"Soya Beans and Cricket Bats":

SOCIETY AND THE ARTIST IN THE

PLAYS OF TOM STOPPARD

by

DOREEN HELEN THOMPSON

B.A., University of Victoria, 1982

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

English

ACCEPTED
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

[redacted]

DEAN

DATE May 4, 84

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

[redacted]

Dr. Anthony W. Jenkins

[redacted]

Dr. Reginald C. Terry

[redacted]

Dr. Alan Hughes

[redacted]

Dr. William Kinderman

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

April 1984

Supervisor: Dr. Anthony W. Jenkins

ABSTRACT

In the early Stoppard plays, the hero-heroine prototypes are super-sensitive characters whose exclusive, often irresponsible behaviour is justified by the special dispensation implied in being an artist, whether in fact or in fancy. But in Travesties, Stoppard expresses a concern with the neutrality of the artist vis-à-vis the day-to-day politics of the rest of society. The shift from detached craftsman to committed artist becomes increasingly apparent in the later plays as the artist-figures become participants in issues which move substantially closer to real-life situations. An exploration of the role of the artist throughout the plays provides a valuable insight into the continual tension that Stoppard experiences as regards the privilege and responsibility of the artist and the function of art in society.

The first chapter examines the spectator-hero of Stoppard's earliest writings, beginning with Lord Malquist, who advocates stylish withdrawal from social pressures. Similar escapist maneuvers are employed by the artist-figures in Albert's Bridge, Enter a Free Man, If You're Glad, I'll Be Frank, and Jumpers, who find themselves at odds with an incompatible world. For Stoppard himself, artistic detachment manifests itself as an overt intellectualism that refuses to take sides, and a fascination with his own unique ability to present ideas cleverly, effectively, and with a dazzling theatrical

flair. The verbal and visual jokes which claim no other purpose than to entertain can be justified however on the basis of Stoppard's particular "art for art's sake." Stoppard's artfulness, at least in the early plays, can be seen as stylish withdrawal.

The second chapter focuses on Travesties, the work in which Stoppard most clearly articulates the problem of neutrality versus involvement. Significantly, the war of ideas in Travesties is waged with no suggestion of a clear-cut authorial position. But Stoppard's link with Oscar Wilde, through frequent allusions to The Importance of Being Earnest, encourages the view that the author is operating on more than one level, deliberately assuming a superficial frivolity as a means of advancing more serious considerations. Even though, in Travesties, Stoppard continues to create visual and verbal complexities in the cause of "art for art's sake," he is faced with the same dilemma that he devises for his artists-in-war who ask themselves whether the pursuit of art for its own sake can be maintained amidst political disasters that affect all mankind.

The third chapter deals with the social commitment of Stoppard's later, more polemical writing, in plays such as Every Good Boy Deserves Favour and Professional Foul, which also heralds a departure from his former dispassionate rendering of ideas by puppet-like figures to the creation of relatively self-motivated characters, capable of expressing human emotions in recognizably true-to-life situations. A growing uneasiness with the discrepancy between his own art and actuality probably caused Stoppard to narrow the gap in his most recent play, The Real Thing. Questions pertaining to art

are no longer presented in the form of an open-ended debate, but relate to matters which the hero, Henry, must resolve on a personal level. The theory of art for art's sake has now been replaced by Henry's conviction that art is his means of shaping what he has to say into a more effective instrument for conveying his ideas. As Stoppard aligns himself more directly with the play's central character, we receive a clearer picture of the privileged and gifted artist coming to terms with his responsibilities as they relate to his art, and to the politics of his public and private life.

Examiners:

[redacted]

Dr. Anthony W. Jenkins

[redacted]

Dr. Reginald C. Terry

[redacted]

Dr. Alan Hughes

[redacted]

Dr. William Kinderman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Professor Katharine Worth, Department of Drama and Theatre Studies, Royal Holloway College, for making available to me the resources of the British Universities Film Council during the summer of 1983. I particularly appreciate the kind assistance rendered by Miss Marion Holmes of the B.U.F.C.'s London office who provided access to research materials held by the Consortium for Drama and Media in Higher Education. In addition, I owe special thanks to those friends and associates who have drawn my attention to current articles about Tom Stoppard which I might otherwise have missed. Finally, I wish to acknowledge my faculty advisor, Dr. Anthony Jenkins, to whom I am forever indebted. In his multiple role as teacher, critic, and mentor, he has diligently read and commented on numerous manuscripts, always offering guidance and inspiration. Not only did Dr. Jenkins first introduce me to the works of Tom Stoppard, but he has continued to nurture my interest in them.

INTRODUCTION

In his "Profile" of Tom Stoppard in the December 1974 issue of The New Review, Ronald Hayman refers to the "debate about art which has been going on inside [Stoppard's] brain for years,"[1] and cites this internal argument as the "mainspring" of Travesties (1974).[2] The play's central character is Henry Carr, a minor official in Zurich's British Consolate during World War I, around whom revolve the legendary figures of James Joyce, Tristan Tzara, and Lenin. As the self-styled chronicler of actual and imagined events, Carr may be seen as a provocative (if unreliable) spokesman for the playwright himself as he alternately attacks and defends the artist and his role in society.

It is Carr who defines the artist as "someone who is gifted in some way that enables him to do something more or less well which can only be done badly or not at all by someone who is not thus gifted" (Travesties, p. 38). A similar definition appears in an earlier Stoppard play written for radio, Artist Descending a Staircase (1972),[3] where the lines are spoken by Donner and expanded upon by his fellow-artist, Beauchamp, who insists that "the artist is a lucky dog":

> . . . in any community of a thousand souls
> there will be nine hundred doing the work,
> ninety doing well, nine doing good, and
> one lucky dog painting or writing about
> the other nine hundred and ninety-nine.
>
> (Artist Descending, p. 43)

The idea of the artist as a unique and privileged member of society is further elaborated upon in Travesties when Carr questions Tzara as to the source of the artist's special dispensation:

> When I was at school, on certain afternoons we all had to do what was called Labour -- weeding, sweeping, sawing logs for the boiler-room, that kind of thing, but if you had a chit from Matron you were let off to spend the afternoon messing about in the Art Room. Labour or Art. And you've got a chit for life? (passionately) Where did you get it?
>
> (Travesties, p. 46)

Unlike Donner and Beauchamp, Carr makes no claims to being an artist himself; nevertheless, when his quirky imagination reshapes historical events to enhance his own importance in them, he reveals the sensitivity, eccentricity, and inventiveness normally associated with an artistic personality. In this regard, he can be linked with the hero-heroine prototypes of Stoppard's earlier writings, those extra-sensitive characters whose exclusive behaviour is justified by the possession of a real or an assumed "chit from Matron." At odds with their perception of the world around them, they place themselves, imaginatively or in actual fact, above or beyond the main action: Lord Malquist in his 19th-century horse-drawn coach, George Riley in a fantasy-world of his own invention, Gladys in the clockwork of eternal Time, Albert on his bridge, George Moore in his "ivory tower" study, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern trying to make sense of events in Elsinore.

But if Henry Carr, as he fabricates his own recollections of the first World War, is a continuation of Stoppard's early heroes, he is

also the forerunner of the later "artists" who are more deliberately questioning of their roles and more active in their direct participation in social and political issues which they can neither ignore nor evade. When Henry Carr, arguing with Tzara about the justification for being an artist, states that "to be an artist _at all_ is like living in Switzerland during a world war" (_Travesties_, p. 38), he is expressing Stoppard's concern with the neutrality of the artist _vis-à-vis_ the day-to-day politics of the rest of society, a disquieting sense of guilt which anticipates the feeling of the "artists" in the later plays, such as _Every Good Boy Deserves Favour_ (1977)[4] and _Professional Foul_ (1977),[5] those writers and philosophers who find themselves personally involved with the plight of imprisoned dissidents in present-day Russia and Czechoslovakia. On the other hand, in _Jumpers_ (1972),[6] a play written two years before _Travesties_, an impractical and ineffectual philosopher, George Moore, exercises his logical powers on questions of morality while refusing to commit himself against the social violence and political corruption which threaten both his private and public life. In this connection, C. W. E. Bigsby likens Stoppard to George Moore:

> In many ways, his [George's] problem is that of the playwright himself, in love with words and ideas, but detached from the real world by virtue of his craft, as the philosopher is by virtue of his need to deal in abstractions rather than concrete realities.[7]

Bigsby sees this retreat into art as central to Stoppard's next major work, _Travesties_, which he describes, as did Hayman, as an attempt "to examine the whole question of the role of the artist."[8] Yet the shift from detached craftsman to committed artist which, with the benefit of

hindsight, is easily discernible in the plays which follow the Travesties debate, is already apparent in a statement made by Stoppard during a 1974 interview:

> Art . . . is important because it provides the moral matrix, the moral sensibility, from which we make our judgments about the world.[9]

In this and subsequent interviews, Stoppard elaborates on what is "important" in art (its moral effect) and what it is that distinguishes "good" from "bad" in art (its aesthetic form). Moreover, in keeping with his developing concern, the artist-figures in the major plays written after Travesties, rather than maintaining the position of spectators at whatever cost, become participants in issues which move substantially closer to real-life situations. Significantly, in Stoppard's most recent work, The Real Thing (1982),[10] another Henry, this time a playwright and a more reliable mirror-image of Stoppard himself, is cast as the artist's "voice" in a play which at first glance appears to be a continuation of the Travesties controversy but which actually illustrates a new emphasis on Stoppard's constant preoccupation.

Because the role of the artist is so central to Stoppard's works, an exploration of this theme throughout the plays provides a valuable insight into the continual tension Stoppard experiences as regards the role of the artist in his society, a unique position, implying both privilege and responsibility, with which the playwright seeks to come to terms.

CHAPTER I

Art vs. Labour: "A Chit for Life"

In Lord Malquist and Mr. Moon (1966),[1] Stoppard's only novel to date, the perfect stereotype of the "artistic" temperament is personified in Lord Malquist. An artist, as opposed to one who labours with his hands, Lord Malquist adopts the stance of the spectator-hero, "the man of inaction who would not dare roll up his sleeves for fear of creasing the cuffs" (Malquist, p. 79). Malquist's eccentricity and self-absorption, as well as his predilection for form and colour, are obvious hallmarks of his artistic personality:

> My hat is of a colour described by my hatter as pearl black. My pearl pinned to my lapel is of a colour described by my jeweller in literal translation from his native Chinese as sunkissed dewdrop on earlobe of bathing-in-pool maiden. My earlobes are gems of their kind. My Regency coat for gaming at the club is of a brocade as blue as the midnight sky over Firenze. My gloves are lilac, my hose is white, my cravat is of the palest blue silk, my boots are the hand-stitched hide of unborn gazelles and my stick is ebony, filigree-ed in silver. My malquist is slightly less pink than a sunrise though slightly less yellow than a sunset, and it is drawn by two dappled greys in black harness, and driven by a venerable coachman caped in mustard box-cloth . . .
>
> (Malquist, p. 10)

Indeed, his elegant attire and mode of transport, both outrageous anachronisms in the 20th century, distinguish him from the ordinary "crowd," which he finds "extraordinarily lacking," because, taken as a whole,

crowds "have no sense of form or colour" (Malquist, p. 10).

But the elegant Lord Malquist is presented from an authorial stance that is satirically critical of the privileges which the ninth earl assumes as his natural right. After his coach runs over a woman in the street and Malquist is told, "she's not moving," he expresses no concern for her welfare but remarks, with approval, "Breeding . . . As Lord Curzon said to the actress, a lady does not move" (Malquist, p. 12). While his response to the woman's misfortune is amusing in the context of the novel, it reinforces Malquist's inability to relate to the sufferings of others, as well as Stoppard's implied judgment of such an attitude.

On the other hand, Lord Malquist advocates withdrawal from any battle over moral issues. For him, style is all-important. He proclaims himself as "an aesthetic, inbred and disengaged, and in such precarious times these are virtues" (Malquist, p. 79), as though aesthetics were justification enough for aloofness. This view explains why Moon, the other protagonist in the novel, who has been hired to write Lord Malquist's "life," is particularly commended by his employer for having "stood and watched" (Malquist, p. 135) when a pet lion and a hunting hawk got loose and created mayhem in a public place. Moon's refusal to take action is the equivalent of the heroic attitude in Malquistian terms. And indeed, throughout the novel, Lord Malquist maintains a tenacious hold on his position of detachment regardless of the pressures of a troubled world. "When the battle becomes a farce the only position of dignity is above it" (Malquist, p. 8). Even so, Stoppard's satirical rendering of Lord Malquist suggests that, even in

his earliest writings, he is uneasy about privileged individuals who deliberately maintain a separation from the rest of society.

The desire to distance oneself safely from the external world is present also in Albert, the spectator-hero of Albert's Bridge (1969),[2] a character who is portrayed more sympathetically, but whose withdrawal from society is seen to have detrimental effects on his family. Albert, an ex-student of philosophy, prefers the perspective on life that the bridge gives him, "separate -- complete -- removed" (A's Bridge, p. 16), a view that is accentuated when Fraser, intending to escape society by leaping from the bridge, discovers that "seen from above . . . the idea of society is just about tenable" (A's Bridge, p. 32). And despite the fact that Albert is engaged in the laborious task of single-handedly painting a bridge which will take eight years to complete and which will then require to be painted again, he takes artistic pleasure in his occupation. To him, painting the bridge is analogous to a work of art, a creative activity to which a man could dedicate his whole life. Moreover, the peculiar sense of isolation which his superior position on the bridge gives him contributes to his idea of society as "dots, bricks and beetles," and of himself as a "lone explorer feeling his way between the iron crevasses, tacked against the sky by his boots and fingers" (A's Bridge, p. 24), an ironic suggestion by the playwright that to those ordinary mortals far below, the solitary artist must also resemble an insect. As Albert literally clings to the bridge, seeing it as a personal retreat from life's problems, he succeeds in isolating himself from a troublesome society but, in doing so, he completely neglects his wife and child.

Yet however ludicrous and irresponsible they may appear to others, Lord Malquist and Albert have an inherent dignity that derives from their belief in themselves and in the authenticity of their artistic endeavours. This dignity is also characteristic of George Riley, the highly imaginative but commercially unsuccessful inventor of Enter a Free Man (1968),[3] who is described in the stage directions as having a "tattered dignity," he is "certainly not mad," but "definitely odd," and, despite the repeated disappointments of his failed creative efforts, he is "unsinkable" (Free Man, p. 9). Riley's dignity derives from an inner conviction of his special role in life as an inventor, that "chit from Matron" which allows him to abstain from common labour, but which makes him utterly dependent on his wife and daughter for the practicalities of day-to-day survival. As Linda, Riley's daughter, points out, "the only thing he's ever invented is a way of having a job without earning any money" (Free Man, p. 62). In spite of her cynicism, Riley has an obsessive faith in his fantastic inventions: a pipe which will never go out as long as you smoke it upside down, a bottle-opener for which no bottle-top has yet been invented, a chiming grandfather-clock which plays "Rule, Britannia" at noon and midnight and wakes people who would rather be sleeping, an indoor rain-system for watering house-plants which cannot be shut off during a storm. When the impracticality of his latest invention, a re-usable envelope with gum on both sides of the flap which foreseeably becomes useless once the flap has been torn, is callously exposed by pub acquaintances, Riley almost loses heart as well as face and has to make an "evident effort to sustain dignity" (Free Man, p. 77). But almost immediately he is consoled by the thought

that the public is not ready for an idea that is "ahead of its time" (Free Man, p 78) This ability to distance himself from an insensitive society with which he is aesthetically at odds links Riley with both Lord Malquist and Albert And like them, his artistic aloofness and irresponsibility is shown to be detrimental to others

The repercussions of such isolationism become even more severe in Jumpers, in which George Moore, a bewildered and blundering professor, attempts to solve moral questions from a philosophical standpoint while closetting himself away from the very real problems attendant on living in a social climate soured by a political system based on logical positivist ideology

George is the epitome of the spectator-hero, the socially displaced person whose actions demonstrate that to maintain any semblance of dignity in an alien world, which in George's case is extremely pressing and dangerous, requires escapist techniques such as those employed by Riley, or else withdrawal from any contact with the masses, as advocated by Lord Malquist and practised by Albert George's creative use of language and his imaginative use of visual aids (a tortoise, a rabbit, a bow and arrow), as he prepares a lecture to prove through logical argument the existence of a First Cause or Creator as the origin of the universe and of a code of behaviour based on moral absolutes, establish him as an artist-figure, albeit a rather foolish one, as he attempts to prove faith by logic His isolated position is highlighted by the fact that he is at odds with his pragmatic colleagues, the "jumpers" of questionable ethics, whose sudden changes in direction are occasioned by political expediency. As George's arch-rival, Archie Jumper, says of

the honest but ineffectual Professor Moore, "he is our tame believer, pointed out to visitors in much the same spirit as we point out the magnificent stained glass in what is now the gymnasium" (Jumpers, p. 63) (So much for artists and art-objects in Archie's new regime!)

Yet while George's refusal to "jump along with the rest" (Jumpers, p. 51) lends a touch of intensity to his philosophical detachment, his inability to recognize or alleviate the distressing needs of others, such as his mentally disturbed wife, Dotty, and his threatened colleague, Clegthorpe, raises moral questions concerning the role of the "artist"-hero as an uninvolved spectator. When one of the academic gymnasts is "shot" out of a pyramid of performing acrobats, it is left to Dotty to dispose of his corpse. Unable to make her preoccupied husband listen to her pleas for help, she turns to the efficient, but exploitive Archie. Similarly, when Clegthorpe is maneuvered into a pyramid of "jumpers" from which he too is subsequently shot, his cries to George for help go unheeded. Both murders can be attributed to the onslaught of a totalitarianism that threatens to encroach on George's private and public affairs. However, George's preoccupation with matters of "universal import" excludes any consideration of more immediate problems, either domestic or social, and causes Dotty to accuse him of "living in dream-land" (Jumpers, p. 31), a phrase used by Linda Riley with respect to her equally oblivious and impractical father. But in George's case, non-involvement in practical matters has much wider and more threatening ramifications.

However, the literal artist (or "artiste") in Jumpers is not George, the academic, but his wife, Dotty, described as a "prematurely-

retired musical-comedy actress of some renown" (Jumpers, p. 13). Even more than her career as a singer, it is her retreat from society that identifies Dotty as an "artist" in Stoppardian terms. Dotty retires from the stage and into her bedroom after the first moon-landing, an event which severely shakes her concepts of the earth and its inhabitants in relationship to a divinely ordered and morally stable universe:

> Not only are we no longer the still centre of God's universe, we're not even uniquely graced by his footprint in man's image . . . Man is on the Moon, his feet on solid ground, and he has seen us whole, all in one go, little -- local . . .
>
> (Jumpers, p. 75)

Furthermore, Dotty's faith in fundamental moral truths completely disintegrates when she sees a televised broadcast of two astronauts fighting on the moon for personal survival:

> . . . all our absolutes, the thou-shalts and the thou-shalt-nots that seemed to be the very condition of our existence, how did they look to two moonmen with a single neck to save between them?
>
> (Jumpers, p. 75)

If it is belief in themselves and in the intrinsic value of their peculiar pursuits that lends a kind of dignity to Lord Malquist, Albert, Riley, and George Moore, it is the shattering of that belief that causes Dotty Moore to come apart at the seams.

Dotty's dismay over her changed perspective of society links her with Gladys, the heroine of If You're Glad, I'll Be Frank (1969),[4] who, as the telephone service's Speaking Clock, has a notion of Time that

separates her aesthetically from the rest of humanity to the point where, despite the urgings of her husband, Frank, she can never return to normal life.

> I don't think I'll bother, I
> don't think there's any point.
> Let sleeping dogs and so on.
> Because I wouldn't shake it off
> by going back, I'd only be in
> the middle of it,
> with an inkling of infinity,
> the only one who has seen both
> ends
> rushing away from the middle.
> You can't keep your balance
> after that.
>
> (If You're Glad, p. 15)

Having accepted the exclusive anonymity which being the voice of the Speaking Clock gives her, Gladys literally disappears from society but continues to make comments on it. Her escapist behaviour represents as literal a withdrawal from social pressures as Albert's escape to his lofty refuge high up on the Clufton Bay bridge.

To remain well removed from the main event is the deliberate choice of characters like Dotty, Gladys, and Albert. But there are those who, in times of social upheaval, use their art to adapt and survive. For instance, the rather sinister figure of the Player, in Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead (1967),[5] is an enterprising opportunist rather than a mere spectator. He leads a troupe of artists for whom he claims a special classification. "We're actors -- we're the opposite of people!" (R & G., p. 45). The Player sadly acknowledges that in better times "we were purists," but, "times being what they are, . . . we'll stoop to anything if that's your bent" (R & G., pp. 17,19).

The sexual innuendo is made more graphic when the boy, Alfred, is ordered to dress in "a female robe," much to the anger and disgust of Guildenstern who perceives that the Player and his travelling actors are "a comic pornographer and a rabble of prostitutes" (R & G, p 19). Because he exploits others and perverts his art in order to make money, the Player is closer in temperament to Archie Jumper and the logical positivists, who are also engaged in various forms of exploitation and are motivated entirely by expediency, than he is to the artist-heroes.

Thus, being an artist by profession is not necessarily justification for having a "chit from Matron," that special dispensation which identifies the hero or heroine of the early Stoppard plays. Lord Malquist is a member of the privileged upper-class, a titled gentleman without occupation, Riley is an earnest inventor but is "unemployed", Albert, like George Moore, is educated in philosophy, but Albert chooses the menial task of painting a bridge, the poetical Gladys mechanically recites the time of day, and the hyper-sensitive Dotty remains in her bedroom, mentally and emotionally incapable of pursuing her art.

What then, to echo Henry Carr, is an artist? In the plays preceding Travesties, the artist is an individual of sensitive perception, eccentric, self-absorbed, oblivious to the demands of normal family and community relationships. Certainly, Lord Malquist, Riley, and Albert fall in this category. Highly imaginative, but generally impractical or ineffectual from the standpoint of a society governed by technological, commercial, or political interests, the artist-figure is isolated and confined, usually by his or her own choice. Such is the case with

George Moore, Gladys, and Dotty. Above all, the artistic temperament is revealed in a uniqueness of style and manner which often includes a characteristic dignity, a reflection of the artist's belief in himself which is nevertheless coupled with an overwhelming need to distance himself from an incompatible world. The artist's special skill ensures his life-long "chit from Matron" and gives a certain credibility to his role as an artist in relationship to the rest of society. But it is his preoccupation with style that is his chief means of staying detached. Indeed, Lord Malquist speaks not only for himself but for all the "artist"-heroes and heroines of the early plays when he says: "Since we cannot hope for order let us withdraw with style from the chaos" (Malquist, p. 21). By this method, the artist is able to maintain a position of spectator even with regard to the major events of his own life-drama.

In addition to questioning the role of the artist, Stoppard, either directly or by inference, asks the question, What is art? Whether by choice or by circumstance, the artist enjoys the distinction of being engaged in an activity that, to the 99.9% of the population who are non-artists, can scarcely be considered real work. By the same token, what is called art is of questionable value in a society structured on technological achievement. But does art have to justify itself according to its usefulness to society, or is it true that "art for art's sake" is justification enough? These questions are implied throughout all of Stoppard's works.

Jim Hunter in his valuable study-guide entitled, Tom Stoppard's Plays, makes the following comment: "Art is, of course, often wise,

lucid and carefully reasoned. But it is always irrational . . . in so far as it is not productive, not purposeful."[6] Hunter's assumption derives in part from George Moore's defense of art in a speech to his wife, Dotty, who has aligned herself, for the purposes of argument and out of frustration with George's inability to cope, with Archie's pragmatic views:

> Dotty: Archie says the Church is a monument to irrationality.
>
> George: . . . The National Gallery is a monument to irrationality! Every concert hall is a monument to irrationality! -- and so is a nicely kept garden, or a lover's favour, or a home for stray dogs! You stupid woman, if rationality were the criterion for things being allowed to exist, the world would be one gigantic field of soya beans!
>
> (Jumpers, p. 40)

In the same vein, Lord Malquist points out that it is the duty of the artist "to leave the world decorated by some trifling and quite useless ornament" (Malquist, p. 68). Similarly, the glory of Albert's bridge, a utilitarian "symbol of Clufton's prosperity" (A's Bridge, p. 10) as far as the city fathers are concerned, pales before the magnificent purposelessness of the Eiffel Tower:

> The pointlessness takes one's breath away -- a tower connects nothing, it stands only so that one can go up and look down. Bridge-builders have none of this audacity, compromise themselves with function.
>
> (A's Bridge, p. 27)

A similarly exalted view of art for art's sake obviously prompted Stoppard to make the following rather facetious statement in a 1974

interview when contemplating whether or not his plays were political or if they needed to be:

> . . . I think that in the future I must stop compromising my plays with this whiff of social application. They must be entirely untouched by any suspicion of usefulness. I should have the courage of my lack of convictions.[7]

And indeed, at the time of this interview, Stoppard had gained a reputation for being a "cool, apolitical"[8] playwright, interested mostly in making patterns, such as he does in After Magritte (1971),[9] a stage-picture based on surrealistic art, and in The Real Inspector Hound (1968),[10] a parody of the cliché-ridden Agatha Christie murder mystery, The Mousetrap.

While the kind of art which these plays represent may serve no "useful" function, it is not obliged to, according to the foregoing assumptions. If it is art which incorporates style, that is reason enough for its continued existence. Lord Malquist recognizes this fact when he says that "substance is ephemeral but style is eternal" (Malquist, p. 156). His own contribution to posterity is his "life" which is being recorded by his Boswell-type companion, Moon, because the life of the Stylist is in itself a work of art. "I stand aloof," says Lord Malquist, "contributing nothing except my example" (Malquist, p. 79).

Like Lord Malquist, Riley, the inventor, also fantasizes about the influence that his particular brand of art may have on future generations:

> You see a man standing on the brink of great things. Below me, a vast flat plain stretches like an ocean, waiting to receive my footprints, footprints that will never be erased, and in years to come, people will see this once uncharted untrod path and say . . . George Riley walked this way --
>
> (Free Man, p. 32)

While there may be no guarantee of the type of immortality Riley envisions, the work of art itself has an inherent quality that ensures its continued existence.

As well as its eternal quality, art contains moral elements that place it at the opposite pole from the purely practical objects of the mechanistic world. Again, it is Albert, the philosopher-turned-painter, who recognizes the virtues that distinguish his own creative occupation from that of the factory worker. Even though no one will see it from the ground, he takes infinite pains with his painting. To Albert, the best thing about his "art" is that it lies there, under his eye, "fixed and immediate" without harmful consequences, in contrast to the work of the factory man whose "bits and pieces scatter, grow wheels, disintegrate, change colour, join up in new forms which he doesn't know anything about," and who "doesn't know what he's done, to whom" (A's Bridge, p. 9).

By comparison with mechanical trades, bridge-painting is a metaphor for "poetry" (A's Bridge, p. 18), and indeed Albert uses poetical language, as does Gladys, to express a growing apprehension of a society in which life is becoming increasingly mechanical:

> All conversation is hidden there,
> among motors, coughing fits, applause,

> screams, laughter, feet on the stairs,
> secretaries typing to dictation,
> radios delivering the cricket scores,
> tapes running, wheels turning, mills grinding,
> chips frying, lavatories flushing, lovers sighing,
> the mayor blowing his nose.
>
> (A's Bridge, p. 25)

Gladys passes a similar verdict upon the human race, whom she sees as mechanical puppets at the mercy of the monstrous clockwork they have invented:

> . . . they think that
> time is something they
> invented,
> for their own convenience,
> and divided up into ticks
> and tocks
> and sixties and twelves
> and twenty-fours . . .
>
> (If You're Glad, p. 11)

> Because they don't know what
> time is . . .
> Because they didn't invent it
> at all.
> They only invented the clock.
>
> (If You're Glad, p. 15)

Stoppard himself admits to a "neurosis" which he had at the time he wrote these plays that had to do with a "lack of faith in the technological machine which holds society together continuing to operate."[11] Consequently, his characters, when faced with an impinging technology which they fear may destroy itself, distance themselves by means of their application to their art, as Albert and Gladys do when they make poetry of bridge-painting and time-telling. Lord Malquist takes a similar, if more impartial attitude, towards the onslaught of society

when he indicates that he longs to "impose some aesthetic discipline" on crowds and "rearrange them into art" (Malquist, p. 10). Lord Malquist suggests here that art is the means by which mankind is saved from the evils of mechanization. Not surprisingly, Stoppard also sees art in this light: "We get our moral sensibility from art. When we have a purely technological society, it will be time for mass suicide."[12] In fact, Fraser, in Albert's Bridge, is saved from suicide after he retreats, in the manner of a spectator-hero, away from the "noise, and the chaos . . . the enormity of that disorder" (A's Bridge, p. 31). But ironically, it is the mechanical march of 1,799 painters, advancing on the bridge en masse, whose unbroken step brings down the structure, and Albert and Fraser with it. Their reclusiveness does not save them from the technologically-oriented society whose advance signals the demise of the artist as well as the common people.

What is paramount in these early plays is the focus on art as the saving grace in a purely practical world. The moral impact of art is consequent upon its stylistic shaping which in turn distances it from the real world. The Player in Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead goes to some lengths to demonstrate that art rightly deals more with illusion than with reality. For example, his actors are trained in "dying". "They can die heroically, comically, ironically, slowly, suddenly, disgustingly, charmingly, or from a great height" (R & G, p. 60). But when an actor, condemned to death for stealing, is actually hanged on stage to add a touch of realism to the drama, "he just wasn't convincing . . . it was impossible to suspend one's disbelief . . . he did nothing but cry all the time -- right out of

character -- just stood there and cried" (R & G, p. 61). Thus while art may often appear to mirror real life, it is more shaped than reality and is primarily concerned to illustrate by illusion.

This view of art explains why the Player and his troupe of actors are embarrassed when they discover that their "dramatic spectacle" is without an audience. The Player tries to explain the cause of their humiliation to Ros and Guil:

> . . . to be tricked out of the single assumption which makes our existence viable -- that somebody is watching . . . and every gesture, every pose, vanishing into the thin unpopulated air.
>
> (R & G, p. 45)

Without an audience, an actor is no longer under the necessity of creating an illusion that is his special art, and, what is worse, in such cases his mimicry could be construed as real life. As the Player points out:

> We're actors . . . . We pledged our identities, secure in the conventions of our trade, that someone would be watching. And then, gradually, no one was. We were caught, high and dry.
>
> (R & G, p. 46)

But art, in terms of the early Stoppard plays, is more than just the means of creating illusion, through stage techniques or otherwise. Because of its artistic shaping, art has an eternal quality which in turn invests the artist with a sense of the immortal nature of his work. It is also the means by which his aesthetic personality survives in an insensitive world even as it forces him into a position of isolation. By his very profession, the artist is segregated from those whose

labour produces objects that are functional and serve a useful purpose. But despite its seeming lack of practicality in a technological sense, art is capable of creating order out of the chaos produced by human beings in a machine-oriented society. This sentiment, echoed throughout the plays, is expressed by George Moore in this way: "The irrational, the emotional, the whimsical . . . these are the stamp of humanity which makes reason a civilizing force" (Jumpers, p. 40).

Stoppard's view of the artist and art, as defined by the plays written prior to Travesties, bears directly on his own literary style. For the central characters in these plays, the very acceptance of the "chit for life," which goes with being a privileged "artist," leads to some form of artistic detachment. In Stoppard's case, this detachment manifests itself as an overt intellectualism that refuses to take sides, together with a self-indulgent fascination with his own skill, his unique ability to present ideas cleverly, effectively, and with a dazzling theatrical flair. His lack of commitment with regard to political and social debate and his frequent inclusion of a joke for a joke's sake, which admits to no other purpose than to entertain, led critics of the '60's and early '70's to conclude that Stoppard was little more than a word-spinner and was not to be taken seriously. Certainly, these early plays consist mainly of scenes that are developed for their intellectual ideas and for their verbal game-playing.

Stoppard's satirical and often critical assessment of his own characters, and his reluctance to agree definitively with the attitudes adopted by them precludes an acceptance of the artist-hero as a spokesman for the author. In Jumpers, for example, even though

Stoppard may be presumed to support George Moore's unprovable but morally sound beliefs in favour of Archie Jumper's logical positivism, he nevertheless allows the more conciliatory but unethical Archie the last word in the argument. "Do not despair -- many are happy much of the time . . . Hell's bells and all's well -- half the world is at peace with itself, and so is the other half" (Jumpers, p. 87).

This pull between different viewpoints is the basis on which Stoppard constructs his plays, a pattern which he describes as "a series of conflicting statements made by conflicting characters [who] tend to play a sort of infinite leap-frog."[13] It was Stoppard's predilection for intellectual leap-frogging that caused John Russell Taylor in his book, The Second Wave: British Drama for the Seventies,[14] to express doubts about Stoppard's "fundamental seriousness as a playwright," and that later aroused the censure of Walter Kerr, of the New York Times, who described Stoppard as being "intellectually restless as a hummingbird."[15] It is quite possible that Stoppard's presentation of both argument and counter-argument, which critics saw as a lack of conviction, masks an underlying anxiety with his own role as an artist. On the other hand, the shift between several viewpoints is in itself a form of detachment whereby an extra-sensitive artist can create his own immunity and avoid direct commitment to social and political issues.

And, in the manner of Lord Malquist, Stoppard withdraws "with style," using ingenious patterns in the form of word-play, puns, witticisms, and theatrical illusions to put distance between himself and the world that exists outside the theatre. Stoppard's fascination

with double-edged language that can be twisted into a variety of meanings is clearly this playwright's personal interpretation of "art" created purely for its own sake.

Escape through language is the hallmark of Stoppard's play about Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, who engage in amusing and clever word-games in order to cover their own panic and confusion at Elsinore: "Words, words. They're all we have to go on" (R. & G., p. 30). Predictably, their banter is literate, intellectual, and filled with a wit that gives a cushioning effect even to a discussion of their own deaths:

> Ros: . . . Do you ever think of yourself as actually dead, lying in a box with a lid on it?
>
> Guil: No.
>
> Ros: Nor do I, really . . . It's silly to be depressed by it. I mean one thinks of it like being alive in a box, one keeps forgetting to take into account the fact that one is dead . . . which should make all the difference . . . shouldn't it? I mean, you'd never know you were in a box, would you? It would be just like being asleep in a box. Not that I'd like to sleep in a box, mind you, not without any air -- you'd wake up dead, for a start and then where would you be? . . . if I asked you straight off -- I'm going to stuff you in this box now, would you rather be alive or dead? Naturally, you'd prefer to be alive. Life in a box is better than no life at all. I expect. You'd have a chance at least. You could lie there thinking -- well, at least I'm not dead! In a minute someone's going to bang on the lid and tell me to come out. (Banging the floor with his fists.) "Hey you, whatsyername! Come out of there.'"
>
> Guil: (jumps up savagely): You don't have to flog it to death!
>
> Ros: I wouldn't think about it, if I were you. You'd only get depressed. (Pause.)

> Eternity is a terrible thought. I mean, where's it going to end? . . .
>
> (R. & G., pp. 50-51)

Even though Stoppard's two protagonists are caught up in a life and death drama that they are powerless to control, their humorous exchanges serve to lighten their situation. The clash between the modern colloquialism of their normal conversation and their Elizabethan diction when they enter Hamlet is in itself a verbal joke that undercuts the seriousness of their fatal entrapment. Compared with Beckett's Vladimir and Estragon in Waiting for Godot,[16] whose language is sparse, economic, and as barren as the stripped-down ennui of their pointless, timeless existence in a bare, unaccommodating landscape, Ros and Guil wait "in style," as they engage in verbal fun at Shakespeare's expense.

Besides the use of clever word patterns, Stoppard's art depends on spectacular gimmicks that are just as contrived and intricate. Yet they serve no function other than to amuse and bewilder his audience. This is particularly true of the bizarre opening scene of After Magritte, a staged picture puzzle which juxtaposes people and objects as they might be portrayed in a surrealistic painting. Actually, it is an elaborate joke by the playwright which keeps the audience guessing but makes no directly meaningful point. Similarly, Jumpers begins with a pyramid of eight acrobats which collapses when one of them is shot. Stoppard admits to creating these and other spectacles in order to give "nine hundred people in a big room which we call a theatre a sort of moment."[17] Because the murder of the Jumper is never satisfactorily

resolved by the play's dénouement, the appearance of the pyramid is a purely artistic aspect of a larger complexity, serving no direct purpose in the play other than as a metaphor for the mental gymnastics undertaken by the play's characters. Perhaps the most obvious example of the private kind of game-playing in which this playwright indulges is the absurd apparition of a man in shaving cream carrying an unrecognizable object and wearing pyjamas. This best known of Stoppard's visual jokes recurs in several of his plays but springs from a personal anecdote[18] rather than from the demands of the plot in which it happens to appear.

The verbal and visual jokes which claim no other purpose than to entertain can be justified however on the basis of Stoppard's particular "art for art's sake." In his 1974 Theatre Quarterly interview, Stoppard confesses that he writes "through a series of small, large and microscopic ambushes -- which might consist of a body falling out of a cupboard, or simply an unexpected word in a sentence," in order to retain an audience's interest.[19] Since these "ambushes" frequently cause a certain obscurity in the play's overall meaning, and often confuse rather than enlighten the audience, Stoppard's artfulness, at least in these early plays, can be seen as stylish withdrawal. However, in Travesties, Stoppard's artistic detachment becomes increasingly difficult to maintain, and takes the form of a more problematical neutrality.

CHAPTER II

Portrait of the Artist: "The Importance of Being Neutral"

> "Oh, Switzerland' -- unfurled like a white flag, pacific civilian Switzerland -- the miraculous neutrality of it, the non-combatant impartiality of it, the non-aggression pacts of it, the international red cross of it --"
>
> (Travesties, p. 25)

The neutral position adopted by Switzerland during World War I, surrounded as it was on all sides by larger, more powerful nations with conflicting ideologies, languages, and cultures, is an apt symbol for the detached isolationism of the sensitive "artist" of the early Stoppard plays. And, in Travesties, the insular setting of Zurich in 1917 provides a natural ambience for this play about the role of the artist in times of international upheaval such as a continental war and a social revolution. At the time the play was written, Stoppard's own "neutrality," as demonstrated by his refusal to use his art for polemical purposes, had brought repeated accusations from critical reviewers such as Kenneth Tynan and John Russell Taylor. But up to this point, the playwright had withstood the pressure put upon him because of the lack of a firmly stated political position in his plays. However, the decision to remain neutral, which acts as a protective device for the precariously situated, strategically vulnerable Swiss nation, becomes increasingly difficult to

sustain when it pertains to the escapist attitudes reflected in the artist-figures of Travesties. Obviously, this dilemma has now become central to an entire play, hence the focus, in this chapter, on Travesties as the work in which Stoppard most clearly articulates the problem of neutrality versus involvement -- even if he does not entirely solve it.

The artist-in-war, which is a major issue in Travesties, had already been touched upon in a minor way in a 1966 television play entitled A Separate Peace.[1] Stoppard refers to it as a play about "exclusion, about disappearing into oneself, about finding a substitute for reality,"[2] and claims that the play was written with chess-players[3] in mind. But the elements of exclusiveness and escapism which Stoppard points to as central to the plot serve as a portrait of the kind of artist-figure which dominates the early plays. The arbitrator of "a separate peace" is a man called John Brown whose neutrality is captured in his name as well as in his nature, which is "calm, pleasant, implacable." He checks into a private hospital to escape social pressures because the place offers the kind of security he previously felt in a prisoner-of-war camp when "the war was still going on but I wasn't going to it any more" (Separate Peace, p. 19). The quiet efficiency of the hospital routine, operating like "clockwork," an analogy that suggests the dependability of a smoothly running Swiss time-piece, is for Brown like a safe retreat away from the battle zone. Cloistered in his hospital room, he reflects that "anything could be going on outside . . . there could be a war on, and for once it's got nothing to do with me" (Separate Peace, p. 16).

Brown's delighted wonder at finding himself in peaceful surroundings is akin to that expressed by Carr: " -- the first thing to grasp about Switzerland is that there is no war here. Even when there is war everywhere else, there is no war in Switzerland" (Travesties, p. 26). Significantly, Brown's soldierly occupation, prior to his capture by the enemy, had been as an "artist," whose task it was to camouflage the machinery of war. As he indicates, he could "turn a row of tanks into a leafy hedgerow," but, to his regret, "not literally" (Separate Peace, p. 17). Even though Brown, the supreme pacifist, is presented sympathetically, his doctor expresses a different view of the artist-in-isolation. He tells Brown, "It's not enough . . . you've got to -- connect" (Separate Peace, p. 22). This remark suggests that Stoppard was already aware of certain reservations concerning the general sanction of artistic neutrality.

One aspect of Stoppard's personal neutrality, for which he had been criticized in his early writing, is apparently based on an infinite capacity for seeing all sides of any issue. The writer can thereby justify a position that refuses to be aligned with one point of view to the exclusion of any other. This form of neutrality is evident, for example, in Lord Malquist. Having spent the entire period of the Second World War in Jamaica, Malquist takes intellectual refuge from the chaos of conflicting opinions that mark the post-war years by stating: "I distrust attitudes . . . because they claim to have appropriated the whole truth and pose as absolutes. And I distrust the opposite attitude for the same reason" (Malquist, pp. 52-3).

Similarly, in Stoppard's portrayal of the imaginary confrontation between Joyce and Tzara, the war of ideas in Travesties is waged with no suggestion of a clear-cut authorial position. The fact that the Zurich encounters are presented through the muddled recollections of Henry Carr ensures that a rigid point of view is never advanced. As Stoppard confided to A.C.H. Smith in a 1974 interview, "I don't feel certain enough about anything to put up a hero to say it for me."[4] Stoppard demonstrates this uncertainty by inserting detailed stage directions to indicate that "most of the play . . . is under the erratic control of Old Carr's memory, which is not notably reliable, and also of his various prejudices and delusions" (Travesties, p. 27). It is a structure which enables Stoppard to present differing viewpoints while he himself maintains a somewhat Malquistian attitude of non-commitment in the pro-art, anti-art debate.

Stoppard defends the technique of argument and counter-argument in the following excerpt from an interview given in April 1979, in which he also attempts a multi-faceted self-portrait:

> In Travesties I found that various voices of my own which were on a collision course made up whole scenes of Travesties for me . . . Henry Carr's skepticism about the valuation which artists put on themselves is very much my own skepticism. But then Joyce's defense of art is mine, too . . . one doesn't think . . . with one mind on these matters. One has two or three minds battling with each other. And even in the case of Tristan Tzara in that play, who had to put the case for his particular form of anti-art, I went into that having as I thought to create his arguments from nothing since I had no sympathy with them to start with. He wasn't speaking for me at all. But in the event

> I found some of the things Tzara had to say quite persuasive.[5]

It is Stoppard's refusal to take sides, and his self-styled "leap-frogging" between different viewpoints, that affects the stylistic shaping of this play in which "various voices" collide. Despite this ambivalence, which the very structure of the play sustains with separate conversations ensuing at the same time on stage, it is with Travesties that Stoppard takes an important step towards confidently formulating a more consciously defined view of art and its function in society. Indeed, the play can be seen as an exercise for the playwright in self-discovery which, while it employs the usual Stoppard trickery with language and spectacle, becomes more pointed in its questioning of the degree to which neutrality, in terms of artistic detachment, is morally defensible.

Writing about Travesties in the Times,[6] Irving Wardle notes that, with three revolutionary figure-heads to draw on, Stoppard chooses for his protagonist a minor British consular official called Henry Carr. Although his presence in the play is based on a real-life encounter between Carr and James Joyce during the Zurich production of The Importance of Being Earnest,[7] performed under Joyce's management by a group called The English Players, the fictional Carr is expanded into a character who is part-Algernon Moncrieff, part-Oscar Wilde, and part-Stoppard. His frequent "time-slips" in and out of the drawing-room milieu of the Wilde play link him with Algernon, and his extreme dandyism, revealed in an overly fastidious taste in clothes, is reminiscent of Wilde. And, by creating a character who is a distanced,

though prejudiced spectator, Stoppard is able to focus on the clash of disparate theories about art endorsed by such controversial figures as Joyce, Tzara, and Lenin from a position that reinforces his own detachment.

On the other hand, Stoppard implies a sterner judgment of the artist-in-war simply in the way that he emphasizes Carr's preoccupation with his wardrobe at a time of European conflict. For Carr, remembrances of the outbreak of war in 1914 are intimately connected with matters concerning his apparel:

> I was in Savil[l]e Row when I heard the news, talking to the head cutter at Drewitt and Madge in a hounds-tooth check slightly flared behind the knee, quite unusual. Old Drewitt, or Madge, came in and told me. Never trusted the Hun, I remarked. Boche, he replied, and I, at that time unfamiliar with the appellation, turned on my heel and walked into Trimmett and Punch where I ordered a complete suit of Harris knicker-bockers with hacking vents. By the time they were ready, I was in France.
>
> (Travesties, p. 28)

Although this satirical portrait of the artist-in-war may seem grossly exaggerated, it is actually inspired by a lengthy court case involving James Joyce and the real Henry Carr in a legal dispute over a pair of trousers.[8] So for Stoppard's "hero," even the horrors of trench warfare are documented in terms of the losses incurred in Carr's inventory of custom-made garments:

> . . . I was there, in the mud and blood of a foreign field, unmatched by anything in the whole history of human carnage. Ruined several pairs of trousers. Nobody who has not been in the trenches can have the faintest conception of the horror of it.

> I had hardly set foot in France before I sank in up to the knees in a pair of twill jodphurs with pigskin straps handstitched by Ramidge and Hawkes. And so it went on -- the sixteen ounce serge, the heavy worsteds, the silk flannel mixture -- until I was invalided out with a bullet through the calf of an irreplaceable lambswool dyed khaki in the yarn to my own specification.
>
> (Travesties, p. 37)

And while Carr claims that his enlistment in the army, when he "sent round to Hamish and Rudge for their military pattern book" (Travesties, p. 38), was motivated by feelings of "patriotism," "duty," "love of freedom," "hatred of tyranny," and a "sense of oneness with the underdog," he gladly exchanges the field of battle for the comfort and safety of Switzerland:

> Wonderful spirit in the trenches -- never in the whole history of human conflict was there anything to match the courage, the comradeship, the warmth, the cold, the mud, the stench -- fear -- folly -- Christ Jesu!, but for this blessed leg! -- I never thought to be picked out, plucked out, blessed by the blood of a blighty wound -- oh heaven! -- released into folds of snow-white feather beds, pacific civilian heaven!, the mystical swissticality of it, the entente cordiality of it!, the Jesus Christ I'm out of it! -- into the valley of the invalided . . .
>
> (Travesties, p. 41)

Stoppard's ironic rendering of Carr's mixed loyalties captures the over-sentimentalizing of the glories of battle which marked the early poems of World War I, but which in later works gave way to a more graphic depiction of its senseless and tragic waste of life.[9] Humorous as the treatment of the subject may be by virtue of Carr's

rambling discourse, Stoppard still provides a reminder of the devastated world just outside the borders of neutral territory. What is more telling is that, despite claims of his patriotic fervour and his noble sense of duty, Carr fails in a mission of extreme importance to the Allied cause, that of preventing Lenin's return to Moscow for the express purpose of furthering the Bolshevist revolution. To say that the course of social history and the lives of millions of people were drastically affected by Carr's negligence is to place an even greater weight of responsibility on the character whose self-centred detachment prevents him from taking positive moral action. Even as Lenin's train is departing, Carr's attention is diverted by his amorous pursuit of Cecily, a pretty librarian and Lenin's devotée from whom Carr originally intended to extract secret information about the Russian's movements. In this regard, Carr appears to be fulfilling the same role as that of the ineffectual "artist"-figure typified in Stoppard's earlier plays.

Yet another aspect of Carr's function in the play is to defend traditional views of art against the Dadaist theories of anti-art propounded by Tristan Tzara. In his somewhat ambiguous role, Carr is shown to be equally skeptical of the elevated concept of art projected by James Joyce. Furthermore, he is critical of both artists for their lack of commitment regarding the war, despite the fact that he enjoys the benefits of neutrality no less than do the artists whom he condemns. Very like Brown in A Separate Peace, Carr experiences a "sense of sheer relief at arriving in a state of rest, namely Switzerland, the still centre of the wheel of war" (Travesties, pp. 25-6). And

his mental lapses, which to him are excusable, "constant digression being the saving grace of senile reminiscence" (Travesties, p. 22), cause old Carr to shift conveniently from the discomforting recollection of young Carr's experience of trench warfare to a re-enactment of Algy's discussion of the most suitable outfit to wear to the theatre.

> Never in the whole history of human conflict was there anything to match the carnage -- God's blood', the shot and shell' -- graveyard stench' -- Christ Jesu' -- deserted by simpletons, they damn us to hell -- ora pro nobis -- quick' no, get me out' -- I think to match the carnation, oxblood shot-silk cravat, starched, creased just so, asserted by a simple pin, the damask lapels -- or a brown, no, biscuit -- no -- get me out the straight cut trouser with the blue satin stripe and the silk cutaway. I'll wear the opal studs.
>
> (Travesties, p. 27)

The ambivalent position assigned to Carr with regard to his professed feelings about the war and his own role in it, when juxtaposed with the outspoken, if debatable, views of Tzara and Joyce, casts an even stronger light on the validity of their revolutionary ideas about the artist-in-war. At least they do not delude themselves with protestations of false patriotism. Both express their individual theories of the artist as a privileged person and of the artist's duty in terms of the rest of society. The diversity of their viewpoints, together with Carr's more conventional attitudes, allows the playwright to explore the whole question of the artist's justification for neutrality.

Tzara defends his neutral position by arguing that wars are not

fought for honour, but for nationalistic expansion and self-interest.

> Wars are fought for oil wells and coaling stations, for control of the Dardanelles or the Suez Canal, for colonial pickings to buy cheap in and conquered markets to sell dear in. War is capitalism with the gloves off and many who go to war know it but they go to war because they don't want to be a hero. It takes courage to sit down and be counted. But how much better to live bravely in Switzerland than to die cravenly in France, quite apart from what it does to one's trousers.
>
> (Travesties, pp. 39-40)

The absurdity and irrationality of a world that could produce an event so monstrous as a Great War leads Tzara and the Dadaists to conclude that "causality is no longer fashionable." Since "everything is Chance, including design," . . . "traditional art is irrelevant" and "anti-art is the art of our time" (Travesties, pp. 36-9). Tzara, therefore, feels no compunction about abnegating his civil duties with regard to the war effort. The only duty of the artist, in his view, is to "jeer and howl and belch at the delusion that infinite generations of real effects can be inferred from the gross expression of apparent cause" (Travesties, p. 37). In other words, there is no point in seeking to bring order when all is chaos, an attitude which allows him to reside comfortably in Switzerland without a sense of guilt.

As a destroyer of systems, Tzara's anti-art theory is diametrically opposite to the principle of "art for art's sake" which Tzara vigorously attacks in a speech directed at Joyce.

> Your art has failed. You've turned literature into a religion and it's as dead as all the rest, it's an overripe corpse and you're cutting fancy

> figures at the wake. It's too late for geniuses! Now we need vandals and desecrators, simple-minded demolition men to smash centuries of baroque subtlety, to bring down the temple, and thus finally, to reconcile the shame and the necessity of being an artist!
>
> (Travesties, p. 62)

What Tzara condemns in Joyce's art is its failure to reflect the world's modern values, or rather its lack of them. In advocating anti-art, Tzara feels that he can maintain his role in life as an artist without "the shame," because Dadaism perfectly expresses the discordant spirit of the times.

But despite their antagonism towards each other on the subject of art, Joyce and Tzara do agree that the artist is a unique and privileged member of society deserving special dispensation. Tzara maintains that even in prehistoric times the artist was distinguished from those who hunted and went to war for the rest of the tribe:

> When the strongest began to fight for the tribe, and the fastest to hunt, it was the artist who became the priest-guardian of the magic that conjured the intelligence out of the appetites.
>
> (Travesties, p. 47)

Joyce similarly sets the artist apart from the rest of society, attributing to him almost superhuman powers:

> An artist is the magician put among men to gratify -- capriciously -- their urge for immortality.
>
> (Travesties, p. 62)

Such views emphasize their sense of separateness from their fellowmen and justify their neutral stance on international matters.

While both men advocate neutrality, in Joyce's case it arises out of the conviction that art is above war and politics not, as in Tzara's argument, because these things have made art meaningless, but because art is the only thing of importance. "As an artist, naturally I attach no importance to the swings and roundabout[s] of political history" (Travesties, p. 50).

Joyce is the epitome of the "cool, apolitical" attitude which critics had ascribed to Stoppard. And, like the playwright, Joyce arouses public censure because of the received impression that he regards both sides "with equal indifference" (Travesties, p. 50). Furthermore, in real life, Joyce expressed his neutral position on social issues in a poem entitled, "Mr. Dooley,"[10] portions of which appear in the Stoppard play. In it, Joyce lionizes the man who remains uncommitted.

> Who is the man, when all the gallant
> nations run to war,
> Goes home to have his dinner by the
> very first cable car,
> And as he eats his cantaloupe contorts
> himself with mirth
> To read the blatant bulletins of the
> rule[r]s of the earth?
>
> It's Mr. Dooley
> Mr. Dooley
> The wisest wight our country ever knew'
> 'Poor Europe ambles
> like sheep to shambles'
> Sighs Mr. Dooley-ooley-ooley-ooo.
>
> (Travesties, pp. 49-50)

Moreover, Mr. Dooley "thinks that every son of man has quite enough to do / To paddle down the stream of life his personal canoe" (Travesties, p. 50).

The duty of the artist, according to Joyce's final word to Tzara in the play, is entirely fulfilled in his artistic rendering of great events "from Troy to the fields of Flanders," an accomplishment which need serve no purpose other than to enrich mankind's awareness of past glories and to give meaning to history.

> If there is any meaning in any of it, it is in what survives as art . . . What now of the Trojan War if it had been passed over by the artist's touch? . . . But it is we who stand enriched, by a tale of heroes, of a golden apple, a wooden horse, a face that launched a thousand ships -- and above all, of Ulysses . . . It is a theme so overwhelming that I am almost afraid to treat it. And yet I with my Dublin Odyssey will double that immortality . . .
>
> (Travesties, p. 62)

Joyce's views on the glorified duty of the artist provide one of the most comic sequences in Stoppard's play at the first Act curtain when Carr, in his own imagination, is conducting a cross-examination of Joyce:

> And what did you do in the Great War?
> I wrote Ulysses, he said. What did you do?
> Bloody nerve.
>
> (Travesties, p. 65)

Carr's closing remark shows how incensed he is with Joyce's elevated view of the artist. But it also indicates that he has lost the argument since he, in fact, did virtually nothing towards either the war

effort or the advance of art. But then, Carr is suspicious of the value that society places on art:

> Art is absurdly overrated by artists, which is understandable, but what is strange is that it is absurdly overrated by everyone else.
>
> (Travesties, p. 46)

Despite this observation, Carr defends traditional art against the anti-art promoted by Tzara, refusing to accept Tzara's suggestion that the word, Art, means whatever you wish it to mean, as in a poet drawing words out of a hat. Carr is closer to Joyce in his belief that "it is the duty of the artist to beautify existence" (Travesties, p. 37). And in a speech that aligns him with Stoppard's own views at the time, Carr protests to Cecily, a loyal Marxist, that art must never be used as social criticism, and asserts that "what we call art has no such function", its true value to society rests on the idea that "in some way it gratifies a hunger that is common to princes and peasants" (Travesties, p. 74).

As the debate rages between Carr and Tzara, between Tzara and Joyce, and between Carr and Cecily, the role of the artist begins to clarify in this play and to take on a sharper definition as the characters relinquish the ineffectual, escapist stance of the earlier spectator-heroes for a more tenuous neutrality that suggests a more obvious unease with the reluctance of the artist to assume social responsibility. For example, the effects of a failure to take responsibility in the early plays is revealed only by innuendo. In Albert's Bridge, these effects related only to Albert's family who suffered

from his retreat from society, and in Enter a Free Man, they applied primarily to Riley's daughter, who was forced into the position of family provider. Even for Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, there must have been a point where they could have taken control of their own lives and avoided their fate. The implications of this failure to act become more apparent in Jumpers, when Moore's indifference to his distraught wife and to his threatened colleague can be directly related to matters of life and death. The emphasis on individual responsibility takes on even greater significance in Travesties, where artistic detachment is linked with an ignoble retreat to a neutral country while a world war is being fought by one's compatriots.

The increasing threat from outside the neutral domain of the self-protecting "artist" is implied both visually and aurally by the screen in Jumpers and by the train in Travesties. In Jumpers, the sound effects of jet planes roaring overhead while the television screen shows a fascistic victory-celebration held by the Rad-Lib party, the political arm of the logical positivists, is a reminder that, in the new regime, there can be no safe retreat for sensitive non-conformists like George and Dotty. In Travesties, a similar threat is implied in the image of Lenin's train whose return to Moscow sparked the most violent social revolution in this century. Significantly, the noise of the train, an ominous forewarning of things to come, gradually becomes "very loud" (Travesties, p. 84). It is followed by a speech in which Lenin drastically reduces the individual freedom of the artist in the interests of the "party."

Part of the underlying concern in this play is with the function of art in a society which threatens to restrict the freedom of the artist. While, from a neutral position, Joyce may uphold "art for art's sake" against Tzara's chaotic and purposeless art, and vice versa, without threat to themselves, Lenin's speeches raise the disquieting thought that, in a totalitarian society, art will be tolerated only to the degree that it serves the State. Not surprisingly, Lenin sees art only as an instrument of the Marxist cause.

> Today, literature must become party literature . . . Literature must become a part of the common cause of the proletariat, a cog in the Social Democratic mechanism . . .
>
> (Travesties, p. 85)

Echoing Lenin's views, Cecily maintains that the responsibility to change society has become the new function of art, and moreover, "art is a critique of society or it is nothing'" (Travesties, p. 74). Stated in these terms, as an aesthetic, Cecily's attitude is very like that of Tynan's theatrical criticism: "All I want is for drama to realize that it is a part of politics, in the sense that every human activity . . . has social and political repercussions."[11] Cecily's heated argument with Carr degenerates, however, into a parody of the courtship scene in The Importance of Being Earnest in which the heroine is determined to reform the hero even though, in Cecily's case, she believes him to be a "decadent nihilist" (Travesties, p. 71). Stoppard's satirical treatment takes the edge off the real impact of Cecily's argument. But the fact that Lenin's own speeches are

presented didactically and without humour gives a powerful thrust to his ideas about art and the artist, which are often contradictory. For example, Lenin denies that he has ever thought of persecuting the intelligentsia, but he later condones the imprisonment of intellectuals for "a few days, or even weeks . . . in order to prevent the massacre of tens of thousands of workers and peasants" (Travesties, p. 88). Lenin's idea is to silence any dissident voices, thus hastening the process of revolution and avoiding further bloodshed. But this concern for the masses does not extend to personal human relationships like the one he instances from Dickens' Cricket on the Hearth between the old toymaker and his blind daughter, according to Lenin's wife, its "saccharine sentimentality got on his nerves" (Travesties, p. 89).

Even more ironic is Lenin's fluctuation between an acknowledgment of the miraculous beauty of Beethoven's "Appassionata" Sonata as an example of human genius and a suspicion that the effects of such art are contrary to the Revolution:

> I don't know of anything greater than the Appassionata. Amazing, superhuman music. It always makes me feel, perhaps naively, it makes me feel proud of the miracles that human beings can perform. But I can't listen to music often. It affects my nerves, makes me want to say nice stupid things and pat the heads of those people who while living in this vile hell can create such beauty. Nowadays we can't pat heads or we'll get our hands bitten off. We've got to hit heads, hit them without mercy, though ideally we're against doing violence to people . . .
>
> (Travesties, p. 89)

While Lenin acknowledges the unique position occupied by the artist and even expresses his involuntary appreciation of those gifted individuals who can create beautiful works of art despite the external circumstances in which they live, he is also wary of encouraging those whose spontaneous, unpredictable expression could be a threat to his plans for social reform. The ultimate danger to artists in Lenin's ideology is recognized by Carr. He warns Tzara, who believes that Lenin will listen to artists since he listens to the playwright, Gorki, that there is no future for artists in the Bolshevist regime:

> You're an amiable bourgeois with a chit from Matron and if the revolution came you wouldn't know what hit you. You're nothing. You're an artist . . .
>
> (Travesties, p. 83)

Obviously, Carr has surmised that under Lenin's leadership there would be no "chit from Matron." Since the Revolution determines worth by measurable, utilitarian output, everything that is done must be done for the State, and art itself would have to become functional. The point that Stoppard is seemingly moving towards in Travesties is that the concept of art for its own sake, without moral purpose, may be drastically shaken by the demands of impinging social issues, just as the role of the "neutral" artist may become more subject to external forces which could impel the individual towards direct action.

The importance of Travesties as a pivotal play between Stoppard's former stylish withdrawal and his later more direct commitment is established by elements of both stances that are present in this highly complex play. Stoppard's use of artifice (in language and patterned

episodes) as a form of artistic detachment, or as a retreat from a direct expression of social issues, is still very much in evidence in this play and indeed is essential to the "art for art's sake" aspect of the Travesties debate. Even the title suggests that the playwright is exercising his considerable talents as a wordsmith in order to indulge in some private game-playing. His travestying consists in borrowings from Wilde, Joyce, Shakespeare, and other writers, using various prose styles to mimic them, or to parody them through the use of poems, sonnets, limericks, and music-hall routines. (The title could also be Stoppard's apology for the play's distortion of historical events, altered for his own purposes, but attributed to the unreliability of Carr's failing memory). If in fact there is a moral message to be gleaned from the play, it is masked, sometimes to the point of obscurity, by the density of witty material which depends on recognizable allusions to other writers' works and by rapid shifts in time and location that impel its audience on a three-hour obstacle race. On the surface, the play might appear to be the brain-child of a gifted artist involved in his own craft to the exclusion of larger issues. On the other hand, Stoppard's link with his enigmatic predecessor, Oscar Wilde, encourages the view that the author is operating on more than one level, deliberately assuming a superficial frivolity as a means of advancing more serious considerations.

It is perhaps a happy coincidence for Stoppard that the play which brought the real-life Henry Carr and James Joyce together and provided the stimulus for Travesties was Wilde's The Importance of Being Earnest. By using the Wilde play as a backdrop for his own, Stoppard

substantiates the strictly "art for art's sake" doctrine that Wilde endorsed. The phrase itself, originating with Walter Pater, became the watchword of the English aesthetic movement of which Wilde was an enthusiastic supporter, and it was subsequently expanded on by Wilde in the following statement: "Art never expresses anything but itself. It has an independent life . . . and develops purely on its own lines."[12] Hence, in Travesties, Stoppard relies on Wilde's precepts, if not explicitly, then by association, to support the role of the uncommitted artist who, by virtue of "art for art's sake," is free to focus on stylistic forms. Such an approach is in keeping with Wilde's opinion that "the sphere of Art and the sphere of Ethics are absolutely distinct and separate."[13] Stoppard expresses a similar sentiment when he says, "I'm not impressed by art because it's political, I believe in art being good art or bad art, not relevant art or irrelevant art."[14] Certainly, Stoppard's rather frivolous treatment of his subject matter in Travesties is an approach that Wilde would have found congenial considering the Wildean maxim: "Art is the only serious thing in the world. And the artist is the only person who is never serious."[15]

In Travesties, "art for art's sake" takes the form of verbal and visual game-playing which is often based on esoteric knowledge of those writers whom he is parodying or, from a more critical standpoint, which arises out of private jokes that could scarcely be fully appreciated by his audience at a first viewing. Dialogue from the Wilde play is inserted in Travesties with humorous effect, as in the scene in which Joyce enters the room to find Gwen and Tzara embracing. Joyce

immediately assumes the authoritative tone and speech of Wilde's Lady Bracknell: "Rise, sir, from that semi-recumbent posture.'" (Travesties, p. 55). The humour of the line derives mainly from its original use in the Wilde play and the audience's recognition that Joyce has been cast as a Victorian dowager.

Of greater obscurity is the opening scene of Travesties which features Tzara's drawing pieces of paper at random out of a hat and assembling the words written on them into the lines of a Dadaist poem. It begins meaninglessly as "eel ate enormous appletzara," which presumably, when spoken aloud, is supposed to sound like the French, "Il est un homme, s'appelle Tzara." Finally, the entire five lines of what is actually a limerick, when translated back into English, reads as follows:

(Eel ate enormous appletzara
key dairy chef's hat he'lllearn
oomparah!
Ill raced alas whispers kill
later nut east,
noon avuncular ill day Clara!)

He is a man called Tzara
Who has unparalleled talent,

He stays in Switzerland
Because he is an artist,
'We have only art,' he declared.

(Travesties, p. 18)

In its final coherent form, the poem has particular reference to the play's central theme, yet its meaning would surely not be accessible to the average theatre patron or even to a reader of the text. However, Stoppard enthusiasts will appreciate not only the poem's ingenious cleverness but the ironic implication that even Tzara's anti-art must yield to design in the hands of an artist such as Stoppard.

Later in the first Act, when Tzara offers Gwendolen a Shakespeare love sonnet torn into bits and pieces, Stoppard humorously turns the

scene into a delightful collage of Shakespeare quotations that relies for its full savouring on an intimate knowledge of Julius Caesar, Hamlet, As You Like It, Much Ado About Nothing, Othello, and 1 Henry IV, in addition to Sonnet 18.[16] Moreover, Stoppard has again apparently followed the formlessness advocated by the Dadaists and created, not from random samplings but from carefully selected lines, a Shakespeare dialogue with a logical word pattern. So complex are these and other word-games devised by the playwright to baffle and amuse that even Jim Hunter, in his elaborately annotated Study-Guide, does not attempt a complete investigation of the text but suggests that a more thorough analysis could serve "as a game for a fairly erudite reader confined to bed with a temperature."[17]

A more accessible form of verbal fun is employed by Stoppard as a parody of James Joyce when an entire scene is given over to the limerick form, with the characters of Carr, Joyce, Gwendolen, and Tzara speaking different lines and finishing each other's lines with suitable rhymes, all with an extremely humorous effect. A less obvious reflection of the Irish writer's work is Stoppard's imitation, in the question and answer scene between Joyce and Tzara, of the catechism-like style used by Joyce in the Ithaca chapter of Ulysses.[18] Yet the fact that the dialogue in which Joyce questions Tzara about Dadaism goes on for almost six pages confirms the impression that with Stoppard the central concern of the play tends to give way to the playwright's fascination with this kind of stylistic wonderland (or wanderland). Another example of Stoppard's literary playfulness appears on the last page of Travesties where Stoppard includes a line

in Old Cecily's speech which echoes the last page of Ulysses, "yes I said yes when you asked me" (Travesties, p. 98), a clever touch which would be inaccessible to anyone unfamiliar with the Joyce work.

Aside from his extended use of literary jokes, Stoppard succumbs to many temptations to add visual humour to the play. Aware of the titillation that a certain kind of art can give, he includes a "Carr's-mind-view" of Cecily doing a strip-tease, an added attraction that relieves the play's verbosity. In another scene, the antagonism between Joyce and Tzara is visually represented when the hat used by Tzara to scramble the words of poems he is ostensibly "re-creating" is mistakenly picked up by Joyce who subsequently re-enters "covered from head to breast in little bits of white paper, each bit bearing one of the words of Shakespeare's eighteenth sonnet" (Travesties, p. 56). But Joyce is later rescued from this humiliation in yet another visual display when Stoppard portrays him as the artist-magician who can achieve more with his art than Tzara can with his avant-garde trickery. Joyce "conjures" articles out of a hat, namely a carnation, a string of silk handkerchiefs, a row of flags, and finally, a rabbit. The result is a spectacular piece of stage business that allows Stoppard to give free rein to his own brand of theatrical magic.

Even though in Travesties Stoppard continues to create visual and verbal complexities in the cause of "art for art's sake," he is faced with the same dilemma that he devises for his artists-in-war[19] who ask themselves whether the pursuit of art for its own sake is still relevant in the 20th century. Tzara suggests that "cleverness has been exploded along with so much else, by the war" (Travesties, p. 37).

Variations of this disturbing theme dominate throughout the play, but Stoppard is unwilling to commit himself entirely and maintains an ambivalent position. On the one hand, he allows himself to be diverted by his own ingenuity into displays of intellectual prowess that embroider upon the play's central issues without furthering them directly. On the other hand, his ironic treatment of the themes of war and revolution, particularly within the context of the Wilde play, implies a subtle criticism of those who seek to maintain the status quo regardless of world-shaking events. The question of artistic responsibility versus detachment, however, is never satisfactorily resolved in this play.

Meanwhile, Stoppard's characters move in and out of the Wilde play, their Stoppardesque dialogue creating an amusing counterpoint to the original Earnest text, and providing some clever characterization, Joyce assuming an authoritative tone reminiscent of Lady Bracknell, and Carr passing himself off to Cecily as "Tristan," the younger brother of the equally fictitious "Jack," a deception practised by Algernon in the Wilde play. Underlying the comedy and perhaps revealing the most vital clue to Stoppard's developing social conscience are the frequent intrusions of war-talk into the Wildean conversations. The anachronistic device of interjecting 20th-century concerns such as a world war and a social revolution into a 19th-century drawing-room has a jolting effect which moves the audience abruptly from trivial to universal matters.

Stoppard uses a similar technique at the beginning of the second Act which opens with Cecily's lengthy and instructive speech on the historical Lenin. This shift to straightforward lecturing must come as

a surprise despite a hint from the playwright which appears in a line spoken by Carr in the final scene preceding the first Act curtain when he says: "Anybody hanging on just for the cheap comedy of senile confusion might as well go because now I'm on to how I met Lenin . . ." (Travesties, p. 64). Yet this remark hardly prepares the audience for those dark moments later in the play in which Lenin, as orator, presents a grim picture of the restrictions to be placed on art and the artist under his party's political system. But it is not a mood which Stoppard sustains for long. The mere idea of the kind of limitations suggested by Lenin impels Stoppard to express his own artistic freedom by launching immediately into the tea-sipping episode of the Earnest play, cleverly adapting the Cecily-Gwendolen interchange to the vaudeville routine of "Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Shean." It is a comic technique that reverses the seriousness of the Lenin scene, yet cannot entirely obliterate its forceful impact.

Stoppard's avoidance of any strong polemical statement in this play, or in those which precede it, makes the connection with Wilde even more pronounced. Wilde also avoided didacticism, emphasizing style rather than "earnest"-ness in matters of importance. But his use of paradox, irony, and dialogue, literary devices which imply a double view of the points they make, suggest that his writings should not be taken too simply or at their face value. The same could apply to Stoppard's flippant handling of serious concerns which in Travesties covers his deep anxiety about his own reluctance to give up his artistic detachment and become socially committed. An even more revealing comparison between the two writers is suggested by the fact

that in Wilde's poem, "The Ballad of Reading Gaol,"[20] which was inspired by his prison experience, Wilde's humane impulses finally overcome his artistic scruples in verses that deplore man's inhumanity to man:

> This too I know -- and wise it were
> If each could know the same --
> That every prison that men build
> Is built with bricks of shame,
> And bound with bars lest Christ should see
> How men their brothers maim.[21]

Stoppard, too, under the pressure of a growing sense of social turmoil, eventually becomes confident enough or provoked enough to take a stand on public politics in plays such as Professional Foul and Every Good Boy Deserves Favour, and, most recently, in The Real Thing, to deal with the private politics of the artist's commitment in the more personal realms of love and marriage.

CHAPTER III

Art and Real Life: "Writing Cricket Bats"

The complex structure of Travesties, with its multiplicity of ideas that revolve around the role of the privileged artist and its multi-faceted debate as to whether or not a social conscience should have any bearing on art, represents a culmination for Stoppard "in terms of trying to put together serious statement and witty expression."[1] Indeed, the play's rich mixture of verbal and visual jokes, together with its intricate patterning of literary styles and political ideologies, is a monument to the ingenuity and craftsmanship of a gifted and highly intelligent writer in full command of his art.

Yet it is the very artfulness of this play that has led Stoppard to remark that, with Travesties, he had arrived at a "terminus," and to conclude that, "if one is going to write that kind of play in that kind of idiom,"[2] then he could do it no better than he had already done. This conclusion, Stoppard found, was "slightly worrying"[3] in that it signalled the need to move in a totally new direction, as he indicated in the following statement:

> My instinct now is to go in the opposite direction, because Travesties is about as rich as I can get. It's a play which has rhyming sections, Shakespeare extracts, Oscar Wilde parodies, song, dance, extracts from the works of Lenin . . . and I feel like that man who used to make a living by

> riding a unicycle while using the toe of one of his feet to flick cups and saucers alternately on to the top of his head until they formed a pagoda up there . . . I felt that, with Travesties, I wanted to get down off the unicycle and write a play about a man sitting in a chair and a woman sitting in another chair with a bowl of cornflakes between them, talking about the fading of the light.[4]

Elsewhere, Stoppard has said that he "was sick of flashy mind-projections speaking in long, articulate, witty sentences about the great abstractions," and felt that instead he "ought to write a play about a middle-class family having a crisis," the kind of play based on "observation, truth, no showing off."[5] In view of this shift in focus, Travesties may be seen as a bridge across which Stoppard moves from the dilemmas of the self-absorbed artist, who remains aloof from social realities, towards a personal involvement with external events.

The play's positioning in the Stoppard oeuvre, midway between the comparative detachment of his earlier works and the social commitment of his later, more polemical writing, also heralds a departure from his former dispassionate rendering of ideas by flat, puppet-like figures who move in abstract settings to the creation of relatively self-motivated characters, capable of expressing human emotions in recognizably true-to-life situations. Indeed, there appears to be a definable link between the absence of emotion and the absence of social commitment, both of which characterize Stoppard's earlier works, so that what constitutes a major breakthrough for Stoppard affects both aspects of his writing.

Stoppard's anticipation of a change in the form and content of his

plays may well have resulted from Kenneth Tynan's criticism of Travesties while it is a "layer cake of pastiche [which] the well-read playgoer will happily consume," the play as a whole is "no substitute for bread."[6] In other words, it is somehow deficient in the substance of life. Tynan sees in this deficiency a lack of "the magic ingredient of pressure" on the characters which might impel them "towards a credible state of crisis, anxiety, or desperation."[7] From this standpoint, one can recognize that the figures of Joyce, Tzara, and Lenin, in their function as spokesmen for various points of view, are life-size puppets set in motion by the playwright, whose main object is seemingly to create a theatrical arena in which to stage his own internal debate about art. Even Henry Carr's references to trench warfare are not heartfelt, emotional recollections of a personal crisis so much as a way of settling the argument with Tzara over the moral defensibility of artistic neutrality, and a reflection on the benefits of actual neutrality to himself. Indeed, it is the characters' passionless existence, as well as that absence of self-motivation, that justifies Tynan's major criticism of Travesties.

Nor was Tynan the only critic to note a lack of emotional content in Stoppard's writing. Geoffrey Reeves agreed that "Tom hasn't yet made a real emotional statement."[8] And, according to Derek Marlowe, Stoppard's reluctance to reveal genuine emotion in his plays was closely linked with his inability to create convincing roles for women:

> His female characters are somewhere between playmates and amanuenses . . . his private

> self is . . . reclusive, intimidated by women, unnerved by emotion.[9]

Stoppard's own dissatisfaction with the purely intellectual and abstract lives of his characters indicates the internal and external pressures which compelled him towards the kind of "truth-telling writing" which he had formerly avoided, for the reason that it was "as big a lie as the deliberate fantasies I construct."[10]

Yet it was not only Stoppard, the private man, unwilling to reveal genuine emotion in his plays, who came under attack from the critics. It was also Stoppard, the man of ideas, who was criticized for his refusal to express himself politically. Stoppard's counter-attack rested on a belief that art should be judged on its merits as either "good" or "bad" art, and not on whether it was "relevant" or "irrelevant."[11] In a 1974 Theatre Quarterly interview, Stoppard stated:

> The plain truth is that if you are angered or disgusted by a particular injustice or immorality, and you want to do something about it, now, at once, then you can hardly do worse than write a play about it.[12]

Stoppard's insistence on "the impotence of political art" led the Theatre Quarterly interviewer to presume that this attitude towards art explained why Stoppard's plays "tend to bear on life in an oblique, distant, generalized way," a view of his work that Stoppard readily acknowledged because, in his opinion, "that's what art is best at."[13] In defence of this doctrine, Stoppard pointed to Travesties which "asks whether an artist has to justify himself in political terms at all," and to Joyce's vision of art:

> . . . if Joyce were alive today, he would say, juntas may come and juntas may go but Homer goes on for ever.[14]

While Stoppard felt uneasy about aligning himself with "authentic geniuses," such as Joyce, he did so in support of the notion that "the legacy of a genius who believe[s] in art for art's sake"[15] can scarcely be measured. Even though Stoppard was continually pressed during this interview to acknowledge that he was at least "moving in the direction of 'issues,'"[16] he remained adamant in his refusal to be identified with those playwrights who use their art to make political statements.

Such unwillingness to use art to address social problems is another bone of contention in Tynan's criticism of Travesties and the plays which preceded it. Tynan is quick to note Stoppard's lack of commitment towards even his own dramatic "statements," commenting that Stoppard "[hates] to be pinned down, politely declining to be associated with the opinions expressed by his characters."[17] Tynan's own concern with the social commitment of art is contained in several statements which he made in the Observer with respect to the plays of Eugene Ionesco, whom he attacked for assuming that his works "are more valid and important than the external world it is their proper function to interpret."[18] In the same article, Tynan objects to the kind of artist who accepts a "passive role," when he should concern himself "with such things as healing," because art itself, in Tynan's view, exists for a larger purpose:

> . . . no ideology has as yet abolished fear, pain or sadness. Nor has any work of art. But both are in the business of trying. What other business is there?[19]

While such a statement represents Tynan's general criticism of those playwrights whom he classifies as "cool, apolitical" writers, he is more specific in his judgment of Stoppard to whom he attributes, rightly or wrongly, an absurdist approach to art for the following reasons:

> . . . I decided that for Stoppard art is a game within a game -- the larger game being life itself, an absurd mosaic of incidents and accidents in which . . . 'something is taking its course.' We cannot know what the something is, or whither it is leading us, and it is therefore impermissible for art, a mere derivative of life, to claim anything as presumptuous as a moral purpose or a social function.[20]

Although this definition of his approach to art is one that Stoppard later disclaimed,[21] it represents a view of his work that might well have inspired his shift towards a less ambivalent position with regard to contemporary social problems.

But even if such criticisms as those expressed by Tynan and Marlowe did little to affect his public stance or to move him towards political writing, the fact remains that in Night and Day (1978),[22] his first full-length stage play after Travesties, Stoppard is less inclined to display his virtuosity with language and instead uses his art to portray and interpret the external world. Correspondingly, the "artist"-figures in the play, in this case, professional writers for a national newspaper, combine their literary skills with integrity. Moreover, Stoppard establishes an inner life for at least one of the characters, creates a fairly convincing role for a woman, and concerns himself with specific social issues that relate to his personal

experiences.

The semi-realist setting of Night and Day marks a change in approach for Stoppard as he shifts from the abstract world of Travesties, where the action takes place inside an old man's memory, to a more tangible situation involving contemporary characters who are less eccentric and more life-like. The private home of a British mine-owner, Geoffrey Carson, and his wife, Ruth, who reside in the fictitious African state of Kambawe, provides the modern background for an ongoing debate about the relative value of a free press which can spread both truth and slander, information and propaganda. The various "voices" in the controversy belong to Wagner and Guthrie, both of whom are tough, seasoned newspapermen, Milne, a young and zealous free-lance reporter, Mageeba, the ruthless, militaristic dictator of Kambawe, and Ruth Carson. Stoppard draws on his own youthful past as a journalist to develop his characters and their various points of view in a play based on "observation, truth, no showing off," and rarely resorts to visual and verbal conundrums, the kind of stage trickery that one had come to expect from him.

Admittedly, some confusion may result from the play's enigmatic opening scene in which Guthrie, a press photographer, is threatened by a hovering helicopter and machine-gun fire while covering a news story, but this is quickly dispelled when the strange occurrence is revealed as Guthrie's "nightmare" during a cat-nap in the Carson's garden. At first, Stoppard's use of light and sound images in this opening scene appears to be characteristic theatrical trickery, at odds with the naturalistic setting that follows. But the scene's initial impact is

crucial to the plot, acting as an ominous forewarning of the "real" attack in which Milne is actually killed. Even the word-games in which Stoppard so often indulges in his earlier plays are replaced by a more conventional dialogue which uses the usual Stoppard wit to retaliate in arguments, to give an ironic twist to harmless remarks, or, most significantly, to expose deeply felt concerns. Moreover, the fact that the words seem to spring from private experiences suggests Stoppard's interest in a personal life for his characters.

This more intense rendering of his characters is particularly evident in Stoppard's portrayal of Ruth Carson. A complex personality with an inner as well as an outer self, she represents Stoppard's first attempt at writing a convincing female role. She converses freely and intelligently in a male-dominated world, yet inwardly voices anxieties, self-doubts, and passions that she keeps hidden from public view. Her unheard cry for help links Ruth with Dotty and Gladys, both of whom reveal their private thoughts in interior monologues and seek help from a husband who is unable to "hear" them. But unlike these previous heroines who seek to escape from life's problems, Ruth manages to cope with such external pressures as a military coup and a civil insurrection, as well as with the internal problems of a loveless marriage, self-recrimination over her brief, unsatisfying affair with Wagner, and despair over the sudden death of Milne, for whom she had felt a strong sexual attraction.

The inclusion of Ruth's "asides" indicates a level of consciousness to which only the audience is privy, a dramatic device which

allows us inside her thoughts and feelings. In addition, the inner and outer facets of her personality become visual as well as aural when Ruth, enacting her own fantasy, literally "splits" into two characters, one who plays the role of devoted wife in normal conversation with her husband and one whose naked figure follows her lover out of the room. Ruth is the only character in the play whose inner self is exposed in this manner. This focus arouses an audience's interest in her in a unique way and provides a springboard for her outer actions. But, at the play's conclusion, the resumption of her affair with Wagner, to whom she has been hostile throughout the play, seems more in the interests of a tidy ending than the natural outcome of her inner drive. So that, despite the success of the role in terms of its exploration of the female psyche, Ruth at this point becomes a pawn moved about by the playwright's hand. Towards the play's end, even Ruth becomes a puppet-figure in Stoppard's debate on the value of a free press.

This practice of setting up a debate to explore all sides of a question is a structural device that had already formed the basis of Travesties, but now, with Night and Day, Stoppard's own position in the argument is less ambiguous. The ideas expressed in the play clearly derive from personal knowledge gained during Stoppard's early years as a newspaperman (Stoppard describes himself as a "journalism groupie"[23]). So even as he presents various sides of the debate, he leaves no doubt as to where he personally stands regarding free speech.

The limitations imposed on freedom of the press by individual prejudices are projected through the characters of Wagner and Mageeba. Wagner, the hard-nosed union man, to whom a "right-thinking press" is one that thinks like he does (N. & D., p. 59), objects to working for a millionaire newspaper owner with the power to limit the freedom of his employees. Consequently, Wagner advocates "worker solidarity" as an instrument for social change. Ironically, it is a union strike instigated by Wagner himself against his own newspaper, that prevents his front-page story from reaching the British readers. Mageeba is similarly averse to capitalistic ownership of newspapers. But under his dictatorship, freedom of the press is severely limited. His take-over of Kambawe's only newspaper ensures that the press is "relatively free," meaning that it is edited by one of his relatives. Ruth, with typical Stoppardian wit, undercuts both of these arguments. She points out the shortsightedness of Wagner's trade-union idealism by asserting that "free expression includes a state of affairs where any millionaire can have a national newspaper" (N. & D., p. 84). And her subsequent remarks to Wagner are also an indirect attack on Mageeba's dictatorial regime. "A state of affairs . . . where only a particular approved, licensed, and supervised non-millionaire can have a newspaper is called, for example, Russia" or, by extension, Kambawe (N. & D., p. 84). The underlying message in Ruth's argument is Stoppard's own objection to any restriction on free speech, whether imposed by an autocratic newspaper owner, by an organized union, or by a totalitarian government.

But it is the highly-principled Milne who seems specifically to speak for Stoppard when he describes a free press "as the last line of

defence for all the other freedoms" (N & D, p. 58). Milne overrules Ruth's objection to the sensational, news-mongering side of journalism that publicizes people's private lives.[24] He claims that such misuse of the press is "the price you pay for the part that matters" (N & D, p. 60). He also seems to voice Stoppard's own opinion when he states that, with a free press, "everything is correctable, and without it, everything is concealable," a view which Stoppard substantiates in his interview with Gambit's editors:

> Milne carries more conviction than Ruth . . . what Milne says is true . . . however imperfect things are they are correct[a]ble if people know they're going on. If we don't know they're going on, it's concealable . . . I believe it to be a true statement.[25]

According to Stoppard, the death of Milne in the play confirms, "not directly, but in some psychological way,"[26] the truth to which he becomes a martyr. Even though an angry and embittered Ruth questions whether the end-product, the Sunday newspaper back home, is worth giving one's life for, the answer, as formulated by Guthrie, upholds Milne's own principles as well as those of Stoppard:

> People do awful things to each other. But it's worse in places where everybody is kept in the dark . . . Information is light. Information, in itself, about anything, is light.
>
> (N & D, p. 92)

The play, as a whole, encapsulates the importance to Stoppard of free speech. Moreover, his overt stance in this play points to Stoppard's developing sense of responsibility towards contemporary issues that affect both the individual and society. Added to this, the fact that

the play is dedicated to a fellow-journalist, Paul Johnson, who provided much of its background material, is further indication of a merging of art and real life.

Stoppard's delving into personal experience as a source for his plays, together with his concern for free expression and an increasing commitment to current problems, provide the impetus for three shorter works, Every Good Boy Deserves Favour, Professional Foul, and Cahoot's Macbeth. All of these plays deal specifically with social and political issues and all are inspired by actual events. They seem to hinge on a statement made by Henry Carr in Travesties: "The easiest way of knowing whether good has triumphed over evil is to examine the freedom of the artist" (Travesties, p. 39). In these plays, Stoppard is primarily concerned with the artist in Soviet-bloc countries. As is the case in Night and Day, the plays are dedicated to living persons whose actual experiences provided the germinal idea.

The connection which these plays have with Stoppard's personal life relates to his affiliation with Amnesty International. In August 1976, he addressed a rally in Trafalgar Square sponsored by the Committee Against Psychiatric Abuse and joined a march to the Soviet Embassy to deliver a petition denouncing the use of mental homes as punishment camps for Russian dissidents. In February 1977, Stoppard travelled to Moscow as a representative of Amnesty International to meet a number of the victimized Soviet non-conformists in support of whom he wrote an article for the London Sunday Times.[27] Another area of personal concern to Stoppard, who was born in Czechoslovakia, was the censorship of the works of Czech playwrights, particularly those of

Vaclav Havel, whom Stoppard regards as his "doppelganger."[28] In January 1977, Havel was imprisoned as one of the spokesmen for a document called Charter 77, signed by 241 leading Czech writers and intellectuals, which urged the government to respect human rights, especially those relating to free speech. The link with Havel was made more concrete when Stoppard visited his fellow-playwright in June 1977; this meeting inspired two more newspaper articles, "Prague: the Story of the Chartists"[29] and "The Czech Trials."[30] No doubt these political concerns, so disturbing to Stoppard, were at the forefront of his mind when he was commissioned by André Previn, conductor of the London Symphony, to write a dramatic piece for actors and orchestra, and by the B.B.C. to write a television play to mark Amnesty International's 'Prisoner of Conscience Year' (1977). The combination of these events produced, in that year, Every Good Boy Deserves Favour and Professional Foul which represent a further shift from two-dimensional to life-like characters whom Stoppard creates from a first-hand knowledge of people and events.

Stoppard acknowledges the connection with living persons in these plays when he dedicates Every Good Boy . . . . to Victor Fainberg and Vladimir Bukovsky, both victims of the abuse of psychiatry in the U.S.S.R. Professional Foul is dedicated to Vaclav Havel, the Czech playwright whose imprisonment inspired the story of Pavel Hollar who shares a similar fate. And a later play, Cahoot's Macbeth (1979), is dedicated to another Czech playwright, Pavel Kohout, who was responsible for starting a Living-Room Theatre in Prague in order that two "great and forbidden Czech actors, Pavel Landovsky and Vlasta

Chramostova," might perform Macbeth in the homes of their friends.[31] Because Stoppard is unremitting in his condemnation of political orders that deprive the individual of free speech, these plays are heavily weighted in favour of the characters who are in the focal position. The author's point of view is never ambivalent and we are expected to side with those who stand by their principles. In contrast to the spectator-heroes of the earlier plays, both Alexander in Every Good Boy . . . and Anderson in Professional Foul relinquish a passive role when they place their moral principles ahead of their personal well-being. And with artistic enterprise, the writers and actors of Cahoot's Macbeth show that they will go to any lengths to assert their right to free expression. Taken as a whole, these plays reveal Stoppard's own sense of an artistic commitment towards real-life issues that affect both the individual and his society.

Alexander, the hero of Every Good Boy . . . represents this committed stance. As a man who takes a stand against unjust authority, his actions reveal the importance of an individual's morality to the ethical standards of the community as a whole. Unlike the earlier "artist"-figures, Alexander bravely meets the extremes of physical and mental hardship without seeking to evade them by retreating into neutrality. He is confined in a mental hospital for having done something "crazy" by writing letters to his "superiors," to the "Party," to the "newspapers," and to "foreigners," in order to protest against the incarceration of sane people in mental hospitals because of their political opinions. "My madness consisted of writing to various people about a friend of mine who is in prison" (EGBDF, p. 28). As to the

torture to which he is subjected as a "cure" for his delusions, Alexander grimly suggests that "for the politicals, punishment and medical treatment are intimately related" (EGBDF, p. 29).

In addition to physical and mental torture, Alexander is subjected to an emotional strain caused by separation from his young son, who tries to persuade his father to effect a quick and easy release by confessing to his "insanity": "Papa don't be rigid! Be brave and tell them lies" (EGBDF, p. 35). Instead, Alexander goes on a hunger strike as an act of defiance against his captors. This strategy eventually secures his release, because "they don't like you to die unless you can die anonymously. If your name is known in the West, it is an embarrassment" (EGBDF, p. 24). Alexander's moral concerns, which go beyond his own immediate suffering, are translated into a self-denial that is rendered more poignant by his son's pleading:

> Sacha: Tell them lies. Tell them they've cured you. Tell them you're grateful.
>
> Alex: How can that be right?
>
> Sacha: If they're wicked how can it be wrong?
>
> Alex: It helps them to go on being wicked. It helps people to think that perhaps they're not so wicked after all.
>
> Sacha: It doesn't matter. I want you to come home.
>
> Alex: And what about all the other fathers? And mothers?
>
> Sacha: (Shouts) It's wicked to let yourself die!
>
> (EGBDF, p. 35)

Despite the pleas of his son, Alexander is unwavering in his dedication to a moral principle which he refuses to abandon even in the face

of physical, mental, and emotional pressure.

A similar stance is taken by the protagonist of Professional Foul when Anderson, a philosophy professor, is forced to make the distinction between private and public codes of behaviour. The play is concerned with the persecution of writers and other intellectuals by communist-bloc governments who place a ban on their writings and force them to work at menial tasks for their livelihood. On a visit to Prague to deliver a lecture on "Ethical Fact in Ethical Fiction," Professor Anderson meets a former student, Pavel Hollar, who is prevented from writing and forced to work as a lavatory-cleaner. Hollar begs Anderson to smuggle out a thesis which argues that "the ethics of the State must be judged against the fundamental ethic of the individual" (Prof. Foul, p. 55). At first, Anderson refuses to take the paper back to England on the grounds that such action would be "unethical," since he is a guest of the Czechoslovakian government. Paradoxically, it is Anderson's colleague, MacKendrick, whose own ethics are somewhat ambivalent, who pinpoints Anderson's failure to distinguish between "bad manners" and "immoral practices" by remarking "You end up using a moral principle as your excuse for acting against a moral interest" (Prof. Foul, p. 78). Anderson's "neutrality" changes to commitment only after he is subjected to a first-hand experience of the abuse of civil liberties in a police state. He is a witness when Hollar's apartment is searched, incriminating evidence is "found," and Hollar is falsely accused of dealing in foreign currency.

For Anderson, the debate between private and public ethics moves out of the intellectually objective arena into the emotional realm of

personal relationships. He is visibly shaken by the effects of the State's "morality" on the lives of Hollar's wife and son. As a consequence, he not only manages to smuggle Hollar's thesis out of the country by "unethically" hiding it in MacKendrick's luggage, which he rightly anticipated would not be as thoroughly searched as his own, but he attempts to deliver a lecture at the Colloquium in Prague which is an outright censure of the unethical politics of the host country.

> When . . . we are being persuaded that it is ethical to put someone in prison for reading or writing the wrong books, it is well to be reminded that you can persuade a man to believe almost anything provided he is clever enough, but it is much more difficult to persuade someone less clever. There is a sense of right and wrong which precedes utterance. It is individually experienced and it concerns one person's dealings with another person. From this experience we have built a system of ethics which is the sum of individual acts of recognition of individual right.
>
> (Prof. Foul, p. 90)

Anderson's crusade against bureaucracy does not end with this speech, for he has already indicated to Hollar's wife and son that he will be working for Pavel's release when he returns to England; thus, his new sense of commitment is to be translated into deliberate action. Like Alexander in Every Good Boy . . . . , Anderson has accepted responsibility for the well-being of society as a whole through his adherence to a personal and private ethic.

Stoppard's concern for freedom of speech is also the basis for a shorter play, Cahoot's Macbeth, which evolved out of the real-life

experiences of actors and writers in Czechoslovakia. In actual fact, writer Pavel Kohout and actor Pavel Landovsky, having been prevented from engaging in their professions, formed a living-room theatre of five performers who met to present a 75-minute Macbeth. Stoppard's version of their experiences captures the determination of these dedicated artists to work at their craft despite government restrictions. In Cahoot's Macbeth, the actors confound a police inspector who tries to halt their performance because of subversive elements in the Shakespeare text.

> The fact is, when you get a universal and timeless writer like Shakespeare, there's a strong feeling that he could be spitting in the eyes of the beholder when he should be keeping his mind on Verona . . . He didn't know he was doing it, at least you couldn't prove he did, which is what makes the chief so prejudiced against him.
>
> (C's Macbeth, p. 60)

Undeterred, the actors suddenly switch into "Dogg" language[32] in which familiar words and phrases are replaced by others with different meanings. In place of the expected lines of Lady Macbeth's sleep-walking scene, "Out, damned spot! Out, I say!" the actress says, "Hat, daisy puck! Hat, so fie!" And Macbeth's famous speech beginning, "Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow," becomes "Dominoes, et dominoes, et dominoes" (C's Macbeth, pp. 75, 77). This deceptive language-game enrages the inspector who, at a loss to understand what is going on, nevertheless senses that the actors' performance is a criminal offence, because "if it's not free expression, I don't know what is'" (C's Macbeth, p. 75). And indeed, the actors' playfulness

is an assertion of their artistic freedom. Moreover, those who gather for the purpose of performing great plays, even for small gatherings of friends, see art as a refuge from political oppression as well as an implied protest against the ban on free speech. Stoppard's version of their activities emphasizes the very real situation in which many mid-Europeans find themselves and demonstrates the ingenuity of the artistic spirit in overcoming external obstacles to free expression.

Yet despite Stoppard's more committed stance in the overtly political plays which follow Travesties, and his use of material derived from his own life and the lives of others, there is still the sense that his stage characters, with the possible exception of Ruth Carson in Night and Day, are chess-board pieces maneuvered by the playwright for his purposes rather than life-like "people" motivated by their "own" individual thoughts and feelings. Most are stereotypes who must function within the framework of the play's design. What Anthony Smith refers to as "heartless patterns" in Stoppard's work suggests, to him, that the audience is presented with the problem: "Who's in control of this pattern? It's me, the playwright."[33] And indeed, in these plays, it is Stoppard's patterning which seems to control the characters as he places them strategically for the purposes of his argument, balancing them against each other while exhibiting a certain inhibition about revealing their emotional depths.

Stoppard himself recognized the discrepancy which often exists between art and real life when Vladimir Bukovsky, having been released from detention in the Soviet Union, attended a London rehearsal of Every Good Boy . . . ., a play based on the latter's own experiences.

Both Stoppard and Ian McKellen, the actor portraying the character, Alexander, felt extreme embarrassment and "a sense of worlds colliding"[34] because of Bukovsky's presence at the rehearsal in which his actual suffering was converted into artifice:

> . . . the feeling of unease which I got -- which Ian got . . was to do with the discrepancy between art and life full stop . . . What we were engaged in was a sort of artifice . . to simulate something, not to live it. And it was that discordance which suddenly went 'clang!'[35]

Probably it was the growing uneasiness with this kind of discrepancy between his own art and actuality that caused Stoppard to narrow the gap in his most recent play, The Real Thing, a full-length stage drama, in which Stoppard moves still further, from political and public concerns to the private and personal.[36] This play marks a huge leap from Stoppard's previous disinclination to project deep feeling. Previously, his rebuttal to criticisms aimed at his lack of emotional concern alternated between a defensive attitude, which did not see "any special virtue in making my private emotions the quarry for the statue I'm carving," and the excuse that he was waiting "until I can do it well."[37] In The Real Thing, Stoppard reveals a direct and more personal involvement with the emotional natures of his characters, particularly Henry, the playwright, who is a mirror-image of Stoppard himself.

The play's dramatis personae includes three strong-willed, highly opinionated female characters, all of whom offer penetrating insights into Henry's personality. These are Charlotte, an actress who is

Henry's first wife, Debbie, their teen-age daughter, and Annie, another actress and Henry's second wife. Henry's major fault, according to these women, is that he is "uncaring" and incapable of revealing strong feelings, either in his close relationships or in his writing. Following her divorce from Henry, Charlotte, with characteristic sarcasm, analyzes her former husband's complacent attitude towards their marriage:

> There's something touching about you, Henry. Everybody should be like you. Not interested. It used to bother me. Even when we were first together . . . You think making a commitment is <u>it</u>. Finish. You think it sets like a concrete platform, and it'll take any strain you want to put on it. You're committed. You don't have to prove anything. In fact, you can afford a little neglect, indulge in a little bit of sarcasm here and there, isolate yourself when you want to. Underneath it's concrete for life.
>
> (<u>Real Thing</u>, p. 62)

His new wife, Annie, is equally dismayed by Henry's lack of jealous feelings about the other men with whom she associates. She attributes this to a lack of love:

> You don't love me the way I love you. I'm just a relief after Charlotte, and a novelty. . . . You don't care enough to <u>care</u>. Jealousy is normal.
>
> (<u>Real Thing</u>, p. 44)

Henry's tendency to remain detached, even in his personal relationships, immediately links him with the "aloof" artists of the early plays, as does his voluntary retreat into an isolated world that includes only himself and Annie. This exclusiveness, which Henry

refers to as "the insularity of passion," is smugly defended by him because, as he explains to Annie, there are "only two kinds of presence in the world. There's you and there's them" (Real Thing, p. 45). This introverted view of human relationships is one that Debbie seeks to correct with her observation that "exclusive rights isn't love, it's colonization" (Real Thing, p. 69). Initially, at least, Henry, like the "neutral" artists in Travesties, attempts to shut out the external world from his personal life, nor does he allow any part of his personal life to intrude on his art.

Henry's inability to write about human emotion in his plays apparently goes hand-in-hand with that defensiveness concerning personal relationships, which both Charlotte and Annie interpret as "uncaring." Henry admits to his inabilities in writing about emotion:

> I don't know how to write love. I try to write it properly, and it just comes out embarrassing.
>
> (Real Thing, p. 40)

Henry's lines are almost an echo of Stoppard's own feelings at a time when he too was loathe to express anything deeply personal in his work. In a 1968 interview, Stoppard told Giles Gordon:

> I am sensitive about self-revelation. I distrust it. I've written very little which could be said to be even remotely autobiographical and I've been subsequently embarrassed by what I have written.[38]

But almost in a parallel to Stoppard's own artistic and personal evolvement, Henry undergoes a dramatic change in his understanding of what personal commitment in a close relationship requires. This

metamorphosis is achieved through a crisis which arises when Henry fears that he may be losing Annie to a younger man, an actor called Billy, with whom she is working. The hitherto separate worlds of Henry's art and his private life suddenly collide in a confrontation with Annie regarding her intimacy with Billy that is a replay of a scene from Henry's own play, House of Cards. In that play, the leading character, played by an actor called Max, who happens to be Annie's first husband, suspects his "stage" wife, played by Charlotte, of having an adulterous affair. In this "play-within-a-play," the hero responds to his wife's suspected infidelity with witty remarks, clever puns, and humorous innuendoes. Such objective coolness proves to be beyond Henry when he is faced with the identical situation in his own "real" life. Ironically, his interpretation of Annie's apparent unfaithfulness is expressed in much the same terms that Charlotte had earlier judged his lack of passion. It is a revelation to Henry to discover that "not caring doesn't seem much different from not loving" (Real Thing, p. 74). The point being made is that Henry's emotional crisis allows him to recognize the disparity between his artistically distanced rendering of domestic situations and the passionate demands of a personal relationship.

Like the puppet-figures of Stoppard's early plays, Henry's own imagined characters are without passion or self-motivation, speaking lines that are given to them by the playwright but which often have no direct bearing on the plot. Stoppard also, as we have noted, was seemingly unable to create characters of substantial depth. But whereas Max, in Henry's play, jokingly accepts the idea of his wife's

infidelity, Stoppard's depiction of the "real" Max is that of a heartbroken man totally crushed by the thought that his wife, Annie, is in love with someone else. It is Max's emotional and heartfelt outburst in a scene that repeats, in his own life, the patterns of one that he performed on stage, which indicates the extent of Stoppard's move towards more profound characterization.

But it is the women's roles that give the strongest evidence of Stoppard's shift to the portrayal of "real" people. The exploration begun in Night and Day with the character of Ruth is taken one step further in The Real Thing. Again, the distinction is made between Stoppard's play and Henry's to show the difference between women who speak their own words and those who are merely following a script. For instance, Henry's idea of a woman's role, according to Charlotte who must play the part on stage, is to "feed" lines to the male actor and to fetch drinks for him. "That's Henry's idea of women's parts. Drinks and feeds" (Real Thing, p. 21). When lines from Henry's play are repeated in the context of ordinary conversation by the off-stage Charlotte, they sound shallow and urbane:

> I'm a victim of Henry's fantasy -- a quiet, faithful bird with an interesting job, and a recipe drawer, and a stiff upper lip, and two semi-stiff lower ones all trembling for him -- 'I'm sorry if you've had a bad time . . . There's a right thing to say now . . . '
>
> (Real Thing, p. 20)

And Charlotte rightly pinpoints the contrast between what happens in Henry's plays and what happens in similar episodes of their own lives.

> That's the difference between plays and real life -- thinking time, time to get your bottle back. 'Must say, I take my hat off to you, coming home with Rembrandt place mats for your mother.' You don't really think that if Henry caught me out with a lover, he'd sit around being witty about place mats? Like hell he would. He'd come apart like a pick-a-sticks.
>
> (Real Thing, p. 22)

Indeed, the play as a whole focuses on the intrusion of reality into the segregated, self-sufficient world of the artist to the point where he is under the necessity of confronting the issues of day-to-day living and the people who inhabit his world.

In addition to these concerns, reflected in this new focus on the emotions and inner motivations of his characters, Stoppard uses The Real Thing to project his views on art. The play becomes a sounding board for some profound and direct thought about what constitutes "good" art; it also emphasizes his disinclination to use his art to further political causes. For example, Henry refuses to involve himself in Annie's campaign to free a young soldier called Brodie who is arrested for setting fire to a Cenotaph wreath during an anti-missile protest. Henry's objection to campaigning on Brodie's behalf is that "public postures have the configuration of private derangement," and he has no wish to be identified with those who pretend to be "properly motivated members of the caring society" while acting out of personal interest. Neither does Henry want to re-shape a play ineptly written by Brodie for the express purpose of publicizing his unjust imprisonment. Later, when Henry does dramatize Brodie's story for television, he is motivated entirely by his love for Annie rather than by any

concern to secure Brodie's release. Even Annie's interest in Brodie's cause arises from her guilty feelings rather than from altruism. Apparently, Brodie's civil misdeeds were undertaken to impress Annie, whom he had recognized as the heroine of a television series:

> He didn't know anything about a march. He didn't know anything about anything, except Rosie of the Royal Infirmary. By the time we got to Liverpool Street he would have followed me into the Ku Klux Klan. He tagged on. And when we were passing the Cenotaph he got his lighter out. . . . Private Brodie goes over the top to the slaughter, not an idea in his head except to impress me. What else could I do? He was my recruit.
>
> (Real Thing, pp. 82-3)

Annie's revelation confirms Stoppard's own mistrust of "political" acts which are so rarely free of personal contradictions and complications.

Another reason for Henry's reluctance to re-write Brodie's play pertains to the young soldier's colossal lack of talent as a writer. In his condemnation of Brodie's literary ineptness, Henry expresses Stoppard's own view of what constitutes "good" art. In an interview with Anthony Smith, Stoppard stated that "a play might say important things, but if it's a bad piece of art, then I don't think it's an important piece of art simply by virtue of tackling an important subject."[39] Henry demonstrates this idea theatrically in a speech to Annie during which he brandishes a cricket bat to illustrate the same point:

> This thing here, which looks like a wooden club, is actually several pieces of particular wood cunningly put together in a certain way

> so that the whole thing is sprung, like a dance floor. It's for hitting cricket balls with. If you get it right, the cricket ball will travel two hundred yards in four seconds, . . . What we're trying to do is to write cricket bats, so that when we throw up an idea and give it a little knock, it might . . . travel . . .
>
> (Real Thing, p. 53)

In contrast to "writing cricket bats," Brodie has succeeded only in producing a "lump of wood . . . trying to be a cricket bat" (Real Thing, p. 53). In the brief snatches of Henry's version of Brodie's play that we hear, there is ample proof of the difference that fine honing of material can make. As Annie says, the play "works," although her meaning of the term is misconstrued by Brodie. He judges the play on its effectiveness in bringing public attention to his case. The fact that it is not the moral message of the play but the overcrowding of the prisons that expedites Brodie's release, merely confirms Stoppard's doubts as to the efficacy of "political art" to achieve its writer's ends. What is important to Stoppard, and to Henry, is that using one's art to express an inner conviction does not obviate the necessity for an artistic rendering of the material, hence it is the play as a work of art that is the foremost consideration.

The views which Henry advances give a clear indication of where Stoppard now stands with regard to art and its function. Stoppard's focus on Henry and his problems establishes The Real Thing as the personal story of one man. In this sense, it differs from Travesties, a conglomerate package of various viewpoints with no obvious authorial

position and from Jumpers, in which George Moore, who apparently speaks for Stoppard in principle, shares the stage with Dotty, whose screams for help are a more direct comment on the social and moral concerns in that play than are George's lengthy philosophical discourses. Moreover, the questions which are raised in The Real Thing pertaining to art are no longer presented in the form of an open-ended debate, but relate to matters which the dispassionate, self-indulgent Henry must resolve on a personal level. The problems which Henry faces reflect Stoppard's own concerns as he attempts to reconcile cleverness with passion, the intellect with the emotions.

The theory of art for art's sake with which the artists in Travesties wrestled has now been replaced by Henry's conviction that art is his means of shaping what he has to say into a more effective instrument for conveying his ideas. Like the "privileged" artists of Travesties, Henry's skill sets him apart from those who are "not thus gifted." Annie accuses him of being "jealous of the idea of the writer," and of wanting to keep his craft "sacred, special, not something anybody can do" (Real Thing, p. 52). It is these superior feelings that provoke him to elevate his art above Brodie's mediocre attempts at writing and, much to their annoyance, habitually to correct the grammatical mistakes made by his family and friends. But while he has an intellectual fetish for correctness in language, Henry's taste in music is surprisingly banal, based on a purely emotional response to a certain kind of pop music. Moreover, Henry resists repeated attempts to interest him in classical music, as evidenced in his first introduction to grand opera.

> I was taken once to Covent Garden to hear a woman called Callas in a sort of foreign musical with no dancing which people were donating kidneys to get tickets for. The idea was that I would be cured of my strange disability. As though the place were a kind of Lourdes, except that instead of the front steps being littered with wooden legs, it would be tin ears. . . . That woman would have had a job getting into the top thirty if she was hyped.
>
> (Real Thing, p. 25)

Obviously, Stoppard is projecting, through Henry, a distinction between artfulness and the "arty"-ness of those who like what is fashionable. Another aspect of Henry's art is his dependence on hack-writing for a livelihood, the television plays which pay the "alimony." Henry explains: "If Charlotte made it legal with that architect she's shacked up with, I'd be writing the real stuff" (Real Thing, p. 55). In two earlier plays, Artist Descending a Staircase and A Separate Peace, art for utilitarian purposes is referred to, somewhat perjoratively, as "making picnic baskets." But Stoppard now takes pains to clarify the work of the artist in all its aspects. In a personal interview, he says:

> . . . not all plays are written because of a gut need to write about factor X. In common with all professional writers one is asked whether one would like to do certain things . . . the BBC asks if you'd like to adapt Three Men in a Boat and you don't think, 'These are not the times.' . . . you do it. When it's a thing like that, you're more a craftsman than an artist.[40]

While he may be under the necessity of using his craft for commercial purposes, Stoppard will not use it to preach directly or, in

violation of his own dictum on the worst in art, to make "inartistic" political statements. But in addressing the problems confronting his fellow-artists in Russia and Czechoslovakia, he demonstrates that art can be a useful tool for expressing his own moral principles and his belief in human rights, particularly as these relate to freedom of expression. The effectiveness of his skill in projecting these ideas is revealed in the fact that Every Good Boy . . . . has been presented all over the world and in twelve different languages, and that Stoppard has been banned from Russia.

As Stoppard aligns himself more directly, in The Real Thing, with the play's central character, we receive a clearer picture of the privileged and gifted artist coming to terms with his responsibilities as they relate to his art and to his private life. Henry's special dispensation as an artist sets him apart from those around him who see his detachment as a sign of "not caring." But stylish withdrawal is no longer a tenable position for the Stoppardian hero. His "chit for life" is a gift that carries with it a burden, for he must pursue his art in the recognition that he cannot simply separate himself from the realities of life with its public and private responsibilities. Indeed, the role of the artist is to teach us about life's problems and to enable us to see more clearly the pressures which meeting those problems places on individuals.

In this regard, the artist's personal experiences can provide the substance which he then shapes into art. Significantly, when Henry hears the truth behind Brodie's misdeeds, that worship of Annie had inspired Brodie's heroic, if uncivil gesture, he remarks: "That one

I would have known how to write" (Real Thing, p. 84). At this point, Henry has come to recognize the part which passion can play in artistic achievement. While we have only this remark to indicate that Henry's art has changed from the "heartless patterns" of his earlier writing, we have the proof before us, in The Real Thing, that Stoppard's has.

It is perhaps symbolic that in the original London production of this play, the stage-picture, bounded by the proscenium arch, showed Henry standing in his living-room and, behind him on the wall, an oil painting of Henry in the same setting. This image, which emphasizes the idea of the play-within-a-play ad infinitum, also suggests the layers of artifice which must be stripped away in order that art may reveal real life. But more importantly, it signifies a "portrait of the artist" framed in his limited view of his role in life. Eventually, he breaks out of the frame because it can no longer hold him.

NOTES

Introduction

[1] Ronald Hayman, "Profile 9: Tom Stoppard," The New Review, December 1974, p. 15.

[2] Tom Stoppard, Travesties (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1975). All further references to this work appear in the text.

[3] Tom Stoppard, Artist Descending a Staircase and Where Are They Now? Two Plays for Radio (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1973), p. 21. All further references to this work appear in the text under the abbreviation, Artist Descending.

[4] Tom Stoppard, Every Good Boy Deserves Favour: A Play for Actors and Orchestra (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1978). First performed in July 1977. All further references to this work appear in the text under the abbreviation, EGBDF.

[5] Tom Stoppard, Professional Foul: A Play for Television (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1978). First shown on BBC-TV in September 1977. All further references to this work appear in the text under the abbreviation, Prof. Foul.

[6] Tom Stoppard, Jumpers (New York: Grove Press Inc., 1972). All further references to this work appear in the text.

[7] C.W.E. Bigsby, Tom Stoppard. In the series Writers and their Work (Harlow, Essex: Longman Group Ltd., 1976), p. 22.

[8] Ibid., p. 22.

[9] Tom Stoppard, "Ambushes for the Audience: Towards a High Comedy of Ideas," Theatre Quarterly, May-July 1974, p. 14.

[10] Tom Stoppard, The Real Thing (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1982). All further references to this work appear in the text.

Chapter I: Art vs. Labour: "A Chit for Life"

[1] Tom Stoppard, Lord Malquist and Mr. Moon (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1974). All further references to this work appear in the text under the abbreviation, Malquist.

[2] Tom Stoppard, Albert's Bridge (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1970). All further references to this work appear in the text under the abbreviation, A's Bridge.

[3] Tom Stoppard, Enter a Free Man (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1968). All further references to this work appear in the text under the abbreviation, Free Man.

[4] Tom Stoppard, If You're Glad, I'll Be Frank (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1976). All further references to this work appear in the text under the abbreviation, If You're Glad.

[5] Tom Stoppard, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1967). All further references to this work appear in the text under the abbreviation, R. & G.

[6] Jim Hunter, Tom Stoppard's Plays (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1982), p. 16.

[7] Tom Stoppard, Interview with Ronald Hayman, 12 June 1974. Printed in Contemporary Playwrights: Tom Stoppard by Ronald Hayman (London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 3rd ed. 1979), p. 2.

[8] Kenneth Tynan, Show People: Profiles in Entertainment (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979), p. 47.

[9] Tom Stoppard, After Magritte (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1971).

[10] Tom Stoppard, The Real Inspector Hound (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1970).

[11] Tom Stoppard, Interview with Anthony Smith, 17 December 1976. Cassette recording produced by The British Council, London.

[12] Tom Stoppard, quoted in Show People, p. 116.

[13] "Ambushes," pp. 6-7.

[14] John Russell Taylor, The Second Wave: British Drama for the Seventies (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1971), p. 107.

[15] Walter Kerr, "Tom Stoppard is too Lazy to be Really Funny," New York Times, 23 January 1977, II, 3:1.

[16] Samuel Beckett, Waiting for Godot (New York: Grove Press Inc., 1954).

[17] Contemporary Playwrights, p. 4.

[18] Stoppard claims that this amusing apparition is based on a factual incident: "Somebody I know had a couple of peacocks in the garden, and one escaped while he was shaving. He chased it and he had to cross a main road to catch it, and he was standing in his pyjamas with shaving cream on his face holding a peacock when the traffic started going by" ("Ambushes," p. 17).

[19] "Ambushes," p. 6.

Chapter II Portrait of the Artist: "The Importance of Being Neutral"

[1] Tom Stoppard, A Separate Peace (London: Samuel French Ltd., 1969). All further references to this work appear in the text.

[2] "Ambushes," p. 17.

[3] According to Stoppard, A Separate Peace "was written specifically to go with a half-hour film . . . about international chess masters and grandmasters for the Chess Congress at Hastings in about 1965." See "Ambushes," p. 17.

[4] Quoted in Contemporary Playwrights, p. 40. From an interview with A. C. H. Smith for Flourish, RSC Club News-sheet, 1974, Issue 1.

[5] Tom Stoppard, Interview with Nancy Shields Hardin, April 1979. Printed in Contemporary Literature, Vol. XXII, No. 2 (Spring 1981), p. 156.

[6] Irving Wardle, "A Web to Snare Three Giants," The [London] Times, 11 June 1974, p. 7.

[7] Oscar Wilde, "The Importance of Being Earnest" in Plays, Prose Writings, and Poems (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1975), pp. 345-402.

[8] After the Zurich performance of The Importance of Being Earnest, Carr and Joyce quarrelled and ended up going to law in two separate actions, Carr claiming reimbursement for the cost of a pair of trousers he had bought to wear as Algernon, and Joyce counter-claiming for the price of five tickets sold by Carr. See Introduction to Travesties entitled "Henry Wilfred Carr, 1894-1962," p. 12.

[9] See First World War Poetry, edited by Jon Silkin (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1979), pp. 26-9, for a description of the stages in consciousness of the war poets.

[10] Joyce's version of the poem was actually entitled "Dooley's Prudence," according to Richard Ellman's biography, James Joyce (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 436.

[11] Kenneth Tynan, "Ionesco and the Phantom," [London] Observer, 6 July 1958. Reprinted in Drama in the Modern World: Plays and Essays ed. Samuel A. Weiss (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1964), pp. 485-6.

[12] Oscar Wilde, "The Decay of Lying," Intentions, 12th ed. (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1919), pp. 51-2.

[13] Oscar Wilde, "The Critic as Artist" in Plays, Prose Writings, and Poems (London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1975), p. 52.

[14] "Ambushes," p. 14.

[15] Oscar Wilde, "A Few Maxims for the Instruction of the Over-Educated" in Plays, Prose Writings, and Poems (London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1975), p. 433.

[16] For this information, I am indebted to Jim Hunter. See Study-Guide which appears in Tom Stoppard's Plays, p. 241.

[17] Hunter, p. 241.

[18] James Joyce, Ulysses (New York: The Modern Library, 1934).

[19] According to Donner, one of the characters in Artist Descending a Staircase, the artist-in-war, whether he be a Joyce or a Tzara, cannot justify his occupation:

> We tried to make a distinction between the art that celebrated reason and history and logic and all assumptions, and our own dislocated anti-art of lost faith -- but it was all the same insult to a one-legged soldier and the one-legged, one-armed, one-eyed regiment of the maimed (Artist Descending, p. 27).

[20] Oscar Wilde, "The Ballad of Reading Gaol" in Plays, Prose Writings, and Poems (London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1975), pp. 403-20.

[21] Ibid., p. 417.

Chapter III Art and Real Life "Writing Cricket Bats"

[1] Hayman, p. 139.

[2] Ibid., pp. 138-9.

[3] Ibid., p. 138.

[4] Stoppard, Interview with Anthony Smith.

[5] Hayman, pp. 139-40.

[6] Tynan, Show People, p. 109.

[7] Ibid., pp. 109, 110.

[8] Ibid., p. 63.

[9] Ibid., p. 63.

[10] Ibid., p. 64.

[11] "Ambushes," p. 14.

[12] Ibid., p. 14.

[13] Ibid., p. 14.

[14] Ibid., p. 16.

[15] Ibid., p. 16.

[16] Ibid., p. 16.

[17] Tynan, Show People, p. 54.

[18] Tynan, "Ionesco and the Phantom" in Drama in the Modern World, pp. 485-6.

[19] Ibid., p. 486.

[20] Tynan, Show People, p. 53.

[21] In his interview with the editors of Gambit, Stoppard states: "Somehow he [Tynan] got it wrong. Something I said made him conclude that I was somehow a writer who was not part of an effort to perfect society, some sort of striving for perfectibility. When I read it I thought, 'My God, how can he [ha]ve got it so wrong?'" (Gambit International Theatre Review, Vol. 10, #37 (1981), p. 14.

[22] Tom Stoppard, Night and Day (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1978). All further references to this work appear in the text under the abbreviation, N & D.

[23] Gambit, p. 15.

[24] This is an issue which Stoppard deals with in Dirty Linen (1976), a short play about sex scandals involving Members of Parliament.

[25] Gambit, p. 15.

[26] Ibid., p. 15.

[27] Tom Stoppard, "The Face at the Window," [London] Sunday Times, 27 February 1977, p. 33.

[28] Stoppard's "mirror-image," playwright Vaclav Havel, not only shares the same profession but the same mid-European heritage. Both are Czechoslovakian by birth. Havel is only nine months older than his English-speaking counterpart. Havel had his first play performed in 1963, as did Stoppard, and, by 1967, both writers had attained international recognition. Both are noted for their linguistic virtuosity and their fascination with word-juggling. Moreover, Havel has written a play (The Increased Difficulty of Concentration) about a bumbling professor who is engaged, like George Moore in Jumpers, in dictating a lecture on moral values that are contrary to the intellectual climate of his society.

[29] Tom Stoppard, "Prague: The Story of the Chartists," New York Review of Books, 4 August 1977, pp. 11-15.

[30] Tom Stoppard, "The Czech Trials," New Statesman, 28 October 1977, pp. 571-2.

[31] Preface to Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1979), p. 8. References to Cahoot's Macbeth appear in the text under the abbreviation, C's Macbeth.

[32] "Dogg"-language derives from a section of Wittgenstein's philosophical investigations. It demonstrates that two people can communicate, within a limited sphere of activity, despite their use of alternate languages, but for a third person, interaction is impossible and understanding breaks down.

[33] Interview with Anthony Smith.

[34] Introduction to Every Good Boy Deserves Favour and Professional Foul, p. 8.

[35] Gambit, p. 7.

[36] The play's title indicates Stoppard's ironic self-awareness of a change of focus after a decade of criticism about the "unreality" of his art.

[37] Tynan, Show People, p. 64.

[38] Giles Gordon, "Tom Stoppard," Transatlantic Review 29 Summer 1968, p. 19.

[39] Interview with Anthony Smith.

[40] Gambit, pp. 13-14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Stoppard, Tom. *After Magritte*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1971.

_____. *Albert's Bridge*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1970.

_____. *Artist Descending a Staircase and Where Are They Now? Two Plays for Radio*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1973.

_____. *Dirty Linen and New-Found-Land*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1976.

_____. *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1980.

_____. *Enter a Free Man*. 1968, rpt. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1973.

_____. *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour and Professional Foul*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1978.

_____. *If You're Glad, I'll Be Frank*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1976.

_____. *Jumpers*. New York: Grove Press Inc., 1972.

_____. *Lord Malquist and Mr. Moon*. 1966, rpt. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1974.

_____. *Night and Day*. 2nd ed. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1979.

_____. *The Real Inspector Hound*. 2nd ed. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1970.

_____. The Real Thing. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1982.

_____. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1967.

_____. A Separate Peace. London: Samuel French Ltd., 1969.

_____. Travesties. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1975.

Secondary Sources

Beckett, Samuel. Waiting for Godot. New York: Grove Press Inc., 1954.

Bigsby, C. W. E. Tom Stoppard. In the series Writers and their Work. Harlow, Essex: Longman Group Ltd., 1976.

Ellmann, Richard. James Joyce. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Gordon, Giles. "Tom Stoppard," Transatlantic Review 29: Summer 1968, p. 19.

Hayman, Ronald. Contemporary Playwrights: Tom Stoppard. 3rd ed. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1979.

_____. "Profile 9: Tom Stoppard," The New Review, December 1974.

Hunter, Jim. Tom Stoppard's Plays. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1982.

Joyce, James. Ulysses. London: Egoist Press, 1922. New York: Random House, Inc., 1934.

Kerr, Walter. "Tom Stoppard is too Lazy to be Really Funny," New York Times, 23 January 1977, II, 3:1.

Silkin, Jon, ed. First World War Poetry. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1979.

Stoppard, Tom. "Ambushes for the Audience: Towards a High Comedy of Ideas," Theatre Quarterly, May-July 1974, pp. 3-17.

_____. "The Czech Trials." New Statesman, 28 October 1977, pp. 571-2.

_____. "The Face at the Window." [London] Sunday Times, 27 February 1977, p. 33.

_____. Interview with Nancy Shields Hardin. Contemporary Literature, Vol. XXII, No. 2 (Spring, 1981), pp. 153-66.

_____. Interview with Anthony Smith. London: The British Council, 1977.

_____. "Prague: The Story of the Chartists." New York Review of Books, 4 August 1977, pp. 11-15.

_____. "Trad Tom Pops In." Interview with David Gollob and David Roper. Gambit International Theatre Review, Vol. 10, #37 (1981), pp. 5-17.

Taylor, John Russell. The Second Wave: British Drama for the Seventies. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1971.

Tynan, kenneth. "Ionesco and the Phantom." In Drama in the Modern World: Plays and Essays. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1964, pp. 485-6.

_____. Show People: Profiles in Entertainment. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979.

Wardle, Irving. "A Web to Snare Three Giants." The [London] Times, 11 June 1974, p. 7.

Wilde, Oscar. Intentions. 12th ed. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1919.

_____. Plays, Prose Writings, and Poems. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1975.

VITA

Surname THOMPSON Given Names DOREEN HELEN

Place of Birth WINNIPEG, MAN Date of Birth January 5, 1929

Educational Institutions Attended, with Dates of Entering and Leaving

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, B C	1978 to 1982
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, B C	1982 to 1984
	____ to ____
	____ to ____

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded, with Dates and Names of Institutions

B A (Honours)	1982	University of Victoria, B C

Honours and Awards

First Year English Award, 1979

University of Victoria Fellowship, 1982/83

Publications

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis

"Soya Beans and Cricket Bats": SOCIETY AND THE ARTIST IN THE PLAYS OF TOM STOPPARD

Author [redacted]

DOREEN HELEN THOMPSON

April 2, 1984