

Charles University
Faculty of Education
Department of English Language and Literature

DIPLOMA THESIS

**Compositional-stylistic Unities
in David Lodge's *Changing Places***

Kompozičně stylistické jednoty
v románu *Hostující profesori* Davida Lodge

Author: Bc. Martina Felcmanová

English – Education Science

Supervisor: doc. PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D.

Prague 2018

Odevzdáním této diplomové práce na téma *Compositional-stylistic Unities in David Lodge's Changing Places* potvrzuji, že jsem ji vypracovala pod vedením vedoucího práce samostatně za použití v práci uvedených pramenů a literatury. Dále potvrzuji, že tato práce nebyla využita k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze, 8. dubna 2018

Martina Felcmanová

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my supervisor, doc. PhDr. Petr Chalupský, Ph.D., for his support, guidance and valuable advice, which were essential to the completion of my diploma thesis.

Abstract

The main aim of this diploma thesis is to focus on the forms in which heteroglossia manifests itself in the most widely known campus novel of David Lodge, *Changing Places*. The Theoretical Part explains the two crucial terms of Mikhail Bakhtin's literary theory, namely heteroglossia and dialogism, and describes the impact his ideas had on the critical writings of David Lodge. Moreover, it strives to combine Bakhtin's and Lodge's typologies of novelistic discourse with the terminology of Seymour Chatman, in order to create sufficient terminological framework for the subsequent stylistic analysis. Consequently, the Practical Part attempts to explore how the separate unities of heteroglossia are represented within the structure of *Changing Places*, what effect they have on the implied reader and how they influence the novel as a whole.

Key words

Dialogism, Diegesis, Heteroglossia, Mimesis, Pictorial Style of Reporting, Stylistic Unities, The Real Author, The Implied Author, The Narrator, The Real Author, The Implied Author, The Narratee, Indirect Speech, Interior monologue

Abstrakt

Hlavním cílem této diplomové práce je analyzovat různé formy, jež umožňují vstup heteroglosie do nejznámějšího románu Davida Lodge, *Hostující profesori*. Teoretická část práce vysvětluje dva zásadní termíny literární teorie Mikhaila Bakhtina, konkrétně heteroglosii a dialogismus, a popisuje vliv, který jeho myšlenky měly na teoretické statě Davida Lodge. V rámci teoretické části také dochází k pokusu o propojení typologií novelistického diskurzu obou autorů s terminologií Seymoura Chatmana ve snaze vytvořit dostatečný terminologický rámec pro následnou stylistickou analýzu. Praktická část se následně pokouší odhalit, jakým způsobem jsou jednotlivé stylistické jednoty heteroglosie reprezentovány v románu *Hostující Profesori*, jakých efektů jejich použití dosahuje u implikovaného čtenáře a jakým způsobem ovlivňují román jako celek.

Klíčová slova

Dialogismus, Diegesis, Heteroglosie, Mimesis, Piktoriální styl nepřímé řeči, Stylistické jednoty, Skutečný autor, Implikovaný autor, Vypravěč, Skutečný čtenář, Implikovaný čtenář, Posluchač

Obsah

Introduction	1
1 Introduction of basic concepts	3
1.1 Linguistics, Stylistics and Literary Studies	3
1.2 The relationship of fiction and literary criticism in the light of the traditional humanist model, structuralism and post-structuralism.....	4
2 The novel's identity	8
3 Heteroglossia and Dialogism	11
3.1 Basic compositional-stylistic unities of the novel	12
3.2 The novelist's position within heteroglossia	13
3.3 Heteroglossia in the comic novel.....	14
4 Post-modernist fiction in the light of Lodge's typology of novelistic discourse ...	15
4.1 Diegesis and Mimesis	15
4.2 The Pictorial Style of Reporting	17
4.3 Doubly-oriented speech.....	17
5 Selected literary devices of post-modernist fiction.....	19
5.1 Parties of the Narrative Transaction	20
5.2 Nonnarration, Covert and Overt Narration.....	21
5.3 Metafiction and the intrusive author.....	22
5.4 Point of view and Defamiliarization.....	22
6 The Structuring of the Compositional-Stylistic Unities in Changing Places.....	25
6.1 Flying.....	25
6.1.1 Narrator, Narratee and the Textual Structure	26
6.1.2 Characterisation and Setting.....	27
6.1.3 Summary of the Stylistic Unities	37
6.2 Settling.....	39
6.2.1 Direct authorial narration	41
6.2.2 Direct Speech and Defamiliarization	44

6.2.3	The Stylistic Clash of the American and British Communicative Style	45
6.2.4	Stylisation of Semi-Literary Narration.....	49
6.2.5	The Different Unities Introducing Different Points of View	53
6.3	Corresponding and Reading	55
6.3.1	Contrast of the two marriages	58
6.3.2	Multiplicity of points of view.....	59
6.3.3	Defamiliarization and stereotypes	65
6.4	Changing.....	65
6.5	Ending.....	67
	Conclusion.....	71
	Sources	79
	Primary sources	79
	Secondary sources	79

Introduction

The main objective of this thesis is to demonstrate Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia in the selected novel of David Lodge, namely *Changing Places* (1975). The thesis strives, firstly, to identify the separate compositional-stylistic unities that enable heteroglossia of a language to enter a novel. Secondly, it focuses on the analysis of the way and the purpose for which these specific unities were used by the novelist. Thirdly, it attempts to describe the effect their employment has on the reading experience.

David Lodge is, firstly, a renowned British author, whose campus novels *Changing Places* and *Nice Work* were shortlisted for the Booker Prize. Apart from his career as a novelist, however, he is also a former English Literature Professor at Birmingham University and a literary critic. In one of his publications of literary criticism, *After Bakhtin* (1990), Lodge explains the crucial impact of Mikhail Bakhtin's literary theory on the development of literary criticism of the novelistic genre. Furthermore, the significance of Bakhtin's theory on Lodge's own writing is considerable. He states that it has achieved "the same effect, as of a light-bulb being switched on in one's head" as it revealed to him "why [he] was a novelist rather than a poet" (Lodge, *After* 7). Thus, it was interesting to analyse not only how the different voices of heteroglossia interact within Lodge's most widely known post-modernist novel, *Changing Places*, but also to detect the ubiquitous dialogism between his critical essays and prosaic writing (which is influenced by his life-experience of a university lecturer).

The structure of the proposed thesis is divided into two parts, the Theoretical and the Practical. The Theoretical Part is devoted to the terminology that needs to be established before the analysis can be carried out in the Practical Part. Prior to the introduction of the most crucial stylistic concepts of Mikhail Bakhtin, the thesis delves into the struggle between the disciplines that claim the authority over the study of language and the increasingly more complicated relationship of fiction and the conflicting theories of literary criticism. After sketching the main reasons for discord between linguistics, stylistics and literary criticism and the contradictions of traditional humanism and post-structuralist theories, the theoretical part introduces the focal points of this thesis, namely Bakhtin's concepts of heteroglossia and dialogism. As Lodge explains in his own theoretical works, the posthumous discovery of Bakhtin's stylistics shed a new light onto literary criticism and the stylistics of the novel in particular. The following chapter, therefore, endeavours to canvass the influence Bakhtin's literary theory had on Lodge's own typology of novelistic discourse. The last chapter of the theoretical part then focuses on

additional classifications of the narrative, since it, firstly, relates to the terminology used by Lodge and, secondly, provides further tools for the analytical part of the thesis.

Consequently, in the Practical Part, the analysis is carried out of how the stylistic unities defined by Bakhtin are horizontally structured within each chapter to compose the artistic whole of *Changing Places*. Thus, the Practical Part consists of five sub-chapters, each corresponding to one chapter of the novel (except for Chapter 6.3, which provides a combined analysis of two chapters of *Changing Places*, namely “Corresponding” and “Reading”) and focusing on how, why and to which effect the individual unities are used in the individual chapters. The conclusion, then, strives to examine the unities from the vertical perspective to compare and contrast the diverse alternations of the stylistic unities that Lodge employs in each chapter and the various literary effects the specific combinations enable him to achieve in the mind of the implied reader.

Theoretical Part

1 Introduction of basic concepts

Before delving into the different theories of Lodge, Bakhtin or Jakobson, it is crucial to understand, firstly, the relationship between different disciplines whose primary interest lies in the study of language and, secondly, the “fierce struggle for intellectual dominance” (Lodge, *Language* xi) between conflicting literary theories, schools and methodologies. They all, like different voices of heteroglossia, interact and influence each other dialogically and it is thus impossible to seriously study one without the need to at least touch upon the others.

1.1 Linguistics, Stylistics and Literary Studies

Firstly, it might be useful to demonstrate the relationships and struggle for dominance between linguistics, stylistics and literary studies, by which I mean both literary theory and literary criticism.

From the linguistic perspective, there is a name that has to be mentioned since one cannot progress very far in any field connected with the study of language without at least a brief reference to Ferdinand de Saussure. His division of language into *langue* and *parole* together with the introduction of a linguistic sign that consists of two aspects, “the signified” and “the signifier”, influenced any study of language that followed. As Lodge aptly encapsulated, Saussure explained that language is a structure, “a system of differences” where any signification is possible not because of “the relationship between words and things” but thanks to the “difference between elements of the linguistic system” (Lodge, *After* 13) and thus gave rise to structuralist and post-structuralist theories.

In contrast, while Saussure called for the linguistic study of *langue*, Bakhtin approached language as “essentially social or *dialogic*” (Lodge, *After* 57) and by his “interest [...] in each specific game of chess, and not in the rules” (Vice 11) he anticipated modern linguistic disciplines, which focus mostly on the study of *parole* or discourse. Consequently, this approach to language greatly influenced Bakhtin’s stylistics of the novel, which is discussed in greater detail in chapter 3.

Roman Jakobson, a linguist and literary critic, claimed in his essay *Linguistics and Poetics* that “[p]oetics is entitled to the leading place in literary studies” and since “[it] deals with

problems of verbal structure” and “linguistics is the global science of verbal structure, poetics may be regarded as an integral part of linguistics” (Jakobson 350). According to this logic, linguistics is somewhat superior to literary studies.

David Lodge, on the other hand, states that literary criticism is irreplaceable by linguistics because literary interpretation is to a certain degree always subjective and its findings cannot be scientifically validated, unlike, of course, in the field of linguistics. However, he explains that “there are recurrent attempts to import the ‘scientific’ methods of linguistics into literary criticism *via* stylistics” (Lodge, *Language* 61). Lodge, who frequently uses the above mentioned methods of stylistics and refers to the work of Bakhtin and Jacobson, repeatedly claims in his essays that linguistics and literary studies are two disciplines of equal importance and value that cannot, however, ever be merged into one. Neither can one gain dominance over the other. Nevertheless, by cooperation they can learn and profit from each other.

1.2 The relationship of fiction and literary criticism in the light of the traditional humanist model, structuralism and post-structuralism

Apart from the potentially diverging perspectives of linguistics and literary studies that were briefly discussed above, Lodge draws attention to the development of the relationship between fiction and its production and literary criticism, which has gradually become more and more complicated.

He states that at the beginning of his parallel novelistic and academic career in the early 1960s “the relationship between fiction and criticism was comparatively unproblematical” (Lodge, *After* 11). In a word, since the academic study of literature depended (and despite structuralist and deconstruction theories it still largely depends) on a canon, the task of critical activity consisted, firstly, of “description, interpretation and evaluation of texts” and, secondly, of “the maintenance of a canon” (Lodge, *After* 11). He provides a metaphor to explain such a canonical selection, when he compares “the storehouse of fiction” to a pyramid, where “there is a lot of space on the ground floor for contemporary work” but “[t]he top floor reserved for the classics, is very small” since “the collective consciousness can store only a finite number of texts” (Lodge, *After* 11).

Lodge labels this traditional fiction-criticism relationship as the “humanist model”, or he uses a term coined by Catherine Belsey: “expressive realism” (Lodge, *After* 12). He says that in this model both academic critics and reviewers “shared the same implied aesthetic” according

to which the novels are “powerful expressions of a unique sensibility [...] – the author’s – and more or less truthful representations of reality” (Lodge, *After* 12). Consequently, it was the critic’s task to assess and comment on whether (and how) the novel succeeds to represent the author’s world-view and present the reader with a semblance of a real-life experience of the world.

However, after the rise of structuralism, which based its theories on Saussurean linguistics, in the 1960s and the development of the varied branches of post-structuralism (e.g. deconstruction, feminist theory) in the 1970s, a lot of paradox and contradiction occurred between the practice of writing and literary theory and criticism (Lodge, *After*). It logically ensues that the line between structuralism, post-structuralism and deconstruction is extremely blurred and even the most prominent theorists, such as Roland Barthes, Jacques Lacan, Michel Foucault or Jacques Derrida, are generally labelled as both structuralists and post-structuralists (Culler 123-6). Lodge describes post-structuralism as “a second phase of [structuralist] debate” which “became more and more scholastic, esoteric and inward-looking” (Lodge, *After Bakhtin* 13). Therefore, since these theories are outside the main objective of this thesis, only their brief outline needs to be given. I do not meticulously distinguish between structuralism and post-structuralism and throughout the thesis I am generally using “post-structuralism” as a term encompassing all the related concepts, i.e. structuralist as well as deconstructionist.

As a visual aid one could place the different literary theories on a scale with the humanist model or “expressive realism” at one end and the theory of post-structuralism at the other; the two crucial issues in which these two extremes differ most fundamentally being the relationship of the author to his work and of fiction to reality. The expressive realism considers a novel to be the creation of the author, who is “the originator and in some sense owner of his work” (Lodge, *After* 14), in which he conveys his “observation and experience” (Lodge, *After Bakhtin* 16) of reality. In contrast, structuralism criticises the basic premises on which expressive realism stands, beginning with the essential notion of the author’s existence.

The structuralist theory, like Saussure, puts emphasis on the system as such. It is not interested in the uniqueness of literary texts, but in what underlies them – the codes, conventions and rules they share. Thus, structuralism and post-structuralism began to disturb the traditional humanist model by subverting the position of the author and by assigning the ability to produce meaning to texts and their readers instead (Lodge, *After*). Barthes claims that “the modern scriptor is born simultaneously with the text” and it does not precede or exceed its writing because “every text is written here and now” (Barthes 145). Similarly, Paul de Man denied any

connection of fiction and reality, when he said that “readers degrade the fiction by confusing it with a reality from which it has forever taken leave” (De Man 17). Since the semiotic systems could be studied in folk tales and myths as well as in the products of popular culture, the importance of maintaining a literary canon diminished significantly. In addition, structuralism attacked “the notion of realism”, calling it “an art of bad faith” that denies “its own conventionality” (Lodge, *After* 13), and serves as “an instrument of ideology” by pretending that “bourgeois culture is ‘natural’” (Lodge, *After* 122). Lodge tellingly summarized the effect post-structuralism had on traditional literary studies when he compared it to “an earthquake followed by a tidal wave” (Lodge, *After* 88).

It comes as no surprise that there is a huge contrariety between post-structuralist theories that are demolishing the traditional idea of an author who nourishes his creation, who “exists before it, thinks, suffers, lives for it” and whose relation to his book is that of “a father to his child” (Barthes 145) and the way fiction is received in modern culture. Lodge states that despite the fact that such theories took literary criticism by storm, the general reception of fiction is more focused on the author than ever before, as writers receive prizes for their books, give interviews and public readings. Furthermore, he claims that he does “feel a kind of parental responsibility of the novels” he writes and that his fiction “is in some significant sense a representation of the real world” (Lodge, *After* 15). Nevertheless, he does admit that the attention paid to authors of fiction gives rise to many unwanted questions that excessively “emphasize the mimetic connection between fiction and reality” with the negative effect of “a reductively empirist reading” that seeks to “establish a perfect fit between the novelist’s personal identity and his *oeuvre*” (Lodge, *After* 16).

Post-structuralist theories seem to provide only two extreme options from which one has to choose: that a text either (A) conveys a “single meaning”, a single realisation of reality created strictly by the author, or (B) it is “a system capable of generating an infinite number of meanings when activated by the reader” (Lodge, *After* 159). However, Lodge is reluctant to identify with either option, as any modern writer who is at the same time “familiar with modern critical theory” should be suspicious of both (Lodge, *After* 159). In general, although he finds some of the concepts of post-structuralism fruitful, he disagrees with most of its theories. He doubts that any person following the deconstructionist doctrine could even create a novel (Lodge, *Language* 300) and he states that he finds “the post-structuralist attack on the idea of the author and on the communicative function of language unappealing, to say the least” (Lodge, *After* 89).

The posthumous occurrence of Bakhtin's work in the 1980s offered a solution that enabled a reconciliation of this conflict between post-structuralist and humanist critics. In Lodge's view Bakhtin's typology of literary discourse gave "hope to literary critics who were beginning to wonder whether there was life after post-structuralism" (Lodge, *After* 4) because of his "timely reaffirmation of the writer's creative and communicative power" (Lodge, *After* 7) that post-structuralism disclaimed altogether.

As has already been mentioned, Bakhtin's linguistics is essentially "a linguistics of *parole*" in which a word is not "a two-sided sign" but "a two-sided *act*" (Lodge, *After* 21). Consequently, meaning is not created by the differences between linguistic signs but by the interaction and struggle for power between utterances. A word is never impersonal or neutral but always innately dialogic. That means that it exists only "in other people's mouths, [...] contexts [and] serving other people's intentions" (Bakhtin, *Discourse* 294) and it is always "directed towards an answer" that it anticipates and by which it is inescapably shaped (Bakhtin, *Discourse* 280). Thus, Lodge argues that there is no need to refute the post-structuralist notion that meaning cannot be located in isolated utterances, as Bakhtin aptly demonstrated that there is no such thing as a truly isolated utterance and he claims that:

Instead of trying desperately to defend the notion that individual utterances, or texts, have a fixed, original meaning which it is the business of criticism to recover, we can locate meaning in the dialogic process of interaction between speaking subjects, between texts and readers, between texts themselves. (Lodge, *After* 86)

Moreover, *parole* cannot be explained simply by reference to *langue* because the only way to understand any utterance is to view it in its context which inevitably entails non-verbal elements such as "the status of and relations between speaker, addressee and the object of reference" (Lodge, *After* 58). Consequently, neither language nor literature can be described with scientific precision, as any thorough analysis needs to take into account even such non-linguistic data.

Thus Lodge, with Bakhtin's assistance, manages to merge the antithetical theories of expressive realism and post-structuralism. On the one hand, he agrees with expressive realism, that literary works do not just accidentally happen. They are intentional products of novelists who thus partly convey their own experience and a view of reality. On the other hand, he argues, that Bakhtin's introduction of heteroglossia explained that even if a writer strived to force his individual point of view on the reader, the multiplicity of voices that are inherent in the novel

would preclude him from doing so. Similarly, he admits that although his emotions towards his works under creation are of parental nature, “once the child leaves home” (Lodge, *After* 159) – meaning after the book is published, the situation changes:

It is of the nature of texts, especially fictional ones, that they have gaps and indeterminacies which may be filled in by different readers in different ways, and it is of the nature of codes that, once brought into play, they may generate patterns of significance which were not consciously intended by the author who activated them, and which do not require his “authorization” to be accepted as valid interpretations of the text. (Lodge, *After* 159)

To conclude, Bakhtin’s legacy enables the literary critic to assume a neutral position between the extreme attitudes of expressive realism and post-structuralism. Thus, it can be said that novels come into being thanks to the creative minds of living individuals. However, after the process of creation is completed, the text is separated from its author and new meanings can be produced by the reader. As to the fiction-reality relationship, the critic must realise that although the novelist might be inspired by his personal experience, it is not reality that the novel shows. It is an artistic *representation* of reality and the critic’s interest should not lie in the connections between the artist’s life and his work, a fact frequently referred to by novelists themselves.

2 The novel’s identity

The outline of the way linguistics and literary studies intermingle and of the struggle between the most prominent literary theories brings us to the identity of the novel as a literary genre. It has already been demonstrated above that a novel is both a representation of a reality by its author and a text open to infinite number of interpretations by an infinite number of readers. The question still remains, however, what exactly the novelist’s medium is and what precisely the art of novel-making encompasses.

It is indisputable that a crucial purpose of the novel is to provide a certain view of life, to create a representation of reality. If the author’s construction of this fictional world is successful, the reader, convinced by the illusion, shares the provided life-perspective at least as long as the reading experience lasts. Thus, it can be said, and it is claimed by both Bakhtin and Lodge, that fiction is greatly a rhetorical art thanks to its ability to address, impress and persuade its reader.

In his first book of literary criticism, *Language of Fiction* (1966), Lodge ponders whether the novel's most characteristic aspect is the successful representation of life as such, or the way the novelist creates this reality, comprising of characters and their actions, through words. He concludes that language, rather than life, is the novelist's most crucial medium. Although terms such as *plot* or *character* remain indispensable to novel criticism, one should keep in mind that the objects and events in which the writer represents reality are "abstractions formed from accumulated messages conveyed through language" (Lodge, *Language* 18). Therefore, it follows logically that if the art of poetry is considered an art of language, then the art of the novel must be treated in an equal manner. Thus, the critic is obliged to be committed to the study of the novel's language as fully as the critic of poetry (Lodge, *Language* 50).

However, in the afterword written eighteen years later as well as in his later books of literary criticism, Lodge significantly alters his standpoint. He acknowledges that there are fundamental differences between novels and poetry and thus poetics that is based on the latter is not automatically applicable to novel criticism. Instead of assuming an extreme monist position by insisting on the inseparability of meaning and form (where the form is superior to the meaning), he later accepts that "narrative is itself a language, a code of signification [...] that functions independently of specific verbal formulations" (Lodge, *Language* 291). Consequently, he divides narrative texts into two levels. Firstly, "a deeper level" where the author's fundamental decisions about, for example, the point of view or the management of time are realised and, secondly, "the surface structure of the text", where the action and characterization is shaped into an exact verbal form (Lodge, *Language* 291). The deeper level of a novel remains unaltered even if it is transferred to a different medium (e.g. a film) or translated into a different language and therefore it has an aesthetic quality of its own and might be analysed separately from the surface structure.

Bakhtin's arguments mostly go along the same lines as Lodge's as he strives to defend novelistic prose from the attacks that exclude novels from artistic genres altogether and as he stresses the need of the novel to have stylistics of its own. Thanks to the fact that novels take on a form of everyday discourse and typically do not resemble any form associated with poetry, the novel has often been labelled as "an extra-artistic medium" which lacks any unique style and therefore any artistic value (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 260). In Bakhtin's view, the association of the novel with rhetoric discourse, although essentially wrong, is still largely positive. He states that any attempt to analyse a novel by using the means of traditional stylistic categories, which were designed to fit poetic genres, must inevitably fail. The critic either provides a linguistic

description of an author's language or dissects a few stylistic elements that can be comprehended by poetics, while ignoring the rest of the work. Neither of these options enables us to give an account of the novel in its totality and both are therefore insufficient. Bakhtin claims that the novel's proximity to rhetorical genres is the same as to the epic, dramatic or lyric ones and that the novel has always "preserved its own qualitative uniqueness and was never reducible to rhetorical discourse" (Bakhtin, *Discourse* 269).

The fundamental difference between poetic genres in the narrow sense and novelistic prose lies mainly in the approach of the artist to language. The traditional poetic genres (epic, lyric and tragedy) employ "each word, each expression according to its unmediated power to assign meaning" without making use of its "natural dialogization" (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 285). A poet thus strips his language of all the additional semantic meanings and overtones that are naturally imposed on it by other speakers, he monologizes it, to be able to express the poet's direct intention and a unified view of the world.

In contrast, novelistic discourse is "a phenomenon multiform in style and variform in speech and voice" (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 261). It is precisely the novel's ability to display as many kinds of discourses as possible within a single work, without deforming their own expressive capacity that makes narrative prose so distinct from poetry. Bakhtin claims that the world of a novelist is "full of other people's words, among which he must orient himself" and "introduce them into the plane of his own discourse" (Bakhtin, *Problems* 200-1). It is an innate quality of novels, to be able to display not one, but various ideological perspectives through characters and their actions. It is essential to realise that while in everyday discourse language is there to serve the speaker as means of conveying information, in a novel, it is contrariwise. Language does not fulfil the needs of characters, but the characters and their actions fulfil the needs of various "languages" that the novelist wishes to display. Similarly, the plot is "subordinated to the task of coordinating and exposing languages to each other" (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 365).

To summarise, it has been established that the novel as a literary genre is very close to the art of rhetoric thanks to the ability to address its readers and provide them with a certain representation of reality. At the same time, however, the novelist always fills his work with various discourses and voices of others. Thus, instead of trying to impose upon the reader a single authoritarian impression of the world of his own, the author's primal aim is to display numerous ideologies or "images of languages" (Bakhtin, *Discourse* 366) through speaking persons and their actions. This multiplicity of voices within the novel and the display of

ideologies that interact, clash and illuminate each other takes us to Bakhtin's two key concepts: heteroglossia and dialogism.

3 Heteroglossia and Dialogism

It has been discussed already that, from the linguistic perspective, Bakhtin was interested in living discourse, or the *parole* aspect of language. To understand his own stylistics of the novelistic discourse, one must firstly understand his description of language as a social phenomenon. According to Bakhtin, every language is internally stratified into:

[...] social dialects, characteristic group behaviour, professional jargons, genetic languages, languages of generations and age groups, tendentious languages, languages of the authorities, of various circles and of passing fashions, languages that serve the specific socio-political purposes of the day, even of the hour (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 262-3)

A logical consequence of this stratification is the fact that any language at any moment of its existence is heteroglot and:

[I]t represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, all given a bodily form." (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 291)

Bakhtin labels this stratification of "social" languages within one language as "heteroglossia", while any interaction, any communication or conflict between them is called "dialogism". In simple terms, heteroglossia means the existence of these languages and it is a "linguistic description", while dialogism is "a relational property" (Vice 50). It goes without saying that even though heteroglossia and dialogism are two distinct concepts, it is virtually impossible to speak of or detect one without the other. It must also be emphasised that the post-structuralist term "intertextuality", which was coined by Julia Kristeva in 1966, is derived from Bakhtin's concept of dialogism (Kristeva 34).

Bakhtin explains that every one of these languages (e.g. a professional jargon) presents a distinct perspective of the world. Therefore, the languages can all "be juxtaposed to one another, mutually supplement one another, contradict one another and be interrelated dialogically" (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 292). However, according to Bakhtin, there is a significant difference in the

approach that the poet and the novelist adopt towards this multiplicity of voices that is omnipresent in every language.

While a poet intentionally ignores this stratification, and introduces only a single style into his discourse, a novelist borrows as many of “social speech types” and “individual languages” as possible and artistically organizes them within his work (Bakhtin, *Discourse* 262). Thus, the novelist actively enables heteroglossia to enter the novel and the dialogism that is thus created between the various voices is idiosyncratic of the genre. Consequently, Bakhtin argues that the traditional stylistics is inapplicable to the novel because it was designed to describe genres that are essentially “single-linguaged” and “single styled” (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 266) and he introduces stylistics of his own.

3.1 Basic compositional-stylistic unities of the novel

According to Bakhtin, if a novel is studied properly, the critic encounters within it “several heterogeneous stylistic unities” that are “often located on different linguistic levels and subject to different stylistic controls” (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 261). These basic compositional-stylistic unities, “with whose help heteroglossia can enter the novel” (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 263), are as follows:

- (1) Direct authorial literary-artistic narration (in all its diverse variants);
- (2) Stylization of the various forms of oral everyday narration (*skaz*);
- (3) Stylization of the various forms of semiliterary (written) everyday narration (the letter, the diary, etc.);
- (4) Various forms of literary but extra-artistic authorial speech (moral, philosophical or scientific statements, oratory, ethnographic descriptions, memoranda and so forth);
- (5) The stylistically individualized speech of characters (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 262)

Every single component of a novel (typically a phrase or a clause) is firstly informed lexically, semantically and syntactically by the stylistic unity to which it immediately belongs as these unities can function within the novel quite autonomously (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 262).

The direct authorial narration usually provides a certain stylistic backdrop, a neutral language, against which all the other voices stand in contrast (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 314). Simultaneously, it presents the direct expression of the writer’s intentions (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 301). A *skaz* narrator is an epitome of such contrasting tendencies as it enables the novelist to

assume a highly colloquial style of oral narration. The immediate elements that fall under this subordinate stylistic unity thus take on the features characteristic of *skaz*, such as syntactically simple sentences that are full of repetition, exaggeration, slang expressions and grammatical mistakes (Lodge, *Art* 18-19). Incorporating either artistic (e.g. lyrical songs, poems, short stories) or extra-artistic genres (e.g. essays, letters, reviews, newspaper articles) into the novel renders the same effect, as all of them are idiosyncratic in terms of lexis and in formal stylistic rules they must follow (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 320-321). Lodge explains the purpose of the forth compositional-stylistic unity quite clearly. He states that authorial narration can be easily used as a device of introducing “encyclopedic knowledge and proverbial wisdom” into the novel (Lodge, *Art* 10). Lastly, the voices of different characters do not only present various inconsistent belief systems but they also provide the writer with many secondary languages that he can impersonate (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 315).

However, none of these subordinate unities alone has the power to determine the overall style of the novel. It is the exact way in which they are combined and organised within it into a “structured artistic system” that determines “[t]he stylistic uniqueness of the novel as a whole” (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 262). Thus, the novel’s style can be described as nothing less than the ultimate combination of all these subordinate styles contained within and, by the same token, the novel’s language comprises all the types of discourse used.

These five subordinate stylistic unities facilitate the introduction of heteroglossia, i.e. different social voices of a language, into the novel and each of these voices presents a different world-view (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 333). Consequently, heteroglossia enables the novelist to bring different ideologies and language varieties into conflict and allows them to compete for influence and social significance.

3.2 The novelist’s position within heteroglossia

When writing narrative prose, the author discovers that his medium at hand is not language but languages, as he is “already surrounded by heteroglossia” of his epoch (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 295). Lodge explains virtually the same idea in *Language of Fiction*, a book written before Bakhtin’s work was published in English, when he says that:

The writer’s medium differs from the media of most other arts [...] in that it is never virgin: words come to the writer already violated by other men, impressed with meanings derived from the world of common experience. (Lodge, *Language* 50)

As if agreeing with Lodge, Bakhtin states that the novelist does not purify the words that are populated by other people's intentions. Instead he incorporates this language diversity into his work. However, the writer's design is not expressed directly. It is in a way "refracted" into separate compositional-stylistic unities and the reader is compelled to collate it from various voices of heteroglossia through which the whole work is organised (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 292). While consciously composing his style out of these languages, the author does not necessarily identify himself with any of these voices. Consequently, he shifts his position from one voice to another, and while exploiting them to achieve his own artistic purpose, he can retain a neutral stance within their ideological and stylistic dialogism.

3.3 Heteroglossia in the comic novel

Bakhtin states that the author's dynamic motion through various strata of language is especially profound in the form of the comic novel. There "the comic style demands of the author a lively to-and-fro movement in relation to language" so that distinct aspects of heteroglossia are exposed (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 302). Sometimes, different voices are intentionally exaggerated and at other times the author blends in with someone else's discourse to let his own stand-point resonate with it.

Most importantly, Bakhtin claims that the English comic novel typically represents and parodically stylizes "almost all the levels of literary language, both conversational and written, that were current at the time" (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 301). To provide an example of languages that are thus reproduced he mentions, for instance, the language of newspaper articles, the professional jargons of politicians, businessmen of the City or university academics. Similarly, the speech of different socially determined characters is a device of the author to introduce different languages, typical of his epoch, into the novel (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 301).

Interestingly, Lodge states that thanks to Bakhtin's explanation of how the novelist exploits and shapes the heteroglossia that surrounds him, he retrospectively understood why he creates novels rather than poetry. He says that it helped him realise why he has always been attracted to "pastiche, parody and travesty", among others, of precisely the same type of discourse that he seriously strives to produce as an academic critic (Lodge, *After* 6).

4 Post-modernist fiction in the light of Lodge's typology of novelistic discourse

As has been established in the previous chapter, Bakhtin aptly demonstrated that the novelist possesses the ability to incorporate various heteroglot voices of the language that surround him into his work. Thus, he presents an illusory world in which he orchestrates different ideologies through narrators, speech and action of characters or incorporated genres.

This coexistence of multiple ideologies is, as Linda Hutcheon, the author of *A Poetics of Postmodernism* (1988), explains one of the crucial features of postmodernism. She states that postmodernism “retains its own contradictions” and “foregrounds them to such an extent that they become the very defining characteristics”. Instead of succumbing to absolutism, postmodernism lays bare the fact that “there are all kinds of orders and systems in our world - and that we create them all”, which is both their “justification” and “limitation” (Hutcheon 43).

Consequently, this chapter focuses on Lodge's typology of novelistic discourse. A typology which he creates to better describe the most crucial differences between the realist, modernist and post-modernist literary tradition. In the process, Lodge largely draws on Bakhtin's stylistics presented in the *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art* but also incorporates terminology of other authors.

He states that he is “dissatisfied with maps of contemporary fiction” because they comprehend only the “most deviant and marginal kinds of writing” while ignoring the rest (Lodge, *After* 26). For that reason, he searches for a theory that would allow him to produce a subtler interpretation of fiction and simultaneously a formal, rather than ideological distinction of realism, modernism and post-modernism. He merges and polishes three closely related concepts to suite his own purpose: Platonic typology of narrative and discourse typologies of Bakhtin and his colleague Valentin Volosinov. It should be mentioned that Volosinov's work is often considered to be the work of Bakhtin, who was not allowed to publish under his name in Stalinist Russia (Lodge, *After* 2).

4.1 Diegesis and Mimesis

Firstly, Lodge explores Plato's division of narrative into diegesis and mimesis. The terms, which were coined in Book III. of *The Republic*, have undergone a long development. They were used normatively, firstly by Plato himself and subsequently by the Modernists. While

Plato feared that mimesis threatened “the unity of soul” of the Republic’s citizens and, thus, considered it unethical and dangerous, the Modernists, on the other hand, found the diegetic mode inartistic and sought to eradicate it from novelistic discourse altogether. Since then, however, other authors attempted to overcome the insufficiencies of the diegesis/mimesis dichotomy by extending, supplementing and reworking it into an efficient tool which would be applicable to a descriptive analysis of novelistic narrative.

Booth, who labels these two modes of writing as telling and showing (Booth 3), respectively, disputes the dogmatic doctrine of the modernists. In his view, the novelist composes his work in such a way as to control the “reader’s involvement and detachment along various lines of interest” and he needs to choose the mode most suitable for his artistic design (Booth 123). He distinguishes between three types of literary interest, the intellectual, the qualitative and the practical (Booth 125). The intellectual interest is raised by a kind of truth (e.g. about the norms and values of the given fictional world) or knowledge that can be discovered within a work or in the pleasure of uncovering recurrent themes, images and symbols (Booth 126). The qualitative interest is satisfied by features such as causal chains of events, stylistic excellence, special wit, irony, ambiguity or when the novel fulfils the conventional expectations about the specific genre (Booth 127). Lastly, the practical interest, which is often considered the least artistic and therefore least desirable and yet, which is most commonly the main motivation that compels the reader to continue, lies in the emotional engagement in either the plot or the characters’ development. Since every type of interest is highlighted through different rhetorical tools, it is the job of a literary critic to judge the successful employment of telling or showing in the specific context of the work rather than to discard the artistic value of one of the modes altogether.

Having briefly established the validity of both narrative modes, it is necessary to firstly provide the basic contemporary definition of the two terms, before one can approach the improved and extended narrative typology of Lodge. Diegesis occurs whenever the novelist reports, describes, summarises or comments on what is happening, in other words, when he literally tells the reader about characters and their actions. Mimesis, on the other hand, takes place when the author shows his reader what is going on through the direct speech of his characters. Consequently, the diegetic mode corresponds to Bakhtin’s first stylistic unity, the direct authorial literary artistic narration, while the mimetic mode is analogous with the fifth unity of the individualized speech of characters.

4.2 The Pictorial Style of Reporting

However, this simple distinction of mimetic and diegetic mode cannot account for a third possibility that is characteristic of the novel, namely the mode of reported speech (Lodge, *After* 28-29). At this point, therefore, Lodge borrows Volosinov's concept that divides reported speech into linear and pictorial style of reporting.

In linear reported speech, it is always clear where diegesis ends and mimesis begins. The reader is either presented with authorial commentary or direct speech of the characters and if any reporting occurs, it is stylistically indistinguishable from the authorial narration. Therefore, it is not of prominent interest in terms of novelistic discourse. It is the pictorial style that is typical for narrative prose. It enables the novelist to present what his characters think and feel, in addition to what they say, through a complex fusion of telling and showing. In contrast to linear reporting, the pictorial reported speech retains the style belonging to the character in question. At the same time, however, it is somewhat tainted by the author's attitude. Thus, it may add, for instance, ironical, critical, loving, humorous and many other overtones. Reported speech is, therefore, extensively exploited in novelistic discourse, because it allows the author to move freely and fluently from diegesis to mimesis and vice versa. In consequence, the authorial and character's speech often become intermingled to the point where it is impossible to recognize one from the other (Lodge, *After* 30-1).

Thus, in the novel, one usually encounters diegesis, mimesis and reported speech, especially the pictorial style of reporting. It is, therefore, rather surprising that in Bakhtin's stylistics, the pictorial style does not merit a separate category and is labelled as "represented speech" together with the direct speech of characters (Lodge, *After* 33). However, as the pictorial reporting stylistically merges Bakhtin's first and fifth unity, and yet cannot be decisively matched with either, Lodge's incorporation of the term into his own typology presents a powerful tool for the practical analysis of novelistic discourse.

4.3 Doubly-oriented speech

Moreover, Lodge draws attention to an additional category that is contained within Bakhtin's typology, which goes beyond the terminology of Plato or Volosinov, namely the concept of "doubly-oriented speech". A term that Lodge considers "Bakhtin's most original and valuable contribution to stylistic analysis" (Lodge, *After* 59).

Bakhtin describes doubly-oriented speech as any speech that “serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: [e.g.] the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author” (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 324). This, of course, is exactly the fraction of the author’s design through various compositional-stylistic unities that bring heteroglossia into the novel, which has been discussed in the previous chapter. There are four subordinate terms that fall under Bakhtin’s doubly-oriented speech: “stylization, parody, *skaz*” and “hidden polemic” (Lodge, *After* 33).

Stylization means that the author “borrows another’s discourse and uses it for his own purposes”, however, he does not change the original intention of the discourse that he appropriates (Lodge, *After* 59). Conversely, parody stylistically mimics another’s discourse but uses it for “a purpose opposite or incongruous with the intention of the original” (Lodge, *After* 60). Hutcheon labels parody as “a privileged mode of postmodern formal self-reflexivity” and “a favourite postmodern literary form of writers” who are in some sense outside the dominant culture (such as “black, ethnic, gay, and feminist artists”). She explains that parody enables the postmodern artist to “speak to a discourse from within” the past or present without the need of “being totally recuperated by it” (Hutcheon 35). Consequently, the author may retain his idiosyncratic style and ideological stance, and to exploit the borrowed discourse to achieve his own artistic purposes. Both stylization and parody imitate the syntax and lexis of another’s speech and their employment is at its most striking when the novelist incorporates other genres into his work. This specific type of doubly-oriented speech is, therefore, most prominent in Bakhtin’s third stylistic unity (stylisation of various forms of semi-literary everyday narration).

A *hidden polemic* is a term for any discourse that seems to expect and answer someone else’s comment, retort or objection that is, however, not directly contained within the text (Lodge, *After* 86). It is particularly characteristic of letters, where the author often anticipates a reaction of the recipient and tries to address it in one way or the other. Ample examples of hidden polemic can also be identified in academic writing, where the writer expects possible counter-arguments of fellow academics or criticism of future reviewers. Therefore, it seems appropriate to demonstrate the concept using two passages from Lodge’s critical essays. In the first example, he anticipates and consequently prevents a possible opposition of a post-structuralist theorist or a reviewer. In the second extract, he seems to avert a possible objection from a feminist critic (a complaint that his own heroin, Robyn Penrose, would undoubtedly raise):

- (1) Post-structuralist theorist, some of whom have been known to collaborate in this process, *would no doubt explain it by saying that the institution of literature is still in thrall to bourgeois ideology.*” (Lodge, *After* 156-157, emphasis added)
- (2) The serious modern writer is, therefore, likely to be just as suspicious of position A, above, as of position B. He (*or she*) knows that [...] (Lodge, *After* 159, emphasis added)

Pursuant to this combined typology of novelistic discourse, Lodge explains the most crucial differences between realist, modernist and post-modernist fiction. While in the classic realism telling and showing was used with equal frequency and importance, the modernist aesthetics attempted to suppress diegesis as much as possible, for instance by focalized narration through different characters (Lodge, *After* 37-8). By contrast, post-modernism is, according to Lodge, characterized by “its foregrounding of diegesis” (Lodge, *After* 28), meaning that it intentionally draws attention to the process of narration as such. Thus, post-modernist fiction turned the stream of consciousness into “a stream of narration” (Lodge, *After* 44). This effect is often achieved by metafictional devices such as the intrusive author.

Moreover, Lodge singles out British post-modernism, which ignores modernist experimental attempts and instead perpetuates “the mode of classic realism which Joyce, Woolf and Co. thought they had dispatched for good” (Lodge, *After* 25). Since both *Changing Places* and *Nice work* are illustrative examples of post-modern novels, the following chapter elaborates further on a subtler classification of the novelistic narrative and strives to define selected literary devices that are characteristic of post-modernism.

5 Selected literary devices of post-modernist fiction

It has already been suggested in the previous chapter that post-modernist fiction is characterized by drawing attention to the act of narration, that is to the diegetic mode. To provide greater terminological precision in describing the first of Bakhtin unities in Lodge’s novels, it seems appropriate to expound on two concepts of Seymour Chatman, which efficiently compensate for the insufficiencies in the dichotomy of diegesis and mimesis: “the parties to the narrative transaction” (Chatman 147) and “degrees of teller’s audibility” (Felcmanová 11).

5.1 Parties of the Narrative Transaction

Before analysing any form of narrative, it is crucial to be able to distinguish the difference between the real author, the implied author and the narrator, as well as between the real reader, the implied reader and the narratee. Furthermore, the distinction between the real author and the implied author sheds more light onto the conflict of expressive realism and post-structuralism discussed in Chapter 1.

The real author in Chatman's terminology denotes the actual human being who composes the novel, physically writes down the words and who is in the limelight of the public attention, providing the novel is successful. Analogically, the real reader is any individual who opens a book and proceeds to read it. They are both personalities with everyday worries and issues to solve, with their own set of moral values and beliefs. As was already established in chapter 1, the real author is the productive mind who brings the work into existence but who loses any authority over the meaning which is actually understood by the reader at the moment of its publication .

In the process of the novel creation, the real author creates the image of the implied author, a shadow of himself or herself, through the specific artistic arrangement of the stylistic unities which he chooses to combine in his work. As opposed to the real author, this "author's second self" (Booth 71) remains contained within the text. It is the implied author, not the real author, who sets the cultural codes of the work as the moral values and world beliefs of the individual implied authors may vary from one book to another, as well as from the actual values and norms held by the personality of the real author. This discrepancy is well illustrated by the example of a film character, an author of romantic fiction for women, in a popular comedy *As Good as It Gets* (1997). While the implied author, cast by Melvin in his novels, perfectly understands the nature and psychology of women (Robyn Penrose would, of course, protest, as would any other feminist, that there is no such thing), the real author is completely incapable of understanding the motives of any human being apart from his own, since he suffers from a severe form of the obsessive-compulsive disorder. However, the world beliefs and the traits of the real author are of no importance to the reader of his books. Consequently, it is the implied author who has the power to set the image of the implied reader of the work and mould them into a personality best able to appreciate the qualities of the given text. Only in the most successful of readings, the implied author's and the implied reader's beliefs may coincide and the two manage to find perfect agreement.

Further distinction must be made between the implied author and the narrator as, while the implied author is the creative principle behind the narrator, he does not have a voice of his own. The implied author composes the narrative and the values set by the work, but he cannot directly communicate with the reader as that power may (or may not) be manifested in the presence of a narrator who may (or may not) be speaking to a narratee.

Both the narrator's and the narratee's existence is optional in the narrative transaction. Furthermore, their presence comes in degrees. Either one can be incorporated in the plot in the form of a concrete character or they can remain outside of the story in various levels of overtness or covertness. It is this idea of the degrees of the teller's audibility that provides a highly useful extension of the diegesis and mimesis, as it turns the narrative dichotomy into a gradual scale (Chatman 147-51).

5.2 Nonnarration, Covert and Overt Narration

With the use of Chatman's terminology, it is possible to use the two binary terms of diegesis and mimesis as two extreme points of a scale on which it is then possible to mark the degrees of the narrator's audibility.

In the purest form of mimesis, or in what Chatman calls "nonnarration" (166), there is no mediation of the narrative and the implied author merges with "the undramatised narrator" (Booth 151), which is best exemplified in epistolary and diary novels, or by tagged or free direct speech and thought of the characters. In the middle of the scale lies the covert narration which corresponds to Lodge's concept of pictorial style as it encompasses both the indirect speech and thought, tagged or untagged. Moving from this middle point towards the diegetic end of the scale or the covert forms of narration, Chatman lists, firstly, set descriptions, summaries, direct characterisation and lastly, implicit and explicit authorial commentary. While the implicit commentary occurs when the narrator communicates with the narratee to mock or ridicule one of the characters, the explicit commentary entails "interpretation, judgement, generalisation, and self-conscious narration" (Chatman 228).

One of the most extreme examples of diegesis is then any form of authorial commentary which draws attention to the process and problems of writing, in other words, the use of metafiction and the form of the intrusive author.

5.3 Metafiction and the intrusive author

Lodge introduces metafiction as “fiction about fiction”, namely as anything in the text that draws attention to its fictitious nature (Lodge, *Art* 206). Similarly, Patricia Waugh defines metafiction in *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-conscious Writing* (1984) as “writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality” (Waugh 2).

She explains that “[t]he metafictionist” realises that within a novel it is impossible to “‘represent’ the world” as such and the author can only strive to imitate “the *discourses* of that world” (Waugh 3, emphasis original). At the same time, the post-modernist respects that “[t]here is no one privileged ‘language of fiction’”, but multiplicity of rival languages (e.g. “of memoirs, journals, diaries, histories”) which compete for position and thus “question and relativize each other”. She claims that metafiction makes this relativization that Bakhtin refers to “as the dialogic potential of the novel” explicit and “in so doing foregrounds the essential mode of all fictional languages” (Waugh 5). Consequently, metafiction can be used to highlight heteroglossia within the novel.

One of the common metafictional devices is the use of the intrusive author through which the novelist reveals himself openly to the reader. According to Lodge, the authorial voice usually carries a tone of “ironic self-consciousness” (Lodge, *Art* 10). He can react to the reader in the form of hidden polemic or call attention to the fact that it is only an illusion of reality that he is trying to create. Typically, he also points out the fact that his characters are only fictional products completely at his disposal.

It was already stated that the British post-modernist novel typically pursues the mode of classic realism (see Chapter 4). Consequently, Lodge considers metafiction a useful defence against the post-structuralist attacks on the conventionality of realist fiction, because it “disarms criticism by anticipating it” (Lodge, *Art* 207). Metafiction, therefore, can be seen as a kind of Bakhtin’s hidden polemic. Although the post-modernist writer continues to fully “exploit the resources of realism”, he prevents any post-structuralist critique by openly displaying the conventionality of his fiction (Lodge, *After* 43).

5.4 Point of view and Defamiliarization

Having discussed in detail the degrees in which the author’s voice can be discernible, it yet remains to differentiate between the concept of the author’s voice and the point of view in which

the narrative is realised. Both Chatman and Booth state that the term is rather imprecise to be an effective tool in describing the intricacies of modern narrative and needs to be further developed.

Chatman, therefore, strives to solve the imprecision of the term by dividing it into three categories, the perceptual, conceptual and interest point of view, and by setting it clearly apart from the notion of the narrative voice. The perceptual point of view provides the most literal interpretation of the term as it denotes through whose vision the action is perceived. The conceptual point of view signifies whose “attitudes”, “way of thinking” or “ideology” the narrative takes into consideration and the interest point of view expresses through whose well-being and general welfare the story is filtered (Chatman 152). However, while the point of view provides the “perspective in terms of which the expression is made” (Chatman 153), the wording of events might be realised through any degree of the narrator’s audibility, which has been discussed in the previous sub-chapter. Thus, while the point of view might be clearly of one of the characters, the style of the passage may possibly belong to a more eloquent narrator. Contrastingly, it might happen that the reader is presented with thoughts rendered in language clearly attributable to the character and yet tainted by the narrator’s judgement. Such discrepancy is most noticeable, when the narration gradually changes from the free indirect thought of the character to the overt narratorial commentary through the employment of the pictorial style of reporting, which has been discussed in chapter 4 (see xy).

Lodge considers the point of view one of the crucial choices of the novelist, since it significantly influences the reader’s emotional and moral reaction (Lodge, Art 26). Changes in point of view also produce powerful rhetorical effects when combined with the literary device of defamiliarization. The term “defamiliarization” was first defined by the Russian Formalists as “ostanenie”, which literally means “making strange”. By employing the device of defamiliarization the author often represents “familiar things in unfamiliar ways” (Lodge, Art 53) and, thus, makes the reader perceive the everyday, ordinary reality with new eyes by rendering it in an innovative and original way. That is often most easily done by shifting the point of view of the narrative in such a way as to show a certain phenomenon or state of affairs that seems mundane and habitual to one character through the eyes of another who is unaccustomed to it. The resulting effect might vary from shock and surprise to comedy.

To conclude, it should be emphasized that features that are typical of post-modern texts at the same time highlight the omnipresence of heteroglossia in a language and the post-modernist fully exploits this multivoicedness. For instance, he or she focalises the narrative

through multiple points of view which allows him to introduce different ideologies that often clash and compete for dominance (e.g. the strikingly different moral code, beliefs and life experience of the left-wing feminist intellectual Robyn Penrose and the conservative factory manager Vic Wilcox in Lodge's *Nice Work* (1988)).

Similarly, as was already said, the post-modernist is aware of the fact that reality as such cannot be imitated (as opposed to the voices and ideologies that constitute human reality). Waugh claims that while realism attempts to suppress the dialogic quality of language by subordinating the heteroglot voices to the "voice of the omniscient, godlike author", the post-modernism strives to emphasize the dialogism that is characteristic of all novels. Metafiction serves the author as a powerful tool for such highlighting, as the post-modern novel is often based "on the principle of fundamental and sustained opposition: the construction of a fictional illusion (as in traditional realism) and the laying bare of that illusion" (Waugh 6). This comment supports Lodge's statement that metafiction is a form of doubly-oriented speech, as it allows the author to exploit the realistic mode of writing and to concurrently satirize it.

According to Arthur McHale, postmodernism concerns itself with the ontological existence of both literature and the world which leads to queries such as "What kinds of world are there, how are they constituted, and how do they differ?; What happens when different kinds of world are placed in confrontation, or when boundaries between worlds are violated?" (McHale 10). By incorporating as many different language varieties, ideologies and subjective perspectives into the novel, in other words, by enhancing the inherent dialogic nature of language instead of suppressing it, the post-modern novelist, in a way, provides answers to these questions. The campus novels of David Lodge are illustrative examples of such breaking of boundaries and of confrontation of people from different worlds.

Practical Part

6 The Structuring of the Compositional-Stylistic Unities in *Changing Places*

The practical part of this thesis strives to demonstrate how the theoretical concepts of heteroglossia and dialogism are realised in Lodge's first campus novel *Changing Places*. Since the narrative mode changes not only from chapter to chapter, but even within the chapters themselves, the practical part is structured so that each sub-chapter corresponds to a chapter of the novel (apart from "Corresponding" and "Reading" which are analysed in Chapter 6.3).

The main focus of the analysis is, firstly, on which stylistic unities are combined within each chapter, and, secondly, on what reasons and the resultant effect of their employment are. *Changing Places* is divided into six chapters altogether, which are titled according to the activity that is most significant to the plot ("Flying", "Settling", "Corresponding", "Reading", "Changing", "Ending"). The structure of the novel is strikingly symmetrical not only within the chapters, but also in-between them, as the six chapters form pairs which in some way mirror each other. The first and the sixth chapter are connected by the motif of travelling, even though they differ in the narrative mode. They also complement each other since the first introduces and characterizes the main protagonists, while the last chapter brings all of them together to form an inconclusive ending. The second and the fifth chapter largely correspond in the narrative mode in which they are realised and complement each other since the second chapter presents the first conflicts to the plot, while the fifth begins to provide the first resolutions. Lastly, the two middle chapters present the two sides of one coin – the process of writing and reading – and lay the grounds for the main conflicts of the story.

6.1 Flying

The novel is introduced by a chapter whose action takes place solely on board of two planes as is signalled to the reader by its title, "Flying". The introductory paragraph is rendered by an omniscient, overt narrator who portrays a scene of two planes bearing the two main characters, an American and a British professor of English literature. There seem to be three main narrative "functions" of the chapter. Firstly, it establishes the relationship of the narrator and narratee of the novel and gives the narrator room to comment on the structure of the text. Secondly, the

chapter focuses on characterising the two main protagonists and, thirdly, it introduces the setting.

6.1.1 Narrator, Narratee and the Textual Structure

By depicting the image of the two aircrafts in flight, the omniscience of the narrator is visualised clearly as it demonstrates the novelist's ability to view his characters from an even greater, god-like, height. Furthermore, the narrator explicitly comments on his privilege and draws attention to his existence and can, therefore, be labelled as an intrusive author: "One of these differences we can take in at a glance from our *privileged narrative altitude (higher than that of any jet)*." (6, emphasis added)

Thus, within the first two pages, an overt narrator and an overt narratee are established through metafictional comments such as "the crossing of their paths [...] unremarked by anyone other than *the narrator of this duplex chronicle*", "Imagine, if *you* will" (5, emphasis added), "*we* can take in", "*our* privileged [...] altitude" (6, emphasis added), "While Morris Zapp is working on this problem, *we* shall take time out to explain something of the circumstances" (9, emphasis added). By the use of the second person singular and first person plural personal and possessive pronouns, the narrator overtly addresses the narratee. Furthermore, he invites them to share his elevated perspective of the story from which he can not only see all that is happening at one time, but can also zoom in and out of the two planes and switch points of view.

Consequently, it does not take long for the reader to notice the symmetry of the novel's composition, which is perhaps the most striking in the structure of the first two chapters, since the narrator constantly switches focus between the two characters. Not only does he provide identical information about both the characters, but every action, encounter or dialogue undertaken by one of the protagonists is mirrored by the other.

Thus, the narrative is based on constant comparing and contrasting of their standard of living, way of thinking, approach to work, or their marriage, which is what generates most of the novel's comical potential. In the first metafictional passage of the novel, the narrator draws attention to this structure, labelling the story a "duplex chronicle". He then inserts an OED definition of the word "duplex", which is, in its most general meaning, synonymous to "two-fold" and which, in a more specific sense of telegraphic communication, denotes a two-way communicative system (5).

The narrator builds a metaphor based on this definition, suggesting that the two characters are linked by "an infinitely elastic umbilical cord of emotions, attitudes, and values" to their

homeland, family and work. He, then, asks the reader to imagine that these two cords get entangled during the flight. Consequently, messages are sent, getting modified in the process, so that “not before long the whole system is twanging with vibrations travelling backwards and forwards” (6). The narrator’s use of this metaphor is a kind of justification of the reciprocal structure of the plot, whose coincidences might at times seem far-fetched to the reader, as he states that it is, then, “not surprising” the two professors’ experiences should correlate (6).

Interestingly, Lodge admits in the introduction to *The Campus Trilogy* edition (2011) that he “feared the symmetry of the plot might come to seem a little mechanical and predictable” and has therefore decided to “loosen up the narrative method” by employing “different styles of discourse” in the subsequent chapters (xi-xii). Possibly, Lodge, the real author of the work, feared that the symmetry might diminish the plausibility of the plot and felt the need to defend this artistic decision through the voice of the intrusive author.

At the same time, Lodge formulates an extremely visual metaphor for Bakhtin’s concept of dialogism, as the words of any language are connected by similar “cords” of emotional and attitudinal meanings. Lodge, thus, reverberates the intertextual “cord” connecting his artistic text, some of his academic publications (After Bakhtin) and Bakhtin’s work.

6.1.2 Characterisation and Setting

Another narrative function of the chapter is to establish the two main characters, Philip Swallow and Morris Zapp. The characterisation is realised through a combination of pure diegesis, pictorial style of reporting and mimesis and as was already stated above, the two characters are constantly contrasted with each other. Mingled with various forms of characterisation are the explanatory passages and retrospective summaries, in which the protagonists’ motives for participation in the exchange are explained.

The Narrator’s Movement Through the Mimetic-Diegetic Scale

It was already mentioned that the chapter begins with a diegetic description of the setting, followed by a metafictional passage. It is concluded by a comparison of Swallow’s and Zapp’s attitude towards air-travel within a sentence which opens the contrastive characterisation of the protagonists:

It is obvious, from his stiff, upright posture, and fulsome gratitude to the stewardess serving him a glass of orange juice, that Philip Swallow, flying westward, is unaccustomed to air travel; while to Morris Zapp, slouched in the seat of his eastbound aircraft, chewing a dead cigar (a hostess has made him extinguish it) and glowering at

the meagre portion of ice dissolving in his plastic tumbler of bourbon, the experience of long-distance air travel is tediously familiar (6).

The semantic structure of the sentence, which is based on dichotomy (stiff-slouched, westward-eastbound, juice-bourbon, unaccustomed-familiar), foreshadows both the structure of the chapter and of the novel. The comparison is developed into two consecutive paragraphs, one dedicated to Philip's and the other to Morris' experiences of flying, the description of which is, then, turned into a direct characterisation by the narrator. Within each paragraph the narrative starts to shift gradually towards the mimetic mode as the narrator begins to move from pictorial reporting to free indirect speech and back to diegetic commentary:

Philip Swallow has, in fact, flown before; but so seldom [...] His baggage is safely stowed away in the plane somewhere, or *if it is not, that isn't his fault, which is the main thing. Flying is, after all, the only way to travel.*

[...] Flying for Philip Swallow is essentially a dramatic performance [...] He is a mimetic man: unconfident, eager to please, infinitely suggestible. (7, emphasis added)

While the first sentence of the paragraph clearly belongs to the omniscient narrator, the reader can soon detect Philip's own thoughts as the narrative shifts into free indirect thought (see the emphasized passage). Yet, the paragraph ends with the narrator's overt judgement and assessment of his character's personality. An analogous shift into and from the character's mind can be detected in the following paragraph:

It would be natural, but incorrect, to assume that Morris Zapp has suffered no such qualms on his flight. [...] Zapp reckons that he has reduced his chances of being caught in such an Armageddon by fifty per cent. [reported speech] But weighing against this comforting thought is the fact that he is travelling on a charter flight, [...] being, he infers, [...] flown by *pilots long gone over the hill, alcoholics and schizoids* [...] *hijackings by crazy Arabs and homesick Cubans wielding sticks of dynamite and dime-store pistols.* Furthermore, this is his first flight over water (yes, Morris Zapp has never before left the protection of the North American landmass, *a proud record unique among the faculty of his university*) and he cannot swim. The unfamiliar ritual of instruction, at the commencement of the flight, in the use of inflatable lifejackets, unsettled him. *That canvas and rubber contraption was a fetishist's dream, but he had as much chance of getting into it in an emergency as into the girdle of the hostess giving the demonstration.* [free indirect thought]

[...]

No, this is not the happiest of flights for 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* [...]). There is something funny, he tells himself, about this plane [...] While Morris Zapp is working on this problem, we shall take time out to explain something of the circumstances that have brought him and Philip Swallow into the polar skies at the same indeterminate (for everybody's watch is wrong by now) hour. (7-9, emphasis added)

The passage dedicated to Zapp's experience is framed by a diegetic commentary as was the case in the Swallow's paragraph and the first sentence of the quote shifts the reader's focus from one aircraft to the other. However, the narrative voice soon becomes mingled with Morris's opinions and attitudes which are formulated in his own words (italics). This shift is, at first, signalled to the reader by expressions such as "Normally, such morbid thoughts visit him only at the beginning and end of a flight" or "he will ask" (8), and through reported speech ("Zapp recons", "he infers"). The tags, however, disappear as the paragraph progresses and, since some of the expressions can be matched with what Zapp is possibly thinking at the time ("That canvas [...] demonstration."), it is possible to label them as free indirect thought. However, most of the passages in Zapp's voice are rather his favourite bon mots ("all women [...] all religion"), which are inserted by the narrator as a device for introducing his personality. At the end of the paragraph, the narrator figuratively leaves the mind of his character and takes the reader back to the "narrative altitude" to proceed to a diegetic passage which explains the exchange scheme.

This explanatory passage is, yet again, built mainly on contrast – of the two universities, American and British Educational system and, finally, of the exchanging professors who are "characteristic of the educational systems they had passed through" and of the institutions at which they teach (12). While the State University of Euphoria is surrounded by "one of the most agreeable environments in the world" with its "blond beaches and incomparable Bay", the University of Rummidge is built in "a large, graceless industrial city sprawled over the English Midlands". Rummidge University is of "middling size and reputation" as opposed to the Euphoric State which is "one of America's major universities" (10).

Consequently, while Zapp is a "distinguished" academic with many publications in his resumé, Swallow is "scarcely known outside his own Department" (11-12). At the end of this diegetic passage, the narrator compares the two educational systems, which differ mainly in the

nature and timing of the academic demands placed on the student. While in America, the narrator explains, the difficulty and rivalry grows gradually from bachelor to post-graduate studies, in Britain all success or failure depends on the Finals. Thus, Zapp is the product of “Wall-Street”-like competition, while Philip lacks any motivation for academic progress, having his position guaranteed by life-long tenure. Again, this short comparison of capitalist competition between professors in America and freely-given tenure in Britain, which is presented at first within two short paragraphs, constitutes a recurrent theme throughout the novel.

Characterisation Through Contrast and Comparison

Since the stretches of text that are dedicated to each character become more extensive as the chapter progresses, the tight symmetry loosens slightly. Nevertheless, even though the analogical passages do not adjoin directly, the same information is given about both characters, usually in an identical narrative form. Philip’s and Zapp’s approach to their career is contrasted, their family background is given and further information about why and how the exchange came about is laid out for the reader. To demonstrate the effect the constant contrasting produces within the narrative, it seems best to consider the following two extracts which illustrate the protagonists’ approach to academic publication:

He visualized a critical work of *totally revolutionary* form, a *concise, comprehensive* survey of English literature consisting entirely of questions [...] that would be *miracles of condensation, eloquence and thoughtfulness*, questions to read and re-read, questions to brood over, *as pregnant and enigmatic as haikus, as memorable as proverbs*; questions that would [...] contain within themselves the *ghostly, subtly* suggested *embryos* of their own answers. Collected Literary Questions, by Philip Swallow. (14, emphasis added)

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* [...] 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 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*. (37, emphasis added)

Even though the two passages are separated by twenty-three pages of text, their parallelism is so striking that Morris's extract makes the reader instantly recall the first. The two paragraphs are intentionally made to reverberate with dialogical conflict, to communicate and clash with each other to, firstly, indirectly portray the characters and, secondly, to produce comical effect. Philip's vision of the "Collected Literary Questions" is humorous in its own accord, but even more so when the reader realises it is meant completely seriously. The comical effect is, however, greatly enhanced when compared with Morris's critique, which, although meant generically, presents an extremely fitting description of Philip's personality even outside the academic world.

Philip, who is incorrigibly out of touch with reality and incapable of irony, let alone of sarcasm is incapable of self-criticism and always takes himself seriously. At the same time, however, he profoundly lacks self-confidence. Zapp, on the other hand, takes pride in the "size" of his own ego which is fed, firstly, by his carefully maintained image of an aggressively provocative, critical and sarcastic academic and, secondly, by his parallel "career" of a womaniser. While he incessantly criticises and ridicules others, he is, nevertheless, also sarcastic when thinking of or describing himself.

The choice of adjectives describing Zapp's fellow academics matches Philip's character so perfectly, that the implied author's presence (the narrator remains silent here, as the linguistic formulation belongs to Zapp, and it is the implied author's power, not the narrator's, to position these two passages in such manner that they come into conflict) is almost palpable within them. Philip, who is described in an overt narratorial commentary as incapable of "settling on a field" because of his "undiscriminating enthusiasm" (13) for all kinds of literature, is incapable of producing any academic publication and is, therefore, extremely "fickle". Similarly, his reluctance to take any responsibility (in literary criticism and in life) is suggested at the beginning of the chapter when he relaxes on board after realising that if his luggage gets lost it is no longer his fault, "which is the main thing" (7). The comical effect is, therefore, generated mainly by the fact that the passage indirectly enables the reader to realise that Philip is the prototype of an academic (and man) that Zapp detests.

In addition, if one analyses the two passages (which are both rendered in pictorial style of reporting), they provide ample examples of the characters' idiosyncratic communicative style, which corresponds with their personality. Although both characters frequently augment their discourse with many attributes ("concise", "ghostly", "vague, fickle, irresponsible", etc.), similes ("as pregnant and enigmatic as haikus, as memorable as proverbs", "like hippopotami

in mud”), or metaphors (“miracles of condensation”, “embryos of their own answers”, “vineyards of literature”), their use achieves distinctly disparate results. Zapp uses these figures of speech and hyperbolic expressions to criticise and to maintain his constant mode of sarcasm (usually directed against others). Philip, on the other hand, strives for a certain poetic quality and sophistication of his speech and he, consequently, demonstrates precisely the “pathetic attempts at profundity” Morris talks about. Furthermore, the quote exemplifies another typical feature of Zap’s style, which is the frequent employment of vocabulary from both ends of the formality scale (“profundity”, “manoeuvre” vs “damn fool”, and colloquial idioms such as “separated the men from the boys”).

Diegetic Flashbacks Within the Mimetic Framework of the Present-time Dimension

In relation with the loosening of the regular, repetitive structure is also a gradual change of the degree of narrative control, as the chapter moves forward. There is a less overt commentary as the narrator gives more room to the character’s own voice and point of view. Consequently, the characterisation and setting get more frequently communicated through devices of the mimetic scale of narration.

There are two temporal dimensions that constitute the narrative. The flight itself, which is rendered in present tense and constitutes, firstly, descriptions of the character’s surroundings and events that take place throughout the journey, and, secondly, the mimetic dialogue of Zapp with Mary Makepeace and Philip with Charles Boon. This present-time dimension provides a narrative framework for many retrospective passages that carry most of the information crucial for the reader’s understanding of the setting. To exemplify this framework, consider the following extracts:

There had been times, lately, when he had begun to wonder whether he was entirely suited to the career on which he had been launched some fifteen years earlier, not so much by personal choice as by the mere impetus of his remarkable First. (15)

This long honeymoon was the key that unlocked the American experience for Philip Swallow. [...] Hilary was four months pregnant when they sailed back to England in September. It was raining hard [...] and Philip caught a cold which lasted for approximately a year. They rented a damp and draughty furnished flat [...] moved to a small, damp and draughty terraced house [...] moved to a large, damp and draughty Victorian villa. (16)

That is why there is a gleam in Philip Swallow's eye as he sits now in the BOAC Boeing. He looks forward [...] to exercising again his command of American idiom, grown a little rusty over the years from disuse. (17)

On Philip's return from his Fellowship, newly acquired Americanisms had quickly withered on his lips [...] American idiom still, however, retained for him a secret, subtle enchantment. *Was it the legacy of a war-time boyhood [...]?* *Perhaps, but there was also a purely aesthetic appeal [...] a subtle music of displaced accents, cute contractions, quaint redundancies and vivid tropes [...]* (17, emphasis added)

[...] so Philip Swallow, strapped (because of the turbulence) into the seat of his Boeing, lips perceptibly moving [...] tries out on his tongue certain half-forgotten intonations and phrases (18)

The first citation introduces a two-page long retrospective passage, which summarizes in Philip's point of view (but in the narrator's voice) the progress of his academic career and his marriage. It starts with the postgraduate studies and a year Fellowship in America, the time when he felt "happy and free" (17), married Hilary and enjoyed a passionate, bohemian honeymoon and ends with a comparatively short summary describing their return to England and birth of their three children (and subsequent relocation to a more spacious abode). The third quote follows the end of the retrospective paragraph and brings the reader back into the present dimension of the flight. The penultimate quote presents another example of indirect thought and, together with the last, exemplifies the frequent to-and-fro movement between the narrator's and character's voice. The fifth citation, although in the present tense, provides a description both in the narrator's voice and perceptual point of view (the fact Philip is mouthing the idioms must, logically, be seen by another party). A similar movement between the temporal dimensions and narrative voice can be analysed in Zapp's passage:

'Why not? Where are you going?'

'A dump called Rummidge. You don't have to pretend you've heard of it.'

'Why are you going there?'

'It's a long story.'

It was indeed, and the question put by Mary Makepeace had exercised many a group of gossiping faculty [...]

Then at last the word got round that Morris was going to England on his own, and all was clear: the Zapps were breaking up. The gossip dwindled away; it was nothing unusual after all. Just another divorce.

Actually, it was more complicated than that. Désirée, Morris's second wife, wanted a divorce, but Morris didn't. (32)

In the example above, Mary makes Morris retreat into a train of thought explaining the reasons for which a respectable academic such as him decided to travel to such a "dump" of a university. The flashback is conducted through pictorial reporting, within which, however, three kinds of voices seem to be mixed. The passage appears to be Morris's own sarcastic reflection of the gossip that he knew had surrounded his departure. Whether the final stylization of the original rumours is Zapp's or the narrator's is, however, impossible to distinguish clearly, since some lexical choices belong to Zapp ("Just another divorce.") and some formulations to the narrator ("Nobody dared to test this hypothesis on the man himself [on Morris]"). The last sentence of the quote, however, is a yet another overt commentary of the narrator, who feels the need to "correct" his character's explanation ("Actually, it was more complicated"), and provide further details for the reader.

It is, therefore, clear from the two sets of quotes analysed above that the narrator does not altogether disappear from the text. The retrospective passages are embedded in the temporal dimension of the flight, rendered in the point of view of the characters' and masked as the character's musings about their family and academic career. However, the voice that presents these flashbacks is clearly the narrator's, since he provides the additional explanatory passages and summaries without which the character's reflections would be rather incomprehensible for the reader. Even when the narrative moves to the present temporal dimension and the wording of the narrative becomes the characters', the narrator often reminds the reader of his presence by a sudden insertion of an overt commentary:

How enchanting, those flashing thighs and twitching buttocks, lolling heads and bouncing breasts; how deliciously mindless, liberating, it all was! [...] it was too late to [...] persuade Hilary to experiment with new sexual postures.

In short, if Philip Swallow felt sensually underprivileged, it was in a strictly elegiac spirit. [...] It never occurred to him to be unfaithful to Hilary [...] Such ideas, that is, never occurred to his conscious, English self. His unconscious may have been otherwise occupied; and perhaps, deep, deep down, there is, at the root of his present jubilation, the anticipation of sexual adventure. If this is the case, however, no rumour

of it has reached Philip's ego. At this moment the most licentious project he has in mind is to spend his very next Sunday in bed, smoking, reading the newspapers and watching television.

Bliss! No need to get up for the family breakfast, wash the car, mow the lawn. (22-3)

Within this short passage, the narrator inserts an overt commentary, which is an excellent example of what Chatman labels as the interest point of view, in which the reader is presented with information that even the character does not consciously realise, but which the narrator has the power to provide. Thus, he informs the reader both about the unconscious plans for "sexual adventure" and the present thoughts of the "next Sunday in bed" that are currently occupying Philip's mind to disappear again so that he can give room to Philip's own voice in the form of free indirect thought. Furthermore, the fact Philip (although latently) desires or expects extramarital intercourse humorously contrasts with Zapp's "small provisional vow not to be unfaithful to Désirée, just to annoy her" (39).

The Idiosyncratic Voices of the Characters

The most mimetic form of narration that adds to the characterising of Philip and Zapp are passages of direct speech. In these, the voices of the characters are void of narratorial control and the two language varieties, American and British English, come into contrast.

As mentioned in Chapter 3.1, the diegetic passages of a novel typically present a linguistically unmarked, neutral language which works as a kind of contrast medium for the multiple voices of heteroglossia. The narrator of *Changing Places* conducts the story in Standard British English and, stylistically, his expressions are frequently formal ("infinitely", "entangle", "alight", "exert a reciprocal influence") or literary ("domestic hearth"), and he commonly employs register typical of academic discourse ("aforesaid", "It follows that", "vice versa" (6)).

Consequently, the language of Philip Swallow, a British academic, does not significantly differ from the style of the narrator (apart from its poetic tendencies mentioned above) either in the pictorial reporting, indirect thoughts or direct speech. The American English of Morris Zapp, however, constitutes a linguistically marked variety of language that clashes with the overt narrator's and Philip's discourse. Consider the following examples, first of a narratorial passage, second of indirect thought and third of direct speech:

Meanwhile, back in the other Boeing, Morris Zapp has just discovered what it is that's *bugging* him about his flight. The *realization* is a delayed consequence of walking the

length of the aircraft to the toilet, and strikes him, like a slow-burn *gag* in a *movie-comedy*, just as he is concluding his business there. On his way back he verifies his suspicion, covertly *scrutinizing* every row [...] He sinks down heavily and, as is his wont when thinking hard, crosses his legs and plays a complex percussion solo with his fingernails on the sole of his right shoe [...] (23-4, emphasis added)

Why should he suffer with all these careless callous women? He has *knocked up* a girl only once and he has made an honest woman of her [...] all his roused moral indignation and superstitious fear focused on this *kooky* blonde. (26, emphasis added)

‘Listen, *kid*, let me give some fatherly advice. Don’t do it. You’ll never forgive yourself. Have the baby. Get it adopted - *no sweat*, the adoption agencies are screaming for *new stock*. Maybe the father will want to marry you when he sees the kid - they often do, you know.’ (26-7, emphasis added)

Zapp’s discourse is idiosyncratic mainly in the sense of its informality (“bugging”, “gag”, “no sweat”, “stock”) and American lexis (“movie”, “knocked up”, “kooky”, “kid”). However, these features do not occur in the direct speech and pictorial reporting only. From the examples above it follows that even the passages that are focalised through Zapp’s point of view, but told by the narrator, are rendered in American English.

Although the first quote begins with another direct change of perspective indisputably controlled by an overt narrator (“Meanwhile, [...] has just discovered”), even within the first sentence the American spelling (“realization”, “scrutinizing”) and vocabulary characteristic of Zapp’s discourse (“movie”, “bugging”, “gag”) begin to appear. However, even though the passage is filled with formulations typical of Zapp’s style (for example the simile “like a slow-burning gag in a movie comedy”), they cannot be plausibly transformed into Zapp’s reported thought and the passage does not present the intermingling of the narrator’s and character’s voice either.

The passage is purely diegetic, as it is the narrator who informs the reader and describes the process and actions that lead Zapp to finally solving his puzzle. (To support this claim, it should be mentioned that the realisation itself is, consequently, formulated and even emphasised by the use of italics at the beginning of a new paragraph in the form of free indirect thought: “*Every passenger on the plane except himself is a woman.*” (24)) It can, therefore, be stated that the narrator focalises the passage through Morris’s interest point of view but the perceptual point of view and most of the wording (consider expressions such as “delayed consequence”,

“concluding his business”, “verifies his suspicion”, “as is his wont”) belongs clearly to the narrator. Accordingly, the first passage is, in Bakhtin’s terms (Chapter 4.3), a kind of doubly-oriented speech, a stylisation of sorts, as the narrator lexically imitates the character’s speech for his own purposes.

It should also be mentioned that there is a dialogical tension of comical potential in Morris’s use of the phrase “knock up”, since Philip plans somewhat later to enlighten Boon that it means “something entirely different” (31) in America and this “duplex” use of the phrase serves as a foregrounding of the possible conflict of the two language varieties.

The Diegetic Structural Framework

The chapter is concluded with a purely diegetic passage which, in its style, mirrors the introductory paragraph and contrasts with the immediately preceding passage rendered in direct speech:

And now, in the two Boeings, falls simultaneously the special silence that precedes an airliner’s landing. The engines are all but cut off, and the conversation of the passengers is hushed as if in sympathy. [...]

Then houses, hills, trees, hangars, trucks, skim by in recognizable scale, like old friends seen again after a long separation.

Bump!

Bump!

At exactly the same moment, but six thousand miles apart, the two planes touch down.
(43-4)

In this distinctly visual description of the landing, the narrator rises again above the two aircrafts and makes the reader picture the two planes as though in a film, “directing” the cuts and, thus, displaying again the degree of his omniscience. Consequently, he completes the chapter’s structure in such a way that it corresponds to the individual “sections” dedicated to both characters. This fact adds to the overall symmetry of the chapter since nearly all paragraphs of “zooming” from one plane to another begin with a narratorial introduction, then gradually move to the mimetic modes of pictorial reporting and indirect speech to abruptly change back into a conclusion of overt narration in the form of a judgement, commentary or description.

6.1.3 Summary of the Stylistic Unities

Based on the analysis of the passages scrutinised above, it can be concluded that the first chapter of *Changing Places* is composed mainly of a complex combination of direct authorial artistic

narration, the stylistically individualised speech of characters and the fusion of these two unities through the pictorial style of reporting. Within the first chapter, then, the three most prominent voices (at least quantitatively) that compose the heteroglossia of the novel are introduced: the narrator, Philip Swallow and Morris Zapp. However, the chapter contains several other instances which add to the multi-voicedness and should, therefore, be at least briefly mentioned – the first constitutes the stylistic unity of the characters’ speech, the second and third belong to the incorporation of semi-artistic literary genres.

Firstly, the reader is provided with a brief introduction of the stylistic voices of Hilary Swallow and Desirée Zapp. While Hilary, also a former British post-graduate student of literature, does not (at least in her short passage of direct speech granted to her within the first chapter) significantly differ in style from Philip or the narrator. Desirée’s voice and communicative style, on the other hand, provides even greater stylistic contrast than Morris’s, since her patience with their marriage (and men in general) has finally run out and she does not feel the need to “mince words” with anyone, let alone her husband:

‘[...] It’s that student you found me with last summer, isn’t it?’

‘No, but she’ll do to get the divorce. Leaving me at the Dean’s reception to go home and *screw* the baby-sitter, that should make an impression on the judge.’

‘I told you, she’s gone back East, I don’t even know her address.’

‘I’m not interested. Can’t you get it into your head that I don’t care where you keep your *big, fat circumcised prick*? You could be *banging* the entire women’s field hockey team every night for all I care. We’re past all that.’” (33, emphasis added)

Without any need of direct characterisation, the reader, who has already begun to form an idea of Morris as a rather singular personality, can easily assume from the short dialogue that Desirée is a strong contender in terms of formidability of character, cynicism and forcefulness in her communicative style. Without any doubt, her voice presents the stylistic extreme of vulgarisms (“screw”, “prick”, “banging”) and demonstrates the widest informal lexical range when compared to all the other characters.

Secondly, the implied author incorporates a list of Charles Boon’s lapel buttons which can be labelled as an instance of stylisation. At the surface level of the narrative, the narrator describes in Philip’s point of view what the character can see. However, the buttons serve two different purposes of the implied author and, thus, are an example of doubly-oriented speech. Firstly, they are used as a summary of Charles’ lecture to Philip about “the situation in

Euphoria” (31) and, secondly, at least one of the buttons (“KEEP KROOP” (41)) functions as a fore-shadowing device of a recurrent theme of academic politics, specifically the issue of tenure.

Thirdly, when thinking about the conversation with Boon, Philip mentally composes a letter to Hilary, describing the encounter:

Well, it would make a good story for his first letter home. *Who should I meet on the plane but the incorrigible Charles Boon [...] He was all dolled up in the latest ‘gear’, with hair down to his shoulders, but as full of tall stories as ever. Patronized me like mad, of course! But he’s so transparent, you can’t take offence.*

His train of thought, and Boon’s continuing monologue, are interrupted by an announcement from the captain [...]

By letting Philip transform his disbelief of Boon’s story into an anecdotal episode told and stylised in his own voice, the implied author emphasizes the comical effect evoked at the end of the paragraph when Charles disappears into the First-Class cabin. It then begins to dawn on Philip (and the reader) that his story might actually be genuine.

Furthermore, the employment of such stylisation provides one of the first instances of Philip’s hypocrisy – he complains of Boon patronising him when, in fact, he himself planned to lecture Charles on the American way of life, (or as the narrator ironically comments, rather to “show off” (31)). Even after finding out that Boon has been living there for the last two years he tries to patronise Boon (““Yes, well, I have been to America before...”” (43) and is rather arrogant in thinking that Boon is lying about his success. The greater his shock and the reader’s amusement, when Charles Boon, to Philip’s “considerable mortification” turns out to be his “chief social asset at Euphoric State” (61) in the second chapter and, in the course of the story, intermeddles with Philip’s part of the plot in many unexpected ways. Similarly, Morris might think that accidentally getting on a charter flight full of pregnant American girls seeking legal abortion in Britain is the worst coincidence that could befall him, but just as Boon, Mary Makepeace turns out to be a significant device in generating the (im)possible coincidences designed by the implied author.

6.2 Settling

The second chapter of the novel corresponds with the first in terms of the symmetry of its composition and the consequent contrasting of the two protagonists. Potentially, the plot

appears even more regular here as a result of a minor change in the ratio of the diegetic-mimetic mode of narration.

While, in the first chapter, considerably long passages of overt narration occur, and the narrator frequently intrudes with his own comment or judgement in the middle of the character's indirectly rendered train of thought, in the second chapter, mimesis dominates. The point of view changes regularly after every passage from Philip to Zapp and back again and the adjoining sections always describe identical events and situations. Within the passages, the story is rendered consistently in the characters' point of view and voice (apart from a few exceptions which are analysed in the following section), either through tagged reported thought, pictorial reporting, free indirect thought or direct speech and the narrator "takes a step back" into the background.

The chapter entitled "Settling" depicts the process of finding accommodation and getting acquainted with the landlord or fellow-tenants, arriving at the university and getting to know the new colleagues and, also, meeting the exchanging partner's wife. Towards the end of the chapter, the first conflicts of the plot appear in the form of the still pregnant Mary Makepeace and of the coitus of Philip and Melanie Byrd. The duplexity of the plot is brought to an extreme at the end of the chapter, when the two protagonists visit a strip club at, virtually, the same minute (and of course, leave with a completely dissimilar experience – one enthralled and one nearly frozen to death):

But strip-tease, and all the specialized variations on it indigenous to Esseph . . .

Which at this very moment Philip Swallow is observing for the first time: (93)

. . . that was strictly for hicks, tourists and businessmen. Morris Zapp's reputation as a sophisticate would have been destroyed the moment he was seen by a colleague or student [...]

[...] he thinks, 'Why not?' and ducks into the very next strip-joint [...]

And 'Why not?' thought Philip Swallow. 'It's something I've never seen [...]' (94)

[...] So he [Zapp] sat and smoked and stared at the empty stage, chafing his chilled limbs from time to time to keep the circulation going.

While Philip Swallow, having been prepared to be disappointed, cheated, frustrated and finally bored [...] found that on the contrary he was not at all bored, but quite entranced (95)

The first sentence (or rather the beginning of it) is at the end of Zapp's section in which he, accidentally wanders into a street full of "touts" in Soho and thinks about the fact he has "never actually sampled this form of entertainment" (93). It is, however, discontinued by the most "radical" cut of the whole chapter, switching to Philip who has just walked into the Esseph district of strip-joints. After a short passage in Swallow's point of view, Morris's unfinished sentence continues and by this insertion, the implied author enables the reader to visualise the speed of the switch of points of view. Furthermore, he impresses upon them that even though the two protagonists' actions must be described consecutively, it is happening simultaneously. Thus, a similar effect is achieved as though a television screen were divided into two halves and both characters were viewed at the same time.

Although the plot's regularity might begin to border on the absurd (just as the narrator – or rather the author – feared), the comical potential that such a structure generates fully compensates for its moderate implausibility. Throughout the chapter, the implied author strives to satirise various aspects of the British Society (there is much more admiration for and much less ridicule of the American way of life), and he achieves most of the mockery via defamiliarization. It is the discrepancy and opposition of their experiences in the respective ventures and the strict adherence to the protagonists' point of view (which generates the defamiliarizing effect) that allows the implied author to ridicule what he, as a British citizen and academic, is profoundly familiar with.

6.2.1 Direct authorial narration

The chapter begins with a descriptive and somewhat retrospective passage and, at first, it seems that the summary explaining the peculiar circumstances of Philip's accommodation is rendered by an omniscient narrator. An unspecified voice is informing the reader that the house at Pythagoras Drive stands on a "Slide Area" and is, therefore, cheap, but also slowly moving towards the Bay of Esseph. After the first two sentences, however, the reader realises the passage is already focalised through Philip's point of view:

[...] but then, he had not learned the full history [...] until signing the six months' lease. That history had been related to him on the first evening of his occupancy by Melanie Byrd, the prettiest and most wholesome-looking of the three girls who shared the ground-floor apartment (45)

Thus, it becomes clear that the information previously given is the knowledge that Philip has already obtained (and therefore not necessarily a sign of the omniscient narrator). The use

of “but then” is Philip’s own justification of the decision he had made, since now, only “tenants too indigent, or too careless of life” lived in the area (45). Similarly, the assessment of Melanie (“the prettiest and most wholesome-looking”) belongs to Philip’s attitudinal point of view and even the choice of the adjectives is most probably his own and not the narrator’s.

Consequently, there are but a few instances of pure diegesis in the whole chapter and most of them are represented by the first sentence of each paragraph, establishing the change of point of view between the two protagonists:

Philip Swallow rented an apartment [...] When he drew back the curtains in his living-room each morning, the view filled the picture window like a visual *tour de force* at the beginning of a Cinerama film. (45, emphasis original)

Morris Zapp was less enchanted with his view - a vista of dank back gardens, rotting sheds and dripping laundry [...] spent a couple of days thawing out. Only then did he feel ready to investigate the Rummidge campus and introduce himself to the English Department. (46)

Philip Swallow was more impatient to inspect his place of work. (48)

As Morris Zapp learned much later, he made a bad impression on his first appearance in the Rummidge English Department. The secretary, young Alice Slade, returning from her coffee break [...] observed him doubled up [...] Miss Slade had wondered whether it was a mature student having a fit [...] but Miss Mackintosh ventured the opinion that he was only laughing, which was indeed the case. (48)

As exemplified above, in the topic sentence, the narrator usually introduces the thematic link between two adjoining paragraphs, most frequently through comparison and the connection is, typically, made with the last paragraph of the previous passage (e.g. “Only then did he” – “more impatient to inspect”). Even though the narrator’s voice is audible in these shifts of perspective, even within the first sentence the narrative is focalised through the character’s perceptual (“when he drew back the curtain [...] the view”) and attitudinal (“only then did he feel ready”, “Philip was more impatient”) point of view.

The last of the given samples of text, however, presents a beginning of a paragraph that, yet again, presents a complex fusion of the narratorial and the character’s voice. While the first paragraph provides the secretary’s interpretation of Morris’s behaviour, it is followed by Morris being led (by the same secretary) towards his new office, where he discovers a welcome letter

from Philip. It follows from the introductory phrase (“As Morris Zapp learned much later”) that Alice’s version of the story was unknown to Morris at the time. Since the temporal placement of the rest of the paragraph does not enable Zapp to obtain the information, it must, logically, be the information the omniscient narrator grants the reader. However, it is difficult to decide whether the irony contained within the formulation: “ventured the opinion” belongs to Zapp himself, retrospectively ridiculing the whole episode, or to the narrator. The subsequent satirical description of the noticeboard is, however, most definitely realised in Zapp’s point of view and voice:

The noticeboard distantly reminded Morris of the early work of Robert Rauschenberg: a thumb-tacked montage of variegated scraps of paper - letterheaded notepaper, memo sheets, compliment slips [...] The end of the Gutenberg era was evidently not an issue here: they were still living in a manuscript culture. (49).

Consequently, the narrator’s voice fuses with Morris’s, changing into the mode of free indirect thought (“The end [...] manuscript culture.”) and even when a flashback appears a moment later, it is presented as Zapp’s own reminiscence:

He recalled Luke Hogan [...] complaining in his Montana cowboy’s drawl, ‘Goddammit, Morris, what are we gonna do with this guy Swallow? He claims he ain’t got a field.’ Morris had recommended [...]

Recollecting all this reminded Morris that he had not been able to prise any information about his own teaching programme (49-50)

However, there are two more examples in which the narrator’s presence is apparent, which should be mentioned:

Morris Zapp was to experience the same sense of surprise and paradox many times in his first weeks at Rummidge. Public affluence and private squalor, was how he formulated it. [...] If the British university teacher had nothing else, he had a room he could call his own [...] and the *use of a John* that was off-limits to students. That seemed to be the underlying principle. Such coherent thoughts were not yet forming in Morris Zapp’s mind, however, as he first cast his eyes round Philip Swallow’s room. He was still in a state of culture shock (50, emphasis added)

Miss Slade was just about to knock on Morris Zapp’s door to inform him that there was nothing in the files about his teaching programme, when she heard the noise of the

hundred and fifty-seven tobacco cans falling out of the cupboard. He listened to the sound of her high heels fleeing down the corridor. She did not return. (57)

The first passage appears to be a defamiliarized assessment of the paradoxical division of “affluence” in the British society rendered in the form of free indirect thought (e.g. “That seemed to be the underlying principle.”) and in the protagonist’s voice (e.g. the American expression “use of a John”). Yet, there is an overt intrusion of the narrator, informing the reader that these truly are Zapp’s thoughts, but as Morris is going to reach this exact conclusion somewhat later, the narrator (in his omniscience) provides them for the reader beforehand.

The second example constitutes the most overtly narrated part of the chapter, since there, the narrator begins the paragraph in his own perceptual point of view, as only the omniscient narrator can provide the description of what is happening behind the door of Morris’s office at the moment the cans start falling on his head. As such, the passage diverges from the otherwise meticulously maintained adherence to the characters’ point of view.

6.2.2 Direct Speech and Defamiliarization

Compared with the first chapter, the second contains a considerably greater number of dialogues. While in “Flying”, the dialogical passages functioned partly as a temporal framework for the retrospective summaries, here the most striking effect seems to be the satirising of the British way of life through defamiliarization. However, the chapter is so thoroughly filled with defamiliarized experience (rendered not only in direct speech, but in reporting and indirect thought) that it is rather difficult to choose the most striking examples. Since the scope of the thesis is limited, only two illustrative passages are given:

“‘Don’t seem to be many people on campus today.’ She looked at him as if he had just arrived from outer space.’ It’s the vacation,’ she said.

‘ Uhuh. Is Professor Masters around?’

‘No, he’s in Hungary. Won’t be back till the beginning of term.’

‘At a conference?’

‘Shooting wild pigs, I’m told.’ (51)

Ringbaum nodded impatiently.’ What’s your field?’

‘Yours is Augustan pastoral, I believe,’ Philip returned evasively. (63)

Of the two questions he was asked at the cocktail party by everyone he met, this was the one he preferred. The other was,’ What are you working on?’

‘What are you working on, Mr Swallow?’ Luke Hogan asked him when they bumped into each other again. (64)

It is clear from the two examples that both academics struggle in the new unfamiliar environment, being utterly unaccustomed to the new reality. While Zapp, one of the best contenders in the fierce race of American academics, is flabbergasted by the fact nobody is working between terms in Britain, Philip is constantly made uncomfortable by ubiquitous questions about his field (there is none) and the theme of his current publication-to-be. Although even the separate experience of each protagonist would be humorous enough, it is the contrast between the two protagonists (enhanced by the regularity of the structure) that achieves the defamiliarizing and satirising of the British (university) life (in the late 60’s – as Lodge states in the introduction, the discrepancy between the American and British standard of living and academic demands has long been levelled (xii)) that would be considered commonplace by most British readers (and academics).

6.2.3 The Stylistic Clash of the American and British Communicative Style

The second chapter contains two of the most prominent and amusing dialogues of the novel, namely the first encounter of Philip with Desirée and Zapp with Hillary. The comical potential of both meetings occurs at several levels.

Partly, it is based on situational comedy – especially in the case of Zapp-Hilary introduction. Zapp, whose “vocal organs began to deteriorate from disuse” (58) during the vacation, as he waited in vain for any kind of acknowledgement of his presence from other members of the faculty, is startled by a knock on the door. In his eagerness to welcome the visitor, he drops his cigar under the table (and on the “Indian” carpet of “Philip’s grandmother”) and, in consequence, there is a lot of confusion, a crisis to be solved (by taking turns in crawling under the table) and injuries to be examined even before the two get the chance to introduce themselves:

‘I’ll come back another time,’ said the woman.

‘No, don’t leave me,’ said Morris urgently. ‘I may need medical attention.’

[...] ‘You’ll have a bump there,’ she said. ‘But I can’t see any skin broken. You should put some witch-hazel on it.’

‘You know a good witch?’

The woman tittered. ‘You can’t be too bad,’ she said. ‘What’s the matter with your hand?’

‘I burned it on my cigar.’ He withdrew his injured hand from his armpit and tenderly unclasped it.

‘I can’t see anything,’ said the woman, peering. ‘There!’ He pointed to the fleshy cushion at the base of his thumb.

‘Oh, well, I think those little burns are best left alone.’

Morris looked at her reproachfully and rose to his feet. (70)

The reader (and Zapp) does not yet know that the woman is Hilary Swallow, but the hilarity of the extract lies partly (and retrospectively) in the role that the two characters automatically assume upon first meeting each other. There are several instances throughout the novel, which appear to be an indirect parody of a psychoanalytical reading (or a hidden polemic between the implied author and a literary critic of such a reading). The most obvious example being Melanie Byrd’s (who is, as the reader finds out in the third chapter, Zapp’s daughter from his first marriage) whimper of “Daddy.” (87), which she mutters in her sleep after the intercourse with Philip. Similarly, Zapp seems to be seeking the mother-son relationship in his attraction to Hilary (e.g. as little as he covets “her company, he hunger[s] for a home-cooked meal” and has a “hunch she [is] a good cook” (73)). Even their first exchange noticeably imitates a mother treating her child’s injuries as it is quite ridiculous for a grown man (not to mention such a “macho” character) to need “medical attention” for a “bump” and a small blister. Similarly, his reaction (“looked at her reproachfully”) after Hilary refuses to “kiss them better” reminds the reader of a sulking child.

Furthermore, upon realizing the woman is Hilary, the whole scene matches (to a comical effect) the narrator’s indirect description of her character from the first chapter. There he reports in Philip’s point of view that he finds “it difficult [...] to think of her as ontologically distinct from her offspring” and that he perceives her merely as “a transmitter of information, warnings, requests and obligations” regarding their three children (20-1). Thus, the first impression of Hilary is that of a mother without any identity of her own. Yet, there is a foretaste of Hilary’s individuality in the remark she gives (A ghost of a smile hovered on Mrs Swallow’s lips. ‘I hope you weren’t hurt?’ (72)) after Morris enquires about the tobacco cans which fell on top of his head. For the first time, the reader can get a glimpse of her ironical sense of humour that is hidden underneath the British façade of polite standoffishness.

There is, however, one more significant source of humorous potential. While Hilary’s conversational turns are filled with formulaic expressions bordering on clichés (“I didn’t get a chance to introduce myself”, “How do you do?” (71), “I’m sorry to have been such a nuisance.”,

“it’s nice to have met you”, “I hope you’ll enjoy your stay in Rummidge.” (72) or “Well, I mustn’t keep you any longer” (73)) and the use of hedges (“I’m sorry to barge in on you like this, but” (72)), Moris’s only sentence adhering to conventions seems to be: “Glad to meet you, Mrs. Swallow. Won’t you take off your coat?” (71). Afterwards, his choice of topics only shocks and embarrasses Mrs Swallow:

‘So you didn’t go to Euphoria with your husband?’

‘No.’

‘Why was that?’

The look she gave him couldn’t have been more hostile if he had inquired what brand of sanitary towels she used.

‘There were a number of personal reasons,’ she said. (71)

‘Mrs Swallow, may I ask you a personal question about your husband?’

She looked at him in alarm. ‘Well, I don’t know. It depends...’ (72)

The inquiry after such a personal topic appears to be so customary for the American, that Zapp does not even notice the implied meaning of Hilary’s austere answer (“No.”) and proceeds to investigate further. It requires both the pragmatic force of her second answer and the non-verbal negative reaction (the “hostile” look) that his direct question of “Why?” induces in her face, to help him recognise its impropriety. Yet, instead of correcting his mistake, he intentionally provokes her even further (“may I ask you a personal question”).

The comical potential of the Philip-Desirée dialogue lies mostly in the use of language in the respective conversations which feature an analogous (and perhaps even more extreme) clash of communicative styles:

‘[I know him] Very well. He’s my husband.’

Philip choked on his drink. ‘You’re Mrs Zapp?’

‘Is that so surprising? You think I look too old? Or too young?’

‘Oh, no,’ said Philip.

‘Oh no which?’ Her small green eyes glinted with mockery. (65-6)

Désirée, having strengthened her natural lack of inhibition by a considerable amount of alcohol, ignores the fact she has only just met Philip and incessantly flouts the Maxims of the Politeness principle. She flouts the Approbation Maxim by implicitly insulting him. Firstly, throughout the dialogue, she opts for calling him “Sparrow” and referring to Rummidge as “Rubbish”, and although the first mistake begins as a slip of the tongue (66) and the second is

a consequence of mishearing him pronounce the name of the city (67), she continues to use both to her own amusement. Subsequently, she inquires after Rummidge, but before he manages to answer, provides her own comment (“Morris tried to make out it was the greatest, but everybody else says it’s the asshole of England.” (67)), which is, firstly, rather offensive, and, secondly, it forces Philip to adopt a defensive attitude before he has even begun to speak. Furthermore, she disregards the Maxim of Agreement by intentionally misinterpreting every ambiguity present in his speech:

‘[...] Tell me more about Rubbish. No, on second thoughts, tell me more about your family.’

Philip preferred to answer the first question. ‘Well, it’s not really as bad as people make out,’ he said.

‘Your family?’

‘Rummidge. I mean it has a decent art gallery [...]’ (67)

From the two questions she asks, Philip, conforming to the British stereotype that the implied author satirizes throughout the book, chooses to answer the less personal one. Although it is Désirée, who introduces the ambiguity into the conversation (and it can be easily inferred from the context that Philip has decided to answer the preceding question), she chooses to misinterpret to mock him. Furthermore, she takes her ignorance of the inadvisability of bringing up personal topics in conversation with British speakers to extreme:

‘You mean, Morris being in England? It’s great, just great.’

Philip politely pretended not to have heard this remark.

‘Just to be able to stretch out in my own bed’ – she gestured appropriately, revealing a rusty stubble under her armpit - ‘without finding another human body in my way, breathing whisky fumes all over my face and pawing at my crotch...’

‘I think I’d better be going back inside,’ said Philip. (66-7)

While Philip obviously finds even the first implication that everything is not as it should be with Zapp’s marriage embarrassing and chooses to “politely” pretend “not to have heard”, Désirée is unconcerned by the possibility of causing mortification. Consequently, she provides detail so intimate (“breathing whisky fumes all over my face and pawing at my crotch”) that Philip attempts (unsuccessfully) to escape further embarrassment by leaving the balcony.

6.2.4 Stylisation of Semi-Literary Narration

In comparison, the first chapter contains only two rather insignificant samples of incorporated genres, while the second chapter features much more extensive and prominent examples which serve distinctive narrative functions.

The first example is a “hand-written letter from Philip Swallow” (51) that Morris finds on the first inspection of his new office:

Dear Professor Zapp,

I gather you’ll be using my room while you’re here. [...] Do feel free to use my books, though I’d be grateful if you wouldn’t lend them to students, as they *will* write in them. The second-year groups are rather hard going, especially the Joint Honours, but the first-year group is quite lively [...] There are a few points you might like to bear in mind. Brenda Archer suffers badly from pre-menstrual tension so don’t be surprised if she bursts into tears every now and again. [...]

The letter continued in this vein for several pages, describing the emotional, psychological and physiological peculiarities of the students concerned in intimate detail. Morris read through it in total bewilderment. What kind of a man was this, that seemed to know more about his students than their own mothers? And to care more, by the sound of it. (51-2, emphasis original)

The letter’s humorous potential lies in several aspects. Firstly, the epistle adds comicality to Zapp’s satire of the “manuscript culture” by confirming the assumption to be true. Secondly, Zapp, who has never met Swallow and only knows he “ain’t got a field” or “a PhD”, is interested in what kind of a man he came in exchange of, and the letter provides the first clue. Thirdly, in wanting to ease Zapp into his new position, Philip unconsciously formulates exactly what is normal in his day-to-day teaching. Thus, he, at first, produces a kind of reversed effect of defamiliarization, since he basically defines the commonplace without realising that what is normal to him might be bizarre for Zapp. By letting the reader see the letter through Zapp’s point of view, the implied author turns it into a kind of defamiliarizing device. Firstly, he, thus, ridicules the small tutorials and close personal relationship between the students and teachers (an aspect that is commented on by Zapp: “What kind of a man [...] And to care more”). However, there is a more indirect defamiliarizing effect which is intended for the reader only. The fact Philip invites Morris to use his books as a gesture of collegiality (and at the same time

asks him to protect them from the students' vandalization) highlights the comical force of an episode which comes in the following passage in Swallow's perspective:

'What's the problem, Professor Swallow?'

'These books . . . Where have they come from?'

'Publishers. They want you to assign them for courses.'

'And what if I don't?'

'You keep them anyway. Unless you want to sell them. I know a guy will give you fifty per cent of the list price...'

'No, no,' Philip protested, greedily tearing the wrappers from huge, heavy anthologies and sleek, seductive paperbacks.

A free book was a rare treat in England, and the sight of all this unsolicited booty made him slightly delirious. (54)

Philip's rapture over the riches of American life is potentially even more comical to the reader and, at the same time, the dialogue (upon remembering the letter) makes his gracious offer more ridiculous.

The second incorporated genre is the students' assessment in the *Course Bulletin*, "a kind of consumers' guide to teachers and courses" (56), which is given to Philip on the day of his first arrival at the university by Willy Smith, a minor protagonist of the novel. As Philip browses through the *Bulletin*, the description of three characters is provided – a critique of Howard Ringbaum, an ode to Karl Kroop and an appraisal of Morris Zapp:

English 350. Jane Austen and the Theory of Fiction. Professor Morris J. Zapp. Graduate Seminar. Limited enrolment.

Mostly good reports of this course. Zapp is described as vain, sarcastic and a mean grader, but brilliant and stimulating. 'He makes Austen swing,' was one comment. Only 'A' students need apply. (56-7, emphasis original)

Thus, Philip receives his first depiction of Morris, an image which tallies with what the reader has already gathered from the narrator, Zapp's own behaviour and the perspective of Desirée. Although Philip comments that the students "don't mince words", the fact the evaluations differ in positivity, yet all provide both positive and negative aspects of the course (eg. even Ringbaum's extremely negative report contains a positive remark: "seems to know his material very well"), enhances their objectivity to the reader.

Furthermore, the *Bulletin* presents a complex mixture of doubly-oriented passage – since within these, the implied author incorporates not only the final stylization compiled by Wily (57), but also provides quotes of anonymous students (“Dull, dull dull.” (56), “makes Austen swing”). Thus, it presents a stylistic unity of individualised speech of characters within the stylistic unity of an incorporated semi-literary genre and at the same time, at the level of the narrative structure, it serves as a tool for further characterisation of the three protagonists (all of them having their specific function within the plot).

The last incorporated genre constitutes several quotes from *Let's Write a Novel*. The comical potential of this insertion lies mainly in the accumulated dramatic irony of this particular episode, since, firstly, Zapp suggests Swallow should teach the course because “If he makes a fuck-up of English 305, nobody’s going to notice.” (49). Consequently, when Philip finds the content of his teaching programme from Willy Smith, his initial reaction is that it must be a mistake, because he “couldn’t write a novel to save [his] life” (54). Such comment is already humorous, since the reader (unlike Philip) already knows what courses have been assigned to him and why. The next mention of this strand of the story comes in the middle of the first encounter of Morris and Hilary Swallow:

‘Go ahead. Let me help you. What’s the name of the book?’

She coloured slightly. ‘He said it’s called *Let’s Write a Novel*. I can’t imagine what he wants it for.’

Morris grinned, then frowned. ‘Perhaps he’s going to write one,’ he said, while he thought to himself, ‘God help the students in English 305.’ (71)

It is, yet again, dramatic irony which makes the passage comical, since both the reader and Morris know “why” Philip wants the book and, thus, Morris’s private joke (“Perhaps he’s going to write one” and “God help the students”) is shared with the reader. By letting Morris find the book “five minutes” after Hilary’s departure, the implied author enables the character to leaf through it and satirize it for the amusement of the reader:

It had been published in 1927, as 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. [...]

The best kind of story is the one with a happy ending; the next best is the one with an 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. (73-4)

The stylisation provided by the extracts presents again the doubly-oriented speech and the “refracted intention” (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 324) of the implied author. Firstly, the use of the title (which is a stylisation of the implied author, not an example of intertextuality, since the book does not exist), viewed and satirized through Morris’s perspective, closes the episode and emphasises its humorous effect.

However, there is a deeper level of dialogism, which the reader can uncover only after reaching the end of *Changing Places*, since it is exactly “the kind of story” that “doesn’t really end at all”. The implied author, assuming the voice of the author of *Let’s Write a Novel* (as he has no voice of his own – see Chapter 5.1) is, thus, able to share a self-deprecating comment with the reader, “over the heads” of his character and the (presently covert) narrator. Consequently, he seems to suggest that he either has a “Genius” or must have made an error of judgement and he lets the reader decide for themselves. Three more examples of such a self-directed irony of the implied author appear throughout the novel, all of them directed at the choice of the narrative mode:

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? (110)

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. (159)

HILARY: This is not what I meant by a serious talk. You sound like a couple of scriptwriters discussing how to wind up a play. (210)

The first extract is a rhetorical question in Hilary’s voice, taken from the third chapter, which is rendered in epistolary form. The second extract is taken from the fifth chapter, which is interspersed with retrospective passages in Philip’s point of view (see Chapter 1.1.4). Philip finally receives *Let’s Write A Novel* and opening the book at random reads this particular piece

of advice, whose doubly-oriented use is identical with the preceding passages of the book. The third example presents direct speech from one of Hilary's turns in a film script.

All extracts are instances of doubly-oriented speech. Although all three passages serve a particular intention of the character (or, in the second extract, the author of *Let's Write a Novel*), in all of them the part of the discourse also fulfils the narrative intention of the implied author. In the first and third example he uses Hilary's voice to share an ironical remark with the implied reader, as he allows his own character to criticise and ridicule his artistic choice of the immediate mode of narration.

6.2.5 The Different Unities Introducing Different Points of View

To recapitulate, the narrator remains rather covert throughout most of the chapter, as even the retrospective, descriptive or summative passages are rendered in the protagonists' voice and point of view. Consequently, most of "Settling" comprises passages of reporting, free indirect thought and dialogues, in other words the unity of individualised speech of the characters. However, there are also notable examples of artistic stylisation of semi-literary genres which serve to fulfil various narrative intentions.

The combination of these unities enables the implied author to present the characters and events from various angles. Thus, the reader does not have to rely solely on the opinion of the narrator (e.g. on the overt commentary and judgement of Philip and Morris from the first chapter) but can also judge the protagonist based on the information provided from other sources (e.g. *Course Bulletin*) and on the mimetic rendering of events through dialogues. An illustrative example is the gradually unfolding episode of university politics behind the tenure of Karl Kroop. Philip (and the reader) first encounter the name on the "KEEP KROOP" badge worn by Charles Boon, in the second chapter, by Willy Smith: by Willy Smith? Or on the badge?

'Tell me, that badge you're wearing — what is Kroop?'

Kroop turned out to be the name of an Assistant Professor in the English Department who had recently been refused tenure. 'But there's a grass-roots movement to have him kept on here,' Willy explained. 'Like he's a real groovy teacher and his classes are very popular. The other professors make out he hasn't published enough, but really they're sick as hell because of the raves he gets in the *Course Bulletin*.

The passage is, again, a combination of two different modes, since the dialogue is interrupted by pictorial reporting (“Kroop turned out [...] refused tenure”) which condenses Willy’s explanation in direct speech into a single summative sentence. Although Philip’s point of view is retained, the summary is directed by the narrator. The passage then continues by the stylisation of Willy’s speech, which provides another example of the many heteroglot voices of the novel, introducing the colloquial expressions of the American student slang (e.g. “like he’s a real groovy teacher”, “sick as hell”, “raves”). At the same time, the reader is given the first description of the enigmatic character, which is followed shortly by two evaluations of the *Course Bulletin*:

English 14s. Augustan Pastoral Poetry. Asst. Professor Howard Ringbaum. Juniors and Seniors. Limited enrolment.

Ringbaum, according to most reports, does little to make his subject interesting to students. [...] Another comment: ‘Dull, dull, dull.’ Ringbaum is a strict grader and, according to one report, ‘likes to set insidious little quizzes.’

English 213. The Death of the Book? Communication and Crisis in Contemporary Culture. Asst. Professor Karl Kroop. Limited enrolment.

Rise early on Enrolment Day to sign on for this justly popular interdisciplinary multi-media head-trip. ‘Makes McLuhan seem slow,’ was one comment, and another raved: ‘the most exciting course I have ever taken.’ Heavy reading assignments, but flexible assessment system. Kroop takes an interest in his students, is always available. (56)

Thus, both Philip and the reader gain an image of the two professors, which influences their ability to judge the following mimetic passage more objectively:

Ringbaum looked pleased. ‘Right. How did you know? You’ve seen my article in College English?’

‘I was looking through the *Course Bulletin* the other day...’

Ringbaum’s countenance darkened. ‘You don’t want to believe everything you read in that.’

‘Oh no, of course . . . What d’you think of this chap Kroop then?’ Philip inquired.

‘As little as possible. I’m coming up for tenure myself this quarter, and if I don’t make it nobody around here is going to be wearing RETAIN RINGBAUM buttons.’

‘This tenure business seems to create a lot of tension.’

‘You must have the same thing in England?’

‘Oh no. Probation is more or less a formality. In practice, once you’re appointed they can never get rid of you – unless you seduce one of your students, or something equally scandalous.’ Philip laughed.

‘You can screw as many students as you like here,’ said Ringbaum unsmilingly. ‘But if your publications are unsatisfactory. . . ‘He drew a finger expressively across his throat.
(63)

Again, the conversation is potentially comical in many ways and the reader can appreciate the humour arising from the contrast of the conversation above and the perusal of the *Bulletin*. Firstly, the reader can judge for themselves that Philip’s impulse of mentioning the *Bulletin* to Ringbaum is rather unwise in the first place (given the negative comments he merited). Secondly, it is then possible to suspect that Howard’s view on the subject is probably not the most objective one (an assumption that is confirmed by his jealous remark of “nobody around here is going to be wearing RETAIN RINGBAUM buttons”). Yet, it is an opinion that adds a new perspective on Kroop, who is as hated by his fellow-academics as he is loved by the students.

Furthermore, one of the effects of the dialogue is another defamiliarization through the comparison of the American and British university politics. Not only is there a clash between Ringbaum’s and Philip’s experience (which is amusing partly because neither of them realises how different the situation is on the opposite side of the Atlantic Ocean), but also the two language varieties (or rather the communicative styles) come into conflict. There is a stark contrast between the register Philip and Howard choose to use to describe the same fact (“unless you seduce”, “equally scandalous” vs “screw”), which highlights the comicality of the whole situation.

By providing the reader with different points of view and through different modes (or stylistic unities) of narration, the implied author, therefore, allows them to see the situation from a greater distance and with more objectivity. Since the reader receives “the full picture” of the situation, they can be amused by the dramatic irony that such rendering of the story generates.

6.3 Corresponding and Reading

The third and fourth chapter of the novel are, compared to the previous two, homogenous as far as the narrative mode is concerned, since they are both realized solely through stylization of

semi-artistic literary genres. While the third chapter is stylized into a form of an epistolary novel, consisting of letters exchanged between the two married couples, the fourth chapter comprises of extracts of various newspaper articles, pamphlets and student manifestos.

Consequently, the voice of the narrator disappears for the space of the two chapters and the narrative is coordinated by the implied author only. However, it should be mentioned that there is a subtle sign of overt narration as each of the letters is preceded by the information of who writes to whom (e.g. *Hilary to Philip*, *Desirée to Morris*), information which is, logically, added for the benefit of the reader. Through the artistic stylisation that substitutes the narrative voice (Lodge describes the epistolary mode as “a mimesis of an act of diegesis” or “diegesis at a second remove” (Lodge, *After* 30)), the implied author significantly changes the way the story is perceived by the reader and achieves different narrative effects.

As opposed to the first two chapters in which the implied reader is moulded by overt commentary and judgement of the narrator, who grants the reader an almost unlimited access to the characters minds (the only restriction being the two points of view), the following two chapters significantly narrow the breadth of information that the reader receives. Furthermore, there are no explanatory passages or summaries that would fill the blank spaces in the plot and the implied reader is left to uncover the discrepancies contained in the subjective narratives of the characters' letters and to attempt to discover the connection between the articles and the plot.

Thus, one of the significant effects of the two chosen modes is the generating of humorous potential through dramatic irony. Since the readers often possess the information one/or more of the characters lack, they can compare the reality with the character's attempts to manipulate facts to suit their own purposes. For instances, Hilary's comment in her first letter that she “expect[s] the girls underneath” to “offer to wash [his] shirts and sew buttons” must appear (tragi)comical to the reader, who already knows that Melanie has truly taken “pity on [Philip's] wifeless state” (100), but that she saw to rather different needs than those Hilary has in mind. Similarly, although Hilary explains to Philip that Mary Makepeace has “worked illegally for a while in Soho as a waitress”, the reader can easily deduce that Zapp decided to alter some details of Mary's employment to enhance her chances of being taken in by Hilary.

In addition, the reader is presented with two new perspectives of Hilary and Desirée, who are, through the employment of the letters, granted their narrative voice. As a result, the implied author creates new comical potential by, firstly, contrasting the communicative style (and

personalities) of the four main characters in an innovative way and, also, by providing several points of view on a single episode of the plot.

The fourth chapter, on the other hand, provides the reader with texts of varying degree of formality and objectivity. Sometimes only headlines are given, which effectively invokes the process of a character browsing through the periodical, however, without any signification of reference to which of the protagonist is currently doing the reading. Consequently, the reader can only assume the connection of the text with a specific character by using the clues of the source and location of the article. Ideally, the newspapers should provide an objective depiction of reality (as opposed to the subjective rendering of events in the letters). However, the reader must filter the attempts at manipulations of reality by various ideological perspectives (e.g. the contrast between the student's pamphlets and manifestos and the statements issued by the Chancellor in which the struggle over "the People's Garden in Plotinus" is depicted (132)).

The reader is also unable to determine the exact period of time that the articles cover and in which they are left with only vague hints of the character's actions. Thus, the implied author creates a considerable degree of suspense by denying the reader detailed information about the conflicts in the plot that could have been easily rendered mimetically through dialogue and action and covered several pages. An illustrative example is the episode of Philip's arrest, which is, at first mentioned only indirectly ("Sixteen persons, including a visiting professor from England [...] were arrested") and later in greater detail ("Professor Philip Swallow [...] arrested on Saturday for allegedly stealing bricks from the demolition site (133)). Through the choice of the narrative mode, the implied author evokes a sense of disbelief in the implied reader, created by the contrariety between what the reader already knows about Philip's character and the content of the articles. As a result, the reader is left to wonder whether there has been a mistake or what motives and reasons there could have been that lead Philip into police custody.

Another effect that the implied reader achieves through the incorporation of articles is enhancing the plausibility of some of the less credible coincidences. There are two pieces of news that inform of two natural disasters. Firstly, it is a "landslip" on Pythagoras Avenue which has made the house n. 1037 (which the reader can easily identify as Philip's accommodation) "unsafe for habitation" (131-2). Secondly, a "block of green ice" which is later identified as a "hailstone" of "frozen urine" (141), which has damaged "the top floor" of a house belonging to "Dr Brendan O'Shea" (Zapp's landlord). The reader does not need to worry about the two protagonists, since both articles report that "no one was hurt" (141), however, no more

information about the inhabitants is given. Both accidents, implausible as they are, serve as a device of the implied author, who, thus, moves the professors from their respective flats and into their exchanging partner's home. Thus, the articles function, firstly, as a device which moves the plot forward and, secondly, as a tool that enables the implied author to generate suspense and surprise at the beginning of the fifth chapter.

Consequently, the fourth chapter serves as a kind of framework for the fifth one, since a significant share of the action is clarified through retrospective summaries in Philip's and Zapp's point of view.

6.3.1 Contrast of the two marriages

One of the effects of the epistolary form of narration is the comparison the reader can make of the nature of communication between the two couples, from which a great deal can be inferred about the two relationships.

Although both pairs have children and both women are, supposedly, stay-at-home mothers – there is no mention of either Hilary's or Desirée's occupation – the topics discussed in the letters greatly differ. Hilary's letters, at least at first, confirm her image of "the mother" and display her practicality, which stands in contrast to Philip's tendencies to escapism. However, with three children, someone needs to concern themselves with the mundane and, having Philip for a husband, it leaves the reader to wonder, whether her rationality is not more of a learnt habit than a naturally prominent feature of her character. Although Hilary discusses the options of repairing or exchanging an old washing-machine and answers to Philip's romantic reminiscences of their American honeymoon that "there is no point in getting sentimental" with him away and her having "washing up still to do", she also admits she remembers the view and the "funny little attic apartment" "so well" (100).

While Philip appears to know little about his wife's personality (which, to him, has been exchanged by the identities of their children), Hilary appears to have much more realistic idea of her husband. Thus, Philip's attempts to stifle his guilt (in what seems to be the implied author's parody of the stereotypical reaction of men to extra-marital sexual intercourse) by sending her "a huge bunch of red roses [...] by Interflora", immediately raises suspicion ("I said there must be some mistake because it wasn't my birthday or anything [...] Philip, is anything the matter?"). Furthermore, the episode provides additional contrast of their personalities, displaying again Hilary's unsentimental character as she comments that "Roses

in January must have cost the earth. They were hothouse, naturally, and are dying already.” (103).

Desirée, on the other hand, informs Morris that his attempts to be “witty and charming” to save their marriage are futile, since she is “NOT TAKEN IN” and that he should not throw away “six months’ good screwing for nothing” (101) as she is rather enjoying listening to “all that Slav romanticism [he] made [her] feel ashamed of liking” (102). Furthermore, she incessantly mocks him (and the size of his ego) by comments such as: “A propos of that, isn’t the Lotus Europa you’ve ordered a somewhat young car for you? [...] frankly it’s just a penis on wheels, isn’t it?” (101). However, even in her letters there is a certain contrariety between what she writes and the implications that can be drawn from the fact that she not only answers Morris’s letters (and admits she rather enjoys them (101) but also puts quite a lot of effort into stylizing her own (considering the fact she has set her mind on divorcing him). Even her insults are rather a friendly form of extreme banter that is constantly exchanged between them, as there is very little left that could be said for them to hurt each other.

6.3.2 Multiplicity of points of view

The mode of the epistolary novels enables the implied author to control the story from more than two points of view which results in various effects upon the implied reader.

Firstly, the reader, who has already been provided with a description of Desirée through Philip’s and of Hilary through Zapp’s point of view is given the description of Zapp by Hilary and of Philip by Desirée. Similarly, considerable comical potential is raised by providing different perspectives on events that were rendered previously in one of the main protagonists’ point of view:

I asked Bob Busby how he was settling in, and he said that very few people had seen much of him - he seems to be a rather silent and standoffish person, who spends most of his time in his room. (100)

The statement of Busby, contrasts comically with Zapp’s feeling of isolation and his description of how the staff of the department are avoiding him. The reader is, therefore, lead to doubt the degree of objectivity that the restriction to Zapp’s point of view has provided.

Consequently, an episode, which would (if the narrative mode of the two first chapters was maintained) otherwise be presented through Zapp’s perspective, is described by Hilary Swallow. The reader can, therefore, view the academic without his own adjustment of reality

and is granted the details that Zapp himself might otherwise decide to alter in his favour (he might, for example, omit the fact that, having no idea how to wash the dishes, he managed, in his attempt to help, to break “two plates and a glass” before Hilary managed to “stop him” (109)). In one of her letters, Hilary describes in her own voice how Zapp appeared on their doorstep “at the most awkward time”, meaning just as she was “about to serve up the dinner”, on the pretence of delivering *Let’s Write a Novel* (108). What she does not know, however, is the fact that she is, in fact, describing to the reader the execution of Zapp’s plan to “take it round [...] one suppertime and stand on her stoop, salivating ostentatiously” (73). The knowledge of Morris’s intention enhances the comicality of her comments as she describes that he “practically knocked [her] over in his eagerness to get in the house” and ignored what, to her, was a clear “hint to him to leave promptly”:

[...] he said no, he didn’t mind and I should eat too, and he took off his hat and coat and sat down to watch us. And I mean watch us. His eyes followed every movement from dish to plate to mouth. It was acutely embarrassing. In the end I had to ask him if he wouldn’t like to join us at the table. I don’t think I’ve ever seen anyone so heavily built move quite so fast. It was lucky that I’d cooked a biggish joint because there wasn’t much left on the bone by the time Mr Zapp had had his third helping. Though his table manners left something to be desired, I didn’t really begrudge him the food, since he was obviously starved of decent home cooking. (109)

Firstly, the formality of her expressions (“acutely embarrassing”, “begrudge him the food”) and the subtle irony of her understatements (“there wasn’t much left on the bone”, “table manners left something to be desired”) contained within them makes the portrayal even more comical – especially when compared to the style (and lexis) with which Désirée Zapp chooses to describe various events in her letters. Furthermore, by expressing her relief that she “cooked a biggish joint”, she inadvertently confirms Zapp’s prediction she is the type of a cook who serves “[g]ood plain food”, but in “lavish” quantities (74).

Another way of using the multiplicity of points of view is displayed by the double description of a party that is attended both by Philip and Désirée and at which Philip teaches the guests the game of “Humiliation”. Firstly, while Philip reports that he introduced the game to “stem” Désirée’s “flow of intimate reminiscence” (111), Désirée, unaware of his true motivation, comments that he was “[d]oing his British best to redeem what was looking to be a draggy dinner” (114).

Secondly, they both describe the resultant clash of the American and British cultural differences that the game brings out. While self-promotion (or even talking about one-self) is considered egotistical and inappropriate for the British, the Americans are used to a more aggressive style of communication (<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/cultural-conversation-clashes-between-americans-british-diligent>). Thus, Philip complains about “how difficult it was to get across the basic idea”, since everyone “kept naming books they had read and thought everyone else hadn’t” and voices his astonishment over the “frightening intensity” with which they delved into the game somewhat later (111). Désirée, who also automatically assumed the point was humiliating others (“I assured him I was married to the World Champion”), stresses out to Zapp that “this was a game you won by humiliating *yourself*” (114, emphasis original).

Furthermore, the game has a drawback unintended by Philip, as the most ambitious of the party, Howard Ringbaum, who, according to Désirée, “has a pathological urge to succeed and a pathological fear of being thought uncultured” (114-5) sets his mind on winning the game. Désirée, who has a detailed knowledge of the university politics, reports that Ringbaum “unexpectedly flunked his review three days later” as a consequence of admitting to not having read *Hamlet* (a move which wins him the game and loses him a job which is, in the end, given to Kroop). While Philip, in Désirée’s words “blissfully ignorant of his responsibility for the whole drama” (116), quite absurdly writes that he is “glad to be well out of” the argument concerning the tenure of Ringbaum and Kroop” (113), Ringbaum himself (according to Désirée’s information) is “convinced Swallow conspired to discredit him” (116). It is by providing the reader with these two versions of the story (as they partly contrast with and partly complete each other) that the implied author maximizes the comical potential of this particular episode.

However, the strand of the plot in which the four points of view are exploited most fully, is the gradual disclosing (to all the characters and to the reader) of the fact that Philip has, rather preposterously, had an affair with Melanie Byrd, Morris Zapp’s daughter. The fact is, firstly, revealed by Hilary, having received (together with Morris) a “poison-pen letter”, and her initial reaction is grief and denial (“I know it’s not true but please write at once and tell me that it isn’t. I keep bursting into tears and can’t tell anybody why.” (120)). Morris, on the other hand, instantly believes the anonymous letter as he already suspects Philip of writing a negative review on one of his articles (“Having assassinated my academic character in the TLS, he proceeds to screw my daughter.” (120-1)) and asks Désirée, rather hysterically, to find out the truth from Melanie herself. Consequently, Melanie’s identity is exposed to Philip by Désirée,

who is, thus, able to confirm the rumour to Morris and the reader receives the description of Philip's reaction in Désirée's voice ("if he'd just discovered that he'd screwed his own daughter, he couldn't have looked more shocked" (123)), which, again, renders the whole situation comical. The fourth voice that adds to the whole picture, is of course, Philip's.

She took it for granted that we should sleep together. So I'm afraid we did. [...] I was wretched afterwards, thinking what I'd done to you. It wasn't even particularly enjoyable at the time, because I was fuddled with drink and Melanie was half-asleep. (121)

He fails to give any excuse for his infidelity ("She took it for granted that we should sleep together. So I'm afraid we did.") and rather overrates his guilt and assures Hilary that "it only happened on that one occasion" (121). However, the reader has witnessed his infatuated attempts to persuade Melanie into a love-affair by, somewhat pathetically (although he is certain that he sounds "passionate and poetic"), quoting Marlowe's pastoral poetry to her ("*Come live with me and be my love. And we will all the pleasures prove.*" (98)). Therefore, the reader realises that the abrupt termination of the infidelity was not caused by Philip being unbearably tortured by guilt, but by Melanie escaping from the house to avoid him and explicitly refusing him when forced into direct confrontation. Furthermore, he attempts to downplay the significance of his action by providing unsolicited (and rather sordid) details ("It wasn't even particularly enjoyable at the time, because I was fuddled with drink and Melanie was half-asleep.") (121) of the intercourse. Having already formed an opinion of Hilary's extremely rational and somewhat standoffish personality, the reader is able to judge (without any narratorial commentary) the absurdity of such information, which must surely provide little comfort to her.

In the last few letters of the chapter, the infidelity is used as a catalyst for the final contrasting of Hilary's and Philip's personalities. Furthermore, the implied author inserts a comment in the voice of Désirée (I've heard about the hypocrisy of the English, but I didn't know it was contagious. (124)) which serves as a device for underlining Philip's stunning display of hypocrisy that follows in his last letter (and it is, therefore, another example of doubly-oriented speech).

Since Hilary hasn't answered his letter of guilt confession, he writes that he is "finding it a strain waiting for [her] reply" and tries to propitiate her in a way that confirms, firstly, the weakness of his character, secondly, the irrationality and escapism that is symptomatic of his

behaviour and, thirdly, the absence of any realistic idea of his wife's personality. He suggests that they need to "put the whole thing behind" them and should "see each other, talk, kiss and make up" their "misunderstanding" (what it is exactly, however, that Hilary has misunderstood concerning his unfaithfulness, he does not specify). Consequently, he tries to coax her into leaving the children "with this Mary Makepeace" and into flying over to America (which is probably the most striking example of hypocrisy, since, in the preceding letters, he strongly disapproved of Hilary's decision to provide accommodation to the girl, likening Zapp to Nabokov's "Humbert Humbert" (111), assuring her that Mary must be carrying Zap's child (118) and insinuating that "having an unmarried mother on the premises" might affect the moral well-being of their children (119)). To cap the absurdity of his letter, he finishes with the last attempt to persuade Hilary to visit him: "Girls in summer dresses and people playing guitars. You would enjoy it." (125).

However, the greater the reader's astonishment over his idea that his wife would somehow "enjoy" the ubiquitous "[g]irls in summer dresses", the greater the subsequent amusement caused by Hilary's reply, since the practicality (emphasized again by the formality of her expressions) with which she reacts (the only admittance of grief that she ever expresses over the incident remains her admission of "bursting into tears" (120)) is as extreme as the degree of Philips hypocrisy. She informs him that since he needed "six or seven weeks to get round to telling" her about Melanie, she felt "entitled to take as many days thinking about [her] reply" (127). Yet, she feels that his interpretation of her silence ("I hope you aren't thinking of divorce, or anything silly like that?" (125)) is a "remarkably panicky reaction" (127) and explains that she responded to his infidelity by not waiting "any longer for the central heating" and putting it "immediately on the HP". Furthermore, she provides the reasoning behind her decision:

I thought to myself, here I am, slaving away, running a house and family single-handed for the sake of my husband's career and my children's education, and I'm not even warm while I'm doing it. If he can't wait for sex till he gets home, why should I wait for central heating? (127)

The humorous potential of the passage lies partly in the contrast of the "second honeymoon" (125) offered by Philip and Hilary's own solution of the marital crisis. However, the passage is also comical to the reader since, although her decision is practical in comparison with Philip's suggestions, when viewed in the context of her own behaviour it is extremely impulsive. In her first letter, the implied author indirectly causes the reader to realise that Hilary is so economical a person that even a rather insignificant expanse of repairing or buying a new

washing-machine must be discussed thoroughly. Consequently, the fact that she has so carelessly decided to buy the central heating on a hire purchase, not to mention “put” their account “in the red” (without ascertaining first that they will be able to pay the instalments: “the repayments are pretty heavy [...] so please send some more money home soon”) only proves the emotional upheaval his actions had stirred.

To Philip’s suggestion of coming to America, she reacts, however, with a rather surprising feminist analysis (being greatly influenced by Mary Makepeace, who – as a form of pre-shadowing – is the first person to ever mention the “Woman’s Liberation” Movement to Morris as a reaction to one of his chauvinist remarks (27)). Firstly, she points out the irony and hypocrisy of Philip being “so exercised about [Zapp’s] bad influence on [his] daughter” and adds that, according to Mary, his “obsessive concern to protect Amanda’s innocence” suggests that he is “really in love with her” himself and the “affair with Melanie was a substitute gratification for the incestuous desire” (127). Consequently, Hilary provides a remark which is another example of the implied author’s double-speech, aligning with the previously mentioned parody of the psychoanalytical reading of the novel (see Chapter 1.1.2.3.). Secondly, she (truly not mollified by the romantic image set by Philip: “hills are green, the sky is blue [...] The bay is winking in the sun, and the cables [...] are shimmering like harpstrings on the horizon” (125)) informs him that she would “find it a strain coming over” (again exemplifying her ability to incorporate subtle irony into her speech by repeating his own remark), since he is “prepared to fly [her] six thousand miles” only to obtain “lawful sexual intercourse”, obviously being “frightened off attempting any more extra-marital adventures” (128). In addition, she concludes the argumentation by another feminist comment:

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. Have you come across any signs of it? (128)

Hilary’s inquiry is echoed by the last letter of the chapter, in which Désirée asks Morris, whether he has “ever heard of Women’s Liberation” and informs him that she “was fascinated” by the information she gained by attending their “discussion group in Plotinus”. The chapter, thus, ends by her, in Morris’s perspective somewhat ominous, comment of: “Boy, have they got *your* number! (129, emphasis original). The implied author, thus, foreshadows to the implied reader that both men’s marriages might be influenced by the revolutionary ideas that

the feminist movement is bringing into America at the time (e.g. Hilary sends an application to finish her post-graduate studies (186)).

6.3.3 Defamiliarization and stereotypes

The last effect that is achieved (or rather recycled) through the employment of letters are the new opportunities for the implied author as far as defamiliarization is concerned, since the characters can share their amazement of the scandalising nature of life on the opposite side of the ocean. Thus, Désirée satirises the initial encounter with Philip (“I was somewhat slewed by this time [...] kept calling him Sparrow, but he took it straight on the stiff upper lip” 102), Philip voices his “shock” of the Americans using “four-letter words all the time” (104) and Hilary accuses him of being “thoughtless” in adding demonstrative examples (nice young girls saying ‘shit’ and ‘fuck’, as one might say ‘ Gee whizz’, or ‘ darn it’ (104)), since, as a consequence, “she couldn’t of course let Amanda read it” (108). Similarly, Morris does his best to amuse Désirée with satirical description of the British university system (“Did I say system? A slip of the tongue [...] They have something called tutorials, instead.” (105) and housing:

A very strange John it is, too, a large room obviously designed originally for some other purpose, perhaps ballroom dancing [...] a small oil lamp burning to prevent the water pipes from freezing give the whole place a slightly spooky ecclesiastical atmosphere. (113)

It is obvious that Morris intentionally exaggerates and stylizes his depiction to achieve maximal comical effect, since, although Désirée has advised him to cease trying to save their marriage, he perseveres in his attempts to amuse her.

6.4 Changing

The chapter is realised through a mixture of narrative modes that are very similar to the first two chapters, namely focalisation through Philip’s or Zapp’s point of view, pictorial reporting, indirect thought and direct speech. Similarly, the degree of the narrator’s overtness can be compared to that of the second chapter. In the fifth chapter, however, the implied author exploits the narrative effects achieved by the employment of the articles in *Reading* and the time lapse, the restriction of the amount of information that are given to the reader and the suspense that is created in consequence are utilised to create new narrative possibilities.

Firstly, the implied author exploits the element of surprise, since instead of starting the chapter with a descriptive or summative passage in the diegetic scale of narration (as was the

case in the first two chapters), the fifth chapter begins in the mode of pure mimesis. It starts in the middle of a dialogue and in the first few turns of the conversation the readers are not aware of whose point of view they are presented with. Even the topic of the conversation is rather ambiguous, since pronominal reference is used to express the themes of the first few sentences, which the reader is unable to interpret, having no knowledge of the situational context (“*You* don’t think *it’s* on the small side”, “*It* looks fine to *me*”. “*I’ve* been thinking lately *it* was rather small.” (142, emphasis added)).

After several turns it becomes clear that one of the speakers is Philip (“I’m disappointed in you, Philip, really I am.”) and it is possible to estimate that the woman with whom he is discussing the size of his penis is Désirée as she comments that she likes Philip “not demanding applause for [his] potency” since “with Morris it had to be a four-star fuck every time” (142). Although, at the end of the first page the mode changes into a narrative focalised through Philip’s point of view and Désirée’s identity is confirmed, the reader is left to wonder how the two could have become lovers (as Désirée frequently ridiculed Philip in her letters and Philip explicitly expressed his dislike for her), not to speak of how they came to live together (as Philip proceeds to prepare breakfast for Désirée and the twins).

Consequently, the implied author structures “Changing” in such a way as to be able to sustain the reader’s suspense by gradual disclosure of the missing information. Firstly, the chapter is divided into two halves – the first is rendered in Philip’s, the second in Zapp’s point of view (as opposed to the frequent changes in the first two chapters). Secondly, the plot is, yet again, divided into two temporal dimensions – the present-time dimension providing a framework for retrospective passages, as was the case in the first chapter.

However, the two “halves” of the chapter somewhat differ in terms of the structure, since it is Philip’s part of the story that carries most of the suspense and surprise. Consequently, its composition is somewhat more complex, being framed not only by the temporal dimension, but also by incorporation of the unity of semi-literary genres, specifically, various versions of a letter for Hilary which Philip attempts to compose in his mind. This letter-composing is prompted by Désirée, who asks Philip whether he has finally “written to Hilary” or whether he would rather “another poison-pen letter” did “the job” of informing her about their affair for him (149).

Thus, Philip’s journey to a silent vigil that he promised to attend at the university, is interspersed with his attempts at mentally writing the letter’s introduction. The attempts vary in

the degree of absurdity, starting with somewhat preposterous formulations (“*By the way, I’m having an affair with Mrs Zapp I should have mentioned it before but it slipped my...*”, “*Not to put too fine a point on it, I have been getting laid by Désirée Zapp three or four times a week lately, and it’s done me the world of good...*” (151, emphasis original). However, the tone gets more serious as Philip strives to identify the impulse that enabled the relationship to begin (“*It all started, you see, on the night of the landslide*” (152, emphasis original). Every piece of the letter he composes, is followed by a retrospective passage and, gradually, the reader is provided with summaries and explanations that fill in the information gaps left by the articles. Thus, the evening of the landslide and the subsequent move to Hilary’s house is described (152-3) and his involvement in the Garden of Plotinus, which results in his arrest, is clarified (160-1).

Morris’s half begins with him waking up in the morning in “the Swallows guest room” and, lying in bed, he thinks about how “close” he had “come to getting in the sack with Hilary” the previous night and the present-time dimension is disrupted by a four-page-long retrospective passage describing the whole episode. However, most of Zapp’s section consists of mimetically rendered action in the present-tense dimension, its narrative power lying in situational humour created by events such as Morris being chased by his superior (who has just escaped from a psychiatric clinic and is supposedly trying to shoot Zapp) all over the university (in the end, Morris manages to trap Gordon Masters in the paternoster (194)).

6.5 Ending

The last chapter of the novel is rendered in the form of a film script, which is (just as the form of drama (Lodge, *After 28*)), an example of pure mimesis. The narrator is, therefore, completely effaced, since the descriptions of setting (“*Exterior: BO AC VC10 flying from left to right across screen - afternoon, clear sky. Sound: jet engines.*” (203, emphasis original)) and the characters’ and camera’s movement (*Close-up: PHILIP, asleep, wearing headphones, his mouth slightly open. Draw back to reveal DÉSIRÉE sitting next to him* (203, emphasis original)) are presented in the impersonal form of screen directions, which help the reader visualize what would otherwise be “shown” by the film medium.

As was the case in the choice of the epistolary narrative form, the implied author employs this specific mode since it helps him successfully achieve the intended narrative effects and it allows the author to include events that would seem rather far-fetched, if rendered in the form of overt narration.

An illustrative example is the initial scene in which the two planes, one carrying Philip and Désirée, the other Morris and Hilary, nearly crash over the Kennedy airport, causing panic and confusion in both aircrafts. The implausibility of such an accident borders on the intolerable. However, by presenting it through the film medium (although in written form), the implied author manages to “persuade” the implied reader to accept the incident, since one is accustomed to watching most unbelievable scenes with little scepticism on the screen, for instance, in various action movies.

The accident is, subsequently, used as the last (and possibly the most exaggerated) contrasting of the British and American communicative style, since, while the British captain “coolly” informs the Flight Control that he has “to report an air miss”, the American pilot provides a more “enraged” reaction to the incident: “What the fuck do you think you guys are doing down there?” (204)

Furthermore, the comical potential of the last chapter relies mainly on situational humour and the mode of the film is well suited for its realisation:

MORRIS: (shrugs) OK, honey. You and Philip have the other room. We’ll stay here.

HILARY: Either way, isn’t it rather prejudging the issue?

MORRIS: (*spreads hands*) O K. What do you suggest?

Cut to:

Interior: blue hotel room - night.

PHILIP and MORRIS are in the twin beds, PHILIP, wearing pyjamas, is apparently asleep, MORRIS, bare chested, is awake, one hand behind his head, the other under his sheet.

MORRIS: We shouldn’t have let them get away with it. (207, emphasis original)

In the example given above, the two couples arrive at the hotel and are deciding on the room arrangement. It is the direct cut and the visualisation of the two men in one room together, that generate most of the comedy, since the same scene described by the narratorial voice would, most probably, be less effective.

However, the most crucial intention of the author which leads to the choice of the narrative mode, is mentioned by Lodge in the introduction to *The Campus Trilogy*. He admits that approaching “the end of the novel” he realised that he did not wish to end the novel with a final resolution of the plot and, thus, “favour[ed] any of the possible life choices it entailed”.

Consequently, he adds that: “The conventions of film narrative provided a convenient solution.” (xii).

Watching the Plotinus March on the TV screen, a philosophical discussion is started, firstly, by Philip’s monologue about the problem of the generation gap between them and the minor character’s (Willy Smith, Melanie Byrd, Charles Boon). His opinions are contradicted by Désirée’s newly gained feminist ideas. While he talks of “fucking in the streets” as a form of revolution of the young, she points out that the Garden of Plotinus is, in fact, “a sexual trap” as “girls [are] getting raped every night down” there without the fact being recognised by the newspapers (214). Philip, rather ignoring her speech (“Well, you may be right, Désirée. All I’m saying is that there *is* a generation gap” (214, emphasis original), compares his generation to “the great tradition of realistic fiction” and adds that it is “an unnatural medium” for the young generation’s experience as they are “living a film, not a novel” (214). Zapp disagrees, arguing that the “paradigms of fiction are essentially the same whatever the medium”, since it “makes no difference at the structural level” and Philip opposes the statement by introducing the problem of “endings”.

While at the beginning of the rather academic discussion, the two women attempt to terminate the dispute and bring the conversation back to “what the four of [them] are going to do in the immediate future”, when Philip starts his last monologue, pointing out that “the novelist can’t help giving away [...] that his book is shortly coming to an end”, they all start listening attentively. The camera, therefore, focuses on Philip as he argues that in the film “at any point the director chooses, without warning, without anything being resolved, or explained, or wound up, it can just... end” at which point the final cut freezes “him in mid-gesture” and the readers are left to ponder the possible resolutions of the marital quadrangle on their own (215).

In the last part of the chapter, the refracted use of the character’s speech as a tool of the implied author is almost tangible. The speech of the characters primarily serves the author’s intention to bring all the ideologies (of feminism, literary criticism or sociologically or philosophically motivated issues) into final conflict. In consequence, the dialogue becomes rather a set of monologues that are only loosely connected, which, at moments, creates a somewhat unnatural effect (even Philip’s final turn resembles a prepared speech or lecture rather than an instance of spontaneous spoken discourse).

Zapp's argument that the choice of the narrative medium is not significant is, however, disputed not only by Philip's argumentation, but by the narrative realisation of the whole novel. Since, in the structure of *Changing Places*, every introduction of a different narrative medium provides the implied author with varying narrative tools and achieves innovative effects.

Conclusion

The aim of the final chapter of this thesis is to, firstly, summarize which unities have been identified in the chosen novel and, secondly, to list and compare the effects that Lodge achieves by the employment of the same stylistic unity in varying contexts and combinations. Within *Changing Places*, the implied author combines three of the stylistic unities defined by Bakhtin, namely the direct authorial literary-artistic narration, the stylistically individualized speech of characters and the stylization of the various semi (or extra)-literary everyday narration.

The unity of authorial narration most frequently appears in the form of metafictional passages (e.g. defending the structure of the novel in the first chapter), diegetic descriptions of the setting (which often serve as a means of changing the point of view) or direct (often ironical) judgement and clarifying narratorial comments (e.g. “Actually, Gordon Masters had decided to back Philip [...] because he wanted to give a Senior Lectureship to a considerably younger member of the Department [...] Philip was not to know this, of course, though a less innocent politician might have suspected it.” (20)). Although the first chapter begins with a long diegetic passage which is filled with metafictional commentary, with every chapter the narrator’s overtness moves closer to the mimetic scale of the narrative mode and the narrator gets gradually more effaced. Thus, the implied author uses the first chapter to explain his artistic intention and justify his decisions and he controls the initial characterisation through overt commentary of the narrator. Consequently, he enhances the probability of creating the ideal implied reader (and securing a successful reading of his novel) from the start and may “step back” in the following chapters, letting the reader discover the implied ironies without any overt help. That is not to say, however, that the presence of the implied author disappears completely as he continues to manipulate the narrative through many instances of doubly-oriented speech that were analysed in detail in the practical part.

As was explained in the theoretical part, there is a mode of narration that is not specifically defined in Bakhtin’s typology and that borders between the two unities of the narrator’s and character’s speech. The pictorial style of reporting is used extensively in the first, second and fifth chapters of the novel. In the first chapter, the pictorial reporting is used to introduce the idiosyncratic style of the characters and, thus, serves as a means of characterisation. Furthermore, the mixture of the pictorial reporting, indirect thought and direct speech which is, in the first chapter, incessantly interrupted by overt commentary, is the narrative device that enables the implied author to create the implied reader that is most likely to enjoy and appreciate

his narrative. On the one hand, he gives his characters the opportunity to express themselves, therefore, he “shows” the reader what they are like through indirect characterisation (realised by free indirect thought and the dialogues with Mary and Charles). At the same time, however, he directly “tells” the reader what to think about the characters either through overt commentary or by adding ironical and judgemental overtone to the passages of pictorial reporting.

The unity of the individualised speech of the characters functions, firstly, as a mimetic form of characterisation, since the style of each of the characters reflects their personality traits. Secondly, the clash between them generates a considerable amount of the comical potential of the novel. It should be emphasized, that the individualised speech does not appear in direct speech only, but also in the mode of pictorial reporting (see Chapter 6.1.2, 35-6) and in the epistolary form of narration.

The clash between the characters’ style is determined, firstly, by the cultural differences between the American and British characters (see Chapter 6.2.3) and it is succinctly summarized in the fifth chapter of the novel in which Zapp, already used to the oddities of the British communicative style, comments on the weather forecast:

“Sunny spells.” [...] he was getting used to the quaint meteorological idiom [...] He accepted that, like so much British usage, it was a language of evasion and compromise, designed to take the drama out of the weather. [...] all was moderate, qualified, temperate.” (171)

Secondly, there are striking differences in the characters’ personalities and their idiosyncratic use of language. Hilary’s straightforward style (and the down-to-earth topics she usually discusses) contrasts with Philip’s sentimentality. Her strict adherence to social communicative norms and customs (e.g. her constant employment of politeness formulas) clashes with Désirée’s use of profanities and flouting of the Politeness Maxims. Most of the contrarities, however, can be found in the comparison of the style of Philip and Morris.

As was discussed in Chapter 6.1.2., the two protagonists’ use of adjectives, idioms and figures of speech significantly differs and the contrast serves as a means of indirect characterisation. Furthermore, a parallel effect is achieved by the employment of intertextuality in their speech and thinking. Zapp usually uses allusions to emphasize his sarcastic judgement (“Everything he knew about England warned him that the heresy [of naïve theories of realism] flourished there with peculiar virulence [...] encouraged by the many concrete reminders of the actual historic existence of great authors that littered the country [...] houses with plaques,

second-best beds” (40, emphasis added), or alluding to Robert Rauschenberg and Marshall McLuhan when ridiculing the departmental noticeboard (49)). Even the fact his children are named (as Philip comments, “rather preposterously” (104) Elisabeth and Darcy, which could be read as an instance of the sentimentality he hates and ridicules, is in fact a kind of personal satire, a sarcastic joke, but decidedly not a heart-felt reverence for Jane Austen’s characters.

Philip, on the other hand, uses intertextual references either to sound more poetic (citing pastoral poetry to Melanie (98)) or because he seriously identifies himself with the author. Such allusions are usually indirectly mocked by the ironical overtone of the narrator. To exemplify, it takes Philip one extra-marital coitus with Melanie to be able to feel like Lawrence (“He felt a dark Lawrentian joy in his domination over the prone girl” (84)) and to identify with Conrad’s Mr. Kurtz, as his exclamation of “Oh God, the guilt, the guilt!” (87) reminds one of the repetition of Kurtz’s “The horror! The horror!” (Conrad 100). Furthermore, after spending a few hours in a prison cell and starting an affair with Désirée, he is suddenly sure that not only can he understand all the famous writers, but his life, finally, truly resembles theirs:

“[...] Philip felt himself finally converted to expatriation [...] He thought of James’s *The Ambassadors* [...] of Henry Miller [...] with his notebook on his knee and the smell of cunt still lingering on his fingers and he felt some distant kinship [...] understood Walt Whitman [...] and Herman Melville [...] and why Mark Twain [...] and why Stephen Crane wrote [...] and what Gertrude Stein meant” (167).

At this point, there is no need for any overt commentary of the narrator as the reader can detect the implied author’s irony behind Philip’s absurd thoughts without any direct assistance.

Furthermore, the passages rendered in Philip’s point of view are often filled with what John Ruskin termed “pathetic fallacy”, in other words “the projection of human emotions onto phenomena in the natural world” (Lodge, Art 85), when he describes the landscape and weather:

[...] a perfect marriage of Nature and Civilization, this view” (46)

[...] autumn joined hands with spring and summer, and together they danced a three-handed jig all year long [...] Philip felt his pulse beating to its exhilarating rhythm. (48)

A solitary woman was leaning against the balustrade, staring moodily at the Bay, where a spectacular sunset was in progress, the orange globe of the sun just balanced, it seemed, on the suspension cables of the Silver Span bridge. (64)

Probably the most emblematic (and the most ridiculous) example of pathetic fallacy appears when Melanie refuses to have an affair with Philip and he immediately describes a sudden change of weather to emphasize his feeling of despair: “The sun had dropped behind the rooftops and he shivered in a sudden gust of chill wind off the Bay. The glory had gone from the afternoon.” (99).

The implied author ridicules such descriptions through other characters, who either directly attack Philip’s sentimentality or indirectly ridicule it. In the third quote given above, Philip exalts again in the beauty of the Bay moments before meeting Désirée for the first time. It does not take long for her to attack his sentiment by saying that all the wealthier households must have “The view.” so that “Every time you go to dinner or to a party, it’s a different house, and different drapes [...] but the same fucking view.” (67). Similarly, Hilary wards off all Philip’s attempts to evoke old (or new) emotions by pathetic fallacy descriptions in his letters (see Chapter 6.3.1., 58 and Chapter 6.3.2., 63). The most obvious contrast, however, is presented through Zapp’s point of view, since, in case Morris comments on the weather, it is always with cynical overtone (“It can’t be England if it’s not raining. We must be off course.” (43). The only instance of a weather description that does not, at first, appear sarcastic and which is, at the same time, an epitome of pathetic fallacy (“Through the murk the dull red eye of a sun that had scarcely been able to drag itself above roof level all day was sinking blearily beneath the horizon, spreading a rusty stain across the snow-covered surfaces.”) is, however, immediately followed by a reported thought (“Real pathetic fallacy weather, Morris thought.”) in which Morris critiques his own thinking (69).

Consequently, both Philip’s poetic descriptions and their satirical counterparts in the voice of the other characters are, in fact, doubly-oriented expressions serving the implied author’s intention. They present another example of hidden polemic and self-deprecation of his own writing, since Lodge states that the employment of pathetic fallacy is frequently the sign of “overblown, self-indulgent writing” (Lodge, Art 85). Thus, by inserting instances of pathetic fallacy in Philip’s voice only, he is able to, firstly, distance himself from its use and mock his character at the same time, and, secondly, to direct an ironic comment towards his readers and literary critics.

Lastly, there are various instances of incorporating the semi-literary narration into the novel and the varied stylisations serve, yet again, as devices that achieve a wide range of effects on the implied reader. Some function as a foreshadowing device (e.g. the lapel buttons on Charles Boon’s jacket, Philip’s welcome letter for Zapp, in which he warns Morris that “Brenda Archer

suffers badly from pre-menstrual tension” (52) which later causes her to faint during a tutorial (106) and the fact the reader is able to match the two pieces of information generates the resultant comical effect), as means of characterisation (e.g. the passages of the *Student Bulletin*), of creating suspense and increasing the distance between the implied reader and the characters or as a framework for retrospective passages (the letter of adultery-admission that Philip composes in his mind in the fifth chapter). At times, the chosen form of stylisation enables the author to include such coincidences and accidents that would, if rendered in a different form of narrative, be considered too implausible (e.g. the two natural catastrophes that befall the protagonist and force them out of their accommodation that are rendered in the objectified form of the newspaper articles or the near collision of the two planes that is visualised in the mode of the film script).

It should be emphasized that the incorporation of letters, in fact, combines two of Bakhtin’s stylistic unities. Firstly, such incorporation presents a discourse that is stylistically informed by the rules that are characteristic of the given genre and as such falls into the category of semi-literary genres. However, in the case of *Changing Places*, the letters also provide the implied reader with the “authentic” speech of the characters, since both direct speech and epistolary mode belong to the purest mimetic forms of narration. Consequently, the third chapter that is composed of letters, presents a plane in which the communicative style of the four main protagonists’ can most effectively contrast and, at the same time, it enables the implied author to provide two more points of view to a considerable comical effect.

One of the most significant effects that the constant changing of narrative modes and combining various stylistic unities enables the implied author to achieve is to fully exploit the comical potential of defamiliarization. Throughout the novel, the same aspects of the British and American society are defamiliarized, but by changing the narrative mode, the author is able to repeatedly exploit one topic and yet create new comical situations and effects. The cultural differences of the communicative style, university politics – especially the problem of tenure, the insufficiencies of the British housing compared to the comfortable American homes – all of these aspects are continuously ridiculed through different stylisations – firstly via indirect thought and pictorial reporting (e.g. Zapp describing his accommodation in the second chapter), then through direct speech (e.g. the first meetings of Zapp with Hillary and Philip with Désirée, the dialogue of Zapp and the department’s secretary or Philip with Ringbaum (see Chapter 6.2.2.)). Later, the same aspects are defamiliarized in the form of letters in order to amuse and startle the spouses at home and, moreover, at the end of the novel, the implied author uses the

novelty of the film script to reinforce the cultural and stylistic clash of the two language varieties (e.g. the verbal reaction of the two captains to the air miss).

Furthermore, the rich mixture of stylistic unities provides the author with varied opportunities to bring the heteroglossia of the English language into the novel and to allow its singular voices to come into conflict. However, in Lodge's work, there is not only extremely vivid dialogism contained within his novels, but also a vibrant communication between his critical publications, his novels and his teaching career.

Being a novelist himself and, thus, being acquainted with the challenges of creating a certain representation of reality in which the characters come to life, Lodge, the literary critic, cannot fully agree with the theoretical paradigms of post-structuralist theories (especially the effacement of the author). Consequently, this dissatisfaction leads him to create his own critical theory that combines the seemingly incorrigible paradigms of the traditional humanist model and post-structuralism and which draws significantly on the theoretical work of Mikhail Bakhtin. At the same time, the reservations he has concerning certain doctrines of the leading critical theories of the 1970's are reflected in the characters of his campus novels and influence the "world-view" (Lodge, *After* 12) that he presents therein. Although there are passages which reverberate with such dialogism in *Changing Places* (e.g. "In Morris Zapp's view, the root of all critical error was a naïve confusion of literature with life. [...] Literature was never about what it appeared to be about [...] considerable ingenuity and perception were needed to crack the code of realistic illusion" (Lodge, *Campus* 39) or Philip and Zapp's theoretical dispute about the significance of the chosen medium of fiction which concludes the novel), his disagreement with deconstruction is most noticeable in the third novel of his campus trilogy, *Nice Work* (1988).

The character of Robyn Penrose, a university lecturer who specializes in the deconstruction of the industrial novel, is the epitome of the dialogic conversation between his theoretical works and his artistic writing. Within the novel, the implied author uses Robyn's character as a literary device which enables him to satirize the deconstructionist notions that he most disagrees with. Robyn is first introduced to the reader through overt narratorial commentary, in which the intrusive author states that the reader is going to "meet" a protagonist "who, rather awkwardly for [the author], doesn't herself believe in the concept of character", since it is "a bourgeois myth, an illusion created to reinforce the ideology of capitalism" (Lodge, *Campus* 602). The reader is also informed that Robyn is of the opinion that "there is no thing as an author" and all texts are created through "intertextuality, a tissue of allusions to and

citations of other texts". Subsequently, the narrator intrudes again to inform the reader that he "shall", however, "take the liberty of treating her as a character" (Lodge, *Campus* 603). Thus, he indirectly ridicules the subversion of the author's position by practically demonstrating that even though Robyn does not believe in his existence he, as the creative mind behind his work, has the power to use her as a narrative tool and shape her "destiny" within the plot.

Lodge, however, takes the satire even further. He partly complies with the post-structuralist notion that all texts are produced through intertextuality as the plot of *Nice Work* and the relationship of the two main protagonists provide a parody of one of the novels that Robyn dissects in her lectures, namely Gaskell's *North and South*. Nevertheless, he uses the intertextual reference to satirize Robyn's academic beliefs even further.

While the implied reader mimetically shows her lecture, and lets her criticise the "narrative solutions" which are "invariably negative or evasive" (Lodge, *Campus* 637) since "all the Victorian novelist could offer [...] to the problems of industrial capitalism were: a legacy, a marriage, emigration or death" (Lodge, *Campus* 638), as the novel approaches its end, he, ironically, provides Robyn with three options from the list she mentioned earlier. Firstly, Morris Zapp offers her a job in America (868-9). Secondly, her former feminist boyfriend, Charles, asks her to marry him, since, having become "a merchant banker" (829) he is "confident that [he] shall be earning enough [...] to support [her] in the style to which [she has] become accustomed" (883). Thirdly, she receives a letter informing her about "her uncle Walter's will" in which he left her a sum of money so enormous that she "could live off the interest" (884).

Thus, Lodge punishes his female character for her disbelief of his creative power by tempting her with these Victorian solutions to her life situation. At the same time, he mocks the deconstructionist critic in a perfect instance of doubly-oriented speech – or rather doubly-oriented narrative act. To enhance the comical potential of the mockery, the implied author makes Robyn tell her feminist friend that she feels "as if [she's] getting dragged into a classic realist text, full of causality and morality" (824) even before she is left to choose between all those alternatives.

As was already mentioned, *Nice Work* is analogous to *North and South* in many ways. Firstly, there is a great resemblance of the life-philosophy and experience of Vic Wilcox and the manufacturer John Thornton, and of the left-wing thinking of Margaret Hale and Robyn Penrose. Most importantly, however, although the novel does not end with Vic and Robyn

getting married, Lodge partly copies the ending of *North and South*, since Robyn, just as Margaret, unexpectedly inherits a large sum of money which she decides to invest by lending a major part to Vic (Gaskell 402). Thus, both female protagonists enable the “fallen businessmen” to start from scratch again. Consequently, even though Robyn refuses the option of marriage and emigration, she uses the sudden possession of capital to get involved in the capitalist world she so ardently criticises throughout the novel. Furthermore, the economic security the inheritance grants her allows her to risk staying in Rummidge for a slight chance of getting tenure (890).

Lodge’s roles of a novelist, critic and teacher both enrich and battle one another. It is this triple perspective which lends his novels a powerful comical potential. Furthermore, this perspective makes his theoretical work accessible and comprehensible even for the general public and simultaneously makes *Changing Places* a fascinating material for stylistic analysis. His ability to introduce multiple voices through various characters and stylisations and the stylistic variety that he manages to incorporate into a single literary work is rather overwhelming, but also stimulating to analyse. While the thesis focuses on a single novel so that a thorough analysis of the unities and their effects can be conducted, it would also be beneficial to extend the practical part to focus on a comparative analysis of Lodge’s novels.

Sources

Primary sources

Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness*. London: Penguin Books, 1994. Print.

Gaskell, Elisabeth C. *North and South*. London: Wordsworth Editions Limited. 1994. Print.

Lodge, David. *The Campus Trilogy: Changing Places; Small World; Nice Work*. London: Vintage Classics, 2011. Print.

Secondary sources

Barthes, Roland. *Image Music Text*. London: Fontana Press, 1977. Print.

Culler, Jonathan. *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Print.

Forster, E.M. *Aspects of the Novel*. New York: RosettaBooks LLC, 2002. Print.

Holquist, Michael. *The Dialogic Imagination by M.M.Bakhtin: Four Essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2008. Print.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetic of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. London: Routledge, 1988. Print.

McHale, Brian. *Postmodernist Fiction*. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1978. Print.

Jakobson, Roman. Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (ed.) *Style in Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1960. Print.

Lodge, David. *After Bakhtin*. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.

Lodge, David. *The Art of Fiction*. New York: Viking Penguin, 1993. Print.

Lodge, David. *Language of Fiction*. London: Routledge Classics, 2001. Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Ed. Caryl Emerson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984. Print.

Booth, Wayne C.. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983. Print.

Vice, Sue. *Introducing Bakhtin*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997. Print.

Waugh, Patricia. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*. London: Routledge. 2001. Print.