theory is not only part of the theoretical books of David Lodge, but also of his novels. The three academic novels *Changing Places, Small World* and *Nice Work*

> correspond roughly to the shift among Lodge's principal critical books. In *Changing Places*, as in *Language of Fiction*, the orientation of everyone- even the trendy Morris Zapp- is still basically New Critical and humanist. *Small World*, like *The Modes of Modern Writing* (and like *Modern Criticism and Theory*) moves into structuralist and poststructuralist concerns and debates. And the affinity [...] between *Nice Work* and the essay "A Kind of Business," extends to many of the other pieces in *After Bakhtin* in their critique of the extremes of poststructuralism [...][9]

The influence of the critic on the novelist is incontestable, his fiction projecting the ideas discussed in the works of criticism; from this perspective the novels could be regarded as practical illustrations of the theoretical points with which the critic is concerned. On account of this, he was labelled as a '*writer-critic*' whose creative works contain theoretical reflections.[10]

Lodge's double role as novelist and theoretician of literature has as a result "the constant criss-crossing of references between his fiction and his criticism,"[11] which gives the impression that his novels "look like treaties on literary theory" voicing "the topics Lodge deals with in his theoretical work: the future of the realistic novel in *Changing Places*, the different schools of contemporary criticism in

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[8] Daniel Amman, *David Lodge and the Art-and-Reality Novel*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1991, p. 134.
[9] Bruce K. Martin, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-89.
[10] Cf. Göran Nieragden, *Figurendarstellung im Roman. Eine narratologische Systematik am Beispiel von David Lodges "Changing Places" und Ian McEwans "The Child in Time"*, Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 1995, p. 94.
[11] Bárbara Arizti, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

Small World, the applicability of the pair metaphor/ metonymy to the analysis of texts in *Nice Work*."[12]

Contrary to Lodge's view that his fiction and his critical interests are in conflict– opinion shared by Christopher Norris or Pilar Hidalgo–[13] most of his critics have found no such discrepancy showing that the preoccupation of the critic goes hand in hand with that of the novelist as they develop together and reflect each other.

1.1.3. Realism and tradition

A further issue dealt with in David Lodge's criticism and fiction is that of realism. Bernard Bergonzi even groups his novels according to this criterion drawing the conclusion that the first two novels (*The Picturegoers* and *Ginger, You're Barmy*) and the fourth (*Out of the Shelter*) are characterised by a conventional realism. Bruce K. Martin, too, agrees with this view stating that Lodge masters a "considerable command of the techniques of traditional realism."[14] The third novel (*The British Museum Is Falling Down*) is a mixture of realism, comedy and experimental elements.[15] Then there follows a change in the mode of writing marked by the first two university novels (*Changing Places* and *Small World*), which are "funny, formally inventive, technically sophisticated"[16] and self-conscious making use of intertextuality, of parody as well as of the carnivalesque narrative as described by Bakhtin.[17] *Nice Work*, the next novel, is "less continuously funny" marking a "return to the conventions of Victorian realism,"[18] being to James Acheson's mind "a contemporary version of the industrial (or 'condition of England') novel of the 1840s."[19]

Daniel Amman has remarked that "Lodge does not attempt to define realism by reference to 'reality', 'life', or 'experience'– terms that have become highly

---

[12] *Ibid*., p. 31.
[13] Cf. *ibid*., pp. 29-30.
[14] Bruce K. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
[15] Cf. Bernard Bergonzi, *David Lodge*, p. 1.
[16] *Ibid*., p. 15.
[17] Cf. *ibid*., pp. 17-18.
[18] *Ibid*., pp. 23-26.
[19] James Acheson, "The Small Worlds of Malcolm Bradbury and David Lodge", in: James Acheson, ed., *The British and Irish Novel since 1960*, London: McMillan Academic and Professional Ltd, 1991, p. 89.

problematical to writers in this century."[20] Rather, his definition of realism in literature is *"the representation of experience in a manner which approximates closely to descriptions of similar experiences in non-literary texts of the same culture.* (MMW 25)"[21] But there is also a development in his view upon realism and, consequently, his later novels "have proved receptive to modernist techniques and postmodernist fabulation."[22] Bergonzi holds the same opinion, that is, Lodge's "fiction is predominantly realistic, though his later novels make gestures towards self-reflectiveness".[23]

According to Bárbara Arizti, it is the pressure of the intellectual scene that makes Lodge hesitate between tradition and innovation; she observes that "his fiction dresses up in the clothes of experiment while retaining the values of liberal humanism, and his critical work echoes the latest theoretical trends at the same time that it filters their most radical elements."[24] To sum up, it is precisely this mixture of tradition and innovation, of realism and experiment that makes Lodge's novels complex, but, at the same time, they become difficult to classify.

1.1.4. Experimental elements

In spite of Lodge's attachment to traditional conventions of fiction writing, his critics have paid special attention to the postmodern techniques (metafiction, self-consciousness, intertextuality, parody, satire) characterising his novels. When discussing *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, Bergonzi observes that professional readers "will respond to its exploration of intertextuality, the sense that literature inevitably draws on other literature."[25] Likewise, intertextuality and parody turn other novels, too,– especially *Changing Places* and *Small World,* into "critical reflection[s] of the art of fiction."[26]

Intertextuality is considered to be a necessity in the process of creative writing, its very condition: "Art necessarily imitates other art, and intertextuality may

---

[20] Daniel Amman, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
[21] Quoted from Daniel Amman, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
[22] Daniel Amman, *op. cit.*, p. 134.
[23] Bernard Bergonzi, *The Myth of Modernism and Twentieth Century Literature*, Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1986, p. 179.
[24] Bárbara Arizti, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
[25] Bernard Bergonzi, *David Lodge*, p. 7.

be seen as one of the writer's struggle with originality."[27] In other words, making numerous references to other texts reflects not only the writer's quest for originality, but also his awareness of the fact that originality is no longer possible. In order to illustrate this struggle to achieve originality, the novelist makes use of "witty parodies of the style of twentieth-century novelists."[28] To Amman's mind, Lodge's fiction

> deals self-consciously with the burden of a long literary past and the anxiety of influence. However, Lodge does so systematically, with irony, humour and satire. Allusiveness and intertextuality in his work have become functional contributions in the collaborative game between author and reader.[29]

Being considered a very talented parodist,[30] David Lodge discusses theoretical problems with humour; his parodies have the effect of lightening a serious subject.[31]

The extensive use of metafiction adds to the complexity of his fiction; the opposition between the realistic conventions and the modern devices makes Göran Nieragden speak of a "problematic novel," which he defines as follows: "Konzept einer Romanform, die zwischen klassisch realistischer Fiktion einerseits, also einer kompletten *slice of life*-Imagination, und illusionsdestruirender, autoreferentieller und metafiktionaler Erzählprosa anderseits auszusiedeln ist."[32] It is then a novel form situated between two poles, that of classic realistic fiction on the one hand and that of self-reflexive narrative on the other hand. From this point of view, most of Lodge's novels are situated somewhere between conventional modes of writing and postmodernist devices.

Nieragden also explains that this mixture which he calls 'hybrid form' (*Hybridform*) is actually the result of American and European continental theoretical trends catalogued as 'Avantgarde' and postmodernism:

> Zugrunde liegt dieser Hybridform des post-modernen Romans das viel beschworene spezifisch britische Problem des Umgangs mit den US-

---

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[28] Bernard Bergonzi, *The Myth of Modernism*, p. 182.
[29] Daniel Amman, *op. cit.*, p. 137.
[30] Cf. Wolfgang Weiß, *Der anglo-amerikanische Universitätsroman. Eine historische Skizze*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988, p. 149.
[31] Cf. James Acheson, *op. cit.*, p. 85.
[32] Göran Nieragden, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

amerikanischen und kontinentaleuropäischen Strömungen der Avangarde und der Postmoderne.[33]

This complex form of narration is specific of postmodernism, the latest trend in the literature of the twentieth century, which "will undoubtedly have discovered the related categories of exhaustion, excess, the limit, and transgression– the strange and unyielding form of these irrevocable movements which consume and consummate us."[34]

The evocation of the classic realist literature through parody shows that originality is possible by imitating what has already been written, as well. The complexity and 'hybridity' of Lodge's novels is expressed by Bárbara Arizti, too; she describes them as "formally innovative" but "ideologically conservative."[35]

Lodge's critics have equally commented on the narrative techniques used by him in his novels. In this respect, *Changing Places* has attracted a lot of attention because it is a novel written in four main techniques: "authorial description"– an omniscient narrator who is also symbolised by the air trip with which the novel begins, "epistolary novel"– presenting different points of view expressed by characters, "a section composed of newspaper reports" describing the social and political situation and finally a "film script"[36] which metafictionally discusses the problem of an open ending. James Acheson shares the interest in the different narrative techniques in *Changing Places* remarking that they give the novel a self-reflexive aspect.[37]

In the next place, the narrators of Lodge's novels will be discussed, for they, too, contribute to the complexity of his fiction. Bergonzi observes that, although both *Ginger, You're Barmy* and *Therapy* are told in the first person, there is a significant difference between them: whereas the former is "supposed to be a written narrative," the latter is "a spoken utterance, colloquial, slangy, sometimes obscene," an "oral monologue called *skazz* by the Russian Formalist critics."[38] Ingrid Pfandl-Buchegger regards the first person narrative in *Ginger, You're Barmy* as unusual for David

---

[33] *Loc. cit.*

[34] Michel Foucault, "A Preface to Transgression", in Michel Foucault, *Michel Foucault. Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977, p. 49.

[35] Bárbara Arizti, *op.cit.*, p. 28.

[36] Bernard Bergonzi, *David Lodge*, p. 17.

[37] Cf. James Acheson, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

[38] Bernard Bergonzi, *David Lodge*, pp. 58-59.

Lodge as it is a "strict perspective."[39] Nevertheless, the story is interspersed with flashbacks, which throw a different light on it: "Als Relativierung dieser monoperspektivischen Darstellung führt der Autor eine Spaltung des Ich-Erzählers in ein zeitlich und altersmäßig differenziertes erlebendes und erzählendes Ich durch [...]"[40] The impression of having a single perspective is compensated by the time discrepancy between the character who tells the story and the character who experiences the events.

How far Can You go? is narrated by a character, who, in Bergonzi's opinion, is "a version of David Lodge himself."[41] Thus it is the "author-as-character"[42] who tells the story and who, to Acheson's mind, is "an old-fashioned intrusive author, entering the narrative from time to time to comment on its characters, tone and events."[43] On the whole, the novels which do not have an omniscient narrator are considered to be more interesting as they play with experimental features.

1.1.5. Literary genres

One of the most discussed aspects of Lodge's fiction is that of literary genre. *The Picturegoers*, *The British Museum Is Falling Down* and *How Far Can You Go?* have Catholicism as a central theme, but their belonging to what is called a Catholic novel is controversial. *Changing Places, Small World* and *Nice Work*, gathered in a trilogy, are mainly concerned with the academic life and therefore considered to be campus novels. *Small World* is simultaneously a romance being even subtitled *An Academic Romance*; apart from this, it consists of a number of conscious references to this genre and it makes use of the quest-motif.

1.1.5.1. Catholic novels

Critics agree that the most recurrent experiences and milieus of Lodge's fiction are the university and the English Catholicism,[44] but, according to Bruce K. Martin, the

---

[39] Cf. Ingrid Pfandl-Buchegger, *op. cit.*, p. 468.
[40] Loc. cit.
[41] Bernard Bergonzi, *David Lodge*, p. 36.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[43] James Acheson, *op. cit.*, p. 85.
[44] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 78 and Bárbara Arizti, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

novelist "has kept the two categories mostly separate in his writing."[45] Being raised in a Catholic family and receiving his early education at a Catholic grammar school is regarded as one of the reasons for Lodge's concern with religion by the critics who view his fiction from a biographical perspective.[46] Ingrid Pfandl-Buchegger argues that Lodge's first novel, *The Picturegoers*, deals largely with Catholicism:

> Das prägende Thema ist die Auseinandersetzung mit dem Katholizismus- so ist es nicht überraschend, daß sich sowohl thematisch wie auch in der Strenge der perspektivischen Darstellung Anklänge an Greene und vor allem bereits auch an Joyce erkennen lassen. Wie Lodge selbst bestätigt, war es für einen katholischen Autor in den 50er Jahren kaum möglich, sich dem Einfluß von Joyce und Greene zu entziehen.[47]

Lodge's interest in Catholicism is a result of the influence of Catholic writers such as Greene and Joyce, whom he parodies on the one hand out of admiration and on the other hand out of an "anxiety of influence."[48] Bruce K. Martin is another critic who mentions Lodge's inclination to these Catholic novelists: "His early sense of being an 'outsider' in the Church may explain his affinity not only for James Joyce but for writers who had converted to Catholicism (Greene, Waugh, Spark, and others)."[49] Almost all of Lodge's novels have Catholic characters, but in two of them, *The British Museum Is Falling Down* and *How Far Can You Go?*, this becomes the main theme:

> There are Catholic characters in all of Lodge's novels apart from *Nice Work*. Catholic families, couples, adolescents, university students, lecturers, unmarried mothers, conscripts, theologians, ex-nuns, priests and would-be priests populate his fictional universe. *The British Museum Is Falling Down* (1965) and *How Far Can You Go?* (1980) constitute his most extensive explorations into the topic. Both novels can be said to be about Catholic moral questions concerning sex and birth control.[50]

Except for *Nice Work* there are Catholic characters in all his fictional books, but the two novels mentioned above make religious morality their central topic.

---

[45] Bruce K. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

[46] Cf. Ingrid Pfandl-Buchegger, *op. cit.*, p. 13 ; Bernard Bergonzi, *David Lodge*, p. 1, and Bárbara Arizti, *op. cit.*, p.15.

[47] Ingrid Pfandl-Buchegger, *op. cit.*, p. 467.

[48] David Lodge himself acknowledges the double nature of his parodies making references to Harold Bloom's "Anxiety of Influence"; cf. David Lodge, "An Afterword", in: David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, London: Penguin Books, 1983 (1965), p. 165.

[49] Bruce K. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

[50] Bárbara Arizti, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

So far it has been stated that Lodge's novels deal with the theme of Catholicism and have Catholic characters. Nonetheless, the main issue here is whether Lodge has written what one calls Catholic novels. The novelist states that he is "not a *Catholic* writer at all," but rather a "wholly secularized author that employs Catholic material in his novels."[51] This problem is further discussed by Bergonzi; outlining a history of the Catholic novel, Bergonzi says that "David Lodge is a Catholic writer who started his literary career at about the time the Catholic novel was declining."[52] That is why "Lodge transforms the Catholic novel, as it existed when he was growing up, into something quite other: the Catholic anti-novel perhaps."[53]

However, David Lodge preserves elements of the traditional Catholic novel; for example, in *The Picturegoers* Mark Underwood's regaining faith together with the presentation of grace can be seen as a "Greeneish simile."[54] There are also traces of the French Catholic novel in the first novel of Lodge, namely the lesson that "marriage may be a high Christian state, but celibate priesthood is a higher one."[55] Another reason for regarding Lodge as a religious writer is his use of happy endings, which are "against the grain of the age" because "traditionally, religious literature implied a work with a happy ending, a *commedia*."[56] Bergonzi claims that Lodge's fiction presents "the collapse of the Catholic world-picture" since

> [r]eligion seldom appears as a mode of transcendence or transformation. There are no great passions in it, either: people are more concerned with sex– getting enough of it, of a respectable quality– than with love. This is in marked contrast to the old Catholic novel where [...] carnal passion and divine Passion could become dangerously confused.[57]

In conclusion, pending between old and new ways of writing, David Lodge's Catholic novel is equally problematic. In other words, the traits which are typical of Catholic novels are contra-balanced by totally opposed themes in his works.

---

[51] *Loc. cit.*
[52] Bernard Bergonzi, *The Myth of Modernism*, p. 179.
[53] *Loc. cit.*
[54] *Ibid.*, p. 180.
[55] *Ibid.*, p. 181.
[56] *Ibid.*, p. 47.
[57] *Ibid.*, pp. 186-187.

1.1.5.2. Tales of the academy

If the labelling of David Lodge as a Catholic writer remains open to question, there is no doubt in asserting that he has written several novels which entirely fit in the tradition of the campus novel. These "tales of the academy," as Bergonzi calls them, follow the trend of this sub-genre, which emerged in America in the 1940s.[58] Lodge is considered to be "a chronicler of academic life," a "master of the genre and even the best British university novelist at the present time".[59]

According to Rudolph Böhm, who focuses exclusively on this aspect of Lodge's fiction, the three novels mentioned above do contain features of this genre, namely the place of the action is a redbrick or new university, they deal with topics related to the university life[60] and the characters are professors: "im Gegensatz zur älteren Tradition sind die Protagonisten des Nachkriegsromans fast ausnahmslos Angehörige des Lehrkörpers".[61] Due to the depiction of two universities, an English and an American one, *Changing Places* is regarded as a double university novel.[62] Wolfgang Weiß sees in this sub-genre the ideal possibility of writing satires as well as of introducing pornographic elements:

> Die Darstellung akademischer Lehrer, die an diesen Experimenten teilnehmen in der Hoffnung, ihre Verklemmungen aus Zeiten einer restriktiven Sexualmoral loszuwerden, bot den akademischen Romanciers reichlich Gelegenheit, sich in Satire zu üben und gleichzeitig die Pornographie, die so lange aus der Universitätsliteratur verbannt war, wieder in diesem Genre heimisch zu machen.[63]

Lodge's campus novels, especially *Changing Places*, are very entertaining as they contain numerous comic effects.[64] In a most interesting manner, the motif of an exchange programme serves the comic presentation of a cultural shock.[65] Ahrens stresses the satirical aspect of this book, arguing that "the motif of the visiting professor in a reciprocally duplicated form […] has the effect of further intensifying

---

[58] Bernard Bergonzi, *David Lodge*, p. 13.
[59] Bárbara Arizti, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
[60] Cf. Rudolph Böhm, "Der englische Universitätsroman" in: Maria Diedrich und Christoph Schöneich, ed., *Studien zur englischen und amerikanischen Prosa nach dem ersten Weltkrieg*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986, p. 83.
[61] *Loc. cit.*
[62] *Ibid.*, p. 80.
[63] Wolfgang Weiß, *op. cit.*, p. 130.
[64] Cf. James Acheson, *op. cit.*, p. 86 and Rudolph Böhm, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

the novel's satirical potential."[66] To Barbara Arizti's mind, *Changing Places* "appears as a sexual comedy which celebrates the potentialities of sexual pleasure in itself" differing from the classical comic because it "avoids the final celebration of marriage."[67]

If the two universities presented in *Changing Places* transform it into a double university novel, *Small World* enlarges the space of the action since it deals with a globalisation of the campus by making it international. This global campus "knows neither national nor linguistic boundaries".[68] As J. Acheson notes,

> Lodge is interested in the global campus not only because it is familiar to him [...], but because the university world is in his view 'a kind of microcosm of society at large, in which the principles and conflicts that govern collective human life are displayed and may be studied in clear light and on a manageable scale'.[69]

So Lodge's interest in studying society is manifested in his global campus, which permits him to examine it more easily. Indeed the setting of foreign countries "has a mirroring effect for the domestic situation" as "this strategy enables the authors to reflect on the situation at home."[70] *Small World* is a very complex novel, being at the same time a university novel concerned with the internalisation of the campus on the one hand, and a romance on the other hand.

1.1.5.3. Romance

The quest-motif in the novel *Small World* has been analysed by various critics; the subtitle *An Academic Romance* is justified by the fact that teachers of English Literature replace the medieval knights as Wolfgang Weiß points out.[71] Consequently, "the motif of the Quest for the Grail is the thematic focus of *Small*

---

[65] Cf. Wolfgang Weiß, *op. cit.*, p. 149.
[66] Rüdiger Ahrens, "Satirical Norm and Narrative Technique in the Modern University Novel: David Lodge's *Changing Places* and *Small World*", in: Joachim Schwend, Susanne Hagemann, Hermann Völkel, ed., *Literatur im Kontext – Literature in Context*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992, p. 281.
[67] Bárbara Arizti, *op. cit.*, pp. 166-167.
[68] Bruce K. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
[69] James Acheson, *op. cit.*, p.78.
[70] Heinz Antor, *Der englische Universitätsroman. Bildungskonzepte und Erziehungsziele*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1996, p. 691.

World;[72] however, the Holy Grail acquires different shapes in the modern world: "idealistic love, sex, intensity of experience, creative writing, the UNESCO Chair of literary criticism, or, quite generally, the meaning for life."[73]

A mythological approach of the quest-motif has already been applied to *Small World*. Drawing on the traditional genre of romance, the novel has as main character the young Irish poet Persse McGarrigle. His telling name has its origins both in the Percival/ Parzival of the Arthurian legend and in the Perseus of Greek mythology.[74] McGarrigle seems to mean "Son-of-super-valour"[75] while the character of Angelica derives from the princess in Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*, a sixteenth-century romance.[76] Moreover, Fulvia Morgana, the Italian Marxist professor, is a "latter-day version of Morgan le Fay of the Arthurian cycles, mentioned in Ariosto as Morgana;" Arthur Kingfisher, the distinguished professor of literary theory, is "impotent, and easily identified with the Fisher King, familiar to readers of Eliot's *Wasteland*."[77] Nevertheless, the Perceval of this romance is searching for the beautiful Angelica, who, in her turn, is looking for a theory of romance. Besides, Persse McGarrigle asks the "Parzival-Question"[78] unlike the hero of Chrétien de Troyes's romance. Although the book draws on the Arthurian legend, Persse's view on sex is different from those of the traditional romance: "Being an Irish Catholic he is, in principle, against sex outside marriage […]."[79]

According to Barbara Arizti, "the medieval chivalric romance is the most noticeable intertext in the novel."[80] Furthermore, *Small World* is also "a postmodernist romance" because "both characters and narrator self-consciously comment on the genre".[81] The metafictional aspect has been observed by Amman, too.[82]

---

[71] Cf. Wolfgang Weiß, *op. cit.*, p. 158.
[72] Rüdiger Ahrens, "Satirical Norm and Narrative Technique in the Modern University Novel: David Lodge's *Changing Places* and *Small World*", p.289.
[73] Daniel Amman, *op. cit.*, p.108.
[74] Cf. James Acheson, *op. cit.*, p. 89 and Bruce K. Martin, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-51.
[75] Bernard Bergonzi, *David Lodge*, p. 20.
[76] *Loc. cit.*
[77] *Ibid.*, p. 21.
[78] Wolfgang Weiß, *op. cit.*, p. 159.
[79] Bárbara Arizti, *op. cit.*, p. 199.
[80] Bárbara Arizti, *op. cit.*, p.197.
[81] *Ibid.*, p. 198.
[82] Amman writes that *Small World* is "a self-conscious (though less experimental) version of the 'mythical method' Eliot saluted in *Ulysses*." Cf. Daniel Amman, *op. cit.*, p.107.

The novel has a double ending: on the one hand the Perceval question puts an end to the 'waste land' marked by impotence and sterility, on the other hand Persse's quest for love remains unfulfilled. The first ending reminds one of the Shakespearean romance by presenting "scenes of family reunion and reconciliation" and, therefore also a celebration of marriage.[83] The second ending "follows the conventions of medieval romance and sends Persse in search of Cheryl, whom he now believes to be the real object of his love."[84]

Nonetheless, behind the quest-motif there is much more than the search for love or for the UNESCO Chair. The most profound quest of the novel is that for the adequate "critical instruments" as well as for "a human solidarity;" it is the ultimate "search for truth." Lodge presents these quests by "using the post-structuralist type of discourse," since it has the ability "to dissolve itself, which follows from the linkage of language with power and from its self-reflexivity […]."[85]

---

[83] Bárbara Arizti, pp. 201-202.

[84] *Ibid.*, Bárbara Arizti, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

[85] Cf. Rüdiger Ahrens, "Shifts of Aesthetic Discourse: National, Post-colonial and Post-structuralist Discourses" in: Rüdiger Ahrens and Laurenz Volkmann, ed., *Why Literature Matters. Theories and Functions of Literature*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1996, pp.61-63.

1.2. Methodology: Foucauldian discourse analysis

Starting from Michel Foucault's concept of discourse, which is intricately linked with those of truth, power and knowledge, this analysis will distinguish four main types of discourse, namely religious, gender, ethnic and literary. The aim is to show that, although David Lodge declares himself totally against poststructuralism pleading for humanist values, his novels can be viewed from a Foucauldian perspective, a task that has not been done so far by critics interested in Lodge's fiction. After a presentation of what the French thinker terms as discourse, it will be shown that the traditional quest-motif can be seen as conquest by equating knowledge, truth and, more importantly, power. The four main chapters of the dissertation correspond to four central themes of Lodge's novels; the novelty of this approach lies in the fact that it will reveal that the British writer's fictional works illustrate Foucault's theory, according to which discourses, circulated by institutions, form individuals and are caught in a relation of interdependence with truth, knowledge and power.

As this is part of the larger domain of discourse analysis, a preliminary presentation of this general field and of what it deals with is necessary. According to Barabara Johnstone, discourse analysis has two main branches working with two kinds of research topics: on the one hand, questions "traditionally asked in linguistics: about linguistic structure, about language change, about meaning, about language acquisition;" on the other hand, issues that are "more interdisciplinary: about social roles, communication and identity."[1] Thus, discourse analysts "help answer questions about social relations, such as dominance and oppression or solidarity," their work being "useful in the study of personal identity and social identification."[2]

---

[1] Barabara Johnstone, *Discourse Analysis*, Massachusetts, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002, p. 4.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

1.2.1. The concept of discourse

The influential French philosopher Michel Foucault[3] states that his interest in discourse is "not so much in the linguistic structure which makes such a series of utterances possible, but rather the fact that we live in a world in which things have been said" and which is "completely marked by, all laced with, discourse."[4] He is then more interested in the social aspect of discourse; to his mind, discourses are actually "discursive events" which, unlike language, described as a limited ensemble of rules that enables an infinite number of performances, are defined as being the finite set of linguistic sequences that have already been formulated.[5]

The term "discourse" is defined by Foucault as "a group of statements that belong to the same system of formation;"[6] a system of formation is not only the juxtaposition, the coexistence and the interaction of heterogeneous elements (institutions, techniques, social groups, perceptive organizations, relations between various discourses), but also their interrelation as determined by discursive practices,[7] which are not "purely and simply ways of producing discourse," but "embodied in technical processes, in institutions, in patterns for general behaviour, in forms for transmission and diffusion, and in pedagogical forms which, at once, impose and maintain them."[8] The study of these discursive practices is what Foucault labels 'archaeology;' the new discipline is required because established sciences like logic or linguistics cannot explain discursive practices, which are more than simple cognitive domains as they also define the knowing subject as well as their own rules. Among these rules, the principle of selection and exclusion plays a special role. Although this

---

[3] Foucault's great impact on the modern cultural life is evident also in the fact that his discourse analysis is one of the main theories on which Cultural Materialism, New Historicism and Cultural Studies are based. (Cf. Moritz Baßler, "New Historicism, Cultural Materialism und Cultural Studies", in: Nünning, Ansgar/ Nünning, Vera, ed., *Konzepte der Kulturwissenschaften*, Stuttgart: Verlaf J. B. Metzler, 2003, pp. 135-155.).

[4] Michel Foucault, *Death and the Labyrinth: The World of Raymond Russel*, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1986, p. 177.

[5] Michel Foucault, *L'archéologie du savoir*, Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1969, pp. 38-39.

[6] Quoted in Jeremy Hawthorn, *Cunning Passages. New Historicism, Cultural Materialism and Marxism in the Contemporary Literary Debate*, London: Arnold, 1996, p. 30.

[7] Cf. Michel Foucault, *L'archéologie du savoir*, pp. 95-96.

definition makes one think of discursive practices as sciences, Foucault points out that they usually regroup several disciplines.[9] Far from being fixed, discursive practices can change throughout history:

> These transformations cannot be reduced to precise and individual discoveries; and yet we cannot characterize them as a general change of mentality, collective attitudes, or a state of mind. The transformation of a discursive practice is linked to a whole range of usually complex modifications that can occur outside of its domain (in the forms of production, in social relationships, in political institutions), inside it (in its techniques for determining its object, in the adjustment and refinement of its concepts, in its accumulation of facts), or to the side of it (in other discursive practices).[10]

These epistemological shifts happen gradually standing in connection with transformations at a socio-political level, with inner changes or with modifications in coexisting discursive practices. It must be noted that institutions are extremely important in the discussion of discourses; moreover, Richard Terdiman thinks that it is in institutions that discursive formations become operative.[11] However, Foucault stresses the relative autonomy of these discursive practices, explaining that there is a close relation between discursive practices and knowledge, in that the former determine the will to knowledge, which is by no means universal and fixed, but, on the contrary, is subject to modifications taking various forms.[12] Knowledge is seen as "a political anatomy, a political economy, a discursive formation, a discursive disposition, and a political technology."[13]

In his *History of Sexuality* Foucault states that there is an incitement to discourse, that sex is put into discourse in our society, which was undoubtedly the first one in history to invest a whole apparatus to discover, to analyse and to know.[14] The discourse

---

[8] Michel Foucault, "History of Systems of Thought", in: Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, transl. from the French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977, p. 201.

[9] Cf. *ibid*., pp. 199-200.

[10] *Ibid*., p.200.

[11] Richard Terdiman, *Discourse/ Counter-Discourse. The Theory and Practice of Symbolic Resistance in Nineteenth Century France*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985, p. 58.

[12] Cf. Michel Foucault, "History of Systems of Thought", pp. 200-201.

[13] Charles Lemert and Garth Gillan, *Michel Foucault. Social Theory as Transgression*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1982, p. 60.

[14] Cf. Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité 1. La volonté de savoir*, Paris: Gallimard, 1979, p. 45.

on sex is also linked with power because one of its effects is to modify desire; power operates on the body through it.[15] Discourse is "not simply that which expresses struggles of domination, but that for which, and by which, one struggles; it is the power which one is striving to seize."[16]

1.2.2. Power and knowledge

Foucault starts from the premise that we should renounce the traditional belief that knowledge and power can exist without implying each other or that power always leads to madness. It is important to admit that power produces knowledge and that they necessarily presuppose each other. Furthermore, to Foucault's mind, it is wrong to analyse the relations between knowledge and power starting from a subject of knowledge:

> Ces rapports de «pouvoir-savoir» ne sont donc pas à analyser à partir d'un sujet de connaissance qui serait libre ou non par rapport au système du pouvoir ; mais il faut considérer au contraire que le sujet qui connaît, les objets à connaître et les modalités de connaissance sont autant d'effets de ces implications fondamentales du pouvoir-savoir de leurs transformations historiques. En bref, ce n'est pas l'activité du sujet de connaissance qui produirait un savoir, utile ou rétif au pouvoir, mais le pouvoir-savoir, les processus et les luttes qui le traversent et dont il est constitué, qui déterminent les formes et les domaines possibles de la connaissance.[17]

It is not the subject which produces knowledge, but the relation between the two concepts mentioned above constitutes the possible forms and fields of knowledge. Foucault's theory treats discourse as interrelated to knowledge, power and truth. In this context he speaks about the will to knowledge: he is unsatisfied with the studies on the will to knowledge which have been done so far as he finds the tools of examination undeveloped as well as inappropriate for history. Foucault disqualifies psychoanalysis and, as it has already been mentioned, he pleads for an archaeology of knowledge.[18]

---

[15] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 33, p. 45.
[16] Quoted in Richard Terdiman, *op. cit.,* p.55.
[17] Michel Foucault, *Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison*, Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1975, p. 32.
[18] Cf. Michel Foucault, "History of Systems of Thought", p. 201.

Looking at history, he observes that, just like discourses, knowledge is constructed through the principles of choice and exclusion.[19] The two principles establish what is worth knowing and what should be ignored, norms being thus set. Knowledge is discursively constructed and circulated in society through different media among which Foucault enumerates newspapers, television and schools,[20] emphasising once again the importance of institutions in the circulation of knowledge. Foucault considers knowledge to be an "invention" originating in the struggle of "instincts, impulses, desires, fear, and the will to appropriate." Knowledge is equally seen as being "always in bondage, dependent, and interested (not in itself, but to those things capable of involving an instinct or the instincts that dominate it)." Donald F. Bouchard, explains that the term "interested" stands for the French "intéressé," which has the meaning of "selfish" as well. Selfish interest is important in this discussion because it links the concepts of knowledge with power.[21]

As for the European and, more specifically, French history Foucault remarks a shift from a '*disciplinary society*' to a '*society of control*'. He describes the former as a society regulated by certain disciplinary apparatuses such as the prison, the hospital, the factory or the school, whose main function was to prescribe norms of thought and behaviour. Foucault identifies classical France as an example for the disciplinary society; Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri state that it could also describe the beginnings of capitalism in general.[22] On the contrary, the society of control is characteristics for our (post)modern age

> in which mechanisms of command become ever more "democratic," ever more immanent to the social field, distributed throughout the brains and bodies of the citizens. The behaviors of social integration and exclusion proper to rule are thus increasingly interiorized within the subjects themselves. Power is now exercised through machines that directly organize the brains (in communication systems,

---

[19] Foucault states that: "Knowledge initially implies a certain political conformity in its presentation. In a history course, you are asked to learn certain things and to ignore others: thus, certain things form the content of knowledge and its norms." (Michel Foucault, 'Revolutionary Action: "Until Now"', in: Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, p. 219.)

[20] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 225.

[21] Cf. Michel Foucault, "History of Systems of Thought", pp. 202-203.

[22] Cf. Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, *Empire*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000, pp. 22-23.

information networks, etc.) toward a state of autonomous alienation from the sense of life and the desire of creativity. [23]

Thus one could say that the society of control is marked by an internalisation of power which becomes biopolitical"[24] Furthermore, power is seen by Foucault as a network linked with the body, circulating through the whole society: "Power is thus expressed as a control that extends throughout the depths of the consciousness and bodies of the population– and at the same time across the entirety of social relations."[25] It enters the very consciousness of individuals, affecting their bodies as well as their social interrelations. Therefore, in Foucault's opinion power has a "capillary form:" it acts not only on the bodies of individuals, but also on their inner selves; it dictates their performances and shapes their opinions.[26] In other words power forms individuals together with their everyday life behaviour. Power is considered to be capillary because on the one hand, it operates on many levels of the individual's life, on the other hand, it is not centred in one point, but spread in the whole society. As power is infiltrated in the very self of the individual, discipline becomes a part of subjectivity.[27] Power goes so deep inside one's consciousness that it forms the latter, acting so subtly that it is impossible to separate it from the individual's will.[28] McNay observes that "[t]hroughout his work, the development and reformulation of a concept of power remains a constant preoccupation of Foucault's."[29] However, it is important to note that Foucault's position to power is different from a Marxist standpoint in that he is interested neither in its centralised forms nor in class inequalities, focusing on the subtle way power traverses

---

[23] *Ibid*., p. 23.
[24] Biopower is defined as "a form of power that regulates social life from its interior, following it, interpreting it, absorbing it, and rearticulating it." Power efficiently commands over all the fields of life of a society only if "it becomes an integral, vital function that every individual embraces and reactivates of his or her own accord." It seems that "only the society of control is able to adopt the biopolitical context as its *exclusive* terrain of reference." (*Ibid*., pp. 23-24.)
[25] *Ibid*., p. 24.
[26] Foucault says: "In thinking of the mechanisms of power, I am thinking rather of its capillary form of existence, the point where power reaches the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives." (Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977. Michel Foucault*, ed. by Colin Gordon, New York: Pantheon Books, 1980, p. 39.)
[27] Cf. Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, *op. cit.*, p. 329.
[28] Thus, "discipline is not an external voice that dictates our practices from on high, overarching us, as Hobbes would say, but rather something like an inner compulsion indistinguishable from our will, immanent to and inseparable from our subjectivity itself." (*Loc. cit.*)
[29] Lois McNay, *Foucault. A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994, p.2.

the social practices;[30] above all, he attacks the Enlightenment, which, to his mind, means the limitation and not the freedom of the individual.

According to McNay, Foucault's book *Madness and Civilization* also deals with power, but it is an understanding of power as essentially negative, for it is manifested as repression and exclusion. Foucault's position changes along his works and, to be more exact, "[i]t is in Foucault's work from the mid-1970s onwards, however, that the issue of power is addressed in the most sustained fashion, resulting in the well-known reformulation of power as an essentially *positive* phenomenon."[31] Power is not regarded as being centralised in the hands of a specific social class, but is to be seen everywhere. It is important to analyse all its manifestations in the everyday life in order to really understand it; for this reason, we speak here of a so-called "microphysics of power." Foucault considers power to be mysterious as it is difficult to define: one can, at the same time, see and not see it, which makes it hard to specify the exact field where it is manifested. That is precisely why the French philosopher writes that Marx's and Freud's theories are not satisfactory in understanding power.[32] Foucault goes on by saying that "[t]he question of power remains a total enigma. Who exercises power? And in what sphere? We now know with reasonable certainty who exploits others, who receives the profits, which people are involved, and we know how these funds are reinvested. But as for power... We know that it is not in the hands of those who govern."[33] Although power cannot exist without being exercised, it is, nevertheless, difficult to realise who actually has it; on the other hand, one can easily see who does not have it.[34] It is certain that "the desire for power establishes a singular relationship between power and interest" and that "[t]his play of desire, power, and interest has received very little attention."[35] In spite of

---

[30] Cf. Madan Sarup, *An Introductory Guide to Post-structuralism and Postmodernism*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1988, p. 82; see also Barbara Riebling, "Remodeling Truth, Power, and Society: Implications of Chaos Theory, Nonequilibrium Dynamics, and Systems Science for the Study of Politics and Literature", in: Nancy Easterlin and Barbara Riebling, ed., *After Poststructuralism. Interdisciplinary and Literary Theory*, Evanston, Ilinois: Northwestern University Press, 1993, p. 179.

[31] Cf. Lois McNay, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

[32] Cf. Michel Foucault, "Intellectuals and Power", in: Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, transl. from the French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977, pp. 212-213.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 213.

[34] Cf. *loc. cit.*

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 215.

the problematical aspects of this phenomenon, Foucault came to think that, because of its relation to knowledge, power is positive, producing things and discourses.[36]

The relation of power to knowledge is a reciprocal one because "[t]he exercise of power perpetually creates knowledge and, conversely, knowledge constantly induces effects of power".[37] Furthermore, they are inseparable since one cannot talk of power without making references to knowledge and vice versa:

> Knowledge and power are integrated with one another, and there is no point in dreaming of a time when knowledge will cease to depend on power [...]. It is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge, it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power.[38]

All in all, discourse, power and knowledge are caught in a circular relation, which sustains the interpretation of quest as conquest. Another concept that needs to be dealt with in this area is that of truth.

1.2.3. Truth

Truth is another indispensable concept in Michel Foucault's theory of discourse as it is strongly related to knowledge and power. Speaking about Nietzsche[39] and genealogy, Foucault draws the conclusion that there is no such thing as a transcendental truth; history teaches that there is no essence outside time, but, instead, truth is a mere polymorphous appearance changing throughout the centuries. Truth is constructed within the Age of Reason the will to truth being the result of the strenuous competition between scholars and scientists.[40] Discussing Foucault, Robert Young states that "truth, like historicity is derived from particular discursive practices; it operates internally as a

---

[36] Cf. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, p. 119.

[37] *Ibid.,* p. 52.

[38] *Loc. cit.*

[39] Foucault's special interest in analysing power can be seen as a result of the great influence Nietzsche has on him; according to the latter, "[o]nly where life is, there is also will: not will to life, but [...] will to power!" (Quoted from Reginals John Hollingdale, *A Nietzsche Reader*, London: Penguin Books, 1977, p. 226.).

[40] Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History", i n: Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, transl. from the French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977, pp. 142-143.

form of regulation, as well as being the historical product of the battle between different discursive regimes."[41] Truth is created through discourse while discourse is "animated by the will to truth."[42] Foucault says that "effects of truth are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false."[43] From his perspective, there is no absolute truth as discourses construct it: in each culture there is a specific system of distinguishing between the true and the false, resulting in the relativity of truth.[44] This view is definitely post-structuralist; the search for the origins of truth is fruitless because truth is anchored in history.[45] Thus, Foucault discards the metaphysical point of view according to which an incontestable objective truth would exist in a world of its own.[46] On account of this, his genealogical method is not a search for an atemporal essence, but attempts to analyse mentalities in a socio-historical context. Foucault explains that "[a] genealogy of values, morality, asceticism, and knowledge will never confuse itself with a quest for their "origins," will never neglect as inaccessible the vicissitudes of history," as "it will cultivate the details and accidents that accompany every beginning; it will be scrupulously attentive to their pretty malice; it will await their emergence, once unmasked, as the face of the other."[47] Foucault regards the will to knowledge as something unfulfilled since it does not lead to a metaphysical truth, but to the destruction of the self.[48] This pursuit does not constitute either the liberation of the subject or a rational act, but, on the contrary, it enslaves the self.[49]

---

[41] Robert Young, *White Mythologies. Writing History and the West*, London and New York: Routledge, 1990, p. 70.

[42] Charles Lemert and Garth Gillan, *op. cit.,* p. 63.

[43] Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, p.118.

[44] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 131.

[45] Cf. Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History", pp. 143-144.

[46] According to Foucault, "[t]ruth is undoubtedly the sort of error that cannot be refuted because it was hardened into an unalterable form in the long baking process of history. Moreover, the very question of truth, the right it appropriates to refute error and oppose itself to appearance, the manner in which it developed (initially made available to the wise, and withdrawn by men of piety to an unattainable world where it was given the double role of consolation and imperative, finally rejected as a useless notion, superfluous, and contradicted on all sides)– does this not form a history, the history of an error we call truth? Truth, and its original reign, has had a history within history from which we are barely emerging "in the time of the shortest shadow," when light no longer seems to flow from the depth of the sky or to arise from the first moments of the day." (*Ibid.*, p. 144.)

[47] *Loc. cit.*

[48] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 163.

[49] Foucault observes the following: "Knowledge does not slowly detach itself from its empirical roots, the initial needs from which it arose, to become pure speculation subject only to the demands of reason; its development is not tied to the constitution and affirmation of a free subject; rather, it creates a progressive enslavement to its instinctive violence. Where religions once demanded the sacrifice of bodies, knowledge

The French philosopher believes that the interrelation between truth and knowledge is evident in the study of history; as it has already been mentioned, his point of view is an attack on Enlightenment, particularly on Enlightenment's belief in Man as a rational subject, for it is on the basis of passions that knowledge and truth arise. The tight connection between knowledge and truth consists in the fact that the former "produces truth through the play of a primary and always reconstituted falsification, which erects the distinction between truth and falsehood."[50] The Foucauldian idea that selfish interest subjects knowledge has already been commented on, but its relation to truth has not been mentioned yet. The following quotation is useful in this respect:

> Thus, selfish interest is radically posed as coming before knowledge, which it subordinates to its needs as a simple instrument; a knowledge, which is dissociated from pleasure and happiness, is linked to the struggle, the hate, and the spitefulness directed against it until it arrives at its own rejection as an excess created by struggle, hate, and spitefulness: its original connection to truth is undone once truth becomes merely an effect– the effect of a falsification that we call the opposition of truth and falsehood. This model of a fundamentally selfish knowledge, produced by volition as an event and determining truth as an effect of falsification, is undoubtedly alien to the assumption of classical metaphysics.[51]

Thus, in this paradigm interested knowledge creates the difference between the true and the false; according to the French philosopher the idea that truth, knowledge and interest are interrelated contradicts older systems of thought which assumed the existence of a transcendental truth. Truth is never outside power: on the one hand, it "induces regular effects of power;"[52] on the other hand, there is a "battle 'for truth,' or at least 'around truth,'" truth meaning not "the ensemble of truth which are to be discovered and accepted," but rather "the ensemble of rules according to which the true and the false are separated and specific effects of power attached to the true."[53] The terms "struggle" and "battle" are extremely important because they can be applied to the discussion of the

---

now calls for experimentation on ourselves, calls us to the sacrifice of the subject of knowledge. 'The desire for knowledge has been transformed among us into a passion which fears no sacrifice, which fears nothing but its own extinction. It may be that mankind will eventually perish from this passion for knowledge. If not through passion, then through weakness. [...]' " (*Loc.cit.*)

[50] Michel Foucault, "History of Systems of Thought", p. 203.

[51] *Loc. cit.*

[52] Colin Gordon, *op. cit.,* p.118.

[53] *Ibid*., p132.

quest motif. Dieter Schulz describes the middle stage of a traditional quest, namely the proper journey in the same terms;[54] their relation to truth, knowledge and especially power enable the consideration of the quest as conquest.

---

[54] Dieter Schulz, *Suche und Abenteuer. Die <<Quest>> in der englischen und amerikanischen Erzählkunst der Romantik*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1981, pp. 8-9.

2. Religious Discourse

2.1. Quest and romance

This subchapter will focus on the tradition of the quest-motif as well as on that of romance, a literary genre deriving from the old Arthurian legends. It is far from easy to define romance, especially because it does not have only one sense:

> »Romance« wird im modernen Englisch auch im Sinne von »romantic fiction« verwendet. Von diesem unspezifischen Gebrauch des Wortes wird im folgenden abgesehen. Wer von der Gattung »romance« spricht, assoziiert dabei auch heute noch die Kriterien des Abenteuerlichen, Ritterlichen und Zauberhaften; insbesondere denkt man an die ritterlichen Erzählungen des Mittelalters, sowie die späteren Werke ähnlicher Art in Vers und Prosa, vor allem die des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts.[1]

According to Göller, "romance" has two important meanings, namely on the one hand, a work dealing with love and sentimentalism, on the other hand, a literary genre developed in the Middle Ages and containing specific elements, such as knights, adventure, magic. It is this second meaning which will be discussed and its tradition is to be followed back to the Middle Ages. The attempt to define romance proves to be a complex task:

> Der Begriff evoziert ein Bündel von Assoziationen, das die Klischeevorstellung einer fiktiven idealtypischen Gattung ergibt. Welche Merkmale bei dieser Gattungskonzeption im Vordergrund stehen, hängt vom Bildungsgrad des einzelnen Kritikers ab. Als Kriterien werden Riesen und Zwerge, das Wunderbare und das Romantische, die höfische Liebe und das Rittertum genannt. Wer sich von solchen Leitvorstellungen aus z.B. der mittelenglischen Erzählliteratur nähert, wird erstaunt sein, daß die »Romanzen« mit derartigen gängigen Klischees nur wenig zu tun haben. Die verwirrende Vielfalt von Stoffen und Formen führt meist zu Unsicherheit hinsichtlich des Anwendungsbereiches des Terminus *romance*.[2]

Various literary critics define romance in different ways; among the features of this genre are giants and dwarfs, magic and romanticism, courtly love and knighthood,

---

[1] Karl Heinz Göller, unter Mitarbeit von Manfred Markus und Rainer Schöwerling, Romance *und* Novel. *Die Anfänge des englischen Romans*, Regensburg: Verlag Hans Carl Regensburg, 1972, p. 9.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

which have become clichés. However, there are works containing none of these elements and yet they are considered to belong to romance since the respective genre displays an impressive spectrum of forms and elements.

2.1.1. The tradition of the literary genre of romance

Romance has its origins in the medieval cycle of the Arthurian legend, which appeared in the second half of the twelfth century:

> King Arthur is the central figure of one of the most famous cycles of legend. His name evokes a whole cluster of characters and themes. First is the King himself, magnificent monarch of a glorious realm. Beside him is Guinevere, his fair and high-spirited queen. Close by is Merlin, the enchanter who contrives his birth, guides him from the beginning, and sets him firmly on his throne. We may think, too, of Excalibur, his wonderful sword. Of Camelot, his royal city. Of the Knights of the Round Table, vowed to uphold the noblest ideals. Of Lancelot, the most splendid among them, torn by his love for the Queen. Also of another love affair, the doomed passion of Tristan and Iseut (Isolde). The story of the Grail Quest and the saintly Galahad enshrines a spiritual mystery. At the close is the treason of Mordred, followed by the tragedy of Arthur's downfall and his passing away to Avalon. Yet even that is not quite the end, because of the prophecy of his return, "King that was, King that shall be."[3]

Romance, in its traditional meaning, is a story whose centre is the court of King Arthur and of his beautiful Queen Guinevere. The King owes his crown to Excalibur, a magic sword, and to the wizard Merlin; the story is also about the Knights of the Round Table, who try to find the Grail. This multitude of characters and events have fascinated a lot of readers since the Middle Ages and that is why this theme has repeatedly been dealt with in literature. Different writers have made use of the legend in one way or another:

> The Arthurian legend is multifaceted, a literature in itself, built up by romancers and poets during the Middle Ages in Europe. But it did not expire afterward. Many authors have handled it since, developing its themes or, conversely, turning it into a fairy tale for children. Several modern writers have satirized it, or given it new meanings, or tried to reconstitute a reality

---

[3] Norris J. Lacy and Geoffrey Ashe with Debra N. Mancoff, *The Arthurian Handbook. Second Edition*, New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997, p. 1.

underlying it. Such questings are all valid, each in its way, and they have enlarged and enriched the legend. The essential creation, however, is medieval, and King Arthur's Britain is an idealized medieval kingdom, a sort of chivalric Utopia.[4]

The complexity of the legend is undeniable: since the Middle Ages it has appeared under different forms, be they fairy tales or satires. The medieval legend has inspired authors who have reworked its themes changing it into different forms "in all the main languages of Europe."[5] Among the numerous writers who have developed it by adding new characters as well as topics, Chrétien de Troyes, in the French literature, Wolfram von Eschenbach, in the German one, and Sir Thomas Malory, on the English scene, are relevant names because they improved the stories considerably and interwove them "in a unity not attained before."[6]

Chrétien de Troyes is considered to be the author of the first "courtly or chivalric romance organized around the notion of Arthur as a feudal monarch."[7] The French author seemed to be sure that the Grail stories would fascinate readers along centuries: "His story, he concludes, will be remembered as long as Christendom endures; that the line puns on his own name (Chrétien, *chrétienté*) does not diminish his evident confidence in his posterity."[8]

Although the first romances are placed in the twelfth century, the Arthurian legend is older having "its roots in earlier chronicles and legends."[9] As the first romances were written, the figure of Arthur and the composition of his court had already been clearly established. The legend was probably transmitted through oral tradition,[10] coming from the Celtic peoples:

> Yet Celtic tradition had developed a body of Arthurian material, especially in Welsh, well before the time of Chrétien. How long before is difficult to determine, since the problems of dating Celtic texts by linguistic or other means make chronology uncertain. Among the important manuscripts that preserve the Celtic Arthurian works, the Black Book of Carmarthen dates from around 1200; the White Book of Rhydderch, from the early fourteenth century; the Red Book of Hergest, from nearly a century later. Yet fragments of certain texts contained therein appear in earlier manuscripts, and some of

---

[4] *Loc. cit.*
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 2.
[6] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 1-2.
[7] *Ibid* , p. 62.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 68.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 59.
[10] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 57.

them may have taken form during the tenth or eleventh century, or even before.[11]

Apparently, the quest-motif is very old having its origin in the tenth or eleventh century and ever since it has fascinated humanity. Celtic culture is seen by some scholars as being the space in which the Arthurian legend took form:

> In addition to the texts mentioned above, the Celtic lands have preserved an important store of Arthurian folklore and legend. Traditionally, certain scholars have emphasized Celtic influences on continental versions of the Arthurian story, although the extent of those influences is a subject of strenuous controversy.[12]

According to other scholars, the Celtic influence is not one of extreme importance; a third category of literary historians even contradict it totally:

> There have been scholars who ascribed to French romances, and to virtually every sequence and symbol within them, a Celtic source. Few would go now that far, and there have been a number of vehement attacks on Celtic theories. Yet, even if we cannot accept without reservation the notion of Celtic origins and transmission, it is reasonable to acknowledge that Celtic lore and, in particular, Welsh literature preserve an important store of Arthurian material and provide striking analogues to continental Grail themes and other motifs.[13]

Nevertheless, no one can deny the fact that Celtic culture is rich in Arthurian stories and the evident similarities between these Celtic versions and their continental counterparts.

2.1.2. Characteristics of the romance

Romance has a multitude of elements, which makes various critics emphasise different features. Journey and adventure are elements considered to be always part of a quest. Erich Köhler considers adventure to be the basic characteristic of a romance:

---

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 67.
[13] *Loc.cit.*

> Köhler legt dar, daß die *aventure* Grund- und Wesenszug der höfischen Ritterdichtung sei und daß Aneinanderreihung von *aventuren* nicht etwa auf die Einfallslosigkeit der Dichter, sondern auf das Weltbild der Zeit zurückgeführt werden müsse. Die *aventure* sei äußeres Zeichen der Entfremdung von Mensch und Umwelt.[14]

In fact, adventure represents a sign of estrangement, specific to the romance genre; this opinion is shared by Dieter Schulz, who also states that the search and the journey are always present in romances,[15] creating the opposition between the domestic, familiar world and a foreign space, in terms of both people and landscape. Therefore, a quest is characterised by binary oppositions: friend/ enemy, good/ bad, everyday life/ foreign world, virtuous/ seducing (lady).[16]

The social aspect plays here an important role because the heroes of romance are always members of a community in which they struggle to get a higher position.[17] This is identified as the aim they usually strive to reach:

> Ritter, die auf *aventure* ausziehen, verbinden damit meist ein ganz bestimmtes Ziel: Sie wollen sich auszeichnen, Ruhm und Ansehen gewinnen, einer höfischen Dame ebenbürtig werden, in der »Gesellschaft« akzeptiert sein. Gefangene werden an den Artushof geschickt, wo über die Ruhmestaten der Einzelritter Buch geführt wird und man deshalb ziemlich genau weiß, an welcher Stelle der Einzelne steht.[18]

From a social point of view, romances are paradoxical as, on the one hand, as Göller shows, the individual achievement is taken into account and glorified in a book thus differentiating the knights, but on the other hand, the Round Table implies the noble idea of equality between the members of a group. Medieval romances also present the determinist idea that a hero can only be successful in an adventurous search if it has been meant for him: "Immer wieder wird betont, daß bestimmte *aventuren* für bestimmte Ritter gedacht oder reserviert sind, daß ein Ritter bei einer *aventure* nur dann Erfolg haben kann, wenn sie für ihn bestimmt ist.[19] Predestination is absolutely necessary for a hero to succeed in performing a certain task. This belief in Providence, specific to romances, is to be found in Lodge's novels as well. At the

---

[14] Karl Heinz Göller, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
[15] Cf. Dieter Schulz, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
[16] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 10.
[17] Cf. Karl Heinz Göller, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
[18] *Ibid.,* p. 19.
[19] *Loc. cit.*

same time it constitutes one of the reasons why the quest-motif is discussed within a larger religious discourse.

Schulz distinguishes three important phases in a quest: "Eine vollständige Quest besteht aus drei Hauptvarianten: dem Aufbruch, der Reise mit ihren Abenteuern, und der Rückkehr bzw., Erhöhung."[20] The first phase, the hero's departure, is determined by an element of disharmony in his social group. The next episode, the journey, is marked by battles against enemies and by good advice received from friends. This phase can equally be regarded as a ritual of initiation. The last part of the quest includes the exaltation of the hero and can be seen as regeneration.[21] *Small World*, by presenting its main hero, Persse McGarrigle only during the middle stage of the quest, falls into the category of the works in which only one phase appears.[22]

2.1.3. The Holy Grail

The Holy Grail is a constant element of a romance, but its origin remains unclear. Some critics agree that it has its roots in the Celtic culture whereas others strongly oppose this assumption. The Celtic influence on the Arthurian legend is controversial for several reasons, one of them regarding the Holy Grail:

> An example of that controversy involves one of the important theories concerning the origin and meaning of the Grail (and of related material, such as the Grail procession and the Fisher King). The most persistent proponent of Celtic theories, Roger Sherman Loomis, emphasized the relationship of Bran, his wound, and the wasting of his land, to the equivalent in French romance: the Fisher King, whose name the *Didot-Perceval* gives as Bron. Loomis argued that a drinking horn, or horn of plenty (*corn*), that belonged to Bran was mistranslated into French as "body" (that is, the Corpus Christi or sacramental wafer) through the confusion surrounding the nominative form *cors*, meaning both "horn" and "body". The Celtic theories, to these brief comments cannot do justice, have provoked passionate debate; while acknowledging the intrinsic value and interest of Celtic legends and texts, many scholars now deemphasize the theories of Celtic origins, and some discount those theories entirely.[23]

---

[20] Dieter Schulz, *op. cit.*, p.8.
[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 22.
[23] Norris J. Lacy and Geoffrey Ashe, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

Roger Sherman Loomis provides a theory in favour of the Celtic origin of the Grail arguing that the word *cors*, which has two meanings, namely 'horn' and 'body,' has been mistranslated into French and thus the Grail as the body of Christ came into being.

Traditionally, the object of the quest can be the following: "das Lebenselixir, der Besitz eines Reiches, die Befreiung eines Landes oder eines Mädchens aus den Händen des Bösewichts (Riesen, Drachen, etc.), oder das eigene Seelenheil."[24] Therefore, the Grail does not have a fixed form, appearing under different aspects. In romances the hero usually longs for material wealth, for the liberation of a country, for the hand of a beautiful girl, or simply for the salvation of his own soul. In spite of the possible Celtic influence the Holy Grail has acquired Christian values and this justifies the inclusion of the quest-motif within the religious discourse; it is Chrétien de Troyes who introduces the Grail into the Arthurian legend:

> The Grail is first mentioned by Chrétien de Troyes, in his final romance; for Chrétien, it is a "very holy thing," but it is not yet the Chalice of the Last Supper and the cup in which Christ's blood was collected at the Crucifixion; that identification would be made by Robert de Boron. Chrétien's Grail was a platter or vessel that held a single mass wafer.[25]

The Grail, together with the Fisher King, both first described by Chrétien, is related to a quest and has Christian connotations. However, the Christian symbolism will be further elaborated by the continuators of the unfinished *Perceval*, Chrétien remaining the one who provided rich material for this development.[26] The Grail as we know it today came into being at the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century:

> Around the end of the twelfth century or during the first years of the thirteenth [...], the poet Robert de Boron wrote *Le Roman du Graal*, known also as the *Joseph d'Arimathie*, in which he transformed the Grail into a sacred relic whose meaning is clear: it is the vessel used by Christ at the Last Supper and the one in which Joseph of Arimathea collected Christ's blood after the Crucifixion. The bleeding lance, moreover, became the spear with

---

[24] Dieter Schulz, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
[25] Norris J. Lacy and Geoffrey Ashe, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
[26] Cf. Derek Pearsall, *Arthurian Romance. A Short Introduction*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2003, p. 36.

which Christ's side was pierced. Robert thus linked the Arthurian story to that of Christ [...].[27]

The Holy Grail is then the chalice from which Jesus Christ ate his Last Supper and which was later filled with Christ's blood by Joseph of Arimathea. The latter meaning is added by Robert de Boron, who consequently gives it the holy connotations known until today. Likewise, the bleeding lance in the Grail procession is considered to be the spear which penetrated Christ's body. The Grail suffers further transformations:

> Robert's transformation of the Grail into the Chalice is the innovation that has proved more productive; few are the medieval and modern Grail narratives that reject that identification. However, in Wolfram von Eschenbach (*Parzival*), the Grail is a precious or semi-precious stone, and in the Welsh *Peredur*, the object corresponding to Chrétien's Grail, though it does not carry that name, is a platter holding a human head.[28]

In Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival* the Grail appears as a precious stone while in the Welsh *Peredur* it is a tray with a human head. Along the time, the Grail has acquired new values, but it has basically remained linked with Christian meanings, being seen as something precious, but difficult if not impossible to find. In David Lodge's *Small World* the Holy Grail is suggestively defined by the Japanese translator Akira Sakazaki as "that which can be seen but cannot be grasped."[29] It is unattainable and that is why quests never come to an end. In the above mentioned novel the search itself appears to be the *raison d'être* not only of the characters, but also of human beings in general, becoming more important than its fulfilment. The discussion of the quest-motif in *Small World* will help to show that the numerous forms under which the Grail appears can be reduced to knowledge, truth and power, concepts which are considered to be interdependent and intricately linked with the concept of discourse theorised by Michel Foucault. This justifies the association between quest and conquest, the former referring both to the literary genre romance and to the Holy Grail, and the latter dealing with the omnipresent search for power. The Grail enables its discussion within the religious discourse by being basically

---

[27] Norris J. Lacy and Geoffrey Ashe, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
[28] *Ibid,*, p. 73.
[29] David Lodge, *Small World*, London: Penguin Books, 1985, p. 295.

holy while its association with the Foucauldian discourse analysis lies in its connection to power.

2.2. Quest and conquest in *Small World*

2.2.1. *An Academic Romance*

First of all it is necessary to prove that *Small World* is a romance, in which, as already stated, the Grail takes different forms, among which the UNESCO Chair for Literary Theory, love, adventure and money are presented in foreground. The reader gradually recognises in the mobile professors the medieval knights willing for adventure and determined to find the Holy Grail. Various critics of Lodge's novels have commented on *Small World* considering it a romance:

> The characters of David Lodge's *Small World* (1984) are constantly discussing the Grail, and the elderly and impotent patriarch of the literary establishment, Arthur Kingfisher, is cured at a New York meeting of the Modern Language Association when Persse asks the right question.[30]

The plot of this complex novel containing a great number of characters and quests is here very well summarised, the metafictional aspect being equally mentioned. *Small World* is a comic novel which deals with the Grail Quest extensively:

> *Small World*, David Lodge's brilliant tale, is, however, an academic novel, and some of the humour will be most appealing to professors familiar with the literary conferences and lecture trips that obsess Lodge's characters and provide a structure for their lives. Although the characters frequently discuss Arthurian matters, including Jessie Weston's theory of Grail origins, the reader only gradually becomes aware that *Small World* is itself a "Grail novel." One of the central characters is the patriarch of the literary establishment, the elderly and impotent Arthur Kingfisher. His infirmity is cured during a New York meeting of the Modern Language Association, when a character named Persse asks the proper question. A certain amount of the humour derives from inside jokes concerning the academic literary establishment, but the novel nonetheless offers entertaining reading and makes fascinating and usually effective use of its Arthurian framework.[31]

---

[30] Derek Pearsall, *op. cit.*, p. 162.
[31] Norris J. Lacy and Geoffrey Ashe, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

It is doubtless a Grail novel which presents various searches and is structured on the pattern of an Arthurian romance. Beside the subtitle *An Academic Romance* and the motto taken from Nathaniel Hawthorne, the very beginning of the novel announces the reader that he or she is about to read a romance:

> WHEN April with its sweet showers has pierced the drought of March to the root, and bathed every vein of earth with that liquid by whose power the flowers are engendered; when the zephyr, too, with its dulcet breath, has breathed life into the tender new shoots in every copse and on every heath, and the young sun has run half his course in the sign of the Ram, and the little birds that sleep all night with their eyes open give song (so Nature prompts them in their hearts), then, as the poet Geoffrey Chaucer observed many years ago folk long to go on pilgrimages. Only, these days, professional people call them conferences.[32]

By means of the third person narration, the time of the story is given, namely the month April. The use of a prologue, the presentation of the wet weather specific of April and the pilgrims alluded to constitute evident intertextual references to Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*,[33] the name of the poet being explicitly mentioned in the text. The narrated time is not chosen at random; as the quoted fragment states, it is the moment of regeneration of the whole nature celebrated by the sun, too; it is a new beginning in the cycle of life, the right moment for the beginning of a new quest. The last sentence vaguely introduces the characters, who are to be academics and, at the same time, already shows that the quest takes different forms in modern times: the knights are replaced by university professors travelling from one conference to another all over the world. It does not deal with a religious quest, but, nevertheless, it contains both Christian and pagan elements. The breathing of life into the earth reminds one of the biblical creation of the world, but the presence of the zephyr sends the reader to the Greek mythology. The word "pilgrimages" is of Christian origin constituting a further reason for the discussion of this novel within the religious discourse. After the Prologue, the first part of the novel begins with the opening line of T. S. Eliot's *Waste Land*,[34] another important intertextual source of the book:

---

[32] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 1.
[33] Cf. Geoffrey Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*, ed. by A. C. Cawley, London: Dent, 1958, line 1.

> "APRIL is the cruellest month," Persse McGarrigle quoted silently to himself, gazing through grimy windowpanes at the unseasonable snow crusting the lawns and flowerbeds of the Rummidge campus. He had recently completed a Master's dissertation on the poetry of T. S. Eliot, but the opening words of *The Waste Land* might, with equal probability, have been passing through the heads of any one of the fifty-odd men and women, of varying ages, who sat or slumped in the raked rows of seats in the same lecture-room. For they were all well acquainted with that poem, being University Teachers of English Language and Literature, gathered together here, in the English Midlands, for their annual conference, and few of them were enjoying themselves.[35]

T. S. Eliot's poem, which is to provide further material later, is here introduced together with the main character of the novel, Persse McGarrigle, through whose eyes the omniscient narrator also presents the setting. If the narrated time has already been mentioned, the place is now revealed, too: the characters, all university teachers, are together at an annual conference in Rummidge, situated in the English Midlands. The atmosphere is not very pleasant as boredom is to be read on the faces of most of the conferees[36] and the "unseasonable snow" does nothing to lighten the mood, but, on the contrary, it intensifies the general spirit of dismay.

The time, the setting and the characters of the story are introduced in the first pages which already let the reader know that this romance is populated by university professors who take the place of the medieval errant knights in search of the Holy Grail. The idea that there is going to be a lot of journeys and adventures is obvious while the intertextual references to other romances imply the beginning of numerous quests.

2.2.2. The struggle for promotion

Small World is both a campus novel and a romance because it deals with university life, its main characters being university teachers who are all looking for their Holy Grail. The second paragraph of the Prologue already explains the nature of the characters' quest: "The modern conference resembles the pilgrimage of medieval Christendom in that it allows the participants to indulge themselves in all the

---

[34] Cf. T. S. Eliot, "The Waste Land", in: T. S. Eliot, *Collected Poems 1909-1962*, London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1963, pp. 61-86, line 1.
[35] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 3.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

pleasures and diversions of travel while appearing to be austerely bent on self-improvement."[37] The journey is presented as a ritual of initiation since it enables the pilgrims to have new experiences, to see places or meet people, and thus widen their knowledge of the world. The presentations of papers are compared with "penitential exercises" constituting actually the tests, the hardships which the hero of a quest has to face on his way to the Holy Grail. A conference also endows its participants with authority, so they go back home "with an enhanced reputation for seriousness of mind," which means they are afterwards intellectually mature.[38] This shows how knowledge confers power and how both are circulated in society by the institutions which facilitate the respective journeys. The Prologue of the novel not only lets us know the subject of the novel, but also explains its title pointing to "[t]he frantic traffic around the globe,"[39] with planes having consistently reduced distances.

All the characters of the novel are searching for something. Robin Dempsey, for example, is an ambitious professor struggling to get promoted. As he meets Persse McGarrigle, he tells him how he left Rummidge University when Philip Swallow received a higher position because he was older. This made Dempsey move to Darlington in order to achieve his aim– a "[r]eadership straight away, and a free hand to develop [his] special interests– linguistics and stylistics."[40]

Morris Zapp sees university life in the same way, namely as a stage on which various fights take place: "[…] You know Freud's idea of primitive society as a tribe in which the sons kill the father when he gets old and impotent, and take away his women? In modern academic society they take away your research grants. And your women, too, of course."[41] The American professor is aware that it is difficult to keep the pace with younger academics and for this reason tries to take care of his health by quitting smoking and taking up jogging. Although he has attained a certain age, his highest "ambitions are not yet satisfied" because he wants "to be the highest paid Professor of English in the world."[42] This is then Morris Zapp's quest, namely for money as well as fame and he tries to be the supreme expert on Jane Austen in order to reach this goal.

---

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 1. At a later point in the novel Morris Zapp makes a similar statement: "[…] Scholars these days are like the errant knights of old, wandering the ways of the world in search of adventure and glory." (*ibid.*, p. 63).
[38] Cf. *loc. cit.*
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 6.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

The Australian Professor Rodney Wainwright wishes to present a paper in Morris Zapp's conference, but his problem is that he has not finished his presentation yet. Apparently, Rodney Wainwright does not want to take part in the conference in order to enlarge his knowledge, to learn more, but in order to meet people able to help him get a better chair in a big city.[43] In other words, he is only searching for authority as well as power, knowledge being just a condition for acquiring them. The example of Rodney Wainwright and that of Morris Zapp very well illustrate the Foucauldian idea that knowledge is interested.

2.2.3. Sexual desire

Although "[e]ach of us is a subject in search of an object,"[44] as Michel Tardieu states, that object can vary from one person to another. What the English Professor Philip Swallow is searching for is "intensity of experience," but he realises that he "won't find it at home any more, but there's always the hope that [he]'ll find it abroad. [He] found it in America in '69."[45] His quest is only for intensity, which he has experienced only twice in his life, in Euphoria (intertextual reference to the exchange presented in *Changing Places*) and in Italy with Joy, a married woman for whom he felt "the most powerful desire."[46] When finally re-seeing Joy after many years, Philip Swallow "ate her with his eyes, wolfing the features he had thought he would never see again,"[47] thus displaying a feeling of power over the woman who could offer him pleasure, and this is an evident sign of conquest.

The Canadian Howard Ringbaum's quest is similar to Philip Swallow's, with the difference that the former understands intensity of experience as "sexual congress while airborne."[48] Being characterised by a "humourless determination to succeed in every form of human competition,"[49] Ringbaum tries to persuade his wife Thelma to have sex with him on a plane during a trip and, as she refuses, he later tries the same with a stewardess. His second attempt fails as well ending with an accusation for

---

[42] *Loc. cit.*
[43] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 84.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 200.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 66.
[46] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 71.
[47] *Ibid.*, p. 216.
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 90.

sexual harassment. Ringbaum's strong desire to compete with and beat other people in any possible way reveal his fierce aspiration to affirm his power over others.

In a conversation with Hilary Swallow, Morris Zapp proves to be conscious of people's desire for power. He states that "[w]hat we really lust for is power, which we achieve by work"[50] in order to explain young female students' desire for the old Philip Swallow. In conclusion, sex, knowledge and power appear in this context as being closely interrelated.

2.2.4. The Perceval-question

The young Irish Persse McGarrigle is the Perceval of this romance, on the one hand, because of his telling name, and, on the other hand, because his quest is presented in foreground. On account of this, one could even state that he is the main character of *Small World*. In the first pages of the novel, he appears as an inexperienced young man, both sexually and intellectually. During his conversation with Robin Dempsey he proves not only to be unacquainted with slang phrases like '*dip his wick*' standing for sexual intercourse, or, in Dempsey's words, "having it off. Screwing", but also to feel highly embarrassed ("Persse blushed") when hearing them.[51]

Persse McGarrigle's behaviour as he follows his mother's advice to visit his aunt in Rummidge[52] reminds of Chrétien's young Perceval who fails to ask the question in the castle of the Fisher King just because he was taught by his mother to speak only when asked to do so. The university teacher of Limerick seems to be unfamiliar with modern literary theory. For instance, he confesses that he is unaware of what structuralism is; as far as his intellect is concerned, he is still a beginner:

> "[...] Anyway, what I'm trying to say is that I've never been in what you might call the swim, intellectually speaking. That's why I've come to this conference. To improve myself. To find out what's going on in the great world of ideas. Who's in, who's out, and all that. So tell me about structuralism."[53]

---

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 91.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 59.
[51] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 7.
[52] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 32.
[53] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

This short excerpt presents the young man uninformed of what is going on the modern scene of literary criticism, but willing to acquire knowledge and experience. At a later point in the novel, he is called a "conference virgin"[54] by Morris Zapp, which only sustains the idea that Persse McGarrigle is about to be initiated. The word "swim" could be interpreted as a kind of baptism, a religious ritual of initiation. He travelled from Ireland in order to perform his quest for knowledge; Britain appears here as a centre of learning which establishes the canon and selects the information that is worth studying.

All along the book Persse McGarrigle is searching for the beautiful Angelica, who, in her turn, is looking for a suitable theory of the romance. Angelica Pabst is described as a fine princess of a fairy tale while her entrance is an essential moment in the novel as it marks the beginning of Persse McGarrigle's quest for love. [55] Interestingly enough, Angelica Pabst is making her research on the literary genre romance and this enriches the novel on a highly metafictional level. For this reason, when meeting Persse, Angelica is surprised by his telling name, which makes clear references to Perceval, the young knight of medieval romances and to Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* as well. His second name, McGarrigle, meaning "Son of Super-valour" in Irish, goes hand in hand with his role in the romance.[56] The Celtic influence on the Arthurian legends is alluded to by the young poet's Irish origin, Ireland being a country strongly influenced by the Celtic culture. Angelica Pabst is also a telling name, the former deriving from 'angel' and the latter from the German 'Papst' ('pope'); this emphasises the religious nature of Persse McGarrigle's quest. The reference to the pope, the highest rank in the Catholic Church, makes her a worthy Grail.

As it has already been mentioned, Chrétien's Perceval and Persse McGarrigle are similar in many respects: both of them are inexperienced at the beginning of the story, they are searching for the Holy Grail, they travel having a lot of adventures and both of them meet the impotent Fisher King. However, Lodge's character acts differently in some respects. For example, Chrétien's Perceval watches the Grail procession without asking any question and then finds out that his question would have meant the sick Fisher King's cure. On the other hand, this is his punishment for

---

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[55] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 8.
[56] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 9.

breaking his mother's heart when he left her for his journey.[57] Unlike Chrétien de Troyes's hero, Persse McGarrigle finds the right moment to ask the question which cures Arthur Kingfisher, the Fisher King of *Small World*: "What follows if everybody agrees with you?"[58] This question puzzles the speakers, making them avoid Kingfisher's eye and glance "instead at each other, with grimaces and gesticulations expressive of bafflement and suspicion."[59] Therefore, it remains unanswered, but, nonetheless, it puts an end to the old professor's depressive state of mind.

Persse McGarrigle also reminds us of Chrétien's Perceval when he sleeps with Lilly mistaking her for Angelica. In *Perceval ou Le Conte del Graal* Perceval "falls into error and sin because, in order to become a knight, he rejects his youthful simplicity and purity in favor of a code of behavior that he cannot understand."[60] McGarrigle agrees to make love with the seducing Lilly although they are not married, which is against his Catholic faith. The Irish teacher seems to have reached the end of his quest, to have grasped his Holy Grail. Possessing Angelica is the aim of Persse's quest and he does this through sex, a clear example of patriarchal discourse. His first sexual experience is part of his initiation: afterwards he feels "ten years older, and wiser" considering sex to be the lovers' "knowledge of each other's nightside," "a secret bond between them."[61] Confused by Lily's affirmation that she is not Angelica, Persse realises that Cheryl Summerbee loves him and thus she becomes his new Holy Grail. The end of the novel consists in the beginning of a new quest, which is accompanied by normal meteorological conditions: "[t]he temperature had returned to normal."[62]

2.2.5. Arthur Kingfisher and the Halcyon Days

Arthur Kingfisher, the distinguished professor of literary theory, reminds us of Chrétien de Troyes' King, who is no longer a warrior, but just the monarch taking

---

[57] Cf. Norris J. Lacy and Geoffrey Ashe, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-72.
[58] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 319.
[59] *Loc. cit.*
[60] Norris J. Lacy and Geoffrey Ashe, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
[61] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 325.
[62] *Ibid.*, p. 336.

part in social events.[63] Lodge's Arthur Kingfisher can be identified with the passive King; he no longer participates in the battle for the UNESCO Chair for literary theory, but, instead, he encourages the other professors to fight for it. This fight becomes an extremely important quest of the novel and implies a great number of journeys and adventures.

The King is indeed passive but, nonetheless, he remains at the top of the social hierarchy.[64] He is introduced in the novel as an old naked man whose "body is thin and scraggy, […] tanned but blotchy, the chest hair grizzled, the legs bony and slightly bowed, the feet calloused and horny."[65] The image of decay expressed by Arthur Kingfisher's physical appearance is strongly contra-balanced by his scholarly distinctions in the field of literary theory:

> This is Arthur Kingfisher, doyen of the international community of literary theorists, Emeritus Professor of Columbia and Zürich Universities, the only man in academic history to have occupied two chairs simultaneously in two different continents […] now retired but still active in the world of scholarship, as attender of conferences, advisory editor to academic journals, consultant to university presses. A man whose life is a concise history of modern criticism: born (as Arthur Klingelfisher) into the intellectual ferment of Vienna at the turn of the century, he studied with Shklovsky in Moskow in the Revolutionary period, and with I. A. Richards in Cambridge in the late twenties, collaborated with Jakobson in Prague in the thirties, and emigrated to the United States in 1939 to become a leading figure in the New Criticism in the forties and fifties, then had his early work translated from the German by the Parisian critics of the sixties, and was hailed as a pioneer of structuralism. A man who has received more honorary degrees than he can remember […][66]

This is a relatively detailed description of Arthur Kingfisher's impressive career and reputation on the international academic scene. In spite of being no longer able to come up with an original idea, he continues to be considered a "king among literary theorists," a man who "kind of personifies the whole profession of academic literary studies."[67] His name is undoubtedly an allusion to the Fisher King who appears in a number of Arthurian romances and was first introduced in the story by Chrétien de

---

[63] Cf. Norris J. Lacy and Geoffrey Ashe, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
[64] Cf. Karl Heinz Göller, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
[65] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 93.
[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 93-94.
[67] *Ibid.*, p. 119.

Troyes in his *Perceval*.[68] This character is limp and probably impotent because of a wound which makes him unable to walk anymore. Arthur Kingfisher too is impotent, both sexually and intellectually, and his beautiful Korean assistant, Song-mi Lee, sustains him in his desperate condition[69] thus taking the position of a patient Guinevere. As the academic life is a site of struggling for higher positions, other literary critics show no understanding for Arthur Kingfisher's situation; thus, after listening to a paper delivered by him at a conference, Fulvia Morgana criticises him for having merely repeated the things he had said years before.[70]

Persse McGarrigle's question causes a number of changes in different areas, the first one being meteorological. Although it is the end of December, spring seems to have come to New York; this is a traditional symbol of life, regeneration, rebirth. Such references are evident in the animals which end their hibernation as well as in the image of the lovers who can now get closer to each other. Everybody seems to be happy and capable of rare gestures, such as giving priority to other cars, or smiling to each other while waiting for the bus.[71]

Arthur Kingfisher is in his hotel room accompanied by his loyal partner Song-mi Lee at the time of these meteorological modifications. Nevertheless, he secretly feels that something has changed and, as a result, to the young woman's surprise, he asks her to open the window.[72] Breathing the warm air which is "like wine,"[73] he tells her that "[i]t's like the halcyon days", which are

> "[a] period of calm weather in the middle of winter. The ancients used to call them the halcyon days, when the kingfisher was supposed to hatch its eggs. Remember Milton– '*The birds sit brooding on the calmèd wave*'? The bird was a kingfisher. That's what 'halcyon' means in Greek, Song-mi: kingfisher. The halcyon days were kingfisher days. My days. Our days."[74]

Arthur Kingfisher consciously comments on the present situation: he is aware that the warm weather has something to do with the old halcyon days and with himself. There is an interesting relation between the names: Arthur Kingfisher, the Fisher King of traditional romances and the bird called kingfisher, a play upon words which

---

[68] Cf. Derek Pearsall, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-37.
[69] Cf. David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 94.
[70] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 119.
[71] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 320.
[72] Cf. *loc. cit.*
[73] *Ibid.*, p. 321.

is comic as well. Indeed it is at this moment that he regains his sexual potency, which makes him decide to marry Song-mi Lee.[75] The president of the MLA realises that he has his intellectual creativity back, too. For this reason, he takes the UNESCO Chair for Literary Criticism himself.[76] Arthur Kingfisher's rebirth heels his entire land, that is the world of literary critics and creative writers. Thus, Désirée Byrd, Morris Zapp's ex-wife, and Ronald Frobisher regain their inspiration as writers.[77]

2.3. The Catholic Church as a powerful institution

Most of David Lodge's novels are concerned with the theme of Catholicism or at least have Catholic characters. In the novels largely dealing with this issue, like, for instance, *How far Can You Go?*, *The British Museum Is Falling Down* or *The Picturegoers*, the Church appears as a powerful institution which acts upon individuals assigning them identities and roles.[78] The Catholic discourse is presented on two levels: the institutional dogma and its actual impact on individuals. On the one hand, there is an abstract level of the Catholic doctrine, the established separation between what is right and what is wrong; on the other hand, the novels depict the concrete cases of characters who try hard to apply the teachings of the Church to their real lives. The stories are told in a comic tone which lightens the serious matter of discussion.

The Church imposes its power on individuals by inducing a feeling of guilt. The believers are controlled through the fear of mortal sins, of the hell. Power is exercised on bodies as well; thus, Lodge's Catholic novels equally deal with the theme of birth control and its impact on sexual life.

---

[74] *Loc. cit.*
[75] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 334.
[76] Cf. *loc. cit.*
[77] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 330-331.
[78] According to Michel Foucault, "discursive practices shape individuals and, indirectly, the institutions in which lives are led." Cf. Simon During, *Foucault and Literature. Towards a Genealogy of Writing*, London and New York: Routledge, 1992, p. 119.

2.3.1. The Catholic doctrine

The Catholic Church is depicted as an institution which decides on the distinction between morality and immorality. The doctrine of the Church, the position of the Pope and the Vatican Councils make their way in some of the novels, conferring them realism. *How Far Can You Go?* is an impressive novel chiefly concerned with the theme of Catholicism and its effect on the lives of a number of married couples. The first references to the Catholic dogma are made early in this book; it is explained in such a simple way that it is clearly meant for children, but, on the other hand it is legible for non-Catholic readers as well. The tone is far from being serious; practising Catholicism is seen as a game in which winning means going to Heaven after trying to do only what is considered to be good. Losing the game leads to Hell, the place of those who do bad deeds. There are also indifferent actions, which could always be turned into good ones.[79] Good is ironically defined as "anything you positively disliked doing" whereas bad represents "anything you liked doing enormously" because it can become "an occasion of sin."[80]

Sin is a key word in the Catholic doctrine and, as a result, the novel presents a classification of it. Sins are divided into "venial and mortal," the latter being so serious that they lead directly to Hell unless one has confessed and received absolution. [81] Catholics are also supposed to take communion, whose importance is explained by the doctrine of transubstantiation, which refers to the transformation of bread and wine into Christ's flesh and blood.[82]

Most of the characters of *How Far Can You Go?* are young people who have been brought up as Catholics. They enter the novel as young students attending mass on week day and their lives are further presented by emphasising the immense influence of the Catholic dogma on their identity, self-fashioning and conduct. This shows how individuals are formed by discourses denoting the power the Catholic Church has on individuals' inner selves. Power is maintained not by the promise of a happy afterlife in Heaven, but rather by the terrible fear of Hell which possesses the characters.

---

[79] Cf. David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, London: Penguin Books, 1981, pp. 6-7.
[80] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 7.
[81] Cf. *loc. cit.*

2.3.2. The fear of Hell and the confessional

Catholics are kept under control through the fear of Hell, an issue explicitly stated in *How Far Can You Go?*. Beside Heaven and Purgatory, Hell is the worst place where a soul can get after its life on earth because fire is the eternal punishment of those dying in a state of mortal sin. [83]

Michel Foucault's complex work proves to be useful in the present discussion, too; in fact, it is his account of the Panopticon that can be applied to Catholicism in this context. Foucault explains that Bentham's Panopticon is a machine employed for the surveillance of prisoners functioning on the principle that the prisoner can be watched without seeing the viewer. Therefore, it constitutes a way of exercising power by imposing a certain behaviour. [84] The numerous examples of fields in which the Panopticon can be utilised enables one to apply it to religion as well. That is to say, the Catholic is so frightened of committing sins because he or she too is being observed all the time by the omnipresent Christian God, who can never be seen. Aware of this permanent surveillance, the believers must acknowledge their sins and, as the Catholic doctrine requires, confess them as soon as possible. Consequently, by means of surveillance power is exercised directly on individual behaviour regulating it without any use of physical force.

Guilt and fear are the main strategies of sustaining the control of individuals by the Church. Most of the Catholic characters of the novel *How Far Can You Go?* get married and, as their Church prescribes, use the Rhythm Method as the only system of family planning. Only when this method turns out to fail repeatedly, do they decide to use the progesterone pill as a means of efficient contraception. Many yeas after, they try to find out why it has taken so long to make this decision and Dorothy states that "It was guilt, […] guilt about sex. Sex was dirty enough without going into birth control, that was the general feeling."[85] Michael, another character of the novel, realises that "It was fear, the fear of Hell" and, bitterly, they all agree that "it all came down to fear of Hell."[86]

---

[82] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 19.
[83] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 113.
[84] Cf. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, transl. by Alan Sheridan, New York: Vintage Books, 1977, pp. 200-202.
[85] David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, p. 79.
[86] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 79; p. 126.

One can get rid of this terrible guilt and fear only by going to confession. In the first volume of his *Histoire de la Sexualité* entitled *La volonté de savoir*, Michel Foucault asserts that the extension of the confessional, especially the confession of the flesh does not cease to increase. To his mind, the last three centuries have been characterised by a discursive explosion on sex and this multiplication of discourses about sex appears in the field of exercise of power because the incitement to speak about it is an institutional one. The confessional is seen as an attempt to impose meticulous rules of examining oneself, paying more and more attention to all the insinuations of the flesh: thoughts, desires, voluptuous fantasies or delights. Everything must enter in detail the game of the confessional; everything must be said or, in other words, put into discourse. Confession has a special importance in the Western society because in a Christian society the individual has to become aware of his or her inner desires and subsequently confess them not only to another person, but also to himself or herself. All the pleasures, sensations or thoughts that have anything to do with sex are to be confessed as often as possible. This discursivity of sex has its origins in an ascetic and monastic tradition. It is, therefore, the absolute obligation of a good Christian to confess all his or her deeds against the law making out of each desire a discourse.[87] The confessional is also linked with the will to knowledge, which is, in Foucault's opinion, characteristic for our society, considered to be the first one in history to invest a whole apparatus in making discourses, analysing and knowing as much as possible.[88]

Truth has its place in this paradigm as well; Foucault traces throughout history two great procedures of producing truth: on the one hand, there are societies like, for instance, Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Roman, Arabo-Muslim, which have an *ars erotica*, in which truth is extracted from pleasure itself, taken as practice and received as experience. On the other hand, there is our civilisation, which has no *ars erotica*, but it is doubtless the only one to practise a *scientia sexualis*. The Western societies have developed the confessional as a method of telling the truth subordinated to a form of power-knowledge. Since the Middle Ages, the confession has been one of the major rituals from which one expects the production of truth. For this reason, Foucault says that our society is a singularly confessing one ("*une*

---

[87] Cf. Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la Sexualité I*, pp. 25-30.
[88] *Ibid.,* p. 45.

société singulièrement avouante"). The confession has been and still remains the general matrix which governs the production of true discourse on sex. [89]

However, the confessional does not always extract truth. The case of Violet, an emotionally labile girl is an example for it. She proves to be very superstitious and unable to deal with her sins as well as with the feeling of guilt she has because of them. Confession becomes a therapy for Violet, who superstitiously believes she is under a curse. Seeing that her sins are not shocking for the different priests who listen to her, she begins inventing more serious ones. Thus, the confessional sometimes fails to bring forth the truth. She makes 'false confessions' and this leads to a greater terror, the thought of having committed sacrilege. [90]

The necessity of confessing each desire has a very evident reason: it should have among its effects the displacement, intensification, reorientation and modification of the desire itself. Hence the discursivity of sex is essential for the mechanisms of power to function[91] in the civil and religious domains. Foucault openly states that the confession of truth is inscribed at the heart of the procedures of individualisation by power.[92] Confessing what one has done leads to a regulation of the individual's behaviour: "One day Angela emerged weeping from the confessional of the parish priest of Our Lady and St Jude's, and for a long time there was no touching of legs or breasts in any circumstances."[93]

The confessional is defined as a ritual of discourse in which the subject who speaks coincides with the subject of the utterance. It is also caught in a relation of power: the instance of domination is not on the part of the one who speaks as he is forced to do that, but on the part of the one who listens.[94] The characters of *How Far Can You Go?* seem to be conscious of this power. Adrian explicitly states: "It was the repressive power of the clergy, wielded through the confessional."[95] The listening subject, the clergyman, is endowed with power through the confession because he is the one who establishes the penance, gives the absolution and manages to reorient the individual's behaviour.

---

[89] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 76-84.
[90] Cf. David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, pp. 32-33.
[91] Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la Sexualité I*, p. 33.
[92] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 77-79.
[93] David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, p. 31.
[94] Cf. Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la Sexualité 1*, pp. 82-84.
[95] David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, p. 126.

The Evangelical Miriam, Michael's future wife, has a real problem with the confession during her conversion to Catholicism:

> When she had got over these doctrinal hurdles, or bypassed them […] Miriam got into a panic about making her first confession. To go into that dark, cupboard-like cubicle and whisper your most shameful secrets to a man on the other side of a wire mesh might be tolerable if you were brought up to it from childhood, but for herself it seemed humiliating, a violation, a hideous ordeal.[96]

Miriam's view on the confessional shows that it establishes a relation of power in which the listener appears as a violator of the other's most inner thoughts, feelings and desires. The main character of the novel *Therapy*, Laurence Passmore, proves to feel the same repulsion toward the Catholic confession.[97] Thus, it seems that the confessional is perceived by non-Catholics as the main obstacle in converting to and practising this religion.

Nevertheless, the characters of *How Far Can You Go?* come to a point where they realise that they have lost their fear of Hell, but they find difficulty in identifying the very moment when they lost it:

> At some point in the nineteen-sixties, Hell disappeared. No one could say for certain when this happened. First it was there, then it wasn't. Different people became aware of the disappearance of Hell at different times. Some realized that they had been living for years as though Hell did not exist, without having consciously registered its disappearance. Others realized that they had been behaving, out of habit, as though Hell were still there, though in fact they had ceased to believe in its existence long ago.[98]

This is the very beginning of the middle chapter (the fourth out of seven) entitled "How They Lost the Fear of Hell." The frustrations and failures in their lives make the characters disobey the Church and finally they show their protest by becoming "Catholics for an Open Church".

---

[96] *Ibid.*, p. 59.
[97] Cf. David Lodge, *Therapy*, London: Penguin Books, 1995, p. 243.

2.3.3. The body: a site of control

The body is the very place on which the Church acts by accepting only one contraceptive method as being moral, namely the Rhythm or Safe Method. On that account, the sexual lives of individuals are regulated, their desires being modified. Foucault speaks of a 'biopower' which is essential in the modern Western society. The control of reproduction is very well hidden in society and it is the key to sovereignty or, in other words, power. [99] The body has not only a biological dimension, but also a political one because its control is linked with the control of populations. A historical survey on the body clearly shows that it has been an object of study for biologists and physicians as well as a part of the political and economical domains. Foucault speaks about a political technology of the body consisting of a knowledge and a mastery of the body as an economical force. This technology is rarely formulated in continuous and systematic discourses, but it is diffuse and polymorphous; Foucault stresses the fact that it cannot be located in any specific institution or apparatus; in a way this technology is linked with a microphysics of power that the apparatuses and the institutions put on stage. The study of this microphysics supposes that the power which is exercised is conceived as a strategy whose effects are attributed to dispositions, manoeuvres, techniques. This power is exercised and not possessed; it is not the acquired privilege of a dominant class, but the effect of strategic positions, the effect which manifests and reorients the position of those who are dominated. This power is not simply applied, like an obligation, to those who do not have it, but it invests and traverses them. That is to say, these relations are to be found deep in the society, they are not located in the relations between the state and its citizens or at the border between classes; they also reproduce at the level of individuals, bodies, gestures and behaviours the general form of law and government.[100]

The idea that religion regulates behaviour by acting directly on the body is explicitly expressed in David Lodge's first novel *The Picturegoers*. Living with the Catholic Mallory family as a lodger, Mark Underwood finds their practices, such as praying before eating, strange. In the beginning he uses the opportunity of collective

---

[98] David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, p. 7.
[99] Cf. Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
[100] Cf. Michel Foucault, *Surveiller et punir*, pp. 30-32.

prayer to study Clare Mallory's body thinking that prayer's most fierce enemy is the discovery of sex he himself favouring the latter.[101] However, after some time spent with this family, he has a revelation, namely the fact that the first site on which the Church exercises its power is the body. Practising Catholicism means, above all, subjecting one's body to the extent of denial if possible; this is believed to subsequently open one's mind to understand the true meaning of life.[102]

The human body and especially its sexuality are extremely important in *The British Museum Is Falling Down*. Published in 1965, it is an innovative novel from a formal point of view, differing in narrative techniques from the traditional omniscient narrator of the two novels written before it (*The Picturegoers* and *Out of the Shelter*). Catholicism, birth control and its consequences on the sex relations of the characters is one of the essential themes of the book. David Lodge himself states in his "Afterword" (written in 1980) to the novel that the main subject of the book is Catholic birth control, which is dealt with in a comic manner. It is treated on two distinct levels: that of the doctrine and that of the personal lives of the characters.[103] Foucault believes that controlling the body is important for a powerful institution, be it the Church or the juridical system. Even if our society does no longer make any legal use of violence and torture as a means of rehabilitation, the obedience of the body remains an important condition for the maintenance of a moral system of laws.[104] The Catholic Church has clear and rigid moral rules and one of them is that the Rhythm or Safe Method represents the only right means of contraception. This is evidently a way of controlling the most intimate aspect of the individuals' lives.

The main characters of the novel *The British Museum Is Falling Down* are Adam and Barbara Appleby, a Catholic married couple with three children. Their use of the Rhythm Method has already failed three times and, both being very young, this makes their life difficult, on the one hand, because of financial problems– Adam has not completed his doctoral thesis yet and, as a result, has no job; on the other hand, this influences their sex relations. The omniscient narrator depicts the present situation of the two young people: because Barbara's period is overdue, they are both afraid of another pregnancy, which has a direct impact on their sexual life. Their

---

[101] Cf. David Lodge, *The Picturegoers*, London: Penguin Books, 1993 (1960), p. 51.
[102] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 180-181.
[103] Cf. David Lodge, "An Afterword", in: David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, London: Penguin Books, 1983, p. 163.
[104] Cf. Michel Foucault, *Surveiller et punir*, p. 30.

libido is thus modified; they are only sure of the fact that they do not want to have another child. Adam is aware that this fear is specific for married Catholics and compares their desperate condition to that of non-Catholic parents, who really have the freedom to decide themselves on the contraceptive means they want to use. Reflecting on their own situation, Adam symbolically sees it as an island surrounded by fertility threatening to flood it and he realises how frustrating it is. The two young people enter their marriage without knowing much about the Rhythm Method, trusting Providence to take care of their family. Accordingly, their first sexual intercourse seems to have brought about their first child and, in spite of their careful calculations regarding contraception, they get two more children after that. Their third child changes their attitude towards sex: abstinence is a possible solution for the married couple, but, unfortunately, not the happiest one. Following the advice of a Catholic organization they end up having sexual intercourse a few times a month being afraid of another pregnancy all the time.[105]

An ironic passage presents Adam imagining how the Martians research the evidence of a Catholic world after the Earth has been destroyed:

> Roman Catholicism was, according to archaeological evidence, distributed fairly widely over the planet Earth in the twentieth century. As far as the Western Hemisphere is concerned, it appears to have been characterized by a complex system of sexual taboos and rituals. Intercourse between married partners was restricted to certain limited periods determined by the calendar and the body-temperature of the female. Martian archaeologists have learned to identify the domiciles of Roman Catholics by the presence of large numbers of complicated graphs, calendars, small booklets full of figures, and quantities of broken thermometers, evidence of the great importance attached to this code. Some scholars have argued that it was merely a method of limiting the number of offspring; but as it has been conclusively proved that the Roman Catholics produced more children on average than any other section of the community, this seems untenable. Other doctrines of the Roman Catholics included a belief in a Divine Redeemer and in a life after death.[106]

Adam Appleby is attempting here to evaluate Catholic birth control objectively. The Martians who visit the Earth after its imaginary destruction stand for detachment, which allegedly excludes subjectivity. The fact that the aliens are supposed to be

---

[105] Cf. David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, London: Penguin Books, 1983 (1965), pp. 8-10.
[106] *Ibid.,* p. 12.

archaeologists and scholars alludes to a scientific discourse which claims to tell the truth. Interestingly, there is a sense of anti-Eurocentrism in this excerpt as the 'civilized' Occident is seen by the Martians as being primitive. Such ethnographic studies of rituals and taboos are usually done by Europeans on so called 'savage' societies. Roman Catholicism is mocked at, as the means of contraception accepted by the Church proves to fail in most of the cases. This matter appears to be more important than the doctrine of salvation and afterlife, emphasising once again the central place that the respective topic occupies in the whole novel. Frustration is the result of obeying Catholic rules; feeling that he is on the verge of having a nervous breakdown, Adam Appleby thinks of possible solutions to his problem. One of them would be to write a petition to the Pope to allow him and his wife to use artificial contraception.[107] A conversation with his friends Camel and Pond in the cafeteria of the British Museum reveals to Adam that Pond is limping because of having tried positions proposed by *Kama Sutra* with his wife the previous night. This arouses his imagination, deepening his frustration, which makes Camel advise him to simply leave the Church.[108]

The British Museum Is Falling Down presents at large not only the doctrine of the Catholic Church regarding birth control, but also the actual impact it has on the lives of the characters. Adam Appleby is aware of the importance of sex in the life of a married couple identifying it as the source of his depression. The lack of enough sex in his life as well as the general feeling of sadness are the result of using a failing contraceptive method. The young Ph.D. student believes that sex is the only real thing he can have; therefore, he seeks refuge in literature.[109] He evokes his earliest months of marriage: like any good Catholics, Adam and Barbara begin their married life as virgins and, for this reason, their first sexual experiences are not satisfying. When they really start finding pleasure in sex, an advanced pregnancy already prevents them from further intercourse. Adam regards this situation as his fate, an evident influence of his faith in Providence.[110] Father Finbar tries to explain to Adam that the Church does not intend to make the lives of married couples difficult by accepting only the Safe Method as a means of contraception. The priest loudly states

---

[107] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 47.
[108] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 57.
[109] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 74.
[110] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 116.

his disapproval of artificial contraception in a chemist's shop where such means are sold. He regards it as murder comparing it to drug consumption.[111]

As the greater part of the novel is told by an omniscient narrator who uses a focalising character, Adam, it is the latter's view on the whole debate of contraception that predominates. Nonetheless, the end of the book consists of Barbara's interior monologue, an intertextual reference to *Ulysses* by James Joyce, for whom David Lodge has an undisguised admiration. This stream of consciousness presents Barbara's point of view regarding the Safe Method: it is the lack of spontaneity that bothers her; she finds difficulty in enjoying sex because she is the one who must watch the calendar every day making the necessary calculations. The longest sentence of the novel is also concerned with contraception: on the one hand, Barbara is not satisfied with her present situation, but, on the other hand, she would not be happy to use artificial contraception either. The young woman does not blame the Catholic Church for her problems; she thinks it is the original sin that makes sex so difficult and unnatural.[112] However, Adam and Barbara Appleby long for a change in the Catholic doctrine, but, interestingly, none of them does even think of disobeying the Church in this respect, their hope lying in passive waiting. Although the novel is concerned with a Catholic issue, David Lodge explains that it was not written only for Catholic readers. Thus, the comic effects are supposed to make not only the non-Catholic but also the non-Christian reader sympathise with the sexual frustration of the characters.[113]

In an excellent intertextual passage in *Haw Far Can You Go?* David Lodge states that *The British Museum Is Falling Down* was indeed received as a comic novel. The comic effects were perceived as such by Catholics and, interestingly enough, people suffering from lethal diseases found it funny as well. Lodge believes that it is people having no chance of experiencing sex anymore who considered the book comic. Trying to reassure the readers who perceived the tragic aspect of the novel rather than its comic devices, David Lodge goes beyond the end of the book revealing that the two characters have finally made the sensible decision to use artificial contraception.[114]

---

[111] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 136.
[112] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 155-160.
[113] Cf. David Lodge, "An Afterword", in David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, p. 166.
[114] Cf. David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, p. 74.

In conclusion, Foucault's consideration of the human body as a space on which power is exercised by regulating individual behaviour finds expression in Lodge's *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, which shows how the Catholic Church, seen as an institution, controls individuals' sex relations by means of the imposed Rhythm Method.

2.4. Subversion of Catholicism

As already stated, a number of David Lodge's novels extensively treat the theme of Catholicism and its effects on the lives of the characters. There is a dominant Catholic discourse in these books, but, at the same time, it is also subverted by other discourses, such as eroticism, cinema or tourism, just to name some of the most important. This subchapter is divided into three main sections dealing with the three main discourses that subvert Catholicism most openly. In this context Foucault's theory is again helpful because he makes it clear that there is no transcendental truth to be discovered and, consequently, no divine origin of the world. The French philosopher explains how, according to Nietzsche, Darwinism has taken the place of religious beliefs. The idea of a sacred origin only emphasises man's power on the rest of the world.[115] The attack on religion is part of several novels that will be commented in the next place.

2.4.1. Erotic discourse

Michel Foucault's essay "A Preface to Transgression" published in the collection *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews* edited by Donald F. Bouchard is extremely useful in the discussion on erotic discourse. The French thinker starts from the premise that we have no access to reality at all because our world as well as our selves are entirely constructed by discourses. Accordingly, he asserts that sexuality is inseparable from its representation and that transgression becomes a typical trait of human behaviour.

---

[115] Cf. Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History", pp. 142-143.

2.4.1.1. Human sexuality and its representation

In Foucault's opinion there is an intricate relation between power and body as the latter is the space where the former is exercised. Thus, "the individual, with his identity and characteristics, is the product of a relation of power exercised over bodies."[116] The body becomes an economic and political problem because the power operating on it, especially in the domain of sexuality, has effects in the sphere of the demography, which is closely linked with economy and politics.[117] Our society has realised that its fortune and future depend actually on the way in which one uses its sex.[118] Foucault claims that, although Christianity seems to make a taboo out of sex, it does talk about it rather openly. He argues that sexuality has recently begun to be regarded as something natural. Yet, it has always been like this, only in a disguised form. In the Christian depiction of humanity sexuality has been considered natural all the time.[119]

The Catholic Church actually tries to keep sexuality natural by prohibiting any artificial methods of contraception. Taking the progesterone pill is considered by the Church a premeditated sin and, for this reason, different from other carnal sins. The position of the Church is very strict: the natural purpose of sex is reproduction; that is why, it is allowed only inside marriage and, to keep it as natural as possible, artificial contraception should be totally excluded.[120]

Interestingly enough, Michel Foucault does not believe that there is anything outside language, not even sexuality. He states that sexuality does not link humans with animals because human sexuality is produced in language, which has lost its referential function. This means that sexuality is not natural at all, but is discursively constructed. This reminds us that there is nothing transcendental since the modern discourse on sexuality does not show man as a natural being, but it does only proclaim the death of God. Sade was the initiator of this language, in which God is absent and which stands for profanation as well as transgression. This language is considered by Foucault to be characteristic of contemporary sexuality in the Western

---

[116] Michel Foucault, *Power/ Knowledge*, pp. 73-74.
[117] *Ibid.*, p. 125.
[118] Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la Sexualité 1,* pp.36-37.
[119] Cf. Michel Foucault, "A Preface to Transgression", in: Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, p. 29.
[120] Cf. David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, p. 79.

culture. Although Christianity is still an important part of the Occidental cultural heritage, the absence of God turns experience from exterior to interior.[121]

How Far Can You Go? is a novel that helps illustrate the reduction of sexuality to its representation. The book makes several references to D. H. Lawrence's literary descriptions of sexual relations. For example, Michael becomes aware of his frustration caused by the discrepancy between reality and his sexual fantasies fed by his reading of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. His situation is an illustration of the idea that sexuality is culturally conditioned and indissoluble from its representation, showing how erotic discourses shape the inner desires of individuals. Hoping that D. H. Lawrence's book will have the same effect on his wife, he passes it to her, but he is disappointed when she abandons reading it on the ground that its aesthetic value is rather low.[122] As far as the language of modern sexuality is concerned, Michael realises that people nowadays not only use different words to describe their sexuality, but they also talk about it in public spaces. Miriam still considers these words vulgar believing that they should remain linguistic taboos. Unlike her, Michael is more open to this language which accompanies both his imagination and his actions.[123]

The representation of sexuality in the modern Western society is not restricted to fictional texts; there are further forms as well. One of them is sex instruction books, which seem appealing to Adrian, but not to his wife Dorothy,[124] the two conforming to the gender stereotype of the active curious man opposed to the passive woman. Apart from fiction and instruction books, magazines are another important means of spreading and encouraging new forms of sexuality. Two magazines are named, *Playboy* and *Penthouse*, in order to express the interest of media in sexuality. Again such images seem to have an impact only on men; Violet, too, proves to be a stereotypical woman as she is willing to please her husband, Robin, even by doing things which bring her no pleasure at all.[125] A further hugely influential form of representation of human sexuality is film, but this category will be dealt with later in the subchapter on the cinema as a means of undermining religion.

---

[121] Cf. Michel Foucault, "A Preface to Transgression", pp. 30-32.
[122] Cf. David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, p. 76.
[123] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 216.
[124] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 153.
[125] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 154.

To sum up, in David Lodge's Catholic novels the religious discourse is contra-balanced by an erotic one. Interestingly enough, sexuality appears as interrelated with its representations thus exemplifying Michel Foucault's argumentation.

2.4.1.2. Transgression of the law

In spite of the great power the Catholic Church has on its believers, David Lodge's novels dealing with Catholicism at large depict a number of characters who break the moral laws regarding sexuality. The limits established by the Church are thus transgressed for the sake of eroticism. The most important cases in this respect are young Catholics having sexual intercourse before marriage; married couples who use artificial contraception for a more satisfying sex life without consequences; priests and nuns who masturbate or abandon their vocation in order to get married or to simply enjoy sex.

Michel Foucault's ideas on sexuality and transgression are useful in the treatment of the novels in this subchapter. According to him, eroticism is an experience of sexuality showing that God and the limits imposed by him exist only to be surmounted. In this context the key word is transgression, which is seen as the base of sexuality and of the European Christian discourse because of its connection to the limit.[126] If contradictions were at the heart of dialectical thought, transgression is now a feature of modern thinking. Sexuality is an ontological matter related to the death of God and to the questioning of limits. The quest for totality and the play of contradictions have no place in this system of thought. Sexuality being produced in language and the latter having lost its referential quality, language actually questions itself.[127] David Lodge's *How Far Can You Go?* is a novel which is very useful in the discussion of transgression, too. Numerous characters subvert the Catholic discourse by breaking the regulations settled by the Church. The first of the characters to commit the grave sin of copulating before getting married is Poly, who goes to Italy as an *au pair* girl. There she is seduced by the Catholic father of the family and then she has several affairs with men whom she does not love. After her corruption, Polly

---

[126] Cf. Michel Foucault, "A Preface to Transgression", p. 33.
[127] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 50.

stops going to mass as she is disappointed by the Italians' hypocrisy and realises that Catholics are unhappy because they take their religion too seriously.[128] Having left the Church, Poly looks at Catholicism from a certain distance and with detachment, which enables her to claim that sexual lust is natural to human beings and it cannot be controlled by the Church.

Violet is the second Catholic character in the novel to lose her virginity without being married. Seduced by Robin, a university teacher of hers, she finally loses her self-esteem as she is aware of having committed a mortal sin. Violet gets pregnant and, refusing Robin's advice to have an abortion, she manages to persuade him to marry her.[129]

Edward and Tessa are the next to be unable to resist temptation. The circumstances of their first night together are different from those of other characters. Intending to attend a conference for young engaged couples, they get into a convent where a conference for married couples is organised because of a coincidence of names. As they are considered to be married, they receive a room to themselves and the fact that they have sexual intercourse inside the convent[130] constitutes a serious attack on the Catholic Church. At a later point in the novel, Dennis realises that sex before marriage gradually becomes something normal even to Catholics.[131] The idea that fulfilling one's sexual needs can be a substitute for religion is conveyed by other novels written by Lodge, too; for instance, both Robyn Penrose in *Nice Work* and Helen Reed in *Thinks...* admit that their discovery of sex while being unmarried students put an end to their life as practising Catholics.[132]

There are also married couples who undermine the Church's teaching by choosing to enjoy their sex life without having children. They finally decide to use artificial contraception in order to satisfy their sexual desires, but, unfortunately, this leads to routine as well.[133] However, it is important to note that the characters follow their erotic fulfilment more than their faith.

Interestingly, there are also priests who abandon their profession in order to start a relationship with a woman. In *How far Can You Go?* Father Brierley's Bishop

---

[128] Cf. David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, pp. 38-39.
[129] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 45-48.
[130] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 55-57.
[131] *Ibid.,* p. 201.
[132] Cf. David Lodge, *Nice Work*, London: Penguin Books, 1989 (1985), p. 243; David Lodge, *Thinks...*, London: Penguin Books, 2001, p. 29.
[133] Cf. David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, p. 151.

is sure that women are the only reason for which priests give up their vocation. The Bishop's opinion is evidently based on experience; priests who claim to have doubts about the Catholic doctrine actually have a secret attraction to or passion for a woman.[134] This is the case of Adrian Brierley, who comes unexpectedly to a party where a short play is performed and sees how Polly strips. This sight is enough to wake suppressed desires in him[135] and, consequently, he later leaves the priesthood in order to marry Lynn, a young single mother of a child.[136] Bernard Walsh in *Paradise News* is also a priest who feels sexually attracted to a woman. The memory of Daphne's nakedness follows him all his life and makes him give up his religious vocation.[137]

How Far Can You Go? presents a further example of a priest who leaves his career for a woman. It is the case of Tom who confesses to his sister Angela that he has applied to be laicized because he intends to marry a young woman called Rosemarry. Tom does not consider Catholicism to be a great thing anymore arguing that even football is regarded as the new religion since it is more popular than Christianity.[138]

Of particular interest is the character Miles, a Catholic who realises that he is homosexual. Since the Church accepts only heterosexual relations as being lawful, Miles abstains from confessing as well as satisfying his needs. After a long time of torment, he seeks his peace at a monastery in Nottinghamshire. There he meets Bernard, a monk who encourages him to accept himself as he is. Later the reader finds out that Miles admits his homosexuality publicly and, moreover, leads a relationship with a former monk, who is undoubtedly Bernard.[139]

The Picturegoers contains a very similar case: inside a convent the young Clare Mallory leads a lesbian relationship with her good friend Hilda. The situation becomes really serious after some time as the emotionally labile Hilda betrays their secret by trying to commit suicide. Consequently, Clare is expelled from the convent on the ground that she lacks any deep vocation.[140] Outside the monastery Clare starts going out with Mark Underwood, the student lodger at her family's house. Falling in

---

[134] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 132.
[135] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 27-29.
[136] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 242.
[137] Cf David Lodge, *Paradise News*, London: Penguin Books, 1992, p. 30 and p. 220.
[138] Cf. David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, pp. 166-168.
[139] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 199.
[140] Cf. David Lodge, *The Picturegoers*, pp. 152-153.

love with him, she realises that, although she continues going to church, she no longer finds ecstasy when practising her religion, but being with Mark makes her feel thrilled.[141] Mark proves to have been aware of this long before her; according to him, "the libido, deprived of sexual fulfilment, [conspires] with the ego and the super-ego for religious fulfilment. In the abasement before the supernatural it [finds] a substitute for the abandonment of the sexual act. Prayer [is] spiritual orgasm."[142] Thus, religious experience and sensual pleasure appear as two opposite irreconcilable poles between which one must necessarily choose. Interestingly, in spite of his scepticism toward Catholicism at the beginning of his life with the Mallorys, Mark's final choice is religion.

Nuns sometimes leave the convent to get married, but it is a quest for erotic fulfilment that drives their action. In *How Far Can You Go?* the nun Ruth, who makes a journey to the United States of America, receives from one of her mates a letter in which she clearly admits that she "*left to get married, and not to anyone in particular.*"[143] To her greater surprise, Ruth hears another striking confession from Josephine, an American nun, namely that she sometimes masturbates.[144] Masturbation is also an alternative Adrian Brierley's parish priest proposes to him in order to forget Poly's leg which aroused his desire.[145]

All in all, the examples analysed above show that eroticism seems to have a greater impact on the characters than the Catholic doctrine. The actions of all these categories of people (couples having sex before marriage or using artificial birth control; priests abandoning the priesthood; nuns or monks leaving the convent in search for a sexual partner and last but not least, priests and nuns fulfilling their lust through masturbation) stand for the subversion of the Catholic Church as they show how the erotic discourse substitutes religion.

Transgression appears as a characteristic of the Western society and even of the Catholic communities. Sexuality is extremely important in this context because there are rules concerning it that the characters break. Moreover, as it has already been mentioned, Foucault asserts that this leads to a change in the modern thought:

---

[141] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 111-112.
[142] *Ibid.*, p. 103.
[143] David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, p. 139.
[144] *Ibid.,* p. 141.
[145] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 29.

> In this sense, the appearance of sexuality as a fundamental problem marks the transformation of a philosophy of man as worker to a philosophy based on a being who speaks; and insofar as philosophy has traditionally maintained a secondary role to knowledge and work, it must be admitted, not as a sign of crisis but of essential structure, that it is now secondary to language.[146]

The man as worker has become the man who speaks; language is now the most characteristic feature of the human being and it is also superior to philosophy because the latter "experiences itself and its limits in language and in this transgression of language which carries it."[147]

2.4.2. Cinema– a way of escapism

Apart from eroticism, but in relation to it, cinema constitutes a further means of undermining and sometimes even substituting religion. As David Lodge explains in the "Introduction" to *The Picturegoers*, the opposition Church vs. Cinema[148] is one of the main topics exploited in the novel, which presents several Catholic characters who like spending their Saturday nights at the cinema as well as the impact the films they see have on them as individuals. This subchapter will be divided into two parts: firstly, the emphasis will fall on the relation between cinema and religion seen as two institutions in competition for the control over individuals; secondly, it will be argued that, like religion, cinema is a way of escaping the hard reality with which the characters cannot cope. In both instances cinema appears as a means of circulating erotic discourses.

Mark Underwood is conscious of the fact that cinema is "in a way a substitute of religion."[149] The cinema's subversion of the Church lies in its erotic content, which urge individuals to disobey the strict laws imposed by religion. Going to the cinema thinking that he will watch the religious film called *Song of Bernadette*, Father Martin Kipling describes his experience as a spectator in the most negative terms, emphasising the depraved nature of the erotic scenes shown in it. For this reason, he strongly urges his parishioners to stop attending cinemas, which are in his

---

[146] Michel Foucault, "A Preface to Transgression", p. 50.
[147] *Ibid.,* pp. 50-51.
[148] Cf. David Lodge, "Introduction", in: David Lodge, *The Picturegoers*, p. ix.
[149] David Lodge, *The Picturegoers*, p. 58.

eyes "temples of Mammon and Belial."[150] Thus, Father Kipling realises that the cinema is one of the main institutions acting against the Catholic Church; however, his "crusade" fails due to a scandal in the press after which the priest is required by his bishop to rectify his fierce affirmations against the cinema.[151]

Interestingly, both the Church and the cinema exercise their control on the individual's body. After watching the film condemned by Father Kipling, several characters imagine their lives developing in a similar manner.[152] Moreover, reinforcing the principle "life imitates art,"[153] Mr Mallory suggests to his wife that they should "try one of those open-mouth kisses, all spit and breath."[154]. Similarly, *How Far Can You Go?* also illustrates how films shape individual desires: the influence of sex films on Michael is extremely great. However, this is not the case with his wife Miriam, who proves to be uncooperative and indifferent to his sexual fantasies in the beginning, but she does not remain immune to the impact of such films; accordingly, one evening after having watched such a film, she declares herself ready and willing to try something new.[155] This example is useful in showing how the cinema regulates human behaviour by prescribing certain patterns; at the same time, it also alludes to the inseparability of sexuality from its representation

The novel *The Picturegoers* provides further similarities between the two institutions, the Church and the cinema; Mark Underwood observes that in bothe people sit quietly and watch.[156] Placing the Church on the same level with the cinema represents a serious subversion of the former because it is debunked.

More importantly, escapism seems to be the main role films play in the characters' lives; that is to say, the cinema

> encouraged people to turn their back on real life. Escapism had always been a fundamental and harmless function of popular art; but the cinema invested such escapism with a new and sinister plausibility, projecting a seductive image of a stream-lined, chronium-plated, hygienically-packed, deep-frozen, King-sized superlife, which could be vicariously and effortlessly enjoyed by slumping into a cinema-seat. Father Kipling was fighting a losing battle. The cinema […] had already become an acceptable substitute for religion. What

---

[150] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 105-106.
[151] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 125-126.
[152] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 83, p. 85.
[153] Cf. Oscar Wilde, "The Decay of Lying", in: *Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*, ed. by Vyvyan Holland, London: Collins, 1966, p. 992.
[154] David Lodge, *The Picturegoers*, p. 87.
[155] Cf. David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?*, p. 152.
[156] Cf. David Lodge, *The Picturegoers*, pp. 108-109.

was more alarming was that in time it might become an acceptable substitute for living.[157]

This excerpt, in spite of being narrated in the third person, constitutes an insight into Mark Underwood's consciousness after listening to Father Kipling's sermon directed against the cinema. Mark sees the problem not in the fact that the cinema has begun to replace religion, but in its urging individuals to find a temporary refuge in an illusory world, free from the negative aspects characterising reality.

On the whole, it is the above mentioned feeling of escaping reality, brief as it is, that assures cinema's great success. Escapism illustrates the idea that "[h]ow that reality is produced is as much an effect of the power relations and resistances within the industry as it is within the **audiences**."[158] The impact the cinema has on human behaviour is comparable with that of the Catholic Church, which is also the reason for the competition between the two. Regardless of religious laws, pop-culture makes extensive use of erotic images thus appealing to individuals' bodies by not only stimulating, but also shaping their desires. As the novel suggests, the Church has no chance of winning the battle against the cinema since the latter manages to undermine the former functioning on similar principles.

2.4.3. Pilgrimage, a form of tourism

Starting from the consideration of the journey as an essential element of a traditional quest, this subchapter will focus on the relation between pilgrimage and tourism. First of all, it is necessary to state that the will to travel is stimulated by the desire to know more, which has always been characteristic of human beings. The so-called "institutionalized pilgrimage" proves to be extremely important in religions such as Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam because it is "a search for knowledge."[159] There are controversial views on the connection between religion and

---

[157] *Ibid.*, p. 107.
[158] Susan Hayward, *Key Concepts in Cinema Studies*, London, New York: Routledge, 1996, p. 112.
[159] Cf. Luigi Tomasi, "*Homo Viator*: from Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism via the Journey", in William H. Swatos, Jr. and Luigi Tomasi, Ed., *From Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism. The Social and Cultural Economics of Piety*, Westport Connecticut, London: Praeger, 2002, p. 1.

tourism: some theorists believe that the two have nothing in common while others state that tourism as we know it today derives from pilgrimage.[160]

According to Dean MacCannell the modern tourist and the ancient pilgrim are not very different.[161] He states that, after long researches, he has come to the conclusion that the present-day popular sights attracting tourists function on a symbolism similar to primitive religions.[162] Similarly, Swatos and Tomasi stress the relation between pilgrimage and religion, but they are also very interested in the fact that pilgrimage constitutes a journey, an aspect that makes one think of globalization.[163]

It must be acknowledged that the modern tourist performs a kind of ritual whose climax is the moment of arrival at the sight, which in its turn has been conferred a sacred function by various institutions. Moreover, religious buildings such as churches or cathedrals are visited by more tourists than by people who seek them for their religious function.[164]

2.4.2.1. The journey as a ritual

Paradise News is an interesting novel which presents the idea that tourism is the new world religion. The novel has as main character Bernard Walsh, an English ex-priest who, accompanied by his father, travels to Hawaii in order to visit his dying aunt, Ursula. During the journey he meets a number of characters among which Roger Sheldrake, a researcher writing a book on tourism:

> "I'm interested in religion myself, obliquely," he continued. "The thesis of my book is that sightseeing is a substitute for religious ritual. The sightseeing tour as secular pilgrimage. Accumulation of grace by visiting the shrines of high culture. Guidebooks as devotional aids. You get the picture."[165]

---

[160] Cf. Boris Vukonic, *Tourism and Religion*, Translated by Sanja Matešic, Oxford: Pergamon, 1996, p. 135.
[161] Cf. Luigi Tomasi, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
[162] Cf. Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist. A new Theory of the Leisure Class*, London and Basingstoke: The MacMillan Press Ltd, 1976, p. 2.
[163] Cf. William H. Swatos, Jr., and Luigi Tomasi, "Epilogue: Pilgrimage for a New Millenium", in William H. Swatos, Jr. And Luigi Tomasi, Ed., *From Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism. The Social and Cultural Economics of Piety*, Westport Connecticut, London: Praeger, 2002, p. 208.
[164] Cf. Dean MacCannell, *op. cit.*, p. 43-44.
[165] David Lodge, *Paradise News*, p. 75.

There is a reversion of poles here: tourism is considered to be a religious ritual whereas pilgrimage is desacralised. The contact with high culture is declared to be the Holy Grail of the tourists' quest, but it is the guidebooks which are endowed with authority as they establish the canon. Sheldrake then openly states that "tourism is the new world religion". Since pilgrimage seems to be the common feature of tourism and religion, the Ph.D. student intends to treat the connection between the two in his dissertation. Defining the method used by him as deconstruction, Sheldrake regards tourism as "the new opium of the people." Arrogantly he considers himself to be on the same scale with Marx and Freud on the ground that he will revolutionise the studies on tourism as well as on religion, or, in other words, that he will become an initiator of discourses. In his opinion, holidays, which are thought to be an occasion of relaxation, generate only stress in reality because people usually try to behave in the manner which is expected of them.[166]

The term 'landscape' is essential in the discussion of tourism as it is said to suggest a certain perspective on nature. Therefore, landscapes, too, depend on their representation, which shapes their perception entirely. That is to say, landscapes are culturally constructed reflecting a tight connection between art and tourism.[167]

Analysing the case of Hawaii, Roger Sheldrake notices that the brochures advertising its beaches create an image of the paradise, which is contradicted by reality.[168] According to Luigi Tomasi, the journey is the link between the pilgrim and the tourist; he speaks of a *homo viator*, seen in any culture of the world and defined as someone travelling in order to find both exoticism and sacredness.[169] It is exactly this idea of the sacred that the association of the Hawaii with a paradise illustrates.

Pilgrimage has been given several legitimate definitions, but the one provided by Tomasi is useful in the discussion of *Paradise News*. He sees it as a journey usually performed by a group towards a destination which often has utopian characteristics in the pilgrims' minds.[170] Indeed, in Lodge's novel the promised paradise in the brochures about the Hawaii resembles a utopia which is actually the real object of the tourists' desires. Sheldrake comments on this aspect of the holiday arguing numerous people travel to Hawaii in search of a utopian landscape, which

[166] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 76-79.
[167] Cf. Cara Aitchison, Nicola E. MacLeod and Stephen J. Shaw, *Leisure and Tourism Landscapes. Social and Cultural Geographies*, London and New York: Routledge, 2001, p. 72.
[168] Cf. David Lodge, *Paradise News*, p. 78.
[169] Cf. Luigi Tomasi, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

they never find.[171] Roger Sheldrake collects the Paradise references making a long list of them, among which: "Paradise Florist, Paradise Gold, Paradise Custom Packing, Paradise Liquor, Paradise Roofing, Paradise Used Furniture, Paradise Termite and Rat Control…"[172] Such names constitute on the one hand comic effects arising from exaggeration and association of incompatible terms such as 'paradise' and 'rat', but on the other hand they are clear examples of demystification of the idea of the Christian paradise. In support of the idea of desacralization it must be added that Sheldrake also observes that the association of an island with paradise is not of Christian but of pagan origin.[173]

After watching the tourists in his hotel gathering around the swimming pool every day, Sheldrake formulates the idea that tourism is a ceremonial, considering the pool to be "a *sine qua non*" which makes baptism possible.[174] Therefore, dipping into the pool appears to be a baptism which is necessary for the people to become real holiday makers.

Roger Sheldrake comes to an interesting theory of tourism: he dismisses the structuralist classification of tourism into "wanderlust" and "sunlust" pleading for a one that starts from the pair "culture/ nature." Thus, he distinguishes between "the holiday as pilgrimage and the holiday as paradise;" while the former consists in visiting places which are famous for their cultural and artistic value (e.g. museums, castles) the latter is in fact the holiday on the beach, in which the tourist searches the total relaxation of his or her body. Unlike the pilgrimage, which is "*dynamic*" since it implies running from one sight to another, the holiday as paradise is "*static*" because it represents a quest for a timeless reality marked by repetition.[175]Although the two types of tourism appear to be opposites, they have something in common, namely the connection with religion, be it under the form of pilgrimage or paradise. Nonetheless, eventually, Sheldrake draws the conclusion that "[t]*he holiday paradise is inevitably transposed into a site of pilgrimage by the innate momentum of the tourist industry*.[176] The border between the two kinds of holiday is fluid; landscapes are culturally constructed for industrial reasons and thus itineraries are created.

---

[170] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 3.
[171] Cf. David Lodge, *Paradise News*, p. 78.
[172] *Ibid.,* p. 163.
[173] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 164.
[174] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 112.
[175] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 242.
[176] *Ibid.,* p. 251.

All in all, holiday making means pilgrimage and this evidently shows that tourism not only resembles religion, but also replaces it. Tourism has a lot of features that make it be considered a ritual and, according to Roger Sheldrake, the expert in *Paradise News*, it is undoubtedly a substitute of religion.

2.4.2.2. The way to Santiago de Compostela

Pilgrimage is equally defined as "a journey undertaken for religious purposes that culminates in a visit to a place considered to be the site or manifestation of the supernatural– a place where it is easier to obtain divine help."[177] This is the case of the pilgrimage presented in David Lodge's novel *Therapy*; the main character of the book is Laurence Passmore, a successful film-script writer who tries various therapies in order to heal the unexplainable pain in his knee. He is also the narrator of the whole story which appears under the form of a diary in colloquial English. Remembering Maureen, his first love as a young boy, he starts looking for her and thus finds out where she lives. Unfortunately, he only finds her husband, Bede, who tells him that Maureen is on a pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela, in Spain. Maureen has chosen this place because it is considered to be sacred as the bones of St. James are thought to be buried there. It is clear that she is doing the pilgrimage against her husband's will, which makes her seem an independent woman. Bede has prejudices: he finds it absurd that a woman of Maureen's age goes on such a long journey on foot. He regards women as being weak and for this reason he is amazed when getting a card from his wife that she has got to the Pyrenees safely.[178]

Generally speaking, pilgrimages are usually performed outside England because of the Reformation which, being directed against the Pope's control, made the country Protestant and at the same time meant the end of religious pilgrimages.[179] The journeys to Santiago de Compostela were first encouraged by the Cluniac monks and originated in the eleventh century with the Christian reconquest of Spain.[180] It is actually sacred buildings that link tourism with religion, but most tourists are

---

[177] Luigi Tomasi, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
[178] Cf. David Lodge, *Therapy*, pp. 274-275.
[179] Cf. Cara Aitchison, Nicola E. MacLeod and Stephen J. Shaw, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
[180] Cf. Luigi Tomasi, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

interested rather in the historic than religious aspect of such sights.[181] We deal here with the so-called *homo turisticus religiosus* or the religious tourist, a concept on which both secular and theological theory have been concentrating.[182]

Laurence Passmore's decision to search for his first love marks the beginning of his "quest for Maureen."[183] He reads a lot of information about Santiago de Compostela, which is believed to be a place where the supernatural manifests itself. For instance, there is a legend saying that St. James once rescued a man from drowning.[184] Passmore also finds out that "[t]he church contains relics of some gruesome mediaeval miracle, when the communion bread and wine turned into real flesh and blood, and the place is also said to be associated with the legend of the Holy Grail."[185] The religious meaning of the church becomes evident, as it is considered to contain the Holy Grail as well as to represent a space in which the divine was palpable once. The sight of this place has a strong impact on Passmore, who perceives his presence there as an essential moment in his quest.[186] The object of his search is Maureen, the woman he loves, the pilgrimage constituting a kind of therapy for him. Finding Maureen means the completion of his quest and the miraculous cure of his knee.

More importantly, the novel *Therapy* makes it clear that people do not go on a pilgrimage only out of religious reasons. Passmore's experience proves it: most of the pilgrims he meets are native young people who, on the one hand, want to be free from their parents, on the other hand, find the pilgrimage a good opportunity of flirting, which is enabled by the mixed accommodation as well. Passmore remembers that he has already experienced this kind of flirtation in a Catholic club, the place it should be the least expected. Other pilgrims have totally different reasons, namely some foreigners like this route for its beautiful landscapes which at the same time constitute free camping place. Sport is the main motive for cyclists and other people are interested in the historic as well as architectural aspect of Spain, so they do the pilgrimage out of cultural grounds. Nevertheless, for all of these groups, the journey means a very nice wayof spending a holiday.[187]

---

[181] Cf. Boris Vukonic, *op. cit.*, p. 61.
[182] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 69.
[183] David Lodge, *Therapy*, p. 280.
[184] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 287.
[185] *Ibid.,* p. 293.
[186] Cf. *loc. cit.*
[187] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 292.

There are further reasons that can mobilize people to go on a pilgrimage. Liliane Voyé's view on pilgrimages is useful here because she thinks that they have a spiritual side, which means that pilgrims are given the opportunity of gradually finding themselves during their journey. In other words, pilgrimage is defined "as a personal quest of one's identity."[188] In this context it is necessary to explain that

> identity seems no longer something that is constructed at a certain moment of life. It changes, more or less often, depending on various experiences and relationships. "Roles" appear less and less ascriptive. So, to travel, to meet other people, to see another environment for a while are conditions that are supposed to help one to discover oneself at a certain moment.[189]

Thus, pilgrimage and journey in general help establish or become aware of one's identity, which is by no means static as it develops continually. The age of the traveller is irrelevant because he or she can discover a new self any time. This is the case of Maureen, who completes an interesting questionnaire on her way:

> "*Name*: Maureen Harrington. *Age*: 57. *Nationality*: British. *Religion*: Catholic. *Motives for Journey (tick one or more)*: *1. Religious 2. Spiritual 3. Recreational 4. Cultural 5. Sporting*." I noticed with interest that Maureen had only ticked one: "Spiritual."[190]

Although Maureen is Catholic, she ticks spiritual when asked about the reason of her pilgrimage; her choice indicates that she is on a quest for her own identity. She confesses to Laurence Passmore that all her life has been dedicated to other people, but that she is doing this pilgrimage exclusively for herself.[191] Tired of doing sacrifices for others all the time, Maureen sees in her journey an opportunity of discovering her inner self, which has got lost in her hard life as a good Catholic wife and mother doing only the things that have been expected from her. Additionally, her journey to Santiago de Compostela represents a subversion of the Catholic religion as she does not look for the sacred nature of the place, but for an opportunity of meditating on her own life, the pilgrimage becoming thus an act of self-affirmation.

---

[188] Cf. Liliane Voyé, "Popular Religion and Pilgrimages in Western Europe", in William H. Swatos, Jr. and Luigi Tomasi, ed., *From Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism. The Social and Cultural Economics of Piety*, Westport Connecticut, London: Praeger, 2002, p. 124.
[189] *Ibid.,* p. 125.
[190] David Lodge, *Therapy*, p. 290.
[191] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 303.

To conclude the whole chapter on religious discourse, it must be repeated that the starting point was the traditional concept of the quest for the Holy Grail; the analysis of *Small World* helped to show that it is a romance in which the Grail, in spite of its various metamorphoses, can be reduced to power. It was argued that in each case the search for knowledge is accompanied by a striving for power, a fact which illustrates Michel Foucault's equation of the two concepts, simultaneously explaining the equation of quest and conquest announced in the title of the paper. The next section was concerned with the discussion of the Catholic Church as an institution which controls individuals through the fear of Hell and the confessional. Foucault's assumption that the exercise of power on the human body not only shapes subjectivities, but also regulates behaviour was applied to Lodge's novels, which illustrate this idea in the modification of the characters' desires and sex relations by the Safe Method imposed on them by the Church. The last part of the chapter deals with some of the discourses that undermine the authority of the Catholic Church. Thus, the main reason for disobeying religious rules is the characters' decision to fulfil certain erotic fantasies, which are, in their turn, the result of representations of sexuality circulated by various media, such as books, magazines or films. It must be added that the cases commented upon go hand in hand with the Foucauldian idea that sexuality is inseparable from its representation; moreover, they were catalogued as acts of transgression, another concept borrowed from the French philosopher in order to stress the attack on religion. Then the cinema was treated as a further means of subverting the Catholic Church; the main idea was that the former is an institution competing with the latter to 'conquer' individuals and sometimes even becoming a substitute for it. The last subchapter dealt with pilgrimage, which, becoming in the modern age a common form of tourism, has lost its sacred meaning, thus undermining religious discourse.

3. Gender Discourse

3.1. Feminism. A theoretical introduction

3.1.1. Object of study, goal, definition

Feminism deals with women and their status in society and asks questions about oppression, consciousness, gender. Deborah Madsen states that the concerns of feminist theory are: "the unique experience of women in history; the notion of female consciousness; the definitions of gender that limit and oppress; and the cause of women's liberation from those restrictions."[1] Then she explains that "[i]n anthologies and introductory monographs, feminist literary theory is frequently explained in terms of how theorists deal with the concepts of 'Woman' or 'the Feminine'."[2] Among the key terms used in feminist theory are gender, sex, misogyny and patriarchy. Thus, 'gender', referring to the social and cultural differences between men and women, is not to be confounded with 'sex', considered to be natural. 'Misogyny' means woman-hatred and designates a social system in which women occupy positions inferior to men. Furthermore, in certain cultures there are really extreme misogynist practices, such as mutilation, slavery or marriage by force. Another frequent term is 'patriarchy', which describes cultures, ideologies, societies favouring men and masculinity in general, or, in other words, a world ruled by men.[3]

Toril Moi defines feminist criticism as "a specific kind of political discourse: a critical and theoretical practice committed to the struggle against patriarchy and sexism."[4] According to this view, feminists' task is not only to bring to light social power relations disadvantaging women, but also to change them. In a book on literary criticism, Charles E. Bressler states that throughout history women have been turned into the "nonsignificant Other" by men. Then he explains that aiming to change

---

[1] Deborah L. Madsen, *Feminist Theory and Literary Practice*, London, Sterling, Virginia: Pluto Press, 2000, p. ix .

[2] *Ibid.,* p. x.

[3] Cf. *ibid.,* p. xii.

[4] Toril Moi, "Feminist, Female, Feminine", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford,

women's situation as Others feminists explicitly demand that women and men should have equal rights and chances to participate in all fields of life.[5] That is why feminism is defined as "a politics" including, beside the acknowledgement of women's lower status in society, the determination to act for improvement.[6] In other words, there are two important steps to be made by women: firstly, they must acknowledge their inferior position; secondly, they should fight to change this state of things. Studying and speaking for oppressed "Others", feminism resembles postcolonialism.[7] Feminism has also penetrated numerous theoretical domains of study; that is why today we can speak of feminist literary criticism, which is defined as a new way of analysing literary texts and has developed a lot recently.[8] As it will be shown, applying such an approach to David Lodge's novels will bring forth interesting results.

3.1.2. A historical overview on feminist criticism

A diachronic consideration of feminist literary criticism proves to be helpful in understanding the complexity of its orientations to whose development various scholars have contributed. According to Lizbeth Goodman, the beginning of feminist thought was marked by the so-called "first wave" of feminists known as suffragists because they fought for the right to vote.[9] Bressler too considers the origins of feminist criticism to go back to the first part of the twentieth century, in the "Progressive Era," when women started to take an active part not only in social fields, but also in literature. Virginia Woolf's groundbreaking essay "A Room of One's Own" (1929) is said to have laid the foundations of feminist criticism as she draws attention to the fact that women are still

---

New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, p. 246.

[5] Cf. Charles E. Bressler, *Literary Criticism. An Introduction to Theory and Practice*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1994, p. 103.

[6] Cf. Lizbeth Goodman, "Introduction: gender as an approach to literature", in: Lizbeth Goodman, ed., *Literature and Gender*, London, New York: Routledge, 1996, p. x.

[7] Cf. Leela Ghandi, *Postcolonial Theory. A Critical Introduction*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998, pp. 82-83. Sara Mills also remarks affinities between feminist and postcolonial theory. Cf. Sara Mills, "Post-colonial Feminist Theory", in: Stevi Jackson and Jackie Jones, ed., *Contemporary Literary Theories*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998, pp. 98-112.

[8] Cf. Lizbeth Goodman, *op. cit.,* p. xi.

[9] Cf. *ibid.,* p. x.

treated as inferior to men, who, in reality, establish what 'female' means controlling all areas of life, such as economy, politics, society, literature. Virginia Woolf takes over Samuel Taylor Coleridge's idea that "great minds possess both male and female characteristics." Then there follows a break in the continuity of the development of feminist ideas caused by the Great Depression of the 1930's and by World War II. The interest in feminist matters is raised again in 1949 when Simone de Beauvoir publishes *The Second Sex*, which is regarded as "the foundational work of twentieth-century feminism" as it claims that Western cultures are indeed patriarchal. The French writer agrees with Virginia Woolf that women are defined by men as Others. The title of de Beauvoir's treatise announces the objectification of women present in the idea of the Other applied to them by an implicitly male perspective. The French feminist's aim is very clear: the encouragement of women to reject this categorization by fighting to become human beings.[10] This work turns Simone de Beauvoir into the precursor of the next important stage in the development of feminism, the "second wave" in the late1960's when both Europe and America were shaken by political fights for women's rights.[11] Throughout the 1960's and 1970's feminist critics move from the political to the literary domain and, after looking at canonical works from a new perspective, they prove that Beauvoir was right when asserting that women are represented in a most unfavourable manner. The results of their analysis are impressive; first of all, the literary canon is rich in gender stereotypes. Thus, women appear as being nymphomaniac, beautiful, stupid or spinsters. Secondly, in comparison with canonised male authors, the number of women writers who have acquired such positions is surprisingly low. Third, as far as protagonists are concerned, the main characters are usually men. Finally, scholars like Virginia Woolf or Simone de Beauvoir were given very little attention by male critics who establish the canon. Consequently, feminists declare themselves unpleased with the place women occupy in literature, so they demand change in these respects while rediscovering literary texts written by female writers such as Kate Chopin in America, Doris Lessing in England or Monique Wittig in France.[12]

In the 1980's Elaine Showalter uses the term "**gynocriticism**" to talk about

---

[10] Cf. Charles E. Bressler, *op. cit.*, p. 104.
[11] Cf. Lizbeth Goodman, *op. cit.*, p. x.
[12] Cf. Charles E. Bressler, *op. cit.* , pp. 104-105.

women writers.[13] Nowadays there are numerous directions labeled as feminist; thus, Keith Green and Jill Lebihan state that calling oneself simply a feminist critic is no longer possible as "one has to be a deconstructionist feminist, a Marxian feminist, a lesbian feminist, a materialist feminist or a combination of these labels."[14] Charles E. Bressler classifies "three distinct geographical strains of feminism […]: American, British, and French"[15] continuing by explaining each one of them individually. He starts with the assumption that the kind of feminism practised in American universities "emphasizes the actual text with all its textual qualities, such as theme, voice, and tone, while at the same time being suspicious of any one theory that would attempt to explain the differences between male and female writings."[16] Unlike it, British feminism considers itself to be more political:

> Often viewed as Marxist, British feminism is more ideological and therefore seemingly more concerned with social and cultural change than its American counterpart. Finding its home outside the university in the publishing world, journalism, and politics, British feminism attempts to analyze the relationship between gender and class and to show how the dominant power structures controlled by men influence all of society and oppress women.[17]

The difference between American and British feminism lies in the fact that if the former is described as a semiotic approach remaining restricted to the university, the latter is more politically oriented as it relates gender to class aiming to improve woman's social position. French feminism is totally different from both of them as it

> concentrates on language, analyzing how meaning is produced through various linguistic symbols. Such an analysis usually leads these critics into other areas of study, such as metaphysics, psychology, and art. Most recently, these theorists have speculated that a style of writing peculiar to women exists. **L'écriture féminine** or "women's writing," they maintain, is fundamentally different from

---

[13] Cf. *loc. cit.* Elaine Showalter also draws attention to the multiple orientations classified as feminist; cf. Elaine Showalter, "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness", in: David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, London and New York: Longman, 1988, pp. 331-353.

[14] Keith Green and Jill LeBihan, *Critical Theory and Practice: A Coursebook*, London, New York: Routledge, 1996, p. 228.

[15] Charles E. Bressler, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

[16] *Loc. cit.*

[17] *Loc. cit.*

male writing and obtains meaning through the writing process.[18]

French feminists are mostly preoccupied with defining a female essence that would explain why women write differently from men. Therefore, "the question in French feminist texts that seems most relevant and urgent is that of a specifically feminine discourse."[19] In spite of being divergent, these directions do have common assertions, namely, all feminists agree that "they are on a journey of self-discovery that will lead them to a better understanding of themselves" since "once they understand and then define themselves as women, they believe they will be able to change their world."[20]

3.1.3. The dichotomy gender vs. sex

Starting from the assumption that "[b]etween man and woman, there really is otherness: biological, morphological, relational,"[21] the dichotomy gender/ sex is essential in the discussion of feminism. Lizbeth Goodman distinguishes between the two terms as follows:

> '**Gender**' refers to ways of seeing and representing people and situations based on sex difference. By contrast, 'sex' is a biological category: female or male. The term 'sexuality' refers to the realm of sexual experience and desire– sometimes it refers to a person's sexual orientation (as heterosexual, bisexual or homosexual). 'Gender' is a social or cultural category, influenced by stereotypes about 'female' and 'male' behaviour that exist in our attitudes and beliefs. Such beliefs are often said to be 'culturally produced' or 'constructed'.

Whereas sex is seen as describing the biological differences between males and females, gender is a cultural construct referring to the social roles that women and men assume. Sexuality is another concept useful in feminist criticism as it classifies people according to their sexual orientation. Michel Foucault too is of the opinion that gender and

---

[18] *Loc. cit.*

[19] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "French Feminism in an International Frame", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 54.

[20] Charles E. Bressler, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

[21] Luce Irigaray, "The Other: Woman", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 310.

sexuality are discursively constructed pointing to the fact the clear delineation between male and female is a product of an Enlightenment quest for truth.[22] It has been argued that "[a]n open web of social, psychological, and cultural relations, dynamics, practices, identities, beliefs […] comes to constitute gender as a social, cultural, and psychological phenomenon."[23] As Monique Wittig remarks, "[i]n the case of women, ideology goes far since our bodies as well as our minds are the product of this manipulation."[24] The consideration of gender as a cultural construct constitutes an attack to "essentialism," which "is classically defined as a belief in true essences– that which is most irreducible, unchanging, and therefore constitutive of a given person or thing." On the contrary, "[c]onstructionism, articulated in opposition to essentialism and concerned with its philosophical refutation, insists that essence is itself a historical construction."[25]

Proclaiming gender feminism's main concern, Jane Flax expresses her opinion that

> [t]he single most important advance in feminist theory is that the existence of gender relations has been problematized. Gender can no longer be treated as a simple, natural fact. The assumption that gender relations are natural, we now see, arose from two coinciding circumstances: the unexamined identification and confusion of (anatomical) sexual differences with gender relations, and the absence of active feminist movements."[26]

To sum up, feminist scholars have succeeded in revealing the fact that gender is by no means a natural difference between men and women as it has been believed for so long. Confusing gender with sex has stopped women from fighting for equal rights. Taking the view that "[c]ulture, society, history define gender, not nature," one can state that "identity is a role."[27]

---

[22] Cf. Michel Foucault, "Das Wahre Geschlecht", transl. by Eva Erdmann and Annette Wunschel, in: Michel Foucault, *Herculine Barbin. Über Hermaphrodismus (Herculine Barbin dite Alexine B)*, ed. by Wolfgang Schöffner and Joseph Vogl, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1998 (1978), pp. 8-10.

[23] Nancy Chodorow, "Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 184.

[24] Monique Wittig, "One is not Born a Woman", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 221.

[25] Diana Fuss, "The 'Risk' of Essence", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, pp. 250-251.

[26] Jane Flax, "Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 174.

[27] Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, ed., *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1987, pp. 263-265.

As far as literature is concerned, gender can be applied to its study in various ways:

> So, when we refer to the study of literature and gender, we don't just mean literary analysis of texts with regard to the sex (female or male) or sexuality of authors, but the wider study of literary texts as they are written, read and interpreted within cultures, by women and men. We are all aware of some degree of cultural stereotyping about gender.[28]

Therefore, when discussing gender in relation to literary texts, one should examine not only the sex of the author, but also the way the text is written and how it is interpreted. Each society is rich in gender stereotypes, which are cultivated from an early age: for instance, "the Western tradition of designating colours to signify sex difference: 'pink for girls, blue for boys.'"[29] Accordingly, these colours become "symbols for sex difference" as they can be associated with certain ideas, "pink perhaps suggesting softness and 'girlishness' and blue suggesting 'boyishness.'"[30] Such connections easily generate stereotypes, which unavoidably lead to preconceived ideas:

> While the designations 'female' and 'male' are sex categories, the imaginative ideas associated with these differences include a range of cultural and individualized ideas about gender. Preconceptions about gender might include the idea that 'women drivers' are in some way less able than 'drivers' (assumed to be male), or the notion that 'big boys don't cry'. Further examples might include giving boys bigger portions of food or giving boys trucks rather than dolls as gifts. In the world of work, there is the gendered division of labour, characterized by a striking male domination of high status, highly paid areas of work.[31]

The gender differences are rooted in childhood when boys and girls are dressed in different colours, receive different toys to play with and are prescribed different patterns of behaviour. These differences become deeper in adulthood, men obviously having better chances of getting better jobs and naturally higher wages. Therefore, gender is a category used in analysing both society and literature:

---

[28] Lizbeth Goodman, *op. cit.*, p. vii.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. viii.
[30] *Loc. cit.*
[31] *Loc. cit.*

So, gender can be read in sexual stereotypes and in power relations between individuals and groups. In the process of studying these phenomena, we engage with symbolic ideas attached to sex difference (colours, ideas, images) which involve our imaginations and interpretative skills. If we read with concern for identifying assumptions and stereotypes about gender, we learn about society as well as about literature.[32]

A close look at gender reveals the fact that social life and literature abound in numerous stereotypes which are considered to be self-evident truths, but which ensure unequal power relations between men and women. Circulated by dominant discourses and usually taken for granted, gender stereotypes directs both men's and women's thinking and behaviour by making them identify with the role they are supposed to play in society.

3.1.4. Feminist methodology

Although feminism includes a variety of approaches to literary texts, feminist critics generally try "to challenge and change Western culture's assumption that males are superior to females and therefore are better thinkers, more rational, more serious, and more reflective than women." They "may begin their debunking of male superiority by exposing stereotypes of women found throughout the literary canon" because gender stereotypes "must be identified and challenged, and such abuse of women by male authors must be acknowledged as ways men have consciously or unconsciously demeaned, devalued, and demoralized women."[33] In other words, generalised images of women are to be recognized, acknowledged and regarded as means of degrading them. For a feminist critic there are two important ways of reading literature: one of them consists in rediscovering texts written by female authors who have not been included in the canon and the other one lies in reading canonised texts by male authors from a woman's perspective.[34] Aware of the different orientations within feminism, Bressler

---

[32] *Loc. cit.*
[33] Charles E. Bressler, *op. cit.*, p. 108.
[34] Cf. *loc. cit.*

identifies several general questions that can be asked of a text, such as:

> Is the author male or female? Is the text narrated by a male or a female? What types of roles do women have in the text? Are the female characters the protagonists or secondary and minor characters? Do any stereotypical characterizations of women appear? What are the attitudes toward women held by the male characters? What is the author's attitude toward women in society? How does the author's culture influence her or his attitude? Is feminine imagery used? If so, what is the significance of such imagery? Do the female characters speak differently from the male characters? By asking any or all of these questions of a text, we can begin our journey in feminist criticism while simultaneously helping ourselves to better understand the world in which we live.[35]

The questions enumerated above belong to two levels of analysis: on the one hand, there is the level of the characters (including their representation, the relations between them, their attitudes towards each other), on the other hand, the narrators can also be described in terms of gender. Moreover, these questions are useful in understanding not only a text, but they also unveil thought-provoking facts about our society. A feminist methodology will be applied to David Lodge's novels in order to highlight how relations of power are maintained by social roles attributed to men and women as well as to reveal aspects that are to be identified as patriarchal elements typical of the Western culture.

3.1.5. Foucault and feminists

There is a controversy whether Foucault's theory of power is suitable for a feminist approach or not; the *pro* opinions are based on the fact that feminist and Foucauldian ideas have something in common, namely the attack on Enlightenment and the questioning of established values taken for granted. Thus, Nancy Hartsock agrees with the French thinker's assumption that "the philosophical and historical creation of a devalued 'Other' was the necessary precondition for the creation of the transcendental

rational subject outside time and space, the subject who is the speaker in Enlightenment philosophy."[36] The universal subject whose main quality is reason is a mere creation of Enlightenment, which intended to make a clear distinction between the self and the Other, a model in which the Other can be interpreted as woman as well. Michèle Barrett explains at large why such thought is attacked by feminist critics:

> [...] there has been an extensive critique of two central aspects of what is usually referred to as "Enlightenment" thought, or philosophical 'liberalism': the doctrine of *rationalism* and the *'Cartesian'* concept of a human subject. Feminist political theorists and philosophers have built up a considerable body of work on the masculine character of 'rationalism', and these debates are represented elsewhere. The so-called 'Cartesian subject' is a topic of complex debate, and much of what is written within post-structuralist and post-modern thought touches on this question. At the heart of the issue is the model of the rational, centred, purposive (and in practice modern European and male) subject for whom Descartes deduced *'cogito ergo sum.'* There are so many things wrong with this model of subjectivity, one scarcely knows where to begin. It displaces and marginalizes other subjects and other forms of subjectivity. It also denies what many would now accept as a central contribution of psychoanalysis- that the self is built on conflict and tension rather than being essential or given. [...] If we replace the given self with a constructed, fragmented self, this poses not only the obvious political question of who is the I that acts and on what basis, but the more teasing conundrum of who is the I that is so certain of its fragmented and discursively constructed nature. Hence the critique of the Cartesian subject has posed a new set of questions about identity and experience [...].[37]

Feminit scholars subvert the Cartesian subject on account of its being necessarily white and male, which implies the exclusion of women from knowledge classifying them as Others. This deconstruction of the concept of self constitutes a converging point of Foucauldian, feminist and postcolonial theories. However, Nancy Hartsock rejects Foucault's theory of power cataloguing it as not suitable for feminism. In order to sustain her opinion, she starts her argumentation with to Albert Memmi:

> Foucault represents one of the several figures in Memmi's landscape. I have so

---

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 109.

[36] Nancy Hartsock, "Foucault on Power: A Theory for Women?", in: Linda J. Nicholson, ed., *Feminism/ Postmodernism*, New York and London: Routledge, 1990, p. 160.

[37] Michèle Barrett, "Words and Things: Materialism and Method in Contemporary Feminist Analysis", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 114.

far spoken only of the colonizer and the colonized, and these are indeed the basic structural positions. But Memmi makes an important distinction between the colonizer who accepts and the colonizer who refuses.[38]

In this model the poststructuralist philosopher is classified as "Memmi's colonizer who refuses and thus exists in a painful ambiguity. He is, therefore, a figure who also fails to provide an epistemology which is usable for the task of revolutionizing, creating, and constructing."[39] This position seems to influence his methodological books:

> The colonizer who refuses to become a part of his group fellow citizens faces the difficult political question of who might he be.
> This lack of certainty and power infuses Foucault's work most profoundly in his methodological texts. He is clearly rejecting any form of totalizing discourse: Reason, he argues, must be seen as born from chaos, truth as simply an error hardened into unalterable form in the long process of history. He argues for a glance that disperses and shatters the unity of man's being through which he sought to extend his sovereinty.[40]

Being a coloniser who refuses means being unable to integrate in his society, which leads to a crisis of identity. This is regarded by Hartsock as the reason why Foucault comes to the conclusion that reason is generated by chaos while truth is to be found exclusively in history. Yet, he is not completely indifferent to the social problems of his age as he sympathises with prisoners, people who obviously lack power:

> [...] he has engaged in social activism around prisons. His sympathies are obviously with those over whom power is exercised, and he suggests that many struggles can be seen as linked to the revolutionary working-class movement.
> In addition, his empirical critiques in works such as *Discipline and Punish* powerfully unmask coercive power. Yet, they do so on the one hand by making use of the values of humanism that he claims to be rejecting.[41]

Paradoxically, he is criticised for using humanist tools in pointing out the coercive nature of power. Hartsock holds the view that "Foucault is a complex thinker whose situation as a colonizer who resists imposes even more complexity and ambiguity on his

---

[38] Nancy Hartsock, *op. cit.*, p. 164.
[39] *Loc. cit.*
[40] *Ibid.*, pp. 164-165.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 165.

ideas."[42] She gives further arguments to justify her conviction that the Foucauldian account of power is unusable for feminism:

> [...] to make just two arguments:
> 1) despite his obvious sympathy for those who are subjugated in various ways, he writes from the perspective of the dominator, "the self-proclaimed majority"
> 2) perhaps in part because power relations are less visible to those who are in a position to dominate others, systematically unequal relations of power ultimately vanish from Foucault's account of power– a strange and ironic charge against someone who is attempting to illuminate power relations.[43]

She considers his position as a coloniser to strongly influence his thinking, which could be the reason for his having slowly abandoned the treatment of unequal power relations in his work. The fact that "Foucault himself recognizes the effects of decolonisation and the revolt of many dominated groups" serves Hartsock as evidence "that he does not offer a theory of power adequate to the analysis of gender."[44] As a result of this she makes a determined statement: "In sum, reading Foucault persuades me that Foucault's world is not my world but is instead a world in which I feel profoundly alien."[45] In the next place she exposes her opinion at large:

> Foucault's is a world in which things move, rather than people, a world in which subjects become obliterated or, rather, recreated as passive objects, a world in which passivity or refusal represent the only possible choices. Thus, Foucault writes, the confession "detached itself" from religion and "emigrated" toward pedagogy, or he notes that "hypotheses offer themselves". Moreover, he argues that subjects not only cease to be sovereign but also that external forces such as power are given access even to the body and thus are the forces which constitute the subject as a kind of effect.[46]

Foucault's philosophy is one in which the concept of subject is deconstructed: it is no longer the autonomous self observing the objects around it, instead it becomes the result of an exercise of power or it is merely a discursive construction. Nancy Hartsock draws to Edward Said whose view on the reason for which Foucault writes about power at all

---

[42] *Loc. cit.*
[43] *Loc. cit.*
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 166.
[45] *Loc. cit.*
[46] *Ibid.*, p. 167.

she shares:

> [...] it is sensible to begin by asking the beginning questions, why imagine power in the first place, and what is the relationship between one's motive for imagining power and the image one ends up with. Consider these four possibilities. You think about power (1) to imagine what you could do if you had power; (2) to speculate about what you would imagine if you had; (3) to arrive at some assessment of what power you would need in order to vanquish present power, and instate a new order of power; (4) to postulate a range of things that cannot be imagined or commanded by any form of power that exists at present.
>
> It seems to me that Foucault was mainly attracted to the first and second possibilities, that is, to thinking about power from the standpoint of its actual realization, not of opposition to it. The third and the fourth possibilities are insurgent and utopian. Foucault's emphasis, for example, upon the productivity of power, its provocative inventiveness and generative ingenuity, invigorated his analyses of how disciplines and discourses get things done, accomplish real tasks, gather authority.[47]

Said distinguishes four grounds that can lead somebody to write about power believing that Foucault's special interest in it is due to his wish to imagine a situation in which he would be endowed with power, not to oppose it. The postcolonial theorist concludes as follows:

> In short Foucault's imagination of power is largely *with* rather than *against* it, which is why the third and the fourth possibilities do not seriously interest him as matters of either moral choice or rationalized political preferences. I wouldn't go as far saying that Foucault rationalized power, or that he legitimized its dominion and its ravages by declaring them inevitable, but I would say that his interest in domination was critical but not finally as contestatory or as oppositional as on the surface it seems to be. This translates into the paradox that Foucault's imagination of power was by his analysis of power to reveal its injustice and cruelty, but his theorization to let it go on more or less unchecked. Perhaps this paradox is rooted in the extreme isolation one senses in Foucault's efforts, the discomfort both with his own genius and with an anonymity that does not suit him[...].[48]

To his mind, Foucault does not criticise power, but considers it together with its effects to be unavoidable. Consequently, it can be stated that his attitude is one in favour of

---

[47] Edward W. Said, "Foucault and the Imagination of Power", in: Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, Third Printing , 2002, pp. 241-242.

rather than against the realisation of power. For this reason, Hartsock is convinced that "poststructuralist theories such as those put forward by Michel Foucault fail to provide a theory of power for women."[49] Feminism, she says, does need a theory of power, but as "different theories of power rest on differing ontologies and epistemologies, [...] a feminist rethinking of power requires attention to its epistemological grounding.[50]

Then again Hartsock makes it clear that, although poststructuralism and feminist do have something in common, namely the attack on the Enlightenment, they are very different:

> In our efforts to find ways to include the voices of marginalized groups, one might expect helpful guidance from those who have argued against totalizing and universalistic theories such as those of the Enlightenment. [...]
> The writers, among them figures such as Foucault, Derrida, Rorty, and Lyotard, argue against the faith in a universal reason we have inherited from Enlightenment European philosophy. They reject stories that claim to encompass all of human history: As Lyotard puts it. "let us wage war on totality." In its place they propose a social criticism that is *ad hoc*, contextual, plural and limited. A number of feminist theorists have joined in the criticism of modernity put forward by these writers.[...]
> Despite their apparent congruence with the project I am proposing, I will argue these theories would hinder rather than help its accomplishment.[51]

Apparently the subversion of the usually taken for granted canon and especially the rejection of universalistic assumptions constitute common traits between the two theories, but their real usefulness for feminism is contradicted by Hartsock. She analyses the effects Foucault's perspective as colonizer has on his philosophy delivering the following examples:

> 1) from the perspective of the ruling group, other "knowledges" would appear to be illegitimate or "not allowed to function within official knowledge", as Foucault himself says about workers knowledge. They would appear to be, as Foucault has variously categorized them, "insurectionary", "disordered", "fragmentary," lacking "autonomous life." To simply characterize the variety of "counter-discourses" or "antisciences" as nonsystematic negates the fact that they rest on organized and indeed material bases.

---

[48] *Loc. cit.*
[49] Nancy Hartsock, *op. cit.*, p. 158.
[50] *Loc. cit.*
[51] *Ibid.*, p. 159.

> 2) [...] Foucault calls only for resistance and exposure of the system of power relations. Moreover, he is often vague about what exactly this means. Thus he argues only that one should "entertain the claims" of subjugated knowledges or "bring them into play." Specifically, he argues that the task of intellectuals is less to become part of movements for fundamental change and more to struggle against the forms of power that can transform these movements into instruments of domination.[52]

The poststructuralist thinker is accused of discarding knowledges that belong to other groups than the ruling ones, a view reminding of the tight relation between knowledge and power discussed in the introduction of this paper. Noticing that he only tries to describe power relations without encouraging any attempts towards change, Hartsock infers that "[p]erhaps this stress on resistance rather than transformation is due to [his] profound pessimism."[53] In her opinion, his "insisting that those of us who have been marginalized remain at the margins" is determined by the fact that "[d]omination, viewed from above, is more likely to appear as equality." Anyway, she admits that "[h]is account of power is perhaps unique in that he argues that wherever there is power, there is resistance."[54] Foucault's statement that "power must not be seen as [...] a single individual dominating others" has a clear result: it "has made it very difficult to locate domination, including domination in gender relations"[55] since

> [h]e has on the one hand claimed that individuals are constituted by power relations, but he has argued against their constitution by relations such as the domination of one group by another. That is, his account makes room only for abstract individuals, not women, men, or workers.
>   Foucault takes yet another step toward making power disappear when he proposes the image of a net as a way to understand power.[56]

The Foucauldian account of power is considered to be unsuitable for an analysis of gender in culture and society because on the one hand, due to the generalised concept of individuality, it is, paradoxically, universalistic; on the other hand, the description of power as a network as well as the assumption that "[t]here is no binary opposition

---

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 167.
[53] *Loc. cit.*
[54] *Ibid.*, p. 168.
[55] *Ibid.*, p. 169.
[56] *Loc. cit.*

between rulers and ruled, but rather manifold relations of force"[57] exclude any discussion of relations of domination.

Hartsock's argumentation shows that her position is one that favours Marxist thinking: in order to change the present relations of power, feminists "need a revised and reconstructed theory (indebted to Marx among others) [...] rather than getting rid of subjectivity or notions of the subject, as Foucault does."[58] According to her, "Marx's method and the method developed by the contemporary women's movement recapitulate each other in important ways."[59] From this perspective, she proposes several points which are seen as real tasks of feminism: first, it is extremely important "to develop an account of the world which treats our perspectives not as subjugated or disruptive knowledges, but as primary and constitutive of a different world," which constitutes no danger as "marginalized groups are far less likely to mistake themselves for the universal 'man.'"[60] The next step is to "do our work on an epistemological base that indicates that knowledge is possible– not just conversation or a discourse on how it is that power relations work" because "[t]o create a world that expresses our own various and diverse images, we need to understand how it works"[61] and to develop "a theory of power that recognizes our practical daily activity."[62] The idea of change is essential in this context:

> […]as an engaged vision, the understanding of the oppressed exposes the relations among people as inhuman and thus contains a call to political action. That is, a theory for power for women, for the oppressed, is not one that leads to a turning away from engagement but rather one that is a call for change and participation in altering power relations.[63]

The inferior position of women in society should not only be acknowledged, but also changed, which turns feminism into a political movement aimed to liberate a marginalised group. For the achievement of this purpose some critical steps are

---

[57] *Loc. cit.*
[58] *Ibid.*, p. 170.
[59] *Ibid.*, p. 152.
[60] *Ibid.*, p. 171.
[61] *Ibid.*, pp. 171-172.
[62] *Ibid.*, p. 172.
[63] *Loc. cit.*

necessary:

> The critical steps are, first, using what we know about our lives as a basis for critique of the dominant culture and, second, creating alternatives. [...] To paraphrase Marx, the point is to change the world, not simply to redescribe ourselves or reinterpret the world yet again.[64]

Taking Marxism as methodology implies not only a thorough analysis of the existent relations of domination, but also ideas for alternatives. On the whole, Hartsock refutes Foucauldian discourse analysis on the ground that it declares the disappearance of the subject, it renders true knowledge impossible and finally it is too passive as it fails to suggest any strategies for change. This last aspect can be traced back to Edward Said's critique of Foucault:

> [...] he [Foucault] showed no real interest in the relationship his work had with feminist or postcolonial writers facing problems of exclusion, confinement, and domination. Indeed, his Eurocentrism was almost total, as if "history" itself took place only among a group of French and German thinkers.[65]

Said disapproves of Foucault's lack of concern for feminist and postcolonial theorists who have drawn on his work calling his thinking Eurocentric. Nonetheless, Said recognises the merits of Foucault's books, which have also inspired him particularly in writing *Orientalism*.

If Nancy Hartsock's view of feminism as politically oriented rejects Foucauldian discourse analysis in favour of Marxism, other feminist critics have acknowledged the great impact Foucault has had on modern thinking in general and feminism in particular. For instance, Michèle Barrett claims that the influential philosopher's ideas have offered a good base for developing further theories:

> Feminist theory has been able to take up a number of issues outside that classically 'materialist' perspective: in particular the analysis of corporeality and of the psyche. 'Post-structuralist' theories, notably Derriadian deconstructive reading, Lacanian psychoanalysis, and Foucault's emphasis on the material body

---

[64] *Loc. cit.*
[65] Edward W. Said, "Foucault and the Imagination of Power", p.196.

and the discourse of power, have proved very important in this. Feminists have appropriated these theories rather than others for good reasons: these theorists address the issues of sexuality, subjectivity, and textuality that feminists have put at the top of the agenda.[66]

Along with Derrida and Lacan, Foucault belongs to the poststructuralists who have contributed to the development of essential theses used by feminists in the discussion of topics such as sexuality, subjectivity, or textuality. Maggie Humm also acknowledges the common ground– most evident in the attack on the universalistic claim of Enlightenment– shared by feminism and poststructuralism.[67] Lois McNay is another critic holding the view that:

> Foucault's critique of Enlightenment rationality and of the rational subject [...] has resonated, in particular, with feminist and postcolonial critiques of Enlightenment thought as a highly gendered and ethnocentric construct that implicitly naturalizes a white, masculine perspective and correspondingly denigrates anything directly and analogously associated with a feminine or non-European position.[68]

By attacking the Enlightenment he does subvert European universal values and, for this reason, his description of power and knowledge goes hand in hand with feminist criticism. As Deborah L. Madsen states, feminists deal with "those identity categories that are in fact *effects* of institutions, practices, discourses with multiple and diffuse points of origin;" furthermore, their task is to "investigate these institutions that define the terms of gender identity: compulsory heterosexuality […] and phallogocentrism– that discourse of power that designates the phallus as the defining centre of all systems of value and knowledge."[69]

Other feminists, like Jane Flax, consider that "feminist theory more properly belongs in the terrain of postmodern philosophy," which has evident affinities with poststructuralism, as "[f]eminist notions of the self, knowledge, and truth are too

---

[66] Michèle Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 119.
[67] Cf. Maggie Humm, *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Feminist Literary Criticism*, New York: Harvester Wheatsleaf, 1994, p. 134.
[68] Lois McNay, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6.
[69] Deborah L. Madsen, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

contradictory to those of the Enlightenment to be contained within its categories."[70] The three theoretical directions have in common the fact that they all undermine Enlightenment values. Thus, "[f]eminist theorists enter into and echo postmodernist discourses as [they] have begun to deconstruct notions of reason, knowledge, or the self and to reveal the effects of the gender arrangements that lay beneath their 'neutral' and universalizing facades."[71]

Judith Butler, one of the most influential feminist scholars, acknowledges the fact that Foucault's discourse analysis is indispensable for understanding concepts such as 'sex' or 'gender:'

> To expose the foundational categories of sex, gender, and desire as effects of specific formation of power requires a form of critical inquiry that Foucault, reformulating Nietzsche, designates as "genealogy." A genealogical critique refuses to search for the origins of gender, the inner truth of inner desire, a genuine or authentic sexual identity that repression has kept from view; rather, genealogy investigates the political stakes in designating as an *origin* and *cause* those identity categories that are in fact the *effects* of institutions, practices, discourses with multiple and diffuse points of origin. The task of this inquiry is to center on– and decenter– such defining institutions: phallogocentrism and compulsory heterosexuality.[72]

Butler borrows from Foucault the idea that the search for origins is useless as they, as well as identities in general, are discursively constructed and maintained by institutions. The concept of truth plays an essential part in this view because "[t]he notion that there might be a 'truth' of sex, as Foucault ironically terms it, is produced precisely through the regulatory practices that generate coherent identities through the matrix of coherent gender norms."[73] The very definition of 'gender' includes the assumption that it is by no means based on the Enlightenment transcendental truth, but on a culturally constructed one. Power must not be excluded from this consideration on the ground that, speaking of prohibitions, Foucault regards them to be "invariably and inadvertently productive in the sense that 'the subject' who is supposed to be founded and produced in and through

---

[70] Jane Flax, *op. cit.*, p.173.
[71] *Loc. cit.*
[72] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York, London: Routledge, 1990, pp. viii-ix.
[73] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

those prohibitions does not have access to a sexuality that is in some sense 'outside,' 'before,' or 'after' power itself."[74]

In conclusion, despite the voices against the Foucauldian discourse analysis, it must be admitted that the philosopher's "discourses of power and corporeality […] have proved invaluable tools to feminist theorists across the disciplines,"[75] which is to say, it is appropriate for the discussion of gender since it helps to prove that gender is merely a discursive construct.

3.2. Patriarchal discourse: strategies of control

3.2.1. Hierarchy and relations of power

Feminists have not only tried but also managed to identify a patriarchal discourse, which is characteristic of our society and culture and which has been taken for granted by both male and female individuals. Patriarchy functions by establishing a hierarchy in which man holds the superior position while woman remains inferior; it is circulated by different institutions being visible in language, which "embodies and communicates a male-centred worldview."[76] Patriarchal language is described as follows:

> This language is distinguished by its power to expose the values of male supremacy and female selflessness or invisibility that pervade everyday life under patriarchy. The normalisation of violence and the naturalisation of atrocities against women are achieved through patriarchal norms and values. Violence against women is a normal part of life in a patriarchal society; the assumption that evil has a feminine character is a patriarchal value [...].[77]

A careful examination of language reveals the invisibility of woman proving that she is by no means considered equal to man. Negative stereotypical images of women belong to both the linguistic domain and to real life, the two fields being closely linked.

---

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[75] Sandra Kemp and Judith Squires, "Introduction", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 8.

[76] Deborah L. Madsen, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

Feminist critics have come to interesting results; for example, the personal pronoun 'he' as well as the noun 'man' can be used in two different senses:

> The *he/man* approach to language involves the use of male terms to refer both specifically to males and generically to human beings ("A Man for All Seasons" is specific; "No man is an island" is generic). The *he/man* approach has received most attention in current debates on sexist language, due not only to its ubiquity but also to its status as one of the least subtle of sexist forms. In linguistic terms, some have characterized the male as an unmarked, and the female as a marked, category. The unmarked category represents both maleness and femaleness, while the marked represents femaleness only [...].[78]

Male terms stand not only for males but also for human beings in general; this places man at the centre of the world while woman remains peripheral. In other words, the female is regarded as lacking in self-sufficiency thus becoming an extension of the male, whose needs she assists. Another strategy of sustaining gender hierarchy consists of giving women certain names:

> Men's extensive labelling of women as parts of body, fruit, or animals and as mindless, or like children– labels with no real parallel for men– reflects men's derision of women and helps maintain gender hierarchy and control. Researching terms for sexual promiscuity, Julia Penelope Stanley (1977) found 220 terms for a sexually promiscuous woman and only 22 terms for a sexually promiscuous man. She notes that there is no linguistic reason why the first set is large and the second small.[79]

Women are often reduced to some labels; on the other hand, language proves to be patriarchal as there are approximately ten times more terms for designating a sexually promiscuous woman than a male counterpart. Linked with truth, knowledge and power, patriarchal discourses are circulated by various institutions (e.g. Church, State, marriage, family), constructing hierarchies based on binary oppositions. Accordingly, one of feminism's tasks is to identify male myths:

---

[77] *Ibid.*, pp. 165-166.
[78] Barrie Thorne, Cheris Kramarae, Nancy Henley, ed., *Language, Gender and Society*, Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1983, pp. 25-26.
[79] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

> Daly seeks out and exposes the phallocratic myths and symbols that are direct sources of Christian myth which promotes a male-centred view of the world to the exclusion of female experience. [...] she is engaged in the rediscovery of women's meanings (myths and symbols) that have been hidden, buried, their significance reversed by the historical operations of patriarchy.[80]

Marginalising women, Christianity is seen as a phallocentric myth, which makes feminists search for female voices that have been suppressed by the patriarchal culture. Women have become part of the large notion of 'colonised,' a peripheral group on which coercive power is exercised. Nancy Hartsock thinks that "[t]hose of us who have been marginalised enter the discussion from a position analogous to that which the colonized holds in relation to the colonizer."[81] Edward Said explains that "the colonized" has since expanded considerably to include women, subjugated and oppressed classes, national minorities, and even marginalized or incorporated academic subspecialties."[82] This assumption makes it clear that women, by being considered inferior to men and treated as such, belong to the group of the colonised.

Patriarchy can be regarded as a "politics of the ego" because "[m]an establishes his 'manhood' in direct proportion to his ability to have his ego override hers, and derives his strength and self-esteem through this process;" that is why "domination is masculine."[83] Although "[d]ifferent tools of oppression are experienced by women in different circumstances, [...] they remain the tools of patriarchal oppression."[84] Women are seen "as the most fundamentally oppressed class within a misogynistic Western patriarchal culture," in which gender is "a system that operates to ensure continued male domination."[85] While "women are categorized as an inferior class based on their sex," man "identifies with and carries out the supremacy privileges of the male role."[86] Feminist critics describe the subordinate situation of women in society as follows:

> [...] this condition [of women] as one in which women are obliged to give their

---

[80] Deborah L. Madsen, *op. cit.*, p. 163.
[81] Nancy Hartsock, *op. cit.*, p. 160.
[82] Edward W. Said, "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutaors", in: Edward Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, p.295.
[83] Deborah L. Madsen, *op. cit.*, p. 154.
[84] *Ibid.*, p. 168.
[85] *Ibid.*, p. 152.
[86] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

assent and conform in their social behaviour to this paradigm. To rebel against this prescription for female behaviour is to risk incurring the wrath of the men around her. [...] women are kept passive and subordinate by the ever-present threat of male violence. Women internalise patriarchal values to perfect their obedience; they conform to the stereotypes, they display unwavering loyalty, they do not betray any sign of dissatisfaction or resistance to male control– all in order to avoid violence against their persons. And this threat of male violence is present all around each individual woman in patriarchal culture: 'rape, wife beating, forced childbearing, medical butchering, sex-motivated murder, sadistic psychological abuse'– these are some of the punishments Dworkin catalogues, in addition to destitution, ostracism, confinement in a mental institution or gaol, or death, that await the rebellious woman. Conformity means survival in a misogynistic patriarchal culture.[...][87]

Women have no choice but behave according to the patterns prescribed by society; they must conform to the roles ascribed to them by males because any attempt to rebellion is punished through violence. In extremely misogynist societies women's survival depends on their obedience to men's demands. Madsen divides men and women into "sexual classes" observing that the latter are oppressed by the former:

[...] both men and women occupy sexual classes; differences in socio-economic class status are insignificant compared to the common experience of oppression of women by men. Women constitute the oppressed class in patriarchal society and men constitute the class of oppressors. Men 'of all ideological persuasions' define women and femininity in the same patriarchal terms, and all women are subject to this definition. This sexual oppression through the gender relation is the most basic relation of social and cultural oppression, and the one from which all other oppressive relations derive. Secondly, the relation is maintained by means of unceasing physical violence and psychological aggression against women. Thirdly, the operation of gender class and sexual coercion work within the context of patriarchy as a system that operates through 'persons, institutions, and values'. Gender oppression is systematic under patriarchy and not a matter of isolated violent and discriminatory incidents. But the systemic nature of patriarchy is obscured, except when subjected to feminist questioning and analysis.[88]

A close look at gender relations reveals their oppressive nature as they are maintained by violence, be it physical or psychological. Patriarchy is seen as a system which becomes visible when questioned by feminism. Four main strategies of maintaining patriarchy are

---

[87] *Ibid.*, p. 161.

distinguished:

> There are four primary patriarchal strategies used to keep women mystified about their true condition. First, there is 'erasure' which means the removal of women from the historical record: Daly cites the execution of witches that does not appear in patriarchal scholarship. Secondly, there is 'reversal', such that women are placed in subordinate and passive roles: Daly cites the example of Adam giving birth to Eve. Thirdly, there is 'false polarization', for example, male-defined feminism set up in opposition to male-defined sexism. Fourthly, there is 'divide and conquer' which Daly illustrates with the example of '(t)oken women [who] are trained to kill off feminists in patriarchal professions'.[89]

The so-called 'erasure,' 'reversal,' 'false polarization' and eventually 'divide and conquer' strategies ensure the functioning of the patriarchal system. In this context some feminists examine "the violence done to feminine traditions, myths and 'herstory' (or history) by the power of white patriarchy."[90]

It has already been stated that one of the most important strategies to maintain gender power relations is the fact that women are usually given names of animals or reduced to parts of the body. In the novel *Nice Work* Brian Everthorpe presents Robyn Penrose to Vic Wilcox like this: "[…] Your shadow's a bird, Vic! […] A very dishy redhead. I prefer bigger boobs, myself, but you can't have everything."[91] When angry with her, Wilcox calls her "[t]hat silly bitch from the University"[92] thus associating her with an animal. The same is valid for Morris Zapp in *Changing Places*; being unpleased with his wife's behaviour, he simply calls he a "bitch."[93] This technique is frequently used to describe women who have broken patriarchal social norms by not confirming to the male's expectations.

The objectification of the female body represents a recurrent strategy of maintaining the patriarchal hierarchy. The novel *Nice Work* contains a significant scene which illustrates the objectification of Robyn Penrose, namely the moment when she goes alone through the factory in order to warn Danny Ram that he will be fired soon:

---

[88] *Ibid.*, pp. 161-162.
[89] *Ibid.*, p. 164.
[90] *Ibid.*, p. 167.
[91] David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 107.
[92] *Ibid.*, p. 164.
[93] Cf. David Lodge, *Changing Places. A Tale of Two Campuses*, London: Penguin Books, 1975, p. 236

> In the machine shop, without Victor Wilcox to escort her, Robyn was as conspicuous in her high-fashion boots, her cord breeches and her cream-coloured quilted jacket, as some rare animal, a white doe or a unicorn, would have been in the same place. Wolf-whistles and catcalls, audible in spite of the mechanical din, followed her as she hurried through the factory. The more the men whistled, the more ribald their remarks, the faster she walked; but the faster she walked, the more of a sexual object, or sexual quarry, she became [...] her eyes fixed steadfastly ahead, refusing to meet the gaze of her tormentors. *''Allo, darlin', lookin' for me? Fancy a bit of that, Enoch? Show us yer legs! Coom over 'ere and 'old me tool, will yow?'*[94]

Robyn is explicitly associated to an animal, dehumanised and evidently regarded as a sexual object whose only function is to please the male gaze and satisfy men's lust. The rude workers' reactions can be read as a proof for their attitude of superiority manifested in their considering themselves the reason for her being there. On the other hand, these men are compared with animals, too (''Wolf-whistles,'' ''catcalls''), which stresses the primitive nature of their behaviour dominated by instincts. Under such circumstances, even a self-confident feminist like Robyn Penrose feels intimidated and, as she perceives them as her ''tormentors,'' she is unable to confront them by looking them in the eye.

Nice Work is essential in the discussion of unequal gender relations because of the manner in which women are regarded in the specifically male industrial world presented in it. Thus, meeting Robyn Penrose on the way to the factory in which she is going to shadow Vic Wilcox, Brian Everthorpe believes she is going to work there as a secretary, the typical job for women if they work at all. Working in a world of men, in which women are welcome only to assist them, he finds her unlikely to be a customer.[95] When Vic Wilcox takes Robyn Penrose to a meeting in Leeds, he stops at ''a pub he knew for lunch,''[96] where, looking around, Robyn notices that ''[t]he clientèle were mostly businessmen in three-piece suits laughing boisterously and blowing cigarette smoke in each other's faces, or talking earnestly and confidentially to well-dressed young women who were more probably their secretaries than their wives.''[97] The well-

---

and p. 243.
[94] David Lodge, *Nice Work*, pp. 145-146.
[95] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 101-102.
[96] *Ibid.*, p. 198.
[97] *Ibid.*, p. 199.

known gender stereotype of the secretaries who sleep with their bosses is thus illustrated not only in this scene, but also in a conversation between Vic and his father. Becoming aware of the problems in his son's marriage, the old man raises the matter as follows:

> 'You're not carryin' on with some young wench, are you? I seen it happen enough times,' he went on rapidly, as if he feared having his question answered. 'Bosses and their secretaries. It always gets round at work. […] The game's not worth the candle, son, take my word for it. I seen it happen many a time, blokes that left their wives for a young wench. They ended up penniless, paying for two families out of one pay packet.[…]'[98]

The father proves to be familiar to a lot of cases of bosses having affairs with their young attractive secretaries for whom they are ready to go through a divorce, which causes them great material loss. This speech appeals to Vic's sympathy for other men, who are here victimised as well as to his reason. The possible hurt feelings of the betrayed and abandoned wives play no role at all in this argumentation.

Conforming to the demands of society is seen by some feminists as the only chance of surviving, but it has serious consequences. Women are supposed to internalise patriarchal values and this leads to a displacement of anger on other women or on oneself:

> [...] survival is only possible on male terms. This means, Dworkin argues, that the anger women feel for their male abusers and oppressors must be displaced elsewhere, on to 'those far away, foreign, or different' […], so these women become extreme nationalists, racists, anti-Semites, homophobes and bigots; they hate religious or political groups other than their own, people on welfare or unemployed, the destitute, pregnant teenagers and single mothers, and so on.

Thus there is a displacement of anger on people who are different in all respects because women need to justify their fear by finding symbols of danger in groups of outsiders.[99] This kind of displaced anger is to be found in *Nice Work* under the form of women jealous of other women. For instance, when Shirley first sees Robyn Penrose, she states 'Hmmm, not a bad-looking wench […]. If you like that type.'[100] Later, in a discussion

---

[98] *Ibid.*, p. 317.
[99] Deborah L. Madsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 162-163.
[100] David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 108.

with George Prendergast, the Personnel Director, Vic Wilcox says that, because of Robyn, 'the secretaries are beside themselves with jealousy.'[101] Such displacement of anger reveals women's frustration and indicates their subordination to men because the latter are not always held responsible for being attracted to certain women.

As "[t]he systemic nature of gender ensures continued male domination through the masculine control of feminine sexuality,"[102] pornography, regarded as another important strategy of sustaining patriarchy, requires a special analysis.

3.2.2. Pornography: depiction of whores

Among "the modes of patriarchal violence and atrocities committed against women" there are "mutilation, sexual abuse, pornography, battering and incest, prostitution."[103] Pornography has been dealt with by various feminists, who define it "as the opposite of the erotic" or as "sensation divorced from feeling and hence from knowledge."[104] Etymologically speaking, "[t]he word *pornography*, derived from the ancient Greek *porne* and *graphos*, means," as Dworkin explains, "the graphic depiction of women as vile whores."[105] In his book entitled *Sexuality* Joseph Bristow cites Robin Morgan's radical statement that "[p]ornography is the theory, and rape the practice,"[106] which is why feminists "stressed how pornography degraded women as sexual objects."[107] Pornography "institutionalizes the sexuality of male supremacy, fusing the erotization of domination and submission with the social construction of male and female" since it "defines women by how we look according to how we can be sexually used."[108] Feminists disapprove of this phenomenon because in pornography women are presented "dehumanized as sexual objects, things or commodities;" "as sexual objects who enjoy humiliation or pain;" "as sexual objects experiencing pleasure in rape, incest or other

---

[101] *Ibid.*, p. 118.
[102] Deborah L. Madsen, *op.cit.*, p. 153.
[103] *Ibid.*, p. 166.
[104] *Ibid.*, p. 168.
[105] Andrea Dworkin, "Pornography", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 325.
[106] Quoted from Joseph Bristow, *Sexuality*, London and New York: Routledge, 1997, p. 148.
[107] *Ibid.*, p. 149.
[108] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

sexual assault;" "as sexual objects tied up, cut up or mutilated or bruised or physically hurt;" "in postures or positions of sexual submission, servility, or display." Moreover, "women's body parts (vaginas, breasts, or buttocks) are exhibited such that women are reduced to those parts;" at the same time they are "being penetrated by objects and animals" as well as posing "in scenarios of degradation, humiliation, injury, torture."[109] In Foucault's opinion the control of sexuality exerted by the state has led to an intensification of desire manifested in an increased interest in pornography; at the same time, the state exercises power on its subjects by economically and ideologically exploiting eroticism.[110]

This topic is treated in David Lodge's novel *Nice Work*, which has as main characters Robyn Penrose, Temporary Lecturer in English Literature at the University of Rummidge, and Victor Wilcox, who is the Managing Director of J. Pringle & Sons Casting and General Engineering. The novel presents two different worlds, that of the university and that of the economic sector, which are united by a so-called Industry Year Shadow Scheme proposed by the British government, Robyn Penrose being thus supposed to shadow Vic Wilcox in the course of the winter semester. The young feminist lecturer has a lot of interesting experiences and she declares herself totally against pornography, which turns out to be at home in the factory she visits.

There are two important pornographic aspects presented in *Nice Work*: that of the pin-ups hanging all over the factory and the fact that Shirley, Wilcox's secretary, wants to have naked photos of her daughter Tracey on a calendar. As a visit through the factory is part of his daily programme, Vic Wilcox shows Robyn Penrose round, but he does not care to introduce her to anyone because he never talks to the simple workers subordinated to him. Although the workers do not have the courage to look their boss in the eye, they are not afraid of looking insistently at Robyn reducing her to "an object of curiosity" or of talking about her without any reserve. In this context she becomes aware of her being considered an object whose function is to delight the male gaze. Noticing

---

[109] *Ibid.*, pp. 154-155.

[110] Cf. Michel Foucault, "Macht und Körper. Ein Gespräch mit der Zeitschrift 'Quel Corps?'", transl. by Werner Garst, in: Michel Foucault, *Microphysik der Macht. Über Strafjustiz, Psychiatrie und Medizin*, Berlin: Merve Verlag, 1976, pp. 106-107. It must be specified that Foucault does not regard this power as entirely negative since it constitutes an incitement to discourse; cf. Michel Foucault, "Das Abendland und die Wahrheit des Sexes", transl. by Ulrich Raulf, in: Michel Foucault, *Dispositive der Macht. Über*

the numerous pinups which are hung everywhere and which expose naked bodies of women in pornographic postures, Robyn cannot conceal her revolt as a fervent feminist. Being a very direct person, she talks to Wilcox about the pin-ups with the intention of changing the situation. She thinks they are extremely degrading because not only do they depict naked girls in indecent positions, but they have also become invisible and as dirty as the place they are in, which means that the models are actually mocked at as well as humiliated.[111] Visiting Tom Rigby, the general manager, Robyn discovers that even his office is decorated with a pornographic calendar showing a woman wearing a bikini and fur-boots.[112] Therefore, this model appears ridiculous as, on the one hand, fur is regarded as a symbol of power, on the other hand, she is obviously in the inferior position of an object meant to please men. Such pictures of women seem to be part of the everyday life in the industrial world dominated by men.

The second case of pornography in *Nice Work* is more particular as it refers to Tracey, the underage daughter of Shirley, Wilcox's secretary, who is proud of the young girl's promising body. Internalising patriarchal norms, such as the assumption that woman's role is to satisfy man's needs, Shirley not only encourages Tracey in her dream of becoming a model, but also keeps boasting with photos of her daughter in underwear. Interestingly, Wilcox is not a man who particularly enjoys pin ups; moreover, seeming to be aware that such pictures objectify women, he looks down upon his secretary. However, Shirley keeps insisting on showing him the new achievements of the young girl. One time Wilcox is really shocked to see Tracey's photos as they are displaying her half-naked, which only increases Shirley's parental pride; no longer trying to hide his surprise, he openly expresses his total disapproval of such photos. Nevertheless, Shirley fiercely defends her point of view: arguing that all the girls who look good should show their bodies naked, she proves to have internalised patriarchal discourses which, reducing women to their bodies, declare their function to be the delight of the male eye.[113] Brian Everthorpe, one of Vic Wilcox's colleagues, shares Shirley's opinion; he tries to persuade Vic that a pornographic calendar depicting, in his words, "[b]irds with

---

Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit, Berlin: Merve Verlag, 1978, p. 103.
[111] Cf. David Lodge, *Nice Work*, pp. 124-125.
[112] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 128.
[113] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

boobs," would constitute a positive advertisement for the company. Furthermore, he comes up with the proposal of using Tracey as a model adding that her mother gladly agrees to it, but encounters not only Wilcox's, but also Robyn Penrose's objection. After listening to the discussion, the latter states her opinion openly as usual. Everthorpe is a stereotypical man who finds female nakedness on a calendar entirely natural and artistic; apart from, he thinks that it would be a celebration of the model. Contradicting him, Robyn points out that one should not take for granted the fact that only women are supposed to pose naked for men. She argues that if men like looking at naked women, the latter would like to see the former naked, too; on the other hand, a calendar containing only naked women excludes homosexual clients thus discriminating them as well. For this reason, she goes as far as proposing to Brian Everthorpe to pose himself for the pornographic calendar, a suggestion that really puzzles him. He adopts a clearly patriarchal perspective as he finds difficulty in believing that women too would like to look at naked men; his stereotypical images of men and women implicitly declare the superior position of males. Robyn argues that pornographic pictures of women degrade not only the models, but also the men who see them as, what is more important, they make human sexuality seem dirty. To her mind, pornography is nothing less than "the exploitation of women's bodies," on account of which she makes it clear to Vic Wilcox that, being the boss, he has the power to have all the pin ups removed from the walls of the factory.[114] She fails to make him ban these posters, but she manages to convince him of the fact that photos of naked women degrade them. Thus, when Shirley talks to him about the "great chance" Tracey would have if she posed for a pornographic calendar, he replies that it would be "[a] great chance to degrade herself" as men would take "the picture home to wank off with."[115]

There is a further case of pornography in *Nice Work*, namely that of Marion Russell, one of Robyn Penrose's students. She asks for more time to hand in her essay explaining that her delay is due to the two jobs she had in the holiday. In this context she adds that she now has a much better job, which she describes as being "sort of underwear." This makes Robyn Penrose imagine the situation in which the girl is to be

---

[114] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 138-141.
[115] *Ibid.*, pp. 212-213.

found when performing such a job and the image of the men staring at the young girl dressed in underwear revolts the feminist teacher to such an extent that, feeling sorry for Marion, she makes the inappropriate gesture of embracing the student.[116] Once again pornography appears as a way of exploiting female bodies as well as a part of the social system we live in. If she gave the girl an extension of one week for her essay at the beginning of the discussion, she now prolongs it to two weeks. Later she really gets to see the girl doing her new job in the factory where she shadows Vic Wilcox. Marion Russell has been paid for an unusual task: dressed in underwear she must enter a hall during a general meeting in which Wilcox holds a speech before all the workers and then start singing a mocking song. The men in the audience are amused and shout at her vulgar things like "Show us yer tits!", "Tek yer knickers off!", or simply "OFF, OFF, OFF!"[117] This scene constitutes an evident illustration of the feminist assumption that pornography degrades and objectifies the female body.

The novel also shows that pornography is circulated by different institutions like the media, which make money out of spreading it. Thus, Vic Wilcox realises that heroes "uttering the usual obligatory moans and sighs"[118] appear more often on television than football games:

> The decline of soccer and the increase of explicit sex in the media seemed to be reciprocally related symptoms of national decline, though Vic sometimes thought he was the only one who noticed the coincidence. You saw things on television nowadays that would have been under-the-counter pornography when he was a lad. It made family viewing an anxious and uncomfortable business.[119]

The ever more numerous and daring sex scenes broadcast on television remind one of the idea of transgression, which Wilcox considers to be a sign of decay as well as a reason for feeling embarrassed especially when the whole family is gathered together. Another important point in this quotation is the fact that what used to be labeled as pornographic once has slowly become something normal, which illustrates the Foucauldian view according to which sexuality is inseparable from its representation due

---

[116] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 68.
[117] *Ibid.*, p. 252.
[118] *Ibid.*, p. 161.
[119] *Loc. cit.*

to its being a cultural construct. Therefore, it can be argued that pornography is by no means universal, but very relative as it clearly differs from one epoch to another.

Pornographic images of women are mediated not only on television, but also in special magazines like *Playboy*, a magazine which generates a relevant incident for the discussion of gender in the novel *Changing Places*. Coming to Rummidge, England in the frames of an exchange programme, the American university teacher Morris Zapp finds a room in the Irish Dr O'Shea's house, where Bernadette, a young relative of the family, also lives. Feeling sorry for the girl's position as a servant of the house and hoping to lift her spirits, Morris Zapp lends Bernadette a copy of his *Playboy*, but, as she is caught reading it and masturbating simultaneously, she must cope with tragic consequences:

> And Morris Zapp felt some pangs of guilt as he listened, cowering behind his door, to the wails of Bernadette and the imprecations of Dr O'Shea, as the latter chastised the former with the end of his belt, having caught her in the act of reading a filthy book, and not merely reading it but abusing herself at the same time– an indulgence that was (O'Shea thundered) not only a mortal sin which would whisk her soul straight to hell should she chance to expire before reaching the confessional (as seemed, from her screams, all too possible) but was also a certain cause of physical and mental degeneration, leading to blindness, sterility, cancer of the cervix, schizophrenia, nymphomania and general paralysis of the insane…[120]

The poor young girl is brutally beaten by her uncle, who is 'naturally' the head of the family having the important responsibility of Bernadette's moral and religious education with special regard to her health– physical and psychological. As it is expected of such traditional families, the wife is totally invisible while violence against women is a strategy of maintaining power relations. Grounding his cruel action with the statement that reading pornographic books and masturbating are seen as mortal sins in the Catholic Church, Dr O'Shea believes that his niece does indeed deserve this punishment. However, he is presented in an ironic light: as a physician he appears not only bitterly funny but also unprofessional because of his adopting popular beliefs, which seem to enjoy a more real claim to truth than scientific knowledge. This scene is based on an

---

[120] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 104.

ethnic stereotype, too: the Irish doctor is indoctrinated with Catholicism; at the same time he behaves in a primitive uncivilised manner, not to mentioned the fact that his medical knowledge is questioned. As a result he asks Morris Zapp not to bring pornographic magazines in the house anymore, to which request the latter claims that "*Playboy* isn't *pornography*, for heaven's sake! Why, clergymen read it. Clergymen *write* for it!"[121]

The importance pornography holds in academic men's lives is evident in Morris Zapp's interest in it, leading him to Soho when he visits London. At the same time Philip Swallow, the English university teacher with whom he has changed places finds himself in "one of the world's great centres of the strip industry, namely South Strand in Esseph" in Euphoria. Thus, he finds that "[p]ornography was an accepted diversion of the Euphoric intelligentsia" and he thinks that "anyway it's a phenomenon of cultural and sociological interest."[122] In conclusion, David Lodge's novels help prove that the interest in pornographic pictures of women is generally shared by men of any age, class or profession.

3.2.3. Patriarchal violence: rape, incest and abuse

Gender power relations are enforced by patriarchal violence, too; with one significant exception– Sean's abuse of his sister Ursula in *Paradise News*– Lodge's novels do not contain literal manifestations of sexual violence against women. Instead, one can identify a tendency of certain male characters towards rape or incest, but it must be emphasised that such desires remain confined to the realm of fantasy as they are never put into practice.

Philip Swallow in *Changing Places* is a character suspected of having such inclinations. After betraying his wife Hilary with the young Melanie Byrd in Euphoria, he asks the former to fly to him so that they can talk about his affair. In response to his demand Hilary writes an interesting letter:

---

[121] *Ibid.*, p. 105.
[122] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 111-112.

> […] I can't avoid the conclusion that you desire my presence mainly for the purpose of lawful sexual intercourse. […] you're prepared to fly me six thousand miles to obtain relief. […] Mary says that men always try to end a dispute with a woman by raping her, either literally or symbolically, so you're only confirming to the type.[123]

Mary Makepeace's influence causes a kind of awakening in Hilary, who now realises how selfish Philip is in expecting her to travel all the way from Rummidge to Euphoria for his sake. Behind this request his actual aim seems to be a symbolic rape that would re-enact his domination over his wife.

Nice Work is another novel in which the idea of imaginary rape appears; in order to discuss it, one must look at the particular circumstances under which such a fantasy emerges. As far the sex relations between Vic Wilcox and his wife are concerned, Robyn Penrose finds out that during their twenty-two-year marriage, the two have made love only "in the missionary position,"[124] a fact showing how this couple complies to the stereotypical image of man and woman– he is active while she behaves passively. Being used to his obedient wife, Vic becomes extremely furious when Robyn interferes with his business by warning Danny Ram that he will lose his job soon. In a state of extreme outrage he goes to her place where they quarrel fiercely,[125] a scene in which gender relations play an important role. He proves his desire to dominate her in feeling good about finding her wearing only a bathrobe as he thinks "[i]t put her at a disadvantage, not being properly dressed."[126] Later in bed with his wife

> he was only able to come by imagining he was doing it to Robyn Penrose, sprawled on the rug in front of her gas fire, […] that was sweet revenge on the silly stuck-up cow […]– yes, that was good, to have her there on the floor amid the incredible litter of books and dirty coffee cups and wine glasses and album sleeves and copies of *Spare Rib* and *Marxism Today*, […] thrashing and writhing underneath him like the actresses in the TV films, moaning with pleasure in spite of herself and thrust and thrust.[127]

---

[123] *Ibid.*, p. 150.
[124] David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 294.
[125] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 153-154.
[126] *Ibid.*, p. 166.

Imagining how he rapes Robyn fills him with total satisfaction as he conceives it as a well deserved revenge for her feminist attitudes. In fact, Vic's imaginary abuse of the young woman expresses his wish to conquer the female body in order to maintain a patriarchal hierarchy. His fantasy also contains the masculine cliché of the victim enjoying being raped; besides, he associates Robyn with an animal– a cow– thus dehumanising and placing her outside culture in spite of the numerous books speaking for her intellectual tastes. The dirty dishes along with the chaos in her house evidently show that she is by no means a good housekeeper, therefore she proves to be no stereotypical woman.

Men's rape fantasies go hand in hand with the feminist assumption that "domination is masculine and therefore erotic in men; passivity is feminine and therefore erotic in women. 'Sexuality' is not a neutral term; it refers to male sexuality of which feminine sexuality is seen as a variant (or deviant)."[128] The fact that the perspective from which sexuality is defined is masculine explains why Jonathan Browne in *Ginger, You're Barmy* supposes that women too like being raped. Wondering about the reasons for which certain women work for the Army, he finds the answer very quickly:

> Through the window on my right I saw two pretty shorthand typists making their mid-morning tea. Women look maddeningly desirable in an Army camp. Perhaps that is why they choose to work in such places: it must be exhilarating to know that you are being mentally raped a hundred times a day.[129]

He complies to the stereotypical patriarchal man by considering women's aim to be restricted to that of becoming sexual objects meant to delight the male gaze and of being possessed. Interestingly, Helen Reed in *Thinks...* also holds the view that women wish themselves to be raped; in an act of introspection analysing her feelings for Ralph Messenger, she writes in her diary: "I had to ask myself whether this train of thought wasn't a variation on the famous female rape fantasy the pop psychologists tell us about, the desire to abandon oneself to sex without having to take moral responsibility for

---

[127] *Ibid.*, pp. 166-167.
[128] Deborah L. Madsen, *op. cit.*, p. 154.
[129] David Lodge, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, London: Penguin Books, 1984 (1962, 1982), p. 102.

it."[130] Furthermore, the word 'rape' is used even to describe intimate relations in a marriage; thus, in *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, telling Adam Appleby about George's and Sally's attempt to conceive a baby, Camel says that "George lunged up the stairs intent on nothing else than rape."[131] *Paradise News* contains a significant scene in this respect: on account of having cheated on his bride Cecily, Russ is denied any sexual intercourse during the honeymoon spent in Hawaii; after watching a pornographic film, the "outraged" Russ "contemplates marital rape, but decides against it."[132] Indeed, he does not abuse his wife, but the fact that he does think about it reveals his inner desires, which fit into a patriarchal discourse. Regarding rape, the novel *The Picturegoers* is the most daring of all; if all the above mentioned cases were examples of mere symbolic or imaginary rape, Harry, one of the characters in Lodge's first published book, really plans to rape Bridget, "that poxy blonde"[133]as he calls her, but, fortunately, she defends herself so fiercely that she succeeds in escaping.[134]

Robyn Penrose observes that the objectification of the female body is so widespread that one can find it in advertisements, as well. *Nice Work* provides a good example for it, namely the Silk Cut advertisement: a "huge poster on roadside hoardings, a photographic depiction of rippling expanse of purple silk in which there was a single slit, as if the material had been slashed with a razor. There were no words on the advertisement, except for the Government Health Warning about smoking." The repeated sight of it "both irritated and intrigued Robyn, and she began to do her semiotic stuff on the deep structure hidden beneath its bland surface."[135] Her thorough analysis looks like this:

> It was in the first instance a kind of riddle. That is to say, in order to decode it, you had to know that there was a brand of cigarettes called Silk Cut. The poster was the iconic representation of a missing name, like a rebus. But the icon was also a metaphor. The shimmering silk, with its voluptuous curves and sensuous texture, obviously symbolized the female body, and the elliptical slit, fore-grounded by a lighter colour showing through, was still more obviously a

[130] David Lodge, *Thinks...*, p. 144.
[131] David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, p. 77.
[132] David Lodge, *Paradise News*, p. 145.
[133] David Lodge, *The Picturegoers*, p. 21.
[134] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 21, p. 160 and p. 165.
[135] David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 220.

vagina. The advert thus appealed to both sensual and sadistic impulses, the desire to mutilate as well as penetrate the female body.[136]

Her feminist examination of the poster reveals the stereotypical analogy between female bodies and silk. The advertisement is addressed to men as it alludes to the penetration and mutilation of the woman's body. The encouragement of such impetuses is subtly used to sell cigarettes although most people are unaware of it. In spite of the fact that Vic Wilcox is not convinced of her analysis, Robyn Penrose strongly sustains that the advertisement has sexual connotations adding that "[w]hether they were consciously intended or not doesn't really matter."[137] He tries to persuade her that she is wrong by asking the question why women too like smoking these cigarettes. Interestingly, Vic uses the very word 'rape' to refer to what Robyn explained considering this to prove the invalidity of her semiotic analysis. But then he must hear Robyn's reasonable explanation that a great number of women have internalised the patriarchal values circulated in society to such an extent that they have become masochistic.[138]

In the novel *Changing Places* the American feminist Mary Makepeace "is full of fascinating theories about men and women."[139] After Hilary Swallow finds out that her husband cheated on her with Morris Zapp's daughter, she asks Mary Makepeace for advice and then writes back to her husband the following words:

> I showed Mary your letters and she says your obsessive concern to protect Amanda's innocence indicates that you are really in love with her yourself, and that your affair with Melanie was a substitute gratification for the incestuous desire. An interesting theory, you must admit. Does Melanie look anything like Amanda?[140]

Mary is obviously influenced by psychoanalytic theories according to which all fathers want to posses their daughters sexually no matter if they are conscious of this desire or not. Incest and abuse, on the mental level in the case of Philip Swallow, can be seen as further ways of enforcing patriarchal power.

---

[136] *Loc. cit.*
[137] *Ibid.*, p. 222.
[138] *Loc. cit.* Robyn Penrose's exact words are: "Many women are masochistic by temperament" because "[t]hey've learned what's expected of them in a patriarchal society."
[139] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, pp. 150-151.

The novel *Paradise News* contains an example of sexual abuse which is at the same time incest, that of Ursula, who remembers how her brother Sean "used to make [her] hold it and then stuff like catarrh would squirt out of the little hole in the top, over [her] hand."[141] Sean was sixteen and Ursula seven at the time. When Yolande hears about this from Bernard, she says that in child abuse "[i]t's the fear, the shame, that leave the scars,"[142] an observation which testifies the feminist assumption that self-hatred is another case of displacement of anger,[143] in this case manifested in the shame. Looking at Ursula's later situation– the divorce from Rick because of sexual problems[144] and her need of an apology from Jack, her brother who knew what was going on and did nothing about it– Yolande proves to be right with the scars left by such an experience. Although Ursula is now an old woman lying on her death bed, she is haunted by this memory "as if it happened yesterday" feeling that the only way of getting relief and dying in peace would be Jack's apology for not having interfered.[145] Eventually, her last wish comes true when Jack asks forgiveness assuming responsibility for what happened.[146]

On the whole, the feminist assumption that patriarchy is supported by violence against women can be exemplified with Lodge's novels, which, it must be repeated, usually make allusions to rape or incest fantasies that never find their expression in the characters' actions.

---

[140] *Ibid.*, p. 149.

[141] David Lodge, *Paradise News*, p. 283.

[142] *Ibid.*, p. 285.

[143] Deborah L. Madsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 166.

[144] Carole Vance states the sexuality is perceived by women either as pleasure or as danger; she classifies "forcible incest" as belonging to "the dangers of sexuality" which "make the pleasures pale by comparison." (Carole Vance, "Pleasure and Danger: Toward a Politics of Sexuality", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 327.). Thus, Ursula's failure to overcome her negative experience as a young girl makes her unable to lead a normal sexual life as a mature woman because she associates sex with danger. This case also illustrates Catherine Mackinnon's remark that "[s]exually abused women […] seem to become either sexually disinclined or compulsively promiscuous," Ursula belonging to the first category. (Catherine Mackinnon, "Toward a Feminist Theory of the State", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 355.).

[145] Cf. David Lodge, *Paradise News*, p. 304.

[146] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 319.

3.2.4. Female otherness: mutilation and pathology

Mutilation of women is an important topic for feminists since it is a form of male violence against women and serves to maintain the patriarchal hierarchy. Talking about Daly, Madsen explains:

> Her [Daly's] term for this pervasive violence that is constitutive of patriarchy is the Sado-Ritual Syndrome, and in a series of chapters she explores the patriarchal practices or customs of widow-burning (suttee) in India, Chinese foot-binding, the genital mutilation or 'circumcision' of young girls in Africa, the massacre of women as witches in Renaissance Europe, and the 'gynocide' that goes by the names of gynaecology and psychotherapy in America.[147]

These practices are specific of Asia, Africa and Renaissance Europe, but they are also to be found in the Western civilised world of today. This kind of mutilation is not present in any of Lodge's novels; nevertheless, there are two cases of mutilated women's bodies: Maureen in *Therapy* and Tess in *Paradise News*. The two examples are very different from each other, but both of them can be interpreted with regard to gender.

To begin with, Maureen has had a mastectomy because of a malign tumour; this operation has totally changed her relationship with her husband, Bede. She tells Laurence Passmore or, more familiar called Tubby, about the consequences brought about by her losing one breast. Maureen's mutilation is not part of any sadist ritual, but a surgical necessity in order to survive a lethal tumour. The problem is that her husband cannot accept her body as it is now, which makes him refuse not only to make love to her, but also to sleep in the same bed. He manifested his affection by encouraging her as long as he did not see her naked mutilated body.[148] Unlike him, Tubby feels sorry for Maureen because, to his mind, "she had lost a breast, the part of a woman's body which defines her sexual identity perhaps more obviously than any other."[149] This remark together with Bede's rejection of his wife after seeing her scar serves to show that women are indeed defined by their bodies, being reduced to breasts in this case. Nonetheless, Tubby manages to accept Maureen, mutilated as she is; consequently, he

---

[147] Deborah L. Madsen, *op. cit.*, p. 166.
[148] Cf. David Lodge, *Therapy*, p. 314.
[149] *Ibid.*, p. 308.

makes friends with the married couple becoming at the same time Maureen's lover,[150] which seems to be the ideal solution to a "[s]exless, perhaps, but not loveless"[151] marriage.

Paradise News presents a totally different illustration of mutilation, namely that of Tess. In an open conversation with her brother Bernard, Tess recollects memories of a hard childhood caused by the fact that he had a privileged life only because he was a boy. Thus, he was not expected to help in the household, but still he was the one to get the best part of the food available in a relatively poor family.[152] Moreover, his sisters did not get new shoes every year although they were growing out of their old ones:

> '[…] And if you needed new clothes or shoes, they appeared without your having to ask. Whereas with us… Look at that toe.' She raised her foot in the air and pointed to a deformed big toe joint. 'That came from wearing shoes that I'd grown out of , for far too long.'
> 'But that's awful! You make me feel terrible.'
> 'It wasn't your fault, it was Mummy and Daddy. They walked around putting screens between you and the real world.'[153]

Tess remembers how the girls in the family were supposed to help do the housework while Bernard was expected to do nothing except for his homework. As Tess realises, it was not his fault, but that of the parents, who took care that their son should not be confronted with trivial problems like clothing. Therefore, family and education appear as ways of establishing gender roles putting girls at disadvantage.

These two examples of mutilation of the female body are placed in England, part of the Western civilised world. In the case of Maureen, the mutilation itself proves to be necessary, but its consequences show that in her husband's opinion she has lost her femininity together with the amputated breast. On the contrary, Tess gets her deformed toe only because she is a girl while her parents do everything to protect their son. In spite of the differences between the two women, they are both victims of a patriarchal civilised society, their situations proving that women are not men's equals.

In *Nice Work* there is an impressive passage about Vic Wilcox's perception of

---

[150] *Ibid.*, p. 320-321.
[151] *Ibid.*, p. 316.
[152] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 307.

the biological differences between men and women; since he finds female bodies and their illnesses dirty and disgusting, he proves to be not only unable, but also unwilling to understand women:

> The pathology of women's bodies is a source of great mystery and unease to Vic. Their bleedings and leakages, their lumps and growths, their peculiarly painful-sounding surgical operations– scraping of wombs, stripping of veins, amputation of breasts– the mere mention of such things makes him wince and cringe, and lately the menopause has added new items to the repertory: the hot flush, flooding, and something sinister called a bloat.[154]

He feels horrified at the thought of such problems and, instead of supporting his wife who has difficulty in accepting her menopause and the changes it brings about, he simply rejects her. However, female otherness is not always considered to be repulsive; for instance, Bernard Walsh in *Paradise News* realises that in his life as a priest he was "deprived, especially of the mysterious physical otherness of women, their soft, yielding amplitude, their smooth satiny skin, their sweet-smelling breath and hair."[155] Here the woman's body appears as distinct from the male one, but the differences are by no means negative.

In conclusion, the representations of female bodies offered by the novels discussed here are useful in revealing the unequal power relations between men and women as well as in identifying a male perspective from which femininity is perceived and defined.

3.3. Stereotypical representations of gender

In the discussion of gender a definition of stereotypes is absolutely necessary because they shape peoples' perceptions of themselves and of the others. The notion 'stereotype' was introduced in the social sciences by the American journalist Walter Lippmann in

---

[153] *Loc. cit.*
[154] David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 22.
[155] David Lodge, *Paradise News*, p. 209.

1922.[156] A closer examination of stereotypes shows that they

> are 'images' or 'representations' of an 'objective world' in that those who have stereotypes as 'pictures in the mind' assume some correspondence between their image of reality and the objective world out there (characteristics of nations, peoples, ethnic groups, and so on). A stereotype is not purely imagination or fiction, it somehow reflects an objective world.[157]

Stereotypes are held by many to reflect a so-called 'objective reality.' However, they are constructed mental pictures circulated in a certain society. Therefore, they do not have an individual character, but are collective. Stereotypes are representations shared by a group and transmitted from generation to generation, but they can also change if the relations between certain groups change.[158] It has also been stated that "[s]tereotyping is a form of caricature of cultural, index features of group differentiation."[159] The collective character of stereotypes is confirmed by Ruth Amossy, too:

> En effet, notre esprit est meublé de représentations collectives à travers lesquelles nous appréhendons la réalité quotidienne et nous faisons signifier le monde. […] cet imaginaire social est en prise sur les textes et l'iconographie de son époque. Il s'inspire et s'en nourrit incessamment.[160]

She adds that these collective representations help us to understand reality, which is thus endowed with meanings. Stereotypes also have a temporal dimension, they depend on the ideas of an epoch. Stereotypes are "social constructions of reality" being

> related to the personality structure of individuals in at least two ways: (a) persons with a personality structure in which rigidity is a dominant trait […] are more prone to stereotypical thinking than persons with a flexible, open mind; (b) persons with such a personality structure will cling to the stereotypes current in the group culture to which they belong.[161]

---

[156] Cf. Ruth Amossy, *Les idées récues. Sémiologie du stéréotype*, Paris: Editions Nathan, 1991, p. 9.

[157] Jan Berting, "Patterns of Exclusion: Imaginaries of Class, Nation, Ethnicity and Gender in Europe", in: Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Bhikhu C. Parekh, ed., *The Decolonization of Imagination: Culture, Knowledge and Power*, London: Zed Books, 1995, pp. 160-161.

[158] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 161.

[159] Manning Nash, "The Core Elements of Ethnicity", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 24-28, p. 25.

[160] Ruth Amossy, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[161] Jan Berting, "Patterns of Exclusion: Imaginaries of Class, Nation, Ethnicity and Gender in Europe", in:

Inflexible individuals prove to have a special tendency to assimilate stereotypical representations. Since stereotypes are "elements of a collective life orientation," they are also "related to social and economic conditions." They are considered to be "manifestations of 'closed thinking': persons who cling to stereotypes do not confront their constructs with reality (no reality testing). Evidence that runs counter to the social construct does not destroy or change it; on the contrary, it is declared an exception ('some of my best friends are Jews')."[162]

Gender stereotypes constitute one of the main topics feminists deal with as they not only direct the way people think, but also shape their behaviour in society. Being so widespread they are to be found in the novels of David Lodge as well. Patriarchy has divided women into several groups:

> Literature and society have frequently stereotyped women as angels, barmaids, bitches, whores, brainless housewives, or old maids; women must break free from such oppression and define themselves. No longer, assert these critics, can they allow male-dominated society to define and articulate their roles, their values, and their opinions.[163]

The stereotyped images of women are visible not only in real life, but also in literature, which shows that our society is one dominated by men. Feminist critics assert their opinion against such generalisations arguing that "[w]omen […] cannot be simply depicted and classified as either angels or demons, saints or whores, brainless housewives or eccentric spinsters."[164] Discussing the topic of the eighteenth century documents known as 'lettres des cachet' (letters written to the king by people seeking justice), Arlette Farge and Michel Foucault notice that they contain gender stereotypes: women are usually accused of being prostitutes, thus reflecting the dichotomy angel vs. depraved woman.[165] Before looking at the gender stereotypes in Lodge's novels it is

---

Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Bhikhu C. Parekh, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 163.

[162] *Loc. cit.*

[163] Charles E. Bressler, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

[164] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

[165] Cf. Arlette Farge and Michel Foucault, ed., *Konflikte: Die »Lettres de cachet«. Aus den Archiven der Bastille im 18. Jahrhundert (Le désordre des familles. Lettres de cachet des Archives de la Bastille)*, transl. by Chris E. Paschold and Albert Gier, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989 (1982), pp. 38-39.

necessary to explain that they are based on binary oppositions in which woman is the negative term:

> Thus, all that is designated masculine is highly valued both in itself and as an object of knowledge– ultimately, it is what enables knowledge by dictating the cultural terms upon which understanding takes place– and all that is designated feminine, lacking the value of the phallus, is rendered invisible, unknowable, mysterious outside the terms of masculine knowing.[166]

The idea of masculinity refers to something worth knowing whereas the feminine, being surrounded by mystery, is not as valuable.[167] Binary thinking in terms of gender seems to be typical for Western societies; taking the dichotomies "Head/ heart," establishing man as a rational being while woman appears marked by emotion, and "Activity/ passivity,"[168] in which the former is a male characteristic, the latter describing woman, one can illustrate them with a passage taken from *Ginger, You're Barmy*:

> She always seemed to get more out of it than I did. At the first touch of my hand, which I slipped under her dressing-gown and pyjama-top, on her stomach, she lapsed into a kind of sensual trance. I enjoyed it all right, and my flesh signalled its response in the usual way, but I never stopped *thinking*, as she seemed to. Perhaps when it came to the real thing I too would stop thinking. Meanwhile my chief pleasure was in a sense of power over her body.[169]

The main character of the novel, Jonathan Browne, sees in himself the rational subject *par excellence*, never stopping thinking, unlike his girlfriend, Pauline, who is here the passive woman associated with sensuality. Whereas he is in control of both his and her body, she extracts her pleasure from being dominated.

The novels commented upon in this chapter are populated by two important stereotypical groups of women: on the one hand, there are the housewives who sacrifice themselves for the sake of their men's careers; on the other hand, several female characters prove to be radical feminists whose aim is to play themselves the usual roles

---

[166] Deborah L. Madsen, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
[167] For a detailed presentation of binary oppositions describing men and women and declaring man's superiority cf. Hélène Cixous, "Sorties", in: David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, pp. 287-293.
[168] *Ibid.*, p. 287.
[169] David Lodge, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, p. 15.

of men. Interestingly, there are a few women who, at certain moments, seem to be pending between the two poles, but they do not change exceedingly.

3.3.1. Home-bound women

In her analysis of "numerous patriarchal strategies" Andrea Dworkin "begins with the stereotype of women as conservative, home-bound and nurturing"[170] observing that

> [n]oxious male philosophers from all disciplines have, for centuries, maintained that women follow a biological imperative derived directly from their reproductive capacities that translates necessarily into narrow lives, small minds, and a rather meanspirited puritanism."[171]

From the dominant male perspective women have been described as belonging to nature, which reduces them to their reproductive function; this serves men to enforce and maintain relations of inequality, that is of male control and supremacy.

Feminist critics have pointed out that space can be considered as a cultural phenomenon having on the one hand, a semantic function and on the other hand, a mimetic one as it refers to social reality.[172] For this reason space represents an important category in the examination of power relations as far as gender is concerned. Natascha Würzbach makes an interesting observation regarding the binary opposition 'home' ("Heimat") vs 'away' ("Fremde"): she describes the former as being a protective place associated with certain gender roles for women like mother, lover and wife. On the contrary, 'away' embodies the ideas of unpredictability and irrationality. However, both are feminine spaces where the active male subject either rules or conquers.[173] Thus, in *Small World* Hilary Swallow stays at home taking care of the children while her husband keeps travelling all around the world in search of amorous adventures.

Another good example of a home-bound woman is delivered by the character Marjorie, Vic Wilcox's wife, in *Nice Work*. He "married [her] for what she was, a

---

[170] Deborah L. Madsen, *op. cit.*, p. 160.
[171] *Loc. cit.*
[172] Cf. Natascha Würzbach, "Raumdarstellung", in: Vera Nünning und Ansgar Nünning, ed., *Erzähltextanalyse und Gender Studies*, Weimar: Veralg J.B. Metzler Stuttgart, 2004, p. 49.
[173] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 51.

simple, devoted, docile young woman, with the kind of plump good looks that quickly run to fat."[174] She is presented in a difficult period of her life, the menopause, and, as the stereotype demands, she is hysterical.[175] Her interests seem to be restricted to her house; for example, Vic remembers how Marjorie insisted on buying a house with an "*en suite* bathroom."[176] She is the one who takes care of her husband and of their three children keeping the house clean and cooking for them. When they have guests at dinner, she does not like to take part in the conversation vividly; for example, being invited to lunch at their house, Robyn Penrose manages to talk to all the members of the family, except for Marjorie:

> Thanks to Robyn, the meal was not the social minefield he had feared. Instead of talking a lot herself and making the family feel ignorant, she drew them out with questions about themselves. […] Only Marjorie had defeated Robyn's social skills, absorbing all her questions with monosyllabic murmurs or faint, abstracted smiles. But that was Marjorie for you. She always kept herself in the background, or in the kitchen, when they had guests. But she'd served up a cracking good dinner […].[177]

The difference between Robyn and Marjorie is more than evident in this excerpt: while the former behaves naturally on social occasions, the latter not only feels embarrassed, but also remains in the shadow of her husband. She seems to be confined to the background or the kitchen and if she does not know how to conduct herself properly in front of a guest, she can cook excellent meals. Later Vic tries to excuse his wife to Robyn by saying that "Marje is no intellectual […] as you probably noticed. She left school without any O-Levels."[178] As might be expected from a man like him, he laughs

---

[174] David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 165.
[175] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 14. This is an instance when women are regarded as essentially emotional whereas men are not only considered, but also requested to be rational in Western societies: "Women appear to be more emotional than men because they, along with some groups of people of color, are permitted and even required to express emotion more openly." (Alison Jagar, "Love and Knowledge: Emotion in Feminist Epistemology", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 190.). Elizabeth Grosz argues that hysteria is defined by Freud as "a largely feminine neurosis." (Elizabeth Grosz, "Psychoanalysis and the Imaginary Body", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p.302.). According to Juliet Mitchell, "[h]ysteria is the woman's simultaneous acceptance and refusal of the organization of sexuality under patriarchal capitalism." (Juliet Mitchell, "Femininity, narrative and psychoanalysis", in: David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, pp. 426-430.)
[176] David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 15.
[177] *Ibid.*, p. 236.
[178] *Ibid.*, p. 237.

at Robyn's suggestion that Marjorie should continue her education. His wife is an illustration of the stereotype of home-bound women: she has no studies, is a good mother, takes her role as a housewife seriously and, more importantly, she is dominated by her husband.

Hilary Swallow in *Changing Places* constitutes another example of a home-bound wife and mother who behaves the way she is expected to in a society ruled by men. At the beginning of the novel, the reader finds out that Hilary Broome was a postgraduate student interested in Augustan pastoral poetry when Philip, being in America, Harvard, with a Fellowship, proposed to her. Then the young girl, "who was growing bored with Augustan pastoral poetry, returned her books to the library, bought a wedding dress off the peg at C & A, and flew out to join him on the first available plane. They were married by an Episcopalian minister in Boston just three weeks after Philip had proposed."[179] So, we learn from this ironic passage that, although she was willing to do a Master in Arts, Hilary interrupts it in order to marry Philip. She confirms to the stereotype of the young woman whose intention to continue her intellectual development is superficial since her highest goal is to get married. Later in their life, when Philip has a new opportunity of going to America, she decides to sacrifice herself for his sake staying home to look after their three children.[180] He realises then that he will not miss either his children or his wife:

> He bore his children no ill-will, but he thought he could manage quite nicely without them, thank you, for six months. And as for Hilary, well, he found it difficult after all these years to think of her as ontologically distinct from her offspring. […] if there were no children in the picture he couldn't readily put his finger on any reason why he should be in need of a wife.[181]

Seeing in his children a real burden, Philip obviously looks forward to being away from them in order to have a time free from the responsibility of their education. As far as Hilary is concerned, he no longer sees in her a woman whom he once found attractive, but only the mother of his children, her role in his life being thus reduced to taking care of them. He thinks there is nothing else binding them together, not even sex, which has

---

[179] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 19.
[180] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

played a minor role in their marriage for a long time.

Hilary is a woman who dedicates her life to her husband's career, for which she suffers as if it were her own. Janet, the wife of Robin Dempsey, one of Philip Swallow's colleagues, is equally preoccupied with her husband's promotion. The two men compete for the same position at university and this turns their wives into competitors, too. Thus, Hilary writes: "I think what gets me is the way Janet implies that I'm naturally going to be as fascinated by her husband's career as she is."[182]

While Philip is in Euphoria Hilary keeps worrying about him as she very well knows he is not used to doing any housework at all. Therefore, after finding out that he lives in a house with some young girls, she writes him: "I expect the girls underneath you will take pity on your wifeless state and offer to wash your shirts and sew buttons etc."[183] Hilary expects all women to perform the same role as she does, which illustrates that she has internalised patriarchal values. At this point of the story she does not know yet that one of the girls is Melanie Byrd, who does take care of Philip's needs, but in the sexual domain. Tortured by his consciousness, Philip orders flowers for Hilary; being unaccustomed to such nice gestures on the part of her husband, she is so surprised that she cannot even feel joy.[184] When she finds out about Philip's affair with Melanie, Hilary reacts in a most interesting manner. Under the influence of Mary Makepeace she refuses his proposal to fly to America in order to discuss their problems; however, realising in which miserable situation she finds herself, she decides to have the long-wished for central heating installed in her house:

> You see, Philip, I decided not to wait any longer for the central heating, but to have it put in immediately on the HP. It was the first thing I did after receiving your letter about Melanie […]. I suppose that sounds funny, but it was quite logical. I thought to myself, here I am, slaving away, running a house and family single-handed for the sake of my husband's career and my children's education, and I'm not even warm while I'm doing it. If he can't wait for sex till he comes home, why should I wait for central heating? […] please send some more money home soon.[185]

---

[181] *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26.
[182] *Ibid.*, p. 130.
[183] *Ibid.*, p. 119.
[184] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 122.
[185] *Ibid.*, p. 150.

Hilary realises, perhaps for the first time in her life, which position and tasks she has in the family and, as might be expected, she feels bitterly offended by her husband's adultery. At first sight Mary Makepeace seems to have awakened a feminist consciousness in Hilary, but at a closer look one realises that she does not really change. She takes indeed revenge on Philip by spending more money than he initially wanted her to, but that money goes on their common house, too and, for this reason, in spite of her revolt, she remains a home-bound wife. No matter how unhappy her situation is, Hilary tries to resist Morris Zapp's advances, managing it for a while.[186] Nevertheless, she finally gives in and has an affair with him,[187] which turns her into a character pending between the traditional and the emancipated woman. *Small World* symbolically illustrates this 'in-betweenness' through the motif of the window. Despite its apparent triviality, the act of looking out the window acquires a profound symbolism: "Der Blick durchs Fenster, das die Grenze zwischen Drinnen und Draußen markiert, aber auch zwischen den beiden Bereichen vermittelt, vermag die Schwierigkeit der Grenzüberschreitung zu symbolisieren […]"[188] Thus, the window has a double function, that of separating as well as mediating between inside and outside, a duplicity signifying the problematic of transgression. In the morning of his departure from the Swallows' house, Morris Zapp sees from his taxi how "a curtain is drawn back from a bedroom window and a face– Hilary's?– hovers palely behind the glass."[189] Immediately after this scene, Hilary and Philip Swallow have sexual intercourse and, significantly, "[h]e is thinking of Joy, a purple-lit bedroom on a warm Italian night" while "[s]he is thinking of Morris Zapp, in this same bed, in this same room, curtains drawn against the afternoon sun, ten years ago."[190] Watching Morris's taxi from the bedroom's window reminds Hilary of her short affair with him. The Swallows' sex life indicates their frustrations as well as the gap that has grown between them. At the same time it shows some relevant gender differences: whereas his sexual adventure with Joy took place far away in a foreign country, her affair with Morris was confined to her home. The later development

---

[186] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 204-205.
[187] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 230.
[188] Natascha Würzbach, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
[189] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 92.

of the novel also sustains the idea that, although Hilary transgresses her borders once, she remains a faithful housewife to Philip forever after. That is to say, she sacrifices her desires for the sake of a marriage in which she does not even receive gratefulness, not to mention a kind treatment.

Changing Places can also be used to show that the social roles ascribed to both women and men illustrate a male perspective. At a certain moment, Hilary decides that it is time she finished the Master she abandoned when she got married and makes an application at university. Reading it, Rupert Sutcliffe, one of Philip Swallow's colleagues, is revolted. He himself being a bachelor, he believes that the only place where wives should be found is their home:

> If his colleagues had to have wives, he intimated, the least they could do was to keep them at home in decent obscurity. 'I think Swallow might at least have discussed the matter with us before letting his wife make a formal application,' he sighed.
> 'I don't think he knows anything about it,' said Morris carelessly.
> Sutcliffe's glasses nearly jumped off his nose. 'You mean she's *deceiving* him?'[191]

Sutcliffe's opinion on women is clear here: he believes that wives should live in the shadows of their husbands and is obviously surprised to hear that Hilary Swallow made an application without her husband's permission. In his eyes a wife is not entitled to any further education; furthermore, she should be totally subjected to her husband's will.

Therefore, Marjorie Wilcox (*Nice Work*) and Hilary Swallow (*Changing Places*, *Small World*) are the most representative examples of female characters who identify themselves with the gender role attributed to them by society. Both comply to the stereotype of the home-bound woman who, having no ambitions of her own, is confined to her role as wife and mother.

---

[190] *Ibid.*, p. 95.

3.3.2. Reversed gender roles

Feminist theories and movements have helped a lot of women to realise their inferior position in society. Some of Lodge's novels have female characters who refuse to act according to patriarchal expectations, but, instead, they assume the dominating role that men usually play.

Changing Places provides the example of the American Mary Makepeace who travels to England in order to have an abortion. Sitting next to Morris Zapp on the plane, she tells him that she used to work as a topless dancer, but gave up because she "realized how exploitative it was" and then "got interested in Women's Liberation."[192] After arriving in England, she decides to have the baby, but explains that "there was nothing ethical about [her] decision" as she "still believe[s] in a woman's right to determine her own biological destiny."[193] Mary Makepeace's situation as an unmarried mother makes it impossible for her to find any place to sleep in Rummidge. We read that "[p]eople were prejudiced against her, he [Morris Zapp] said. Was she coloured, I [Hilary Swallow] asked compassionately. No, he said, she was pregnant."[194] As it is normal in a patriarchal society, a pregnancy outside marriage is considered to be the responsibility of the respective woman, who is marginalised for this reason. Thus, Mary is not admitted in any house as Dr O'Shea, Moriss Zapp's landlord, "had the fear of God and Mrs O'Shea" while the landladies "obviously regarded Mary as a whore."[195] Taking all this into account, one can say that Mary Makepeace is rejected and judged by both men and women as she transgresses certain ethical rules by refusing to behave according to the expectations of a patriarchal culture. Mary's pregnancy becomes, to use Nathaniel Hawthorne's expression, a 'scarlet letter,'[196] a stigma assuring her exclusion from society. However, Hilary Swallow's kind-heartedness together with Morris Zapp's pleas help her overcome her prejudices and take the young unmarried woman warmly in her

---

[191] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 218.
[192] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[193] *Ibid.*, p. 115.
[194] *Ibid.*, p. 138.
[195] *Ibid.*, pp. 148-149.
[196] Cf. Nathaniel Hawthorne, "The Scarlet Letter. A Romance", in: Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Scarlet Letter and Other Writings*, ed. by Leland S. Person, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1994, pp. 3-166.

house.

Feminists point out that there are also women who behave the way men are expected to in a patriarchal society:

> For men, as the subject of desire, 'trouble' is represented by the female 'object' of desire who unexpectedly returns and answers the masculine gaze, who refuses the passive position of the feminine object and thereby 'contests the place and authority of the masculine position' […]. 'What configuration of power constructs the subject and the Other, that binary relation between "men" and "women", and the internal stability of those terms?' […] [T]he relation is based upon the presumption of heterosexuality– a male subject desiring a female object […]."[197]

A woman who 'strikes back,' that is takes man's attempt to conquer her as a challenge instead of complying to his demands, constitutes a real problem for the male. Stereotypically, the female is supposed to assume her passive role as though it were a natural fact, which turns her into an Other as opposed to the always male subject. This binary thinking presupposes heterosexuality, typical of the present Western culture, in order to function. If a woman refuses to act according to the pattern of behaviour imposed on her, she necessarily does the opposite, which automatically means that she has reversed the 'normal' order by identifying herself with an essentially male role. On the other hand, Judith Butler observes that, in this case, "[t]he radical dependency of the masculine subject on the female 'Other' suddenly exposes his autonomy as illusory."[198]

Robyn Penrose, one of the main characters in *Nice Work*, very well illustrates this type of woman, who consciously refuses to confirm to the gender role attributed to her behaving like men usually do. She is described as "being among other things a feminist"[199] and the reader finds out of her biography that "[s]he competed successfully for a post-doctoral research fellowship at one of the less fashionable women's colleges."[200] Although she is young, she has already begun her promising career as a university teacher whose courses on women's writing are very popular among students. After her success with the book *The Industrious Muse: Narrativity and Contradiction in*

---

[197] Deborah L. Madsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.
[198] Judith Butler, *op. cit.*, p. vii.
[199] David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 40.
[200] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

the Industrial Novel she is asked by the publishing house to write another book entitled *Domestic Angels and Unfortunate Females: Woman as Sign and Commodity in Victorian Fiction*.[201] Robyn Penrose's special interests lie in feminist theory and the study of the Victorian industrial novel. Combining them she comes to the following conclusions:

> '[I]ndustrial capitalism is phallocentric. […] The most commonplace metonymic index of industry– the factory chimney– is also metaphorically a phallic symbol. The characteristic imagery of the industrial landscape or townscape in nineteenth-century literature– tall chimneys […], the railway train rushing irresistibly through the passive countryside– all this is saturated with male sexuality of a dominating and destructive kind.[202]

Robyn Penrose uses psychoanalysis to comment on the industrial novel noticing that all the marks of industrialisation can be interpreted as phallocentric symbols; moreover, they show a male who rules over and destroys a passive landscape– standing for the female. This imagery goes hand in hand with the specifically male character of the industrial world presented in Lodge's *Nice Work*. Robyn's examination goes on as follows:

> 'For women novelists, therefore, industry had a complex fascination. On the conscious level it was the Other, the alien, the male world of work, in which they had no place. […] On the subconscious level it was what they desired to heal their own castration, their own sense of lack.'[203]

Interestingly, Robyn Penrose reverses the gender roles by exposing a feminist perspective in the novels she discusses: the industrial world being one populated exclusively by men, female novelists perceive it as an Other. But then she uses Freudian theory to identify in these novels a subconscious sufferance caused by the lack of prominent genital organs.

Robyn's feminist preoccupation is evident not only in her research, but also in her private life. For example, her best friend Penny Black is said to have been

---

[201] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 52.
[202] *Ibid.*, p. 78.
[203] *Ibid.*, pp. 78-79.

"converted to radical feminism"[204] during her studies in California. Apart from that, Robyn Penrose shows no interest at all in keeping her house clean, which she justifies by stating "I have more important things to do than housework."[205]

On another level, Robyn's feminist opinions are visible in the way she styles her hair: "according to mood– drawn back in a severe bun like Simone de Beauvoir's, or allowed to fall to the shoulders in a Pre-Raphaelite cloud."[206] Not only does she agree with and further develop the French feminist writer's ideas, but she also imitates her way of wearing her hair. Robyn's clothes are also relevant in this respect as she "generally favours loose dark clothes, made of natural fibres, that do not make her body into an object of sexual attention. The way they are cut also disguises her smallish breasts and widish hips while making the most of her height: thus are ideology and vanity equally satisfied."[207] Two points are to be made here: on the one hand, she refuses to dress in a sexy manner which would delight the male eye, on the other hand, she wants to emphasise how tall she is, which is a way of confronting as well as dominating men. After meeting his shadow for the first time, Vic Wilcox is unsettled by her height: "A *tall* trendy leftist feminist lecturer in English Literature!"[208] All of her characteristics are problematic to him, but the fact that the word 'tall' is stressed by being written in italics shows that this feature is the most disturbing one. Later, Vic becomes aware of the fact that, unlike most women, who choose their clothes so that they please men thus objectifying themselves, Robyn dresses in a way that is first of all comfortable for herself. Nevertheless, she looks different from radical feminists as she takes care of the clothes she wears. Her self-confidence is evident in her daring behaviour, for example in the courage with which she looks men in the eye. Robyn is an independent woman, which is considered to be a male feature of character; this is the reason why Vic perceives her as a desexualized human being– 'chaste.' The word 'chaste' reminds him of a painting he saw at the Rummidge Art Gallery when he was a schoolboy: "[a] large oil painting of a Greek goddess and a lot of nymphs washing themselves in a pond in the middle of a wood, and some young chap in the foreground peeping at them from behind

---

[204] *Ibid.*, p. 94.
[205] *Ibid.*, p. 153.
[206] *Ibid.*, p. 49.
[207] *Loc. cit.*

a bush."[209] It is a reference to the myth of Artemis or Diana and Aktaion in which the 'Peeping Tom' is punished for having seen the unattainable goddess naked by being transformed into a deer and then torn into pieces by the dogs. [210] Vic sees analogies between the painted Artemis and Robyn:

> For some reason the painting was associated in his mind with the word 'chaste', and now with Robyn Penrose. He pictured her to himself in the pose of the goddess– tall, white-limbed, indignant, setting her dogs on the intruder. There was no place for a lover or husband– the goddess needed no male protector. That was how he had thought of Robyn Penrose, too […].[211]

Robyn has similarities with the goddess since she also emanates a feeling of self-sufficiency and independence to which Vic is not accustomed from the part of a woman. To his mind, a man's function in the relationship with a woman is that of protecting her, a well-known stereotype based on the dichotomy strong/ weak. At a later point in the book, after their short affair, Vic tells Robyn about his reconciliation with Marjorie. He tries to comfort her by saying "One day you'll meet a man who deserves to marry you," to which remark he is given an answer that suits the young feminist: "I don't need a man to complete me."[212] Robyn sees married life as an endless source of unhappiness for women; she expresses her sympathy with housewives by stating "I wouldn't be a housewife. When I think of most people's lives, especially women's lives, I don't know how they bear it."[213]

One of the most significant cases of inverted gender roles is the relationship between Robyn and Charles in *Nice Work*; during their student years she focuses on her studies being at the same time engaged in socio-political activities while he takes care of the flat they share and cooks for her. Furthermore, Robyn is also the better of them intellectually speaking: although his grade in the Final Examinations is very good, hers is higher, but Charles has no problem living with this because he finds it normal to be

---

[208] *Ibid.*, p. 116.
[209] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 225-226.
[210] Cf. Victor Kernbach, *Dictionar de mitologie generala*, Bucuresti: Editura Albatros, 1983, p. 67.
[211] David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 226.
[212] *Ibid.*, p. 380.
[213] *Ibid.*, p. 238.

eclipsed by Robyn.[214] She is undoubtedly the one who takes decisions for both of them. When Charles intends to marry her, she refuses without hesitation puzzling her mother who cannot understand this. The difference between mother and daughter is explicitly presented: the latter has always been happy assisting her husband by typing for him and doing the housework alone whereas the former has ambitions for a career of her own. Robyn's family is aware of the fact that she possesses a strong will, which marks her off in a patriarchal society, leading Robyn's brother to call her 'bossy.'[215]

The intimate relations between Robyn and Charles also show that she dominates him: "Robyn, who was lying naked, face down on the bed, wriggled over towards the centre of the mattress. Charles, who was also naked, knelt astride her legs and poured aromatic oil from The Body Shop on her shoulders and down her spine."[216] Lying at the centre of the mattress emphasises her importance; on the contrary, Charles has the typical position of a slave who is kneeling beside her. They are "into non-penetrative sex these days" because Robyn "renounced the pill on health grounds" and Charles regards "condoms as unaesthetic;"[217] their stimulation of each other with special regard to Robyn's pleasure[218] indicates that the couple's perception of sexuality differs from the traditional one, which reduced women to merely their reproductive function.

Later after they separate, Charles sends Robyn a letter in which he asks her again to be his wife:

> I wonder whether it isn't time we bowed to the inevitable, and got married. […] And if you can't find another job when your contract at Rummidge runs out, you might find it pleasanter to be unemployed in London than in Rummidge. I'm fairly confident that I shall be earning enough by then to support you in the style to which you have been accustomed, if not rather better. There's no reason why you shouldn't go on doing research and publishing as a lady of leisure.[219]

Charles's proposal is based on a gender stereotype, namely that a woman, no matter how liberal, would gladly accept being financially supported by her husband. Her only

---

[214] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 44-45.
[215] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 54-55.
[216] *Ibid.*, p. 154.
[217] *Loc. cit.*
[218] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 158.
[219] *Ibid.*, pp. 375-376.

reaction to this is a "Humph!"[220] which unveils her indignation since she considers herself a strong self-sufficient woman needing neither a husband nor his money.

Robyn Penrose is a fierce feminist who pretends to fight for equal rights with men, but she actually tries to reverse the gender roles taking herself the position of the stronger. Therefore, when Vic Wilcox expresses his opinion that she should employ a woman to tidy up her house, she declines his suggestion immediately. The idea of a woman cleaning the place for her does not suit Robyn's feminist principles, but, interestingly enough, she would have nothing against a man doing this job if she could afford it. Yet, Vic's offer to pay for it is promptly rejected because it would mean the end of Robyn's independence.[221] Thus, her fight can be identified with one for the reversal of the power relations between males and females.

Like Robyn Penrose, Désirée Zapp in *Changing Places* is an equally self-confident feminist who is aware that men exploit women and who does not necessarily need a man in her life, either. Marrying Morris Zapp because of an accidental pregnancy, she wants to divorce him three years later on the ground that "[h]e was a bad influence on the children anyway, and as for herself she could never be a fulfilled person as long as she was married to him."[222] As he cannot understand her decision, she explains:

> 'You eat me.'
> 'I thought you liked it!'
> 'I don't mean that, trust your dirty mind, I mean psychologically. Being married to you is like being slowly swallowed by a python. I'm just a half-digested bulge in your ego. I want out. I want to be free. I want to be a person again.'[223]

Désirée feels suffocated by her husband, or, in other words, enchained by his dominating behaviour; she realises that she is no longer a person as he sees in her a mere extension of himself, which reminds us of Beauvoir's 'second sex.' After finding out that his wife has an affair with Philip Swallow, Morris Zapp tells Hilary Swallow that Désirée "hates

---

[220] *Ibid.*, p. 376.
[221] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 298.
[222] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 40.
[223] *Loc. cit.*

men. Especially weak-kneed men like [her] husband." He describes her as "a ball-breaker" adding that '[s]he eats men like [Hilary's] husband for breakfast."[224] This characterisation of Désirée conveys the image of an extremely dominant woman displaying traits usually associated with men. Interestingly, the very word 'eat' was used by Désirée to describe her husband's behaviour towards her.

A further similarity between Robyn and Désirée is the fact that they are both bold enough to pronounce words like "prick,"[225] which is, in patriarchal terms, a typical male behaviour as one reads in *Nice Work* that it is men who use swear words in their language, but not in front of a lady.[226] Philip Swallow notices that, in America "everybody, including Mrs Zapp, uses four-letter words all the time, even in front of their own children."[227] It seems that, as far as language is concerned, American women generally swear like men.

Discovering the Women's Liberation Movement Désirée gets involved in it as she finds it fascinating.[228] This helps her question assertions which are usually taken for granted, for example Philip Swallow's statement that his wife really needs a brassiere to go out of the house:

> 'She couldn't do without a bra, like you.'
> 'Why not?'
> 'Well, you know, it would be flopping about all over the place.'
> 'It? Don't you mean them?'
> 'Well, all right, them.'
> 'Who says they shouldn't flop? Who says they have to stick out like cantilevered terraces? I'll tell who, the brassiere industry.'[229]

Désirée's reaction shows that she is conscious of the fact that the Western culture imposes brassieres on women. This cultural phenomenon has its roots in industry, which underlines the economic interest characteristic of the modern age.

Désirée Zapp's affair with Philip Swallow in *Changing Places* is a significant illustration of the reversal of the gender roles. Living at her place, he is the one who

---

[224] *Ibid.*, pp. 235-236.
[225] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 41.
[226] Cf. David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 131.
[227] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 123.
[228] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 151.

prepares breakfast for both Désirée and her twin daughters. Philip even makes the sandwiches the girls take with them to school while their mother is still in bed. After the children's departure he brings breakfast on a tray to her bedroom. Moreover, she asks him to baby-sit for her the following evening because she has her Karate class.[230] In their relationship it is the man who is supposed to take care of the children whereas the woman takes Karate classes, a violent sport considered to be typically male. Désirée appears to enjoy commandment over her lover as well as freedom while Philip is the one confined to the house.

Since Désirée knows exactly that she is not good at doing housework and intends to start working again, she suggests that Philip should not only stay in Euphoria, but also give up his university career in order to work for her as a housekeeper.[231] Such a proposal is indeed perceived by the reader as comic, but, at a deeper level, it reveals the fact that Désirée's ultimate aim is to turn the power relations upside down. In reality Désirée Zapp would like to take over the superior position that man has in the Western culture and transform the patriarchal society she lives in into a matriarchy in which men should be exploited by women.

Taking all this into account, Robyn Penrose in *Nice Work* and Désirée Zapp in *Changing Places* are both feminists who prove to fight not for equality with men, but rather for grasping themselves the power man enjoys in a patriarchal order. In this context, the title of the novel *Changing Places* becomes symbolic in gender terms, too.

3.3.3. Family and/ or career

A very attentive look at David Lodge's novels has interesting results: whereas men do not usually have to choose between a family and a career, for women these constitute two irreconcilable poles. Thus, there are plenty of career men who confirm to the gender stereotype attributed to them by society. *Changing Places* provides several examples in this respect; one of them is Philip Swallow, university teacher in Rummidge, husband of

---

[229] *Ibid.*, p. 168.
[230] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 170-174.
[231] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 176.

Hilary and father of three children. Taking part in a Rummidge-Euphoria exchange scheme he goes to Euphoria for one semester and leaves his wife alone with their children at home. At first Philip Swallow feels guilty,[232] but his guilt is not strong enough to prevent him from sleeping with the young Melanie Byrd, Morris Zapp's daughter, shortly after his arrival in Euphoria.[233] As Hilary receives an anonymous letter reporting on Philip's affair with Melanie, he is forced to confess it, so he writes her about it. Getting no reply from Hilary he sends her another letter in which he expresses his bewilderment caused by her silence. Believing that having admitted the affair entitles him to his wife's forgiveness, he becomes a little worried at the thought that she might want a divorce, which he describes as something silly.[234] This arrogant reaction shows that he does not take into account Hilary's hurt feelings holding his role as leader of the family to be self-evident. Later he begins a new affair, this time a longer one with Désirée, Morris Zapp's wife and he even forgets to congratulate Hilary on her birthday.[235] In spite of all these mistakes as well as of the ones depicted in *Small World* (e.g. his affair with Joy Simpson), he always receives his wife's forgiveness and is therefore never put in the situation of choosing between his family and his career.

Another male character who complies to the stereotype is the American Morris Zapp: he is not used to doing any housework at all, but instead he expects to be served by women. For instance, he once invites himself to dinner at Hilary Swallow's house and, after eating everything he gets on the table, he offers to wash the dishes, which he is evidently unable to do.[236] Interestingly, Morris Zapp has already been twice married and divorced, but *Small World* ends with prospects of a third marriage with Thelma Ringbaum.[237]

Victor Wilcox too is representative of stereotypical career men, who usually believe that women have two important roles, that of the mother and of the housewife. He is described as very short, which does not fit into the image of a strong man, and suspected of having a rough manner of dealing with people in order to compensate for

---

[232] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 23.
[233] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 103.
[234] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 147.
[235] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 201.
[236] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 130.
[237] Cf. David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 329.

this physical 'imperfection.'[238] When first seeing him, Robyn Penrose disregards him on account of his stature until she shakes hands with him and meets the fierce determined look in his eyes.[239] This male character proves useful in illustrating the idea that "[m]asculinity, as it is currently constructed in western culture, draws on notions of virility, conquest, power and domination."[240] As it is normal in a traditional family, he is the husband and the father who supports the whole family financially.[241]

Marjorie, Vic Wilcox's wife, represents the typical uneducated woman whose role is restricted to being a caring housewife and a loving mother. She has neither a wish nor a chance to make a career of her own, but, instead, she is content with her family. However, although she has no idea about her husband's affair with Robyn Penrose, she feels the menace of, in Helena Michi's terms, "the 'other woman' who comes from outside to disrupt the home" and who is "[i]n popular parlance […] the mistress, the rival, the sexual threat."[242] It is this suspicion that makes Marjorie find a new style of clothing and hair, try to lose on weight through a diet and sport, and lie in the sun to get a tan.[243] Marjorie's efforts to save her marriage show that she cannot even take for granted her family in spite of all her sacrifices for it. In any case, the novel ends with a reconciliation due to Vic Wilcox's acknowledgement of how important his family is to him.

Beside the traditional women who have no ambitions of their own as they are totally dedicated to looking after their husbands and children thus identifying themselves with their gender role in society, Lodge's novels contain a number of female characters who are interested in making a career themselves. Barbara Appleby in *The British Museum Is Falling Down* and Hilary Swallow in *Changing Places* as well as in *Small World* resemble in this respect: both are educated women who give up postgraduate research for the sake of their marriages. Unlike them, Désirée Zapp (*Changing Places*, *Small World*, *Nice Work*) and Sally Passmore (*Therapy*) do indeed start a family and

---

[238] Cf. David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 16.

[239] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 109.

[240] Liz Kelly, "A Central Issue: Sexual Violence and Feminist Theory", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 347.

[241] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 201.

[242] Helena Michie, "Not One of the Family: The Repression of the Other Woman in Feminist Theory", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 57.

[243] Cf. David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 318.

make careers, but finally divorce their husbands. Only after the separation from Morris Zapp does Désirée become a well-known feminist novelist; Sally is a university teacher who divorces Laurence Passmore because of his egotism. Helen Reed in *Thinks...* seems to be an exception to the rule: she was happily married and at the same time a famous novelist. Nevertheless, the widow bitterly finds out that her marriage was only an illusion as her husband started having affairs with younger women at the time of her depression caused by the worries about her new novel.

Robyn Penrose (*Nice Work*, *Thinks...*), Fanny Tarrant (*Home Truths*) and Constance Fenimore Woolson (*Author, Author*) belong to the career unmarried women who have found their way into novels since the end of the nineteenth century.[244] The three characters are all successful in their domain– Robyn Penrose as an academic, Fanny Tarrant as a journalist , Constance Fenimore Woolson as a writer– but, in spite of their relationships with men (in the latter case only a platonic relationship with Henry James), they never get married.

On account of the previous observations one can draw the conclusion that, whereas David Lodge's male characters can have a family *and* a career simultaneously, in the case of women one speaks of either family *or* career. Even if the novels contain some feminist voices, for instance Désirée Zapp's and Robyn Penrose's awareness of the unequal power relations between men and women, these characters are presented in a most parodic manner, which seems to subvert the feminist discourse.

3.4. Narratology and gender studies

So far the gender category has been used to analyse how female characters are presented in connection to male protagonists and how these representations are discursively constructed.[245] In this final subchapter of the discussion on gender roles and identities the emphasis will fall on the examination of the various narrative techniques of the

---

[244] Cf. Natascha Würzbach, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
[245] This would correspond to the story level; cf. Vera Nünning und Ansgar Nünning, "Von der feministischen Narratologie zur *gender*-orientierten Erzähltextanalyse", in: Vera Nünning und Ansgar Nünning, ed., *Erzähltextanalyse und Gender Studies*, p. 14.

novels with the intention of highlighting the gender of the narrators. It will be argued that the perspective from which a story is told is equally relevant for narratology and feminism.[246]

First of all it must be acknowledged that 'sex', 'gender' and 'sexuality' constitute central categories in a gender-oriented narratology[247] being considered to be essential in the interpretation of a text.[248] Before getting to the problem of the narrator's gender, one must take into account the formalist/structuralist distinction *story* vs. *discourse* explained by Vera and Ansgar Nünning as follows:

> Viele Ansätze legen eine Opposition von >Sujet< und >Fabel< bzw. von *story* und *discourse* zugrunde, die auf den russischen Formalismus und den Strukturalismus zurückgeht. Während der Begriff der *story* die Abfolge der erzählten Ereignisse nach ihrem zeitlichen Ablauf meint, bezieht sich *discourse* auf die Gestaltung der Geschichte durch den Erzähler. Die Grundfragen, die sich aus dieser Unterscheidung ergeben, lauten: (1) Was wird erzählt? (2) Wie wird eine Geschichte erzählerisch (oder auch filmisch) vermittelt? Die Unterscheidung zwischen der Ebene der *story* und des *discourse* trägt der Tatsache Rechnung, dass ein und dieselbe Geschichte im Hinblick auf Auswahl und Betonung einzelner Ereignisse, sprachliche Gestaltung sowie Wahl der Perspektive und Bestimmter Erzählmuster ganz unterschiedlich erzählt werden kann.[249]

Whereas *story* refers to the chronological series of events underlying a book, *discourse* represents the manner in which these events are narrated. Perspective, which belongs to the discursive level, plays a crucial role since one and the same story can be told from several standpoints. On account of this, the narrator is given special attention by critics adopting a narratological approach. Recently feminist scholars have come up with a new category when analysing the narrator, namely that of gender; they try to find those

---

[246] Cf. Susan Sniader Lanser, "Toward a Feminist Poetics of Narrative Voice", in: David H. Richter, ed., *Narrative/ Theory*, New York: Longman Publishers USA, 1996, p. 183.

[247] Cf. Gaby Allrath und Marion Gymnich, "Neue Entwicklungen in der *gender*-orientierten Erzähltheorie", in: Vera Nünning und Ansgar Nünning, ed., *Erzähltextanalyse und Gender Studies*, p. 38; see also Marion Gymnich, "Konzepte literarischer Figuren und Figurencharakterisierung", in: Vera Nünning und Ansgar Nünning , ed., *Erzähltextanalyse und Gender Studies*, p. 136.

[248] Cf. Gaby Allrath und Carola Surkamp, "Erzählerische Vermittlung, unzuverlässiges Erzählen, Multiperspektivität und Bewusstseinsdarstellung", in: Vera Nünning und Ansgar Nünning, ed., *Erzähltextanalyse und Gender Studies*, p. 149.

[249] Vera Nünning und Ansgar Nünning, "Von der feministischen Narratologie zur *gender*-orientierten Erzähltextanalyse", p. 14.

characteristics that would help the reader ascribe a certain gender to the narrator.[250] Some features like names, pronouns or social roles are less ambiguous than others, such as jobs, clothing or patterns of behaviour.[251] While it is relatively easy for the reader to tell the gender of a homodiegetic or intradiegetic narrator (a narrator who is at the same time a character), with a heterodiegetic or extradiegetic narrator (omniscient narrator) the gender usually remains unmarked,[252] but in such a situation "readers are invited to equate the narrator with the author."[253] However, if the narrators in books written by men always receive a male identity, process known as "normative masculinity", in the case of female authors the gender of the tellers becomes problematic according to Susan Sniader Lanser because, besides sex, authority is another important criterion.[254]

Looking at David Lodge's fictional works from this point of view one can argue that the male perspective dominates while female voices are marginal. Thus, *The Picturegoers*, *Out of the Shelter*, *How Far Can You Go?*, *Small World*, *Home Truths* as well as *Author, Author* (with omniscient narrators) and *Ginger, You're Barmy* (narrated in the first person) are told from an exclusively masculine point of view. Although all the other novels (*The British Museum Is Falling Down*, *Changing Places*, *Nice Work*, *Paradise News*, *Therapy*, *Thinks...*) contain female voices, they will be examined individually because there are significant differences between them.

Most of *The British Museum Is Falling Down* is narrated by an omniscient perspective having Adam Appleby as focalizer; it is only at the end of the book that a female voice appears, namely that of his wife Barbara. Nonetheless, Barbara's interior monologue serves to parody James Joyce's *Ulysses* and not to equal the predominant male perspective, in comparison with which it has a limited quantitative place. As it has already been observed, *Changing Places* constitutes a display of four main narrative techniques (omniscient narrator, letters, newspaper articles, film script), but only the part made up of letters presents female perspectives, namely that of Hilary Swallow and that of Désirée Zapp. However, the letters written by the two women represent only an eighth of the novel, which makes them peripheral. Likewise the letters written by the

---

[250] Cf. Gaby Allrath und Carola Surkamp, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

[251] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

[252] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 149-150.

[253] Susan Sniader Lanser, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

female characters in *Paradise News* are marginal as the most part of the book is told in the third person or under the form of Bernard Welsh's journal. In *Nice Work* the narrator is omniscient and presents everything by means of two main focalizers, Vic Wilcox and Robyn Penrose. As "focalization identifies the governing perspective of a scene, episode, or entire narrative,"[255] one could say that the male and female perspectives are equal in this novel. In fact, the sympathetic depiction of Vic and the parodic picture of Robyn entitle one to declare the narrator essentially male.

The case of *Therapy* is unique in one point: although it is narrated in a colloquial style by Laurence Passmore in the first person, it contains a few monologues whose titles (coinciding with the names of their authors, mainly women) and contents (what their authors think about Laurence Passmore) make one believe that they were indeed written by the pretended female characters. Later the reader finds out with surprise that the author of all the monologues is nobody but Laurence Passmore himself. This constitutes a good illustration for "**cross-gendered narratives**" defined as stories in which the gender of the author does not coincide with that of the narrator.[256] On account of this statement one can consider the novel *Thinks...* a partially cross-gendered narrative as a significant part of it is told from Helen Reed's perspective. This book is very rich in narrative techniques: Ralph Meesenger's recording of his stream of consciousness, Helen Reed's diary, an omniscient narrator, parodic essays written by students and a section made up of emails, a modern form of the epistolary novel. Interestingly, the letter and the journal are seen as typically feminine literary genres while the epic and the drama are said to be masculine, thus echoing the dichotomy private vs. public.[257] Ralph Messenger's recording of his thoughts is also a kind of

---

[254] Cf. Gaby Allrath und Carola Surkamp, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

[255] Laura Wadenpfuhl, "Glossary", in: David H. Richter, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 326.

[256] Vera Nünning und Ansgar Nünning, "Von der feministischen Narratologie zur *gender*-orientierten Erzähltextanalyse", p. 16.

[257] Cf. Christoph Bode, *Der Roman. Eine Einführung*, Tübingen und Basel: A. Francke Verlag, 2005, p. 281. The feminist critic Iris Young observes that traditionally "[i]n the social scheme expounded by Rousseau, and Hegel after him, women must be excluded from the public realm of citizenship because they are the caretakers of affectivity, desire, and the body." (Iris Young, "The Ideal of Impartiality and the Civic Public", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 194.). Patricia Waugh too exposes "Enlightenment's construction of a public/ private split which consigns women to the 'private' realm of feeling, domesticity, the body, in order to clarify a public realm of Reason as masculine." (Patricia Waugh, "Modernism, Postmodernism, Gender: The View from Feminism", n: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, p. 206.).

journal, but his aim in doing so is to reach a scientific understanding of human consciousness.[258] Nonetheless, his tendency towards the public sphere is stronger than that of Helen Reed, which confirms the opposition stated above. Thus, after learning that Helen Reed keeps a diary, too, Ralph Messenger comes up with the proposal to exchange their journals. As she refuses firmly, he tries to persuade her in an email:

> surely a novelist, especially a woman novelist, should jump at the chance to look inside a man's head, to really see what goes on in there. i,m taking a trremendous risk, much more than you would be i,m sure. you'll be shocked, disgusted by a lot of the things bobbing about in my stream of consciousness. it's more like a sewer most of the time. it's possible that when you've read my journal you'll nver want to see me or speak to me again. i sincerely hope not of course. i hope that like me you value the truth above all else. if we do this we shall 'know' each other more completely than lovers ever know each other. they penetrate each others bodies to the depth of a few inches or so, with tongues, fingers, etc, but we would get inside each other's heads, we would possess each other as no two people have ever done before. doesn't that idea excite you?
>
> ralph[259]

To this she replies:

> Dear Ralph,
> You're very eloquent, but no thanks. Of course as a novelist I'm curious about other people's minds, and what goes on inside them, and a lot of the business of writing fiction consists of trying to imagine what X or Y would be thinking in this or that imaginary situation. And yes, OK, perhaps reading your journal would give me some insights into the male psyche in general and yours in particular. But ultimately I feel that the privacy of our thoughts is essential to human selfhood and that to surrender it would be terribly dangerous. We all have bad, ignoble, shameful thoughts, it is human nature, what used to be called Original Sin. The fact that we can suppress them, conceal them, keep them to ourselves, is essential to maintain our self-respect. It's essential to civilization.
>
> Why is torture so horrible, so morally repugnant? Not just because of the pain it inflicts, but because it uses bodily pain to prise secrets from the mind, which should be inviolable.
>
> Helen[260]

---

[258] The problem of consciousness will be largely discussed in the chapter on literary discourse.
[259] David Lodge, *Thinks...*, p. 188.
[260] *Ibid.*, p. 189.

Comparing the two emails one can comment on them on several levels; to begin with, the first thing that strikes the reader is the way they are written. For Ralph the email is simply a rapid modality of communicating, which makes him pay no attention to capital letters, punctuation marks or spelling mistakes. At the same time he shows no concern in building his sentences, which are written just as they come to his mind; moreover, his email has no addressee. Unlike him, Helen proves to be very careful about stylistic matters making her email almost look like a formal letter, which is due to her being a novelist. A further point to be made would be to consider the differences between the two voices by taking into account the category of gender. Ralph Messenger becomes indeed aware of the fact that he could never publish his journal without compromising himself, but this does not prevent him from wishing to show it to Helen Reed in order to read hers. His proposal does not enter the larger realm of the public, rather it belongs to the domain of intimacy, which he actually defines in his email. Contrary to him, Helen not only defends her privacy with total conviction, but also values it as one of the conditions for the existence of civilization equating consciousness with the Christian idea of soul. All in all, the two emails exemplify two opposed points of view illustrating the female preference for the private and the male tendency toward the public sphere. Although the letter and the journal are usually regarded as characteristic for women, one can recognise the scientific aims Ralph Messenger attempts to reach in both his emails and his recorded diary. Thus, he fits into the traditional stereotype of the rational male subject constantly observing reality modelled on Enlightenment ideals; furthermore, the ideas expressed in his email illustrate the Foucauldian triad of truth-knowledge-power: as he himself puts it, he "value[s] the truth," therefore he wants to "know" her most intimate thoughts in order to "possess."

Of all Lodge's novels *Thinks...* contains the most elaborate female point of view; besides, the use of the cross-gendering technique helps to deconstruct gender as an essence.[261] Considering all this, it is equally important to examine gender at both the level of the story and that of the discourse; thus, feminists should analyse not only gender stereotypes and representations, but also narrative techniques since the latter, as

---

[261] Cf. Christoph Bode, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-283.

Lanser emphasises, reflect relations of power, too.[262]

In conclusion, the chapter on gender discourse began with a theoretical introduction defining feminist literary criticism. There followed a discussion of the controversy whether the Foucauldian approach to power is suitable for a feminist examination or not. After a thorough presentation of various points of view, it was stated that numerous feminist scholars adapted Foucault's discourse analysis to their methodology in order to highlight the discursive nature of gender, thus contradicting Enlightenment universalistic assumptions giving priority to the male subject. The next section focused on strategies of maintaining patriarchy, such as hierarchy, pornography, imaginary rape, incestuous abuse or the othering of the female body, themes dealt with by Lodge's novels. It was observed that Lodge's fiction is not free from stereotypical representations of men and women; thus, there are two main groups of female characters: home-bound women, who sacrifice themselves for the sake of their families, and feminist characters, who refuse to comply to patriarchal norms, but who are presented in an exaggerated manner as they assume the role men usually have in Western society. Such an examination had an interesting result: whereas most of the male characters have both a family and a career, women must choose between them. The last subchapter analysed the relation between narratology and gender studies visible in the gender of the narrators. On the whole, this chapter revealed unequal power relations between male and female characters as well as the fact the gender is a discursive construct.

---

[262] Cf. Susan Sniader Lanser, *op. cit*, p. 184.

4. Ethnic Discourse

4.1. Key concepts: definitions

4.1.1. Ethnicity

A preliminary definition of ethnicity and of other related terms and concepts is necessary before commenting on their manifestation in David Lodge's novels. Being a relatively new term in English– its first appearance is identified in the 1950s– ethnicity is not easy to define as

> [i]t can mean 'the essence of an ethnic group' or 'the quality of belonging to an ethnic community or group', or 'what it is you have if you are an "ethnic group" ' […] generally in the context of (opposed) other ethnic groups. Alternatively, it may refer to a field of study: the classification of peoples and the relations between groups, in a context of 'self–other' distinctions […].[1]

Ethnicity is used in several different senses, but all these meanings have something in common, namely the implication of the dichotomy 'self vs. other.' Stuart Hall's consideration of ethnicity goes hand in hand with Foucault's concept of discourse: "The term ethnicity acknowledges the place of history, language and culture in the construction of subjectivity and identity, as well as the fact that all discourse is placed, positioned, situated, and all knowledge is contextual."[2] The attempt to explain related concepts is equally important. Therefore, it must be said that:

> 'Ethnic identity' and 'ethnic origin' refer to the individual level of identification with a culturally defined collectivity, the sense on the part of the individual that she or he belongs to a particular cultural community. 'Ethnic origin' likewise refers to a sense of ancestry and nativity on the part of the individual through his or her parents […].[3]

---

[1] John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, "Introduction", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed. *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, p. 4.
[2] Stuart Hall, "The New Ethnicities", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, p. 162.
[3] John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, "Introduction", p. 5.

Thus, individuals seem to need an ethnic identity and origin in order to have a feeling of belonging to a group. As ethnic origin is very important in this context, one needs to make references to Foucault' s ideas on it. He speaks of the concept *Herkunft* explaining it as follows:

> *Herkunft* is the equivalent of stock or *descent*; it is the ancient affiliation to a group, sustained by the bonds of blood, tradition, or social class. The analysis of *Herkunft* often involves a consideration of race or social type. But the traits it attempts to identify are not the exclusive generic characteristics of an individual, a sentiment, or an idea, which permit us to qualify them as "Greek" or "English"; rather, it seeks the subtle, singular, and subindividual marks that might possibly intersect in them to form a network that is difficult to unravel. Far from being a category of resemblance, this origin allows the sorting out of different traits [...]. Where the soul pretends unification or the self fabricates a coherent identity, the genealogist sets out to study the beginning– numberless beginnings whose faint traces and hints of color are readily seen by an historical eye. The analysis of descent permits the dissociation of the self, its recognition and displacement as an empty synthesis, in liberating a profusion of lost events.[4]

Foucault equates *Herkunft* with *descent* stating that there is not only one beginning, but a lot of beginnings, which the historian fails to seize. The French philosopher believes that his genealogical approach shows us the fact that there is no unique origin, no ethnic essence to be found:

> Genealogy does not resemble the evolution of a species and does not map the destiny of a people. On the contrary, to follow the complex course of descent is to maintain passing events in their proper dispersion; it is to identify the accidents, the minute deviations– or conversely, the complete reversals– the errors, the false appraisals, and the faulty calculations that gave birth to those things that continue to exist and have value for us; it is to discover that truth or being do not lie at the root of what we know and what we are, but the exteriority of accidents.[5]

The attempt to trace the course of descent leads to the discovery that our identity does not derive from truth, but from accidental events which have created values important

---

[4] Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History ", pp. 145-146.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 146.

for us. Therefore, one can say that Foucault questions everything taken for granted, the subversion of traditions being typical for poststructuralism.

4.1.2. Nation

It has been observed that that there is an Anglo-Saxon "tendency to reserve the term 'nation' for oneself and 'ethnic' for immigrant peoples,"[6] the difference consisting in the perspective. In defining nation Edward Said, one of the most famous names in postcolonial studies, makes it clear that national identity is a cultural construct:

> One of the great lessons of the critical spirit is that human life and history are secular– that is, actually constructed and reproduced by men and women. The problem with the inculcation of cultural, national, or ethnic identity is that it takes insufficient note of how these identities are constructions, not god-given or natural artifacts.[7]

He argues that history itself is constructed by human beings and therefore, no ethnic, national or cultural identity is natural. Homi K. Bhabha too writes that "[t]he 'nation' is precisely what Foucault has called a 'discursive formation.'"[8] The nation is considered to be "first and foremost a Western idea, one which emerged at a certain moment in Western history due to specific economic circumstances."[9] Moreover, it has been stated that "the origins of the nation in the West have much to do with the pursuit of a set of human ideals often identified as the European 'Enlightenment.'"[10] This conceptualisation of the nation is used to justify the European expansion:

> The sense of the Western nations as representing the very best in human progress and civilisation, firmly committed to a project of modernisation, becomes all too quickly a way of legitimating colonial expansion in moral terms. That is to say,

---

[6] John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, "Introduction", p. 5.

[7] Edward W. Said, "Identity, Authority, and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveler", in Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2002, Third Printing, p. 397.

[8] Homi K. Bhabha, *Nation and Narration*, London and New York: Routledge, 1990, p. 46.

[9] John McLeod, *Beginning Postcolonialism*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2000, p. 104.

[10] *Loc. cit.*

colonialism can be justified with recourse to nationalism as a liberal, morally just, crusade to conquer the perceived ignorance and savagery *of others*.[11]

Thus, Enlightenment provides a view on the nation which enables the consideration of colonialism as a civilising act as well as a moral obligation. The discursive nature of identity will be discussed at large in the next subchapter.

4.1.2.1. National identity– a discursive construct

In thinking about nation, one must bear in mind "[t]he idea that **identity** […] is built upon the characterisation of others as different from oneself" because "[i]t ties into how we might think about the cultural geographies of the differences between people and places in terms of power relations, and allows us to think about the city and the country as well as nationalism and national identity."[12] It is extremely important to be aware of the fact that 'identity is a construction, a consequence of process of interaction between people, institutions and practices.'[13] According to Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 'subjectivity is discursively produced' and 'identity is a discursive product.'[14] In his work *Orientalism* the influential postcolonial scholar Edward Said[15] tries to reveal the construction of concepts like the Occident and the Orient making 'use of theories of **discourse** […] to think about how power and knowledge are connected in the representation of places.'[16] Said discusses the problem of national identity in a series of essays observing that there is a competition among the different nations of the world:

---

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 104-105.
[12] Elain Baldwin et al., *Introducing Cultural Studies*, London: Prentice Hall, 1999, p. 168.
[13] Madan Sarup, "Home and identity" in: George Robertson et al., ed., *Travellers' Tales. Narratives of Home and Displacement*, London and New York: Routledge, 1994, p. 102.
[14] John McLeod, *op. cit.*, p. 218.
[15] Raman Selden calls Edward Said "Foucault's most distinguished American disciple" adding that "he is attracted to Foucault's Nitzschean version of post-structuralism because it allows him to link the theory of discourse with real social and political struggles." (Raman Selden, *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*, Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1985, p. 100.) Reina Lewis also recognises Foucault's strong influence on Said's consideration of "the Orient as an object of knowledge." (Reina Lewis, *Gendering Orientalism. Race, Femininity and Representation*, London and New York: Routledge, 1996, p. 16)
[16] Elain Baldwin et al., *op. cit.*, p. 168.

> But as one looks elsewhere in the world, one finds that many places are experiencing much the same contest of what the national identity is or ought to be. This contest, almost more than anything else, defines the political and cultural situation of the late twentieth century: that as the world grows smaller and more independent economically, environmentally, and through the revolution in communications, there is a greater sense that societies interact, often abrasively, in terms of who or what their national identities are.[17]

The contest of national identities seems to be the mark of the twentieth century being deepened by the growing number of interactions between different societies, interactions enabled by the progress in the domain of communication and transport. A closer look at the relations between the world's nations provides a lot of examples sustaining this assumption:

> Consider on a global level the importance today of the Western European community as one of the large cultural block interacting with the Eastern European community and the Soviet Union, with Japan and the United States, and with many parts of the Third World. Similarly, look at the contest between the Islamic world and the West, in which national, cultural, and religious self-images and self-definitions play so powerful a role. To speak of hegemony, attempts at domination, and the control of resources in this global struggle is, I strongly believe, to speak in very accurate (if also melodramatic) terms.[18]

All these examples show that each group or society has a self-image which urges it to fight for power over other groups. Moreover,

> [w]ithin societies such as this one and those in other parts of the Western, African, Asian, and Islamic world, there is also a contest as to which concept of national identity ought to prevail. Although this question is principally of philosophical and historical derivation, inevitably it leads one to the urgent political issue of how, given the definition of identity, the society is to be governed. To look closely at the recent history of imperialism and decolonization is to grasp the centrality of the debate.[19]

The question regarding which concept of national identity should be the dominating one leads to an important problem, namely who should govern the given society.

---

[17] Edward W. Said, "Identity, Authority, and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveler", p. 394.
[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 394-395.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 395.

Enlightenment thinking emphasises the difference between oneself and the others: '[t]his model contains universal values that its adherents, the in-groups, express to the highest degree, while from their point of view the behaviour and ideas of the 'others' represent aberrations.'[20] It has been observed that each culture considers itself better than the other ones:

> All cultures teach about themselves, and all cultures naturally assert their supremacy over others. To study the tradition, the masterpieces, the great interpretative methods of a culture inclines members of that culture to reverence, respect, loyalty, and even patriotism. This of course is understandable. But my point is that no culture exists in isolation, and since it is a matter of course that the study of one's tradition in school and university is taken for granted, we must look at what of *other* cultures, *other* traditions, *other* national communities also is communicated as one's culture is studied. I should like to argue that if the authority granted our own culture carries with it the authority to perpetuate cultural hostility, then a true academic freedom is very much at risk, having as it were conceded that intellectual discourse must worship at the altar of national identity and thereby denigrate or diminish others.[21]

Regarding one's own culture as superior incites patriotic feelings and disregard for others, endangering the academy's freedom. It may also lead to nationalism, which can have positive effects in certain situations:

> Nationalism is the philosophy of identity made into a collectively organized passion. For those of us just emerging from marginality and persecution, nationalism is a necessary thing: a long-deferred and –denied identity needs to come out into the open and take its place among other human identities.[22]

For the colonised, nationalism becomes a necessity as they must rediscover their own identity. Nonetheless, one should be very careful because exaggeration has serious consequences:

> To make all or even most of education subservient to this goal is to limit human horizons without either intellectual or, I would argue, political warrant. To assume that the ends of education are best advanced by focusing principally on

---

[20] Imaginaries of Cultural Pluralism, p. 152-153.
[21] Edward W. Said, "Identity, Authority, and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveler", pp. 395-396.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 402.

our own separateness, our own ethnic identity, culture, and traditions ironically places us as subaltern, inferior, or lesser races we had been placed by nineteenth-century racial theory, unable to share in the general riches of human culture. To say that women should read mainly women's literature, that blacks should study and perfect only black techniques of understanding and interpretation, that Arabs and Muslims should return to the Holy Book for all knowledge and wisdom is the inverse of saying along with Carlyle and Gobineau that all the lesser races must retain their inferior status in the world. There is room for all at the rendezvous of victory, said Aimé Césaire; no race has a monopoly on beauty or intelligence.[23]

Said asserts that, if a marginalized group restricts itself to its own culture and traditions, paradoxically it situates itself in an inferior position in comparison with other groups. We deal here not only with ethnic or national identities, but also with supernational concepts. Giving the example of the Western character of the Americans and that of the Arabness of the Arabs, Said observes that universities all over the world create and encourage such identities:

In both cases a kind of supernational concept– that of the West in the United States, and that of the Arabs or Islam in countries like Algeria, Syria, and Iraq (each of which has large minority populations)– is pressed into service. This scarcely improves things, since in both a combination of authority and defensiveness inhibits, disables, and ultimately falsifies thought. What finally matters about the West or the Arabs, in my opinion, is not what these notions exclude but to what they are connected, how much they include, and how interesting are the interactions between them and other cultures.[24]

These supernational concepts also run the danger of encouraging the rejection of otherness; nevertheless, since they transgress national boundaries, they can be regarded as potentially positive provided that inclusion and connectivity were emphasised.

4.1.2.2. Creating otherness

It has already been stated that each culture usually declares its superiority over others; this leads to a clash between one's own identity and that of other peoples and, inevitably, to the creation of 'Others'. Defining British identity is a difficult task because "[t]o

---

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 402-403.

represent someone or even something has now become an endeavour as complex and as problematic as an asymptote, with consequences for certainty and decidability as fraught with difficulties as can be imagined."[25] It is certain that one cannot speak of Britain without referring to its history and inevitably to colonialism. Each people characterises itself in comparison to other peoples, which become a mirror reflecting one's own identity. Homi Bhabha, a leading figure in postcolonial theory, observes that the colonial discourse created the otherness on the principle of fixity:

> An important feature of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of 'fixity' in the ideological construction of otherness. Fixity, as the sign of cultural/ historical/ racial difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of representation: it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and demonic repetition. Likewise the stereotype, which is its major discursive strategy, is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always 'in place', already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated…[26]

The construction of the Other, necessarily by means of stereotypes, is paradoxical since on the one hand, stereotypes are inflexible, on the other hand, they are always repeated.

Anthropology is extremely important in discussing ethnicity as it considers the notion of 'otherness' at length. This is the reason for Edward Said's special interest in this discipline:

> Like my own field of comparative literature, anthropology, however, is predicated on the fact of otherness and difference, on the lively, informative thrust supplied to it by what is strange or foreign, "deep-down freshness" in Gerard Manley Hopkins's phrase. These two words, "difference" and "otherness", have by now acquired talismanic properties. Indeed it is almost impossible not to be stunned by how magical, even metaphysical they seem, given the altogether dazzling operations performed on them by philosophers, anthropologists, literary theorists, and sociologists. Yet the most striking thing about "otherness" and "difference" is, as with all general terms, how profoundly conditioned they are by their historical and worldly context.[27]

---

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 396.

[25] Edward W. Said, "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors", in Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, p. 294.

[26] Homi Bhabha, "The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism", in: Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge, 1994, p. 66.

[27] Edward W. Said, "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors", p. 302.

'Otherness' and 'difference' are prominent notions in various fields of study and, despite the general character with which they have been endowed by philosophers, they can acquire very specific features in certain historical contexts. But anthropology has "the additional mission of humanizing the Others while differentiating them."[28]

In the case of the British, the colonial discourse created national stereotypes by developing binary oppositions in which the white Christian Europeans become the civilising colonisers while the conquered are equated with the primitive. Taking into account the relation between cultures and places, one can discover further binaries which "radically distinguished and hierarchized 'home' and 'abroad,' the West and the Orient, the center and the margin, and the subject of study and the disciplinary object of study."[29] Thus, "the world came to be seen as divided into the world 'Here' (the West) and the world 'Out There' (the non-West);" but, what is more important, this division implies the fact that the whole world is conquered by "the dominant U.S.-Eurocenter."[30]

4.1.2.3. The colonised

Edward Said has tried to describe the ideas and symbols related to the notions of coloniser and colonised. Although he draws on Michel Foucault's theory of discourse, power and knowledge, he also tries to detach himself from the French philosopher for several reasons. First, in spite of his well-known statement "Where there is power, there is resistance," Foucault "does not fully engage with the implications of his theory."[31] He argues that:

> This is a perfect example of Foucault's unwillingness to take seriously his own ideas about resistances to power. If power oppresses and controls and

---

[28] Smadar Lavie and Ted Swedenburg, "Introduction: Displacement, Diaspora, and Geographies of Identity" in, Smadar Lavie & Ted Swedenburg, ed., *Displacement, Diaspora, and Geographies of Identity*, Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1996, p. 2.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[30] *Loc. cit.*
[31] Peter Childs and Patrick Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*, London: Prentice Hall Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1997, p. 108.

manipulates, then everything that resists it is not morally equal to power, is not neutrally and simply a weapon against that power. Resistance cannot equally be an adversarial alternative to power and a dependent function of it, except in some metaphysical, ultimately trivial sense.[32]

Foucault is criticised for showing no interest in the resistance of marginalised groups to coercive forms of power. A further reason for the distance Said wants to keep between himself and Foucault is the fact that

the latter is not interested in individuals or intentionality, whereas for Said these are both too important to be dismissed or diminished, not least because they are closely linked to the move to reclaim human dignity and active historicity for colonial and post-colonial subjects which is at the heart of resistance movements.[33]

Said values individuality as it is tightly connected with resistance movements, which, in their turn, play a central part in postcolonialism. Foucault's remaining silent on the subject is the reason why the postcolonial theoretician feels it is necessary to further develop these ideas himself.

Nevertheless, although colonialism came to an end in the middle of twentieth century when many colonies became independent, the inhabitants of these states have continued to be regarded as colonised:

There was, however, a continuing colonial presence of Western powers in various parts of Africa and Asia, many of whose territories had largely attained independence in the period around World War II. Thus "the colonized" was not a historical group that had won national sovereignty and was therefore disbanded, but a category that included the inhabitants of newly independent states as well as subject peoples in adjacent territories still settled by Europeans. Racism remained an important force with murderous effects in ugly colonial wars and rigidly unyielding polities.[34]

This category of people together with their territories they inhabit are still controlled by Western countries. In this context racism is seen as being the cause of many

---

[32] Quoted from *loc. cit.*
[33] *Loc. cit.*
[34] Edward W. Said, "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors", p. 294.

misunderstandings, leading even to brutal conflicts. Borrowing Fanon's ideas Said writes:

> The experience of being colonized therefore signified a great deal to regions and peoples of the world whose experience as dependants, subalterns, and subjects of the West did not end– to paraphrase from Fanon– when the white last policeman left and the last European flag went down. To have been colonized was a fate with lasting, indeed grotesquely unfair results, especially after national independence had been achieved. Poverty, dependency, under– development, various pathologies of power and corruption, plus of course notable achievements in war, literacy, economic development: this mix of characteristics designated the colonized people who had freed themselves on one level but who remained victims of their past on another.[35]

In spite of the official ending of colonialism marked by the total retreat of the European armed troops from their territories, the colonised remain subject to the former Empire, their unfair experience thus becoming part of their identity. They are considered to be inferior, which causes their marginalisation:

> Thus the status of colonized people has been fixed in zones of dependency and peripherality, stigmatized in the designation of underdeveloped, less-developed, developing state, ruled by a superior, developed, or metropolitan colonizer who was theoretically posited as a categorically antithetical overworld. In other words, the world was still divided into betters and lessers, and if the category of lesser beings had widened to include a lot of new people as well as a new era, then so much the worse for them. Thus to be one of the colonized is potentially to be a great many different, but inferior, things, in many different places, at very different times.[36]

Associated with dependency, peripherality as well as underdevelopment, the colonised are said to be, to use Said's words, the 'lessers.' The colonial discourse functioned because it was sustained by various disciplines:

> I there begin to describe the emergence of a global consciousness in Western knowledge at the end of the nineteenth century, particularly in such apparently unrelated fields as geography and comparative literature. I then go on to argue that the appearance of such cultural disciplines coincides with a fully global

---

[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 294-295.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 295.

imperial perspective, although such a coincidence can only be made to seem significant from the point of view of later history, when nearly everywhere in the colonized world there emerged resistance to certain oppressive aspects of imperial rule like theories of subject races and peripheral regions, and the notions of backward, primitive, or undeveloped cultures.[37]

The postcolonial movements of resistance reveal the fact that the new fields of study in the nineteenth century justified the imperialist perspective reducing the colonised to primitive beings for whom colonialism was meant to be a salvation.

Unlike the colonised, the colonisers are the so-called betters, whose main function is to civilise the world. The Victorian discourse is considered to be a Eurocentric one because "[p]erhaps like many of his Victorian contemporaries– Ruskin comes quickly to mind– Newman was arguing earnestly for a type of education that placed the highest premium on English, European, or Christian values in knowledge."[38] Such a way of thinking is based on dichotomies and, as a result, non-European cultures and values are entirely discharged.

Anthropology again proves to be taken into consideration since it constitutes one of the most significant disciplines dealing with the differences between the coloniser and the colonised:

> As for anthropology as a category, [...] a couple of currents can be stressed here. One of the major tendencies within disciplinary debates during the past twenty or so years has derived from an awareness of the role played in the study and representation of "primitive" or less-developed non-Western societies by Western colonialism, the exploitation of dependence, the oppression of peasants, and the manipulation or management of native societies for imperial purposes. This awareness has been translated into various forms of Marxist or anti-imperialist anthropology [...]. This kind of oppositional work is admirably partened by feminist anthropology, [...] historical anthropology, [...] work that relates to contemporary struggle, [...] American anthropology,[...] and denunciatory anthropology.[...]
> The other major current is the postmodern anthropology practiced by scholars influenced by literary theory generally speaking, and more specifically by theoreticians of writing, discourse, and modes of power such as Foucault, Roland Barthes, Clifford Geertz, Jacques Derrida, and Hayden White.[39]

---

[37] Edward W. Said, "The Politics of Knowledge", in Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, pp. 372-373.
[38] Edward W. Said, "Identity, Authority, and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveler", p. 401.
[39] Edward W. Said, "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors", pp.295-296.

One of the main tendencies in anthropology is the representation of the colonised with reference to race and class. This branch has clear Marxist echoes whereas the other main direction mostly deals with theories of power and discourse deriving from poststructuralist critics, among which the name of Michel Foucault is cited, too. Said agrees with Foucault that truth is not transcendental, but historically and culturally conditioned:

> At the heart of the imperial cultural enterprise I analyzed in *Orientalism* and also in my new book, was a politics of identity. That politics has needed to assume, indeed needed firmly to believe, that what was true for Orientals or Africans was *not* however true about or for Europeans. When a French or German scholar tried to identify the main characteristics of, for instance, the Chinese mind, the work was only partly intended to do that; it was also intended to show how different the Chinese mind was from the Western mind.[40]

Orientalism discusses a politics of identity starting from the assumption the each culture has its own truth. Western philosophy has always tried to compare the European with the non-European ways of thinking thus emphasising the differences between the two. This has contributed to the emergence of stereotyping images of other peoples:

> Such constructed things– they have only an elusive reality– as the Chinese mind or the Greek spirit have always been with us; they are at the source of a great deal that goes into the making of individual cultures, nations, traditions, and peoples. But in the modern world considerably greater attention has generally been given to such identities than was ever given in earlier periods, when the world was larger, more amorphous, less globalized. Today a fantastic emphasis is placed upon a politics of national identity, and to a very great degree, this emphasis is the result of the imperial experience. For when the great modern Western imperial expansion took place all across the world, beginning in the late eighteenth century, it accentuated the interaction between the identity of the French or the English and that of the colonized native peoples.[41]

These stereotypes are helpful in the formation and maintenance of ethnic as well as national identities. Nowadays it is amazing how much significance the politics of

---

[40] Edward W. Said, "The Politics of Knowledge", p. 376.

national identities has gained; this is seen as the result of imperialism, more specifically of the interaction between the identity of the coloniser and that of the colonised, which deepens the difference between the two:

> And this mostly antagonistic interaction gave rise to a separation between people as members of homogeneous races or exclusive nations that was and still is one of the characteristics of what can be called the epistemology of imperialism. At its core it is the supremely stubborn thesis that everyone is principally and irreducibly a member of some race or category, and that race or category cannot ever be assimilated to or accepted by others– except as itself. Thus came into being such invented essences as the Oriental or Englishness, as Frenchness, Africanness, or American exceptionalism, as if each of those had a Platonic idea behind it that guaranteed it as pure and unchanging from the beginning to the end of time.
> One product of this doctrine is nationalism [...].[42]

In this respect individuals are regarded only as members of a certain race or nation with no possibility of change. Hence the creation of cultural constructs like Englishness or Africanness, which are mere generalisations accepted as universal truths or essences. Said warns that such stereotyping is extremely dangerous as it can lead to nationalism.

4.2. Constructing Britishness

4.2.1. Army discourse

The novel *Ginger, You're Barmy* deals with "peacetime National Service, as an institution and as an experience- one which most young men born between, say, 1928 and 1941, underwent."[43] The Army is intricately linked with the national state as it contributes to the formation of national identity. At the same time it regulates individual behaviour standing for hierarchy and power. Beside the academy, the Army circulates a discourse destined to attribute identities as well as roles to individuals. On account of

---

[41] *Loc. cit.*
[42] *Ibid.*, pp. 376-377.
[43] David Lodge, "Afterword" in David Lodge, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, p. 212.

this, one can claim that, although the two discourses are very different from each other, they both serve the same aim.

The narrator of the novel *Ginger, You're Barmy*, Jonathan Browne, is an educated young man who sees in the National Service an injustice since the soldiers are "subjected to abuse and criticism without any appeal to the written and unwritten laws which control conduct in civilized life."[44] In his depiction the Army appears as the opposite of civilization. Jonathan Browne realises that, in order to be a good soldier, a man does not need to be learned at all. Therefore, when meeting the educated men he will train, Corporal Baker warns them: "But even if some of you *are* supposed to be educated, even if you have degrees in every subject under the bleeding sun, that doesn't mean you're any better as soldiers. In my experience it makes you worse."[45] The corporal's prejudices against educated men make him be even harsher than he usually is. Being offered the chance of becoming an officer, Jonathan Browne refuses. In front of the C.O. (Commanding Officer) he justifies his decision arguing that his education has taught him to question everything, and not to take it for granted. The Army means hierarchy, that is to say, repressive power is exercised on soldiers all the time. What the graduate Browne cannot accept is the fact that one must execute orders even if they seem absurd. The C.O. finds this normal as he believes that there must be a superior instance of power which is to be simply accepted.[46]

As far as power relations are concerned, the Army is associated with the feudal hierarchy, in which the Queen, symbol of the national state, is seen as the ultimate authority, the Sovereign endowed with the Divine Right. Browne presents the military hierarchy as ridiculous and stresses the fact that the soldiers, compared with serfs, are the ones on which the oppressive power is most clearly exercised. Indeed, the narrator finds that officers do not need to be very intelligent, but that an important quality is absolutely necessary, namely "*leadership*."[47] Thus, in order to get a higher position, one must enjoy both dominating other people and accepting higher authorities. Jonathan

---

[44] David Lodge, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, p. 24.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 46.
[46] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 87.
[47] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 76-77.Cf.

Browne is aware that officers abuse their power and, seeing the effects this has on the weak soldiers, he finds the Army unjust beginning to detest it.

Moreover, the National Service is associated with both prison and hell; the prison-like elements of the Army are evident: lack of freedom, unsatisfactory alimentation, coercive power, strange physical appearance. Furthermore, the soldiers are devoid of their individuality becoming a number on their identity cards.[48] This image reminds us of Michel Foucault's description of the prison:

> To place someone in prison, to confine him there, to deprive him of food and heat, to prevent him from leaving, from making love, etc.– this is certainly the most frenzied manifestation of power imaginable. [...] Prison is the only place where power is manifested in its naked state, in its most excessive form, and where it is justified as moral force. [...] What is fascinating about prisons is that, for once, power doesn't hide or mask itself; it reveals itself as tyranny pursued into the tiniest details; it is cynical and at the same time pure and entirely "justified," because its practice can be totally formulated within the framework of morality. Its brutal tyranny consequently appears as the serene domination of Good over Evil, of order over disorder.[49]

The prison is associated with despotism and internment making the abuse of power most visible. Foucault finds it interesting that such authoritarian power can be exercised in a justified manner. The same is valid for "the Army's despotic authority:"[50] the soldiers are oppressed for a good purpose. Jonathan Browne expresses his shock at becoming conscious of the real state of 'Army discipline': crime and punishment seem to be the main features characterising it. Moreover, the border between the two becomes fluid as one can no longer differentiate between them.[51] The worst things about Army discipline is that it does not correct deviant behaviour, but, on the contrary, it encourages sadism by making it possible.[52]

---

[48] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 89.
[49] Michel Foucault, "Intellectuals and Power", in: Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, pp. 209-210.
[50] David Lodge, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, p. 90.
[51] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 102-103.
[52] There is a further example of sadism in the novel: while attending the Clerks' Course, Jonathan Browne observes that the two teachers, Mason and Wilkinson, usually challenge their pupils and if the latter become impertinent, they are punished by having to stand in one corner of the room. Then the former delightfully throw a tennis ball at them, thus nourishing their sadistic pleasure in humiliating their subalterns. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 138.

The other image of the Army is that resembling hell:

> The feeling of being in prison was perhaps the dominant one, but there were times when life was touched by a quality of surrealism, of nightmarish unreason, and the prison-image gave way to one of hell. Not a real hell of course, but a kind of *opéra bouffe* hell, a macabre farce, one's response to which oscillated between hysterical laughter and a metaphysical despair.[53]

Life in the Army sometimes appears as a grotesque hell that throws the narrator-character into a deep anguish, the description of his feelings reminding us of existentialist philosophy and literature. Indeed, Jonathan Browne speaks of two images of hell that correspond to the two phases in his National Service: the first part of his training is marked by a macabre traditional hell whereas his time as a Clerk makes him feel the *ennui* depicted by Paul Sartre's in *Huis Clos*.[54]

One should keep in mind the reason for the existence of the Army, namely its relation to the national state. The Commanding Officer who disapproves of Jonathan Browne's choice not to become an officer sees in the National Service a duty towards the country, which now asks for something in return for the good education provided to the ungrateful soldier.[55] After listening to this speech, Jonathan Browne is hardly surprised to read in a newspaper that National Service teaches young men to have an independent and responsible spirit, essential features of character.[56] Therefore, the media too contribute to the formation of national identity emphasising the Army's positive impact on its soldiers.

Ginger, You're Barmy divides people into two main groups: the ones who cultivate their mind through education and the ones willing to undergo a hard training in order to climb the hierarchical ladder of the Army. As Jonathan Browne is part of the former, he does not enjoy his National Service at all. Taking this grouping into account, the national state assures its support from individuals by circulating two important discourses, the academic and the Army one.

---

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 89.
[54] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 139.
[55] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 87.
[56] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 189-190.

4.2.2. Ireland, a British colony

As for the Irish, the British had difficulty in sustaining their colonialist attitude because in this case there was no race difference between the coloniser and the colonised. It was evident that "[t]he Irish were colonized yet they were white" and "[t]his lack of clear racial markers meant that colonial discourse had to work differently, with a different cultural logic from that which relied on the black-white distinction."[57] After a visit to Ireland, Charles Kingsley writes: "I am haunted by the human chimpanzees I saw along that hundred miles of horrible country… But to see white chimpanzees is dreadful; if they were black, one would not feel it so much, but their skins, except where tanned by exposure, are as white as ours."[58] The association of the Irish with chimpanzees intends to show their inferiority on the evolution scale; interestingly, although Kingsley clearly sees that they look like himself, he rejects them on racial grounds and describes their country as 'horrible' without arguing why. This proves that Ania Loomba is right stating that "the lack of colour difference *intensified* the horror of the colonial vis-à-vis the Irish."[59]

In this context the British invented a physiological difference in order to declare their superiority and to justify their colonial expansion in Ireland. For instance, articles published in *Punch* in the middle of the nineteenth century reduced the Irish to "the missing link between the gorilla and the Negro."[60] The Irish were called "the niggers of Europe,"[61] which is problematic because "they are niggers who happen to be Europeans, who belong to a greater social and cultural world that encompasses both England and Ireland."[62] There were even scientists who supported the colonial discourse by stating that the Great Famine of 1845-47 had consequences on the physiology of the Irish, namely their jaws became afterwards "more like the negro."[63] This enabled the British

---

[57] Catherine Hall, ed., *Cultures of Empire. A Reader. Colonizers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, p. 27.
[58] Anne McClintock, "Soft-soaping Empire: Commodity Racism and Imperial Advertising" in: George Robertson, et al., ed.,*op. cit.*, 1994, p. 141.
[59] Ania Loomba, *Colonialism/ Postcolonialism*, London: Routledge, 1998, p. 109.
[60] Catherine Hall, ed., *Cultures of Empire*, p. 105.
[61] Andrew Murphy, *But the Irish Sea Betwixt Us. Ireland, Colonialism, and Renaissance Literature*, The University Press of Kentucky, 1999, p. 12.
[62] *Loc. cit.*
[63] Ania Loomba, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

imperialists to describe the Irish "in ways directly analogous to those employed for Africans and Indians," which resulted into "[h]ostile images and stereotypes of Irishness."[64] However, "[t]he Irish as a whole could not be induced or coerced into accepting a wider British identity"[65] although Ireland became a British colony. A lot of stereotypes were developed; for example, there were parallels between "immoral lives of the British underclass," "Irish peasants" and "primitive Africans."[66] Thus, the Irish are seen by the British as a primitive, rural and underdeveloped people, images that are to be found in several of David Lodge's novels, too.

An uncivilised and infantilised picture of Ireland is found in *The British Museum Is Falling Down*. Adam Appleby knows very well that "Daddies often used pots" as "[e]ighty per cent of the rural dwellings in Ireland had no sanitation of any kind, for example."[67] Hence, the Irish are seen as peasants whose living conditions are far below the British standard.

Ireland is represented by the inexperienced Persse McGarrigle from University College, Limerick in *Small World*.[68] Asked about this university, of which nobody has heard, Persse McGarrigle explains: "As a matter of fact, there's only the three of us. It's basically an agricultural college. We've only recently started offering a general arts degree."[69] In this remark the emphasis falls on the rural character of Ireland as well as on its insignificance on the world cultural map. The young Irishman confesses that, although he studied in Dublin, he "never heard anything about structuralism there."[70] The very University College Dublin is depicted in an unfavourable light: being isolated from the rest of the world, its professors are ignorant regarding the modern ideas on the cultural scene.

Ginger, You're Barmy is the novel which presents, apart from the Army life, the friendship between the English Jonathan Browne and the Irish Mike (Michael) Brady. The relationship between the two men is analogous to the relation between the nations

---

[64] Stephe Howe, *Ireland and Empire. Colonial Legacies in Irish History and Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 49.
[65] Andrew S. Thompson, *Imperial Britain. The Empire in British Politics, c. 1880-1932*, Singapore: Pearson Education Asia Pte Ltd., 2000, p. 32.
[66] Catherine Hall, ed., *Cultures of Empire*, p. 105.
[67] David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, p. 11.
[68] Cf. David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 7.
[69] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

they stand for. As the story is narrated by Jonathan Browne, the perspective is a British one; furthermore, the reader can sense the feeling of superiority of the narrator over his friend whom he describes in negative terms: "I knew him mainly as a curiously aimless individual who could be seen at most hours of the day in the Union Bar, drinking beer and playing darts with a group of cronies who seemed hell-bent on occupying their time at the university as unprofitably as possible."[71] This is how the narrator remembers his former university colleague, an aimless student wasting his time in performing futile activities such as drinking or playing instead of concentrating on more serious tasks like learning.

Interestingly, the British man is not sure whether Mike Brady is Irish or not because "[h]is name and physical appearance seemed to suggest that he was Irish, but his speech was distinguishable from standard Southern English only by a certain melodic softness of the vowels."[72] This uncertainty is due to the fact that Mike's parents are Irish who immigrated to England, which is actually the country where he was born. From a conversation with him Jonathan Browne finds out a lot about his family background:

> The Bradys were a politically conscious clan, fervently nationalist anti-clerical. Mike's great-uncle had been a friend of Parnell. His father, a medical student at the time, had been closely associated with the Easter Rising of 1916. He still treasured a piece of rusty thread with which he had stitched a flesh-wound of Pearse's. Mr Brady had escaped the reprisals after the failure of the Rising, but he had continued to support the Nationalist movement until, disgusted by the betrayal of the Partition, he had emigrated with his wife, paradoxically to England, in 1924. He re-qualified and set up practice in Hastings.[73]

This story is indeed "a vivid miniature of recent Irish political history"[74] as the men in the family were actively engaged in movements of liberation. They prove to greatly value the Irish nationalist heroes who fought for their country's independence.

---

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 14.
[71] David Lodge, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, p. 21.
[72] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[73] *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.
[74] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

Disappointed by the Partition, Mike Brady's father left Ireland and settled with his wife in the enemy country where he got the chance of opening his own medical practice.

This family is typical for the Irish: it is very big (Mike has "two brothers and three sisters. And two others died."[75]) and, being Catholic, it proves intolerant towards practitioners of other religions (Mike's mother disapproves of Pauline, Mike's girlfriend, because of the fact that she has another religion.[76]). Trying to convert to Catholicism, the young English woman finds difficulty in understanding their religion as "it's all mixed with Irish politics, which makes it even more confusing."[77] Indeed, in *The British Museum Is Falling Down* the Irish Father Finbar also mixes Catholicism with politics. Although his parish is "at least half-populated by Irish," this is not, "in Adam and Barbara's eyes, an adequate excuse for nostalgic allusions to 'Back Home' in sermons, or the sanctioning of collections in the church porch for the dependants of IRA prisoners."[78] The Irish immigrant priest is unable to separate his religious faith from his support of nationalist movements. This makes Catholicism not only essentially Irish, but almost identical with Ireland's nationalist fight for acknowledgement.

A comparable family with the Bradys is that of Dr. O'Shea in *Changing Places* and *Small World*. Like Mr. Brady, he is also "an Irish doctor" with an "extensive family" living in England.[79] The Walsh family in *Paradise News* is equally a big Irish and Catholic one[80] who left Cork and immigrated to England.[81] Father Finbar in *The British Museum Is Falling Down* is a member of a numerous family, too; he is "the youngest of eighteen children."[82] Dr. O'Shea is presented in a most negative way; he seems to be very greedy and exceedingly economical.[83] He takes all the possible profits from his lodger, Morris Zapp; for instance, he uses any opportunity "to watch Morris's

---

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 157.
[76] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 159-160. The mother's objection to an intermarriage helps to illustrate the statement that "[t]hat type of religion confessed by group actors is also a significant factor in interethnic dynamics." (Cynthia Enloe, "Religion and Ethnicity", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, p.198.).
[77] David Lodge, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, p. 160.
[78] David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, p. 29.
[79] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 57.
[80] Cf. David Lodge, *Paradise News*, p. 42.
[81] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 229.
[82] David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, p. 31.
[83] Cf. David Lodge, *Changing Places*, pp. 57-58.

colour TV and to drink his whisky."[84] Dr. O'Shea pretends to be generous to his wife's niece, Bernadette, who should be happy to live in his house as "[a] month ago she was milking cows in Sligo."[85] The past life of the young girl is part of the stereotypical rural image of Ireland. Bernadette is said to have left her home farm in order to lead a descent life in an urban house, but, in reality, she "had come to live with the O'Sheas as domestic slave labour."[86]

Looking at Mike Brady's physical appearance, one remarks that he has "vivid ginger hair" and that he wears "soiled and neglected clothing" such as the following outfit: "a dirty sports shirt open to the lower chest for want of buttons, and revealing the absence of a vest; an old brown sports jacket frayed at the cuffs and button-holes; a pair of shapeless, stained corduroy trousers; and black shoes that had never been polished since he walked out of the shop in them."[87] This unflattering description stressing Mike Brady's negligence reveals the British narrator's disdain of his companion.

To the negative sides of the young Irishman belongs his poverty, too; thus, during his National Service he keeps borrowing money from his English friend, but always pays it back as promised. The latter is sure that it is the former's girlfriend, Pauline Vickers, who actually finances him.[88] Hearing about Mike's revenge on Corporal Baker and his imprisonment, she describes him in a most unfavourable manner: "Oh dear, oh dear… what a fool that boy is… just a wild Irish boy that never grew up… not a scrap of common sense…"[89] or "He's always been a wild, wayward boy. Never did any work,– well you know that. Never had any money. Never any thought for the future."[90] These terms form the image of an immature, purposeless and irrational Other in the position of the colonised. Although he is a grown up man, he is called a boy, which suggests infantilization as well as underdevelopment, laziness and wilderness being further features that characterise him. Mike Brady is seen not only as a boy, but also as lacking both seriousness and responsibility. Colonial discourse makes

---

[84] *Ibid.*, p. 72.
[85] *Ibid.*, p. 90.
[86] *Ibid.*, p. 91.
[87] David Lodge, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, pp. 21-22.
[88] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 145.
[89] *Ibid.*, p. 155.
[90] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

use of similar representations when speaking about the native populations thus proclaiming the Westerners' civilising task.

The title of the novel, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, is very symbolic from a postcolonial point of view: on the one hand, ginger is the stereotypical hair colour of the Irish, even becoming Mike's nickname,[91] on the other hand, 'barmy' suggests that the colonised do not possess the colonisers' reason. Walking in the streets of London, he is accosted by children singing a song with which they associate the young soldier:

> Ginger, you're barmy,
> You'll never join the Army,
> You'll never be a scout,
> With your shirt hanging out,
> Ginger, you're barmy.[92]

These lyrics seem to perfectly describe Mike Brady: ginger hair, folly, negligence and failure. The song somehow predicts the fate of the Irishman highlighting his madness which, being a mark of the colonised, turns him into an Other. Even Jonathan Browne realises that "Mike was no hero, he was barmy;"[93] as a result of this, "[h]e would never find rest or peace."[94]

Mike Brady proves his wild nature in several situations: to begin with, he is the only one to confront an officer by complaining about the bad taste of the food in the Army.[95] Furthermore, during a guard duty he and Jonathan Browne do together, the former hits Corporal Baker, whom he holds responsible for Percy Higgins's death, before challenging him, thus committing a crime against the military law. His deep sympathy with Percy, who was so overwhelmed by the roughness of the Army life that he accidentally killed himself while trying to mutilate his hand,[96] can be seen as a sign of solidarity between the weak colonised. By acting according to his feelings without thinking about the consequences, Mike Brady confirms to Matthew Arnold's stereotypes

---

[91] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 106-107.
[92] *Ibid.*, p. 130.
[93] *Ibid.*, p. 205.
[94] *Ibid.*, p. 209.
[95] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 27.
[96] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 96-98 and pp. 110-112.

of "a Celt whose foremost characteristic was emotion."[97] After hitting the corporal, Mike Brady asks Jonathan to lie for him[98] in order to avoid punishment, but, as his friend refuses to conceal the truth, he is eventually imprisoned. Being a wild character that refuses to let himself domesticated, he escapes, which only makes his situation worse.[99]

The young Irishman's entourage seems to be more than malefic, namely criminal. Jonathan Browne once meets his friends in an Irish pub, where he is surprised to hear how much pride they take in their illegal actions. For example, they narrate how "[a]n Irish student had coolly walked out of the Tate Gallery with the picture under his arm, in full view of the public and the gallery staff" justifying this theft by stating that "[t]here's only one place where it belongs: the Municipal Gallery in Dublin."[100] This gesture is seen as a sign of "Celtic fanaticism" by Jonathan Browne, but, a postcolonial reader can interpret it as a subversion of the imperial centre by the marginalised colonised, who are reclaiming their works of art back.

Later the narrator learns that after his escape from the military prison, "Mike had been smuggled across to Ireland, and there had become involved with the I.R.A."[101] Nevertheless, he soon realises that the I.R.A. is a terrorist organisation and wants to put an end to his collaboration with it. They make a deal according to which, if Mike participates in a raid intended to make the English Army look ridiculous, he will be taken to South Africa in return.[102] The raid fails and, ironically, it is Jonathan Browne who plays the leading role in catching the raiders, including his friend.[103]

Unlike Mike Brady, Jonathan Browne appears as the coloniser. The latter questions their friendship because of the deep differences between them: "My temperament was prudence and my destiny success, as surely as Mike's were foolhardiness and failure."[104] Thus, the dichotomy "rationality/ light versus irrationality/

---

[97] Quoted from David Cairns and Shaun Richards, *Writing Ireland: Colonialism, Nationalism and Culture*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985, p. 48.
[98] Cf. David Lodge, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, p. 152.
[99] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 173.
[100] *Ibid.*, p. 128.
[101] *Ibid.*, p. 201.
[102] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 203.
[103] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 192-199.
[104] *Ibid.*, p. 205.

darkness"[105] applied to the pair coloniser versus colonised is confirmed by the two men who thus become representative of their cultures. Moreover, the thinking coloniser is successful while the "gaunt and wild-eyed"[106] colonised is doomed to failure. Therefore, the English student succeeds in graduating university with excellent marks whereas the Irishman fails.[107] Being jealous of Mike Brady because of Pauline Vickers, Jonathan Browne wants her to become his girlfriend, which he finally manages. He even marries her although he does this out of a sense of responsibility for her pregnancy, not out of love. At any rate, this marriage can be regarded as a further triumph of the British man on his Irish fellow.

Many years after the events in the Army, Mike Brady regains his freedom, which scares Jonathan Browne, who writes: "I feel a certain panic when I reflect that he will no longer need my support. It is not a question of what he will do without me, but of what I will do without him."[108] This progression of the events is similar to the relation between Britain and Ireland: with colonialism coming to an end, the colonisers somehow feel useless as their help is no longer needed.

4.2.3. Internal Others

The relation between the British and the Irish is a colonial one, in the sense that even if Ireland ceased to be a colony, its image still coincides with that of an inferior country. Most of the Irish characters mentioned in the previous subchapter are actually internal others, that is to say, they belong to the people coming from outside and living in Britain. The Irish are one of the main minority groups living in Britain and contributing to its multicultural character. It is common knowledge that there is no society made up entirely of people belonging to the same culture, race and religion:

---

[105] Cf. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, *Unthinking Eurocentrism. Multiculturalism and the Media*, London and New York: Routledge, 1994, p. 140.
[106] David Lodge, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, p. 209.
[107] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 22.
[108] *Ibid.*, p. 210.

> Historically, every society has its Other. The Greeks had the barbarians, the Arabs the Persians, the Hindus the Muslims, and on and on. But since the nineteenth century consolidated the world system, all cultures and societies today are intermixed. No country on earth is made up of homogeneous natives; each has its immigrants, its internal "Others", and each society, very much like the world we live in, is a hybrid.[109]

History proves that there is no homogeneous society, but that the whole world is characterised by hybridity. Nevertheless, the minorities are perceived by the majority as the 'Others', which can lead to various conflicts. To Edward Said's mind, the problem consists in the contradiction between the diversity of the population and the education, which propagates one single national identity:

> Yet a discrepancy exists between the heterogeneous reality and the concept of national identity, to which so much of education is in fact dedicated. If we recall once again the two examples I gave earlier of debate about what is Western in the American university and of politicization of the Arabness of the Arab university, we will note that in both instances a faltering and outdated concept of a single national identity more or less lords it over the true variety and manifold diversity of human life.[110]

One concept of national identity, mediated by university, cannot define all the various members of a society. It has been argued that "since each society can […] have only one dominant group but a plurality of subordinate groups, it follows that an overwhelming preponderance of ethnic groups are in subordinate rather than dominant positions."[111] *Nice Work* shows that Britain's internal Others have less chances of performing good jobs than the native people. Thus, during her visit through the factory whose manager she shadows, Robyn Penrose encounters "the shock of the foundry," which is "a place of extreme temperatures" and "of indescribable mess, dirt, disorder" marked by "the most barbaric noise Robyn ha[s] ever experienced."[112] This exceedingly negative description of the foundry corresponds to the lecturer's image of hell:

---

[109] Edward W. Said, "Identity, Authority, and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveler" p. 396.

[110] *Loc. cit.*

[111] Richard Schermerhorn, "Ethnicity and Minority Groups", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ehnicity*, p. 18.

[112] David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 127.

To Robyn's eye it resembled nothing so much as a medieval painting of hell– though it was hard to say whether the workers looked more like devils or the damned. Most of them, she observed, were Asian or Caribbean, in contrast to the machine shop where the majority had been white.[113]

The association of the foundry with hell becomes relevant from an ethnic point of view, for Robyn Penrose notices that the people working in the worst place of the company are not English, but Asian and Caribbean. In "the most terrible place she ha[s] ever been in in [sic!] her life" Robyn feels "terror, even a kind of awe" when she imagines

being that man, wrestling with the heavy awkward lumps of metal in that maelstrom of heat, dust and stench, deafened by the unspeakable noise of the vibrating grid, working like that for hour after hour, day after day… That he was black seemed the final indignity: her heart swelled with the recognition of the spectacle's powerful symbolism. He was the noble savage, the Negro in chains, the archetype of exploited humanity, quintessential victim of the capitalist-imperialist-industrial system.[114]

This vivid scene is very significant to show the low positions immigrants have in the British industrial market. Race and ethnicity seem to be important criteria for getting a job; at the same time this constitutes a problem of class as well. Robyn Penrose rises this issue in a discussion with Vic Wilcox:

'You have a lot of Asians and Caribbeans working in the foundry, but not so many in the other part.' […]
'Foundry work is heavy work, dirty work.'
'So I noticed.'
'The Asians and some of the West Indians are willing to do it. The locals aren't any more. I've no complaints. They work very hard, especially the Asians. […] Mind you, they have to be handled carefully. They stick together. If one walks out, they all walk out.'
'It seems to me the whole set-up is racist,' said Robyn.
'Rubbish!' said Wilcox angrily. […] 'The only race trouble we have is between the Indians and the Pakis, or the Hindus and the Sikhs.' […] 'We have plenty of coloureds in skilled jobs. Foremen, too.'
'Any coloured managers?' Robyn asked.
[…] 'Don't ask me to solve society's problems,' he said.[115]

---

[113] *Ibid.*, p. 128.
[114] *Ibid.*, p. 133.
[115] *Ibid.*, p. 134.

Vic Wilcox's opinion about the coloured immigrants is a stereotypical one; first, he finds it normal for them to perform a dirty work because he considers them to be dirty themselves. Indeed he explicitly states that, since they vandalize toilets, "[t]hey seem to like dirt" rejecting Robyn's explanation that it might be an act of "[r]evenge against the system." [116] Secondly, Vic's appraisal of the Asians is based on the stereotype of the hard-working Oriental implicitly pointing to the colonial perception of Africans as lazy. Thirdly, Vic Wilcox denies any racial discrimination holding the immigrants' various origins and religions responsible for their internal problems. Finally, when Robyn accuses him of racism on account of the lack of any coloured people in leading positions, he simply evades her attack by means of a new strategy, that of indifference.

Of particular interest is also the meeting during which Robyn Penrose hears how Danny Ram is put a trap in order to make mistakes and, consequently, be dismissed. The uncertainty of his being an Indian or a Pakistani is considered to be irrelevant ("whatever. Who can tell the difference?"[117]) by the managers of the company. As might be expected, Robyn warns the worker without Vic Wilcox's knowing, thus, causing a general strike. Eventually, Robyn's intervention proves to be beneficial as the situation calms down and Danny Ram keeps his job.

As John Rex states that, in need for workers after WWII, "[t]he United Kingdom drew upon Ireland, and, then, primarily on former colonial territories in the Caribbean, the Indian subcontinent, East Africa and the Mediterranean.[118] On account of this as well as of the examples from *Nice Work*, one can conclude that in Lodge's novels Britain's immigrants appear as internal Others not only because of their origin, religion and race, but also because of the inferior roles attributed to them by society. Such exploitation can be regarded as an illustration of internal colonialism, which ensures certain unequal power relations.

---

[116] *Ibid.*, p. 136.
[117] *Ibid.*, p. 143.
[118] John Rex, "Multiculturalism in Europe", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, p. 241.

4.3. USA– a new Empire

The novels of David Lodge figure a world in which power relations have changed, namely Europe has ceased to be the centre of the world just like Britain is no longer the centre of a large Empire. The Americans appear in the novels more frequently and are presented in more detail than representatives of other nations. This indicates that the centre of power has slowly moved to the other side of the Atlantic, fact which corresponds to reality. According to Hardt and Negri, "[i]f the nineteenth century was a British century, then the twentieth century has been an American century; or, really, if modernity was European, then postmodernity is American."[119]

The power acquired by the USA needs special attention since it challenges the leading role played by Britain in the history of the world. In an essay entitled "US Imperialism: Global Dominance without Colonies", Donald E. Pease raises this issue starting from the assumption that historians use "a terminology that would recognize the existence of US imperialism only when qualified as 'informal,' 'accidental,' 'involuntary,' or otherwise differentiated from the European kind."[120] Nevertheless,

> from the time of its founding, the state administered colonial institutions that included "Indian removal" policies, slave plantations, and settlements for defeated populations. While it confined itself to the exercise of internal colonialism during most of the nineteenth century, at the turn of the twentieth the US acquired a colonial empire overseas.[121]

The American internal colonialism[122] was specific of the nineteenth century while the expansion overseas begins in the twentieth century. It is then argued that "throughout most of its history, the US participated in the imperial world system."[123] Yet,

---

[119] Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *op. cit.*, p. xiii.

[120] Donald E. Pease, "US Imperialism: Global Dominance without Colonies", in: Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, ed., *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005 (2000), p. 203.

[121] *Loc. cit.*

[122] Although "[i]n North America […] the plural society was created largely out of the free mingling of peoples through immigration"– apart from the "impressed black slaves brought by traders"– (Daniel Bell, "Ethnicity and Social Change", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, pp.138-139.), the fact that "[t]he assimilating power of American society and culture operated on immigrant groups in different ways, to make them, it is true, something they had not been, but still something distinct and identifiable" (Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, "Beyond the Melting Pot", in: John Hutchinson and

its official representatives have proposed that US imperialism be conceptualized as an adventure that the state accomplished without US imperialists who would claim knowledge of or responsibility for this fact. The disparity between the United States' imperial policies and the refusal to acknowledge them bears powerful witness to the power of the doctrine of US exceptionalism which authorized the refusal.[124]

Interestingly, as American imperialism is seen as an adventure, it fails to be acknowledged; the refusal to admit such policies and to assume responsibility for them is due to the well-known idea of American exceptionalism, which "is a political doctrine as well as a regulatory ideal assigned responsibility for defining, supporting, and transmitting the US national identity."[125] At the same time, it is regarded as "a transhistorical model" which reveals "the nation's world historical role" by describing it as "the 'redeemer nation,' 'nation of nations,' 'leader of the free world,' 'conqueror of the world's markets.'"[126] Donald E. Pease then observes that "each of these variations on the nation's exceptional place in the world order is derivable from the conviction that colonialism was absent from US history."[127] The country itself used to be a British colony once, but it is different from other "postcolonies" on account of its having turned into "an oppressor state."[128] It must be added that "[a]fter formally separating from Britain, the members of the US postcolony continued British colonial practices in their relations with native populations of neighboring territories and with migrants from other European colonies."[129] In conclusion, "US exceptionalism supplied the discourse through which US citizens could plausibly disavow knowledge of US colonialism."[130]

The novels which will be discussed in this chapter show that the United States of America have extended beyond the borders of the two oceans both metaphorically and literally. The novel *The British Museum Is Falling Down* is about the subversion of the

---

Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, p. 135) could also be interpreted as a form of internal colonisation, but it is not restricted to the nineteenth century.
[123] Donald E. Pease, *op. cit.*, p. 203.
[124] *Loc. cit.*
[125] *Loc. cit.*
[126] *Ibid.*, p. 205.
[127] *Loc. cit.*
[128] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 208-209.
[129] *Ibid.*, p. 209.
[130] *Loc. cit.*

British Museum, interpreted as a symbol of the Empire, by an American character. *Changing Places* is built upon a dichotomy, Rummidge and Euphoria, in which the American city is described in a significantly more positive light. Additionally, this book together with *Small World* proclaim New York as the centre of the world. *Paradise News* gives the example of the Hawaii, an archipelago conquered and turned into an American territory. In *Out of the Shelter* the Germans are depicted as being the enemies of the whole world whereas the Americans, allied with the British, are regarded as heroes.

4.3.1. Britain: America's other

Since Britain's colonial past placed it at the centre of the world, the idea of cultural superiority is dominant in the construction of British identity. However, the analyses in this section will serve to prove that nowadays the centre of power seems to move to the other side of the Atlantic. Beginning with the depiction of a British traditional identity, directly linked with the idea of the greatness of Empire, the discussion will continue by showing the gradual change from a British to an American imperialism.

4.3.1.1. The British Empire is falling down

In the representation of Britain the metropolis London plays a particularly important role.[131] The first pages of *Out of the Shelter* describe the British capital in a most favourable manner. Timothy Young is proud of having been born in London because, although the status of the city is subverted by Tokyo's bigger population, the former remains the most beautiful city all over the world. London is here described in terms of glamour: its river and towers shine in the sunlight, a symbol of civilisation. The British

---

[131] Cf. Crystal Bartolovich, "Global Capital and Transnationalism", in: Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, ed., *op. cit.*, pp.126-127.

metropolis eclipses all the towns and villages surrounding it, which makes Timothy very happy that he was not born anywhere else.[132]

In addition, London appears as a multicultural city: we read that not only does it have Jewish markets, but that they may also work on Sunday, when other stores are closed.[133] Thus, the British are seen as a civilised people who warmly welcomes and integrates foreigners and, what is more important, who shows consideration for other cultures and religions by giving them the freedom to live as they like. Accordingly, this image fits into Fredrik Barth's depiction of multiculturalism as a society in which the traditions of each ethnic group are treated with respect.[134]

As a little boy, Timothy internalises a traditional British identity; for this reason, the Christmas present he receives from his sister means a lot to him:

> Kath gave Timothy an atlas one Christmas. There was a map of the world spread over the first two pages, and Great Britain and all the countries in the British Empire were coloured pink. Britain was very small but there were a lot of pink countries and some of them were very big. Germany was a small yellow country and Italy was a small green country. When he looked at the size of the pink countries, and of America and Russia, the war didn't seem quite fair, though he didn't like to think about that. We were fighting Japan, too, but that was another small country. Germany and Italy and Japan had started the war, so it was their own fault if they got beaten, but it was taking a long time to beat them.[135]

The map of the world clearly shows how big the British Empire is, making Timothy wish the Allies won the war as soon as possible. His sympathy for the Americans as well as for the Russians is based on the coalition of these countries with Britain. The young boy hates the enemy countries being glad to see how small they are on the world map. The plastic description of his map reminds us of colonialism and imperialism, which had no respect for ethnic identities, dehumanising them:

---

[132] Cf. David Lodge, *Out of the Shelter*, London: Penguin Books, 1970, p. 70.
[133] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 242.
[134] Fredrik Barth defines multiculturalism as "a poly-ethnic society integrated in the market place, under the control of a state system dominated by one of the groups, but leaving large areas of cultural diversity in the religious and domestic sectors of activity." Cf. Fredrik Barth, "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, p. 80.
[135] David Lodge, *Out of the Shelter*, p. 24.

> Imperialism was really an extension of the sovereignty of the European nation-states beyond their own boundaries. Eventually nearly all the world's territories could be parceled out and the entire world map could be coded in European colors: red for British territory, blue for French, green for Portuguese, and so forth. Wherever modern sovereignty took root, it constructed a Leviathan that overarched its social domain and imposed hierarchical territorial boundaries, both to police the purity of its own identity and to exclude all that was other.[136]

The European powerful states conquered the whole world and divided it between them; thus, the colours representing the different empires on the map became symbols of domination and control. The different nations or ethnic communities living on the respective territories were not taken into account their traditions being simply discredited.

Timothy's atlas inspires him to paint:

> Timothy liked to do paintings of races– car races, aeroplane races and boat races. Each car, plane or boat had a little flag to show what country it belonged to. The picture showed the end of the race, and the order was always the same: England was first, America was second, Russia was third, France was fourth, Italy fifth, Germany sixth and Japan last. Sometimes Germany and Japan crashed or sank and didn't finish.[137]

The child's paintings express his awareness of the competition between the different powerful countries of the world. Furthermore, in his imagination England appears to be the most powerful of all immediately followed by the USA. As it is expected, the countries fighting against the Allies in World War II are the last in the race. Interestingly, all the nations mentioned share a European culture except for Japan, which, perhaps for this reason and because of the race difference, comes last, even after Germany.

Although Britain is considered to be part of Europe, the British see a difference between themselves and the rest of the Continent. Thus, after Kath invites her brother to spend the summer in Heidelberg, their mother thinks it is inappropriate to spend Timothy's savings on what she calls "Continental holidays."[138] At a certain moment

---

[136] Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *op. cit.*, p. xii.
[137] David Lodge, *Out of the Shelter*, p. 24.
[138] *Ibid.*, p. 59.

during his trip, Timothy realises that the flat European landscape he sees out of the train window differs a lot from the English green and white cliffs, obviously preferring the latter.[139] He finds the journey horrible wanting to be restored home and perceives a deep discrepancy between Britain, associated with light, and Europe, covered by darkness. [140]

Finding out that Rudolf was a prisoner of war in Britain, Timothy is curious to know more details about this experience. Then, he is surprised to hear Rudolf describe the British in most positive terms explaining that they treated even their war prisoners in such a nice manner that the latter felt like in a holiday camp. [141]

Nevertheless, the novel conveys an image of the British as being conquered by the Americans. Thus, as the Americans are wealthier than the British, Timothy expresses his gratefulness for their generosity by acting like a clown to entertain them.[142] Likewise, since she started to work for the American Army, Kath has got any kind of food unavailable in shops and has had access to any kind of entertainment. When she visits her family, she brings lots of rare presents among which there are also British goods made exclusively for export.[143]

As he visits his sister, Timothy is surprised to find an entirely different Kath in Heidelberg. Having undergone a process of Americanisation, she not only changes her name into "Kate,"[144] but also intends to immigrate to the United States.[145] After spending a lot of time with the Americans and adapting herself to their living standards, Kath sees her home from another perspective. After her Americanised lifestyle, Kath cannot readapt to the conditions to which she was once accustomed. Her image of London is totally different from Timothy's as, being aware of the fact that the British living standard is far bellow the American one, she sees only negative aspects: "mean, shabby little back gardens with their sheds, coalsheds and toolsheds and bycyclesheds, sagging and rotting away in the damp" or "[t]he cold and the damp and the dirt."[146] On her way back to Heidelberg Kath is so depressed by the crowded train that she promises

---

[139] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 75.
[140] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 82.
[141] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 181-182.
[142] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 157.
[143] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 25, p. 28, p. 34 and p. 38.
[144] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 90.
[145] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 167.
[146] *Ibid.*, p. 163.

herself never to return to England again.[147] The English girl has been so influenced by the American way of life that now she would like to become one herself.

The Americans appear to be superior to the British from several points of view. For instance, Timothy realises that he prefers American war films to British ones; he also finds out that there are not only more than one television channel in the USA, but also commercials between the programmes. As far as fun fairs are concerned, the Americans have the better ones, too. Moreover, Timothy witnesses a very interesting event, namely the fact that the British football team is eliminated by the American one out of the World Cup.[148] This victory over Britain definitely stands for a reversal of power relations between the two nations. The centre of power is removed from Britain to the USA, a fact acknowledged by David Lodge, who states in the "Afterword" to *Out of the Shelter* that the Americans constitute "the richest, most powerful and most privileged nation in the world."[149]

The British Museum Is Falling Down is another novel which presents the gradual substitution of the British centre with an American one. A special emphasis will be placed on the image of the British Museum as a symbol of London, Britain, and, more importantly, the British Empire. This image is undermined by a representative of the Americans, who clearly intend to become the most powerful nation in the world in all respects. The title of the novel suggests the fall of the great British nation and culture as well as the beginning of a new era.

The British Museum is described in religious terms: a "great temple of learning, history and artistic achievement" to which Adam Appleby, the main character of this novel, performs a "diurnal pilgrimage;" for this reason, he is allowed to get in without showing his card, a fact that makes him feel important in comparison with the tourists waiting outside.[150] As the Museum appears as a Holy Grail searched for by many pilgrims, Adam Appleby considers himself happy to belong to the group of initiated people who have easy access to the library's secrets.

---

[147] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 164.
[148] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 124, p. 179, p. 133 and p. 43.
[149] David Lodge, "Afterword" in: David Lodge, *Out of the Shelter*, p. 273.
[150] Cf. David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, pp. 34-35.

The Reading Room is amazingly symmetrical suggesting the idea that the Museum is the centre of the world. Climbing up the stairs, Adam is impressed by what he can see:

> The disposition of the furniture, which at ground level created the effect of an irritating maze, now took on the beauty of an abstract geometrical relief […]. Two long counters extended from the North Library entrance to the centre of the perfectly circular room. These two lines inclined towards each other, but just as they were about to converge they swelled out to form a small circle, the hub of the Reading Room. Around this hub curved the concentric circles of the catalogue shelves […].[151]

Being a symbol of order, symmetry is the main principle of classical beauty; therefore, it can be interpreted as standing for European aestheticism. This regularity is calculated by the mind, thus being associated with reason; on the other hand, it is visible only from above, that is for initiated, privileged people. The terms used to describe the Reading Room indicate the perfection of a closed system– implying self-sufficiency[152]– while the analogy with a hub suggests the idea of centre. The next quotation sustains this interpretation, too:

> It was like a diagram of something– a brain or a nervous system, and the foreshortened people moving about in irregular clusters were like blood corpuscles or molecules. This huge domed Reading Room was the cortex of the English-speaking races, he thought, with a certain awe. The memory of everything they had thought or imagined was stored here.[153]

Intellectual work and systemic thinking are the marks of the Museum, which becomes a symbol of the British Empire's greatness. It is seen as a store house of the only valid knowledge of the world. The mention of the different races which constitute the English-speaking world is an allusion to the conquered colonies. At the same time the recordings present in the British Museum establish the canon whereas everything else is labelled as invalid knowledge. Interestingly enough, the Reading Room appears as a maternal womb, this resemblance evoking protection, life and regeneration. The scholars are

---

[151] *Ibid.*, p. 92.
[152] Cf. also *ibid.*, p. 45.
[153] *Ibid.*, pp. 92-93.

associated with foetuses who develop by absorbing the knowledge offered to them by a caring mother and who are closed in this circular space like in a shelter. Adam Appleby becomes aware of the clear distinction between two worlds which have no connection: there is no interaction between the warm safe inside and the cold noisy outside world.[154] On the other hand, the dome of the Museum is presented as a sacred being, a God who watches over his children all the time making sure that they are not disturbed from learning.[155] The personification of the Museum also appears in the telephone conversation between Adam Appleby and the American operator who calls him simply Museum as if it were his name.[156] The greatness of the library is evident in the extensive unique collection of rare books it contains, too.[157]

As it has already been stated, the British Museum is a closed system, totality and self-sufficiency being its main features. Getting everything they need inside, the scholars do not leave the Museum. This is the reason why the women outside hate the famous library:

> From their dingy flats in Islington and cramped semis in Bexleyheath, they looked through the windows at the life of the world, at the motor-cars and the advertisements and the clothes in the shops, they found them good. And they resented the warm womb of the Museum […] and they looked at their children whimpering at their feet, and they clasped their hands, coarsened with detergent, and vowed that these children would never be scholars.[158]

In spite of the analogy with a mother, the British Museum is a symbol of reason, an essentially male feature in patriarchal terms. The excerpt above contains further gender stereotypes: women are placed outside, which stands for their marginalization, their daily activities being trivial in comparison with the intensive intellectual work that the men inside do all day long. That is to say, the novel presents women as reduced to their role as housewives and mothers while their men appear as serious scholars. Taking this into account, one is not surprised to read that Adam Appleby believes that he is dreaming when, during the fire alarm, he can see his wife and children entering the

---

[154] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 44.
[155] Cf. *loc. cit.*
[156] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 83.
[157] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 46 and p. 87.

Museum while he himself is outside.[159] Thus, the British Museum is the symbol of scholarship and intellectual activity while the world of domesticity is its opposite. The reversal of roles is extremely significant because it announces the fall of the Museum. Adam's wife, Barbara, together with their three children are climbing up the stairs of the library, which seems to suggest a rise of the peripheral Others. Simultaneously, the male library is feminized as its image symbolically becomes "pregnant" making Adam wish to "penetrate" it, that is to dominate it.

The British Museum is presented as a maze, too, which is very meaningful in this context. After a series of misunderstandings, Adam Appleby unintentionally triggers a fire alarm in the library. Believing that he is looked for, he tries to escape through the North Library, which is perceived as dark labyrinth.[160] The maze can be seen as the symbol of the British Empire, which, like the Museum, is a closed world from which escape is an extremely difficult task.[161]

The novel makes a lot of references to the idea of chaos and confusion; an example of this is the word 'fog,' which appears in an obsessive manner, namely more than twenty times in a relatively short novel. There is fog everywhere in London on the day presented in the book, even the British Museum looks "as if built of petrified fog."[162] Being considered to be a symbol of indeterminacy, evoking a transition from one state to another as well as preceding important revelations,[163] fog seems to announce the 'fall' of the Museum and, indirectly, of Britain.

---

[158] *Loc. cit.*

[159] One reads that "[s]cholarship and domesticity were opposed worlds, whose common frontier was marked by the Museum railings. This reversal of the natural order, with himself outside the railings, and his family inside, was a vision, pregnant with symbolic significance if only he could penetrate it." (*Ibid.*, p. 96.)

[160] The North Library is depicted as "another country: dark, musty, infernal. A maze of iron galleries, lined with books and connected by tortuous iron staircases, webb[ing] his confused vision." (*Ibid.*, p. 90.)

[161] According to Greek mythology, the labyrinth was originally Minos's palace in which the Minotaur was confined and from which Theseus managed to escape with the help of Ariadne's thread. The labyrinth is exceedingly rich in meanings, but only the ones relevant for the present discussion will be enumerated. Thus, it consists of numerous ways, some of which being dead ends, that are to lead to its centre; it was used by the Greeks to defend their fortresses; it announces a sacred presence; it can symbolise the sun and even royal power; most importantly, it can stand for the triumph of the spiritual over the material, of the eternal over the ephemeral, of intelligence over instincts, as well as of knowledge over blind violence. (Cf. Jean Chevalier and Alain Gheerbrandt, *Dictionar de simboluri. Mituri, vise, obiceiuri, gesturi, forme, figuri, culori, numere*, Vol. 2, Bucuresti: Editura Artemis, 1995, pp. 191-193.) On account of these characteristics of the labyrinth, the British Museum can be read as a representation of the British Empire.

[162] David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, p. 43.

[163] Cf. Jean Chevalier and Alain Gheerbrandt, *Dictionar de simboluri*, Vol. 1, ,pp. 278-279.

The attack on the power of the British Museum is sustained by further examples offered by the novel. So the reader finds that businessmen use the Museum not as a library, but as an opportunity to park their cars without paying.[164]

However, the most important person who undermines the Museum, together with everything it stands for, is the mysterious American. He makes his entrance in the plot as a very rich man: "Inside the limousine, a fat man was smoking a fat cigar and dictating into a portable dictaphone."[165] The fact that he is fat and eccentric apparently symbolises the American wealth and megalomania. Adam Appleby has the opportunity of seeing the glamorous limousine from inside, too, where the American has an impressive variety of drinks to offer, "Scotch, Bourbon, gin, Cognac." He does not worry about the confusing fog as he proudly says that his luxurious car is equipped with a radar as well.[166]

The fat American shows no respect for the British Museum from the very beginning: thus, he smokes inside although it is forbidden.[167] Moreover, it is the misunderstanding of his curious name, Bernie, as 'burning' that leads to the false fire alarm in the library.[168] The threat with a destructive fire symbolically comes from an American character.

Adam Appleby discovers that the American is on a quest for original manuscripts in London. This can be seen as an attempt to move the literary canon to the United States of America, which are ready to pay extraordinary sums of money for the manuscripts.[169] Furthermore, Bernie confesses to Adam his real reason for being in England:

> 'I was going to buy the British Museum and transport it stone by stone to Colorado […]. Yeah, you see we have this little College in Colorado, high up in the Rockies– highest school in the world as a matter of fact, we have to oxygen on tap in every room… […] but we are not expanding as we should be– you know, we're not getting the good students, the top teachers. So I told the trustees what was needed: a real class library– rare books, original manuscripts, that sort

---

[164] Cf. David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, p. 34.
[165] *Ibid.*, p. 28.
[166] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 150.
[167] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 43.
[168] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 85.
[169] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 84.

of thing. "O K Bernie," they said, "go to Europe and get us a library." So I came to the best library in the world.'[170]

Burnie's intention to buy the British Museum in order to move it to Colorado is an evident subversion of the British Empire. Seeing that it is impossible to do so literally, he decides to search for manuscripts and rare books. The American College he mentions is situated higher than any other school in the world, but it must also get the highest reputation, that is replace the British centre.

Adam Appleby quickly turns from a coloniser into a colonised when, in response to the American's offer to work for him and his library, he says that he must ask his wife for advice.[171] This constitutes a double reversal of roles: on the one hand, he is feminised by leaving his wife to take decisions for him, on the other hand, as he is very likely to accept the job, he becomes a British subject serving the Americans.

4.3.1.2. Rummidge vs. Euphoria

4.3.1.2.1. The promised land

David Lodge's fiction displays a multitude of people belonging to different cultures as well as their interactions with British characters. From this point of view, *Changing Places* is an essential novel as it depicts an exchange programme in which a British university teacher changes places with an American one for one semester. Thus, the American university in Euphoria is seen through the eyes of the British Philip Swallow while the campus in Rummidge is described from the American Morris Zapp's perspective.

The very subtitle of the novel, *A Tale of Two Campuses*, shows that the whole story concentrates on the differences between the two teachers, the two universities and the two cities, all of them standing for the country to which they belong. The universities of Rummidge and Euphoria have an agreement according to which they exchange

---

[170] *Ibid.*, p. 151.
[171] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 152.

teachers for certain periods of time. As the visitor is paid a salary by the host university, experience has shown that the American teachers are totally unsatisfied with what they receive in Rummidge whereas the British visitors are pleasantly surprised by the sum of money paid to them in the USA.[172] The difference between the two cities is evident from the beginning:

> Euphoria, […] situated between Northern and Southern California, with its mountains, lakes and rivers, its redwood forests, its blond beaches and its incomparable Bay, across which the State University at Plotinus faces the glittering, glamorous city of Esseph– Euphoria is considered by many cosmopolitan experts to be one of the most agreeable environments in the world.[173]

After reading this description, the University in Euphoria is easily identified with Berkeley, California. As its symbolic name suggests, Euphoria, with its wonderful landscape and warm climate, is not only a utopian space for tourists in search of fun and relaxation, but also a dream for its inhabitants whose lives are turned into permanent holidays. Unlike it, Rummidge is "a large, graceless industrial city sprawled over the English Midlands at the intersection of three motorways, twenty-six railway lines and half-a-dozen stagnant canals."[174] Rummidge appears to be the opposite of Euphoria, namely the absolute dystopian place whose main features are work, noise and pollution; in reality, it stands for Birmingham, Lodge's home city.

Philip Swallow is not for the first time in the United States of America; thinking of the honeymoon he spent there with Hilary, he remembers the positive impact the American way of living had on him. That experience was a very happy one for Philip Swallow because it intensified his appetite for sensuality soliciting all his senses; this influenced his intellectual, too, as he finished his MA thesis very fast. Moreover, behaving in accordance with the spirit of the age gave him a lot of self-confidence. Nonetheless, returning to England, the life of the young couple changes completely: if their stay in America was marked by a continual joy, life in England becomes very serious or rather tedious because of Hilary's pregnancy. Instead of the sunshine of

---

[172] Cf. David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 13.
[173] *Loc. cit.*
[174] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Euphoria, they must now cope with the rainy weather, from which Philip suffers. Financially speaking, their situation is also problematic as they must move from one house to another. For this reason, in spite of the political instability of the United States Philip Swallow still perceives this country as a dreamland. Aware of the differences between himself and the Americans, Philip Swallow is proud of being British as this draws a lot of attention to his person. Hence, seeing in America a Paradise he is thrilled at the thought of going there again and looks forward to the exchange programme.[175] In contrast to this heavenly image, his life in Rummidge is associated with Hell. That is why, he is glad not only to return to the place where he was once very happy, but also to get rid of Rummidge, the city in which life is full of duties, but devoid of pleasures. Compared to the nice experiences offered by the American way of life characterised by fun and adventure, Rummidge appears as being extremely dull. Philip's responsibilities as a head of the family and the repetitive activities– typical for English families- he performs constitute a real burden for him.[176]

However, in spite of the sexual liberties encouraged in the States, Euphoria proves to be Puritanical as it declares itself against abortions. As a result, pregnant women who decide against having a baby go to Britain whose laws are in favour of abortions.[177]

At any rate, according to the American professor sent to Rummidge for one semester, Morris Zapp, who holds himself for an indisputable expert in English literature, Rummidge does not exist on the world map.[178] Therefore, Rummidge seems to have a poor reputation in the world being presented in an unfavourable manner. Morris Zapp loves Euphoria because his life there satisfies all his needs: sunny weather all the year, access to any book he needs, and such a high salary that he can afford living in luxury.[179]

Similarly, looking out the window of his living-room in Euphoria, Philip Swallow realises that Euphoria delights the eye with a wonderful panorama made up of a mixture of natural and artificial landscape. It has both a seaside and hills covered with

---

[175] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 20-21.
[176] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 28.
[177] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 31.
[178] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 39.

forests; it is also very populated having skyscrapers, which are typical of America. Compared to this view, Rummidge offers the opposite: "a vista of dank back gardens, rotting sheds and dripping laundry, huge, ill-looking trees, grimy roofs, factory chimneys and church spires."[180] The industrial polluted townscape contrasts strongly with the Euphoric natural and clean landscape. Seen from above Rummidge is depicted as a city whose Victorian aspect is eclipsed by the new buildings imitating the American style.[181] Since Morris Zapp himself regards Rummidge as a city under strong American influence, one can say that this is a kind of colonisation.

The weather in Rummidge too contributes to the disadvantages of the American visitor. Thus, Morris Zapp is dismayed to notice that it is not only very cold, but also rainy. Additionally, instead of the bright sunshine of Euphoria, the British industrial city is constantly covered by fog and even smog, which make the sun almost invisible.[182]

In a conversation with Philip Swallow, Désirée Zapp pretends to have misunderstood the name of the city calling it "Rubbish," after which she adds that nobody has heard about it in America. The English teacher gives a neutral reply, namely that living in Rummidge has both advantages and disadvantages. Nonetheless, when Désirée asks him about the advantages, he is unable to name any.[183]

Moreover, Morris Zapp discovers that it is quite difficult to find a warm hotel room which is reasonably equipped and nicely decorated.[184] Thus, life in general appears to be not only much poorer, but also more tasteless in England than in America.

The novel *Changing Places* contains a lot of national stereotypes regarding both the Americans and the British. Thus, we read that American car dealers can be far more persuading and sell a car more easily and faster than a British one.[185] However, Hilary Swallow holds Americans to be more naive.[186] As far as family life is concerned, Philip Swallow notices that in America there are much more divorces than in Britain, which is

---

[179] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 41-42.
[180] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 56-57.
[181] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 210.
[182] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 89.
[183] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 81.
[184] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 57.
[185] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 93.
[186] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 120.

in his eyes a stable society.[187] From this point of view Morris Zapp and Philip Swallow are representative for their cultures: while the former's second wife, Désirée, is determined to have a divorce, Hilary avoids it in spite of her husband's disappointing her.

As the British are known to be extremely punctual, Philip Swallow is a stereotypical character in this respect. During his stay in Euphoria he is invited to a party, which he describes in a letter to his wife. The description is evidently restricted to a subjective point of view, that of Philip Swallow, who perceives all the differences between a British and an American party. His view emphasises the negative aspects of the Americans, who are not punctual at all and have the strange habit of drinking before eating.[188] Philip's letter conveys a very unfavourable image of the Americans, whom he sees as Others.

The British rainy weather as well as the highly polluted air have become well-known stereotypes. Therefore, in a conversation between Mary Makepeace and Morris Zapp on the plane, we find that the latter expects to make out Britain by the rainy clouds. Morris Zapp is surprised to find an exceptionally clear England, but the famous English pollution is representative of Rummidge ("A great dark smudge."[189]) making it easy to identify. Similarly, Philip Swallow encounters rain instead of the Californian sunshine he expected to find in Euphoria.[190] Nevertheless, Morris Zapp's meteorological anticipation is not confirmed by the weather forecast on radio– "Temperature about the seasonal average;" "Rather cool;" "Scattered showers and bright periods"– because of the "imprecision of these terms" which are, to his mind, "a language of evasion and compromise, designed to take the drama out of the weather. No talk of 'lows' or 'highs' here: all was moderate, qualified, temperate."[191] Moderation seems to be an essential feature of the British, who always avoid excesses.

As for race, it is interesting to note that, apart from the Asian restaurants of which Morris Zapp is tired, Rummidge appears as a city populated by Englishmen. On the contrary, Euphoric State seems to offer a multicultural view. Beside the "Indian

---

[187] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 123.
[188] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 131-132.
[189] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[190] Cf. *i bid.*, p. 53.

novelty shops," Philip Swallow observes the Great March of the Flower Power movement:

> […] the young bearded Jesuses and their barefoot Magdalenes in cotton maxis, Negroes with Afro haircuts like mushroom clouds […], junkies and potheads […], ghetto kids and huckleberry runaways hustling the parking meters, begging […], priests and policemen, bill-posters and garbage collectors, a young man distributing, without conviction, leaflets […], hippies […] , and girls, girls of every shape and size and description, […], girls white, brown, yellow, black, girls in kaftans, saris, skinny sweaters, bloomers, shifts, muu-muus, granny-gowns, combat jackets, sandals, sneakers, boots, Persian sleepers, bare feet, girls with beads, flowers, slave bangles, ankle bracelets, earrings, straw boaters, coolie hats, sombreros, Castro caps […].[192]

This multitude consists of people belonging to different races and cultures; the Afro-Americans are presented in an ironic light being called "Negroes," which is nowadays considered to be a politically incorrect term. The coloured children appear to be dangerous beggars who scare people into giving them money. The American multiculturalism is visible in the various girls described here: they are not only of different races, but they wear clothes, shoes and accessories belonging to different cultures, making this march fit into the American idea of the melting pot. The above excerpt shows that, apart from national stereotypes, the novels of David Lodge encompass race stereotyping, too. Thomas H. Eriksen remarks that "race exists as a cultural construct, whether it has a 'biological' reality or not;"[193] likewise, John McLeod writes that "it is important to realise that all constructions of racial difference are based upon human invention and not biological fact."[194] Then he explains that

> [t]here exist no objective criteria by which human beings can be neatly grouped into separate 'races', each fundamentally different from the other. Racial differences are best thought of as *political constructions* which serve the interests of certain groups of people. Theories of racial difference are often highly selective in choosing certain biological 'facts' in making distinctions.[195]

---

[191] *Ibid.*, p. 200.
[192] *Ibid.*, pp. 193-194.
[193] Thomas H. Eriksen, "Ethnicity, Race, Class and Nation" , in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, p. 29.
[194] John McLeod, *op. cit.*, p. 110.
[195] *Loc. cit.*

This quotation contains two important points Michel Foucault makes: firstly, knowledge is always interested; secondly, truth is made up of a selection of facts, thus being neither true nor false. One must be aware of the fact that "'[e]thnic group' is a collocation often used in covert synonymy for […] 'race.'"[196] However, race is to be differentiated from ethnicity; if the former refers exclusively to "physiological features as evidence of similarity between individuals," the latter includes "a variety of social practices, rituals and traditions in identifying different collective groups."[197]

Beside the coloured people presented in the march Philip Swallow watches, *Changing Places* contains a further scene in which two imprisoned black criminals appear. Thus, when Philip Swallow is taken to jail for having stolen bricks, he is forced to share a cell with "two powerfully built Negroes."[198] In their conversation one of the Blacks meaningfully makes a remark about how attractive Philip Swallow looks. The white Professor expresses his gratefulness when Désirée Zapps bails him out expressing his fear that he would have been raped if he had had to stay overnight there.[199] This episode presents a negative image of the two dangerous black prisoners who are not only criminal and homosexual, but also suspected of being potential rapists.

4.3.1.2.2. University systems

Seeing the situation of the faculty staff in Rummidge, Morris Zapp becomes more aware of the differences between the two countries. The living standard of the British university teachers is indeed under the level of Morris Zapp's expectations, but the former have much more space and privileges at university than their American counterparts. The campus in Rummidge appears as a smaller copy of Euphoric State painted in a disturbing red and looking like a "detumescent penis," which also

---

[196] Elisabeth Tonkin et al., "History and Ethnicity", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, *Ethnicity*, p. 23.
[197] John McLeod, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
[198] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 188.
[199] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 189.

participates to Zapp's state of "culture shock."[200] The association of Rummidge with a "detumescent penis" has an ironical value; here we come across the well-known device of the foreigner describing satirically the country he visits.[201] The negative aspects of the English campus are deepened by the treatment Morris Zapp receives from the other members of the staff. Having assumed that he would be warmly welcomed and shown around, he is disappointed by the silence he comes across in the English Department.[202] Thus, instead of playing the polite host, the Rummidge faculty pay no attention to their American guest, making the campus look like a prison.

As far as the universities are concerned, Euphoric State is presented as having a wealthy university affording to employ distinguished professors who have conferred it a very good reputation. The narrator presents the political situation of California in a humorous manner, ironically associating Ronald Reagan with the comics character Donald Duck. The Americans appear as a people valuing pop culture to such an extent that a film star can become an important politician. In spite of the political tensions, Euphoria remains one of the most famous universities all over the world. The situation of the medium-sized redbrick University of Rummidge is totally different. It is too new to compete with the traditional Oxbridge and too old to face the increasing reputation of the latest universities. Consequently, the British professors must undergo a competition in order to take part in the exchange programme with Euphoria, whereas it is difficult for the American university to find someone willing to spend a semester in Rummidge.[203]

The university systems in the two countries also differ from each other in several respects. Unlike Philip Swallow, who has neither a PhD nor a special field of research,[204] Morris Zapp turns out to have already become not only full professor, but also a scholar with a long list of publications.[205] Regarding intellectual achievements, the American professor is better qualified than his British counterpart. Morris Zapp proves to be an extremely ambitious and successful man who, by the age of thirty, has achieved everything he has wished for in the professional domain: publications, an

---

[200] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 61.
[201] Cf. Charles Louis de Secondat de Montesquieu, "Lettres Persanes", in: Charles Louis de Secondat de Montesquieu, *Oeuvres complètes, Vol. I*, ed. by Roger Caillois, Paris: Gallimard, 1949, pp. 129-373.
[202] Cf. David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 69.
[203] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 13-14.
[204] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 60.

extremely well-paid job and a professorship. In contrast, Philip Swallow seems to be too lazy to publish or to fight for a higher position, which does not mean that he is not a capable intellectual. The comparison of the two academics is useful in showing the differences between the universities to which they belong since they are representatives of the respective systems. Thus, the American has a relatively easy life as a graduate student, not having to dedicate much of his or her time to learning; instead, it is difficult to obtain a PhD in America. On the contrary, in Britain it is extremely hard to get a bachelor's degree; however, doing a PhD does not imply as much effort as in the USA. Finding a job is also rather easy in Britain, but the salary is not as high as in America.[206]

The curricula of the two universities prove to be very different, too; if the British read the so-called canonised texts, the Americans do not stick to them. Philip Swallow observes that he is not even sure if he can spell the name of the Greco-Armenian mystic Georgy Gurdjieff correctly and has no idea of who the science fiction author Isaac Asimov is. Instead he is well acquainted with the European canon, which seems to be totally unknown to the American students.[207]

In a letter to his wife Désirée, Morris Zapp describes his amazement at the discovery of the British university system. To his mind, it is far below the American standard; therefore, he finds it difficult to adapt to the British system which he despises. His depiction of a tutorial shows that it is so boring that the students almost fall asleep. Despite his great efforts to listen to the paper presented by a British student, Morris Zapp pretends not to understand anything because of the British accent which he contemptuously calls "limey." His inability to adapt to the new culture makes him miss his home environment. He disapproves of the despotic Head of the English Department, Gordon Masters, expressing his surprise at the fact that the English teachers accept this situation.[208]

The American Visiting Professor also encounters difficulties regarding the timetable. After noticing that his British colleagues teach their lessons only between 10

[205] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 43-44.
[206] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 15-16.
[207] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 123-124.
[208] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 125-126.

a.m. and 4 p.m. except for Wednesday afternoon, he realises that his students are always late for his tutorial because it begins at 9 o'clock in the morning.[209]

Morris Zapp turns out to have further prejudices against the British; for instance, he considers them to be superficial and arrogant. To his mind, the British are not as exact as the Americans, but, instead, they make numerous mistakes in their publications. Moreover, what disturbs Morris Zapp most is the fact that, given their own incompetence, they dare to criticise their American counterparts. This being his view on the British, it seems normal that he does not expect to enjoy England as he is afraid of being unable to continue his researches on Jane Austen successfully in this country which he considers to be morally decayed.[210] Désirée Zapp proves to share her husband's negative opinion on the English when she writes that their hypocrisy is known to her.[211]

The relationship between a teachers and his students constitutes another difference between the two men. Reading the letter Philip Swallow wrote him, Morris Zapp regards him as being an "eccentric character" because he knows too many intimate details about his students.[212] Thus, the British teachers have a close relationship with their students while the American ones are interested exclusively in the students' results.

Promotion at the University of Rummidge is done according to age and jobs are given for a lifetime. Philip Swallow explains that only a scandal can be a good reason for losing one's job. In contrast, in Euphoric State, Howard Ringbaum says that affairs with students would not lead to dismissal, but, instead satisfactory publications are absolutely necessary.[213] As publications are not very important at Rummidge University, Gordon Masters has become Head of the English Department without having published anything at all.[214]

Age is the most important criterion of promotion in the English Department in Rummidge. Thus, Hilary Swallow writes in a letter to her husband that she has found out with surprise that Robin Dempsey, a much younger but better qualified colleague of

---

[209] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 210-211.
[210] *Ibid.*, p. 47.
[211] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 147.
[212] Morris Zapp wonders: "What kind of a man was this, that seemed to know more about his students than their own mothers? And to care more, by the sound of it." (*Ibid.*, p. 63.)
[213] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 76.

Philip, intends to leave Rummidge unless he gets promoted.[215] Indeed when it comes to promotion, Vice-Chancellor Stroud asks Morris Zapp's advice. On the one hand, Dempsey has researched and published more, on the other hand, Swallow is the senior one. Having got to know Hilary and her children better, Morris Zapp convinces Stroud to promote Philip Swallow arguing that it would prevent a scandal inside the faculty.[216] Thus, Philip Swallow enjoys promotion merely on the principle of age in spite of his relatively poor professional achievements.

4.3.1.2.3. An American centre

At the end of the novel *Changing Places* both Philip Swallow and Morris Zapp can imagine staying in the visited country. The British Professor states: "[…] I don't feel British anymore. Not as much as I used to, anyway. Nor American, for that matter. 'Wandering between two worlds, one lost, the other powerless to be born.'"[217] Indeed, these words describe a hybrid identity, but it must be acknowledged that Philip Swallow becomes a colonised. He no longer feels at home in Britain, but, instead, praises the American culture despising the British way of living. Comparing his life in Euphoria to his life in Rummidge, he finds the former adventurous and tempting while the latter consists of repetitive activities, which make it boring. Philip Swallow is a good example of hybridity, but also for the reversal of the roles: the British coloniser turns into a colonised.

Similarly, at the end of his six months in Rummidge, Morris Zapp has a new perspective on Britain and even thinks of settling there. He realises how much he changed during the semester spent at the Rummidge University:

> *Could* he face settling in England? Six months ago, the question would have been absurd, the answer instantaneous. But now he wasn't so sure… It would be

---

[214] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 89.

[215] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

[216] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 221-222.

[217] *Ibid.*, p. 174. This quotation is a reference to Matthew Arnold's lines "Wandering between two worlds, one dead/ One powerless to be born." (Matthew Arnold, "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse", in: Kenneth Allott, ed., *The Poems of Matthew Arnold*, London: Longmans, 1965, lines 85-86.).

> a solution, of sorts, to the problem of what to do with his career. Rummidge wasn't the greatest university in the world, agreed, but the set-up was wide open to a man with energy and ideas. Few American professors wielded the absolute power of a Head of Department at Rummidge. Once in the driver's seat, you could do whatever you liked. With his expertise, energy and international contacts, he could really put Rummidge on the map, and that would be kind of fun… Morris began to project a Napoleonic future for himself at Rummidge […].[218]

Morris Zapp has evidently undergone a process of hybridisation, but, unlike Philip Swallow, he appears in the position of the coloniser. In his dream of making a career at Rummidge, he sees himself as the most important person of the faculty, the Head of Department. His train of thoughts reminds us of the colonial discourse, which justified the expansion of Britain by emphasising the need of the colonies to be civilised. In an analogous way, Morris Zapp believes that Rummidge needs him as a leader in order to gain a reputation and to become competitive with the world's best-known universities. The figure of Napoleon stands for repressive power, expansion of one's borders and conquest of other people(s). This sustains once again the idea of the American imperialism which replaces the British one.

As far as the relation between the British and the Americans is concerned, *Small World* conveys the same idea of "American cultural imperialism."[219] The novel deals mainly with university teachers who travel all over the world in order to take part in various international conferences. It opens with an international conference held at Rummidge University, which, described as "a blown-up replica in red brick of the Leaning Tower of Pisa,"[220] stands for decay. The guests are accommodated in a ten-year old building which already looks very deteriorated.[221] Aware of the fact that Rummidge enjoys no reputation in the world, Professor Philip Swallow, now Head of the English Department, offers to host the international conference hoping to change this situation.[222]

---

[218] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 234.
[219] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 276.
[220] *Ibid.*, p. 43.
[221] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 3.
[222] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 5.

The whole city of Rummidge is despised by the foreigners who visit it; for example, when Persse McGarrigle expresses his disappointment at not being able to see any stars in the sky, Morris Zapp adds several other discomforts that make the lack of stars seem unimportant. For example, he thinks that Rummidge has nothing comfortable to offer to an American, who can find pleasure neither in the British food, nor in the hotel accommodation.[223] An unknown University, industry, together with a constant terrifying traffic[224] seem to be the typical marks of Rummidge.

This negative image of Britain contrasts with the manner in which the Americans appear in the novel. As for literary criticism, Morris Zapp looks down upon Philip Swallow's book on Hazlitt considering it to be old-fashioned both in contents and in method. Unlike the British critic, Morris Zapp declares himself an adept of deconstruction, a critic who has come up with the newest ideas in this field. Furthermore, *Small World* presents the American Arthur Kingfisher as the ultimate authority as far as literary theory is concerned.[225] Thus, the American literary critics are more famous and modern than their British counterparts, who are defined as a conservative people in this respect, too.

As the American way of living is more tempting than the British one, Philip Swallow, who, in *Changing Places*, is said to be "a mimetic man,"[226] appears as a colonised in *Small World*, as well. He confesses to his friend, Morris Zapp, that it was in America, during the exchange programme presented in *Changing Places*, that he found the long wished for "[i]ntensity of experience" explaining that:

> "[…] It was the excitement, the richness of the whole experience, the mixture of pleasure and danger and freedom– and the sun. You know, when we came back here, for a long time I still went on living in Euphoria inside my head. Outwardly I returned to my old routine."[227]

---

[223] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 32.

[224] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 57.

[225] Arthur Kingfisher is considered to be "a great man" or "[a] king among literary theorists" since "to many people he kind of personifies the whole profession of academic literary studies." Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 118-119.

[226] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 10.

[227] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 66.

Thus, Britain means routine and boredom to Philip Swallow while America stands for the sun as well as for the unexpected, the unpredictable, or, in other words, adventure. It is needless to say that the American life is presented in a positive light whereas Britain appears as a very conservative country lacking excitement. This perception of Britain is simultaneously a heterostereotype and a self-image as it is the view of not only Morris Zapp, but also of Philip Swallow.

Small World deals with a great number of international conferences on literary theory held all over the world. A closer look at these conferences leads to an evident conclusion: the USA seem to become the centre of the world. For instance, hearing that the conference in Rummidge is being attended by fifty-seven people, Morris Zapp arrogantly remarks that the MLA in New York the previous year gathered together about twenty times more people.[228] The ultimate example of American imperialism is the megaconference organised by the MLA in New York with which the novel ends. The international importance of the MLA is explained in detail, which shows the didactic function of David Lodge's novels, but also the great significance of this Association. Claiming to be very modern it enjoys authority regarding employment in American universities. The organisation is known to linguists and literary critics on both sides of the Atlantic as its list of publications endows the authors with reputation all over the world. The MLA is very famous for its annual conference which lasts three days between Christmas and New Year and takes place in the USA. Unlike the conference organised by the Rummidge University, this one has enough financial support to bring the most eminent academics and writers in the philological field.[229] The splendid setting of the conference[230] actually praise the magnificent American city New York,[231] which now stands for grandeur while the multiplicity of activities performed by the scholars emphasise the importance of the MLA as well as its great reputation. The fact that this megaconference is hosted on American territory constitutes further evidence for the assumption that there is a new centre of the world. In the competition between the

---

[228] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 19.

[229] The novel declares that "[t]he MLA is the Big Daddy of conferences. A megaconference. A three-ring circus of the literary intelligentsia." Cf. *ibid.*, p. 313.

[230] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 313-314.

various nations of the globe, the Americans appear as masters differentiating themselves from the others by displaying an impressive richness as well as megalomania.

4.3.2. Hawaii, the conquered Paradise

The novel *Paradise News* presents Hawaii at large, simultaneously making use of various ethnic and national stereotypes, which are reflections of American imperialism, too. The exotic image of Hawaii goes hand in hand with the idea of expansion. In an article entitled "The Exotic" David Lodge himself explains that exotic settings are typical of the British novels written since the emergence of European colonialism explaining that imperialism influenced the British novelists to such an extent that journeys to exotic places have become leitmotifs in their books, exotic meaning foreign. Then Lodge adds that "[t]he exotic in fiction is the mediation of an 'abroad' to an audience assumed to be located at 'home'."[232] Indeed Hawaii appears as an exotic Other while the manner in which it is presented helps the reader who has never been there imagine the foreign place.

Since Hawaii was originally a Polynesian land, the Polynesian Cultural Center is supposed to preserve this culture, which has already been assimilated. Instead, the Center is described negatively being associated with Disneyland.[233] Thus, the Polynesian Cultural Center appears as an amusement park which is, culturally speaking, something peripheral. Being a symbol of the assimilated culture, it suggests that this culture has become marginal, too.

Hawaii is seen as a Westernised colony situated at the border between the Occident and the Orient. Remembering her coming here, Yolande Lewis says that the archipelago is situated at the border between two different worlds, the West as opposed to the East,[234] but it was conquered and transformed into a colony by the Americans. The

---

[231] The ending of *Changing Places* also declares New York City to be the centre of the world; although the novel is based on the opposition Rummidge vs. Euphoria, eventually, New York appears as a place of compromises between the four main characters. Cf. David Lodge, *Changing Places*, pp. 237-251.
[232] Cf. David Lodge, *The Art of Fiction*, London: Penguin Books, 1992, pp. 158-159.
[233] Cf. David Lodge, *Paradise News*, p. 133.
[234] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 174-175.

native Polynesians were quickly assimilated, which is the reason why it is believed that Hawaii

> has no real cultural identity. The original Polynesian culture has been more or less wiped out, because it was oral. The Hawaiians didn't have an alphabet until the missionaries invented one for them, and it was applied to translating the Bible, not to recording pagan myths. […] All there is to show for a thousand years of Hawaiian history before Captain Cook are a few fishhooks and axe heads and pieces of *tapa* cloth in the Bishop Museum. There's […] not much history, history in the sense of continuity.[235]

The Polynesian culture is evaluated from a Eurocentric perspective; it is considered to be less important because it was oral. It was the Christian missionaries who brought "civilisation" to the "primitive" islands in the form of the alphabet used to transcribe the Bible. Therefore, Christianity appears as a main means of conquering as well as controlling the native people; on the other hand, the fact that their so called pagan myths were not taken into account shows that their culture was discredited from the first contact by the representatives of the civilised Western world. The history of the Hawaii is considered to be more or less non-existent before the expedition of Captain Cook, having been recorded only since the American conquest.

Yolande Miller complains about her inability to adapt to the life on the sunny island in spite of her efforts to get integrated:

> 'I did my best to adapt. I took courses in Hawaiian culture, I even learned a bit of the language, but I soon got bored, bored and depressed. There's so little left that's authentic. The history of Hawaii is the history of loss.'
> 'Paradise lost?' I said.
> 'Paradise stolen. Paradise raped. Paradise infected. Paradise owned, developed, packaged, Paradise sold.[236]

Considering all this, one cannot speak about the authenticity of the Hawaiian culture because it has been lost; likewise, the language, seen as boring, is equally dismissed. Yolande expresses her awareness of the fact that the Hawaii has been brutally conquered and commercialised. The perception of the islands as a Paradise has two main sources:

---

[235] *Ibid.*, pp. 175-176.

on the one hand, the idea of Paradise derives from Christianity, which is the Eurocentric religion *par excellence*; on the other hand, such an idealisation is based on the distinction between the Self and the Other, distinction functioning by making the Other exotic. Hence the image of Hawaii appears as a projection of Western ideas and desires, Exoticism implying the othering of the native population, which is also to be seen in the construction of the archipelago as a picturesque space.[237] This is an example of how tourism reifies the locals transforming them into objects whose main function is to please the eye of the Western viewer.

In addition, *Paradise News* offers a feminine image of the conquered Hawaii, which illustrates the observation that "in the 1990s there has been a surge of interest in the relationship of gender and sexuality to national subjectivity." Postcolonial theory shows that the colonial discourse regards "the colonizer as the masculine/ active and the colonized as the feminine/ passive," [238] which is to say that gender stereotypes are applied to the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised. From this point of view, it is important to notice that *Paradise News* presents girls dancing hula as a symbol of the archipelago. At the airport, before leaving England, one of the characters, Mr. Everthorpe, impatiently states that he looks forward to seeing the dancing girls in Hawaii.[239] As it was expected, it is "a beautiful brown-skinned young woman"[240] who, working for the Travelwise agency, welcomes the group of British tourists in Hawaii. Each detail in the description of the woman is important: she is attractive, coloured and, naturally, young. As far as the hula is concerned, Yolande explains that it

> was originally a religious dance, but it's been so debased by tourism and Hollywood that it's hard to see it that way any longer. Even the authentic demonstrations they put on at the Bishop Museum are essentially theatrical, while the hula you see in Waikiki is halfway between belly-dancing and burlesque.[241]

---

[236] *Ibid.*, p. 177.
[237] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 108.
[238] Allen Carey-Webb, *Making Subject(s). Literature and the Emergence of National Identity*, New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998, p. 22.
[239] Cf. David Lodge, *Paradise News*, p. 12.
[240] *Ibid.*, p. 84.
[241] *Ibid.*, pp. 231-362.

As it has already been stated, the religion of the native people was disregarded by the Western conquerors. The once religious dance has been transformed into a ridiculous spectacle for tourists; moreover, even the performances in the Bishop Museum lack authenticity as they are too theatrical. The American film industry plays an important role in this process of debunking, which is, at the same time, an illustration of the modern consideration of culture as commodity.

To sum up, the Americans appear as the masters of a colony which has been not only strongly Westernised, but also turned into an ideal place for holiday makers. Hawaii is depicted as an archipelago whose native culture has been assimilated almost entirely, the few surviving aspects of the Polynesian culture being used to create an exotic otherness and exploited to make money.

4.3.3. Americans in Germany

In the discussion of the relation between Americans and Germans the analysis of the novel *Out of the Shelter* is essential on the grounds that it describes an English young boy's holiday in Heidelberg six years after the end of World War II. In the "Afterword" to the book David Lodge states that on the one hand it is a *Bildungsroman*, as it deals with the spiritual progress of a character, on the other hand, it depicts cultural clashes thus reminding us of Henry James.[242] It is the international character of the novel that is to be examined in this section as, beside the national stereotypes defining the Germans, there are also images of the British and, more importantly, of the Americans. The narrative technique of the novel becomes extremely significant because the story is told by an omniscient narrator who uses the English Timothy Young as a focalizer,[243] that is to say, the perspective through which the Germans and the Americans are seen is a British one. For this reason, Germany is presented in a very negative way since it is considered to be the enemy of the entire world immediately after WWII.[244] Nevertheless, Timothy Young accepts the invitation to spend his summer holiday in

---

[242] Cf. David Lodge, "Afterword", in: David Lodge, *Out of the Shelter*, p. 275.
[243] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 282.
[244] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 274.

Heidelberg, invitation from Kathy, his sister, who works for the American army still stationed in Germany after the war in order to control it.

As Timothy's life as a schoolboy is marked by the war, he grows up learning to hate the Germans and especially their leader, Hitler, the British seeing in the latter the most dreadful man in the world. Thus, when Timothy's baby-sitter, Jean Collins, is angry with him, she menaces him saying that Hitler will punish him.[245] The young boy dislikes this threat because he associates Hitler with pure evil and, moreover, in his imagination, Hitler's image overlaps with that of the Germans in general.[246] As a result, after having watched a film about the German *Führer*, Timothy begins to have nightmares with him.[247] Even on the morning of his departure to Germany six years after the end of the war, he wakes up from a terrible dream with Hitler.[248] The boy is somehow afraid to visit Germany considering that its negative picture must correspond to reality.[249] Obviously, he blames both Hitler and all the Germans for the injustices of the war.

Consequently, as Germany is held responsible for World War II, it is associated with the idea of darkness: reading about Timothy's home in London, one finds out that "[t]here was a dark sideboard in the front room which he had never liked because of its stiff drawers and sharp corners, so he called it Germany and sent his Wellingtons to bomb it."[250] What is immediately noticeable about this child's game of bombing Germany is the hatred for the people considered to be his enemy. On the other hand, Germany is metaphorically represented as a sideboard in a British home, which reminds of Edward Said's supernatural concept of Eurocentricism.[251] Thus, Germany is part of the wider European identity, but, by starting a cruel war, it created an internal discrepancy acquiring a peripheral position (note 'side' in 'sideboard'). In other words,

---

[245] Cf. David Lodge, *Out of the Shelter*, p. 20.

[246] Timothy's opinion of Hitler and of the Germans is presented as follows: "Hitler was the head of the Germans. He had started the war. He was a nasty man with a black moustache. Another name for Germans was Nazis, which sounded like Nasties, so it was a good name." *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[247] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 20.

[248] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 57.

[249] The young boy thinks that "[i]t couldn't have been just one man who was responsible– there must have been plenty of others willing to do what he told them. Like the people who ran the camps. That alone must have taken quite a lot of people as wicked as Hitler." *Ibid.*, p. 185.

[250] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[251] Cf. Edward W. Said, "Identity, Authority, and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveler", p. 396.

it became an Other labelled as extremely stubborn ('stiff') and dangerous ('sharp'). As a child, Timothy wishes he were an adult just because he would be allowed to fight and kill Germans.[252] The news of his dear uncle Jack's death in the war, only adds to Timothy's hatred for this people.[253]

For this reason, we learn that Timothy considers himself to be lucky to have been born in Britain. Imagining an alternative life, he tries to think what it would be like if he were a German:

> He might have been a French boy, or a German… What would *that* have been like? To grow up in that benighted country, knowing that everybody in other countries hated and despised you, because of Hitler, because of the concentration camps, because of the war which your country had started and lost.[254]

In his reverie the mere thought of being a German seems to be frightening because of the country's history. Appearing as the enemies of the entire world, the Germans are again identified with Hitler and the war. The fact that Timothy considers them to be not only ignorant, but also uncultured shows his feeling of superiority over them as well as his pride of being British, a civilised nation.

However, as a teenager Timothy changes his attitude towards this people as he realises that he has indeed ceased to hate the Germans. Nevertheless, that does not necessarily mean that he likes them now; on the contrary, he is not even curious enough to want to get to know them, the aim of his visit to Germany being to spend time with his sister, who enjoys an American entourage.[255]

Timothy Young's long train journey to Heildelberg enjoys a detailed account in the novel. After the passport control at the German border, his train stops at a station announced as Bad Aachen, which is perceived by the British teenager in conformity with his prejudices against Germany: "The signs, for some reason, said *Bad Aachen*, and it seemed appropriate. Bad Aachen. Bad Germany."[256] Apart from this ironic play upon words, the comfort offered by the German train is considered to be below that of the an

---

[252] Cf. David Lodge, *Out of the Shelter*, p. 22.
[253] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 25.
[254] *Ibid.*, p. 70.
[255] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 70.
[256] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

English one, which again indicates a feeling of superiority on the part of the British traveller.[257]

However, Germany proves to be devastated because of the war; for example, Kath admits that she is shocked by the great number of damaged buildings she has seen.[258] Timothy too realises that Germany is far more devastated than London;[259] at the same time, reconstruction works are in progress as the Germans are said to really like to work.[260] The well-known stereotype of the hard-working and exceedingly exact German makes its way in the novel here; so does the racial image of the Aryan type.[261]

Nonetheless, as it is often the case, Timothy is surprised at finding out that his expectations of Germany are not confirmed by reality. Except for a rough man whom he once sees in the street and whose face coincides with the boy's picture of a German working in a concentration camp, he meets only people who look common.[262] Thus, little by little, the difference between the British, the Americans and the Germans is diminished, which has as result the humanisation of the latter.

Furthermore, Timothy spends a day with the German Rudolf, who tells him about his own experience of the war: we discover that his father used to be a National-Socialist and also that at school pupils were taught that Germany was meant to be Europe's leader. That is why, at the age of ten, he became a member of the *Jungvolk* out of conviction. It was only later that he started to question the reasons for the war, but, when he was sixteen, he had to do his duty as a soldier, which ended with his becoming a prisoner.[263] Timothy slowly begins to like Rudolph, but, remembering the death of his cousin Jill, Auntie Nora and Uncle Jack during the war,

> [h]e felt a sudden coldness towards Rudolf. Not that he was to blame personally: but it seemed a kind of betrayal of the dead to be, to be… well, too easy and friendly with a German. Surely if two countries hated each other enough to kill

---

[257] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 83.
[258] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 35.
[259] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 86.
[260] We read that the Germans "[work] feverishly," that is "with typical German thoroughness" making "the restoration […] so perfect." *Ibid.*, pp. 219-220.
[261] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 183.
[262] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 127-128.
[263] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 183-184.

each other in hundreds and thousands, the hate ought to last a bit longer than six years?[264]

This excerpt illustrates how stereotypes are constructed by making generalisations: in spite of being aware of the fact that Rudolf is not personally guilty for the death of his relatives, Timothy proves to be unable to transgress his national borderlines. His national identity seems to form him to such an extent that he makes friends with people according to the group to which they belong and not to the manner in which they behave. However, he does have contradictory feelings: on the one hand, he likes Rudolf and would like to get closer to him, on the other hand, he keeps a certain distance because of his prejudices.

The situation becomes more interesting when Timothy meets Rudolf's father, an ex-Nazi. The English boy "experience[s] a slight queasiness as they [shake] hands, the old man wiping his own on a handkerchief first and evidently apologising for their earthiness."[265] The symbolic gesture of the former Nazi can be interpreted in two ways; on the one hand, it stands for his acknowledgement of the responsibility for the war as well as for the inferior position to the British. On the other hand, the passage above reminds us of a scene in the Bible, namely when Pilat of Pontus washes his hands in front of the people who demand Jesus's death, thus refusing to assume the responsibility for condemning the innocent Jew. Likewise, Rudolf's father wipes his hands to show that he is not guilty for the Jews killed during the war. This ambiguity goes hand in hand with Timothy's mixed feeling as far as the Germans are concerned.

The image of the Germans as Nazis is present in *Small World*, too; dealing with the theme of the global campus, the novel has Siegfried von Turpitz as representative of this nation. He is a scholar who pleads for *Rezeptionsästhetik*,[266] thus confirming to the stereotype of the German literary critic. Von Turpitz is a most mysterious character suspected of hiding a terrible secret as his hand is always hidden by a black glove.[267] This metaphor reminds us of the dirty hand of Rudolf's ex-Nazi father in *Out of the*

---

[264] *Ibid.*, p. 185.

[265] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[266] The American Morris Zapp shows his disrespect for Siegfried von Turpitz by describing him as "a kraut who's into reception theory." Cf. David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 195.

[267] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 96.

Shelter, symbolising collective guilt. Being a German is automatically associated with being a Nazi and, for this reason, von Turpitz's glove is believed to camouflage a wound from World War II:

> Siegfried von Turpitz has never been known to remove this glove in the presence of another person. No one knows what hideous injury or deformity it conceals, though there have been many speculations: a repulsive birthmark, a suppurating wound, some *unheimlich* mutation such as talons instead of fingers, or an artificial hand made of stainless steel and plastic– the original, it is alleged by those who favour this theory, having been crushed and mangled in the machinery of the Panzer tank which Siegfried von Turpitz commanded in the later stages of World War II.[268]

The black glove functions as a distinct mark which helps identify von Turpitz whereas the allusions to a birthmark or a mutation stand for the stigma with which the Germans are born in popular prejudice. On the other hand, von Turpitz is dehumanised by the people who think he has an artificial hand as this symbolises a lack of feelings, meaning that he must have lost his hand together with his humanity during the war. The same message is conveyed by Siegfried von Turpitz's face, which is described with adjectives like "pale" and "impassive."[269] Morris Zapp considers him to be a Nazi and when Fulvia Morgana defends him by saying that he was ceratainly forced to fight, he replies: "Well, he looks like a Nazi. Like all the ones I've seen, anyway, which is admittedly only in movies."[270] Films contribute to the creation and maintenance of stereotypes as well as prejudices because they circulate discourses on ethnicity, too.

Von Turpitz appears as a monster even to his wife; asked by her to divulge his secret, Von Turpitz puts an end to her pleas by inferring that his first wife died because of having seen his mysterious hand.[271]

As it is expected from a typical German, Siegfried von Turpitz drives a car of exceptional quality. The reason for the detailed description of the car[272] is not only the

---

[268] *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97.
[269] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 111.
[270] *Ibid.*, p. 134.
[271] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 144.
[272] Von Turpitz is said to drive a "black BMW 635Csi coupé, with 3453 cc Bosch L-jetronic engine and five speed Getrag allsynchromesh gearbox" at "a steady one hundred and eighty kilometres per hour in the fast lane of the autobahn." *Ibid.*, p. 111.

wish to create verisimilitude, but also the stereotype of Germany as standing for high technological quality.

The German professor does not act according to ethic principles as he cheats by plagiarising. At the conference in Amsterdam, Persse McGarrigle realises that Siegried von Turpitz holds a speech containing the Irishman's ideas from a manuscript sent to a publisher in London.[273] Accused of plagiarism, von Turpitz threatens McGarrigle in German and leaves the stage immediately.[274] His reaction, which is rather emotional than reasonable, makes him seem guilty in the eyes of the audience.

Even the black glove he wears all the time proves to conceal no secret at all. At the MLA conference held in New York, Persse McGarrigle manages to remove the glove, which reveals a totally normal hand.[275] This incident makes everybody believe that Siegfried von Turpitz has only wanted to seem more interesting than he is in reality and perhaps to look more frightening, thus hoping to gain more respect from the others.

Going back to *Out of the Shelter* one should mention that, as the Americans in the novel are perceived through Timothy Young's eyes, their image is a subjective one, standing in stark contrast with that of the Germans. First of all, he is happy that the Americans are on the same side with Britain,[276] which shows that his sympathy comes out of his pride of being English and out of the fact that the Americans are allied with his country. Hearing that about the atom bomb which finally defeated the Japanese[277] Timothy cannot help wishing that the Americans had dropped it on Germany. The Americans are seen as the real heroes of the war being the guardians of freedom. The young boy is reticent about travelling to Germany, but he thinks he will be safe there because of the American presence. He proudly remembers the American troops that impressed him in England when he was a boy, his memory giving him a "reassuring" feeling at the thought of going to Germany.[278] After all, the Americans prove to be the real masters there; the situation in Germany is very clearly described: there are two main groups of people: on the one hand, the Germans, who are dominated, on the other hand,

---

[273] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 198.
[274] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 199.
[275] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 335.
[276] Cf. David Lodge, *Out of the Shelter*, p. 24.
[277] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 30.
[278] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 70.

the Americans, who are their lords. More importantly, the two communities do not interact with each other, the lack of contact encouraging Timothy's extremely reserved attitude towards the Germans.[279] Since the Germans themselves acknowledge their inferior position, they do not expect the British visitor to learn their language. Therefore, Rudolf's father tries to talk to Timothy in English although he cannot speak this language properly.[280] As Kath explains to Timothy, the Germans must speak English because of the Americans stationed in their country.[281] In other words, the immediate dependence of the Germans on the Americans is the former's only chance of survival. A further example in this respect is the answer to Timothy's question if German girls like going out with American soldiers, namely that most of them would do anything for it.[282]

The young German Rudolf, in spite of having lost his left arm, works as a porter at Fichte Haus, where Kath together with other people working for the American Army live. Kath is conscious that Rudolf is under-qualified for this job, but also that Germans are not in the position of choosing.[283] Thus, the Germans have restricted rights in their own country under American occupation. In contrast, the Americans appear as the triumphant liberators of the world finding their high status in Germany an act of justice.

Heidelberg, being among the few towns in Germany that have not been damaged during the war, has become the American headquarters. As the river Neckar is polluted, only Americans have access to the only pool Heidelberg has. Moreover, Timothy discovers that with his P.X. card he is admitted to any nice place he wants.[284] The Americans even built a lot of blocks in South Heidelberg giving them names like Lincoln Block and suggestively calling this district America Town.[285]

Timothy's American friend Don Kowalski does not agree with the American rule in Europe. He is an intellectual who wishes to study in London and who despises the American soldiers he meets in Heidelberg. Don considers the American soldiers to be opportunists who have come to Europe in order to take advantage of the post-war situation of different countries, especially Germany. Interestingly enough, they are the

---

[279] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 98.
[280] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 187.
[281] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 90.
[282] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 158.
[283] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 96.
[284] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 127.

ones who detain the power although they are the outsiders. Furthermore, according to Don, they do not deserve the master position, which is seen as arbitrary or, in other words, a matter of good luck.[286]

4.4. Other ethnic groups

4.4.1. Italians

Among the numerous nations in the novel *Small World* one is offered a stereotypical image of the Italians, too. Philip Swallow presents them as extrovert people when he tells Morris Zapp: "you know what they're like– they don't hide their feelings."[287]

The representative of this nation is Fulvia Morgana, a scholar interested in Marxist theory. Although she works in Padua and her husband in Rome, they live in Milan because this is the most active Italian city. A negative aspect of Italy is the unreliability of the postal services. Fulvia Morgana appears contradictory to Morris Zapp's, who, seeing her expensive car and house, is so puzzled that he asks her how she can be a rich person and a Marxist at the same time. She sees no problem in this arguing that her money enables her to help certain groups of people, about whom she refuses to talk.[288] Later, hearing that Morris Zapp was kidnapped, Fulvia Morgana realises that this is the act of one of these groups and, asking her husband to intervene, the American professor is finally liberated.[289] The couple seems to be involved in strange affairs with dangerous organisations, which contributes to an unfavourable image of the Italians.

The Marxist professor is a very attractive and authoritative woman who reminds Morris Zapp of the Romans. For instance, when seeing her in a white robe, the American associates her with "a Roman empress."[290] Therefore, the Italians are defined through the glorious history of their ancestors. Italy also standing for art, Fulvia

---

[285] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 174.
[286] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 152.
[287] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 69.
[288] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 126-129.
[289] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 289.
[290] *Ibid.*, p. 128.

Morgana can display "a smile as faint and enigmatic as the Mona Lisa's."[291] Thus, Leonardo da Vinci, too, plays an important role in the Italian national identity.

4.4.2. Australia

Australia belongs to the numerous countries appearing in *Small World*, Rodney Wainwright of the University of North Queensland standing for it. Australia's image in the novel goes hand in hand with its colonial past; it is presented as an exotic space whose mark is an unbearable heat. Sweating at his desk and trying in vain to write his presentation for a conference on literary criticism, Rodney Wainwright is distracted by the noises on the beach where his students spend their free afternoon lying in the sun and swimming. He also knows what their evening will look like: a barbecue, some drinks and music. Australia appears as a utopian place of pleasure and perpetual holiday. The everyday life of the students is mainly made up of playful activities: they attend a serious course on literary criticism in the morning while the rest of the day is dedicated to having fun on the beach. As colonies are usually associated with a feminine sexuality, Rodney Wainwright can imagine the beach crowded with attractive girls exposing their bodies by wearing only a bikini.[292] Consequently, Australia is an unsuitable place for the professor to write a paper on literary theory; he does indeed have difficulties in concentrating on the task.

The contents of his presentation speaks for the inferior position of Australia since his ideas are Eurocentric:

> *The question is, therefore, how can literary criticism maintain its Arnoldian function of identifying the best which has been thought and said, when literary discourse itself has been decentred by deconstructing the traditional concept of the author, of authority?*[293]

---

[291] *Ibid.*, p. 129.
[292] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 83.
[293] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

Rodney Wainwright tries to reconcile two opposite directions in literary criticism. One of them is the position of Matthew Arnold who adopts the view that literature is "*the best that is known and thought in the world*"[294] thus pleading for a universal truth propagated by Enlightenment. The other direction is deconstruction, which questions the concept of the author attacking traditional ideas which have been taken for granted. The influence of Michel Foucault on this perspective is visible both in the idea of a constructed truth implied by the attack on the canon and in the reference to the concept of discourse. Rodney Wainwright's question situates him somewhere between a Eurocentric and a poststructuralist thinker.

However, the Australian critic tends to behave like a colonised who knows that his career in Australia depends on important people who live and work in Europe:

> The paper must be finished soon, for Morris Zapp has asked to see a draft before accepting it for the conference, and on acceptance depends the travel grant which will enable Rodney Wainwright to fly to Europe this summer (or rather winter), to refresh his mind at the fountainhead of modern critical thought, making useful and influential contacts, adding to the little pile of scholarly honours, distinctions, achievements, that may eventually earn him a chair at Sydney or Melbourne. He does not want to grow old in Cooktown, Queensland. It is no country for old men.[295]

Europe is definitely presented as the centre of the world here: the Australian critic must take part in a conference in Europe in order to get a better chair in his own country. Queensland appears as a place of permanent summer where only young people are at home thus seeming to be a paradise in which time does not pass by.

4.4.3. Orientals

In his work *Orientalism* Edward Said uses Michel Foucault's theory of discourse; therefore, the postcolonial theorist does not regard what has been assumed about the Orient as lies, but to his mind Orientalism is a discourse which actually constructs or

---

[294] Matthew Arnold, "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time", in: Rüdiger Ahrens, ed., *Englische Literaturtheoretische Essays 2. 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1975, p. 130.

creates the Orient. The results of this investigation show that the East or the Orient is nothing else but "a Western invention," an exotic space characterised by romance, surprising landscapes and exciting experiences. Said shows that this discourse leads to hierarchies since the Orient becomes the Occident's Other and helps it to identify itself. It is equally important to add that this discourse attributes a certain gender to a certain space, namely the East is seen as feminine whereas the West is masculine.[296]

The Orient is represented in David Lodge's novels by four main countries: Israel, Turkey, Japan and Korea. Even if Israel is usually regarded as a Western country, the image of Jerusalem is an exotic one, which justifies its discussion in this section.

4.4.3.1. Jerusalem

Morris Zapp decides to organise his conference in Jerusalem because it is a nice place many people want to visit.[297] This conference consists of

> just one paper a day […], and the remainder of the day is allocated to […] swimming and sunbathing at the Hilton pool, sightseeing in the Old City, shopping in the bazaar, eating out in ethnic restaurants, and making expeditions to Jericho, the Jordan valley, and Galilee.[298]

Like other colonies, Israel is not a country where serious activities can be performed. Even scholars are infantilised here: instead of focusing on the topics that should be discussed, they prefer having fun.

The weather differs from that of Europe transforming Israel into an Other, namely it is extremely hot. Being encouraged to cover their bodies with mud on the ground that it is healthy, the four people who do this, Philip Swallow, Joy Simpson, Morris Zap and Thelma Ringbaum, are compared with "naked aborigines." The reference to the aborigines reminds one of Australia as well as of a race difference; the native people are associated with dirt and mud while their nakedness shows that they are

---

[295] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 84.
[296] Cf. Elain Baldwin et al., *op. cit.*, pp. 169-171.
[297] Cf. David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 65.

primitive and uncivilised. The group goes then to Masada, where the temperature is really suffocating for the tourists.[299] The conferees are overwhelmed by the foreign climate to which they can hardly adapt. The image of the desert alludes to the Australian landscape, this association being at the same time a means of othering Israel.

4.4.3.2. Turkey

There are other Oriental Others, too, among which Turkey constitutes an important example. The main Turkish character presented in the novel *Small World* is Dr Akbil Borak, who did his Bachelor of Arts in Ankara and got his PhD in Hull. Turkey appears as a very poor country; at breakfast Akbil Borak is forced to drink tea because coffee is unavailable in his country. Moreover, he and his family consisting of his wife Oya and their son Ahmed do not enjoy the comfort of a central heating either. They live in a suburb of Ankara, whose houses are imitations of European cities thus symbolising an act of mimicry,[300] a Westernised Orient. However, these copies are different from the original; instead of being cosy, they are forlorn. The gardens, which can be interpreted as a symbol of the conquered nature and of order, are not different from the wild space outside. Poverty together with wilderness seem to be the dominant marks of the suburban landscape of Ankara while suburbia stands for civilisation in the European culture. [301] At university Akbil Borak must share an office with six colleagues,[302] a fact which conveys the idea of poverty, too. He does indeed have a "Citroën Deux Chevaux," a sign of his Westernised personality, but it is cold inside.[303] This means that, in spite of the attempts to imitate the Europeans, Turkey remains an Eastern Other.

People behave in a most uncivilised manner even at university: Akbil can see how politically involved students argue so fiercely that soldiers must intervene. The

---

[298] *Ibid.*, p. 298.
[299] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 301-302.
[300] For a discussion of mimicry see John McLeod, *op. cit.*, p. 55.
[301] Cf. David Lodge, *Small World*, pp. 100-101.
[302] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 113.
[303] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 101.

academic thinks then to himself that the situation in Hull was totally different, thus looking down upon his own culture.[304]

Philip Swallow, who is invited to visit the English Department in Ankara, is a little sceptical because he does not know much about Turkey, except from the fact that it is the border between two continents. Asked about what Turkey is like, Digby Soames from the British Council depicts it in very negative terms: a primitive country in which terror is at home. Self-justice and poverty are its main features, but there is one positive thing about the Turks, their hospitality.[305] There remains only the implied question about what they can offer to a British professor.

As he expects, Philip Swallow does have an accident when, as soon as he is outside the airport in Ankara, he falls into a pothole. Telling his wife about this incident, Akbil Borak states: "You know how bad the roads are since winter. This hole must have been half a metre deep, right outside the terminal building. I felt ashamed. We really have no idea how to make roads in this country."[306] Moreover, on the way to the British Council office, Philip Swallow cannot conceal his nervousness caused by the fact "that the highway to the airport is only paved on one side for certain stretches, so traffic moving in both directions uses the same side of the road."[307] Akbil Borak proves to be aware of the awful state of the Turkish roads, which means that the autostereotype of the Turks coincides with the image the British have about them.

As far as the Turkish hospitality is concerned, Philip Swallow meets only kind people during his stay. He is also conscious that, because of him, the English faculty in Ankara organises receptions as it is offered rare drinks and food by the British Council.[308] This evidently shows the inferior position of the Turks, who need a British Professor in order to receive alcoholic drinks from the British Council. It is at the same time an illustration of colonial power relations.

There are stereotypes of the Turkish women, too; hence, Philip Swallow looks in surprise at an older female professor who performs a belly-dance in front of him. However, despite all the parties and pleasures the Turks try to offer to him, the

---

[304] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 112.
[305] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 158-159.
[306] *Ibid.*, p. 179.
[307] *Ibid.*, pp. 179-180.

Englishman cannot adapt to the foreign culture. He perceives such great differences that he cannot feel good beginning to question the reasons for his travelling. He feels strange in Turkey, seen as otherness, while he wishes to be at home, which is England. His problem is the Oriental culture considered to be the total opposite of his Western country. Furthermore, the visiting professor is disappointed when realising that it will not be possible for him to have any sex affair in Turkey because the women he meets are all carefully watched by men, be they husbands or fathers. Therefore, he comes to the conclusion that on the one hand this country is still dominated by an old moral code, on the other hand Turkish women are regarded as objects owned by men.[309] These aspects deepen the differences between the European and the Oriental culture making it more difficult for Philip Swallow to enjoy his time in Turkey.

4.4.3.3. Japan

Among the multiple number of nations in *Small World* the Japanese are represented by Akira Sakazaki, a university teacher of English from Tokyo. He is introduced in the novel as a man who lives alone in a so-called modern flat, which is described as being exceedingly small. There follows a detailed presentation of the "four metres long, three metres wide and one and a half metres high" apartment: it is equipped with "a stainless sink, refrigerator, microwave oven, electric kettle, colour television, hi-fi system and telephone"[310]and

> [t]he room is air-conditioned, temperature controlled and soundproof. Four hundred identical cells are stacked and interlocked in this building, like a tower of eggboxes. It is a new development, an upmarket version of the "capsule" hotels situated near the main railway termini that have proved so popular with Japanese workers in recent years.[311]

---

[308] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 209.
[309] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 209-211.
[310] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 103.
[311] *Loc. cit.*

In spite of the apparent comfort and the high tech devices, which are typical for the Japanese modern culture, the image of the apartment is mainly negative. It is associated with a cell, a reference to prison, and with a capsule, which symbolises a closed claustrophobic space. The eggboxes are a sign of "animalization,"[312] which refers to the association of non-white races with animals in colonial discourse. Thus, hierarchies in which the colonised occupied the inferior position were created and maintained throughout colonialism. On the other hand, the eggboxes are a symbol of "infantilization,"[313] a process through which the colonised were compared to children in order to show that they were immature and consequently unable to lead an independent life. This is how the colonisers justified their conquest of foreign lands and their transformation into colonies. Indeed, in *Small World* the Japanese are said to be "very *little* people"[314] thus being associated with children.

The idea of infantilization and minimisation is also sustained by Akira Sakazaki's "tiny windowless bathroom, with a small chair-shaped tub just big enough to sit in, and a toilet that can be used only in a squatting position, which is customary for Japanese men in any case."[315] This bathroom seems to have been built for a child and the toilet which makes it impossible for a man to use it standing refers to a feminisation of the colonised.

In the colonial discourse there is also "the trope of light/ darkness, implicit in the Enlightenment ideal of rational clarity."[316] The darkness of the colonised draws Persse McGarrigle's attention immediately: "When he arrived in Tokyo it was still night. The

---

[312] "Animalization" is a "key colonialist trope" seen by Ella Shohat and Robert Stam as "rooted in a religious and philosophical tradition which drew sharp boundaries between the animal and the human, and where all animal-like characteristics of the self were to be suppressed." It has been observed that "the Social Darwinist metaphor of 'the survival of the fittest' transferred a zoological notion to the realms of class, gender, and race" and that "[t]he animalizing trope surreptitiously haunts present-day media discourse." On a closer look "[a]nimalization forms part of the larger, more diffuse mechanism of naturalization: the reduction of the cultural to the biological, the tendency to associate the colonized with the vegetative and the instinctual rather than with the learned and the cultural." Cf. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-138.

[313] As far as "infantilization" is concerned, it "projects the colonized as embody an earlier stage of individual human or broad cultural development" or, in Renan's words, of the "everlasting infancy of [the] non-perfectable races." Cf. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

[314] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 286.

[315] *Ibid.*, pp. 103-104.

[316] This representation "envisions non-European worlds as less luminous, whence the notion [...] of Asians as 'twilight people.' [...] Sight and vision are attributed to Europe, while the 'other' is seen as living in 'obscurity,' blind to moral knowledge." Cf. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

night seemed to go on for ever."[317] Darkness with its metaphorical implications appears as a characteristic of Tokyo, the capital of Japan.

After his courses at university, Akira Sakazaki is aware of the differences between Europeans and Japanese, too; for instance, he is pleased with the small size of his flat because it prevents him from wasting time moving from one room to another. Comparing his way of living with the European one, he cannot help his amazement as he equates time with space.[318]

After his courses at university, Akira Sakazaki spends his time translating an English novel, *Could Try Harder*, by a novelist called Ronald Frobisher. Confronted with numerous problems regarding certain stylistic means,[319] he keeps writing the author letters in which he politely asks for his help. This repeated gesture can be interpreted in two ways: firstly, the Japanese translator adopts the traditional belief that it is the author who creates the meaning of a text; secondly, this is the case of a colonised who is willing to mediate European, especially English, literature, but is totally lost without the coloniser's help. Nevertheless, Akira Sakazaki knows that "[l]anguage is the net that holds thought trapped within a particular culture."[320]

During his short stay in Tokyo, Persse McGarrigle goes to a pub where he meets Akira Sakazaki together with other Japanese translators of English literature. In the small karaoke bar he sees Japanese men singing "Mrs Robinson" in English.[321] Apart from songs of Simon and Garfunkel, the Japanese prove to be familiar with the Beatles and Bob Dylan, too. This scene of the novel shows Westernised Japanese people imitating European singers and bands, an act of mimicry typical for the colonised.

The Japanese culture is regarded from a Eurocentric perspective and, for this reason, Akira Sakazaki's living standard appears strange and ridiculous. This negative image of a dark, less developed and small people emphasises the differences between the West and the East contributing to the creation of an easily perceptible otherness.

---

[317] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 291.
[318] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 104.
[319] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 105.
[320] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

4.4.3.4. Korea

Korea is represented in *Small World* by Song-mi Lee, who is described as a most attractive young woman and first introduced as wearing a black ”*cache-sexe*”[322] thus appearing as an 'eroticized' Other.[323] Moreover, Song-mi Lee's position is inferior to that of Arthur Kingfisher, whose personal assistant she is. She

> came ten years ago from Korea on a Ford Foundation fellowship to sit at Arthur Kingfisher's feet as a research student, and stayed to become his secretary, companion, amenuensis [sic!], masseuse and bedfellow, her life wholly dedicated to protecting the great man against the importunities of the academic world and soothing his despair at no longer being able to achieve an erection or an original thought.[324]

In other words, the young Korean woman is the Western man's servant. She has dedicated her whole life to his care, her *raison d'être* being his academic success. Her total devotion to Arthur Kingfisher shows that she is a colonised who, accepting the coloniser's superiority, is glad to serve him.

Being both a non-Westerner and a woman, Song-mi Lee undergoes a double process of suppression: on the one hand is a subaltern of the American literary critic, on the other hand she must obey her father's will as far as the choice of a husband is concerned. In a conversation with Persse McGarrigle on the plane to Seoul, Song-mi Lee talks about her cultural shock when she first visited the USA. The differences between the Occident and the Orient appear to be very deep. As a woman she enjoys certain rights, such as smoking in public, on the American territory, but her relationship with Arthur Kingfisher keeps her in a subject position. Song-mi Lee is sad especially because her parents have arranged a marriage for her. A young girl must not contradict her parents, she must simply obey their will. The Korean culture seems to prefer politeness and the performance of certain social obligations to sincerity and happiness. After arriving in Seoul, Persse McGarrigle is surprised to see her transformation into a sober-

---

[321] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 292.
[322] Cf. *loc. cit.*
[323] Postcolonial theorists draw attention to the fact that the colonised are regarded as feminised and eroticised Others. Cf. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, *op. cit*, pp. 141-145.

looking daughter seeming to care a lot about her parents, who, interestingly, are wearing European clothes.[325] Their clothes prove that even the most conservative old people have undergone a certain Western influence.

The young Irishman's experience in Korea testifies this mixture of old and new; an example in this respect is "the resort town of Kongju, site of many ancient monuments, temples and modern hotels, and an artificial lake on which floats, like a gigantic bathtoy, a fibreglass pleasureboat in the shape of a white duck."[326] Thus, modern hotels have been built next to temples out of economic reasons to develop tourism. This stands for desacralisation and demystification, but it is also an illustration of the culture as commodity. The landscape represents a mixture of nature and culture as well. The terms used to describe the boat, "bathtoy," "pleasureboat," "duck," indicate an infantilisation of the Koreans, who seem to offer the foreign tourists a playful space whose main attraction is pleasure even at the price of spoiling the seriousness of the ancient monuments.

Seoul, the capital of Korea, appears as a big city which frightens Persse McGarrigle:

> It is monsoon season in Korea, and Seoul is wet and humid, a concrete wilderness of indistinguishable suburbs ringing a city centre whose inhabitants are apparently so terrorized by the traffic that they have decided to live under the ground in a complex of subways lined with brightly lit shops.[327]

A city is usually considered to be something cultural characterised by order, but Seoul seems to be associated with wilderness, symbolising chaos and danger. The suburbs show the Western influence on the Oriental capital, thus being a sign of mimicry, but the Koreans have not succeeded in imitating the European or the American suburb system perfectly. That is why, Seoul seems to be a faint and grotesque copy of a Western modern city. Its inhabitants are animalized by being compared to moles on account of the fact that they tend to live under the ground.

---

[324] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 94.
[325] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 297-298.
[326] *Ibid.*, p. 298.
[327] *Loc. cit.*

In conclusion, Korea is presented in a negative fashion, special emphasis being placed upon the differences between the Occident and the Orient. This image is the product of a Eurocentric perspective going hand in hand with Edward Said's idea of the discursive construction of the Oriental otherness by the European Self. The Koreans are definitely depicted as feminised or animalised Others pending between their traditions and the Western influences.

4.5. Hybridity: transgressing ethnic borders

Postcolonial theoreticians have become aware of the fact that European thinking imposed itself through colonialism all over the world. They try to subvert Eurocentrism by arguing that Western values are not universal. Edward Said makes it clear that replacing one centre by another is not a good solution at all. The voices of the marginalised groups do not demand that Eurocentrism should be substituted by another way of thinking.[328] Said points out that possessing only one identity means being narrow-minded; therefore, one should be open to other cultures because this is the only way to enlarge one's knowledge and to acquire academic freedom, which means not only accepting oneself, but also accepting other ways of being and thinking.[329] In spite of the universalistic claim of Eurocentrism, one should not totally reject the European culture, either. The origin of an author should not be taken into account as much as how the work is written and how it is received by its readers. What really matters is to finally admit the peripherality of certain groups of people in order to put an end to it.[330]

The academy has always had a special place in each society because it develops and encourages intellectual operations. Defined as a site of education, it proves to play an important part in the lives of the members of a society. The academy influences as well as forms young people much more than anything else since it offers values, be they intellectual or moral, claiming to help individuals in their quest for truth.[331] Yet the

---

[328] Cf. Edward W. Said, "The Politics of Knowledge", pp. 380-381.
[329] Cf. Edward W. Said, "Identity, Authority, and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveler", pp. 402-403.
[330] Cf. Edward W. Said, "The Politics of Knowledge", p. 385.
[331] Cf. Edward W. Said, "Identity, Authority, and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveler", p. 388.

academy is always dependent upon the political situation of a country and consequently involved in the creation and mediation of the national identity. Said expresses his opinion in this respect, too, explaining that the only *raison d'être* of the academy should be the engagement of the mind in asking questions and looking for answers, not its subjection to a discourse of national identity because in doing so the academy loses its freedom, which constitutes a serious reason of worry.[332] People should ask themselves what academic freedom really means and, more importantly, if the academy in their society enjoys such freedom. Nowadays it is common knowledge that the university is subjected to the government. The new types of studies introduced into the curricula seemed to subvert the authority of the government, favouring marginalized groups. These influences coming from the outside reality were said to reduce the university's traditional high standards. The initiators of this movement called academic freedom the old canonical ideas that form the mainstream Western culture. Edward Said states that this is not the case of Arab universities and depicts their situation as altogether different from the European ones. Colonialism disregarded native cultures and traditions proclaiming European values not only superior, but also universal. Therefore, the colonised had no access to their own culture as they were educated in a Western manner. Said recalls that education was among the first fields to be changed after the achievement of independence. The fact the colonisers had no respect for the colonised is revolting enough; yet it is more revolting that the former also attempted to induce the latter a feeling of shame for their culture and for themselves.[333] The independence of the former colonies meant a great change in education, namely that the academy became a major mediator of the national identity because "in a condition in which cultural conflict is, to all intents and purposes, universal, the relationship between the national identity and other national identities is going to be reflected in the academy."[334] It is a fact that "in actuality no university or school can really be a shelter from the difficulties of human life and more specifically from the political intercourse of a given society and culture."[335] Said tries to make the real function of the academy clear and for this reason

[332] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 397.
[333] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 388-392.
[334] *Ibid.*, p. 395.
[335] *Ibid.*, p. 400.

he cites Newman, according to whom the university's only role should be to urge the intellect to search for knowledge and, ultimately, truth. In this view there is no place for conveying national identity or any moral values.[336] In order to reach this goal the university should be free from any political constraints and the academic should be mobile. The ideal model of freedom is the traveller who is willing to know other identities as well and to put an end to the fight for superiority. One should be aware of the fact that the discourses on the colonies served a specific purpose, namely that of imperialism. Today it is clear that colonialism used even sciences such as geography or biology to justify itself. The academy should enable one to look for knowledge by transgressing one's ethnic or national boundaries, and not to try to manipulate it in order to gain control over others. That is why having a single identity means being confined to one's own limits while crossing it is the real freedom of the mind. Two images of university professionals emerge out of the academy; the first one is that of the king or potentate, who longs for power over others proclaiming his or her identity the ultimate one, be it European or non-European. Unlike the potentate, the traveller migrates, mobility and playfulness being the main traits of the traveller, who transgresses his or her own identity in order to assume more. He or she is open to other ways of being and enters other cultures. This is the real aim of the academy: the unending search for knowledge and freedom.[337]

The journey is essential in the creation of a hybrid self; Trinh T. Minh-ha expresses the importance of travelling in a most poetic way. To his mind, travelling implies transgressing one's borderlines since it is a negotiation between the self and the Other[338] situated in a 'Third Space', to use Homi Bhabha's term.[339] As John McLeod notes, "the 'in-between' position of the migrant" is one of the main concerns of postcolonial theorists and writers like Salman Rushdie or Hanif Kureishi.[340] There is one

---

[336] Cf. *loc. cit.*
[337] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 403-404.
[338] Cf. Trinh T. Minh-ha, "Other than myself/ my other self" in: George Robertson, et al., ed.,*op. cit.*, p. 9.
[339] Cf. Homi K. Bhabha, "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences" in: Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith and Helen Tiffin, ed., *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, 1995, p. 208.
[340] John McLeod, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

more point to be made here, namely that hybridity is not characterised by completeness but by fluidity.[341]

It is exactly this idea of motion and transgression of one's own national borders that the novels *Changing Places* and *Small World* deal with. The motif of the journey as an opportunity to acquire a new self is anticipated in the novel *Out of the Shelter*. Thus, the young Timothy realises that "that [is] the point of going away, [isn't] it, to see your home with a fresh eye when you [return].'[342] Shortly after his arrival in Heidelberg, he becomes aware that "[h]ome seem[s] infinitely remote, and the self that belong[s] there just as distant."[343] Many years later he evaluates his experience in Germany as "a turning-point" since "[i]t brought [him] out of [his] shell, enlarged [his] horizons."[344] Timothy Young does indeed acquire a hybrid identity and he is conscious of his new self as well as of the importance of travelling to other countries in its formation.

According to the model proposed by Edward Said, the centre of the world should not be moved from Britain to America, but, instead, the university teachers should travel in order to open to new cultures and develop an intercultural identity. David Lodge knows how important an exchange programme is in this context. Therefore, he writes that

> [i]t would not be surprising […] if two men changing places for six months should exert a reciprocal influence on each other's destinies, and actually mirror each other's experience in certain respects, notwithstanding all the differences that exist between the two environments, and between the characters of the two men and their respective attitudes towards the whole enterprise.[345]

Thus, the experience of travelling and actually changing places must have an impact on the lives of the two characters although they are very different from each other. The motif of the mirror is significant as it refers to the fact that the two cultures reflect each other. This helps the characters realise that they "need a change. A new perspective. The

---

[341] McLeod remarks that "[h]ybrid identities are never total and complete in themselves, like orderly pathways built from crazy-paving. Instead, they remain perpetually in motion, pursuing errant and unpredictable routes, open to change and reinscription." Cf. *ibid.*, p. 219.
[342] David Lodge, *Out of the Shelter*, p. 69.
[343] *Ibid.*, p. 98.
[344] *Ibid.*, p. 265.
[345] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 8.

challenge of a different culture."[346] The two academics in *Changing Places* acquire a new perspective not only on the foreign culture but also on their own until the end of the novel. The double campus presented in this book is multiplied and transformed into a global campus in *Small World* because, as a highly metafictional passage explains, "[e]ven two campuses wouldn't be enough. Scholars these days are like the errant knights of old, wandering the ways of the world in search of adventure and glory."[347]

Globalization is made possible by significant progress in the field of telecommunications and transportation (hence the metaphor 'small world') and by developing an intercultural competence as well as a cultural awareness. It seems that globalization, especially in the economic and cultural domains, has marked the whole world in the last decades, which lead to a series of exchanges.[348] Morris Zapp is aware of the recent changes in technology and of their impact on the university. It is now much easier to get to information than it used to because of the three inventions enumerated by Morris Zapp, namely the plane, the telephone and the Xerox. They help to multiply and facilitate the interactions between the different scholars of the world. Like other professors, Morris Zapp is no longer confined to his own university, but travels a lot and, more importantly, he has the necessary conditions to read while travelling on the plane from one conference to another.[349] International conferences play a major role in this respect since it enables academics to travel all over the world and to keep in touch with other professors.[350] When Hilary Swallow complains that her husband has been travelling a lot lately, Morris Zapp tells her that this has become absolutely normal for university teachers. The novel makes it clear that the modern "world is a global campus" characterised by motion.[351] The whole globe seems to be marked by travelling in all possible directions; people look for novelty, for landscapes totally different from their homelands. The plane journey has become typical of the world nowadays as people are no longer rooted in one place, but are always moving.[352] The omniscient narrator of *Small World* states that conference hopping is "a way of converting work into play,

[346] *Ibid.*, p. 43.
[347] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 63.
[348] Cf. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *op. cit.*, p. xi.
[349] Cf. David Lodge, *Small World*, pp. 43-44.
[350] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 44.
[351] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 62-64.

combining professionalism with tourism."[353] The association of terms like work and play, or professionalism and tourism– parts of binary oppositions– stands for hybridity since it suggests a mixture of seriousness and playfulness.[354]

The ultimate aim of globalization is the development of an intercultural competence, which can be defined as the ability of adapting oneself to another culture and of acting according to the expectations of its representatives is part of the intercultural competence. It encompasses the capacity to acknowledge the differences between one's own and the foreign culture and handle the possible problems coming out of these differences. Understanding people belonging to other cultures implicates helping them to be aware of their own identity, too.[355] This cultural awareness implies the passage from a monocultural competence to an intercultural one.[356]

Small World seems to convey the same message: academics travel from one country to another in order to develop an intercultural competence. In doing so, they become aware of the differences between the world's nations:

> Oh, the amazing variety of *langue* and *parole*, food and custom, in the countries of the world! […] people of every colour and nation are gathered together to discuss the novels of Thomas Hardy, or the problem plays of Shakespeare, or the postmodernist short story, or the poetics of Imagism. […] There are at the same time conferences in session on French medieval *chansons* and Spanish poetic drama of the sixteenth century and the German *Sturm und Drang* movement and Serbian folksongs; there are conferences on the dynasties of ancient Crete and the social history of the Scottish Highlands and the foreign policy of Bismarck […].[357]

Langue and *parole* are clear references to Ferdinand de Saussure's structuralism applied to anthropology by Claude Lévi-Strauss in order to exemplify the differences between

---

[352] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 271.

[353] *Ibid.*, p. 231.

[354] Edward Said also expresses the idea that the traveller is both serious and playful and sees no contradiction in the association of these terms. Cf. Edward W. Said, "Identity, Authority, and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveler", p. 404.

[355] Cf. Dieter Buttjes and Michael Byram, ed., *Mediating Languages and Cultures*, Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 1991, p. 137.

[356] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

[357] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 233.

various cultures.[358] The aim of the travelling conferees is to overcome these differences and understand the otherness. Nevertheless, the main topic of the conferences is the English literature. Anticipating the reader's reaction, the narrator continues by saying that there are a lot of other important issues to be discussed, too. But the long enumeration consists of solely European cultural subjects and one must admit that, in spite of pursuing the nice aim of interculturality, the contents of the conferences presented in this novel remains selective and exclusively Eurocentric. In this context, it does not come as a surprise when the narrator states that knowledge of English is indispensable.[359]

David Lodge's campus novels express indeed a longing for hybridity, but its realisation remains utopian. In spite of the numerous conferences in which the characters participate interacting with each other, they are always in competition. Their stereotypical presentation entitles one to regard them as representatives of their cultures or, more importantly, nations. Hence, their rivalry suggests a struggle of affirmation of the nations they stand for; it has already been argued that, although Philip Swallow and Morris Zapp think about staying at the university at which they spent one semester as visiting professors, they cannot be considered hybrid because, whereas the former has undergone a process of colonisation visible in his high evaluation of the American culture as well as in his contempt for the British life style, the latter imagines his life at Rummidge University as Head of the English Department, a position that would help him to "put Rummidge on the map,"[360] an aim that reminds us of the coloniser's civilising task. Moreover, the foreign cultures, particularly the non-European ones, are depicted as Others, which excludes any intercultural competence on the part of the travellers.

On the whole, the starting point of this chapter was the assumption that ethnic identity is a discursive construct based on the opposition self vs. Other. Then, the British

---

[358] Cf. Claude Lévi-Strauss, "Linguistics and Anthropology", in: Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, transl. from the French by Clare Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf, New York: Basic Books, 1963, pp. 67-80.

[359] Cf. David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 234. The stress on the importance of speaking English nowadays reflects the modern age. As Kosaku Yoshino observes, we must not forget that we live "[i]n the 'age of internalisation'– as so called by the Japanese– in which knowledge of cultural differences is considered essential in addition to a spoken command of English." Cf. Kosaku Yoshino, "Globalization and Ethno-Cultural Differences", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, p. 372.

were defined by revealing the contribution of the Army discourse to the formation of national identity and by describing the colonial relations between them and the Irish as well as other internal Others (immigrants). The next subchapter focused on the substitution of the British centre with an American one giving various examples of American imperialism. The other ethnic groups commented upon were useful in illustrating the fact that they appear as Others. Finally, the section on hybridity was meant to stress the contribution of the academy to the formation of national identity and to show that the utopian aim proposed by Lodge's campus novels is not achieved by the characters as they remain in a perpetual competition.

---

[360] David Lodge, *Changing Places. A Tale of Two Campuses*, London: Penguin Books, 1975, p. 234.

5. Literary Discourse

5.1. Author and authority

In a theoretical discussion of literature it is absolutely necessary to have a closer look at the concept of the author, which has been considered to be essential in literary criticism since the nineteenth century, when this discipline acquired the status of a field of knowledge. Traditionally the biography of the author of a book is extremely important being equated with the criticism of the text.[1] Nowadays this view is contradicted by a great number of theoreticians who are concerned with how a text comes into being.

5.1.1. Poststructuralist anti-authorialism

Like most of the poststructuralists, Foucault rejects the idea of author as origin of a discourse pleading for the disappearance of the subject.[2] To his mind, discourse "must not be referred to the distant presence of the origin, but treated as and when it occurs."[3] Together with Barthes and Derrida, he takes "anti-authorialism to the extreme of promoting authorial exclusion from a methodological prescription to an ontological statement about the very essence of discourse itself."[4]

5.1.1.1. Roland Barthes's "The Death of the Author"

Literary theory took a new turn in the 1960's, years marked by "radical shifts" which "have challenged traditional assumptions regarding the author as the originator or

---

[1] Roger Webster writes that "[c]riticism and biography became at times virtually indistinguishable from one another, so that the more you knew about an author's life, the more you were likely to understand the literature he/ she wrote." Cf. Roger Webster, *Studying Literary Theory. An Introduction*, London, New York, Sydney, Auckland: Arnold, 1996, p. 17.

[2] Anthony Easthope also discusses the fact that the attack on the Enlightenment subject is typical for poststructuralism; cf. Antony Easthope, *British Post-Structuralism since 1968*, London and New York: Routledge, 1991 (1988), p. 33.

[3] Quoted in Jeremy Hawthorn, *op. cit.,* p. 25.

[4] Seán Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992, p. 16.

producer of the literary work and questioned the author's authority over the text. The best example of this argument is Roland Barthes' essay 'The Death of the Author', published in 1968."[5] Barthes states that "writing is the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin. Writing is that neutral, composite, oblique space where our subject slips away, the negative where all identity is lost, starting with the very identity of the body writing." In other words, "the author enters into his own death"whereas the importance of the author in our society is seen by Barthes as "the epitome and culmination of capital ideology."[6] He continues by attacking the so-called "biographical fallacy"[7]:

> The image of literature to be found in ordinary culture is tyrannically centred on the author, his person, his life, his tastes, his passions, while criticism still consists for the most part in saying that Baudelaire's work is the failure of Baudelaire the man, Van Gogh's his madness, Tchaikovsky's his vice. The explanation of a work is always sought in the man or woman who produced it, as if it were always in the end, through the more or less transparent allegory of fiction, the voice of a single person, the *author* 'confiding' in us.[8]

To his mind, the predominant interest in the biography of the author is a tyranny as far as literary criticism is concerned. He is against this approach which explains a text according to the life of the person who wrote it. Moreover,

> Barthes argues that 'it is language which speaks not the author', and that we need to abandon an author-centred approach if we are to realize the full range of meanings contained within a literary text. Once a text is in circulation the umbilical cord, so to speak, between author and text is cut and the text leads an independent existence. Barthes also raises questions which we shall examine shortly about the individuality of the author in the writing process. He concludes by arguing that the 'multiplicity' of meanings which make up a text is focused not on the author, but on the reader, […] and that we need to overthrow the myth of the author […]. Barthes' use of 'myth' is closely allied to ideology in the sense that the traditional view of the author is one which obscures and controls the potential meanings in a literary text- the myth of the author operates as a

---

[5] Roger Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
[6] Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author", in David Lodge, Ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, p. 168.
[7] Roger Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
[8] Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author", p. 168.

form of cultural control."[9]

Roland Barthes dismisses the interpretation of a text by taking exclusively its author into account; instead he favors language, which produces meanings. To his mind,

> a text is not a line of words releasing a single 'theological' meaning (the 'message' of the Author-God) but a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture. […] the writer can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original. His only power is to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them.[10]

Barthes evidently considers intertextuality to be the only way of writing a new text, which, consequently, acquires a multiplicity of meanings. In this context, originality appears to be impossible and the author is not the 'God' of the text anymore as his message is lost among the numerous interpretations. The so long believed in "ultimate meaning" is rejected and finally replaced by "an anti-theological activity."[11]

Roland Barthes considers the text to exist independently from the author thus giving priority to the reader, who is "*someone* who holds together in a single field all the traces by which the written text is constituted." The French theorist believes that "a text's unity lies not in its origins but in its destination." In conclusion, he openly states that "it is necessary to overthrow the myth: the birth of the reader must be at he cost of the death of the Author."[12]

5.1.1.2. Michel Foucault's "What Is an Author?"

Like Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault adopts an anti-authorial position, too, but his view differs in some respects. His essay "What Is an Author"[13] is described by David

---

[9] Roger Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
[10] Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author", p. 170.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 171.
[12] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 171-172.
[13] It is in 1969, a year after Roland Barthes' "The Death of the Author" appeared, that Michel Foucault's essay "What Is an Author?" was published in France, but the English translation by Joseph V. Harari

Lodge as an illustration of the Foucauldian "historicizing approach;"[14] Roger Webster summarizes it as follows:

> In his discussion the figure of the author is linked to the emergence in western culture of what Foucault calls 'individualization', that is the central place occupied by named individuals in the way that forms of knowledge are organized. The author thus confers identity and status on various kinds of writing as they circulate in society; he or she provides a point of recognition, 'a solid and fundamental unit'. Foucault calls the ways in which an author's name is used to control the circulation of literature the 'author-function' and suggests that it is actually a way of restricting the forms of reading and the meanings which can arise from a text- a similar view to that of Roland Barthes above. His argument is that the figure of the author is not so important to literary works before the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, when the individual author's seal of approval was not needed to validate the 'truth' or authority and works were accepted anonymously. With emergence of bourgeois society and the new emphasis on ownership and property laws, combined with the growth in scientific knowledge as a way of explaining the world, literary texts became more significant as products and indicators of individualism, and occupied a rather different terrain.[15]

In short, Foucault reduces the author to a function that confers identity, unity and value to a text restricting the possibilities of its interpretation. He does not agree with the traditional authority of the author and points out that this authority is a product of the bourgeois property rights. This famous provocative essay opens with the statement that "[t]he coming into being of the notion of 'author' constitutes the privileged moment of *individualization* in the history of ideas, literature, philosophy, and the sciences." Then, Foucault refers to Samuel Beckett's formulation "What does it matter who is speaking," which he interprets as an "indifference" in which "appears one of the fundamental ethical principles of contemporary writing [*écriture*]." The use of the term "ethical" is justified by the fact that this indifference features "a kind of immanent rule, taken up over and over again, never fully applied, not designating writing as something completed, but dominating it as a practice." The author of the essay regards writing as "a question of creating a space into which the writing subject constantly disappears."

---

appeared only ten years later. Cf. David Lodge, "Michel Foucault", in David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, p. 197.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 196.

[15] Roger Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

Moreover, "the mark of the writer is reduced to nothing more than the singularity of his absence; he must assume the role of the dead man in the game of writing."[16]

There follows a discussion of the "author's name," which "serves to characterize a certain mode of being of discourse"[17] and which "indicates the status of this discourse within a society and a culture."[18] This is what Foucault calls the "author-function," which he defines as "characteristic of the mode of existence, circulation, and functioning of certain discourses within a society."[19] The author-function is further discussed four main characteristics being attributed to it. Firstly, it must be noted that the end of the eighteenth as well as the beginning of the nineteenth century were marked by the appearance of "a system of ownership for texts" and by the enacting of "strict rules concerning author's rights," "author-publisher relations" and "rights of reproduction."[20] The author-function seems to be typical for "the system of property that characterizes our society,"[21] or, in other words, it "is linked to the juridical and institutional system that encompasses, determines, and articulates the universe of discourses."[22] Secondly, Foucault makes the point that "[t]he author-function does not affect all discourses in a universal and constant way."[23] Thirdly, he states "that it does not develop spontaneously as the attribution of a discourse to an individual,"[24] but it is defined "by a series of specific and complex operations."[25] Fourthly, the author-function "does not refer purely and simply to a real individual, since it can give rise simultaneously to several selves, to several subjects– positions that can be occupied by different classes of individuals."[26]

All the above mentioned characteristics refer to a restricted meaning of the word "author," namely to "a person to whom the production of a text, a book, or a work can be legitimately attributed."[27] There are also authors of "a theory, tradition, or discipline

---

[16] Cf. Michel Foucault, "What Is an Author?", in David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, p. 197-198.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 201.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 202.
[19] *Loc. cit.*
[20] *Loc. cit.*
[21] *Loc. cit.*
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 205.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 202.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 203.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 205.
[26] *Loc. cit.*
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 206.

in which other books and authors will in their turn find a place" and their position is labelled as "transdiscursive" while they are called "founders of discursivity." Freud and Marx are given as examples because "they both have established an endless possibility of discourse."[28]

Going back to the author-function, Foucault writes that

the author is not an indefinite source of significations which fill a work; the author does not precede the works, he is a certain functional principle by which, in our culture, one limits, excludes, and chooses; in short, by which one impedes the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of fiction. […] One can say that the author is an ideological product, since we represent him as the opposite of his historically real function.[29]

The real function of the author is that of grouping texts and, as he or she is represented in an opposite way, the author is the product of an ideology. Commenting on the Foucauldian conception of the author, Roger Webster emphasises the ideological aspect:

Foucault's view of the author-function is that it serves an ideological purpose: that is authors are commonly represented as being the source of creative talent, genius and imagination but function in an opposite way to this. The labelling of works according to authors can be viewed as an impediment to the free circulation of knowledge in that the works are already 'placed' in a particular system of knowledge and value governed by conceptions and conventions of authorship and biography.[30]

The name of the author actually labels texts; therefore, authorship and biography guide interpretation imposing limits on it. The same critic observes that Foucault's attitude towards the author is totally opposed to that of Leavis:

What seems to be for Leavis a question of judgement, experience and intuition in knowing or 'placing' a literary work becomes for Foucault a largely predetermined and ideological process which functions to maintain knowledge and consequently power in specific and dominant sections of society. [...] One final point which Foucault makes is that the convention of the author does not precede the literary text, but rather follows it; this is an inversion of one aspect of

---

[28] *Loc. cit.*
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 209.
[30] Roger Webster, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-20.

the process of literary production as it is normally conceived.[31]

Thus, the poststructuralist thinker declares that the categorisation of literary texts serves the clear purpose of preserving knowledge and power in certain parts of society. The traditional model according to which the author creates the text is overthrown by stating that the text creates the author. That is to say, the individual is not a creator of discourses, but a product of discursive practices.

David Lodge also read Foucault and, referring to his view, he writes in his critical book *After Bakhtin. Essays on Fiction and Criticism* that the poststructuralist scholar "prefers to speak of the author as a 'function' rather than as an origin of discourse: the era of bourgeois capitalism *required* the idea of the author as one who individualistically produced, owned and authenticated the literary text, but it was not always so, and it need not be so in the future."[32] The British novelist agrees that "[t]he idea of the author which Barthes and Foucault seek to discredit is the product of humanism and the Enlightenment as well as of capitalism."[33]

Foucault concludes his essay about the author with a question similar to the one announced on its first page: "What difference does it make who is speaking?"[34] To his mind, it is necessary to dissolve the subject;[35] that is why he rejects the approach which "gives absolute priority to the observing subject" leading "to a transcendental consciousness" and prefers "a theory of discursive practice."[36]

It is commonplace knowledge that the Foucauldian conception of the subject is directly linked with his consideration of the author. Thus, McNay writes:

> The second theme that lies at the centre of Foucault's work is that of the subject, or rather a critique of the various notions of the rational subject that have governed Western thought since the Enlightenment. Foucault's whole oeuvre is oriented to breaking down the domination of a fully self-reflexive, unified and rational subject at the centre of thought in order to clear a space for radically

---

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[32] David Lodge, *After Bakhtin. Essays on Fiction and Criticism*, London and New York: Routledge, 1990, p. 157.

[33] *Loc. cit.*

[34] Michel Foucault, "What Is an Author?", p. 210.

[35] Michel Foucault, *Knowledge/ Power*, p. 117.

[36] Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, London: Tavistock Publications, 1970, , p. xiv.

'other' ways of thinking and being.[37]

The subject occupies the second place in the issues dealt with by Foucault; he attacks the Enlightenment by totally rejecting the Western rational self making universally valid judgements about the world. Instead, he proposes a new definition of the subject:

> In the [...] archaeological enquiry into the conditions of possibility of thought, the attack on the rational subject takes a more general form. Here Foucault shows that the idea of the subject as the sole origin of meaning is in fact an illusion generated by deep-level rules of formation that govern all thought and speech. Far from being the source of meaning, the subject is in fact a secondary effect or byproduct of discursive formations. By laying bare these deep-seated rules that constitute the condition of possibility of thought, Foucault undermines not only the notion of an originating subject but also associated notions of truth and progress.[38]

This model does no longer view the subject as the originator of meaning, but as a discursive product, thus highlighting the relation between discourse and truth; Foucault discharges the existence of a human soul, psyche or subjectivity because in his eyes there is no transcendental truth:

> In an analysis of the modern penal system and of contemporary notions of sexuality, Foucault shows how the assumption that individuals have a deep interiority and innermost truth– expressed in concepts such as the soul, psyche and subjectivity- is a coercive illusion. The idea of an inner and essential depth is in fact an effect of material processes of subjection. To be a subject, in Foucault's view, is necessarily to be subjected. Even when individuals think that they are most free, they are in fact in the grip of an insidious power which operates not through direct forms of repression but through less visible strategies of 'normalization'.[39]

Foucault sees how these concepts contribute to the so-called normalisation of thought and behaviour, showing how subtly power operates at this level. Western thought is marked by humanism, which he defines as follows:

---

[37] Lois McNay, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

> By humanism I mean the totality of discourse through which Western man is told: "Even though you don't exercise power, you can still be a ruler. Better yet, the more you deny yourself the exercise of power, the more you submit to those in power, then the more this increases your sovereignty." Humanism invented a whole series of subjected sovereignties: the soul (ruling the body, but subjected to God), consciousness (sovereign in a context of judgment, but subjected to the necessities of truth), the individual (a titular control of personal rights subjected to the laws of nature and society), basic freedom (sovereign within, but accepting the demands of an outside world and "aligned with destiny"). In short, humanism is everything in Western civilization that restricts *the desire for power*: it prohibits the desire for power and excludes the possibility of power being seized. The theory of the subject (in the double sense of the word) is at the heart of humanism and this is why our culture has tenaciously rejected anything that could weaken its hold upon us.[40]

Foucault deliberately uses the term "subject," which has a double meaning, to express the idea that in humanism the individual both exercises power and suffers its effects. He illustrates this paradox with several examples stating that humanism is based on the theory of the subject, who is necessarily devoid of power. Humanism is not only part of a system of thought, but it has also been institutionalised:

> From the beginning of the Roman law– the armature of our civilization that exists as a definition of individuality as subjected sovereignty. This system of private property implies this conception: the proprietor is fully in control of his goods; he can use or abuse them, but he must nevertheless submit to the laws that support his claim to propriety. The Roman system structured the government and established the basis of propriety. It controlled the will to power by fixing the "sovereign right of property" as the exclusive possession of those in power. Through this elegant exchange, humanism was institutionalized.[41]

The consideration of the individual as a "subjected sovereignty" is as old as the Roman law, which regards the proprietor in two ways: firstly, as a master over his or her property, secondly, as a subject to the law which gives him or her the right of property. As humanism is visible at two distinct levels, namely the philosophical and the institutional ones, it can be attacked both theoretically and practically:

> But it can be attacked in two ways: either by a "desubjectification" of the will to

---

[40] Michel Foucault, "Revolutionary Action: 'Until Now'", pp. 221-222.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 222.

power (that is, through political struggle in the context of class warfare) or by the destruction of the subject as a pseudosovereign (that is, through an attack on "culture": the suppression of taboos and the limitations and divisions imposed upon the sexes; the setting up of communes; the loosening of inhibitions with regard to drugs; the breaking of all the prohibitions that form and guide the development of a normal individual). I am referring to all those experiences which have been rejected by our civilization or which it accepts only within literature.[42]

On the one hand, humanism can be politically undermined by class struggle; on the other hand, philosophy can attack the idea of subject by questioning the cultural limits of taboos.

In conclusion to this section, although theorists like Barthes and Foucault are controversial, "their ideas are provocative and do lead us to question what have been taken as axiomatic 'truths' regarding literature. The essays in question seek to theorize and problematize the 'author' so that it is no longer an assumed or 'natural' category."[43] Poststructuralism does indeed question all the assumptions that have been taken for granted so far.

5.1.2. Lodge's view on authorship

5.1.2.1. Theoretical argumentation

If Michel Foucault sees the quest for the origin as useless, David Lodge adopts an entirely different position. In the introduction to the essay "What Is an Author?" Lodge, who is the editor, presents the French thinker as "one of the most powerful and influential figures in a remarkable galaxy of intellectual stars who shone in Paris in the 1960s and 70s."[44] Nevertheless, he does not share the "vision of a culture in which literature would circulate 'anonymously'" postulated at the end of the essay; on the contrary, he writes that "whether this vision (which has something in common with the conclusion to Derrida's essay 'Structure, Sign and Play' […]) offers an attractive

---

[42] *Loc. cit.*
[43] Roger Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

prospect is open to argument."[45]

Being both a creative writer and a literary critic, David Lodge takes a keen interest in contemporary literary theory. With regard to poststructuralism, he observes that "[t]he most influential figures [...]– Lacan, Derrida, Althusser, Foucault– were not literary critics by discipline" and that "although their theories have had a profound effect upon academic literary studies, it is not one which, at first glance, seems likely to inspire or encourage the writer who practices his art outside the academy."[46] Lodge criticises poststructuralism because "this discourse is so opaque and technical in its language that the first glance– baffled, angry, or derisive– is likely to be the last one."[47] He continues by stating that "[a]n unhappy consequence of recent developments has certainly been the loss of a common language of critical discourse which used to be shared between academic critics, practising writers, literary journalists and the educated common reader."[48] According to him, the cause for this negative change is the fact that "[c]ritics these days are too busy keeping up with each other's work."[49]

David Lodge disagrees with the theories developed by Roland Barthes and Paul de Man. He refers to two important topics which he considers to be treated in a most unsatisfactory manner by the two poststructuralists, "the idea of the author, and the relationship between fiction and reality, which have been central both to the practice of fiction writing and the reception and criticism of fiction in modern culture."[50] These two matters are tightly linked to the novel:

> The idea of the author as a uniquely constituted individual subject, the originator and in some sense owner of his work, is deeply implicated in the novel as a literary form and historically coincident with the rise of the novel; so is an emphasis on the mimetic function of verbal art, its ability to reflect or represent the world truthfully and in detail.[51]

The conception of the author as the origin of the text which he or she owns appeared

---

[44] David Lodge, "Michel Foucault", p. 196.
[45] *Loc. cit.*
[46] David Lodge, *After Bakhtin. Essays on Fiction and Criticism*, p. 14.
[47] *Loc. cit.*
[48] *Loc. cit.*
[49] *Loc. cit.*
[50] *Loc. cit.*
[51] *Loc. cit.*

simultaneously with the recognition of the novel as a literary form; the same is valid for the artistic mimesis.

Barthes challenges the traditional view according to which the author is "the past of his own book: book and author stand automatically on a single line divided into a *before* and an *after*." Lodge, on the contrary, adopts this traditional standpoint, stating that "[t]he Author is thought to *nourish* the book, which is to say that he exists before it, thinks, suffers, lives for it, is in the same relation of antecedence to his work as a father to his child."[52] Unlike him, Barthes "seeks to replace 'author' with the term 'scriptor,'"[53] who "is born simultaneously with the text, is in no way equipped with a being preceding or exceeding the writing, is not the subject of the book as predicate; there is no other time than that of the enunciation and every text is eternally written *here and now…*"[54] The British critic also criticises Paul de Man, who expresses his opinion on the mimetic function of literature in the essay "Criticism and Crisis" (1971)[55] where he announces the fiction's "separation from empirical reality."[56] De Man remarks that "[i]t is always against the explicit assertion of the writer that readers degrade the fiction by confusing it with a reality from which it has forever taken leave."[57] Lodge rejects both theories giving a vehement response:

> Now my first reaction as a novelist is to contest these remarks– to say to Barthes that I *do* feel a kind of parental responsibility for the novels I write, that the composition of them *is*, in an important sense, my past, that I do think, suffer, live for a book while it is in progress; and to say to de Man that my fiction has not 'for ever taken leave from reality' but is in some significant sense a representation of the real world, and that if my readers did not recognize in my novels some truths about the real behaviour of, say, academics or Roman Catholics, I should feel I had failed, and so would my readers.[58]

It is extremely important to note that this reaction comes from Lodge, the novelist, not the critic. As he knows what it is like to write fiction, he makes an analogy between the

---

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[53] *Ibid.*, p. 14.
[54] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[55] Cf. *loc. cit.*
[56] Quoted from *loc. cit.*
[57] Quoted from *loc. cit.*
[58] *Loc. cit.*

relationship writer-book and the parent-child one, implying that the author precedes the book which he or she creates. De Man's claim that literature does not have any mimetic function is also contradicted, for David Lodge considers his own novels to be realistic as they represent "truths" about real life. In fact, his special interest in contemporary theory and his resistance to its radical forms are due to his double role as novelist and critic. He himself admits that

> [p]erhaps this discontinuity between the most advanced and innovative discourse about literature and the production and reception of new writing matters more to someone like me, who has a foot in both worlds, than it does to writers who have no connection with the academic world and are free to ignore its abstruse debates, or to academics who take for granted that the high ground of aesthetics will always be accessible only to a small minority.[59]

Lodge believes that it is his special position– as critic and novelist– which makes him give a response to such radical theoretical trends. He remarks that these views can be more easily accepted by writers who are not preoccupied with literary criticism or by critics who have never written fiction. Then he writes that "[c]ertainly the way in which fiction is produced and circulated and received in our culture today is totally at odds with the assertions of Barthes and de Man" because "[t]he reception of new writing has in fact probably never been more obsessively author-centred than it is today, not only in reviewing, but in supplementary forms of exposure through the media– interviews and profiles in the press and on TV, prizes, public readings and book launches [...]."[60] As it will be shown, the modern advertising of fiction and, what is more important, of authors constitutes an important topic dealt with in his novels as well.

In the preface to his recent critical book *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays* (2002) David Lodge remembers that, looking for a "poetic of fiction," he "started, in a book called *Language of Fiction* (1966), by applying to novels the kind of close reading that the New Criticism had applied primarily to lyric poetry and poetic drama."[61] However, he did not remain indifferent to the new theories and, as a result, "[i]n the 1970s and 1980s, like many other English and American academic critics, [he]

---

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 14.
[60] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[61] David Lodge, *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays*, London: Secker & Warburg, 2002, p. ix.

absorbed and domesticated some of the concepts and methods of Continental European structuralism, applied them in *The Modes of Modern Writing* (1977) and *Working with Structuralism* (1981)."[62] Afterwards he "discovered the work of the great Russian theorist Mikhail Bakhtin, which went back to the 1920s but only became widely known in the recent past."[63] Lodge then explains that Bakhtin's "idea that the novel, unlike the classic genres of epic, lyric, and tragedy, was essentially dialogic or polyphonic in its verbal texture, and his subtle analysis of the various types of discourse that are woven into it, informed and inspired most of the essays in [his] book *After Bakhtin* (1990)."[64] He summarises these phases as follows:

> In short, my quest for a poetics of fiction was at every stage furthered by exposure to some new, or new-to-me, source of literary theory. But the journey ended with my discovery of Bakhtin, partly because he seemed to answer satisfactorily all the remaining questions I had posed myself; and partly because as literary theory entered its post-structuralist phase it seemed to be less interested in the formal analysis of literary texts, and more interested in using them as a basis for philosophical speculation and ideological polemic.[65]

David Lodge calls his interest in different theories a "quest for a poetics of fiction" which came to an end with his reading of Bakhtin's consideration of culture as dialogic.[66] Lodge presents his understanding of the Bakhtinian dialogism in his book *After Bakhtin. Essays on Fiction and Criticism* where he emphasises the idea that polyphony is specific for the novel:

> It was the destiny of the novel as a literary form to do justice to the inherent dialogism of language and culture by means of discursive polyphony, its subtle and complex interweaving of various types of speech (e.g. parody)– and its carnivalesque irreverence towards all kinds of authorian, repressive, monologic ideologies.[67]

The novel is by definition dialogic and carnivalesque, features which make it opposed to

---

[62] *Loc. cit.*

[63] *Ibid.*, pp. ix-x.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. x.

[65] *Loc. cit.*

[66] Cf. also Mikhail Bakhtin, "Heteroglossia in the Novel", in: David H. Richter, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-182.

[67] David Lodge, *After Bakhtin. Essays on Fiction and Criticism*, p. 21.

totalitarian ideologies. Lodge overtakes Bakhtin's interpretation of the dialogic as including "the relationship between the characters' discourses and the author's discourse (as represented in the text) and between all these discourses and other discourses outside the text, which are imitated or evoked or alluded to by means of doubly-oriented speech."[68] David Lodge draws attention to "Bakhtin's point that the variety of discourses in the novel prevents the novelist from imposing a single world-view upon his readers even if he wanted to."[69] The Russian theorist sees

> an indissoluble link [...] between the linguistic variety of prose fiction, which he called heteroglossia, and its cultural function as the continuous critique of all repressive, authoritarian, one-eyed ideologies. As soon as you allow a variety of discourses into a textual space– vulgar discourses as well as polite ones, vernacular as well as literary, oral as well as written– you establish a resistance [...] to the dominance of any one discourse.[70]

The main idea here is the fact that presenting a multiplicity of discourses and viewpoints in the novel means favouring none of them, or, in other words, freedom and variety. Language itself is regarded as "essentially social and *dialogic*."[71] According to Bakhtin,

> [p]rose literature [...] is dialogic or, in an alternative formulation, 'polyphonic'– an orchestration of diverse discourses culled both from writing and oral speech. 'The possibility of employing on the plane of a single work discourses of various types, with all their expressive capacities intact, without reducing them to a common denominator– this is one of the most fundamental characteristic features of prose.'[72]

Prose is necessarily dialogic or polyphonic, terms that are "virtually synonymous"[73] in this context. It is amazing how the novel, in spite of its unity, can make use of discourses which are so different. It is exactly this quality that attracts and interests David Lodge, the critic and the creative writer.

As far as the concept of the author is concerned, Lodge agrees that there should not be a single voice in a novel, but his position is still different from that of Foucault.

---

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 22.
[69] *Loc. cit.*
[70] Loc. cit.
[71] *Ibid.*, p. 57.
[72] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

To Lodge, the author is not the God of the novel, but he or she still preserves a voice although it gets mixed with those of the characters. The author's discourse enters a dialogue with the other discourses and the result is a polyphonic or dialogic novel, to use Bakhtin's terms.

Lodge tries to be moderate and does not exaggerate the role of the author in the interpretation of his work. On the contrary, he is aware that the reader is the destination of a text and, as a result, is significant as far as interpretation is concerned. Asking whether "writers are always the best critics of their own work" David Lodge answers that "[t]hey are far too involved to assess the value of their work, or to generalise about its meaning and significance."[74] However, this does not deny the fact that "the writer has an advantage over her [sic!] critics in explaining how a book came to be written, what its sources were, and why it took the form that it did."[75] Indeed Lodge enjoys giving such explanations, but he "would not claim that this is the most vital, the highest kind of criticism that [he] or anyone else could write" because he thinks "that sometimes works of literature mean more than their authors were conscious of."[76]

A further point to be made here is the fact that David Lodge's conception of the author is inevitably related to his interest in the "self" or, a term dear to him, "consciousness." This seems to be the main theme of the novel *Thinks...* (2001) and of the critical book *Consciousness and the novel*. Consequently, an examination of these two books will provide a detailed presentation of their author's view on this topic.

5.1.2.2.2. Thinking of consciousness

In the novel *Thinks...* Lodge proves to be very fond of the humanist idea of author maintaining this position in *Consciousness and the Novel*, too: "One must concede that the Western humanist concept of the autonomous individual self is not universal, eternally given, and valid for all time and all places, but is a product of history and

---

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 86.
[74] David Lodge, *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays*, p. 108.
[75] *Loc. cit.*
[76] Loc. cit.

culture. This doesn't, however, necessarily mean that it isn't a good idea, or that its time has passed. A great deal of what we value in civilized life depends upon it."[77] One can remark a trace of Eurocentrism in the defence of the Western concept of the self. Lodge proves once again to be situated between traditional ideas and modern concepts, finding in Bakhtin the middle way theory between the classical conception of the author and the radical destruction of the self by poststructuralist theory. This preoccupation with the self is the central theme of the novel *Thinks...*, which presents two main points of view: that of Ralph Messenger, representing the scientific discourse and that of Helen Reed, a novelist who believes in the humanist conception of consciousness.

5.1.2.2.1. Consciousness as artificial intelligence

Ralph Messenger, one of the main characters in *Thinks...*, stands for the scientific perspective on consciousness. As he tells Helen Reed, he was a philosopher who then studied Moral Sciences and completed a PhD in the domain of the Philosophy of Mind, after which he specialised in artificial intelligence. His present field is that of cognitive science, which he defines as "[t]he systematic study of the mind," a subject that has attracted the interest of a great number of scientists and that has the understanding of human consciousness as its highest target.[78]

    The novel *Thinks...* opens with an excellent piece of metafiction in which Ralph Messenger explains that he is recording his thoughts intending to analyse his stream of consciousness. The aim of the recording is clearly formulated: to represent thought in the most realistic way.[79] Ralph Messenger proves to be well acquainted with philosophical questions regarding consciousness: he makes references to William James's discussion of the stream of consciousness and to the Cartesian formulation of human essence. This shows the special interest Ralph Messenger has in the philosophical treatment of consciousness. He distinguishes between two kinds of thought, processing sense data and posing philosophical questions, but he emphasises

---

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 91.
[78] Cf. David Lodge, *Thinks...*, pp. 35-36.
[79] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 1.

the importance of brain activity.[80] At a later point in the novel, the scientist differentiates between other two types of consciousness, coming to the conclusion that, beside being self-conscious, there is another type of consciousness, too, namely when we are aware that other people are conscious that we are self-conscious.[81]

According to Ralph Messenger, human consciousness can be compared to a computer. The way humans think is analogous to the way a machine functions: their capacity of working is not always in use, but it can be used any time.[82] His ultimate aim is to create artificial intelligence and understanding human consciousness is a necessary phase in getting there. Thus, the first problem to be solved is that of rendering as well as understanding the stream of consciousness as this can lead to the possibility of creating artificial intelligence.[83] In any case, there is a long way to go because we know very little about consciousness, one difficulty arising from the fact that it is impossible to tell what other people really think.[84]

One of the problems with which cognitive scientists are confronted is that of "*qualia*" which refer to subjective experiences such as smell or taste. The first step towards artificial intelligence would be to prove that qualia are real and then to understand them. Cognitive scientists define the mind as a kind of complex computer, not as something immaterial. Starting from these assumptions, Ralph Messenger runs a centre in which post-graduate students try to build a machine that would think like human being.[85]

Realising that, in spite of his attempt to record his thoughts in the most accurate manner, the recordings fail to represent the exactitude of his consciousness, Ralph Messenger admits that his experiment is not possible to realise as speaking is slower than thinking.[86]

---

[80] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
[81] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 149.
[82] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 4.
[83] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 8.
[84] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 41-42.
[85] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 36-38.

5.1.2.2.2. The human(ist) self

A totally different position is that of the novelist Helen Reed, who is another main character of *Thinks....* She represents the humanist view on consciousness resembling David Lodge in several respects: they both have a Catholic education and background, are creative writers and reject not only scientific, but also philosophical theories discrediting the individual self. A thorough reading of this novel and of the critical book *Consciousness and the Novel* leads to the evident conclusion that Helen Reed's voice coincides with that of the author.

As far as Christianity is concerned, Foucault discovers a religious vein in traditional criticism, whose view on the author is similar to the evaluation and canonisation of texts by Christian exegetes.[87] In the case of David Lodge as well, one could argue that one of the reasons for which he rejects the poststructuralist perspective on the author is his Catholic religion. In this critical book Lodge proves to be aware that the humanist idea of self, derived from the Christian tradition, is questioned by scientists.[88] With regard to religion, Lodge thinks that the idea of "soul" does not necessarily imply literal faith in an afterlife. Although the concept of the autonomous self has its origin in Christianity, it is useful outside religion, too.[89] This is exactly the case of Helen Reed, who writes in her journal that although she does not practise her religion any longer, she does not regret being educated as a Catholic at all. Furthermore, she is also glad that her children went to a Catholic school as they got a very good moral sense as well as a good understanding of literature, which has been strongly influenced by Christian ideas.[90] In a conversation with Ralph Messenger, she expresses her wish to believe in a transcendental truth.[91] The woman novelist does not take the Catholic dogma for granted, but she states openly and clearly that she believes in the existence of souls. Ralph Messenger can accept the term 'soul,' but only as a synonym of 'self-consciousness,' which is devoid of its religious connotations of immortality. As Helen

---

[86] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 172.
[87] Cf. Michel Foucault, "What Is an Author?", p. 204.
[88] Cf. David Lodge, *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays*, p. 2.
[89] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 5.
[90] Cf. David Lodge, *Thinks...*, pp. 28-29.
[91] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 33.

Reed rejects his argumentation, the scientist tries to convince her that her opinions are culturally constructed.[92] In this statement, Ralph Messenger formulates, without realising, the Foucauldian idea that the self is a mere discursive product.

The woman novelist does not remain indifferent to the scientific arguments against religion. She admits to herself that Ralph Messenger could be right with his assumptions. Suddenly she views religion from a different perspective: religion can be interpreted as a story invented by humans when they became self-conscious, that is to say, it was the result of the fear of death acquired through consciousness. The longed for afterlife should compensate for the certainty of death, which would mean that religion appeared as a necessity because it makes consciousness endurable.[93]

Helen Reed sees another important role Christianity has in society: she is well aware that the belief in a soul modifies human behaviour as religion sustains a certain ethical code which is to be followed by individuals in order to gain an afterlife. For this reason, she sticks to the traditional self as soul:

> *'If there is no God, everything is permitted.,'* says one of the Karamazovs. Is that true? Then why don't we all kill, rob, rape, and deceive each other all the time? Enlightened self-interest, the materialists say– the recognition that we increase our personal chances of survival by accepting social constraints and sanctions. Civilization is based on repression, as Freud observed.[94]

This regulation of behaviour can be interpreted from a Foucauldian perspective by arguing that the religious discourse enjoys power in the Western society, inducing individuals an ethic sense, which is in reality self-interest. Nonetheless, to Helen's mind, it constitutes a necessity for the existence of civilization. And indeed, as David Lodge remarks, the traditional conception of the self has not disappeared form our language or literature yet.[95]

*Thinks…*contains a great number of references to religion; for instance, Ralph Messenger knows that even scientists like Charles Darwin or his collaborators, who subverted religion, could not completely cease to believe in a supernatural power. If his

---

[92] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 100-102.
[93] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 107-108.
[94] *Ibid.*, pp. 178-179.
[95] Cf. David Lodge, *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays*, p. 5.

associates found comfort in spiritualism, Darwin himself manifested his doubts about his theory by following the advice of non-qualified medicine men when being sick. Ralph Messenger realises that all of Darwin's psychosomatic illnesses were caused by his guilt at seeing the fatal impact his evolutionary theory had on religion. More importantly, the scientist whose researches revolutionised science and made Christianity seem an illusion, lost his faith in God not because of the theory he developed, but because of the sorrow generated by the death of his dear daughter.[96]

David Lodge states in *Consciousness & the Novel* that consciousness connects science and literature, but he also points out the fact that literary and scientific discourses differ from each other. The argumentation results in a definition of literature and a presentation of the reasons for its existence.[97] Finally, literature is favoured to science because it helps us far more to understand consciousness. Moreover, unlike the latter, which is characterised by repetition, the former has a unique character.[98] Since consciousness is equated with self-consciousness, the development of the human self is compared to the production of a story. Thus, human consciousness is not stable, but it changes all the time like a literary work-in-progress. According to Daniel Dennett, "telling stories" constitutes the essential trait of human beings and, consequently, literature in general and narration in particular gain a main importance in the study of consciousness.[99]

The biggest problem with which science is confronted is, as V.S. Ramachandran says, the "need to reconcile the first and third person accounts of the universe."[100] Interestingly, the novel can achieve this reconciliation:

> Both the classic novel and the modernist novel took on the challenge of telling a story from several points of view, representing the consciousness of more than one character, and doing so in what was basically a third-person narrative discourse, even if it might contain some elements in the form of interior

---

[96] Cf. David Lodge, *Thinks...*, pp. 58-59.
[97] David Lodge writes: "[…] literature is a record of human consciousness, the richest and most comprehensive we have. Lyric poetry is arguably man's most successful effort to describe qualia. The novel is arguably man's most successful effort to describe the experience of individual human beings moving through space and time." Cf. David Lodge, *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays*, p. 10.
[98] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
[99] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 14-15.
[100] Quoted from *ibid.*, p. 28.

monologue.[101]

The representation of subjective consciousness through the third person narrative is regarded as an intrinsic quality of the novel. This reminds of Bakhtin's consideration of the novel as essentially dialogic, a theory that goes hand in hand with the humanist concept of the self. The novel *Thinks...* conveys the same idea; thus Ralph Messenger states that the biggest problem in science is "[h]ow to give an objective, third-person account of a subjective, first-person phenomenon", to which Helen Reed replies the following: "Oh, but novelists have been doing that for the last two hundred years." After that, she recites a quotation taken from Henry James's *Wings of the Dove* and comments on it arguing that "it's all narrated in the third person, in precise, elegant, well-formed sentences. It's subjective *and* objective."[102]

David Lodge disagrees with Clifford Geertz, who attacks the concept of self propagated by the humanist discourse showing that Westerners usually take it for granted without questioning it. Seen from the perspective of another culture of the world, this self appears "peculiar." Lodge's answer to this is somehow Eurocentric: "Well, maybe it is; but how many of those cultures have produced great novels that were not formally derived from the Western literary tradition?"[103]

Helen Reed is totally surprised to learn that science takes so much interest in consciousness. She writes in her journal:

> Consciousness, after all, is what most novels, certainly mine, are *about*. […] The problem is how to *represent* it, especially in different selves from one's one. In that sense novels could be called thought experiments. You invent people, you put them in hypothetical situations, and decide how they will react.[104]

This metafictional, self-reflexive passage expresses the position David Lodge takes in the critical book on consciousness. Literature means representing consciousness first of all and the author of a text does have an important role in doing that. Helen Reed develops further these ideas:

---

[101] *Ibid.*, p. 81.
[102] Cf. David Lodge, *Thinks...*, pp. 42-43.
[103] Cf. David Lodge, *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays*, p. 89.
[104] David Lodge, *Thinks...*, pp. 61-62.

> The 'proof' of the experiment is if their behaviour seems interesting, plausible, revealing about human nature. Seems to whom? To 'the reader'– who is not Mr Cleverdick the reviewer, or Ms Sycophant the publicist, or your fond mother, or your jealous rival, but some kind of ideal reader, shrewd, intelligent, demanding but fair, whose persona you try to adopt as you read and re-read your own work in the process of composition. I sort of resent the idea of science poking its nose into this business, *my* business. Hasn't science already appropriated enough of reality? Must it lay claim to the intangible invisible essential self as well?[105]

The belief in the concept of author as the origin of a fictional world is clearly formulated here, but the reader's role is explained, too. In the process of reading the author has a split personality assuming the role of the reader as well in order to evaluate the text and improve it. Thus, schizophrenia becomes the mark of the author and, what is more important, his or her double quality is essential in the representation of consciousness. Helen Reed declares herself unhappy because science tries to extend its domain over consciousness, which, to her mind, belongs to her field. For this reason, she considers literature to be indispensable in society.

There is indeed a rivalry between science and literature as far as consciousness is concerned. Ralph Messenger will host the annual International Conference on Consciousness and asks Helen Reed to give the so-called 'Last Word' as they have. Hearing that it will be the first time that a fiction writer will do this, the novelist is really amazed and accepts to do it.

David Lodge remarks that the humanist point of view on consciousness is rejected by both science and poststructuralist theory.[106] Michel Foucault represents a leading figure in poststructuralist thinking by assuming that the individual is discursively constructed. David Lodge sees similarities between this view and the scientific definition of consciousness as brain activity. The critic and novelist agrees that "the individual self is not a fixed and stable entity, but is constantly being created and modified in consciousness through interactions with others and the world,"[107] but he objects to the idea that the self is merely a discursive construction as this would dismiss his quality as an author. He uses his statement that his "novels are the products of

---

[105] *Ibid.*, p. 62.
[106] Cf. David Lodge, *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays*, p. 89.

numerous revisions"[108] as an argument for the existence of both an autonomous self and an originating author.

Interestingly, poststructuralism is rejected by both Helen Reed, who retains a humanist view on the self, and Ralph Messenger, who stands for the scientific discourse. Attending Robyn Penrose's[109] presentation of a paper on the Subject, Helen Reed is horrified to learn that the Subject is "a Bad Thing" concluding that "[i]t was quite a dazzling discourse" with "a dry and barren message."[110] She realises that science and poststructuralism have something in common, namely the idea that there is no autonomous self. The former argues that "it's a fiction that we make up" while the latter views the self as being "made up for us by culture."[111] In a most curious way, in spite of these similarities, the scientific and the poststructuralist discourses reject each other, too. Ralph Messenger explains this reciprocal antipathy: the scientist cannot agree with the poststructuralist assumption that science is merely a discourse among other discourses. To his mind, science has a special status as it constitutes the only real knowledge, that is to say, it holds the truth or, better said, it is truth.[112] At the same time it is a quest for authority and thus the interdependence of these concepts, knowledge, truth, power, is once again exemplified. It is precisely this claim that poststructuralists and particularly Foucault attack by stating that there is no truth to be discovered because everything exists exclusively within discourse.

David Lodge's view on the humanist concept of self is largely presented in Helen Reed's 'Last Word' to the International Conference on Consciousness. She begins by expressing her amazement at scientists' interest in consciousness and then she acknowledges the importance of consciousness as it is the human trait *par excellence*. That explains the special interest different fields of knowledge take in it. The attempt to understand consciousness constitutes a quest for knowledge. Helen Reed declares herself unsatisfied with the absence of literature from the discussions of the conference. She

---

[107] *Ibid.*, p. 91.
[108] *Loc. cit.*
[109] Robyn Penrose is a young poststructuralist theorist presented as a main character in *Nice Work*. Her presence in *Thinks...* emphasises the intertextual quality of Lodge's novel. He often follows the lives and careers of his characters in further novels.
[110] David Lodge, *Thinks...*, p. 225.
[111] *Ibid.*, pp. 225-226.
[112] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 228-229.

continues her speech by reading and commenting the poem entitled 'The Garden' by the seventeenth century poet Andrew Marvell. The first stanza is described as useful in the discussion on consciousness as, in spite of being written in the first person, the experiences presented in it are typical of humans in general. Helen Reed then goes to the second stanza, in which the poet insists on the subjective quality of consciousness, namely on the idea that we are endowed with an impressive power of imagination. The woman novelist calls this "dualism," by which she means the ability of differentiating between the mind and the body. The third stanza of the poem shows that Marvell believed in dualism, which Helen Reed associates with the Cartesian philosophy. Although the distinction between the soul and the body derives from religion, it is known that nobody believes in it literally. However, the humanist concept of the self is essential in the Western culture and society because of the ethic sense it creates in individuals. Helen Reed argues that nowadays this view on the self is subverted by both scientists and poststructuralist thinkers.[113] Her position coincides with that of David Lodge:

> I want to hold on to the traditional idea of the autonomous individual self. A lot that we value in civilization seems to depend on it– law, for instance, and human rights– including copyright. Marvell wrote 'The Garden' before the concept of copyright existed, but the fact remains that nobody else could have written it, and nobody else will ever write it again– except in the trivial sense of copying it out word for word.[114]

This quotation reminds us of the ideas expressed in *Consciousness and the Novel*: the humanist self is indispensable in our civilization and literature proves its existence by its quality of uniqueness. The argumentation implies the existence of an author who is the origin of his or her text. Helen Reed closes her speech by referring to the "tragic dimension to consciousness," namely "madness, depression, guilt, and dread" or "the fear of death– and strangest of all, the fear of life."[115] She argues that there are people who decide to kill themselves because they cannot stand being conscious.[116] Her

---

[113] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 316-319.
[114] *Ibid.*, p. 319.
[115] *Loc. cit.*
[116] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 319-320.

conclusion that literature plays a vital role in understanding consciousness[117] voices David Lodge, who, under the present-day circumstances, feels the need to defend the function literature has in society: by giving glimpses of other people's consciousness, literature helps us to understand the Other as well as to establish harmonious interhuman relationships. Furthermore, human beings' need to tell, listen to or read stories[118] turns literature into something essential in ordering, structuring and making sense of the world.

In any case, it is clear that "[t]he difficulty of understanding the nature of literary creation is part of the larger problem of understanding the nature of consciousness."[119] The critic David Lodge cannot accept the dismissal of the individual self and of the author as origin of a text for two main reasons: on the one hand, being a creative writer prevents him from accepting the scientific and the poststructuralist discourses; on the other hand, like Helen Reed, he was brought up in a Catholic family and this makes him more fond of the humanist self. He acknowledges the fact that the religious equation of consciousness with the soul contradicts the scientific discourse.[120]

5.1.2.3. The author as origin of the text

One must note that many of David Lodge's novels have writers as characters; the insistence on their lives and especially on the effort required by the process of writing is one of his works' central themes, standing for Lodge's defence of humanism. His latest fictional book, (2004), is described on the cover of the Secker & Warburg edition as being "essentially a novel about authorship– about the obsessions, hopes, dreams, triumphs and disappointments of those who live by pen– with, at its centre, an exquisite characterization of one writer, rendered with remarkable empathy." This writer is Henry James and the experiences in the novel are mainly negative. Concerned with a few years of Henry James's life, *Author, Author* contains several descriptions of the energy

---

[117] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 320.
[118] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 83.
[119] David Lodge, *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays*, p. 110.
[120] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 112.

invested in writing a text; to give just a few examples, the reader learns that Henry James works "tremendously hard"[121] on *The Tragic Muse* or that buying Lamb House influences his imagination in a very positive way,[122] which leads to the success of *The Turn of the Screw*. Inspired by his friend George Du Maurier, who decides to write novels and dictates them to his wife Emma because of his poor sight, Henry James hires a secretary, a Scottish young man called MacAlpine. This has a great impact on his writing:

> He was aware that his sentences were becoming longer and more intricately wrought under this new regime [...]. He could form the sentences, order and rearrange the clauses, select the words, all in his mind, or as it were in the air, holding them there for contemplation before he uttered them; and later, with the transcript in his hand, he could dictate the passage again, adding and inserting new units of sense to thicken the richness of meaning.[123]

The beneficial influence of technological developments on the process of writing is evident in this excerpt. The accurate description of how the writer creates his texts goes hand in hand with the belief in the originating author. Henry James is especially preoccupied with his sentences, interest that reminds one of Gustave Flaubert's style. He becomes conscious himself of the similarity when he remembers the so-called "mania for sentences,"[124] implying the conscious hard work invested in writing literature, can be interpreted as a further proof for the idea that it is the author who creates the text. By pursuing literary success, Henry James proves to agree with the role of the author as acknowledged by Enlightenment. Moreover, he refuses to reciprocate Constance Fenimore Woolson's feelings in order to achieve his goal. He writes to his brother William James that in the case of a play the meaning of the word "authorship" becomes wider to include its production and, eventually, its reception. The fate of a story, no matter if it is a novel or a play, becomes the fate of its author.[125] Consequently, if it is successful, its author is celebrated whereas its failure means the author's fall. Therefore,

---

[121] David Lodge, *Author, Author*, London: Secker & Warburg, 2004, p. 99.
[122] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 346.
[123] *Ibid.*, p. 329.
[124] Henry James thinks of Gustave Flaubert, who has once told him what his mother wrote to him, namely "*Your mania for sentences has dried up your heart,*" believing that these words can also be applied to him and his literary style. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 211-212.

the resounding success of Du Maurier's *Trilby* brings him an overwhelming fame especially across the Atlantic. This can be viewed as another example of the acknowledgement of the author as the producer of a work. Moreover, Du Maurier tells Henry James about the great number of letters he receives and in which he is asked about the intended meaning of certain details.[126] Such questions show that the readers need the author's directions in interpreting a literary work, implying that it is the author who establishes the meaning.

Nevertheless, in the process of mediating *Trilby*, Du Maurier loses control of his story and is influenced by other interpretations himself. For instance, in a theatrical production, the name 'Svengali' is pronounced by an actor with a long 'a', which makes*Trilby*'s author say that he will soon pronounce it like this, too and that the story does no longer seem to be the one he himself wrote.[127] This course of events can be interpreted as an illustration of the poststructuralist assumption with which Roland Barthes' essay ends: "the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author."[128]

Still, Du Maurier continues being famous as the author of *Trilby*, but declares himself extremely unhappy about it.[129] Henry James is puzzled by the fact that Du Maurier's success causes him more sorrow than satisfaction.[130] In an article about his now dead friend, James develops this matter explaining that Du Maurier was so devastated by his fame that his life became unbearable. The conclusion Henry James draws is that *Trilby*'s enormous prestige brought about so much publicity for its author that it finally killed him with its penetrating power.[131]

The opposite case of a work of art, failure, generates the same pain to its author as the destructive celebrity mentioned above. It is Henry James who illustrates this tragic destiny in the novel *Author, Author*. After the immense energy and the long time he invested in writing, adapting and revising the play *Guy Domville* for the stage and after the long agonising weeks, days and hours before the first night, the author must face not

---

[125] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 121.
[126] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 287-288.
[127] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 321.
[128] Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author", p. 172.
[129] Cf. David Lodge, *Author, Author*, p. 288.
[130] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 336.

only the fiasco of the play, but also his public humiliation. Arriving at the theatre at the end of the performance, James is unaware of the negative reception and naturally very excited when hearing the audience call "Author! Author!" This makes him think that the play was well received[132] and, encouraged by Alexander, main actor and manager, he

> turned to face the audience… as he turned to face… as he turned…
>
> [As Henry James turned to face the audience, and prepared graciously to bow, a barrage of booing fell from 'the gods' on his defenceless head. *'Boo! Boo! Boo!'* […] He seemed paralysed, canted forward in the act of bowing […]. His mouth opened and closed once or twice, slowly and silently, like a fish in a bowl. *'Boo! Boo!'* His outraged friends and supporters responded with more vigorous applause and cries of *'Bravo!'* – which only provoked the booers to louder efforts.[…]][133]

This extraordinary scene is presented from different points of view, which, according to Henry James, the writer, are meant to be closer to truth than one single perspective. The excerpt above contains a part seen as by Henry James, the character, and one presented by an omniscient narrator. The square brackets mark the passage from one voice to another, a game in Bakhtinian manner. The humiliation of the author is intensified by his surprise and, ironically, by his friends' attempts to minimise it. The interesting point in this scene and the reason for its discussion in this chapter is that, despite the fact that *Guy Domville*, unlike a book, is a play mediated by its performance, it is the author and not the actors who is held responsible for its failure. Henry James is humiliated and booed whereas Alexander is asked to hold a speech, which succeeds in attracting applause and understanding.[134] In conclusion to this part, the reception of a work of art determines and shapes the perception of its author; this idea is used by David Lodge to exemplify his conviction that in our society the author is still viewed in a humanist fashion.

The novel *Thinks...* too strongly defends the concept of author as origin of a literary text. Helen Reed writes in her novel that self-exposure does not necessarily

---

[131] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 337-338.
[132] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 256.
[133] *Ibid.*, pp. 256-257.
[134] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 258-259.

mean that the text is autobiographical; rather, a text exposes its author's inner life. Therefore, reviews affect writers because they can say something about their persons.[135] The reference to the author's self-exposure is present in the novel *Author, Author* as well. Its statement that writing offers insights into the author's consciousness is an argument for the humanist view of the self.[136] The belief in the author as source of the text is also evident in Henry James's remark "Creation is always such an agonising effort, but revision is pure pleasure,"[137] meaning that he is the creator of his works.

As already said, Helen Reed teaches a course on creative writing at the fictive University of Gloucester. Reading from the work-in-progress handed in by one of her students, Sandra Pickering, Helen recognises in Alastair, the main character, her own character Sebastian in *The Eye of the Storm*, her latest novel. Confronted with the accusation of having unconsciously copied this character, the student answers that it is a cliché. This makes Helen Reed think seriously about her novel and about the process of writing in general. As the resemblance between the two characters cannot be of an intertextual nature, the only reasonable explanation in this case would be the assumption that both characters are stereotypes. This also seems hard to believe as the novelist actually described her real husband in her fictional character.[138] David Lodge decides to reject stereotypical characters; instead, he pleads for the realism of the novel. Thus, Helen Reed realises that Sandra Pickering also described Martin in her text and suspects her of having had an affair with him.[139] This bitter truth is proved by the student's personal file at university. Realism is therefore presented as the evidence for the author's role in the process of writing. However, a realistic representation of life does not mean simply copying it; the author of a novel also needs a lot of imagination to develop and change the details he or she takes from real life.[140]

In his novels David Lodge emphasises the private and emotional lives of the characters who are creative writers insisting on describing the process of writing itself. The fact that the novel *Author, Author* is the biography of a writer is a further argument

---

[135] Cf. David Lodge, *Thinks...*, p. 111.
[136] Cf. David Lodge, *Author, Author*, p. 63.
[137] *Ibid.*, p. 69.
[138] Cf. David Lodge, *Thinks...*, pp. 121-123.
[139] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 195.
[140] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 211.

for Lodge's conviction in the humanist idea of author. The novel focuses on the personal life of Henry James, seeking to explain the decisions he takes. For example, Henry James's decision against founding a family is based on his will to concentrate on his writing. His quest is to become an authority in literature; consequently, James perceives marriage as an impediment on his way. Nevertheless, he spends a lot of time with his friend George Du Maurier and the latter's family because he likes to experience what he has given up.[141] Henry James expresses his opinion on marriage in a conversation with his other close friend, the American Constance Fenimore Woolson, who is an unmarried writer herself. He writer argues that a marriage, be it happy or not, always prevents one from pursuing artistic ambitions. To his mind, the problem is the financial responsibility of a father, but he does not agree with a free love relationship either.[142]

Henry James's writings contain autobiographical traits: the opposition of marriage to art belongs to these features. For instance, he writes a short story entitled "The Middle Years" about a novelist willing to be successful and refusing to get married for this reason. The author himself becomes conscious of the striking similarity between him and his fictional hero.[143] A further and more important example in this respect is the ending of the play *Guy Domville*. Henry James wants his hero to sacrifice his love for a woman for the sake of his religious vocation, but the manager who wants to produce the play on the stage does not share the author's enthusiasm. Although he wants success, Henry James is not ready to renounce certain standards of value in his works. Nonetheless, his fierce determination to have an end without marriage is of autobiographical nature: he not only identifies himself with his main character, but also realises that he used his friend Constance Fenimore Woolson as a model for Mrs Peverel.[144] Therefore, the novel *Author, Author* emphasises, among others, the autobiographical side of literature. This is used by Lodge as a further argument for the humanist concept of author, whose role in the creation of a work is evident in the facts taken out of his or her own life.

The importance of autobiography in the interpretation of a literary work is

---

[141] Cf. David Lodge, *Author, Author*, pp. 54-55.
[142] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 155.
[143] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 167-169.
[144] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 176-177.

recognised by critics, too. Thus, they are extremely interested in searching for details of authors' private lives. This interest is felt like a pressure by creative writers, who try to keep certain things for themselves. In order to prevent speculations on the nature of his relationship with Constance Fenimore Woolson, Henry James tries by all means to keep it secret. That is why he asks her to burn all their correspondence explaining how disturbed authors are when other people violate their privacy by trying to find out as much as possible about their lives. This tendency is perceived as an American influence on the European culture and as a pure economic occupation meant to bring material profit.[145] Later in his life, after the death of Constance Fenimore Woolson, Henry James suffers a nervous beak-down and burns all his letters to prevent their posssible publication. Indeed, his nephew Harry is disappointed at the thought that he will not be able to publish the letters his uncle exchanged with numerous famous people.[146]

George Du Maurier's *Trilby* proves to be autobiographical to such a great extent that real people can identify themselves with the characters.[147] Furthermore, after Du Maurier's death Felix Moscheles publishes *In Bohemia with Du Maurier* in which he interprets *Trilby* in the light of their common experiences in Flanders and Germany by associating real people with the characters of the story.[148]

In conclusion, *Author, Author* alludes to the biographical and autobiographical nature of the novel on several levels. In the first place this novel is a biography of Henry James focusing on several crucial moments of his life; a second biographical layer can be distinguished in James's play *Guy Domville*, in which the author identifies himself with his protagonist. Likewise George Du Maurier admits that his novel too originates in his own life experiences. The technique of *mise en abîme* confers *Author, Author* a metafictional quality typical of postmodernism. Besides there is a further metafictional level, at which David Lodge arguably mirrors himself in his main character. Unlike Henry James, David Lodge has managed to receive large public acknowledgement by writing best-sellers; on the other hand, the latter resembles the former in one respect: he is not ready to give up certain aesthetic standards for the sake of sales. What is more

---

[145] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 87.
[146] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 363.
[147] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 293.
[148] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 331-334.

important is that David Lodge is to be identified with the author in general as he writes about the fears, desires, ambitions and frustrations any author has on his or her way.[149]

5.2. Literature as institution

The novels of David Lodge deal with the issue of literature as institution in a most conscious way. *Home Truths*, which was originally written as a theatre play and later turned into a novella, is representative for this topic. It discusses the consideration of art as commodity in our pragmatic society insisting on the affirmation of the author through interviews, reviews and various awards, which place certain texts in the canon by mediating them. Journalism plays here an essential role as it has the power to give reputation to authors and their works or to dismiss them. As Adrian Ludlow puts it, we live in "[a] world dominated by the media. The culture of gossip" or, in Samuel Sharp's words, "[t]he culture of envy […]."[150] This aspect of journalism is treated in *Author, Author*, too; for instance, the article Henry James writes on George Du Maurier focuses on the impact of publicity on the author of *Trilby*. In it journalism is described as being monstrous on the ground that it penetrates the personal life of the author against his will. This kind of publicity has its roots across the Atlantic and its spread in Europe stands for the American expansion. Interviewers are considered to be intruders that drive the author towards the edge of madness. It is also of importance to note that such journalism is associated with gossip, thus questioning the truth it claims to hold, just like in *Home Truths*.[151]

Home Truths* makes a lot of references to the fact that literature and art in general can be viewed as commodity. The novel *Author, Author* is relevant in this respect, too; on its very first page one reads that "the author is dying propped up in bed among starched sheets and plump pillows."[152] The reference to Henry James by calling him

---

[149] *Author, Author* is not the only novel in which David Lodge deals with the intense inner life of an author and the process of writing. This theme is exploited in several other novels too, for instance *Thinks…*, *Therapy*, *Small World*.

[150] David Lodge, *Home Truths*, London: Penguin Books, 2000 (1999), p. 15.

[151] Cf. David Lodge, *Author, Author*, p. 337.

[152] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

simply "the author" shows that this is seen as his profession. Indeed, later we learn that his financial situation relies on what is called his "authorial earnings."[153] Being regarded as a kind of commodity, literature becomes part of the economic life. This perspective goes hand in hand with the concept of author as the creator and possessor of a text. However, the policy of the best seller has serious consequences on the literary work.

5.2.1. Interviews circulating truths

David Lodge writes a few words about the interview as genre in his "Afterword" to *Home Truths*. He traces a short history of the interview and talks about its importance nowadays. Originally, the interview comes from the nineteenth century America, but meanwhile it has become both a mark of our culture and an essential means of promoting art. Having developed into a "more probing and more aggressive" conversation, the interview can turn not only the interviewee into a celebrity, but also the interviewer. David Lodge sees it as "a struggle, a transaction, a confession, a seduction."[154]

The main theme of the novella *Home Truths* can be formulated like this: "the interviewer is unknowingly being interviewed by the interviewee, who is risking his own jealously guarded privacy in the process."[155] After reading the malicious interview with him by Fanny Tarrant, the successful scriptwriter Sam Sharp decides to take revenge in a most interesting way with the help of his friend Adrian Ludlow, a retreated novelist, whom he asks to find out her weakness while being interviewed by her.[156] The scriptwriter proposes a reversal of the roles: the interviewer should be transformed into an interviewee. Sam Sharp's speech is very persuasive as he describes the interviewed artists as victims of a mean interviewer who, in reality, only wants to affirm herself.[157] As a result, Adrian Ludlow agrees to carry out this project, so at an appointed day he meets Fanny Tarrant for an interview at his house. The novelist's wife, Eleanor Ludlow,

---

[153] *Ibid.*, p. 95.
[154] Cf. David Lodge, "Afterword", in: David Lodge, *Home Truths*, pp. 138-139.
[155] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 139.
[156] Cf. David Lodge, *Home Truths*, pp.22-23.

goes deliberately away in order to avoid the journalist by all means.

Meeting the ambitious journalist Fanny Tarrant, Adrian Ludlow tells her that, according to a newspaper, Sir Robert Digby-Sisson cried after reading the interview she did with him. Her reply to this– "He wept while he was *giving* the interview."[158] – shows how truth is distorted in newspapers. Eleanor Ludlow's description of a journalist's work speaks for the destructive consequences it has on people. She despises Fanny Tarrant because the latter earns her money ruining people who trusted her.[159]

As the interview proceeds, Adrian Ludlow keeps asking his interviewer questions until Fanny Tarrant is irritated. The novelist proposes a natural dialogue instead of answering questions in an artificial manner whereas the journalist defends the interview arguing that it is a means of getting to the truth. At this point Adrian Ludlow questions the truth making references to Christianity.[160] The interview claims to hold the truth, but it proves to be far from reality as it presents a selected truth. Adrian Ludlow and Fanny Tarrant touch this topic, too. The journalist asserts that the interview represents reality, but after Adrian Ludlow goes into details arguing that she will not publish the interview exactly as it happens, she admits that it presents merely a selected truth or, in other words, an interpretation.[161] The idea of truth as being a selection of facts reminds of Michel Foucault's argument that what is considered to be the truth is neither true, nor false.[162] Adrian Ludlow continues the conversation by stating that the interview is a game, assumption rejected by Fanny Tarrant. The novelist regards the interview as a game because he is trying to interview the interviewer without her knowing. That is why he feels like in battle from which one of them will be the winner and the other the loser. On the contrary, Fanny Tarrant sees in the interview a deal: both parts will earn something.[163]

In spite of the different views the interview remains a means of mediating artists and its importance in society proves the public interest in the personal lives of authors. This interest shows that, on the one hand, the institution of journalism sustains the

---

[157] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 25-26.
[158] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 53.
[159] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 91.
[160] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 57.
[161] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 46-47.
[162] Cf. Michel Foucault, *Knowledge/ Power*, p.118.

humanist discourse on the concept of author as origin of a work, on the other hand, literature becomes comparable with any economic kind of production, a model in which creative writing appears as a profession whose main aim is to make as much money as possible. The Foucauldian relation between truth, power and knowledge is also evident: the interview transforms authors into celebrities, endowed with authority or power and this implies the fact that their works become part of the knowledge worth reading; at the same time, the interview has a claim to truth.

5.2.2. Reviews: portraits of the artist

Reviews evaluate works of art when they appear on the market, being so influential that they actually determine the sales. *Home Truths* makes references to this journalistic genre, too. Asked by Fanny Tarrant if reviews help a novelist in any way, Adrian Ludlow argues that they reveal more about the person who wrote them.[164] Thus, he denies the review the quality of giving an objective report on a work emphasising its interpretative aspect.

However, reviews have a lot of power: firstly, they determine the reception of a book in society; secondly, they have a great impact on the authors' lives. Eleanor Ludlow betrays her husband by revealing his well-kept secret to the journalist: the personal life of the author becomes a perpetual agony because of the reviews his books receive. Moreover, the family life is also shaken by these publications as his wife and even his children suffer because of the nervousness and anxiety caused by the new reviews. Adrian Ludlow is so affected that finally he gets depressed, which makes his wife give him an ultimatum, to chose between his family and his career, and he decides to give up writing fiction for the sake of a quiet life in a country cottage.[165]

Reviews play an essential role in the novel *Author, Author*, too. Theodora Bonsaquet, Henry James's secretary, is aware of the pain generated by negative

---

[163] Cf. David Lodge, *Home Truths*, p. 47.
[164] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 53.
[165] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 88-89.

reviews.[166] Furthermore, the book conveys the idea that the success of a theatre play depends mostly on its reviews. Therefore, Henry James's dream to 'conquer' the London stage with the performance of his play *The Americans* can come true only if the reviews are good or if the spectators in Southport are so enthusiastic that they advertise the play themselves.[167]

The London first night of Henry James's play *Guy Domville* ends with the public humiliation of the author. On the next day he cannot help himself reading the review in *The Times* and this only deepens his hurt feelings. If witnessing the failure of the first night did not discourage him altogether, the unfavourable review does.[168] Reading it, Henry James admits defeat and realises that his quest "to conquer the English stage"[169] is useless. Therefore, he decides to go back to writing fiction as his critics have never denied his talent at doing it. The impact this review has on him is almost destructive:

> He was overwhelmed by a feeling of total hopelessness, and for the first time in his life he felt the real seduction of the idea of suicide. He had always believed that consciousness was the supreme value, but what did it profit a man to be conscious if it was only of failure, humiliation, and regret?[170]

The bad reception of his play causes the author so much sufferance that he not only contemplates suicide, but also questions the value of consciousness. This quotation reminds us of Helen Reed's 'Last Word' to the conference presented in *Thinks...*; she also identifies a tragic side of consciousness, referring to the awareness of disturbing experiences and feelings. On the whole, the low spirits of Henry James caused by the negative reaction of the public at the first night of *Guy Domville* and deepened by the hostile reviews prove the extent to which an author is affected by the fate of his or her creation.

---

[166] Cf. David Lodge, *Author, Author*, p. 34.
[167] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 135.
[168] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 269.
[169] *Ibid.*, p. 108.
[170] *Ibid.*, p. 270.

5.2.3 Prizes and awards

Prizes and awards perform the same function as interviews and reviews, namely they contribute to the fame of authors playing an important role in the reception of their books on the market. In *Home Truths* Samuel Sharp is a well-known scriptwriter, proud of his "[t]hree BAFTAs, two Royal Television Society Awards, one Emmy, one Silver Nymph […] [f]rom the Monte Carlo TV Festival, […] [o]ne Golden Turd from Luxembourg.[…]."[171] All these awards have made him not only famous, but also rich.

Thinks… refers to the well-known Nobel Prize and discusses its significance for its winner. Ralph Messenger tries to imagine what it would be like when he won it:

> […] wonder what it's like, really like, to win a Nobel… the qualia of Nobelness… it must be like, what's the word for becoming a god… *apotheosis*, yes… suddenly you become invulnerable, immortal… […] and you don't have to struggle anymore while you live… any further achievement is a bonus, your cup overflowing… you have nothing to fear from others… you are above competition…[172]

The overwhelming power of the Nobel Prize is evident in this quotation: its winner is compared with a god, symbol of knowledge, power and truth, this interpretation alluding to Foucault's association of these three concepts. The Nobel Prize is regarded as the ultimate Holy Grail pursued by scientists (also by novelists) and thus the concepts of quest and conquest appear once again as sides of the same coin.

David Lodge's latest novel *Author, Author* also deals with the fame a prize can bring to its winner. At the end of December 1915 Mrs Alice James, the widow of William James, announces to Henry James's servants that Henry James will the Order of Merit As a servant asks what this means, Mrs James gives an explanation:

> 'I understand it's a very high honour, recommended by the Prime Minister to the King,' says Mrs James. At the word 'King' a little tremor of excitement passes through her audience. 'Something like a knighthood, but without the "Sir" attached.' […] 'Mr Gosse told me it is actually *more* distinguished than a knighthood, because only twenty-four people can hold the

---

171 David Lodge, *Home Truths*, p. 27.
172 David Lodge, *Thinks…*, p. 115.

Order of Merit at any one time.'[173]

The description of the Order makes it clear that the person who is awarded it is automatically endowed with fame and authority. The mention of the monarch's involvement produces a great impression on the servants. However, the fact that Henry James receives this honour attracts not only the admiration of the people working in his household, but also numerous congratulations from celebrities of the literary life.[174] Thus, receiving prizes has become an important means of mediating as well as establishing art and of entitling authors with fame.

5.2.4. The politics of the best-seller

This subchapter will focus on the work of art seen as pending between the politics of the best-seller and the pursuit of aesthetic value. David Lodge is a successful novelist whose books sell in great numbers and maintain a high aesthetic value as well. Being an artist and earning one's living through art is not as easy as it might seem; interviewed by Rüdiger Ahrens the novelist admits that he is perfectly aware of the impact economy has on his fiction:

> But something happens to a writer when you become technically a best-seller. You are very much aware of the huge amount of business that you constitute. You know, the huge operation involving investment by publishers and circulation through bookshops and all that comes into play. […] When you become a professional writer whose work sells in significant quantities then you feel you are a business operation as well as an artist and that is quite difficult to handle. You may feel challenged not to let your markets slip. At the same time you are trying to do new things artistically and there can be a certain tension there. So it is a sensitive area, I think. On the whole literary writers now are much more aware of their market and are much more anxious to reach a large public than they used to be 20, 30, 40, 50 years ago.[175]

---

[173] David Lodge, *Author, Author*, pp. 28-29.
[174] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 32.

David Lodge talks about the difficult task of reconciling two opposite poles, that of the best-seller and that of the artistic value. The tension coming out of the attempt to have it both ways becomes a burden for the contemporary writer.

The novella *Home Truths* raises this issue, too; for example, Samuel Sharp, who started his career as a playwright, has become so successful that he has received numerous offers from televisions and recently from Hollywood. His latest contract includes rewriting a film script about Florence Nightingale and brings him a lot of money.[176] The way Samuel Sharp puts it indicates that the materialist interest goes before that in the artistic value of his work. Consequently, he advises his novelist friend, Adrian Ludlow, to do the same.[177] However, the latter declares himself happy because his novel *The Hideaway* is included on the bibliography for the "A" levels, which is supposed to speak for its value.[178]

The journalist Fanny Tarrant interviews Sam Sharp and afterwards writes a negative portrait of him. Accused of having been unfair to Adrian Ludlow, she justifies herself by stating that her role is to show that success does not necessarily achievement. The young woman explains that Sam Sharp writes too fast, thus giving priority to the economic side of his art. She compares the writing process with a normal repeatable process of car production. The scriptwriter is so obsessed with producing as much as possible that he forgets to revise his work in order to check its aesthetic quality. However, the journalist believes that she can make him try harder and, as a result, improve his scripts.[179] Interestingly, Fanny Tarrant manages to achieve her aim: Sam Sharp does understand that his scripts are rather poor from an artistic point of view and consequently, takes the decision to spend more time writing.[180]

Sam Sharp's working for television is seen by Adrian Ludlow as a kind of Faustian pact. The two friends have always competed with each other and this is evident in a quarrel between them:

---

[175] Rüdiger Ahrens, "David Lodge, Birmingham, in Interview with Rüdiger Ahrens, Würzburg", in: Rüdiger Ahrens, ed., *Anglistik. Mitteilungen des Deutschen Anglistenverbandes, 10. Jahrgang, Heft 1, März 1999*, Heidelberg: C. Winter Verlag, 1999, p. 15.

[176] Cf. David Lodge, *Home Truths*, p. 28.

[177] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 34.

[178] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 49.

[179] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 71-72.

[180] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 107.

> 'You were a promising playwright once. You sold your soul to television for the sake of popular success.'
> 'I'd rather be a popular success than a high-minded failure. You're afraid I'll write a popular, successful novel now, aren't you?'[181]

Television is regarded as popular culture whereas the novel has kept its status as high culture. Turning writing into a kind of economic production is compared to a contract with the devil, that is to say, renouncing an immortal soul for the sake of temporary success and money.

The quest of attaining public acknowledgement and achieving artistic mastery simultaneously becomes a central theme in the novel *Author, Author*. Henry James tells his friend George Du Maurier in confidence that his greatest wish is to become "the Anglo-American Balzac."[182] Thus, in the early 1890s James's aspiration is to be considered one of the best writers of his generation and included in the literary canon.[183] Unlike certain modernist novelists such as Lawrence, Joyce or Virginia Woolf who do not write for the large public,[184] Henry James hopes to get fame and money with his books. Confident that he will succeed, James offers his share of the wealth inherited at his father's death to his sick sister Alice. His generosity is rooted in the belief in his golden future as a writer who will unify material earning with aesthetic value. As time goes by, he begins to realise that such a target might be impossible to attain. [185] However, he does not give up easily deciding to start a "campaign to conquer the English stage,"[186] but his career as a playwright is doomed to failure. The negative reception of *Guy Domville* and the author's humiliation on the first night constitute the worst moment of his artistic life. Interestingly, the author of the play considers it to be very well written and appealing because of the moral problems it raises. Yet the theme proves to be too serious for commercial purposes; especially the unhappy ending, Guy Domville's renunciation to love and his choice of following a religious vocation, is too

---

[181] *Ibid.*, p. 113.
[182] David Lodge, *Author, Author*, p. 49.
[183] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 94.
[184] Cf. Rüdiger Ahrens, "David Lodge, Birmingham, in Interview with Rüdiger Ahrens, Würzburg", p. 15.
[185] David Lodge, *Author, Author*, pp. 95-96.
[186] *Ibid.*, p.272.

grave to satisfy the taste of a large public.[187] Therefore, the politics of the best-seller either excludes too serious topics or implies their discussion in a comic manner.

The fact that David Lodge's novels are both popular with a large readership and highly valued among literary critics is due to his treatment of serious issues by using comic effects. Discussing his novels Wolfgang Weiß remarks that such themes are lightened under the form of parody, of which Lodge makes extensive use.[188] The entertaining side of a work is essential for its becoming a best-seller. The novelist convincingly argues that the comic treatment of moral principles is a typically English tradition.[189] David Lodge continues his argumentation by giving the example of adultery which appears in a serious manner in some of his novels whereas "in other, more carnivalesque novels, it is taken more lightly," but this implies "perhaps rather two-dimensional" characters.[190] This aspect can be seen as one of the consequences the awareness of writing a best-seller brings about.

David Lodge's hero in *Author, Author*, Henry James, pursues the same target, namely to achieve a best-seller by maintaining a high literary quality. Unlike his author, the character fails because he is not ready to give up any of his artistic standards. The novel focuses on the opposition between a best-seller and an established work of art.

Trying to define the best-seller, the *Prentice Hall Guide to English Literature* explains that "[a] transformation of the means of production in the early years of the 19th century made it possible for a single text to be printed, advertised, distributed and sold in numbers hitherto inconceivable."[191] It is through technological progress that the best-seller appeared in our culture. However, one should not ignore the consequences it had on literary texts as "[t]he financial return on this new mode of production was highly profitable, and a wide market for the commodity was opened up."[192] Nowadays, best-sellers are mediated by advertisements:

---

[187] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 175.

[188] Cf. Wolfgang Weiß, *op. cit.*, p. 85. Weiß, however, does not point to the relevance this technique has for the sales of Lodge's novels.

[189] Cf. Rüdiger Ahrens, "David Lodge, Birmingham, in Interview with Rüdiger Ahrens, Würzburg", p. 16.

[190] *Loc. cit.*

[191] Marion Wynne-Davies, *Prentice Hall Guide to English Literature*, New York: Prentice Hall, 1990, pp. 351-352.

[192] *Ibid.*, p. 352.

> In our own day the best-seller is associated not only with high sales, but also with quick ones. […] national newspapers carry weekly charts, showing the titles which are selling most strongly in fiction and non-fiction. This may be seen as a form of advertisement, encouraging further sales of what has been guaranteed as an acceptable product by market success. Writing a best-seller may make a large sum of money for the author and some make it clear […] that they gear their fiction with that intention.[193]

A book becomes an economic product that brings a lot of money to its author as well as to its publisher. The establishment of a best-seller is directly sustained by the media and this can be interpreted from a Foucauldian point of view: the best-seller is presented on the market as knowledge worth reading and this whole discourse is circulated through the institution of journalism, which thus proclaims its power in society.

Author, Author depicts Henry James's failure as opposed to Du Maurier's immense success with *Trilby*. Ironically, the latter has never intended to achieve such popularity while the former has always dreamed of fame. What is more interesting is that Du Maurier does not rejoice in his fortune at all. Although the book has caused what can be called a general frenzy in the Anglo-American world, which does indeed justify calling *Trilby* a best-seller, its author does neither understand this phenomenon nor enjoy it. In a private conversation with his close friend Henry James, Du Maurier proves to be so overwhelmed by the celebrity his book has brought to him that he sees something supernatural in the whole thing. He is totally aware that talented novelists like Thackeray or James do not have what he calls a "boom."[194] This implies the opposition between the best-seller and the literary canon, a reconciliation of both seeming impossible in *Author, Author*. Finally Henry James manages to accept the idea of never writing a best-seller because he is not willing to do any compromises regarding the quality of his works. Talking to the publisher Clarence McIlvaine about Du Maurier's last novel *The Martian*, James finds out that it resembles *Peter Ibbetson*, Du Maurier's first novel, more than *Trilby*. As the publisher is surprised to hear that James likes *Peter Ibbetson* more than *Trilby*, he argues that the latter was a best seller considering this a reason for liking it. Henry James uses then the opportunity of expressing his opinion on the concept of best-seller: according to him, the use of the word 'best-seller' implies that

---

[193] *Loc. cit.*

high sales stand for the quality of a book. Additionally, this is a grammatical mistake because, as a closer look at the meaning of the word shows, there can be only one best-seller in the world at a particular moment. Even in these terms *Trilby* is the best-seller *par excellence*; James mentions the American origin of this means of making money and the importance the media have in determining the sales of a book.[195]

Henry James's wish to have a "boom," as George Du Maurier calls his tremendous success, never fulfils for evident reasons: he stubbornly refuses to submit to the requirements of the best-seller. An insight into Alice James's thoughts reveals the fact that she is perfectly aware that her brother-in-law's style is too cryptic. This makes his works inaccessible to the larger reading public and evidently renders them impossible to become best-sellers. What the writer considers to be his progress as an artist means nothing but a regress to Alice. Her opinion is influenced by the jealousy Henry's Order of Merit causes. It is clear that there was a competition between the two brothers while William was still alive and that the latter's wife rejects the idea of Henry's being as influential on the literary scene as her husband in psychology and philosophy.[196] On the other hand, it must be stated that she internalises her gender role as her ambitions are related to her husband's achievements, not her own.

Henry James fails not only as a playwright, but also as a short-story writer. Although he considers *The Aspern Papers* to be nothing less than "first-class," he must face the fact that they do not sell successfully because people prefer reading novels. Thus, if an author intends to write a best-seller, he or she must necessarily comply to the requirements of the market. Advertisement is a further factor in determining the sales of a book.[197] This emphasises the power of the press– the main means of advertising– as it directs the reception of a literary work by establishing it as true knowledge. Here, one can again see an illustration of Foucault's discourse analysis, which links power, knowledge and truth and which implies discourses' circulation through institutions.

As the years pass by, Henry James becomes conscious that he will never have a 'boom.' Therefore, he accepts his situation and continues pursuing aesthetic perfection:

---

[194] Cf. David Lodge, *Author, Author*, p. 306.
[195] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 325-326.
[196] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 361.
[197] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 98-100.

He was resigned now to never being a really popular author, or producing a 'best seller', like poor Du Maurier. Something had happened in the culture of the English-speaking world in the last few decades, some huge seismic shift caused by a number of different converging forces– the spread and thinning of literacy, the levelling effect of democracy, the rampant energy of capitalism, the distortion of values by journalism and advertising– which made it impossible for a practitioner of the art of fiction to achieve both excellence and popularity, as Scott and Balzac, Dickens and George Eliot, had done in their prime. The best one could hope for was sufficient support from discriminating readers to carry on with the endless quest for artistic perfection.[198]

James is aware of the changes caused by the economic and political developments. One could say that the above description stands for what Foucault calls a shift from one episteme to another; thus, the amazing differences emphasise the discontinuities which are typical for history as Foucault states. Anyway, Henry James knows very well that he has to choose between becoming a popular creative writer, in which case he would focus on the entertaining side of his fiction, and achieving artistic value, which he hopes to be acknowledged by a less numerous group of readers, but who have benefited from a better education and consequently have sharper minds than the average person. He decides to follow the second goal and can thus be classified as a modernist writer whose fiction is not accessible to the large public.

Towards the end of the novel a first person narrator whose discourse is marked by italics and whose voice can be identified with that of the author David Lodge pays homage to Henry James, who, in the meanwhile, has become a classic writer. In order to show the changes that took place in the reception of James's fiction, the narrator imagines how he travels back in time to tell the writer that his stories and novels not only are appreciated by literary critics, but they have also succeeded in reaching a very large public. The fantasy becomes more and more vivid ending as follows: *"You only contributed one word to the English language,* [...] *but it's one to be proud of: 'Jamesian'."*[199] These words express David Lodge's sincere admiration of Henry James's fiction; in fact, the whole novel proves its author's deep interest in James's both literary creation and personal life.

---

[198] *Ibid.*, p. 348.

On the whole, David Lodge's novels are concerned with the institutionalisation of literature; in the modern Western society writers are aware of the economic aspect of their fiction, but this has effects on their works. The novelist's aim in treating this issue is to deliver further evidence for the humanist concept of author.

5.2.5. Class and classicism

In a book entitled *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*, Stalllybrass and White refer to Curtius's tracing the appearance of the concept of the 'classic author.' Interestingly, this phrase originates in ancient types of taxation. Curtius's book *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* shows that *classicus* was the opposite of *proletarius*. This distinction according to taxation stands for the intricate link existing between the idea of the author and social class; thus an author was necessarily part of an elitist group of society.[200] Nowadays this kind of evaluation of literature is no longer common as other criteria are used. At any rate, the novel *Author, Author* contains the suggestion that the reception of Henry James's fiction and theatre plays is quite negative due to class differences as well.

In a delirium shortly before his death, the author blames "the beast in the jungle" for his falling down his bed. Puzzled by this remark, the servant Minnie Kidd reports it to the author's secretary Theodora Bonsaquet. The latter explains that one of James's stories is entitled "The Beast in the Jungle."[201] This arouses Minnie's curiosity to such an extent that she is willing to read the story. Unfortunately her attempt proves to be a failure from the very first sentence:

> Can this really be the beginning of the story? She turns back a page to confirm that indeed it is. […] Minnie is used to stories where you are told at the outset who is who […] before the story proper gets going. This sentence seems as if it comes from the middle of something.[202]

---

[199] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 375-376.
[200] Cf. Peter Stallybrass and Allen White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*, London: Methuen, 1986, pp. 1-2.
[201] Cf. David Lodge, *Author, Author*, p. 11.
[202] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

The difference between the Jamesian story and the literature to which the servant is accustomed implies the difference between high and low culture. Whereas the former requires a certain degree of education on the part of the reader, the latter is highly readable as everything is explained in simple terms. The play of the narrator with the reader's imagination and patience, meant to rise interest in the story, is not enjoyed by Minnie at all. Rather she feels irritated, but not totally discouraged by the first sentence:

> She almost groans aloud at the frustrated effort to understand. […] She yawns and rubs her eyes and pinches herself to stay awake. Then she peeps at the end of the story to see if it is a happy one. It is not. […] That is enough for Minnie. She closes the book, blows out the candle and falls instantly asleep.[203]

The ironic description of Minnie's efforts to understand anything marks the class difference between the educated master and the poor servant. The omniscient narrator mocks her loss of interest in the story and her giving it up too soon; a further main idea in this excerpt is the importance of a happy ending for the large public. Joan Anderson, another servant working for Henry James admits that she too tried to read something written by her lord, but "couldn't make head nor tail of it," to which Burgess Noakes, also a servant, replies: "Well, they weren't written for the likes of us […]. Them books are Literature."[204] In a grammatically incorrect language, typical of the lower classes, Burgess observes that what Henry James writes is for high society and calls his works 'Literature,' the capital letter opposing it to low culture.

The same class difference seems to have caused the failure of James's play *Guy Domville*. The detailed description of the audience's behaviour contains exact specifications of the seats, implying the financial and social situations of the spectators. Thus, towards the end of the first act one can hear people in the gallery coughing,[205] but the noise is not disturbing yet. However, after the first act, there are some clear differences in the reception of the play, namely the spectators in the gallery, expecting a

---

[203] *Ibid.*, pp.20-21.

[204] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[205] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 243.

more complicated plot, do not find it as good as the ones in the stalls and lower boxes.[206] The division of the audience into the wealthier occupying the more expensive seats and the poorer–implicitly less educated– sitting in the gallery and the pit is more than evident. The differences between the two groups are deepened at the end of the play: the spectators having the cheapest seats behave impolitely and disrespectfully whereas the occupants of the better seats, the stall and the lower boxes, disapprove of the vulgar manner in which the former express their attitude towards the play.[207] The two separate groups have different conducts towards the author, too. Thus, when the performance has come to an end, the gallery starts calling "Author!" and is followed by Henry James's friends in the stalls.[208] Not knowing what awaits him, Henry James goes onto the stage and, instead of the 'boom' he expects, he encounters a humiliating 'Boo!'. At first he is baffled because he can hear boos from the gallery and applause from the stalls, a scene described by Arnold Bennett as "*A battle between the toughs and the toffs*!"[209] These terms emphasise the clash between the lower and upper classes of society. This conflict is explicitly formulated by George Bernard Shaw in a conversation with G. H. Wells: Shaw is aware of the discrepancy between the lower and the upper classes and how representatives of each behave, also suggesting the distinction between low and high culture. On account of the fact that James's play is neither a "crass melodrama" nor a "coarse farce" it is a fiasco, to which its unhappy ending further contributes.[210]

In conclusion; Henry James's failure to write a best-selling fiction book and to acquire a resounding popularity as a playwright is partially due to his belonging to high society. Having benefited from an excellent education mixed with various travels he pursues artistic perfection without taking into account a less educated readership. His fiction is therefore inaccessible to his servants and his play *Guy Domville* does not find any appreciation in the spectators who represent the lower classes of society. This again illustrates how the individual in general and the author in particular are constructed by the various discourses circulated in a specific culture.

---

[206] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 246.
[207] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 252-253.
[208] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 256.
[209] *Ibid.*, p. 257.

5.3. Postmodernist elements in David Lodge's novels

5.3.1. What is postmodernism?

After asking the question "What is it like to be postmodern?"[211] Simon Malpas writes that answering it constitutes an extremely difficult task. He continues by calling such a definition "all but impossible" and explains that it exactly the idea of a clarity that postmodernism subverts. When speaking of the postmodern, we refer to radical tendencies in contemporary theory and practice. However, there is a multitude of definitions of postmodernism;[212] if some relate it to the development of capitalism,[213] others hold a contrary opinion. In any case, Malpas associates it with "ideas of fracturing, fragmentation, indeterminacy and plurality, all of which are indeed key postmodern features."[214] Interestingly, there is a lot of fragmentation within the postmodern discourse itself.

Malpas detects the beginning of postmodernism in the 1950s and 1960s, but observes that the following three decades were marked by the omnipresence of the terms 'postmodernism' and 'postmodernity' on both sides of the Atlantic.[215] He then refers to the interactions between postmodernism and other theories and fields such as feminism,[216] postcolonialism[217] or philosophy. There follows a presentation of the definitions given by numerous critics of various orientations:

> As a means of thinking about the contemporary world, the postmodern has been
> defined in a huge variety of different ways: as a new aesthetic formation
> (Hassan, 1982, 1987), a condition (Lyotard, 1984; Harvey, 1990), a culture

---

[210] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 261.

[211] Simon Malpas, *ThePostmodern*, London and New York: Routledge, 2005, p. 1.

[212] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 3-5.

[213] Cf. Fredric Jameson, "Postmodernism and Consumer Society", in: E. Ann Kaplan, ed., *Postmodernism and Its Discontents. Theories, Practices*, London, New York: Verso, 1988, pp. 13-29.

[214] Simon Malpas, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[215] Cf. *loc. cit.*

[216] E. Ann Kaplan too sees similarities between postmodernism and feminism, namely "a search for a liberatory new position that would free us from the constraints and confines of oppressive binary oppositions." E. Ann Kaplan, "Introduction", in: E. Ann Kaplan, ed., *Postmodernism and Its Discontents. Theories, Practices*, p. 5.

[217] Ato Quayson too is interested in seeing postmodernism as close to postcolonialism. Cf. Ato Quayson, "Postcolonialism and Postmoderism", in: Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

(Connor, 1997), a cultural dominant (Jameson, 1991), a set of artistic movements employing a parodic mode of self-conscious representation (Hutcheon, 1988, 2002), an ethical or political imperative (Bauman, 1993, 1995), a period in which we have reached the 'end of history' (Baudrillard, 1994; Fukuyama, 1992; Vattimo, 1988), a 'new horizon of our cultural, philosophical and political experience' (Laclau, 1988), an 'illusion' (Eagleton, 1996), a reactionary political formation (Callinicos, 1989), or even just a rather unfortunate mistake (Norris, 1990, 1993).[218]

This impressive multiplicity of defining postmodernism stands for the difficulty of grasping the meaning of this complex cultural manifestation. In spite of this plurality of definition, the postmodern undoubtedly "evokes ideas of irony, disruption, difference, discontinuity, playfulness, parody, hyper-reality and simulation."[219] There are also critics who distinguish between 'postmodernism' and 'postmodernity', the former referring to a style and the latter to a period of time, but a clear separation between the two terms seems impossible to Malpas.[220]

Linda Hutcheon defines postmodernism as "a phenomenon whose mode is resolutely contradictory as well as unavoidably political."[221] That is to say that "it takes the form of self-conscious, self-contradictory, self-undermining statement" being thus characterised by "doubleness, or duplicity" and it "ultimately manages to install and reinforce as much as undermine and subvert the conventions and presuppositions it appears to challenge." A further point made by Hutcheon is the fact that postmodernism favours the 'cultural' at the cost of the 'natural'.[222]

In the next place the emphasis will fall on the ideas shared by postmodernism and poststructuralism. It is meanwhile common knowledge that "postmodernism has consistently acted to knock individual disciplines off centre."[223] Apart from that, postmodern thought also rejects the belief in an origin, in a transcendental truth adopting the so-called "death of God." The its affinity to poststructuralism lies in the fact that

---

[218] Simon Malpas, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.
[219] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[220] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 9.
[221] Linda Hutcheon, *The Politics of Postmodernism*, London and New York: Routledge, 1989, p. 1.
[222] *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.
[223] Steven Connor, "Introduction" in: Steven Connor, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism*, Cambridge: University Press, 2004, p. 17.

both of them challenge the humanist conception of knowledge, reality and the subject.[224] Robert Eaglestone also associates postmodernism with "openness," "otherness," "fracture" and an "opposition to totalizing systems".[225] In her hugely influential book *A Poetics of Postmodernism. History, Theory, Fiction* (1988) the Canadian Linda Hutcheon draws attention to the current interest in the "subject." Observing that this concept has been attacked by various critics and thinkers such as Derrida, Foucault or Lacan, she states that postmodernism also considers subjectivity to be problematic.[226] Paul Sheehan explicitly states that postmodernism is indistinguishable from poststructuralism;[227] what is more important is that he identifies Michel Foucault as the leading figure who proclaims the so-called "death of the subject." The Foucauldian discourse analysis denies the existence of the autonomous self thus influencing poststructuralist and postmodernist thinking.[228] Linda Hutcheon remarks in *The Politics of Postmodernism* (1989) that Umberto Eco too associates postmodernism Michel Foucault, arguing that power is not separable from ourselves.[229] To her mind, Foucault's discourse analysis constitutes one of the theories labelled as postmodernity.[230]

According to this understanding of postmodernism, namely as going hand in hand with poststructuralism, the novels of David Lodge are not postmodern at all. They do indeed contain allusions to poststructuralist theory, but these ideas are parodied and rejected. The novels are essentially humanist in content as it has been proved in the previous subchapters with the help of especially his latest novels, *Thinks...*(2001) and *Author, Author* (2004). David Lodge clings to humanist values as he considers them to be an important European cultural heritage. In spite of this, his novels are postmodern according to other definitions of postmodernism. For instance, if postmodernism is regarded as "a form of writing that signifies a revolution at the level of style,"[231] then

---

[224] Cf. Paul Sheehan, "Postmodernism and Philosophy" in: Steven Connor, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism*, pp. 20-21.

[225] Robert Eaglestone, "Postmodernism and ethics against the metaphysics of comprehension" in: Steven Connor, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism*, p. 182.

[226] Cf. Linda Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism. History, Theory, Fiction*, New York and London: Routledge, 1988, pp. 158-159.

[227] Cf. Paul Sheehan, *op.cit.*, p. 21.

[228] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 25-26.

[229] Cf. Linda Hutcheon, *The Politics of Postmodernism*, p. 3.

[230] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 24.

[231] Paul Sheehan, *op.cit.*, p. 22.

many of Lodge's novels[232] enter this classification because of the experimental techniques he uses. Ihab Hassan's theorising of postmodernism also enables the inclusion of these novels in this category.

Ihab Hassan is one of the main theoreticians of the postmodern and defines postmodernism as the opposite of modernism making a list of the characteristics of both. Some of the items given by him under the title postmodernism can be applied to David Lodge's novels. Thus, *Changing Places* can be viewed as an example of "Antiform (disjunctive, open)" due to its division into four sections- a third person discourse, a chapter made up of letters, a collage of newspaper articles and a final chapter under the form of a film script. "Play", "Anarchy" and "Dispersal" are evident in the carnivalesque nature of *Small World*, which presents a number of literary theories rejecting hierarchies. *The British Museum Is Falling down* contains parodies of a series of writers thus illustrating the idea of "Exhaustion/Silence". The relation "Text/Intertext" is omnipresent in Lodge's novels; in all of them there are references to other texts. A further feature of postmodernism, to Ihab Hassan's mind, is "Metonymy". David Lodge is also interested in the distinction between metaphor and metonymy both as a critic and as a novelist. In his book *The Modes of Modern Writing. Metaphor, Metonymy, and the Typology of Modern Literature* (1977) he theorises the pair metaphor/ metonymy with reference to literature, but the novel *Nice Work* deals with this topic, too. Lodge considers realism to be essentially metonymic;[233] from this point of view his novels are postmodern. "Schizophrenia," another characteristic of postmodernism, is evident in the author's double quality as literary critic and creative writer, instances which influence each other. The critic rejects the poststructuralist death of the subject because this would not recognise the role of the writer in the process of writing whereas the novels deal with theoretical issues extensively becoming highly metafictional. The numerous parodies in his fiction stand for a further feature of which Hassan speaks, namely "Irony."[234] Although Lodge's novels are traditional in content, these postmodern elements indicate

---

[232] Interestingly, it seems that "[l[iterary postmodernism has tended to be focused on one kind of writing, namely, narrative fiction." *Ibid.*, p.62.

[233] Cf. David Lodge, *The Modes of Modern Writing. Metaphor, Metonymy, and the Typology of Modern Literature*, London: Edward Arnold, 1977, p. 81.

[234] All the postmodern characteristics enumerated in this paragraph are taken from Ihab Hassan as quoted from Simon Malpas, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8.

that he is nonetheless influenced by the dominant discourses of his time. In the next section there follows a discussion of an extremely important postmodern element, namely parody; this will also help to show that David Lodge is a postmodern novelist.

5.3.2. Defining parody

David Lodge's extensive use of the parodic mode of writing makes it necessary to include a discussion of parody in general and of how it appears in his novels with special regard to its intertextual, metafictional and comic characteristics. His interest in parody proves the influence the postmodern discourse has on his fiction.

It is common knowledge that parody is not the invention of postmodernism and still it is typical of it. The postmodernist use of parody is different from the modernist one especially because "postmodernism's irony is one that rejects the resolving urge of modernism toward closure or at least distance."[235] It has been pointed out that "we always have to place parody within the specific cultural practices of particular social and discursive formations."[236] This statement alludes to the Foucauldian theory of discourse, which is to say, parody acquires new meanings in different epochs according to their dominant discourses. Parody has become essential in postmodernism: "[…] with the rise of what has been called 'postmodernist' literature and theory, parody has seen something of a revival in contemporary theory and artistic practice […]"[237] For this reason, David Lodge's parodic novels are an argument for classifying him a postmodernist novelist.

Linda Hutcheon's examination of parody points to the various definitions given to this technique, also exposing her view as far as the relation present–past is concerned. The Canadian critic disagrees with the assumption that parody denies the past by proclaiming the absolute domination of the present.[238] Instead, she considers it to have a double nature of installing and criticising the past; she states explicitly that "[t]o parody is not to destroy the past; in fact to parody is both to enshrine the past and to question it.

---

[235] Linda Hutcheon, *The Politics of Postmodernism*, p. 99.
[236] Simon Dentith, *Parody*, London and New York: Routledge, 2000, p. 187.
[237] Margaret A. Rose, *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-modern*, Cambridge: University Press, 1993, p. 1.

And this, once again, is the postmodern paradox."[239] This duplicity is repeated in a later book in which she writes that "postmodern parody does not disregard the context of the past representations it cites, but uses irony to acknowledge the fact that we are inevitably separated from that past today."[240] Additionally, she sees in parody an attack on humanism as it questions the belief in originality.[241] Hutcheon draws attention to the paradoxical character of postmodern parody:

> Intertextual parody of canonical American and European classics is one mode of appropriating and reformulating– with significant change– the dominant white, male, middle-class, heterosexual, European culture. It does not reject it, for it cannot. Postmodernism signals its dependence by its *use* of the canon, but reveals its rebellion through its ironic *abuse* of it.[242]

The terms "use" and "abuse" illustrate the paradoxical nature of parody as well as the complex relation it establishes between the past and the present.

In a book entitled *Parody* Simon Dentith too observes that postmodern novels– among which he quotes David Lodge's *The British Museum Is Falling Down* and *Small World*– "reus[e] specific cultural productions from the past in ways which, at the very least, indicate both some connection to, and some distance from, their predecessors."[243] It is important to add that Dentith associates parody with a quest for power as he writes that "[p]arody and the parodic forms more generally are inevitable manoeuvres in the to-and-fro of language, in the competition between genres, and in the unceasing struggle over meanings and values that make up any social order."[244] What is more interesting is his conception of parody as a "parasitic mode," which again emphasises the battle for power:

> The temptation is to see parody as a parasitic mode, necessarily coming after the host text which it imitates or feeds upon. There is an evident truth in this common-sense perception […]. But the force of this perception needs to be

---

[238] In that Linda Hutcheon contradicts Fredric Jameson.; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 93-94.
[239] Linda Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism. History, Theory, Fiction*, p. 126.
[240] Linda Hutcheon, *The Politics of Postmodernism*, p. 94.
[241] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 93.
[242] Linda Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism. History, Theory, Fiction*, p. 130.
[243] Simon Dentith, *op. cit.*, p. 164.
[244] *Ibid.*, p. 188.

tempered by two considerations […]. The first is that there is no unsullied point of origin, in which the hypotext existed without the contaminating presence of parody or the parodic forms […]. Second, the parodic paradox, by which parody creates new utterances out of the utterances that it seeks to mock, means that it preserves as much as it destroys […] and thus the parasite becomes the occasion for itself to act as host.[245]

This view on parody goes hand in hand with Foucault's discourse analysis: both stress the futility of a quest for origins, the endless process of discourses generating new discourses and the continual reversal of roles. The denial of any original hypotext is exemplified by David Lodge's *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, novel parodying, among others, James Joyce's *Ulysses*, which is, in its turn, a metafictional parody of Homer's *Odyssey*.[246] This also shows how a parasite can become a host and how discourses create new discourses; therefore the parasitic nature of parody does not necessarily exclude its creative function.[247]

The fact that any discourse is born out of other discourses is called in literary theory 'intertextuality.' Roland Barthes considers it to be "the impossibility of living outside the infinite text" [248] and Umberto Eco writes that "books always speak of other books, and every story tells a story that has already been told."[249] Intertextuality is then the text's very condition of existence and parody is necessarily a form of intertext. Frank Wünsch defines parody as essentially intertextual and comic:

> Eine Parodie bezieht sich immer auf eine Vorlage (ein Original, einen Bezugstext), die sie partiell wiederholt (imitiert, nachahmt, nachbildet), aber gleichzeitig auch variiert (verändert, adaptiert). Die Art der Variation ist grundsätzlich abweichend, unpassend, verzerrend, und verzerrt wird immer dergestalt, daß eine komische Wirkung entsteht, speziell eine komische Diskrepanz zwischen Original und Parodie bzw. Zwischen den wiederholenden und den variierenden Textpassagen oder -schichten innerhalb der Parodie. Die komische Wirkung richtet sich auch oder ausschließlich gegen das Original.[250]

---

[245] *Ibid.*, p. 189.
[246] Cf. Margaret A. Rose, *op. cit.*, p. 255.
[247] Roger Fowler, ed., *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms*, London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973, p. 137.
[248] Roland Barthes as quoted from Linda Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism. History, Theory, Fiction*, p. 128.
[249] Umberto Eco as quoted from *loc. cit.*

Parody means imitation, but also variation; intertextuality is included in it and the distortion it creates is comic, which directs it against the original. A short and concise definition would be: "**Eine Parodie ist ein Text, der einen anderen Text dergestalt verzerrend imitiert, daß eine gegen diese Vorlage gerichtete komische Wirkung entsteht.**"[251] That is to say, parody is a text which imitates another text in a distorted manner thus generating a comic effect. In addition, parody is intrinsically conscious and intentional.[252]

It is equally important for critics to mark clear borders between parody and other related forms, such as pastiche. Jameson, for instance, distinguishes between the two, arguing that the former "challenges and subverts that which it mimics" whereas the latter "is concerned only with the superficial appropriation of different modes and genres for the generation of its own performative style."[253] Pastiche is seen as "blank parody" or "parody that has lost its sense of humour."[254] Margaret A. Rose is also concerned with explaining the differences between the two terms. She acknowledges the often use of the term pastiche to talk about parody, but points out that although pastiche is close to parody, it lacks the critical and comic character of the latter. Therefore, pastiche refers to the imitation of another author's style without any ironic or critical intention.[255]

There is one more point to be made in this account of parody, namely the fact that it is metafictional. Hutcheon argues that "[p]arody can be used as a self-reflexive technique that points to art as art, but also to art as inescapably bound to its aesthetic and even social past."[256] Dentith too mentions self-reflexivity and parody when he explains metafiction to be:

> Fiction which has built into it a moment of self-reflection, or which alludes to its own, or others', fictional practice. Parodic novels which include parodies of other fictions tend to have a metafictional aspect, since they draw attention to the nature of story-telling in suggesting the inadequacy of the styles that they

---

[250] Frank Wünsch, *Die Parodie. Zu Definition und Typologie*, Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovac, 1999, p. 11.
[251] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[252] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 17.
[253] Simon Malpas, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
[254] Fredric Jameson as quoted from Catherine Constable, "Postmodernism and Film" in: Steven Connor, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism*, p. 48.
[255] Cf. Margaret A. Rose, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
[256] Linda Hutcheon, *The Politics of Postmodernism*, p. 101.

parody.[257]

This definition of metafiction can be exemplified with some of David Lodge's novels, whose parodic forms are indeed self-conscious and self-reflexive.

On the whole, it is important to keep in mind that to parody's characteristics belong ambivalence– seen in the relation between past and present and in the double process of reinforcing and criticising–, intertextuality, comic distortion and metafiction. Finally, postmodernist literature uses parodic forms extensively and this makes it possible to call David Lodge a postmodernist creative writer.

5.3.3. Metafiction as a comic device

Critics have manifested a particular interest in analysing parody in the novels *The British Museuem Is Falling Down*, *Changing Places* and *Small World* because it occupies an extensive place in them. Dentith considers the first to be an example of a novel which is comic and serious simultaneously and which uses parody simply for its sake.[258] Margaret A. Rose argues that like Umberto Eco and Malcolm Bradbury, David Lodge is regarded as a postmodernist writer also because of the double nature of his parody, namely comic and metafictional.[259] Rose remarks a change in the way Lodge uses parody: *The British Museum Is Falling Down* contains parody which is both comic and metafictional, but, like Joyce's *Ulysses*, it favours metafiction whereas in *Changing Places* and *Small World* the comic and the metafictional are equally important. In the case of *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, the emphasis on metafiction is seen as a 'pre-postmodern' feature while Lodge's other two novels mentioned above are labelled as postmodern since their parodies do not establish clear borders between the comic and the metafictional.[260]

In "An Afterword" to *The British Museum Is Falling Down* David Lodge himself draws attention to the fact that "each episode echo[es], through parody, pastiche and

---

[257] Simon Dentith, *op. cit.*, p. 192.
[258] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 165-166.
[259] Cf. Margaret A. Rose, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

allusion, the work of an established modern novelist."[261] He then explains the reasons for which he wrote the novel in this manner:

> No doubt the use of parody in this book was also, for me, a way of coping with what the American critic Harold Bloom has called 'Anxiety of Influence'– the sense every young writer must have of the daunting weight of the literary tradition he has inherited, the necessity and yet seeming impossibility of doing something in writing that has not been done before.[262]

Lodge admits that it was the pressure of the literature written so far[263] that led him to use parody at such an extent. The quest for achieving originality seems illusory to a young writer and parody appears as a way of imitating older models and simultaneously creating something new. The very title of the novel can be interpreted as standing for the apparent impossibility of being original: the British Museum represents the most valuable literature of the world; its falling down seems to symbolise, on the one hand, the enormous pressure felt by the overwhelmed novelist, on the other hand, the attack on classic writers, attack necessarily present in parody.

Aware of the difficult task the reader is confronted with, David Lodge enumerates the writers he parodies: "Joseph Conrad, Graham Greene, Ernest Hemingway, Henry James, Franz Kafka, D. H. Lawrence, Fr. Rolfe (Baron Corvo, author of *Hadrian VII*), C. P. Snow, and Virginia Woolf" adding the allusions to "William Golding's *Free Fall*, and to literary schools and subgenres: the Chesterbelloc style of essay writing," to "the post-Amis campus novel" and finally to "Malcolm Bradbury's *Eating People Is Wrong* (1959)."[264] Although his first two novels, *The Picturegoers* and *Ginger, You're Barmy*, are written in a realistic serious mode, working on the satirical revue *Between These Four Walls* together with Malcolm Bradbury and Jim Duckett makes Lodge detect in himself "a zest for satirical, farcical and parodic writing that [he] had not known [he] possessed," which meant a liberation "from the

---

[260] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 257-258.
[261] David Lodge, "An Afterword" in: David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, , p. 167.
[262] *Ibid.*, p. 168.
[263] John Barth too discusses this topic using the term "exhaustion" meaning "only the used-upness of certain forms or exhaustion of certain possibilities– by no means necessarily a cause of despair." Cf. John Barth, "The Literature of Exhaustion", in: Malcolm Bradbury, ed., *The Novel Today. Contemporary Writers on Modern Fiction*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977, p. 70.

restrictive decorums of the well-made, realistic novel."[265] Thus, he writes *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, a comic and, at the same time, experimental novel. He sees in comedy "a way of reconciling a contradiction […] between [his] critical admiration for the great modernist writers, and [his] creative practice, formed by the neo-realist, anti-modernist writing of the 1950s."[266]

The main intertextual source of the novel is Joyce's *Ulysses* as Lodge himself reveals: the action of the novel is reduced to one day and the narrative style differs from one chapter top the next. Furthermore, if most of the novel uses Adam Appleby as focalizer, at the end of it the perspective changes to offer an insight into Barbara Appleby's consciousness by means of an interior monologue hinting at the ending of *Ulysses*.[267] There is one significant change, namely the repetition of the word "yes" in Molly Bloom's monologue is replaced by another word,[268] which can be easily identified with "perhaps." The ending of *The British Museum Is Falling Down* consists of a stream of consciousness which unveils Barbara's feelings about her situation. Married to a PhD student who does not have a full-time job and already having three children, she recalls the dreams she and Adam had for their life together. She is bitterly conscious of the problems they must cope with and yet she does not lose any hope in a better future.[269] Barbara accepts her present situation, but the word "perhaps" shows the optimism she still possesses. On the other hand, this word describes the open ending of the novel: the reader only learns that Barbara is not pregnant again, but he or she does not receive any hint at whether the young couple will use artificial contraception to prevent further pregnancies or if Adam will finish his thesis and get a job which will enable him to provide his family sufficiently. In conclusion, the word "perhaps" expresses uncertainty and indeterminacy;[270] as Barbara's monologue reflects on the open ending of the novel itself, it constitutes a piece of metafiction, so typical of

---

[264] David Lodge, "An Afterword" in: David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, p. 168.
[265] *Ibid.*, p. 169.
[266] *Ibid.*, p. 170.
[267] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 171.
[268] David Lodge explains that "[f]or Molly's keyword, 'yes', [he] would substitute a more tentative word, as more appropriate to Barbara's character and the mingled notes of optimism and resignation on which [he] wanted to end the novel." Cf. *loc. cit.*
[269] CF. *ibid.*, p. 161.
[270] "Indeterminacy" is another characteristic of postmodernism in Ihab Hassan's view. Cf. Simon Malpas, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

postmodernism.

     Changing Places is another novel which has attracted the attention of many critics so far. Margaret A. Rose discusses it in order to illustrate the "comic meta-fictional parody in which parody gives new life to other literary works and devices by making them part of a 'meta-fictional' reflection on the author's own literary practice."[271] Her high appreciation of this novel is due to the fact that it is indeed complex as it uses parody, irony and satire, which give it a comic quality. In addition, the novel is metafictional and realistic at the same time as the two modes of writing do not exclude each other.[272] Rose's exemplification of parody in the novel is a passage taken from one of Hilary Swallow's letters to her husband. In this letter she talks about the book *Let's Write a Novel*, which Philip Swallow needs in order to teach a course on creative writing. Hilary remarks: "What a funny little book it is. There's a whole chapter on how to write an epistolary novel, but surely nobody's done that since the eighteenth century?"[273] Rose comments on this emphasising the parodic and comic nature of this allusion and highlighting the evident metafictional aspect.[274]

     Small World is perhaps the best example of David Lodge's talent as a postmodern novelist and especially as a parodist. This novel is particularly concerned with the quest for truth: on the one hand there is a metafictional level on which self-conscious characters try to find the most suitable theory of romance, on the other hand there are several theorists competing for the UNESCO Chair of Literary Criticism. All the literary theories are presented in a most comic manner which confers the book a clearly parodic aspect. The examination of *Small World* in this chapter will serve to prove Margaret A. Rose's idea that postmodern parody is both metafictional and comic. With regard to romance, some of the novel's characters show a keen interest in theorising this genre. One of them is the young Angelica Pabst, who is writing her doctoral dissertation on romance.[275] She admits that finding a theory of romance is not an easy task at all because, although she has already read romances by various writers ("Heliodorus and Apuleius, Chrétien de Troyes and Malory, Ariosto and Spencer, Keats

---

[271] Margaret A. Rose, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
[272] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 96.
[273] David Lodge, *Changing Places*, p. 130.
[274] Cf. Margaret A. Rose, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-96.

and Barbara Cartland"[276]), she has not been able to find an appropriate theory for all of them yet. The inclusion of Barbara Cartland– a writer belonging to popular culture– on the above list of classical writers ranging from Antiquity to Romanticism creates a strong comic effect. Thus, David Lodge uses once again parody as a means of subverting the literary canon. Equally comic is the moment when Cheryl Summerbee, a petty employee of the British Airways, describes the "Bills and Moon type of romance,"[277] which she usually reads, as "debased versions of the sentimental novel of courtship and marriage that started with Richardson's *Pamela*."[278] One is amused to read how a person who is by no means an expert in literary criticism comments on the commercial best-sellers explaining that the romance precedes the novel and that to its main elements belong adventurous events as well as the quest for the Holy Grail. Not only the literary canon is ridiculed, but also theoretical ideas as they are expressed by the young woman working at the airport. Cheryl Summerbee's discourse derides psychoanalysis too as she states that the libido is a further constitutive element of romances.[279]

Another interesting character which discusses romance is the retired Miss Sybil Maiden of Girton College, Cambridge. She is very well acquainted with Jessie Weston's *From Ritual to Romance*[280] and with T. S. Eliot's *Waste Land*, works to which *Small World* makes several references. Miss Maiden occurs as both a faithful disciple of Jessie Weston and as the stereotypical spinster who is obsessed with sex. Her interpretation of the quest motif according to a phallic theory obviously parodies T. S. Eliot's famous poem.[281] The old woman becomes even funnier when she applies Weston's theory of the Grail to *Puss in Boots*. She explains *Puss in Boots* as a Grail story in an exaggerated and most vulgar manner. At the same time her whole thinking seems to be directed to identifying phallic symbols of the Grail everywhere.[282] This phallogocentrism is finally adopted by Angelica Pabst, too, who claims to have found the so long looked for theory

---

[275] Cf. David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 10.
[276] *Ibid.*, p. 24.
[277] *Ibid.*, p. 258.
[278] *Loc. cit.*
[279] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 258-259.
[280] Cf. Jessie Weston, *From Ritual to Romance*, Garden City: Doubleday, 1957.
[281] Cf. David Lodge, *Small World*, pp. 11-12.
[282] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 36.

of romance. In the paper she delivers towards the end of the novel, she makes references to, apart from the Freudian phallic symbolism, two influential poststructuralist theoreticians, Jackes Derrida and Roland Barthes. First of all, her speech stresses the relation between knowledge and power, between the will to know and the possession of that knowledge, justifying the interpretation of the quest motif as conquest. Drawing on Derrida and Barthes, Angelica Pabst develops a theory of romance of her own: unlike epic and tragedy, which have only one (male) climax, romance consists of an endless quest associated with a multiple (female) orgasm.[283] In fact Angelica's lecture ridicules feminist approaches as it interprets genres as genders.[284]

Small World parodies not only the genre of romance and the attempts to define it, but also literary criticism in general. As nearly all the characters are teachers of English language and literature, their quest is one "for interpretation"[285] as the American Morris Zapp very well puts it. The last part of the novel gathers the literary critics together in the mega-conference organised by the Modern Language Association. The famous conference, held in New York, is the context in which the conferees whose greatest wish is to occupy the UNESCO Chair of Literary Criticism present their papers: Philip Swallow lectures on the function of criticism in a traditional tone being a promoter of liberal humanism; Michel Tardieu exposes his belief in structuralism; Siegfried von Turpitz claims that reception theory best explains a literary text; Fulvia Morgana adopts a Marxist position regarding literature as a specifically bourgeois phenomenon; and Morris Zapp holds a poststructuralist standpoint.[286] In the next place, it is necessary to remark that there is a significant difference between the narrator's attitude towards the first four theories and the last one: in the case of the former the ideas themselves are presented in a serious neutral fashion whereas their supporters are ridiculed; on the contrary, looking at the latter, one observes that not only Morris Zapp is mocked at, but also his poststructuralist approach. Thus, the traditional Philip Swallow participates in the conference not due to his merits, but because Rudyard Parkinson missed the plane

---

[283] Cf. i*bid.*, pp. 322-323.

[284] This mockery is taken to the extreme when "[s]omebody in the audience was asking Angelica if she would agree that the novel, as a distinct genre, was born when the epic, as it were, fucked the romance." (*Ibid.*, p. 323.) This remark uses gender stereotypes– the active male opposed to the passive female– in order to ironically suggest the birth of the novel.

[285] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

and the English Professor happens to be in New York at the time. In his private life Michel Tardieu appears as a possessive jealous homosexual who incessantly suspects his young partner of cheating on him. The German receptionist Siegfiried von Turpitz can be seen as a caricature; he is accused of plagiarising Persse McGarrigle, who finally proves that the fearful black glove hides no secret at all contradicting all the rumours about the activities performed by von Turpitz in World War II and about the heart attack his first wife died of when she saw his hand. Fulvia Morgana's image is equally negative: in spite of her Marxist convictions, the Italian attractive theorist's living standards are impressively high; moreover, she is presented as a fashion slave and as a nymphomaniac.

Since Morris Zapp and his critical orientation occupy a more extensive place in the novel, their discussion requires special attention. The controversial American chooses to apply a poststructuralist approach to   literature. Interestingly, his ideas are exposed not only at an early stage of the novel, but also in great detail. Starting as a critic confident that literary texts can be interpreted, Zapp used to describe himself as "*the* Jane Austen man" whose quest was one for the ultimate truth: he wanted to analyse her novels from all possible points of view and thus establish their true meaning.[287] He then admits that his project is impossible to carry out because language lacks a stable meaning.[288] Zapp expresses Derrida's deconstructionist ideas[289] especially in his slogan "*every decoding is another encoding*,"[290] which is interpreted by Margaret A. Rose as a comic parody of poststructuralism.[291] Claiming that "conversation is like playing tennis with a ball made of Krazy Putty that keeps coming back over the net in a different shape"[292] Morris Zapp expresses the impossibility of grasping the real meaning of

---

[286] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 316-318.
[287] Morris Zapp states that his goal "was to be utterly exhaustive, to examine the novels [of Jane Austen] from every conceivable angle– historical, biographical, rhetorical, mythical, structural, Freudian, Jungian, Marxist, existentialist, Christian, allegorical, ethical, phenomenological, archetypal, you name it. So that when each commentary was written, there would be *nothing further to say* about the novel in question." Cf. *ibid.*, p. 24.
[288] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 25.
[289] Cf. Jacques Derrida, "Structure, sign and play in the discourse of the human sciences" in: David Lodge, Ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, pp. 108-123.
[290] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 25.
[291] Cf. Margaret A. Rose, *op. cit.*, p. 124.
[292] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 25; this is a parody of Derrida's ideas on the play of the signifier (cf. Jacques Derrida, *op. cit.*, p. 109 ff.).

language. Soon he turns his attention to the reading process, which he describes as follows: "a flirtation without consummation, or if there is consummation, it is solitary, masturbatory. […] The reader plays with himself as the text plays upon his curiosity, desire, as a striptease dancer plays upon her audience's curiosity and desire."[293] This model is essentially patriarchal as it engenders the general reader as male and presents the stripper as necessarily female. On the other hand, it anticipates Zapp's consideration of textuality as sexuality, the reading process being compared with a striptease show. The reader is seen as the spectator who suffers from the Oedipus complex and whose ultimate aim is consequently the possession of the mother's vagina:

> The dancer teases the audience, as the text teases its readers, with the promise of an ultimate revelation that is infinitely postponed. Veil after veil, garment after garment, is removed, but it is the *delay* in the stripping that makes it exciting. […] The vagina remains hidden within the girl's body, […] [at this point several ladies in the audience noisily departed] […] Staring into that orifice we find that we have somehow overshot the goal of our quest, gone beyond pleasure in contemplated beauty; gazing into the womb we are returned to the mystery of our own origins. Just so in reading. […] Freud said the obsessive reading […] is the displaced expression of a desire to see the mother's genitals [here a young man in the audience fainted and was carried out] […]To read is to surrender oneself to an endless displacement of curiosity and desire from one sentence to another, from one level of a text to another.[294]

Morris Zapp's radical position totally excludes the author as the emphasis falls exclusively on the relation between the reader and the text. The idea that the text does not have any established meaning to be discovered reminds us of Michel Foucault's consideration of knowledge as discursively constructed while the quest for the possession of meaning indicates the pursuit of truth as well as power. This exposé makes a lot of references to Jacques Derrida's concept of deferral of meaning[295] present in Zapp's terms "delay" and "displacement," to Roland Barthes's *Pleasure of the Text* by considering the reading process comparable to sexual pleasure[296] and to Sigmund

[293] David Lodge, *Small World*, p. 26.
[294] *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27.
[295] Cf. Jacques Derrida, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-123.
[296] Cf. Roland Barthes, "Le Plaisir du texte" in: Roland Barthes, *Oevres complètes, Tome II, 1966-1973*, ed. by Éric Marty, Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1994, pp. 1493-1529, p. 1499.

Freud's elaboration of the Oedipus complex.[297] On account of the comic effects derived not only from the exaggerated and partially vulgar manner of presentation, but also from the shocked reaction of the audience culminating with the breakdown of a young man it is justifiable to regard Morris Zapp's lecture as highly parodic of both psychoanalysis and, what is more important, of poststructuralism.

Nice Work is another novel in which David Lodge ridicules poststructuralist ideas thus demonstrating his strong rejection of such theories and his attachment to humanism. The representative of poststructuralism in this book is Robyn Penrose, who is introduced as a character who refuses to believe in the idea of character. Robyn Penrose's orientation is not only Marxist– she regards literature as an economic product– but also poststructuralist– she rejects the concept of the self considering it a mere illusion.[298] The ironic tone in which the young lecturer is presented expresses Lodge's antipathy of this character. The narrator continues by exposing Robyn's anti-humanist ideas without conviction:

> Why the classic novel should have collaborated with the spirit of capitalism is perfectly obvious to Robyn. Both are expressions of a secularized Protestant ethic, both dependent on the idea of an autonomous individual self who is responsible for and in control of his/her own destiny, seeking happiness and fortune in competition with other autonomous selves.[299]

This passage is marked by irony, which stands for the narrator's doubts regarding both Marxism and the poststructuralist denial of the existence of the subject. Furthermore, the use of "he/she" to refer to people in general recommended by feminists is equally parodied as David Lodge usually employs the masculine personal pronoun to talk about both sexes. However, parody is taken to its extreme in the following fragment:

> According to Robyn (or, more precisely, according to the writers who have influenced her thinking on these matters), there is no such thing as the 'self' […]; there is only a subject position in an infinite web of discourses– the discourses of power, sex, family, science, religion, poetry, etc. And by the same

[297] Cf. Sigmund Freud, *Darstellung der Psychoanalyse*, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1969, p. 170.
[298] Cf. David Lodge, *Nice Work*, p. 39.
[299] *Loc. cit.*

token, there is no such thing as an author, that is to say, one who originates a work of fiction *ab nihilo*. Every text is a product of intertextuality, a tissue of allusions to and citations of other texts; and, in the famous words of Jacques Derrida (famous to people like Robyn, anyway) , '*il n'y a pas de hors-texte*', there is nothing outside the text. […] It might seem a bit bleak, a bit inhuman ('antihumanist, yes; inhuman, no,' she would interject), somewhat deterministic ('not at all; the truly determined subject is he who is not aware of the discursive formations that determine him. Or her,' she would add scrupulously, being among other things a feminist) […].[300]

There are clear references to Foucault's discourse analysis here: the idea that the individual's identity is formed by a great number of dominant discourses; the presence of the concept of power; the futility of the quest for origins; the disposal of the self and implicitly of the author. Concurrently, the text alludes to Derrida's assumption that the only reality to which human beings have access is textuality. Robyn Penrose's feminist principles become explicit in her refusal to let woman continue being invisible in language. The intrusive narrator continues to mock at this character by saying that, in spite of adopting these ideas, she appears to lead a perfectly normal private life. Therefore, one can state that *Nice Work* constitutes an attack on poststructuralism, Marxism and feminism by means of typically postmodern parody, which, it must be repeated, is both comic and metafictional.

However, David Lodge does not forget the character of Robyn Penrose at the end of *Nice Work*; he not only follows her destiny in his more recent novel *Thinks…*, but also gives her a voice in it. A lecture on the concept of the subject delivered by her has already been discussed in a previous section of the chapter on literary discourse. It must be added that Helen Reed's summary of Robyn Penrose's paper ("As far as I could follow it the general argument was that the Subject […] is a Bad Thing […]."[301]) constitutes a further parody of poststructuralism.

Apart from this, *Thinks…* contains remarkable pieces of parody of a number of important writers. The most obvious of them appear under the form of essays on the theme "What is it like to be a bat?" handed in by Helen Reed's students in her course on creative writing. One can recognise the authors alluded to as their names are easily

[300] *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.
[301] David Lodge, *Thinks…*, p. 225.

readable even if spelt without vowels.

The first essay, entitled *What is it Like to be a Freetail Bat?*, parodies Martin Amis:

> We hang out in caves, crevices, under eaves, inside roofs, anywhere that's dark and warm. Caves are favourite. We hang from the ceiling and crap on the floor, only it seems like we're hanging from the floor and crapping on the ceiling because we're upside down. […] The crap generates heat as it decomposes; also, of course, a smell. […]
>> The women are only interested in one thing: your sperm. […]
>> I wouldn't mind if the women looked after the newborn kids properly.[302]

This excerpt brilliantly illustrates Martin Amis's style which is regarded to make use of black humour, sordid absurdity and misogyny, defined by the novelist himself as satire.[303]

The next composition imitates Irvine Welsh's unmistakable style:

> We goat back to the auld cave aboot the same time, Gamps n me, jist is the sun wis rizin. Scotty wis back already, hangin from the ceiling feelin sorry for hisself. Ah hud goat ma fix from one ay they Highland bullocks that feel like shagpile rugs on legs, n Gamps hud foond a sheep wi its throat torn oot by a fox, the jammy cunt, but Scotty hud goat fuckall.[304]

As one can notice, the language of this essay is the Scottish vernacular of which, according to Lars Heiler, Welsh is a master. For this reason his novels are considered to have a strong regional and social authenticity; thus, the three bats speak as if they belonged to the class of young drug addicts populating Welsh's fiction.[305]

The Indian writer Salmon Rushdie is equally referred to in another essay on the topic *What is it Like to be a Bat?*:

> What kind of question is that, sir? With all due respect, what would you say if I asked *you*, 'What is it like to be a man?' You would undoubtedly reply, 'It all

---

[302] *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91.
[303] Cf. Marion Wynne-Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 308.
[304] David Lodge, *Thinks...*, p. 91.
[305] Cf. Lars Heiler, *Regression und Kulturkritik im britischen Gegenwartsroman. Kulturwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zu Romanen von Ian McEwan, Jim Crace, Irvine Welsh und Will Self*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2004, p. 145.

depends on what kind of man.' What race, what colour, what class, what caste, what situation in life?[306]

This comic fragment shows Rushdie's interest in "question[ing] the relation of history to fiction" as well as his "resistance to the unitary nature of Imperialist ideology and political control."[307] The subversion of Eurocentrism is evident in the rejection of theories which claim to be universally valid by enumerating multiple differences between various groups. The parodic element lies in the ironic tone of presentation and in the comic effects generated by the characterisation of the groups of bats.

Samuel Beckett's conveyance of a feeling of isolation appears in *What is it Like to be a Blind Bat?*:

> Where? When? Why? Squeak. I am in the dark. I am always in the dark. It was not always so. Once there were periods of light, or shades of darkness. […] All I know, if know is the word, and it is not, is that I can see nothing. I can feel, here, smell, but not see. Squeak.[308]

The reader is immediately reminded of the Beckett's "view of life's absurdity" seen as "both bleak and grotesquely comic."[309] Blindness and darkness along with the series of questions asked in the beginning stand for the total confusion of the narrator unable to understand anything of what is happening around.

These are not the only writers parodied in *Thinks…*; in a conversation with David Lodge, Craig Raine, editor of the magazine *Areté*, mentions Gertrude Stein and Henry James, too.[310] The former's style is imitated in an essay about Mary, a girl who is confined to a monochrome world and who, finally shown a red rose, should help scientists explain the sensation of colour.[311] Seeing for the first time in her life a colour, Mary refuses to name it saying "A rose is a rose is a rose is a rose.'[312] As far as Henry James is concerned, he is parodied all along the novel. The ending of another story about

---

[306] David Lodge, *Thinks…*, p. 93.
[307] Marion Wynne-Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 867.
[308] David Lodge, *Thinks…*, p. 95.
[309] Marion Wynne-Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 346.
[310] Cf. David Lodge, *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays*, p. 283.
[311] The question how the red colour of a rose is perceived by humans constitutes an important issue in modern science. Cf. Manon Baukhafe, "Die 7 Rätsel des Bewusstseins. Wie entstehen unsere Gedanken und Gefühle?", in: *P. M. Welt des Wissens*, November, 2005, p. 13.

Mary is undoubtedly a replica to the ending of *The Turn of the Screw*. The intensity of the red colour of the rose is so overwhelming that it kills Mary,[313] which reminds us of the final scene in James's novella when Miles dies in the arms of his governess after being confronted by her. Besides, Craig Raine cleverly observes that Helen Reed's choice of words strongly alludes to Henry James's pompous style.[314] Furthermore, the editor is aware of the function these parodies have in the novel, namely to create "polyphony– a prose carnival" as they "do a great deal for the dynamic of the book– lend it orchestral colour."[315]

As already stated, parody is also metafictional and David Lodge proves to be highly aware of this. Thus, when Craig Raine remarks that Helen Reed considers stream of consciousness to be old-fashioned,[316] David Lodge replies:

> I'm a metafictional novelist, I suppose, because I was a teacher of fiction and therefore a very self-conscious novelist. I think it is generally true of the present literary period. We're all very conscious of what we are doing. So if you want to write a realistic novel, you have to signal to the audience that you're operating a convention. But, basically, it's because I was involved in teaching and analysing fiction formally for so long. That's why my work is riddled with this sort of allusion and joke.[317]

This most interesting confession serves to summarise the subchapter on postmodernism in general as well as on parody in particular. David Lodge is conscious of the influence the postmodern discourse has on him as a novelist: his fiction is marked by metafiction, which can either be serious or take the form of comic parody. At the same time the

---

[312] David Lodge, *Thinks…*, p. 161.

[313] "She stared, and her face was deathly pale. […] Her own eyes had been drawn to a brighter spot of colour on the lapel of his [Professor Hubert Dearing's] jacket, where a red rosebud, plucked from his garden that morning, and framed by a green leaf or two, was pinned to his buttonhole. […] 'This is–' he began. But before he could say more she had collapsed at his feet.

'Mary!' he exclaimed in horror. He knelt swiftly beside her, her pulse, ripped apart the bodice of her dress, loosened the tight lacing of her corset, and pressed his ear to her breast. But to no avail. The redness of the rosebud had penetrated her brain like an arrow, and her fragile heart, overcharged by the intensity of the sensation, had stopped." (*Ibid.*, p. 157.)

[314] Craig Raine states that Helen Reed "has a slightly overwrought style– she talks about 'repasts,' not about meals," adding that "[w]hen you read 'it was dark outside…'; 'sought to mitigate,' you think, 'here is a woman who is still under the influence of Henry James.'" Cf. David Lodge, *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays*, p. 286.

[315] *Ibid.*, pp. 286-287.

[316] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 295-296.

[317] *Ibid.*, p. 296.

novelist admits that the metafictional quality of his works is the result of the critic's concerns within the academy.

To sum up, the chapter on literary discourse started from the concept of author, intricately linked with the self or subject, giving two contrary views on it. First, it was stated that, according to poststructuralist thought, the author is not the originator of a literary text because he or she is merely a product of language, in Roland Barthes's opinion, or of various discourses, to Michel Foucault's mind. These assumptions are strongly contradicted by David Lodge, who both in his critical books and in his fiction adopts a humanist position which goes hand in hand with the Bakhtinian dialogism of the novel. It was argued that Lodge's rejection of the poststructuralist disappearance of the subject is due to, on the one hand, his religious education, on the other hand, his being both a literary critic and a novelist. His humanist orientation is visible in his novels, which not only comment on this topic self-consciously, but also contain characters who are creative writers. Thus, the insistence on the description of authors' lives and, more importantly, of the writing process emphasises Lodge's belief in humanism. The examination of literature as institution– referring to the importance of interviews, reviews and awards in our culture as well as to the consideration of the work of art as commodity, a result of a politics of the best-seller– also served to illustrate that, as Foucault says, the capitalist system places "the author-function" in the spotlight. As far as postmodernism is concerned, the discussion helped to show that, in spite of the traditional humanist ideas propagated by Lodge's novels, his fictional works are postmodernist because of the extensive use of parody which is both comic and metafictional, all reflecting the influence of the twentieth century's dominant literary discourses.

6. Conclusions

In spite of David Lodge's rejection of the theories labelled as poststructuralist, this analysis proves that his novels can be interpreted from a Foucauldian perspective. The concept of discourse, seen by the French philosopher as intricately linked with knowledge, power and truth, enables the distinction of four main discourses in Lodge's novels, religious, gender, ethnic and literary. Although all these themes have been partially dealt with by some of Lodge's critics, the discursive approach casts a totally new light on his fiction.

The chapter discussing religious discourse starts from a theoretical presentation of the traditional quest-motif, which, due to Foucault's equation of knowledge with power, permits the consideration of quest as conquest. This search for power predominates in *Small World*, considered to be Lodge's quest-romance *par excellence*. In the next place, the Catholic Church is presented as an institution controlling individuals by inducing them a fear of Hell that leads to their expressing sins in the discursive form of the confessional (Foucault stresses the relation between the confessional and truth). Imposing a certain form of birth control, the Safe or Rhythm Method, the Church also acts on the individuals' bodies, at the same time regulating their behaviour– visible in the intimate relations exposed in the novels. However, religion suffers attacks from various directions; the section on erotic discourse helps to exemplify Foucault's assumption that, because language has lost its referential function, sexuality is inseparable from its representation, but also to comment on the characters who choose to transgress, to use another Foucauldian concept, the limits established by the Church. Cinema too appears as a rival institution offering the characters a temporary refuge from reality as well as a substitute for religion. Tourism is another discourse undermining Catholicism by turning the once religious pilgrimage into a commodity.

The next main chapter, on gender, requires further examination tools besides the theory provided by Foucault. Therefore, it begins with a theoretical presentation of feminism emphasising the cultural nature of the category gender. There follows a discussion regarding the question whether the Foucauldian discourse analysis is appropriate for a feminist methodology or not. After exposing different views on this

issue, one draws the conclusion that Foucault's concepts have been further developed and successfully adapted to feminist theory. The novels of David Lodge reflect numerous strategies of maintaining patriarchy, among which the most important are hierarchy, pornography, violence as well as stereotypical images of gender. It must be noticed that, whereas the male characters usually have both a family and a career, women must choose between them. A final subchapter points to the relation between narratology and gender studies by analysing the link between gender and narrative techniques, in particular points of view. On the whole, the chapter reveals unequal power relations between men and women as well as the fact that gender is a discursive construct.

The discussion of ethnic discourse begins with definitions of key concepts, such as ethnicity, nation, identity, pointing out that all of them are discursively constructed. In this chapter too it is necessary to add several terms taken from postcolonial theory (otherness or the binary opposition coloniser vs. colonised), but they go hand in hand with Foucault's method. It is then shown that to the formation of British identity the army discourse plays an important role; it is equally necessary to take into account Britain's colonial past, exemplifying it with the Irish characters, who are depicted as colonised, and to reveal the fact that immigrants remain Others. More importantly, in Lodge's novels one can note an increasing American imperialism; compared to the Americans, the British become Others themselves, taking the position of the 'lessers.' Additionally, American colonialism is further exemplified with the situation of Hawaii as a conquered paradise; furthermore, the Americans appear as opportunists trying to seize control of Europe and especially Germany after World War II. There are a lot of other ethnic groups in the novels, but their common denominator is the fact that they are all perceived as Others. This makes hybridity seem impossible to realise despite the globalization of the campus; competition for superiority, that is for power over Others, prevails in Lodge's fiction.

Literary discourse concentrates on the concept of author, derived from that of self or subject. After an account of Roland Barthes's and Michel Foucault's dismissal of the author, David Lodge's humanist view is presented; one could argue that his refusal to accept poststructuralism lies in his Catholic upbringing as well as in his double

quality as critic and novelist. Lodge's defence of humanism is evident in his fiction not only in the metafictional discussions on this topic, but also in his depiction of characters who are creative writers as well as in his portrayal of the efforts invested in the writing process. The consideration of literature as institution includes interviews, reviews, prizes and awards, regarded as means of determining the reception of art in society; moreover, they are arguments for showing the importance of what Foucault calls "the author-function" in the reader's view of literary works in modern Western culture and the integration of the author into the capitalist system of property obvious in the politics of the best-seller. Class seems to be another factor in the reception of art illustrating how individual taste is shaped by social discourses. The subchapter on postmodernism proves that, even if Lodge clings to humanist values, his fiction can be classified as postmodernist particularly because of the various devices he uses, such as intertextuality, parody and metafiction. On the other hand, the postmodern elements in his novels indicate an author caught under the spell of the dominant discourses of his age. All in all, this analysis reveals that in David Lodge's fiction there is a perpetual struggle for power illustrating Foucault's idea of the interdependence between power, knowledge, truth and discourses circulated by institutions.

7. Bibliography

Acheson, James, "The Small Worlds of Malcolm Bradbury and David Lodge", in: Acheson, James, ed., *The British and Irish Novel since 1960*, London: McMillan Academic and Professional Ltd, 1991, pp. 78-93.

Ahrens, Rüdiger, "David Lodge, Birmingham, in Interview with Rüdiger Ahrens, Würzburg", in: Rüdiger Ahrens, ed., *Anglistik. Mitteilungen des Deutschen Anglistenverbandes, 10. Jahrgang, Heft 1, März 1999*, Heidelberg: C. Winter Verlag, 1999, pp. 11-22.

Ahrens, Rüdiger, "Satirical Norm and Narrative Technique in the Modern University Novel: David Lodge's *Changing Places* and *Small World*", in: Joachim Schwend, Susanne Hagemann, Hermann Völkel, ed., *Literatur im Kontext – Literature in Context*, Frankfurt am Main: Petr Lang, 1992, pp. 277-295.

Ahrens, Rüdiger, "Shifts of Aesthetic Discourse: National. Post-colonial and Post-structuralist Discourses" in: Ahrens, Rüdiger and Laurenz Volkmann, ed., *Why Literature Matters. Theories and Functions of Literature*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1996, pp.49-63.

Aitchison, Cara, Nicola E. MacLeod and Stephen J. Shaw, *Leisure and Tourism Landscapes. Social and Cultural Geographies*, London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

Allott, Kenneth, ed., *The Poems of Matthew Arnold*, London: Longmans, 1965.

Amman, Daniel, *David Lodge and the Art-and-Reality Novel*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1991.

Amossy, Ruth, *Les idées récues. Sémiologie du stéréotype*, Paris: Editions Nathan, 1991.

Antor, Heinz, *Der englische Universitätsroman. Bildungskonzepte und Erziehungsziele*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1996.

Arizti, Bárbara, *Textuality as Striptease: the Discourse of Intimacy in David Lodge's "Changing Places" and "Small World"*, Frankfurt am Main; Berlin; Bern; Bruxelles; New York; Oxford; Wien: Peter Lang, 2002.

Arnold, Matthew, "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse", in: Kenneth Allott, ed., *The Poems of Matthew Arnold*, London: Longmans, 1965, pp. 285-294.

Bakhtin, Mikhail, "Heteroglossia in the Novel", in: David H. Richter, ed., *Narrative/ Theory*, New York: Longman Publishers USA, 1996, pp. 176-182.

Baldwin, Elain et al., *Introducing Cultural Studies*, London: Prentice Hall, 1999.

Barrett, Michéle, "Words and Things: Materialism and Method in Contemporary Feminist Analysis" in: Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Barth, Fredrik, "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 75-82.

Barth, John, "The Literature of Exhaustion", in: David H. Richter, ed., *Narrative/ Theory*, New York: Longman Publishers USA, 1996, pp. 77-86.

Barthes, Roland, "Le Plaisir du texte" in: Roland Barthes, *Oevres complètes, Tome II, 1966-1973*, ed. by Éric Marty, Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1994, pp. 1493-1529.

Barthes, Roland, "The Death of the Author", in: David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, London and New York: Longman, 1988, pp. 167-172.

Bartolovich, Crystal, "Global Capital and Transnationalism", in: Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005 (2000), pp. 126-161.

Baßler, Moritz, "New Historicism, Cultural Materialism und Cultural Studies", in: Nünning, Ansgar/ Nünning Vera, ed., *Konzepte der Kulturwissenschaften*, Stuttgart: Verlaf J. B. Metzler, 2003, pp. 135-155.

Baukhafe, Maon, "Die 7 Rätsel des Bewusstseins. Wie entstehen unsere Gedanken und Gefühle?", in: *P. M. Welt des Wissens*, November, 2005, pp. 10-17.

Beauvoir, Simone de, *Das andere Geschlecht. Sitte und Sexus der Frau (Le Deuxième sexe)*, Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1994.

Bell, Daniel, "Ethnicity and Social Change", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 138-146.

Bergonzi, Bernard, *David Lodge*, Plymouth: Nortcote House, 1995.

Bergonzi, Bernard, *The Myth of Modernism and Twentieth Century Literature*, Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1986.

Bhabha, Homi K., "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences" in: Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith and Helen Tiffin: ed., *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, 1995, pp. 206-209.

Bhabha, Homi K., "The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism", in: H. K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge, 1994, pp. 66-84.

Bhabha, Homi K., *Nation and Narration*, London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Böhm, Rudolf, "Der englische Universitätsroman" in: Maria Diedrich und Christoph Schöneich, Hrsg., *Studien zur englischen und amerikanischen Prosa nach dem ersten Weltkrieg*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986, pp. 72-85.

Bressler, Charles E., *Literary Criticism. An Introduction to Theory and Practice*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1994.

Bristow, Joseph, *Sexuality*, London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Burke, Seán, *The Death and Return of the Author*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.

Butler, Judith, *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity,* New York and London: Routledge, 1990.

Buttjes, Dieter and Michael Byram, ed., *Mediating Languages and Cultures*, Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 1991.

Carey-Webb, Allen, *Making Subject(s). Literature and the Emergence of National Identity*, New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998.

Chaucer, Geoffrey, *Canterbury Tales*, ed. by A. C. Cawley, London: Dent, 1958.

Childs, Peter and Patrick Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*, London: Prentice Hall Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1997.

Chodorow, Nancy, "Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 182-188.

Cixous, Hélène, "Sorties", in: David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, London and New York: Longman, 1988, pp. 287-293.

Connor, Steven, "Introduction" in: Steven Connor, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism*, Cambridge: University Press, 2004, pp. 1-19.

Connor, Steven, "Postmodernism and Literature, in: Steven Connor, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism*, Cambridge: University Press, 2004, pp. 62-81.

Constable, Catherine, "Postmodernism and Film" in: Steven Connor, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism*, Cambridge: University Press, 2004, pp. 43-61.

Dentith, Simon, *Parody*, London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Derrida, Jacques, "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences" in: David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, London and New York: Longman, 1988, pp. 108-123.

During, Simon, *Foucault and Literature. Towards a Genealogy of Writing*, London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Dworkin, Andrea, "Pornography", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 325-327.

Eaglestone, Robert, "Postmodernism and Ethics against the Metaphysics of Comprehension" in: Steven Connor, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism*, Cambridge: University Press, 2004, pp. 182-195.

Easterlin, Nancy and Barbara Riebling, ed., *After Poststructuralism. Interdisciplinary and Literary Theory*, Evanston, Ilinois: Northwestern University Press, 1993.

Easthope, Antony, *British Post-Structuralism since 1968*, London and New York: Routledge, 1991 (1988).

Eliot, T. S., "The Waste Land", in: T. S. Eliot, *Collected Poems 1909-1962*, London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1963, pp. 61-86.

Eliot, T. S., *Collected Poems 1909-1962*, London: Faber and Faber Ltd, 1963.

Enloe, Cynthia, "Religion and Ethnicity", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, *Ethnicity*, Oxford, ed., New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 197-202.

Eriksen, Thomas H., "Ethnicity, Race, Class and Nation" , in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 28-31.

Eschenbach, Wolfram von, *Parzival*, ed. by Peter Knecht, Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn Verlag, 1993.

Ewald, François, "Foucault – Ein Vagabundierendes Denker", transl. by Hans-Joachim Metzger, in: Michel Foucault, *Dispositive der Macht. Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit*, Berlin: Merve Verlag, 1978, pp. 7-19.

Farge, Arlette and Michel Foucault, ed, *Konflikte: Die »Lettres de cachet« . Aus den Archiven der Bastille im 18. Jahrhundert (Le désordre des familles. Lettres*

de cachet des Archives de la Bastille), transl. by Chris E. Paschold and Albert Gier, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989 (1982).

Flax, Jane, "Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 170-178.

Foucault, Michel, *L'archéologie du savoir*, Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1969.

Foucault, Michel, "A Preface to Transgression", in: Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, translated from the French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977, pp. 29-53.

Foucault, Michel, "Das Abenland und die Wahrheit des Sexes", transl. by Ulrich Raulf, in: Michel Foucault, *Dispositive der Macht. Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit*, Berlin: Merve Verlag, 1978, pp. 96-103.

Foucault, Michel, "Das Wahre Geschlecht", transl. by Eva Erdmann and Annette Wunschel, in: Michel Foucault, *Herculine Barbin. Über Hermaphrodismus (Herculine Barbine dite Alexine B)*, ed. by Wolfgang Schäffner and Joseph Vogl, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1998 (1978), pp. 7-18.

Foucault, Michel, "Die Machtverhältnisse durchziehen das Körperinnere. Ein Gespräch mit Lucette Finas", transl. by Jutta Kranz, in: Michel Foucault, *Dispositive der Macht. Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit*, Berlin: Merve Verlag, 1978, pp. 104-117.

Foucault, Michel, "Historisches Wissen der Kämpfe und Macht. Vorlesung vom 7. Januar 1976", transl. by Elke Wehr, in: Michel Foucault, *Dispositive der Macht. Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit*, Berlin: Merve Verlag, 1978, pp. 55-75.

Foucault, Michel, "History of Systems of Thought," in: Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, translated from the French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977, pp. 199-204.

Foucault, Michel, "Intellectuals and Power", in: Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, translated from the French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977, pp. 205-217.

Foucault, Michel, "Macht und Körper. Ein Gespräch mit der Zeitschrift 'Quel Corps?'", transl. by Werner Garst, in: Michel Foucault, *Mikrophysik der Macht. Über Strafjustiz, Psychiatrie und Medizin*, Berlin: Merve Verlag, 1976, pp. 105-113.

Foucault, Michel, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History", in: Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, translated from the French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977, pp. 139-164.

Foucault, Michel, "Räderwerke des Überwachens und Strafens. Ein Gespräch mit J. J. Brodier", transl. by Walter Seitter, in: Michel Foucault, *Mikrophysik der Macht. Über Strafjustiz, Psychiatrie und Medizin*, Berlin: Merve Verlag, 1976, pp. 31-47.

Foucault, Michel, "Revolutionary Action: 'Until Now'", in: Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, translated from the French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977, pp. 218-234.

Foucault, Michel, "Wahrheit und Macht. Interview mit Michel Foucault von Alessandro Fontana und Pasquale Pasquino", transl. by Elke Wehr, in: Michel Foucault, *Dispositive der Macht. Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit*, Berlin: Merve Verlag, 1978, pp. 21-54.

Foucault, Michel, "What Is an Author?", in: David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, London and New York: Longman, 1988, pp. 197-210.

Foucault, Michel, *Death and the Labyrinth: The World of Raymond Russel*, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1986.

Foucault, Michel, *Die Geburt der Klinik. Eine Archäologie des ärttzlichen Blicks (Naissance de la Clinique)*, transl. by Walter Seitter, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1988 (1963).

Foucault, Michel, *Histoire de la sexualité 1. La volonté de savoir*, Paris: Gallimard, 1979.

Foucault, Michel, *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. by Colin Gordon, New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel, *Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison*, Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1975.

Fowler, Roger, ed., *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms*, London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

Fuss, Diana, "The 'Risk' of Essence", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp.250-258.

Ghandi, Leela, *Postcolonial Theory. A Critical Introduction*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan, "Beyond the Melting Pot", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 135-138.

Göller, Karl Heinz, unter Mitarbeit von Manfred Markus und Rainer Schöwerling, *Romance und Novel. Die Anfänge des englischen Romans*, Regensburg: Verlag Hans Carl Regensburg, 1972.

Goodman, Lizbeth, "Introduction: Gender as an Approach to Literature", in: Lizbeth Goodman, ed., *Literature and Gender*, London, New York: Routledge, 1996, pp. vii-xiv.

Green, Keith and Jill LeBihan, *Critical Theory and Practice: A Coursebook*, London, New York: Routledge, 1996.

Grosz, Elizabeth, "Psychoanalysis and the Imaginary Body", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 299-308.

Hall, Stuart, "The New Ethnicities", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, *Ethnicity*, ed., Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 161-163.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri, *Empire*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Hartsock, Nancy, "Foucault on Power: A Theory for Women?" in Linda J. Nicholson, ed., *Feminism/Postmodernism*, New York and London: Routledge, 1990, pp.157-175.

Hartsock, Nancy, "The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 152-160.

Hawthorn, Jeremy, *Cunning Passages. New Historicism, Cultural Materialism and Marxism in the Contemporary Literary Debate*, London: Arnold, 1996.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel, "The Scarlet Letter. A Romance", in: Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Scarlet Letter and Other Writings*, ed. by Leland S. Person, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1994, pp. 3-166.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel, *The Scarlet Letter and Other Writings*, ed. by Leland S. Person, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1994.

Hayward, Susan, *Key Concepts in Cinema Studies*, London, New York: Routledge, 1996.

Heiler, Lars, *Regression und Kulturkritik im britischen Gegenwartsroman. Kulturwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zu Romanen von Ian McEwan, Jim Crace, Irvine Welsh und Will Self*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2004.

Hollingdale, Reginals John, *A Nietzsche Reader*, London: Penguin Books, 1977.

Humm, Maggie, A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Feminist Literary Criticism, New York: Harvester Wheatsleaf, 1994.

Hutcheon, Linda, *A Poetics of Postmodernism. History, Theory, Fiction*, New York and London: Routledge, 1988.

Hutcheon, Linda, *The Politics of Postmodernism*, London and New York: Routledge, 1989.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith, "Introduction", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 3-14.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Irigay, Luce, "The Other: Woman", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 308-315.

Jackson, Stevi and Jackie Jones, ed., *Contemporary Literary Theories*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.

Jagar, Alison, "Love and Knowledge: Emotion in Feminist Epistemology", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 188-193.

Jameson, Fredric, "Postmodernism and Consumer Society", in: E. Ann Kaplan, ed., *Postmodernism and Its Discontents. Theories, Practices*, London, New York: Verso, 1988, pp. 13-29.

Johnstone, Barbara, *Discourse Analysis*, Massachusetts, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.

Joyce, James, *Ulysses*, ed. by Declan Kiberd, London: Penguin Books, 1992.

Kaplan, E. Ann, "Introduction", in: E. Ann Kaplan, ed., *Postmodernism and Its Discontents. Theories, Practices*, London, New York: Verso, 1988, pp. 1-9.

Kaplan, E. Ann, ed., *Postmodernism and Its Discontents. Theories, Practices*, London, New York: Verso, 1988.

Kelly, Liz, "A Central Issue: Sexual Violence and Feminist Theory", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 345-351.

Kemp, Sandra & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Kemp, Sandra and Judith Squires, "Introduction", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 3-12.

Kernbach, Victor, *Dictionar de mitologie generala*, Bucuresti: Editura Albatros, 1983.

Lacy, Norris J. and Geoffrey Ashe with Debra N. Mancoff, *The Arthurian Handbook. Second Edition*, New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997.

Lavie, Smadar and Ted Swedenburg, "Introduction: Displacement, Diaspora, and Geographies of Identity" in: Smadar Lavie & Ted Swedenburg, ed., *Displacement, Diaspora, and Geographies of Identity*, Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1996, pp. 1-25.

Lawrence, D. H., *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Melbourne: Heinemann, 1958.

Lemert, Charles and Garth Gillan, *Michel Foucault. Social Theory as Transgression*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude, "Linguistics and Anthropology", in: Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, transl. from the French by Clare Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf, New York: Basic Books, 1963, pp. 67-80.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude, *Structural Anthropology*, transl. from the French by Clare Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf, New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Lewis, Reina, *Gendering Orientalism. Race, Femininity and Representation*, London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

Lodge, David, "Afterword" in: David Lodge, *Out of the Shelter*, London: Penguin Books, 1970, pp. 273-282.

Lodge, David, "Afterword", in: David Lodge, *Home Truths*, London: Penguin Books, 2000 (1999), pp. 137-143.

Lodge, David, "An Afterword", in: David Lodge, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, London: Penguin Books, 1983 (1965), pp. 163-174.

Lodge, David, "Introduction", in: David Lodge, *The Picturegoers*, London: Penguin Books, 1993 (1960), pp. vii-xvi.

Lodge, David, "Michel Foucault", in: David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, London and New York: Longman, 1988, pp. 196-197.

Lodge, David, *After Bakhtin. Essays on Fiction and Criticism*, London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Lodge, David, *Author, Author*, London: Secker & Warburg, 2004.

Lodge, David, *Changing Places*, London: Penguin Books, 1975.

Lodge, David, *Consciousness and the Novel*, London: Secker & Warburg, 2002.

Lodge, David, *Home Truths*, London: Penguin Books, 2000 (1999).

Lodge, David, *How Far Can You Go?*, London: Penguin Books, 1981.

Lodge, David, *Nice Work*, London: Penguuin Books, 1988.

Lodge, David, *Out of the Shelter*, London: Penguin Books, 1970.

Lodge, David, *Paradise News*, London: Penguin Books, 1992.

Lodge, David, *Small World*, London: Penguin Books, 1985.

Lodge, David, *The Art of Fiction*, London: Penguin Books1992.

Lodge, David, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, London: Penguin Books, 1983 (1965).

Lodge, David, *The Modes of Modern Writing. Metaphor, Metonymy, and the Typology of Modern Literature*, London: Edward Arnold, 1977.

Lodge, David, *Therapy*, London: Penguin Books, 1995.

Lodge, David, *Thinks…*, London: Penguin Books, 2001.

MacCannell, Dean, *The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, London and Basingstoke: The MacMillan Press Ltd, 1976.

Mackinnon, Catherine, "Toward a Feminist Theory of the State", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 351-358.

Madsen, Deborah L., *Feminist Theory and Literary Practice*, London, Sterling, Virginia: Pluto Press, 2000.

Malpas, Simon, *The Postmodern*, London and New York: Routledge, 2005.

Martin, Bruce K., *David Lodge*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1999.

McClintock, Anne, "Soft-soaping Empire: Commodity Racism and Imperial Advertising" in: George Robertson et al., ed., *Travellers' Tales. Narratives of Home and Displacement*, London and New York: Routledge, 1994, pp. 131-154.

McEvilley, Thomas, *Art & Otherness. Crisis in Cultural Identity*, New York: McPherson & Company, 1992.

McLeod, John, *Beginning Postcolonialism*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2000.

McNay, Lois, *Foucault. A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.

Michie, Helena, "Not One of the Family: The Repression of the Other Woman in Feminist Theory", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 55-58.

Mills, Sara, "Post-colonial Feminist Theory", in: Stevi Jackson and Jackie Jones, ed., *Contemporary Literary Theories*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.

Minh-ha, Trinh T., "Other Than Myself/ My Other Self" in: George Robertson et al., ed., *Travellers' Tales. Narratives of Home and Displacement*, London and New York: Routledge, 1994, pp. 9-26.

Mitchell, Juliet, "Femininity, narrative and psychoanalysis", in: David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, London and New York: Longman, 1988, pp. 426-430.

Moi, Toril, "Feminist, Female, Feminine", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 246-250.

Montesquieu, Charles Louis de Secondat de, "Lettres Persannes", in: Charles Louis de Secondat de Montesquieu, *Oevres complètes, Vol. I*, ed. by Roger Caillois, Paris: Gallimard, 1949, pp. 129-373.

Nash, Manning, "The Core Elements of Ethnicity", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, *Ethnicity*, ed., Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 24-28.

Nieragden, Goran, *Figurendarstellung im roman. Eine narratologische Systematik am Beispiel von David Lodges "Changing Places" und Ian McEwans "The Child in Time"*, Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 1995.

Nünning, Ansgar and Nünning Vera, ed., *Konzepte der Kulturwissenschaften*, Stuttgart: Verlaf J. B. Metzler, 2003.

Pearsall, Derek, *Arthurian Romance. A Short Introduction*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Pease, Donald E., "US Imperialism: Global Dominance without Colonies", in: Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, ed., *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005 (2000), pp. 203-220.

Pfandl-Buchegger, Ingrid, *David Lodge als Literaturkritiker, Theoretiker und Romanautor*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1993.

Quasyson, Ato, "Postcolonialism and Postmodernism", in: Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, ed., *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005 (2000), pp. 87-111.

Rex, John, "Multiculturalism in Europe", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 241-245.

Riebling, Barbara, "Remodeling Truth, Power, and Society: Implications of Chaos Theory, Nonequilibrium Dynamics, and Systems Science for the Study of Politics and Literature", in: Nancy Easterlin and Barbara Riebling, ed., *After Poststructuralism. Interdisciplinary and Literary Theory*, Evanston, Ilinois: Northwestern University Press, 1993, pp. 177-201.

Rose, Margaret A., *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-modern*, Cambridge: University Press, 1993.

Said, Edward W., "Foucault and the Imagination of Power", in: Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, Third Printing , 2002,pp. 239-245.

Said, Edward W., "Identity, Authority, and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveler", in: Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2002, Third Printing, pp. 386-404.

Said, Edward W., "Michel Foucault, 1927-1984", in: Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, Third Printing, 2002, pp.187-197.

Said, Edward W., "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors" in: Edward Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, Third Printing, 2002, pp. 293-316.

Said, Edward W., "The Politics of Knowledge", in: Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2002, Third Printing, pp. 372-385.

Sarup, Madan, "Home and Identity" in: George Robertson et al., ed., *Travellers' Tales. Narratives of Home and Displacement*, London and New York: Routledge, 1994, pp. 93-104.

Sarup, Madan, *An Introductory Guide to Post-structuralism and Postmodernism*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1988.

Schermerhorn, Richard, "Ethnicity and Minority Groups", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 17-18.

Schulz, Dieter, *Suche und Abenteuer. Die <<Quest>> in der englischen und amerikanischen Erzählkunst der Romantik*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1981.

Schwend, Joachim, Susanne Hagemann, Hermann Völkel, ed., *Literatur im Kontext – Literature in Context*, Frankfurt am Main: Petr Lang, 1992.

Selden, Raman, *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*, Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1985.

Sheehan, Paul, "Postmodernism and Philosophy" in: Steven Connor, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism*, Cambridge: University Press, 2004, pp. 20-42.

Showalter, Elaine, "Feminist criticism in the wilderness", in: David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*, London and New York: Longman, 1988, pp. 331-353.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, "French Feminism in an International Frame", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 51-55.

Stallybrass, Peter and Allen White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*, London: Methuen, 1986.

Swatos, Jr., William H. and Luigi Tomasi, "Epilogue: Pilgrimage for a New Millenium", in William H. Swatos, Jr., and Luigi Tomasi, ed., *From*

Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism. The Social and Cultural Economics of Piety, Westport Connecticut, London: Praeger, 2002, pp. 207-208.

Terdiman, Richard, *Discourse/ Counter-Discourse. The Theory and Practice of Symbolic Resistance in Nineteenth Century France*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.

Thorne, Barrie, Cheris Kramarae and Nancy Henley, ed., *Language, Gender and Society*, Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1983.

Tomasi, Luigi, "*Homo Viator*: from Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism via the Journey", in William H. Swatos, Jr. And Luigi Tomasi, ed., *From Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism. The Social and Cultural Economics of Piety*, Westport Connecticut, London: Praeger, 2002.

Tonkin, Elisabeth *et al.*, "History and Ethnicity", in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 18-24.

Troyes, Chrétien de, "Le Conte du Graal ou Le Roman de Perceval", transl. by Charles Méla, in: Chrétien de Troyes, *Romans*, Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1994, pp. 937-1211.

Vance, Carole, "Pleasure and Danger: Toward a Politics of Sexuality", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 327-335.

Voyé, Liliane, "Popular Religion and Pilgrimages in Western Europe", in William H. Swatos, Jr., and Luigi Tomasi, Ed., *From Medieval Pilgrimage to Religious Tourism. The Social and Cultural Economics of Piety*, Westport Connecticut, London: Praeger, 2002, pp. 115-135.

Vukonic, Boris, *Tourism and Religion*, translated by Sanja Matešic, Oxford: Pergamon, 1996.

Waugh, Patricia, "Modernism, Postmodernism, Gender: The View from Feminism", in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 206-212.

Webster, Roger, *Studying Literary Theory. An Introduction*, London, New York, Sydney, Auckland: Arnold, 1996.

Weiß, Wolfgang, *Der anglo-amerikanische Universitätsroman. Eine historische Skizze*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988.

Weston, Jessie, *From Ritual to Romance*, Garden City: Doubleday, 1957.

Wilde, Oscar, ”The Decay of Lying”, in: *Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*, ed. by Vyvyan Holland, London: Collins, 1966, pp. 970-99.

Wittig, Monique, ”One is not Born a Woman”, in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 221-226.

Woolf, Virginia, ”A Room of One's One”, in: Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own and Three Guineas*, ed. by Morag Shiad, Oxford: University Press, 1998, pp. 1-149.

Woolf, Virginia, *A Room of One's Own and Three Guineas*, ed. by Morag Shiad, Oxford: University Press, 1998.

Wünsch, Frank, *Die Parodie. Zu Definition und Typologie*, Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovac 1999.

Wynne-Davies, Marion, *Prentice Hall Guide to English Literature*, New York: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Yoshino, Kosaku, ”Globalization and Ethno-Cultural Differences”, in: John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 370-374.

Young, Iris, ”The Ideal of Impartiality and the Civic Public”, in: Sandra Kemp & Judith Squires, ed., *Feminisms*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 193-198.

Young, Robert, *White Mythologies. Writing History and the West*, London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

8. Zusammenfassung

Die vorliegende Dissertation beschäftigt sich mit dem narrativen Gesamtwerk von David Lodge, einem sehr erfolgreichen und bekannten englischen Romanautor der Gegenwart, der heutzutage in Birmingham lebt. Die Untersuchung vollzieht sich im theoretischen Sinne auf der Grundlage von Michel Foucaults Diskursanalyse, die die Differenzierung von vier Diskurstypen in Bezug auf Religion, Geschlecht (*Gender*), Ethnizität und Literatur in den Romanen des Britischen Autors erlaubt. Die folgenden Werke werden untersucht: die Romane *The Picturegoers* (1960), *Ginger, You're Barmy* (1962), *The British Museum Is Falling Down* (1965), *Out of the Shelter* (1970), *Changing Places* (1975), *How Far Can You Go?* (1980), *Small World* (1984), *Nice Work* (1988), *Paradise News* (1991), *Therapy* (1996), *Thinks...* (2001), *Author, Author* (2004) und die Novelle *Home Truths* (1999). Die Einleitung dieser Studie besteht aus zwei Hauptteilen: einem Forschungsbericht und der methodologischen Grundlegung.

Im Forschungsbericht werden die Themen, die bisher von Lodges Kritikern analysiert wurden, dargestellt. Zum einen werden seine fiktionalen Werke vom biographischen Standpunkt aus betrachtet, zum anderen befassen sich Kritiker mit dem Einfluss von Lodges theoretischen Interessen auf seine narrativen Werke. Realistische und traditionelle Merkmale sind ein weiterer Aspekt der Romane, jedoch sind experimentelle Versuche genauso relevant. Die Werke werden auch in der Tradition der katholischen Romanliteratur betrachtet und außerdem wird Lodge als ein Meister des englischen Universitätsromans gewertet. Schließlich wurde *Small World* als Romanze interpretiert, indem das mythische *Quest*–Motiv diskutiert wird.

Der methodologische Ansatz beinhaltet eine Darlegung des Diskurskonzepts, wie es der französische Philosoph Michel Foucault in seinen zahlreichen Schriften schildert. Foucaults Interesse liegt nicht in der linguistischen Form des Diskurses, sondern in seinen sozialen Auswirkungen. Er definiert den Diskurs als eine Gruppe von Aussagen, die zum selben Bildungssystem gehören. Ein Bildungssystem besteht sowohl aus der Koexistenz und Interaktion, wie auch der Interrelation von heterogenen Elementen (Institutionen, Techniken, sozialen Gruppen, Relationen zwischen verschiedenen Diskursen). Laut Foucault sind Diskurse in technischen Prozessen, in Institutionen, in Verhaltensmustern, in Übertragungs- und Diffusionsformen und in pädagogischen Formen, die sie gleichzeitig aufzwingen und

erhalten, verkörpert. Die Untersuchung solcher Erscheinungen wird Archäologie genannt. Darüber hinaus, historisch gesehen, verändern sich schrittweise Diskurse, aber solche epistemologischen Veränderungen geschehen in Verbindung mit sozialpolitischen Gestaltungen, internen Wechseln und schließlich mit Veränderungen von anderen simultanen Diskursen. Insbesondere ist Foucault der Meinung, dass der Diskurs in enger Verbindung mit den folgenden Begriffen steht: Wissen, Macht und Wahrheit. Das Wissen ist eine diskursive Konstruktion und zusätzlich von Macht untrennbar. Die Macht ist nicht in einen Punkt konzentriert, sondern in der ganzen Gesellschaft verbreitet. Vor allem behauptet Foucault, dass die Macht positiv sei, da sie Wissen kreiert. Die Wahrheit ist keinesfalls transzendental, sondern auch ein Produkt der Diskurse und Machtverhältnisse, die für eine bestimmte Gesellschaft zu einem bestimmten Zeitpunkt typisch sind. Wenn man all dies berücksichtigt, kann man behaupten, dass Foucaults Diskursanalyse einen Angriff auf die Aufklärung in Gang setzt: Diese Theorie dekonstruiert das rationale Subjekt, in dem sie ihn als eine Folge der Diskurse betrachtet und betont die zirkuläre Beziehung zwischen Diskurs, Wissen, Macht und Wahrheit.

Auf der Grundlage des Diskursbegriffs von Foucault erfolgt die Einteilung der Dissertation in vier Hauptkapitel, die den Themen Religion, Geschlecht, Ethnizität und Literatur gewidmet sind. Der Teil, der sich mit dem religiösen Diskurs beschäftigt, beginnt mit einer Diskussion des traditionellen Motivs der *Quest* und des Heiligen Grals. Da Foucault das Wissen und die Macht gleichstellt, kann man die Suche ("quest") nach Wissen als Eroberung ("conquest") ansehen. In der Tat beweist die Untersuchung von *Small World*, dass trotzt der unterschiedlichen Darstellungen des Grals jede Figur im Roman nach Macht sucht. Das nächste Kapitel befasst sich mit der Behandlung der Religion sowohl als institutionelle, wie auch als persönliche Kategorie. Einige von Lodges Romanen (vor allem *The Picturegoers*, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, *How Far Can You Go?*) behandeln dogmatische Grundfragen des Katholizismus und Definitionen von Begriffen wie z. B. Himmel, Hölle, Purgatorium, Sünde, Beichte. In diesem Sinne spielt die Furcht vor der Hölle eine sehr wichtige Rolle, weil sie das Verhalten von Lodges Figuren kontrolliert und dazu bringt, alle ihre Sünden (Taten, Gedanken oder Lust) in der diskursiven Form der Beichte zu gestehen. Die Konfession ist ein weiteres Konzept, das Michel Foucault in theoretischer Form mit seiner Diskursanalyse verbindet. Er argumentiert, dass die Diskursivität des Geschlechts nicht nur die Vorstellungen des Individuums,

sondern auch sein Verhalten (die Machtausübung der Kirche ist darin offensichtlich) umformt und bestimmt. Die Katholiken der Romane akzeptieren die Beichte als eine moralische Pflicht, die sie vor dem Absturz in die Hölle bewahrt. Im Gegensatz zu ihnen wehren sich die Nichtkatholiken heftig dagegen, weil sie die Beichte als eine ungeheuerliche Verpflichtung wahrnehmen (z. B. in *Ginger, You're Barmy*, *Therapy*). Weiterhin erscheint der menschliche Körper als der Raum, durch den Macht ausgeübt wird. In dieser Hinsicht zeigen die Romane *The British Museum Is Falling Down* und *How Far Can You Go?*, wie die Kirche nur eine fehlerhafte Methode als mögliche Kontrazeption erlaubt. Diese Maßnahme prägt die sexuelle Lust und das Intimleben der Hauptfiguren. Außerdem reflektieren die oben genannten Romane durch viele Anspielungen auf Bücher, Filme und Zeitschriften Foucaults Idee, dass die Sexualität untrennbar von ihrer Repräsentation ist.

Anschließend wird die Subversion der Katholischen Kirche durch andere Diskurse analysiert: Erstens wird der erotische Diskurs in Betracht gezogen, um Foucaults Überschreitungsbegriff mit Beispielen aus den Werken *The Picturegoers*, *How Far Can You Go?*, *Nice Work* und *Thinks...* zu erläutern; zweitens schildert insbesondere Lodges erster Roman *The Picturegoers* das Kino als eine mächtige Institution, die den Figuren eine temporäre Flucht aus der Realität bietet und zu einem der Hauptkonkurrenten der Kirche wird; drittens beschäftigt sich der letzte Teil dieses Kapitels mit der Verbindung von Tourismus und Religion. *Paradise News* beschreibt Tourismus als die neue Weltreligion. Gleichzeitig ist die Landschaft eine kulturelle Konstruktion, deren Ziel materieller Natur ist. In *Therapy* geht es um eine Pilgerfahrt nach Santiago de Compostela, die ihren religiösen Zweck verloren hat und die eine Art Tourismus geworden ist; mit anderen Worten der Tourismus ähnelt der Religion und ersetzt diese.

Der zweite Hauptteil der Dissertation umreißt die *Gender*-Frage als Verhältnis der Geschlechter zueinander. Die Untersuchung dieser Problematik verlangt noch weitere theoretische Ansätze außerhalb von Foucaults Diskursanalyse. Folglich beginnt dieses Kapitel mit einer umfassenden theoretischen Präsentation des Feminismus, dessen Gegenstand die Frau und ihre Position in der Gesellschaft ist. Feministische TheoretikerInnen haben sich ein doppeltes Ziel gesetzt: die ungleichen Machtverhältnisse zwischen Männern und Frauen aufzudecken und diese im Kampf um Gleichberechtigung zu verändern. Nach einem historischen Überblick der feministischen Literaturkritik folgt eine Behandlung der kulturellen oder, in

Foucaults Sinne, diskursiven Kategorie *Gender*. Dazu kommt eine Debatte, die die Frage, ob Foucaults Kulturtheorie für eine feministische Methodologie geeignet ist, zu beantworten versucht. Aus der Darstellung unterschiedlicher Meinungen dazu ergibt sich der Schluss, dass Foucaults Ideen – vor allem seine Behauptung, dass die Identität das Resultat verschiedener Diskurse ist, und sein Angriff auf einen universalistischen Anspruch der Aufklärung – weiter entwickelt und erfolgreich zu einem feministischen Ansatz ausgebaut wurden. Weiterhin wird gezeigt, dass Lodges Romane viele Strategien, die die patriarchalische Kontrolle unterstützen, einschließen. Dazu gehört eine deutliche Hierarchie der Geschlechter, die auf binären Oppositionen basiert. Aus diesem Grund werden Frauen Teil des umfassenden Begriffs der "*colonised*". Ein Beispiel dafür ist die Gewohnheit, den Frauen, die die Erwartungen der Gesellschaft enttäuschen, Tiernamen zu erteilen (so wie in *Nice Work* und *Changing Places*). Die Pornographie ist eine andere Strategie, die für die männliche Vormachtstellung sorgt; etymologisch gesehen, bedeutet das Wort "Pornographie" aus griechischer Abstammung die "Beschreibung der widerlichen Huren". Deshalb darf behauptet werden, dass die Pornographie die Frauen erniedrigt und entmenschlicht, indem sie diese zu sexuellen Objekten umwandelt, deren einzige Funktion das Vergnügen des männlichen Blicks ist. In dem Roman *Nice Work* gibt es zwei pornographische Beispiele: einerseits die zahlreichen Plakate, die überall in der Fabrik hängen, andererseits, der Fall der Sekretärin Shirley, die ihre minderjährige Tochter Tracey ermutigt, nackt zu posieren. Außerdem werden pornographische Diskurse von unterschiedlichen Medien in der Gesellschaft verbreitet (z. B. Fernseher in *Nice Work* oder die Zeitschrift *Playboy* in *Changing Places*). Die patriarchalische Macht wird auch durch Gewalt (Vergewaltigung, Inzest, sexueller Missbrauch) durchgesetzt. Lodges männliche Figuren haben eine Tendenz zur Vergewaltigung, aber diese bleibt in der Phantasie, da sie nie zur Geltung kommt (z. B. *The Picturegoers*, *Ginger, You're Barmy*, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, *Changing Places*, *Nice Work*, *Paradise News*, *Thinks...*). Was Inzest betrifft, so interpretiert Mary Makepeace in dem Roman *Changing Places* Philip Swallows Affäre mit der jungen Melanie Byrd als ein Beweis dafür, dass er sich zu seiner eigenen Tochter hingezogen fühlt. Im Gegensatz dazu schildert *Paradise News* den wiederholten sexuellen Missbrauch von Ursula durch ihren Bruder Sean. Darüber hinaus gibt es zwei sehr unterschiedliche Fälle von Verstümmelung des weiblichen Körpers. Erstens liest man in *Therapy* über Maureens Brustamputation. Interessant

daran ist die Tatsache, dass nach der Operation ihr Mann sich weigert, weiter eine sexuelle Beziehung mit ihr zu unterhalten, und dass er sogar ein getrenntes Bett verlangt. Die Relevanz dieses Falles liegt darin, dass er zeigt, wie Frauen zu einem Teil ihres Körpers reduziert werden, denn Maureen wird nicht mehr als Frau betrachtet, nachdem sie durch Krebs eine Brust verloren hat. Zweitens erzählt Tess in *Paradise News*, wie sie ihre deformierte Zehe bekommen hat. Im Gegensatz zu ihrem Bruder musste sie als Mädchen Jahre lang dieselben Schuhen tragen, obwohl sie zu klein geworden waren, während ihr Bruder immer wieder alles bekam, was er brauchte. Dieses Beispiel beweist, wie die Institution der Familie das männliche Geschlecht bevorzugt. Außerdem wird der weibliche Körper manchmal als *otherness* (Andersartigkeit) wahrgenommen. Während Vic Wilcox in *Nice Work* die Frauenpathologie ekelhaft findet, ist Bernard Walsh in *Paradise News* der Meinung, dass Frauenkörper besonders reizend sind.

Ein anderer wichtiger Aspekt der Romane ist die stereotypische Darstellung der Geschlechter. Die weiblichen Figuren gehören entweder zu der Gruppe der Hausfrauen, die, egal ob sie selbst studiert haben oder nicht, sich für die Karriere ihrer Männer und die Erziehung ihrer Kinder opfern, oder sie sind radikale Feministinnen, die eigentlich die Rollen umtauschen, indem sie die überlegene Position übernehmen. Die Untersuchung der Werke ergibt, dass Männer normalerweise sowohl eine Familie, als auch eine Karriere haben. Die Frauen müssen jedoch zwischen beiden wählen. Auf einer anderen Ebene wird die erzählerische Seite der Romane von einem feministischen Gesichtspunkt aus untersucht; das heißt, dass das Geschlecht der Erzähler relevant ist. Im Falle von extradiegetischen (oder heterodiegetischen) Erzählern kann man ausschließen, dass die Perspektive männlich ist. In den Werken mit intradiegetischen (oder homodiegetischen) Erzählern bleibt der weibliche Standpunkt peripherisch. In dieser Hinsicht ist der Roman *Therapy* interessant, da er *cross-gender* Erzählungen (d. h. das Geschlecht des Erzählers ist mit dem Geschlecht des Autors nicht identisch) umfasst; ähnlich beinhaltet *Thinks...*, auch eine teilweise *cross-gender* Erzählung, die ausführlichste weibliche Perspektive in allen Romanen von Lodge. Schließlich dekonstruiert diese Technik die Wahrnehmung des Geschlechtes als Essenz, und gleichzeitig reflektiert sie Michel Foucaults Diskursanalyse.

Das vierte Hauptkapitel befasst sich mit der ethnischen Zugehörigkeit der fiktionalen Personen. In dieser Diskussion kommt neben Foucaults Diskurstheorie

ein weiterer theoretischer Ansatz, nämlich der Postkolonialismus hinzu. Deshalb fängt das Kapitel mit Definitionen von Begriffen wie Ethnizität, Nation, Identität, *otherness*, die Dichotomie *coloniser*/*colonised* an (alle diese Konzepte werden als diskursive Konstruktionen betrachtet). Anschließend wird argumentiert, dass der Diskurs der Armee in *Ginger, You're Barmy* dazu beitragt, die Britische Nationalidentität herauszubilden. Allerdings muss man hier die koloniale Vergangenheit der Briten berücksichtigen. In diesem Sinne merkt man, dass die Iren in Lodges Romanen eindeutig als *colonised* erscheinen (*Ginger, You're Barmy*, *The British Museum Is Falling Down*, *Small World*, *Paradise News*). Da die Iren Einwanderer sind, gehören sie zu Großbritanniens internen *others*. Dazu kommen noch die karibischen und asiatischen Immigranten, die die schlimmsten und schmutzigsten Arbeiten in der Fabrik von *Nice Work* erledigen müssen. Das Interessante an Lodges fiktionalen Werken ist der offensichtliche Amerikanische Imperialismus, der immer wieder auftaucht. Diesbezüglich ist der Roman *Out of the Shelter* extrem wichtig. Der Engländer Timothy Young, der am Anfang sehr stolz darauf ist, in London geboren zu sein, entwickelt sich zu einem Clown, der die amerikanischen Soldaten in Heidelberg amüsiert. In *The British Museum Is Falling Down* wird das Britische Museum, Symbol des Britischen Empires, von einem Amerikaner, der es kaufen will und der Adam Appleby anstellt, um Manuskripte für ihn zu suchen, unterminiert. Darüber hinaus basiert *Changing Places* auf einem Doppelcampus, Euphoria und Rummidge, in dem die amerikanische Universität und die Stadt wesentlich positiver als ihr britisches Gegenstück dargestellt werden. Weiterhin können sich am Ende dieses Romans sowohl Philip Swallow als auch Morris Zapp vorstellen, in der anderen Universität zu bleiben, aber, während der britische Professor den amerikanischen Lebensstil bevorzugt und sein eigenes Land verachtet – eine Einstellung, die einem erlaubt, ihn als *colonised* zu bezeichnen –, bedenkt Morris Zapp die Möglichkeit, als Leiter der Englischen Fakultät Rummidge zu internationalen Standards zu bringen, was eine imperialistische Mentalität zeigt. Außerdem deklariert dieses Buch durch die finale Szene und *Small World* durch die Megakonferenz der MLA New York zum Zentrum der ganzen Welt. In *Paradies News* findet man ein weiteres Beispiel des Amerikanischen Kolonialismus, nämlich den Archipel Hawaii, der als ein erobertes Paradies erscheint. Der Roman *Out of the Shelter* beschäftigt sich mit drei Nationen, den Briten, den Amerikanern und den Deutschen. Im Gegensatz zu den Amerikanern, die als Helden der Welt und Besitzer

von Europa beschrieben werden, ist das Bild der Deutschen sehr negativ, da sie mit Hitler und dem Zweiten Weltkrieg in Zusammenhang gebracht werden. Genauso negativ ist die Darstellung von Siegfried von Turpitz, der deutsche Literaturkritiker, der sich mit Rezeptionsästhetik beschäftigt, in *Small Word*. Er ist ein enigmatischer Man, dem vorgeworfen wird, ein unveröffentlichtes Buch von Persse McGarrigle plagiiert zu haben. Der komplexe Roman *Small Word* schließt noch andere ethnische Gruppen ein. So steht Fulvia Morgana, eine Nymphomanin, die, obwohl sie sich als marxistisch bezeichnet, ein reiches Leben in ihrem beeindruckenden Palast führt, für die Italiener. Australien ist ein sehr heißer Ort des Vergnügens, wo die Karriere des Professors Rodney Wainwright von den europäischen Konferenzen, an denen er teilnimmt, abhängt. Der Orient wird von mehreren Nationen repräsentiert. Jerusalem erscheint als heiße und verwestlichte Stadt. Die Hauptstadt der Türkei, Ankara, versucht europäische Architektur zu imitieren (das Konzept der *mimicry*). Der japanische Akira Sakasaki wird als ein animalisiertes, infantilisiertes und unterentwickeltes Wesen dargestellt. Schließlich wird Korea von Song-mi Lee als traditionell bezeichnet, während Persse McGarrigle Seoul als eine Stadt des Chaos, der Wilderness und der Dunkelheit wahrnimmt. Trotz der Unterschiede haben alle diese orientalen Länder eine Gemeinsamkeit: Sie werden zweifellos als *others* beschrieben, was die Realisierung der Hybridität schwierig macht. Nachdem argumentiert wird, dass die Akademie eine bedeutende Rolle in der Bildung der Nationalidentität spielt, wird Edward Saids Muster des reisenden Professors erklärt. Laut dem postkolonialen Theoretiker, soll der Akademiker seine ethnischen Grenzen überschreiten, um mehrere Identitäten zu erwerben. In dieser Hinsicht zeigt der Roman *Out of the Shelter*, dass eine fremde Kultur die eigene Kultur widerspiegelt. Aus diesem Grund werden *Changing Places* (Doppelcampus) und *Small World* (Globaler Campus) relevant für die Diskussion. David Lodges Universitätsromane zeigen im Vordergrund ein Streben nach Hybridität, die jedoch nie zu Geltung kommt. Obwohl die Figuren ständig reisen, um auf einander in verschiedenen Konferenzen zu wirken, bleiben sie harte Konkurrenten. Betrachtet man die zahlreiche Akademiker als Repräsentanten der ethnischen Gruppen, zu denen sie gehören, zieht man den Schluss, dass das Ziel der Hybridität weit entfernt von Verwirklichung bleibt.

Das letzte Kapitel über den literarischen Diskurs befasst sich erst mit dem Konzept des Autors oder dem allgemeinen Subjekt und bietet zwei gegenseitige

Standpunkte, den Poststrukturalistischen und den Humanistischen. Für die Ablehnung des Autors spricht Roland Barthes in seinem einflussreichen Essay "The Death of the Author" (1968), wo er behauptet, dass der Autor durch die Sprache geschaffen wird. Von großer Bedeutung ist auch Michel Foucaults "What Is an Author?" (1969), in dem er den Autor zu einer Funktion reduziert und die Herkunft dieses Begriffes zurück zu bourgeoisen Besitzrechten ableitet. Gemäß Foucault ist der Autor keinesfalls ein Schöpfer der Diskurse, sondern ein Produkt von ihnen. Diese zwei Ansichten werden von David Lodge vor allem in seinen kritischen Büchern *After Bakhtin. Essays on Fiction and Criticism* (1990) und *Consciousness & the Novel. Connected Essays* (2002) heftig widersprochen. Lodge vergleicht die Beziehung Autor/Text mit der zwischen Vater und Sohn, was heißt, dass der Autor dem Text vorausgeht. An dieser Stelle muss man hinzufügen, dass diese Reaktion nicht von Lodge dem Kritiker, sondern dem Schriftsteller kommt. In seinem letzten kritischen Buch erklärt Lodge, dass seine Suche nach einer Literaturtheorie zu Ende gekommen ist, als er den russischen Theoretiker Mikhail Bakhtin entdeckt hat. Laut Bakhtin ist Polyphonie das bedeutsamste Merkmal der Literatur und insbesondere des Romans. Das heißt, dass ein fiktionales Werk mehrere Stimmen oder Diskurse, die im Dialog stehen, beinhaltet. Deswegen plädiert Lodge nicht für einen Autor, der im Vordergrund steht, sondern er glaubt, dass der Autor eine Stimme unter anderen im Text hat. Der Roman *Thinks...* konstituiert eine Verteidigung der humanistischen Ansicht über den Autor in Bakhtins Sinne. Deshalb präsentiert das Buch zwei unterschiedliche Meinungen über das menschliche Bewusstsein. Einerseits liest man, dass der kognitive Wissenschaftler Ralph Messenger das Bewusstsein als Gehirnaktivität, dessen Verstehen zu der Schöpfung künstlicher Intelligenz führen wird, berücksichtigt. Andererseits vertritt die Schriftstellerin Helen Reed die humanistische Ansicht, dass das Subjekt autonom und verantwortlich ist. Ein dritter Diskurs, nämlich poststrukturalistisch (Robyn Penroses Rede) wird in dem Roman auch diskutiert, aber alle drei Direktionen unterscheiden sich von einander und lehnen sich gegenseitig ab. Im Grunde reflektiert Helen Reed die Überzeugungen von David Lodge, mit dem sie noch weitere Gemeinsamkeiten hat. Beide wurden als Katholiken erzogen und beide schreiben Romane. Daher adoptieren sie eine anti-poststrukturalistische Position, indem sie die guten Seiten des Humanismus betonen. Lodges Position gegenüber dem Autor ist offensichtlich in seinen Romanen, die häufig Figuren, die Schriftsteller sind, haben. Darüber hinaus besteht Lodge darauf,

sowohl den Prozess des Schreibens, als auch die darin gesteckte Energie detailliert darzulegen. Folglich bringt *Author, Author* Henry James in den Vordergrund und konzentriert sich auf das öffentliche Interesse am Autor und seinem Privatleben. Beispielsweise bekommt George du Maurier Briefe von Leuten, die ihm Fragen bezüglich der Bedeutung seines Buches *Trilby* stellen. Dazu kommt das Fiasko von dem Theaterstück *Guy Domville*, an dem Henry James sehr hart gearbeitet hat: Der Autor wird verantwortlich für das Scheitern des Stückes gemacht, während die Schauspieler sogar vom Publikum bemitleidet werden. Auch der Roman *Thinks...* deutet darauf hin, dass der Autor der Schöpfer seines Textes ist. Deshalb wird das Schreiben von Literatur als eine Art *self-exposure* des Autors betrachtet. Dazu kommen noch autobiographische Elemente und realistische Charakteristika, die als Argumente für einen schöpferischen Autor bloßgestellt werden. Die Betrachtung der Literatur als Institution beweist, dass Kunst in unserer pragmatischen Gesellschaft zu Ware wird. Vor allem in *Home Truths* und in *Author, Author* erscheint das Schreiben als ein Beruf wie jeder andere. Zu den Medien, die die Literatur verbreiten, gehören: Interviews (*Home Truths* definiert das Interview als eine Interpretation der Realität oder mit anderen Worten eine Selektion der Fakten, was an Foucaults Diskurstheorie erinnert), Rezensionen (*Home Truths* und *Author, Author* beschreiben, wie Rezensionen die Gefühle der Autoren beeinflussen und die Rezeption der Literatur bestimmen) und schließlich Preise (*Home Truths, Thinks...* und *Author, Author* zeigen, dass Preise die Kunst vermitteln und den Autoren Ruhm und Autorität schenken). Betrachtet man all dies, kann man den Schluss ziehen, dass Lodges Fiktion Beispiele für Foucaults Beschreibung des Autors als eine bloße Funktion anbietet. Die Diskussion der Politik des Bestsellers konzentriert sich auf die Art und Weise, in der das ökonomische Prinzip den ästhetischen Wert der Kunst beeinflusst. Deshalb wird der erfolgreiche Drehbuchautor Samuel Sharp (*Home Truths*) mit Doktor Faust verglichen. In *Author, Author* schafft Henry James nicht, einen Bestseller zu schreiben, da er bestimmte ästhetische Standards nicht aufgeben will. An dieser Stelle wird argumentiert, dass die wirtschaftliche Seite seiner Romane David Lodge bewusst ist. Allerdings ist er erfolgreich, weil er sehr seriöse Themen auf eine komische Art und Weise behandelt. Was soziale Klasse und Klassizismus betrifft, beinhaltet *Author, Author* Beispiele für Curtius' Behauptung, dass der mittelalterliche Autor eng mit der Klasse gebunden war. Einerseits können Henry James' Diener seine Bücher nicht verstehen, andererseits wird beschrieben, dass die

Leute, die die billigsten Sitzplätze des Theaters haben, *Guy Domville* ablehnen, da das moralische Dilemma der Hauptfigur nicht unterhaltsam ist.

Der letzte Teil der Dissertation beschäftigt sich mit postmodernen Elementen in David Lodges fiktionalen Werken. Die Postmoderne zu definieren ist eine schwierige Aufgabe, aber, setzt man die Postmoderne mit dem Poststrukturalismus gleich – denn beide greifen die Behauptung der Aufklärung, dass die europäischen Werte universal seien, an und dekonstruieren das Subjekt –, schließt man aus, dass Lodge kein postmoderner Schriftsteller ist. Jedoch enthalten seine Romane Elemente, die als postmodern bezeichnet wurden: Antiform (*Changing Places*), Spiel, Anarchie und Zerstreuung (*Small World*), Verausgabe/Schweigen (*The British Museum Is Falling Down*), Intertextualität (alle Romane von Lodge), Metonymie (*Nice Work*), Schizophrenie (Lodge ist sowohl Schriftsteller als auch Kritiker). Anschließend wird die Parodie definiert. Zu ihren Merkmalen gehören Ambivalenz, Intertextualität, komische Verzerrung und Metafiktion. Schließlich wird bewiesen, dass Lodge ein postmoderner Autor ist, da die Parodie in seinen Romanen sowohl metafiktional als auch komisch ist (z. B. *The British Museum Is Falling Down, Changing Places, Small World, Nice Work, Thinks...*). Außerdem muss man hinzufügen, dass der britische Romanschriftsteller nicht nur andere Autoren, sondern auch Literaturtheorien, insbesondere den Poststrukturalismus, parodiert. Insgesamt, kann Lodge trotz der humanistischen Überzeugungen als postmodern bezeichnet werden, was auf einen Autor unter dem Einfluss der dominanten Diskurse seiner Zeit hinweist.

Zusammengefasst bringt die vorliegende Dissertation zum Vorschein, dass es einen unendlichen Kampf um Macht in Lodges Fiktion gibt und dass, obwohl er sich gegen den Poststrukturalismus wehrt, seine Romane Michel Foucaults Diskurstheorie auf sie anzuwenden erlauben. Folglich liegt die Innovation dieser Untersuchung darin, dass sie zeigt, dass David Lodges Romane Foucaults Diskursanalyse, in der Diskurse, die von Institutionen verbreitet werden, in Interabhängigkeit mit Wissen, Wahrheit und vor allem Macht stehen, reflektieren.

LEBENSLAUF

Persönliche Daten

Name, Vorname	Sava, Mihaela-<u>Ramona</u>
Geburtsdatum	14.11.1978
Geburtsort	Petrosani/Rumänien
Nationalität	rumänisch
Familienstand	ledig

Ausbildung

1985 – 1993	Schülerin an der Schule Nr.4 in Petrosani/Rumänien
1993 – 1997	Schülerin an dem Informatik-Lyzeum in Petrosani (Abteilung: Englische und Französische Philologie)
1995	Eine Woche Austauschprogramm – Eastleigh College/England
1997 – 2001	Studentin an der Babes-Bolyai-Universität in Cluj-Napoca/Rumänien (Studiengang: Englische Sprache und Literatur/Französische Sprache und Literatur)
2000	Ein Semester pädagogisches Praktikum (Englisch) an dem Onisifor Ghibu Lyzeum in Cluj-Napoca
2000-2001	Ein Semester pädagogisches Praktikum (Französisch) an dem George Cosbuc Lyzeum in Cluj-Napoca
2001 – 2002	2 Semester Erasmus-Studentin an der Universität Würzburg (Studiengang: Galloromanistik/Anglistik)
2002	Abschlussprüfung – *Licenta* – und Diplomarbeit mit dem Titel: *Celtic and Irish Femininity*
Seit 2002	Promotion an der Bayerischen Julius–Maximilians–Universität Würzburg (Studiengang: Anglistik/Galloromanistik)
2004	Aufnahme ins Internationale Promotionsprogramm "Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaft" (IPP) an der Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen

Arbeitserfahrung

Seit 2002	Nebenberufliche wissenschaftliche Arbeit an der Universität Würzburg – Begleitendes Tutorium zur Lektürenliste in Englischer Fachdidaktik (Themen: Landeskunde, Interkulturelles Lernen, Sozialformen u. a.)
Seit 2003	Englisch- und Französischlehrerin bei „Institut IL für Individuelle Lernhilfe", Würzburg

Außeruniversitäre Tätigkeiten

1999-2000	Ehrenamtliche Betreuung von Waisenkinder
2001	Mitgestaltung eines Plakates für die Wintervortragsreihe 2001/2002 des Universitätsbundes Würzburg

Sprachkenntnisse

Rumänisch	(Muttersprache)
Englisch	(sehr gut)
Französisch	(sehr gut)
Deutsch	(sehr gut)
Spanisch	(gut)

Freizeitaktivitäten

Reisen, Basketball, Lesen, Malen