

T.C. Dođuř Üniversitesi
Institute of Social Sciences
MA in English Language and Literature

Parody of the Academy in the Novels of
David Lodge and Malcolm Bradbury

MA Thesis

Utku Erkan Ertekin
200389002

Thesis Advisor:
Assist Prof Dr Clare BRANDABUR

Istanbul, May 2006

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores a comparison of two of the principal craftsmen of Modern British Fiction, David Lodge and Malcolm Bradbury, whose works, as well as their lives, are immensely interrelated and dialogic. My attention is devoted especially to the two authors' differing deployment of postmodernism and post-structuralist theory, as well as variants of more traditional devices such as parody, satire, and double imagery in a discourse aimed at criticizing the academy by being seriously funny. I also underline both authors' contribution into the academic novel with their representative works while keeping the development this sub-genre as a background to this study and analysing it according to the perceptions of Elaine Showalter in *Faculty Towers: The Academic Novel and Its Discontents* (2005).

This study takes into consideration four novels by David Lodge: (*The Picturegoers* (1960), *The British Museum is Falling Down* (1965), *Changing Places* (1975), and *Small World* (1984)) and three novels by Malcolm Bradbury namely *Eating People is Wrong* (1959), *Stepping Westward* (1965), *The History Man* (1975), and a novella titled *Mensonge: My Strange Quest for Structuralism's Hidden Hero* (1987). During the course of the study, I consult and refer to various literary criticisms written by both authors as well as other theories of the major critics of literary theory but my utmost attention is on Mikhail Bakhtin's conception of parody with means of having "dualistic characteristics" that is directly linked with his idea of "Carnival".

In my comparison of these two equally talented craftsmen, I concentrate on two main points. My first point is to analyse both authors' treatment of the academy through their imaginary characters that are mainly shaped as academics, who are pictured in an endless quest for recognition and power. My second point is an attempt to reply Amanda Craig's wondering in her review of David Lodge's *Consciousness and the Novel* (2002), "... why [David Lodge], unlike Bradbury, has not been knighted yet for his services to literature [for] he is the much better critic and novelist" (2).

ÖZET

Bu tez, eserleri kadar yaşam hikayeleri de birbiriyle bağlantılı ve çoksesli/çok yönlü olan Modern İngiliz Romanının iki temel ustası David Lodge ile Malcolm Bradbury arasında bir kıyaslama incelemesidir. Çalışmadaki ana gözlemim, akademiyi komedi formlarıyla eleştirirken oldukça ciddi gözlemlerde bulunan bu iki yazarın, parodi, hiciv ve karşılaştırmalı ikili imgeler gibi çeşitli geleneksel edebiyat tekniklerinin yanı sıra post-modernizm ve yapısalılık ötesi teorilerini de eserlerinde uygulamaları arasında kıyaslama yapmaktır. Aynı zamanda, bu çalışma Elaine Showalter'ın 2005 yılında kaleme aldığı *Faculty Towers: The Academic Novel and Its Discontents* (Fakülte Kuleleri: Akademik Roman ve Hoşnutsuzlukları) adlı çalışmasında analiz ettiği akademik roman tarzının gelişimini arka planda tutarak, David Lodge ve Malcolm Bradbury'nin eserlerinin, bu alt roman tarzına olan katkılarını irdeler.

Bu çalışmada David Lodge'un dört romanı: *The Picturegoers* (1960), *The British Museum is Falling Down* (1965), *Changing Places* (1975), ve *Small World* (1984) ile Malcolm Bradbury'nin üç romanı: *Eating People is Wrong* (1959), *Stepping Westward* (1965), *The History Man* (1975), ve *Mensonge: My Strange Quest for Structuralism's Hidden Hero* (1987) adlı kısa romanı göz önüne alınmıştır. Çalışmada her iki yazar tarafından kaleme alınan çeşitli edebiyat eleştirileri ile önde giden edebiyat eleştirmenleri ve eleştiri tekniklerine başvurulsa da, vurgulanan nokta Mikhail Bakhtin'in parodi algılamasındaki ikicilik karakteristikleri ile yine kendisine ait "karnaval" terimi arasındaki bağlantıdır.

Eşit derecede yetenekli olan bu iki ustanın karşılaştırılmasında iki ana noktayı göz önüne alıyorum. Birinci noktam, her iki yazarın akademiyi irdelerken kullandıkları ve genellikle akademisyen olarak nitelenen hayali karakterlerin güç ve prestij peşinde sonsuz koşuşturmalarını analiz etmek. İkinci noktam ise, Amanda Craig'in David Lodge'un *Consciousness and the Novel* (2002) adlı çalışmasına yazdığı inceleme metninde dile getirdiği "daha iyi bir yazar ve eleştirmen olmasına rağmen, edebiyata katkılarından ötürü neden halen David Lodge, Malcolm Bradbury gibi Sör ünvanına layık görülmemiştir" (2) sorusuna bir cevap bulabilmektir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to my advisor Assist Prof Dr Clare Brandabur for her support during the entire process of this dissertation. She was the only person who trusted in me during my writing process and did her best to encourage me in my desperate hours. She was the driving force of this thesis and I would like to dedicate my study to her.

I would like to thank to Assist Prof Dr Gülşen Sayın Teker for her understanding and help, and to Assist Prof Dr Özlem Görey who kindly accepted to be a member of my examining jury and provided me with valuable information for the final editing process of my thesis.

I also would like to thank to Mr Ahmet Korman who supported me throughout my graduate studies at Doğuş University and literally saved my life by taking me out of dirt. I am grateful to his both material and immaterial support during the course of this study.

Lastly, I would like to thank to my mother and father for their unconditional love and their immense support and trust throughout my whole life.

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
I. Chapter 1	
The Development of the Academic Novel in Post-War Britain	5
II. Chapter 2 – The Fifties:	
<i>The Picturegoers</i> (1960) and <i>Eating People is Wrong</i> (1959)	13
2.1 <i>The Picturegoers</i> (David Lodge)	13
2.2 <i>Eating People is Wrong</i> (Malcolm Bradbury)	25
III. Chapter 3 – The Sixties:	
<i>The British Museum is Falling Down</i> (1965) and <i>Stepping Westward</i> (1965)	39
3.1 <i>The British Museum is Falling Down</i> (David Lodge)	39
3.2 <i>Stepping Westward</i> (Malcolm Bradbury)	46
IV. Chapter 4 – The Seventies:	
<i>Changing Places: A Tale of Two Campuses</i> (1975) and <i>The History Man</i> (1975)	59
4.1 <i>Changing Places: A Tale of Two Campuses</i> (David Lodge)	60
4.2 <i>The History Man</i> (Malcolm Bradbury)	78
V. Chapter 5 – The Eighties:	
<i>Small World: An Academic Romance</i> (1984) and <i>Mensonge</i> (1987)	86
5.1 <i>Small World: An Academic Romance</i> (David Lodge)	86
5.2 <i>Mensonge</i> (Malcolm Bradbury)	100
CONCLUSION	107
WORKS CITED	115

INTRODUCTION

I was led to an interest in the academic novel by Kingsley Amis' *Lucky Jim* (1954), a novel which influenced me sufficiently to motivate further analysis of the entire genre that will be discussed in this study. Further research on this genre revealed the names of David Lodge and Malcolm Bradbury who have contributed to the academic novel with several works of fiction. Further investigation on both authors/critics showed that not only are their novels linked in many ways, but so are their lives. Both craftsmen were interested in the distribution of power and prestige and the schemes to obtain them in closed systems, such as the academy. In the meantime, both authors/critics were not only unveiling the structures of academic issues and scholar's quest for power and prestige but also parodying these issues as well as satirizing the academics' endless quest for recognition. The academic debates between Professor Welch and Jim Dixon in *Lucky Jim* served as a basis for this study which focuses on the parody of the academy in the novels of David Lodge and Malcolm Bradbury.

The secondary material that I hoped would enhance this study proved very limited in number, and many sources that seemed promising were unsatisfactory because their critical analysis of the subject novels were unsuited to my purpose. Therefore, in my analysis of parody of the academy in the novels of Lodge and Bradbury, it was necessary to criticize and to analyze the subject novels with my own originality. This study is divided into five chapters and except for the first chapter (that will be on the development of academic novels in Britain) each will discuss the novels of Lodge and Bradbury in the four decades beginning with the fifties and ending with the eighties. The novels that I will analyze in this study are David Lodge's *The Picturegoers* (1960), *The British Museum is Falling Down* (1965), *Changing Places* (1975) and *Small World* (1984) and Malcolm Bradbury's *Eating People is Wrong* (1959), *Stepping Westward* (1965), *The History Man* (1975) and *Mensonge: My Strange Quest for the Structuralism's Hidden Hero* (1987). Although these novels are analyzed separately in terms of their deployment of academic parody, this study will also try to show the links between the novels of both craftsmen by pointing out the intertextuality between their novels as well as interrelations between their lives.

Before moving on to analyze the novels, it is necessary to discuss a few critical terms and theories that will be employed in this study. First of all, as the title suggests, this study will make use of parody, which in a sense can be interpreted as "awkward" since parody

usually applies to a relationship of one text with another. A few definitions of the term “parody” are required before the reason of my employment of the term in the title is finally stated. In her study titled *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-Modern* (1993), Margaret A. Rose quotes the definition of term from Christopher Stone’s *Parody* (1914) who says that “ridicule is society’s most effective means of curing elasticity. It explodes the pompous, corrects the well-meaning eccentric, cools the fanatical, and prevents the incompetent from achieving success. Truth will prevail over it, falsehood will cower under it” (26) which, as Rose further indicates, is a widened description of “Sir Owen Seaman’s view of the ‘highest function’ of parody as being its ability to criticize that which is false” (26). According to these terms, parody is used as a medium to mediate between two opposite poles regarding one of them is ‘good’ and the other is ‘bad’, which is always subject to ethical discussions.

In the meantime, Rose also quotes Mikhail Bakhtin and his idea of ‘carnival’:
“Carnival brings together, unifies, weds, and combines the sacred with the profane, the lofty with the low, the great with the insignificant, the wise with the stupid” (161). Then, it will not be wrong to suggest that two opposite poles – not necessarily two, they may be multiple – are gathered together in terms of carnival. Rose continues to quote Bakhtin in the sense of carnival’s “‘dualistic’ character” (161): “All the images of the carnival are dualistic; they unite within themselves both poles of change and crisis. ... very characteristic for carnival thinking is paired images, chosen for their contrast or for their similarity” (161) and concludes her discussion with Bakhtin’s words: “Parodying is the creation of a decrowning double; it is that same ‘world turned inside out’” (162). In this sense, the term “parody” can be freely discussed as a “decrowning” action regardless of any ethical questions involved about the person in power.

Furthermore, Julia Kristeva comes into play just as when Bakhtin describes “carnivalistic discourse as breaking through the rules of censored speech” (Rose, 178). As Rose indicates, Kristeva “had taken a special interest in Bakhtin’s analysis of what she termed ‘the intertextual’” (178) which Kristeva defines as “that every text builds itself up as a mosaic of quotations, and that every text is the absorption and transformation of another text” (178). Therefore, when a text is written, its originality is always subjected to the ones that precede it. In another sense, the term well applies to parody in an attempt to “decrown” many previously established texts. In addition, Rose connects Barthes’ “The Death of the Author” with Kristeva’s intertextuality with respect to parody as: “... a text is made of multiple writings,

drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody, contestation, but there is one place where this multiplicity is focused and that place is the reader, not, as was hitherto said, the Author” (186). This Barthesian dictum is a very famous theory that invites readers into the play. After all, following Saussure, it is the reader, the addressee, who gathers the meaning regardless of the authority that sends the message. In this sense, the “decrowning” is more an issue for the readers than it is an issue for the original author who – viewed in Mensongian terms, I would say – is dead anyway.

On the other hand, Rose also quotes from Leslie Fielder’s essay titled “Cross The Border – Close The Gap” in which Fielder discusses “high” and “low” cultures; and arts as well, noting that “the ‘goodness’ and ‘badness’ of art [is] quite separated from distinctions between ‘high’ and ‘low’ with their concealed class bias” (214). Rose further adds, “Fielder, however, had also spoken of the destructiveness of parody might be put to use in closing the gap between the high and the low – the elite and the popular – by bringing the high low” (214). It is another “decrowning” act that parody, in Fielder’s terms, wishes to employ itself on “high culture” and “popular culture” to mediate between them.

Finally, I would like to indicate Foucault’s lecture on “The Discourse on Language”, at the College de France on December 2, 1970, which will conclude this theoretical discussion. In this lecture, Foucault affirms that, “in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed according to a certain number of procedures, whose role is to avert its powers and its dangers” (216). This is the very idea that I wish to apply to the academy in general. In the course of his lecture, Foucault also identifies the term “fellowship of discourse”, “whose function is to preserve or to reproduce discourse, but in order that it should circulate within a closed community, according to strict regulations, without those in possession being dispossessed by this very distribution” (225), and further indicates that “[e]very educational system is a political means of maintaining or of modifying the appropriation of discourse, with the knowledge and the powers it carries with it” (227). Likewise, the academy, and more precisely, the Head that is in power, has its own “strict regulations” and “means of maintaining” it, which could easily be revised or manipulated in time and space but would always maintain its original meaning as an ultimate “text” to claim its discourse. In the same lecture, Foucault analyses another term, “discontinuity” remarking that “the existence of systems of rarefaction does not imply that, over and beyond them lie great vistas of limitless discourse, continuous and silent, repressed and driven back by them,

making it our task to abolish them and at last to restore it to speech” (229). It is this kind of discontinuity that I wish to employ in the present study of the parody of the academy in the novels of David Lodge and Malcolm Bradbury.

In short, to get back from here to the starting point, I will employ the discourse of the academy and the “fellowship of discourse” in Foucault’s terms, as my ultimate text whereas I will deal with the novels of Lodge and Bradbury in terms of “discontinuity” that is related specifically to this ultimate text; but can also be applied to another “closed community”. I propose to apply it to the only non-academic novel that I wish to discuss in my study, namely David Lodge’s *The Picturegoers*, but which, in a sense, will slide into my whole discussion eventually.

In the meantime, Bakhtin’s idea of the carnival will be another driving force of my study. Having much in common with the previously discussed ideas on parody, in his critical study called *The Dialogic Novels of Malcolm Bradbury and David Lodge* (1989), Robert A. Morace identifies Bakhtin’s carnivalesque with “dialogue [that] involves a play of voices, no one of which emerges as final or superior; the play is serious, however, for its goal is a truth which, although elusive, even unattainable, does exist” (Preface xvi). As in the course of my novel analyses, this idea will be much clearer with both authors’ employment of “open-endings” and their discussion of multiple plots with multiple characters with a further employment of Bakhtin’s “heteroglossia” enabling them to deploy an unidentifiable narrative authority to make things happen. As Morace further suggests, “[i]n the dialogic novel, not even the narrator/author enjoys privileged status; he too takes part in the dialogic interplay, the ultimately open-ended give and take of voices and views” (xvi) and further adds, “Freed of monologic, or univocal, meaning, the dialogic novel inevitably leads to the extreme of deconstructionists intertextuality (Julia Kristeva’s synonym for Bakhtin’s dialogism)” (xvii), as previously discussed.

To sum up, this study will follow the development two postwar authors from the traditional realistic treatment of the novel through the postmodern era of the 1980s in the genre of the academic novel.

I. Chapter 1 – The Development of the Academic Novel in Post-War Britain

Today, it seems, there is an acknowledged genre of the university novel, and I am assumed to have contributed to it. In some ways the term annoys; whether Joseph Conrad relished being called an author of “sea-stories” I cannot recall, but few of us, who are instinctively popular or market writers like to have our novels labelled by their settings. (*Bradbury, No Not Bloomsbury*, 330)

In an attempt to find out the origins of the academic novel, it would be hard and useless to list all the novels in English literature that are set at universities or somewhat linked with universities throughout their plots. Instead, I will only point out the most important precursors that have influenced the authors whose works will be discussed in this study. As Elaine Showalter observes in her recent *Faculty Towers* (2005), the nineteenth century novel that provides a model for 1950s authors of the academic novel is Anthony Trollope’s *Barchester Towers* (1857). This novel is the second book of Trollope’s *The Chronicles of Barsetshire* series which consists of six novels set in the imaginary cathedral city of Barchester in the Victorian period. The very first lines of the novel, “In the latter days of July in the year 185-, a most important question was for ten days hourly asked in the cathedral city of Barchester, and answered every hour in various ways – Who was to be the new Bishop?” (1) clearly indicates that a competition for power is taking place in the cathedral’s closed clerical academic system. While satirizing this quest for power, Trollope analyses human reason and comments on the human condition.

Almost a century after the publication of *Barchester Towers*, English author and physicist Charles Percy Snow dealt with the same theme in his own eleven interrelated novels in the form of series known as *Strangers and Brothers* analyzing the life and career of his character Lewis Eliot from his adolescence up to his retirement. Published in 1951, *The Masters* is considered to be the first academic novel ever published in Britain. Following the fashion, which Trollope used in *Barchester Towers*, C.P. Snow discusses the competition for power in a Cambridge college, where thirteen academics try their best to replace the dying Dean. On the other hand, the election that is held in the novel finally turns into a rivalry between humanities and scientific studies in which traditional values are described as humanities and liberal values are represented by scientific research. *The Masters* portrays the academics, serious and calm, the products of a traditional education system; but a few liberal

minded professors are present within the election to suggest, support and even to get elected to promote their revolutionary ideas about the system. Elaine Showalter says, “C. P. Snow was among the first to show the deadly serious and highly worldly machinations of university politics and their relation to the political machinations outside in an ugly dark decade” (16).

At this stage, it is worth pointing out that Snow always treated Trollope as his master and wrote a book about him in which it is said that Snow was “admired chiefly for his ability to see his characters from the inside and the outside” (Showalter 16). *In Faculty Towers*, Elaine Showalter further states,

In his own analysis of academic politics, Snow follows Trollope in his efforts to understand what motivates even the most crotchety or vain among the fellows, and although he has none of Trollope’s humor, his detailed, sensitive portraits of the way these men function as scholars, as members of an academic community, as political animals, and as vulnerable human beings still stands as the best portrait of the academic type. (16)

Both authors were interested in power and its application in various institutes so it was almost impossible for them to avoid dealing with politics in their real lives. Trollope’s election campaign as a Liberal was unsuccessful but Snow served as a private secretary in the Ministry of Technology under Prime Minister Harold Wilson. Although Snow left the parliament in 1966, he was always in the public eye. In a review of C.P. Snow, George Watson says, “He had always wanted to be where the power was, and adored meeting important people. . . . Life was a power-game, and more than a game. Life was about excelling” (1).

More than analyzing human behaviour in their quests for power and recognition throughout his *Strangers and Brothers* series, C.P. Snow also manages to show a new path to the post-war British authors of the 50s. William Cooper, who acknowledges Snow as his “comrade-in-arms”, discusses this progression:

We meant to write a different kind of novel from that of the Thirties and we saw the Thirties Novel, the Experimental Novel, had to be brushed out of the way before we could get a proper hearing. Putting it simply, to start with: the Experimental Novel was about Man-Alone; we meant to write novels about Man-in-Society as well. (Please note the ‘as well’; it’s important. We have no qualms about incorporating any useful discoveries that had been made in the course of Experimental Writing; we simply refused to restrict ourselves to them.) (quoted in Bradbury, *No, Not Bloomsbury* 173)

The term “Man-in Society” clearly identifies Snow’s *Strangers and Brothers* series, which has more in common with Victorian Novel than with Modernism. Malcolm Bradbury states that “*Strangers and Brothers* is told like a Victorian novel and written in much the spirit of a Wellsian one,” (*No, Not Bloomsbury* 178) and furthermore, believes that both Snow and Cooper provide the missing link between “experiment” and “realism”, the “moderns” and the “contemporaries”:

The novel, Snow, Cooper and others suggested, should not be an aesthetic distillation of experience, but of experience as it was known and felt, experience as a given. It arose not from the intense speculation of an artist working solely in fiction’s special universe, but the sharing of the extant world with others through the medium of fiction’s local powers of attention. (*No, Not Bloomsbury*, 188)

Randall Stevenson further analyses this link in his book *The Last of England?* published as the twelfth volume of *The Oxford English Literary Series*:

Many novelists emerging in the 1950s turned away from modernism as firmly as Movement poets did at that time. Interests in class and society – even the serial method of publication – resumed much of the manner of Victorian fiction in novel-sequences by Snow and Powell. Concern with social change likewise encouraged other writers in the late 1950s and early 1960s to return, if not directly to the manner of Victorian fiction, at any rate to the example of early twentieth-century authors modernism had rejected. (405)

In short, the post-war authors of 1950s manage to combine Modernism’s experience with Victorian realism in order to analyze both their characters’ feelings inside and their interactions with the society outside.

In America, the sub-genre of academic novel mainly began with Mary McCarthy’s *The Groves of Academe* (1952). The novel is set at a small campus called Jocelyn and tells the story of a professor’s struggle with the aspects of academic life. The temporary professor, Henry Mulcahy, loses his post at the university and spreads a rumour, telling a lie that he is fired because he once was a member of the Communist Party. He wants to accuse the university of a witch-hunt in order to question the academy’s liberal values, a plot that was recent history in America during the MacCarthy period. As a reply to *The Groves of Academe*

and mainly as a reply to its author, Randall Jarrell writes *Pictures from an Institution* (1954). Gertrude Johnson, the new visiting writer employed as creative writing instructor at the all-girls college of Benton, decides to write her experiences at the college, which, at the end, turns out to be satire about the institution and the academy in general. In the meantime, Gertrude's employment at Benton overlaps the tenure of a poet, which provides another great satire within the novel. Charles Knight reveals this hidden strategy of Jarrell in the novel:

[Gertrude's] stay overlaps with that of a poet, who is leaving the college in part because of his impatience with its limiting pedagogy. The novel [Jarrell] writes about the satiric novelist is presumably the novel we are reading. Jarrell's position as poet at Sarah Lawrence College overlapped with Mary McCarthy's stint as visiting writer, and the novel seems a fictional description of McCarthy's composition of *The Groves of Academe*. ("Satire and The Academic Novel (1950)" 3)

In his review of Elaine Showalter's book *Faculty Towers, The Academic Novels and its Discontents* (called "Civilization and Its Malcontents, or Why Are Academics So Unhappy?"), Joseph Epstein discusses this strategy of Jarrell, observing that, "The most menacing character in Jarrell's novel, Gertrude Johnson, is based on Mary McCarthy ... of whom Jarrell has one of his characters remark: 'She may be a mediocre novelist but you've got to admit that she's a wonderful liar'" (2). While satirizing the academy, Jarrell wonderfully succeeds in satirizing a former colleague of his and even avenges the frustration of his post at Sarah Lawrence College.

Upon these first examples of academic novel in the United States, Malcolm Bradbury comments,

Hence the genre appropriately had its match in the United States, where the theme of the "new liberalism" sounded through fiction. The intellectual and moral crisis of liberalism and progressivism thus sounds firmly through the two great American examples from the time, Mary McCarthy's *Groves of Academe* (1952), a very sharp novel about a progressive institution exploited by a member of faculty who projects his tenure by pretending to be a communist, and Randall Jarrell's *Pictures from an Institution* (1954), which adds a new level of irony by in fact being a comment on Mary McCarthy writing her book. Thus is genre born. Both are indeed the sharpest of satires, on the innocence of the new liberalism, and they explore amongst other things the relation between the writer or general intellectual and the intellectual institution which now

served as a new artistic milieu in the age of a fading avant garde and an incorporated intelligentsia, the campus itself. (*No, Not Bloomsbury* 332)

The term “new liberalism” that Bradbury chooses to call these works is important for he believes fiction in general does enter a progressive period in 1950s which liberates the author by putting the action back into the scene in order to develop the character within the society and its related setting.

Turning back to Britain, the year 1954 is an unforgettable one for the development of Campus Novels. In January 1954, Kingsley Amis’ *Lucky Jim*, undeniably the best Campus Novel ever written up to this date and possibly for a long time hereafter, gets published. It is the original, one of a kind, the funniest and the wittiest academic satire ever. The novel tells the story of Jim Dixon, a temporary lecturer of history at a provincial redbrick university, who tries to maintain his post in the academy by playing the game with the academy’s rules. He certainly feels he does not belong to the university but on the other hand he does not try to leave the academy either. Written by such an insight, *Lucky Jim* is full of paradoxes between Jim Dixon’s thoughts and actions, which David Lodge analyses thus:

The main source of comedy in the novel is therefore the contrast between Jim’s outer world and his inner world. While he tries – not very successfully – to show the outer world the image of an industrious, respectable well-mannered young man, his mind seethes with caustic sarcasm directed against himself and others, with fantasies of violence done to enemies, of triumph for himself. (*Language of Fiction* 267)

In his book on David Lodge titled *David Lodge* (1995), Bernard Bergonzi cannot keep himself from saying a few words about *Lucky Jim*, which is one of the main influences on David Lodge:

It was a wonderfully comic work, but it had its serious implications, and it brought into public consciousness a new setting – a minor English provincial university – and a new kind of hero, the iconoclastic young man with good academic qualifications but a marked lack of sympathy for the traditional claims and attitudes of high culture. (14)

In *Faculty Towers*, Elaine Showalter, who stresses the importance of the novel in the development of the academic novel, combines both Malcolm Bradbury's and David Lodge's opinions on *Lucky Jim* showing the influence of the novel on both authors:

The '50s also produced the funniest academic satire of the century, Kingsley Amis' *Lucky Jim*, set in a provincial redbrick university. The book portrays professors as stuffy, ridiculous phoneyes, whose confidence is complacency and whose self-importance is matched only by their significance. In the *Modern British Novel*, Malcolm Bradbury describes *Lucky Jim* as "the exemplary fifties novel. The story of Jim Dixon, the young history lecturer in a provincial university who is inwardly and comically at odds with the Bloomsburified academic, artistic and social culture of his elders, captured a powerful contemporary mood." David Lodge who read *Lucky Jim* in 1955 "with exquisite pleasure" when he finished his degree at University College, London, and who was "deeply indebted" to its example, recalls that "to many young people who grew up in the post-war period, and benefited from the 1944 Education Act, it seemed that the old pre-war upper classes still maintained their privileged position because they commanded the social and cultural high ground." Jim Dixon is "taking up a university post at a time when provincial universities were all mini-Oxbridges, aping and largely staffed by graduates of the ancient universities." (14-5)

The 1944 Butler Education Act, the emergence of redbrick universities in Britain and their impact upon Malcolm Bradbury and David Lodge will be further discussed in the following chapters but before that it is better to summarise the main plot of *Lucky Jim* and quote a few remarkable passages from the novel.

David Lodge contributes to *Lucky Jim*'s reprint by Penguin Classics in 2000 with his introduction to the novel in which he admits that, "*Lucky Jim* certainly started something ... My own novels of university life, and those of Malcolm Bradbury, Howard Jacobson, Andrew Davies et al., are deeply indebted to its example" (vii-viii). In David Lodge's own words, the main plot of the novel is like this:

As a temporary assistant lecturer at a provincial university, Jim Dixon is totally dependent for the continuance of his employment on his absent-minded professor's patronage, which itself requires that Jim should demonstrate his professional competence by publishing a scholarly article. Jim despises both his professor and the rituals of academic scholarship, but cannot afford to say so. His resentment is therefore interiorised, sometimes in fantasies of violence (e.g. "to tie Welch up in his chair and beat him about the head and shoulders with a bottle until he disclosed why, without being French himself, he'd given his sons French names") and at other times in satirical

mental commentary upon the behaviour, discourses and institutional codes which oppress him.
(*The Art of Fiction* 111)

In his book *British Culture: An Introduction*, David Christopher describes Jim Dixon as “a young, philistine university lecturer who drinks heavily, hates classical music and is critical of the cultural pretensions of academia” (38). Throughout the novel, Jim is mostly critical about his professor Welch, and tries to find a reasonable answer to the question that disturbs his mind:

How had [Welch] become Professor of History, even at a place like this? By published work? No. By extra teaching? No in italics. Then how? As usual, Dixon shelved this question, telling himself that what mattered was that this man had decisive power over his future, at any rate until the next four or five weeks were up. Until then he must try to make Welch like him, and one way of doing that was, he supposed, to be present and conscious while Welch talked about concerts. But did Welch notice who else was there while he talked, and if he noticed did he remember, and if he remembered would it affect such thoughts as he had already? (*Lucky Jim* 8)

On the other hand, being a temporary lecturer at the university, his position depends on an article that he is supposed to write and get it published in *Times Literary Supplement* journal. Without having started writing and having no intention in doing so, Jim answers, or rather intends to answer, Welch’s question about his article’s title:

It was a perfect title, in that it crystallized the article’s niggling mindlessness, its funeral parade of yawn-enforcing facts, the pseudo-light it threw upon non-problems. Dixon had read, or begun to read, dozens like it, but his own seemed worse than most in its air of being convinced of its own usefulness and significance. ‘In considering this strangely neglected topic,’ it began. This what neglected topic? This strangely what topic? This strangely neglected what? His thinking all this without having defiled and set fire to the typescript only made him appear to himself as more of a hypocrite and fool. ‘Let’s see,’ he echoed Welch in a pretended effort of memory: ‘oh yes; The Economic Influence of the Developments in Shipbuilding Techniques, 1450 to 1485. (14-5)

This passage is one of the funniest and one of the most quoted passages of the novel. Criticizing the academy and the academic articles written for academic journals, both Jim and his author Kingsley Amis question the functions of academic writing in terms of their writing processes, in what situations they are prepared, and to what purposes that they are produced. In general, Amis analyses the hypocrisy in the academy with his character Jim Dixon, but he

also includes Jim in his satire by criticizing Jim's own hypocrisy within the hypocritical academy. According to David Lodge,

The saving grace of Amis' novel is that Jim himself is involved in the comedy, he is himself a hypocrite. Temperament and circumstances impel him to present a false appearance to the world: he pretends to be a keen young scholar and university teacher, when in fact he detests his subject and despises his colleagues; he pretends to be sympathetically attracted to Margaret when in fact he finds her plain and tedious. What makes us value Jim above the other shams in the novel is the fact that at least he admits he is a sham, chiefly to himself; and that his deceptions – as in the case of Margaret – can reflect a kind of moral decency as well as a kind of moral cowardice. (*The Language of Fiction*, 267)

Through the end of the novel, Jim decides to put his thoughts into action and finally reveals the need for physical violence that he has been hiding inside towards hypocrites around him by punching Welch's son. After his thoughts and actions are combined and become one, Jim becomes wholly himself. He understands what he really is and decides to take control of his life. He leaves the university, gets over his obsession with Margaret and begins his new life, which truly belongs and only depends on himself. He leaves the hypocrisy of the academy behind as well as the hypocrisy that is imposed on him by the institution.

Obviously, then, Showalter, concludes, "*Lucky Jim* is the source of the most of the academic novels that followed, the real origin of the genre" (33). In the same context, Elaine Showalter also values Jim Dixon's portrayal as "the author's vehicle for an attack on a dying tradition and a suffocating institution" (33). She also analyses Jim's decision on leaving the academy, comparing *Lucky Jim* with Snow's *The Masters*: "*The Masters* appeals to and address that side of the academic psyche that idealizes the ivory tower, *Lucky Jim* speaks to the academic spirit of rebellion and impatience, the feeling that life must be lived more intensely outside the walls" (23).

Having analyzed the importance of Kingsley Amis' *Lucky Jim* in the development of 'academic novel', it would be better now to turn to the main subject of this study by starting to analyse the novels of David Lodge and Malcolm Bradbury to find out how they had become "literary twins" with their interrelated 'academic novels' throughout their writing careers.

II. Chapter 2 – The Fifties: *The Picturegoers* (1960) and *Eating People is Wrong* (1959)

I prefer to begin my analysis of David Lodge and Malcolm Bradbury with their first works in order to define their first steps into the literary scene. Published almost in the same period; Malcolm Bradbury's *Eating People is Wrong* (1959) and David Lodge's *The Picturegoers* (1960) generally deal with social issues of the 1950s post-war provincial England. David Lodge's first novel is set in an imaginary district of London and, as its title suggests, it analyzes contemporary social issues through the eyes of a group of characters who meet at a cinema. On the other hand, Malcolm Bradbury's first novel takes place at an imaginary redbrick university based in provincial London and analyzes the social and moral issues of the 1950s in post-war England. Both settings are carefully chosen to serve as microcosms of contemporary society. Although Lodge's first novel does not deal with the academy in general, his protagonist is a student of English literature and one of the main themes of the novel is his development in the 1950s and the novel does provide a closed community in which ideological conflicts anticipate the kinds of controversies and personality types which will flourish in the later academic novels. On the other hand, Bradbury's first novel is considered an academic novel though it is not limited to academic issues of the period. Bradbury simply uses a university as the microcosm of the society, just as Lodge uses cinema, to analyze the society in general.

2.1 *The Picturegoers* (1960)

Palladium, a defence or protection, from the Greek *Palladion*, the statue of Pallas, on whom the safety of Troy was fabled to depend. (18)

The Picturegoers, the first novel of David Lodge, was published in 1960 but had been completed in 1956 when Lodge was twenty-one years old. Set in Brickley, an imaginary district of London, the novel is a combination of stories which seem rather separate but get combined through the end of the novel. As the title suggests, the residents of Brickley, the characters of Lodge, are the picturegoers who gather together at the Palladium Cinema at Saturday nights. The Palladium Cinema, which is managed by Mr. Berkeley, is an ex-theatre converted into a cinema to supply the demands of a younger generation that prefers going to movies rather than to plays. Mr. Berkeley, who is not altogether happy to be the manager of

the cinema, misses his past glorious days in theatre with actors and actresses when they were entertaining a much more cultured group of people, rather small in size but totally self-satisfactory in terms of human relationships and entertainment. In the meantime, he is grateful to be the manager of the cinema, because if the theatre had not been converted to a cinema, it would have been a warehouse of which he would have been the manager, and this position would have severely diminished his reputation and social status in Brickley. On the other hand, though we are not introduced to his wife in the novel, Lodge reveals that Mrs. Berkeley refuses to divorce him in spite of the troubles in the marriage. Predictably the unloved Mr. Berkeley finds the passion he is looking for in Doreen Higgins, an usherette at the Palladium Cinema almost young enough to be his daughter. Doreen's mother knows about this relationship and is against it, but Doreen continues this affair hoping that Mr. Berkeley will one day divorce his wife and marry her.

The main story, if there is one in the novel looked at as a whole, is developed around the Mallory family. The mother of the family, Elizabeth Mallory, was responsible for the conversion to Catholicism of her husband Tom Mallory. Being Irish Catholics, for whom birth control is forbidden, they have eight children. James, the eldest, is a missionary in Africa. Robert is at National Service in Germany and is due to attend a teacher's training college after his release from the army. Christine, the eldest daughter, is a nurse. Clare, one of the main characters of the novel, is a beautiful shy schoolgirl with auburn hair who has recently returned from two years as a postulant in a convent. Although we are not told her exact age, she must be at least one year older than Patricia, her younger sister, who at 17 has problems with her parents complaining that they do not understand her. One of Patricia's main problems is her brother Patrick, who, Patricia thinks, is favoured by their parents just because he is a boy. Monica and Lucy are twelve-year-old twins and the youngest of the family. The three adult children, James in the priesthood, Robert away at National Service in the artillery, and Christine, a nurse, are present neither in the foreground of the novel nor in the house of the family (48). In their absence, Elizabeth has decided that renting out a now unoccupied room will help their economy. So, she has placed an advertisement in the paper including a note saying "Good Catholic family – co-religionist preferred" (46). Mark, assuming that this small note belonged to the next advertisement, answered the ad and, although he reveals that he is not a Catholic and not even interested in religion, gets accepted by Elizabeth and becomes the Mallory's lodger.

Mark Underwood is a student of English Literature at London University and plans to become a writer after his graduation. He has written a short story that is constantly being rejected by publishers. An attraction develops between Mark and Clare Mallory and in this relationship, Mark allows Clare to realize “the dream she cherished – to reform, or rather, to convert Mark,” (37) just as her mother had converted her father to Catholicism in the past. Although Clare really loves Mark and wants him to educate her, Mark engages in a covertly seductive campaign to break down Clare’s innocence. Clare thinks he only wants to “worry her, to inflict his depression on her” (22). In fact, Clare is aware of something ambiguous in their relationship and makes it clear to Mark saying, “I never know whether you regard me as a girl or as a huge joke,” (25) but at such moments, Mark carefully changes the subject, never enabling Clare to know his true feelings towards her. Though we assume initially that Clare Mallory had left the convent voluntarily, we learn later that she had been asked to leave. Clare explains to Mark that Hilda Syms, one of her students, had developed a crush on her and their relationship had come to resemble a love relationship in its intensity. Clare admits honestly that she had been asked to leave the convent right after “Hilda got hysterical and tried to kill herself with aspirins” (53). Clare’s leaving the convent upset her cousin, Damien O’Brien, an ugly man who has also recently left a religious community in Ireland. Damien is portrayed as a fanatically religious character, preoccupied with judging other people and serving as the secretary of the Committee of the Apostleship of Prayer. He imagines that he himself is in love with Clare and sees Mark as “the Serpent into the Garden” (29). Jealously spying on the two, Damien interprets Mark’s relationship with Clare negatively, worrying about how “that fellow Underwood was doing his best to degrade Clare, and she was almost co-operating” (28). Damien follows Mark and Clare and when he sees them kissing, he calls it as “as shameless as the casual coupling of two dogs” (159). On the other hand Patricia thinks of leaving the house feeling that nobody in the family understands her but Mark. Mark gives Patricia a copy of James Joyce’s *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and “that book had made her decide to be a writer” (32). Because Mark listens to her, and she feels that he understands her, Patricia falls in love with him but never tells him about her feelings. In short, Damien loves Clare, both Patricia and Clare love Mark, but Mark loves no one and later in the novel we see that he becomes much more interested in Catholicism than in any girl around him.

Among several minor characters in the novel an important one is Father Kipling, the Parish Priest of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour, who goes to the Palladium Cinema on the

wrong day to watch *Song of Bernadette*, a religious movie, but is upset and even angry when he finds out that the movie is instead an indecent Hollywood production which shows the actress Amber Lush in her underwear. In order to prevent his parishioners from going to the movies on Saturday nights, Father Kipling decides to hold Saturday night Benediction services at the Church and calls his program a “crusade” against Cinema. Soon it becomes apparent that his crusade is a failure attracting only “a pitiful dozen worshippers” (125) whereas “the other two thousand souls in his parish” (125) prefer going to the movies.

Other regular moviegoers are Len and Bridget who plan to get married after Len is released from his National Service but they get married earlier due to an unexpected event that happens to Bridget on her way to her house from the cinema. Harry, another movie-goer who always wears black and has violent feelings towards people around him much like *A Clockwork Orange*'s Alex, follows Bridget on her way home and tries to rape her (165). Both shocked by this attack, they decide not to delay their marriage further, and Len gets permission from the army to return to Brickley and marry Bridget. Len's family opposes the marriage and we understand for the first time in the novel that Bridget is a “foundling”; so, nobody attends their wedding except Clare, who happens along in time to act as their only witness. Meanwhile, Doreen gets pregnant by Mr. Berkeley, who cannot convince his wife to give him a divorce and therefore cannot marry Doreen. In order to have the baby discreetly away from her family, she travels to Newcastle by train and on this voyage, when a man attempts to flirt with her, Doreen thinks that she can find protection by telling him that she's pregnant:

She wasn't going to encourage him. He might be a real friend, or he might not. In any case she could always find out his real intentions by telling him she was pregnant. That was the quickest way of getting rid of wolves. She smiled secretly as she thought of it. The little bastard inside her was a kind of protection. She could look after herself. But there was no reason why she shouldn't enjoy a bit of company for the rest of the journey. (232)

Turning back to Mark and Clare's relationship, Clare's attempt to convert Mark to Catholicism succeeds just as Mark's cynical indifference towards religion overcomes Clare's preoccupation with religious scruples while his erotic wooing arouses her latent passions. Thus the Clare/Mark thread of the plot takes on the profile of what E.M. Forster in *Aspects of the Novel* calls “hour-glass” patterning, like that in Anatole France's *Thais* and Henry James'

The Ambassadors, in which characters begin at opposite poles, meet and interact, then each takes the position previously held by the other (Forster 150). In *The Dialogic Novels of Malcolm Bradbury and David Lodge* (1989), Robert A. Morace analyses this change:

We witness in their language the fact that Mark and Clare have in effect traded characters. She has become more sceptical and self-consciously dialogical, and he more strident and monologically certain. In the thoughts and words of each we hear the echoes of what the other formerly was, though in a form modified by some essential feature of their characters: in Clare's case, her authenticity, in Mark's his posturing. (115)

In Part II, Mark takes part in a pilgrimage and carries the Cross barefoot, an experience which inspires him so much that he decides he wants to join the Dominican Order and become a priest. Although his application is turned down or at least postponed by Father Courtney, who tells him he is not ready and should wait another year to join the Order, Clare is extremely upset by Mark's decision because if he becomes a Dominican they will never get married. Towards the end of the novel, Clare finally asks Mark a long delayed question:

'Tell me, Mark, did you ever love me?'

'I don't know how to answer that, Clare. I know that sometimes I used to say "I love you" in a light-hearted way. ... But I think you realized that I was never using the words seriously.'

'Yes; you were always very careful.'

'But I felt less affection and respect for you when I said it then, than I do at this minute, when I can't honestly say it. It was just part of the routine. Pretty despicable I know.' (200)

After these words, Mark tells Clare that he will leave both her and Brickley and will return to his hometown Blatcham in order to save his parents, if not Blatcham, by converting them to Catholicism. Upon this, whether by her newly gained self-esteem or by her total anger towards Mark, Clare refuses to wish him farewell and says:

You don't seem to realize that you have certain obligations to me, a certain loyalty owing to me. From the very first time you took me to the pictures, you started to change me, shape me in your own image, make me like you. Now I'm like you, you're like I used to be. It's like a see-saw: one side goes up, one side goes down. That's me gone down I suppose. (202)

Clare's little speech does not move Mark at all, and, strangely enough, he begins to think about how he will explain to Elizabeth his leaving the Mallorys instead of focusing on

his relationship with Clare. Meanwhile, while tidying Mark's desk, Elizabeth accidentally slithers one of his exercise books towards the edge and a loose page drops to the floor. She takes it up, hesitantly looks at it, and finds herself reading a page from Mark's diary in which he describes his past attempts at seducing Clare, wanting to "touch one of the forbidden areas" (212). Upon Mark's return to the house, Elizabeth confronts him, shows him the page she has read, and tells him that she's "very disappointed" (213) in him. At that moment, Mark finds the excuse for leaving that he has been looking for and replies, "You have every reason to be. I'm sorry. Obviously I can't stay here any longer. I'll leave tonight" (213). And off he goes to Blatcham to save the sinful souls of his parents.

The Picturegoers is written in three parts. In the first part, Lodge describes the Palladium Cinema and the events that take place on Saturday night in the cinema and Sunday morning at the Church. In the second part, the next Saturday night and Sunday morning are described and in the third part, events which take place two months later resolve each of the sub-plots and allow Lodge to conclude the novel by drawing the separate stories together. As Lodge suggests in the Introduction to the novel, "*Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* would have been a perfect title for it, if Alan Sillitoe hadn't thought of it first" (xv). Although this novel is Lodge's first, he manages to control his multiple characters perfectly and succeeds in combining them at the end in order to create a microcosm of 1950s society in his imaginary district Brickley. His narrative technique is unique; he describes his characters separately and tells their stories independently.

The novel is like a combination of short stories that are cut into pieces and inserted into the novel in no specific order to create a whole. There is Mark and Clare's story, Len and Bridget's story, Mr Berkeley and Doreen's story, Father Kipling's story, Patricia's story, Damien's story and Harry's story which are sort of cut into segments of one or two pages interspersed among the pages of the novel. Sometimes it is hard for the readers to trace them all at the first reading and the full comprehension of the novel requires a second, more satisfying, reading. Lodge demonstrates suspense; he neither attempts to judge his characters nor to provide a fully detailed analysis of their lives. On the contrary, he acts as a witness to their present situations. He makes use of flashbacks and diaries to give hints at certain moments of the novel but he never allows the readers to become fully acquainted with his characters. All these characters' lives are kept separate and what combines them is the setting of the novel: the Brickley district and the Palladium Cinema.

In a review in *The Observer*, Kingsley Amis states that *The Picturegoers* is “sharp and real,” and although he criticizes the author for a lack of depth in his characterizations, gives Lodge credit for his experimental narrative technique. This narrative skill is further demonstrated in Lodge’s later works as Morace says in *The Dialogic Novels of Malcolm Bradbury and David Lodge* (1989): “In *The Picturegoers*, and indeed throughout his career as novelist and as critic, he has always tempered his willingness to explore new narrative and theoretical modes with a healthy sense of caution, or scepticism.” (115)

In her article “A Desperado of Simplicity” a chapter in *British Desperados* (1999), Lidia Vianu states that David Lodge’s

first novel is amazingly life-like for a beginner. It mixes the realistic tradition with the Stream-of-Consciousness. It is divided into episodes, which build up stories of couples. ... At first the stories are kept separate, but towards the end they begin to entwine and the coincidences are hard to believe and reduce the realism of the book, making it more of a game than a piece of real life. The fingers of the conniving author show. (8-9)

Indeed, some of the “coincidences” in the novel “are hard to believe” but in a sense, reality is stranger than fiction and Lodge takes his authorial freedom to muse upon the coincidences and allows them to have their mysterious ways. On the other hand, on a later re-reading of the novel, Lodge states that, “I was somewhat surprised by the prominence of its religious element, and the seriousness with which the hero’s ‘conversion’ is treated” (viii). These “religious elements” of the novel, help to account for the strange coincidences that take place in the novel which “are hard to believe.” It is not surprising that a twenty-one year old writer, who worked on a study of Catholic Novels for his MA Thesis, should deal with religion in his very first novel. In fact, Lodge indicates that

The Picturegoers was not the first novel I wrote. In my first year as a very young undergraduate at University College London, mostly in the long vacation, I wrote a novel portentously entitled *The Devil, The World and the Flesh*. The epigraph was taken from the Penny Catechism: ‘*Q: What are the enemies we must fight against all the days of our life? A: The enemies which we must fight against all the days of our life are the devil, the world and the flesh.*’ (xi)

It is quite natural, then, that some of the stories in *The Picturegoers* should be directly linked with this unfinished and unpublished novel. Needless to say, religion has its own mysterious ways to impose reality and Lodge assumes this reality in *The Picturegoers*.

Although *The Picturegoers* was quite successful for a first novel, David Lodge admits he had doubts about the merit of re-publishing it when it was out-of-print. In the “Introduction” to the new edition of the novel in 1993, he says,

When, about ten years ago, Secker & Warburg and Penguin began reissuing my early novels, I decided to start with the second of them, *Ginger, You're Barmy* (1962). Without having read its predecessor, *The Picturegoers* (1960), for many years, and without feeling the need to do so then, I was quite sure that I did not want to resurrect it. I began the novel when I was only twenty-one (though it was not, for various reasons, published until I was twenty-five), and in my memory it betrayed the youthfulness and inexperience of its author all too clearly. (vii)

He further states, “Like most first novels, it tends to be a receptacle for whatever thoughts and phrases the author was nurturing at the time of composition, whether or not they are relevant. There are some improbabilities and clichés in the characterizations where I was obviously out of my depth” (viii). On the other hand, Lodge accepts that *The Picturegoers* serves as an introduction to his later novels which have much in common with his first one in terms of narrative style and characterization:

In other respects I see a family resemblance between this first novel and its successors. The structural equivalence/difference between Church and Cinema, and the see-saw relationship between hero and heroine, foreshadowed similar binary oppositions and relationships in subsequent novels: the rebel and the opportunist in *Ginger, You're Barmy*, Rummidge and Euphoria in *Changing Places*, Industry and Academia in *Nice Work*. The plurality of characters in *The Picturegoers*, connected by chance meetings and juxtapositions, anticipated the large casts of minor characters drawn together through coincidence in *Small World* and *Paradise News*. (ix)

Morace agrees with Lodge and states that “Many of the same dialogic concerns and techniques that inform his later works appear here in embryo, as it were, in stumbling, exaggerated form, writ large not so much for the near-blind reader (or critic) as for the tentative would-be novelist.” (109)

In many ways, *The Picturegoers* provides insight into 1950s England and can be read as a period novel dealing with the social issues and concerns of that post-war era. In his “Introduction”, David Lodge states, “The surface texture of the novel is, however, very much of its period. Turning its pages, I had the sense of traveling back in time to a lost world, rediscovering the England in which I grew up, with social practices and linguistic usages that now seem quaintly archaic (ix). The “linguistic usages” that Lodge gives examples of in his novel, show clearly Bakhtin’s influence upon him in terms of carnivalization. Although what Lodge does in his first novel is to describe the social structure of England in the 1950s, the varieties of “cockney” English spoken by the lower class in the novel move directly in line with Bakhtin’s idea of carnivalesque and dialogism in which many different voices and different narratives are combined to fully describe the social structure and system. The linguistic styles of both the children outside the Palladium Cinema asking the adults to let them in to watch an “A” class movie and that of the maids cleaning the cinema while gossiping about Brickley issues, give the readers a hint about how different characters of different class systems conceive and respond to the events taking place in Brickley. This variety of voices also enriches the narrative, giving it not a monotonous single-voiced narrator but a many-voiced one, who can describe the events from different perspectives allowing for a more nuanced judgment. Morace provides an interesting reflection on this issue:

[Lodge] permits each of his picturegoers to speak in his or her own turn and in his or her own voice within the novel’s fictive space and limited carnival freedom (Interview with Haffenden 146 – 147). In his subsequent reading of Bakhtin and Gerard Genette, Lodge found the theoretical rationale behind his inchoate use of essentially dialogic narrative techniques. As he discovered, “the more the characters are allowed to speak for themselves in the narrative text, and the less they are explained by an authoritative narrator, the stronger will be our sense of their individual freedom of choice – and our own interpretive freedom.” (110)

In his “Introduction”, Lodge himself provides a brief explanation about why he chose to use a cinema for his setting:

In *The Picturegoers*, the treatment of the cinema as both institution and medium is more sociological and cultural in emphasis. I was influenced in this respect by Richard Hoggart’s *The Uses of Literacy*, which I read shortly after it was published in 1957. Hoggart’s examination, critical without being condescending, of the connections and contradictions between the often tawdry and trivial products of popular literature and journalism, and the real lives of the people who consume them, encouraged me to think about the role of cinema in society in a similar

spirit. Much of the material discussed by Richard Hoggart belonged to the pre-war era, and was being supplanted by brasher, slicker publications. By the late Fifties, cinema-going was also in decline, under the impact of television and other developments in popular culture, and I made this a theme of my novel, giving it a slightly elegiac note which also resonates in parts of *The Uses of Literacy*. (x-xi)

In some terms, the above quotation from David Lodge can be analyzed as indicating that his main intention in his first novel was to criticize the media and its effects on society. Vianu states that

What all the characters have in common is going to the cinema during the weekend, as if they were projecting themselves on the screen. David Lodge begins by X-raying their thoughts in a mildly Joycean way, only towards the end he changes his manner, and decides in favour of a more Hardy-like plot, with premonitions, blatant coincidences, unresolved frustrations. (9)

Vianu discusses both the cinema's effects on the characters and Lodge's narrative technique in *The Picturegoers*, which she says begins like a "Stream-of-Consciousness" novel but later turns into a realistic one with a sense of humour at the end. On the other hand, Morace analyzes the setting as:

The Palladium Moviehouse, formerly the grander Palladium Theatre, serves the same purpose on the thematic level that the novel itself does in the larger structural sense. It acts as a meeting place, not only for people but for styles, forms, and languages as well. Just as the characters go to the Palladium for a variety of reasons – to be entertained, to be titillated, to fantasize, to rest, to kill time, to earn a living – the reader experiences a similar diversity in the novel as a whole – a variety of characters and overlapping, or intersecting, but nonetheless largely discrete plots. (110-11)

In theory, Lodge's idea seems reasonable and useful: to use the moviehouse to show media's effects on society in the post-war era. However, in practice, Lodge cannot put his thoughts on paper properly. In the novel, he deals only with three movies; one is a romantic movie starring Amber Lush which Father Kipling finds indecent and is the reason he starts his 'crusade' against cinema: another is a European movie titled *Bicycle Thieves*, which lacks the violence Harry looks for; and the last one is a Rock'n'Roll movie which is truly screened due to the expectations of the young people since they are the only ones that buy tickets regularly. There is no in-depth analysis of any of these movies' effects on the characters except for a few

minor examples which may be analyzed as effects of cinema upon them. For example, after watching Amber Lush, the sexy actress getting her clothes off in the movie, Tom Mallory has sex with his wife Elizabeth that night which is suggested in the novel as the first one after many years. Another example is Harry's attempted violence against Bridget, which may directly be linked with the non-violence in the movie titled *Bicycle Thieves* in which Harry expected to watch scenes of violence. The non-existence of violence in the movie affects Harry to be violent afterwards. And the last Rock'n'Roll movie, somewhat surprisingly affects Harry to break out of his isolation and relate to young people of his same age and who are as angry as he is towards life, enabling him to socialize with them; maybe even to fall in love with a girl. Once the novel is analyzed in this respect, the main character of *The Picturegoers* can be said to be Harry.

In an interview with Lodge in November 2001, Lidia Vianu asked Lodge about the portrayal of Harry in *The Picturegoers*, whether he had any main concern about teenage angst which authors such as Burgess and Golding had developed as major issue in their novels. Lodge answers thus:

The Picturegoers is a very early, immature novel, and reflects the influence Graham Greene had on me at that time. Harry is somewhat derivative from the character of Pinkie, the teenage gangster in Greene's *Brighton Rock*. He is not really based on experience or observation. I have never been much drawn to the depiction of violent or psychopathic behaviour, like the writers you mention. (2)

This anger of Harry, and therefore his author Lodge, can be linked with the "Angry Young Men" of the 1950s, whose works were popular by that time. In the Introduction, David Lodge tells that the publishers of the 1950s

were particularly interested in the new wave of British writing associated with the phrase 'Angry Young Men' – they had published an 'Angry' symposium called *Declaration* edited by Tom Maschler, and Kenneth Allsop's survey, *The Angry Decade*. My novel, though hardly angry, had, in its realistic rendering of contemporary urban social life from a lower-middle class perspective, some kinship with the fashionable novels of the day. (xiv)

The Palladium Cinema that Lodge uses as his setting is interesting in a different perspective as well. As we will see in his later novels, Lodge frequently makes use of cinema techniques and in some ways compares cinema with the novel to find out which one is more

effective in terms of both describing and analyzing human behaviour and social matters. Talking about *The Picturegoers*, Morace states that,

The separate narratives not only focus on different characters, they are narrated in variously stylised ways in the manner of Joyce's "scrupulous meanness" or what Park Honan has called Lodge's "cinematic style." "Lodge's manner with narrative viewpoints is innovative," Honan contends. "In *The Picturegoers*, the novelist's own camera – in that familiar maneuver of impressionism – is set behind the characters' eyes. 'Reality' is perceived and felt by representative South Londoners. But the viewpoints are not developed in the showily imitative fashion of dialogue. Instead, there is a subtle shift between kinds of vocabularies as viewpoints change" (Morace's quotation, 171). (111)

Robert A. Morace believes that the "narrative cinematism" (112) has an influential effect in the development of the modern novels. The term also applies to Lodge's dialogic concerns enabling him to watch over his authorial techniques while distancing his critical side to the view of the camera. Morace further states that the novel "includes not only various stylised languages but numerous interpolated and carnivalized forms as well" (112). The influence of Bakhtin upon Lodge, both as a writer and a critic, is undeniable and he manages to employ Bakhtin's theories in all of his novels combining them with his own unique style. As I suggested earlier, the cinema and its techniques are extensively used in Lodge's novels as well as many popular culture elements such as popular songs and magazines. In any way possible, Lodge tries to analyze and to compare the "high culture" of literature with that of "popular culture" of the movies and songs and, in many ways, he finds no one superior to the others. And this attitude completely goes in line with Bakhtin's carnivalesque spirit.

The discussion of *The Picturegoers* can be rounded out by referring to Lidia Vianu's views about the novel in the same article quoted above, "A Desperado of Simplicity" which I truly share:

The novel is indeed agreeable, well narrated, with individualized heroes. It creates its own world. This world is commonplace, soothing, very traditional. If it is told in episodes, like flashes of thought, it is because actually David Lodge must have put it together as a bunch of short stories that, at a certain point, happen to artificially intersect. For a beginner, it is an appealing book that envelops you in the magic of an imaginary world. Which is a lot more than many mature books do. (9)

2.2 *Eating People is Wrong* (1959)

Do we establish terribly, terribly interesting university personalities for ourselves? (25)

Eating People is Wrong, the first novel of Malcolm Bradbury, was published in 1959, one year earlier than Lodge's *The Picturegoers*. Just as Lodge describes the social contents of the 1950s in his imaginary London district of Brickley, Bradbury analyses the social status of post-war England in his imaginary college which is based in London but not linked with any place in particular. Professor Stuart Treece, the main character of the novel, is in his late-thirties and the head of English department of the university. The novel is mainly based upon his humanistic and liberal thoughts and his employment of them upon the characters in the novel. One main issue about the university is that unlike Oxford or Cambridge, it is a redbrick university situated in one of the provinces of London "which had still been a university college even when Treece was appointed to his chair, it was frequently mistaken for the railway station and was in fact closely modelled on St. Pancras" (24). The students at this university were called 'students', rather than 'undergraduates' as they were called at Cambridge and Oxford. Professor Treece knows them well:

They were youths straight from some grammar school sixth-form, rejects of Oxford, Cambridge and the better provincial universities, whose course could be charted easily enough; one could name almost the haphazard collection of books that they would read, one could sketch out beforehand the essays they would write, indicate simply their primary values. (14)

Among these students, an extraordinary one called Louis Bates is another major character of the novel. He is 26 years old and formerly has been a teacher in a girl's school. After he leaves the girl's school, he had taken six months off and later applies to the university as a student of English literature. The reason for this six month's break is hinted on his form as "the nature of this pause; his experience, he said, included six months' library work in a mental hospital" (16). He is indeed intelligent but is a failure in socializing with people, especially with women. He is very self-conscious about coming from a lower class working family, and he puts all the blame for his present loneliness onto his social background. In every word he utters, there are direct or indirect references to the class structure of England. In a discussion with Professor Treece, in which Louis decrees that in his literature studies he should be treated specially, Louis says:

“Actually, as it happens, you know, I don’t exactly fit in here; I’m a lot older than the other students, and I come from a different social class, perhaps.”

“Oh, I don’t know ...” said Treece.

“Well,” said Louis brusquely, indicating that he intended to come from a different social class from the others whether Treece liked it or not. “My father was a railway-man, and that was in the days when the railways were a form of puritanism. Hard work, honesty, thrift, clean living, self-restraint. Indulgence I’m suspicious of. I believe in application and self-training. I’m self-made. Now you have me in a nutshell.” (20)

The novel suggests that Louis Bates is mad in many ways and the university happens to be an ex-asylum converted into a university because, as the omniscient narrator remarks, “it was not big enough for an asylum, then; but it was big enough for a university college. So, as Treece frankly admitted, it became an asylum of another kind; great wits are thus to madness near allied” (24). Whether the ex-asylum university is the right place for Bates to be a part of or not can be considered but the main issue in the novel is Treece’s analysis of Bates and his attempts to give a method to Bates’ madness. After all, Treece is “a liberal humanist who believes in original sin” (15). He thinks “of man as a noble creature who has only to extend himself to the full range of his powers to be civilised and good; yet his performance by and large has been intrinsically evil and could be more so as the extension continues” (15). Treece both believes in “original sin” and “free-will” which directly oppose each other and that is what Treece’s character is generally based upon: he is a man of paradoxes who tries to impose and to motivate the characters in the novel while he watches them from a safe place. In other words, he acts as a god watching his creatures from a safe distance without taking responsibility for their actions once their deeds are done.

In addition to Treece and Bates, Emma Fielding is another major character in the novel. She is “a post-graduate student in the [English] department, and [is] writing a thesis on the fish imagery in Shakespeare’s tragedies” (35). She is twenty-six years old, “and therefore rather older than most of her fellow students; older, you had to say, and wiser” (36). Her role in the novel is important because she becomes the centre of attraction for three male characters throughout the novel. The first male character is Mr. Eborebelosa, an exchange student from Africa and literally the son of a chief who is in England to analyse English culture, science, sociology and more interestingly, to learn about the secrets of the gunpowder. But his stay in England does not happen to be as he expects. He has trouble in socialising, chiefly because people in England do not respect him as he was respected in

Africa. He hides himself in university's lavatories and does not get out all day long. As usual, Treece tries to get him out of the lavatories and directly throws him into the college parties and, in a reception held for foreign students, Treece introduces him to Emma. Once Mr Eborebelosa finds the intimacy which he is looking for in Emma, he immediately falls in love with her and, more than that, he wants to marry her to make her his fifth wife. When Emma understands that she cannot break loose from Mr Eborebelosa's suit, she tells him that she is engaged but that makes him more enthusiastic and he proposes to Emma once again saying that he will kill her fiancé, who is nothing but an obstacle between them. Then, thinking that an imaginary fiancé with authority can put an end to his affection towards her, Emma tells him that she is engaged to Treece and, in this way, puts Treece back into action.

The second male character interested in Emma is no other than Louis Bates. He meets Emma at another party at Tanya's flat. Tanya, a lecturer in Slavonic languages, is a close friend of Dr Viola Masefield, who has "taken her degree at Leicester" (25) and has come to this university to lecture on Elizabethan drama. Like her friend Tanya, with whom she shares the flat, Viola is a strong female character whose

reactions to problems and to people were violent and immediate, as Treece was well aware; people who met her for the first time sometimes used the word 'sophisticated' to describe her, because her manner was bright and when she smoked it was through a long jade holder, but those who knew her better were aware that this was the last word for Viola, for even simple female cunning of the type that's given to every sheltered country girl was missing in Viola's case; this itself was her charm. (26)

Because Tanya and Viola share the same flat, it is suggested in the novel that they should be lesbians, as all strong female types are thought to be. But in the course of the novel, it is observed that they are as straight as any other characters in the novel. The flat they share is modern and is "not a place where you simply lived; you *proved* something" (99). At the party in this flat, Louis meets Emma and her attitudes and opinions immediately attract Louis. He writes two letters to Emma in which "he had confessed his mad passion" (94) for her. After that, he goes to where Emma stays as a lodger and although Emma is not at the house, he gets into her room and decides to wait for her return despite the concerted efforts of Emma's landlady Mrs Bishop. Upon Emma's return, and much to her surprise, Louis proposes to her but is rejected.

The third and the last male character interested in Emma is none other than Professor Treece but this time it is a mutual interest. After another party, this time a Christmas party, Treece takes Emma to her house and asks her if he can go upstairs. Emma agrees and some sort of a love relationship between these two characters begins. Although it is a mutual love, Treece hides it from the other characters in the novel and avoids meeting Emma in public places since relationships between Professors and their students are frowned on. Because their meetings only take place either in Emma's room or in Treece's office and their relationship does not go any further than a sexual one, Emma gets disinterested and when Treece proposes to her, she also rejects him telling him, "You don't want to marry *me*; you just want to marry. I'm a perfectionist. I can't make do with that" (254). So being a 'perfectionist', she rejects three suitors in two semesters. She is not successful in finishing her thesis on 'fish imagery in Shakespeare's tragedies,' but she sure is successful in putting an end to relationships.

Apart from these chasings to have Emma's hand in marriage, another important sub-plot of the novel is Carey Willoughby's visit to the university to give lectures on modern poetry. Willoughby is a modern author who is introduced as a part of the "Angry Movement" of the period:

People said he was an angry young man, though he was not conscious of it – he had thought of himself a perfectly detached observer of the modern scene. They compared him with people he scarcely knew, like Amis and Wain, and called him a movement. Actually he felt, as doubtless as Amis felt, and Wain, that he had got on to it all first, and the others were just taking advantage. (223)

Louis, who has by this time become the Chairman of the Student Literary Society, was instrumental in arranging Willoughby's visit. Because the Society lacks the funds to support Willoughby's hotel expenses, Louis asks Treece if Willoughby can stay at his house for three nights. Having no other alternatives, Treece accepts the offer. In fact he is a bit curious about Willoughby because although Treece does not read modern novels, he must read Willoughby's last novel having heard that he is in it:

"I read this one because someone said I was in it. And I *am*. Do you realise that the story about the professor who left the script of one of his articles among some student essays, and another tutor gave it C minus, is about *me*? Someone must have told this man. Even down to the bit about, 'This is a good lower second stuff.' It was B minus actually. That makes it worse." (200)

Viola, who calls this funny coincidence as “poet’s licence” (200), later confesses that she is the one who told Willoughby about Treece’s story. At this stage, it is also useful to stress Treece’s relation with Viola. During the end of the party at Tanya’s flat, Viola gets angry with Treece and goes upstairs to be alone for a while. Then, Treece follows her to her room and finds her crying. They talk for a while and Viola tells Treece to his face all the things that she has avoided saying all the time, like her conviction that Treece’s treatment of people is wrong. After her words of anger, she says that she admires him after all because he is “a dedicated man” (117). Then Treece begins to kiss her and they have sex. They have some sort of a romantic relationship after that night but Treece’s usual disinterest on the subject stops the affair even before it starts. This failed relationship may be the reason why Viola tells Treece’s little examination anecdote to Willoughby.

In the meantime, Willoughby’s opinions about literature that he shares in lectures and in a particular dinner accompanied by Vice Chancellor of the university, perfectly summarizes Bradbury’s view of literature in the post-war era and in satirizing Willoughby, the author, in the novel, Bradbury also satirizes himself as a modern post-war era author, who is by then also considered to be a part of the “Angry Young Men”. In the lecture at the university, in which Willoughby is introduced by Treece as, “one of the so-called novelists of the new movement. ... I mean, one of the novelists of the so-called new movement” (224), Willoughby states, “There is no movement. ... All made up by the Literary Editor of *The Spectator*” (228). In response to the Vice Chancellor’s question at dinner: “why don’t your novels have proper endings, why aren’t they resolved, why don’t people die or live happily after?” (230), Willoughby answers thus:

“With my sort of book there’s no resolution, because there’s no solution. The problems aren’t answered in the end, because there is no answer. They’re problems that are handed on to the reader, not solved for him so that he can go away thinking he lives in a beautiful world. It’s not a beautiful world.” (231)

In fact, Willoughby’s novel is much like Bradbury’s. Emma tells Treece about Willoughby’s novel:

“It’s about this young man, who is an outsider, excluded from the ordinary life of the world because he isn’t in the class system, and in the business world, and doesn’t share the common values ...”

“Please,” said Treece, “I’d rather not hear about it. Modern novels depress me so much.”

“Yes, I suppose they might,” said Emma. (183)

The young man in Willoughby’s novel as described by Emma does have much in common with Bradbury’s character Louis Bates. Furthermore, at the Christmas party, when the band plays a song, Emma tells Treece, “This tune they are playing is the one Carey Willoughby’s novel is named after,” and when Treece asks for the name of the song, Emma answers, “It’s called ‘Baby, It’s Cold Outside’. It’s a very appropriate title” (183). Interesting enough, Bradbury’s novel is also named after a song to which Bradbury pays tribute on the cover page of the novel: “With acknowledgements to Michael Flanders and Donald Swann, originators of the song *The Reluctant Cannibal* from which the title of this novel is taken.” In the meantime, Stuart Treece is named, as Robert Morace remarks, after “Henry Treece, [who] it is worth noting, was one of the romantic writers against whom the Angry Young Man revolted” (38). Furthermore, with Willoughby’s answer to “where do novelists get their ideas from?” (236), Bradbury shares his opinions about his own campus novels:

“What you write is incidental, just simply what your world happens to be. I write about universities because I work in a university and I can collect the stuff. ...”

“What’s this I hear about your novels being *romans a clef*?” interposed Professor de Thule.

“Oh, everyone thinks he can identify people in these books. He can’t, of course. I’m not a fool. I like to keep my friends. I can’t afford to lose any more friends. A man needs friends. It’s simply that my novels are about people who exist in such multiplication in our world.”

“Oh, I hope you won’t put *us* in, then,” said Mavis.

“What Mrs de Thule means,” interposed Tanya, “is that she hopes you will put us in.”

“Now would I tell you?” asked Willoughby, feeling warmed by all this attention. The group grew larger. (236-7)

The group grows larger, indeed. Although Willoughby says that his novels have nothing in common with *romans a clef*, and Bradbury further states in the “Afterword” to *Eating People is Wrong* that “I should add, the book is not a *roman a clef*” (292), many academics like to be a part of campus novels. In the “Introduction” titled “What I Read and What I Read For” of her book *Faculty Towers: The Academic Novel and Its Discontents* (2005), Elaine Showalter remarks:

Moreover, because we professors now live in the age of celebrity, publicity, and fame, being a character in a satiric academic novel, even a nasty one, may be a kind of distinction. Stanley Fish likes being identified with David Lodge's Morris Zapp; Laurie Taylor didn't mind being falsely thought to be the original History Man; and when Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar wrote a parody of the academic world called *Masterpiece Theater*, more people were offended because they were excluded than because they were mocked. (5)

Turning back to the conclusion of the novel, we find both Louis Bates and Stuart Treece in hospital due to illnesses that may directly be linked with Emma. Locally famous and with a new-found self-esteem gained from the publication of his poems in an important literary magazine, Bates approaches Emma once more. In an attempt to win Emma's heart with romanticism, he hires a canoe – he does not hire a boat for “the river is too full for punting” (266) – but unfortunately overturns the canoe and falls into middle of the river. Because he does not know how to swim, it is Emma who saves him from the very moment of drowning. After this ill-fated adventure, he catches pneumonia and goes to hospital. He feels perfectly peaceful in his room lying in his bed and watching the outside world from the window, taking notes for his future poems. But his perfect time of harmony gets interrupted when Emma visits him and tells him all about her affair with Treece. Later that day, Louis attempts to commit suicide with aspirins but is saved by the doctors and is transferred to a mental hospital the following morning. So he has gone back to where he came from, or furthermore, to where he always belonged as several of the other characters, especially Viola, have suggested throughout the novel.

On the other hand, Treece is in the hospital because of oral haemorrhages, which his doctor thinks can be a start of ulcer, and depression. The doctors put him in a room and after three examinations by three doctors, they tell him that he has to stay in the hospital and receive blood transfusion. During his stay, he witnesses other patients' and doctors' behaviours, which can be analysed in terms of the carnivalesque. Furthermore, he is present when Louis is admitted to the ward having attempted to commit suicide. Treece was awakened late at night by the admission of an attempted suicide, and later hears a German psychiatrist questioning this emergency case in a harsh manner but he does not know until later that the victim is Louis. Later, Emma tells him all about Louis and blames herself for his depression. “I feel guilty about him too,” said Treece. “Guilty's all you can feel. I suppose all

you can say for us is, at least we can feel guilty” (290). Gradually Treece’s his stay at the hospital begins to change his point of view towards people and life in general:

As the days wore on Treece found that the objectivity he had always possessed, the faculty he had for seeing himself as an actor in a play by some outsider, the faculty that looked down upon himself judiciously and thought of *other* ways to behave, began to fail under his current pressure. He ceased to be inquisitive object and began to be suffering subject. This was happening to him; the pain was his and soon it would be all of him. The experiential character of the whole incident, which had given it an interest for Treece and made it just bearable, now began to fade. He lay in bed, reading nothing; he fed; he moved his bowels. Moving the bowels was, so to speak, the breath of life for him, the real truth about existence, a dramatisation of the emotional and intellectual processes that preserve us to go on living. (286)

Treece, the perfect liberal humanist, who believes in ‘original sin’, the great motivator and the objective analyst of consequences of his motives, finally lays there in his bed at the hospital dying with ulcer, unable either to move and or to escape: “[Emma] went away and he lay there in his bed, and felt as though this would be his condition for evermore, and that from this he would never, never escape” (290).

In a chapter excluded from the novel, which was later modified and published in Bradbury’s *Who Do You Think You Are* (1976) as a short story titled “The Adult Education Class,” Bradbury further comments on the relationship between Louis and Treece:

It seemed to him that the only man he could convince, the only man who shared what he most believed in, was a preposterous madman. To this he was fettered; this was his own half-self; and he suspected that there was nothing in the world he could do to set himself free. He watched Bates walking ahead of him down the street, pacing out his strange long step, and his shoes seemed to fit in the same footprints. ‘I wondered whether we were going in the same direction,’ Bates had said. ‘Perhaps we are,’ thought Treece, getting on his motorized cycle, and riding off into the provincial city, ‘Perhaps after all we are.’ (67-8)

The last two sentences from this passage clarify both Treece and Louis’ ending at the hospital because, however separate they seem to be, they share the common concerns about literature life in general; therefore they move “in the same direction”, a direction that leads to ‘illnesses’: Treece gets depressed and Louis attempts suicide. On this matter, Robert Morace states,

The primary issue in *Eating People is Wrong* is, as Martin Tucker has pointed out, the very commitment that Treece himself lacks. “He is the eternal questioner: everyone listens to his questions, but no one tries to answer them, including himself. His questions are never meant to be answered: that is his tragedy” (19-20). But in this “sad comedy” (“Introduction” 7), Treece is only partly a tragic figure, and about him Bradbury expresses a necessary ambivalence. Bradbury agrees with Treece’s Anglo-liberal desire to leave his character undefined but knows too how such a desire can easily degenerate into moral evasion. (34-5)

The problems that both Treece and Louis try to solve have no humanistic solutions but they keep on asking. There are no answers to their questions and their paradoxes finally lead them to hospitals. In a sense, this attitude can be considered as the self-destruction of the creative minds that Willoughby talks about in his second lecture. But the only indisputable fact in the novel is that, both Louis and Treece end up at a hospital: their choice of directions finally leads them to the same inevitable place.

Published in 1959, just one year before publication of Lodge’s *The Picturegoers*, *Eating People is Wrong* became a huge success for Bradbury. Although it was his first novel, critics begin to compare him with Kingsley Amis and the other Angry Young Men. On the novel, Robert Morace comments, “Written largely while the author was still a student and published when he was just twenty-seven years old, *Eating People is Wrong* is clearly an apprentice work composed and, just as importantly, read and reviewed in the shadow of Kingsley Amis’s *Lucky Jim*.” (30) The reason for this comparison generally is due to Bradbury’s employment of a university as his setting. In his “Afterword” to the novel, Malcolm Bradbury remarks,

When it came out, the book was identified with the newly fashionable genre of campus comedy, and the reviewers were inclined to compare it with *Lucky Jim*. This was not quite what I had intended; as the title suggests, I had meant the book to be about the tensions and contradictions and comedies of the liberal life, as it was lived by a group of people, in the changing and chaotic world of the middle ‘fifties, and for this a provincial university seemed an apt setting. (291)

Bradbury makes it clear that his main aim was to criticize the liberal values of the fifties and as his character Willoughby states in the novel, Bradbury writes about the university because during the fifties, he experienced life at the university first as an undergraduate then as a graduate student and “he collects his stuff” from the institution. Bradbury further states in his “Afterword,”

In fact I began the book in 1951 or 1952, well before *Lucky Jim* and some of the other campus novels appeared, and at the time I was an undergraduate – except that we did, indeed, usually say ‘student’, being very conscious of our redbrick limitations – at what was then University College, Leicester, now the University of Leicester. (292)

Even though the critics still compare *Eating People is Wrong* with *Lucky Jim*, there is no discernible resemblance between these two novels except their settings and the satiric approach to the academics. On the contrary, the satire of Amis’ and Bradbury are altogether different. In *Lucky Jim*, Amis satirizes the academics from the inside, that is, he himself is an academic by the time he writes his novel, but in *Eating People is Wrong*, Bradbury satirizes the academic from the outside, being a student in the writing process of his novel. On this issue, Bradbury comments to this effect in his “Afterword,”

Indeed, when I started the book, I was not on the inside or the faculty side of a university at all. I wrote it from the innocent, fascinated standpoint of the student, in fact the first-generation student, for whom universities were both a novelty and a social opportunity, a striking step into the strange philosophies of disinterested liberalism and cultural anxiety that came to me oddly after the commonsense ordinariness of my lower-middle-class social background. (291-2)

Bradbury further indicates that he was a student at a redbrick university and experienced what it was like to study in a provincial university, whereas other authors, who write about the redbricks, never had a chance to experience the same feelings as students. In his “Afterword”, Bradbury says,

It is true that the ‘fifties saw a cult of provincialism, that the redbrick became an appropriate subject, a motif for those interested in the centres and comedies of cultural change and mobility; but most of the writers who did write about them did not go there, or at least not as students. (292)

On the other hand, Professor Stuart Treece is considered to be Malcolm Bradbury’s future self as the head of English Department and the novel is written with the perspective of Bradbury’s imagining himself as the head of department in the fifties but Bradbury rejects this identification in the “Afterword” saying,

Stuart Treece, in his forties, was not exactly my intended destiny, but he was considerably based upon my twenty-year-old self, or was, rather, a projection of my own commitments and anxieties about the liberal humanism of personal relations that I now both espoused and questioned. If I did not intend to become like him, that was mostly because I intended to become a writer, a liberal writer: the ambition preoccupies several other characters in the novel. (292)

Elsewhere, however, Bradbury talks about two characters other than Treece, namely Louis Bates and Carey Willoughby. During my research on *Eating People is Wrong*, I have come across many criticisms that deal with Stuart Treece as Bradbury's own voice in the novel but I have not seen any piece of criticism that identifies Willoughby with Bradbury. In fact, I believe that Willoughby is the intended voice of Bradbury in the novel. With a remarkable insight, Bradbury, in the writing process of his novel, answers many questions asked by critics after the publication of the novel, through Willoughby's words. Bradbury is often confused with the "Angry Young Men," but in the novel Willoughby says, "there's no movement" as such. Critics wonder if *Eating People is Wrong* is a *romans a clef*, and Willoughby answers it is not. Many criticisms indicate that *Eating People is Wrong* does not have a proper ending, and Willoughby answers, "there's no resolution, because there is no solution." On the other hand, in one of his lectures, Willoughby talks about madness and its relation to art suggesting that the world is mad, not the artists. It is Willoughby who severely criticizes 'high culture' in favour of 'popular culture', stating the 'high culture' wastes the artists by rejecting the popular values and works of the suffering artists. Bradbury often concentrates on combining 'high culture' with 'popular culture' and, just like Lodge, Bradbury aims to bring back reality and action into the novel which are excluded in the experimental Modernist era. Willoughby succeeds in doing just that in his novel *Baby, It's Cold Outside* that depresses Stuart Treece and the old generation, who are in favour of 'high culture'. In his "Afterword," Malcolm Bradbury analyzes this progress as,

And the tone of the writing that began to emerge in the decade – a decade that bred many new writers, because literature seemed to have a significance in the new cultural economy, which is why reading English at university became a prevalent moral passion – reflected this. Forster and Orwell were strong influences, the novel turned toward the realism of cultural renewal, and many of the key books of the period – books as various as Amis' *Lucky Jim* and Sillitoe's *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* – tend to have plots of reform and reconciliation, plots that modulate toward a critical but commonsensical acceptance of the contemporary world. In short, a certain realism came back into fiction, and more in England than in other countries; if

the novel has tended historically to oscillate between two poles, one of experimental self-questioning, the other of a realistic reporting of the social and material world, and a humanistic attitude toward character, then it was the latter pole toward which it was now drawn. (295)

After all, *Eating People is Wrong*, much like Lodge's *The Picturegoers*, can be considered as a fair documentation of the 1950s. Indeed, both novels are written with same exact intention. In his "Afterword," Bradbury remarks,

The book was written across most of the 'fifties, and was intended as in many ways respects a culture-reading of the decade. . . . It is like many 'fifties novels, about provincial life, the virtues and limitations of unc cosmopolitan and ordinary existence; in this it seems to follow in that influential tradition set up by William Cooper's *Scenes from Provincial Life*, published in 1950, a book that encouraged many younger writers thereafter to see a straightforward, local commonsense realism as a way to renew the novel and adjust it to the political reality of contemporary England, a postwar, welfare England the novel-form chose to explore and colonise. (294)

In reflecting and satirizing the fifties social issues, Bradbury also gives some remarkable messages to English literature as well. Throughout the novel, Louis compares himself to Romantic writers such as Blake (130), Keats (131) and Rimbaud (194) and, in the meantime, Stuart Treece is named after Henry Treece, who is one of the leading figures of fantasy literature and also the one, as I mentioned above, against whom the Angry Young Men revolted. Bradbury puts both Treece and Louis into hospital and by doing so; he sort of not only sends them to exile but also the literary conventions that they represent. Bradbury certainly wants a reform in literature and *Eating People is Wrong* is his first revolt against past literary conventions.

Like *Lucky Jim*, Bradbury's first novel is a comedy but the comic issues of the novel end in sadness. In his "Afterword", Bradbury tells this:

It is a sad comedy, perhaps even a tragicomedy. But it is indeed a comedy. It was intended to be very funny, and this I hope it still is. It is a liberal comedy, allowing the characters their selfhood, their own sort of fate. My irony is greater than Treece's; but the spirit is intolerant, and the characters in a sense know their own comic lot – which is to live in a world where there is a gap between expectation and reality, between personal or social betterment and

ordinary fact, between the heroic idealisation of deed, whether it is going to Spain or taking a driving test on a motorised bicycle, and its execution. (297)

In the same context, Bradbury adds,

In all this, it is a more generous comedy than I would write now, in a world that has so changed. Comedy has always been an essential aspect of the novel; it has something to do with its openness, its curiosity about people and society, and it administers precisely to that space between appearance and reality that has so long preoccupied English novelists; it also has had another vein, a vein of irony or absurdist farce, a sense of people at a loss in a totally contingent world. *Eating People is Wrong* has both of these elements, partly because it is an inclusive sort of novel that deals in social observation and satire, farce and ironic self-knowledge; but it tends in the humane direction. Writing more recently, I have found it harder to write in this spirit, because style is indeed a facet of history and changes with it. I have found comedy needs to become a more precise, more economical, a harder instrument, if the contradiction between our humanist expectations and our sense of ourselves as exposed historical performers is to be expressed. (297-8)

Lidia Vianu in her article “At the Gates of Commonsense” (1999) analyzes the novel as comedy:

Eating People is Wrong is “a comedy,” too, as the author announces from the very first page. It is a mass of comic remarks and incidents, indeed. A provincial university, with a Department of English whose head is Stuart Treece, imparts the joys of literature to a bunch of unlikable individuals – but we must not go farther than that, since, the title warns us, “eating people is wrong.” Malcolm Bradbury just munches them a little, then spreads them on the page like a doubtfully amusing (or nourishing) paste. (1)

While I would agree with Vianu that Bradbury is a satirist who likes to write in a comic fashion, he is nonetheless a realist interested in social and political issues of his day and age. In his first novel, he limits his social analysis only to 1950s post-war England, but as we will discover in the following chapters, he later includes United States in his social analysis and then deals with USSR and Communism extending his satire to the politics of the cold-war era. In *Eating People is Wrong*, he begins his description of the academy and post-war England in a comic manner and continues with this style almost to the end, but when realistic elements like pneumonia, depression and ulcer get in the way, his comic manner fades away and leaves in its place sadness and depression. In fact, Bradbury says in his “Afterword” that

he “had to have a serious operation back in England in 1958. This concentrated the mind wonderfully; I finished the book off in hospital, a ward of the National Health (a fact that explains something of the texture and tone of the final chapters)” (293). Indeed, this can explain his sad tone at the end of the novel but I wonder if he would have let his characters live happily ever after in a comic fashion if he had not had that serious operation. I certainly doubt he would, because after all, as Willoughby suggests, “It’s not a beautiful world” (231).

As a result, both authors manage to lift the burdens from their backs by getting their first novels published quite successfully. Although David Lodge’s first novel may be lacking in some respects in terms of characterization and employment of reality, and Lodge did not want to ‘resurrect’ the novel until 1993 after it became out-of-print, *The Picturegoers* proves to be highly satisfactory, especially in terms of its narrative technique. Lodge’s successful management of multiple characters encouraged him to deal with more different characters in his later novels. His first novel definitely serves as an introduction to his more specifically academic novels and he finds a chance to develop his unique narrative style even further in his more mature novels. Likewise, Malcolm Bradbury shows his quality in his first novel. *Eating People is Wrong* serves as a good example of Bradbury’s themes and concerns that he further develops in his later novels. The liberal analysis of social, political and moral issues that he first employs in this novel, prepares the basis of his discussions and satires he carefully, and successfully, deploys throughout his writing career.

III. Chapter 3 – The Sixties: *The British Museum is Falling Down* (1965) and *Stepping Westward* (1965)

This chapter will deal with David Lodge's *The British Museum is Falling Down* and Malcolm Bradbury's *Stepping Westward* in an attempt to underline their deployment of the academic satire in course of the 1960s and to analyze their narrative techniques in order to both compare and contrast the improvements and/or differences of same from the ones they applied in their earlier novels.

Showalter detects within the academic novels of the 1960s "a shift of focus from the university or the Oxbridge college to the American English department" (34). Indeed, Bradbury's second novel examines an academic institution in America and narrates a British author's experiences in an American college. On the other hand, there is a brief subplot that serves as a climax in Lodge's third novel, which describes an American character who comes to Britain in pursuit of a purely academic mission. Showalter further suggests "the tone certainly shifts from admiring tones of Snow to a much more acerbic view of academic life and a much more Darwinian sense of the university and the struggle for survival" (34). Moreover, Showalter calls the deployment of departments in the academic novels of the decade as 'tribes' in which there is an Oedipal theme to eliminate the authority figure and to replace him (34-5). Bradbury makes use of this Oedipal theme that Showalter mentions and, furthermore, employs a character who seeks power and prestige in an English department by all means possible. In the meantime, Lodge criticizes the academic struggles from the perception of his graduate student hero.

3.1 *The British Museum is Falling Down* (1965)

There of the young men present were writing academic novels of manners. From time to time they detached themselves from the main group of guests and retired to a corner to jot down observations and witty remarks in little notebooks. Adam noticed one of them looking over the shoulders of the other two, and copying. (125)

The British Museum is Falling Down is the third novel of David Lodge first published in 1965. Apart from the academic issues that are fairly described and parodied in the novel, Lodge's main concern in this as in his other early novels until *Changing Places* (1975), is the

search for a birth-control method other than the method known as Safe or Rhythm Method, for the Catholic world. Consisting of ten chapters, each opening with an epigram from famous authors who had used British Museum as their study place throughout their careers such as Yeats, Carlyle, Thackeray and Ruskin, and a few important quotations from the User's Guide to the Library, the novel depicts the story of a day in the life of Adam Appleby, who is a graduate student of English Literature in his third and final year at the university trying to finish his thesis "that would rock the scholarly world and start a revolution in literary criticism" (18). He is married with three children and what concerns him more than his thesis is his wife Barbara's overdue period. During the course of a single day, readers witness Adam's struggle in the British Museum, at the English Department of his College, at a postgraduate sherry party, his interactions with the staff as well as with his wife, checking with her almost hourly to find out whether her period has started or not. Although Lodge has much to say about birth control, I will leave those discussions aside, and deal with the parody of academe as well as the parody of modern authors in my study of the novel that follows.

Before starting my analysis, it is useful to indicate Malcolm Bradbury's direct collaboration on the novel. In his dedication part of his novel, Lodge writes: "... and to Malcolm Bradbury (whose fault it mostly is that I have tried to write a comic novel)". Indeed, Bradbury is responsible for the changes in Lodge's literary style and *The British Museum is Falling Down* stands as the first novel that Lodge writes after his meeting with Bradbury. It will not be wrong to say, this meeting serves as a starting point in Lodge's writing career so that, his whole output can be discussed and/or identified as 'Before Bradbury' and 'After Bradbury'. Robert A. Morace explains this start of a long term interaction between the authors: "[Lodge's] liberation as a writer had in a sense already begun some three years earlier when Malcolm Bradbury joined the University of Birmingham English Department and began to convince Lodge of the liberating possibilities of literary comedy" (133-4). Apart from his dedication to Bradbury, in his "Afterword" for the novel written in 1980, Lodge indicates that the original title for this novel "had been *The British Museum Had Lost Its Charm*, a line from a song by George and Ira Gershwin" (171-2), much as Bradbury's title for *Eating People is Wrong* had been taken from another song, but he couldn't get the permission to use this title and changed it to *The British Museum is Falling Down* instead. In the "Afterword", Lodge further indicates that the idea of limiting all the events to a single day originally came from the song and not from the James Joyce novel, *Ulysses*, as is commonly thought (172). Having these facts in mind, we can commence with the analysis.

The thesis on which Adam Appleby works is about Modern English Novels: “The subject of Adam’s thesis had originally been, ‘Language and Ideology in Modern Fiction’ but had been whittled down by Board of Studies until it now stood as ‘The Structure of Long Sentences in Three Modern English Novels’.” (48) Even with this immense help from the Board of Studies in limiting his topic for the thesis, Adam still has nothing to say or write about this topic in the final year of his scholarship. Likewise, his friend Camel has problems in finishing the PhD thesis that he has been working on “as long as anyone could remember” (40):

Its title – ‘Sanitation in Victorian Fiction’ – seemed modest enough; but, as Camel would patiently explain, the absence of references to sanitation was as significant as the presence of the same, and his work thus embraced the entire corpus of Victorian fiction. Further, the Victorian period was best understood as a period of transition in which the comic treatment of human excretion in the eighteenth century was suppressed in terms of social reform, until it re-emerged as a source of literary symbolism in the work of Joyce and the other moderns.” (40)

Both Adam and Camel are quite intelligent graduate students who have original ideas of their own and an urge to shape the future of literary criticism; however, they are bound to the difficulties of their individual lives which do not allow them to study with full concentration. Certain matters of everyday life, which are seen as minor issues that can easily be dealt with, mean a lot more to these graduates. For instance, the expiry of Adam’s Library Card, and the bureaucratic process of its renewal can ruin Adam’s whole day of study. Needless to say, the possibility of his wife’s being pregnant again and his being unemployed at this current stage of his life, depresses Adam more than anything, motivating him to think of ways to support four little children without a basic income. Lodge points out this problem right before he concentrates on the academic quest for power.

In Adam’s visit to consult his supervisor Briggs at the university, Lodge portrays a basic view of the academic issues experienced from the eyes of his graduate protagonist:

[Briggs] was talking to Bane, who had recently been appointed to a new Chair of Absurdist Drama, endowed by a commercial television company. This I knew, had been a blow to Briggs, who was the senior man of the two, and who had been looking for a Chair for some time. His own field was the English Essay. No one was likely to endow a special Chair in the English

Essay, and Briggs knew it. His best chance of promotion lay in the retirement of the Head of Department, old Howells, who was always raising Brigg's expectations by retreating at the beginning of term to a Swiss sanatorium, only to dash them again by returning refreshed and reinvigorated at the beginning of the vacations. (66)

This passage is the first criticism of the academic matters ever written by Lodge in a published novel, a subject of which Lodge would become a master in his later novels. Promotions, tenure and the unending quest for power in the academic world are structured as the basic concerns of his later novels and this above quoted passage serves as an introduction to his new style influenced by Bradbury and which he continues to use in his later works. Adam further analyses the situation:

I felt a certain thrill at being witness to one of those classic struggles for power and prestige which characterize the lives of ambitious men and which, in truth, exhaust most of their time and energy. To the casual observer, it might seem that nothing important was at stake here, but it might well be that the future course of English studies in the University hung upon this conversation. (67)

Indeed, as we will see in my analysis of Bradbury and Lodge's later novels, "the future course" of studies in the universities "hangs upon" these kinds of private conversations that take place between the authorities of the departments. Their quests for power and prestige happen to shape the directions of the whole department towards an uncertain future. In these kinds of meetings, which Lodge describes as a simple conversation to a "casual observer", the futures of the whole departmental staff can be discussed and finalized. What is vital at this stage is, the issues that are sorted out in these kinds of meetings, are not meant to be discussed in front of all the members of the department but are kept as secrets until the whole scheme is finalized at the end. In the above quoted passages, Lodge gives a clear description of all these matters and makes use of them as a basic introduction to his later academic satires.

Apart from these private meetings behind closed doors, another basic occasion, which serves as a setting for the academic satires of both Bradbury and Lodge, is the literary party. In his first attempt to describe one, Lodge interprets thus:

The postgraduate sherry party was a regular feature of the first term of the academic year, designed to introduce students to staff and to each other. For many it was hail and farewell, since the Department did not have the resources to mount a proper graduate programme, and in

any case espoused the traditional belief that research was a lonely and eremitic occupation, a test of character rather than learning, which might be vitiated by excessive human contact. As if they sensed this the new postgraduates, particularly those from overseas, roamed the floor eagerly accosting the senior guests, resolved to cram a whole year's sociability into one brief evening. (117)

In the "Afterword", Lodge states the main idea behind his decision to insert a party scene into his novel: "My association with Malcolm Bradbury, and the example of his own work in comedy, was therefore a crucial factor in this development of my writing, and the dedication to *The British Museum*, as well as the sherry-party scene, acknowledges that debt." (170) Like many literary parties, this "sherry-party" has a purpose of introducing people to each other as well as discussing literature. In this party, Lodge does not fail to employ his witty criticisms on academic struggle – in fact, Lodge describes Adam's attempt to secure a lectureship for the next academic term. Briggs helps Adam by introducing him to the Head of the Department, Howells, thereby enabling Adam to further discuss the matter with Howells. But this discussion leads to the revelation of a scheme already carefully planned by the department to offer Camel a lectureship and to put him on probation until he finishes his PhD thesis. This scheme leaves Adam out of the whole issue and motivates Camel to finish his thesis at last. Lodge gives a brief insight into conversations that take place in such parties by describing Adam's conversation with a "bald-headed man in a pale striped suit" (118) as thus:

'What do you think of anus?' said the man.

'I beg your pardon?'

'The novelist, Kingsley Anus,' said the man impatiently.

'Oh, yes. I like his work. There are times when I think I belong to him more than to any of the others.'

'Please?' said the man, frowning.

'Well, you see, I have this theory,' Adam, who had just thought of it, said expansively. 'Has it ever occurred to you how novelists are *using up* experience at a dangerous rate? No, I see it hasn't. Well, then, consider that before the novel emerged as the dominant literary form, narrative literature dealt only with the extraordinary or the allegorical – with kings and queens, giants and dragons, sublime virtue and diabolic evil. There was no risk of confusing that sort of thing with life, of course. But as soon as the novel got going, you might pick up a book at any time and read about an ordinary chap called Joe Smith doing just the sort of things you did yourself. Now, I know what you're going to say – you're going to say that the novelist still has to invent a lot. But that's just the point: there've been such a fantastic number of novels written in the last couple of centuries that they've just about exhausted the possibilities of life. So all of

us, you see, are really enacting events that have already been written about in some novel or other. Of course, most people don't realize this – they fondly imagine that their little lives are unique ... Just as well, too, because when you *do* tumble to it, the effect is very disturbing.'

'Bravo!' said Camel, over Adam's shoulder. Adam ignored him, and eagerly searched the face of the bald-headed man for some response to his own remarks.

'Would you say,' said the man at length, 'that Anus is superior or inferior to C. P. Snow?'

'I don't know that you can compare them,' said Adam wearily.

'I have to: they are the only British novelists I have read.' (118-9)

With this passage, Lodge manages to satirize the precursors of the academic novel, namely Kigsley Amis and C. P. Snow with their novels *Lucky Jim* and *The Masters* discussed in my first chapter. On this subject, Morace states, "Further, like Adam Appleby, Lodge felt the weight of the literary past and as a result chose to turn the novel into "a kind of joke on myself" ("David Lodge Interviewed", 110, Morace's quotation), an act of comic revenge." (137) Therefore, Lodge not only satirizes the authors who, in some way or other, influenced his writing style, but also satirizes himself as a recent collaborator to the kinds of novel he criticizes in the above passage.

In the "Afterword", Lodge tells us that he has written *The British Museum is Falling Down* during his "absence from (his) post as lecturer in English Literature at the University of Birmingham to take up a Harkness Commonwealth Fellowship in America" (163) with a "liberating effect of the American experience" (163). This "American experience", which Lodge further analyses in his later novels, is first introduced in this novel and characterized by an American entrepreneur called Bernie Schnitz, a fat American who is smoking a cigar each time Adam sees him and happens to be in Britain to buy the whole British Museum:

'I had this great idea, a vision, you might call it. I was going to buy the British Museum and transport it stone by stone to Colorado, clean it up and re-erect it.'

Adam boggled. 'With all the books?'

'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 have oxygen on tap in every room ... Well, it's a fine place, but we're 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 of thing. "OK Bernie," they said, "go to Europe and get us a library." So I came to the best library in the world.' (151)

Although this passage is funny enough, and Lodge's novel happens to be a comedy of manners, it serves as a good example of the way that both Bradbury and Lodge deal with the 'free-spirited' Americans, whom they compare and contrast with the British in their later novels.

In his "Afterword", Lodge indicates that his main aim in writing this novel was "to make the narrative and its frequent shifts of style fully intelligible and satisfying to a such reader, while offering the more literary reader the extra entertainment of spotting the parodies" (170). Somewhat ruefully, he further informs that the parodies of the novel were not understood by many of the British critics until the publication of the novel in America with a "blurb on the dust jacket" (171): "When an American edition was published later, the blurb carefully drew attention to the parodies, and they were duly noticed and generally approved" (171). Morace analyses this occasion:

While early reviewers tended to overlook the novel's parodic side, later readers run the risk of making opposite mistake and thus failing to realize that in Lodge's third novel, realism and parody, life and literature, feed on and reflect each other, creating a comical but nonetheless disturbing confusion of realms." (132-3)

Morace further comments that, "Lodge achieves a similar if more effective and more self-conscious narrative revolution by carnivalizing his text in an effort to undermine the monological seriousness of various forms of authority" (135). Indeed, in this novel, Lodge makes fun of the authors whose works he almost memorized during his MA thesis dealing with Catholic fiction, with the self-esteem he gained throughout his studies in British Museum and having the independence of feeling himself an authority with his recently published literary study called *Language of Fiction* (1966) but, as Morace suggests, completed right before he started *The British Museum is Falling Down*. (134). Morace further indicates that, "The parodies also enabled Lodge to transform critical theory into narrative art. He could draw on his study of the language of fiction and yet at the same time distance himself from a character made in the author's own image, or, rather in caricature of that image" (136-7).

Lodge ends his novel with an epilogue, which is a parody of Molly's monologue at the end of *Ulysses*, through the words of Adam's wife, Barbara. On the parodic treatment of the novel, Morace states,

Lodge is able to carnivalize so adroitly because he cannibalizes so well. The novel comprises a multitude of literary allusions and lengthy parodies of individual authors – Conrad, Greene, Hemingway, James, Joyce, Kafka, Lawrence, Woolf, C. P. Snow, and Baron Corvo – as well as of literary schools. The novel devours and adapts not only literary authors, styles, and works at a bewildering rate, but literary and subliterary forms as well, including newspaper reports, advertising jingles, encyclopedia entries, unpublished manuscripts, plot summaries, letters to the editor, and slapstick comedy. To compound matters, Lodge’s novel has as its main character not only a postgraduate English student who feels – or finds – that most of his life has been “annexed” by literature (82, Morace’s quotation), but one who is himself given to parody. (135)

As a result, as Lidia Vianu says, “Lodge calls this novel ‘experimental,’ as opposed to the previous two, which were ‘essentially serious works of scrupulous realism’” (12). *The British Museum is Falling Down* stands as an introductory work to his later academic novels, an experiment of Lodge’s recently gained self-esteem after the completion of his thesis and after his meeting with Malcolm Bradbury. This novel also shows how well Lodge is equipped for English literature in terms of analyzing, interpreting and, as in this case, parodying major works and authors of influence up to that point of his career.

3.2 *Stepping Westward* (1965)

‘Critics!’ said Bourbon in some disgust. ‘That means they can go around spoutin’ their own opinions all the time as much as they want, without ever havin’ to check a fact. Needn’t use the library ever.’ (215)

First published in 1965, the same year with Lodge’s *The British Museum is Falling Down*, *Stepping Westward* is Malcolm Bradbury’s second novel published ten years after the publication of *Eating People is Wrong*. The novel depicts an American university’s employing a British author as a ‘writer-in-residence’ to teach Creative Writing lessons during an academic term in which he is also required to write a novel that discusses the life at the same university to serve as an advertisement for prospective students and academic staff. Mostly satirizing academic issues, Bradbury also continues his tradition of questioning ‘liberalism’ within an institution in America, the country commonly known as the ‘land of the free’.

Bradbury opens his novel with an introductory note:

The characters in this fiction are total inventions; the university where part of the action takes place is much too improbable to resemble any existing institution; the American state to which the university belongs does not exist, though it has of necessity been set down in an area occupied by other states; and the America of the novel differs in many details of geography, politics, law, and customs from the real, as it were original, America.

Such disclaimers are common in almost every academic novel but it is worth noting that this is the first employment of such a note in a Bradbury novel. It is a directly informative note denying that the setting and events of the novel have any links associated with the real places and events. But, as we will later see, Bradbury plays with these kind of introductory notes as his satire and parody get wider in the course of his writing career.

Divided into three books, each beginning with epigraphs; first one with Wordsworth's poem from *Memories of a Tour in Scotland, 1803*, also called *Stepping Westward*, second one with Alexander Pope's *Essay on Man* taken from "Epistle II: Of the Nature and State of Man, With Respect to Himself as an Individual" and titled by Bradbury as "The Middle State", and the third one with D. H. Lawrence's essay "The Spirit of Place" taken from his book *Studies in Classic American Literature*, Bradbury allows himself to discuss the course of his novel in three linked episodes. Each epigram is perfectly chosen to give an insight into the following episode. In the first episode, James Walker, the British author appointed by Benedict Arnold College to be their 'writer-in-residence' for the following academic term, journeys to America and Bradbury describes his journey to the West. In the second episode, James arrives in America and Bradbury discusses his experience in America as well as his interactions with Benedict Arnold's academic procedures. In the final episode, Bradbury further discusses James' American experiences and his self-search towards his journey back to Britain.

In addition to these three books, the novel has a prologue and an epilogue, each describing the Benedict Arnold College's department meetings on deciding the path they will follow in the next academic term. In the prologue, Benedict Arnold University's academic staffs are introduced and we witness them in their decision to appoint the next 'writer-in-residence' for the upcoming academic term. The epilogue is much like the prologue; we witness the department meeting once more, but this time with some changes in the

professional positions and some absent members. Bradbury ends his novel exactly where he started and with the three books that he uses to develop his argument, Bradbury perfectly rounds out his analysis of a term in the life of an American College, satirizing the institution as well as the academic procedures that the staffs use for means of obtaining power and prestige.

Benedict Arnold College is situated in “Party – a town reclaimed from nothing, captured from one of the least desirable sections in the frontier” (1), which “is a marginal sort of town” (1) that “has an unfinished look” (1). The town is only famous for an annual rodeo contest and for “a college called Benedict Arnold University, a curious foundation, half private, half state-owned,” (2) which is run by “President Coolidge – Ralph Zugsmith Coolidge, President of Benedict Arnold these last five years” (4) whose ideas on Benedict Arnold are quite favourable indeed; for according to Coolidge, Benedict Arnold “was more scholarly than Harvard, better built than Yale, more socially attractive than Princeton, and with better parking facilities than all of them” (5). The Head of English Department of the college is Dr Harris Bourbon, “a big and totally unimpressive man who had been raised locally on a farm and had risen in the academic world through sheer endurance” (8), who “read nothing after 1895, and regarded *Jude, the Obscure* as the ultimate in literary daring” (15). The English Department that this man leads is not in a rank to compete with other colleges but had a reputation for two noteworthy achievements:

firstly because an enterprising member of that faculty, since gone into the advertising business, conceived the idea of approaching living poets and novelists and asking them, not for their cast-off manuscripts, which came expensive, but for their cast-off clothes, which are to be seen, displayed on facsimile dummies, in a small museum in the library; and secondly because it is in the custom of taking on, each year, a writer-in-residence – a young poet or novelist, who usually, after or even before the expiration of his term of duty, writes a novel in which the university and many of its faculty appear in print under the faintest of disguises. (6)

Apart from Coolidge and Bourbon, another important member of the English department is Bernard Froelich, a Jew (293), who was “educated in the east” (13) and described as “not only a partisan but a politician” (13) who has revolutionary thoughts about the future of the department as well as the future of himself in a reformed department:

He was a complicated, ambitious person who took rather a different view of the function of the creative writing fellow from his colleagues. He thought these writers proved the superiority of creation over criticism, a thing that English Departments quickly forget about, and every excess they achieved, every shock they gave to Bourbon, provided Froelich with a peculiar pleasure.

(13)

Bernard Froelich is characterized in such a manner that he almost seems to be an updated version of Treece from *Eating People is Wrong*, though Froelich is more ambitious, more politic and more aggressive than Treece in terms of getting what he wants: “When people asked Bernard Froelich why he had gone into academic life, he usually answered, ‘Oh, for the prestige, the power.’ It was a joke, but a half-true one. He had always been an ambitious man” (293). His main motive for getting James Walker appointed as the next ‘writer-in-residence’ is because Walker is British and he is thought to be associated with the Angry Young Man. “His name had appeared in literary magazines and little reviews in connection with Amis’s, Wain’s, Murdoch’s” (15) says Froelich when introducing Walker to the department. For Froelich, Walker represents the modern English novel, which definitely is miles away from Bourbon’s comprehension. Walker’s employment means that Froelich will have a chance to challenge Bourbon’s current position at the department and that he will force his way into Bourbon’s place right after the rebellion that Froelich presumes will take place during Walker’s employment: “Froelich wanted a rebel, but he wanted an interesting one” (16) and also “a concealed bomb or catalyst, a disintegrator and changer who would explode in faculty meetings and in the classrooms and somehow dislodge the world of dullness and fog that Bourbon swirled around in, and so bring prestige to himself and his cause” (293-4). So, Walker’s association with the Movement, and his presumed state of being “angry”, makes him the perfect “rebel” and “the concealed bomb” required to start Froelich’s revolution. In the meantime, Froelich supposes that Walker will help and influence him to finish his own novel on “Plight” at last.

On the other hand, James Walker can be analyzed as an updated version of Louis Bates, also from Bradbury’s first novel. Consistent with Bradbury’s tradition of interpreting in doubles, here he uses a detailed analysis of events from two different perspectives by the means of employing two different characters that can be described as ‘binary oppositions’. Walker is thus characterized as Froelich’s ‘binary opposition’ and a much mature version of Treece’s ‘binary opposition’ Bates. In many ways, Walker is like Bates; a sensitive man, who

managed to enter the literary world with three novels that deal with “heroes like himself, sensitive provincial types to whom fate had dealt a cruel blow, for whom life was too plain and ordinary to be worth much at all” (22) after successfully having his treatment at the mental hospital. (Walker has never been to a mental hospital but I suggest that, in *Stepping Westward*, he serves as a ‘grown-up’ version of Bates, who definitely was put into a mental hospital at the end of *Eating People is Wrong*.) Even the occupation of Walker’s wife is linked with Bates; for Elaine Walker is a nurse, who looks after his husband in all terms that is possible and who, happens to a perfect candidate for Bates to marry. Morace deals with the same issue as thus:

But it is also his [Bradbury’s] own first novel, for like his half-self, Stuart Treece, the author of *Stepping Westward* has not, perhaps cannot, free himself from his alter-ego/echo, Louis Bates, who returns, reshaped and reimagined, as an integral part of *Stepping Westward*’s plodding, largely passive protagonist, James Walker. (44)

I objected to Morace’s analysis that Treece is Bradbury’s own voice in *Eating People is Wrong*, and I still continue to do so, but I definitely agree with his analysis on the employment of Froelich and Walker in *Stepping Westward*.

In the meantime, at this stage, it is noteworthy to record that “For two years [Walker] had been teaching, in the Georgian premises of the Adult Education Centre on Shakespeare Street, an ambling, inconsequential class on modern literature to a group of day-release clergyman” (23). In line with this quotation, I will be able to further discuss the last line of the chapter that was excluded from *Eating People is Wrong* but later published in Bradbury’s *Who Do You Think You Are* (1976) as a short story titled “The Adult Education Class” which was the answer of Treece to Bates’ wondering if he and Treece were heading towards the same path, as: ‘Perhaps after all we all are’ (68). I would suggest that, in *Stepping Westward*, Walker, and therefore Bates, has become what Treece was in *Eating People is Wrong*: a teacher in an Adult Education Class. Because it will be absurd to call *Stepping Westward* a sequel to *Eating People is Wrong*, this coincidence can only be analyzed as intertextuality and also as its employment at one of the most appropriate situations.

To return to the course of events in *Stepping Westward*, we come across Walker’s voyage to America by ship following Walker’s realization that Froelich has used him for his

own agenda. On this journey, he interacts with other important characters, such as Miss Fern Marrow, a British woman at 32 and still a virgin, Miss Julie Snowflake, an American, who is an English major at Hillesley University, who happens to write a term paper about the post-war English novel that includes Walker, and Dr Jochum, who, according to Julie, has left Hillesley because of not getting tenure but has been teaching at Benedict Arnold since then. It is clear from his words to Walker that he is acquainted with Froelich: “‘Vell,’ [sic] said Dr Jochum, ‘you are like all reformers. You like to reform the world because it is easier than trying to reform yourself. I have met such man’” (98). Although his words are meant to be a joke, – for with these words, he is calling Walker to join him to swim on the deck while Walker is reading *The Brothers Karamazov* – it can be suggested that Walker and Froelich have the same kind of passion for reformation; that is, they both want to change their current situations not by trying to change themselves but by trying to change the people around them: Walker leaves Nottingham, his wife and his obligations in order to experience a glimpse of freedom in America, while Froelich eliminates his ‘enemies’ in the English department one by one and tries to get new people appointed to create a revolution in the faculty. That is why, when he receives the letter from Benedict Arnold, Walker cries, “Ah, an envoy! It offered a promise of esteem, a taste of freedom, and a passable salary for being free. And freedom – *that* meant something to Walker” (24). And that is why Froelich awaits “the arrival of the man who was to be ally and admirer, and who would understand and applaud” (60) crying “Hurry up, James Walker” (60). In this sense, they hardly oppose another. But what opposes them are not their goals but the ways each tries to reach those goals.

When Walker finally reaches Benedict Arnold, he meets Bourbon who gives his new faculty member some general information on Benedict Arnold’s academic situation:

‘Lots of folks,’ said Bourbon, letting out the clutch, ‘call Benedict Arnold a play school, figurin’ that our kids just come here for a good time. Course we do have a lot of good sports around here, but that’s only a part of the students’ life around here. I get annoyed when people say our kids don’t learn nothin’. They learn a lot. They teach us and we teach them. We expect ‘em to learn a lil and live a lil and play a lil. That’s what a U is for.’ (212)

Later, Bourbon shows Walker the offices of the academic staff. In one of the rooms, they meet Luther Stewart, “a large and thin young man with a small moustache” (215) and William

Van Hart, “a tall, elegant and rather sophisticated” (215) figure. After they are introduced, Bourbon muses on them:

‘You know, boy, these young kids come out of here from the east, read Cassier and Buber and all that stuff, they’re pretty darn sure of themselves. They think they’re mighty good. Tain’t always so. I always make it my rule, beware of intellectual arrogance. Now take me, I’m a scholar. That’s what I’ll be hung for. But these boys, know what they are?’

‘No,’ said Walker.

‘Critics!’ said Bourbon in some disgust. ‘That means they can go around spoutin’ their own opinions all the time as much as they want, without ever havin’ to check a fact. Needn’t use the library ever.’ (215)

Bourbon’s hatred for the critics is understandable for, as discussed earlier, he has read nothing written after 1895 and still regards Hardy’s *Jude, the Obscure* as the ultimate modern novel. On the other hand, he has written a book called *The Bucket of Tragedy* (1947) that deals with Jacobean drama. He reads A. C. Bradley’s *Shakespearean Tragedy* at the lavatory of his house and, with the influence of Jacobean dramatists, currently keeps his mind busy with a condemnation of “all literature not formally tragic in structure” (15). It would be hard for ‘these boys’ to explain to him their ideas and it would be even harder from him to comprehend their discussion. But in the same passage, Bradbury satirizes some new critics of the 1960s who appeared on the literary scene just by their philosophical thoughts and took the liberty of criticizing literary works without ever reading them.

Then, in a meeting of the English department, Walker is introduced to Benedict Arnold’s academic staff. In the meeting, a reporter from the *Party Bugle*, Benedict Arnold’s local paper, is present. The reporter asks him questions about his association with the Angry Young Men and also asks whether he is still angry at Party. Walker says, at that current stage of his life, he is not angry and also he is not ‘young’ anymore. Also in the same meeting, Walker is told that he is required to give a public lecture at Fogle Auditorium, on the topic that the department already had taken the authority to choose for him and also had titled his lecture “The Writer’s Dilemma”. This lecture worries Walker right at the stage he begins to question his position at a university where he is required to teach a writing course when he has no sense of what the graduate students are taught about literary criticism. But having no alternative than accepting to give the lecture, he starts preparing to give one. In the meantime, the *Party Bugle* announces that “Angry Young Man Loses Anger in Party” (259).

In terms of analyzing academic institutions, Bradbury also discusses his own opinions on these kinds of institutions which supposedly play a liberal, free-minded and independent role in the society. Taking into consideration America's MacCarthy period, Bradbury installs a subplot into his novel in which Walker is required to sign a 'loyalty oath' in order to get employed by Benedict Arnold. As it is understood in the course of the novel, this 'loyalty oath' is not a big issue and, like MacCarthy, has almost lost its validity. It is also specified in the novel that all members of the Benedict Arnold's academic staff have signed this oath without further investigating. But Bradbury's liberal character Walker refuses to sign it, since he thinks it may compromise him as a foreign national, and may limit his freedom. The word 'loyal' confuses his mind further: after all he is British and it would not be proper to sign an oath identifying him as a person who is loyal to America and to one of its institutions. While Walker's mind is busy with this loyalty oath issue, the time of his lecture comes and he takes his place at the podium to speak:

He looked down at his speech in the blue folder. The first page of the typescript said neatly *The Writer's Dilemma*. After that followed realms of windy persiflage, hammered out in the security of isolation. He looked at it, then out at the audience, and then decided to stray away from the text. It was a decision of panic and fear, and he knew that he would regret it. A curious sense of utter freedom came over him; he felt that he could say whatever he liked, that nothing would be remembered, that there was no one real here but him. He thought about the real writer's dilemma, which was that you had to come from the right class, be able to hold your liquor, know how to undo a brasserie at the back first go, and have the courage to stay away from lectures you might be invited to give on the subject of your dilemma. But it was too late to know that now. (287)

The lecture that he gives to Benedict Arnold, and in general, to America, which had always symbolized the sense of freedom to Walker until the 'loyalty oath' incident, has much in common with Jim Dixon's drunken speech in Amis' *Lucky Jim*. Both lectures stand out as the long repressed anti-hero's giving a piece of his mind at last. Walker relies upon his individuality in a foreign land, which is chaotic as well as free, and speaks about his own dilemma rather than giving a lecture on an already arranged topic by the department:

I came here for the chance to be uncommitted; it was a marvellous chance, and I'm proud to be here, I suppose. Yes, I think I am. It was very disloyal of me to come, really. But I came to be loyal to being a writer. That means not being limited. As I say, I'm not sure whether this is a

good commitment. But if you think enough of it to ask me here, then don't limit it at all by anything like, well, the loyalty oath that I have on my desk in my apartment. That's a mistake. (289)

Walker concludes his speech by announcing that "Well, that's my dilemma. I think I want freedom and I shall take it if you give it to me. That's what I came to America for. You might like my dilemma or you might not. All I'm saying is that it is, in a way, yours too" (290). After his 'liberal' speech, *Dimity Gazette* writes, "*British Author Lashes Loyalty Oath*" (299) and further states that the public protested Walker's speech. Always scheming politically, Froelich tries to instigate Walker's rebellion by telling him that he is a victim, "a man misused by the society" (305) who stands "for truth suffering against ignorance for a whole bunch of folk on this campus" (305). Froelich's attempts do not cheer Walker up but give a hint to the readers on how he will demonstrate his defense of Walker's speech in the next department meeting.

Not surprisingly, Bourbon summons Walker to his office to discuss his position at the university after this public speech. He says, "... the state legislature has sent President Coolidge a memo saying that he should either require you to sign the oath or fire you" (320) and further adds, "So President Coolidge sent back a memo saying that if you don't sign he'll refuse to renew your contract at the end of this year, that's this academic year." (320). He makes it clear that both the department and Walker are in a pretty hard situation:

'Waal, it's a sticky wicket, Mis' Walker, and you know I wish it hadn't never happened. But looks like the U's tryin' to look after you, and I hope you're feelin' mighty grateful. But this could get worse. We're under fire from without and within. Without means the press, the townspeople, the state legislature. Within, waal, that's all these here students who have protested to me, and some of the faculty. Number of the faculty have protested to the President 'bout your indiscretion.'

'They have?' asked Walker. 'Who?'

'Well, seems a pee-tition was started by a man you know.'

'A man I know?'

'Yes, Dr Jochum.' (321)

With this conversation, Bradbury introduces another academic scheme which is getting backstabbed by a person who Walker is not even suspicious of. Hearing Bourbon's words and Jochum's unsuspected behaviour towards himself becomes a second shock for Walker. He

understands that his free speech did not begin a free-minded academic discussion among the so-called liberal university but, on the contrary, did start a local campaign against himself that is being run both by the press and by the academic staff. When he comes to think of this entire scheme, he realizes that he can trust no one but himself in an academic institution:

An aroma of treachery seemed to fill the world in which he had been moving so unsuspectingly. Even the trees and paths seemed no longer reliable, and the faces of the students he passed seemed very foreign indeed. Though he was unsure of his alliances and his connections, and hadn't thought about them very much, missing all that sensitivity to the political which those trained in institutions possess, Walker had felt that there were certain stabilities – human ones: that Jochum was his friend, that Froelich was, that the teaching staff of the department was on the whole behind him. He knew now that his appointment had been disputed; but he assumed that the human appeal of his existence had put an end to that. And he also assumed that the human took precedence over the political; this he took to be an essential rule of life. But now the wind seemed overnight to have overturned all these connections and assumptions. (322-3)

In the meantime, Dean French, a bachelor who has a “modern A frame house composed almost entirely of glass” (333), and who is famous around Party for his parties gives another party and invites Walker. During the party, he tells Walker about the outcome of the recent department meeting, filling in detailed information about the history of the ‘loyalty oath’ that still is in force at Benedict Arnold:

‘Well, it all goes back to the MacCarthy period, when there were a lot firings round here. A character called Leonov, who’s still at the U, but on leave this year, was behind that. So anyway, the local Chapter of the AAUP rallied round, a bit late in the day, I have to admit, and they resolved democratically to support the principle that college teachers shouldn’t be forced to declare their political allegiance, by oath or any other means, and they shouldn’t be fired on solely political grounds. The AAUP here has taken that line over since, and we’ve put a hell of a lot of pressure on the college admin at different times to withdraw the state oath. The last president, who was a lazy but very well-meaning guy, finally agreed to do that, but he was caught up between the faculty and the regents and the regents finally got at him and he resigned, quit.’

‘I see.’

‘Then we got Coolidge. Of course, he tried to play it all ways but the point is he never fired anyone for disloyalty. You know that careful line he walks.’

‘Yes,’ said Walker, ‘I know it very well now.’

‘So you see you came in at the end of quite a battle. Now what happened after your crazy speech, which incidentally was pretty innocuous stuff, was that the Leonov faction got moving

again. Another of the *émigré* wing, a man called Jochum, presented a petition asking the college to affirm in favour of the oath.’

‘How did Jochum get tied up with these people?’ asked Walker.

‘Oh, he’s a friend of Leonov’s, they have sad Russian pasts in common. Jochum wouldn’t hurt a fly, he’s carrying the can for Leonov. So our friend Bernie got up at the meeting and accused the petitioners of prejudicing the AAUP stand. Jochum tried to fight him, but the point is that the meeting supported Bernie. So then Bernie moved that the meeting counter-petition the university to come out in opposition to the oath. Now obviously it can’t do this, because of the state backing, but Bernie proposed it as a gesture, to repudiate the Jochum petition. So we approved it. Then there was a big scene. Coolidge saw Jochum and Bernie on Monday and condemned the first petition, so Bernie withdrew his. Then Jochum resigned and that’s it.’ (347-8)

After all, Froelich’s ambitious personality and his ways of obtaining power and prestige are noteworthy. Leonov was a person Froelich counted as his enemy and it is suggested at an early stage of the novel (60) that he had gotten rid of him before we, as the readers, ever witnessed life at Benedict Arnold. At this recent meeting, Froelich also manages to get rid of Jochum, who was not an active enemy of his but represented Leonov’s opinions in certain ways. The only loser in his entire scheme is Walker, who leaves Party right after Dean French’s party together with Julie and first heads to San Francisco to experience the Beatniks and then goes to Mexico but then decides to return to Britain. He decides he is not equipped with certain requirements for hanging onto life as a ‘freestyler’; for instance, he cannot mend the car (he does not even know how to drive) when it breaks down in Mexico, and both he and Julie have to spend the night in the wilderness of Mexico right in the middle of nowhere. When he finds out that he is not man enough to survive in the free and carnivalized world of San Francisco and Mexico during the 1960s, he returns back home defeated and depressed but surely experienced.

In the Epilogue, Froelich attends the meeting as the Head of the English Department. We understand that Bourbon resigned just because of his ethical values; that the whole writer-in-residence scheme was originally Bourbon’s idea and he resigned when Walker ran away and sent his resignation letter from San Francisco, analyzing the situation as his own fault. Although Froelich seems not to be directly linked with Bourbon’s resignation, Walker, the writer he got appointed, gave Bourbon the last blow. Froelich, having achieved the prestige and power that he lacked at the beginning of the novel, is not fully satisfied at all because his book on Plight which he achieved to finish during Walker’s employment at Benedict Arnold,

is refused by four publishers. To overcome his latest problem, he comes up with a new very self-serving suggestion:

‘But I’d just like to make one proposal to this meeting. I don’t know whether this is possible under the terms of the funds, but I’d like to suggest that we accept the fact that the writing fellowships have been less than successful, and we put the money into a literary quarterly edited from this campus by the staff of the English Department.’ (386)

His original plan is to publish his own novel in that literary quarterly in episodes and to get credit for its publication in the years that will follow. President Coolidge accepts his proposal and Froelich successfully achieves everything that he sought for throughout the novel. He definitely knows how to play the game with the academic discourse of which he is a master and his ambitious and greedy personality enable him to hurt and ‘eat’ people whenever necessary. In fact, it can be suggested that there are no neutral people for Froelich; he divides people into two groups as enemies and allies, as if he is in a war with academy. To win the battle, he appoints his allies to attack his enemies and watches them eating and eliminating each other:

[Walker] had gone believing himself a manipulated man, and believing too that he, Bernard Froelich, was puppeteer of the whole marionette show. That was what his cryptic letter of resignation, written from San Francisco, had in essence said: You have made me destroy a man. Even if, to a point, Walker’s picture of the situation was true, Froelich had never seen it primarily in that light. He had had a notion of an ideal collaboration – of writer and critic; of English liberal and American liberal; of two men of good spirit and goodwill. This world, it was true, favoured those who had ends in view, and to this extent Froelich had gone forward and Walker had, well, gone back. This was because Walker was subjective pessimism and he was objective history, a turning wheel. And in that matter, too, out of affection and regard, he had tried to be a mentor, to show Walker that to live in the ethically flabby belief that the world is good and innocent and that all men can be assimilated and loved without hurt was wrong, that deeper connections had to be made. Walker, a believer in personal relationships and a conspicuously bad performer in what he believed in, had never succeeded; he could never have succeeded even without Froelich. Froelich had tried to show him the true face of love, with Patrice, with Julie; there are no disconnected idylls, he had tried to hint. No hurting, Walker had said. But Walker had not sailed without a hurt or two left behind on his own account. He thought of Patrice and for Froelich too in that abandonment. But risktakers expect that; and it was Walker, really, who had sailed away most intact, wrapped in the bundle of himself. And if the world had reformed behind him and left some high and others low, then that was the way of the world, the way it progressed and changed. There were no special injustices, just those of

process and the human lot. *That* had been the lesson Froelich had prepared for this classroom sessions; but the pupil had gone, cut class, and Froelich was Chairman, and the President was now accepting his proposal, and all that Froelich could think was that he, since he *was* human, was missing Walker very, very much. (387-8)

“The Walker he misses may be Walker the friend, though one suspects that, even more, it is Walker the audience, the dutiful student willing to learn the lesson of the master, Froelich,” (52-3) says Morace. It can be added that Froelich misses Walker, the admirer who should have been there to applaud and congratulate Froelich’s achievements when all’s been said and done. But life goes on; Bradbury does not resolve many strands of the sub-plots of his novel and rather leaves them all to his readers’ imaginations. But one cannot help wondering who will be Froelich’s next victim. President Coolidge? Why not? Or maybe he can even try to challenge the English departments in Britain. Coolidge would be an easy challenge for Froelich but the satisfaction of overcoming the English in England would be much bigger. Bradbury leaves many questions unanswered but manages to satirize fully the academic institutions and their working procedures in an energetic narrative style.

IV. Chapter 4 – The Seventies: *Changing Places* (1975) and *The History Man* (1975)

The seventies had been an era of revolution in which the ‘discontinuities’ in Foucault’s terms, revolted against ‘the fellowship of discourse’. The minorities demanded freedom with their counter cultures and their alternative life-styles. Both Bradbury and Lodge included these demands of youth in their respective novels published in the seventies and discussed sexual freedom and student protests in their own terms. In *Changing Places*, Lodge includes a ‘wife-swapping’ theme in his plot which illustrates an exchange scheme between a British and an American professor. While satirizing the academic schemes employed for power and prestige, Lodge also manages to contrast British and American education systems in his own unique narrative style. On the other hand, in *The History Man*, Bradbury satirizes the revolutionary ideas of the era with his Marxist character Howard Kirk who embodies all diabolical motives required for power and prestige in the 1970s. Showalter comments on both authors’ discussion of the era thus:

But while Bradbury saw permissiveness, collectivity, swinging, protest, and the counterculture as sinister, and the Howard Kirks who exploited it as monsters, Lodge identified with the other side, let its comic potential flourish openly, rather than surreptitiously (for Howard Kirk is so very deliciously awful, seductive, and power-mad as to be quite attractive). *Although Changing Places* is critical of the excesses, pretensions, and posturings of the ‘60s university, overall it affirms the carnivalesque and liberatory aspects of the decade without sourness or cynicism. As Lodge said in an interview, “I don’t think that in good faith I could satirize in a destructive way an institution which I belong to. I think I can stand back from the academic profession enough to see its absurd and ridiculous aspects, but I don’t think it’s really wicked or mischievous.” (Showalter 62)

As Showalter remarks, Lodge analyses the events of the era in a comic fashion without judging the limits of ongoing rebellion against major ethical values, Bradbury discusses the extremities of these rebellions for Howard Kirk is symbolized as an ultimate monster rather than a handsome and attractive ‘flower-child’ who tries to make the world a better place. Bradbury accepts the revolutionary ideas but is against their extreme employments. By all means, both novels question the era in which they are written.

4.1 *Changing Places: A Tale of Two Campuses (1975)*

At the age of forty, in short, Morris Zapp could think of nothing he wanted to achieve that he hadn't achieved already, and this depressed him. (44)

David Lodge's fifth novel *Changing Places* was published in 1975 and it will not be wrong to suggest that it is the most revolutionary and the most experimental novel that Lodge has ever written in terms of narrative technique. Apart from its individual existence, the novel is also the first book of what is later to be known as David Lodge's trilogy of academic novels which consists of *Changing Places* (1975), *Small World* (1984) and *Nice Work* (1988). Just as Bradbury opened *Stepping Westward* with an introductory note denying references to real people, in *Changing Places*, Lodge employs a similar disclaimer; and it is worth stating that this introductory note is Lodge's first ever:

Although some of the locations and public events portrayed in this novel bear a certain resemblance to actual locations and events, the characters, considered either as individuals or as members of institutions, are entirely imaginary. Rummidge and Euphoria are places on the map of a comic world which resembles the one we are standing on without corresponding exactly to it, and which is peopled by figments of the imagination. (6)

As Lodge gets deeper into the conventions of the academic novel, we will notice that he will, like Bradbury, play with his introductory notes and confuse readers in search of attempting to sort out fact from fiction; or in an attempt to decode fiction into reality.

Changing Places is divided into six chapters with the following titles: 1.Flying, 2.Settling, 3.Corresponding, 4.Reading, 5.Changing and 6.Ending. Each chapter's title almost summarizes their following actions. In the first chapter, the two main characters, Philip Swallow and Morris Zapp, that are changing places, are on two separate planes and each flies to his new setting; in the second chapter, they get to know their new environments; in the third chapter, they communicate with their wives with letters; in the fourth chapter, readers are allowed to trace the course of events with newspaper articles and advertisements; in the fifth chapter, the characters 'change' indeed; and in the last chapter, the course of events described in the novel just ends. As Morace indicates, "All six chapters are told from what is identified early in the novel as 'our privileged altitude' (Morace quotes from *Changing Places*, 8) – a phrase which immediately puts the novel into postmodern dialogue with the

literary tradition.” (163). Indeed, Lodge makes use of pastiche, intertextuality and arbitrariness of meaning in terms of communication; all included in the vocabulary of postmodern players, and parodies the traditional novel sequence as much as possible. In *The Art of Fiction* (1992), Lodge himself describes the chapters of the novel as thus:

The first shift is comparatively inconspicuous – from present-tense narration in Chapter One to past-tense narration in Chapter Two. But the third chapter is in epistolary form, and the fourth consists of extracts from newspapers and other documents the characters are supposed to be reading. The fifth chapter is conventional in style, but deviates from the cross-cutting pattern of the previous chapters, presenting the interconnected experiences of the two main characters in consecutive chunks. (227)

In each novel, Lodge keeps introducing new forms and styles in terms of narration and experiences his own limits as an author. But before getting into an analysis of narrative structure, it will be better to analyze the characters and the plot.

Between the Rummidge University in Britain and the Euphoria State University in America, there is an exchange scheme for a period of six months to celebrate the two institutions’ architectural resemblance; a similarity that stands erect at each campus out of pure coincidence. Each university has a replica of the Tower of Pisa and the only difference between the replicas is in their sizes and in the materials used for their construction: “built of white stone and twice the original size at Euphoric State and of red brick and to scale at Rummidge, but restored to the perpendicular in both instances” (13). As a symbolic exchange, usually, this scheme is applied with an exchange of inexperienced academics, but in the year of 1969, this plan is slightly revised due to some minor personal problems of our forty-years-old professors namely Philip Swallow and Morris Zapp. Philip Swallow, the British professor from Rummidge, is “a mimetic man: unconfident, eager to please, infinitely suggestible” (10); a professor, who is famous for his questions and his genuine love of literature: “in odd moments when nobler examples of the written word were not to hand he read attentively the backs of cornflakes packets, the small print on railway tickets and the advertising matter in books of stamps” (17), but this “undiscriminating enthusiasm” (17) does not enable him to specialize in a certain field:

He had done his initial research on Jane Austen, but since then had turned his attention to topics as various as medieval sermons, Elizabethan sonnet sequences, Restoration heroic tragedy,

eighteenth-century broadsides, the novels of William Godwin, the poetry of Elizabeth Barrett Browning and premonitions of the Theatre of the Absurd in the plays of George Bernard Shaw. None of these projects had been completed. (17)

Morace suggests that Philip Swallow is, “As birdlike and as seemingly shallow as his name suggests, he completely lacks what the comic book super-critic Zapp possesses so excessively: will and ambition” (157), and Showalter adds that “[h]e is a survivor of the British examination system, a man who excels at taking exams and at giving them, and his ideal critical work would be “a concise, comprehensive survey of English literature consisting entirely of questions” (13, Showalter quotes from *Changing Places*)” (63). In the meantime, it should be said that Philip is married to Hilary Swallow and the couple has three children.

In fact, Philip had never applied for the exchange scheme but when the year’s nominee had been offered a chair in Australia, Rummidge had difficulties in replacing him. Therefore, Gordon Masters, the head of English Department at Rummidge, asks Philip if he could cover for this colleague who has left for Australia, and Philip accepted it after sleeping on the offer. After all, Plotinus, the city where Euphoria University is situated, is the city in which Philip and Hilary had spent their honeymoon, and also it is the place where Philip finally “finished his MA thesis, almost effortlessly” (20). In the meantime, contrary to the industrial and foggy atmosphere of Rummidge, Plotinus can be described as a ‘heaven on earth’. For all these reasons, this exchange scheme seems to be a wonderful opportunity for Philip however, it also has a disadvantage: Hilary cannot join him in Plotinus for she has to stay at Rummidge to take care of the children’s education. But when Hilary thinks how happy and ‘free’ Philip was during their honeymoon, she lets him go. So, off he goes.

Up to this point, everything seems perfectly reasonable, but the exact academic scheme behind the years exchange programme is not quite so straightforward as it seems: Gordon Masters wants to send Philip to America because he wants to give a Senior Lectureship to Robin Dempsey, a young linguist with many publications, instead of to Philip, who does not have any publications at all and who can only deserve this post by being a Senior at Rummidge. Masters does not want to activate his plan when Philip is around, so he tries Philip with this suggestion. And Philip accepts.

On the other hand, the passenger of the jet from America to Britain, Philip's "opposite number" (121) is Morris J. Zapp, "a seasoned veteran of the domestic airways, having flown over most of the states in the Union in his time, bound for conferences, lecture dates and assignations ..." (10). Morris Zapp is a Jewish man with "long, gorilla-like arms" (12), a distinguished academic, *the Jane Austen man*, a man who got published in PMLA while still a graduate student, a man who, when he had been approached by Euphoria, asked "for twice the going salary, and got it; who had published five fiendishly clever books (four of them on Jane Austen) by the time he was thirty and achieved the rank of full professor at the same precocious age" (15), a man who is famous for his "stare" and a man who would indicate his middle name as:

Morris J. Zapp ('Jehovah,' he would murmur out of the side of his mouth to girls who inquired about his middle name, it never failed; all women longed to be screwed by a god, it was the source of all religion – 'Just look at the myths, Leda and the Swan, Isis and Osiris, Mary and the Holy Ghost' – thus spake Zapp in his graduate seminar, pinning a brace of restive nuns to their seats with the Stare). (12)

There comes a time when words become inadequately weak to describe Zapp, but Showalter tries to define him thus:

Morris Zapp, the American, is one of academic fiction's most hilarious and revolutionary characters – an academic who approaches the university as if it were a corporation, aims for financial and sexual success, loves power, and is not despised or punished for being crass, sexist, competitive, hedonistic, and horny. (63)

The evil plan that moves this man from Euphoria to Rummidge (or "Rubbish" as Desiree would call it, further defining it as "the asshole of England" (81)) has nothing to do with academic schemes, for Morris is political and distinguished enough to not to be a victim of such schemes, but has something to do with his marriage. Desiree Zapp, his wife and the mother of twins, Elizabeth and Darcy (Morris is definitely *the Jane Austen man*), wants a divorce and Morris does not. He is not mad about Desiree but he does not want to leave the twins to her. Desiree proposes that she will think over the matter once more if he leaves the house for six months. Morris accepts and asks the head of English department to arrange for him a place to spend the next six months. The only alternative is the Rummidge-Euphoria exchange scheme and Morris takes it without giving it a second thought. And so the exchange starts.

In the very beginning lines of the novel, Lodge states, “the crossing of their paths at the still point of the turning world passed unremarked by anyone other than the narrator of this duplex chronicle” (7) and further describes “duplex” as “‘systems in which messages are sent simultaneously in opposite directions’ (OED)” (7-8). While allowing each to live their lives simultaneously without having any the need to know or investigate each other until the third chapter of the novel, Lodge carefully links the actions of each characters’ to be echoed in their native lands and employs them to lead parallel lives until the fifth chapter. Lodge narrates this situation thus:

It follows that when the two men alight in each other’s territory, and go about their business and pleasure, whatever vibrations are passed back by one to his native habitat will be felt by the other, and vice versa, and thus return to the transmitter subtly modified by the response of the other party – may, indeed, return to him along the other party’s cord of communication, which is, after all, anchored in the place where has just arrived; so that before long the whole system is twanging with vibrations traveling backwards and forwards between Prof A and Prof B, now along this line, now along that, sometimes beginning on one line and terminating on another. It would be surprising, in other words, 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. (8)

Morace suggests that, “structural, thematic, and even syntactical doublings have played a prominent part in Lodge’s early writings” (156) and further states that in *Changing Places*, “[Lodge] raises doubling more directly to the novel’s textual surface in order to ironize it and thereby to gain the necessary level of dialogic detachment” (156). Indeed, what Lodge manages to achieve in this novel is to walk each character in his opposite’s shoes and to experience the outcome. But the Zapp of *Small World* would definitely oppose Lodge’s communication process, which is quoted above, suggesting that the meaning is deferred each time it is addressed and addressee would interpret what he understood to another addressee and whole meaning would be deferred and its outcome would be completely different and finally burst out with the idea that it is impossible to get a precise meaning. Zapp will follow Derrida’s steps in *Small World*, but right now, this novel is *Changing Places* and another nine years would be required for Zapp to change his critical assumptions to oppose his author. In

this current novel, Morris is just *the* Jane Austen man with an exquisite plan to silence and to empty the famous English departments:

Some years ago he had embarked an ambitious critical project: a series of commentaries on Jane Austen which would work through the whole canon, one novel at a time, saying absolutely everything that could possibly be said about them. The idea was to be utterly exhaustive, to examine the novels from every conceivable angle, historical, biographical, rhetorical, mythical, Freudian, Jungian, existentialist, Marxist, structuralist, Christian-allegorical, ethical, exponential, linguistic, phenomenological, archetypal, you name it; so that when each commentary was written there would be simply *nothing further to say* about the novel in question. (44)

In terms of seeking prestige and power, Bradbury's Jewish character Froelich in *Stepping Westward*, does not even come close to Lodge's Jewish academic Zapp. While Froelich makes small plans to get the Chairmanship of the English department of Benedict Arnold, Zapp is after huge plans like emptying the English departments of famous universities by analyzing the works of major English authors' works in every way possible and leave other English scholars with nothing to work on. In the meantime, when it comes to prestige, Morris also has another plan: to be the highest paid professor of English worldwide. Lodge further narrates Morris' ideas on his colleagues:

As is perhaps obvious, Morris Zapp had no great esteem for his fellow-labourers in the vineyards of literature. They seemed to him vague, fickle, irresponsible creatures, who wallowed in relativism like hippopotami in mud, with their nostrils barely protruding into the air of common-sense. They happily tolerated the existence of opinions contrary to their own – they even, for God's sake, sometimes changed their minds. Their pathetic attempts at profundity were qualified out of existence and largely interrogative in mode. They liked to begin a paper with some formula like, 'I want to raise some questions about so-and-so', and it seemed to think they had done their intellectual duty by merely raising them. This manoeuvre drove Morris Zapp insane. Any damn fool, he maintained, could think of questions; it was answers that separated the men from the boys. If you couldn't answer your own questions it was either because you hadn't worked on them hard enough or because they weren't real questions. (45)

As Showalter discussed Philip's being a 'question man', Morris, being his 'opposite number' in almost every circumstance, is an 'answer man'. Therefore, it can be suggested that Lodge contributes to Bradbury's 'binary oppositions' like Treece/Bates and Froelich/Walker with his own oppositions as Zapp/Swallow. In his book, Morace quotes Lodge's words on this matter:

“I tend to balance things against each other; my novels tend towards binary structures – with, for example, opposite characters – and they very much leave the reader to make up his own mind” (Interview with Haffenden 152)” (166, Morace’s quotation). With these words, Bradbury’s influence upon Lodge becomes more obvious.

In the second chapter of the novel entitled “Settling”, both Zapp and Swallow get to know their new environments. In Euphoria, Swallow finds an apartment to share with three undergraduates; one of them is “Melanie Byrd, the prettiest and most whole-some-looking of the three girls who shared the ground-floor apartment” (55), who happens to be the daughter of Morris from his first marriage but keeps it a secret because of her father’s ill-reputation around the campus. Meanwhile in Rummidge, Zapp becomes the lodger of Dr O’Shea, an Irish man with an “extensive family” (57). The top floor of the house is cold but Zapp finds Swallow’s room at the university to which he is directed by a secretary large and warm: “Walking along the corridors of Dealer Hall was like passing through some Modern Language Association Hall of Fame, but he recognized none of the nameplates here except the one on the door Miss Slade finally stopped at: MR P.H. SWALLOW” (60). At the department IN Rummidge, Morris also notices the notice-board:

The noticeboard distantly reminded Morris of the early work of Robert Rauschenberg: a thumb-tacked montage of variegated scraps of paper – letterhead notepaper, memo sheets, compliment slips, pages torn clumsily from college notebooks, inverted envelopes, reversed invoices, even fragments of wrapping paper with tails of scotch tape still adhering to them – all bearing cryptic messages from faculty to students about courses, rendezvous, assignments and books, scribbled in a variety of scarcely decipherable hands with pencil, ink and coloured ball-point. The end of the Gutenberg era was evidently not an issue here: they were still living in a manuscript culture. (59)

In the meantime, back in the USA, Swallow is welcomed at Euphoria University by student protests, police lines, and a bomb explosion. He is directed to “room number 426” by a “petite Asian secretary” “in her crisp white blouse and scarlet pinafore dress”, (64) who gives him information on department parking facilities, manual or electric typewriter rental options, as well as rules governing the use of the Xerox machine. He meets Wily Smith, an undergraduate who is behind all student protests in some way or the other. Wily wants to apply for Philip’s novel-writing class for the next term for he is interested in writing an autobiographical novel “about this black kid growing up in the ghetto” a rather peculiar ambition since Wily is white (66). What surprises Philip at first is that though he has no idea

in novel-writing, he is supposed to teach a novel-writing class in the next term, and secondly that Wily and Philip share the same white skin color. It is later understood that Morris is the one who has suggested that Philip teach novel-writing:

Morris had recommended putting Philip down to teach English 99, a routine introduction to the literary genres and critical method for English majors, and English 305, a course in novel-writing. . . . As Morris said, 'If he makes a fuck-up of English 305, nobody's going to notice. And any clown with a PhD should be able to teach English 99.'

'He doesn't have a PhD,' Hogan said.

'What?'

'They have a different system in England, Morris. The PhD isn't so important.'

'You mean the jobs are hereditary?' (60)

Philip Swallow, a genuine lover of literature, a 'question man', the product of the British education system, happens to be a professor with a PhD. Here Lodge satirizes the 1944 Butler Act in Britain, an education act, which both he and Bradbury had the chance to experience at the first hand. Under this act, all students at the age of 11 had to take an exam, also known as '11+ exams' (a form of IQ test), upon which they were classified for their results accordingly. This act proposed three types of school: grammar schools, secondary modern schools and secondary technical schools. The idea was that, a few bright children would have the benefit of continuing their educations in grammar schools, which offered "high-level academic education" and ensured their university education, whereas the students who failed the test, or had unsatisfactory results, were to continue their education at secondary modern and technical schools and would later become industrial workers (Sociology at Hewett, 1). Lodge and Bradbury were among these 'a few bright students' to enter grammar schools, and later had the chance to continue their studies at newly founded redbrick universities. In the meantime, this act also had its own classification system installed into the already severe hierarchical class system of Britain. So, Lodge satirizes this British education system with the words of Zapp; the "jobs" are not "hereditary" as Morris wonders, but depends on an IQ exam taken at the age of eleven – which is equally ironic.

In the meantime, at Rummidge, Morris has a chance to learn some basic information about Philip while checking out the books in his room: "The books did no more than to confirm Swallow's confession that he had no particular scholarly field, being a miscellaneous collection of English Literature, with a thin representation of modern criticism, Morris's own

not included” (63). In that same room, Morris meets Hilary for the first time. She is there to look for a book that Philip requested from America to help him in his novel-writing class, and that book plays an effective part in Lodge’s narrative parody throughout the novel:

[Morris] found *Let’s Write a Novel* five minutes later. The cover had come away from the spine, which was why they hadn’t spotted it earlier. It had been published in 1927, as a part of a series that included *Let’s Weave a Rug*, *Let’s Go Fishing* and *Let’s Have Fun With Photography*.

‘Every novel must tell a story,’ it began. ‘Oh, dear, yes,’ Morris commented sardonically.

And there are three types of story, the story that ends happily, the story that ends unhappily, and the story that ends neither happily nor unhappily, or, in other words, doesn’t really end at all.

Aristotle lives! Morris was intrigued in spite of himself. He turned back to the title page to check out the author. ‘A. J. Beamish, author of *A Fair But Frozen Maid*, *Wild Mystery*, *Glynis of the Glen*, etc., etc.’ He read on.

The best kind of story is the one with a happy ending; the next best is the one with unhappy ending, and the worst kind is the story that has no ending at all. The novice is advised to begin with the first kind of story. Indeed, unless you have Genius, you should never attempt any other kind.

‘You’ve got something there, Beamish,’ Morris murmured. Maybe such straight talking wouldn’t hurt the students in English 305 after all, lazy, pretentious bastards, most of them, who thought they could write the Great American Novel by just typing out their confessions and changing the names. (87-8)

“Kitty, a fair but frozen maid”, is taken from a riddle from Jane Austen’s *Emma*, and Beamish’s other novels remind me of Henry Treece, the romantic/fantastic author against whom the Angry Young Man rebelled, and also after whom, Bradbury’s Stuart Treece is named. Therefore, *Let’s Write a Novel*, symbolizes everything that the Angry Young Man stood against, and symbolizes the values of the traditional novel sequence to which both Bradbury and Lodge contributed for its reformation in the post-war period. In *Changing Places*, Lodge both parodies himself as an author, and the traditional novel writing sequence as it is described in Beamish’s critical work. For instance, the third chapter of *Changing Places* is written in the format of an epistolary novel that consists of both characters’ communication with their wives through letters. In one of the letters from Hilary to Philip, she writes: “Do you still want me to send on *Let’s Write a Novel*? 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?” (130). In the fifth chapter, right at the stage when Lodge is actually using flashbacks, Philip checks out Beamish’s book and reads, “Flashbacks should be

used sparingly, if at all. They slow down the progress of the story and confuse the reader. Life, after all, goes forwards, not backwards” (186). And what is more obvious among all these ironies is that Lodge manages to write “the worst kind of story that has no ending at all” by leaving his novel with an open ending.

Morace indicates that *Changing Places* “begins as a more or less conventional realistic comedy – a campus novel – but that quickly develops into something quite different and quite effective” (158). The development that Morace analyzes, takes place in terms of characters’ voices, and in author’s narrative style as well. According to Morace, these ‘changes’ in voices “serve a distinctly postmodern purpose insofar as each voice not only changes but becomes, as the novel itself does, a pastiche of various parodically rendered voices” (158). Indeed, Philip grows to like Charles Boon, whom he hated during his undergraduate studies at Rummidge. Philip’s American experience makes him like the guy: “Many things changed since then, including his attitude to Charles Boon, which had swung through a whole spectrum of feelings – amusement, annoyance, envy, anger, raging sexual jealousy and now, all that passion spent, a kind of grudging respect” (184-5). Philip also takes an active part in student protests for the liberation of ‘the Garden’. In the meantime, Philip quotes a line from Matthew Arnold’s poem: “But 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”” (174). America changes him, frees him and while sitting at Pierre’s café and watching the passers by, generally hippies, junkies, potheads and “girls of every shape and size and description” (194),

Philip felt himself finally converted to expatriation; and he saw himself, too, as part of a great historical process – a reversal of that cultural Gulf Stream which had in the past swept so many Americans to Europe in search of Experience. Now it was not Europe but the West Coast of America that was the furthest rim of experiment in life and art, to which one made one’s pilgrimage in search of liberation and enlightenment; and so it was to American literature that the European now looked for a mirror-image of his quest. He thought of James’s *The Ambassadors* and Strether’s injunction to Little Bilham, in the Paris garden, to ‘Live ... live all you can; it’s a mistake not to,’ feeling himself to partake of both characters, the speaker who had discovered this insight too late, and the young man who might still profit by it. He thought of Henry Miller sitting over a beer in some scruffy Parisian café with his notebook on his knee and the smell of cunt still lingering on his fingers and he felt some distant kinship with that coarse, uneven, priapic imagination. He understood American Literature for the first time in his life that afternoon, sitting in Pierre’s on Cable Avenue as the river of Plotinus life flowed past,

understood its prodigality and indecorum, its yea-saying heterogeneity, understood Walt Whitman who laid end to end words never seen in each other's company before outside of a dictionary, and Herman Melville who split the atom of the traditional novel in the effort to make whaling a universal metaphor and smuggled into a book addressed to the most puritanical reading public the world has ever known a chapter on the whale's foreskin and got away with it; understood why Mark Twain nearly wrote a sequel to Huckleberry Finn in which Tom Sawyer was to sell Huck into slavery, and why Stephen Crane wrote his great war-novel first and experienced war afterwards, and what Gertrude Stein meant when she said that 'anything one is remembering is a repetition, but existing as a human being, that is being, listening and hearing is never repetition'; understood all that ... (194-5)

Therefore, Philip manages to become what Walker tried to become in *Stepping Westward*: 'Henry James in reverse'. But as his quotation from Matthew Arnold's poem clearly indicates, Philip is aware that he belongs neither to America nor to Britain anymore. Lodge's double narrative alienates Philip: "*Will the real Philip Swallow please stand up?* I should be interested to meet him myself, Philip thought" (178). On the other hand, as Morace suggests, "It would be wrong, however, to think that Swallow simply and merely moves ahead, either psychologically or linguistically. His Whitmanic cadences (and revelations) do not in fact replace his earlier British rhythms (and ideas) but instead alternate with them" (161). Instead, Philip becomes an experienced Brit, who cheats on his wife with his 'opposite number's wife and daughter.

In the meantime, Lodge celebrates the birth of feminism in his own manner. He creates a minor character called Mary Makepeace who travels from America to Britain to get an abortion. She has been 'knocked up' by an instructor priest in her Catholic School and earns her living in London by stripping at one of the clubs at Soho but later manages to stay at Hilary's house to take care of the children by Morris' arrangements. Although it is surprising to witness 'the ultimate male chauvinist' helping a young woman, but hearing her words about male and female relationships is surprising: "Mary says that men always try to end a dispute with a woman by raping her, either literally or symbolically, so you're only conforming to type. Mary is full of fascinating theories about men and women. She says there is a movement for the liberation of women starting in America" (150-1). On the other hand, Desiree is among the ones to hear about this movement:

Have you ever heard of Women's Liberation, Morris? I've just discovered it. I mean I read about the way they busted up the Miss America competition last November, but I thought they

were just a bunch of screwballs. Not at all. They've just started up a discussion group in Plotinus, and I went along the other night. I was fascinated. Boy, have they got *your* number!
(151)

In *Changing Places*' sequels, readers witness Desiree become one of the leading figures of the feminist movement by being the author of *Difficult Days* and *Men* that are among the major works on the subject.

Returning to academic matters and their employment in Rummidge and Euphoria, we witness Morris' yawning about British education system in one of the funniest scenes of the novel:

Now the teaching has thrown me back to square one. I swear the system here will be the death of me. Did I say system? A slip of the tongue. There is no system. They have something called tutorials, instead. Three students and me, for an hour at a time. We're supposed to discuss some text I've assigned. This, apparently, can be anything that comes into my head, except that the campus bookshop doesn't have anything that comes into my head. But supposing we manage to agree, me and the students, on some book of which four copies can be scratched together, one of them writes a paper and reads it out to the rest of us. After three minutes the eyes of the other two glaze over and they begin to sag in their chairs. It's clear they have stopped listening. I'm listening like hell but can't understand a word because of the guy's limey accent. All too soon, he stops. 'Thank you,' I say, flashing him an appreciative smile. He looks at me reproachfully as he blows his nose, then carries on from where he paused, in mid-sentence. The other two students wake up briefly, exchange glances and snigger. That's the most animation they ever show. When the guy reading the paper finally winds it up, I ask for comments. Silence. They avoid my eye. I volunteer a comment myself. Silence falls again. It's so quiet you can hear the guy's beard growing. Desperately, I ask one of them a direct question. 'And what do you think of the text, Miss Archer?' Miss Archer falls off the chair in a swoon. (125)

With this passage, Lodge pays homage to Bradbury for it is an allusion to Bradbury's opening passage in *Eating People is Wrong* (12-8). The only difference in this passage is that, Morris does not have an enthusiastic student to oppose himself as Bates opposes Treece in Bradbury's novel. I must admit, that this passage also contains one of the best English sense of humor about the academy since Amis' *Lucky Jim*. It can be suggested that Lodge is a great adapter; an author that is master of allusion and pastiche, but he always adds his vast intelligence and originality in re-narrating his influences in his own unique narrative style.

On the other side of the Atlantic, Philip is also confused by his American students of English literature:

I confess I had something of the raw-recruit feeling when I went to meet my classes for the first time this week. The system is so different, and the students are so much more heterogeneous than they are at home. They've read the most outlandish things and not read the most obvious ones. I had a student in my room the other day, obviously very bright, who appeared to have read only two authors, Gurdjieff (is that how you spell him?) and somebody called Asimov, and had never even heard of E. M. Forster. (123-4)

On the British side, there are undergraduates who obviously are familiar with major English authors but faint when they are encouraged to comment on them; on the American side, there are English majors who do not even know the name of E.M. Forster, but who are enthusiastic enough to write an "autobiographical" novel of a black boy growing up in the ghetto ignoring their own white skin color.

In the meanwhile, Morris has a further chance to investigate administrative staff of Rummidge's English department. Bob Busky, "a brisk, bearded man," (89) tells him about Gordon Masters, the Head of English Department, confiding that he had been "captured at Dunkirk," during WWII, and has published nothing: "We had a student once, name of Boon, organized a bibliographical competition to find something Gordon had published. Had students crawling all over the Library, but they drew a complete blank. Boon kept the prize" (89). Morris asks for more:

'How come,' he gasped, 'Masters is Head of your Department?'

'That was before the war. Gordon was extraordinarily young, of course, to get the Chair. But the Vice-Chancellor in those days was a huntin', shootin', fishin' type. Took all the candidates down to his place in Yorkshire for a spot of grouse-shooting. Naturally Gordon made a great impression. Story goes the most highly qualified candidate had a fatal accident with a gun. Or that Gordon shot him. Don't believe it myself.' (90)

Morris, who is not after small successes like getting the Chair of English department at Rummidge, does not concern himself with Masters. But ironically, Masters, who has not published anything in his whole life, happens to have written an essay critical of Morris's "Apollonian-Dionysian Dialectic in the novels of Jane Austen" (126). Morris only discovers this unflattering essay during his stay at Rummidge, and thinks that it is Philip who wrote this

very negative review. In the course of events, Masters resigns from his post during student protests, which spread from Euphoria to Rummidge but, in a very humanistic manner, is taken to a mental hospital to re-vitalize his nervous system that had been shattered by the protests. After Masters, Morris describes the English department of Rummidge thus:

Suddenly freed from Masters' despotic rule after thirty years, the Rummidge English Department was stunned and frightened by its own liberty, it was going round and round in circles like a rudderless ship, no, more like a ship whose tyrannical captain had unexpectedly fallen overboard one dark night, taking with him sealed instructions about the ship's ultimate destination. The crew kept coming out of habit to the bridge for orders, and were only too glad to take them from anyone who happened to be occupying the captain's seat. (214)

During Masters' absence, Morris has been offered the Chair, of course, but asks for time to think about it. Unlike Walker and Philip, who are considered to be 'Henry James in reverse', Morris is the embodiment of Henry James, in terms of an American innocence seeking English experience. With a slight difference, of course; as Dr Jochum suggests in Bradbury's *Stepping Westward*, Zapp is the American experience coming to seek the European innocence. (*Stepping Westward* 65). After Masters' unexpected resignation, Morris manages to reform Rummidge in his own American way: He moves into Masters' office, gets a direct telephone line connected, and begins to give his tutorials at the same office. Just as he is about to be "the next captain of the ship", he muses about his future at Rummidge:

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 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: sweeping away the English Department's ramshackle Gothic syllabus and substituting an immaculately logical course-system that took some account of developments in the subject since 1900; setting a postgraduate Centre for Jane Austen Studies; making the use of typewriters by students obligatory; hiring bright American academic refugees from student revolutions at home; starting a new journal ... (234)

Sounds much like a future for Froelich – with a new journal and the idea of an American Jew taking control of an English Department in England – but this scheme would not be enough to satisfy the needs of a distinguished professor like Zapp. Instead, Morris prefers to help his ‘opposite number’ to get his Senior Lectureship in his native country. When he is asked to choose between two different candidates for promotion: Robin Dempsey, the young linguist, who was to be granted this post under Masters’ original scheme, and in the meantime, is a much “stronger candidate of research and publication” (221) rather as Morris had been in his youth, on the one hand, and Philip Swallow, who has published nothing except some handful of unremarkable essays, Morris suggests:

‘I’d say, promote Swallow,’ Morris said, handing back the file.
‘Really?’ Stroud drawled. ‘I thought you’d favour the other man. He seems the better scholar.’
‘Dempsey’s publications are OK, but they’ve more show than substance. He’s never gonna really make it in linguistics. The senior class MIT could run rings round him.’
‘Is that so?’
‘Also, he’s not popular in the Department. If he gets promoted over so many older people, all hell will break out. The Department is already drifting into collective paranoia. No point in making things worse.’ (222)

Although Morris’ motive in suggesting Philip for this Senior Lectureship post is his goodwill towards Hilary and Philip and their three children, it also has much to do with his own prestige and power. A man of Zapp’s caliber would not want to see a ‘replica’ of himself around the academic borders: Robin is young and ambitious, he already has many publications and has already specialized in a field that will shape the future of literary studies. By any measure, he is a possible rival to Zapp. By favouring Philip over Robin, Zapp eliminates the rapid growth of a future rival. This is how an institution works: the old decides for the young and has a right to limit the young if they are hard-working and are sensed to be possible threats. Like all institutional discourse, academic discourse knows how to protect entrenched interests, and Morris Zapp is a master of this discourse.

Leaving these academic schemes aside and heading towards to the final chapter of the novel, we will see that Lodge has chosen to write his final chapter in a movie scenario format. He makes use of rapid changes in scenery by enabling his “narrative altitude” (8) like a camera shooting the characters in different settings instantaneously. The readers first witness the characters in their respective planes, – just like the very beginning of the novel – which

take them to their final destination, New York, in order to sort their current situations out. The planes carrying them nearly collide with each other over New York Airport as they are landing. At the hotel, Morris and Philip share the blue room whereas Hilary and Desiree share the pink one. Needless to say, the room colors indicate guests' genders. But then Hilary wants to speak to Philip and the couples rearrange their rooms putting Philip and Hilary in the blue room and Desiree and Morris in the pink one. Lodge does not indicate what happens in each room; instead he lets his camera witness them early next morning: Philip and Hilary "asleep in each other's arms" (244) in one bed, and Morris and Desiree naked on the floor between the beds and all furniture is seriously damaged. Later that day, they gather together in hotel's coffee-shop to decide what to do next in their lives. Morris comes up with four suggestions: they can return to their own homes as "respective spouses" (244), or, they can all divorce and re-marry each other, or, Morris can take Desiree to Rummidge and Philip can take Hilary to Euphoria, or, they can all live together in one house and call their relationships a "group marriage" (245).

Next, we see them all in the blue room in front of a television set, watching the Plotinus March for the Garden. On the TV, they watch a carnival, a grand march that includes nearly all the minor characters of the novel gathered together for two purposes: the first is clearly identified with the celebration of the People's Garden now is re-united with its people, and the other, linked with the narrative purposes of Lodge, is that the characters watch a summary of their lives spent in Euphoria. Hilary has a chance to see the ones that indirectly changed her life in Rummidge, the ones that she had previously only gotten from Philip's letters, live at last, with the help of a television set. For Morris, this event serves as a remembrance of his life in Euphoria, and for Desiree and Philip, it allows them to see the outcome of their recent struggles and their influence at Euphoria State. With a TV set and the ending lines of a movie scenario, Lodge also points out the comparison between movies and novels and links his discussion with the generation gap:

PHILIP: All I'm saying is that there *is* a generation gap, and I think it revolves around this public/private thing. Our generation – we subscribe to the old liberal doctrine of the inviolate self. It's the great tradition of realistic fiction, it's what novels are all about. The private life in the foreground, history a distant rumble of gunfire, somewhere offstage. In Jane Austen not even a rumble. Well, the novel is dying, and us with it. No wonder I could never get anything out of my novel-writing class at Euphoric State. It's an unnatural medium for their experience. Those kids (*gestures at screen*) are living in a film, not a novel. (250)

Instead of celebrating the death of the novel as Karl Kroop – an assistant professor at Euphoria who refused tenure but whose teaching style and classes had been very popular among the students, celebrates in his English 213 course by deleting the query mark in *The Death of the Book?* (68) – Lodge introduces a new medium; a supporting link to mediate between the old generation’s ‘realistic fiction tradition’ and the new generation’s ‘movie tradition’. In the meantime, it is worth pointing out that, the biggest influences on Morris Zapp, whom Lodge describes as “the biggest fish ever to swim into this academic backwater” (69), are TV and pop songs. He writes his academic papers while watching sports on TV or listening to pop songs on the radio, and he is so well-equipped on this subject that he can get into a detailed discussion on the *Top Twenty List of Top of the Pops* with Philip’s little daughter Amanda. Therefore, Lodge offers a link to close the gap between generations by the reformatory narrative technique he chooses to employ to the novel’s ending:

PHILIP: That’s it. Well, that’s something the novelist can’t help giving away, isn’t it, that his book is shortly coming to an end? It may not be a happy ending, nowadays, but he can’t disguise the tell-tale compression of the pages.

HILARY and DESIREE begin to listen to what PHILIP is saying, and he becomes the focal point of attention.

I mean, mentally you brace yourself for the ending of a novel. As you’re reading, you’re aware of the fact that there’s only a page or two left in the book, and you get ready to close it. But with a film there’s no way of telling, especially nowadays, when films are much more loosely structured, much more ambivalent, than they used to be. There’s no way of telling which frame is going to be the last. The film is going along, just as life goes along, people are behaving, doing things, drinking, talking, and we’re watching them, and at any point the director chooses, without warning, without anything being resolved, or explained, or wound up, it can just ... end.

PHILIP shrugs. The camera stops, freezing him in mid-gesture. (251)

The novel ends with this last frame. Lodge does not even try to resolve the suspense he has created throughout the novel and manages once more to surprise his readers, who are left curious about the outcome of the wife-swapping plot. The whole novel becomes a suspense fiction, a sort of detective novel which has no resolution. Morace suggests that *Changing Places* is a “highly discontinuous yet nonetheless highly readable novel” (164). He further discusses its ending: “in the concluding chapter, which brings together for the first time all four of the principal characters in narrative time and space, though this continuity is again

disrupted by the mode of narration: filmscript.” (164). I regard it as a witty and well-structured conclusion, and in *The Art of Fiction* (1992), Lodge comments upon his own ending in this perspective:

The idea of writing the last chapter (which is called “Ending”) in the form of a filmscript seemed to solve all these problems at a stroke. First of all, such a format satisfied the need for a climactic deviation from “normal” fictional discourse. Secondly it freed me, as implied author, from the obligation to pass judgment on, or to arbitrate between, the claims of the four main characters, since there is no textual trace of the author’s voice in a filmscript, consisting as it does of dialogue and impersonal, objective descriptions of the characters’ outward behaviour. (228)

Commenting on the novel as a whole, Morace remarks that “Lodge’s narrative method is certainly in keeping with Bakhtin’s definition of the novel as a metagenre” (162) and further identifies Bakhtin’s definition as:

The novel permits the incorporation of various genres, both artistic (inserted short stories, lyrical songs, poems, dramatic scenes, etc.) and extra-artistic (everyday, rhetorical, scholarly, religious genres and others) ... All these forms permit languages to be used in ways that are indirect, conditional, distanced ... [in order to achieve] a relativizing of linguistic consciousness” (Dialogic 320, 323). (162, Morace’s quotation).

Therefore, Morace concludes that, “the novel’s wholeness – its aesthetic integrity – grows out of the artful fragmentation of its parts. The entire novel may be said to function as a large-scale narrative paradox, holding together by breaking apart, a literary *e pluribus unum*” (165). Exactly; especially, the third, the fourth and the last chapters do not hold a meaning separately; that the novel can only be comprehensible as a whole. The whole novel, as Morace says: “mediates between life and art, between the liberal tradition and postmodern innovation, narrative drive and verbal texture, verbal muscle and quiet conversation” (169). Being both an author and a critic, Lodge succeeds in combining his originality and the uniqueness of his authorial style into the recent trends of literary theories; as Showalter further states, “Lodge himself was an experienced novelist, a critic, and literary theorist of distinction, and *Changing Places* reflects his fascination with narrative theory and its binaries” (62). Lodge successfully plays upon literary theories for the satisfaction of the critics while satisfying his own needs as the author.

4.2 *The History Man* (1975)

The History Man is Bradbury's third novel that was published in 1975, in the same year of *Changing Places*' publication. Bradbury continues his own fashion of publishing his novels at ten-year intervals but with *The History Man*, he changes his attention from English departments to a Sociology department and re-evaluates the moral concerns he employed in his first two novels. Furthermore, Bradbury includes both himself as an author and his earlier liberal concerns in his third academic novel to satirize himself as well as to satirize the academy and its free-minded intellectuals.

Morace suggests that "the liberalism that Bradbury previously sought both to test and to preserve, that he then placed under various 'strains' is now under 'threat'" (61). Liberalism, as Bradbury defines it, "is a set of virtuous principles which are secreted in our culture without necessarily being functional in our culture. (Interview with Bigsby 66)" (Morace's footnote, 62) During the course of the novel, Howard Kirk, already the author of *The Coming of the New Sex*, works on his second critical study called *The Defeat of Privacy*, which begins as "The attempt to privatize life, to suppose that it is within single, self-achieving individuals that lie the infinite recesses of being and morality that shape and define life, is a phenomenon of narrow historical significance" (98). This sociologist author is Bradbury's 'history man', namely Howard Kirk, a lecturer at the Sociology Department of Watermouth University in Britain; a radical, by all means, who can be distinguished by his Zapata moustache and who analyzes the bourgeois idea of the self – and therefore the character – by a knowledge of "a little Marx, a little Freud and a little social history" (25), a critical approach that he applies to identify and/or problematize almost anything. He is an action man, "a solemn party-giver, the creator of a serious social theatre" (76) and Bradbury's main source to describe what Jonathan W. Doering calls "the radical atmosphere on Britain's 'new' university campuses" ("Malcolm Bradbury: A History Man for Our Times", 1).

Barbara Kirk, Howard's wife and the mother of their two children, Celia and Martin, is as radical as her husband but not active as he is after giving birth to her second child, the period after which "she became, of course, a housewife, or rather, as she put it, a flatwife" (22). Nevertheless, the Kirks like to call their 'institution' an "open marriage", that is Barbara spends her weekends in London with a young actor called Leon whereas Howard occasionally

lies with his colleagues and ‘problematic’ students and no one seems to take notice. They are the ultimate radical couple that is the subject of Howard Kirk’s critical studies of the late sixties. As James Acheson, in his essay called “Thesis and Antithesis in Malcolm Bradbury’s *The History Man*” (2003) points out, “*The History Man* traces the progression of British Society from its late capitalist phase, a thesis characterized by the domination of the bourgeoisie, to its antithesis, dating from 1968, the year Kirk takes to be the beginning of the proletarian rise to power” (1), Bradbury describes a couple from middle-class background in the time of a progressive capitalist stage in Britain. And as Morace further indicates, Bradbury

enters into a dialogue with his age, manifesting, largely through subtle parody, a keen awareness of his cultural milieu, responding obliquely and in decidedly contemporary fashion rather than directly and anachronistically, in a novel of great risks and equally great achievement. (65)

Among the many wonderfully structured social concerns and events that Bradbury satirizes in the novel, my attention will be concentrated on the two main academic issues that the author satirizes: the Mangel lecture, and the George Carmody case.

Professor Mangel is a Jewish academic, who grew up in Nazi Germany and fled to Britain when Hitler was at the maximum of his power. He is a geneticist and this occupation, for Howard Kirk and his allies, represents racism in the first place and, as its outcome, labels the subject professor as a fascist though no objective grounds for either judgment is presented. The maneuver to have Mangel invited to Watermouth is nothing more than a scheme that Howard has planned all by himself and spreads to his colleagues to get some action on the campus. As Acheson argues “Howard confides to some like-minded colleagues that he illicitly arranged for Mangel’s visit to be put on the agenda of a Sociology Department meeting in the interests of attacking the university’s middle-class, liberal humanists” (4). After carefully planning his scheme during the summer, Howard spreads this rumour to his colleague Moria on the first day of the academic term:

‘It’s an insult, an indignity,’ says Moria. ‘It’s an outrage,’ says Howard. ‘But who invited him?’ asks Moria, ‘I don’t remember our agreeing to invite him.’ ‘That’s because we never did agree to invite him,’ said Howard, ‘someone must have acted over the summer, while we were all safely out of sight.’ ‘You mean Marvin?’ asks Moria. ‘I suppose,’ says Howard. ‘Well,’ says Moria, ‘we’re not out of sight now. We all have a say. This passes for a democratic department.’ ‘Right,’ says Howard. ‘I’ll raise it at the departmental meeting tomorrow,’ says Moria, ‘I’m glad

you told me.’ ‘Oh, will you?’ asks Howard, ‘I think someone ought to. I thought I might myself, but ...’ ‘But you’d rather I did,’ says Moria. (63-4)

This is a game of Howard; an academic scheme to manipulate others in order to gain for himself the means of power and prestige. He instructs Moria to announce his game to related people in the department and then acts as if he is not aware of the invitation at all. He also manages to include Mangel’s name on the list of visitors for the academic term using his good relations with the department secretaries, who do not suspect that any kind of diabolical scheme might hide behind Howard’s always reliable words. It is an academic game that reminds Howard of what Henry Beamish, the liberal colleague, the long-time friend and the ‘binary opposite’ of Howard, has once told him, “a game called Fire. Where you ring the alarm, immobilize the lift, and file slowly down the fire escape with a wet jacket over your head” (65).

In the departmental meeting which follows, the fake invitation of Professor’s Mangel to visit the university is discussed and gets voted on. After two voting sessions, the for and against votes are tied but Marvin, the Head of the department, also another liberal, votes for Professor’s Mangel’s visit. Howard’s scheme is well on its way and the student protests begin at once: this supposedly fascist professor is not wanted at Watermouth University. Later that day, Henry and Howard discuss this voting, and Henry says “‘I had to vote for him, of course, on principle. It was quite clear to me, though I respect the other point of view. I suppose you voted against.’ ‘I abstained, actually,’ says Howard” (175). Purely understandable, immensely tricky, hugely academic and very political indeed. Howard adopts the exact scheme which Froelich successfully organizes in *Stepping Westward*. They both create a bomb designed to start an outrage around the campus, and they both benefit from its outcome once it gets exploded.

On the day of the lecture, which Mangel had indicated “in advance that his topic would be ‘Do Rats Have “Families”?’ (235), the student protests are at their most vociferous level. Having no one other than Henry who is willing to introduce Professor Mangel, Henry takes his place on stage and prepares to introduce him between the shouts ‘Fascist! Fascist!’ slogans from the crowd. Henry, a liberal who favours academic freedom and its free-minded nature, cannot stand this scene and shouts back at the crowd: “You’re the fascists; this is a crime against free speech” (235) and then the crowd totally gets out of control. Henry falls off

the stage and breaks his right arm, and, in the meantime, all his notes for his upcoming novel on charisma are ruined by tea that is poured all over them during the outbreak. At the last party of the novel that Howard gives, he tells what actually has happened at the lecture:

In fact it was not until the next day, when Henry was in hospital, that the news about Mangel became known; of the many there that day, only Mangel had neglected to come, having died, the evening previous to the lecture, of a heart attack, in his London apartment. (236)

After all, Howard gets what he wants. His scheme becomes successful; he attacks the liberals who support ‘free-speech’ at the university, gets the work of his ‘binary opposite’ ruined and puts him into the hospital with a broken arm. He gets the action on the campus that he sought for. He defeats the liberals with their own tools and gives the post-liberal bourgeois academic system a lesson in his own style. It is wicked, but Howard holds the power and prestige at the university afterwards. In the meantime, it will be worth noting that Henry Beamish, Howard’s liberal ‘binary opposite’ in Bradbury’s fashion, teaches “an evening class on Conflict in Modern Society, at an adult education centre in one of the nearby seaside towns” (81), just like Treece and Walker in Bradbury’s earlier novels and becomes the latest victim of the ever-changing systems of academy. On the other hand, the coincidence of his surname’s resemblance to the author of *Let’s Write a Novel*, A. J. Beamish in Lodge’s *Changing Places* is surely remarkable.

The other scheme central to the novel and to the revelation of Howard Kirk’s duplicity is the George Carmody case. Carmody is an English major at Watermouth University and possibly attends Howard’s sociology class as an elective. But Howard is a radical, who prefers to bring “Marxist theory into play, too, in his treatment of his students. In class Howard encourages them to take hostile attitude to each other, as a seeming parallel to the class struggle” (Acheson, 4). And Carmody, as Howard suggests is “the enemy personified” (145); “Here he sits, in his chair, looking beamingly around; as he does so, he shines forth unreality. He is a glimpse from another era; a kind of historical offence” (140), with “a university blazer, with a badge, and a university tie” (140) who wears “brightly polished” (140) shoes that suit his “shiny new briefcase” (139). As Morace suggests, “Carmody appears as an undergraduate T. S. Eliot. Cloaked in a blue school blazer, he has all of the (liberal) tradition but little if any of the individual talent to shore the fragments against his, or anyone else’s, ruin” (71). In general, Carmody is a student, who believes in “individualism, not

collectivism. ... I believe the superstructure is a damned sight more important than the substructure. I think culture's a value, not an inert descriptive term" (148). And in this respect, Carmody embodies everything that disgusts Howard.

The trouble between Howard and Carmody officially starts when Carmody prepares and presents a fully detailed paper on "theories about the workings of social change in the works of Mill, Marx and Weber" (140-1) in Howard's sociology class whereas Howard had originally asked for a simultaneous oral discussion with the collaboration of the other students present. Carmody has been getting Ds and Fs occasionally from Howard whereas he has been getting Bs and As in his English courses. During this class, they have another argument on Carmody's written presentation as well as the contents of his arguments – it is clear that Carmody does not share Howard's Marxist teaching concerns – and Carmody leaves the classroom. After the class, Carmody visits Howard at his office and tells him that he has given him a failing grade because he does not mark his papers objectively and asks for the re-evaluation of his papers by the other teachers of the department. Howard sees this suggestion as a threat to his marking style and labels Carmody's suggestion as blackmail, which, in a sense, becomes as blackmail when Carmody follows Howard after classes to get a hint of his private life. He gets some photos showing Felicity Phee, Howard's student and babysitter, and Howard in the same frame kissing each other and gives them to Marvin in order to support his demand that Howard marks the students, who "had a left wing head and, ... female genitals" (217), in a completely different manner than the manner he marks liberal students like himself.

Marvin reads Carmody's papers himself and has them read by other teachers of sociology as well. "The essays were seen by six examiners. Three mark him at passing level, with small variations, but mostly around high C or low B. Roughly in accord with my own judgment, in short" (216), says Marvin to Howard and further adds, "Two gave them Fs, much as you had, and one refused to mark altogether, saying you had told him this was interference with a colleague's teaching" (216). It can be seen that Howard manages to influence three of six examiners to give Fs or not to participate in such a degrading scheme. Just like the voting sessions for Mangel's visit, there also is another tie in this case. But Howard has another academic scheme to play: he invites his 'left wing head' students to solve this matter instead of the departmental judgment. The consequence is that, at the last party of the novel, Howard celebrates his second academic success in one term:

‘He’s gone, he’s gone,’ says Howard; and indeed Carmody has, fled weeks ago after a brief student sit-in – the banners said ‘Preserve academic freedom’ and ‘Work for Kirk’ – had demanded his expulsion, after the story of his campaign against Howard had become widely known. (247)

Afraid of student protests against himself, Carmody leaves the university and Howard continues his post. Although there is clear evidence that Howard marks papers ideologically and favours female students over the males, the novel does not suggest any reaction taken against Howard on this matter. He keeps giving parties, inviting anyone possible, acting cool all the time and receiving power and prestige accordingly. He even does not notice his wife Barbara’s suicide attempt at the end of the novel for he is quite busy entertaining himself and the other extreme monsters around him. Bradbury does acknowledge these people like Howard but is truly against their extreme demands. Bradbury feels that there must be limits for all new theories, otherwise the monsters which these revolutions create cannot be controlled in the end. In *Mensonge*, Bradbury further depicts this idea to the extreme theories in literary criticism.

To conclude the discussion of the novel, I would like to point out Bradbury’s caricature of himself as the author of *Eating People is Wrong* and *Stepping Westward*:

Howard recalls that this depressed-looking figure is a lecturer in the English department, a man who, ten years earlier, had produced two tolerably well-known and acceptably reviewed novels, filled, as novels then were, with moral scruple and concern. Since then there has been silence, as if, under the pressure of contemporary change, there was no moral scruple and concern, no new substance to be spun. The man alone persists; he passes nervously through the campus, he teaches, sadly, he avoids strangers. (220-1)

As an author of ‘moral scruple and concern’, Bradbury cannot escape from Howard’s radical judgments. Following this above quoted passage, Bradbury – the one in the novel – tries to persuade Howard to leave Miss Callendar, another young lecturer at English department and a liberal, alone. But Howard responds that she will find her on his own. “‘I wish you wouldn’t’ says the novelist. ‘I will,’ says Howard, going out of the room and, shutting the door” (221). The novelist tries to protect Miss Callendar from Howard, who wants to ‘modernize’ her

liberal values. And indeed, Howard finds her, has sex with her, ‘modernizes’ her and adapts her to comply with the ever-changing system of the academic scene.

“The novel presents a stark view of academic life in the seventies, and promises little hope for the future” (6) says James Acheson and further quotes Bradbury’s own words on his novel: “‘I was depressed the whole time I was writing *The History Man*’ said Bradbury to a Sunday Times interviewer roughly a decade after the novel was published. ‘It’s certainly my bleakest book’ (14)” (Acheson’s quotation, 6). Morace identifies the whole novel as “a dialogue between the individual self and the abstract theory, between liberal novel and postliberal, postmodern fiction” (70). In terms of narrative style, the whole novel consists of dialogues between the characters and except some rare descriptions, the narrator’s voice is thoroughly absent. As David Lodge introduces his own narrative style into the postmodern scene with *Changing Places*, so does Malcolm Bradbury contribute to the postmodern fashion with *The History Man*. Morace analyzes these changes in both authors’ style as thus:

As Bernard Bergonzi has pointed out in *The Situation of the Novel*, the contemporary writer seems to have but two choices, neither of which appears particularly inviting. One is to continue to produce works of liberal realism, works that will perforce have no importance. And the other is to abandon liberalism and embrace art so as to produce “an energetic, but an implicitly totalitarian or illiberal, fiction, in which the individual agent is dwarfed, diminished, often verbally violated” (Bradbury’s summary; *Possibilities* 205). A novelist at the crossroads, Bradbury resists the extremes. He chooses neither nostalgic liberal realism nor totalitarian postmodernism. Neither a novel of wistful regret nor an example of dehumanized art, *The History Man* is a novel about dehumanization, aesthetic and moral. (81)

Bradbury’s introductory note to the novel, which I have saved for the end of my discussion, confirms Morace’s suggestion of Bradbury being at the crossroads:

This fiction is for Beamish, whom, while en route for some conference or other, I last saw at Frankfurt airport, enquiring from desk to desk about his luggage, unhappily not loaded onto the same plane as he. It is a total invention with delusory approximations to historical reality, just as is history itself. Not only does the University of Watermouth, which appears here, bear no relation to the real University of Watermouth (which does not exist) or to any other university; the year 1972, which also appears, bears no relation to the real 1972, which was a fiction anyway; and so on. As for the characters, so-called, no one but the other characters in this book knows them, and they not well; they are pure inventions, as is the plot in which they more than

participate. Nor did I fly to a conference the other day; and if I did, there was no one on the plane named Beamish, who certainly did not lose his luggage. The rest, of course, is true.

To read this note at the beginning of the novel does not make sense but checking it once more after reading the novel, readers witness Bradbury's witty play around fiction and reality.

Morace further analyzes the note:

To read the note as explanation would not only univocalize as well as privilege the postmodernist "author's" commentary on his text, it would also render that text superfluous by explaining it away in advance. The novel would be nothing more than the inevitable result of the postmodernist theory which conditions it. However, if we accept Roland Barthes' contention that who speaks is not who writes and who writes is not who is, we will form a clearer idea as to why it is necessary to distinguish between the author of the note and the author of *The History Man*. (69-70)

As a result, Bradbury's *The History Man* is a radical stand relative to the seventies radical academic scene; and apart from a being a witty satire on academe, this novel can also be considered as Bradbury's somewhat anguished salute to postmodern fashion and its players.

V. Chapter 5 – The Eighties: *Small World* (1984) and *Mensonge* (1987)

Literary theory and women's studies became institutionalized in the university at almost the same time in the 1980s. Theory was the ticket to intellectual and professional legitimacy, and it became the basis of the academic star system, in which universities hotly competed for the services of a few celebrated, expensive, and mobile theorists, while anonymous exploited masses taught literature and composition. (68)

What Showalter explains above, both Lodge and Bradbury satirize and parody in their works published during the 1980s. Lodge writes an academic romance in which he parodies famous romances mostly based on Arthurian legend while satirizing both the academy – and not limiting himself to one or two campuses, but with many, as Zapp indicates the whole world becomes “the global campus” (*Small World*, 44) – and the literary theory, which, as Showalter mentioned above, started ‘the academic star system’. On the other hand, Bradbury manages to write a perfect parody of modern literary theory since Sartre concentrating mainly on post-structuralism and its well-known theorists.

In my analysis of Lodge's *Small World* and Bradbury's *Mensonge*, my main attention will be on both authors' parodies of the literary theories which surrounded them both as authors and critics during the 1980s.

5.1 *Small World: An Academic Romance* (1984)

“That's how it is in the academic world these days,” says Morris Zapp. “I was telling a young guy at the conference just this morning. The day of the single, static campus is over.”

“And the single, static campus novel with it, I suppose?”

“Exactly! Even 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.”

“Leaving their wives locked up at home?”

“Well, a lot of knights are women, these days. There's positive discrimination at the Round Table.” (63)

Small World, David Lodge's seventh novel, is the most carnivalized (in Bakhtin's terms) and the most original in terms of narrative technique among his novels I have discussed in this study. This novel is a sequel to *Changing Places* in which the unsatisfied readers of the previous ‘tale of two campuses’ finally find out the outcome of the unresolved

wife-swapping theme. Many of the Rummidge academics are also present in the novel but what is unique and carnivalesque about it is that Lodge showers the readers with a multitude of new characters – over twenty-five in number – all linked with the plot(s) – we have to bear in mind that this is an academic ‘Romance’, or rather a parody of it – of the novel which resembles his very first novel, *The Picturegoers*, in terms of separate stories of characters that are later gathered together for a resolution. In this sense, a suggestion for this novel’s title would be ‘Conference-goers’; but that would be too naïve for a well-structured novel such as this by an author/critic in a literary scene shaped by theories. The title perfectly summarizes the conference circles of academics of the decade, who attend conferences in (to name a few), Amsterdam, Lausanne, Honolulu, Seoul, Jerusalem and New York. Therefore, as the title suggests, it is a ‘small world’, indeed.

Lodge opens his novel with the “Author’s Note”, a traditional disclaimer denying that his fiction is based on facts:

Like *Changing Places*, to which it is a kind of sequel, *Small World* resembles what is sometimes called the real world, without corresponding exactly to it, and is peopled by figments of the imagination (the name of one of the main characters has been changed in later editions to avoid misunderstandings on this score). Rummidge is not Birmingham, though it owes something to popular prejudices about that city. There really is an underground chapel at Heathrow and a James Joyce Pub in Zurich, but no universities in Limerick or Darlington; nor, as far as I know, was there ever a British Council representative resident in Genoa. The MLA Convention of 1979 did not take place in New York, though I have drawn on the programme for the 1978 one, which did. And so on.

This is another play around the facts of the so-called real world and their representation in fiction – in effect a *romans à clef* – by an author directly or indirectly linked with these so-called facts. Lodge indicates that any attempt to link the events in his fiction would be in vain but all suggestions are welcome from the traditional realist readers if they still believe in linking fiction with facts in an era of theorists who try to undermine the meaning of even a single word with signifiers and signifieds. Keeping this in mind, I will try to discuss the parody of modern literary theory as well the satire of ‘a global campus’ that Lodge demonstrates in his novel.

The novel opens with a conference at Rummidge University arranged by Philip Swallow as the Head of English Department. Although it is April, Rummidge is still surrounded by snow and it is unknown whether the poor number of attendees – fifty-seven – has something to do with the weather conditions or the reputation and facilities offered by Rummidge University. But one of the biggest fish in these academic waters, Morris Zapp, is there to present his paper. As I have suggested in my analysis of *Changing Places*, Morris Zapp, who used to believe in the necessity of interpretation, does not alienate himself from the latest fashion of the literary theorists – being a man in search of prestige and power that wants to be the highest paid English professor in the world – re-evaluates his literary beliefs and becomes a post-structuralist, no less, and presents his paper titled “Textuality as Striptease” for the attention of the naïve minds of his colleagues at Rummidge: “You see before you,” he begins, “a man who once believed in the possibility of interpretation. That is, I thought that the goal of reading was to establish the meaning of texts” (24), then summarizes his earlier obsession with Jane Austen studies: “to examine the novels from every conceivable angle – historical, biographical, rhetorical, mythical, structural, Freudian, Jungian, Marxist, existentialist, Christian, allegorical, ethical, phenomenological, archetypal, you name it” (24) and makes the audience know his ultimate aim in doing so: “So that when each commentary was written, there would be *nothing further to say about* the novel in question” (24), but he concludes his discussion of his earlier naïve literary studies as “that it couldn’t succeed because it isn’t possible, and it isn’t possible because of the nature of language itself, in which meaning is constantly being transferred from one signifier to another and can never be absolutely possessed” (25). And the readers meet the new Morris Zapp playing the game in post-structuralist fashion:

To understand a message is to decode it. Language is a code. *But every decoding is another encoding.* If you say something to me I check that I have understood your message by saying it back to you in my own words, that is, different words from the ones you used, for if I repeat your own words exactly you will doubt whether I have really understood you. But if I use *my* words it follows that I have changed *your* meaning, however slightly; and even if I were, deviantly, to indicate my comprehension by repeating back to you your own unaltered words, that is no guarantee that I have duplicated your meaning in my head, because I bring a different experience of language, literature, and non-verbal reality to those words, therefore they mean something different to me from what they mean to you. And if you think I have not understood the meaning of your message, you do not simply repeat it in same words, you try to explain it in different words, different from the ones you used originally; but then the *it* is no longer the *it* that you started with. Time has moved on since you opened your mouth to speak, the molecules

in your body have changed, what you intended to say has been superseded by what you did say, and that has already become part of your personal history, imperfectly remembered. Conversation is like playing tennis with a ball made of Krazy Putty that keeps coming back over the net in a different shape. (25)

A Derrida flavored with Saussure indeed. But Morris does not finish his discussion here and further links it with Roland Barthes:

The tennis analogy will not do for the activity of reading – it is not a to-and-fro process, but an endless tantalizing leading on, a flirtation without consummation, or if there is consummation, it is solitary, masturbatory. [Here the audience grew restive.] The reader plays with himself as the text plays upon him, plays upon his curiosity, desire, as a striptease dancer plays upon her audience's curiosity and desire. (26)

Therefore, in his discussion on reading, Morris, as Angelica Pabst hints later in the novel, takes Charles Sanders Peirce's idea that, "the representation itself conceived as stripped of irrelevant clothing. But this clothing never can be completely stripped off; it is only changed for something more diaphanous" (339), and combines this idea with his musings on Barthes' "The Pleasure of the Text":

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, not the stripping itself; because no sooner has one secret been revealed than we lose interest in it and crave another. When we have seen the girl's underwear we want to see her body, when we have seen her breasts we want to see her buttocks, and when we have seen her buttocks we want to see her pubis, and when we see her pubis, the dance ends – but is our curiosity and desire satisfied? Of course not. The vagina remains hidden within the girl's body, shaded by her pubic hair, and even if she were to spread her legs before us [at this point several ladies in the audience noisily departed] it would still not satisfy the curiosity and desire set in motion by the stripping. 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. The attempt to peer into the very core of a text, to possess once and for all its meaning, is vain – it is only ourselves that we find there, not the work itself. Freud said that obsessive reading (and I suppose that most of us in this room must be regarded as compulsive readers) – that 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] but the point of remark, which may not have been entirely appreciated by Freud himself, lies precisely in the concept of displacement.

To read is to surrender oneself to an endless displacement of curiosity and desire from one sentence to another, from one action to another, from one level of the text to another. The text unveils itself before us, but never allows itself to be possessed; and instead of striving to possess it we should take pleasure in its teasing. (26-7)

It is clear that Morris forces way up in the ‘academic system of stars’ of modern critical theory but, in fact, there is nothing original in his paper. Zapp makes use of Saussure, Barthes, Peirce, Derrida, and Freud – a good summary of the 1980s literary discourse which could have been better if Foucault’s *History of Sexuality* were also included – for the sake of getting his name known as a post-structuralist. Actually, Morris’ idea of analyzing Jane Austen’s novels was more original than this replica of famous players’ theories but Lodge enables Zapp to fit right into his place and time by including him in the parody of literary theory with a paper that is a combination of leading theories of the time, which Morris ‘goes over’ in the plane, “while the movie was showing,” (18) and admits he is “pretty pleased with it. The movie was OK, too” (18). After his lecture, Philip comments “But I’m sorry to see that in the intervening years you have succumbed to the virus of structuralism” (27), but Morris immediately informs Philip of the latest trend since structuralism: “I wouldn’t call myself a structuralist,” Morris Zapp interrupted, “A post-structuralist, perhaps” (27).

The quests in this academic romance are as multiple as its characters but I will limit myself with only the quest of the UNESCO Chair, which resembles a sort of Holy Grail for the distinguished academics – including Philip Swallow, who is finally in the scene with his published book on William Hazlitt simply titled *Hazlitt and the Amateur Reader* – as, Morris describes them like, “the errant knights of old, wandering the ways of the world in search of adventure and glory” (63). Morris learns about this UNESCO Chair post from Fulvia Morgana, an attractive Italian Marxist scholar who resides in a villa and who Showalter describes as “a Julia Kristeva figure with the Arthurian-sounding name of Fulvia Morgana” (81), and immediately starts to muse upon the prestige and power that this post offers as well as its salary, which would definitely make Morris the highest paid academic of English literature in the world if only he manages to get the post:

The UNESCO Chair of Literary Criticism! That had to carry the highest salary in the profession. Fulvia confirmed his intuition: \$100,000 a year was being talked about. “Tax-free, of course, like all UNESCO salaries.” Duties? Virtually non-existent. The chair was not to be connected with any particular institution, to avoid favouring any particular country. It was a purely conceptual chair

(except for the stipend) to be occupied wherever the successful candidate wished to reside. He would have an office and secretarial staff at the Paris headquarters, but no obligation to use it. He would be encouraged to fly around the world at UNESCO's expense, attending conferences and meeting the international community of scholars, but entirely at his own discretion. He would have no students to teach, no papers to grade, no committees to chair. He would be paid simply to think – to think and, if the mood took him, to write. A roomful of secretaries at the Place Fontenoy would wait patiently beside their word-processors, ready to type, duplicate, collate, staple and distribute to every point of the compass his latest reflections on the ontology of the literary text, the therapeutic value of poetry, the nature of metaphor, or the relationship between synchronic and diachronic literary studies. Morris Zapp felt dizzy at the thought, not merely of the wealth and privilege the chair would confer on the man who occupied it, but also of the envy it would arouse in the breasts of those who did not. (120-1)

But Morris has rivals to eliminate. His first rival is none other than Fulvia Morgana, a radical Marxist married to Ernesto Morgana, another scholar in the field of English literature, whose marriage can be described as an 'open' one. Fulvia invites Morris to her villa in Milan to personally check the connection between the fact and fiction in Desiree Byrd's (Morris and Desiree are now divorced and Desiree begins to use Morris' first wife's maiden surname) first critical feminist study titled *Difficult Days*, in which Desiree portrays Morris as a male chauvinist with lots of hair and a big penis. Fulvia takes Morris to bed and ties him with handcuffs and when her husband Ernesto comes home, she also invites him to a threesome to which Ernesto agrees. This relationship closely resembles the radical Marxist open-marriage between Howard and Barbara Kirk in Bradbury's *The History Man*. During the 'communication' between them, Fulvia also gives Morris the names of his possible rivals to the UNESCO Chair who are Michel Tardieu and Siegfried von Turpitz.

Michel Tardieu is a French professor of Narratology at Sorbonne University, a homosexual, who lives with his young boyfriend Albert, and whose name and sexual preferences both have much in common with Michel Foucault. Also, Michel's telephone conversation with Siegfried von Turpitz has importance in Lodge's overall parody of the literary theorists. Siegfried mistakenly dials Michel's number instead of Jacques Textel's and tells Michel that, "I was trying to call a friend called Textel. His name is next to yours in my little book, and both are Paris numbers, so I mixed them up" (98). Michel Tardieu, as he later indicates, knows "Textel, a Swiss anthropologist who once occupied the chair at Berne, but moved into international cultural

administration and is now somebody quite important in UNESCO” (111-2). This Jacques Textel, whose name is next to Michel’s in Siegfried’s ‘little book’, has some quite direct resemblance to Jacques Derrida. Of course, Derrida is Algerian (and French accordingly) but has written works on linguistics and anthropology simultaneously and the surname that Lodge gives to him in *Small World* is noteworthy: Textel, after Derrida’s famous words: ‘There is nothing outside the text’. So, Lodge manages to allude to the best known French theorists in his parody of literary theory.

Another of Morris’s rivals for the UNESCO Chair is Siegfried von Turpitz, a German scholar specialized in reception theory, the author of *The Romantic Reader*. According to Morris this book is about, “why people killed themselves after reading *Werther* or made pilgrimages to the *Nouvelle Heloise* country” (195). Siegfried always wears a black glove on his right hand and never takes it off in the presence of others: “No one knows what hideous injury or deformity it conceals, though there have been many speculations” (96) narrates Lodge, adding that one of these speculations is about his hand’s “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” (97). Taking into consideration Siegfried’s Rezeptionasthetik theory, and Morris’ identifying him as a “Nazi” (134), we can clearly link him with Martin Heidegger and his glove with Heidegger’s discussion on usefulness of ‘equipment’ in his work titled *Being and Time*. Lodge satirizes Heidegger’s definition of equipment which he says “is essentially ‘something in-order-to’” (*Being and Time*, 97) that stands as “a structure [in which] lies an *assignment* or *reference* of something to something” (*Being and Time*, 97) and uses the glove as a metaphor to Heidegger’s discussion of equipment that is “ready-to-hand” (*Being and Time*, 107). Heidegger further affirms that, “[d]ealings with equipment subordinate themselves to the manifold assignments of the ‘in-order-to’. And the sight with which they thus accommodate themselves is *circumspection*” (*Being and Time*, 98). In these terms, Siegfried assigns his glove as something to create a mystery, some sort of a charisma to be used as another equipment for the purpose of distinguishing himself from other academics in an environment which Showalter identifies as “academic star system”.

The last rival of Morris for the Chair is none other than his old friend Philip Swallow, who, in fact, becomes a candidate for the Chair by mere coincidence. To cut a long story short, Felix Skinner, Philip’s publisher, incidentally discovers that the copies of Philip’s book on Hazlitt were not distributed to bookstores – that is why Philip has not received any reviews

– and upon this discovery, he immediately sends a copy to Rudyard Parkinson, a South African who holds the post of “the Regius Professor of Belles-Lettres at All Saints’ College, Oxford” (98), who “never refuses an invitation to write a book review” (99), usually taking the role of a “witty, elegant reviewer” (99). By the time Rudyard receives Philip’s book, he is busy reviewing Morris’ brand new book titled *Beyond Criticism* for the *TLS*, and while taking a look at Philip’s book, Rudyard wittily finds out that he can use Philip’s book as a supporting link in his devastating review – for Rudyard totally rejects the French influence on English studies – of Morris’ *Beyond Criticism*.

In the meantime, at a conference in Vancouver, Jacques Textel tells Rudyard about the UNESCO Chair, and Rudyard is “experienced enough in such matters to know that the people who were appointed to top academic posts never actually applied for them before they were approached” (164), feels that he has to come up with a new idea for his claim to the post and reviews both Zapp’s and Swallow’s books simultaneously for the *TLS* linking Swallow’s theories with “The English School of Criticism” (164) and mentioning that “the time has come for those who believe in literature as the expression of universal and timeless human values to stand up and be counted” (164). That surely does the trick and Rudyard sends a copy of his review to Textel but Textel misinterprets (or possibly deconstructs) the review as Rudyard’s supporting Swallow for a candidate for the Chair and gives this review to his British son-in-law, a journalist on *The Sunday Times*, “who had been ordered to write a special feature on “The Renaissance of the Redbrick University””. Lacking supporting facts to write upon, Textel’s son-in-law finds this review as a treasure chest and devotes “a whole paragraph of his article to the Rummidge professor whose recent book has caused such a stir and whose name was being mentioned in connection with the recently mooted UNESCO Chair of Literary Criticism” (236). Upon reading this news, Rudyard nearly chokes on his breakfast. But he gets invited to MLA conference rumoured to be the deciding factor as to who will be appointed to the Chair, but he unluckily misses his plane to New York, and is replaced by Philip Swallow, who is present at the conference, by the decisive votes of the Hazlitt Society. (316). In the end, Swallow joins the conference as a candidate for the Chair.

Admittedly, this is a great academic scheme that Lodge employs in defining the ‘global’ campus of the 1980s. But Lodge does not stop here; he introduces the man who will decide the person to be appointed to the UNESCO Chair:

This is Arthur Kingfisher, doyen of the international community of literary theorists, Emeritus Professor of Columbia and Zurich Universities, the only man in academic history to have occupied two chairs simultaneously in different continents (commuting by jet twice a week to spend Mondays to Wednesdays in Switzerland and Thursdays to Sundays in New York), 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 Klingelfischer) into the intellectual ferment of Vienna at the turn of century, he studied with Shklovsky in Moscow 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, and who has at home, at his house on Long Island, a whole room full of the (largely unread) books and offprints sent to him by disciples and admirers in the world of scholarship. (93-4)

As the name implies, Arthur is both King Arthur and the Fisher King of Arthurian legends. He is the ‘doyen’ of ‘literary theorists’ but Lodge does not limit his studies to a single theory because this man is a combination of all theories; he is above all of them by taking active part on the births of revolutionary theories. But he is now retired, spends his time with his young Korean mistress Song-Mi Lee and attends a few conferences here and there, to enlighten the fresh brains of young scholars, like he attends the “conference on “The Crisis of the Sign” in order to repeat his keynote address in the form of a lecture at Northwestern University for a one-thousand-dollar fee” (142). When Morris Zapp learns that Kingfisher will be the decisive factor for the UNESCO Chair, he writes him a letter,

reminding him that they had been co-participants in an English Institute seminar on Symbolism some years before; saying that he had heard that he, Arthur Kingfisher, had given a brilliant keynote address to the recent Chicago conference on “The Crisis of the Sign”, and begging him, in the most flattering of terms, for the favour of an offprint or Xerox of the text of this address. Morris read through the letter. Was it a shade too fulsome? No, that was another law of academic life: *it is impossible to be excessive in flattery of one’s peers.* (152)

It is fabulous to see Morris Zapp back at work again. By now an experienced professor – 50 years old in *Small World* – he definitely knows how to play the game in the academy. Even in a ‘global’ campus such as this, Morris wastes no time before communicating with Kingfisher and informing him how much he admires his works. The first leg of his plan proves to be

successful when Kingfisher, even though he is a very busy person, finds time to answer his letter with a copy of 'his keynote address'. Morris immediately "fires back a reply asking if Arthur Kingfisher could by any chance contemplate taking part in a Jerusalem conference on the Future of Criticism" (249) that Morris himself arranges. The place of the conference, Jerusalem, also has a vital importance in his scheme because Kingfisher is known to be "half-Jewish" (249). As Morris knows, conferences mean much more than lectures, so he tells Kingfisher that they will stay at the Jerusalem Hilton including "many optional sight-seeing expeditions" that will be available to the participants. He also remembers Song-Mi Lee and adds to his letter that his "invitation to Jerusalem includes any companion he cares to bring with him" (249) with an already arranged transatlantic "Concorde flight" (249) for a smooth journey. This whole scheme will, of course, enable Morris is "to cajole, wheedle and flatter the old guy into seeing his own irresistible eligibility for the UNESCO chair" (249).

But he never gets a chance to send this letter to Kingfisher because, while jogging in Milan, Morris is kidnapped by a group of Marxists, "a group of left-wing extremists out to combine fund-raising with a demonstration of anti-American sentiment," (276), who are, as we learn later in the novel, the "political friends" (289) of Fulvia and Ernesto Morgana. The kidnapers, who know that Desiree is Morris' ex-wife and has made a million dollars with her latest book *Difficult Days*, call Desiree and want half a million dollars in ransom but Desiree is a "tough bitch" (276) who prefers to negotiate with the kidnapers. First the kidnapers reduce the ransom to quarter million dollars and tell Desiree to put a small ad in Paris Herald Tribune as '*The lady accepts*' (281) if she agrees to pay. The next day, Desiree puts an ad saying: "*The lady offers ten thousand dollars*" (282). Then, the kidnapers make Morris call Desiree to tell her that one hundred thousand dollars is their final offer. So Morris does as they want and begs Desiree to pay the ransom stating that she owes everything she owns to him: "if I hadn't been such a lousy husband to you all these years you wouldn't have been able to write the book. I mean you wouldn't have had the pain to express. You could say I made you a feminist." (283) "I'm offering twenty-five grand," says Desiree to her publisher Alice Kauffman, "It's getting kind of interesting, like a Dutch auction. I wonder what the reserve is on Morris" (283). At this moment, Fulvia reads Morris' story in the newspaper and understands at once that Morris has been kidnapped by her friends. She tells them to free Morris at once and they do so. The kidnapers leave Morris in the forest and Fulvia picks him up in her car acting as if she has no idea about this entire scheme. After Morris' release, Desiree comes up with a new idea for her next feminist work:

“The police are all on my side, incidentally, they think I broke down the kidnapers’ morale by bargaining with them. I’m getting a very good press here. ‘The Novelist with Nerves of Steel’, they call me in the magazines. I told Morris that, and it didn’t make him any sweeter ... Anyway, I’m going to put the whole story into my book. It’s a wonderful inversion of the normal power relationships between men and women, the man finding himself totally dependent on the generosity of the woman. I might change the ending.”

“Yeah, let the sonofabitch die,” says Alice Kauffman. (296)

I had originally decided to omit these feminist issues from my discussion of *Small World*, but it seemed important to show how Lodge develops the feminist idea which he first introduced in *Changing Places* with Mary Makepeace, and obviously Desiree, and further extends in his last novel of the trilogy, *Nice Work* (1987) – which I will not discuss in my study – with Robyn Penrose, who, as Showalter rightfully identifies as “the most detailed, convincing, and upbeat portrait of the feminist academic in the ‘80s” (82), to come from a male author in an academic novel so often marked by ‘male chauvinism’. Needless to say, this shows Lodge’s success at raising important issues as an author regardless of the genre he wishes to employ in his novels.

Returning to the issue of parody of literary theory in *Small World*, in the final part of the novel, we witness all of our candidates at MLA Conference in New York that takes place in not 1978 but in 1979:

The MLA is the Big Daddy of conferences. A megaconference. A three-ring circus of the literary intelligentsia. This year it is meeting in New York, in two adjacent skyscraper hotels, the Hilton and the Americana, which, enormous as they are, cannot actually sleep all the delegates, who spill over into neighbouring hotels, or beg accommodation from their friends in the big city. Imagine ten thousand highly-educated, articulate, ambitious, competitive men and women converging on mid-Manhattan on the 27th of December, to meet and to lecture and to question and to discuss and to gossip and to plot and to philander and to party and to hire or be hired. For the MLA is a market as well as a circus, it is a place where young scholars fresh from graduate school look hopefully for their first jobs, and more seasoned academics sniff the air for better ones. (313-4)

As Lodge narrates above, the MLA is the biggest ‘market’ and the biggest ‘circus’ of all small carnivalized microcosms of closed academic systems that vary in shape, size, place, time,

structure, power and prestige all around the world. It is the final destination of our heroes; it is a place that is full of salesmen, jugglers, jokers, kings, queens, traders and knights. Each is believed to be a king or queen of their small carnivalized systems of their own time and place. But this 'grand circus' serves as the ultimate place that reveals their exact positions in the world; in other words, it is the supreme court of all academic systems around the world. And, with regards to modern literary theory, nobody knows who is who and which is which, or which who and who which anymore. In this 'grand circus' of academe, the conference on "The Function of Criticism" (316) that takes place "in the Grand Ballroom" (316), which attracts "over a thousand people" (316) to witness the decisive conference in the awarding of the UNESCO Chair.

Chaired by Kingfisher himself, "The Function of Criticism" begins with Philip Swallow, who naively describes the function of criticism as to assist "literature itself ... enabling us better to enjoy life, or better to endure it" (317) with "a knowledge of history, a knowledge of philology, of generic convention and textual editing. But above all he [the critic] needed enthusiasm, the love of books" (317, ellipses mine) to demonstrate "a bridge between the great writers and the general reader" (317). It is a clear theory out of "The English School of Criticism" indeed, a bit outdated but still represented in many anthologies. The second speaker, Michel Tardieu, analyzes the function of criticism as to "uncover the fundamental laws that enabled such works to be produced and understood" (318) to discover "the deep structural principles and binary oppositions that underlay all texts" (318) with the close studies on "paradigm and syntagm, metaphor and metonymy, mimesis and diegesis, stressed and unstressed, subject and object, culture and nature" (318). Tardieu's paper includes a salute to Foucault, who also died in the same year of this novel's publication and, undeniably, changed the whole course of literary studies around the world. The third speaker, Siegfried von Turpitz acknowledges that, "such art-objects enjoyed only" (318) when "they were realized in the mind of the reader" (318). The reception theory that favours the reader, (Siegfried hits the table with his gloved right hand when he utters 'reader') but is poorly narrated/parodied by Lodge. The fourth speaker, Fulvia Morgana, liberates the function of criticism as "to wage undying war on the very concept of "literature" itself, which was nothing more than an instrument of bourgeois hegemony, a fetichistic [sic] reification of so-called aesthetic values" (318) that are "erected and maintained through an elitist educational system in order to conceal the brutal facts of class oppression under industrial capitalism" (318). Her paper represents a summarized version of Marxism in literary studies discussed

surprisingly well by a person who resides at a villa in one of the desirable locations of Milan. The final speaker, Morris Zapp, deciphers “more or less what he had said at the Rummidge conference” (318). Through these papers, Lodge succeeds in gathering most of the leading theories of 1980s together and parodying them in his own terms. But then a fool stands up and acts beyond all academic schemes achieved until this very moment of judgment.

This fool’s name is Persse McGarrigle, named after Percival of Arthur’s knights, a young and virgin scholar that has recently finished his thesis on Shakespeare’s influence on T. S. Eliot, who also takes the full authority to reverse it as T. S. Eliot’s influence on Shakespeare upon publishers’ expectations – “who can read Hamlet today without thinking of ‘Prufrock’? Who can hear the speeches of Ferdinand in *The Tempest* without being reminded of ‘The Fire Sermon’ section of *The Waste Land*?” (52) – stands up and asks “What do you *do* if everybody agrees with you?” (319) upon which Arthur Kingfisher breaks his long silence:

“Ah.” Arthur Kingfisher flashed a sudden smile that was like sunshine breaking through cloud. His long, olive-complexioned face, worn by study down to the fine bone, peered over the edge of the table at Persse with a keen regard. “That is a very good question. A very in-ter-est-ing question. I do not remember that question was asked before.” He nodded to himself. “You imply, of course, that what matters in the field of critical practice is not truth but difference. If everybody were convinced by your arguments, they would have to do the same as you and then there would be no satisfaction in doing it. To win is to lose the game. Am I right?” (319)

Persse, who is not sure about what he has just started, agrees with Kingfisher and gives him the replenishing desire of youth; Percival asks The Fisher King the right question and heals him as in the Arthurian legends. Upon this development, at the Penthouse party after the conference, Jacques Textel announces thus:

“As most of you know,” Jacques Textel was saying, “UNESCO intends to found a new chair of literary criticism tenable anywhere in the world, and I think it’s no secret that we have been seeking the advice of the doyen of the subject, Arthur Kingfisher, as to how to fill this post. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I have news for you.” Textel paused, teasingly, and Persse looked round the room, picking out the faces, tense and expectant, of Morris Zapp, Philip Swallow, Michel Tardieu, Fulvia Morgana and Siegfried von Turpitz. “Arthur has just told me,” said Jacques Textel, “that he is prepared to come out of retirement and allow his own name to go forward for the chair.” (333)

Although this announcement leaves our candidates dissatisfied, they gather together as if they are in an Arthurian celebration and they happily hail the King that is healed. Even Persse, whose rather weird theory of T. S. Eliot's influence on Shakespeare has been plagiarized by Siegfried in one of the conferences, grabs Siegfried's gloved hand and shakes it with gratitude but when he shakes more than Siegfried's expectations, he also removes Siegfried's glove from his right hand when Siegfried tries to take his hand back and the hand comes out as "a perfectly normal, healthy-looking hand" (335) upon which, "Von Turpitz goes pale, hisses, and seems to shrivel in stature, plunges his hand in his jacket pocket, and slinks from the room, never to be seen at an international conference again" (335). The fool has done his work; he heals and hails the King, unveils 'the villain' and lets people know their exact positions in the 'global campus'.

In the meantime, another character, Angelica Pabst, Persse's Holy Grail in this academic romance, a young scholar specialized in the Romance genre, analyzes Lodge's *Small World* in the fashion of Roland Barthes. "Roland Barthes has taught us the close connection between narrative and sexuality, between the pleasure of the body and the 'pleasure of the text', but in spite of his sexual ambivalence, he developed this analogy in an overly masculine fashion (322) she begins, and further develops her discussion:

Romance, in contrast, is not structured in this way. It has not one climax but many, the pleasure of this text comes and comes and comes again. No sooner is one crisis in the fortunes of the hero averted than a new one presents itself; no sooner has one mystery been solved than another is raised; no sooner has one adventure been concluded than another begins. The narrative questions open and close, open and close, like the contractions of the vaginal muscles in intercourse, and this process is in principle endless. The greatest and most characteristic romances are often unfinished – they end only with the author's exhaustion, as a woman's capacity for orgasm is limited only by her physical stamina. Romance is a multiple orgasm. (322-3)

So Lodge, as the critic, analyzes the book he writes from the perspective of one of his female characters, who is specialized in the Romance genre, by using Roland Barthes' theory that he discussed in *The Pleasure of the Text* (1970, trans.1975) and Lodge ends his novel with Persse, Percival, staring at the destination board at Heathrow Airport wondering where to begin his next quest to find Cheryl Summerbee.

In conclusion, *Small World* is a great parody of ‘the global campus’ regardless of time and space as well as a parody of literary critical theory that reformed the scholars of English studies as well as many other critical studies around in the world during the 1980s. In the meantime, as Bernard Bergonzi hints in his critical work titled *David Lodge, Small World* can be considered as an anthology of modern literary theory like those that Lodge first edited as *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism: A Reader* in 1972, and in 1988 as *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader* with a second revised edition in 2000 (41). In a sense, the novel offers multiple ‘pleasures’ to the readers with multiple ‘orgasms’ as long as the readers’ physical stamina enable or the author gets exhausted in this grand circus of carnivalized world.

5.2 Mensonge: My Strange Quest for Structuralism’s Hidden Hero (1987)

‘What the text says, through the particularity of its name, is the ubiquity of pleasure, the atopia of bliss,’ cries Roland Barthes in *The Pleasure of the Text*. ‘Roland, Roland, please,’ comments Mensonge. ‘Tell me, have you ever *tried* one?’ (71)

While David Lodge was busy parodying the leading literary critics and their best known theories with a general focus on Barthes’ *The Pleasure of the Text*, Malcolm Bradbury was after his own quest, another knightly fashion, to discover even a glimpse of the ‘absent presence’ of Henri Mensonge, ‘Structuralism’s Hidden Hero’ in a parody of basic theorists like Foucault and Derrida with his main attention on Barthes’ “The Death of the Author” (1968, trans.1977). *Mensonge: My Strange Quest for Structuralism’s Hidden Hero* was first published in 1987, in the format of a novella of 104 pages. From the very beginning pages until the very last pages that include Bibliography and Index, this study still stands as the ultimate parody of modern literary theory.

There can be no doubt that any bright student or intellectually active person of the 1980s who is at all alert to the major developments in the humanities, philosophy and the social sciences, or is just getting more and more worried why so many way-out mint-flavoured green vegetables are showing up in a salad these days, is going sooner or later, and far better sooner than later, to have come to terms with a pair of thought-movements that are making all the contemporary running. These twin-thought movements are, as most people now know, called Structuralism and Deconstruction. (1)

Bradbury begins his novella with this passage and it can be suggested that this is the only formal passage of this critical study. Showalter's 'academic star system' is once more stressed but Bradbury widens this suggestion into philosophy: "Philosophy these days requires virtuoso qualities, and the star performers are not themselves always cooperative, a classic problem with very deep thinkers" (2) and Morris Zapp's dilemma in calling his critical studies in *Small World* is also analyzed as "The labels we hear are not necessarily those accepted by the masters themselves. Michel Foucault, the great radical historian, insisted until quite recently, when he died, that he was not a Structuralist, but something quite different along the same lines" (2). Bradbury analyzes how these new movements became "*chic*" (2) in "social and cultural, literary and artistic, linguistic and anthropological" (3) aspects of everyday life as well as how it "disestablished *the entire basis of human discourse*" (7).

Next, Bradbury begins his parody by analyzing the basic precursors of this 'chic' trend. Saussure and his *Cours de linguistique generale*, that started everything so far, is parodied with its writing process: "Saussure himself having died before he wrote it down, its text was retrieved from the various notes and doodles of his students – some of them a little inconsistent, probably due to people horsing around on the back row" (9). Then Bradbury stresses this work's indispensable effect on current literary theories: "In fact, we may regard the book Saussure 'wrote' – which of course he did not – as the strongest piece of evidence we have of the argument the book itself makes, about the separation of the signifier from the signified" (9). The effect was so immense, suggests Bradbury, that the "intellectuals throughout the globe" (14) had to sit down and revise their earlier works by discriminating "their *langues* from their *paroles*, their signifiers from their signifieds" (14) and "some of them are known to have changed their lectures almost entirely" (14). This intellectual dilemma did also have its effects on the readers, says Bradbury, "who turned out to need a lot of critics to help them misunderstand in the proper way" (15) and describes the situation of the readers as: "the day of the modern reader who did not need a book at all was born" (16). During this time of uncertainty, Bradbury, the narrator, finds out the name of Henri Mensonge in one of the reviews of Frank Kermode, in which he analyzes the French influences on literary studies as incomplete because the English do not have all the necessary translations and therefore missing the basic works behind Structuralism and Deconstruction and when Kermode is asked for a basic unheard of theorist, he introduces the name of Henri Mensonge.

This purely neglected theorist is, in fact, “the source and the start, unquestionably the Structuralist’s Structuralist, the Deconstructor’s Deconstructor. He is the hub and the nub, the core and more” (19-20); he is a man “who has out-Barthesed Barthes, out-Foucaulted Foucault, out-Derridaed Derrida, out Deleuzed-and-Guattaried Deleuze and Guattari” (27). Unfortunately, there is no mention of his name in almost all anthologies but he is a “rare and extraordinary figure” (20) who has succeeded “to stand with one foot firmly planted at the very beginning of the major modern thought-movement, while with his other foot standing twenty years later at the very end of it” (20). But in Deconstructionist terms, which Bradbury analyzes as “nothing other than a profound modern philosophy *of*, precisely, absences” (21), Mensonge’s absence in anthologies is the very “*significance of his non-significance*” (20). The only book that can ever be written by Mensonge (or by the language that wished to use Mensonge as its medium) is *La Fornication comme acte culturel* but as Bradbury suggests, there even are debates on the publication date of this extraordinary study:

It came out in 1965, or just possibly 1966. The date, whichever it is, is crucial. For this means that it appeared certainly one year, and very possibly even two, *before*, and therefore not *after*, the key Deconstructionist year of 1967. We call it that because this was the year in which Mensonge’s strongest rival, Jacques Derrida, imposed himself in the intellectual scene, not with just one brilliant book but with three (*Of Grammatology*, *Writing and Difference*, and *Speech and Phenomena*), and very possibly the annual revision of the Michelin Guide as well. So a new spirit was clearly passing through Parisian thought, and it is usually from Derrida’s year that the entire development of the Post-Structuralist or Deconstructionist enterprise is usually dated. However we – I and now you – know quite differently. For Mensonge’s book – it was called *La Fornication comme acte culturel* – came first. And so potent was its argument, so radical its impact, that it does indeed seem perfectly correct to say that Derrida could not have been conceived without the assistance of Mensonge. (34-5)

The translation of this book into English is not to be found anywhere, basically for two reasons: firstly, Mensonge’s extraordinary book that is behind all revolutionary theories is “as scarce as virginity in California and a good deal more expensive” (67), and secondly, the few copies that can be found are “worn copies of this ill-printed” (39) as this “ill-starred book” (39) that contains the most potent and important statements of modern thinking we have had” (39-40). Although there is a rumour that, an English translation of the text is finished and will duly be printed by “the West Coast Marxist-Feminist Gay Collective Press, under the title *Sex and Culture*, with a lovely cover, in their ‘His-and-Her-Meneutics’ series” (39), there is no sign of this text’s translation presence until the time Bradbury published this book.

In order to investigate this Mensonge case further, Bradbury tries biographies, but “Alas” he says, “with the Death of the Author and the Disappearance of the Subject, even an ordinary biography is bound to be a problem these days. Biographies are said to be fictions revealing more about the biographer than they do about their subjects, who of course do not exist anyway” (29), but Bradbury manages to find out that Mensonge was not French in origin, but Bulgarian. His coming to France has nothing to do with academic freedom or any other emigration purposes, but with Mensonge’s deep admiration of trains. He catches a train from Bulgaria and happens to get off of it in France. There, he collaborates with Barthes on road signs (and possibly on train signs) and with Bathes’ assistance, Mensonge joins the group of select ‘new’ critics and his articles and reviews begin to be published in “*Quel Tel*” (32) (of course, it is none other than *Tel Quel*). But that is all Bradbury can find about this total mystery except three photos that are supposedly thought of as Mensonge’s:

In one he sits, a handsome, dark-eyed if decidedly portly young man, of somewhat Slavic appearance, at a table on the terrace of what may or may not be the Café des Deux Maggots. The date is quite indeterminate, the prevailing *chic* of figures in the background suggesting either the 1950s or the 1980s. A bock is on the table in front of him, next to the usual saucer, which he appears to have filled with some liquid. There is also what seems to be a female shoe; it has been argued that this could signify something, though knowing Mensonge as we do, or do not, probably it does not. One arm is raised high at the shoulder, perhaps in a form of revolutionary salute, more probably in a gesture of rage toward the photographer. (37-8)

The second photograph, “presumably taken some years later, or else much earlier” (38), reveals a man who is “quite fat, balding, and several inches shorter” (38) that “holds up a spade, and is looking at it inquiringly, though whether to dig with it, name it or strike someone with it we have no way of knowing” (38). The third and a more recent photograph which “is reproduced as the frontispiece of this book” (38) shows a bald head that “appears to have been taken from the rear, though this is not certain. This makes identification difficult even for those who knew the man well, could we but find any” (38). Bradbury, the knight scholar that is on quest for this ‘hidden hero’, lacks the biographical facts about Mensonge and prefers to look after the only text he is rumoured to have written and luckily finds an ‘ill-treated’ copy of it with many missing pages but Bradbury’s enthusiasm immediately puts him to work to analyze the text; no matter that it is in French. He consults many major scholars about Mensonge’s book but all of them advise him that the work has “such profound

intellectual subtlety, linguistic density and textual disorder” (68) and it is ‘non-translatable’ as well as ‘non-understandable’, “and that only a person of the most limited imagination, and probably the most unmitigated stupidity as well, would even dream of undertaking the task” (68). Bradbury works hard to get a meaning, if there is one, from the text and manages to identify and interpret some minor points that Mensonge clearly analyzes in his masterpiece:

Acknowledging Barthes’s emphasis on the dominance of the text, it totally refutes his concept of *jouissance*, or textual pleasure-taking. ‘Sex is difficult enough in bed, as my philosophic contemporaries should know,’ Mensonge says sourly. ‘To try to perform it in the bookcase is hubristic beyond belief. In any case it is no use pretending we are at a whorehouse when we know we are at a funeral. Try the book any way you like. It will show no sign of enjoying it, and will certainly not give a squeak back.’ The same rigorous honesty is written into every page of *La Fornication*, a book that seems to resist any kind of interpretation. Indeed it positively *defies* the summary of the would-be interpreter, however intelligent and competent he may happen, as in this case, to be. (64)

Mensonge, of course a far better critic than Morris Zapp, comes up with his ideas on *The Pleasure of the Text*, and Bradbury, the author, carries Lodge, the author’s parody of Barthes to a further space and analyzes the ‘pleasure’ literally in an attempt to get, and also to give, ‘pleasure’ from, and to, a text ‘in a bookcase’ which is not a ‘whorehouse’ but a ‘funeral’, in the Barthesian fashion supposing all texts’ authors are dead, whether giving or getting ‘pleasure’ ‘in any way possible’ is almost impossible. Bradbury, the knight – in fact, the would-be knight of the 2000s – further develops his quest for Mensonge but finds himself at an impasse and analyzes his feelings as: “‘A poem should not mean but be,’ Archibald MacLeish once wisely observed in a poem. Unfortunately Mensonge, as is typical, takes this one step further, creating a book that does not simply refuse to mean but also refuses to be” (65).

But this does not dishearten Bradbury, our courageous knight, and he gets deep into the text in an attempt to find a meaning in the last passages of the text of Mensonge, who, in fact, refuses any meaning at all:

‘My aim, by now, must be clear, to deconstruct any illusion of fullness which permits the coital *cogito* to exist,’ he says in some late phrases. ‘What clearly follows is that I must Deconstruct myself, or any illusion of a self, capable of thinking a thought, that you may happen to be left with. I – “I” – do this not to *defer* meaning, to seduce your interest, promise a supplement, as all

too often do those philosophical colleagues of mine who still see long and well-paid careers stretching out in front of them. I wish to *withdraw* meaning, to *withdraw from* meaning, in a word to *subtract* or *decoitalize* myself, so avoiding any impression that you have been reading – impossible word – philosophy.’ (78)

Bradbury analyzes the above as “this coda reminds us that the entire point to his argument is that we may find no entire point to his argument” (78) and Mensonge, in the last words of his masterpiece; although it is worth mentioning that Bradbury’s copy is not complete, concludes his discussion on social, cultural, linguistic, and anthropological – only to name a few – studies thus:

‘Do not allow it to satisfy you, for nothing satisfied me. If it does, I would have failed, as of course I have had to, or some “I” did who is not and cannot be “I”, who must necessarily be nothing, is not capable of a thought, who cannot let even this be a thought, who cannot conceive, will not be conceived, who has desired what desire cannot give and desires only undesired, who is a supplement to what cannot be supplemented, a non-thinking non-subject who has never been, who cannot be, who will not become, who will not be coming, is not even a name, not even a word, not even the word *me en songe* (requiring completion).’ (78-9)

Bradbury, our exhausted knight who obviously is not as pure as our young knight Persse, fails in his quest to find yet even to heal the King. He just utters the following words before he takes a long rest: “Mensonge or ‘Mensonge’, the one we have thought was Mensonge, if such a ‘thought’ is possible, absents himself, absents us, becomes not here, not there, in a way that anybody who takes philosophy at all seriously cannot possibly ignore” (79), Bradbury’s way perhaps of reminding us that Mensonge is a French word for “lie.”

But being Bradbury, the author’s parody does not simply end here. He also invites Lodge into his play to translate Michel Tardieu’s “Foreword/Afterword” to this long deferred study on Henri Mensonge. Professor Tardieu also indicates an important aspect of Mensonge’s mysterious text saying that: “Mensonge devised a still more radical method of placing his discourse sous rapture; that a certain acid was added in the manufacture of the paper on which La Fornication was printed which will ensure that sooner or later all copies of this seminal text will auto-destruct” (93). It is very valuable information indeed, adding a further step into Mensonge’s *significance of his non-significance*. After Michel’s “Foreword/Afterword”, Bradbury reveals the bibliography of the book with many interesting

authors indeed. For instance, we understand that Henry Beamish has recovered some important notes of his ruined book on charisma and managed to write an article titled “Mensonge and Charisma” that is published in *British Journal of Sociology* and Howard Kirk, understandably influenced by Mensonge, to write an article titled “Mensonge and the Technique of Seduction” published in *New Society*. The Index of the book is more playful indeed. It seems Nietzsche appears in this book in connection with: the Index entry under “Nietzsche” reads as follows: “Derrida on, 89; Foucault on, 90; Elton John on, 23; Hitler on, 97” (103) and Sartre is identified as:

Sartre, Jean Paul, 35-8; charismatic role of, 32; philosophical dilemma of, 38; Structuralist reaction to, 41; humanism of, 42; putative friendship of M. and, 44; has problem with chestnut tree, 49; discovers Non-Being, 50; meets S. de Beauvoir, 52; discovers Being, 53.
(103-4)

As a result, the novella *Mensonge*, is the ultimate parody of modern literary theory and stands as one of the wittiest books of Bradbury. Bradbury plays with the idea of fact and fiction and also invites Lodge, who allegedly writes the “Foreword/Afterword”, into his play. Both Lodge’s and Bradbury’s characters are mixed up with real theorists like Derrida, Foucault and Barthes, who are treated as real characters in a fiction in which they are parodied from the very beginning until the very end of the novella. “Unlike Bradbury’s other novels” writes Lidia Vianu “*Mensonge* has an intellectual point to prove, a theory to “deconstruct”. Malcolm Bradbury is sick and tired of the meaninglessness and pretentiousness of all critics who claim they can create new meaning and dispense with all traditions, that of the author included” (18) and I definitely agree with her. In the novella, Bradbury poses himself as a narrator fully devoted to theory but in fact, he finds these theories incomprehensible in terms of meaning. In this parody, Bradbury ‘plays’ the game in theory’s latest fashion and manages to ‘deconstruct’ the meaninglessness behind these theories well-equipped attempts to identify meaning. In fact, Bradbury’s criticism of these ‘new’ theories is well narrated in the novella:

Like Barthes, he [Mensonge, and Bradbury as well] acknowledged that philosophy was a science of signs, though not such big ones, and he agreed that everything could be read as a text. Like Foucault, he acknowledged the fundamental gap between words and things, but could not understand why everyone kept trying to close it. Like Derrida, he considered philosophy as a theory of non-perception or non-theory of perception, but did not think it made any *differance*.
(62)

In other words, Bradbury does not distance his critical approach from these new theories but, like many scholars in the field of literature, he has difficulties in getting the full meaning of these new theories in order to be applied to the literature studies. And this parody manages to say more than any opposing critics would say about this latest fashion.

CONCLUSION

“Malcolm Bradbury was my oldest and closest writer-friend, and since he died I have felt as if some vital element has been removed from my professional as well as my private life” (vii) writes David Lodge in his tribute to Malcolm Bradbury’s last novel *To the Hermitage* (2000). Taking into consideration that they had first met in 1960 at the University of Birmingham as lecturers of English literature, and also as two authors with their recently published novels, it had been 40 years since they had first met. In these 40 years, they had collaborated in each other’s works, had influenced each other’s styles, and had been thought to be the same person in many occasions – which Bradbury parodied in his novel *Rates of Exchange* (1983) enabling one of his minor character’s to ask ““Do you know also a campus writer Brodge?” asks a lady to his left, ‘Who writes *Changing Westward*? I think he is very funny but sometimes his ideological position is not clear”” (294) – but Bradbury’s unexpected death had put an end to this long term relationship.

Bradbury was 3 years older than Lodge (born 1932) and their whole lives could be described as parallel lives; for interrelation would be much too weak a word to describe the 40 years of experience. “We were both grammar school scholarship-boys from lower middle-class families, products of 1944 Education Act, first generation graduates – of London University, not Oxbridge” (Tribute, vii), but all my gratitude to them depends on their getting their higher educations in redbricks as opposed to studies in Oxford and Cambridge. Both Bradbury and Lodge had gone to America for academic purposes and had spent at least a year in there. When Bradbury had returned to England, he had moved to the University of East Anglia and with the influence of his American experience – as Walker first witnesses Creative Writing classes in America – Bradbury had been to first scholar to get an English department open a MA course in Creative Writing and its results meant more than words: Kazuo Ishiguro, Ian McEwan, etc.

The only general point which can be emphasized in my conclusion is hidden in Lodge's words in his tribute to Bradbury:

We became in a way literary twins – sometimes farcically confused, always with an intuitive sense of each other's thoughts and feelings even when separated. As Mikhail Bakhtin observed, all writers glance sideways at their peers as they write, and it was Malcolm Bradbury whom I most often evoked as imagined reader, to test the quality of the work. (viii)

As a result, we have discovered both author's reformative ideas during the 1950s, Bradbury's direct influence on Lodge's style during the 1960s, two revolutionary novels that definitely fit the 1970s and two great parodies of modern literary theories in the course of the 1980s. The novels that I discussed in my study do mark important points in both authors' lives for they also serve to summarize their development through time; from the times of the Angry Young Men to the times of 'floating signifiers'.

In the course of this study of both craftsmen over four decades, I have looked at the novels with Bakhtin's parody perception of "dualistic characteristics," in terms of the intertextuality of novels published in the same decades, and analyzing the "dualistic characteristics" of parody that they employed within their respective novels. I suggest that each novel of these craftsmen is a parody that consists of doubling imageries and narratives to hold Bakhtin's perception of parody and his idea of the carnival. In terms of comparing two of their novels published in the same decade, I suggest that the carnivalized atmosphere of each novel is interrelated to create a bigger carnival within the subject decade. Clarification of this point follows with examples.

In the 1950s, there is a dual narrative of Stuart Trecce and Louis Bates in terms of parodying both the traditional novel discourse and the discourse of the Movement that are represented by the Angry Young Men in Bradbury's *Eating People is Wrong*. But overall, the adventures of Trecce and Bates that start at the university and is finalized at a madhouse and a hospital simultaneously, the novel parodies the liberal values of the era in a small world of carnival without the necessity of favouring one discourse over another. On the other hand, Lodge's *The Picturegoers*, is another small world of carnival with multiple dual narratives in which almost all characters of the novel do have some others to oppose them. Only to give an example, in the beginning of the novel, Mark begins as an atheist liberal who parodies the

values of Catholic conservatism but ends up with Catholic thoughts that question his former atheist liberal values. Likewise, Clare goes through the same reformation in reverse that becomes a liberal atheist leaving the Catholic school and values behind. Both Mark and Clare become the parodies of their former stages at the end of the novel, and in course of events, the Palladium Moviehouse stands as the marketplace of this small carnival where various thoughts and values are bought and sold. If we link these two novels written in the course of the 1950s, we discover a bigger carnival in which the liberal values of the academy and a closed community in London suburbs that both are characterized as microcosms of the society of the era, as two separate but interrelated, in Bakhtin's perception "dialogic", narratives with "dual characteristics" are gathered together to discuss the new liberal and the old conservative traditional values. While Lodge proposes some changes in his characters' personal lives, – in case of Mark's life, there is a change from the new liberal values into the old conservative one, but Clare undergoes this change in reverse – Bradbury does not propose a solution but analyzes the situation from multiple perspectives.

In the 1960s, Lodge, in *The British Museum is Falling Down*, employs a dual narrative in the academic world by discussing the hard conditions that graduate students cope with in the process of finishing their MA theses on the one hand, and the expectations of their professors on the other, while carefully parodying the general atmosphere of the academy in which professors individually present their claims for prestige and power. Meanwhile, in *Stepping Westward*, Bradbury discusses the academic systems of Britain and America and further adds the liberal values of each country into his contrast while criticizing the academic systems of America with a smaller dual narrative of Froelich and Walker. Thus the Froelich and Walker doubling also acts as an updated version of Treece and Bates in Bradbury's related discussion in *Eating People is Wrong*. In a pertinent discussion of both novels, Lodge discusses the academic system in Britain and Bradbury discusses the same in America, and the carnivalized worlds in these separate novels are gathered together to create a bigger carnival in which the dual characteristics of both systems are parodized.

In the 1970s, Lodge's title *Changing Places: A Tale of Two Campuses*, clearly identifies the dual characteristics of his parody. While Morris and Philip's narratives are employed as the basic element of his carnivalized world, the parody analyzes academic systems of Britain and America in a bigger sense of the carnival. On the other hand, in *The History Man*, Bradbury updates his employment of dual characters into a final version of

Howard Kirk and Henry Beamish in an analysis of liberal as opposed to traditional academic values. He widens his carnival with student protests and academic parties in which minor discontinuities introduce a darker note, such as the suicide attempts of Henry and Barbara, whose implications are disregarded by the majorities. In a broader sense of the carnival in both novels, both Bradbury and Lodge parody the “academic star system”, in Showalter’s terms, with their employments of narrative styles in a postmodern fashion.

In the 1980s, Lodge, in *Small World: An Academic Romance*, removes the barriers between separate academic systems and gathers them together in a “global campus” where power and prestige depend on literary theories discussed in international conferences. Following the fashion of Romance genre, Lodge does not limit himself to single dual narratives but creates as many as possible in his ultimate carnival. On the other hand, in his meta-fictional work *Mensonge: My Strange Quest for Structuralism’s Hidden Hero*, Bradbury parodies the ever-changing world of literary theory which becomes the ultimate tool for power and prestige in a “global campus”. Discussed as a whole, both of these works stand as the final destination of these craftsmen’s employment of parody of the academy.

“In my writing lifetime, I have published only four novels,” says Bradbury in his essay “Writer and Critic” published in *No, Not Bloomsbury* (1987), and continues: “one for each of my adult decades – a novel apiece for the Serious Fifties, the Swinging Sixties, the Sagging Seventies and the Economic Eighties” (14-5) which all four are discussed in the course of this study. He further adds, “[i]f over those decades the novel has changed very considerably, the spirit of criticism has changed even more” (15), and gives a brief summary of the concerns he had both as an author and a critic on writing the novels we have discussed during the course of these four decades. In the following discussion, Bradbury uses a marriage metaphor to describe the relationship between his author side and his critic side. While analyzing his development as a writer on one hand, he satirizes the extreme measures that literary criticism led up to on the other.

During the fifties, “I write [*Eating People is Wrong*] about liberal anxieties, and in the prevailing spirit of moral seriousness” (15) says Bradbury while his critic was “deeply into F. R. Leavis and Lionel Trilling, the great tradition and the liberal imagination” (15). It can be seen that their marriage gets along well in the fifties. During the sixties, “we soon found we had to renegotiate our relationship. It was all very understandable. The atmosphere was

changing everywhere, we were all into spontaneous bop prosody, and all the talk was of liberation and improvisation” (16) says Bradbury and talks about his ‘sailing westward’ as the “puritan innocence seeking American experience” (16) being a “Henry James in reverse” (16). Bradbury’s critic also contributes to this change; he “put down his Leavis, and put on his levis” (16) adopting the American life style.

But by the end of the sixties and the beginning of the seventies, his critic’s bookshelf begins to be filled with oeuvres of “Barthes and Barth and Barthelme, Burroughs and Burgess and Borges and Beckett and Butor, Saussure and Sapir, Schlovsky and Scholes, Sollers and Simon” (16) following the fashion of the French. When Bradbury asks his critic about the situation of literary theory in the seventies, he replies: “Leavis is dis-Kermoted, ... if not entirely dis-Lodged; now we’re working on structuralism” (17). His critic further adds, “Fiction is finished” and when Bradbury asks him what to write, his critic replies, “Metafiction, surfiction, intertext” (17). To please his critic, Bradbury writes *The History Man*, “that was all a parody of realism, a mockery of history, a book of plots and plotters” (17) and shows it to his critic but the novel disappoints him because he does not find it “postmodern enough” (17). “I want you to go to the zero degree of meaning” (17), he tells to Bradbury and when Bradbury tells him that would mean he does not exist at all, his critic says, “You do in a sense, ... there has to be a something we can deconstruct” (17).

Finally, during the eighties, Bradbury writes the story of Henri Mensonge, the doyen of Structuralism, and tests the limits of meaning in the newest fashion. But this time, it is Bradbury’s turn to be dissatisfied for he misses their marriage’s “good old days, when [his critic] read Lawrence and not Lyotard, liked people, and believed art was moral knowledge” (18). In the meantime, his critic continues to come up with new ideas which he calls “postpostmodernism and de-de-de-deconstruction” (18) while Bradbury cannot stand to hear Derrida’s name anymore. Unfortunately, their marriage begins to crack and Bradbury discusses the situation thus:

We’ve been having marriage therapy, but it doesn’t do much good; when he comes into the house, I tend to go out of it. He tells me I will not write well unless I get free of him; when I offer to leave he says he cannot exist without me. He starts me and he stops me; when one of us wants the other, the other doesn’t want the one. Yet I go on living in the hope that he will contrive his literature; he goes on living in the hope that I will one day contrive mine. (18)

This is a great discussion that portrays ‘the novelist at the crossroads’ that is discussed in this study. After all, Bradbury acknowledges the development of literary criticism in the course of time but his moral values on art do not appreciate the extreme limits that literary criticism inevitably leads up to. While satirizing the academy and academics in their quests for power and recognition, Bradbury also points out the de-centralization of humanity in the extreme measures of literary criticism. In “A Dog Engulfed in Sand”, he stresses that *The History Man* is about “dehumanization” and affirms that his “sense that the struggle for humane values was put in doubt as much by the utopian desires of radicalism as by the materialism of modern society much increased” (*No, Not Bloomsbury*, 44). He furthermore indicates his reason: “for the values of humanism – skepticism, tolerance, gentleness – seemed rejected on all sides in a world more and more given to totalistic ideas and millennial and coercive visions” (*No, Not Bloomsbury*, 44). Yet, in *The History Man*, Bradbury distances himself from “the psychology or consciousness of the characters” (*No, Not Bloomsbury*, 44) and lets them speak for themselves while he satirizes the dehumanized ‘plots and plotters’ in their extremes. His main aim in doing so is not to include his own authorship into this limitless era in which his belief of art as ‘moral knowledge’ is de-centered and mocked not in just one single way but in many. In the academic scene, Bradbury portrays the ‘plotters’, such as Bernard Froelich and Howard Kirk, as monsters, while he discusses their victims, such as James Walker, Henry Beamish and Barbara Kirk, as tragic heroes who are wasted during the process of these monstrous ‘plots’. In this sense, Bradbury’s novels are about the human condition during the periods of radical developments occurring in the humanities departments of the academy.

In the meantime, David Lodge, in a recent publication titled *Scenes of Academic Life* (2005), indicates that academic novel “is typically focused on the humanities rather than the sciences, and treats the university as a piece of territory somewhat removed from the hurly-burly of ordinary life, a ‘small world’ in which ambition and desire generate comedy rather than tragedy” (1). Upon his identification of academic novels of ‘plots and plotters’, in Bradbury’s terms, as comedy, Bradbury suggests “[a]s comedy so often deals with the gap between our ideals and our practice, irony more bitterly creates distance, difficulty, estrangement, makes us aware of the pain that lies in the body of the strangled victim” (*No, Not Bloomsbury*, 44). It can be suggested that Lodge mainly parodies the academy in the style of comedy whereas Bradbury does the same in the form of satire and this would be the only point that distinguishes their academic novels discussed in this study. In his essay titled

“Dearing Up the Campus” Bradbury, contrary to Lodge’s definition, identifies the academic novel as “an exploration and celebration of what was publicly seen as a major cultural change – a quiet welfare state revolution that transformed the class mix, career prospects, intellectual horizons and world view of an admittedly select cadre of the young in postwar Britain” (*Liar’s Landscape*, 53). He further discusses this idea in “The Days of the History Men” stating that “the campus was hardly pastoral space. It had nuclear physics labs, did research for the army and great corporations, was a site of power and false consciousness. It was also the perfect place for winning hearts and minds” (*Liar’s Landscape*, 108). Therefore, although both Lodge and Bradbury have the same purpose in parodying academic struggles for power and prestige as to point out the ‘discontinuities’ in the history of academic hierarchy, their methods – Lodge’s comedy, Bradbury’s satire – prove to be the main distinguishing element in their intertextual works. In his essay titled “Ideology” (1994), Terry Eagleton states that ideology “represents an attempt to mask the very conflicts from which it springs, either by denying that they exist, or by asserting their unimportance or inevitability” (*The Eagleton Reader*, 234). In line with Eagleton’s perception, in their respective novels discussed in this study, both Lodge and Bradbury try to unmask and to reveal the ‘plot and plotters’ in the academic scene while pointing out the tragedies of the ‘discontinuities’ in the academic ‘fellowship of discourse’ in a fashion of “turning political oppression to artistic advantage” (*The Eagleton Reader*, 271) as Eagleton suggests in his essay titled “The End of English”.

In my final words, I would like to point that, both Lodge and Bradbury were always in the literary scene, whether with their criticisms – and I must say mostly with their criticisms – or with their novels, which were surprisingly neglected by readers as well as by literary critics. Only six months before his death in 2000, Bradbury was honoured as ‘knight’ for his services to literature which he discussed in his essay titled “Honoured”: “The form attached presented me with two boxes: one to be ticked if you agreed to let your name go forward, the other to be marked if you wanted to hear no more of this product” (*Liar’s Landscape*, 407) and further stated: “Ten minutes after I had posted back the form, I could no longer remember which of the boxes I had ticked” (*Liar’s Landscape*, 407). In the “Afterword” of *Liar’s Landscape* (2006), David Lodge remarks that “[i]n fact, Malcolm hated to say no to anybody” (417). This can be one reason why Bradbury did not refuse the honour of knighthood as did Joseph Conrad, Thomas Hardy and Rudyard Kipling, but the main reason why he accepted this honour, as he stated in “Honoured”, was his unconditional love to literature with a belief that “honours given to writers are honours given to literature” (*Liar’s Landscape*, 410).

Turning to the question of the relative merits of our two authors raised by Amanda Craig's wondering in her review of David Lodge's *Consciousness and the Novel* (2002), "... why [David Lodge], unlike Bradbury, has not been knighted yet for his services to literature [for] he is the much better critic and novelist" (2), I would say Bradbury's commitment to literature, as Lodge acknowledges in the "Afterword" of *Liar's Landscape* as "inexhaustible appetite for the craft and business of writing" (416), together with his genuine teaching style that produced Kazuo Ishiguro and Ian McEwan, as well as his moral concerns and his defense of them throughout his writing career would be the distinguishing factor between these two craftsmen.

WORKS CITED

- Acheson, James. "Thesis and Antithesis in Malcolm Bradbury's the History Man." *Journal of European Studies*. 33.1 (2003), *Questia*, 14 Dec. 2005
<<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5002549736>>.
- Amis, Kingsley. 1954. *Lucky Jim*. UK: Penguin, 2000.
- Bergonzi, Bernard. *David Lodge*. ed. Isobel Armstrong. *Writers and Their Work*. UK: Plymouth, 1995.
- Bradbury, Malcolm. *Eating People is Wrong*. 1959. Chicago: Academy Chicago Publishers, 1991.
- _____. *Stepping Westward*. 1965. London: Picador, 2000.
- _____. *The History Man*. 1975. London: Picador, 2000.
- _____. *Mensonge: My Strange Quest for the Structuralism's Hidden Hero*. 1987. London: Arrow Books Limited, 1989.
- _____. *Rates of Exchange*. 1983. London: Picador, 2000.
- _____. *To the Hermitage*. 2000. London: Picador, 2001.
- _____. *No, Not Bloomsbury*. 1987. London: Arrow Books Limited, 1989.
- _____. *Who Do You Think You Are*. 1976. London: Arrow Books Limited, 1986.
- _____. *Liar's Landscape: Collected Writing from a Storyteller's Life*. ed. Dominic Bradbury. London: Picador, 2006.
- Christopher, David. *British Culture: An Introduction*, London: Routledge, 1999.
- Craig, Amanda. Rev. of *Consciousness and the Novel*. By David Lodge. *The Literary Review*, October 2002. 31.05.2006
<http://www.amandacraig.com/pages/journalism/book_reviews/david_lodge.htm>
- Doering, Jonathan W. "Malcolm Bradbury: A History Man for Our Times." *Contemporary Review*. 278. 1622. (2001): 159, *Questia*, 14 Dec. 2005
<<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5000976565>>.

- Eagleton, Terry. *The Eagleton Reader*. ed. Stephen Regan. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Epstein, Joseph. "Civilization and Its Malcontents", *The Weekly Standard*, Volume 010, Issue 32, 31.05.2006
<http://www.weeklystandard.com/Utilities/printer_preview.asp?idArticle=5546&R=C4FE2AAE2>
- Forster, E. M. *Aspects of the Novel*. 1927. San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1955.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.
- Head, Dominic. *The Cambridge Introduction to Modern British Fiction, 1950 – 2000*. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 2002.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. San Francisco: Harper, 1962
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms*. 1985. Urbana & Chicago: UP of Illinois, 2000.
- Knight, Charles. "Satire and the Academic Novel (1950)", *The Literary Encyclopedia*, 31.05.2006 <<http://www.litencyc.com/php/stopics.php?rec=true&UID=1549>>
- Lodge, David. *The Picturegoers*. 1960. London: Penguin, 1993.
- _____. *The British Museum is Falling Down*. 1965. England: Penguin, 1983.
2002.
- _____. *Changing Places: A Tale of Two Campuses*. 1975. USA: Penguin, 1992.
- _____. ed. *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*. 1998. Essex: Longman, 2000.
- _____. *The Art of Fiction: Illustrated from Classic and Modern Texts*. London: Penguin Books, 1994.
- _____. *Small World: An Academic Romance*. 1984. USA: Penguin, 1995.
- _____. Introduction. *Lucky Jim*. By Kingsley Amis. UK: Penguin, 2000. v-xvii.
- _____. *Language of Fiction: Essays in Criticism and Verbal Analysis of the English Novel*. 1966. London & New York: Routledge, 2002.
- _____. *Scenes of Academic Life*. London: Penguin, 2005.
- Martin, Bruce K. *David Lodge*. ed. Kinley Roby. Twayne's English Author Series. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1999.

- Morace, Robert A. *The Dialogic Novels of Malcolm Bradbury and David Lodge*
ed. Jerome Klinkowitz. Crosscurrents/Modern Critiques, Third Series. Carbondale
& Edwardsville: UP of Southern Illinois, 1989.
- Peirce, C. S. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Ed. Charles Hartshorne. Vol. 1.
Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1931-1966. 2 vols
- Rose, Margaret A. *Parody: Ancient, Modern and Post-modern*. ed. Richard Macksey.
Literature, Culture, Theory, 5, Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 1993.
- Showalter, Elaine. *Faculty Towers: The Academic Novel And Its Discontents*
(*Personal Takes*). Philadelphia: UP of Pennsylvania, 2005.
- Sociology at Hewett. "Structure and Organisation of Education" 31.05.2006
<<http://www.hewett.norfolk.sch.uk/curric/soc/EDUCATIO/struct.htm>>
- Stevenson, Randall. *The Oxford English Literary History, 1960-2000:*
The Last of England? ed. Jonathan Bate. Oxford English Literary History,
Vol 12. New York: UP of Oxford, 2004.
- Trollope, Anthony. 1857. *Barchester Towers*. Classic Reader, 31.05.2006
<<http://www.classicreader.com/read.php/sid.1/bookid.428/sec.1/>>
- Vianu, Lidia. "At the Gates of Common Sense – Malcolm Bradbury". *British Literary*
Desperadoes at the Turn of the Millennium, Bucuresti: All Publishing House,
1997 <http://lidiavianu.scriptmania.com/malcolm_bradbury.htm>
- Vianu, Lidia. "Art Must Entertain, or Give Delight". *Lidia Vianu, Desperado Essay*
-Interviews. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din, 2006.
<http://lidiavianu.scriptmania.com/david_lodge.htm>
- Watson, George. "The Future in Your Bones: C.P. Snow (1905-80)". *The Hudson Review*.
Winter 2002.
<http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa4021/is_200201/ai_n9052375>