

PAULINA KEWES
Gdańsk

“TO QUOTE OR NOT TO QUOTE”
A POSTMODERNIST’S GENOLOGICAL DILEMMA
IN EDWARD BOND’S *RESTORATION*

Edward Bond’s 1981 play is entitled *Restoration*, subtitled *A Pastoral*, whilst its setting is designated as “England, eighteenth century – or another place at another time”¹.

Tracing the interaction between these three designations will serve as a starting point for the present discussion of the play.

The very word “restoration” in the title raises definite expectations in the implied reader, namely, that in the course of the play some sort of as yet undefined order will be reimposed, reinstated, in other words restored following a preceding temporary breach². The awaited return to the original balance and hierarchy may be thus taken to apply not only to a corresponding structuring of the plot but also to the stylistic strategies which can be duly expected to conform to the principle of rising orderliness and patterning.

However, none of the expectations thus aroused find confirmation or fulfilment in the actual body of the text. No moral, social or divine order is restored at the end of the play. On the contrary, as regards the plot’s denouement instead of the anticipated comic, poetic justice we are faced with flagrant injustice when the innocent servant is hanged for murder while his

¹ The original production text of *Restoration* (London: Eyre Methuen Royal Court Writers’ Series, 1981) was subsequently revised for the 1982 and the 1988 Methuen editions (E. Bond, *Restoration*, London: Methuen, 1982 & 1988). All references in the present study are to the two latest editions, and page numbers will follow part and scene in parentheses.

² Incidentally, this is precisely how the title of Rose Tremain’s latest novel, *Restoration* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1989), functions. On the one hand it denotes the moral and cognitive restoration of the main protagonist, Robert Merivel, enhanced by the textual patterns of closure and completion. On the other hand, the title unmistakably refers the reader to the historical Restoration when the events of the book take place, with the figure of Charles II looming from afar and occasionally getting directly involved in the action.

master, the play's 'villain', walks away triumphant. Neither does the construction of the text or its stylistic choices disclose any signs remotely indicative of any order whatsoever reasserting itself.

There is, however, another conceivable referential target of the 'restoration' of the title, that is the literary historical Restoration, or more precisely, the dramatic and theatrical conventions characterizing one of the genres the epoch produced, Restoration comedy³. Of course, any direct temporal correspondence to the Restoration is precluded by the time designation of the action, mentioned above.

Bond's play's affinities to the Restoration comic mode are primarily visible in the configuration of characters and the resulting style of expression, as well as in the evocation of typical plot motifs. To begin with, Lord Are who is projected as the most active intratextual agent and instigator of events, reveals a resemblance to the Restoration comic 'hero', traditionally referred to as the Restoration rake and exemplified by the legions of Horners, Dorimants, Fainalls, Maskwells and the like.

The lord's name immediately suggests its bearer's proto/typical status within the class he belongs to, the aristocracy: what they are, he is. Additionally, the potential for pejorative connotations inherent in both pronunciation and spelling of the name is actually made use of when the lord's runaway servant, Frank, abuses his former master by calling him "Lord Arse" and "Arsehole" (I/6:59; II/6::23). It is worth noting that both times the capital letter 'A' is used in the text.

As for the specific features customarily ascribed to the rake, lord Are is, as he himself puts it, "a man of epigrammatic wit" (I/1:8; I/1:2). Are's wit manifests itself in comments like.

"A poem should be well cut and fit the page neatly as if it were written by your tailor. The secret of literary style lies in the margins" (I/1:8; I/1:2).

Moreover, the threat contained in his free exercise of superior verbal power⁴ receives ultimate realization when he succeeds in talking his other

³ In her discussion of the play ("Bond's *Restoration*", *Modern Drama*, XXIV/4, March 1981: 479–493), Katharine Worth suggests that "The 'Restoration' of the title implies the restoration of the stage centre to the humble characters", and that Bond "rewrites the entire convention [of Restoration comedy] (...) to give them the place they had in the old melodramas": 481–482. However, the reader/audience can only arrive at this conclusion retrogressively, after having read/seen the play, whereas I am interested in the semantic field of association created by the title already on the title page. Cf. also Bond's own view of the Restoration dramatic tradition expressed in "Notes on Post-Modernism" (*Two Post-Modern Plays: Jackets; In the Company of Men, with September*, London: Methuen, 1990:231).

⁴ Cf. especially Richard Braverman, "Libertines and Parasites", *Restoration* (II/2: Fall 1987: 79), where the author goes on to say,

"(...) the libertine's prodigality issues from his most characteristic social expenditure, his wit. (...) A figure of eloquence and a cavalier, the libertine-parasite testifies to the power of the Word in a double sense: socially, he survives by his eloquence, and politically, his wit embodies the aristocratic virtues he values".

servant, Bob, into assuming the blame for the murder that Are himself committed (I/5:40–49; I/5:19–20).

Virtually inseparable from his wit is Are's supreme intelligence which provides him with an inexhaustible capacity for scheming, plotting, improvising, acting and in this way always finding a way out of a situation positing discomfort or danger to his person. Consequently, Are represents a Machiavelli rather than a don Juan type. His villainy which reaches the point of the utmost cruelty and sadism, qualifies Are to stand among the ranks of vicious rakes as defined by Robert Hume.⁵ To complete the picture one need only mention Are's vanity, reflected in his constant preoccupation with dress, notoriously reminiscent of the foppishness of Dorimant and Sir Fopling Flutter from Etherege's *Man of Mode*, to give the most obvious examples.⁶

As regards other characters, Old Lady Are appears to be one of a kind with the aging coquettes of the Restoration salon best epitomized in the figure of Lady Wishfort from Congreve's *The Way of the World* or Lady Cockwood from Etherege's *She Wou'd if She Cou'd*. Frank, Are's valet, seems to derive from a host of servants typical of Restoration plays. Ann Hardache, later Lady Are, may be said to correspond to the type of a social climber intent on marrying a title, a bourgeois aspiring to nobility.

Bond's *Restoration* seems to encourage the reader to note apparent parallels between a number of its plot-motifs and those typical of Restoration comedies. To illustrate, let us mention the following: there is the false courtship motivated by dowry hunting (I/1: 7–13; I/1: 1–4), an implication of a preceding procivo scene⁷ (I/3: 23; I/3: 8–9); and ridicule of the clergy in the person of Parson Phelps (I/2:16; I/2:5 & I/4:38–39; I/4:16 & II/11:92; II/11:38–41), the practice which was so mercilessly condemned by Jeremy Collier in his *Short View of the Immorality of the English Stage*.

The setting of particular scenes in such 'familiar' locations as London parks (I/2) and drawing rooms (II/9) on the hand, and a country estate on the other (I/2) echoes the ubiquitous Restoration juxtaposition of town and country.

To conclude the review of Restoration comedy traits as evoked in Bond's play one should also mention the repeated instances of role playing and play acting such as, for example, Lord Are's elaborate 'performance' staged for the sake of Ann Hardache and her affluent father, and aimed at obtaining her for a

⁵ *The Rakish Stage: Studies in English Drama 1660–1800* (Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1983), 165.

⁶ At one point Are succinctly defines the aim of his life in terms of his standing as an unquestionable *arbiter elegantiae*.

"I intend to bequeath posterity the memorial of my life (...) If I have a boot or a cap named after me — as I hope to have a hat — I shall be content" (I/3:23; I/3:8).

⁷ The proviso scene is not actually enacted on stage but from the dialogue between Lord and Lady Are (I/3:23; I/3:8) we infer that it must have taken place, and that the conditions there agreed upon — promises — are not being adhered to by the aristocratic husband.

wife to pay old debts (I/1:7–13; I/1: 1–4). In line with a plethora of its Restoration predecessors, this scene displays virtually all the potential theatrical machinery. To begin with, it is based on a unique kind of script, a sketch,

“I had it drew up by a man renowned for his landscapas to show me how a gentlemann drapes himself across his fields” (I/1:8; I/1:2).

The ‘actor’ starring in it wears a costume carefully chosen for the piece,

“I wore my russet and green of a purpose” (I/1:7).⁸

He is also equipped with a becoming prop,

“Damn! the sketch shows a flower. ‘Tis too late for the shops, I must have one from the ground” (I/1:7; I/1:1).

Finally, the show whose aesthetic effect is to accomplish a very pragmatic feat indeed is ready to begin,

“So here I am set, imitating the wild man of the woods. An extravagant gesture but I would have the gal love me at first sight and be spared the tedium of courting an iron master’s daughter” (I/1:8–9; I/1:2).

However, just as the outcome of Lord Are’s acting endeavours is in the long run far from that anticipated,⁹ so the implied reader’s generic expectations aroused by the evocation of Restoration comedy conventions are repeatedly thwarted and frustrated. In addition to the very un-comedy-like ending of the play, we are presented with an actual death-on-stage scene where Lord Are kills his wife disguised as a ghost (I/5:40–44; I/5:18). No matter how much one might elaborate on the unmistakably farcical aura of the scene, the corpose is there, and whatever expectations of a comic resolution the reader might still cherish at this point are unequivocally disavowed. There is no place for death in Restoration comedy unless it be the death of a far-off relative which leads to the acquisition of a substantial inheritance by one of the heroes or heroines as is the case, for example, in George Farquhar’s *The Beaux’ Stratagem* or *The Recruiting Officer*. Even then, however, death is never presented on stage but reported by a messenger-type figure or announced in a letter.

If we were now to reconsider all the invocations of Restoration comedy, we would discover that each carries a germ of its won inversion in the context of Bond’s textual reality. Lord Are is rake-like, true, but also a murderer which, as has been pointed out above, undercuts his comic provenance. There are Lord Are, Ann Hardache and her father, but then the cast of low characters is much too numerous and much too prominent to match Restoration standards which never allowed a plebeian low plot to take over. The names of both characters and places are telling but lack Restoration univocality where a Witwoud invariably denoted a would-be wit. Here, on the other hand, Are’s country

⁸ This line is absent from the 1988 edition of the play.

⁹ Are gets the wife and the money thanks not to the “beauties of (his) play” as Farquhar would put it (cf. Preface to the Reader, *The Constant Couple*, London: Methuen, 1988:1), but because of his prospective father-in-law’s foreknowledge of the rich coal seams underlying Are’s country estate — of which the owner himself is not aware (II/8:74–75; II/8:32).

estate is called Hilgay, a pun on gay hill, and yet not much gaiety can be extracted from the place as a setting for murder.

It thus becomes clear that Restoration comedy conventions evoked in the text are there only subsequently to be called into question and undercut or displaced. This, in connection with the manner of functioning or rather malfunctioning of the play's title, points to the emerging strategy of manipulating the implied reader's expectations in such a way as continually to misdirect and thwart them. In other words, textual clues repeatedly prove unreliable.

This last supposition is further supported by the fact that as with the title which is in a sense a blind alley, the play's subtitle, *A Pastoral*, constitutes another misleading, textually ungrounded clue. An already familiar procedure is at work: the reader is confronted with a subtitle which provides a straightforward designation of the text's affiliation to a given genre, thereby provoking a set of definite expectations. Those, in turn, are in due course frustrated and displaced.

Incidentally, some commentators on the play tend to feel rather uncomfortable about the subtitle, which is evident in one critic's uneasy remark,

“Yet strangely Bond describes the play as ‘a pastoral’, presumably with the intention of removing it from strict considerations of time and place, and of creating a generalized world which contains the seeds of our own”.¹⁰

It is rather hard to conjecture how this last conclusion could have been reached.

The move whereby the text is subtitled *A Pastoral* is tantamount to putting it, as it were, in quotation marks, wholly subjecting it to a precise strategy of naming. In other words, the subtitle unequivocally NAMES ‘the pastoral’ as a literary genre¹¹ of which *Restoration* is supposedly a specimen. However, if we accept the subtitle in its literal meaning and envisage Bond's text *vis-a-vis* even the simplest and most concise definition of the pastoral,¹² we are forced to conclude that, if anything, the play offers a crude inversion of the genre.¹³ The

¹⁰ G.E. Hughes, “Edward Bond's *Restoration*”, *Critical Quarterly* (25/4: 1983), 78. For more perceptive discussions of the problem, see Philip Roberts “The Search for Epic Drama: Edward Bond's Recent Work”, *Modern Drama* (XXIV/4: 1981), 469–471; Worth 480. D.L. Hirst who offers an appraisal of the play in his study of Bond's literary output ignores the subtitle altogether (D.L. Hirst, *Edward Bond*, London: Macmillan, 1985).

¹¹ As a matter of fact a number of otherwise helpful studies devoted to the subject often fail to make clear the distinction between a pastoral as a literary genre in its own right and pastoral as a supragenological feature characterizing a body of texts of an altogether different, and varied, generic provenance. Cf. e.g., Andrew V. Ettin, *Literature and the Pastoral* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1984); Peter V. Marinelli, *Pastoral* (London: Methuen, 1971).

¹² Such as, e.g., the one proposed in M. Głowiński et al. *Słownik terminów literackich* (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1988) 467.

¹³ Interestingly enough, in his *Restoration Comedy: Crises of Desire and Identity* (London: Macmillan, 1987) Edward Burns offers a revealing account of the status of Restoration comedy *vis-a-vis* the pastoral conventions. The factual material analyzed leads the author to suggest that Restoration comedy “imitates and builds on pastoral while observing an ironical distance from it. It creates a kind of town pastoral, wittily inverting the Arcadian norm to make the town the locus of pleasure fantasy and change and the country the domain of banal quotidian reality”. (17)

initially established contrast between town and country (e.g. I/1:7–14; I/1:1–5 & I/2:18–19; I/2:5–7) is implied to be superficial and consequently undermined by the two locations' equivalence in both being the seat of injustice and social inequality. Moreover, instead of a company of shepherds or, more properly, gentlemen in the literary guise of shepherd, the cast of characters features a blind swineherd, Gabriel. One of the scenes is actually set in a Hilgay copse and, as the stage direction specifies,

"Off, from time to time pig bells and pig grunts". (II/7:62; II/7:25)

Apart from the substitution of the very anti-pastoral pigs for sheep, we witness an extensive use of animal imagery with respect to people.¹⁴ The most frequently recalled images are those of pigs, cows, dogs, apes, or simply beasts, and are employed by virtually all and in regard to all the characters. To give a few examples, (Rose to Bob) "(...) some poor cow carryi'your bastard" (I/1:14; I/1:4);

(Mother about the new Lady Are) "She the sort a creature she looks like? Bob. Yes if thass cow.

Mother. I can handle cows" (I/2:16–17; I/2:6);

(Ann to Lord Are) "Oh you pig! Pig!" (I/3:22; I/3:8).

Human figures ultimately reduced to animal level are definitely not what one would anticipate of 'a pastoral'. As we have seen both the title and the subtle subversively misdirect the reader's expectations, thus evincing a widening rift between the play's authorial meta-designation on the one hand and the text proper on the other. This rift becomes even more conspicuous in the light of two other facets of the text, namely, the play's constructional and functional affinity to the music-hall and the related issue of the autothematic, meta-literary awareness displayed throughout.

Upon close examination *Restoration* reveals functional and constructional affinities to the music-hall conceived of as a theatrical and scenic genre *par excellence* where successive 'turns' or 'numbers' are rounded off by songs only loosely, if at all, connected with what precedes or ensues. There are numerous songs interpolated into the structure of the play. When envisaged in terms of the potential for theatrical realization, the first, prologue-like song, *It's a Big Broad Fine Sunny Day*, which comes before the action proper is actually launched, already establishes a very special kind of contact between the performers and the auditorium. Since it is not precisely specified who sings it, we might presume that all the subsequent players come on stage as if to provide an overture, an introduction to what is to follow, though, of course, the lack of authorial directions to that effect leaves room both for speculation and the inventiveness of the stage manager.

¹⁴ There are more than thirty straightforward animal references to people in the text of the play, not counting several indirect ones.

The very title and the lexical and syntactic choices visible throughout the lyric situate this song along the spectrum of contemporary pop/rock protest songs. There are the familiar contractions “ain’t” and “gonna” used to express the equally familiar sentiments, such as “This time there ain’t gonna be no more war”. The notorious division into ‘us’ and ‘them’ is also there, with the ‘us’ projected as “the wise guys” to be and ‘them’ as “bastards” and “sods”.

Incidentally, our initial conjecture as to who sings the first song gains plausibility in light of the hyper-frequent recurrence of the pronoun ‘we’, “we’re gonna say no (...) we’re gonna be wise guys (...) we won’t load them (bombs) up,” etc., and of the equivalent pronoun ‘they’ whose meaning is extended to embrace the whole of the cast, “This time they’re stying here to play”, as well as the repeated references to the extra-textual and, by implication, the scenic reality, “this time”, “now”, “today”, “here”. Accordingly, the line quoted above may be interpreted as a compere-like announcement of a collective theatrical event about to begin. It goes without saying that both the song and the show it anticipates presuppose a very special kind of addressee who is, so to speak, ‘in the know’ and identifies with the views foregrounded in such a compelling, forceful manner by the lyric.

This last comment touches upon the issue central to the tradition of the music-hall, namely, the genre’s extreme topicality. Music-hall as a rule tends to bring up and probe into current problems, whether political, social, or economic. Bond’s opening song, through the idiom of Osborne-like angry young men, through its references to “rockets (...) aimed in their pits”, “bombs stacked in their racks” and “soldiers (who) will march away (...to..) die for the sods” clearly points in the direction of an extra-textual reality seen as fraught with wars, social injustice and the exploitation of one man by another.

An analogous climate of contention and protest pervades most of the remaining songs with which *Restoration* is interspersed, e.g., *Song of Learning* (I/2:19; I/2:7), *Song of the Calf* (I/4:36-37; I/4:15), *Man Groans* (I/4:39; I/4:16), *Hurrah* (II/8:77; II/8:32), to name just a few. The world-model engendered in the songs is clearly anachronistic with respect to the fictional universe of the action proper. The songs’ thrust towards actuality, towards contemporaneity, is continually foregrounded by such recurrent images as those of modern warfare, parking lots, industrial plants, supermarkets and the like.

This, in connection with the persistent strategy of direct second person address promoting a more immediate contact with the spectators/readers places the songs in an external communication system, i.e. the one comprised of actors and the audience.¹⁵ Each consecutive singer steps out of the role and

¹⁵ There is only one sing in the whole text of the play which is functionally affiliated to the action proper (Frank’s song II/11: 94–95; II/11:40) and is thus part of the internal communication system.

drops the character he or she has been impersonating,¹⁶ so contributing to the suspension of (internal) fictional space and time to the point of their virtual erasure. In effect the unfolding of the plot becomes fractured and disjointed. Moreover, the songs' direct pertinence to the actual scenic *hic et nunc*, so sanctified by the dramatic tradition, is almost completely obliterated, non-existent¹⁷ Its absence not only reinforces the fictionality of the stage action but strongly emphasizes the status of the action as a pretext, as an excuse for the inclusion of songs. Alternately, it could be claimed that the text features two separate spatio-temporal continua: the primary fictional reality of the action proper and the secondary fictional world created by the songs.

The history of drama abounds in genres which make extensive use of songs endowing them with diverse functions. In Restoration comedy songs served as an embellishment, a mere decorative detail and occasionally carried parodistic overtones. In Gay's *The Beggar's Opera* songs provided a vehicle for burlesque, satire and comic commentary. In Brecht's epic theatre songs constituted one of the mediating techniques preventing the spectator's empathy and identification with the fictional figures, thus producing the effect of alienation and defamiliarization. However, in all these cases songs were at least to some extent fused, integrated with and relevant to the plane of action. Though the three instances discussed above actually illustrate a diachronically proceeding transformation and elimination of this interdependence, nowhere, not even in Brecht, is it severed to the point of disappearance. Songs as used by Bond, on the other hand, ultimately cease to function as any sort of link between the world of the characters and the auditorium. Stylistic, thematic, linguistic and historical distance between the songs and the intratextual reality project the former as part of the spatio-temporal continuum of the implied theatre audience only.

So radical a departure from the historical conventions of song usage constitutes yet another means of frustrating expectations created in the reader by the appearance of the songs in the first place. The same strategy of perplexing the reader can be seen to operate in miniature in almost every individual lyric. The expectations undercut in the song entitled *Gentleman* seem to be primarily thematic,

"He steps out of the way to let her pass (...) What politeness he shows the stranger! (...) At the door to the gas chamber He hands the child back to her arms (...)" II/6:56–57; II/6:22–23).

¹⁶ One trace of the relationship between the actor and the impersonated figure remains: stage directions specify which actor – i.e. the actor playing the part of which figure should sing a given song.

¹⁷ It is only present in a latent form in the equivocal allusions scattered throughout the lyrics, e.g. Rose's song from Scene Three (25–26: 9–10) is entitled *Dream* while at the outset of this very scene (20; 7) the young Lady Are recounts her dream. However, the relationship between the two 'dreams' is by no means clear and univocal. Consequently, it could be said that the song takes up a motif from the internal communication system, endows it with alternate significance of verbal signs within the two communication systems respectively.

Anticipation of stylistic unity is negated in the lyric *Man is What He Knows*, where from a passage heavily loaded with ideology, “Sooner believe I could strike it a blow With my fist and miss!” the tone changes to the lyrical “Geese fly over the moon and do not know That for a moment they fill the world with beauty (...)” (II/12:99 – 100; II/12:42).

Bond’s play’s propinquity to certain conventions of the music-hall, notably those featuring ‘numbers’ to be sung, is responsible for breaking the fictive pretence as if from without, from outside the action proper. However, *Restoration* exhibits a parallel tendency towards annihilating and exploding the illusion of reality working its way from within, from inside the presented world. This tendency is primarily visible in the character’s notorious metatheatrical comments in numerous asides *ad spectatores*.

In the first scene of the play Lord Are, alone on stage, delivers an expository aside (I/1:8 – 9; I/1:2), in which he immediately seeks to establish good rapport and understanding with the audience by means of the second person address “Faith boys”. The apparent success of his attempt may be grasped from one of the subsequent asides where in the first person plural he includes both himself and the audience, “Soon we shall hear (...)” (I/1:9; I/1:2). Thus the audience becomes the intended recipient of the ensuing meta-remarks, e.g.,

“Are. (...) (Aside.) ‘For god I am taken with my style. (...)’ (I/5:43; I/5:17),

“Are (Aside.) O the tedium of a tragedy: everything is said twice and then thrice.” (I/5:47; I/5:20),

“Are. (...) ‘tis a scene from a farce (...)” (II/6:57).

Old Lady Are’s comments are likewise astonishingly articulate on the subject of literary theatrical conventions, “Lady Are. (...) Ye made an old lady merry with a farce and now ye mar it with a awiling play! (II/9:82; II/9:35).

Just as Lord Are does not limit himself to side remarks but gets actively involved in staging his own little pieces like, for instance, the previously discussed courtship performance, so Lady Are endeavours to confer upon herself a very special prerogative indeed when she decides to procure a pardon for Lord Are’s innocently condemned servant,

“(...) I shall be the deus ex machina in it. As in the old romances, he shall be reprieved at the tree. (...)” (I/9:83; II/9:35)

Incidentally, when we are confronted with the outcome of the play where the awaited pardon never comes and the quiltless Bob is hanged, the above quotation inevitably forces a comparison with both Gay’s *The Beggar’s Opera* and Brecht’s version of it, *The Threepenny Opera* where Macheath vel Mac the Knife is miraculously delivered from the gallows. As the Beggar says,

“In this kind of Drama, ‘tis no matter how absurdly things are brought about. (...) A Reprieve! – let the Prisoner be brought back to his Wives in Triumph”.¹⁸

¹⁸ John Gay, *The Beggar’s Opera* (London: William Heinemann, 1921), 91. For an interesting comparison with the ending of George Lillo’s *The London Merchant*, see Ian Donaldson, *The World Upside Down: Comedy from Jonson to Fielding* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), 164–165.

In Brecht, after the appearance of the 'mounted' *deus ex machina* on stage, Peachum makes the following statement, "Saviours on horseback are rarely met with in practice",¹⁹ which could serve as a motto for Bond's *Restoration*, whose 'saviour on horseback' is cheated out of his pardon, which makes the piece much like a domestic tragedy with elements of the grotesque.

In any event, both the meta-comments testifying to the fictional figures' heightened awareness of genre conventions as well as the repeated instances of exposure of theatrical apparatus cut right across the internal communication system and alert the reader/spectator to the quasi-burlesque, self-centered aspect of Bond's *Restoration*.

This autothematic, meta-theatrical propensity of the text brings us back to where we started, i.e. to the tension between the play's initial meta-designations occasioned by the title and the subtitle. In our discussion we have pointed to the prevalent textual strategy of provoking specific generic, thematic, stylistic and other kinds of expectations by invoking historical literary and theatrical conventions. In effect there emerges a quasi-pattern of frames, 'quotes within quotes,' the broadest and most inclusive of which is established by the 'Restoration' of the title, then the subtitle 'A Pastoral', then the music-hall frame signalled by the first song, then the first scene reminiscent of the conventions of Restoration comedy, etc. Each subsequent convention or frame stands in sharp opposition to the preceding and the ensuing ones, thus cancelling both its antecedent and follower and itself undergoing cancellation in the process. Instead of the anticipated hierarchy we are faced with an anarchy of discrepant, incongruous, conflicting conventions or frames which incessantly displace one another thus leading to the dissemination of meaning, a typically postmodern successor to the modernist polysemy. Distinction between the two concepts is vital for the understanding of the two epochs' contradictory tenets. As Mark Krupnick puts it,

"Polysemy leads to a thematic criticism, a totalization of meaning, a truth. Dissemination, on the other hand, is lawless and generative (...)"²⁰

Bond's collage of the past literary and theatrical conventions which are evoked only to be displaced, decentered, semantically and culturally nullified is indubitably lawless but not generative.

In his assessment of the postmodern *vis-a-vis* the modern Matei Calinescu claims that the past

"can be quoted — trans-contextualized and duly put between quotation marks — and thus be made fit for reuse in a situation whose real novelty

¹⁹ Bertolt Brecht, *The Threepenny Opera* in Brecht, *Plays: One* (London: Methuen, 1987), 141. The original reads as follows: "Die reitenden Boten des Königs kommen sehr selten, wenn die Getretenen wiedergetretenen haben". (Bertolt Brecht, *Die Dreigroschenoper*, Leipzig: Verlag P. Reclam jun., 1977): 87.

²⁰ *Displacement: Derrida and After* (ed. with an Introduction by Mark Krupnick, Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1983), 10–11.

consists precisely in its renunciation of any claims of 'innocence' (originality, uniqueness, absolute novelty or freshness). (...) postmodernism's aesthetic salvation lies in the... quotation marks!"²¹

And this is exactly how the activation of the past is accomplished in Bond's play where each consecutive frame subjects the next, the more deeply embedded one, to the power of the quotation marks.

Restoration can be thus said to embody and confirm the general tendencies pervading postmodernism, most succinctly envisioned by Ihab Hassan in terms of binary oppositions to modernism, where postmodernist disjunctive, open form is juxtaposed to the modernist conjunctive and closed one, play to purpose, chance to design, anarchy to hierarchy, decreation/deconstruction to creation/totalization, antithesis to synthesis, dispersal to centering, signifier to signified, misreading to reading, etc., etc.²²

And it is only now, from a retrogressive perspective, that the metatextual significance of the title of the play, *Restoration*, can be properly read (misread?) as referring to the re-storing, re-assembling, re-arranging, re-stating of the subtitled past-oral, that is the past evoked orally, in line with the Derridean primacy of speech over writing. From a critical perspective it just seems a pity that this 'speech' is to such an extent incoherent.

CYTOWAĆ ALBO NIE CYTOWAĆ?
GENOLOGICZNY DYLEMAT POSTMODERNISTY NA PRZYKŁADZIE
RESTAURACJI EDWARDA BONDA

STRESZCZENIE

Tekstowe strategie „cytatu”, aluzji i przywołania zastosowane w sztuce Edwarda Bonda *Restauracja* odznaczają się charakterystyczną dla literatury postmodernistycznej manipulacją historycznie uwarunkowanymi konwencjami gatunkowymi. Artykuł jest próbą uchwycenia funkcji wspomnianych strategii w strukturze utworu oraz w szerszym kontekście współczesnej kultury.

Uważna analiza dramatu ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem jego metatekstowych odniesień w postaci tytułu, podtytułu oraz określenia czasu i miejsca akcji wskazuje na istnienie rozbudowanej sieci sygnałów kreujących u odbiorcy określone oczekiwania dotyczące gatunku, tematyki, stylu oraz języka utworu. Jednakże materiał sygnałny tekstu właściwego konsekwentnie neguje uprzednio ewokowane oczekiwania, w rezultacie czego z tekstu wyłania się schemat następujących kolejno po sobie, lecz pozostających w opozycji i napięciu wobec siebie ram gatunkowych, przy czym każda kolejna rama stanowi swoisty cudzysłów, w którym pojawia się następna (technika „cytatu w cytacie”). Konwencje sielanki, obyczajowej komedii okresu *Restauracji*, music-hallu, burleski oraz tragedii z elementami groteski przywoływane poprzez

²¹ Matei Calinescu, "Modernism, Late Modernism, Postmodernism", *Criticism in the Twilight Zone: Postmodern Perspective on Literature and Politics* (ed. D. Zadworna-Fjellestad & L. Björk, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksen Int., 1990), 54. Cf. Bond's political definition of postmodernity in Notes : 213.

²² As quoted in the Introduction to *Criticism in the Twilight Zone*, XII.

konfigurację postaci, budowę akcji, organizację czasoprzestrzenną stylizację językową, (zabieg identyfikacji), są konsekwentnie kwestionowane w kontekście zastosowanego przez Bonda collage'u gatunków i konwencji (zabieg negacji). Zaobserwowane na przykładzie sztuki Edwarda Bonda *Restauracja* strategie tekstowe wskazują, iż współczesny odbiorca miał spodziewanej hierarchii i porządku, staje w obliczu anarchii semantycznej, będącej postmodernistycznym odpowiednikiem typowej dla modernizmu polisemii.

Paulina Kewes