



University
of Glasgow

Norris, Sharon (1995) *"Simply the best (better than all the rest?)" : an investigation into the Booker Prize, 1980-1989, with particular regard to the general rise in business sponsorship of literary awards during the eighties, and the likely effects of the Booker on fiction.* PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/2398/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

**‘Simply the Best
(Better than All the Rest?)’,**

An investigation into the Booker Prize, 1980-1989, with particular regard to the general rise in business sponsorship of literary awards during the Eighties, and the likely effects of the Booker on fiction.

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the
Department of English Literature, University of Glasgow

by

Sharon Norris, M. A.

APRIL 1995

(c) Sharon Norris 1995

SUMMARY

The thesis was planned as an attempt to investigate the general increase in the number of literary prizes in the 1980s and particularly those sponsored by business. However it is also an investigation into the specific workings of the Booker Prize as the best known literary award of its kind in Britain, and into the effects that prizes such as the Booker may have had on fiction.

Part 1 deals initially with the history and founding of the Booker Prize. Then in Chapter Two it covers some of the broader issues involving literary awards in general, such as the tendency among them to encourage a conflation of business and aesthetic ideals.

Part 2 deals with the issue of patronage for the arts and with the predominance of particular social groups among the authors, judges and members of the Management Committee of the Booker Prize. I also examine how certain types of supposedly aesthetic evaluations arise and how they subsequently come to predominate.

In the final part of the thesis I look at the issue of standardisation as it relates to the novels which won the Booker Prize during the 1980s.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As with anyone who embarks upon a research project, there are many people whom I have to thank for making this finished thesis possible. I have received a great deal of help, some of a practical nature, some of the nature of 'moral support'. I am grateful to all of those who helped in any way and would hope I have not offended anyone by singling out the following:

I should like to acknowledge the financial support of the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland, without whom this thesis quite literally would not have been possible. Special thanks are also due to Book Trust, to Booker Plc, to Whitbread, and to Kallaway Ltd. In addition, I am very grateful to all of those representatives of companies and other prize-awarding bodies who took time to answer my many questions and thus to provide me with essential information for this thesis. I am also extremely grateful to Mr Allan Schiach of Glenlivet who took the time to meet me in person, and to Mr David Grant of Glenfiddich who gave me the chance to experience a top-level prize ceremony at first hand.

I should like to thank Mrs Betty Burns and my mother, both of whom helped me out financially when I was in dire straits during the first year of my studies, and also Mr Philip Attenborough of Hodder and Stoughton, who contributed several of his company's Booker winners and who encouraged me greatly during this period.

I should also like to thank my employers over the last few years. In particular, thanks are due here to Mrs Ann Karkalas of the Department of Adult and Continuing Education at the University of Glasgow, to all the staff at the University's Accommodation Office, and especially to Mr Alan Barr of the EFL Unit at the University. I should also like to express my thanks to The Open University in Scotland.

Thanks are due to the following people for the help and advice which they provided during the course of my research: Mary Haight of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Glasgow; Dr Ian Thomson of the Department of Psychology; Valerie Wills, formerly of the Marketing Department at the University of Strathclyde; the Scottish Home and Health Department; and the Scottish Health Education Group.

In addition, special thanks are due to Amal Chatterjee for his patience and computing expertise, to Debby Murphy for typing up Chapter Four while I had a broken wrist, to Jan Green for helping with some proof reading, and to Mrs Margaret Green for advice on formatting and for general moral support and friendship. My thanks are due also to Judith Harriman of the University of Glasgow's Computing Services Unit for advice on the presentation of a very troublesome graph.

I should like to offer my heartfelt thanks to the many friends, colleagues and students who have encouraged me through the "difficult" times which are the lot of the research student.

Finally I should like to offer my special thanks to Professor Philip Hobsbaum, my supervisor and my own 'patron saint of lost causes'. His tolerance and forbearance of a difficult and at times erratic student have been greatly appreciated.

This thesis is dedicated to my fellow pupils at Lavern Primary School,
Nitshill, Glasgow, 1967-1971.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	p7
PART 1	
INTRODUCTION	p24
CHAPTER ONE	p25
CHAPTER TWO	p47
CONCLUSION TO PART 1	p75
PART 2	
INTRODUCTION	p83
CHAPTER THREE	p85
CHAPTER FOUR	p106
CONCLUSION TO PART 2	p129
PART 3	
INTRODUCTION	p134
CHAPTER FIVE	p135
CHAPTER SIX	p175
CONCLUSION TO PART 3	p210
CONCLUSION	p217
POSTSCRIPT	p224
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	p235
TABLES	
TABLE 1	p247
TABLE 2	p249
TABLE 3	p260
FIG. 1	p262
FIG. 2	p263
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX 1	p266
APPENDIX 2	p309

'The basic idea ...is that the concordance of liking evoked by certain works of art...is due to something other than a single excellence inherent in the quality of the work itself; rather it is the product of a complex process in which a variety of forces - some ideological, some highly material - contend with one another and ultimately produce something that is in itself far from immune to the actions of chance.'

LEVIN SCHUECKING,

The Sociology of Literary Taste¹

¹ SCHUECKING, L., (1966), The Sociology of Literary Taste, (2nd Edition), Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, pvii.

INTRODUCTION

'The historians tell us that the decade is far too brief a time-span to reveal an historical trend or manifest any significant process of change or evolution. In artistic and cultural history it has a good deal more importance, for it is about the time it takes for a particular artistic generation to coalesce, or a particular style or mannerism to become central.' ²

It is customary at the start of a thesis to outline the argument which follows for the reader, and also to provide a general introduction or overview for those not intimate with the context within which the chosen topic is to be discussed. Thus in this introduction I propose to outline the basic argument to be presented in the following chapters and I shall also indicate to the reader the context in which this argument has arisen.

For well over a century there have been fears about the growing commercialism and commoditising of literature. These are not new, nor are literary prizes. In fact some of the earliest literary prizes were given by the ancient Greeks at the original Olympic Games. However over the last thirty years or so there has been a large rise in the number of new prizes, and with this have come renewed fears that such prizes have had the effect of commoditising fiction in a way and to an extent not previously anticipated.

The last quarter century in particular has seen a sizeable increase in the number of prizes, awards and bursaries on offer for all kinds of literature. These range from those with conventional types of remit - to reward the 'best' in any given category - to prizes with a more esoteric approach, such as the Quatrefoil Award, which seeks to honour the:

² BRADBURY, M., (1988), "Closing time in the Gardens", or What happened to writing in the 1940s", No. Not Bloomsbury, Columbia University Press, New York, p67.

'...authors of the book or books judged to have contributed the most towards an understanding and/or love and appreciation of oriental rugs.'³

During the 1980s in particular there was a significant rise in the number of awards and this went hand-in-hand with, firstly, a general increase throughout the decade in the level of the business community's involvement in the setting up and sponsoring of awards, and, secondly, with a correspondingly large increase in the amount offered by the sponsors to the author of the winning novel, poem or work of non-fiction. The Booker Prize may be said not only to be representative of these trends; it became the most successful award of its kind during this period. On these grounds alone it deserves a fuller investigation, for to date little work has been done on the implications of literary prizes.

Malcolm Bradbury has argued that a decade is a suitable period of time in which to make an assessment of the importance of any cultural or artistic trend. Certainly the rise in both the number and value of literary awards may be seen in these terms. However, the prize phenomenon may also be seen to have been a useful barometer of the economic climate over the ten years from 1980-1989 as well as reflecting trends and innovations in corporate marketing strategies over this period. This is evident not only in the growth of the prize-sponsorship phenomenon which paralleled the mid-Eighties economic boom, but also in the economic recession which followed, since many prizes subsequently folded, changed their remit, or, as in the case of the Guinness Peat Aviation Award, altered the frequency of presentation.

The Booker has succeeded in a manner unlike any other British literary award in insinuating itself into the common cultural consciousness. Again

³ See Guide to Literary Prizes, Grants and Awards in Britain and Ireland, Book Trust and the Society of Authors, London, 1990, p28.

this is a process that was especially conspicuous during the Eighties. Thus the ageing novelist Maurice Kingsley is a surprise winner of the Booker in later life in Dennis Potter's 1989 television series Blackeyes. Similarly, the plot of Simon Brett's comic novel The Booker Book, also published in 1989, revolves entirely round the repeated efforts of one aspiring novelist to win the prize. In addition, the Booker, along with the Nobel Prize for Literature, is probably the only literary award which members of the general public are likely to have heard of, and that in itself is an achievement.

This thesis arose out of an attempt to understand the phenomenon of the Booker Prize and in particular its rise to a new prominence during the 1980s, and to see the Booker against the background of the general rise in the number of literary awards during this period. However, it also arose out of a desire to explore and understand the following issues: why and how certain evaluations of fiction come about; what social values may be said to influence these; the sort of power and social standing of the group making the evaluations; the importance of financial backing in determining what gets written and published; and, of most importance to the literary specialist, what effects prizes such as the Booker may be said to have had on the writing, dissemination and reception of fiction. The rest of the thesis therefore is a response to these initial concerns.

In the following chapters, and especially in Chapter Two, I shall look at the rise of the Booker against the background of the particularly fevered rash of new and wealthy awards which broke out during the 1980s. I shall argue that during this period, the Booker became something of a phenomenon, in media terms at least, appearing to transcend the intrinsic limitations of business-sponsored awards for fiction to become something of a cultural totem. I shall examine how this situation came about and

whether it is accurate to see the Booker as having become, consummately, a reflection of the prevailing zeitgeist of the 1980s, if indeed it is possible to speak of one particular 'spirit of the age'. It is my belief that both the rise of the Booker during the Eighties, and its potential to influence are of great importance to any discussion of the history the novel during this period.

From a strictly literary point of view the most important questions are those concerned with what sort of effect the Booker Prize and others like it may be said to have had on fiction and on the status thereof. Was the Booker able during the 1980s to form and influence taste for example, and did it subvert or reinforce traditional literary values? In addition, if the Booker may be said in any way to have reflected the literary standards and values of the era, how representative were these values, where did they arise, and how did the prize come to be dominated by members of the literary and media establishments?

I shall contend that during the 1980s this particular prize had the ability to greatly increase the sales of the novels which were shortlisted, that it also had the ability to affect the reception and evaluation of fiction and possibly to promote one recognisable genre of fiction at the expense of others, and moreover, that the prize had the potential to influence writing itself. I shall now expand further on these points.

The author and critic Marge Piercy in an article in The Guardian in 1991 wrote about how publishers deal with the manuscripts of first novels. In it she noted how:

'.. every writer craves the validation of seeing their work in print and the lack of the publisher becomes the badge of failure.'⁴

⁴ See PIERCY, M., (1991), The Guardian, 28th January .

In addition, if literature is an attempt to communicate, then failure to have a novel published, in addition to being a failure in the quest for validation, also represents a lost opportunity for communication. This necessarily includes the possibility of a communication and dissemination of values.⁵ Publication, on the other hand, represents a recognition of talent, of one's writing ability, and indeed a validation of one's own experience as worked out through fiction. For as Patricia Meyer Spacks has said:

' "It can be argued that all fiction (and poetry and philosophy and painting) ultimately constitutes autobiography, the artist inverting whatever the purported aim of his creation, only a series of metaphors for the self."
'6

Since the adoption of the royalties system and the decline of the circulating library, to have had a work of literary fiction published and for it to have been successful may be regarded as being a particular achievement, for the market for this kind of fiction is relatively small, and traditionally publishers have had to rely on the strength of titles which *do* sell in order to support the publication of novels with literary pretensions which generally do not.

It is true that the latter is a tradition which has been under threat since the advent of large multi-national communications groups which have been less willing to sacrifice a share of the profit margin by re-investing in literary titles. However, given that this is still the general pattern, the Booker Prize, during the Eighties and still in the Nineties, perhaps offers the ultimate accolade. Where literary fiction does not normally sell well, here the novelist is offered the tantalising prospect of being able to

⁵ See POTTER, R., (ed.) (1989), Literary Computing and Literary Criticism, p83, where Paul Fortier quotes from Riffaterre.

⁶ SPACKS, P. M., (1976), Imagining a Self: Autobiography and Novel in Eighteenth Century England, quoted in ELLIOT, R. C., (1982), The Literary Persona, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, p33.

combine literary aspirations with the financial rewards of being a bestseller.

It will become clear to the reader in the following chapters to what extent the Booker was able to influence sales of novel during the 1980s, and that this was not only the case for the novels which won but was also true for the other works on the shortlist. Furthermore, the prize was also able to increase the sales of earlier works by the winner and the shortlisted authors. The advantages therefore were, and still are, legion. The winning novelist was almost certainly guaranteed a paperback edition of his or her book, sales abroad, a possible increased advance from the publisher, and fees for personal appearances, signings and media interviews. Although many authors probably found the latter somewhat double-edged, in general terms the rewards were very welcome, and these came in addition to the substantial prize money itself. The financial rewards sometimes had a big impact on the subsequent career of an author. For example, after winning the Booker in 1981, Salman Rushdie was able to quit his job as an advertising copy-writer in order to concentrate full-time on writing.

Clearly, seen in these terms the Booker and similar awards have been no bad thing. As for literature itself, however, my argument in the chapters which follow will be that while fears about the encroachment of the business ethic into the world of literature are not recent, the success of the Booker Prize has added a new edge to the debate and has helped to blur the distinction between two completely different types of evaluations: those based on aesthetic principles and those based on the demands of the market.

The rise of the novel in the Eighteenth Century and the background of bourgeois literacy which brought it to the fore have been well documented. Since that time however there have been many significant changes, both in the methods of production and in the marketing of novels. One of the most important changes to occur in Britain, for example, was the demise in the 1890s of the three-decker novel, and this undoubtedly had an effect on both the market for fiction and on the sort of fiction which was written.

Social and economic factors continue to influence the production of the novel today. In the Twentieth Century however, economic factors have usually been linked to the supposed decline of the novel and of writing in general rather than to any new flourishing of talent. Q. D. Leavis was one of several critics earlier this century who argued that mass literacy and a mass market for all types of fiction had led to a fragmentation of the reading public, a fragmentation of the novel into genres and sub-genres, to a decline in reading taste, and to a fall in the standard of fiction writing. It has also been argued that in the second half of the Twentieth Century especially, increased disposable income and the rise of other more diverse forms of leisure pursuits such as television, have in turn led to the creation of a literate public which rarely reads.

However economic factors may be said to have influenced fiction in a more direct way, and this, I shall argue, is relevant to the rise of business sponsored literary awards. During the 1960s and Seventies several important studies were carried out on the relationship between literature and society, and on how social, political, and economic factors had influenced the role of the writer in society. John Hall in 1979⁷ quoted

⁷ See HALL, J., (1979), *The Sociology of Literature*, p61. Interestingly literary awards feature neither in Hall's assessment of important new sources of patronage, nor in his discussion of literary gatekeepers. This may be due in part to the fact that prizes were not particularly new even in the late 1970s, but it is surely also indicative of the rather alarming rate at which the number of awards began to increase just after this period.

statistics used in Findlater's earlier study The Bookwriters, Who Are They? These showed that in 1965, that is, three years before the setting up of the Booker Prize, fifty per cent of writers lived off earnings from a second job, and only forty-four per cent of those who made a living from literature earned more than £500 per annum. Furthermore, two thirds of writers earned less than £6 a week, and only one sixth made more than £20. To put this into a broader perspective, the average wage per annum for a male non-manual worker at the time was just under £1,500.

If one compares this even with the poverty-stricken world of Reardon and his companions in George Gissing's New Grub Street, or with that of Orwell's hack in the essay "Confessions of a Book Reviewer", it seems clear that it had become increasingly difficult to make a living from writing alone. Yet only four years later when the first Booker Prize was awarded, the winner was presented with a cheque for £5,000.

Clearly then, while the amount of the prize money offered by the Booker has always been an attractive prospect, this must have been especially so in the early days of the award when the prize money alone was worth three times the average salary.⁸

As I shall show in Chapter Three, the financial rewards involved mean that large lucrative business-sponsored awards are always going to be attractive, and especially in the absence of any other comprehensive financial support for young writers. However, it may be argued that in the future awards such as these are likely to be seen to have had some influence on fiction-writing itself, and that this is only to have been expected. In particular it is possible that prizes will be seen to have led to

⁸ See Chapter One, footnote 24.

a standardisation of fiction as well as to the blurring of different types of evaluation.

Of course, literary prizes are not the only factors which may operate to bring about a standardisation and it would be unwise to suggest otherwise. In Scrutiny for example, both Q. D. and F. R. Leavis complained bitterly about the general effects of the application of business ethics to literature, for which they claimed an autonomy and, it seemed, a special moral force. In Mrs Leavis's analysis of the disintegration of a homogenous reading public, she spoke of factors which were continuing to affect the literary sensibilities:

'.. tendencies which, having assumed the form of commercial and economic machinery, are now so firmly established that they have run on their own and whenever they choose.'⁹

What may be argued with some degree of justification however is that the rise of the business-sponsored award has led to an acceleration of the process and extended the degree to which both literature and the evaluation of fiction have become coloured by the dominant business ethic. It may be argued further that literary awards have, in the end, not only failed to increase the financial security of the author, but may actually have made the situation more precarious. Since a great number of prizes which were either founded during the 1980s, or, like the Booker, came to a new prominence during the Eighties, were business-sponsored awards and at root may be said to have had the commercial interests of the sponsor at heart at least as much as aesthetic concerns, it can be seen that this type of sponsorship was possible only as long as the parent company itself enjoyed financial security during this period.

⁹ See LEAVIS, Q. D., (1932), Fiction and the Reading Public, Chatto and Windus, London, 1978.

While it is easy now to sneer at Q. D. Leavis's apocalyptic tone, it is worthwhile remembering that the Leavises and their fellow-contributors to Scrutiny were seeking to assert not only their belief in the importance of literature, but the centrality of the human experience with which it deals. Their fears for literature were essentially based on a fear that literature's role as an expression of the human spirit, as a moral influence, and as a bearer of ideas, was under threat, as was what they perceived to be the inherent integrity of literature.

It was this somewhat idealistic humanist view therefore which led them to excoriate the literary establishment of the Thirties and Forties in the pages of Scrutiny. At least part of the motivation behind their sustained attack on the British critical establishment however was the belief that this itself was inherently flawed.¹⁰ However, as I shall show in Chapter Four, given the degree to which the Booker Prize's judging panels, shortlists and Management Committee were peopled by members of what appears to be a homogenous literary establishment, some of Leavis's criticisms may justifiably be applied here in relation to the Booker.

In fact there are several concerns originally raised by the Leavises which are of relevance to the Booker Prize. For example, are we right in any case to think of literature as being autonomous, and can fiction-writing survive without financial support in a world which is increasingly dominated by market forces? Alternatively, can literature retain its critical force while simultaneously receiving the sort of financial support on offer from the business world, particularly given that the *raison d'être* of business has to do with profit making?

¹⁰ E. g. see LEAVIS, F. R., (1932), "The Literary Racket", in A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Vol. 1. Cambridge at the University Press, p160.

It is my contention here that, as far as prizes are concerned, while people are aware of literary prizes and of some of the hypocrisy which has attended them in the past, and although they may not have taken seriously any claims that the Booker or any other award should be seen as a literary yardstick, they have been largely unaware of the full impact that such prizes can have on fiction, and unaware in particular of the extent and weight of the social interconnections which underpin the workings of such prizes.

Given this, it is my intention in the remainder of this introduction firstly to outline what the effects of this *could* be and to examine if there is any evidence to back this up, and secondly, to discuss whether or not the Booker is any worse in this respect than other awards.

I have already outlined the attraction of lucrative prizes to authors who lack other forms of financial support, and have indicated that one of the dangers here is that if certain types of fiction are perceived to have a better chance of winning than others because they are more in line with the values of the judges, then there is a temptation to write 'to order' as it were. This as I have noted could be a particular danger in the case of younger authors who are struggling financially.

However, although it may sound as if standardisation would be more likely to occur in theory than in practice, nevertheless there is, as I shall show in Chapters Five and Six, evidence both of a thematic unity and of the use of related word groups among the novels that have won the Booker Prize. That said, as I shall show in Chapter Four, the degree of interconnection of the various people involved with the prize is such that it is hard to assess whether this is the result of a deliberate attempt to write 'prize-winning' fiction, or merely a reflection of the shared values and

common background that unite authors and judges alike. Indeed there are several places in the thesis where evidence of certain patterns of occurrence is much less disputable than the possible reasons why these should have occurred.

As to the inherent dangers in the business sponsorship of literature, these may be said to include the potential for a clash of two different types of values, and for a conflation of the two as a result. It is true that the values of the business world would appear to have led to the introduction of the concept of the 'hard-sell' into one branch of literature, literary fiction, which was hitherto largely untouched by such concerns. However, as far as the Booker is concerned there would appear to have been some confusion from the outset as to what constitutes strictly literary values, and specifically concerning what constitutes 'middlebrow', and 'literary' and 'highbrow' fiction. Arguably however this may be said to be true of the literary establishment in Britain as a whole.

Related to this, the combination of conflated values and aggressive marketing may be said to have the potential to affect language, and, specifically, to affect the use of terminology employed to denote value judgements, including the words, 'best' and 'good'. If prizes are only hype, if influential hype nevertheless, then one has to be aware of particular and specific interpretations of the word 'good' when used in relation to fiction. In addition one further potential danger is that in effectively promoting writing, as it were, to order, prizes help to undermine and perhaps to erode the traditional mimetic function of fiction.

In order to assess fully either the impact or the influence of an award such as the Booker Prize during the 1980s, and the extent to which social values were substituted for aesthetic ones, it is clear that the prize and the

evaluations of fiction which emerge from the context of its judging panels must be studied in relation to the broader context. This is not simply because art is only a constituent part of a larger social structure, but also since, as Tolstoy argued, the formation of literary tastes and values is dependent on more general values about life. I shall argue in Chapter Four that it is particularly important to relate the assessments of successive Booker Prize judges to the broader social context since as Schuecking clearly illustrates, it is possible for a small but influential stratum of society firstly to make, then to have widely disseminated, its own standard of 'good' in relation to literature, and one which may involve a 'misreading' of the text. I shall argue in Chapter Four that it is the cultural norms of one particularly influential social group which are very much in evidence in the workings of the Booker Prize during the 1980s.

If it is true that the novels which won the Booker were more representative of the dominant ethos of a small but influential cultural minority than of British fiction as a whole, then it figures that it is likely that writers who were either from outwith this context or whose work did not fit with the values of this group had a raw deal. I shall argue that this is borne out by the evidence of the 1980s shortlists. Not only were writers in such a category unlikely to be shortlisted for the Booker Prize in any case, and particularly not if they were published by a smaller publishing house, but within the limited context of the market for serious fiction, they then had to compete with shortlisted novels which had the benefits of maximum publicity and exposure.

In addition, the difficulty for the young novelist^s in getting published and of getting his or her work noticed in such an environment means that writers from outwith the shortlists are likely to have been doubly disadvantaged, triply so if one considers that the novels which appeared

on the Booker shortlists were usually those which were most likely to be reviewed in any case.

While it is hard to prove that the Booker actually changed people's opinions of what constituted merit in relation to fiction, its power in other areas is indisputable. If, as I shall demonstrate, the prize may be seen to have been able to greatly increase the sales of novels by an author whose work may not in fact have been representative of fiction as a whole, then it must be said to have been extremely influential indeed.

However it is not only certain types of authors that are likely to have been at a disadvantage, for under the circumstances the reader must be said to have lost out too. The comments made by the critic D. J. Taylor in relation to the dishonest reviewing in Britain as a whole may be said to apply to the novels which were shortlisted for the Booker and which were hyped-up as a result:

'.. the reader who buys books on the strength of reviews is likely to feel vaguely swindled, less able to appreciate the really good stuff.'¹¹

Given the proven ability of the Booker to sell large numbers of books and the much higher level of social interconnection among the judges, shortlisted authors and Management Committee members of this prize than among those in other literary prizes of the period, this prize may be said to have been likely to disrupt the reception process of fiction, and more so than other awards at the time. This is because, in its potential for increasing the sales of one author's work above those of another, and for disseminating a non-representative evaluation of 'good' in relation to fiction and one at that which was likely not to have been based on aesthetic considerations, the Booker Prize had a greater potential to do this than the

¹¹ TAYLOR, D. J., (1989), A Vain Conceit: British Fiction in the 1980s. Bloomsbury, London, p86.

other awards, and thus to further disadvantage young writers from outwith the literary establishment of the south east of England.

This then is a brief outline of the arguments contained in the chapters which follow.

The thesis is divided into three parts. Part 1 (Chapters One and Two) covers the background to the founding of the Booker Prize and the history of the award from 1969-1989. In addition I shall also look here at the growth of the prize in relation to the general rise in number of business sponsored awards during the Eighties. In Chapter Two I shall make a detailed comparison between the Booker Prize and a control group of other awards. Part 2 (Chapters Three and Four) deals with the economic background to the development of this new type of patronage, and then with the social interconnections which linked judges, Management Committee members and shortlisted authors during this period, and with what implications the latter had in relation to the integrity of the judges' assessments. In Part 3 (Chapters Five and Six) I shall examine what evidence there is, firstly, of linguistic links, and secondly, of similarities in the treatment of particular themes, among the novels which won the Booker Prize during the 1980s. I shall also discuss in more detail issues relating to standardisation.

I shall begin each part of the thesis with a brief introduction, and conclude each part with a summing-up of the main points discussed in each section. Following the end of Part 3 however I shall offer a general conclusion to the thesis.

PART 1

A Short History of the Booker Prize, and a Comparison With Other Awards.

'Vulgar', Robin Troke-Nuttal pronounced.

'What?'

'This idea of novels becoming part of some kind of horse-race.'

'Oh but surely, Robin, it can do nothing but good. Confer a kind of seal of approval on the English novel. Like the Prix Goncourt.'

'Only a nation as simplistic as the French want seals of approval. English novelists don't need that kind of cheap display.'

SIMON BRETT,

The Booker Book¹

¹ BRETT, S., (1989). The Booker Book: A Novel. Sidgwick and Jackson, London, p7.

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

In this part of the thesis I shall examine the background to the founding of the Booker Prize. In Chapter One I shall look at the existing situation as regards literary prizes in the period prior to the founding of this award and then I shall give a brief history of the prize from its inception till 1989.

In Chapter Two I shall examine the Booker Prize against the background of the general rise in the number of new and financially lucrative business-sponsored awards during the 1980s. I shall attempt to address the issues of why and how this phenomenon came about, and of why the Booker Prize was able to maximise its impact during this period. I shall also make a detailed comparison of the Booker with several other awards which existed during this period to see if there were any significant differences in the structure, the rules or the judging procedure which would help to explain the Booker Prize's remarkable success.

CHAPTER ONE

The Best of Both Worlds': A Short History of the Booker Prize, and an Assessment of its Current Status.

'.. what excited her much more about the announcement [of the founding of the Booker Prize] was the thought that now some objective valuation might enter into the world of letters. No longer would she have to piece together her literary opinions from the vagaries of conflicting critics; soon there would be a prize which would give an authentic imprimatur of success to its winner..' ¹

As this is the first chapter of the thesis, I wish to take the opportunity here to lay the foundations for further investigation in later chapters. Thus I shall concentrate on giving the reader a historical background to the Booker Prize, and also on addressing the following questions. How and why was the prize set up; what has been the *actual* value of the prize to its benefactors and beneficiaries (and indeed who *has* benefited); and, finally, what has been the *actual* status of the award as opposed to its 'received' status and where may the two be seen to have diverged?

I wish to look first of all at the contextual issues which served as a backdrop to the founding of the Booker Prize in 1968, and in so doing I shall examine the socio-political context.

When the Booker Prize was officially launched in October 1968, among the reasons given for the setting up of the award were that the existing prizes, which totalled around fifty, were 'puny' ² and that they suffered from a lack of publicity.

At this point in Britain there was already a number of literary prizes in existence. These included the W. H. Smith, award which had been

¹ BRETT, S., (1989), The Booker Book: A Novel, Sidgwick and Jackson, London, p6.

² See Booker's original press release for the prize.

founded comparatively recently in 1959, and which was worth £1,000. The latter was unusual however, for generally it *was* true that prizes were of fairly insignificant monetary value. What awards such as the Hawthornden and the James Tait Black *did* offer, however, was a limited degree of prestige.

In 1964 a meeting was held by the Society of Young Publishers at the premises of the National Book League (later to be known as Book Trust). Its avowed purpose was to discuss the situation with regard to literary awards in Great Britain. The three speakers at the meeting were the publisher Tom Maschler, the writer Penelope Mortimer, and the journalist Kenneth Allsop, then Literary Editor of the Daily Mail.

At the time, the author of an article in The Bookseller which gave a report on the proceedings³ noted that interest in the matter was such that 'two rooms were packed' and that there was 'standing room only'. In retrospect this meeting seems to have marked the beginning of something of a sea-change in the approach to literary awards in this country, and it is illuminating to compare the suggestions regarding the creation of a new award as they appear in the article with what actually happened when the Booker Prize was set up several years later. Thus I shall refer to the article in some detail.

First to speak was Tom Maschler of Cape⁴. Maschler, as the author of the article reports, put it to the audience that they were there to discuss literary awards, to see if they found the existing situation with all its flaws acceptable, and if not, to decide what improvements could be implemented. He alluded to the fact that this matter had been discussed by

³ "Unnoticed Literary Prizes: plea for a new major national award", The Bookseller, 7th November 1964, pp1966-1970.

⁴ Maschler's father Kurt gave his name to the Kurt Maschler/Emil Award for illustrated children's books.

the Publishers Association a decade earlier but that it had 'decided that nothing could be done.'⁵

He then went on to question what the functions of a literary prize should be. These he outlined as being, firstly, a means of showing appreciation for a writer, secondly, to aid the writer financially, and finally, it was to be hoped, to enhance a writer's reputation and increase his sales as a consequence. Maschler suggested that if a prize were 'really meaningful' it could help other 'worth-while' books and indeed books in general:

'..if notice were taken of it in the right way.'⁶

Maschler raised the issue of the general inadequacy of the thirty-five existing awards in relation to their inability to help writers to be financially independent. His own recommendation for any new prize was that it should offer a substantial amount in prize money, and he suggested the sum of £5,000. It should also be 'anonymous' that is, the name of the prize should not in any way indicate the sponsor as this:

'..would militate in the long run, against the prize being influential.'⁷

He believed that existing prizes lacked the amount of publicity which he envisaged would be necessary if the public was really to take note of a prize. Thus, among his other recommendations for a new award were that an 'occasion' should be created for the awards ceremony in order to attract television and press coverage, which would in turn provide 'free publicity'.

⁵ "Unnoticed Literary Prizes: plea for a new major national literary award", The Bookseller, 7th November 1964, pp1966-1970.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

It is clear that much of the above prefigures the workings of the Booker Prize. Maschler at this point however was of the opinion that the sponsors should be the publishers themselves. Although he recognised that it would be possible to get sponsorship from outside, the writer in The Bookseller notes that Maschler believed that:

'..the essential thing was that the money subscribed should be given with absolutely no strings attached.' ⁸

This was a view re-iterated by Allsop in his address.

Penelope Mortimer, who spoke immediately after Maschler, re-stated much of what he had said, however she also suggested that as far as a new award was concerned:

'The whole idea was not just to give somebody £5,000, but to raise the status of books and to make the whole thing dignified and important to those who read books.' ⁹

Significantly, Mortimer did not believe that the prize should work as an incentive to writers, to spur them on to writing 'good' fiction, but rather that it should be awarded retrospectively ¹⁰ to a book which was recognised to have been important, irrespective of how many copies it had sold.

Allsop, as a past winner of the John Llewellyn Rhys Prize, was well-placed to criticise the existing system. He too warned of the dangers for any new prize of receiving sponsorship from business, and suggested that links with sponsors would inevitably help to define the type of novel

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ In fact the Booker Prize was a retrospective award until the rules were changed in 1971. See below.

which would win ¹¹. However, he recommended that there should be some association with, though not sponsorship from, the universities.

It is interesting to trace the similarities between the projected new award and the Booker Prize as it was established several years later. Implicit, and sometimes explicit, in all three speeches was the belief that the new prize, were it to become a reality, should have 'dignity', 'prestige', and 'importance', and that it should be for 'serious' fiction, and these are terms which are still frequently stressed by the organisers of the Booker Prize. However, given the nature of the many criticisms that have been made of the Booker Prize over the years, it is perhaps especially ironic that many of the dangers inherent in the setting up of large, lucrative awards for fiction were discussed at this early meeting.

Overall, it seems that those present at the meeting were greatly in favour of a new award being instigated. However, if the Booker Prize were in any way the manifestation of this desire to create a new prize, then it took another four years before the workings of this new award were set in motion. Furthermore, in the meantime many of the original recommendations were shelved, and warnings as to the perils of business funding ignored.

In 1968 Booker McConnell Ltd was a multinational group worth £28 million and with interests in sugar, rum and engineering.¹² At this point in time its interests were based mainly in the Caribbean, in Guyana, however during the 1960s the company had begun to diversify, and, increasingly, to concentrate its business interests in the U. K. The setting-

¹¹ According to the article, Allsop referred here to the examples of the newly-founded Columbia, Heinemann and Corgi Awards.

¹² See original press release for the Booker Prize. Compare this with 1989, the twentieth anniversary of the prize, when Booker Plc was worth over £2 billion and employed over 20,000 people worldwide. Its interests had expanded considerably and they included agriculture, fisheries and health care products. British brand names included Allisons the Bakers, Health Care and Family Choice.

up of the Booker Prize in 1968, then, may be seen in terms of the company's wish to signal a larger presence in this country.

As part of this process of re-location and diversification the company had set up a subsidiary called Booker Books which dealt with writers' and artists' copyrights. This particular area of diversification, however, had proved to be far more lucrative than the parent company had ever imagined, and by 1968 The Times¹³ article predicting the announcement of the launch of the literary prize put the total revenue from Booker Books¹⁴ that year at around £100,000. Among the writers whose copyrights Booker Books held¹⁵ were Agatha Christie, Ian Fleming and John and Penelope Mortimer.

The official Booker line on the setting up of the prize was given by the former chairman of the company, Sir Michael Caine in his "Preface" to Prizewriting, a compilation of work from past winners of the Booker Prize which was published in 1989. Here he states that, having made a considerable amount of money from the copyrights of authors such as these, the company had:

'..felt a corresponding obligation to promote the living word and to encourage authors.'¹⁶

This reason for Booker's involvement with the prize is confirmed by Martyn Goff, the prize's administrator since 1970. In his "Introduction" to Prizewriting,¹⁷ Goff states that the chairman of Booker Books and the managing director had begun:

¹³ The Times, (Diary), 18th July 1968.

¹⁴ Currently known as Booker Entertainment.

¹⁵ This also included film though not theatre rights.

¹⁶ See Prizewriting: An Original Collection of Writings by Past Winners to Celebrate 21 years of The Booker Prize, Hodder and Stoughton, London 1989, p2.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p13. Goff, the Chief Executive of Book Trust, was formerly a bookseller, and novelist.

'.. to think of ways of showing their appreciation for this success in the form of establishing bursaries, scholarships or prizes.'

It was also at this time, he notes, that Tom Maschler and Graham C. Greene, respectively the chairman and managing director of Jonathan Cape, were, co-incidentally, looking for sponsorship for a major new literary prize 'that might one day rival the Prix Goncourt'. The two representatives of the publishing company thus approached Booker McConnell Ltd, and it was as a result of this that the Booker Prize came into being, originally with the Publishers' Association involved as co-sponsor and provider of the administrative support for the award.

It had taken four years to get a new prize off the ground which roughly corresponded to that outlined in 1964. In the meantime there had been a number of factors which probably made for an environment more sympathetic towards the setting up of a new award. For one thing, the number of literary awards had increased in any case from thirty-five in 1964 to 'almost fifty' in 1968, and this can be seen as a slow but steady general trend towards the setting up of new prizes.

In terms of the socio-political context, by 1968 there had been a number of events which had added more weight to the arguments of those who, like Penelope Mortimer, wished to see a literary prize which would be a tribute to the writer's role in society. In the autumn of that year tanks from the Warsaw Pact countries had rolled into Czechoslovakia in order to crush Dubcek's experiments in 'socialism with a human face' and with this move came a crackdown on those writers who were explicitly against hard-line Soviet Communism. In January 1968, seven months before the tanks had

entered Prague, the Russian writer Yuri Galanskov had been sentenced to seven years' hard labour for anti-Soviet activities¹⁸.

The West however was not immune from censorship of its own. Although 1968 saw the official end to censorship in the theatre in Britain, the summer of that year also saw the trial on the grounds of obscenity of the novel Last Exit to Brooklyn¹⁹. Thus it could be said that by this time there was additional moral justification for the setting up of any new prize which would highlight the role of the author in society.

In addition, in economic terms the setting up of the prize was good news for publishers, for by the spring of 1969 when the first Booker Prize was awarded, the publishing industry was in the midst of a recession and ready to welcome any new marketing strategy which had the potential to increase sales.

Thus it can be seen then that these combined factors made the period 1968-1969 one which was ripe for the introduction of a new award.

It was after some speculation in the press that the Booker Prize was finally launched officially on 3rd October 1968, and the inaugural prize awarded in April 1969. Initially, as it was under the wing of Booker Books rather than the parent company, the award was to be known as 'The Booker Prize'. However when the parent company took over responsibility for the prize as a corporate venture in 1974, the prize became, for a time, 'The Booker McConnell Award' before reverting to its original, and arguably more marketable, name in 1986.²⁰

¹⁸ See "Review of the Year", in The Times, 31st December 1968.

¹⁹ One of the counsels for the defence was John Mortimer Q. C., novelist, and husband of Penelope Mortimer.

²⁰ SHAKESPEARE, N., (1986), "Boosting up with the Booker", The Times, 23rd August.

In the press release issued on 4th October 1968, it was reported that the sponsors, while realising that the £5,000 prize money was a 'generous reward' for any author, hoped:

'... that his real success [would] be a significant increase in the sales of his book.' ²¹

and that this would have a knock-on effect both for other shortlisted authors and indeed for writers in general. The press release also alluded to the contemporary political situation in 1968 and strove to relate the foundation of the prize to this situation in expressing the hope of the sponsors that in future, writers should:

'...not need to be censored, imprisoned or labelled outrageous and controversial before hitting the headlines.'²²

The British literary world, then, finally got its new award, five years after the meeting at the National Book League's premises. In the meantime however some rather curious shifts in attitude had taken place among those involved in instigating the award. For one thing it seems that Maschler had managed to overcome his initial distrust of certain aspects of business sponsorship in the interim. Otherwise his stamp was all over the prize, including the sum which he had originally suggested as being a suitable amount for the prize money having been adopted by the Booker.

In addition, it does seem rather odd that Booker Books, who had allegedly wanted to reward authors as a result of their own success in the copyright business, should have chosen a prize which, from the beginning, wished to style itself as an award for 'serious' or highbrow fiction, for the Booker McConnell subsidiary had enjoyed success with authors who were popular, 'low-to-middle brow' writers rather than

²¹ See original press release.

²² Ibid.

'highbrows'. While authors such as Christie, Fleming, and Dennis Wheatley were able to sell books, they had few literary pretensions.

In the end one has to be cynical about the reasons for Booker's eventual choice of venture. It seems inevitable that this was swayed by the fact that, of the three options which the company had considered, it was always more likely that a prize such as the one Maschler had outlined would reap more in the way of publicity for the sponsor than either a scholarship fund or bursary scheme. That said, however, even Booker could not have foreseen the level of publicity that the prize was to generate in later years. What the final choice signalled nevertheless was that business concerns such as *value for sponsorship*²³, which I shall examine in more detail in the next chapter, were to feature large from the outset.

The first prize ceremony was held at Drapers' Hall in April 1969, where Dame Rebecca West, one of the panel of judges, presented a cheque for £5,000 and a trophy to the winning novelist, P. H. Newby.

Overnight the Booker Prize became Britain's most lucrative award for fiction in the U. K. and the first award of its kind, both in so far as it introduced to prizes in this country the idea of the literary award as means of providing financial independence for the author, and also in that it was the first time that a company had given an amount of this magnitude to sponsor a literary award²⁴. Even the W. H. Smith, which at this point was the only award in any way comparable to the Booker in terms of prize money, offered only a fifth of the latter's total. That said, sponsorship for

²³ See Sir Michael Caine's comments, *Prizewriting*, p2.

²⁴ In fact, in 1968 the average weekly wage for a male, non-manual worker was just over £29, and for a manual worker £16.5. For women the figures were £15.4, and £9.7, respectively. See *New Earnings Survey, 1968*, Department of Employment and Productivity, H. M. S. O., London, 1970, Table 43, p68. In real terms then the current value of the award, at £20,000, is worth only about half the value of the prize in 1969.

the Booker award was guaranteed, in the first instance, for a period of seven years only. The company however reviewed its position in 1975 and sponsorship was extended for another seven years.

In 1968 the rules of the prize stated that the Booker ²⁵ would be awarded 'to the best novel in the opinion of the judges', and that the novels submitted were to have been published in the period between December 1st and November 30th the following year. Any novel by a British, Commonwealth, Southern Irish or South African citizen which had been published first in Britain between these dates was eligible. Publishers were originally allowed to submit only two novels from their lists, though the judges were free to call in 'any others'.

The shortlist of novels was to be announced between four and six weeks prior to the winner being chosen in order to increase publicity and, significantly, given the repeated efforts to compare the Booker with the Prix Goncourt so that:

'..the sort of speculation so beloved in France will be possible in Britain for the first time.'

Over the years the rules of the prize have undergone several significant changes. In December 1970, it was announced that in future the awarding of the prize would take place in the autumn instead of the Spring. Also, from 1971 the administration of the award was taken over by the National Book League, later to be known as Book Trust.

In 1975, as mentioned above, the sponsors reviewed their financial commitment to the prize. While Booker McConnell decided to continue its financial support for another seven years, some changes were made. In

²⁵ See original press release. The press release does not indicate whether or not the original rules stipulated, as they do now, that the publisher of a novel which was shortlisted had to spend a certain amount on publicising that book.

particular it was noted in the media at the time ²⁶ that the company was unhappy about certain aspects of the running of the prize, and, having renewed its financial commitment, it announced in March 1975 ²⁷ that the period of qualification for a novel published prior to the award was to be extended, and also that the number of novels any one publisher could submit would now be increased to four.

Later in 1975, following a shortlist which consisted of only two novels, the rules were further changed to ensure the inclusion of a minimum of three novels in future. In 1978 the prize money was doubled to £10,000, and the following year, in what, according to Martyn Goff, was one of the most significant changes to the rules, the practice was abolished of informing publishers in advance of the identity of the winner in order to allow them to re-issue a novel. This move was intended to heighten speculation as to who would win.

1983 saw the first female Chairman of the judges, something which Booker had deliberately tried to encourage that year, and the year after, the prize money was again raised, this time to £15,000. Co-incidentally, this increase in the amount of prize money offered occurred the same year as a new award, the Betty Trask, was founded, and the latter also offered a sum of £15,000 to the winner ²⁸.

From 1988, the rules on judges being able to call in novels were changed. This followed the decision by the judges in 1987 not to call in any, a move taken in response to the strategy frequently employed by publishers which

²⁶ E. g. see TREWIN, I., (1975), "Booker Prize assured for seven more years", The Times, 23rd January. N. B. Trewin later went on to become a member of the Management Committee for the prize.

²⁷ See "Booker Prize to allow more time for entries", The Times, 7th March 1975.

²⁸ By the late Eighties the Betty Trask was Britain's most lucrative single category award i. e. it was always for a work of romantic fiction. This award currently offers £26,000 in prize money, £16,000 of which goes to the winner and £2,000 each to a maximum of five runners-up. However the division of prize money may be altered from year to year. See Chapter Two.

involved them submitting some of their less accomplished novels, secure in the knowledge that the judges were more than likely to call in their stronger titles. In this way they sought to maximise the potential number of submissions from their company's lists.

In 1989 therefore, the maximum number of novels any one company could submit was three, though past winners did not count against this. Thus, if, during the year, a company had published a novel by a previous winner of the prize, it could submit this *and* three others, plus it could have some additional titles called in. The publisher could also submit an additional five novels which he or she wished to draw to the judges' attention, though since 1988 these had had to be accompanied by a statement explaining why the publisher thought them worthy of note.²⁹ From these extra submissions the judges were now obliged to call in between five and fifteen books and, as before, they could also call in any novel which had neither been submitted or listed but which they believed *should* have been.

As Chapter Two is concerned with the Booker Prize in relation to other prizes, I shall leave detailed analysis of the structure of the Management Committee and of the judging procedures until then. Suffice to say that this is a two-tier system with the Management Committee appointed by Booker Plc, and the judges in turn appointed by the Management Committee. The day-to-day administration of the prize is carried out, for the most part, by Book Trust.

Having dealt with the issues of how and why the prize was set up and with the structure of the award, it is necessary to look at some of the issues raised by the prize, and specifically, at the question of who has actually benefited from it.

²⁹ See APPENDIX 2. for rules for the 1989 Booker Prize.

In terms of its ability to sell novels the status of the Booker during the 1980s was unchallenged. It has been estimated that sales of P. H. Newby's novel Something to Answer For were increased by around 1,500 copies as a result of winning the Booker Prize in 1969.³⁰ However, by 1980 Margaret Forster³¹ estimated that winning the prize that year could boost sales by up to 9,000 copies.

It was in the early Eighties that the Booker Prize began to develop something of the status of a phenomenon, and for reasons which I shall discuss in more detail at a later point. Co-incidentally the impact of the Booker on sales 'mushroomed'. David Lodge has said of the Booker that in the 1980s it:

'...suddenly developed the power to make any book that won it a bestseller',³²

and this ability of the prize helped to further confirm its status as phenomenon.

Evidence of the Booker's increasing ability to sell novels as the decade progressed can be found in the sales figures for J. M. Coetzee's novel Life and Times of Michael K. This novel was estimated to have sold around 40,000 more copies than would normally have been expected, purely as a result of its having won the prize in 1983.³³ The prize's positive effect on sales is even more conspicuous in the case of Anita Brookner's novel Hotel du Lac which won the following year.

³⁰ See SHAKESPEARE, N., (1986), "Boosting up with the Booker", The Times, 23rd August.

³¹ See FORSTER, M., (1980), "Secrets of a Glittering Prize", The Sunday Times, 26th October.

³² Quoted in ADAIR, T., (1992), "The Prize of Fame", Scotland on Sunday, 29th November.

³³ See ROSENTHAL, T. G., (1984), "Life and Times of the 1983 Booker Prize", The Bookseller, 18th February, pp581-583.

Rupert Lancaster, the publicity director for Brookner's publisher, Cape, showed in a 1985 article in The Bookseller how sales of Brookner's novel went up by an astonishing 10,000 copies in one week, following the announcement that it had won the Booker Prize.³⁴ Lancaster's article however also provides figures which show persuasively that the prize was having an ever-increasing effect on sales during the 1980s. In the period from having won the prize up to the December of 1984, Salman Rushdie's 1981 winner Midnight's Children had sold a total of 18,000 copies in hardback. The 1982 winner, Schindler's Ark, had sold 39,000 copies (excluding sales in Australia), and the 1983 winner, Life and Times of Michael K, 44,000 copies. However Hotel du Lac which was the most recent winner had sold 50,000 copies over the same period, and between the December of 1984 and the publication of Lancaster's article in April the following year, he records that it sold an additional 19,000 copies. [See Fig. 1.]

In addition, Lancaster's article also points to the prize's ability to boost the sales of other novels on the shortlist and of previous works by the winning author, and this is entirely as the sponsors of the prize had intended things to be.

Clearly the Booker's ability to sell novels has been good news for author, publisher and bookseller alike, as well as being a vindication of the prize as a marketing device. Furthermore, in addition to increased sales for the winning author, the prize money alone has always been enough, technically at least, to allow him or her to be financially independent. The prize has also added to the status and media-profile of writer, publisher and sponsor alike. Moreover, the media attention which surrounded the award has meant that very often, if only for a brief period, fiction in general has become a topic for discussion.

³⁴ LANCASTER, R., (1985), "Up for the Cup [The effect of the Booker prize (sic) on sales of Hotel du Lac]", The Bookseller, 13th April, pp1604-5.

Ultimately, however, the main beneficiaries of the award have been the sponsors, who for a relatively small financial outlay covering the prize money, funding of the presentation dinner, and the administration, have ensured themselves a significant amount of 'free' publicity in the way of television coverage of the ceremony and a high level of attention in the press.

In these respects then, the Booker Prize may be said to have successfully fulfilled its original aims and to have brought benefits to those involved. In addition there can be no doubt that the Booker achieved a remarkable level of public awareness in a comparatively short time. However, many of the supposed benefits of the award have in fact been double-edged, and, at the end of the day, the only group for whom the benefits have been unequivocal are the sponsors, for questions surround the positive influence of the prize on all the others listed above as beneficiaries.

For example, whilst the increase in sales brought about by the Booker has benefited author, publisher and bookseller in the short-term, the author, as a result has often had to cope with pressures such as those from an inquisitive media which are the lot of the minor celebrity.

Furthermore, the long-term benefits of prizes to the publishing world in general have been debatable. In an environment where independent houses were increasingly being elbowed out by larger media corporations, the Booker Prize during the Eighties arguably intensified the focus on a novel's potential to be a bestseller, and may in this respect have made it more difficult for certain publishers to justify taking the decision to back a novel which did not appear to have this capacity. Thus the tradition of publishers using revenue from the sales of more commercially successful titles to subsidise works which were of a more literary nature, a tradition

which was already under threat, was possibly undermined further by the existence of prizes such as the Booker which appeared to demand a certain commercial potential even in the area of literary fiction.

In addition, while I shall examine some of the practical effects of the Booker on the writing of fiction in more detail in Chapters Five and Six, in general it may be argued that the Booker, in tending to go to older more established writers, in real terms actually made it even more difficult for emerging writers to get noticed.

The period of media interest in fiction generated by the award furthermore has in reality been all too brief, and it has been argued that in the event the Booker and related awards have tended to increase interest in 'the book' at the expense of books in general. Moreover, although the prize *has* provoked discussion about fiction, it has not automatically followed that it has fostered a discerning attitude towards literature *per se*. All too often during the 1980s the type of publicity which the prize was afforded in the press was that which focused more on the personality of the winning author and on his or her personal life than on the merits of the winning novel.³⁵

Finally, in a situation where there is a limited market for literary fiction, the Booker and related awards arguably have increased sales of a few novelists' work and detracted from the sales of other novelists whose work may have been of equal merit but who have not received anything like the same level of publicity as those fortunate enough to be on the shortlists of literary prizes. In general terms therefore, as I shall discuss in

³⁵ In this respect the prize's own publicity may be said to be rather suspect. E. g. see the 1989 and 1992 promotional leaflets where the names of the authors are printed in a manner which makes them stand out more than the titles of their work. This is especially true of the 1992 leaflet where the writers names are printed in white against a turquoise background, making them stand out much more strongly than the black of the titles, particularly if viewed from a distance.

more detail in Chapter Three, the Booker Prize and related business-sponsored awards may actually have made the financial position of the writer more tenuous.

Though many of these objections could be raised in relation to any commercially-oriented literary award, they are more justified in relation to the Booker Prize during this period because of what I have shown to be the extent to which the prize was able to increase sales of fiction. For ultimately the significance of the Booker Prize has been its efficacy as a marketing device.

As for other criticisms which may be directed at this award specifically, since the inception of the Booker and especially during the 1980s, the prize has appeared not just to engender, but to positively court controversy, and this was undoubtedly a major factor in the prize's reaching a new level of fame in the 1980s.

As to the other reasons for the prize's new level of success or notoriety in the Eighties, Martyn Goff supplies five possible answers in Prizewriting.³⁶ These are: the amount of money offered by the award, although as he notes, by 1989 it was no longer the most lucrative award in Britain; the controversies which have arisen over the years in relation to certain aspects of the award; the choice of judges; the composition of the Management Committee; and, finally, the change in the rules which prevented the identity of the winner being known in advance. In the end, he suggests, it is probably a combination of all these reasons.

Goff however fails to take into account several other significant factors such as the fact that from 1981 there was live television coverage of the award ceremony, and this clearly had some impact on the public's

³⁶ See Prizewriting, pp11-13.

awareness of the prize. Furthermore, although Goff attempts to play down the scandals that have always beset the prize by pointing to a controversy surrounding another award,³⁷ controversy has actually aided the prize in increasing the amount of media coverage it has received and in getting it talked about. In fact, it was one particular controversy in 1980, when the favourite Anthony Burgess' novel Earthly Powers was beaten by William Golding's novel Rites of Passage, that actually resulted in the decision being taken by the BBC to televise the awards ceremony live.³⁸

Many of the controversies which have surrounded the award are directly traceable to the contentious nature of the sponsors' original aims. By the same token, to a large extent it is these which have ensured the prize's success as a marketing device, though in the long-term they have probably militated against the prize being taken seriously as a gauge of literary excellence.

Goff notes in Prizewriting³⁹ that of all the rules it is the Booker Prize's aim to reward 'the best novel in the opinion of the judges', that has caused the most problems over the years since it has inevitably raised questions as to how and on what grounds the term 'best' should be applied. Perhaps given the background of the prize and its original aims, it was inevitable that commercial and aesthetic considerations should vie against each other from year to year. It may be argued additionally that given the power of marketing during the Eighties it was inevitable too that this would become even more a characteristic feature of the award during the decade. Indeed, the result of this as Goff notes, was an unconscious 'see saw' effect during the 1980s in terms of the type of novels which won. These, he

³⁷ I. e. The Sunday Express Book of the Year Award. See Prizewriting, p11.

³⁸ Burgess not only refused to attend the ceremony, but openly criticised the winner in the media. See also MOSLEY, P., (1988), "Looking at the Booker: Literary Prize as Media Spectacle", Channels of Communication: Papers for the Conference of Higher Education Teachers of English, ed. Philip Hobsbaum, Paddy Lyons, Jim McGhee, HETE-88 at the Department of English Literature, University of Glasgow, 1992, for further details.

³⁹ See Prizewriting, p17.

says, tended to veer from books which met the approval of the literary purists and those which pleased the booksellers, which he notes were any books that have the potential to sell. It is certainly possible to discern a swing between 'popular' and 'literary' choices in the list of the Top Ten Bestselling Winners of the prize from 1980-1990. [See Fig. 1.]

Perhaps even more contentious however has been the statement in the original press release for the award that one of the hopes that the sponsors had was that the new prize would:

'.. help to narrow the all too frequent gap between artistic and commercial success.'⁴⁰

This is confusing, for there *is* a substantial gap between the aims of the writer or artist and those of the businessman. Nevertheless the media during the Eighties also displayed a tendency to conflate the two. An example of this may be found in an article by Patricia Miller in The London Illustrated News which was featured in the promotional leaflet for the 1989 Booker Prize. Here Miller is quoted as saying:

'The Booker Prize for fiction has become the ultimate accolade for artistic endeavour of any sort in Britain. The Booker is *it*; the glory, the television coverage, the leap in sales and of course the £15,000 in prize money.'⁴¹

It seems strange that a prize which supposedly set out to promote artistic achievement has clearly encouraged a conflation of aesthetic and commercial ideals, and under the circumstances it is not surprising that the Booker Prize has continued to be seen as little more than a media circus with little or no relevance to contemporary fiction. This view of the prize has been encouraged by the repeated use in the media of betting metaphors in relation to the announcements of both the shortlisted authors and of the

⁴⁰ See original press release.

⁴¹ See promotional material for the 1989 Booker Prize.

winner. It appears however that this was a trend which was welcomed by the organisers of the award during the Eighties ⁴².

The tendency to conflate values, however, can be explained in terms of the relative status of certain values in a given context ⁴³, an issue which I shall discuss in greater detail in Part 2 of this thesis. This would account for Booker's decision to reward the success of the low-to-middlebrow authors whose copyrights it held by sponsoring an award for a more up-market genre of fiction. For example, given that the received status of highbrow fiction is undeniably higher than the alternative, and assuming that the company's reason for becoming involved with sponsorship of a literary prize was in large measure to do with enhancing its prestige, it was natural that it should have opted to sponsor an award for what was received to be the more up-market of the two. With regard to the issue of commercial considerations posing as judgements of aesthetic value, the status of the latter, especially within the context of a literary prize, is received to be the higher of the two. Therefore a connection is made between the two in which commercial success is initially compared to, then becomes synonymous with, aesthetic merit. This also ties in with the concept of *prestige by association* which I shall discuss in more detail in the next chapter.

The very success of the Booker Prize during the Eighties raises questions as to its long-term effects on the processes of evaluating, marketing, and even on the writing of fiction. I shall discuss the implications of the latter more fully in Chapters Five and Six. The price the Booker has paid for its success at selling novels may be said to have

⁴² See also Mosley (op. cit.) where the author refers to this tendency, and suggests that the organisers encouraged it in an attempt to increase the sense of anticipation. Since the late 1970s bookies' odds have been offered on the shortlisted novels, and a run down on these became a central part of the live television coverage of the ceremony during the 1980s.

⁴³ C. f. also DYER, R., (1990), "A Star is Born and the construction of authenticity", in *Stardom: Industry of Desire* (ed. Gledhill), Routledge, London, 1991.

been a lack of any clear aesthetic standard, and one result of this has been the general lack of credibility for the award as a sign of artistic merit. In fact the rampant commercialism and media hype of the prize during the 1980s, which may be said to have been even more noticeable than now was paralleled by an even greater lack of credibility for the prize at that time.

To sum up, it may be said that Maschler and his fellow-speakers in 1964 were extremely foresighted in being able to envisage a prize which could capitalise to such a great degree on publicity, as, in fact, the Booker has done. What they did not foresee, however, or chose to overlook, was that the level and nature of publicity itself could have an effect not only on the received status of the prize, but also, potentially, on the nature of the fiction submitted for it, and possibly on the received standing of fiction in general.

These are all issues which will be discussed in later chapters. However, in the next chapter I wish to look at the Booker Prize in relation to other literary awards and in particular at how it compares with several of the large, business-sponsored awards which were set up during the 1980s.

CHAPTER TWO

'Better Than All the Rest?': A Comparative Study of the Booker Prize in Relation to Other Awards.

'I can see the day coming when there'll be a separate prize for every book that's published. Best First Novel about a graduate housewife living in Camden Town with two young children and a cat and an unfaithful husband who works in advertising. Best travel book by a man under twenty-nine who has been round the world using only scheduled bus services and one pair of jeans.'¹

In this chapter I shall look at the Booker Prize in relation to both the general context of literary prize-awarding, and to the specific changes which took place in the prize-awarding system during the 1980s.

The chapter is divided up into four sections. In the first section I shall look at the historical context of prizes and at the ethos behind them in the period prior to the late 1970s. Then I shall examine the reasons for the rise in the number of awards, and in particular of those awards sponsored by business, during the 1980s. In the second section I shall examine the concepts of *value for sponsorship* and *prestige by association* to see how business ethics are applied in practice to fiction awards. In the third section I shall make a detailed comparison between the Booker and, firstly, a control group of several other British awards, then with some prestigious overseas awards. Finally in the fourth section I shall look at what some of the implications are with regard to the Booker's status in relation to other awards.

I shall now examine the historical context of prizes in this country.

¹ LODGE, D., (1984), Small World - an Academic Romance, Secker and Warburg, London, p170.

I - THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Although a number of European prizes including the Prix Goncourt was set up around the turn of the century, the earliest British awards were the Hawthornden Prize and the James Tait Black Memorial Prize. Both of these were set up in Scotland at the end of the First World War, and they each continue to this day. Thus when the Booker Prize was founded there was already a number of prizes in existence. However awards like the Hawthornden and the Black offered very little in the way of financial gains for the author, either in terms of the prize money or in terms of guaranteeing increased sales. What they did offer was a certain amount of prestige for the winner.

During the 1970s and 1980s, however, the situation in Britain began to change as regards literary prizes. While there was a gradual rise in the total number of awards during the 1970s, this was nothing in comparison to the increase during the 1980s,² particularly in business-sponsored awards, and indeed, prize-awarding in general at this time became something of a phenomenon.

As for the part played by the Booker in the rise in number and growth in popularity of business-sponsored awards, the influence of the latter cannot be said to have been a major factor in the founding of new prizes, since if this were the case the question would then arise as to why more businesses did not follow suit and establish their own awards during the 1970s.

² I. e. in the period from 1968 to 1988 the number of awards in Britain jumped from 'almost fifty' to 184. [See Booker McConnell's 1968 press release to announce the setting up of the prize, and also "Guide to Literary Prizes, Grants and Awards in Britain and Ireland", Book Trust and Society of Authors, London, 1990, piii.] Although taken overall, this amounts to an average increase in the number of awards of around 6.7 per cent per annum, in reality the increase was not so straightforwardly incremental.

In fact the reasons for the growth in the number of new business-sponsored awards are more complex than this. To the extent that the Booker Prize may be said to have had any influence in the overall trend, this was probably limited to that of being an example to other companies of how to set up an award and of how best to reap the benefits of this kind of sponsorship. That is, once it became clear what the advantages for a sponsor could be through the very high profile which the Booker gained and maintained throughout this period, the prospect of setting up an award was probably more attractive to other companies.

The general trend probably owed a great deal more to the influence of social, economic, and political factors. In addition, in order to understand fully how this trend came about one must also look in some detail at the issue of patronage. I shall leave an in-depth discussion of this issue till the next chapter. For the moment however I wish to concentrate on what the likely benefits were for businesses who decided to become involved in the sponsorship of literary prizes during the 1980s.

From the point of view of potential sponsors, literary awards clearly had many attractions. In return for a relatively small outlay to cover the cost of the ceremony, prize money, judges fees and administration, the promoter had the potential to maximise publicity for the company or product, and this was in addition to any other benefits which prizes also carried with them³. Prizes thus became, as never before, legitimate expenditure from a company's overall budget for publicity.⁴

³ E. g. the various schemes run by A. B. S. A. [The Association for Business Sponsorship of the Arts], such as the Business Sponsorship Incentive Scheme (BSIS), administered by A. B. S. A. on behalf of the Department of National Heritage. This scheme, which was popular round the late Eighties and early Nineties, offered to match first time sponsors' donations on a £1 for £1 basis, and offered similar, though reduced, levels of additional funding to businesses already involved in sponsorship of the Arts.

A. B. S. A. is an independent body which advises sponsors as to how to go about assessing a sponsorship programme, and on the best ways to maximise sponsorship objectives. In addition to the above, the organisation also offers Government endorsement in the form of engraved plaques for all companies

The rise of business sponsorship of literary awards during this period and the fact that this was seen to be acceptable owed much to the general increase in the level of business funding for the arts. This was a policy encouraged by the Conservative Government of the time, which consistently tried to refute any suggestion that the responsibility of central government included a moral obligation to engage in a wide-scale funding of the arts. However, undoubtedly, once it had gained momentum, the sponsorship of literary awards became something of a trend in itself.

The implications of this increase in business funding for literary awards were far-reaching. Company sponsorship brought with it concerns previously confined to the world of business, and concepts such as value for sponsorship and the importance of the winning novel's being 'bankable' were now applied within the context of literature, and, more importantly, within the context of 'serious' or 'highbrow' fiction which hitherto had been largely untouched by the 'hard-sell' approach.

As a result of the large amounts of money now on offer from the business sector in the way of sponsorship, prizes arguably now became more akin to rewards 'for services rendered' than token recognitions of merit. Furthermore, implicit in the idea of 'literary prize as reward' was the suggestion that the reward was given, at least in part, for a writer's contribution to the attempt by a company to increase its prestige by association, in this case via an association with literature.

involved in sponsorship and receptions held around the country by the Minister for National Heritage.

⁴ C. f. A. B. S. A. 's own definition of sponsorship :

"The payment of money to an arts association for the purpose of promoting the business's name, products, or services. Sponsorship is part of a business's general promotional expenditure. It can encompass a sense of corporate or social responsibility".'

By the mid-Eighties, the proliferation of awards had grown out of all proportion. The sheer number of prizes alone led to criticism from several quarters on the grounds that the whole system of prize-awarding was being undermined and that the status of individual prizes was being tarnished.⁵ Competition between prizes themselves and between the companies which sponsored them increasingly became a feature of literary awards during this period⁶, and in this ever more competitive arena, new sponsors, in addition to offering even larger sums of money, frequently tried to find new areas such as non-fiction, where as yet awards had less of a foothold, in order to make more of an impact.

During this period, then, the whole rationale of literary awards began to change. It began to look as if the point of literary awards was to offer large sums of money in order to draw attention to a sponsor. In addition to new prizes being set up for categories of books where awards were less common, as the public became increasingly indifferent to this proliferation of prizes, some existing awards such as the Whitbread underwent major changes in their structure and administration so that the impact they made could be maximised.

Some older awards,⁷ unable to compete with the newer, more financially weighty prizes, often found a way round this by accepting sponsorship from the business sector. Many companies were only too happy to enter the world of literary prize sponsorship via this route, for,

⁵ The American sociologist and publisher Irving Louis Horowitz, writing of a similar proliferation of awards in America during the 1980s, suggested that the rise in the number of prizes had 'devalued the whole system' of prize-awarding, and he referred to it as a 'plague of good tidings'. See HOROWITZ, I. L., (1987), "Publishing and Prizing", Book Research Quarterly, Winter 1987-1988, pp18-21.

⁶ See CONNOLLY, J. (1987), "Cashing in where Booker pioneered", The Times, 20th April 1987. Also The Times Literary Supplement, 20th March, p296. Furthermore, as business sponsorship of awards increased overall during the 1980s sponsors themselves became award winners. C.f. the A. B. S. A. Awards, run in conjunction with The Daily Telegraph.

⁷ E.g. the John Llewellyn Rhys Prize.

ironically, at the end of the day, it tended to be the older, less commercial awards, which retained any degree of credibility in terms of being seen as literary yardsticks⁸.

During the last three or four years of the Eighties, criticism surrounding the proliferation of awards and the suitability of certain winners to bear the tag of 'best' co-incided with the decision by some companies to pull out of their sponsorship commitments. Although there are several reasons for this, it may be interpreted, in part, as a being the result of a growing awareness in business circles that the associations fostered by such prizes no longer brought the desired level of prestige. That is, in business terms, sponsorship was no longer 'cost-effective'.

II - 'VALUE FOR SPONSORSHIP' AND 'PRESTIGE BY ASSOCIATION'

I now wish to look more closely at the concepts of *value for sponsorship* and *prestige by association*. The information here is based largely on the replies to the questionnaire detailed in Section III below. In all I received over fifty replies, however, the replies given were often less detailed than the questionnaire actually required, and thus there are a several instances where the information given in this chapter is necessarily less detailed than I would have wished. While the replies to the questionnaires were being collated it soon became clear that, overall, the sponsors of non-literary book prizes were much more forthcoming on issues such as finance of awards and other non-aesthetic concerns than the sponsors of awards where artistic credentials were at stake.⁹ This is

⁸ See Connolly (op. cit.) and Horowitz (op. cit.) on the relative status of older awards.

⁹ E. g. in response to question 7), Booker's representative's reply was simply: 'We do not reveal the cost'. See letter from Anne Riddoch to Sharon Norris, 23rd January 1992. A number of those who responded to the questionnaire, especially those who sponsored awards for literary fiction either refused directly to give financial details, or if the refusal was not explicitly stated, financial details were noticeably absent, as in the case of the Whitbread Awards.

interesting, for it seems likely that the reluctance of some literary award sponsors to divulge financial details of their prize has again to do with the relative status of values in a given context. This is an issue which I touched on briefly in the previous chapter, and it is linked with the concept of *prestige by association*.

Probably the main impetus for businesses to become involved with literary award sponsorship was, as it still is, an attempt to gain prestige by association, for whatever the current state of fiction and the actual status of the novelist in society, the fact is that the status of literature is still received to be high. Ironically, this is probably because the arts are not easily quantifiable in material terms. Therefore, in being 'above' purely material concerns the arts, including literature, are perceived to represent something more essential, and by extension, quality.

In addition to the kudos of an association with literature *per se*, however, there was also prestige to be gained from being seen to be a benefactor of the arts. That said, however, sound business principles required that sponsors attempted to maximise the potential gains for their financial outlay, or *value for sponsorship*.

In terms of what constitutes value for sponsorship, one sponsor, who wished to be nameless, when asked as to how one might go about assessing this, suggested that a possible 'rule of thumb' might be to divide the total amount of money spent on the award by the number of references in the press to the award itself and to the company. In a covering letter sent with the questionnaire detailed below, I put this suggestion to David Grant whose company William Grant and Sons sponsors the annual Glenfiddich Awards for writing and broadcasting on food and drink. Grant refers to this point in his reply to the questions set. While he states that the company does not:

'..measure the success of the Glenfiddich Awards by the column inches.. those column inches are important in ensuring that the Awards are successful.'¹⁰

The company's aims in sponsoring the award are to establish links with the trade media, and also:

'.. in one way and another [to] encourage people to consume our brands.'¹¹

The annual ceremony is also seen by the company as an opportunity to market itself. It consists of a champagne reception held at the Savoy for over seven hundred guests, including 'restaurateurs and other opinion-formers'. Naturally, Glenfiddich is also served to the guests and cases are offered as part of the prize. Grant says:

'Our objective is to make as many of these sort of people as possible feel as warm as possible towards our company and the brands which we make.'¹²

Allan Schiach, Chairman of another whisky company, Glenlivet, which sponsors the Macallan/Scotland on Sunday Award for a Short Story,¹³ also sees the point of sponsorship as being not so much to increase the total number of people who drink whisky, but rather to increase his company's share of the market. However Schiach, in addition, sees a literary prize as the means by which a company may extend its share of the market in a specific direction. That is, it may be used to target a specific social class¹⁴.

¹⁰ See letter from David Grant to Sharon Norris, 27th June 1992. The Glenfiddich Awards consist of eleven set categories, plus special categories and an overall winner, similar to the Whitbread's 'Book of the Year'.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid. Grant and Sons' emphasis on the role of the ceremony in achieving their sponsorship aims echoes Maschler's sentiments in 1964 about the importance of having a ceremony which would be 'an occasion'.

¹³ Schiach is also a screenwriter and has been Chairman of the Writers' Guild of Great Britain.

¹⁴ For example, Schiach says a company with a more exclusive brand may wish to attract a particular social grouping, say, the ABC1 class. By associating their brand with something else, in this case literature, which is likely to be

Both these companies, then, may be said to have clear aims as regards the purpose of their sponsorship and what they expect in return. Both operate on a principle of prestige by association, and although in the case of the Glenfiddich Awards prestige does not come via an association with literature as such, the company nevertheless takes great care to ensure associations are made with quality. For example, in addition to the quality of the books that win, the sponsors wish to underline the quality of their hospitality. Grant also notes that great care is taken to ensure that the standard of the audio-visual presentation at the ceremony is high. This is clearly important given that members of the media are present and that the company wishes to attract favourable publicity.

Although neither of these awards was founded during the 1980s, the principles at work in these two examples may, nevertheless, be said to shed some light on the general motivation behind a sponsor's desire to involve itself with an award, and the underlying objectives of businesses.

III - A COMPARISON OF AWARDS

I now wish to make a comparison of the Booker Prize with other awards.

Although there are still a great many awards in existence, there are about fifteen really significant prizes in Britain. By this I mean literary awards which are likely, through the prestige they afford, or by the amount of prize money on offer, or both, to have a significant impact on

attractive to this same grouping, and by generating publicity for the company in its association with this, the company attempts to ensure that this particular social class will remember the name of the company or of the brand when it next comes to buy whisky.

on the subsequent careers and sales of the winning writer. From these I chose five awards with which to compare the Booker Prize, and each of these was in existence for at least part of the 1980s, when the publicity machine for the Booker was at its height. However it was also necessary to look briefly at two foreign literary prizes of some status, for these are two awards with which the sponsors of the Booker have repeatedly attempted to cultivate comparison. They are the Prix Goncourt and the Nobel Prize for Literature.

Before going on to privilege these awards however, I wish to discuss briefly the methodology used in order to make this comparison. A questionnaire was drawn up covering significant areas of prize structure and methods of awarding. This was sent out to over eighty prize-awarding bodies, and it consisted of the following nine questions:

- 1) When and why did your company/organisation decide to sponsor this award?
- 2) How long did it take to plan things (i. e. from the initial idea till the first award was made)?
- 3) Why did you choose to award a prize for this particular genre of writing? (i. e. fiction/short story etc, as appropriate).
- 4) Who in your company/organisation is responsible for planning, liaising with the judges etc?
- 5) Judging Procedures - Who appoints them, how are they chosen, is it the same panel every year or does it change? Does your company/organisation set any criteria for what it thinks should be considered to be prize-winning writing, or is this left entirely to the judges?
- 6) Do the judges read all the shortlisted works themselves, or do they 'get people in' to sift through and sort out a final list?
- 7) Exactly how much money is involved in total i. e., planning/administration, prize money and publicity, and any other costs (e. g. fees for judges)?
- 8) What happens at the prize ceremony?
- 9) What does your company/organisation see as its aims in sponsoring this award - is it entirely to do with increased publicity or are there any other considerations? Furthermore, why did you choose to become

involved with financing an award for writing as opposed to, say, a sporting event?

My guidelines for choosing which prize-awarding bodies should be approached were very loose as I wished to build up as detailed a picture of literary awards as possible. My general criteria, however, were as follows: the best known prizes; the most lucrative; other prizes which have cropped up repeatedly in the course of my reading; those awards which were referred to by other sponsors whom I contacted; prizes which are not especially well-known, but which are nevertheless relevant in terms of having been won by some of the people involved with the Booker Prize;¹⁵ and, finally, prizes which may be neither well-known nor awarded to literary fiction, for example the Glenfiddich Award mentioned above, but which are useful for the purposes of illuminating certain aspects of the processes involved in prize-awarding.

The five prizes with which I shall compare the Booker are the W. H. Smith Award, the Guardian Fiction Prize, the James Tait Black Memorial Prize for Fiction, the Sunday Express Book of the Year Award, and the Whitbread, generally held to be the Booker's nearest rival. Together these prizes represent those awards which were in existence before the founding of the Booker, those which have come into existence since, and those existing prizes which have undergone some degree of restructuring during their history. I shall now briefly privilege each of these awards before going on to examine the structure of each prize in detail, where I shall focus on why each of the prizes was originally set up, on the judging systems, and on the aims of the sponsors as stated.

The Whitbread Prize has often been portrayed as being the Booker's main rival. It is certainly true that in terms of the level of publicity it

¹⁵ E. g. The Miles Franklin Award which is relatively unknown outside Australia, but which was won by the 1988 Booker winning author, Peter Carey.

attracted during the Eighties it was nearer to the Booker than any of the other British prizes which I examined, though certainly not equal in this respect to the Booker. However, it is not strictly accurate to talk about 'the Whitbread Award' in any case, since there are five category prizes plus the overall Whitbread Book of the Year Award.

Whitbread Plc has sponsored the Awards since these were established in 1971, however the awards were substantially re-structured in 1985 ¹⁶. Since then the administration and promotion of the Awards has been handled by Kallaway Ltd, a professional arts consultancy. Each of the five category awards is currently worth £2,000 and the Book of the Year Award is worth £21,000.

The W. H. Smith Award, which is currently worth £10,000, was, as the name suggests, founded by the retail and distribution group W. H. Smith in 1959. It was the first award to offer prize money which amounted to a four-figure sum, and in this respect the W. H. Smith may be said to be similar to the Booker Prize ten years later. That is, it was a prize which broke new ground in terms of what was an acceptable sum to offer in prize-money. However, unlike the Booker and the Whitbread Awards there is no stipulation as to what type of book is eligible and past winners have included volumes of short stories, poetry, biography, a collection of essays, and various novels.

The Guardian Fiction award was founded in 1965 by W. L. Webb, then Literary Editor of the paper. Webb was also Chairman of the first panel of Booker Prize judges in 1969. Until 1991, the award was worth £1,000 for one book. Thereafter, it was expanded, and the total prize money is

¹⁶ As to why the Awards were relaunched in 1985 the official publicity for the Whitbread states that this occurred:

'.. in order to achieve [their] objectives more effectively..'.
Prior to 1985 there had been inconsistency both in the number of categories, and in what these categories actually were.

now £3,000, with the winner receiving £2,000, and two runners-up £500 each.

The James Tait Black Memorial Prize is an annual award. There are two categories, one for fiction and one for biography, and I shall concentrate on the former. It is one of the oldest existing literary prizes in Britain, and was founded in 1918 in memory of one of the partners of the Scottish publishing company, A. & C. Black Ltd. In 1979, however, the awards were supplemented by the Scottish Arts Council, and each category is currently worth £1,500.

The final award which I wish to examine is the Sunday Express Book of the Year. This prize is of particular interest since it was set up in direct response to the Booker Prize.¹⁷ Since its inception in 1987, this prize has carried a hefty sum in prize money, and, in common with the Booker, it is currently worth £20,000. However, as with the Guardian award, this prize also rewards runners-up and here £1,000 each is given to three of them.

I shall now discuss the structure of each award, starting with the Booker Prize. Here, I have found it necessary to turn once again to the "Introduction" to Prizewriting in order to supplement some of the answers given.

The structure of the Booker Prize is such that the answers to questions 4) and 5) are linked. The role of the Management Committee, which is appointed by Booker Plc and contains three Booker directors, is: **'..to choose the judges each year and amend the rules as necessary.'**¹⁸

¹⁷ C. f. Martyn Goff notes of the Booker Prize that: 'It has led to a number of other prizes'. See Goff's "Introduction" to Prizewriting - a Collection of Writing by Past Winners to Celebrate 21 Years of The Booker Prize, Hodder and Stoughton, London (1989), p23.

¹⁸ See letter from Anne Riddoch to Sharon Norris, 23rd January 1992.

The Management Committee changes gradually over a period of time, and the theory behind this is that although each of the members has the power of veto when it comes to choosing judges, individual prejudices are eventually flushed out.

Martyn Goff, in the "Introduction" to Prizewriting, gives more details about the selection of judges.¹⁹

When the Management Committee has its first full-scale meeting to arrange the prize ²⁰, which usually takes place in February, its first duty is to choose a Chairman. Great care is evidently taken to ensure a 'balanced' panel of judges. There is a set pattern from year to year concerning the constitution of the judging panel, and this usually includes:

'.. an academic, a critic or two, a writer or two, and the man-in-the-street.' ²¹

Usually the judges meet on three occasions, firstly in April to learn what their duties will be, then again in September to draw up a shortlist, and finally on the day the announcement is made in order to decide on the winner. The Booker Prize is unusual in that the judges are required to read all the submissions, and these can total up to one hundred and twenty works.²²

¹⁹ Op. cit.

²⁰ He notes that there is a short meeting just after the awards ceremony every year in order to discuss all aspects of the ceremony, including the television coverage.

²¹ Ibid, p18. However, the latter category of judge, which was introduced in 1976 in response to criticism that the prize was becoming too rarified, has included Lady Wilson and the actress Joanna Lumley, as well as the Labour MP, Ted Rowlands.

²² Goff, in Prizewriting [p20], talks of how both he and Sir Michael Caine have made attempts to cut down the number of novels which the judges have to read by trying to get publishers to submit only those novels which:

'...they believe actually have a chance of being shortlisted..'

Goff notes however that this has been 'in vain', due to the pressures put on publishers from authors and agents.

In addition to their official duties there is some evidence to suggest that, from time to time, the Management Committee gives some guidelines to the panel of judges. The criteria which they appear to set seem to reflect an interpretation of 'best novel' based on longevity of appeal.²³

With regard to the company's continued aims in sponsoring the award, Anne Riddoch, who answered the questionnaire on behalf of Booker Plc, referred me to Sir Michael Caine's "Preface" to Prizewriting.²⁴

I have already noted Sir Michael's explanation for the company's initial involvement with the prize in Chapter One. However, he also gives further reasons for the group's continuing commitment. They are, briefly, that the prize's success and pursuit of excellence reflect the success and the striving for quality which characterise Booker's business interests, and that the company is proud of the prize which provides:

'..a focus of recognition to our shareholders, employees, customers, and the communities we serve',

and this reinforces:

'...the corporate identity of a diversified group.'²⁵

²³ See THWAITE, A., (1987), "Booker 1986", Encounter, Vol 68, pp 37-38, and also FORSTER, M., (1980), "Secrets of a Glittering Prize", The Sunday Times, 26th October, and TAYLOR, A., (1994), "Prize fight: Inside the Booker", Scotland on Sunday (Spectrum), 16th October. Thwaite, Forster and Taylor, all former judges, have suggested that the Management Committee exerted some influence, in so far as they were told to vote for a novel which would still be read in years to come. In Forster's case the judges apparently were asked to look for a novel which would still be read in fifty years' time, while by 1986, Thwaite's panel of judges was asked to look for one which would still be read in twenty years', as was Taylor's eight years later. However, Riddoch's response to this is that:

'The committee does not seek to influence the judges in any way. The judges' views you quoted were derived, I should think, from informal guidance given on request by the prize's administrator, Martyn Goff, who sits in on the judges' meeting.'

See letter from Anne Riddoch to Sharon Norris, 23rd January 1992.

²⁴ See Prizewriting, pp1-2.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

Furthermore, Booker Plc's commitment to physical health, through its health care and food products, is reflected in the Booker Prize, for this, according to Sir Michael Caine, is evidence of the company's parallel commitment to mental and spiritual health. ²⁶

The final reason he gives for the group's continued involvement with the prize is that the style of management employed therein accords with the overall management style favoured by Booker in its businesses. That is, the Booker Prize's specialist Management Committee, ultimately responsible to the parent company, reflects Booker Plc's smaller, specialist companies, all run independently, yet all under the umbrella of the parent company.

I now wish to turn my attention to the other prizes in the control group.

The original aims of Whitbread Plc in sponsoring the Whitbread Awards are stated as having been to:

'...encourage and promote the skills of writers, to stimulate a greater interest in good English literature amongst a wider public, and to promote book sales in general.'²⁷

The judging system for the awards, which are run in conjunction with the Booksellers' Association, is unique. The judges are appointed after consultation between Whitbread and Kallaway. Each of the categories is judged by three 'assessors' who are always writers, booksellers, or literary critics, ²⁸ and the category award winners are announced in November. Thereafter the winner of each category goes on to be

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Rather than reply directly to the questionnaire, the administrators, Kallaway Ltd sent official publicity material, which covered most of the questions. See the publicity material under "A Brief History of the Whitbread Literary Awards".

²⁸ See Kallaway Ltd's publicity material for the prize under "A Brief History of the Whitbread Literary Awards".

considered for the overall Whitbread Book of the Year Award, and this is judged by a panel made up ²⁹ of one member from each of the five categories' panel of assessors together with:

'.. four to six people distinguished in other fields but who have an evident interest in literature.' ³⁰

The judges for each of the category awards are not required to read all of the submissions, and this is where the Whitbread differs markedly from the Booker Prize. Instead, submissions are sifted by representatives of the Booksellers' Association, and each of the judges is then sent copies of fifteen to twenty different books from which he or she is expected to make up his or her own shortlist. The publicity material states that:

'There are no over-riding criteria for judging except those which are self-imposed by the panelists.' ³¹

The collection of shortlists is then circulated to the other judges and thereafter the official shortlists and category winners are decided. Judges are not under any obligation therefore to read all of the entries for their category, though apparently some do. ³²

As for the overall Book of the Year Award, each of the judges on the extended panel makes his or her choice of winner without consultation with any of the others. The results are known in advance by the winner, and there is no formal sitting of the panel except in the case of a tied result. ³³

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., "Judging procedure". Past 'guest' members of the overall panel have included the former BBC Political Commentator, John Cole, and Michael Howard, the current Home Secretary. (See "Programme for the Whitbread Book of the Year Presentation Dinner, 21st January 1992").

³¹ See Kallaway Ltd's publicity material for the Awards, under "Judging procedure".

³² Ibid., "Judging procedure".

³³ The reader will note that it is possible for a novel to win both the Novel category and the Book of the Year Award, and it was perhaps to be expected that the novel would dominate the overall Award. However, this has proved not to be the case. In fact the breakdown of winners of the Book of the Year Award from 1985 to 1993 (inclusive) was: three novels, three biographies, one first novel and one volume of poetry.

Among the current objectives stated by the company are to:

- '-encourage and promote good English literature,**
- position Whitbread as a prominent sponsor of literary excellence...**
- make a broad range of English literature more accessible to the British public**
- provide a prestigious event for entertaining opinion formers, local and national government representatives, business peers, and valued clients.'**³⁴

These aims are said to complement Whitbread's other areas of sponsorship such as its Community Investment programme and the company's sports sponsorship projects.

The original aims of the sponsor in setting up the W. H. Smith Award seem, from the information available, to have been rather vague. It is said to have been founded at a time when:

'...people seemed to be conscious of the need for a renewed effort at encouraging literary talent.'³⁵

Likewise, no one category of book is exclusively eligible for the award.

The main criteria for a winner is that it has:

'...in the opinion of three independent judges, ... made the most outstanding contribution to literature in the year under review.'³⁶

This prize differs from both the Booker and the Whitbread awards in that it does not accept submissions. Books are called in by the judges who are appointed by the sponsors. The judging panel, like the Booker Management Committee, changes gradually over a period of time.

The brochure which details the extensive W. H. Smith Arts programme states that the group:

³⁴ Ibid., "The Objectives of the Awards".

³⁵ See promotional booklet, "W. H. Smith Literary Award".

³⁶ Ibid.

'...aims to provide a service to the community... which reflects and enhances its core businesses.. Its primary method of doing this is by making available an appropriate arts sponsorship programme.'³⁷

One other notable feature of the W. H. Smith Award is that although originally the prize tended to be presented towards the end of the year, since 1979, the organisers have chosen to present it in the Spring. Thus it differs from the majority of the larger, more commercially oriented prizes whose ceremonies tend to take place towards the end of the year in order to capitalise on the traditionally good sales period in the run up to Christmas. In this respect then the W. H. Smith Award may be said to be less geared towards increasing sales than either the Booker or Whitbread.

In 1965 the criteria set for the Guardian Fiction Award by W. L. Webb were that the winner should be a work of fiction, by a British or Commonwealth writer which shows 'promise and originality'. Books of short stories are also eligible. The award is judged by:

'.. the regular round-up of fiction reviewers who change infrequently and one-by-one, and by the Literary Editor.'³⁸

The newspaper's four regular fiction reviewers make a selection during the year of novels or short stories which may be contenders for the award. A list is then sent to the Literary Editor in October. The four, plus him or her, then read their own choices and those of the others again, and through consultation by telephone or letter, they arrive at a winner.

Although it is not an official rule of the prize, in the past there has been a tendency to avoid awarding the prize to someone who has already won a major award and a 'slight bias' towards first books.³⁹

³⁷ See promotional booklet, "W. H. Smith Literary Award".

³⁸ See letter from Tim Radford to Sharon Norris, 27th November 1991.

³⁹ Ibid.

Unlike most of the larger awards there are no fees for the judges.

As for the aims of the Award, the judges and the prize's founder, W. L. Webb, who until his death last year was still closely involved, see it:

'...as another way of encouraging new or newish authors, who tend to get little attention in the press of publications clamouring for attention.'⁴⁰

The James Tait Black Memorial Prizes, are unusual in that the will of James Tait Black's widow stipulates that the judge for both categories should be:

'The Professor of Literature of Edinburgh University.'

Traditionally this has been interpreted to mean the Regius Professor in the Department of English Literature.⁴¹ The Fiction Prize is given to the 'best work' in each category published during the calendar year, and the winner is usually announced some time in February.

This award is significant in that while it is a prize which is slight in monetary terms compared with the Booker or the Trask,⁴² it nevertheless carries a great deal of prestige, and several past winners of the Booker Prize have also won this award. [See Table 1.]

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ While this chair was vacant for a number of years during the 1980s other members of the department helped out, with additional support from the Professor of Mediaeval and Scottish Literature. Now however, with the appointment of a Regius Professor in the Department of English Literature, he, in conjunction with the administrative staff in the department, is partially responsible for the award. The overall responsibility however lies with staff from the University's Information Office. See letter from Professor Ian Donaldson to Sharon Norris, 16th April 1992.

⁴² The Betty Trask Award, which was founded in 1984, is currently worth £6,000 more than the Booker (i. e. £26,000 in total), however, given that the money is divided among the winner and several runners-up in what appears to be a rather arbitrary manner, in actual fact the Booker is worth more to the winner.

The final British prize which I have chosen to focus on is the Sunday Express Book of the Year Award. This was set up by Graham Lord, then Literary Editor of the paper, in order:

'To counter the pernicious influence of The Booker Prize, which had so often been won by books of little interest to the average intelligent reader.'⁴³

Like the Booker, the structure of the Sunday Express Award consists of a Management Committee, which in this case is overseen by the Literary Editor of the newspaper, plus the judging panel. The panel changes annually except for the presence of the Literary Editor.

A nominations panel selects a shortlist consisting of a maximum of twenty novels. The judges then read these and select the winner. Their remit is to find a novel which is:

"...stylish, literate, but also compulsively readable."⁴⁴

I now wish to turn to the foreign award with which the Booker is most often compared, the Prix Goncourt, and to the Nobel Prize for Literature.

The Prix Goncourt, like the James Tait Black Prize, has the status afforded by age, for the Academie Goncourt which awards the Prix was set up in 1903. The main impetus towards the founding of this prize was a desire on the part of the Goncourt brothers that their memories should live on.

⁴³ See letter from Graham Lord to Sharon Norris, 7th May 1992. N. B. D. J. Taylor sees this prize and its aims as being an example of the 'anti-intellectualism' which prevails in the literary reviewing world. See *A Vain Conceit: British Fiction in the 1980s*, Bloomsbury, London, 1989, p91.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

The Prix is judged by the same group of people from year to year, and the amount of money offered, Fr50 (£5), is really only a token gesture these days. In fact most winners do not even bother to cash the cheque. This prize, therefore, unlike the Booker, cannot guarantee the winner any level of financial independence on the basis of the prize money alone. Nevertheless, the novel which wins the Prix Goncourt is likely to sell between 150,000 and 500,000 copies, which is well beyond the aspirations of any Booker winner.

The Nobel Prize for Literature is the most prestigious award of all, and the most lucrative. In common with the four other original Nobel Prizes, it was first awarded in 1901, and it is currently worth around £680,000.

The awards were set up in accordance with the will of Alfred Nobel. However, the will is extremely vague and thus contentious, since it is open to interpretation. It states that the prize for literature should go to the person:

'... who shall have produced the most important work of an ideal tendency.' ⁴⁵

As it is not clear exactly what Nobel meant by this it is usually interpreted to mean 'striving for the good of mankind, for humaneness, common sense, progress and happiness'.

The awarding body for the prize is the Royal Swedish Academy, whose existence pre-dates the prize by over a century. From the eighteen members of the Academy, who are elected for life, a Nobel Committee is selected, consisting of five ordinary members and one co-opted member,

⁴⁵ STAHLE, N., (1978), Alfred Nobel and the Nobel Prizes (third revised edition), The Swedish Academy.

plus a secretary. This Committee is elected for three years, however it may be re-elected.⁴⁶

In order to be considered for the prize for literature, which like all the other Nobel awards is awarded annually, a writer must receive nominations. These usually total between three and four hundred. However, given that nominations are very often duplicated, this usually ends up as being between one hundred to one hundred and fifty names. It is unusual for a Nobel laureate to have been nominated only once.

By May or June the recommendations of the Committee will have been given to the Academy who are not, however, bound to follow them. The final decision is taken in October after a secret ballot of all eighteen members of the Swedish Academy. The decision may not be made if there are any less than twelve of the eighteen present, and the winner must have at least half of the votes cast.

The Nobel differs from the majority of literary prizes, including the Booker, in that it is usually awarded to an author for a body of work. Nobel's will states that the winning author must, during the previous year, have 'conferred the greatest benefit on mankind'. However, this is usually interpreted in such a way as to avoid giving the award for recent work alone or for any one work, and this mode of interpretation has possibly added weight to the award, while lessening the potential for contention.

The Booker Prize clearly differs from other prizes in the control group in a number of respects. Given its success, those who organize the award

⁴⁶ This system of judging is similar to that of the American Pulitzer Awards, which were set up almost ten years after the Nobel.

may be said to have found out early on the secret of how to capitalise on its financial backing and how to maximise value for sponsorship, for unlike several of the awards in the control group, the Booker has not undergone any significant changes in its administrative structure since the early Seventies. Unlike the James Tait Black and Whitbread Awards it is a single category award, given for a work of fiction. Unlike the Guardian, which is open to a book of short stories, this is always a novel.⁴⁷ Nor is the prize one facet of a larger overall sponsorship commitment, as is the case with the Whitbread and W. H. Smith awards.⁴⁸

All of this creates an aura of exclusiveness for the Booker Prize,⁴⁹ and this aura of exclusivity is increased by the judging system, since the judges for the Booker meet more frequently⁵⁰ and on a more formal basis than those of the other awards. This in turn suggests a more serious-minded approach to the judging of this prize, an image which the sponsors have consistently tried to encourage.

A comparison of the various judging systems inevitably raises the issue of consistency. Although on the one hand the fact that the Booker Prize, unlike the Smith, is awarded exclusively to a novel and on an annual basis, would seem to make for more consistency in judging from year to year, the W. H. Smith Award keeps the same judging panel for a number of years, and this may be said to balance things out to some extent. The

⁴⁷ In theory if not in practice. E. g. see Alice Munro's The Beggar Maid which was shortlisted in 1980, and, of course, Schindler's Ark.

⁴⁸ The Sunday Express is also involved in the sponsorship of sports events.

⁴⁹ Nevertheless, publishers, subject to certain rules, at least get the chance to submit novels for the Booker, which is not the case with the Smith or Guardian awards. See Chapter One.

⁵⁰ They also get paid more. Even if the 1983 estimate of £1,000 has not altered since then, [see RYLE, J., (1983), "Novels of the year wait for judgement", The Sunday Times, 25th September] the judges will still be receiving far more money than the judges for any of the other awards in the control group. Arguably though, given that they also have to read as many as one hundred and twenty novels, they may be said to deserve this.

Guardian Fiction award may be said to be potentially more consistent in its standard of judging insofar as there is not a rapid turnover of the reviewers who judge the prize. However, if keeping the same judging panel is a criterion for consistency, then theoretically at least, the most consistent prize of all in terms of judging is the James Tait Black insofar as it is judged by the same individual from year to year.

In spite of the attempts by some critics to portray the Whitbread Awards as in some way a rival to the Booker Prize, this is clearly not the case, and for a number of reasons. In the first place, strictly speaking any comparison made would have to be between the Booker and the Whitbread Novel category award. However financially there is a huge gap between the two, with the Novel category award worth only one tenth of the Booker's total prize money. Even allowing for the fact that the Whitbread is a multi-category prize however, the system employed by the category judges in order to come up with a shortlist is substantially different from the Booker Prize's system of judging.

As far as sales are concerned, while these show evidence of a significant impact made by the Whitbread Book of the Year Award at least, the sales of the winning books are still significantly less than would normally be expected of a Booker winner.⁵¹ As with the Booker Prize, publishers whose authors are contenders for the Whitbread Awards are required to spend a set amount of money on the promotion of each book. However, in contrast with the Booker Prize, the publishers do not have to

⁵¹ See Kallaway Ltd's promotional material for the Awards, under "The Achievements of the Awards". E.g. Nicholas Mosley's novel Hopeful Monsters sold 2,000 copies in thirty-six hours after being shortlisted and a fresh 5,000 copies were re-printed when it won the Book of the Year Award. Paul Sayer's The Comforts of Madness sold 2,000 copies before being shortlisted, 3,500 between being shortlisted and having won the Book of the Year, and 15,000 after having won (C. f. with sales figures given for the Booker in Chapter One).

agree to this until after the winner of each category has been announced.⁵²

In 1969 when the Booker Prize was set up perhaps the really significant thing about it was the sum of money on offer to the winner.⁵³ A decade earlier the W. H. Smith Award had offered a similarly ground-breaking sum to the first winner, however, unlike the Smith, the Booker has gone all out to maximise sales by awarding the prize during what is a traditionally strong period for sales of fiction. Furthermore, the W. H. Smith has not up-graded its prize-money as frequently or by as much as the Booker.

It is misleading to suggest that the Booker Prize represents the British equivalent of the Prix Goncourt, though the reader will note from Chapter One that this is a claim which is frequently made, and, that it is a comparison which Booker Plc itself has consistently tried to foster. Any attempt to equate the two prizes, however, is inappropriate, for the comparison has only limited validity. For one thing, unlike the Booker, the decision to found this award was based purely on personal and not commercial, motives. In addition there is a great difference, both in the amount of financial support offered by the sponsor in each case and also in the level of sales usually guaranteed to the winner of each prize.

It is ironic that the two areas in which the Booker and the Prix Goncourt may be said to be comparable are in the ability of both prizes to

⁵² I. e. it only applies to the category winners, not to the publishers of the novels on each individual category shortlist.

⁵³ See Chapter One.

arouse controversy⁵⁴, and in the domination of both prizes by the literary establishment in each country.⁵⁵

The Nobel is clearly an altogether different type of award from the Booker. The age of the Royal Swedish Academy and of the prize itself probably adds to its status, however this is also due to the apparent seriousness of purpose with which the members of the committee go about their task. Commercial concerns have no part to play in the decisions of the committee. Furthermore the press coverage of the Nobel tends to be less frivolous than coverage of most other awards.

Unlike most literary awards the Nobel is known world-wide and is generally well-respected. Furthermore, unlike virtually any other award, and in accordance with the will of its founder, it attempts to take into consideration the long-term effects fiction can have for the good of humanity. Thus it may be said that the Nobel Prize for Literature emphasises and promotes the moral/ethical dimension of literature.

IV - IMPLICATIONS

As far as the relationship between the Booker and other awards is concerned, although interest in the Booker Prize may be said to have tailed off somewhat towards the end of the Eighties,⁵⁶ with every

⁵⁴ E. g. compare the 1960 Goncourt winner Vintila Horia's denunciation of the French prize with the attack made by John Berger the 1972 Booker winner on the sponsors of the British prize.

⁵⁵ In France the juries of the Prix Renaudot, Interallie, and Goncourt all tend to consist of authors who vote for a winning novelist with whom they share a publisher. This is borne out by the domination of the three prizes by publishers Grasset, Le Seuil, and Gallimard. See RYLE, J., (1983), "Novels of the year wait for judgement", The Sunday Times, 25th September.

⁵⁶ See CONNOLLY, J., (1989), "My own little list of Booker disaffection", The Times, 21st October. Also, in 1992 television coverage of the Booker ceremony was very nearly not networked, and the decision to broadcast the ceremony live in Scotland was taken at the last minute and arrived at primarily because of an unexpected change in BBC Scotland's scheduling.

successive increase in the prize money it offered, it probably helped to raise the stakes for the rest. Many business-sponsored prizes in particular do appear to have tried, subsequently, to compete with the Booker by substantially up-grading the amount of prize-money on offer.

However, as I have already noted, the timing of the Booker's remarkable rise to a new prominence in the early 1980s and the subsequent decline in media interest in this prize and in awards in general towards the end of the decade tends to argue against the Booker having been the sole catalyst in the overall rise in the number of awards.

Although it may be argued that the Booker took some time to establish itself, particularly in terms of its effectiveness as a marketing device, the rise in the number of awards probably occurred largely as a result of a combination of social, economic and political factors, some of which I have already looked at briefly, which created a situation generally conducive to the setting up of new awards.

It should also be noted from Horowitz's comments quoted above, however, that the rash of new and lucrative business-sponsored prizes which broke out during the 1980s was not confined to Britain. Thus at least some of the reasons for this new phenomenon must be seen to have been related to more global trends. While it is not the purpose of this present study to examine these universal trends further, in Chapter Three I shall discuss in more detail how certain social, political and economic factors in Britain at this time influenced both the setting up of the new literary awards and the ability of the Booker to maximise its impact within such a context.

CONCLUSION TO PART 1

I now wish to summarise the findings in Chapters One and Two above, and to look at some of the longer-term implications.

I have shown in Chapter One how the Booker Prize came to be set up. In addition I have also indicated how some of the difficulties created by the award relate to the initial aims of the sponsor. In particular the twin aims of increasing the sales of novels and of rewarding aesthetic merit may be said to have caused problems insofar as these have encouraged the conflation of aesthetic and commercial ideals.

To the extent that this prize may be said to have any influence, firstly, on sales of books and thus over what novels are read, and secondly, in terms of literary evaluations emanating from this context being adopted as standard, then it has the potential to lead to future confusion as regards the evaluation of literary merit. For if, within the context of the prize, literary credentials and commercial appeal are held to be synonymous, then within any situation where the evaluations of fiction made within the context of the prize are seen to hold weight, it is likely that such a confusion will be further disseminated and received as a standard interpretation of 'good' in respect of fiction. One thinks here, for example, of Booker winners being adopted as school texts as a result of their having won the prize.

This is one problem area associated with the Booker Prize. However, it may be argued that the very nature of commercial sponsorship in general makes the conflation of ideals inevitable in all prizes of this nature. Nevertheless, the fact that such mutually antagonistic ideals were explicitly stated to be the goals of the sponsors in setting up the Booker

Prize may help to explain why this has been a characteristic feature of this one prize in particular.

Thus the apparently conflicting aims of this prize as stated by the founders of the award, the controversy generated by the Booker, possibly as a result of this, and the level of increased sales which the prize is able to guarantee, set the Booker Prize apart from other awards. So too does the much higher level of media coverage given to this prize than to any other. However, as I have noted in Chapter Two above, there are also some inherent features of the structure of the Booker which help to set it apart from the rest.

If the Booker Prize may be said to be unique in certain respects, then in other areas, and in particular in terms of what may be taken to be the implicit commercial aims of the sponsor, the Booker may be said to display many of the typical characteristics of the new and aggressively-promoted wave of literary awards which arose during the 1980s. This is true even though, as I have noted, the prize was founded over a decade earlier.

If one looks at the general picture, it is clear that the increase in the number of literary awards which began in earnest during the 1980s, and specifically the increase in large, business-sponsored awards, has some far-reaching implications, both for prizes and for fiction itself. In the first place the proliferation of awards has helped to change the whole ethos of literary prize-awarding, making it more aggressive, more commercial, and more competitive. Also, as Horowitz suggests of the similar situation in North America, this very proliferation of awards has acted to devalue the system as a whole.

As far as the situation in Britain is concerned, this devaluation may be said to have operated at several different levels. For one thing the sudden surge in the number of awards during the Eighties inevitably called into question the bases of the value judgements made, especially since these seemed to vary from prize to prize. Some rather ridiculous situations arose at this time concerning the evaluation of 'good' and 'best' from one prize to another. In 1985, for example, Doris Lessing's novel The Good Terrorist was deemed by the judges of that year's W. H. Smith Award to have made 'the most outstanding contribution to literature'. However, it was not considered to be 'the best novel' by the judges of the Booker for which it was also shortlisted.

Even the one shortlist of six or seven novels had the potential to cause problems, as Hermione Lee, one of the Booker judges in 1981, noted.⁵⁷ Judges for any given prize for fiction were often faced, as indeed they still are, with many disparate types of novel, and had to make specious value judgements as to which genre was 'best'. The American writer Gore Vidal has aptly commented on the difficulty of having to prioritise in this way:

'Imagine having to choose between Huckleberry Finn and Crime and Punishment. One is an apple, one quite plainly is a coconut.'⁵⁸

The situation was even more complicated when, as in the case of prizes such as the W. H. Smith, the category of book awarded was very wide, or, as in the case of the Geoffrey Faber Memorial Prize, the category of book to be awarded was rotated every other year.

⁵⁷ See LEE, H., (1981), "The Booker Prize: Matters of judgement", The Times Literary Supplement, no. 4100, p1268.

'My greatest difficulty, and the source of my deepest uncertainty about the value of the whole undertaking was in having to compare works of such entirely different kinds.'

⁵⁸ Quoted by John Ryle in "Novels of the Year Wait for Judgement", The Sunday Times, 25th September 1983.

Such a situation highlights the very arbitrary nature of prize-awarding.

There has been a conspicuous lack among most prizes of any clear standard, and here we may draw further parallels with F. R. Leavis's criticisms of the reviewing establishment in Britain earlier this century. It seems that in any case the bases for the evaluations made and the value judgements themselves, furthermore, have often been of lesser importance than the tension and sense of anticipation created by the judging process or the reception of the final decision. Also, in viewing books primarily in terms of their ability to win awards whatever that may mean, such as, for example, a novel's commercial viability, prizes may be said to have encouraged the tendency to treat literature as a product. They may also be said to have led, effectively, to a kind of literary reductionism, determined in this case not by the principles of any literary theory, but by the ethics of the business world and the demands of 'literary prize as spectacle.'

What may also be said about business-sponsored awards is that as a result of these, increasingly, 'hard-sell' techniques have, as I have noted above, come to be applied to 'serious' or 'highbrow' novels (or at any rate to 'middlebrow-read-as-highbrow' novels), where formerly this type of marketing approach and level of promotion was reserved for lowbrow works or 'bestsellers'. Perhaps more importantly here, as time has gone on, furthermore, this trend has increasingly come to be perceived as being acceptable by the literary establishment itself. Prizes are arguably as much a part of the world of fiction-writing currently as the manual typewriter once was.

As for the definition of 'serious' or 'highbrow' fiction itself, in effect the Booker has helped to redefine these terms by subdividing them into those fictions which have purely aesthetic appeal *or* those which in

addition have commercial credibility, and to have helped to create the concept of the '(apparently) highbrow novel as bestseller'. I mention the Booker Prize in particular here, for it may be said to be more culpable in this than other awards, since, as I have shown, during the Eighties its organisers were especially keen to be seen to be promoters of 'serious' fiction.⁵⁹

In addition to a redefining of 'serious' and 'highbrow' and the possible creation of a new 'middlebrow-read-as-highbrow' genre of prize-winning fiction, both of which may be said to have arisen out of the sponsors' desire to be associated specifically with fiction received to have a certain status, prizes have, in addition, led to a misuse of value-related terms such as 'good' and 'best' and thus to a bastardisation of language. For, as I have shown above, 'good' fiction has often been interpreted to mean something quite different and quite specific from prize to prize. Thus, each award may be said to have effectively created its own definition of 'good', as it were, 'in its own image', and ultimately each of these definitions may be said to boil down to, 'that which is appropriate' for the given prize.⁶⁰

It is apparent then that the large increase in the number of business-sponsored prizes in itself, and the nature of that particular type of sponsorship, have had a number of effects both on the prize system and on other areas related to aesthetic judgements. Given that some of these potentially detrimental effects were mooted in 1964, the question remains as to why Maschler, Greene *et al.* were willing to overlook some of their own reservations in their enthusiasm to set up a new award. While some of these effects may indeed have been unavoidable given the nature of

⁵⁹ E. g. see Sir Michael Caine in *Prizewriting*, p1, and also Martyn Goff in the same, p23.

⁶⁰ As far as prizes in general are concerned, for a large number of awards, 'good' has come to mean, 'that which markets itself well.'

business-sponsorship, the question arises further as to whether or not the drive towards business-sponsorship itself was unavoidable. I shall now go on to discuss this point in some detail in Chapter Three.

PART 2

Patronage, Business-sponsorship, and Social Factors Affecting the Evaluation of Fiction.

'We shall proceed from Sklovskij's words at the end of his foreword: "In the study of literature I am concerned with the investigation of its inner laws. To give a parallel from industry, I am not interested in the situation on the world cotton market, or in the policy of trusts, but only in the kinds of yarn and the methods of weaving.."

Even today the "method of weaving" is, of course the center of interest, but at the same time it is already apparent that we may not disregard the "situation on the world market" either, since the development of meaning - in the non-figurative sense as well - is governed not only by the progress of textile technology.. but at the same time by the market, by supply and demand. The same is valid *mutatis mutandis* for literature.

This opens up a new perspective for the history of literature. It becomes possible for the history of literature to take into account at the same time both the continuous development of literary structure furnished by the constant reshuffling of elements and the external interventions which, though they are not the vehicles of development, nevertheless determine each of its phases..'

JAN MUKAROVSKY,

"A note on the Czech translation of Sklovskij's Theory of Prose", from The Word and Verbal Art.¹

'In the realm of taste..the first task of anyone who wishes to really get down to the truth is the discovery of points of origin. Who is the active agent behind it all? i. e., whence comes a particular taste? Who are the propagators? What is it that enabled it to assert itself?'

LEVIN SCHUECKING,

The Sociology of Literary Taste²

¹ MUKAROVSKY, J. , (1977), "A note on the Czech translation of Sklovskij's Theory of Prose", The Word and Verbal Art, Yale Russian and East European Studies 13, translated and edited by John Burbank and Peter Steiner, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, pp139-140.

² SCHUECKING, L., (1966), The Sociology of Literary Taste, (2nd edition), Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, p104.

PART 2: INTRODUCTION

In this part of the thesis I wish to look at external factors which influence the continued existence of fiction and the reception thereof, and at how these relate to the Booker Prize.

In Chapter Two I referred in general terms to the role played by social, economic and political factors in the rise of business-sponsored literary awards during the 1980s. In Chapter Three I shall examine these in more detail with particular reference to Government policy at the time as regards arts funding. I shall discuss the historical tradition whereby writers have been reliant on patrons, and I shall pose the question of whether or not it is accurate to see business sponsorship merely as a Twentieth Century extension of this.

In addition, I shall examine the reasons why, during the late Seventies and early 1980s, there was a perceived need among some of those involved with literature for financial backing of some kind, and if there was any justification behind the arguments of those who opposed the move among literary professionals towards an embracing of business sponsorship. Furthermore, I shall discuss whether patronage of one kind or another inevitably influences the nature of the work produced.

In Chapter Four I shall go on to examine issues relating to the reception context provided by the successive Booker Prize judging panels during the Eighties. I shall discuss the issues of whether it was possible for those involved to have judged the shortlisted novels purely on aesthetic merit, (as far as this is possible in any case), given the unusually high level of social interconnections which linked the judges, authors and Management Committee alike. Finally, I shall question whether or not the combined influences, of patronage on writing, and of social interconnections on the reception of fiction, inevitably lead to a distortion of the process involved in

the reception of novels and thus to the dissemination of a received standard of 'good' fiction which may not be representative.

Ultimately the underlying theme in this part of the thesis as in Part 1 is that it is necessary to study issues relating to the Booker Prize within the wider context.

CHAPTER THREE

The Problem of Patronage: the Relationship Between Traditional Forms of Patronage and Business-Sponsorship of the Arts.

'...the history of literature is in large part the history of the beneficence of individual princes and aristocrats...But that means that the person supported is in receipt of support and, consequently, must not forget his duty of gratitude.' ¹

I have shown in Part 1 that although there are many financial rewards to be reaped from the Booker Prize, some of the other supposed 'benefits' of the award may be said to be less clear cut. In particular, it has been argued that in the long term prizes such as the Booker help to compromise the status of fiction and to throw into question the artistic autonomy of the writer. However, any discussion of the negative effects of prizes such as the Booker must take into account the fact that historically the author has virtually always been dependent on some form of private funding, and that in the past this was usually in the form of support from a wealthy patron.

It was only towards the end of the Victorian period that the writer was able to rely on sales sufficient to provide him with an income. Even then there must have been a large variation between the most successful writers and the majority in terms of how well they were able to live. It could be argued that the business sector during the 1980s merely began to fill a vacuum which had existed for some time as regards the financial backing of writers. However, if this is true, it must also be accepted that the vacuum had increased from the late Seventies onwards as the Government sought to side-step any responsibility it had formerly been assumed to have in relation to the funding of the arts.

¹ SCHUECKING, L., (1966), The Sociology of Literary Taste, (2nd edition), Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, p10.

While it is easy to criticise this move away from large scale public funding on the part of the Conservative Government which came to power in 1979, in real terms the level of funding on offer prior to the late Seventies was a relatively recent innovation, and as such perhaps destined inevitably to last only for a short period.

Furthermore, as Jeremy Paxman notes, the truth of the matter was that by this point in time consumption of the arts had outstripped the ability to pay for them.² Thus even if had not been official Government policy to deliberately cut down on arts funding it would probably have begun to be perceived as an economic necessity sooner or later.

In total the sort of large scale state funding which for a while was able to be taken for granted was only available from the late Forties until the late Seventies. Its arrival co-incided with the election of a Labour Government in the post-war period and its decline with the advent of a Tory Government in 1979.

Just prior to the end of the war the role of central government in funding the arts had been reviewed, and the Arts Council set up in 1945. A mood of change was sweeping the country as the war drew to a close and this led in time to the foundation of the National Health Service and to great changes being wrought in the education system. This mood of change represented a general re-appraisal of the responsibilities of central government. In retrospect however it seems that MacMillan's apothegm:

'...you've never had it so good'

² PAXMAN, J., (1991), Friends in High Places: Who Runs Britain?, Penguin, London, p309.

might well have been coined in reference to the situation relating to arts funding over the three short decades which ensued. Indeed, it was unlikely ever to be 'so good' again.

Once public funding for the arts became more freely available it was certainly easy to slip into what Paxman calls a 'welfare-statist' mentality. The fact of the matter was however that there was little historical precedent for 'no-strings-attached' funding on this scale, and given this and the economic and political situation during the Seventies and Eighties it was probably doomed from birth.

Schuecking notes that in the past the aristocratic patron often intervened to 'correct' the work of his protege. Indeed this was not only accepted but acceptable. The writer however would have had little choice in this. A source of funding was required if he were to be able to continue writing, free from financial worries, and thus the situation arose whereby the non-specialist patron was able to influence the work of the financially dependent writer. In fact, literary patronage, with its tension between the requirements of the patron and the desire of the author to write in a particular way, and the extent to which the former has modified the latter has been an essential factor in determining the nature of literary works. It has also been essential in determining their reception in the short term and for creating the literary taste of a particular generation.

In terms of determining subject matter too, the influence of the patron on the writer of the past was very evident. For example, works tended to deal with the social milieu and issues which were more directly related to the patron rather than to the writer.³ If there were exceptions to this, when a patron encouraged a writer to develop his skills according to his own will,

³ E. g. Schuecking cites the example of the poet's enthusiasm for the Danish kings in the Old English text Beowulf as being evidence of the likely source of finance. See Schuecking, pp10-11.

generally speaking, for a writer to tackle themes outwith the social stratum of the aristocratic patron, or to go against the wishes of the patron meant running the risk of forfeiting financial support, and clearly the writer would not have wished to jeopardise his livelihood. Furthermore, in a time of limited literacy he would also have forfeited his potential audience.

The patron of the past then, was, in effect, the 'aesthetic arbiter', and the writer and patron each fulfilled the other's needs. Nevertheless, as Schuecking remarks:

'.. how often..must some difference of view between the two have poisoned the whole relationship between them.'⁴

The important point in any discussion on the compromising of the supposed 'autonomy of literature' by literary awards is that we should be clear as to how and in what sense we understand the term 'autonomy'. Furthermore, it should be recalled that historically the author himself has rarely been autonomous in the financial sense.

I have cited the late Victorian period as one during which the author was allowed a level of financial and artistic freedom hitherto unknown. However, some degree of financial and aesthetic independence was possible among Elizabethan dramatists, who, as a result of there being a wider, if not yet working class, audience for drama were able to rely more on box office receipts and less on the patronage of individuals. Even so the actor still earned more at this time than the writer. As a result, although a wider audience had been attracted in part by the fact that it was now able to see its own social class and experiences being recorded on stage, some dramatists such as Kyd, inspite of the popularity and influence of their work, nevertheless decided to revert to to the older classical style since this was more likely to attract aristocratic patronage.

⁴ *ibid.* p10.

Schuecking notes that for some this adoption of a more stilted style would have been temporary, and would have been viewed primarily as a stepping-stone to financial security. Once this was achieved the writer, theoretically, would then have been able to devote himself more freely to the sort of work which pleased him but which would have been less likely to find support from an aristocratic patron. In the cases where this happened, financial security may be said to have brought artistic freedom to some writers. For others however there was a choice to be made between the two.

Given that the author of the past was financially dependent on the patron, his position must always have tended to be fairly precarious. In spite of any qualms which the individual writer may have had about compromising his own aesthetic ideals in order to suit the wishes of his patron, it is true to say that the notional 'freedom' of the writer has always been rather more difficult to exercise in practice. Moreover any real freedom in the modern sense was late in coming.

Thus it is clear that historically writers and artists have been prepared to go along with the requirements of a patron in order to be financially secure, and that sometimes this has been necessary as a temporary measure. Furthermore it seems clear that notions of artistic integrity and of the autonomy of the writer were probably a luxury to the majority of authors of the past who had no other means of financial support.

The emergence of a financially secure and therefore more self-confident author, and one who had at least some social standing, may be traced back to the rise of the middle classes in the Nineteenth Century and to the expansion, then fragmentation, of the reading public. Hereafter, the patronage of the wealthy aristocratic individual was replaced by that of the

publisher, by what Schuecking refers to as the 'collective patronage' of subscription libraries, and by a larger book-buying public.

As people generally became more literate and a reading habit was established, so the techniques of mass production and mass distribution led to cheaper books and a market which could cater for an increasing diversity in taste. The demand for novels increased and thus more writers were able to make at least some sort of living.

The emergence of the author as a figure of some social standing however was also due in part to the influence of Romanticism and its stress on the individual creative genius of the writer, and to the rise of Realism, with its preference for 'truth to nature' rather than an adherence to any classical paradigm. The increasing status of the writer during this time therefore was linked to a growing perception of the writer as 'truth-teller', and, by extension, as moral arbiter. While this was certainly clearly influenced by Romanticism, it also seems, paradoxically, to have been linked to some extent to the fact that, during this heady period of industrialisation, the writer did not do 'work' in the sense of the mechanised labour which a growing percentage of the population was now involved in. Thus he was now seen as being somehow above the purely mundane concerns of daily life.

Schuecking suggests that the more respectable status of the writer during this period was also linked to the development and growing awareness among the general public of theories of personality which stressed the importance of the individual and of the individual's experience. It is certainly true that the latter was to have a great influence on the development of the modern novel and on some of the most significant experiments with form.

As a result of all these factors combined, the status of the writer changed. Prior to this he was in a similar situation to other artists, in that by and large all were viewed primarily as providers of entertainment and decoration for the wealthy and influential and thus as being of relatively low social status. Now, however, the author began to be seen as embodying truth, honesty and profundity, and therefore to be worthy of respect.

The fragmentation of the reading public which led to a stratification of fiction has been well recorded. However Schuecking suggests that one additional reason for this and for the elitism which resulted was that the writer himself began to believe in this idealised view of his role in society.

I have taken some time to outline certain aspects of the history of aristocratic patronage since the growth in independence of the writer and its relation to the changing modes of patronage which made this possible is clearly of relevance to the discussion of the potential effects of patronage afforded by literary awards. For example, the comparatively recent rise in the status of the writer is important to the issue of literary awards since these are supposed, in addition to any financial benefits which they might offer, to be a means of enhancing the prestige of the author.

Although the notionally high status of the author which is re-affirmed in awards, is, as I have noted, recent, it has nevertheless been influential in determining what is appropriate in terms of the writer's expectations in relation to his social status and influence. It may be argued that prizes seek to bolster a rather out-dated image of the role of the author in society, and to further promote a kind of artistic elitism. That said it is certainly true, as I have shown in Chapter One, that some of the early publicity for the Booker Prize attempted to stress the role of the writer in society by drawing parallels with authors in Eastern Bloc countries whose lives were potentially under threat.

In general terms, it is certainly true that in the century from 1868 to the founding of the Booker Prize in 1968 the economic situation of the writer had undergone some profound changes, and it could be said that these changes amounted to one major reason why it was felt to be worth re-stating the importance of the writer's role in society. In Gissing's New Grub Street for example, where the action is set in the 1880s, it is seen to be possible for a young novelist to make enough money to live on (if only just)⁵ from fiction-writing alone. By the 1960s however, according to Findlater's figures quoted earlier, only a very small percentage of writers actually made a significant part of their income from writing.

There may be said to have been a variety of reasons for this, including a general decline in the reading habit, however some of the undermining of the economic security of the author and of his social influence may be said to have arisen directly out of a change in both the nature of the patronage which was available and the relationship between author and patron.

The reliance on patronage of any sort inevitably carries with it inherent risks. Where publishers or subscription libraries were the main source, the difficulty came when it was no longer possible or economically viable for either to continue their support. Thereafter the erstwhile beneficiaries of this support had to adapt themselves and their fiction accordingly, for it is clear that the withdrawal of patronage had an effect on the size and the nature of work produced subsequently.

⁵ E. g. See Gissing's hapless novelist's Reardon's defence of the three-decker novel and of the circulating libraries:

'...how is it possible to abandon the three volumes? It is a question of payment. An author of moderate repute may live on a yearly three-volume novel - I mean the man who is obliged to sell his book out and out and who gets from one to two hundred pounds for it. But he would have to produce four one-volume novels to obtain the same income; and I doubt whether he could get so many published within the twelve months. And here comes in the benefit of the libraries; from the commercial point of view the libraries are indispensable. Do you suppose the public would support the present number of novelists if each book had to be published? A sudden change to that system would throw three-fourths of the novelists out of work.' GISSING, G., (1891), New Grub Street. (edited and with an introduction by Bernard Bergonzi), Penguin, London, 1985, p236.

If both the economic status and the social influence of the writer had declined in real terms by the 1960s, nevertheless, the received standing of the writer in society and of fiction was still sufficiently high for an association with both to be of some value to businesses in terms of prestige. This was no bad thing, for by the 1980s the Conservative Government's assault both on the morale and on the funding of the arts had done much to undermine the confidence of all those involved in creative pursuits.

In fact, while the nature of the activity involved probably meant that the withdrawal of funding had less of an impact on fiction-writing than in other areas of the arts,⁶ nevertheless the loss of confidence across the board was important. For in this hostile political climate questions were raised as to the nature and purpose of the arts and as to their role and value in modern British society. Furthermore it constituted an attack on the assumed right of the arts to consider themselves sufficiently 'different' and of sufficient inherent value to justify financial aid.

Even if it had not been a deliberate policy of the Government at this time to cut back on arts funding in general, there were nevertheless specific reasons in the late Seventies and early Eighties why any demand for funding on the part of the writer would not have been met with a sympathetic ear. These relate to the failure of two high-profile but ultimately ill-judged schemes which had received Government funding in the mid-Seventies. One was the ill-fated New Review, the other, the setting up of the New Fiction Society, which had been intended to function as a sort of highbrow Literary Guild. Alas, both of these schemes went sadly awry. At one point the New Review was subsidised to the tune of £5 per copy and overall the

⁶ N. B. Michael Holroyd noted in 1982 that only two per cent of the Arts Council budget that year went towards literature. See HOLROYD, M., (1982), "Prize or patronage: how writers survive", The Sunday Times, 14th February.

review received half of the total amount given by the Arts Council to literary periodicals.⁷

As for the New Fiction Society, which, co-incidentally, was directed by Martyn Goff, in spite of its initial aim to promote literary fiction, in the end financial pressures and lack of subscription led to its becoming, more or less, merely another middlebrow book club. However, as John Sutherland records, the level of subsidy was such that from October 1974 to January 1977:

'...it had sold 13,000 volumes at a cost of £60,000 to the Arts Council. It would have been cheaper to buy the novels at full-price from a bookshop and give them away to passers-by at Piccadilly.'⁸

As a result, says Sutherland:

'.. 'the period of restraint' which the Arts Council annual report for 1975-1976 foresaw effectively put out of any consideration the imaginative schemes of literary patronage which had been shown to work elsewhere.'⁹

Thus in addition to the changing economic and political climate in the Eighties, the fate of both these schemes and the 'publishing crisis' which had led at various points in the Seventies to a cut-back in the output of novels meant, firstly, that it was more likely that any new source of patronage would be welcomed by the literary world, and, secondly, equally likely that attempts made to solicit public funding would be greeted with hostility. Sutherland himself noted in 1979 that:

'A prize system remains, as a last and insignificant link between wealth and literature.'¹⁰

⁷ See SUTHERLAND, J. A., (1979), Fiction and the Fiction Industry, The Athlone Press, University of London, London, Chapter 7.

⁸ *Ibid.* pp145-6.

⁹ *Ibid.* p147.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p130.

In one sense then it is easy to see why any financial support on offer from the business sector would have been welcomed and why by the mid-Eighties at least there may have been less resistance among arts professionals to funding of this order. As far as literature was concerned, the increase in the amount of money being offered by awards, if not in the number of awards themselves, had some precedent in the W. H. Smith Award, the Booker Prize and the Whitbread Awards.

Furthermore, it is easy to see why those who had previously been less than enthusiastic about support of this kind were perhaps ready to lay caution aside. If 'books were different' as the pro-Net Book Agreement lobbyists had argued, then at a time when the status of literature was perceived to be under threat, some action had to be taken to re-establish this. In a sense, both those who argued in favour of new lucrative awards at this time *and* those who were against them on the grounds that they would be likely to have some sort of influence on the fiction itself may be said to have been fuelled by a common conviction that literature was important.

Thus the issue of financial support for writing may be seen to be an issue of morale as much as anything else. Given the reluctance of the central government to look upon the arts in general as being in any way 'a special case', it could have seemed, as far as books were concerned, as if high-profile business-sponsored literary awards, paradoxically, were one of the few options available to re-assert the validity of the writer and indeed of literature in an increasingly materialistic society. Paxman confirms a reluctance on the part of the Prime Minister herself to see the arts as having any special right to funding, and he records that:

'Committed to reining back public expenditure, Margaret Thatcher saw no reason why the arts should be immune from the cuts which faced almost all government departments in the early eighties.'¹¹

¹¹ Paxman, (Op. cit.) p298.

To an extent the moves made by the government to absolve itself from any fast commitment to supporting the arts out of public funding, and instead to increase funding from the business sector, may be said to have been the result of a very real awareness that public spending had to be curbed. This was an understandable view for any Government to hold after the high-spending years of the Labour administration of the mid-Seventies, and the subsequent economic difficulties in Britain, and the arts were not the only area to feel the effects of swingeing cuts. However, the move away from a commitment to funding the arts out of the public purse may also be said to be a reflection of a certain kind of philistinism which was prevalent at the time.

Increasingly during the Eighties there was a prevalence of the view that "value" meant the ability of anything or anyone to make money. This meant that the arts lobby in particular found itself in a tight corner. However, the apparent decline in the perceived status of the arts while the Government attempted to promote the cause of science and technology did not percolate too far down, and it did not, for example, prevent businesses from seeking prestige from an association with the arts such as via the sponsorship of literary awards.

It is possible to see the rise of the phenomenon of the Booker Prize in the Eighties and of this type of patronage in general as being in some way a reflection of a general 'spirit of the age'. The Booker was certainly well-placed to take advantage of the general trend at this time in favour of business sponsorship of literary awards since it had been established for more than a decade and it did seem to epitomise the new ethos of funding that the Government was keen to encourage. If one accepts this argument, then, given that the Eighties was a decade when the power of marketing was supreme, it was natural that the Booker Prize, itself a prime example of

astute marketing, should have benefited from this and, additionally, that it should have attempted to maximise its impact in the face of competition.

Indeed in one way the whole prize-awarding syndrome and the introduction of this degree of competition in an area where it had previously seemed inappropriate may be taken to reflect the 'zeitgeist' of the Eighties, where society in general was becoming more competitive. However in The Sociology of Literary Taste, Levin Schuecking dismisses the argument that there is ever a 'spirit of the age'. Instead he argues that modern society is so diverse and so stratified that there can be no one 'spirit of the age', merely a collection of spirits of the age.

Although he argues with specific reference to the status of novels received to be 'classics' because they seem to represent some 'spirit of the age', Schuecking's argument can also be applied to the rise of literary awards during the 1980s. According to Schuecking's theory this trend would have to be seen not in terms of its being a reflection of a general 'spirit of the age', but only as a reflection of the values of those in society who had the power to influence. Thus Schuecking would probably argue that it was questionable whether society as a whole had a devalued perception of the arts during the 1980s, or that there was necessarily a groundswell in public opinion towards extending business sponsorship of awards. Nevertheless according to his view it would only have been necessary for a small influential group to feel this way for a change to have been effected.

Certainly, as I have indicated, it was clearly the policy of the Government at the time to disengage itself from responsibility towards the funding of the arts and, in addition, to score an ideological coup in attempting to change the perception of where its duties lay in this area. In addition, however, there were many willing potential sponsors from the business sector ready to take on the role of benefactors. Furthermore, the power of marketing at

this time was at a peak. Thus people could be encouraged to buy novels and to 'buy' business sponsorship. As I have noted, the prestige of literature and of things literary was, in general, still high enough to afford prestige by association.

The Government's desire to decrease its own commitment to funding, therefore, may be said to have been matched by a willingness on the part of the private sector to engage in the sponsorship of awards as a viable means of promoting a company, and, in addition, the desire on the part of some of the beneficiaries of Thatcher's economic policies to spend newly-disposable income on well-promoted novels which were at least received to be 'good' fiction.

Therefore, rather than seeing the development of the literary award syndrome in the 1980s in terms of a general surge of opinion in one particular direction, it is perhaps more accurate to see it as the combination of several different interests, each with a common goal, and this was sometimes interpreted thereafter as being the 'spirit of the age'. The fact that such a move came about was due to the power of the groups in whose interests it was either to engage in sponsorship of this kind or to promote the cause of literary awards. Here however the amenability of the literary world itself must also be seen to have been a factor.

In general the end result of the new political mood of the Eighties, in terms of business sponsorship of the arts, was that more organisations vied for less money overall. This had far-reaching results. For one thing the Government's repeated stressing of the importance of business and management skills and of 'cost-cutting' was now on display in the behind-the-scenes moves to appoint new members to the boards of arts organisations. It could be seen in the composition of the Arts Council and in the nature of the appointments made to the directorships of certain

museums and galleries. Jeremy Paxman quotes Lord Goodman, then Chairman of the Arts Council, who on several occasions during the Eighties:

'... was asked for suggestions for arts appointments. I'd put forward names, and then they were, I'm afraid, ruled out because they weren't the right political colour.'¹²

While as Paxman notes the political case is a hard one to prove, what the majority of appointments clearly *did* have in common was that they were all successful businessmen. It is true that the value of appointing those with business and management-gained skills to the board of the Arts Council, for example, had always been recognised in the past, however businessmen now began to account for a much higher percentage of boards than ever, and in addition, these were people not formerly noted for their sympathies towards the arts.¹³

The changing ethos with regard to the perception of arts funding which was encouraged by Government policy is also clearly illustrated in the massive increase in revenue for A. B. S. A. In 1976 this organisation had had an income of £500,000. Only twelve years later this had increased to £30 million.

Paxman differentiates between the two types of sponsorship, the one which the Arts Council had previously been able to offer, and the sort now on offer from the private sector. It was, he says:

'..the difference.. between disinterested long-term policy and the short-term needs of the market.'¹⁴

¹² Ibid. p300.

¹³ N. B. Paxman notes that:

'There seemed to be a view that not only were the skills of the entrepreneur universally applicable, they were also in some sense superior to the wisdom of academic and welfare-statist professionals.' Ibid. p300.

¹⁴ Ibid. p306.

Somewhat surprisingly perhaps, as Paxman records, Lord Goodman, on his retiral from the Chairmanship of the Arts Council thereafter agreed to become Chairman of A. B. S. A. This was a decision which he rationalised on the grounds that it was a good idea for the Arts Council to have what he calls a 'court of appeal'. However it was a decision which he later came to regret, since, as he himself later argued, the very existence of such a body probably encouraged the Government's line of persuading the arts lobby to look elsewhere for funding.¹⁵ In addition, it further undermined the belief that it should in any way be taken for granted that the state had a duty towards funding the arts.

In addition to these doubts however, there seems to have been a growing realisation on the part of Lord Goodman that the aims of the two organisations were mutually antagonistic.

If there were ever any doubt that the ultimate aim of virtually all forms of business-sponsorship is market-oriented, or that A. B. S. A. was less concerned with aesthetic ideals than with promoting and boosting the prestige of the companies involved, the organisation's own guide to the tax implications of arts sponsorship and the requirements of the Inland Revenue, which Paxman quotes extensively from, helps to dispel these once and for all. According to this publication there should always be a legitimate business objective, and any notion of a contribution being a charitable donation should be disregarded. It says, in relation to the scheme whereby A. B. S. A. was to match a company's sponsorship expenditure on a pound for pound basis:

'It is important that advertising is seen to be the sole objective of the payment. If it is considered to be for a dual

¹⁵ R. e. the power of A. B. S. A. to pull in sponsorship during the Eighties, Goodman is quoted by Paxman as saying that it:

'.. changed the relationship between the Arts Council and its clients. Whereas previously supplicants might have been told that the money was not available one year, but might be forthcoming the next, 'now they're told [says Goodman] to go and beg for the money from other people'. Ibid. p306.

purpose, i. e. that of advertising and benefitting the body in question (or conceivably satisfying a personal whim of a director) the whole expenditure may be disallowed.'¹⁶

It is interesting to remember that this is the organisation which awarded the 1985 Booker Ceremony the accolade of Best Single Event of that year.

If it is inevitable, given their mutually antagonistic aims, that business and artistic values conflict with one another in sponsorship of this order, there has also been an apparent ambiguity in the aims of business sponsors themselves. On the one hand an association with the arts is sought after because the company engaged in sponsorship desires prestige from this and this is possible in part due to the fact that the arts are perceived to be not easily quantifiable in terms of market values. On the other hand, that very prestige clearly has a market value, for as I have already noted in Chapter Two, it is possible to talk in terms of 'value for sponsorship'.

The result of the changes which took place in the system of funding for the arts during the Eighties, whether indeed such a change was inevitable or not, was that there was a general change in attitude in terms of what was required and what was acceptable. It was certainly no longer possible to be complacent about Government funding. Such funds as were available were, and still are, usually given on a competitive basis, and there remains a great deal of cynicism about the whole process among those involved in the arts.

Indeed, in the end, perhaps the most significant result of these changes has been the decline in the morale of those involved, and particularly since whatever the arguments for or against business sponsorship, even where financial aid *is* offered, it usually amounts to no more than 'pump-priming'

¹⁶ *ibid.* p307.

money. Thus it makes the long-term financial position of the majority of beneficiaries no less tenuous.

I have argued here that the beneficiaries of patronage are bound to the demands of the patron, or that at very least the dependent nature of the relationship in some way influences both the nature of the work and, possibly, how the artist views his work.

As far as literature is concerned, business sponsorship was clearly not going to be a long-term solution to the problem of financing the author. Ultimately this type of patronage, as with all financial backing from the business sector, holds good only insofar as the economy is robust and the companies involved continue to enjoy financial security, and, importantly, while they are still able to see returns for their investment.

I have already noted the practical difficulties involved in giving financial aid to writers and that sponsorship in any case may be of less importance here than in other areas of arts activity. However, if one were to think about giving financial support according to the needs of the writer, this would probably involve some kind of longer-term aid in the form of bursaries or allowances to enable the writer to "buy time" to write. If financial backing were to be given according to need furthermore, then such support as was available would be most likely to go to the writer who has not been published for some time, or to the young writer trying to establish himself at the beginning of his career.

It is clear however that none of this offers the same potential for maximising publicity for a business sponsor as, for example, the Booker ceremony at the Guildhall, and therefore this would be less likely to appeal to a potential sponsor. This is something that the organisers of the Booker

Prize undoubtedly recognised in deciding to choose to sponsor a literary award rather than a bursary scheme.

As far as the Booker Prize in particular is concerned, this award, especially during the Eighties, tended to go to authors who were already established in their careers and thus less likely to be in need of financial support than younger novelists starting out on a writing career. In fact the average age of winning authors has always tended to be high. Therefore the argument that the sponsorship offered by this prize has allowed young authors to get on in their career is not particularly valid. It would seem from this therefore that the organisers of this award see the purpose of literary awards more in terms of rewarding merit rather than offering financial support to the most deserving cases.

This however may be one area where the aims of the sponsor and the nature of the sponsorship offered have influenced the nature of the prize and of the prize-winners and shortlisted authors themselves. For, in the face of recession it is surely only to be expected that it will be awards which are already well established or which have the backing of a large company which will be able to continue. Thus, when faced with the difficult economic environment and the decline in both the popularity and the cost-effectiveness of literary awards which occurred as the Eighties progressed, it would clearly have been a priority of those who continued to be involved with the business-sponsorship of awards to make secure the returns from their financial outlay.

It is perhaps not surprising therefore that a conservatism was evident in the Booker Prize during the 1980s. In a situation where there was less money available overall and competition was stiff, any business which offered sponsorship to an arts venture at this time would probably have been more likely to support the activity or artist which was most likely to

ensure the fulfillment of its own aims. While all of this is perfectly understandable from a business point of view, it makes attempts to defend business-sponsored literary awards by those within the literary world less tenable.

Prizes such as the Booker, in addition to not having increased the long-term financial security for authors, arguably have also not increased substantially the status of the writer in society. At least, the writer's role as artist and critical force within society has not been taken any more seriously as a result of the rise in the number of commercially-oriented literary awards.

As with Lord Goodman's retrospective doubts about the benefits of A. B. S. A., the very success of the Booker during a period when there was less funding available than before probably undermined the argument of those who sought to claim that funding of the arts in general both could not and should not be the responsibility of the private sector. Any weakening of this argument and a strengthening of the opposite view would make it very difficult to imagine that the changing ethos as regards the funding of the arts could ever be halted, or that the level and nature of the arts funding which had been available for a comparatively short period after the Second World War could ever again be a possibility. Thus prizes such as the Booker may be said to have completed the ideological coup instigated by the Thatcher Government in relation to the general perception of the responsibility of central government towards the funding of the arts.

While all forms of patronage would seem to have their down side, business sponsorship differs from the more traditional forms of financial backing, and certainly from the sort of funding previously on offer from central government, both in its scale, and insofar as it is less likely, because of the nature of the patron and of the patron's business, to be a long-term

commitment. Furthermore, while the whims and moods of aristocratic patrons may have led to the termination of the relationship with the artist on occasion, insecurity is probably more par for the course with business sponsorship. This is not least of all because aristocratic patronage had more to do with the enhancement of the prestige of the individual and also with the enthusiasm of the genuine 'amateur' than with the need to be 'cost-effective'.

While the readiness of some of those involved with literature to embrace sponsorship in the form of the new business-backed literary awards is understandable up to a point, given the history of patronage and the nature of both sponsor and sponsorship offered, it was naive to assume that there would be no detrimental effects on the work produced or on the way literature was viewed. In addition, awards such as the Booker, in being geared primarily to selling novels, have arguably increased the tendency to view literature as a commodity. The winning author also becomes involved in the larger process of promoting the sponsor.

The conflation of aesthetic and commercial merit thus may be said, ultimately, to have arisen out of the basic incompatibility of the business world and that of literature. However, if business sponsors have often shown themselves to be unaware of and insensitive to the peculiar nature of the arts, nevertheless there may also be said to have been a basic naivety on the part of the literary world about the nature of business, and the likely demands and long-term effects of commercial sponsorship.

CHAPTER FOUR

'Reading Between the Lines': Underlying Social Factors Affecting the Reception, Evaluation and 'Representative' Status of Booker-shortlisted Fiction.

'Today the triumph of the social-personal..principle is complete...And if the club is not narrowly exclusive, the system of relations by which it controls the organs and institutions through which the currency-values are established and circulated is comprehensive and complete.'¹

In this chapter I shall examine the extent and nature of the interconnections which existed among those involved in the Booker Prize during the 1980s and the extent to which it was dominated at this time by members of the literary establishment.

I shall look at what the implications are of there having been such a high level of social interconnections. I shall argue that while it is impossible to prove that the judgements made about fiction from within this context were influenced by social factors, and while it is impossible in any case not to be subjective to some extent when attempting to assess artistic merit, nevertheless the nature and the extent of the connections that existed was such that it must at very least cast doubt on the ability of the judges to have been disinterested.

In addition, bearing in mind Levin Schuecking's rejection of the 'spirit of the age' theory in relation to the 'classic' status of novels, I shall examine the degree to which a group such as the Booker coterie may be said to have the power to influence the reception of novels.

Probably the most significant differences between the Booker and those awards with which it was compared earlier were not those covered by the questionnaire in Chapter Two, but were instead the prize's ability to

¹ LEAVIS, F. R., (1951), "Keynes, Spender and Currency-Values", in A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968, Vol.1, p196.

generate publicity, the controversy which has surrounded the Booker, and, above all, the extent to which it has been dominated by members of the literary establishment.

It is not surprising when seen either as a promotional move or as an attempt to establish the prize's credentials as one which attracted 'the top people', that the shortlist and judging panel for the first Booker award included some very well-known and well-established literary personalities. If one looks at the judging panel for 1969, it is a very distinguished group. In addition to Rebecca West who, at seventy-seven, was a 'grande dame' of the English literary world, there was the Chairman, W. L. Webb, then Literary Editor of The Guardian, David Farrer, a director of the publishers Secker and Warburg Ltd, the poet and academic Stephen Spender - already a C. B. E. and fellow-academic Frank Kermode, with whom Spender had co-edited the periodical Encounter.

The shortlisted authors included Iris Murdoch and Muriel Spark, both of whom were already established as writers. Spark, who had been awarded the O. B. E. in 1963 and who was a Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature, had published her most famous novel The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie two years earlier in 1967. Murdoch too was already respected both as a writer of fiction and as a philosopher. Nicholas Mosley was from an aristocratic if somewhat infamous background.

Although Barry England, Gordon Williams and the eventual winner, P. H. Newby, did not go on to enjoy the degree of celebrity associated with some of the shortlisted authors from more recent times, Newby for one was already an 'establishment' figure, being Controller of the BBC's Third Programme (later Radio Three), and having previously won both the

Atlantic and the Somerset Maugham Prizes in the 1940s and the Yorkshire Post Award in 1968.²

In the long term however, as this pattern continued, the implicit message was, and still is, that those best qualified to judge and assess the fiction submitted for the shortlists were academics, critics and fellow-writers, and in fact no real concession has ever been made to the ordinary reader or book-buyer.³

One other precedent was set in 1969. There was no one on either the shortlist or indeed on the panel of judges who was particularly young, and this has remained a feature of the prize throughout its history.

Furthermore, there was, even in 1969, a very strong pro-Establishment bias, and specifically 'pro' the academic, literary and media establishments as can be seen above, and this too is something that has continued throughout the prize's history. In addition, even in 1969 common membership of certain clubs was in evidence among the personalities involved.

Over the years it seems that the many interconnecting links between shortlisted authors, judges, and members of the Management Committee panels, both in terms of their common links to other bodies and their

² He later went on to become Managing Director of BBC Radio and had been a university lecturer in Cairo just after the war.

³ This pattern seems to have been determined in large measure by the first Chairman of the panel of judges, W. L. Webb (who was also one of the three judges for the 1993 "Booker of Bookers" competition). Webb noted in a 1993 article that Booker McConnell's then literary adviser, Lord Hardinge of Penshurst, had wanted:

'.. a leavening of show-biz characters among the judges - the odd film-star, or a couple of Rolling Stones...'

However Webb had:

'... insisted that we had to have judges with real literary authority, which eventually I got..'

See WEBB, W. L., (1993), "The Booker of Bookers" III, in The Times, 21st September.

monopolising of the shortlists and judging panels of the Booker, have combined to justify claims of a 'Booker coterie'.

Of course, canards, coteries and cliques are nothing new to the British literary world, ⁴ and in the Twentieth Century alone there have been several such groups which at times have seemed to wield a disproportionately large influence. The Bloomsbury Group and the Auden set were among those famously savaged by the Leavises in Scrutiny half a century ago.

However, there are several factors which combine to make the literary world in this country pre-disposed to coteries.

One is that the geographical location of the various literary organs is rooted firmly in the south east. The headquarters of most publishing houses are in London, and it is here too that the BBC has its television and radio headquarters where the majority of arts and literary programmes are produced. London moreover is where most national newspapers which carry review sections are situated, and this is particularly important. Thus traditionally people who are connected to the world of literature, including novelists, have tended to congregate in the south east.

The information contained in APPENDIX 1 illustrates the point that both the shortlists and the judging panels of the Booker Prize have been dominated throughout the history of the prize by members of the literary establishment and that very often there have been social ties between these people. However, while it is understandable from the point of view of prestige that the shortlists should have been peopled by 'experts' in the literary field, this situation clearly has implications as regards the reception of novels submitted for the prize and also regarding the supposedly representative nature of the texts which won.

⁴ However, Helen Fielding argues that recently they have become more powerful than any time since the 1930s and 1940s. See FIELDING, H. , (1991), "You scratch my hardback", The Sunday Times, 27th October.

For example, Schuecking writes that:

'What happens in this intellectual field does not differ greatly from what happens in the realm of natural science: an endless variability of creation is influenced in definite directions by a certain selection. For this selection we find of importance in the past the circumstances that it proceeds from the literary interest of groups in the possession of economic and social sources of power, on which the creative artists are dependent.'⁵

If he is right, then in relation to the Booker Prize, the question arises as to what happens when the:

'..groups in possession of economic and social sources of power'

include the authors and judges themselves?

I wish to postulate that in this instance, given the level of social interconnections and the common background shared by a majority of those on the shortlists and judging panels for the Booker, the reception process becomes distorted. I shall expand on this later. First of all it is necessary to provide a basic model of how the reception process operates.

Clearly, no work of fiction exists in a vacuum. Every novel originates from, is published in, and then is disseminated within a specific context. There are several layers of context. Firstly, there is the given social and artistic context within which the writer operates. Secondly, there is the specific context into which the novel as, simultaneously, creative work and commodity, is received. It is likely that any reading of the novel, if it is to correspond to any great extent to the writer's intended meaning, will take into account the first layer of context and also the audience for whom the author originally wrote the text.

⁵ Schuecking, p18.

There is, in addition, one further layer of context, and that is the wider universal context into which any work is received. This will include all potential readings of the novel at home and abroad, both in the present time and in the future.

While some of the original intended meaning may subsequently get lost in the readings of the novel which are made from outwith the specific chronological period, social situation or geographical location from which the novel has emerged, new and insightful meanings and interpretations may nevertheless arise. Furthermore, re-readings of the texts may emerge in the meantime which will take into account and be influenced by new knowledge of events at the time when the novel was written.

Hereafter, for the sake of convenience, I shall use the term *super-context* to refer to this universal context, and I shall use the more general term, *context*, to include the social situation from and into which the novel emerges.

Within both the original contextual situation and the *super-context* however, there may be said to be any number of smaller contextual sub-groups. These may include, for example, the *sub-context* of the panel of judges for any given prize. The nature of the reading a text receives from within any one of these *sub-contexts* will, in turn, depend very much on the identity of that group.⁶

Together the independent contextual sub-groups form the overall reception group for the novel. Together their various readings of the novel will combine to help shape a received standard reading of the text which may be influential, for example, in selling the novel or in determining

⁶ C. f. Tolstoy's assertion in *What is Art?*, that the value which we give to any work of art will depend very much on our general 'life values'.

whether or not and how it is studied as an academic text. Taken individually however each reading of a novel by a contextual sub-group may not be representative of the reception and interpretation of the text made by a wider audience, and this is relevant to the issue of the influence of literary prizes.

If, for example, an experimental novel is hailed as formal and a thematic breakthrough by an academic sub-context, nevertheless the novel is likely to receive a less enthusiastic and positive evaluation among an audience of more general readers. The academic sub-context here represents numerically only a small part of the overall audience and its views, and in being at variance with the larger overall audience may be said to that extent to be unrepresentative.

That said, however, some individual sub-context groups may be said to be extremely powerful, and to wield a degree of influence out of proportion to their actual size. In this instance the sub-context reading may be able to assert itself above other readings of the text. It is at this point that the balance in the process of reception may be tipped in favour of one particular group, and this, as Schuecking notes, will ultimately depend on how powerful that group is and on what degree of influence it has.

If, for example, a contextual sub-group which offers a particular reading of a novel is able to influence the choice of novels studied at academic institutions, or alternatively, which novels are promoted or reviewed in the literary press, then clearly, in this case, the reading made by that group is likely to carry considerable weight. In this case it is likely too that this particular reading will be disseminated among a much wider audience than would usually be the case.

The sub-context of the Booker Prize judging panels during the Eighties may be said to have been highly influential in that, as I have shown earlier, the prize during this period had the ability to massively increase sales. Furthermore, however, it also carried with it extra weight insofar as the level of sales of shortlisted novels on its own probably indicates that the Booker's seal of approval appeared to the general reader at least to be worthy of respect as a literary yardstick. Certainly the prize was promoted, and indeed promoted itself, as such.

However, the disproportionate influence of this award may be said to have been rather suspect and for a variety of reasons some of which I have already alluded to. Not least of these is the fact that the connections which existed between those involved and the conservatism apparent both in the machinery of the prize and also in the choice of winner, suggest that there may have been an unconscious process of pre-selection in operation.

There may in fact have been a more conspicuous form of pre-selection in operation in any case. It seems that the novels which managed to reach the shortlist of the prize had usually been reviewed in the literary press prior to this. Given that only a very small percentage of novels published in any given year gets reviewed, then this may be said to amount to a form of pre-selection. One has to ask, furthermore, especially given that a large number of Booker judges were reviewers, what criteria governed the decision to review certain novels and not others? It certainly seems that first novels and novels from younger, less well-established authors were less likely to be reviewed.

The reviewing network in Britain has traditionally had a very poor reputation, and in the past it has been accused of dishonesty and lack of intellectual vigour. This was especially so during the 1930s and Forties

when reviewers were criticised by, among others, both the Leavises, Orwell and Grahame Greene.

The reviewing network in addition has traditionally been very incestuous, and this has formed much of the basis for recurrent accusations of dishonesty and for the low reputation of reviewers and reviewing in the past. Cyril Connolly noted in his autobiography, Enemies of Promise, that these links often extended back as far as public school, then continued through to university, (usually Oxbridge), and extended thereafter into the world of literary criticism. Indeed, it was the substitution of social values for literary ones in reviewing which particularly incensed the Leavises.⁷ F. R. Leavis saw the main areas of interconnection among critics such as Connolly, who was one of those attacked in Scrutiny, as being, in addition to school and university, the British Council, the BBC, and membership of clubs.

As far as the Booker Prize in the Eighties was concerned, a high percentage of the judges were critics or literary editors⁸, and were likely to have known personally not only their fellow judges, but also the shortlisted authors. I now wish to examine in more detail the 'Establishment credentials' of those people involved with the Booker Prize during the 1980s and the other areas of interconnections that existed between them.

In particular I will focus on: the number of university-educated authors and judges, and especially those who were Oxbridge educated, (although here I have had to limit myself in the main to undergraduate careers at Oxbridge owing to the very great number who went on to graduate study at either university); the shared publishers and agents; whether or not they had other

⁷ E. g. see LEAVIS, Q. D., (1939), "The Background of Twentieth Century Letters", in A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968, Vol.1.

⁸ See also Table 2. for the interconnections between the judges of various awards.

recognised 'Establishment' honours such as C. B. E. or F. R. S. L.; whether they had a background in academic teaching and may have already had established links with a publisher as a result; whether or not the authors *or* the judges in question had won other literary prizes; and finally, whether they had in common membership of clubs and other associations such as PEN and the Society of Authors.

In compiling the tables in APPENDIX 1 I had to rely heavily on what biographical material was available. Thus where there is a blank in the tables, this is usually indicative of a lack of available information. Although my focus so far in the thesis has been the Booker Prize from 1980-1989, in order to examine whether the situation became more or less Establishment-oriented during this time I have expanded the period covered by the tables.

I now refer the reader to APPENDIX 1.

It is clear from close examination of the data provided in APPENDIX 1 that certain conclusions may be drawn and I shall now attempt to address these.

It is clear that a very large percentage of both the shortlisted authors and of the judging panels were Oxbridge educated, and that there was a particular bias towards Oxford. On closer examination it will be seen that from 1969 till 1979, including 1974 when Nadine Gordimer and Stanley Middleton were joint-winners, four out of the twelve winners of the Booker Prize were Oxbridge-educated. This compares with six out of the eleven winners for the period 1980-1990.

In addition it can be seen that during the 1980s there was a trend towards the winners being, or having been, professional academics. This is apparent in the backgrounds of J. M. Coetzee, the 1983 winner, who was

Professor of Literature at the University of Cape Town, and also in the case of Anita Brookner, the 1984 winner, who was formerly an Art History don. It was also in evidence in 1986 when the winner was Kingsley Amis, again formerly a professional academic, and was similarly apparent in 1987 in the case of Penelope Lively, who not only lectured in Modern History prior to becoming a full-time writer, but who is also married to a Professor of Politics.⁹

The same bias towards winning authors who were or who had been professional academics was not apparent in the 1970s however.

In terms of the judging panels, it can be seen that in the period between 1980-1989, just over fifty per cent of judges were Oxbridge-educated as compared with around sixty per cent between 1969-1979. In the latter half of the 1980s however, as can be seen from APPENDIX 1, another influential group arose from the combined ranks of the judges and shortlisted authors in the form of those who had connections with the University of East Anglia, either as students or lecturers, or as both, and in particular those who had connections with the M. A. course in Creative Writing run by this University. This course was supervised by Malcolm Bradbury, who was Chairman of the panel of judges for the Booker in 1981, and who later became a member of the Management Committee for the prize.

In the year that Bradbury was Chairman of the judging panel, one of his former students at the U. E. A., Ian McEwan, was shortlisted for his novel The Comfort of Strangers. Some critics at the time suggested that this came about primarily because of McEwan's connection with Bradbury, and that furthermore the shortlist itself had been expanded especially in order to allow McEwan's novel a place. However, although one of the other

⁹ Jack Lively, Professor of Politics at the University of Warwick.

members of the judging panel who wrote about the judging procedure in 1981 did note that Bradbury had argued very strongly for the inclusion of the novel on the shortlist, the 1980 shortlist had also consisted of seven novels.¹⁰

Bradbury himself was a shortlisted author in 1983 for his novel Rates of Exchange. In the intervening year the U. E. A. was again represented on the panel of judges, this time by Lorna Sage. Sage, who had been Assistant Lecturer in English Literature at the U. E. A. in the 1960s subsequently went on to become Dean of the School of English and American Studies (in 1985).

In 1984 David Lodge, then Professor of English Literature at the University of Birmingham, was shortlisted for his novel Small World. Lodge was again on the shortlist in 1988 with his novel Nice Work, and in 1989 was Chairman of the panel of judges. However, Lodge too had a U. E. A. connection. In 1977, seven years into Malcolm Bradbury's Professorship, Lodge had been Henfield Writing Fellow at the U. E. A. In addition, during the 1960s both men had been lecturers in the Department of English Literature at the University of Birmingham. Birmingham's Professor of English at that time (from 1962-1973) was Richard Hoggart, who had also sat on the Booker's panel of judges in 1970. Furthermore Hoggart also went on to hold an Honorary Professorship at the U. E. A. in 1984.

The influence of the U. E. A. was particularly strong in the late 1980s, and this culminated in the win in 1989 by another former student on the Creative Writing M. A. course, Kazuo Ishiguro. Ishiguro had also been shortlisted in 1986 when his novel An Artist of the Floating World was favourite to win.

¹⁰ Brian Aldiss. See Aldiss's article "Bell's, Booker and Candle" in The Guardian, 9th October 1981.

In 1989, in addition to the Chairman's connection with the U. E. A. (and with Bradbury), Ishiguro's fellow-shortlisted author, Rose Tremain, who had been a judge for the prize only one year before, and two of the judging panel, also had connections with East Anglia. Tremain was a lecturer at the U. E. A. that year, as was another of that year's judges Helen McNeil, and McNeil's fellow-judge Maggie Gee, had been Creative Writing Fellow there. Furthermore, the Management Committee for the prize in 1989 included Professor Bradbury.

In addition, in October 1989 the University of East Anglia's Centre for Creative and Performing Arts was the venue for a celebratory weekend held to mark twenty years of the Booker Prize. This event was funded jointly by Booker and the U. E. A.

Even authors who may be said to fit less easily into the categorisations above followed the pattern to some extent. The 1982 winner Thomas Keneally had in his time been both a lawyer and a professional academic. In addition, although the 1985 winner Keri Hulme may have seemed an unusual choice both in terms of her novel and of her own background, she too had spent some time at university in New Zealand though she did not graduate, and she had also worked as a television producer, thus providing her with the media background so beloved in Booker circles.¹¹

Oscar and Lucinda, Peter Carey's novel which won in 1988, *had* been expected to win and was the favourite with the bookies. Carey's background was less 'typically' Booker and had less of the 'Establishment credentials' referred to earlier. However, he too had had experience in the media, both from a career in advertising, and from writing film scripts.

¹¹ As to the novel itself, The Bone People was tipped to win and was described as a 'publishing sensation' in an article in The Bookseller in March 1985. Given that this was a full six months before the shortlist was announced, and that the prediction appeared in a trade magazine, it tends to belie, at least on a commercial basis, the argument which says that the 1985 winner was a most unlikely choice.

The three authors that I have mentioned above, moreover, are from Commonwealth or former Commonwealth countries, and it may be that a degree of tokenism worked in their favour. In the period between 1980 to 1985 it can be seen that there were three winning novels from the Commonwealth. This compares exactly with the number of Commonwealth winners in the period 1970 to 1975. However this is slightly complicated by there having been two winners in 1974, and also by the fact that although Salman Rushdie, the 1981 winner, was born in India, he was now generally considered to be a British author.

Hulme, additionally, may have been the token 'Commonwealth woman winner', and thus comparable with Nadine Gordimer in 1974. This all does seem to add credence to the argument that some degree of tokenism was at work, for it is interesting to note that, as with the number of Commonwealth or South African winners overall, the number of female winners in this category was exactly comparable.

Overall, if one looks at the statistics relating to women's involvement in the prize, these suggest a typically Establishment bias against females on the shortlists and judging panels. However, on an individual basis, some women appear to have been extremely successful at 'playing the system'.

Again referring to APPENDIX 1, in the years 1969-1989 there was not one instance where the shortlist was comprised solely of women writers. In 1976, (and again in 1991), the shortlist was comprised entirely of male writers. On only five occasions out of twenty-one was there a higher ratio of women to men. [See Table 3.] On the other hand, there were eleven shortlists where men outnumbered women writers.

The total overall percentage of shortlisted novels written by women during the period covered by APPENDIX 1 is just over forty-one point five per cent, that is, forty-nine out of a hundred and eighteen novels. The percentage of women who won the prize over the period was even lower, at thirty-eight per cent. This represents eight female winners out of twenty-one, or, taking into account the tied result in 1974, eight out of twenty-two [36.3%].

Where matters of judgement were concerned, there was a similarly lower percentage of women than men. That is, women accounted for thirty-eight point five per cent, or thirty-seven out of an overall total of ninety-six judges. In an appalling lack of equality and perhaps the most glaring example of the prize's anti-female bias, in the period from 1969-1989 only two judging panels were chaired by women.

In 1983 Fay Weldon took the chair when Booker, apparently egged on by Carmen Callil, the founder of Virago Press and then on the Management Committee of the Prize, made a concerted effort to go all out to appoint a woman Chairman. This was also a year - there were another four - when women outnumbered men on the judging panel. In 1987 it was the turn of P. D. James, who on paper at least might be assumed to be masculine. Women were also in short supply on the Management Committee.

As for the three examples of writers given above, Keneally and Carey could be said, moreover, to have been more likely to win in that they had already been on the shortlist in previous years; Carey in 1985 for his novel Illywhacker, and Keneally in 1972, 1975, and 1979. It cannot be said to have been an unofficial 'rule' that a novelist was more likely to win if he or she had been on the shortlist of the prize in previous years as there would be many notable exceptions to this, including Beryl Bainbridge, Timothy Mo, and David Lodge. However of the list of Booker winners in the 1980s,

Keneally, Amis, Lively, Carey and Ishiguro had all been shortlisted before. Moreover, Carey and Ishiguro were alone in not having been shortlisted in the 1970s, and in each case in having been shortlisted on only one occasion prior to winning the prize.

It is clear, particularly from my use of asterisks in APPENDIX 1, that a certain conservatism manifested itself in the shortlists as regards the continued reappearance of certain names, and the number of novelists shortlisted more than once would appear to provide further evidence that the prize was slanted in favour of already established authors. From an overall total of a hundred and eighteen novels shortlisted for the Booker over the years from 1969-1989, sixty-three [over fifty percent] were by novelists who had already been on the shortlist.

There were twenty-four novelists in this category, of whom Iris Murdoch was the most conspicuous, having been shortlisted six times. Indeed, Murdoch is reputed to have asked her publishers Chatto and Windus not to re-submit her name in the future and it is important in this context to remember that it is the publisher and not the novelist who decides whether or not to submit a novel for the prize.

As far as the re-appearance of novelists on the shortlist was concerned, thirty-seven point five per cent [nine out of twenty-four] of these were women.

If there was a recurrence of certain names on the shortlists, it can be seen that there was also a regular exchange between shortlists and judging panels, with novelists often going on to be members of the panel. Some fifteen people acted in both capacities and these included Malcolm Bradbury, David Lodge and Fay Weldon, who have also chaired the panel. Furthermore Antonia Byatt, Rose Tremain, Nina Bawden, Marina Warner,

Peter Ackroyd, Paul Bailey, and Bradbury had all sat on the judging panel *before* being shortlisted.

In the case of Tremain, her novel Restoration was shortlisted in 1989, only one year after she had sat on the panel of judges, and the question arises as to whether or not she had 'insider' knowledge of what the judges would be looking for.

There was also a marked recurrence of names among the publishers of Booker winners, with some individual publishing companies such as Cape, Faber, and Chatto and Windus in particular benefitting a great deal from the prize.

Together, up to 1989, Cape, Faber and Chatto and Windus supplied thirty-six out of a total of one hundred and eighteen shortlisted novels, including nine winners. Though this may be explained in part by the fact that each of these publishing houses had a substantial fiction section, or indeed was exclusively a publisher of fiction, in 1981 alone there were three novels published by Cape out of a total shortlist of seven books. It is particularly noticeable [See Fig.1.] that from 1979 there was a swathe of authors from the same companies on the shortlists every year.

As I have already noted in Chapter One, Martyn Goff in Prizewriting, credits Tom Maschler and Graham C. Greene, then respectively Chairman and Literary Editor of Cape, with the idea of suggesting the setting-up of the prize to Booker McConnell, and it is Cape which had both the highest number of winners and of shortlisted novels over this period.

It is also clear from APPENDIX 1 that a number of judges and shortlisted authors had connections with publishing companies, notably Ion Trewin, who later went on to become a member of the Booker Management

Committee, the 1986 Chairman of the judges Anthony Thwaite, a director of Andre Deutsch, and the 1982 shortlisted author Alice Thomas Ellis who was both published by Duckworth, and married to the company Chairman, Colin Haycraft. She herself had worked at Duckworth as Fiction Editor, and she is credited as having 'discovered' her fellow shortlisted author in 1982, Beryl Bainbridge.

There was a strong bias evident in both the shortlists and the judging panels of the Booker Prize during this period towards authors and other figures such as professional academics who were already established in the literary world. It is also interesting to note from APPENDIX 1 that very often even those judges who were not ostensibly 'literary figures' had won other literary prizes, for example for autobiography.¹²

The strong Establishment bias of the prize is also reflected in the number of shortlisted authors and members of the panels of judges who were or who became Fellows of the Royal Society of Literature. What is particularly striking about this is that very often an author was made an F. R. S. L. within a year of first being shortlisted for, or winning, the prize, and there definitely does seem to have been a correlation here between the timing of the two.¹³

There were many shortlisted authors, judges and members of the Management Committee of the prize who worked together in the past. The Lodge-Bradbury connection may be the most apparent, but there were also several people who had been associated with Encounter, and another sizeable group which had been linked in the past with the literary sections of both The Sunday Times and The Observer, as well as with the New Statesman.

¹² Related to this, it is also note-worthy that there were certain prizes which a great number of the people on both the shortlists and the judging panels had won, and this is most evident with the Somerset Maugham Prize. See Table 2.

¹³ See the examples of both Kazuo Ishiguro and Ian McEwan.

In addition it is also evident from the information in APPENDIX 1 that there was a thread linking various shortlisted authors and judges who had written literary critical books about each other's work.

There were also many authors who were members of the same clubs, and the most popular of these tended to be the Garrick, Savile, Beefsteak and the Athenaeum, with White's and Pratt's also rating highly. Professional writers' groups, such as PEN and the Society of Authors were also common meeting grounds.

As I mentioned in Chapter Three, none of the authors who won the prize in the Eighties may be said to have been either young or unknown, and of the winners during this period, William Golding and Kingsley Amis in particular were already well-established in their careers.

I now wish to discuss the implications of the above in relation to the processes of reception and evaluation made from within this context, and to the supposedly 'representative' status of Booker-winning novels.

It is clear that in the main the elements which linked the various people involved with the Booker Prize during the Eighties were little different to those identified fifty years earlier by F. R. Leavis as existing among the reviewing network.

Given both the nature and the extent of the connections between those involved with the Booker, one is certainly justified in talking of a Booker coterie. The question arises however as to how representative this group and its evaluations were of the wider audience.

As far as the successive judgements of 'best novel' were concerned, the inference from APPENDIX 1 is that 'best' usually meant a novel which had been written by someone fairly experienced as an author, and almost certainly by someone known in advance to the panel. Moreover, 'good' fiction was likely to mean fiction written for, and probably, by, people with a high level of education.

As regards the presence of women on the shortlists and judging panels, the implications here are that while women were considered to be able to write 'good' novels according to this received understanding of 'good', they were not in a position to judge in a formal sense what constituted 'good' fiction.

The nature and level of interconnections among those involved with the prize during this period, furthermore, were such that, while it is not possible to prove that the evaluations made were based on social rather than on aesthetic considerations or at best on a conflation of the two, it seems highly likely that this would have been the case. However, it could be argued that in the conservatism which was in evidence both in the choice of shortlisted authors and judges and in their judgements and, furthermore, in the anti-female bias of the prize, the Booker did no more than reflect the values of the wider literary establishment in Britain.

There would appear to be some validity in this argument. For example, Helen Fielding, writing more recently on the interconnections that exist among Booker-shortlisted authors and judges suggests that it is:

'..in the review sections of the fashionable literary press..that thoughts of connections are apt to raise a smile.' ¹⁴

and she gives the example of J. G. Ballard and Martin Amis's mutual 'back-slapping' in reviews.¹⁵

¹⁴ See Fielding, (Op. cit.)

¹⁵ Ibid. She cites Amis on Ballard's Hullo America:

The 1989 judge Helen McNeil, commenting in an article on both the incestuous nature of the reviewing network and the mutual 'back-scratching' which occur in the literary world as a whole records that:

"... you don't necessarily realize that X is Y's best friend, but you recognise that Y has friends...to that extent, I've become more sceptical about reviews of, as it were, received 'good' writers."¹⁶

McNeil also criticises the reluctance of critics to review the work of 'less well regarded' writers. She says that the assumption appears to be made by the reviewer that no novel by an author in this category will deserve a decent review. She notes, furthermore, that some of the less favourable reviews of one of the shortlisted novels that year, Rose Tremain's Restoration, had been written before the novel had been shortlisted, and she says:

"...it did flit through my mind, would they have thought this if Julian Barnes had written the same novel."¹⁷

Thus there does seem to be a parallel here between the values of the Booker and those of the literary establishment as a whole. However as far as the literary media in general is concerned there is some evidence to suggest that it has become more aware of the undesirability of mutual 'back-scratching' in recent years. In 1992 The Sunday Times decided to rethink its policy on reviewing following the results of a survey done in conjunction with the The Spectator the previous year. The survey found that in the list of the one hundred most reviewed books, the authors of one in three of these had reviewed other writers on the list.¹⁸

"All we know for certain is that the novels he will write could not be written, could not even be guessed at, by anyone else",
and Ballard on Amis's Other People:

"Powerful and obsessive...Kafka reshot in the state of psycho."

¹⁶ McNEIL, H., (1990), "Judging the Booker", The Women's Press Bookclub Catalogue, Jan-March 1990, Women's Press, London.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ In an attempt to find out what the present situation was I tried to contact the current Literary Editor of the The Sunday Times. However he did not reply.

If the Booker Prize of the 1980s merely reflected the values of a literary establishment which was traditionally regarded as being highly incestuous and pre-disposed to to coteries, then, according to the argument above, it should not be regarded as being especially sinister or unhealthy. However, the degree of influence which the prize had at this time challenges the validity of this argument. Furthermore the question arises in any case as to how representative the literary establishment as a whole was. Even if the Booker Prize did no more than reflect the values of the literary establishment in general, it could nevertheless be criticised on the grounds that it perpetuated an existing set of values which were in themselves unrepresentative.

Moreover, given the publicity which surrounded the Booker Prize at this time, given the prize's proven influence on sales, and given too the presence on the judging panels of a substantial number of professional literary critics, it could be said that the prize in the Eighties potentially had not only the power to perpetuate an already existing imbalance, but had, in addition, the power to extend this further. In other words this amounted to the power to disseminate a received standard of 'good' which may have been neither representative nor for that matter based primarily on aesthetic considerations.

Given the cachet which the prize had for most of this period, however, it probably mattered little to a substantial number of those who bought the shortlisted novels whether these were of any literary merit or not. As such, Schuecking's statement on the reception of 'classic' novels seems singularly applicable here. He writes:

'To the belief that good wins through, the critic can offer only the sceptical reply that that which wins through will thereafter be regarded as good.'¹⁹

Whether or not the bases for the evaluations made within the context of the Booker judging panels at this time may be said to have been suspect, they were, nevertheless, as I have stated, widely disseminated. In view of this the Booker Prize of the 1980s may be said to have been one example of a highly influential sub-context group whose influence was such that it had the power to distort the wider reception process.

Above all it was the ability of the prize at this time, again whatever the bases of its supposedly literary evaluations, to increase sales, that made the Booker a force to be reckoned with. However if the machinery of the prize may be said to have helped to influence the reception process of fiction in favour of one specific group of novels, it could also be said to have restricted the potential for other fiction to make an impact. In a limited market for fiction of this kind, in successfully promoting certain novels which were already more likely to have been reviewed and therefore to sell, and in consistently failing to acknowledge authors and fiction from outwith the mainstream, such as regional novelists, the Booker may be said to have doubly weighted the odds against the latter.

Thus it can be seen that it was possible for this prize to have influenced sales of fiction, and to have the evaluations of fiction made from within the context of its judging panels widely disseminated, when the bases of these evaluations, firstly, may have had little to do with literary merit, and, secondly, may have had little claim to being regarded as representative.

¹⁹ See Schuecking, (Op. Cit.) p58.

CONCLUSION TO PART 2

I have shown in the preceding two chapters how social, political and economic factors combine to affect the reception and dissemination of fiction. In addition I have examined the way in which economic and political factors may influence the continued existence of fiction. To this extent it must therefore be clear that the phenomenon of the Booker Prize in the 1980s should not be studied in isolation, with no attempt made to relate either the development of the prize's influence or its inner structure to the broader picture.

It is clear from Chapter Three that the reliance on any form of patronage has its own pitfalls. These may include the risk of direct intervention by the patron in order to influence how the writer goes about his work or the inability to survive when that patronage is withdrawn. It is clear however that business sponsorship differs from more traditional forms of patronage in a number of ways. These include the scale of funding involved, and the aims of the company in sponsoring.

Given that the latter have to do with maximising publicity from the company involved, sponsorship of this kind is usually highly conspicuous, tends to be more conservative in that it goes to more established artists and events, and in the case of the Booker Prize, tends also not to be available to those writers who are most in need.

Thus the argument that large business-sponsored literary prizes serve a useful purpose in giving a much-needed boost to financially strapped writers is only of limited validity. Furthermore, in attempting to affirm the social status of the writer, prizes in reality probably do more to confer a celebrity status on the winning author than to encourage a serious appraisal

of him or her as an artist. Nevertheless, for reasons which relate to the sponsor's desire for prestige by association, prizes such as the Booker usually make much of the importance of the writer's role in society. This can be seen, for example, in both the early and more recent press releases for this award.

In seeking to 're-affirm' the role of the author, however, the organisers of award such as the Booker appear to desire for the author a status and role which have long been out-of-date, and which relate more to Victorian perceptions of the writer than to the reality of the current situation. Furthermore, while it may be argued that there is nothing wrong in attempting to regain some lost territory for the writer in terms of prestige, the preferred status which the Booker Prize in particular seems to want to claim for the writer smacks of elitism.

This ties in with Chapter Four, where I have suggested that the common background and social interconnections which link judges, shortlisted authors, and Management Committee members for the Booker Prize justify its being labelled a coterie. The Booker is the Establishment prize, and may be said to be elitist in a social sense at least. In conferring on an author the accolade of 'winner' it extends to him or her the invitation to become part of that elite.

Furthermore, given that the Booker-shortlisted novels are usually those which are reviewed, which is not a significant percentage of all novels published in a year, given the prize's ability to influence what books are bought in Britain, and given, further, that there is at very least a tremendous scope for the substitution of social considerations for aesthetic ones, the Booker may be said to have potential to disrupt the reception process of fiction and thereby to further perpetuate elitist values.

While it may be argued that as the Establishment prize the Booker merely reflects the values of the Establishment, it can be seen from the level of sales it guarantees and the publicity it receives that this prize's ability to maximise the dissemination of such values is unrivalled.

Having argued in the two preceding chapters that social, economic and political factors may affect the reception and continued survival of fiction writing, and that all forms of patronage are likely to have an effect on the work itself I now wish to turn in the final part of the thesis to the literature itself. I shall argue among other things that the shared values of those involved with the Booker Prize are reflected in the novels selected for the shortlists.

PART 3

Evidence of Standardisation in the Novels which Won the Booker Prize, 1980-1989.

'The sphere of social phenomenon to which literature belongs is composed of many series (structures), each of which has its autonomous development. These are, for example, science, politics, economics, social stratification, language, morality, and religion. Despite their autonomy, however, the individual series influence one another...

Therefore, none of them must be made dominant a priori over the others...but neither should the basic importance and special character of a specific function of a given series (in the case of literature it is the aesthetic function related to the literary work as an aesthetic object) be overlooked, because if it were completely suppressed, the series would cease to be itself (for example, literature an art).'

JAN MUKAROVSKY,

"A note on the Czech translation of Sklovskij's
Theory of Prose."¹

¹ MUKAROVSKY, J., (1977), "A note on the Czech translation of Sklovskij's Theory of Prose", The Word and Verbal Art. Yale Russian and East European Studies 13, translated and edited by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. Yale University Press, New Haven and London, pp140-141.

PART 3: INTRODUCTION

Having stated in the Introduction to this thesis that the most important concern for the literary specialist was the extent and scope of the effects which the Booker Prize may be said to have had on fiction-writing itself, I now wish to examine this issue further with detailed reference to the novels which won the prize during the 1980s.

In the two chapters which follow I shall look at one area in particular where it seems that the fiction may have been affected, that is in respect of an apparent standardisation among those novels which won. I shall examine two different aspects of standardisation. In Chapter Five I shall address the issue of standardisation as regards the use of language, and in Chapter Six I shall examine what evidence there is of standardisation in relation to similarities in the treatment of a common theme.

In Chapter Five I shall use the methods of key word analysis in order to establish whether there are similarities between the winning novels in the use of key words. In order to get a clearer picture of what patterns are evident here however, I shall compare the patterns of frequency of occurrence of words among Booker winners with the patterns which exist among a control group of four other novels chosen at random.

In Chapter Six I have chosen to focus on certain aspects of the theme of suffering. I shall focus not so much on the recurrence of this very broad theme, but on the similarities which are evident in the way in which certain types of suffering appear in these novels, and the way in which suffering is depicted via what I have labelled 'motifs of suffering'. I shall attempt to identify a number of recognisable motifs which appear in several novels and to illustrate that the recurrent use of such motifs suggests that standardisation exists here too.

CHAPTER FIVE

Evidence of Standardisation (1). Evidence of a Linguistic Homogeneity: a Key Word Analysis of Four Booker Winners.

'Unless spontaneity enters at some point or another, literary creation is impossible, and language itself becomes ossified.'¹

Until now I have concentrated mainly on the socio-historical context of the Booker Prize. Now, however, having raised the issue of homogeneity in the previous chapter, I wish to examine the effects which a prize dominated by the literary establishment may be said to have on fiction itself.

My methodology in this chapter has involved the use of a key word analysis of several important scenes chosen from each of the Booker novels selected. However, in order to have as clear a picture as possible of what linguistic links may exist among the Booker texts, I have also chosen a control group of four novels which did not win the prize with which to compare results from the first group.

The four Booker winners which I have chosen from the 1980-1989 period are, Anita Brookner's Hotel du Lac, Kingsley Amis's The Old Devils, Penelope Lively's 1987 winner, Moon Tiger, and, lastly, Kazuo Ishiguro's The Remains of the Day. In choosing these four texts, I have been influenced by the fact that each of them may be said to be representative, certainly in terms of the backgrounds of the authors, of certain characteristics of the prize which have already been identified.

All of the first three authors are Oxbridge-educated. All but Brookner had had a history of prize-winning before going on to success in the Booker. Again, all but Brookner had been on the shortlist before. Finally, all but

¹ ORWELL, G., (1946), "The Prevention of Literature", The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell 4. In Front of Your Nose, 1945-50. edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, Secker and Warburg, London, 1958.

Ishiguro were formerly University dons. However, Ishiguro may be said to represent the 'new Establishment' bias of the prize towards the University of East Anglia.

Although the novels in the control group were chosen largely at random, each has a particular interest for this study. Martin Amis's Money and Muriel Spark's A Far Cry from Kensington were both notable absentees from Booker shortlists, in 1984 and 1989 respectively, and in each case this created something of a stir.

Even though James Kelman's novel, A Disaffection, was shortlisted for the 1989 prize, it appears not to exemplify any of the 'typical' characteristics of Booker novels, either in the background of the author, or in the theme of the novel. It is not only a Scottish novel, (though in many respects it is more 'European' than any novel on the shortlist in recent years), but it is also one which deals with, or shows an awareness of, working-class experience.

John Mortimer's novel Summer's Lease, is of special interest in that Mortimer was one of the first authors whose copyrights were held by Booker McConnell after they decided to diversify during the 1960s. Like many of Mortimer's novels and plays, this novel was successfully adapted for television, and it is unlike any of the others here in that, although it is highly literate, it is unashamedly a 'popular' novel. This may be said to be underlined by the fact that the novel is, to some extent, an example of that most popular of literary genres, the detective novel.

There are two questions which I wish to address in this chapter. Firstly, do similarities in the use of vocabulary exist from one author to another among the Booker texts chosen, and if so, what kind of similarities?

Secondly, do novels in the Booker Prize-winning group differ significantly from the novels in the control group in this respect?

I shall now look at the novels which have won the Booker Prize, and first of all I will consider Anita Brookner's novel Hotel du Lac.

The central character in this novel is Edith Hope, a writer of romantic fiction. Edith has been forced to spend a period of 'exile' at the Swiss hotel of the title since she has jilted the man she was supposed to marry. The reason for Edith's presence at the hotel is not explained until well into the novel. As the narrative progresses, it becomes clear that Edith has many conflicting emotions with regard to relationships. One of the reasons for her inability to go through with the marriage to Geoffrey Long has been her love for a married antique dealer, David Simmonds. Edith also realises, however, that although she maybe wishes for commitment and love within a partnership, such a relationship may well be only an ideal, and may never happen.

There is a further tension for Edith between being an independent career woman, and being in a relationship where such independence may be impossible, even though the relationship itself may be fulfilling in other ways. During the course of her stay at the hotel, Edith receives a proposal of marriage from one of the other guests, a Mr Neville, and as a result of this and of her contact with the additional guests at the hotel, she is forced to reconsider her choices.

Brookner's technique is to create an atmosphere with words, as if painting a picture with a range of tones. Throughout the novel, and especially in Chapter One, many words are used which suggest Edith's sadness and her inability to express her feelings. A key word used to develop this theme is 'grey', and there are other words which are closely

related. In fact 'grey' is used throughout the novel as a kind of *leitmotiv*, in order to suggest muted emotion. It is clear that Edith's relationship with Neville is doomed, from the moment he first appears as:

'...a tall man in a light grey suit.'(p55)

I wish to examine three important scenes in this novel in order to assess what the key words are. The first of these occurs on pp25-29 where Edith has lunch with her agent, Harold Webb.

This scene is essential to the novel as a whole in that it is here that Edith's views on relationships are revealed. These are made clear through a discussion of the fable of the tortoise and the hare, and its relation to Edith's fiction. Edith wishes to believe in the underlying message of the novels she writes; however she acknowledges that in real life, men prefer glamorous women to 'mouse-like' creatures like herself.

There are several important word groups here. Words dealing with separation and loneliness are important, as they are elsewhere in the novel. 'Gone' is repeated three times within eleven lines (p29), 'going' twice, and 'leave', 'separation', 'lonely', 'lost', 'abandoning' and the emphatic phrase 'never to return' all feature. There are also words expressing sadness and these include 'upset' (twice), 'alas', 'consolation', 'imploringly' and 'regretting'. Also 'tortoise' and 'hare' both occur frequently.

Edith and Neville go on two outings and it is while they are on the second of these that Neville proposes marriage (pp157-170). On the earlier trip up a mountain (pp90-102), the clarity of vision afforded by high altitude and fine weather is reflected in the use of more forceful words and those suggestive of positive emotions, and this is contrasted with the second outing, a boat trip across the lake. Here, both emotions and weather are

clouded, and this is indicated in the words, 'mist', 'grey' (again) and 'veil'. Neville's smile is described, as ever, as being 'ambiguous', and the weather and the slow passage of the boat add to Edith's feelings of being 'cut off'. This feeling is further conveyed by the words 'desolate', 'hopeless', and 'deserted', and in the phrases 'no hope' and 'lost bearings'.

Neville's actual proposal of marriage is characteristic in its use of very formal vocabulary. He talks about 'arrangements' when discussing marriage plans and the word is echoed by Edith, perhaps in a linguistic prefiguring of how any future marriage would work. Most telling of all is the way in which Neville approaches the subject. He is only less controlled² at this point, and more important is the mental picture Edith has of him. The words used to describe him here suggest duty and responsibility, and these include 'fastidious', 'careful' and the phrase which describes him as the sort of man who 'would inevitably have a fine library'.

Neville does not express love for Edith or even ask her to marry him but says:

'I think you should marry me Edith.' (p163)

It is significant that when the word 'love' does finally appear it is introduced by Neville, but in relation to the material things which he has to offer, and to which he is 'sure' Edith will be attracted (p164).

The use of the passive form throughout the novel is indicative of Edith's powerlessness in the face of strong suggestion from others, and here the use of 'should' again indicates Neville's 'control', and also suggests that, if

² My emphasis.

she were to marry him, Edith would be controlled by Neville, albeit subtly.³

The final scene which I wish to look at from this novel is very short. In just over half a page (p183), Edith discovers Neville emerging from Jennifer Pusey's bedroom and realises that if she were to marry him, she would receive no real emotional commitment. The vocabulary which Brookner has previously used to evoke a sense of muted emotion and dulled communication is again brought into play here, though this time, in part, for ironic purposes, for Neville literally wishes not to be heard.

The key words, 'silently' and 'dim' which are both recurrent throughout the novel, occur here with 'anxious not to awaken or alarm' referring to Edith, and 'concentrated on making no noise', in one last reprise of vocabulary suggesting dulled emotion. Once more Neville is 'controlled' and 'ambiguous', and it is at this point that Edith finally realises why. In spite of his attention to her in the past 'he had felt nothing' while she had unambiguously 'wept' on the boat.

In Penelope Lively's Moon Tiger, which won the Booker in 1987, the central theme is that of history as memory. The main character in the book, Claudia Hampton, has formerly been a writer of popular history. Now she lies dying in a hospital bed. Claudia announces in the first sentence of the novel:

'I'm writing a history of the world..' (p1)

However, she makes it clear that it this will not be a chronological history, for, she says:

'There is no chronology inside my head',

³ This is further reinforced by the assumption Neville makes that Edith will write under the name Neville if they marry (p165).

and, moreover, it 'irritates' her (p2).

The novel proceeds from the 'pre-history' of Claudia's childhood to the 'Crusades' of the Second World War, then on to the present day. However, as memory does not function chronologically, so her history flits between the different stages of her life, guided more by the potency of the memories, and by which of these she wishes to cover over, than by linear time.

Again, I shall concentrate on three incidents in the novel in order to look at key words. One of these occurs in what is the thematic and structural centre of the novel, Claudia's time in Egypt with her lover Tom, while another contains a revelation about her childhood. Firstly, however, I wish to examine Claudia's explanation of, and justification for, the course her history is to take, and this appears on pp2-4. ['There are plenty ... Charmouth beach in 1920'].

Key words here, as throughout the novel, are 'history' and 'chronicle', (and 'chronicler' and 'historian'), 'kaleidoscope', 'kaleidoscopic', and 'ammonite'.

The words 'tendency', 'narrative', 'colour', 'self-centred', 'nurse', 'curled' and 'blue', which each appear once, are of some significance in that these are words which reappear frequently and at regular intervals throughout the novel, often at crucial points. Sometimes the words are changed slightly, however, either in sense or in form. Thus 'blue' (p4) becomes 'blues' (p75) and 'blue-green' (p198), while the word 'nurse', used here to indicate a child-minder, occurs elsewhere at crucial points in the novel⁴ but in reference to nurses in a hospital.

⁴ E. g. p1, and p130 where Claudia miscarries Tom's baby.

The second key scene I wish to examine is on pp75-79. In this scene, the Moon Tiger, an insect repellent, burns while Claudia and Tom make love, and afterwards while they lie awake, talking.

The two words, 'Moon Tiger', appear six times here, three of these within six lines of each other, at the beginning of the scene. These two words however first appear in the novel on p50, where Claudia, watching a television programme about the Second World War years later remembers the smell of the Moon Tiger. In the scene set in Egypt, the smoky coil, which glows in unison with Tom's cigarette, becomes emblematic of the passing of time, and by the end of the scene the Moon Tiger is:

'..almost entirely burnt away.'

Although the words 'Moon Tiger' do not appear again after this scene, the word 'cigarette' recurs more frequently throughout the novel than virtually any other noun.

Other words which appear (pp75-79) and which are repeated throughout the novel are the colours 'green', 'red' and 'grey', though of the three, the colour 'red', which appears twice, (pp75-76) is the most common colour in the novel, again, like 'blue' appearing often in composite forms such as 'blood-red' (p17). In fact, 'red' is one of the most frequently repeated adjectives in the whole novel, appearing over twenty times.

The word 'innocent' appears three times here, (p77) and again throughout the novel, as does the phrase 'apportioning the blame'. Claudia frequently wonders about the point of suffering in history and rails at God for this. Tied in with this, there are many phrases throughout the novel implying a sense of guilt.

Tom confesses in this scene to a fear of 'large dogs' and the word 'dogs', along with 'red', is one of the most recurrent in the novel. Again, this word often appears as part of a composite word, such as 'hang-dog' or 'dog-tired', and together with the related 'Labrador', 'Spaniel' and 'Fox terrier' appears more frequently than most.⁵

The word 'egocentric' reappears as Tom describes his adolescence, during which time he says he became less so. 'Egocentric' is a word usually used in connection with Claudia's lover in later life, Jasper, and the two men are implicitly contrasted here via this word.

One other word which appears twice here (p77) and which is important throughout the rest of the novel is 'mother', as are the two words 'Home Counties'.

The final scene which I wish to examine for linguistic content occurs on pp137-138, and it describes what has previously only been implied in the novel, that is, that Claudia and her brother Gordon have had an incestuous relationship in their youth. This is hinted at in a scene which, though occurring later chronologically, is described at an earlier point in the novel.⁶

In the earlier scene (p74), while Tom and Claudia are on a trip to the tomb of a pharaoh, the subject of incest arises. The phrase 'the faint stir of interest' prefigures the use of the word 'incest' in the following line. Similarly on p138, after the brother and sister kiss, the word 'incest' does not appear as such but is notable for its absence, and is suggested by the quasi-Joycean 'insect-like' only two paragraphs later (p138).

⁵ E. g. see pages 31, 42, 43, 43, 51, 72, 77, 86, 97, 98, 102, 169, 170 and 174.

⁶ I. e. thus underlining Claudia's view on chronology and memory.

The kiss between the siblings is described in the following terms:

'his tongue between her lips, her mouth opening..' (p138).

In the scene at the pharaoh's tomb, Claudia is suddenly 'erotically possessed' at the sight of a picture of the pharaonic couple (who are siblings) on the tomb, and thereafter she and Tom kiss:

'his tongue searching her mouth..' (p74).

The 'erotic possession', described in the scene from her childhood, is suggested by the frequent repetition of:

'slow, quick, quick, slow',

and by:

'body to bodyagain thigh to thigh' (p137).

'Thigh' is a sexual word throughout the novel, and, in the second key scene mentioned above, Tom:

'.. lays a hand on her thigh' (p76).

I now wish to look at Kingsley Amis's novel, The Old Devils, which won the Booker Prize in 1986. This novel is set in Wales and is about a group of friends, recently retired, who are coming to terms with the onslaught of old age. Most of them find this difficult, and part of this is due to the fact that there are still some painful memories from the past. The catalyst for the action in the novel is the news that Alun Weaver, a hack writer and a philanderer, and his wife Rhiannon, are coming back to live in Wales.

The first section of Chapter One (pp1-10) is the first of three scenes which I wish to examine. Here, Malcolm and Gwen Cellan-Davies have

just received a letter from the Weavers announcing their intention to return to Wales.

There are several key words and word groups here, the most noticeable of which is the pairing 'no/not', and the large number of words which end with 'n't', for example, 'wouldn't', 'can't', 'haven't'. The first page has a description of a gesture which the rather sour Gwen makes:

'..when she was putting something to someone, often a possible negative view of a third party' (p1),

and this sets the tone for much of the vocabulary in this section. Related to these negative terms is the frequent occurrence of the words 'down' and 'lower'.

Words indicating location make up a significant grouping here, and this underlines the specifically Welsh setting of the novel. 'Wales' appears in the very first sentence and Wales, or the *idea* of Wales, is a great unifying theme in the novel. There are many Welsh or Welsh-sounding place names here such as 'Llanelli' and the fictional 'Mynydd Tywyll'. 'Welsh' also appears frequently, both as a descriptive noun and also as the language.

Given the theme of old age, it is perhaps not surprising to find a large number of terms which deal with the passing of time. These include 'a long time ago' (p3), 'thirty-five years' (p3), 'not now' (p7), 'two minutes' (p6) and many others. Related to this is the high incidence of numbers and quantities, for example, 'one' (p1), 'a few' (p2), 'two' (p4), and 'sixty-one' (p5), and these again indicate an increasing awareness of age.

There is a strong correlation between these words and word groups and those which recur in a later scene, (pp237-241), where Alun and Charlie's wife neglect to pick up Charlie from the local pub at Birdarthur and instead

make love outside. Charlie is terrified of the dark, and in attempting to return to the house on his own, becomes so disturbed that it is necessary to call his brother Victor in order to calm him down.

From the beginning of the sentence 'They arrived back at the cottage..' (p237), to the paragraph which ends 'finally Victor arrived' (p241), there is again a very high incidence of 'no', 'not' and words ending in 'n't', though there is no corresponding recurrence of 'down' and 'lower'. Neither is there a stress on place names, though unavoidably and less noticeably at this advanced point in the novel, the names of several characters appear frequently. There is again a high occurrence both of phrases referring to the passing of time (e. g. 'still' (p239); 'then' (p238); 'lately' (p238)) and also words indicating numbers and quantities (e. g. 'two' (p237, p239); 'fifteen' (p238); 'two hundred' (p239); and 'several times' (p240)).

The final scene which I wish to examine is central thematically and structurally to the novel, coming as it does almost exactly in the centre of the book.

Here Malcolm and Rhiannon, who had a relationship in the past, go on a day's outing. Malcolm presents Rhiannon with a whole list of facts relating to the date of a previous visit to the spot where they stop. Rhiannon pretends that she too remembers the details of a day which has obviously meant a great deal to Malcolm. The truth of the matter is, however, that she is unable to remember anything, and suddenly her duplicity becomes obvious to Malcolm (p167). From mid-way down p167 until the end of the chapter (p169), Malcolm is, first of all, bitterly disappointed, then attempts to comfort Rhiannon, who by this point is in tears.

The passage deals with the theme of remembering and of not being able to remember, and the words 'remember', 'remembered' or 'remembering' are

repeated, in total, eight times. The sense of current ability being compared with past potential is underlined by the frequent use of 'still' and 'now', and also in 'could' and 'would'. Again the words 'no' and 'not' recur frequently and also there is a stress on words indicating location, including place names. Numbers and quantities are also in evidence again in 'a few', 'twelfth', 'twice', and in the date '17th June 1867' (p167).

In addition a group of words and phrases expressing emotional states, particularly sad feelings, is noticeable. These include 'sorely missed', 'helplessly', 'disappointment', 'unashamed intensity' (all p167), 'feelings', 'hopeless', 'worry', 'wretchedly' (p168) and 'pleasure' and 'dreamily' (p169). This group of words is more in evidence here than in the other passages, and there is also more description here. Furthermore, direct speech is interspersed with short paragraphs of narrative.

Thus it can be seen that there are more striking links between key words and groups of words in each of the three passages here than in the previous novels mentioned, in that certain groups are constant in each passage.

The final Booker winner which I wish to examine from the period 1980-1989, is Kazuo Ishiguro's novel, The Remains of the Day.

The narrator of the novel is Stevens, formerly butler to Lord Darlington of Darlington Hall, and now serving out the remaining years of his life under the new owner, Mr Farraday. Mr Farraday, an American, encourages Stevens to take the car and go on a motoring trip. Thus, the butler decides to use the opportunity to visit a former colleague, Miss Kenton, who is now married and living in the West Country. As the novel progresses, however, it becomes clear that the main reason Miss Kenton left Darlington Hall was her unrequited love for Stevens.

In this novel, which is set in 1956, it is probably true to say that the way language is used as a whole, for example the use of circumlocution in order to indicate the stuffiness of the narrator, is more important than the recurrent use of individual words or phrases, though it is true that certain phrases do recur throughout. The general patterns in the author's use of language however are usually more noticeable in passages of narrative than in those of direct speech.

The first scene which I wish to examine comes in three short paragraphs on pp28-29, and its importance lies in the fact that it introduces Stevens' ideas on what makes a great butler. This theme is crucial to the novel, not only in that it is something about which the usually reserved Stevens seems to feel strongly, but also in that it is Stevens' attempts at perfection in this area which have effectively cut him off from his feelings and, above all, from his ability to love.

'Great' and 'greatness' are repeated several times here, as they are throughout the novel. Stevens 'recalls' discussions on the topic in the past, ('recall' being a preferred verb throughout the text), which took place in the 'servants hall', and duty-related vocabulary dominates the passage. This includes the words 'profession' and 'professionals', which together with 'professionalism' recur throughout the novel, 'servants', 'butler', which, predictably, appears several times, and the word 'employee' which occurs several times here. The word 'understand', used here, recurs throughout the novel and is often used ironically, since this is the one thing that Stevens cannot do.

The second crucial scene I wish to examine occurs (pp103-109) when Stevens' aged father, also formerly a butler, takes ill and dies. Stevens, however, carries on attending to the delegates at the conference which is

taking place at the Hall, and there is a contrast made throughout this passage, between his concern for Dupont, a guest who has sore feet, and his unwillingness to pull himself away from duties to attend to his dying father.

There is some suggestion of emotion on the part of Stevens, and this is conveyed in the repetition of the phrase 'all right' (p105). The fact that Stevens denies three times that there is anything wrong, and by extension denies his feelings for his father, implies a Biblical allusion.⁷ That this parallel is intended is suggested by the conversation taking place in the background, where a Belgian clergyman uses the word 'heretical' twice.

Throughout this novel there is a high number of words and phrases indicating regret, and in this passage the phrase 'I'm sorry' is repeated throughout to underline Stevens' unexpressed regret at the death of his father and his remorse at his own behaviour. The contrast made between the plight of Dupont and that of Stevens' father is further highlighted by the context in which the phrase occurs. While Miss Kenton uses 'I'm sorry' to express her condolences at the death of Stevens' father, (p106) Stevens himself uses the phrase to apologise to Dupont for his lack of aid. In addition the phrase is also used by the butler (p107) to express lack of comprehension when one of the guests teases him.

The word 'good' re-appears in this passage, and is used several times in the dialogue which takes place between Stevens and Dupont (p107).

Throughout the novel, Stevens' attention to duty is illustrated by the use of the word 'immediately' in that it is linked with the butler's ability to fulfil his duties satisfactorily. In this passage (p107), his sense of failing is

⁷ I. e. Peter's denial of Christ in the New Testament. The name 'Stevens' itself suggests an ironic allusion to Stephen, the first martyr of the Christian church, the implication here being that Stevens is supposed to be seen as a martyr to duty.

expressed in his admission to Dupont (p107) that 'assistance is not immediately available'.

The final scene which I wish to examine here takes place (pp232-240) when the ageing Stevens meets up with Miss Kenton, now Mrs Benn, in the tea lounge of a hotel in the West Country. ['Going in through the door..' (p232)] In a manner not dissimilar to Brookner's technique in Hotel du Lac, the words 'grey' and 'gloom', and the stress on the fact that there is poor light and bad weather outside are all used to express emotional states.

The fact that emotions are touched upon, albeit obliquely, justifies the recurrence of the words 'surprisingly', and 'strangers' since elsewhere in the novel Stevens' inability to cope with spontaneity means that 'surprises' are often accompanied by a sense of 'alarm'.

Throughout this passage, as elsewhere in the novel, phrases such as 'turn back the clock' (p239), and 'for a long time (p238), re-introduce the theme of the passing of time. There is a frequent juxta-positioning of past and present here, and as with Kingsley Amis's novel, specifically of past capabilities with the limitations that accompany old age.

Again, as before, this is a high frequency and variety of words related to duty, and these again include 'professional', 'professionalism', and 'work'. Although the word 'personal' appears several times here, Stevens avoids the issue of emotional commitment, and thus the implied 'close relationship' between himself and Mrs Benn is expressed in terms of a 'close working relationship' (p234).

The word 'immediately' again occurs (p235), as does the verb 'recall', and a sense of culpability is expressed in Stevens' repetition of the phrase

'forgive me' and in the appearance, yet again, of 'I'm sorry'. 'Good' (p235 and p237) and 'kind' (p239, p240), also recur and Mrs Benn's phrase 'some trivial little thing' (p239) mirrors Stevens' use of 'quite trivial' (p5).

Ishiguro's overall theme, and his use of recurrent phrases to suggest the passing of time ⁸ show similarities with The Old Devils, and as I have mentioned there are similarities between Brookner's technique and Ishiguro's ways of suggesting sadness and unexpressed emotion in the final scene which I have looked at above.

I now wish to turn to the four novels which did not win the Booker Prize. As it was included on the shortlist the year Ishiguro's novel won, the first novel which I shall consider here, though chronologically it occurs at the end of the period covered, is James Kelman's A Disaffection.

In 1984 Kelman's novel The Busconductor Hines had been one of those originally submitted for the prize. However, the Chairman of the panel of judges that year, Richard Cobb, had singled out the novel without actually naming it in his after dinner speech, and criticised it for its use of the vernacular. Here in A Disaffection the same use of Glaswegian dialect means that the issue of language is given an extra dimension.

Patrick Doyle, the central character in A Disaffection, has gradually become cynical about life in general, and specifically about being a teacher. In particular he is cynical about the teacher's role as authority figure in a society that he sees to be basically corrupt and immoral. Doyle acknowledges that he takes things too seriously, but he feels alienated from the majority of the people with whom he has contact. He is in love with

⁸ In the first paragraph of the novel, for example, Ishiguro (p3) rather cleverly suggests time running on through the use of a progression of phrases implying ever-increasing lengths of time. Thus, 'some days' proceeds to 'five or six days', then 'a fortnight', and finally 'five weeks'.

Alison Houston, a teacher at the school where he works however, Alison is married. Doyle frequently debates in his own mind, firstly, whether or not he really is *in* love with her, and secondly, if so, whether or not it would be appropriate to confront her. Towards the end of the novel he does, finally, manage to broach the subject.

At the beginning of the book, Doyle, who has clearly felt this way for some time, finds a set of electricians' pipes round the back of the local Arts Centre, and thereafter he starts to make plans to change his life. Playing on the pipes takes on a quasi-spiritual significance for Doyle, in that this somehow manages to put him in touch with his feelings. In time, however, he realises that the pipes are no substitute for human contact.

In the first passage I have chosen to examine (pp1-6), Doyle's disaffection is outlined briefly, then there is a description of him finding the pipes, and the fact that this seems to have a positive effect on him. His feelings for the group of teachers with whom he has been out drinking are then described, and in particular his feelings for Alison. There then follows a passage of dialogue between Doyle and Alison as he drives her home. After this, he goes back to his own flat with the pipes, and decides to go to bed. The scene ends with him lying awake in in bed, thinking about his fellow teachers.

The most frequently recurring words here are 'pipes', 'smiled' and 'smiling', 'fucking', 'something', 'nothing' and 'anything', and 'happy' and 'happiness'. There is also frequent use of the words 'warm' and 'warmth', and 'cold', and 'coldness' (p5), firstly, in relation to the lack of heat in the flat, then in relation to the lack of emotional warmth. 'Glanced', 'nodded', 'stared', and 'shook' are all important here and they recur throughout the novel, the latter usually in the context of Doyle or Alison shaking their heads.

This passage is extremely important both thematically and also since the appearance of the word 'pipes' initiates a recurrent use of alliteration on 'p', usually, though not always, at the beginning of words.⁹ Words beginning with 'p' are a central focus of Doyle's thoughts and his own name is, at times, transformed in his mind to 'P for Pat' (e. g. p109).

In the second scene which I wish to examine (p37), the importance of words beginning with the letter 'p' is reflected in one of Doyle's frequent musings on the Pythagoreans. Furthermore, not only does 'Pythagorean' begin with 'p', but the Pythagoreans themselves reduced everything, including names, to numbers (p37). Thus Doyle's initials become reduced to:

'16:4 based on the twenty-six letter roman alphabet..'

Kelman's use of language in this novel is notable for the awareness it displays of the music of spoken language¹⁰, and, in particular, of Glaswegian speech. There is a development here of the theme of the sound and of the appearance of words. Doyle believes that certain consonants, as they appear in names, are essential for survival. The 'n' sound at the end of names, which is apparent in the Christian names of the supply teacher, Norman, and that of Alison, as well as in the surname of Milne, Doyle's headmaster, appears to him to be necessary for survival in the world. Patrick sympathises with Desmond, a colleague whom he usually dislikes, in that his name ends with a 'd'. This, Doyle believes, is as unfortunate as having a name which ends in 'k', such as Patrick (pp36-37).

⁹ This can be seen, for example, on pp4-5.

'The pipes could be looked upon as a surrogate pet. Even better! A surrogate child! Or wife for god sake! In fact these very pipes represented the whole wide world. With these pipes in tow anything was possible. Nay! Probable.'

¹⁰ E. g. see the 'music' of the letter box being flapped by the policeman (p58) and of his father's whistling sounds (p118).

In spite of early hopes that the pipes could become a surrogate pet, child, or wife, Doyle realises (p157) that:

'...playing the pipes was not a substitute for sex.'

He remains pre-occupied by Alison, and eventually, after learning that he is to receive a transfer to another school, he arranges to meet up with her, as usual, in a bar. The final scene which I wish to look at here is the meeting which takes between them (pp228-236).

Here, Alison allows him to touch her hand for the first time. She seems to be fairly confused about her feelings for him, however, she tells Doyle that she does not want to have a relationship with him since it would be too 'complicated' (p230). Doyle accepts this and finds himself trying to make *her* feel better, as she seems upset. They sit close to one another, then Doyle makes the mistake of asking Alison if she loves her husband. At this point she decides it is time they left. Outside she tells him the question was unfair, and she worries that the people in the bar will have overheard their conversation. However, she still allows Doyle to hold her and to kiss her forehead. Then, refusing a lift, she takes a taxi home, leaving Doyle wondering if he should follow in his car.

Words which recur here include 'smiled', 'something'¹¹, 'head' and 'forehead', the phrase 'shook his (or her) head', and again the verbs 'nodded', 'grinned' and 'gazed'. There is also a recurrence of 'tomato juice' as, once again, Doyle attempts to impress Alison by not drinking. 'Cigarette', 'smoke', 'crazy' and 'daft' all recur.

The fact that Doyle has discovered the pipes to be no substitute for sex is reflected in the use of language here. This can be seen both in the absence of the word 'pipes' and in the fact that words which were previously used

¹¹ Alison is described as being 'something special' (p4).

to refer to the pipes are now used in relation to Alison. Thus, where earlier he carried a pipe under each 'elbow', here he puts his hand on the side of Alison's 'elbow'. Likewise, where before he took the pipes back to a 'cold' flat, here he stands out in the 'cold' with her. Furthermore, alliteration tends to fall on words beginning with 's' rather than with 'p', and, for example, 'smile' although it appeared in the first passage above is far more frequent here.

However, it is not all progress. Where before Alison was seen to be 'noticing everything' (p2), at the beginning of this scene she does not even 'notice' Doyle (p228).

There are significant new elements in this passage. 'Touch' is repeated very frequently here, as is the word 'hand', and neither of these figures in the initial passage. Other significant new elements are the repetition within the passage of 'sorry' and 'I'm sorry', and the repetition of phrases which Alison uses to tell Pat that she does not want to go out with him.¹²

There is a recurrence here of the words 'fucking' and 'fuck', but these are less frequent here than elsewhere. 'Fuck', 'fucking', and 'fuck off' appear throughout the novel, and the appearance of 'fuck off' usually signifies Doyle's attempts to veer away from particularly painful thoughts. Indeed, it is a repetition of these two words which ends the novel (p337). However, the function of 'fuck' and of 'fucking' overall, is that they effectively provide a linguistic unity in the text. The words recur throughout, in the midst of shifts of emphases, and moves from narrative to direct speech, and although 'fuck' figures frequently in Kelman's work, its presence here helps to underline thematically Doyle's lack of 'a fuck'.

¹² E. g . c. f. 'It would just make things so complicated' and 'It would make things so complicated' (p230) and Things are always so complicated' (p233). Also 'I dont want to have a relationship with ye' (p230), and 'I dont want a relationship with ye' (p232); also, 'I just can't have a relationship with ye' and 'I just can't' (p232). Finally, 'I'm not going to have a relationship with ye' (p235).

The appearance of such language in this novel however probably did not increase its chances of winning the Booker Prize. The same is true of the language of Martin Amis's Money.

Here language is used to reflect the theme of the book, which is the pornography of money. In a materially oriented society, nothing has any inherent value. Money, however, is essential, since it buys instant gratification of all appetites. The language of the novel reflects this in that it is fast-paced, throwaway and immediate, and this immediacy is strengthened by the high proportion of direct speech. Amis's narrator, John Self, furthermore, lacks a formal narrative style. He is spontaneous, confiding, explicit about his faults and his obsessions.

Language also helps to convey the sense of dislocation in the novel. Self's language is colloquial, yet it is a colloquial speech which belongs to no one place and is a mixture of American English, cockney, and Self's own highly individual slang.

The highly complex plot of Money centres on the attempt by ex-tv commercial director Self to get funding in America for his new film, originally to be titled "Good Money". Self flits back and forth from London to New York, while at the same time indulging his obsession with pornography, and attempting to track down his nubile, money-fixated lover, Selina Street. The plot of the film, is based on incidents in Self's life. However, Doris Arthur, the lesbian screenwriter brought in to dramatise the scenario, presents a travesty of Self's original idea. At this point, Self drafts in the services of Martin Amis, a writer who lives nearby, to re-write the screenplay.

Central to the action of the novel is the youthful figure of Fielding Goodney, a producer whom Self has previously met on a trip to Los Angeles. Goodney constantly urges Self to spend ever-increasing amounts of money on expenses. However what Self does not realise is that all the time Goodney is actually defrauding him of his own money. This is possible because of Self's surname, which Goodney gets him to countersign on official documents related to finance.

I wish to look at three passages in this novel, firstly, Self's visit to a brothel on Third Avenue (pp98-101), then (pp131-136), Self's meeting with his beautiful friend Martina Twain, and, finally, (pp373-379), the scene where Self and Amis play a game of chess prior to Self's 'suicide attempt.'

In the first passage, Amis teases the reader by using vocabulary that can be read subliminally as sexual. For example, the reader is encouraged to make the assumption that Self and a prostitute are talking about some sexual act when Self asks her:

'Yeah, well what do you do? Use the blow-dry after the towels or what?!' (p99)

In fact they are talking about how to dry hair, and the word 'rug', used to mean 'hair', is one of the most frequent in this passage. The reader however is clearly meant to think of 'blow-job' when reading 'blow-dry', and certainly 'blow-job' features throughout the novel up to this point.

An important word group here, as elsewhere in the novel, is those words which imply two of anything. These include 'two', 'double-fisted', 'second', and 'both', and the word 'Twine' in the song that Self hums pre-figures his later meeting with Martina Twain, whose surname also has connotations of doubles.

Given what is in many ways a highly misogynistic text, it is interesting to look at the words used here to describe women. These include 'sex-stewardess', 'women', 'girl', 'chick', 'heft-dispenser', 'unit', and 'bimbo'. One of the general features of the text is that women tend to be referred to purely in terms of their sexual function, and this is clearly related to Amis's message that in a materialistic society, everything becomes a commodity, even women.¹³ 'She-she', the name of one of the prostitutes, is the most repeated word in this passage.

Alcohol, another of Self's many addictions, is described several times here and is usually referred to by the word 'drink'. Liquid in general, however, is suggested in the words 'cordially', 'brothel', 'whine', and 'bargirl'.

Even in a brothel Self cannot forget money, perhaps especially not here, and vocabulary to do with money features largely in this passage. Money-related words include 'dough', 'wallet', 'money', and 'pricey', and the close link between money and sex is reflected in the description of a girl as a 'cashier'.

One of the words which recurs constantly throughout the book is 'handjob', seen here on p98. 'Handjobs' are seen throughout as the ultimate instant gratification (see also p314). Usually Self supplies his own.

In the second passage, Self meets up with Martina Twain, and the cultural 'tone' of the novel is allowed to develop hereafter. Above all, the word which is indicative of this is 'aesthetics' which recurs several times here (pp130-136). This word also allows Amis to compare the two disparate value systems of Martina and John. Self's understanding of the word is

¹³ E. g. In a story told to arouse Self, Selina describes herself on top of an unnamed man as having been:

'... a cock, I'm just a cock' (p74).

related only to cosmetic dentistry, whereas Martina's is related to art and literature. Linked to 'aesthetics' is the word 'beautiful', used firstly to describe Martina, then Selina, then Ossie, Martina's husband. The word 'dog', which is introduced here is important in that it ties up with the later use of the word by Goodney, and also with constant references to Othello.

One of Amis's themes throughout the novel is that literature, art, and culture in general are necessary for any meaningful relationships, and Self decides in this scene that it is time he read more. The sensitivity which Twain brings is reflected in the recurrence of the phrase 'loved one', and in the repeated use of the words 'smile', and 'laugh', and it is noticeable that words used to describe women in this passage are generally more respectful, though 'chicks' appears again (p136) as does 'rape', the latter being a recurrent theme in the novel.

Self's thoughts constantly return to Selina, whom he suspects of infidelity, and the words 'faithful', 'unfaithful' and 'hyperunfaithful' are important here. In addition, 'known', 'unknown', and 'unknowing' are all repeated.

In this passage too, however, there are constant sexual undertones. Even Self's desire to expand his knowledge is expressed in sexually suggestive terms.¹⁴ Linked to this is the recurrence of the word 'money'.

In the final passage which I have chosen to examine (pp373-379), Self and Martin Amis, the character, engage in a chess match. The most frequently repeated words here are 'knight', 'pawn' and 'king', however it is another chess term, 'zugzwang', which, although not especially frequent here, is thematically central. Self, throughout the novel, has been 'forced to

¹⁴ E. g. '...if you're small and the thing you evade is big (have you ever had this dream?), then the only place to hide is a place where the big thing can't fit' (p135).

move' ¹⁵, the implication being that everyone in a materialistic society is, and the word 'move' itself is also frequent here.

Words which indicate a double nature again recur. Thus, 'double' appears frequently and Self and Amis are in a sense 'doubles' of each other. The doppelgaenger theme has been introduced earlier in the name of Martina's Alsatian dog, Shadow, and in this passage the two participants in the game of chess are seen in contrast with each other, one white, one black, though the word 'black' is more frequent here than 'white'.

Other themes which have been important earlier are reprised here through the recurrence of certain words, and the most important of these are 'beautiful' and 'money'.

The word 'dog', which was also introduced earlier is essential here. Self has mentioned his 'tinnitus' on several occasions, (e. g. p99) and in this passage the character Amis suggests that what Self heard as 'new man dog' when he punched Goodney was in fact 'inhuman dog'.¹⁶ Here then there is a reprise of the Othello motif.

In A Far Cry from Kensington, which is set in 1954, Muriel Spark skilfully intertwines several recurrent themes, and, as with her earlier Booker-shortlisted novel Loitering with Intent, there is a high level of interconnection among the characters in the novel. Inevitably both of these characteristically Sparkian traits are reflected in the recurrent use of certain words and phrases.

¹⁵ The character Amis's translation of 'zugzwang'.

¹⁶ E. g., see Othello, Act V, sc.1. Nevertheless the misheard phrase is linked thematically to Self's 'rebirth' after falling dead drunk on to rose bushes in the wake of Martina's dinner party, and also to Self seeing his fate as being in some way linked to that of Martina's dog (see p337).

Spark's central character and the narrator of the novel, is known only as 'Mrs Hawkins' at the start of the book. She is one of the many tenants of 14 Church End Villas, Kensington, and she works for the publishing company, Ullswater Press. As the novel progresses, so too does Mrs Hawkins. She begins to be called by her first name, 'Nancy', she loses weight, and she also starts a relationship with William, one of the other tenants in the house. However, Nancy also manages to lose several jobs on account of her criticism of the hack writer, Hector Bartlett, whom she labels a '*pisseur de copie*'. It is this phrase, above all, which provokes outrage and it is the source of much comedy in the novel.

Bartlett is the prodigy of the successful novelist Emma Loy, and as a result of Loy's intervention, Nancy is sacked, firstly from her job at Ullswater Press, then from her next post with the publishers MacKintosh and Tooley.

The interconnection of characters in the novel however ensures that Mrs Hawkins gains alternative employment each time through her contacts. However, these interconnections have a sinister side, and it transpires that the loathsome Bartlett has links with one of her fellow residents in Kensington, Wanda, the Polish seamstress, and also with her employer at MacKintosh and Tooley. Indeed, it turns out that Bartlett is indirectly responsible for the Polish woman's suicide.

The three scenes in the novel which I wish to examine in more detail are, firstly, Hector Bartlett's initial appearance in the novel (pp45-50); secondly (pp141-145), the scene where Nancy comes home to discover that Wanda has committed suicide, and, finally, the scene where Nancy encounters Bartlett again after a gap of thirty years (pp188-189).

The most striking feature of the first passage is the repetition of the phrase 'pisseur de copie',¹⁷ and its shortened form 'pisseur' (p49). Spark's technique throughout the novel can be seen in the constant repetition, in one form or another, of certain phrases. Here, for example, she repeats the phrases:

'It was a clear day in June',

and:

'.. it was a Monday',¹⁸

which originally occur on p46.

In this passage, there are several words and phrases related to religion, which is a constant theme throughout the novel. These include 'church', (p46, twice), 'Kyrie' and 'Kyrie Eleison', (p46, p47) and 'souls' (p45).

Words which suggest nuance and insinuation are used frequently here. These include 'implication' (p45), 'suppositions' (p45), 'discern' (p46), 'impress' (p48), 'presumed' (p48), and 'influence' (p48), and they all tie in with the theme of the passage, which is Bartlett's attempt to get an introduction to Martin York's uncle through Nancy. The theme of nepotism is also stressed by the frequent repetition of the names 'Hector Bartlett', 'Emma Loy', 'Martin York' and 'S. T. York', and Bartlett's wish for an introduction to S. T. York is contrasted with Nancy's *actual* introduction to Hugh Lederer the previous day.

Throughout the novel Spark frequently uses the verbs 'call' and 'meet', and both feature in this passage. Nancy's intended destination is her office, and the word 'office' is repeated frequently here. Indeed, office-related

¹⁷ E. g. p45 [twice], p47, p48, and p50. In fact 'Pisseur de copie' and the word 'pisseur' in total are repeated more than thirty times throughout the novel.

¹⁸ E. g. see:

'..this fresh Monday morning in June' (p47),

and:

'..my fresh June morning' (p48).

vocabulary recurs throughout the novel. There is also a group of words which are related to literary matters, including 'writer', 'writers', 'publishers', 'published', 'authors' and 'literary'.

Alliteration is frequent throughout the novel. In addition to what it adds to the sound quality of the prose it also functions ¹⁹ as a reminder of certain themes and points up certain characteristics of those who appear in the novel. In this passage, as throughout, there is a repetition of 'w', and here it helps to draw attention to the word 'writer'.²⁰ However, there is also frequent repetition here of 'm', and, less frequently, of 'p', 'b', 'f', 'a', 's', 'h' and 'th'.

The second scene which I wish to examine occurs on pp141-143. Here, Nancy receives the news that Wanda Podolak has committed suicide. A contrast is made between Wanda's 'handbag' with 'the papers inside', and Nancy's 'bag' with the 'slip of paper' in it (see p142). Other recurrent words here are 'letters', 'suicide', and 'policeman' and there are references to religion once again in 'Catholic' (p142), 'priest' and 'devout'. The word 'soul' again appears, in Eva Carlin's reference to Wanda as a 'poor soul' (p142), and this is echoed in her husband's 'poor thing' (p143).

The words 'other', 'room' and 'motive' or 'motives' are repeated several times, as are the phrases 'fished out too late' (e. g. see p143) and 'unsound mind', (p142 and p143).

'Know' is a preferred verb throughout the novel and 'knew' appears several times here as does 'known'. Here too, as throughout the novel, the narrator is very precise about time, and this can be seen in the phrases:

¹⁹ Spark's awareness of sound in her prose may also be seen in the focus on idiosyncrasies of certain characters' speech. For example, Ivy, the Ullswater Press telephonist makes her 'n's sound like 'd's, 'so that name sounded like dame' (p45), and Sir Alec Tooley frequently repeats the phrase 'in fact' (p72).
²⁰ On p46, moreover, there is also assonance and a visual half-rhyme in: 'His writing wri~~th~~ed.'

'It was nearly eight o'clock' (p141)

and,

'At about seven o'clock' (p141).

Alliteration on 'w' throughout this passage reinforces the sense of loss since it is the first letter of Wanda's name, and this is also in evidence in the third passage I wish to look at.

In the short final chapter of the novel, (pp188-189) which takes place thirty years later, Nancy is now married to William, and is on holiday in Tuscany when she meets up with Hector Bartlett. The alliteration on the 'w' in the first sentence here again helps to remind the reader of Wanda's death ²¹, however, there is also alliteration on 't', 'th' and on 's' in this passage (p188).

The word 'voice' is recurrent here, as it is in the previous passage, and the office-related vocabulary which is common throughout the novel is again seen here in the reference to Bartlett's laugh as being:

'...like a typewriter' (p189).

The word 'telephone' appears yet again here (p188), and telephones are important features throughout the novel. This is linked with the recurrence of the verb 'call'.

Again there is precise attention to time in this passage (p188).

²¹ E. g. 'Later that year (i. e. in 1954) when we were planning the wedding, I lay awake for awhile, then drowsily falling asleep I thought how Wanda could make my dress, until I remembered she was dead' (p188).

Thematically, there is a referring back to the opening pages of the novel in the first paragraph here, where Nancy lies awake thinking about her life. This is reinforced by a repetition of 'a far cry from Kensington', the phrase which gives the novel its title, in the last sentence of the novel on p189.²² Perhaps inevitably there is also one final appearance of the phrase 'Pisseur de Copie' (p189).

John Mortimer's novel Summer's Lease was first published in 1988.²³ The story centres on the Pargeter family who rent a villa in Tuscany for three weeks during the summer holidays. In spite of the idyllic setting however, during the course of their holiday the water supply is cut off and a murder takes place. Molly Pargeter, whose idea it was to come to Tuscany, sets out to discover more about the owners of the villa, the Kettering family. In the process she finds out that Fosdyke, the man who was murdered, was Sandra Kettering's lover, and that the murder was a crime of passion committed by Sandra's husband, Buck Kettering.

I will look at three crucial incidents in the novel, and the first of these occurs on pp155-158. Here, Molly has just discovered that her husband has written a postcard to one of his former clients, Marcia Tobias, and she confronts him with this in the evening when they are both about to go to bed.

There are two images which are used throughout this passage. These are, that of a legal cross-examination, with Hugh, a divorce lawyer, for once in the witness box, and that of Molly as a diva singing an aria.

The first image is reinforced by the use of the words 'client' and 'clients', 'case', and 'cases', by 'justice', 'lawyer', 'truthfully', and also by the

²² I. e. the phrase originally occurs on p6.

²³ Summer's Lease won the now-defunct Glasgow Herald People's Prize in 1989.

phrases 'he had told the truth (p157), 'The whole truth and nothing but the truth' (p158), 'I swear' (p158), 'guilty as charged' (p159), and 'entirely innocent' (p159). Similarly, the words 'divorce', and 'divorced' appear throughout the passage.

The operatic theme is prefigured earlier in the novel, and reprised hereafter in the frequent references to Puccini's Turandot. Here the theme is suggested in Mortimer's description of Molly as:

'..a commanding figure in her white night dress.' (p156),

and is even more obvious in the sentence:

'The room with its high ceiling, and the long curtains seemed to encourage such *arias* ..' (p158).

Similarly, there is a repeated use of the word 'voice'.

The words 'sleep' and 'smile' are repeated several times here, in each case relating to Hugh. 'Courage' is an important word here as elsewhere in the novel. It appears twice, firstly describing Molly's 'attack' on Hugh (p156), and again, when Molly accuses Hugh of not having had the 'courage' to be unfaithful.

In addition to words and phrases which are quoted from Hugh's postcard, there are repeated references back to the typed list left by Kettering in the book on Piero della Francesca. In that list Kettering's stated objective was to have:

'B. lost and gone forever',

and in this passage the word 'gone' appears twice (p156).

'Bedroom', 'house', and 'household', all appear on p156, and are linked thematically with 'hotel bedroom', 'flat', and 'maisonette', which appear on p158.

The other most recurrent words in this passage include 'lunch', various forms of the verb 'do', commonly with a sexual implication, (see p158), and 'nothing', which appears several times as Hugh strives to deny any sexual impropriety with Mrs Tobias (pp158-159). The emphatic 'absolutely' (p159), 'entirely' (p157 and p159), and 'of course' (p157, p158 twice, and p159), are also used several times.

The verb 'know' is frequent throughout these pages (e. g. p157), as are the words 'occasionally', 'dreadfully', (both p156), 'paid', (p157), and the phrase 'nothing in particular' (p158).

In the second scene which I wish to examine (pp234-243), Molly's two eldest children, plus the visitors who arrived the previous night, decide to play a game of charades while the adults watch. This scene is central to the novel in that during the game Molly realises that the 'B' mentioned in the typed list was Bill Fosdyke, the dead man, and that he was probably murdered by Buck Kettering.

The most frequently recurrent words here are 'charade' and 'charades', 'mother', 'house', the colours 'black' and 'white', 'husband', 'syllable', 'bed', 'lover', 'candle', and 'two'. Again there are references to the opera Turandot, and there is another quotation of the phrase:

'...lost and gone forever',

as well as a further reference to 'Kenneth Clark's book on Piero'.

The final scene which I wish to look at is Molly's confrontation with Buck Kettering (pp275-281), and there are many similarities between this passage and Molly's earlier confrontation with her husband. The word 'postcard', which appears several times in the first passage is used here to refer to the reproduction of "The Flagellation" which Kettering keeps in his room (see p276, p278). As in the earlier scene, this confrontation takes place in a 'bedroom' (p278), and again here there are frequent occurrences of the words 'room' and 'house'. Also in common with the first scene, there is frequent repetition of the word 'nothing' (p279; p280, six times), and again the colour 'white' is used in relation to Molly, with regard to her 'sensible white shoes' (p280).

Hugh's 'don't be ridiculous' in the first scene (p155), is echoed in Molly's use of the phrase here (p280), and again the emphatic phrase 'of course', previously used by Hugh, is used twice here by Molly (p278). The word 'smile', which is frequent in the earlier passage as Hugh attempts to avoid Molly's ire, also recurs here (p276, p277, p281). Similarly, Kettering, like Hugh earlier, is seen sitting:

'...on the end of the bed' (p278, p281).

Here too there are again frequent allusions to sound and hearing, and perhaps by implication to opera. These are discernible, in the recurrence of the word 'voice', (p275 and p277), and in 'sound' or 'sounds' (p276 and p281). However, there are also several allusions to painting and to the visual, for example in 'the Pieros' (p276 and p277), "The Flagellation" (p276), 'the Kenneth Clark book on Piero' (p279), and in 'paintings' (p275, p280, p281), 'pictures', (p276 twice), 'picture' (p276), 'art gallery' (p276), and 'a work of art' (p278). Furthermore, verbs in this passage very often have visual connotations, and these include 'watching', (p275), 'looked', 'seemed', (all p276), and 'appeared' (p278).

Legal vocabulary is again employed here. This can be seen in 'evidence' (p275), 'the truth untold' (p277), 'accusing' (p276), and in 'honest' (p276 and p277), and 'honesty' (p277). Furthermore, there is a reprise of the 'lost/found' theme in the words which Molly says to Kettering concerning his wife:

'I wonder how she felt when you found out about her and Bill Fosdyke..' (p279).

and once again there is a repetition of the phrase:

'... lost and gone forever..' (p279).

The words 'brandy', and 'water', which are frequent throughout the novel, are also recurrent here and there is also frequent repetition of the words 'understand' (p278, twice; p280, twice; p281), and 'understood' (p278).²⁴

I shall now examine in more detail what evidence there is to suggest a pattern in the repeated use of key words and word groups.

It is difficult to know exactly how to interpret the above. In the first place, there *are* limitations to the type of information which this kind of analysis can provide, and the only way to prove conclusively the existence of links between texts is to subject them to detailed stylometric analysis. However, even allowing for the limitations of an analysis of this kind, certain patterns do emerge. At its simplest, this means that there are several key words which occur in more than one text. Some are common to texts in both groups, some occur exclusively in the texts from the Booker group, and some exclusively in control group texts.

²⁴ Here the theme of the detective novel is picked up, not only in the actual presence of Molly at the motel, but also in the phrases:

'...she felt what she had not bargained for, real danger, and not the second hand fear of detective stories' (p275),

and:

"She lied, not wanting to alarm him by her powers of deduction' (p277).

There are several words which may be regarded indisputably as key words and which appear in more than one of the texts considered. These are the words 'grey', 'lost', 'gone', 'dog' or 'dogs', and the phrase 'I'm sorry'. For example, the word 'grey' is common to the Brookner, Lively and Ishiguro texts. 'Lost' is a key word in both the Brookner and Mortimer novels, and so is 'gone'. 'Dog' or 'dogs' is common to the Martin Amis and Lively novels, and 'I'm sorry' to the Kelman and Ishiguro texts .

Words which are of slightly less significance, though still important include 'voice' which is common in the Spark and Mortimer texts, and the word 'hopeless', which appears in Hotel du Lac and in The Old Devils.

Taking these seven examples as a group it can be seen that where any one of these occurs exclusively in texts from one group only, then there is a slightly higher rate of occurrence of key words within the Booker group than within the control group. Of the seven examples given however, four of these appear in one text from each group.

There are, in addition, several words which appear in key passages selected from more than one text but which have less claim to being key words as such since they are of more importance, either thematically or in terms of their rate of occurrence, in one text than the other. Of those key words which occur in the texts from one group only, a slightly larger percentage of these are exclusive to the Booker-winning texts than those those which occur only in novels from the control group.

An example of this is the word 'cigarette', which is a key word in the selected passages from Lively's novel and which appears, though as less of a characteristic feature, in Kelman's novel. The word 'mother' is common to the Lively and Mortimer texts, but again it is more of a key word in

Moon Tiger since it appears throughout the novel as well as in the selected passages. 'Know' is a common verb in the Spark novel, and, to a lesser extent, in the Mortimer and Martin Amis texts. The opposites 'black' and 'white' both appear in the Mortimer and the Martin Amis texts, and usually together, though 'black' is the more common in the Amis while 'white' is more frequent in Mortimer's novel.

In addition to the examples given above there are some words which appear as key words throughout certain novels but which for some reason do not figure in the passages selected. Examples of these are 'blue', which links the Lively and Brookner texts, and 'cold' which links Brookner and Kelman's novels. Furthermore 'fish' or 'fished' is common in the Brookner, Kelman and Spark novels, while 'mythical or 'mythological' is common in both Lively and Brookner's novels.

It is possible to simplify the above by using the letters A and B to refer to occurrences of key words in the Booker group and control group texts respectively. In other words the occurrence of key words in a Booker group text can be indicated by the letter A, whilst the occurrence of a key word in a text from the control group can be indicated by the letter B. Thus in the case of the indisputable key words, 'grey', 'lost', 'gone', 'dog', and the phrase 'I'm sorry', plus the slightly less important use of 'voice' and 'hopeless', the pattern would be as follows: AAA, indicating the occurrence of 'grey' in three out of the four Booker texts; AB; AB; AB; AB, indicating that 'lost', 'gone', 'dog', and 'I'm sorry' all occur in one text from each group; BB, indicating that 'voice' is a significant word in key passages from two novels in the control group; and AA, indicating that 'hopeless' is an important word in two of the Booker texts.

In the case of words which are key words in selected passages from more than one text but which are more characteristic of one text than the other,

underlining may also be used to indicate where the occurrence is stronger. Thus in the case of the words 'cigarette' and 'mother' which appear in the Lively and Kelman texts and the Lively and Mortimer respectively the pattern of occurrence may be represented as follows:

ΔB; ΔB

'Know', which features in three 'B' group texts, the Spark, Mortimer and Martin Amis should be represented as BBB, while 'black', which appears in both the Mortimer and Martin Amis novels but which is more common in the Amis, may be represented as BB. 'White' which also appears in both of these texts may be represented as BB.

In terms of the words 'blue', which appears frequently throughout the Lively and Brookner texts, 'cold', which appears in the Brookner and the Kelman, 'fish' or 'fished', which appears in the Brookner, the Kelman and the Spark, and 'mythical/mythological' which appears in the Lively and Brookner novels, but not in the key passages of any of these texts, the pattern would be:

AA; AB; ABB; AA.

Taken overall, in terms of the occurrence of single words or short phrases within the texts, out of the sixteen examples given above, exactly half occur in novels from both groups. Of those which occur exclusively in novels from one group, the overall rate of occurrence in all sixteen examples of those appearing exclusively in the Booker group exactly matches that of words which appear exclusively in novels from the control group.

There is, however, a slight variation afforded by the appearance of words or short phrases in more than two texts. The words 'grey', 'know' and 'fish' or 'fished' come into this category, and here the pattern AAA, BBB

and BBB shows a slight bias towards recurrence in the control group novels.

Where the investigation is limited to the indisputable key words and does not extend to any other variations on this, there is evidence of a marginally more restricted use of vocabulary among Booker texts, but it is hard to hold this up as conclusive evidence to support the theory of linguistic homogeneity. Taking all three different types of occurrence into consideration, the evidence is fairly inconclusive, but there is a slightly higher occurrence of key words among the Booker group novels except for in the case of words which appear in more than one text but which are more dominant in one of the texts than in the others. Generally speaking, this type of occurrence is more likely to happen in control group texts than in Booker-winning texts. However, where words in this category appear in one novel from each group, the word is of more significance thematically or in terms of frequency of occurrence in the Booker texts.

In general terms then there is some evidence to suggest a slightly more restricted vocabulary or stronger similarity in patterns of word occurrences in the Booker texts than in the control group novels but this is by no means conclusive. However, this may in itself be of some significance with regard to the supposedly representative status of Booker-winning fiction.

There is one other aspect to the issue of patterns in the use of language which must be considered. It relates to those patterns which occur in the use of cognate or related word groups from text to text. It is here that evidence for the existence of a linguistic unity within the Booker group is most convincing.

If one allows for a comparison of basic word groups there is a clear pattern which occurs in several texts in the use of vocabulary conveying

feelings of loss, sadness and regret. This word group appears in the Brookner, Kingsley Amis and Ishiguro novels, and also, though to a lesser extent, in the Kelman novel which was also shortlisted for the Booker. The pattern is quite striking.

In addition, Kingsley Amis's novel and the Ishiguro text also show similarities in their use of many phrases to indicate the passing of time, and by implication, the ageing process. While a characteristic feature of Spark's novel is the scrupulous attention given by her narrator to exactly locating the time of incidents in the novel, here there is a difference of emphasis, for in A Far Cry from Kensington the purpose is to draw the attention of the reader to the punctiliousness of the narrator rather than to suggest the approach of old age and death.

To conclude, the occurrence of individual words and phrases gives *some* backing to the claim of there having been a linguistic unity among Booker-winning novels of the 1980s, though in fact this is slight. Where linguistic unity is more apparent however is in the relationships which exist between texts in the use of words which are very similar though not exactly the same and which convey very similar meanings. What this also suggests, furthermore, is a thematic link between the Booker novels which is not apparent in the control group texts. In the Chapter Six I shall investigate whether this suggestion of thematic links is indeed borne out by a more detailed examination of the texts.

CHAPTER SIX

Evidence of Standardisation (2): Similarities in the Depiction of Suffering in Booker-winning Novels, 1980-1989.

'Nothing dreadful is ever done with, no bad thing gets any better; you can't be too serious.' This seems to be the message of the Forties from which, alas, there seems no escape, for it is closing time in the gardens of the West and from now on an artist will be judged only by the resonance of his solitude or the quality of his despair.'¹

In this final chapter of the thesis I shall examine whether or not there is evidence of thematic links among the novels which won the Booker Prize during the 1980s. I shall argue that there are indeed thematic links, but that the recurrence of individual themes is of less importance than the similarities in the treatment of these.

I have chosen to focus in particular on the treatment of the theme of suffering and for a variety of reasons. In the first place this is a theme which, given the nature of the novel as a literary form, might be expected to occur frequently in the novels which won during the 1980s and this is indeed the case. Given that it *is* a common theme, however, then one would want to look for notable similarities among the novels in terms of the specific treatment which this theme receives in order to add weight to any suggestion of standardisation.

In The Rise of the Novel Ian Watt, writing of the emergence of the modern novel in the Eighteenth Century says that:

'...literary traditionalism was first and most fully challenged by the novel whose primary criterion was truth to individual experience - individual experience which is always unique and therefore new.'²

¹ From Cyril Connolly's last editorial for Horizon, December 1949/January 1950, quoted in BRADBURY, M., (1988), "Closing Time in the Gardens", or What happened to writing in the 1940s", No. Not Bloomsbury, Columbia University Press, New York.

² WATT, I., (1957), The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Fielding and Richardson, Chatto and Windus, London.

In addition, Watt says, the basic premise of the novel is that it is:
 '... a full and authentic report of human experience..', ³

If the novel is therefore expected to provide a credible picture of human experience then it is only to be expected that it should deal with human suffering for it is an experience which is common to us all.

In addition to this, our expectations of the novel are probably also coloured to a large extent by our knowledge of the Nineteenth Century novel, and in particular by our knowledge of novels from the Realist tradition. Perhaps then our expectations have also been influenced by this movement's insistence on 'truth to nature' which as regards the novel was often interpreted in terms of an author's attention to morbid details of privation.

Given that the novel has traditionally been seen as the literary form most suited to an in-depth investigation into the whole range of human experience, it seems predictable that there should be instances of suffering in all these novels since a full and accurate account of human life would be quite likely to include an account of humanity 'in extremis'. Furthermore, as regards our expectations of how suffering ought to be depicted in fiction, these are likely to include the expectation that suffering will be depicted with some attention to detail both in respect of the cause of suffering and how it is experienced. In addition it is also likely that our expectation will be that the experience of suffering will be depicted via a realist narrative mode.

It is important to bear these basic points in mind.

³ Ibid. p33

The first notable thing about the novels which won during the 1980s is that from the beginning of the decade till the end, it is possible to discern a distinct shift in the way suffering was depicted. As the decade progressed suffering was increasingly depicted more in emotional and mental terms than as physical hardship.

While this distinction may seem to be somewhat artificial in that in fiction as in life the two are often inseparable, I shall argue that emotional and intellectual suffering as they appear in the later winners do so at the exclusion of other forms of suffering, while in the winners from the early Eighties physical and mental suffering usually accompany each other.

The ten novels which won the Booker Prize during the 1980s were: William Golding's Rites of Passage which won in 1980; Salman Rushdie's 1981 winner Midnight's Children; the 1982 winner, Thomas Keneally's Schindler's Ark; J. M. Coetzee's Life and Times of Michael K which won in 1983; Hotel du Lac which won in 1984; the 1985 winner, The Bone People, by New Zealand author Keri Hulme; the 1986 winner, The Old Devils, by Kingsley Amis; Penelope Lively's Moon Tiger, which won in 1987; Oscar and Lucinda, which won in 1988, and, finally, The Remains of the Day by Kazuo Ishiguro, which won in 1989.

It is possible to divide these novels into two distinct groups according to how the treatment of suffering is dealt with in each case. The first group may be said to be comprised of those novels which won during the period from 1980-1983, plus the 1985 winner; the second to be comprised of those novels which won in 1984, and during the years 1986-1989. It will be seen furthermore that each group consists of exactly five novels.

In addition, in the earlier winners there seems to be a link between the prevailing physical interpretation of suffering and the attempts made by the

authors in question to deal with deeper universal issues such as the problem of evil. By contrast, the novels from the latter period very often deal with issues which have little significance outwith the context of the narrative, and it may therefore be argued as a result of this that the earlier winners have more potential resonance than those from the later period.⁴

In the novels which won during the early Eighties there are often graphic descriptions of physical suffering and a general concentration on unattractive aspects of physical life. In Golding's novel for example this may be seen in the frequent and graphic references to the stink of excrement (p40), to sea-sickness (p11) including the memorable picture of Colley vomiting then sliding in it while wearing Talbot's oilskins (p16), to Talbot's diahorroea and colic, (p62), and to the very animal nature of sexual encounters.

Nevertheless, in Rites of Passage, Schindler's Ark, in Coetzee's 1983 winner Life and Times of Michael K, in Midnight's Children, and in the 1985 winner The Bone People, the function of this focus on detailed description of physical privations is linked to the discussion in the novels of more universal themes. It is the case, for example, that very often the themes of physical hardship and suffering within these novels are constructed and depicted in such a way as to provide a particular background against which moral choices have to be made. It is this feature of the texts in addition that makes it possible to argue that the winners from the early Eighties with the possible exception of Anita Brookner's Hotel du Lac have a deeper resonance than the novels from the later period which tend to be much more introspective and self-referential.

⁴ However, it could also be argued that the apparent 'authenticity' in the treatment of the theme of suffering in the earlier winners is itself a convention. Cf. Robert Elliot on honesty and 'authenticity' in the so-called Confessional Poets. ELLIOT, R. C. (1982), The Literary Persona, University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

This use of detailed descriptions of physical suffering to provide a background within which moral choices are to be made may be said to be reflected in a particular way in the novels from the first group in that it is a central feature here for the physical suffering of one character to effect a moral change on another, often influencing directly the latter's future actions. In Golding's novel for example the spiritual 'volte-face' of the main character which is of central importance in the text, is effected by means of the physical indignity endured by his fellow-passengers, and in particular by the hapless Parson Colley. It is the effect of reading Colley's journal and in finding out what mental and physical pain he has had to endure that helps bring about the change in Talbot.

In Thomas Keneally's 1982 winner Schindler's Ark too the suffering of one character is shown to have had a major effect on the subsequent actions and moral choices of the central character. In this case however, the characterisation of the sufferer, an unnamed little girl, is never fully realised, but acts, rather, as a symbol of the atrocities which surround Schindler.

The specific incident which brings about the change here takes place when Schindler and his mistress are out riding in the hills above Cracow. Looking down on the city they witness the clearing of the ghetto by Nazi stormtroopers and they are particularly distressed at the sight of a little girl in red who lines up with the others while all manner of brutalities take place about her.

Keneally describes the incident in the following terms:

'His eyes slewed up Krakusa Street to the scarlet child. They were doing it within half a block of her: they hadn't waited for her column to turn out of sight into Josefinska... While the scarlet child stopped in her column and turned to watch, they shot the woman beneath the window-sill in the neck, and one of them, when the boy slid down the wall whimpering, jammed a boot down on his head as if to hold it still and put

the barrel against the back of the neck - the recommended SS target - and fired.' (p142)

Schindler himself clearly sees this incident to have had a major effect on his subsequent actions and Keneally writes:

""Beyond this day" (Oskar) would claim, "no thinking person could fail to see what would happen. I was now resolved to do everything in my power to defeat the system." ' (p147)

In Coetzee's novel Life and Times of Michael K it is the suffering of the central character which effects a change in someone else. Here Michael K's physical pain and his refusal to give in to the dictates of the system cause the young doctor at the Kenilworth detention centre to question his views. However, implicit throughout this novel is the suggestion that it is primarily the reader whom the author wishes to move. Nevertheless the relationship between sufferer and witness in this novel is highly problematical, and I shall refer to this in more detail at a later point.

In Hulme's 1985 winner, although all three central characters are scarred both physically and emotionally at the beginning of the novel and accrue more scars as the narrative progresses, it is the suffering of the child, Simon, which is of central importance in the text for it is this which initially brings them together and suffering acts thereafter as an instrument for change.

In fact the character of Simon is inextricably linked with physical suffering. His arrival in Joe's life is occasioned by a shipwreck in a storm, and he has previously been physically maltreated by his captors on the boat. Furthermore, his arrival at Kere's tower comes about as a result of his having injured his foot. As the novel progresses however, the intensity of the child's pain and of the beatings he receives from Joe increase with the growing awareness of the two adults of the need for radical change in their

own lives. In the end it is the near fatal beating of Simon by Joe which acts as the catalyst for this.

In the aftermath the two adults go on journeys of self-discovery. In each case their experience of illness and extreme physical suffering bring about both a release from long-term guilt and a deeper level of self-awareness. Thus their suffering is shown to be essential for their future happiness. In this novel then Simon's suffering, as with Colley's in Rites of Passage is seen to have both sacrificial and redemptive qualities.

It is difficult to discuss Salman Rushdie's Midnight's Children in the same vein as the other novels from the first group. This is partly due to novelist's eschewal of formal realism. Nevertheless, the pattern of one individual's suffering affecting another is also present in this novel, even though it is less conspicuous than in the other texts from the first group.

The dominant surreal fabulism of the novel means that the character of Saleem Sinai, who is the narrator of the text, may not be read in the same way or to the same extent as an atoning figure as, say, Colley, or the character of Simon in Hulme's novel, or even for that matter of the little girl in Schindler's Ark. Nevertheless Rushdie's narrator himself is the sufferer, and he constantly asks the reader to sympathise with his physical defects, such as his grotesque nose and his patchy skin, and with the fact that he is literally disintegrating.

If it is difficult to read the character of Rushdie's narrator in the same way as the characters in the other winning novels from the period, and if this is due to Rushdie's choice of surrealism over realism, it is nevertheless true that impact and response are still the aims of the novelist. As with Coetzee's novel however, it is primarily the reader whom Rushdie wishes

to respond to the suffering depicted, and it seems that the desired response here is outrage.

Rushdie's novel is perhaps most effective however when the author turns momentarily from the dominant surrealism of the novel to employ a more directly realist narrative form. This switch is used to particular effect in the last third of the book where various wars involving Pakistan are described⁵, and it can be seen on p343. Here Saleem Sinai brings the autobiographical details of his life up to date before describing the war between India and Pakistan. Thus he tells the reader:

' I am free of Snotnose and Stainface and Baldy and Sniffer and Mapface and washing-chests and Evie Burns and language marches, liberated from Kolynos Kid and the breasts of Pia Mumani and Alpha-and-Omega, absolved of the murders of Homi Catrack and Hanif and Aadam Aziz and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, I have shaken off five-hundred-year old whores and confessions of love at dead of night, free now, beyond caring, crashing onto tarmac, restored to innocence and purity by a tumbling piece of the moon wiped clean as a wooden writing-chest, brained (just as prophesied) by my mother's silver spittoon.'

Immediately after this the following paragraph appears:

'On the morning of September 23rd, the United Nations announced the end of hostilities between India and Pakistan. India had occupied less than 500 miles of Pakistani soil; Pakistan had conquered just 340 square miles of its Kashmiri dream. It was said the ceasefire came because both sides had run out of ammunition, more or less simultaneously; thus the exigencies of international diplomacy, and the politically-motivated manipulations of arms suppliers.'⁶

Rushdie's choice of narrative style is linked with his purpose in the novel, which is to challenge the reader. In using it, the writer, in effect, is asking the reader to confront the question of which is the more surreal - the almost nonsensical narrative of Saleem Sinai, which at least has its own internal

⁵ E. g. see p326, and pp342-344.

⁶ See also pp35-36 where Rushdie again juggles the comic with the serious, and the real with the surreal to great effect when describing the British massacre at Amritsar.

logic, or the 'real' world, where people are killed, territory invaded, then hostilities ceased, all apparently arbitrarily?

I have illustrated the fact that physical suffering as it is depicted in these texts is very often linked with the overall moral purpose of the writer. Furthermore suffering is usually depicted in such a way by the author in order to help provide a credible environment within which the characters may operate, and thus to make more credible the moral choices faced by the characters. Nevertheless, credibility in the depiction of physical suffering in itself does not always lead to a more credible text overall. In fact, the heightened realism in the texts from the first group in some cases actually proves to be counter-productive in terms of creating a credible narrative overall.

It is not always possible in any case to view the novels from the first group as straightforwardly realist. With regard to William Golding's 1980 winner for example, while this novel owes much of its credibility as a narrative to the realistic and highly detailed accounts given of the physical environment on board ship, there is nevertheless a great deal of symbolism in this novel. For example, Golding relies on the traditional literary symbol of the ship as a metaphor for the human soul in order to underline the spiritual theme of the text. In addition, in alluding to the killing of an albatross he is able to make ironic parallels with the spiritual and moral themes of Coleridge's "Rime of the Ancient Mariner".

Thus while the physical world of a ship in the early Nineteenth Century, including the suffering of those on board, is credibly depicted in this novel, nevertheless this is subordinate to the moral aspect of the novel. Realism here is thus important primarily in that it allows the author to show his characters as having 'real' choices in a 'real' world.

One major difficulty with this novel however is the question of whether the intensity of the writing, the author's skill in structuring the novel, and the particular situation chosen to highlight the moral dilemma do enough to justify to the reader the weight which the author intends the spiritual theme to have. Thus the general sense of credibility derived from authentic detail may be said to work against the overall effect in the narrative as Golding's theme is developed. For while the early depiction of Talbot and of Colley's habits, and indeed of the ship itself, work well, this, combined with the reader's trust in Talbot's initial assessment of Colley prove too strong to withstand fully the shift in emphasis which takes place in the latter part of the novel.

Thus the last section of Rites of Passage discomfits the reader both in terms of theme and in that Golding is revealed to have deliberately set out to subvert the reader's expectations. While the force and structure of the narrative probably do succeed in carrying it through, the central characters are less than sympathetic. Ultimately the credibility of the earlier chapters and the generally repellent nature of much of the material in the later part of the novel make for a text which is fascinating and admirable, but one which has no real claim on the emotions.

Problems of credibility also arise in Keneally's 1982 winner and here too the realistic depiction of physical suffering sometimes compromises the credibility of the text as a whole. The author states in the Preface that he has employed 'the devices of a novel' in order to relate his account of Schindler's work to save the lives of Jews, however he also states that he has 'attempted to avoid all fiction', as this would debase the record. This apparent confusion pre-figures some of the stylistic difficulties which Keneally has in the text, and helps to account for some of the difficulties the reader encounters.

One of these may be said to be the difficulty the reader has in knowing how to 'read' the character of Amon Goeth. The need to employ the device of characterisation, that is, a device of fiction-writing, in the description of a real person, and the numbing effect of some of the details of Goeth's actions combine at various points in this narrative to make for a suspension of belief, making the real seem unreal. Thus Goeth's brutality often beggars belief, such as at the hanging of the engineer Krautwirt and of a young boy caught singing a 'communist' song (pp236-238). Yet in spite of this at other times in the text he is depicted in such a way as to make him appear to be almost like a monster in a children's story; his physical presence and reputation consistently terrify, but the reader often has cause to ponder whether he is not, in fact, the stuff of fairy-tales.

It is certainly true that much of the material here is itself barely credible at times, such as the picture Keneally presents of Goeth taking pot-shots at Jews from the balcony of his villa at the Plaszow work camp, and of his offering to give a reference after the war to Helen Hirsch, the maid who he beats so brutally. However, Keneally's main problem is that he is faced with the twin difficulties of having to depict fully Goeth's barbarity, and with the need to communicate to the reader at what level it is possible, and indeed necessary, for the urbane and civilised Schindler to relate to such a man, even if it is only in order for him to be able to use Goeth for his own purposes.

Problems with the overall credibility of the text arise in both Coetzee's novel and in the text where physical suffering is most graphically portrayed, that is, Hulme's 1985 winner, The Bone People.

In Coetzee's text this comes about largely due to the failure on the part of the author to adequately flesh out the character of K. It is the author's intention here to show how a repressive regime affects those at the bottom

of the social scale. However, laudable as this may be, it nevertheless creates problems in the texts, for Michael is inarticulate. This is underlined by the fact that he has a cleft palate. As a result, Coetzee is forced to detail K's sufferings almost exclusively in terms of physical privation.

While Coetzee writes convincingly as he seeks to depict the hardship and pain encountered by the central character, nevertheless, credibility is lost since in the face of all manner of reversals, physical and emotional, K's only response is passivity. Indeed, this response becomes more characteristic as the novel progresses. Therefore, while the descriptions of Michael's descent into an increasingly animal-like state, where he deprives himself of his body's necessities to the point where his gums bleed and his stomach disintegrates, are convincing enough, they evoke little emotional response in the reader other than serving to repel him.

An additional consequence of the lack of development of the character of Michael is that as the action progresses the writer is forced to resort to using the doctor effectively as an interpreter in order to convey to the reader that K's actions should be viewed in existential terms. The effect here is one of proselytising, where the author, through the character of the M. O. appears to beg for the reader's sympathies. Unfortunately this is counter-productive, and the result is that the reader is inclined to switch off.⁷

In The Bone People too, there are inherent structural flaws in the novel which are exacerbated by the realistic nature of earlier descriptions of physical suffering. The main problem however relates to the issue of the justification for Simon's suffering, for the author effectively undermines the credibility of the text as a whole by encouraging the reader to put aside

⁷ D. J. Enright comments on Coetzee's earnestness in an article in The Times Literary Supplement, 30th September 1983, 1037a, where he accuses him of being too 'meaningful'.

some of the strong reactions which she herself has evoked earlier in the novel in response to this character.

The work gains much of its sense of authenticity from its unflinching descriptions of Simon's injuries and from the author's general sensitivity to the issue of child abuse. For example when Kere remembers how she found Simon after the final beating by Joe, the child's appearance is described as:

'The bloody swollen mask on the floor, broken nose and broken jaw. And the horrible indentation in the side of his skull where he had been smashed against the door frame.'
(p314)

However, the credibility of the text as a whole is compromised by the ending of the novel where the author presents the reader with a tableau of love and reconciliation. This is hard to accept in view of the graphic depiction of suffering, particularly that of the child, in the earlier chapters. The lack of credibility therefore comes about in part as a result of the vividness of the earlier descriptions, and it appears at the end of the novel that the writer wishes the reader to see the suffering of the child, in retrospect, as having been justified.⁸

Hulme commits the cardinal sin for a writer of failing to take her character and her readers emotional responses seriously. Thus the overall credibility of The Bone People which the writer has earlier established via her ability to win sympathy for the child, is effectively dissipated at the end of the novel, where the author gives in to the structural imperatives of the text which require her to find a resolution of some kind which will unite the three characters at all costs.

⁸ The author herself refutes this however. See Judith Dale's article "The Bone People (Not) Having It Both Ways" in Landfall, 156 (December 1985), pp413-428. This article also notes that the novel has sometimes been read as an allegory of The New Testament, with Joe, Kere and Simon as the Holy Family. Although this is again an interpretation that the author herself refutes, it has the attraction of helping to explain to some extent Simon's suffering, and also his quasi-mystical arrival in Joe's life.

Thus it can be seen that the detailed and credible descriptions of physical pain in the novels which won the Booker earlier in the 1980s did not in itself guarantee overall credibility in the texts. I have noted the difference between the novels which won the Booker Prize in the first part of the decade and those which won from 1986 on plus the 1984 winner with regard to whether suffering appeared primarily as physical hardship or was depicted more in terms of emotional or psychological pain. I have also noted that within the novels where physical suffering was graphically depicted this was often used to provide a more credible context within which moral choices were made. In addition I have noted that in the earlier winners from the Eighties the authors often dealt with wider issues which had significance outwith the action of the texts themselves.

Furthermore I have remarked with regard to the group of winners from the earlier period that there was a discernible pattern whereby the physical suffering of one character often acted as a spur to the main character in terms of his or her subsequent actions or moral choices. In Midnight's Children and Life and Times of Michael K however, as I have noted, it is the physical suffering of the main character which is meant to act on the reader as a spur to action. I now wish to look at the novels from the second group to see what patterns exist from novel to novel, if any.

I have noted that the novels which won the Booker in 1984, and from 1986-1989 inclusive are more self-referential than the winners from the earlier part of the decade. This self-referentiality furthermore may be said to be reflected in the fact that in Hotel du Lac, Moon Tiger and The Old Devils the central character, or in the case of Amis's novel, one of the central characters, is a writer. In Hotel du Lac, the central character, Edith Hope, is a writer of romantic fiction. In Moon Tiger, Claudia Hampton is a writer of popular history, and in The Old Devils Alun Weaver is a writer and broadcaster on Welsh culture. It is certainly true, in addition, that in these

three novels, as in Oscar and Lucinda and in The Remains of the Day, the suffering experienced by the main characters is largely of a non-physical nature.

The source of Edith Hope's suffering in Hotel du Lac is located in her lack of choice and fulfilment in relationships. Edith swings frequently from a realistic assessment which at times borders on pessimism, of her chances of finding the sort of relationship which she both wants and needs, and a belief that the pain in her relationship with David is mitigated by the happiness it brings her. Thus her choice, as she sees it, is stark. Either she can continue in a relationship with the man she loves and accept that this will never involve anything more permanent than snatched, once-a-month meetings, or she can have the security afforded by the sort of union Neville offers her but forfeit love in the process.

Throughout this novel however, Edith's readiness to accept either one of these grim alternatives stems from a basic lack of belief that anything more satisfying is either possible or deserved, and indeed this seems to be linked to the fact that Edith is shown to have had complicated and unfulfilled relationships with both of her parents, but in particular with her mother.⁹

There is much introspection in this novel as the central character tries to sort through how she feels, what her future is likely to hold, and at what point if at all, she should think of surrendering her hopes for happiness as regards her relationships with men. She walks, she cries, she writes, and she reflects. However, she is also helped to come to some sort of understanding of herself through her relationships with the other guests at the hotel. Nevertheless they too are also shown to experience suffering primarily in terms of psychological pain. Thus, although Mme de Bonheuil's deafness is a reason for her to be pitied by the others, this is

⁹ E. g. see her conversation with Monica, pp145-6.

seen to be more significant in the role deafness plays in her emotional isolation. Similarly, even Monica's eating problem is essentially a neurotic illness, and such pain as Neville is prepared to admit to comes from his wife having walked out on him.

However, if suffering in this novel is depicted almost exclusively in terms of mental and emotional pain, Edith herself is nevertheless aware of the perils of introspection and this awareness is a source of irony in the text. For example, she is irritated by the Puseys' fussing over small incidents such as Jennifer finding a spider in her room. On hearing the shrieks (p78), she assumes that someone must have had 'a heart attack'. In a later incident where Mrs Pusey thinks there has been an intruder in her daughter's bedroom, Edith again assumes that something serious of a physical nature has occurred such as:

'.. some sort of accident or illness.' (p137)

Both Hotel du Lac and Moon Tiger may be said to epitomise certain features of the Booker-winning novel of the second half of the Eighties. They each share many similar characteristics as well as both having been written by women. Therefore, since these two novels have much in common, I shall deal with Lively's 1987 winner Moon Tiger first before looking in detail at The Old Devils.

There are several references made in Lively's novel (as in Amis's) to illness. However illness, including the terminal illness of the central character, is important here as it is in Brookner's novel and elsewhere in the winners from the later period primarily insofar as it symbolises change, loss and isolation, and it is less important as a physical state. Thus although the novel begins with Claudia Hampton in hospital dying of bowel cancer and although there are several additional occasions when Claudia is taken ill or injured including a serious car accident and a miscarriage, there is seldom

any mention made of actual physical pain in the text. As with Brookner's central character however, the main source of Claudia's suffering is the memory of a past relationship and in Moon Tiger the relationship has ended because Claudia's lover has been killed during the Second World War.

Although there are several thematic links between this novel and Hotel du Lac, one of the most important is the theme of loss which pervades both novels. In Moon Tiger, in addition to her lover Tom, Claudia's father, mother, brother, and indeed Claudia herself all die during the course of the novel, and she also loses Tom's baby. As regards Tom, while Claudia is unlike Edith Hope in that she is beautiful, her relationship with him is unique, she realises, in that he is the only man she has ever been able to make happy (p120). Thus her loss is all the more keenly felt.

This like Hotel du Lac is a highly introspective text, and as with the Brookner novel this introspection is underlined by the recurrent use of first person narrative, for example in Claudia's 'history of the world', and in Tom's diary.

Although the 1986 winner, Kingsley Amis's The Old Devils is a more obviously comic novel than the Brookner, and certainly than the Lively text, here too the characters are not immune to suffering. This is again depicted primarily in mental and emotional terms and in this novel is seen to have its roots in an awareness that old age and death are fast approaching, and with these, isolation. While it is possible to forgive the wrongs of the past and to be reconciled, death, however, isolates for ever.

Although The Old Devils is a much less introspective novel than Hotel du Lac, Moon Tiger or The Remains of the Day, the fear of death is universal and it underpins the regret and remorse which all the characters feel about certain aspects of the past. It also underlies their general over-indulgence,

particularly in drink, and their wistful reminiscences about times long gone. In this respect the novel is closely linked thematically to Hotel du Lac, to Moon Tiger and to Kazuo Ishiguro's novel The Remains of the Day.

Physical pain and illness are usually described in one of two ways in The Old Devils. Infirmity is, at times, a source of comedy, and this may be seen, for example, in the frequent references to Malcolm's bowel movements and the difficulty he has with these. In this instance however the problem is not serious or life-threatening. More frequent are the instances where illness is seen to symbolise isolation, and where infirmity is depicted as foreshadowing death, and as leading to a sense of disorientation.

This is illustrated in the scene where the men stop off from a day trip to visit an old friend, Billy Moger. Billy is clearly very ill and the men are shocked by his appearance, particularly since he used to be keen on sport. On leaving the house it strikes Charlie that:

**'..at no time had he seen the Billy Moger he used to know.'
(p105)**

Illness and death thus lead to confusion and to a sense of dislocation and disorientation for those who are left behind. Charlie's own phobia of the dark mirrors this and is surely meant to be read as being symptomatic of the deeper fear of death which each of them feels.

In an important scene towards the end of the novel illness is again linked with the sense of disorientation. Alun discovers a photograph of a beautiful young girl (p255) in the Pumphreys' house and this turns out to be an old photo of Angharad Pumphrey. However this is difficult for Alun and some of the others to believe, for Angharad now uses a walking stick and looks

significantly older than the other wives since she has been ill.¹⁰ Illness then also symbolises change.

The two central characters in Carey's 1988 winner have in common the fact that they have both suffered in similar ways. In addition to the loss of a parent at an early age,¹¹ an experience which they share with Lively's main character, both Oscar and Lucinda have had the experience of being treated as a misfit or an outsider. Oscar is the 'Odd-Bod' at Oxford, while Lucinda scandalises conservative small-town Australia by wearing bloomers. Both are effectively alone in the world, and for Oscar this is especially the case once he arrives in Australia. Again, as with the rest of the novels in this group, suffering in Oscar and Lucinda manifests itself primarily in terms of isolation, estrangement and loss.

Oscar and Lucinda's shared addiction to gambling, furthermore, is also related in large measure to their shared sense of alienation, and lack of social skills. In gambling they each are able to feel the confidence which eludes them in their daily life.¹² For Oscar, gambling, ironically, gives him what God cannot. However his idiosyncratic if not specious interpretation of 'God's will' means that he attempts to justify his gambling in terms of its being a metaphor for faith (p261).

The link between the sense of alienation and the compulsion to gamble however is seen most clearly in Chapter 64 of the novel in relation to

¹⁰ See p32.

¹¹ The absent parent is a common theme in the novels from the second group. For example, in addition to being present in Oscar and Lucinda it may also be seen in Brookner's novel, and in The Remains of the Day. It is often linked with the motif of *the suffering child*. See below.

¹² In fact this is true of virtually all of the characters who fit into the roles of *outsider* or *emotionally paralysed person* (See 'motifs of suffering' below). Claudia, Lively's main character, is alienated but what she lacks in relationships she compensates for in her intellectual brilliance and beauty. Similarly Edith Hope uses her writing to compensate for the lack of close relationships, and even Colley's preaching in Rites of Passage may be seen as an attempt to alleviate isolation. See GINDIN, J. (1988), William Golding, Macmillan Modern Novelists, Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Lucinda. Here Lucinda is feeling particularly alienated having only recently returned to Australia. There has been trouble at the glassworks in her absence and morale is bad. As a woman and as the owner she is not made welcome there when she visits. Her sense of isolation is complete when, on returning home, she realises that her one close friend the Rev. Denis Hasset, is to be given a parish elsewhere. Walking through the streets of Woollahra, her despair makes her feel that she is going mad. She goes to the manse where Hasset used to live but finds no one there except the child of the new occupants (p295), and she feels:

'.. unlaced and not connected.'

By contrast, after having decided to go to a Chinese lottery, she feels herself to be integrated, and although she initially runs through the whole gamut of emotions, eventually she gains some semblance of self-confidence (p298). As a result, by the end of the evening when she is firmly ensconced at the card table, she is described as no longer feeling:

'.. lonely, and she was not frightened or shy.'¹³

In Kazuo Ishiguro's novel The Remains of the Day the themes of regret, loss and isolation appear again, as do those of *the absent parent* and of unexpressed grief.

It may be argued that this narrative also follows the pattern described above in relation to the first group of novels where the suffering of one character effects a change on the actions of another. Here it is the butler Stevens' awareness of the unhappiness of his former colleague Miss Kenton (now Mrs Benn) which makes him confront his own situation. However, in this novel it is not the physical suffering of one character which affects another, but rather emotional pain. Furthermore, the point at the end of the novel is that there is nothing left for Stevens. There is little

¹³ See p299.

open to him in the way of possible changes to be made or moral choices to be taken. He has realised what is truly important at too late a stage in his life. Thus he is faced with the prospect of old age, illness and eventual death and this is paralleled also by the apparently inevitable loss of any opportunities for happiness in the future and of the limited happiness he has had to date, for it is clear after their meeting towards the end of the novel that he will not see Mrs Benn again.

Thus suffering is again linked primarily to the main character's sense of isolation and remorse, and to a retrospective sense of grief for his dead father and for the loss of his own chances of love. Furthermore there is more of a sense of total loss in this novel than in some of the others. Where Claudia Hampton is able to come to some sense of reconciliation with the events of the past as Moon Tiger progresses, and Oscar and Lucinda are to some extent able to ease for each other the pain of isolation, Ishiguro's main character realises all too late that there is no chance to make up for his lack of close emotional commitment in the past. His father is long dead and the woman who once loved him is now married. As he contemplates the full extent of his isolation and the prospect of death at the end of the novel, Stevens realises that he does not even have the chance which his former employer Lord Darlington had to formally admit he was wrong. Even if he had, he realises that having devoted himself to a life of self-effacement and the service of his 'betters' his views would not matter anyway. Ironically, having sacrificed all for duty, all that Stevens now has left is duty.

I have commented above in relation to the novels which won the Booker Prize in the early part of the 1980s that the ability to see suffering in physical terms and to depict this, sometimes in very detailed and graphic descriptions does not necessarily make for a more credible text overall. In fact, I have argued, this aspect of the first five texts which I considered is sometimes one of the facets of the narratives which helps to undermine the

work as a whole. In general terms, the novels in which suffering is depicted mainly in mental and emotional terms are more recognisable as a genre and very often even the depiction of mental anguish or of deep emotion here is, in itself, less than convincing.

Thus whatever links may exist between the ten novels which won the Booker Prize during the 1980s in terms of thematic and linguistic similarities, and in spite of the fact that suffering of one kind or another is prevalent in all of the novels, as a group they lack emotional authenticity. Indeed this may be said to be another way in which the ten novels are linked. Even in 1980 Margaret Forster, one of that year's panel of judges, noted this lack of emotional authenticity when she singled out Anita Desai's shortlisted novel Clear Light of Day. It was, she said:

'.. the only novel of the whole 60 [submissions] which moved me.'¹⁴

In the novels which won during the later Eighties it seems to be the case that this lack of credibility is often linked to an inability on the part of the writer to produce credible exchanges between the characters in the novels. This may in turn be linked to a general lack of awareness among the authors concerned.

In Penelope Lively's 1987 winner Moon Tiger the novel has more than one narrator, but it is Claudia Hampton's voice which is the one most frequently heard. Problems occur in this narrative whichever voice is dominant however, and there are particular problems when dialogue is used. For example, even in the most emotionally authentic section of the novel, when Claudia's relationship with her lover is described, the dialogue

¹⁴ FORSTER, M., (1980), "Secrets of a Glittering Prize", The Sunday Times, 26th October.

does not ring true. On p76 of the novel the following exchange occurs between Tom and Claudia:

**'Tom stirs.
 Claudia murmurs, "Are you awake?"
 "I'm awake".
 "You should have said. We could be talking."
 He lays a hand on her thigh.
 "What should we talk about?"'**

Within an intimate context it seems odd that Tom does not merely reply "Yes" in answer to Claudia's question. Throughout this novel the dialogue sounds inauthentic, and while Lively wishes to show her central character to be pedantic at certain points in the text, the stilted speech at various points elsewhere in the novel calls into question the general ability of the author to authentically reproduce dialogue.¹⁵

A similar problem concerning authenticity arises in Ishiguro's text where the flatness of the dominant narrative voice and ungrammatical circumlocution could in one sense be said to make for a less credible narrative.¹⁶ As with Lively's text the difficulty here presents itself when we consider to what extent the voices of the narrator and the author should be regarded as being one and the same.

In Ishiguro's novel however the solecisms audible in the narrative voice are constant throughout the text, and this encourages the reader to assume that these are in fact intentional and employed by the author to suggest certain characteristics of the narrator. This interpretation is given weight by the fact that elsewhere in the text, including in his conversations with other people,

¹⁵ See also Claudia's retort to her lover in later life, Jasper (p64):
 'I do not see how you can be so majestically egotistical as to place yourself in total detachment from your antecedents just because you find your father inadequate.'

This is not only virtually impossible to say, but sounds ridiculously pedantic and inauthentic.

¹⁶ This point was raised by Howard Jacobson as Chairman of the studio panel during the 1989 coverage of the Booker ceremony on BBC 2's "The Late Show".

the narrator, Stevens, is shown to be pompous and circumlocutious in his speech.

If there are some general patterns in the treatment of the theme of suffering in the Booker Prize-winning novels from this period relating to whether or not suffering is depicted primarily in physical or emotional/intellectual terms and that in general terms they lack credibility, there are nevertheless more specific traits which link the novels from both groups. These relate to what I shall henceforth label 'motifs of suffering', by which I mean images used to depict suffering which are recurrent in novels from both the early and the later group. It is the recurrence of these that gives claims of thematic standardisation extra weight.

There are several easily identifiable motifs which occur in novels from both groups. These include the motif of *the suffering child* and that of *the emotionally paralysed person*. The latter co-incides with the motifs of *isolation* and of *the outsider*. Other motifs include the motif of *the bereft*, and *the torture of the guilty*, and to a lesser extent, the motif of *independence versus relationships* which occurs almost exclusively in relation to women characters.

I shall now look at these in more detail.

The motif of *the suffering child* can be seen to be depicted either in terms of physical or emotional suffering, and sometimes both. It occurs in Carey's novel, particularly in relation to Oscar, and especially in his attempts as a child to cope with the death of his mother and with his father's often severe treatment of him. However it also occurs in relation to Lucinda and again particularly after the death of her father.

It occurs too in Life and Times of Michael K, and Michael suffers particularly in having a cleft palate which both makes him deformed and causes him problems with his speech and general ability to communicate. It also occurs in Hotel du Lac, and especially in The Bone People, where it relates to both Joe and Simon. Similarly it recurs, though to a lesser extent, in Moon Tiger, in relation to both Claudia and to her daughter Lisa, neither of whom have experienced much parental love. The motif of *the suffering child* is discernible in addition in Schindler's Ark where Keneally suggests while recounting details from Oskar's early life that although the young Oskar was materially privileged, relationships were often strained between his mother and his father and this was difficult for the young Schindler to bear.

The motif of *the outsider* is present in Golding's novel in relation to Colley, and is also present, though less realistically pursued, in Midnight's Children. Both Colley and Saleem Sinai are 'different' and both of them are discriminated against. This motif occurs again in Life and Times of Michael K. In the 1985 winner all three central characters are outsiders, for Simon is the mute, long-haired fair-skinned child of a Maori step-father, and Kere the asexual artist who builds her own home in a tower. Joe, furthermore, is an outsider, partly because he has lost the security he formerly had in the relationship with his wife and child, and indeed much of this character's frustration comes from the fact that alone with a Pakeha step-child he feels that he does not fit in. In fact this is shown to be a major contributory factor in his violence towards the child.

There is also an implicit suggestion in Moon Tiger that Claudia Hampton is an outsider, since she, like Kere in The Bone People is 'too clever for her own good'. In addition, both Oscar and Lucinda in Carey's novel are misfits - he, the 'Odd-Bod' who is simultaneously both religious and a

compulsive gambler, she, the single female owner of a glass factory who wears unorthodox clothes.

There are some motifs which are related to each other and which occur in several of the novels. These include the motifs of *the isolated* and of the *emotionally paralysed person*. These are both applicable to some extent to Colley in Rites of Passage, certainly to K in Coetzee's novel, though the character himself seems largely unconcerned and unaware of this, to Edith Hope in Hotel du Lac, and to Kere in The Bone People. They are also applicable to some extent to Claudia in Moon Tiger when Tom dies and she no longer has a close relationship with her brother Gordon, and they are easily applicable to Lucinda at various points throughout Carey's novel.

A particularly important motif in relation to the majority of winners from the Eighties is that of *the bereft*. This is relevant to some extent to Michael K after his mother dies and he finds himself unable to leave the hospital. It is certainly true of Edith Hope, primarily in relation to her affair with David, but also in that she is bereft of any kind memories of her late mother, and in that, as the novel progresses she grows increasingly aware that her chance of a relationship which is both loving and permanent may have gone forever. It is true of both Kere and Joe in The Bone People and of Claudia in Moon Tiger, and it occurs, though to a lesser extent, in The Old Devils where the awareness of death and of loss are prevalent throughout the novel.

This motif also appears in Oscar and Lucinda, at least in relation to the early lives of the two central characters which are coloured by the loss of a parent. It also occurs, though less importantly, in The Remains of the Day, where, years after the event, Stevens relives his experience of bereavement on the death of his father and realises furthermore that his chance of a relationship with Miss Kenton is now gone forever.

Also cognate with the motif of *the bereft* is that of *the torture of the guilty*. Edmund Talbot, Oskar Schindler and the Medical Officer in Coetzee's novel are all affected, sometimes even motivated, by guilt. Similarly as the narrative progresses in Hotel du Lac it becomes clear that Brookner's heroine is still experiencing guilt over her treatment of Geoffrey Long although some time has elapsed since she jilted him. As the novel builds to a climax this involves Edith reliving these events and also in confronting her guilt about what was to be the day of her wedding.

In The Bone People Kere feels tremendous guilt regarding her own role in Joe's final beating of Simon, and she is tortured also by memories of her last meeting with her family. Joe for his part is constantly troubled by guilt relating to his abuse of Simon, while Simon, typically, blames himself for Joe's beatings.

In Kingsley Amis's novel it is Peter more than anyone else who remains troubled by guilt, in this case at his past treatment of Rhiannon, while in Midnight's Children the narrator Saleem Sinai constantly takes the blame for events which have happened in the past, such as the break-up of the Sabarmati family.

The torture of the guilty motif also recurs, though to a lesser extent, in Moon Tiger and in Oscar and Lucinda. In the latter text however this is usually depicted as being as much to do with Oscar's guilt in relation to failing to live up to God's expectations as with his guilt in relation to other people. There is remorse and an understated guilt throughout Ishiguro's novel, but this becomes more explicit when Stevens contemplates his treatment of his father, of the Jewish servant girls whom he had dismissed and, ultimately, of Miss Kenton.

The motif of *independence versus relationships* is of some significance though it occurs less widely than most of the other motifs since it is used almost exclusively in relation to women characters. It appears in Hotel du Lac and to some extent in Moon Tiger, though Claudia is prepared to marry Tom. In Ishiguro's novel furthermore, the character of Miss Kenton is also faced with a hard choice though here there is an additional difficulty in that she is not sure if she will ever have the possibility of a relationship with Stevens. A slight variation on the motif occurs in this novel in relation to Stevens' responses to the call of duty and the attachments he has to people around him.

Another variation on *independence versus relationships* can also be seen in The Bone People. Here, however, Kere's choice is not between the prospect of career-related independence and the potential for erotic love, but rather between solitude and independence, the value of which she in any case has begun to question, and her love for and sense of responsibility towards Simon and Joe. For each of the characters to whom this motif applies in any of the novels a dilemma arises from an awareness of the conflicting natures of their deepest wishes.

Although the motifs identified above occur in novels from both groups, some are more recurrent in one group than the other. Thus the motif of *the bereft* occurs more frequently in the latter group than in the former. The predominantly female motif of *independence versus relationships* also occurs almost exclusively in novels from the second group, that is, in Hotel du Lac, Moon Tiger, and in The Remains of the Day, though as I have noted there is also a slightly modified version of this motif in The Bone People. It may also be relevant that all but one of these novels was written by a woman. The *torture of the guilty motif* however appears in both groups with equal frequency. Generally speaking though the frequency of

these recurrent motifs is more noticeable among the novels from the second group than in those from the first.

The question arises here as to what extent thematic links might be expected to occur in any group of texts. If, for example, we take the group of novels which formed the control group for the key word analysis in Chapter Five, it might be regarded as being significant that there is a murder, a suicide and an allusion to an attempted murder in three out of the four novels. If, in addition, we compare the patterns of occurrence of these motifs in Booker winners to their occurrence in the control group of novels used in Chapter Five, then it is clear that some of the motifs also appear in the control group texts as well as among the Booker winners.

In Summer's Lease, for example, Molly may be considered to exemplify the motif of *independence versus relationships*. She deliberately isolates herself from her husband, having discovered that he has been having regular lunch appointments with Mrs Tobias, and her quest to discover the identity of Fosdyke's murderer is in large measure an attempt to assert herself as woman in her own right, independent of her husband. Moreover, Buck Kettering to some extent could be seen to exemplify *the torture of the guilty* motif, though this is less pronounced, and Hugh Pargeter is to some extent an *emotionally paralysed person* even though by the end of the novel he and Molly have reached a new understanding and are communicating better.

As far as the other three novels are concerned, however, few if any of the motifs would seem to be present in Money, or for that matter in A Far Cry From Kensington, though to some extent there is a suggestion of the motif of *the bereft* in the latter following Wanda Podolak's suicide.

Nevertheless, in A Disaffection, the main character Doyle is certainly *emotionally paralysed, isolated, and an outsider*. Moreover, Doyle's disaffection comes in part from a sense of guilt at being more privileged than most other people from his background, including the rest of his own family. He is further distressed by this since his experience of higher education and the relative security of his job have not made him happy, nor does he feel fulfilled. In fact, Doyle's emotional paralysis comes in part from being caught between two cultures; a working-class culture, with its strong work ethic, and the middle-class culture of ideals and aspirations whose values he feels he has taken on in becoming a teacher.

The general picture here is of suffering as being recurrent in one way or another both in the control group of texts and among the Booker winners. However, the patterns or motifs of suffering appear to be proportionately higher in the Booker winners than in the others. This may be seen as further evidence of a thematic standardisation.

The inference which may be drawn from the above is that where in the previous chapter it looked possible that some similarities in the frequency of certain words and groups of words might be a reflection of some deeper homogeneity, this is in fact borne by an examination of thematic similarities and how these are treated in the Booker texts. In addition, general patterns which existed among the control group texts and the four Booker texts considered in the previous chapter in the use of certain words and word groups seem to be borne out also if one considers thematic concerns.

There is one further area worthy of note here. This relates specifically to Peter Carey's 1988 winner Oscar and Lucinda, and to the links between this novel and Hulme's 1985 winner in respect of the depiction of suffering. Oscar Hopkins shares with the character of Simon in Hulme's novel a fear of the sea. However, not only do the two characters suffer from

thalassophobia, but in each case the root of the fear is the same. Both Oscar and Simon fear the sea because it reminds them of death and in each case too the phobia has its origins in early childhood. In Oscar and Lucinda as with most novels from the second group, the fear of death is of great importance. Oscar's mother's clothes were thrown into the sea after she died, and when Oscar thinks about the sea it:

'..smelt of death to him.'¹⁷

It is interesting to compare this with The Bone People where Simon's fear of the sea is also expressed in terms of smell. For Simon:

'The smell of the sea was the smell of blood.'¹⁸

This is particularly interesting given that Carey's earlier novel Illywhacker which was runner up to Hulme's novel in the 1985 Booker Prize shows many similarities with Rushdie's 1981 winner both in its structure and in some of the depictions of suffering. In Illywhacker as in Midnight's Children the main character is to a large extent a metonym for a developing country and similarities between these two novels extend furthermore to the nature of injuries that Herbert Badgery, his son Charles and daughter Sonia share with Saleem Sinai and the Brass Monkey. Charles, like Saleem, suffers a blow on the head which causes him to become deaf, and Sonia, like Saleem's sister, also goes through a phase of religious fanaticism, though in the case of Sonia this results in her disappearing down a mineshaft.

It may be that this indicates a form of standardisation in Carey's writing in that this author wrote in a specific way which showed similarities with earlier winning novels in the hope that this would offer him a better chance of winning the Booker Prize. It is certainly true, as Anthony Thwaite noted

¹⁷ See Oscar and Lucinda, p16.

¹⁸ See The Bone People, p110.

in 1986,¹⁹ that in the past the early submissions for the prize included a significant number of novels which showed an element of standardisation insofar as they corresponded to recognisable genres of novels which had previously won.

However what it could indicate in addition is a form of pre-selection, or standardisation, on the part of the judges for the prize. This aspect of standardisation is of special interest here as there seems to be more evidence of thematic standardisation as the decade progressed and it is also true as the previous chapter shows, that the winning novels displayed more evidence of standardisation in respect of the use of language as the decade went on. In addition I have shown in Chapter Four that the judging panels became more homogenous and that there were increasing numbers of judges who were socially connected to their fellow-members of the panel. Thus it could be that it was this homogeneity that was reflected in the conservative choices of the judges.

It could be also be argued however that the apparent conservatism reflects some general trends in fiction during this period. This was a point raised by the Australian computer linguist Professor John Burrows when I submitted to him for comment some of the initial findings of the preliminary research for Chapter Five. In the event nothing in Burrows' work had a direct bearing on my own. Nevertheless he too suggested that perhaps the recurrence of word groups dealing with the themes of death, loss and bereavement was no more than a reflection of the general elegaic tone which he believed was evident to an outsider in the novels and films which were coming out of Britain at that time.²⁰ However he noted that this did not explain why the same elegaic quality was present in the Booker Prize-

¹⁹ See THWAITE, A., (1987), "Booker 1986", *Encounter*, Vol. 68, pp37-38.

²⁰ See letter from Prof. John Burrows to S. Norris, 3rd February 1994.

winning novels which had originated in countries other than Britain where this tendency was not otherwise apparent.

This tends to suggest that there was also a form of standardisation apparent in the winners of the Booker Prize during the 1980s which was the result of a pre-selection on the part of the judges.

I should like to turn, finally, to the issue of narrative modes of winning novels, for if it is true that standardisation became more apparent in respect of the similarities in the use of word groups and in the treatment of themes as the decade went on, it is also true that the choices made by the panels of judges also became more conservative in respect of the narrative modes. I indicated earlier in my outline of the basic argument of this chapter that our expectations of the novel and of the depiction of suffering therein in general terms probably include an expectation that this should be depicted largely in terms of a realist narrative mode.

Certainly the novels which won in 1984 and from 1986-1989 employ more traditional narrative styles than the novels in the first group. The two novels from the second group which may be said in any sense to be experimental narratives are Carey's Victorian pastiche Oscar and Lucinda and Penelope Lively's Moon Tiger. However, Lively's experimentation is limited in that she experiments not so much with the style of the narrative as with the chronology of the events related. This serves to back up Claudia's contention that 'history is not chronological'.

In the novels which won in the early Eighties and in 1985, Golding's novel is experimental insofar as it experiments with re-creating the language and indeed the form of earlier novels. This contrasts with the more 'modern' thematic pessimism of the novel, particularly in relation to the unsympathetic and indeed dystopian picture which Golding presents here,

as elsewhere in his work, of life lived in an environment where people are forced to live in close proximity to one another. Thus Talbot writes on the last page of his journal:

'With lack of sleep and too much understanding I grow a little crazy, I think, like all men at sea who live too close to each other and too close there by to all that is monstrous under the sun and moon' (p278).

Hulme's novel is more audacious in its narrative form than many of the other novels which won during the 1980s, mixing passages of first and third person narrative with song-lyric, and also mixing past and present tenses. In addition there are several passages particularly at the beginning of this novel, which are more akin to poetry than to prose.

With regard to an increasing conservatism among the judges, if the emphasis on physical suffering in the first group of novels is paralleled by a more innovative use of narrative overall, it is also true nevertheless that the only wholly experimental text in terms of its narrative form is Rushdie's novel. Although Rushdie's eschewal of formal realism in this text arguably gives the material of the novel heightened impact, not only was this the only explicitly anti-realist text to win during the Eighties, but there appears to have been a strong bias against this type of non-realist narrative thereafter. While the merit of Rushdie's writing was recognised in 1981, by 1988 the Chairman of the Panel of judges, Michael Foot, expressed a distaste for 'the modern cult of magical realism' in his after-dinner speech.

To sum up, it is possible to make a distinction between the winners from the early Eighties and those from 1984 and 1986-1989 inclusive in terms of whether suffering is primarily experienced as physical or intellectualised pain. In addition it is also possible to discern recurrent motifs of suffering in the winning novels from both the early the later group of winners. The second group of novels however may be said to display more of the features which were characteristic of Booker Prize shortlisted fiction of this

period, and these novels may be said to form more of a homogenous group. They are characteristically non-controversial, largely self-referential, show little awareness of life other than as experienced within the narrow confines of the social environment in which the characters operate, and, as I have already noted, three out of the five novels have a writer as the main or a main character.

This lack of awareness of the realities of physical suffering in the novels from the second group which is implicit in the lack of credible dialogue in the novels, may be seen to reflect a more general lack of awareness among the winning authors, though Taylor for one argues that this was a characteristic feature of British fiction as a whole during this period.²¹

²¹ TAYLOR, D. J., (1989), A Vain Conceit: British Fiction in the 1980s. Bloomsbury, London, e. g. pp15-16.

CONCLUSION TO PART 3

In the two chapters above I have shown that there is evidence of standardisation, both in respect of linguistic links among the texts and in respect of similarities in the treatment and depiction of the theme of suffering.

In Chapter Five I showed that the links between texts in respect of the use of language is less pronounced in terms of the recurrence of individual key words than in the use of related word groups. Indeed there was little difference between the Booker-winning texts and the novels in the control group in respect of key words.

This in itself may be of some significance in that it is possible to argue that the fact that there is no great divergence from the pattern displayed in the control group texts among the Booker winners adds further weight to claims made about the representative nature of Booker-winning fiction. On the other hand however, it could be argued that the lack of any characteristic patterns in the use of key words among the Booker texts is significant since it throws into question the idea that Booker winners of the Eighties were in some way special or distinct from other novels of the period. Thus, ironically, one might say that if these novels are in any way 'representative', it is insofar as they represent the run-of-the mill, and are not formally, linguistically, or even thematically innovative.

If the fact that Booker winners from this period did not differ markedly from other novels in the use of language is assumed to be indicative of a general resemblance between Booker novels and other texts, then our attention must return to the selection and pre-selection processes outlined in Chapter Four since this would then seem to imply that the fact that these

novels became bestsellers and their reception as 'good' fiction probably had more to do with this than with any inherent features of the texts themselves.

I suggested in Chapter Five that the fact that there was a recurrence of groups of words relating to loss and bereavement among the Booker texts suggested that there would be thematic links among the novels that won the prize during the Eighties, and indeed this was borne out by further investigation in Chapter Six. I suggested however that this could have been indicative of a prevalence of certain themes in fiction as a whole during this period. However, the fact that the key word analysis showed a correlation among the Booker-winning novels that was not present to the same extent among the control group texts (which were largely drawn from the same period) and, furthermore, as Burrows pointed out, the fact that in any case the elegaic quality which seemed to link these novels was present in novels which originated both in Britain *and* from the Commonwealth further suggests a pre-selection on the part of the judges. The conservatism apparent here in addition may be said to have been reflected in the lack of experimentation with narrative modes apparent in the winners from the second group.

I have noted a thematic standardisation in respect of the way suffering was depicted. In addition to there being general patterns in relation to whether or not suffering was depicted primarily in physical or emotional/intellectual terms, I suggested that standardisation was also evident in more specific ways in respect of the recurrence of motifs of suffering. Furthermore I noted that there was more evidence of homogeneity in the winners from the latter part of the decade than in those which won in the early Eighties.

In addition, while I noted specific links between Carcy's two Booker-shortlisted novels and earlier Booker winners from the 1980s, there were

also more generalised links and 'borrowings' from earlier sources outwith the Booker-shortlists among several other winners. These relate to narrative form as well as thematic content, and several inferences may be drawn from this.

The epistolary form which Golding chooses serves to place the text in a tradition which includes some of the most venerated names in the development of the early novel. This may be seen to help to establish, as it were, the authenticity of the novel as a written account from the post-Napoleonic period. In addition however Golding may also be seen to be attempting to underline his own credentials as an author, in terms of displaying both his knowledge of literary history and his skill at pastiche.

In the past the Booker Prize shortlists and the early submissions have frequently included texts which have sought, either thematically or in their form, to emulate the Victorian novel in particular, though to a large extent this has mirrored a trend which was prevalent in any case in British fiction as a whole. While D. J. Taylor, writing in 1989 of British fiction of the Eighties, bemoaned a general lack of experimentation, he also acknowledged that fictions which harked back to a previous age in many cases had more force than novels of the time which were explicitly contemporary either in form or in theme.²²

The winning novel from 1988 is again of particular interest here for both thematically and stylistically Oscar and Lucinda harks back to the Victorian novel, though the nature of the comedy in this novel is very much rooted in the Twentieth Century. Carey's themes include many which were preoccupations during the mid-Victorian period including emigration, the

²² See Taylor (op. cit.) pp16-17:

'Whenever an accomplished and specifically English novelist does emerge - a Peter Ackroyd, say, or a Graham Swift - it is significant that he moves backwards. *Hawksmoor* and *Waterland* were brilliant books, and their brilliance lay in that they used the past, and in Ackroyd's case the language of the past, to reinterpret the present.'

industrial revolution, and, above all, the peculiar intensity and plurality of religious belief in Victorian society.

In addition, Carey, like Golding, attempts to 'authenticate' the literary-historical background of the novel by referring to real people and incidents from the period. Thus references are made to the Great Exhibition of 1851 and to the writer George Eliot (as Marian Evans), who is supposed to have been a friend of Lucinda's mother .

However, Carey borrows heavily from one source in particular, that is, Edmund Gosse's autobiographical novel Father and Son. Although he acknowledges this debt at the beginning of the novel, it is significant that one of the most crucial incidents in the text is borrowed from Gosse, and, furthermore, that this relates to the theme of suffering. In Chapter Three of Oscar and Lucinda Oscar's father, like Gosse's, forces his son to spit out a mouthful of much-coveted Christmas pudding as he believes it to be contaminated by sin. This is a pivotal scene in the novel, and as in Gosse, it also serves here to underline the increasing alienation of father from son and their mutual incomprehension.

In addition to the 'borrowing' of this particular incident, the characterisation of Oscar's father owes much to Gosse's descriptions of his own father, and the description of Hopkins senior and Oscar on the beach looking for specimens is again highly influenced by Gosse. While as I have noted Carey acknowledges his debt to Gosse there are similarities between this novel and other more recent work. I have already noted the links between Oscar and Lucinda and The Bone People, however there are also similarities with other works such as as Dennis Potter's Where Adam Stood and these were not credited.

Carey is not the only winning author to have made use of material from earlier sources and the source of material borrowed was not restricted to the Victorian novel, nor for that matter was it restricted solely to British fiction.²³ In addition to Golding's attempt at imitating the style of Fielding or Richardson there may be said to be some stylistic links between Rushdie and, for example, Gabriel Garcia Marquez. Furthermore in Coetzee's novel the writer clearly intends a parallel between the main character K and Kafka's K characters. Hulme's novel has less direct parallels with individual novelists, but The Bone People stylistically may be seen to represent a pastiche of various streams of consciousness fictions, while Lively borrows themes from, among others, Keith Douglas's Alamein to Zem Zem.

This trend may be seen among other things as reflecting a tendency among the authors involved (and possibly the judges) to 'play safe'. For while it would be narrow-minded to suggest that a writer should restrict his or herself to wholly 'original' material, firstly since Joyce and Shakespeare among others show that this need not be a recipe for lack of innovation, and secondly since the types of human experience with which literature deals are very often those which, like the experience of suffering, are common to us all, nevertheless in the case of Carey in particular, little attempt is made at re-working the material taken from the source.

I have suggested above that evidence of standardisation in respect of the fiction which won the Booker Prize during the 1980s both with regard to similarities in the treatment of themes and in their lack of experimentation in their narrative modes, and the conservatism on the part of the judges appears to have been more prevalent as the decade went on. It is hard to

²³ If this is a form of conservatism in action however, it should, nevertheless be compared with the tendency of critics in general and fly leaf 'blurb' writers in particular to attempt to authenticate the value of new or at least contemporary writers through a comparison with writers from the past whose works are received to be 'classic'. Thus, for example the 1989 paperback edition of James Kelman's novel A Disaffection compares the author to Beckett and to Kafka.

know exactly why this should have been the case. Nevertheless the increasing conservatism is also reflected in the after-dinner speeches of the Chairman of the panels of judges.

I have already alluded to Michael Foot's comments in 1988, and in Chapter Five I referred to the 1984 Chairman Richard Cobb's comments criticising the use of the vernacular in James Kelman's novel The Busconductor Hines. In fact the speeches made by the Chairmen in 1984 and 1985 are worth examining in detail for it seems to be the case that these two speeches express opposing views as to what sort of fiction it was assumed the Booker Prize ought to reward.

In his speech Cobb asserted that the Booker Prize should be for a novel which was:

'..easy to read', 'pleasant', and '..reassuring'.

More controversially however, he stated that:

'It is not for the judges in a novel prize to tell the general public what it ought to be reading; but to choose books that people are likely to want to read. In an operation of this kind, one would not go for a Proust or a Joyce - not that I would know about that, never having read either.'²⁴

The following year the Chairman of the panel of judges was the former Arts Minister Norman St. John-Stevas. Contrary to what Cobb had said, St. John-Stevas asserted that the purpose of the prize was: .

'.. not for providing a riveting yarn or an easy read...It is for a major and serious contribution to contemporary English fiction.'²⁵

²⁴ Quoted in WALSH, J., (1985), "Will Booker go by the Book?", The Times, 28th September.

²⁵ KEMP, P., (1985), "Winning Ways - The Booker Prize, LWT", The Times Literary Supplement, no. 4310, p1264.

It is clear that the 1985 Chairman believed that it was his duty to try and redress what he believed was a tipping of the balance in favour of a more anodyne, or at any rate more commercial, type of fiction as winner.²⁶

The 1984 and 1985 winners themselves demonstrate more visibly than most the 'unconscious see-saw effect' mentioned by Goff in Prizewriting. As I have noted in Chapter One, the 1984 winner sold proportionately more copies over a shorter period of time than any previous winner of the prize. The 1985 winner was the least popular winner of the decade in terms of hardback sales at least. [See Fig. 1.]

Nevertheless, inspite of St. John-Stevas's sentiments, with the exception of 1985, the winners of the prize from the mid-Eighties on more resembled the sort of fiction which Cobb had described than the type preferred by the 1985 Chairman. Furthermore if this type of winner had more commercial potential, evidently this was derived not from the novels' being representative of thematic or formal innovation, but rather from (or inspite of) their being introspective, uncontroversial and self-referential.

²⁶ N. B. see letter from Lord St. John of Fawsley to Sharon Norris, 25th June 1990, on the subject where he states:

'I was wholly concerned at restoring the status of the Booker Prize to a situation, from which it had slipped, where it was awarded for a genuine and original contribution to literature.'

CONCLUSION

'The Booker is internationally recognised as the world's top fiction prize.'¹

'..the annual preening and self-aggrandising hype known as the Booker Prize.'²

In drawing this thesis to a conclusion I wish to sum up my findings in the preceding chapters and to re-address the issues originally raised in the Introduction in the light of what has been discussed above.

Throughout the thesis I have argued that it is necessary to look at the success of the Booker Prize during the 1980s in a broader context. In Chapter One, I looked at the background to the founding of the prize in respect of the parent company's desire to sponsor an award, the historical context of prizes in Britain in the Sixties, and finally, the socio-political context which made for an environment more likely to be sympathetic to the setting up of an award of this kind.

Then in Chapter Two I looked in addition at the existing situation as regards prizes in Britain and at the sort of agenda behind the motivation of businesses to become involved in the sponsorship of literary awards. I looked specifically at issues relating to the prestige of the sponsoring company and to value for sponsorship, and I examined the general trend during the Eighties towards the setting up of business-sponsored literary awards. I also made a detailed comparison of the Booker Prize with several other awards and noted significant differences in the structure of this award.

As far as the findings of Chapters One and Two are concerned, it seems clear that all businesses have aims in the setting up of awards, whether these

¹ THWAITE, A., (1987), "Booker 1986", *Encounter*, Vol. 68., pp37-38.

² LAMONT, S., (1989), "In Good Faith", *The Glasgow Herald*, 23rd September.

are explicitly stated or not, and, one way or another, these usually relate back to the nature of the company and to the aims of the business world in general. They usually include the desire of the company to maximise publicity for itself and to add to its prestige. As for the specific aims of the Booker's sponsor, these included an attempt to signal the company's relocation of its interests in Britain and an enhancement of its prestige via an association with literature.

In all business-sponsorship of awards, prestige for the parent company comes about via an association with something else, in this case literature, which has a status received to be higher than the status of business. In addition, during the Eighties there were benefits in the way of extra publicity for the sponsor and tax relief to help induce companies to become involved in sponsorship of this kind, for, as I have shown in Chapter Three, it was the Government's policy at this time both to divest itself of responsibilities for the public funding of the arts and to attract business sponsors in its stead.

Given the hard business sense of the sponsors of the Booker Prize, the setting up of a Russian Booker Prize in 1992 and the 1993 "Booker of Bookers" competition must inevitably be viewed with some suspicion. For example, it is hard to see the former as anything other than a cynical attempt on the part of Booker Plc to extend its sphere of influence into the recently opened-up markets of Eastern Europe, and ironically the first Russian Booker Prize proved to be no less controversial than its British relative. In addition³ the winner of the award was not generally considered to be representative of contemporary Russian fiction. As for the latter, this must surely be seen primarily as an attempt by the company to blow its own trumpet and it is perhaps significant that it was Rushdie's 1981 winner, that is, a critically acclaimed novel rather than a commercial choice, which won.

³ See "Booker Shortlist Dismays Russians", The Sunday Times, 12th December 1993, l. p22.

Although Midnight's Children figures very low down on the list of best-selling Booker winners of the 1980s, the novel's success in the "Booker of Booker's" would seem to fit in with the aim of the event which can be seen to have been to underline the company's continued involvement with the arts over a period of time, and, implicitly, to enhance the company's prestige further therein. However, in giving the prize to Rushdie's novel the judges for that particular award may also be said to have underlined one of the explicit aims of the company in setting up the Booker Prize in 1968, which was to re-affirm the role of the author in a situation where he or she was in danger.

Thus if the character of the Booker Prize appears to have changed somewhat in the 1990s, for example in that it was unashamedly commercial in the choice of Roddy Doyle as winner in 1993, and less conservative as regards the use of strong language, and if, further, there may be said to be a new awareness in the novels that won in the Nineties of life lived outside the experience of the middle-class intellectuals of the south east and of social issues, we should nevertheless ask whether this in fact represents a substantial change in approach or whether it merely indicates each of these qualities was now more commercially viable than before.

In Part 2 I discussed the issue of patronage as a historical necessity and related this both to business-sponsorship and to the supposed autonomy of the author. While I suggested in Chapter Three that artistic autonomy was inevitably conditioned by economic factors and that any form of patronage ultimately influenced the nature of the work produced at one level or another, I noted that there was a substantial difference between the patronage of the individual aristocrat of the past and the sort of financial support on offer to the writer through literary prizes. I suggested further in Chapter Three that while there may have been a growing perception of a

need for outside funding for the arts in general, the conflation of business and aesthetic ideals which arose out of the business-sponsorship of literary awards must be seen in some measure to be traceable to a naivety and lack of caution on the part of those in the literary world who were in a position to decide whether this form of financial support should be embraced or not.

The issue of the autonomy of literature also figured in Chapter Four when I discussed social values. I demonstrated that there was a high level of social interconnections among authors, Management Committee members and judges, and I also noted that from the outset the judging panel for the prize was dominated by members of the literary and media establishments. This situation made for an environment where it was at least very likely that social values were substituted for aesthetic ones. I argued that not only did this situation have parallels with the literary establishment of the Thirties and Forties which the contributors to Scrutiny were so critical of, but it suggested that the literary establishment in Britain as a whole had not changed substantially since then. Thus, even if the Booker Prize did no more than reflect the values of the literary establishment, in so doing it nevertheless still perpetuated an unhealthy elitism.

In Part 3 I looked for evidence of standardisation in the novels that won the Booker Prize during the 1980s. While I acknowledged the fact that there may be some general connections among any group of novels, nevertheless, having noted in earlier chapters that the financial rewards of this prize alone were a powerful incentive for any author, I wished to see if there was any indication that winning authors had deliberately attempted to write "prize-worthy" fiction.

In Chapter Five I found some evidence of linguistic links among the novels which won the Booker during the Eighties. This was not particularly pronounced however except in the case of the recurrence of

similar word groups. The implications of this were, firstly, that claims that the novels which won the Booker Prize were somehow representative of current fiction were true only in so far as, linguistically at least, the novels were not significantly different to other fictions, and, secondly, that the recurrence of word groups relating to loss and bereavement indicated that it was likely that thematic links would also be in evidence. In Chapter Six I showed that this was indeed the case, but I argued that as far as the theme of suffering was concerned, it was less the recurrence of this theme that was significant as the similarities in the ways in which suffering was understood and depicted by the authors concerned. I noted in particular the recurrence of certain recognisable 'motifs of suffering'

I argued furthermore that such standardisation as was apparent in novels which won had additional implications. It *could* be interpreted as being an indication that some authors were intent on writing a type of fiction which they perceived to have a better chance of winning the Booker Prize. However, it could, in addition be said to be the result of the shared set of values mentioned in Chapter Four.

In addition to the links apparent in the treatment and depiction of suffering in these texts, I noted a general tendency, both thematically and formally, to 'borrow' from earlier sources, and in particular from the Victorian novel. In addition to an acknowledgement of the belief that the novel as a literary form reached a high point during the Victorian period, I believe this also suggests a common understanding among the shortlisted writers of what the novel is or should be and one which looks back to more realistic and arguably more conservative forms than forward to experimental or 'modern' forms.

However, I believe this also suggests a shared set of values in relation both to an implicitly agreed on canon of 'classic' literature, and also to what

ought to be viewed as being the significant events in history. This in turn further suggests a 'sensus communis' not so much in relation to what have been unquestionably important events in history and particular in the history of the British Empire, but also in respect of a general approach to interpreting historical events. It further indicates an implicit agreement as to the significance of history as an academic subject and it is perhaps significant in this context that a substantial number of judges and authors have undergraduate degrees in some area of history.⁴

I argued in Chapter Six that standardisation in the texts which won the Booker during the 1980s may also be said to reflect a pre-selection on the part of the judges, and conservatism on the part of the judges as regards the choice of winning novel certainly became more apparent as the decade went on. Indeed it seems that the judges at the time chose deliberately not to reward certain authors whose work was in some way distinctive. Thus Graham Swift's Waterland, Martin Amis's Money, and Alasdair Gray's Lanark, plus the work of Angela Carter during this period, are only a few example of fictions which in their own way charted new territory in the geography of the novel yet which were overlooked by successive judging panels.

To conclude then, in the Forties Orwell argued in his essay "The Prevention of Literature"⁵ that 'a bought mind was a spoiled mind' insofar

⁴ N. B. If one looks over the list of winners from the 1980s, virtually all of them are located in a specific period of the past. E. g. Golding's novel in the early Nineteenth Century, Rushdie's in the immediately post-Independence period of Indian history, Keneally's in World War Two. Lively's text is obsessed with history and the idea of history as memory and the narrative flits back and forth between different periods in the main character's 'history'. The 1988 winner is, as I have mentioned, set in the mid-Victorian period, and the 1989 winner in the inter-war years earlier this century. Although the 1983 winner from Coetzee, the Brookner novel which won the year after, Keri Hulme's 1985 winner, and Kingsley Amis's The Old Devils which won in 1986 do not refer to the past in such a specific way, these are very elegaic texts which in general look back to a better past, and Brookner's novel has much wry comment (e. g. in Chapter 2) on the role of the 'new' woman in the Eighties which makes the latter seem less than ideal.

⁵ ORWELL, G., (1946), "The Prevention of Literature", The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell 4. In Front of Your Nose, 1945-50, edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, Secker and Warburg, London, 1968.

as it led to orthodoxy, and that orthodoxy, whatever its root, was the death knell for fiction writing in that it went against everything that the novel stood for. Nevertheless, I argued in Chapter Six that it is possible to talk of a 'typical' Booker-winning novel of the Eighties, at least insofar as there were certain features of the novels which won, particularly those from the latter part of the decade, that seemed to characterise the prize at this time.

If, as Watt suggests, the novel is understood to be the literary form above all others which is most suited to an exploration of the human psyche and of unique and individual human experience, then clearly, insofar as there is any evidence of standardisation among the Booker Prize-winners of the Eighties, the Booker Prize should be viewed with some suspicion. Furthermore some very clear examples of spontaneity and experimentation in respect of fiction seem to have gone unrecognised by judges of the Booker Prize during the 1980s, and instead compromise choices and uncontroversial fictions held sway, particularly in the second half of the decade.

I have argued throughout this thesis that the significance of the Booker Prize has ultimately to do with its efficacy as a marketing device. Insofar as this prize may be seen to have had the capacity during the 1980s to affect the reception process via its capacity to sell novels and therein to disseminate a received understanding of 'good' which may have had very little to do with an assessment of literary merit, this award must be seen to be significant in any overview of the literary history of the last three decades. Furthermore, it will continue to be so as long as it has such a marked effect on the sales of novels.

POSTSCRIPT

'While not the most extraordinary appointment since Caligula made his horse consul, it is undeniably unexpected.'¹

'The Booker is by tradition controversial, apart, of course, from the always controversial final choice.'²

Although the initial quotation above does not refer to the decision to award the 1994 Booker Prize to James Kelman's novel How Late it Was, How Late, it might be said to be equally applicable to the choice of the panel that year as it was to the 1985 winner. The reason for this is that the Kelman novel's success seemed to belie every piece of received wisdom on the Booker Prize, and, apparently, to contradict much of what has been said above.

For a start the novel was the first Scottish winner of the prize in 26 years, and was one of two Scottish novels on that year's shortlist, along with George Mackay Brown's Beside the Ocean of Time. This was something of a record, for throughout the history of the prize only three Scottish authors had been included on the shortlists prior to this, and this included Kelman himself in 1989 and Muriel Spark who had been on the shortlist several times.

Thus it seemed to contradict the unwritten rule that 'regional', in this case Scottish, novels do not win. Furthermore Kelman's novel was more regional than most, being firmly rooted in the west of Scotland.

However, the novel was not only Scottish in terms of its author and the location of the action. It is written in the vernacular, specifically in the

¹ HOWARD, P., (1985), The Times, 1st November.

² JAMES, P. D., (1987), Whitaker '87 (An Almanack for the Year of our Lord 1987, 119th edition), J. Whitaker and Sons, London, p1092.

language of working-class Glaswegians, and it deals with a stratum of society that is not often given a voice in contemporary British literature. It is a novel about a low-life ex-convict called Samuels who drinks too much, begs, is robbed of his shoes and who fights with D. S. S. bureaucrats to have his blindness verified in order for him to be able to claim benefit.

The fact that this novel won therefore contradicts the received wisdom on what kind of a novel the prize goes to, in that it is a social critique and in that it is largely subversive in its irony. The characters in addition are not middle-class intellectuals from the south east of England.

The use of the vernacular in itself set the novel apart from other winners since this was something which seemed from the evidence of past shortlists to have been actively discouraged. Indeed, as I indicated in Chapter Five, Kelman himself was berated by Richard Cobb, the Chairman of the judges in 1984 in his after dinner speech for his use of the vernacular in The Busconductor Hines. Although not mentioning him by name, Cobb referred dismissively to the author's use of 'Glaswegian patois', as if the use of the vernacular was a device employed by Kelman purely to insult the judges. Furthermore, Cobb commented, as he had lacked a dictionary, he had given up reading the novel.³

It was not only Kelman's use of vernacular language that set it apart from that of previous winners. In addition, he uses four-letter words throughout the novel and this angered some critics. In his acceptance speech however, the author defended his use of working-class Glaswegian speech and of the word 'fuck'. In fact it is clear from this speech alone how Kelman's attitude to what he was doing in his writing was subversive. It is also clear that he was attempting to use prose to confront the reader with the bleakness

³ KEMP, P., (1984), "The Booker Prize", The Times Literary Supplement, no. 4310, p1264.

of everyday life lived in poverty and the apparent hopelessness of such a situation.⁴

Thus, language, theme and geographical origin made this novel a controversial choice, at least in that it went against the grain of previous winners of the prize, certainly of those that won during the 1980s, which as Philip Howard noted at the time tended to be a:

'..safe, compromise, uncontroversial candidate, to which none of the judges violently objects, rather than to more adventurous, more controversial books to which some of the judges violently object'.⁵

How then are we to view this choice of winner given what has been said in the body of this thesis?

It is true to some extent as I have indicated in the Conclusion above that changes do seem to have been afoot with in the Booker Prize since around the beginning of the decade. Certainly there seems to have been a more liberal attitude towards the use of expletives and this can be seen in the inclusion of Kelman's earlier novel A Disaffection on the 1989 shortlist, and in the choice of Roddy Doyle's novel Paddy Clarke, Ha Ha Ha as the winner in 1993. Martin Amis, another controversial author who in the past has frequently used four-letter words and who has also been accused of being sexist, furthermore, finally got onto the shortlist in 1991 with his novel Time's Arrow. Amis's frequent and often explicit references to sex had made him a less than likely candidate for the shortlists of the Booker in the 1980s. His style furthermore is not strictly realist and this also made him different to the majority of 1980s winners.

⁴ KELMAN, J., (1994), "Elitist slurs are racism by another name", Scotland on Sunday (Spectrum), 16th October.

⁵ HOWARD, P., (1982), "Curling up with all the Bookers", The Times, 19th October.

That said, sex in itself was not a bar to being shortlisted as the inclusion of Burgess's Earthly Powers in 1980 and D. M. Thomas's notorious novel The White Hotel proves. However in each case the detailed descriptions of sex may be said to have had moral justification within the context of the work, in the Burgess novel in that his central character's promiscuous homosexuality is used by Burgess as an in-road to one of the novel's central themes, which is an examination of the nature of good and evil, morality and immorality. In Thomas's novel explicit sexual fantasies are used as a starting point for the exploration of the disturbed psyche of the main character.

There have also been slight shifts apparent in the type of novel which has won the prize since 1990. The highly popular choice of the judges in awarding the 1993 prize to Roddy Doyle's novel was met with less attempts than might have been expected to cover over the novel's strongly commercial appeal with puff about its aesthetic merit and 'serious' intent and less attempt furthermore to conflate the two.

However, if it is tempting to see a shift in attitude within the prize, and, moreover, to trace a more down-to-earth, humane and socially aware quality in the winners of the 1990s, it is nevertheless important to keep in mind that such concepts and the prize's being awarded to novels which displayed these values may have been nothing more than the promotion of ideals which had begun to become more commercial. In other words the prize's strongly commercial bias may have made it more likely that novels which reflected the current market trends would win. For gone were the heady days of the Eighties, where Thatcherite materialism was the order of the day, and in vogue now were values which corresponded with those of the (apparently) ecologically conscious, spiritual and 'caring' Nineties.

Even if these trends do not reflect a major shift away from the middle-class values of the literary establishment, before one dismisses the Kelman win as a freak result, it is important to examine whether or not it corresponds at any level to patterns in respect of previous winners. In the chapters above I have noted some apparent trends in the awarding of the prize and some of these may be applicable to the 1994 winner. Thus I shall recap briefly on what these are.

As I indicated in Chapter Four, it has certainly been the case throughout the history of the prize that where an author has been on the shortlist several times, he or she has a better chance of winning. One can see this during the 1980s winners in the examples of Kingsley Amis, Peter Carey and Kazuo Ishiguro. This is not an entirely 'hard-and-fast' rule however and writers such as Doris Lessing and Muriel Spark would seem so far to have bucked this particular trend, possibly because of the type of fiction they write. Nevertheless, as a former shortlisted author Kelman may be said to have had a better chance of winning.

Similarly, it could well have been the case that the organisers of the award wished both to make up for the insult to Kelman in 1984 and to be seen to be recognising a major literary talent at last, thus enhancing the prestige of the award itself and of the reputations of the judges. Anyone in any doubt that the latter is an important consideration should consider the example of 1989 when the Chairman David Lodge was apparently in two minds as to whether or not to push for the inclusion on the shortlist of Martin Amis's novel London Fields. On the one hand he was said to have risked the wrath of the largely female panel by pushing for a writer who had previously been considered to be 'sexist'. On the other his own reputation was at stake if he were in charge of a panel for a literary award which strove to highlight the 'best novel' in the opinion of the judges and did not recognise one of the most significant talents of the previous fifteen years.

The writer Simon Brett whose comic novel The Booker Book centred on one would-be novelist's repeated attempts to win the Booker wrote a witty but nonetheless pointed article in The Sunday Times⁶ after the shortlist for the 1989 Booker Prize was announced. In this he stated that Booker winners usually fell into one of seven categories which he labelled as "The Right Author for the Wrong Book Winner", citing the examples of Iris Murdoch, Kingsley Amis and William Golding; the "Small but Perfectly Formed Winner", citing the examples of Penelope Fitzgerald and Anita Brookner; the "Well-written Winner"; the "Isn't It About Time We Had Another One from the Commonwealth Winner"; the "Non-fiction Winner", of which there had only been one to date, that is Schindler's Ark; and finally the "Rush of Blood to the Head Winner", which he suggested could be the only possible explanation for the successes of John Berger and Keri Hulme in 1972 and 1985 respectively.

Although Brett's tone in the article is largely humorous, his observations are based on more than a grain of truth. As I have shown in Chapter Four, there may be assumed to have been some element of tokenism in the pattern of winning novels from the Commonwealth as Brett himself notes. If there was tokenism here, then it seems, by extension, that tokenism may have been at work in 1994 as regards a pro-Scottish bias. Given the dearth of Scottish writers in the past, to have had two on the shortlist in one year and a Scottish winner seems quite a shift. Similarly, this could be the one token 'modern' novel about modern British society, or the token working-class novel.

Other than being the Scottish equivalent of the token Commonwealth winner, the other two categories on Brett's list which would seem to

⁶ BRETT, S., (1989), "In My View, [A Seasoned Booker-watcher Explains How to Identify a Likely Winner and What the Critics' Praise Means]", The Sunday Times, 24th September.

correspond in any way with the 1994 winner are the "Right Author for the Wrong Book" and the "Rush of Blood to the Head" categories. That is, either the Kelman win can be seen to have been something which should have happened for an earlier novel, or indeed an award for tenacity, or alternatively the novel was awarded the Booker Prize by the judges in a moment of madness. In other words it was, after all, a freak win.

I shall refer to the latter in a minute. However there are some additional considerations which should be taken into account as regards precedents. In a general sense the very fact that Kelman's win followed that of a highly commercial novel the year before could be said to reflect the pattern noted by Goff in referring to the winning novels of the Eighties, where a novel that was likely to have appealed to the critics was quickly followed by one that was likely to have appealed to the booksellers. However even if Kelman's novel was a more philosophical work than Doyle's it had already sold 20,000 copies in hardback before the Booker ceremony, a substantial amount for any novel, let alone one that was not supposed to be commercial.

Furthermore two other pointers which are often overlooked by the pundits in their attempts to pick a likely winner are, firstly, the opinion of the booksellers themselves, and, secondly, the bookies' odds. As far as the latter are concerned the last minute surge of bets on the Kelman, which substantially narrowed the odds, should have been some indication that the novel had a good chance of winning. In relation to the view of the book trade it should be remembered that when the one apparent shock win of the Eighties, Keri Hulme's novel The Bone People occurred in 1985, the book trade magazine The Bookseller, some months earlier had carried an article about the phenomenal sales of the novel in its native New Zealand, and furthermore, had tipped it as a likely winner of the Booker Prize. Going by

its sales to date, the Kelman novel must have seemed like a reasonable prospect.

Thus these are some points to bear in mind before dismissing the awarding of the prize to How Late It Was, How Late, as a freak result.

It must nevertheless be acknowledged that the subject matter of this novel and the other qualities outlined above made it unlike any previous winner of the Booker, and it would be wrong to play this down. In that sense therefore it was a surprising choice and one returns to the question of whether this came about as a result of a collective rush of blood to the head on the part of the judges.

In the end it is likely that it was the composition and conduct of the judging panel that year which offers the most likely explanation for how the Kelman novel came to win. If there is ever going to be a genuine 'surprise' winner, that is, not just one which is disapproved of in some circles as being an unsuitable winner, but rather a novel which by its content appears to defy all received wisdom on characteristic Booker novels, then this is most likely to happen when there has been some problem with the judges of the prize or a malfunctioning of the judging procedure. Again in this respect there seems to have been a parallel between the 1994 Booker award and that of 1985. In 1985 the problem stemmed from the fact that one of the panel of judges, Joanna Lumley, was unable to attend the final meeting where they were to decide upon a winner, and in the event it was a novel which she would not have been voting for which won.

The judges for the 1994 Booker Prize had as their Chairman Professor John Bayley, a literature don, married to former Booker winner Iris Murdoch and incidentally Chairman of the panel of judges for the first ever Russian Booker Prize. The other judges were Rabbi Julia Neuberger, Dr

Alistair Niven, literature director of the Arts Council of Great Britain, James Wood the chief literary critic of The Guardian, and Alan Taylor, the Scottish literary journalist who had previously been on the Management Committee of the Booker Prize during the 1980s.

Although the Booker Prize is, as one former Chairman of the judging panel has noted, 'by tradition controversial'⁷, and seems at times not only to have engendered controversy but to have gone out of its way to attract it, the controversy surrounding the 1994 award was not solely confined to the nature of the novel that won. In fact it extended to the very critical comments made by one of the judges, Julia Neuberger, concerning both the novel and the deliberation processes of the judges.

Partly as a result of this there was an even higher level of press coverage of the award than usual. One of the more interesting articles written on the subject appeared in Scotland on Sunday and was written by Alan Taylor, who had formerly been the paper's literary editor.⁸

In the first place the article refutes the suggestion that there might have been any deliberate pro-Scottish tokenism at work. Taylor also criticises Neuberger for her comments about the winning novel and also for suggesting, wrongly, that there was only one judge, namely him, who from the start was strongly in favour of Kelman's novel. More than this the article gives a fascinating insight into the workings of the panel as they attempted to come to their final decision. While he notes that although there was some heavy discussion about the novels which were to be included on the shortlist and in particular about the inclusion of George Mackay Brown's novel Beside the Ocean of Time and of Abdulrazak Gurnah's Paradise, they ended up, he says, with a list that:

⁷ I. e. P. D. James. See Whitaker '87 (op. cit.), p1092.

⁸ See TAYLOR, A., (1994), "Prize fight: Inside the Booker Prize", Scotland on Sunday, (Spectrum), 16th October.

'.. none of the judges expressed themselves unhappy with.'

Taylor continually challenges Neuberger's comments about the unpopularity of the Kelman novel within the panel of judges and says that as soon as the judges were given the novel to read:

'..four judges were highly impressed and remained so throughout all [our] deliberations.'

He notes with relish that both the Chairman and Wood in particular were highly enthusiastic about the novel. In fact Taylor suggests that far from it being the case that only he was in favour of Kelman's novel, Neuberger was the only judge among the five who disliked it, and he quotes her as saying of the shortlist:

'Apart from the Kelman, I'd be happy enough for any of them to win.'

Nevertheless the remarkable thing about the judging procedure at the final meeting as it is described by Taylor is that somehow, having eliminated the Gunesequera, Mackay Brown and Gurnah novels from consideration, and having had two rounds of provisional voting for the remaining three novels where they all had exactly the same number of votes, the first non-binding vote for a winner thereafter seemed to eliminate Kelman's novel altogether. Taylor notes that it received only one vote while Alan Hollinghurst and Jill Paton Walsh's novels received two each.

Having caused Wood to shake his head in disbelief when he owned that he would vote for the Paton Walsh rather than the Hollinghurst if it came to a contest between the two, Taylor then apparently pulled off a masterstroke of manoeuvring. Instead of him voting for another novel which would have been his second choice, Taylor managed to persuade Bayley and Wood that,

given their initial enthusiasm for the novel, they should vote for Kelman's book. As a result of this the Kelman novel received two extra votes to take its tally to three, the Paton Walsh received two, and the Hollinghurst was effectively eliminated.

What this illustrates is, firstly, how in the past the judging procedure has relied heavily on compromise choices, as Philip Howard noted in 1982. What it also indicates however is how much influence one judge can have. Having been a former member of the Management Committee of the prize it may be that Taylor had a special insight into how the judging process worked in practice. Whether this is true or not it seems that one judge who doggedly refuses to give up his original choice of winner may have a very big influence on the final choice of winner. Thus the selection of Kelman's novel in 1994, as far as Taylor is concerned at least, may be seen to have been less of a compromise choice than the result of some judges being unwilling to compromise at all. In the resulting deadlock the most influential judges proved to be those who were able, as it were, to shout the loudest.

It would seem that this intractability on the part of Taylor resulted in a novel winning which was unusual in that it reflected life in Britain from outwith the narrow perspectives of the south east of England. Thus it may be said that one influential judge, himself from a non-typical background (insofar as he worked for the *Scottish* literary media) was able to smooth the passage for the winning of the prize by a non-typical novel.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Brief History of the Whitbread Literary Awards", 1991, Kallaway Ltd. [Official Publicity for the Whitbread Awards].

ADAIR, T., (1992), "The Prize of Fame", Scotland on Sunday, 29th November.

ALDISS, B., (1981), "Bell's, Booker and Candle", The Guardian, 9th October.

ALDISS, B., (1981), "Judging the Booker Prize", The Times Literary Supplement, no.4100, p1301.

AMIS, K., (1986), The Old Devils, Hutchinson, London.

AMIS, M., (1984), Money: A Suicide Note, Penguin, London, 1985.

ATKINSON D., (1993), "Slick Chicks", The Guardian (Context), 18th September, p31.

BARKER, D., (1988), "Making Book on the Booker", The Guardian, 29th September.

BATESON, F. W., (1966), "Postscript", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Vol. 2., Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

BEEVOR, A., (1985), The Times Literary Supplement [Review of The Bone People], 25th October, 1202c.

"Behind the Lines", The Times Literary Supplement, 22nd November 1985, p1322c.

BERRY, S., (1988), "Title Fight for Scottish Talent", The Scotsman, 17th October.

"Booker Brothers to Found Prize", The Times (Diary), 18th July 1968.

"Booker Judge Resigns", The Glasgow Herald, 26th September 1991.

"Booker Prize to allow more time for entries", The Times, 7th March 1975.

"Booker Shortlist dismays Russians", The Sunday Times, 12th December 1993, I, p22.

"Books of the Year", The Sunday Times, 8th December 1985.

BRADBURY, M., (1988), "A Matter for Serious Scrutiny", No. Not Bloomsbury, Columbia University Press, New York.

BRADBURY, M., (1988), "Bookering and Being Bookered", No. Not Bloomsbury, Columbia University Press, New York.

BRADBURY, M., (1988), "Closing Time in the Gardens", No. Not Bloomsbury, Columbia University Press, New York.

BRADBURY, M., (1988), "The Novel no Longer Novel: Writing Fiction after World War Two", No. Not Bloomsbury, Columbia University Press, New York.

BRETT, S., (1989), "In My View, [A Seasoned Booker-watcher Explains How to Identify a Likely Winner and What the Critics' Praise Means]", The Sunday Times, 24th September.

BRETT, S., (1989), The Booker Book: A Novel, Sidgwick and Jackson, London.

BURGESS, A., (1980), Earthly Powers, Hutchinson, London.

CAREY, P., (1985), Illywhacker, Faber and Faber Ltd, London,.

CAREY, P., (1988), Oscar and Lucinda, Faber and Faber Ltd, London, 1989.

CARR, J. L., (1980), A Month in the Country, Penguin Books in Association with The Harvester Press, Harmondsworth, 1987.

CARR, J. L., (1985), The Battle of Pollocks Crossing, Penguin Books, London, 1986.

COETZEE, J. M., (1983), Life and Times of Michael K, Secker and Warburg, London.

CONNOLLY, J., (1987), "Cashing in Where Booker Pioneered", The Times, 20th April.

CONNOLLY, J., (1989), "My Own Little List of Booker Disaffection", The Times, 21st October.

CORK, R. (1992), "Booker Judged by its Covers", The Times, 14th October.

CUNNINGHAM, J., (1989), "Battle of the Books", The Guardian, 24th July.

CUNNINGHAM, J., (1989), "Nice Little Earners?", The Guardian, 18th April.

DALE, J., (1985), "The Bone People - (Not) Having It Both Ways", Landfall, 156, December.

DESAI, A., (1980), Clear Light of Day, Penguin, New York, 1982.

"Desert Island Discs", [Penelope Lively], BBC Radio 4, 17th September 1989.

DOUGLAS, K., (1966), Alamein to Zem Zem (edited by John Walker, G. S. Fraser and J. C. Hall), Faber, London.

DYER, R., (1990), "A Star is Born - and the construction of Authenticity", in Stardom: Industry of Desire (edited by Gledhill), Routledge, London, 1991.

ELLIOT, R. C., (1982), The Literary Persona, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1953), "Rejoinder", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes. Vol. 2., Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

"False Rumours about Fiction", The Guardian, 25th October 1981.

FIELDING, H., (1991), "You Scratch My Hardback", The Sunday Times, 27th October.

FITZGERALD, P., (1979), Offshore, Collins, London.

Foreign Literary Prizes (Romance and Germanic Languages ed. E. C. Butkin), R. R. Bowker, New York, 1980.

FORSTER, M., (1980), "Secrets of a Glittering Prize", The Sunday Times, 26th October.

FORTIER, P. A., (1989), "Analysis of Twentieth-Century French Prose Fiction: Theoretical Context, Results, Perspective", in POTTER, R. A., (1989), Literary Computing and Literary Criticism: Theoretical and Practical Essays on Theme and Rhetoric, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

GEDDES-BROWN, L., (1983), "News in Brief", The Sunday Times, 23rd September.

GINDIN, J., (1988), William Golding: MacMillan Modern Novelists, MacMillan, Basingstoke.

GISSING, G., (1888), New Grub Street: A Novel, edited and with an introduction by Bernard Bergonzi, Penguin, London, 1985.

GISSING, G., (1888), New Grub Street: a Novel, Everleigh, Nash and Grayson, London, 1927.

GOLDING, W., (1980), Rites of Passage, Faber, London.

GOSSE, E., (1907), Father and Son, Four Square Books/Landsborough Publications Ltd, London, 1959.

"Guide to Literary Prizes, Grants and Awards in Britain and Ireland", Book Trust and Society of Authors", London, 1990.

HALL, J., (1979), The Sociology of Literature, Longman, London and New York.

HENSHER, P., (1993), "Losers as winners in the great Prize game", in "The big book bang - after 25 years of the Booker fiction prize they are going for the grand award", The Guardian (Context), 18th September, p31.

HERBERT, S., (1993), "Booker judges seduced by passion", The Daily Telegraph, p4.

HICKEY, L., (1978), "From Unreliable Writer to Reliable Writing", 1936 The Sociology of Literature: Proceedings of the Essex Conference on the Sociology of Literature. July 1978: Vol. 1 The Politics of Modernism (edited by Francis Barker), University of Essex Press, 1979.

HOGGART, R., (1957), The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-class Life with Special References to Publications and Entertainments, Chatto and Windus, London.

HOLROYD, M., (1982), "Prizes or patronage: How writers survive", The Sunday Times, 14th February.

HOLUB, R. C., (1984), Reception Theory - a critical introduction, Methuen, London.

HOROWITZ, I. L., (1987), "Publishing and Prizing", Book Research Quarterly, Winter 1987-88, Vol.3, no. 4.

HOWARD, P., (1982), "Curling up with all the Bookers", The Times, 19th October.

HULME, K., (1983), The Bone People, Spiral in Association with Hodder and Stoughton Ltd, Sevenoaks.

"Humour Leads Booker Race", The Daily Mail, 23rd September 1993.

"I'm sorry.. I'll read that again", The Daily Mail, 23rd September 1993, p9.

ISHIGURO, K., (1989), The Remains of the Day, Faber, London.

"Japanese Author Wins the Booker", The Glasgow Herald, 27th October 1989.

KELMAN, J., (1984), The Busconductor Hines, A Phoenix Paperback Original, London 1992.

KELMAN, J., (1989), A Disaffection, Picador\Pan Books Ltd in association with Secker and Warburg Ltd, London, 1990.

KELMAN, J., (1994), "Elitist slurs are racism by another name", [text for Kelman's acceptance speech for the 1994 Booker Prize], Scotland on Sunday (Spectrum), 16th October.

KELMAN, J., (1994), How Late it Was, How Late, Secker and Warburg, London.

KEMP, P., (1984), "The Booker Prize", The Times Literary Supplement, no.4256, p1216.

KEMP, P., (1985), "Winning Ways - The Booker Prize, LWT", The Times Literary Supplement, no. 4310, p1264.

KENEALLY, T., (1981), Schindler's Ark, (fourth edition), Sceptre\Hodder and Stoughton, Sevenoaks, 1986.

LAMONT, S., (1989), "In Good Faith", The Glasgow Herald, 23rd September.

LANCASTER, R., (1984), "Up for the Cup [The Effect of the Booker Prize on Sales of Hotel du Lac]", The Bookseller, 13th April 1985.

LAWSON, M., (1989), "Black and Blue", The Independent, 30th November.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1932), "The Literary Racket", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis, in Two Volumes, Vol. 1, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1932), "Under Which King Bezonian?", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Vol. 1, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1940), "Retrospective of a Decade", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Vol. 1, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1946), "Henry James and the English Association", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Vol. 1, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1951), "Keynes, Spender and Currency-Values", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Vol. 1, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1951), "Mr Pryce-Jones, The British Council and British Culture", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Vol. 1, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1953), "The Function of Criticism at Any Time", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Vol. 2, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1953), "Valedictory", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Vol. 2, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1962), Two Cultures? The Significance of C. P. Snow, being the Richmond Lecture 1962 with an Essay on Sir Charles Snow's Rede Lecture by Michael Yudkin, Chatto and Windus, London.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1966), "Luddites? or There is Only One Culture", Lectures in America, Chatto and Windus, London, 1969.

LEAVIS, Q. D., (1932), Fiction and the Reading Public, Chatto and Windus, London, 1978.

LEAVIS, Q. D., (1939), "The Background of Twentieth Century Letters", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Vol. 1, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

LEAVIS, Q. D., (1943), "The Discipline of Letters: A Sociological Note", A Selection from Scrutiny, compiled by F. R. Leavis in Two Volumes, Vol. 1, Cambridge at the University Press, 1968.

LEBRECHT, N., (1985), "Booker Voted Bottom of the Pops in Dorset", The Sunday Times, 27th October.

LEE, H., (1981), "The Booker Prize - Matters of Judgement", The Times Literary Supplement, no. 4100, p1268.

LESSING, D., (1981), The Sirian Experiments: The Report by Ambien II of the Five (Canopus in Argos), Cape, London.

LESSING, D., (1985), The Good Terrorist, Cape, London.

LINKLATER, J., (1988), "Two Share Doubled McVitie's Prize", The Glasgow Herald, 1st December.

LINKLATER, J., (1989), "Author Who Puts Maryhill Before a Booker Presentation at Guildhall", The Glasgow Herald, 23rd October.

LINKLATER, J., (1989), "Modest Token, But Reason to be Satisfied", The Glasgow Herald, 9th November.

LINKLATER, J., and TAYLOR, A., (1989), "Can Kelman Break Hold of Booker Mafia?", The Glasgow Herald, 22nd September.

Literary and Library Prizes. (edited by Olga S. Weber), Bowker, New York, 1976.

LIVELY, P., (1987), Moon Tiger, Andre Deutsch, London.

LODGE, D., (1983), Small World: An Academic Romance, Secker and Warburg, London.

LODGE, D., (1988), Nice Work, Viking Penguin, a division of Penguin Books USA Inc, New York, 1989.

LORD, G., (1993), "Where are they now?", The Weekend Telegraph, 11th September, XXIII.

MASSIE, A., (1989), "Beyond the Call of Duty", The Scotsman, 27th May.

MCNEIL, H., (1989), "Judging the Booker", The Women's Press Book Club Catalogue, Jan-March 1990, The Women's Press, London.

MORTIMER, J., (1988), Summer's Lease, Penguin Books, London, 1989.

MOSLEY, P., (1989), "Looking at the Booker: Literary Prize as Media Spectacle", in Channels of Communication: Papers for the Conference of Higher Education Teachers of English, edited by Philip Hobsbaum, Paddy Lyons, Jim McGhee, HETE-88 at the Department of English Literature, University of Glasgow, 1992.

MUKAROVSKY, J., (1977), The Word and Verbal Art - Selected Essays by Jan Mukarovsky, Yale Russian and East European Studies 13, translated and edited by John Burbank and Peter Steiner, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

MUNRO, A., (1978), The Beggar Maid: Stories of Flo and Rose, Penguin Books, London, 1980.

New Earnings Survey, 1968, Department of Employment and Productivity, H. M. S. O., London, 1970.

ORWELL, G., (1940), "Inside the Whale", "Inside the Whale" and Other Essays, Penguin Books in Association with Secker and Warburg, London, 1964.

ORWELL, G., (1946), "Politics vs Literature - An examination of Gulliver's Travels", "Inside the Whale" and Other Essays, Penguin Books in Association with Secker and Warburg, London, 1964.

ORWELL, G., (1946), "The Prevention of Literature", The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, 4. In Front of Your Nose, 1945-1950, edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, Secker and Warburg, London, 1968.

"Overbooked", The Sunday Times, (The arts news in brief), 27th October 1985.

P. A. Press Release [on the setting up of the Booker Prize], 4th October 1968.

- PALMER, R., (1992), "You scratch my book: lit. crit's cosy little world", The Sunday Times, 17th May.
- PAXMAN, J., (1990), Friends in High Places: Who Runs Britain?, Penguin Books, London, 1991.
- People of Today 1991, Debrett's Peerage, London.
- People of Today 1992, Debrett's Peerage, London.
- People of Today 1994, Debrett's Peerage, London.
- PIERCY M., (1991), The Guardian, 28th January.
- Prize Writing: An Original Collection of Writings by Past Winners to Celebrate 21 Years of the Booker Prize, edited and introduced by Martyn Goff, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1989.
- "Programme for 1992 A. B. S. A. Scottish Awards Ceremony."
- "Programme for the Whitbread Book of the Year Presentation Dinner, 21st January 1992".
- "Reading Too Much Into It", The Glasgow Herald, 19th November 1989.
- "Review of the Year", The Times, 31st December 1968.
- RIGILLO, M., (1991), "[British Culture is His Culture at the End of the Day] Literary Angles on the Wages of Fame", The Glasgow Herald, 16th February.
- ROSENTHAL, T. G., (1984), "Life and Times of the 1983 Booker Prize", The Bookseller, 18th February.
- "Rushdie Wins Best Booker Prize", The Glasgow Herald, 21st September 1993, p1.
- RUSHDIE, S., (1981), Midnight's Children, Picador/Pan Books Ltd, London, 1982.
- RYLE, J. (1983), "Novels of the Year Wait for Judgement", The Sunday Times, 25th September.
- SCHUECKING, L., (1966), The Sociology of Literary Taste (2nd edition), Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- SHAKESPEARE, N., (1986), "Boosting Up with the Booker", The Times, 23rd August .
- "Showing Off Their Literary Vital Statistics", TV Times, 24th October 1987.
- SNOW, C. P., (1959), "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution", The Rede Lecture 1959, Cambridge at the University Press.
- SNOW, C. P., (1965), "The Two Cultures: A Second Look", in The Two Cultures and A Second Look, an Expanded Version of the Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution, Cambridge at the University Press.
- SPARK, M., (1981), Loitering with Intent, The Bodley Head, London.

SPARK, M., (1988), A Far Cry from Kensington, Constable, London.

STAHLE, N., (1978), Alfred Nobel and the Nobel Prizes (third, revised edition), The Swedish Academy.

STRACHAN, A., (1989), Prizewinning Literature: U. K. Literary Award Winners, The Library Association, London.

SUTHERLAND, J. A., (1979), Fiction and the Fiction Industry, The Athlone Press, University of London.

SWIFT, G., (1983), Waterland, Heinemann, London.

TAYLOR, A., (1994), "Prize fight: Inside the Booker Prize", Scotland on Sunday (Spectrum), 16th October.

TAYLOR, D. J., (1989), A Vain Conceit: British Fiction in the 1980s, Bloomsbury, London.

"The Booker Prize - Down to Earth", The Economist, 29th October 1988.

"The Booker Prize 1969-1989" [Official Publicity material for the Prize in 1989], Book Trust, London.

"The Dark Filly Romps Home", The Times, 1st October 1985.

"The Late Show Special" (Booker Ceremony Coverage), BBC 2, 26th October 1989.

"The Late Show", BBC 2, 21st September 1989.

The Oxford Companion to English Literature (edited by Margaret Drabble - 5th edition), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1985.

"The Reader in the Street" [Oxford Survey into Book Marketing Council's Best Novels of Our Time Campaign], The Bookseller, 23rd November 1984.

The Sunday Times, 17th August 1980, p33.

The Sunday Times, 31st August 1980, p32.

The Sunday Times, 19th October 1980, p42.

The Sunday Times, 7th December 1980, p33.

The Sunday Times, 1st February 1981, p43.

The Sunday Times, 19th April 1981, p42.

The Sunday Times, 26th April 1981, p42.

The Sunday Times, 24th May 1981, p42.

The Sunday Times, 2nd August 1981, p11.

The Sunday Times, 30th August 1981, p29.

The Sunday Times, 13th September 1981, p37.

The Sunday Times, 20th September 1981, p41.

The Sunday Times, 11th October 1981, p4.

The Sunday Times, 11th October 1981, p43.

The Sunday Times, 18th October 1981, p19.

The Sunday Times, 18th October 1981, p39.

The Sunday Times, 25th October 1981, p38.

The Sunday Times, 22nd November 1981, p32.

The Sunday Times, 25th September 1983, p41 and p43.

The Sunday Times, 3rd October 1983.

The Sunday Times, 7th July 1985.

The Sunday Times, 6th October 1985.

The Sunday Times, 27th October 1985, p3.

The Sunday Times (Diary), 8th October 1989.

"The Sunday Times Guide to the Booker Shortlist", The Sunday Times, 23rd September 1984.

The Sunday Times Magazine [Profile of Anthony Burgess], 26th October 1980, p84.

The Times (Diary), 18th July 1968.

The Times (Diary Note), 4th October 1968

The Times, 5th June 1980, p11.

The Times, 19th June 1980, p22.

The Times, 2nd October 1980, p17.

The Times, 16th October 1980, p17.

The Times, 20th October 1980, p17.

The Times, 22nd October 1980, p1.

The Times, 15th January 1981, p10.

The Times, 23rd April 1981, p10.

The Times, 19th May 1981, p9.

The Times (Review), 21st May 1981, p15.

The Times, 24th September 1981, p8.

The Times, 8th October 1981, p17.

The Times, 19th October 1981, p9.

The Times, 21st October 1981, p1.

The Times, 26th October 1981, p9.

The Times, 28th October 1981, p10 and p13.

The Times (Diary Note), 15th December 1981, p10.

The Times, 22nd September 1983, p22.

The Times, 29th September 1983, p13.

The Times, 27th October 1983, p1.

The Times, 7th March 1985, p10.

The Times, 8th March 1985, p15.

The Times (Diary), 29th August 1985.

The Times Educational Supplement, 29th April 1981, p24.

The Times Educational Supplement, 6th November 1981, 1301a.

The Times Higher Educational Supplement, 23rd January 1981, p7.

The Times Higher Educational Supplement, 30th October 1981, p11.

The Times Literary Supplement, 13th June 1980, 674a.

The Times Literary Supplement, 17th July 1980, 11d.

The Times Literary Supplement, 17th October 1980, 1161a.

The Times Literary Supplement, 24th October 1980, 1189.

The Times Literary Supplement, 16th January 1981, p50.

The Times Literary Supplement, 17th April 1981, p431c.

The Times Literary Supplement, 20th March 1981, 304.

The Times Literary Supplement, 15th May 1981, p535.

The Times Literary Supplement, 9th October 1981, 1145a.

The Times Literary Supplement, 9th October 1981, 1154.

The Times Literary Supplement, 23rd October 1981, 1244b.

The Times Literary Supplement, 30th October 1981, 1268b.

The Times Literary Supplement, 16th December 1984, p1413c.

The Times Literary Supplement, 25th October 1985, 1202c.

The Times Literary Supplement, 8th November 1985, 1264c.

The Times Literary Supplement, 22nd November 1985, 1322c.

THWAITE, A., (1986), "The Booker Prize 100 Years On", The Times Literary Supplement, no.4361, 1218.

THWAITE, A., (1987), "Booker 1986", Encounter, Vol. 68, pp37-38

TOLSTOY, L., (1898), What is Art?, Walter Scott Ltd., London, 1899.

TOMALIN, C., (1983), "The Magical Historical Shortlist", The Sunday Times, 25th September.

TREWIN, I., (1975), "Booker Prize Assured for Seven More Years", The Times, 23rd January.

"Unnoticed Literary Prizes: Plea for a New Major National Award", The Bookseller, 7th November 1964.

WAINSELL, G., (1972), The Times, 23rd November.

WALSH, J., (1985), "Will Booker Go By the Book?", The Times, 28th September.

WALSH, J., (1989), "Under Starters' Orders: the Year's Best Novels?", The Sunday Times, 24th September.

WALTON, J., (1993), "The Ones that Got Away", The Weekend Telegraph, 11th September, pXXIII.

WATT, I., (1957), The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Fielding and Richardson, Penguin Books in Association with Chatto and Windus, Harmondsworth, 1979.

WEBB, W. L., (1993), "The Booker of Bookers", III, The Times, 21st September.

WELCH, J., (1984), "Choosing the Best Novels of Our Time", The Bookseller, 10th March.

Whitaker '87 (An Almanack for the Year of Our Lord 1987, 119th edition), J. Whitaker and Sons, London.

Whitaker's Almanack 1990 (An Almanack for the Year of Our Lord 1990 127th edition), J. Whitaker and Sons, London.

Who Owns Whom 1990, Dun and Bradstreet International, London.

Who was Who, Vol. VI. A Companion to Who's Who Containing the Biographies of those who Died During the Decade 1961-1970, A. & C. Black, London.

Who was Who, Vol. VII. A Companion to Who's Who Containing the Biographies of those who Died During the Decade 1971-1980, A. & C. Black, London.

Who was Who, Vol. VIII. A Companion to Who's Who Containing the Biographies of those who Died During the Decade 1981-1990, A. & C. Black, London.

Who's Who 1991: An Annual Biographical Dictionary, A. & C. Black, London.

Who's Who 1994: An Annual Biographical Dictionary, A. & C. Black, London.

WILKINSON, A., (1989), "The Higher Straits", The Guardian, 21st February.

WOOD, J., (1993), "Playing silly Bookers", The Guardian, (Arts Section), 23rd September.

WOOD, J.,(1993), "The Big Book Bang - After 25 Years of the Booker Prize for fiction they are going for the grand award", The Guardian (Context), 18th September.

£46,500 Prize for Writer", The Glasgow Herald, 29th November 1989.

TABLE 1.

Booker Prize Winners, 1980-1989, Who Have Won Other Awards.**1980****WILLIAM GOLDING**Rites of Passage

Other Prizes:

James Tait Black Memorial Prize (1980), Nobel Prize for Literature (1983).

1981**SALMAN RUSHDIE**Midnight's Children

Other Prizes:

Arts Council Literary Bursary Award (no date given), James Tait Black Memorial Prize (fiction) (1981), E-SU Literary Award (1981) [Both for Midnight's Children], Prix du Meilleur Livre Etranger (1983), Whitbread Novel Award (1988).**1982****THOMAS KENEALLY**Schindler's Ark

Other Prizes:

LA Times Fiction Award (1982) [Also for Schindler's Ark].**1983****J. M. COETZEE**Life and Times of Michael K

Other Prizes:

CNA Literary Award (1977), James Tait Black Memorial Prize (Fiction) (1980), Geoffrey Faber Memorial Prize (1981), CNA Literary Award (1983) [Also for Life and Times of Michael K], Prix Femina Etranger (1985), Jerusalem Prize (1986), Sunday Express Book of the Year Award (1990).**1984****ANITA BROOKNER**Hotel du Lac

Other Prizes:

NONE

1985**KERI HULME**The Bone People

Other Prizes:

Maori Fiction Prize (1984), Pegasus Prize (1984) [Both for The Bone People].**1986****KINGSLEY AMIS**The Old Devils

Other Prizes:

Somerset Maugham Award (1955), Cholmondeley Award [Poetry] (1990).

1987**PENELOPE LIVELY**Moon Tiger

Other Prizes:

Carnegie Medal [Childrens' Fiction] (1973), Whitbread Childrens' Novel Category (1976), Southern Arts Literature Award [Short Stories] (1978), National Book Award* (1979).

1988**PETER CAREY**Oscar and Lucinda

Other Prizes:

Miles Franklyn Award (1981), NSW Premier Award (1981) [Both for Bliss].**1989****KAZUO ISHIGURO**The Remains of the Day

Other Prizes:

Winifred Holtby Award (1982), Whitbread Novel and Book of the Year (1986) [Both for An Artist of the Floating World].

* This award, which was sponsored by the Arts Council of Great Britain, folded after only one year.

Judges for the Booker, Whitbread, Faber, W. H. Smith, James Tait
Black, and Guardian Prizes, 1980-1989.

1980

BOOKER

William Golding - Rites of Passage

Judges:

**PROFESSOR DAVID DAICHES C
RONALD BLYTHE
MARGARET FORSTER
CLAIRE TOMALIN
BRIAN WENHAM**

W. H. SMITH

Thom Gunn - Selected Poems 1950-1975

Judges:

**SIR RUPERT HART-DAVIS
JANET ADAM SMITH
CHRISTOPHER RICKS**

J. T. BLACK (Fiction) *

J. M. Coetzee - Waiting for the Barbarians

WHITBREAD

David Lodge - How Far Can You Go?

Judges (All categories):

**NICHOLAS BAGNALL
PENELOPE MORTIMER
DR JOHN RAE**

GUARDIAN x

J. L. Carr - A Month in the Country

FABER

Hugo Williams - Love Life

George Szirtes - The Slant Door

Judges:

**COLIN FALCK
PETER SCUPHAM
CHRISTOPHER HOPE**

1981

BOOKERSalman Rushdie - Midnight's Children

Judges:

PROFESSOR MALCOLM BRADBURY C**BRIAN ALDISS****JOAN BAKEWELL****SAMUEL HYNES****HERMIONE LEE****W. H. SMITH**Isabel Colegate - The Shooting Party

Judges:

SIR RUPERT HART-DAVIS**JANET ADAM SMITH****CHRISTOPHER RICKS****J. T. BLACK (Fiction)**Salman Rushdie - Midnight's ChildrenPaul Theroux - The Mosquito Coast**WHITBREAD**

Novel:

Maurice Leitch - Silver's City

First Novel

William Boyd - A Good Man in Africa

Judges (All categories):

ANDREW BOYLE**PENELOPE LIVELY****PAUL THEROUX****GUARDIAN**John Banville - Kepler**FABER**J. M. Coetzee - Waiting for the Barbarians

Judges:

HERMIONE LEE**JOHN BRAINE****MARTIN SEYMOUR-SMITH**

1982

BOOKERThomas Keneally - Schindler's Ark

Judges:

PROFESSOR JOHN CAREY C**PAUL BAILEY****FRANK DELANEY****LORNA SAGE****JANET MORGAN****W. H. SMITH**George Clare - Last Waltz in Vienna

Judges:

SIR RUPERT HART-DAVIS**VICTORIA GLENDINNING****CHRISTOPHER RICKS****J. T. BLACK (Fiction)**Bruce Chatwin - On the Black Hill**WHITBREAD**

Novel:

John Wain - Young Shoulders

First Novel:

Bruce Chatwin - On the Black Hill

Judges (All categories):

ROALD DAHL**PETER GIDDY****JOHN GRIGG****GUARDIAN**Glyn Hughes - Where I Used to Play on the Green**FABER**Paul Muldoon - Why Brownlee LeftTom Paulin - The Strange Museum

Judges:

DICK DAVIES**HUGO WILLIAMS****BLAKE MORRISON**

1983

BOOKERJ. M. Coetzee - Life and Times of Michael K

Judges:

FAY WELDON C
ANGELA CARTER
TERENCE KILMARTIN
PETER PORTER
LIBBY PURVES

W. H. SMITHA. N. Wilson - Wise Virgin

Judges:

SIR RUPERT HART-DAVIS
VICTORIA GLENDINNING
CHRISTOPHER RICKS

J. T. BLACK (Fiction)Jonathan Keates - Allegro Postillions**WHITBREAD**

Novel:

William Trevor - Fools of Fortune

First Novel:

John Fuller - Flying to Nowhere

Judges (All categories):

FRANK DELANEY
JOHN ELSLEY
JANE GARDAM
ELIZABETH LONGFORD

GUARDIANGraham Swift - Waterland**FABER**Graham Swift - Shuttlecock

Judges:

BLAKE MORRISON
VALENTINE CUNNINGHAM
PETER ACKROYD

1984

BOOKERAnita Brookner - Hotel du Lac

Judges:

PROFESSOR RICHARD COBB C
ANTHONY CURTIS
POLLY DEVLIN
JOHN FULLER
TED ROWLANDS

W. H. SMITHPhilip Larkin - Required Writing

Judges:

SIR RUPERT HART-DAVIS
VICTORIA GLENDINNING
CHRISTOPHER RICKS

J. T. BLACK (Fiction)J. G. Ballard - Empire of the SunAngela Carter - Nights at the Circus**WHITBREAD (1984/85)****N. B. system of awarding changed hereafter**

Novel:

Christopher Hope - Kruger's Alp

First Novel:

James Buchan -

A Parish of Rich Women

Judges (All categories):

MARTIN AMIS
HUNTER DAVIES
JOHN HYAMS
EDNA O'BRIEN
JILL PATON WALSH
CHRISTOPHER SINCLAIR-STEVENSON

GUARDIANJ. G. Ballard - Empire of the Sun**FABER**James Fenton - In Memory of War

Judges:

ALAN JENKINS
CLAUDE RAWSON
JOHN LUCAS

1985

BOOKERKeri Hulme - The Bone People

Judges:

NORMAN ST. JOHN-STEVAS C
NINA BAWDEN
J. W. LAMBERT
JOANNA LUMLEY
MARINA WARNER

W. H. SMITHDavid Hughes - The Pork Butcher

Judges:

SIR RUPERT HART-DAVIS
VICTORIA GLENDINNING
CHRISTOPHER RICKS

J. T. BLACK (Fiction)Robert Edric - Winter Garden**WHITBREAD**

Novel:

Peter Ackroyd - Hawksmoor

First Novel:

Jeanette Winterson -
Oranges Are Not The
Only Fruit

Judges:

EVA FIGES
PHILIP HOWARD
JOHN MAY

Judges:

PETER GIDDY
EVA MOORE
ALISON RIMMER

GUARDIANPeter Ackroyd - Hawksmoor**FABER**Julian Barnes - Flaubert's Parrot

Judges:

NORMAN SHRAPNEL
ANDREW SINCLAIR
ANITA BROOKNER

1986

BOOKERKingsley Amis - The Old Devils

Judges:

ANTHONY THWAITE C
EDNA HEALEY
ISABEL QUIGLY
GILLIAN REYNOLDS
BERNICE RUBENS

W. H. SMITHDoris Lessing - The Good Terrorist

Judges:

CHRISTOPHER RICKS
VICTORIA GLENDINNING
PHILIP ZIEGLER

J. T. BLACK (Fiction)Jenny Joseph - Persephone**WHITBREAD**

Novel:

Kazuo Ishiguro -
An Artist of the
Floating World

First Novel:

Jim Crace -
Continent

Judges:

ROGER COLE
DAVID HOLLOWAY
JENNIFER JOHNSTON

Judges:

COLIN MORGAN
JOY SINCLAIR
ROSE TREMAIN

GUARDIANJim Crace - Continent**FABER**David Scott - A Quiet Gathering

Judges:

JOHN MOLE
IAN HAMILTON
MICHAEL LONGLEY

1987

BOOKERPenelope Lively - Moon Tiger

Judges:

P. D. JAMES C
LADY SELINA HASTINGS
ALLAN MASSIE
TREVOR MCDONALD
JOHN B. THOMPSON

W. H. SMITHElizabeth Jennings - Collected Poems 1953-1985

Judges:

CHRISTOPHER RICKS
VICTORIA GLENDINNING
PHILIP ZIEGLER

J. T. BLACK (Fiction)George Mackay Brown - The Golden Bird: Two Orkney Stories**WHITBREAD**

Novel:

Ian McEwan - The Child in Time

First Novel:

Francis Wyndham - The Other Garden

Judges:

ROGER BOWEN
SEBASTIAN FAULKS
ROSE TREMAIN

Judges:

JUDY COOKE
SUSAN HILL
ANTONY THORNCROFT

GUARDIANPeter Benson - The Levels**FABER**Guy Vanderhaeghe - Man Descending

Judges:

TERENCE KILMARTIN
NICHOLAS SPICE
MIRANDA SEYMOUR

SUNDAY EXPRESSBrian Moore - The Colour of Blood

Judges:

MONICA DICKENS
ROBIN ESSER
HAMMOND INNES
GRAHAM LORD
AUBERON WAUGH

1988

BOOKERPeter Carey - Oscar and Lucinda

Judges:

THE RT. HON. MICHAEL FOOT C
SEBASTIAN FAULKS
PHILIP FRENCH
BLAKE MORRISON
ROSE TREMAIN

W. H. SMITHRobert Hughes - The Fatal Shore

Judges:

VICTORIA GLENDINNING
HERMIONE LEE
PHILIP ZIEGLER

J. T. BLACK (Fiction)Piers Paul Read - A Season in the West**WHITBREAD**

Novel:

Salman Rushdie -
The Satanic Verses

First Novel:

Paul Sayer -
The Comforts of
Madness

Judges:

JOHN HITCHIN
NICHOLAS SHAKESPEARE
FAY WELDON

Judges:

MONICA DICKENS MBE
PENNY PERRICK
ROGER STRINGER

GUARDIANLucy Ellmann - Sweet Desserts**FABER**Michael Hofmann - Acrimony

Judges:

ALAN JENKINS
JAMES AITCHISON
GEORGE SZIRTES

SUNDAY EXPRESSDavid Lodge - Nice Work

Judges:

KINGSLEY AMIS
ROBIN ESSER
GRAHAM LORD
RUTH RENDELL
AUBERON WAUGH

1989

BOOKERKazuo Ishiguro - The Remains of the Day

Judges:

DAVID LODGE C
MAGGIE GEE
HELEN MCNEIL
DAVID PROFUMO
EDMUND WHITE

W. H. SMITH

Christopher Hill - 'A Turbulent Seditious and Factious People'-
John Bunyan and his Church

Judges:

VICTORIA GLENDINNING
HERMIONE LEE
PHILIP ZIEGLER

J. T. BLACK (Fiction)James Kelman - A Disaffection**WHITBREAD**

Novel:

Lindsay Clarke -
The Chymical Wedding

First Novel:

James Hamilton-Paterson -
Gerontius

Judges:

DAVID COOK
JANE GARDAM
VAL HENNESSY

Judges:

HAZEL BROADFOOT
CATHERINE HEATH
JOHN WALSH

GUARDIANCarol Lake - Rose Hill**FABER**David Profumo - Sea Music

Judges:

NICHOLAS SHAKESPEARE
DEBORAH MOGGACH
PETER PARKER

SUNDAY EXPRESSRose Tremain - Restoration

Judges:

ROALD DAHL
CLARE FRANCIS
SUSAN HILL
GRAHAM LORD
AUBERON WAUGH

KEY TO TABLE 2.

- C** Chairman of the Panel of Judges.
- *** Technically always judged by "The Professor of Literature of Edinburgh University", in accordance with Mrs Black's will. See Chapter Two above.
- x** See Chapter Two above for details of the constitution of the judging panel from year to year.

TABLE 3.

SHORTLIST					JUDGES			
year	M	F	[T]	MF	M	F	[T]	MF
1969	4	2	[6]	2:1	4	1	[5]	4:1
1970	2	4>*	[6]	1:2	3	2	[5]	3:2
1971	4	2	[6]	2:1	4	1	[5]	4:1
1972	3	1	[4]	3:1	2	1	[3]	2:1
1973	1	3>	[4]	1:3	1	2>	[3]	1:2
1974t	3	2*	[5]	3:2	1	2>	[3]	1:2
1975	1	1*	[2]	1:1	3	1	[4]	3:1
1976	6	0	[6]	6:0	2	1	[3]	2:1
1977	2	4>	[6]	1:2	4	1	[5]	4:1
1978	2	4>*	[6]	1:2	3	2	[5]	3:2
1979	3	2*	[5]	3:2	4	1	[5]	4:1
1980	4	3	[7]	4:3	3	2	[5]	3:2
1981	4	3	[7]	4:3	3	2	[5]	3:2
1982	5	1	[6]	5:1	3	2	[5]	3:2
1983	5	1	[6]	5:1	2	3>c	[5]	2:3
1984	3	3*	[6]	1:1	4	1	[5]	4:1
1985	2	4>*	[6]	1:2	2	3>	[5]	2:3
1986	5	1	[6]	5:1	1	4>	[5]	1:4
1987	3	3*	[6]	1:1	3	2c	[5]	3:2
1988	4	2	[6]	2:1	4	1	[5]	4:1
1989	3	3	[6]	1:1	3	2	[5]	3:2

KEY TO TABLE 3.

M Male **F** Female **[T]** Total **M/F** Male/Female ratio

***** - female winner **t** - tied result **c** - includes Chairman

FIG. 1.

The Best-Selling Booker Winners of 1980-1990.*

	YEAR	TITLE
1)	1982	<u>Schindler's Ark</u>
2)	1986	<u>The Old Devils</u>
3)	1988	<u>Oscar and Lucinda</u>
4)	1989	<u>The Remains of the Day</u>
5)	1984	<u>Hotel du Lac</u>
6)	1980	<u>Rites of Passage</u>
7)	1987	<u>Moon Tiger</u>
8)	1990	<u>Possession</u>
9)	1983	<u>Life and Times of Michael K</u>
10)	1981	<u>Midnight's Children</u>

* Source, ASH, R. (1991), Top 10 of Everything 1992, Macdonald, London. (N. B. Figures are for hardback editions including Book Club sales).

1969	X	X	CAPE
1970	X	X	C.&W.
1971	X	X	FABER
1972			S.E.&W.
1973		X	H'MN
1974	2		HAM.
1975			DUCK.
1976	2		DEUT.
1977	X		MAC
1978		X	M.J.
1979			COLL.
1980		X	VIK.
1981	3		H.&S.
1982		X	HUT.
1983	X		WEID.
1984	2	X	B.H.
1985	X	X	W.H.A.
1986	2	X	A.L.
1987	X		GOLL.
1988	X	X	BLOOM.
1989	X		A.&R.
			E.&S.
			J.M.
			HARV.
			METH.
			S.P.
			HOG
			LONG.

X - Shortlisting 2, 3 - More than one shortlisting - Winner

C. & W.	CHATTO AND WINDUS
SE. & W.	SECKER & WARBURG
H'M. N.	HEINEMANN
HAM.	HAMILTON
DUCK.	DUCKWORTH
DEUT.	DEUTSCH
MAC.	MACMILLAN
M. J.	MICHAEL JOSEPH
COLL.	COLLINS
VIK.	VIKING
H. & S.	HODDER & STOUGHTON
HUT.	HUTCHINSON
WEID.	WEIDENFELD & NICOLSON
B.H.	BODLEY HEAD
W. H. A.	W. H. ALLEN
A. L.	ALLEN LANE
GOLL.	GOLLANCZ
BLOOM.	BLOOMSBURY
A. & R.	ANGUS AND ROBERTSON
E. & S.	EYRE & SPOTTISWOODE
J. M.	JOHN MURRAY
HARV.	HARVEST
METH.	METHUEN
S. P.	SALAMANDER PRESS
HOG.	HOGARTH
LONG.	LONGMAN

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

1969 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
P. H. Newby Barry England	Faber Cape			Director of Programmes, BBC Radio	(CBE 1972)		Allanik Award 1946; Somerset Maugham 1948; Yorkshire Post Fiction Award 1968.
Nicholas Mosley	Hodder & Stoughton	OXFORD, Balliol			MC 1944; (Baronet 1980. Also judge for the Booker in 1991 but walked out).		(Whitbread Novel and Book of the Year 1990).
Iris Murdoch	Chatto & Windus	OXFORD, Somerville; Fellow of St Anne's; CAMBRIDGE, Newnham			Philosophy hon. playwright, (CBE 1976; DBE 1987). Married to Professor John Bayley, Chairman of the panel of judges for the first Russian Booker Prize and for the 1994 British Booker).	PEN	(James Tait Black 1973; Whitbread Novel 1974; Shakespeare Prize 1988).
Muriel Spark	Macmillan	Heriot Watt College, Edinburgh	1963	Formerly Editor of <u>The Poetry Review</u> . Writer of radio plays, several novels filmed. Has also published several volumes of poetry. Has written various screenplays and also created the tv series Hazell in collaboration with Terry Venables.	DBE. Editor of the works of Mary Shelley, John Masefield, Wordsworth and Emily Bronte.		Many, including Prix Italia 1962; James Tait Black 1965; Yorkshire Post Fiction 1965; (Scottish Book of the Year 1987).
G. M. Williams	Secker & Warburg						

KEY TO APPENDIX 1

- * has already been on the shortlist
- J has previously been on the judging panel
- C formerly Chairman of Panel of Judges
- c Chairman of the Panel of Judges
- winner

1970 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
<u>Bernice Rubens</u>	Eyre & Spottiswoode	Cardiff		Writes screenplays. Her novel <u>Madame Sousatska</u> was adapted for the screen by the 1975 Booker winner Ruth Praver Jhabvala. Is also a documentary film maker.	A close friend of Beryl Bainbridge. (See 1973 shortlist. Was a judge for the Booker Prize in 1986).		Winner of the American Blue Ribbon Award (1968) for her documentary film <u>Stress</u> .
A. L. Barker	The Hogarth Press		1970	BBC. Formerly worked in publishing.		PEN	Atlantic Award 1946; Somerset Maugham 1947; Cheltenham Festival Prize 1963; (South East Arts Book Award 1981. One of the judges for the Katherine Mansfield Award 1984).
Elizabeth Bowen	Cape				CBE 1948; (Booker Judge 1972). Also an essayist and short story writer.		
Iris Murdoch (see 1969 shortlist for details)	Chatto & Windus				(Hon. CBE 1977); Editor of <u>The Oxford Book of Irish Short Stories</u> .		Various, including Hawthornden 1964; (RSL 1975; Giles Cooper 1980 and 1982; Whitbread Novel 1976 and 1983).
William Trevor	The Bodley Head	Dublin, Trinity College		Writer of tv plays. Several novels have been adapted for tv.			
T. C. Wheeler	Angus & Robertson						

1971 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
V. S. Naipaul	Andre Deutsch	OXFORD, University College			(Rt. 1990). Also a writer of non-fiction		Various, including John Llewellyn Rhys 1958; Somerset Maugham 1961; Hawthornden 1964; W. H. Smith 1968.
Thomas Kilroy	Faber	Dublin, University College	Year not known		University Lecturer		Heinemann and Guardian, both 1971; (Irish Academy of Letters 1972).
Doris Lessing	Cape			A contributor to various periodicals. Several novels have been filmed.	Also writes plays and short stories. Has received many honours including Associate Member AAAL, National Institute of Arts and Letters, U. S.		Various, including Heinemann 1971; Guardian 1971; Somerset Maugham 1976; (Austrian State Prize for European Literature 1981; Shakespeare 1984; W. H. Smith 1987; Palermo Prize and Premio Internazionale Mondello, both 1987).
Mordecai Richler	Weidenfeld & Nicolson	Montreal (did not graduate)		Writer for various periodicals including Encounter. Several novels have been televised.	Also a teacher of creative writing and editor of several anthologies.		Canadian Governor General's Award, 1969 and 1972; Paris Review Humour Prize 1969; (Commonwealth Writers' Prize 1990).
Derek Robinson	Heinemann	CAMBRIDGE, Downing College		Several novels televised. Background in advertising.	Has also published several works of non-fiction.	The Authors Guild Inc. (U.S.)	
Elizabeth Taylor	Chatto & Windus				Also a writer of short stories and of childrens' books.		

1972 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
<u>John Berger</u>	Weidenfeld & Nicolson	Central School of Art and Chelsea School of Art		BBC producer. Art critic for <u>New Statesman</u> , <u>Tribune</u> . Also a dramatist.	Made a controversial acceptance speech at the 1972 ceremony .		Various including James Tait Black, also 1972; (George Orwell Memorial Prize 1977).
<u>Susan Hill</u>	Hamish Hamilton	London, King's College (Fellow, 1978).	1972	BBC Radio presenter/writer; literary critic for various journals; also a writer of tv play.	Editor of various works of literature including Hardy's <u>The Distracted Preacher</u> . (Is now married to Stanley Wells, Professor of Shakespeare Studies, University of Birmingham. Hill was also a Booker judge in 1975).		Somerset Maugham 1971.
<u>Thomas Keneally</u>	Angus & Robertson	New South Wales	(1973)	Writer of screenplays. Several novels have also been filmed including the 1982 Booker winner.	(A. O. 1983). Member of the Council and later Chairman of the Australian Society of Authors. Originally trained as a lawyer. Is also a dramatist.	Australian PEN	(L. A. Times Fiction Award, 1982).
<u>David Storey</u>	Longman	Slade School of Fine Art; Fellow of UCL (1974)		Author of several screenplays, and several novels have been filmed.	Also a playwright and poet.		Macmillan Fiction (U. S.), John Lewelyn Rhys, Somerset Maugham, all 1960. Geoffrey Faber 1973. Also various awards for drama, including the Evening Standard Award 1970.

1973 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
J. G. Farrell	Weidenfeld & Nicolson Duckworth	OXFORD, Brasenose	(1978)	Writer of tv plays. Has also had her own tv series, <u>Forever England</u> . Was a columnist for the <u>Evening Standard</u> . Several novels have been filmed.	Shortlisted again in 1974 and 1990. Was a judge 1977. 'Discovered' by Alice Thomas Ellis (See shortlist 1982) Also, a close friend of the 1970 winner.		Faber 1970. (Guardian 1974; Whitbread Novel 1977).
Beryl Bainbridge							
Elizabeth Mavor	Michael Joseph	OXFORD, St. Anne's College				University Womens.	
Iris Murdoch (see 1969 shortlist for details)	Chatto & Windus						N. B. Murdoch's shortlisted novel this year <u>The Black Prince</u> , won the James Tait Black Fiction Award and it was later adapted for the stage.

1974 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
Nadine Gordimer	Cape	Witwatersrand, (South Africa)			Also a writer of non-fiction, especially on South African politics.		Many, including W. H. Smith 1961; James Tait Black 1971; (Nobel 1991) and various other international awards.
Stanley Middleton	Hutchinson	University College, Nottingham (Later University of Nottingham); (CAMBRIDGE, Wilson Visiting Fellow, Emmanuel Coll. 1982-83).				PEN	
Kingsley Amis	Cape	OXFORD St John's (Also Fellow); CAMBRIDGE, Fellow of Peterhouse		Various tv and film adaptations of novels	(CBE 1981; KI 1990). Amis's wife Elizabeth Jane Howard was on the panel of judges for the Booker this year. Former literature don. Has written lit. crit. books, science fiction and crime fiction. Is also a poet. Was shortlisted again for the Booker in 1978 and won in 1986. Father of Martin Amis, shortlisted author in 1991.	Garrick	Somerset Maugham 1955. (Cholmondeley Award 1990).
Beryl Bainbridge * (see 1973 shortlist for details)	Duckworth						
Baron C. P. Snow	Macmillan	Leicester; CAMBRIDGE Christ's Coll. and Fellow of Churchill		Contributor to various periodicals.	CBE; KI 1957; also politician and academic; writer of various works of non-fiction including <u>The Two Cultures and The Scientific Revolution</u>	Garrick; Savile; MCC; Century (New York)	James Tait Black 1954.

1975 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
<u>Hugh Praver Jhabvala</u>	John Murray	London, Queen Mary		Writer of screenplays including the screenplay for the film <u>Madame Sousatzka</u> , (from the novel by Bemice Rubens) Her Booker winner from this year was also filmed in 1983.	Also a writer of short stories. Brother is Professor of German at OXFORD.		Won an Academy Award in 1986, the only person ever to have won both an Oscar and the Booker Prize.
<u>Thomas Keneally</u> * (see 1972 shortlist for details)	Collins						

1976 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
David Storey. (see 1972 shortlist for details) Andre Brink	Cape W. H. Allen	Pöcheistroom and Rhodes Universities, South Africa			A Professor of literature. Has also written non- fiction, humour and travel books and has edited a book with J. M. Coetzee (See 1983 winner). Writes in both English and Afrikaans. Shortlisted again in 1981.		Various international awards. (E. g. Prix Medici Etranger, 1981; Martin Luther King Memorial 1981.)
R. C. Hutchinson	Michael Joseph	OXFORD, Oriel	year not known				Various, including the Sunday Times Gold Medal for Fiction 1938; W. H. Smith 1966.
Brian Moore	Cape			Various novels adapted for film and tv.	Also a writer of non- fiction. Shortlisted again for the Booker, in 1987 and 1990.		Various, including W. H. Smith 1973; James Tat Black 1975; (Heinemann and RSL, both 1986; Sunday Express 1987); Has also won North American awards including the Canadian Governor General's Award (twice).
Julian Rathbone	Michael Joseph	CAMBRIDGE, Magdalene College			Shortlisted again in 1979.		
William Trevor (see 1970 shortlist for details)	The Bodley Head						

1977 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
Paul Scott	Heinemann		1963	Worked as a journalist. Also wrote plays for tv and radio.	Died in 1978. Was a director of literary agents David Higham Associates. His biographer was Hilary Spurling (See judges 1979).		Mary, including the Eyre and Spotliswoode Fellowship Award 1952 and the Yorkshire Post Fiction Award 1971.
Paul Bailey	Cape	Central School of Speech and Drama	(1982)	BBC. Also past contributor to The Observer, ILS and Daily Telegraph	Was shortlisted again in 1986 and was a judge in 1982. Formerly an actor and University literature don.		Various, including Somerset Maugham and Arts Council Award (both 1968); E. M. Forster 1974. (also, George Orwell in 1978).
Caroline Blackwood	Duckworth		(1982)		Also writes short stories and non-fiction. Has written a cook book with Alice Thomas Ellis (See 1982 shortlist). A member of the Guinness family. Was formerly married to the artist Lucien Freud, to the composer Israel Citkowitz, then latterly to the American poet Robert Lowell.		
Jennifer Johnston	Hamish Hamilton	Dublin, Trinity College	(1979)	Writes screen and tv plays. Several novels have been adapted for the screen.	Also a dramatist.		
Barbara Pym	Macmillan	OXFORD, St Hilda's	(1978)		A close friend of Philip Larkin (See judges 1977).		
Penelope Lively	Heinemann	OXFORD, St Anne's	(1985)	Has written various scripts for tv and radio.	(OBE 1989) Is married to a don. (She herself formerly taught History). Was shortlisted again for the Booker in 1984 and won in 1987. Is also an award-winning writer of childrens' fiction and of short stories.	PEN; Society of Authors	Mary, including the Carnegie Medal 1974; Whitbread Childrens' 1976. (The only winner of the National Book Award [1979]).

1978 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
Kingsley Amis * (see 1974 shortlist for details)	Hutchinson						
Andre Brink * (see 1976 shortlist for details)	W. H. Allen						
Penelope Fitzgerald	Duckworth	OXFORD, Somerville			Booker winner 1979. (Shortlisted again in 1990 and judge 1991). Has written several volumes of lit. crit. and edited William Morris's Novel on Blue Paper		(Rose Mary Crawshay 1985).
Iris Murdoch * (see 1969 shortlist for details)	Chatto & Windus						
Bernice Rubens * (see 1970 shortlist for details)	W. H. Allen						

1979 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
Penelope Fitzgerald (see 1978 shortlist for details)	Collins						
Thomas Keneally (see 1972 shortlist for details)	Collins						
V. S. Naipaul (see 1971 shortlist for details)	Andre Deutsch						
Jane Gardam	Hamish Hamilton	London, Bedford College	1976	Was formerly Assistant Editor of <i>Time</i> and <i>IDE</i> . Several novels adapted for TV.	Also writes short stories	University Women's; Arts; PEN.	Various, including Winifred Holtby and David Higham Awards, both 1975. (Also Whitbread Children's 1981; Katherine Mansfield 1984).
Julian Rathbone (see 1976 shortlist for details)	Michael Joseph						
Fay Weldon	Hodder & Stoughton	St Andrews		Background in advertising. Several novels have been adapted as film or tv scripts	Has also written librettos. Was Chairman of the panel of judges in 1983		

1980 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
<u>William Golding</u>	Faber	OXFORD, Brasenose	1955	Several novels filmed.	(Kl. 1988; C.Lit. 1984), CBE 1966. Golding's shock win over Burgess and the controversy that surrounded it led to the BBC's decision to televisé the ceremony live.	Athenaeum; Savile	James Tait Black 1980; (Nobel 1983).
<u>Anthony Burgess</u>	Hutchinson	Manchester	1964	Has written for radio and tv and has written the screenplays for several films. Formerly a journalist for <u>The Guardian</u>	Also academic, critic, literary biographer, translator, essayist and composer.	Monaco Automobile.	
<u>Anita Desai</u>	Heinemann	Delhi		A reviewer for various periodicals. Has also written film and tv scripts and some of her novels have been filmed.	Also an academic tutor and writes for children.		Many, including Winifred Holby and RSL both 1978. (Also Guardian Children's Fiction Award 1983 and Hadassah Prize 1989).
<u>Alice Munro</u>	Allen Lane	University of Western Ontario		Various film and tv scripts.			Various Canadian awards, including the Governor General's Award, 1968, 1978 and 1986.
<u>Barry Unsworth</u>	Michael Joseph	Manchester	1973	Has written plays for tv. <u>Pascal's Island</u> was also made into a film.	Lecturer in English.		Heinemann 1973. (Joint winner of the Booker in 1992).
<u>Julia O'Faolain</u>	Allen Lane	Dublin, University College; Rome; Paris (Sorbonne)			Daughter of the writer Sean O'Faolain, and married to a history don. Independent publisher. Was shortlisted again in 1985.		
<u>J. L. Carr</u>	Harvester			Several novels adapted for the screen including this year's Booker shortlisted novel.			Guardian 1980.

1981 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
Salman Rushdie	Cape	CAMBRIDGE, King's College	(1983)	Has written screenplays and tv scripts. A reviewer for various periodicals.			Many, including James Tait Black and E-SU Literary Awards 1981. (Prix Meilleur Livre Etranger 1984 and Whitbread Novel 1988). Also won the "Booker of Bookers" Award 1993.
Molly Keane	Andre Deutsch			Has had several novels adapted for tv.	Also a playwright and writes under the nom de plume M. J. Farrell.	Groucho, Lansdowne	
Doris Lessing (see 1971 shortlist for details)	Cape						
Ian McEwan	Cape	Sussex. Also MA in Creative Writing, UEA.	(1982)	Has written plays for film and television.	Adapted Timothy Mo's Sour Sweet (see 1982 shortlist) for the screen.		(Whitbread Novel 1987).
Ann Schlee	Macmillan	OXFORD, (College unknown)		Reviewer for various periodicals.	A Booker judge in 1991. Also writes for children.		
Muriel Spark (see 1969 shortlist for details)	The Bodley Head						
D. M. Thomas	Gollancz	OXFORD, New College.			Poet and translator. Formerly a literature tutor.		

1982 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
<u>Thomas Kenneally</u> • (see 1972 shortlist for details)	Hodder & Stoughton						
John Arden	Methuen	Edinburgh College of Art; CAMBRIDGE, King's College		Writes scripts for radio.	Also writes essays. Known primarily as a playwright. Often writes in conjunction with his wife, Margaretta D'Arcy. Formerly a don at St. Hilda's, OXFORD.		
William Boyd	Hamish Hamilton	Glasgow; OXFORD, Jesus College	(1983)	Writes screenplays. Was tv critic for <u>New</u> Statesman. Formerly Foreign Service Press Officer.			John Llewellyn Rhys 1981; Whitbread First Novel 1981; Somerset Maugham 1982. (James Tait Black 1990; McVitie's Prize 1991).
Lawrence Durrell	Faber		1954		Also a poet and dramatist. Editor and commentator on literary works. Translator. Married to Colin Haycraft, Chairman of Duckworth. Also writes non-fiction and has collaborated with Caroline Blackwood on a cook book (See 1977 shortlist).		Various, including Duff Cooper 1957; Prix du Meilleur Livre Etranger 1958; James Tait Black 1974.
Alice Thomas Ellis	Duckworth	Liverpool School of Art		Former publisher's reader.			
Timothy Mo	Andre Deutsch	OXFORD, St. John's College		Novel <u>Sour Sweet</u> filmed (See also Ian McEwan, 1981 shortlist).	Shortlisted again in 1986 and 1991.		Geoffrey Faber 1979. (Also, Hawthornden 1983).

1983 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
<u>J.M. Coetzee</u>	Secker & Warburg	Cape Town, South Africa and University of Texas, U. S.	(1988)	Several novels have been filmed.	Professor of Literature. Has written in collaboration with Andre Brink (See 1976 shortlist). Also writes books on literary criticism.		C.N.A. Literary Award 1977, 1980 and 1983; James Tait Black, Geoffrey Faber 1980. (Prix Femina Etranger 1985; Jerusalem Prize 1987; Sunday Express Book of the Year 1990).
<u>Malcolm Bradbury</u> (C 1981)	Secker & Warburg	Leicester; London, Queen Mary College.	(1989)	Scriptwriter and tv dramatist. Has adapted some of his own novels for tv as well as works by other people.	(CBE 1991). A Professor at the UEA (Runs the MA course in Creative Writing). Has connections with Lodge and others. Chairman of the Booker judges in 1981, and later on the Management Committee. (The beginning of Bradbury's novel <i>DI Criminate</i> is set at the Booker Prize ceremony). Bradbury was one of three judges for the 1993 "Booker of Bookers".	Royal Over-seas League	(Bradbury's tv adaptation of Tom Sharpe's novel <i>Porterhouse Blue</i> won an International Emmy Award in 1987).
<u>John Fuller</u>	Salamander	OXFORD, New College	1980		Literature don and son of the poet Roy Fuller, a judge for the Booker in 1975. Was also a Booker judge himself in 1984.		Faber 1974; Southern Arts Literary Prize 1980; Whitbread First Novel 1983.
<u>Anita Mason</u>	Hamish Hamilton	OXFORD, St. Hilda's					
<u>Salman Rushdie</u> * (see 1981 shortlist for details)	Cape						
<u>Graham Swift</u>	Heinemann	CAMBRIDGE, Queen's College; York.	(1984)	A film was later made of <i>Waterland</i> .	Has edited a book with David Profumo (See Judges 1989).		Faber, Guardian, RSC and Winifred Holtby, all 1983. (Premio Grinzane Cavour 1987).

1984 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
Anita Brookner	Cape	London, King's College; (Fellow, 1990). CAMBRIDGE, Fellow of New Hall		Hôtel du Lac filmed for TV. Brookner is a regular contributor to various periodicals and had published a selection of academic texts prior to becoming a novelist. Empire of the Sun filmed by Steven Spielberg.	(CBE 1990). Formerly a Professor of Art History.		
J. G. Ballard	Gollancz	CAMBRIDGE, King's College			Mainly known as a writer of Science Fiction. Is a friend of Martin Amis (Shortlisted in 1991).		
Julian Barnes	Cape	OXFORD, Magdalen		Former Assistant Literary Editor at The Sunday Times.	Was formerly Assistant Literary Editor to Clare Tomalin (see judges 1980). Is a close friend of Martin Amis and is married to Pat Kavanagh who is also his agent. Kavanagh's sister Julie was formerly Arts Editor with Harpers and Queen's and in the past was linked romantically with Amis.		Somerset Maugham 1981. (Prix Femina 1992).
Anita Desai* (see 1980 shortlist for details)	Heinemann						
Penelope Lively* (see 1977 shortlist for details)	Heinemann						
David Lodge	Secker & Warburg	London, UCL; Birmingham	1976	Has adapted several of his own novels for the screen.	Has links with Bradbury and Hoggart and with the UEA, where he was Creative Writing Fellow in 1977. Lodge also writes literary criticism.		Yorkshire Post 1975; Hawthornden 1976; Whitbread Book of the Year 1980. (Sunday Express Book of the Year 1988).

1985 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
Keri Hulme	Spiral in Assoc. with Hodder & Stoughton	Canterbury, New Zealand (did not graduate)		Formerly a tv director.	Has taught creative writing at several Universities in New Zealand.		New Zealand Book Award and Pegasus Prize, both 1984.
Peter Carey	Faber	Monash Uni., Australia, (did not graduate)	(1988)	Was a partner in own advertising consultancy before becoming a full-time author. Has written several screenplays.			Miles Franklin Award 1980; NSW Premier's Award, 1980 and 1989; Victorian Premier's Award 1985; Age Book of the Year 1985; Australian National Book Council Award 1985.
J. L. Carr (see 1980 shortlist for details)	Viking						
Doris Lessing (see 1971 shortlist for details)	Cape						
Jan Morris	Viking	OXFORD, (college not known)	year not known	Formerly a professional journalist on the staff of The Times and The Guardian and a travel writer.	Also writes for children.		
Iris Murdoch (see 1969 shortlist for details)	Chatto and Windus						

1986 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
Kingsley Amis* (see 1974 shortlist for details)	Hutchinson						
Margaret Atwood	Cape	Toronto, Canada	(FRSC, 1987)	TV scriptwriter.	Formerly a professional academic. Also writes childrens fiction and poetry. Shortlisted for the Booker again in 1989.		Various Canadian awards. (E.g. the Governor General's Award 1986).
Paul Bailey* (see 1977 shortlist for details)	Cape						
Robertson Davies	Viking	Toronto, Canada; OXFORD, Balliol	(FRSC, 1967)	Literary Editor of Saturday Night and a contributor to various periodicals	Academic and actor.	PEN	Many, including the Canadian Governor General's Award, 1973; World Fantasy Award 1984. (Also Scottish Arts Council Neil Gunn International Fellowship 1988).
Kazuo Ishiguro	Faber	Kent, UEA (MA in Creative Writing)	(1989)	Also writes plays for TV. Ishiguro's 1989 Booker winner was recently filmed.	A graduate of the MA course in Creative writing at the UEA. Also writes short stories and was the Booker winner in 1989.		Winifred Holby and RSL 1982, both 1982; Whitbread Novel and Book of the Year 1986.
Timothy Mo* (see 1982 shortlist for details)	Chailo & Windus						

1987 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
Penelope Lively* (see 1977 shortlist for details)	Deutsch		1985				
Chinua Achebe	Heinemann	Ibadan, NIGERIA	1983	Former Controller of the Nigerian Broadcasting Corporation.	University don and Chancellor in Nigeria. Also an essayist, poet and reviewer.		Various international awards including the Jock Campbell New Statesman Award 1965; Commonwealth Poetry Prize 1972.
Peter Ackroyd (J 1975)	Hamish Hamilton	CAMBRIDGE, Clare College; Yale, U. S. A.	1984	Writer and reviewer for The Times, and Managing Editor of The Spectator.	Also a biographer and has written several volumes of literary criticism. Was a Booker judge in 1975.		Somerset Maugham, Heinemann and Whitbread Biography, all 1984; Whitbread Novel and Guardian Fiction 1985.
Nina Bayden (J 1985)	Macmillan	OXFORD, Somerville College	(1984)	Circles of Deceit (filmed in 1987).	Also writes children's fiction. Was a Booker judge in 1985. President of the Society of Women Writers and Journalists.	PEN; Society of Authors; Oriental; Lansdowne; Ski Club of Great Britain.	Guardian Children's and Yorkshire Post Novel of the Year, both 1976.
Brian Moore* (see 1976 shortlist for details)	Cape						
Iris Murdoch* (see 1969 shortlist for details)	Chatto & Windus						

1988 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
<u>Peter Carey</u> (see 1985 shortlist for details)	Faber						
Bruce Chatwin	Cape		year not known	A professional journalist for <u>The Sunday Times Magazine</u> among others.	A director of Sotheby's		Hawthornden 1977; Whitbread First Novel 1982; James Tait Black 1982.
Penelope Fitzgerald (see 1978 shortlist for details)	Collins						
David Lodge (see 1984 shortlist for details)	Secker & Warburg						
Salman Rushdie (see 1981 shortlist for details)	Viking						
Marina Warner (J 1985)	Chatto & Windus	OXFORD, Lady Margaret Hall	1985	A contributor to various including <u>The Sunday Times</u> , and to BBC radio and tv programmes.	Teacher at the Institute for Contemporary Arts. Warner was a Booker judge in 1985. Also writes non-fiction and childrens' fiction.		Fawcett Society Prize 1986. (PEN 1989).

1989 SHORTLIST	PUBLISHER	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
Kazuo Ishiguro* (see 1986 shortlist for details)	Faber						
Margaret Atwood* (see 1986 shortlist for details)	Bloomsbury						
John Banville	Secker & Warburg			Journalist for <u>The Irish Times</u> .			James Tait Black 1976; Guardian 1981.
Sybil Bedford	Hamish Hamilton		year not known	Literary journalist. Several novels have been filmed.	OBE 1981. Is also a biographer.	PEN (Vice Pres., 1979); Reform	
James Kelman	Secker & Warburg	Strathclyde (did not graduate)			Booker winner in 1994. Also writes short stories.		Cheltenham Festival 1987; James Tait Black 1989.
Rose Tremain (J 1988)	Hamish Hamilton	Paris, (Sorbonne); UEA	1983	Writes radio plays.	Lecturer at the UEA. A Booker judge in 1988.		Dylan Thomas and the Giles Cooper Award (for radio play), both 1984; Sunday Express Book of the Year 1989.

1969 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
W. L. WEBB C	critic journalist	Dublin, Trinity College		Formerly Literary Editor, <u>The Guardian</u>	In 1969 was writing a book for Victor Gollancz Ltd. Webb was one of the three judges for the 1993 "Booker of Bookers".		Founded the Guardian Fiction Prize.
DAME REBECCA WEST	writer journalist			Political journalist and critic for various including <u>Ereowoman</u> and <u>Clarion</u> . Was a witness in Warren Beauty's film Reds.	CBE 1949; DBE 1959; C.Litt 1968.		Various, including the Benson Medal (RSL) 1966.
STEPHEN SPENDER	poet novelist academic	OXFORD, University College	Vice Pres., 1987	Formerly editor of <u>Encounter</u> .	CBE 1962; (KI 1983). Also an essayist, dramatist, writer of short stories and literary biographies and criticism.	PEN (Vice Pres. of PEN International); Pres. of RSL; Society of Authors; Savile; Beefsteak.	Queen's Gold Medal for Poetry, 1971.
FRANK KERMODE	academic	Liverpool; CAMBRIDGE (Fellow of King's Coll.)	1958	Co-editor of <u>Encounter</u> . (See Spender above). A contributor to various periodicals.	(KI 1991).	Savile	
DAVID FARRER	Director of publishing company lawyer civil servant	OXFORD. (College unknown)		Director of Secker & Warburg Ltd	In 1969 was writing a memoir for Weidenfeld and Nicolson on Lord Beaverbrook.		

1970 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
DAVID HOLLOWAY c	journalist critic	OXFORD, Magdalen; London, Birkbeck College		Literary Editor of <u>The Daily Telegraph</u> . A contributor to various periodicals	Chairman of the Society of Bookmen 1967-1971. Holloway was one of the three judges for the 1993 "Booker of Bookers".	Reform.	
DAME REBECCA WEST J (see 1969 shortlist for details)	writer/journalist						
LADY ANTONIA FRASER	writer critic	OXFORD, Lady Margaret Hall		Script writer for tv (usually adaptations of own novels).	Writer of popular history books. Daughter of the writer Elizabeth Longford. (Is now married to the playwright Harold Pinter).	PEN (Pres. 1988-89); Society of Authors; Detection; Vanderbilt	James Tait Black 1969. (Wolfson History Award 1984; Prix Caumont-La Force 1985).
ROSS HIGGINS							
RICHARD HOGGART	academic/critic	Leeds		Gave the 1971 Reith Lecture. (Chairman of the Broadcasting Research Unit., 1981. Edited <u>The Future of Broadcasting</u> with Janet Morgan in 1982. (See judges 1982).	Professor of English at Birmingham 1962-1973 i.e. during the time of Bradbury and Lodge. Honorary Professor at the UEA.		

	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
JOHN GROSS c	journalist/ academic/critical publisher	OXFORD, Wadham College; CAMBRIDGE, Fellow, King's College		Contributor to The Sunday Telegraph, (Editor, ILS, 1974-1981). New Statesman (Lit. Ed. 1973), New York Times.	Editor for Victor Gollancz. Was also a consultant for Weidenfeld.	Beefsteak	Duff Cooper Memorial 1969.
SAUL BELLOW	writer/academic	Chicago, U. S. A.		Various	Also a writer of short stories.		National Book Award (US) 1954, 1965 and 1970; Nobel and Pulitzer Prizes, both 1976. (Malaparte Prize 1984).
JOHN FOWLES	writer	OXFORD, New College		Several novels have been adapted for the screen.	Also writes and edits non-fiction. N. B. Fowles' novel The French Lieutenant's Woman was a shock omission from the Booker shortlist in 1969.		English Centre PEN Silver Pen 1969; W. H. Smith 1970.
LADY ANTONIA FRASER J (see 1970 judges for details)							
PHILIP TOYNBEE	journalist/ critic/ writer	OXFORD, Christ Church		On the editorial staff of The Observer from 1950.	Also a novelist.	Oxford Union Society	

1972 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
CYRIL CONNOLLY c	critic journalist writer	OXFORD, Balliol	year not known	Various including <u>The Observer</u> and <u>The Sunday Times</u> . Founded <u>Horizon</u> .	CBE and C. Lit, both 1972.	Beislak; White's; Pratt's	
GEORGE STEINER	academic/critic/ writer	Paris; Chicago; Harvard; OXFORD, (College not known); CAMBRIDGE, Fellow of Churchill College	1964	Formerly on the staff of <u>The Economist</u> .	Various honours and teaching posts.	Athenaeum; Savile; Harvard (N.Y.)	O. Henry Short Story Award 1958. (PEN Faulkner Stipend for Fiction 1983).
ELIZABETH BOWEN * (see 1970 shortlist for details)							

1973 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
KARL MILLER c	academic	CAMBRIDGE, Downing College		Formerly a BBC Producer. Lit. Editor <u>New Statesman</u> (1961-67). Editor of <u>The Listener</u> (1967-73). Also on the editorial staff of <u>The London Review of Books</u> . Several novels have been adapted for the screen.	Professor of English Literature. Also a writer and editor of literary criticism.		
EDNA O'BRIEN	writer critic	Pharmaceutical College of Ireland			Also a poet and dramatist.		Yorkshire Post Novel Award 1971.
MARY MCCARTHY	writer academic	Vassar, U. S. A.		Formerly on the staff of <u>Partisan Review</u> . Editor of <u>Coyld Freide</u> . Contributor to <u>Horizon</u> , <u>New Yorker</u> , and various others. Several novels filmed.	Professional academic. Also an essayist, novelist, autobiographer, and writer and editor of non-fiction. Received various awards and international honours.		Horizon Award 1948; N.A.A.L. Award 1957. (National Medal for Literature 1984; Edward MacDowell Medal 1984; First Rochester Literary Award 1985, all U. S.)

1974 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
ION TREWIN c	writer/journalist			Professional journalist for various including The Times, Telegraph, Drama Magazine. Also in publishing (a director of Hodder and Stoughton, 1991-2).	(OBE 1990). Literature Panel, the Arts Council. (On the Management Committee of the Booker Prize from 1989). Son of the literary critic and journalist John Trewin.	Garrick MCC	
ANTONIA BYATT	writer/academic/critic	CAMBRIDGE, Newnham; OXFORD, Somerville College	(1983)	Member of the Social Effects of TV Group, BBC	A novelist. (Winner of the Booker Prize in 1990). Has written several books of literary criticism including one on Iris Murdoch's novels. Is the sister of the novelist Margaret Drabble, whose husband the biographer Michael Holroyd, was formerly on the Management Committee of the Booker. In 1974 was married to one of the writers on the shortlist (Amis). (In 1987 Howard published a cook book which she had co-written with Tom Maschler, reputedly one of the founders of the Booker Prize and formerly on the Management Committee).	PEN; Society of Authors.	(PEN Silver Pen Award for Fiction 1986; Booker 1990; Irish Times/Aer Lingus 1990). More recently Byatt has been on the panel of judges for the Betty Trask, Hawthornden and David Higham Prizes among others.
ELIZABETH JANE HOWARD	writer/dramatist/critic/formerly an actress			Reviewer for various. Has also written screenplays. Worked as an actress in various BBC productions of the Fifties.			John Lewellyn Rhys 1950; (Yorkshire Post 1982).

1975 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
ANGUS WILSON c	academic/writer	OXFORD, Merton College	1958 (Pres. 1982)	Several novels adapted for tv.	Various honours including CBE 1968. (Kt. 1980). Professor of Literature at the UEA, 1966-1978. Chairman of the National Book League. (Now Book Trust, who administer the Booker Prize, 1971- 1974). Also a novelist and writer of short stories.	Athenaeum	James Tail Black and Prix du Meilleur Roman Etranger, both 1958; Yorkshire Post Book of the Year 1970.
PETER ACKROYD (see 1987 shortlist for details)	writer/critic/ academic						
SUSAN HILL (see 1972 shortlist for details)							
ROY FULLER	poet/author/ academic/critic	OXFORD (by decree)	year not known	A Governor of the BBC, 1972-79.	CBE 1970. The father of John Fuller, one of the shortlisted authors in 1983.	Athenaeum	Various, including Duff Cooper 1968 and the Queen's Gold Medal for Poetry 1970. (Also Cholmondeley Award 1980; Heinemann 1989).

1976 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
WALTER ALLEN c	academic/critic/ novelist	Birmingham	year not known	Former critic and journalist for various, including Literary Editor of <u>New Statesman</u> , 1960- 1961. Had several volumes of her own poetry published.	(OBE 1979; CBE 1985). Married to Sir Harold Wilson, (former Prime Minister).		
LADY WILSON	poet			Critic for various, (including Drama Critic for <u>The Sunday Telegraph</u> 1978-1988).	Also a biographer and writer of short stories.	Society of Authors; PEN (Pres. 1978. Pres. International PEN 1986-9).	Somerset Maugham Award, 1952; Katherine Mansfield, 1965.
FRANCIS KING	writer/critic	OXFORD, Balliol	1948				

1977 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
PHILIP LARKIN C	poet librarian	OXFORD, St. John's College	year not known	The Daily Telegraph (jazz critic). Reviewer for various others.	(CH 1985), CBE 1975, C.Litt. 1978. Also a novelist and close friend of Barbara Pym. (See 1977 shortlist). Member of the Arts Council Literature Board.		Queen's Gold Medal for Poetry 1965; Loines Award for Poetry 1974; (RSL) A. C. Benson Silver Medal 1975; Shakespeare Prize 1976.
BERYL BAINBRIDGE *(see 1975 shortlist for details)							
BRENDON GILL							
DAVID HUGHES	writer/journalist/ academic	OXFORD, Christ Church (Editor, Isis)	(1986)	BBC producer. Editor of various periodicals including Town Magazine and New Fiction Society. Also, film script writer Drama and music critic, reviewer for various including PUNCH. Also writer and presenter for the BBC.	Also a novelist, academic and stills photographer.	Savile	(Welsh Arts Council 1984; W. H. Smith 1985).
ROBIN RAY	critic/ broadcaster				Compiler of music anthologies.		

1978 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
SIR ALFRED AYER C	academic\ philosopher	OXFORD, Christ Church, Fellow of Wadham			Kl. 1970. Wrote various philosophical texts, also several volumes of autobiography.	Beeisreak; Athenaeum; Garrick	
DERWENT MAY	academic\ critic	OXFORD, Lincoln College		Leader writer for the ILS; Lit. Ed The Listener. (Lit. and Arts Editor, The Sunday Telegraph, 1986-90).	Has published and edited several books.	Beeisreak	(Member of the Hawthornden Prize Committee from 1987).
P. H. NEWBY* (see 1969 shortlist for details)							
ANGELA HUTH	journalist\ novelist\ dramatist	Various art schools	1975	Various, as a television and newspaper reporter. Also tv plays.	Has had several novels published.		
CLARE BOYLAN	journalist\ critic\ writer			Professional journalist.			Benson and Hedges Award for Outstanding Work in Irish Journalism 1974.

1979 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
LORD BRIGGS c	academic historian	CAMBRIDGE, Sidney Sussex Coll.		Chairman of the International Broadcasting Institute, 1968-1987. Wrote a history of the BBC in 1985.	(Life Peer 1976). Specialist in Nineteenth Century History. Provost of Worcester Coll., OXFORD. Also, Chancellor of the Open University.	Beefsteak; United Oxford and Cambridge University.	Marconi Medal for Communications History 1975; Medaille Vermeil de la Formation Fondation de L'Academie d'Architecture 1979.
BENNY GREEN	musician/critic			BBC Presenter. Also music, literary and film critic for various periodicals including <u>Punch</u> , and <u>The Spectator</u> . Member of the BBC Archives Committee, 1976.	Editor of Wisden's Cricket Anthologies. Artistic Director of the New Shakespeare Company from 1973.		Various awards for broadcasting. (E.g. Sony Award for Best Popular Music Series 1984).
MICHAEL HATCLIFFE	journalist/critic	CAMBRIDGE, Christ's Coll.		Has worked for various, including <u>The Sunday Times</u> and <u>The Observer</u> .	Wrote <u>The Novel Today</u> in 1968, and in 1987 completed a work on <u>The Bodley Head</u> for the late J. W. Lambert in 1987. (See Judges, 1983).		(Commended Critic of the Year, British Press Awards 1989).
MICHAEL SPURDING	writer/critic	OXFORD, Somerville		Various including Literary Editor of <u>The Spectator</u> , 1966-1970.	Literary critic and biographer, e.g. of the 1977 Booker winner, Paul Scott.		(Duff Cooper 1985; Heinemann (II) 1985).
PAUL THEROUX	writer academic	Massachusetts U. S. A.	year not known	Various novels have been adapted for the screen including <u>The Mosquito Coast</u> . Has also written his own screenplays.	Travel writer and author of a book on the work of V. S. Naipaul, the 1971 Booker winner.		Whitbread Novel 1978. (James Tail Black 1982).

1980 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
PROFESSOR DAVID DAICHES	academic/critic	Edinburgh; OXFORD, Balliol	year not known		(CBE 1991). Various teaching posts, including at OXFORD, CAMBRIDGE and Sussex. Has written literary criticism books and literary biographies.		(Satire Society Award 1984).
RONALD BLYTHE	writer/critic		1969	Prize-winning novel, <u>Akenfield</u> adapted for tv.	Has written criticism books on Jane Austen, Hardy and Tolstoy.		Heinemann Award 1969. (Angel Prize 1985).
MARGARET FORSTER	writer/critic/biographer/novelist	OXFORD, Somerville College	year not known	Member of the BBC Advisory Committee on the Social Effects of TV, 1975-77. Wrote the screenplay for the film <u>Georgy Girl</u> (from her own novel).	is married to Hunter Davies, the writer who founded the Hunter Davies Lakeland Award. In addition to fiction Forster has also written several volumes of literary biography.		
CLAIRE TOMALIN	journalist/critic/publisher/novelist	CAMBRIDGE, Newnham	year not known	Former Literary Editor of <u>The New Statesman</u> and <u>The Sunday Times</u> . (See also 1984 shortlist for connections with Julian Barnes).	Editor for various publishing companies. Formerly had relationship with Martin Amis (who was on the shortlist in 1991).		(N. C. H. Prize, Hawthornden and James Tait Black, all 1991).
BRIAN WENHAM	broadcaster	OXFORD, St. John's College		Former Controller of BBC 2. (Later Managing Director of BBC Radio and Director of Programmes, BBC TV).			

1981 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
MALCOLM BRADBURY c (see 1983 shortlist for details) BRIAN ALDISS	writer journalist		(1990)	Several novels adapted for the screen. Former Literary Editor of <u>The Oxford Mail</u> and Editor of <u>Science Fiction Horizons</u> .	Mainly a writer of science fiction. On the Arts Council's Literature Board.	PEN (Pres., International PEN 1983); Society of Authors (Mem. of Management Committee); Groucho's; Helen's.	Many, including The Observer Book Award for Science Fiction 1956; Hugo Award 1961 and 1977; B. S. F. A. Award 1974; Prix Jules Verne and Pilgrim Awards 1977.
JOAN BAKEWELL	broadcaster/writer	CAMBRIDGE, Newnham College		Writer and presenter for BBC tv and radio. A contributor to <u>Punch</u> , <u>The Sunday Times</u> and others.	Former President, the Society of Arts Publicists.		
SAMUEL HYNES	academic/critic	Minnesota, U. S. A.	year not known		Author of various works of literary criticism including one on the work of the 1980 winner, William Golding.		Various, including the Explicator Award 1962
HERMIONE LEE	academic/critic	OXFORD, St. Hilda's	year not known	Presenter, Channel Four's "Book Four" programme, (1982-6).	Author of a crit. book on the work of Elizabeth Bowen (See 1970 shortlist).		A judge for various prizes, including the Faber 1981. (Also Cheltenham Festival Prize 1987 and W. H. Smith 1988-90).

1982 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
JOHN CAREY c	academic/critic	OXFORD, St. John's College	1982	Principal book reviewer for <u>The Sunday Times</u> from 1977.	Has written various crit. books and edited several anthologies including the 75th birthday tribute to the 1980 Booker winner, William Golding.		
PAUL BAILEY (see 1977 shortlist for details)							
FRANK DELANEY	broadcaster/ journalist/ novelist			Has worked for the BBC and RTE as presenter.	(Chairman of the National Book League, 1984-1986).	Alhenaem	
JANET MORGAN	writer/consultant/ academic	OXFORD, St. Hugh's; Sussex		Director of Satellite TV Plc 1981-83. (Also Special Adviser to the Director General of the BBC, 1983-1986).	Edited <u>The Future of Broadcasting</u> with Richard Hoggart. (See 1970 Judges). Has also written a biography of Agatha Christie, whose copyrights were held by Booker Books.		
LORNA SAGE	academic/critic/ journalist	Durham, Birmingham		A frequent contributor to various, including <u>ILS</u> and <u>The Observer</u> .	Professor and Dean of the Faculty of English and American Studies at the UEA. Has connections with Lodge and Bradbury. Has also written a literary biography of Doris Lessing (See 1981 shortlist).		

1983 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
FAY WELDON c* (see 1979 shortlist for details) ANGELA CARTER	writer critic	Bristol		A critic for various newspapers and periodicals including <u>ILS</u> and <u>The Observer</u> . Also wrote screenplays.	in addition to novels wrote children's fiction, short stories, radio plays and non-fiction.		John Jewellyn Rhys 1967; Somerset Maugham 1968; Cheltenham Festival 1979. (Kate Greenaway Medal 1983; James Tait Black (It) 1984).
TERENCE KILMARTIN	literary journalist translator			Literary Editor of <u>The Observer</u> , 1952-86.	(CBE 1987). Literary biographer and translator, mainly of Proust.		
PETER PORTER	poet/writer		year not known	Reviewer for various magazines.	Also a translator and editor of foreign poetry.		Duff Cooper 1983. (Whitbread Poetry 1988).
LIBBY PURVES	broadcaster journalist	OXFORD, St. Anne's Coll.		BBC producer, writer and presenter. Has also written for <u>The Times</u> and <u>The Sunday Times</u> and was Editor of <u>The Tatler</u> in 1983.	Marrried to BBC presenter Paul Heiney.	Royal Thames Yacht; Royal Cruising	

1984 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
RICHARD COBB C	academic/ historian/ writer	OXFORD, Merton Coll.			FBA 1967; CBE 1978. N. B. made controversial speech at the 1984 ceremony.		Won the J. R. Ackerley Prize in 1983 (autobiography) for <u>Sill Life</u> .
ANTHONY CURTIS	journalist/critic	OXFORD, Merton Coll.		BBC; <u>New Statesman</u> ; <u>Financial Times</u> ; <u>ILS</u> . Has also written radio plays.	Playwright.	Society of Authors; Garick; Travellers; Beefsteak.	
POLLY DEVLIN	journalist			Has worked for various newspapers and periodicals, including <u>Vogue</u> , <u>The Sunday Times</u> and <u>The Observer</u>	Devlin is the sister-in-law of the poet Seumas Heaney.		(Was a judge for the Irish Times/Aer Lingus Awards in 1992).
JOHN FULLER* (see 1983 shortlist for details) TED HOWLANDS MP	MP/academic	London, King's College		Articles for various periodicals.	Member of governing body, the Commonwealth Institute.		

1985 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
NORMAN ST JOHN-STEVAS MP C (see 1987 shortlist for details)	lawyer MP academic	CAMBRIDGE, Fitzwilliam; OXFORD, Christ Church	1966	Articles for various periodicals.	(Life Peer 1987). Is an expert on constitutional history. Former Arts Minister and Privy Councillor. Has held many arts-related honorary posts.	White's; Garrick; Pratt's; Arts (Hon. Mem. 1980); Grillions; The Other.	
NINA BAWDEN (see 1987 shortlist for details)							
J. W. LAMBERT	journalist/critic			Various. Former Literary Editor of <u>The Sunday Times</u> .	CBE 1970. Member of the Arts Council and on the council of RADA (Chairman, 1985).	Society of Authors; Garrick; Beefsteak.	
MARINA WARNER (see 1988 shortlist for details)							
JOANNA LUMLEY	actress/model writer			Has acted in various BBC and ITV productions.	N. B. unable to make the final judges' meeting, however would not have been voting for Hulme.		

1986 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
ANTHONY THWAITE c	poet critic/publisher	OXFORD, Christ Church	1978	<u>The Listener</u> , <u>New Statesman</u> (Literary Editor); Co-editor, <u>Encounter</u> . Formerly a BBC producer.	(OBE 1990). Director of Andre Deutsch (from 1986). Creative Writing Fellow at the UEA in 1972. Is married to the biographer Ann Thwaite.		Richard Hillary Memorial Prize 1968; Cholmondeley Award 1983.
EDNA HEALEY	lecturer/ broadcaster	OXFORD, St. Hugh's		Writer and presenter for tv and radio.	Has published several non-fiction works.		
ISOBEL QUIGLY	journalist/critic	CAMBRIDGE, Newnham		Has worked for the BBC and as a critic for <u>The Spectator</u> and other periodicals.		PEN	
GILLIAN HEYNOLDS	journalist/critic	OXFORD, St. Anne's College		<u>Daily Telegraph</u> , <u>The Guardian</u> (radio critic). A contributor to various other periodicals.	(First Fellow to be appointed to the Radio Academy, 1990).	University Women's	
BERNICE RUBENS * (see 1970 shortlist for details)							

1987 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
P. D. JAMES c	civil servant/writer		1987	(A Governor of the BBC from 1988). Various novels by James have been serialised for tv.	(Baroness 1991); OBE 1983. Chairman of the Arts Council Literature Advisory Panel and of the British Council Literature Committee. On the board of the British Council from 1988.	Society of Authors (Chairman, 1984-86). Crime Writers' Association; Detection.	
LADY SELINA HASTINGS	journalist	OXFORD, St. Hugh's		Literary Editor, Harpers and Queen's.	Biographer of Nancy Mitford. Also a critic and novelist.		
ALLAN MASSIE	journalist/writer	CAMBRIDGE, Trinity College	1982	Various in Scottish media. (The Daily Telegraph from 1991).	Also a critic and novelist. Member of the Scottish Arts Council. Has written a crit. book on Muriel Spark (See shortlists for 1969 and 1981).	Academy; Seikirk RFC.	
THEVOR McDONALD	broadcaster			ITN newsreader.	Has written biographies of several famous cricketers.		
JOHN B. THOMPSON	journalist/broadcaster/publisher	OXFORD, Pembroke College		Former journalist and Editor of <u>The Observer Magazine</u> . Director of Radio, the IBA, 1973-1987. Editorial Director of BPC Publishing Plc. (Currently Editor of <u>The Viewer</u>).	CBE 1980.	Garrick; Groucho	Sony Special Radio Award 1983

1988 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
MICHAEL FOOT MP c	politician\journalist\critic	OXFORD, Wadham College		Journalist and editor for various, including the Evening Standard; Tribune; Daily Herald.	Former Labour Party Leader and Party Councillor. Writer of several volumes of history and of non-fiction. Also a novelist.		
SEBASTIAN FAULKS	journalist\author	CAMBRIDGE, Emmanuel College		Editor, New Fiction Society 1978-81. Journalist and Literary Editor for various, including: Daily Telegraph; Sunday Telegraph; The Independent.		Guardian; C. C.	
PHILIP FRENCH	broadcaster\journalist\film critic	OXFORD, Exeter Coll. (Editor, Isis)		Various, including BBC (as producer); New Statesman; The Observer	Wrote a triple biography of Edmund Wilson, F. R. Leavis and Lionel Trilling in 1980.		
BLAKE MORRISON	journalist	Nottingham; London, UCL	1988	Various including Literary Editor of The Observer and ILS. (Now with The Independent on Sunday.	A close friend of Martin Amis (See Booker shortlist 1991).		Eric Gregory 1980; Somerset Maugham 1984; Dylan Thomas Memorial 1985; E. M. Forster 1988.
ROSE TREMAIN (see 1989 shortlist for details)							

1989 JUDGES	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	UNIVERSITY	FRSL	MEDIA	OTHER	CLUBS	PRIZES
DAVID LODGE c* (see 1984 shortlist for details) MAGGIE GEE	academic/ novelist/critic	OXFORD, Somerville		Various	Writing Fellow at the UEA .	Society of Authors (Mem. of the Management Committee).	
HELEN MCNEIL	academic/writer	Portland and Yale, both U. S. A.		Reviewer and critic for various periodicals.	Teacher at the UEA. Novelist.		
DAVID PROFUMO	critic/novelist	OXFORD (College not known)			Has written a book in collaboration with jointly with Graham Swift (See 1983 shortlist).		
EDMUND WHITE	novelist/academic	Michigan, U. S. A			Literature don and writer of fiction, biography and non-fiction.		A. A. A. L. Award (year unknown).

APPENDIX 2



Booker Prize



310

Book Trust Book House 45 East Hill London SW18 2QZ Telephone: 01-870 9055/8

1989 Booker Prize for Fiction

Details and rules of the Prize

1 The Prize

- a The Prize is worth £20,000. It will be awarded to the author of the best full-length novel, in the opinion of the judges, that is eligible for the Prize. Only in exceptional circumstances, and then only with the prior approval of Booker, may the Prize be split between two authors.
- b The judges will be responsible for compiling a shortlist of not more than six and not less than three of the outstanding books submitted for the Prize. For inclusion in this shortlist a title should have the full support of at least one judge in whose opinion it is a valid contender for the Prize itself.
- c The panel of judges is chosen by the Prize Management Committee appointed by Booker and the Prize is administered by Book Trust.

2 Eligible Books

- a Any full-length novel, written in English by a citizen of the Commonwealth, the Republic of Ireland, Pakistan and South Africa, is eligible. Such a book must be a unified and substantial work. Neither a book of short stories nor a novella is eligible. Entry of books is dealt with under Rule 3.
- b A book submitted on behalf of an author who was deceased at the date of publication will not be eligible for consideration.
- c No English translation of a book written originally in any other language is eligible.
- d All entries must be published in the United Kingdom, but previous publication of a book outside the UK does not disqualify it.
- e The decision of the judges as to whether a book is eligible shall be binding.
- f No entry shall be ineligible because its author has won either the Booker or any other prize previously.

Sponsored by Booker plc, administered by Book Trust

3 Entry of Books

- a United Kingdom publishers may enter up to three full-length novels, with scheduled publication dates between 1 October 1988 and 30 September 1989. In addition, they may enter eligible titles by authors who have previously won the Booker Prize. Finished copies only may be submitted.
- b Each publisher may also submit, by 1 July 1989, a list of up to five further titles. These should each be accompanied by a justification for the submission of not more than 250 words. The judges will be required to call in not less than 5 or more than 15 of these titles.
- c Entries must be submitted by 1 July 1989 but if publishers know that copies of an eligible book which they wish to submit will be available between 1 July 1989 and 31 July 1989 they must inform Book Trust by 1 July and submit copies by 31 July 1989. Six copies of each entry must be submitted to the 'Judges of the 1989 Booker Prize', care of Book Trust and *not* direct to the judges.
- d Publishers are particularly requested to send entries as soon as they are published. Even if some titles are not available until July, it is nonetheless extremely helpful to the judges to receive the other entries as early as possible.
- e The judges may also, not later than 1 September 1989 call for any book published between 1 October 1988 and 30 September 1989, even if such a book does not appear on publishers' lists referred to in 3b. In that event the publishers will be asked to submit six printed copies of the book to Book Trust.
- f No book entered by publishers or called in by the judges will be returned to publishers.

4 Conditions of Award

Any eligible book which is entered for the Prize shall not qualify for the award unless its publisher agrees:

- (i) to spend not less than £1,000 on direct, paid for media advertising of the winning book, including a winning poster or showcard, within the three months following the announcement of the award.
- (ii) to contribute £1,000 towards general publicity if the book reaches the shortlist.

It is hoped that all shortlist publishers will use every means available including sale or return, see-safe, etc., to get shortlisted books into bookshops.

- f No entry shall be ineligible because its author has won either the Booker or any other prize previously.

