

Picaresque Structure and the Angry Young Novel

Author(s): Angela Hague

Source: *Twentieth Century Literature*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (Summer, 1986), pp. 209-220

Published by: Duke University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/441383>

Accessed: 09-02-2018 13:01 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/441383?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Duke University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Twentieth Century Literature*

Picaresque Structure and the Angry Young Novel

ANGELA HAGUE

Although John Wain's *Hurry on Down* (1953), Kingsley Amis' *Lucky Jim* (1954), and Iris Murdoch's *Under the Net* (1954) were all published several years before the cult of the Angry Young Man appeared in Great Britain, the novels were retrospectively—and erroneously—labeled by some critics as “angry” and their authors grouped with writers of the Angry Movement such as John Osborne and Colin Wilson. Anger did not officially arrive in London until the first production of *Look Back in Anger* at the Royal Court Theatre on May 8, 1956; Osborne's play, along with the publication of Colin Wilson's *The Outsider* on May 26, 1956, appeared to herald a new character in English culture, the working-class or lower-middle-class young man who rebels against the bleakness of the Welfare State and retreats into a self-protective shell of angry vituperation at his surroundings. Wain's Charles Lumley, Amis' Jim Dixon, and Murdoch's Jake Donaghue were then seen as prototypes of the Angry Young Man, despite the protestations of Amis and Wain that they were not particularly enraged about anything. And the error of including Iris Murdoch in this group, who at age thirty-five was neither young, angry, nor male, now seems obvious.

Critics did, however, perceive that the three novels had definite similarities. In a review entitled “Three Comers” in the *Saturday Review*, Bernard Kalb noted that the “most laudatory, if not down right rhapsodic, adjectives” were currently being applied to the novels of Amis, Wain, and Murdoch, and he ironically suggested that “Amis-Murdoch-Wain” were frequently discussed together because “they all (a) went to Oxford, (b) write wittily, (c) teach, and (d) are around thirty

or so."¹ Kalb went on to point out Kingsley Amis' dissatisfaction with being named as part of a "movement" which also included Wain and Murdoch, quoting Amis' statement that discussion of this so-called movement was both inaccurate and harmful. Two years later, however, in an article entitled "Laughter's to Be Taken Seriously," Amis acknowledged that while Wain and Murdoch were "in most ways poles apart," they were similar "in their evident feeling that the novel of a consistent tone, moving through a recognized and restricted mode of emotional keys, was outmoded"; rather, these two novelists have successfully combined "the violent and the absurd, the grotesque and the romantic, the farcical and the horrific within a single novel."² In this essay Amis also approvingly noted that postwar literary England appeared to be in what he called a "Fielding revival," an optimistic assessment from a writer who has voiced his reverence for Henry Fielding throughout his career. Although Amis did not specifically mention the picaresque dimension of Wain's and Murdoch's first novels, several other critics of the time commented on the picaresque structure of contemporary British novels.

In an important article on postwar fiction, William Van O'Connor divided the new British novelistic heroes into two groups, the working-class characters of Allan Sillitoe, John Braine, and David Storey; and a second group which he termed the "Lucky Jim" types who, "seedy, ineffectual, comic," are descendants of Samuel Beckett's *Murphy*.³ He placed Wain's *Hurry on Down*, Murdoch's *Under the Net*, and of course Amis' *Lucky Jim* in this category and commented on an article entitled "These Writers Couldn't Care Less" by V. S. Pritchett in which Pritchett discussed the picaresque structure of several contemporary English novels. In his survey of the new wave of British novelists, a group which included Amis, Wain, Thomas Hinde, and John Braine but omitted Iris Murdoch, Pritchett noted the "neutral" positions of these writers and the private nature of their "rancors" and observed that "a new class of uprooted people" had appeared.

Pritchett compared the "class revolution" of these writers to the social situation in late seventeenth-century England, which he described as the "sour, acrimonious, dissenting, vital, go-getting, new shop-keeping England" of Daniel Defoe; he also perceived a parallel in the "practical, profit recording style" of Defoe, who refused to write "literary" English, with the style of the current English novelists, described by Pritchett as a "desultory vernacular, using every popular circumlocution, or slang phrase, or image to avoid the literary expression of feeling." Pritchett, who explained the picaresque

dimension of these novels by speculating that their authors were in search of different literary models after abandoning their Victorian and modernist forebears, suggested that these writers had soon realized they had more affinities with the picaresque novelists of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries who were also “products of revolution . . . they were engaged in adventure; and the modern adventure was a rambling journey from one conception of society to another.”⁴

In *The Reaction against Experiment in the English Novel*, Rubin Rabinovitz discusses Amis’ and Wain’s interest in eighteenth-century literature and the fact that a number of critics, including Walter Allen, have placed Amis and Wain in the picaresque tradition.⁵ Robert Hewison, in his cultural survey of postwar Britain, *In Anger: British Culture in the Cold War 1945–60*, makes this point even more strongly. He includes Iris Murdoch in the group and believes that “it was the first novels of John Wain, Kingsley Amis, and Iris Murdoch that suggested that a different kind of novel was evolving. . . . They are all concerned with the picaresque adventures of a young man, a plot as old as the novel itself.”⁶ Rather than being united by the common bond of “anger,” I believe it is now clear that these three novelists chose to adopt certain characteristics of picaresque fiction. This discussion will look at how and why this occurred.

In recent years, a number of studies of the picaresque novel have appeared which attempt to account for the emergence of the picaresque in both literary and cultural terms. A common theme in these critical works is the fact that picaresque literature flourishes when a society is in a state of flux: the picaresque character is a reflection of a society undergoing profound social changes. Alexander Blackburn’s *The Myth of the Picaro* (1979) and Richard Bjornson’s *The Picaresque Hero in European Fiction* (1977) both discuss the creation of the Spanish picaresque tradition in light of the situation of the *conversos* (converts to Christianity with Jewish ancestors) in sixteenth-century Spain. Persecuted and denied certain rights and privileges in Spanish society such as the holding of Church or civil offices, the *conversos* were forced to hide their Jewish heritage. Consequently, Bjornson defines the essential picaresque situation as the “paradigmatic confrontation between an isolated individual and a hostile society” and describes the *conversos* as individuals who were permanently alienated both from the Jewish culture they had abandoned and the Christian world they had tried to enter.⁷

According to Blackburn, the *conversos* were “marginal men” who

lived in a world of tension and instability; the typical *converso* was a "member of a caste subject to intense scorn and suspicion, forced into a marginal position within his world, and reacting to persecution in a number of characteristic ways, among them cultivation of irony."⁸ Frequently, says Bjornson, these individuals turned to literature because it was a medium in which their frustration and anxiety—and their desire for a more equitable society—could be expressed. Blackburn states that the background and situation of the *conversos* made them predisposed to the bourgeois ideas of individual freedom and character-as-process which later dominated the early British novel; and Bjornson believes that the picaresque novels of Spanish, French, German, and English authors reflect the same attitudes toward social conditions faced by Spanish *conversos*, a situation he describes as "the disintegration of traditional value systems, the rise of bourgeois ideology, and the increasing difficulty of reconciling aspirations for upward social mobility with psychological needs for security and self-respect in a hostile, dehumanizing society."⁹

The social and political situation of postwar England was similar to sixteenth-century Spain and eighteenth-century England in that it was in a state of very rapid social change. The Welfare State's attempts to equalize wealth and provide greater educational opportunities for the working classes led to an entire new generation of writers from working-class or lower-middle-class backgrounds entering the literary scene in the 1950s, and their work more often than not reflected the social upheaval which surrounded them. Although Amis, Wain, and Murdoch did not come from the working-class backgrounds of John Osborne, Alan Sillitoe, or Shelagh Delaney, their first novels dealt with characters who were distanced from the middle-class world and considered themselves as "outsiders" who had *chosen* their alienation from a certain sector of society. Claudio Guillén's model of the picaresque novel in "Toward a Definition of the Picaresque," perhaps the best summary of the characteristics of picaresque literature, will serve as the framework for this discussion of the picaresque structure of these three novels.

Guillén describes the *pícaro* as an individual who is involved in a "tangle," "an economic and social predicament of the most immediate and pressing nature . . . an entanglement with the relative and the contemporaneous."¹⁰ The picaresque novel presents a confrontation between the individual and his environment which is also a conflict between inwardness and experience. In older picaresque literature, the *pícaro* is an "insular, isolated being" who is frequently an orphan who

must function in an environment “*for which he is not prepared.*”¹¹ He soon discovers that there is no refuge from society and that “social role playing is as ludicrous as it is indispensable”; he can neither join nor actually reject his fellow men and functions as a “half-outsider.” The picaresque novel, a “pseudoautobiography” whose first-person narrative is filtered through the sensibility of the picaro-narrator, contains a double perspective of self-concealment and self-revelation; this perspective results from the fact that the language of the picaresque tradition is the instrument of dissimulation and irony. Partial and privileged, the narrator’s point of view “offers no synthesis of human life.”¹²

The picaro’s world view is, however, reflective and philosophical. He is an “ongoing philosopher” who is intent on discovering what is around him and doubting all values and norms. The material level of existence is emphasized in these novels, where existence and subsistence are discussed in terms of “sordid facts, hunger, money” and a profusion of objects and details. In the same way the picaro observes the world collectively in its “social classes, professions, *caractères*, cities, and nations”¹³; and in his travels the picaro moves horizontally in space and vertically through society. As a result, earlier picaresque novels had a loosely constructed episodic narrative.

Although the first novels of Amis, Wain, and Murdoch deviate from Guillén’s model in several ways (for example, only *Under the Net* is narrated in first person), each novel does exhibit many important picaresque characteristics. It is understandable why contemporary reviewers and critics believed these novels to be the beginning of a “new type” of English novel that was returning to its eighteenth-century beginnings. In each novel the protagonist is, in Guillén’s terms, a “half-outsider” who is both in and out of society, living on the fringes of the middle-class world but involved in forays upon it that usually involve some trickery or deceit.¹⁴ Amis’ Jim Dixon is a lower-middle-class young man half heartedly attempting to adapt to an upper-middle-class academic world whose political, social, and aesthetic values he despises; Wain’s Charles Lumley, an Oxbridge graduate in flight from a middle-class upbringing which has, he believes, almost destroyed his capacity for emotion or spontaneity, is seeking the “classless setting of his dreams,” to be “rid of his class” while “staying outside the class structure altogether.”

Murdoch’s Jake Donaghue inhabits the shadowy, classless world of London Bohemia, frequently making jokes about his never revealed social class, which he ambiguously defines as one that makes being “paid off” for a woman impossible but does not preclude the theft of a

movie-star dog or stealing food and money from a friend's apartment. Charles Lumley describes himself as a "fugitive" who is traveling "without a passport," a description similar to Jake's characterization of himself as a "Professional Unauthorized Person." Jim Dixon goes so far as to call himself a "special agent, a picaroon" at one point in *Lucky Jim*. Unlike the characters in the earlier picaresque novels, who are involuntarily thrust into a situation "for which they are not prepared," these individuals have chosen to inhabit a marginal position in regards to society, a position which determines their response to politics, work, art, and relationships with other people.

In "These Writers Couldn't Care Less," V. S. Pritchett commented on the political apathy of the "young intelligentsia" of Britain which "rejects committal," whose "rancors are private."¹⁵ In his contribution to *Declaration* (1957) entitled "Get Out and Push!" film director Lindsay Anderson, perhaps the angriest of the angries, attacked Amis and Wain for their "neutral" political positions, describing them as "anti-idealist, anti-emotional, and tepid or evasive about their social commitments" and their political attitudes as a "disavowal of responsibility."¹⁶ Although Jim Dixon reacts resentfully to Bertrand Welch's assumption of social superiority and privilege, he espouses very few specific political beliefs in the novel, retreating into the philosophy of "self-interest" that Amis commends in his Fabian pamphlet *Socialism and the Intellectuals*. Charles Lumley reacts against political principles and any kind of political idealism, stating that "the men of the thirties failed" because of their desire to be one of "the People," a desire that, if fulfilled, "would have made their lives hell."¹⁷ Charles rejects both Freudian concepts of the "inner man" and Marxist ideas about "man in society" and seeks instead a completely personal, individualized life-style that avoids any taint of what he calls "the corporate life." Murdoch's Jake Donaghue is equally apolitical, sympathizing in principle with Lefty Todd, the head of the National Independent Socialist Party, but steadfastly refusing to join in any political action. Speaking of the Movement poets, who also included Amis and Wain, Robert Hewison has noted that "Commitment of any kind was considered dubious. . . . Critical and political caution went hand in hand."¹⁸

Claudio Guillén, who believes that this lack of political or social commitment is particularly characteristic of twentieth-century picaresque literature, says that the picaresque tends to reappear during days of "irony and discouragement," when times are less favorable to the "plans of the bold individual."¹⁹ Under these conditions the picaresque novel communicates a "devaluation of courage," and he observes that in

recent years a "loss of gravity" has been evident in writers of picaresque fiction: "It is no longer fashionable to make declarations concerning the future of man. Threatened with events which no one controls, the novelist hesitates to show men truly risking, or even shaping, their own lives."²⁰ Fate has always played a large part in the philosophical assumptions of the picaresque, and its survival in contemporary picaresque literature is obvious in Jim Dixon's reliance on his "luck," Charles Lumley's hope that "chance would decide to favour him" rather than dealing him its usual deathblow, and Jake Donaghue's almost mystical belief in his "destiny." An important question, of course, is *why* postwar writers, in light of the new educational and social opportunities provided by the Butler Education Act and the Welfare State, felt this discouragement and lack of free will in their personal lives. V. S. Pritchett's statement that "They have been given great advantages, but there is no opportunity to exploit them" provides a partial answer, for certainly these writers depict a world in which education is often positively detrimental to happiness because there is no appropriate social or career niche awaiting the recipients of Welfare State generosity.²¹ In his *Declaration* essay "Along the Tightrope" John Wain makes this point clear:

When I wrote *Hurry on Down*, the main problem which had presented itself in my own existence was the young man's problem of how to adapt himself to "life," in the sense of an order external to himself, already there when he appeared on the scene, and not necessarily disposed to welcome him; the whole being complicated by the fact that in our civilization there is an unhealed split between the educational system and the assumptions that actually underlie daily life.²²

Pritchett sums up the situation more succinctly in his statement that the hero of the new English novel is "training for a life in a society which is breaking up,"²³ just as Robert Hewison notes that the difficulty of being a realistic fiction writer in 1950s Britain was that "reality was bleak."²⁴

As a result, these three novels contain a similar distrust of the work ethic, although "work" is valued in its less exalted forms. The real curse of capitalism, says Jake Donaghue, is that "work is deadly," but Jake, like Charles Lumley, takes real pleasure in manual labor. In fact, it is only work which aspires to intellectual or social status—work in the province of the established society these characters wish to avoid—that is devalued in these novels; not surprisingly, *Lucky Jim* and *Hurry on Down* present scathing portraits of academicians. "Honest" work, that is, physical labor, is presented as morally edifying, in contradistinction to

attitudes toward work in more traditional picaresque literature. Jake's and Charles's stints as hospital porters are not simply homages to Samuel Beckett's *Murphy*, although Murdoch acknowledges her debt to this novel in the opening pages of *Under the Net*; instead, these interludes furnish Jake and Charles with a temporary protection from the chaos of the outside world and a chance to experience a separate and quite arbitrarily social hierarchy based on necessity and efficiency rather than the traditionally structured society outside the hospital. For both characters their hospital "stays" are part of a psychological healing process that takes place in spite of the fact that, as Guillén and Stuart Miller observe, in picaresque literature such protected havens from the outside world always prove to be temporary.²⁵

Although Jim Dixon is the most aggressively anti-intellectual of the three characters, he does not leave the university environment to experience a "real life" job; Amis leaves the nature of his new employment at the end of the novel purposely vague, probably because it will involve Jim with the "arty world" for which he claims to have so much contempt. Rather than showing his character's need for an idyll of physical labor which will enable him to reenter the outside world, Amis is content with attacking the enclosed society of snobbishness and eccentricity that the university represents.

The distrust of political commitment and "gainful employment" that characterizes these novels has its corollary in their contemptuous attitudes toward art. *Lucky Jim* shocked contemporary readers in its references to "filthy Mozart," "Brahms rubbish," and other "Teutonic bores," and in the same way Charles Lumley speaks slightly of the "intolerable prosings of Wordsworth, and the namby-pamby dribblings of Shelley." Both novels also contain comic caricatures of artist-figures: the portrait of Bertrand Welch in *Lucky Jim* is of a self-obsessed and mediocre artist who uses his "profession" as an excuse to issue dicta on every subject; in *Hurry on Down* Edwin Froulish, the aggressively eccentric would-be Joycean novelist, reads aloud a section from his novel which allows Wain to parody the self-indulgence of high modernist literature. Froulish and Welch, both self-styled romantic artist-poseurs, take every opportunity to denounce those who question their aesthetic assumptions or achievements. In both instances artists are presented as pompous, self-aggrandizing elitists whose attitude toward creative activity can be described only as Mandarin. Although Jake Donaghue, who goes on to become a creative writer at the close of *Under the Net*, is less suspicious of aesthetic values, he too refuses to write

during the course of the story and at one point informs the reader that he will "do anything rather than creative work."²⁶

However, as Stuart Miller observes, the art theme is an important element in picaresque literature, although the picaro is rarely an artist in the traditional sense of the word.²⁷ Instead, the picaro frequently becomes a "gratuitous trickster" interested only in "art for art's sake" whose practical jokes and manipulations of reality function as the outlet for his aesthetic activities. Art, in these three novels, *is* life: the practical jokes of Jim Dixon and Charles Lumley, like Jake Donaghue's petty thefts and London escapades, show these characters extending an imaginative control over their surroundings which does not, however, involve them in dealings with the established world of "high art." Just as status-oriented or intellectually oriented work is anathema to these young men, so traditionally revered art forms and values are viewed with suspicion. The true picaresque novel, says Blackburn, contains a "direct devaluation of cultural content,"²⁸ and all of these novels reveal this characteristic most clearly in their attitudes toward traditional art forms.

The typical picaro is as alienated from other individuals as he is from politics, established work, or artistic activity. J. B. Priestley, in an article entitled "Thoughts in the Wilderness," noted that the protagonists of the new English novels were "perhaps the most isolated and loneliest characters in all fiction."²⁹ Traditionally the picaro is, as Guillén emphasizes, a "half-outsider" who is permanently estranged both from society in general and the individuals who make it up. Blackburn defines the fundamental situation of the literary picaro as "the loneliness of an individual isolated *within* society," a definition which accurately describes the three characters discussed here.³⁰ Jim Dixon and Charles Lumley lack close friends or confidants, and although Jake Donaghue has that rare possession in picaresque literature, a sidekick, he admits that his relationship with Peter O'Finney is not an equitable one. Rather, Jake says that "I count Finn as an inhabitant of my universe, and cannot conceive that he has one containing me"³¹ and confesses ashamedly at the novel's conclusion that he has never taken the time to know Finn. Relationships with women follow the same pattern in these novels: there is little emotional or sexual interaction between the characters and the women who generally function as objects of a rather disorganized "quest." Christine Callaghan, Veronica Roderick, and Anna Quentin, all of whom "belong" in some fashion to men more wealthy or more powerful than

the protagonists and are inaccessible to them, provide little opportunity for the emotional development of the picaro-protagonists.

In fact, Jim, Charles, and Jake all voice fear or distrust of women, possibly because they represent the potential for emotional involvement, social stability, and the status-quo involvements which these characters, particularly Charles Lumley and Jake Donaghue, are trying to avoid. Guillén's observation that the classic picaro is an orphan permanently cut off from any security the past may represent is also relevant to these novels, for in each instance the characters appear to have been "dropped" into the present with little contact with family members or connections with the past. Jake Donaghue once vaguely refers to his parents as his "elders," and Jim Dixon, like Charles Lumley, casually mentions his parents in passing, but no information about these individuals or any siblings is ever given in these novels. Past familial or social experiences seem to have had little meaning for these characters and do not furnish any kind of stability or continuous background for them.

The typical picaro's problem with identity is partially a result of his dissociation from the past. In the opening pages of *Under the Net* Jake Donaghue ironically says that he is "trying to work out" who he is, a confession equally applicable to Jim Dixon and Charles Lumley, both of whom excel at disguise and role-playing because of the fluidity of their personalities. Jake's early fear that Hugo Belfounder's personality could easily "swallow" him up is paralleled by the fact that Jim and Charles seem to be at the mercy of their impersonations of other people. Jim Dixon's famous face-making and his Merrie England speech, in which he unconsciously and uncontrollably begins to mimic his colleagues, are similar to Charles Lumley's tendency to imitate film stars, sometimes against his will. Stuart Miller interprets the picaro's protean personality in extremely negative terms and believes that the picaro's ability to alter his persona with such rapidity and success is due to the "internal chaos" of his personality. He calls this process a "sacrifice" and blames it to a degree on "the pressures of society, Fortune, and accident" which never permit a character to "rest in a single posture."³² Blackburn agrees with this interpretation, saying that the common denominator of the picaresque myth is the "disintegration" of an orthodox tradition and "the collapse of personality or its submission to an experience of nothingness."³³ But like modern literature's most famous picaro, Thomas Mann's Felix Krull, these characters use their protean personalities as weapons, retaining an intrinsic core of individual

consciousness while assuming roles and disguises in order to further their ends, which are frequently aesthetic as well as practical.

The picaresque dimension of the first novels of Amis, Wain, and Murdoch was a creative response to the problematical situation which faced young writers in the 1950s. The new cultural and educational opportunities offered by the Welfare State were counterbalanced by the still traditional and class-bound society which was providing these opportunities; not surprisingly, these writers felt themselves to be in a confused and "marginal" situation both socially and aesthetically. Their rejection of Romantic and high modernist aesthetics led them to search for literary models which could better express the tensions their fictions embodied; the picaresque tradition, with its focus on the "outsider" protagonist in conflict with a ruling social hierarchy and its emphasis on the concrete details of everyday life, provided the appropriate vehicle. The picaro, who survives by exile, cunning, and imagination, was the perfect prototype for writers desiring a literary forebear untainted by Romantic, modernist, or existential trappings. His reappearance in early postwar British fiction mirrored, as it did in sixteenth-century Spain and eighteenth-century England, the confusion and energy both of contemporary society and its fiction writers.

¹ Bernard Kalb, "Three Comers," *Atlantic Monthly*, May 1955, p. 22.

² Kingsley Amis, "Laughter's to Be Taken Seriously," *New York Times Book Review*, 7 July 1957, p. 1.

³ William Van O'Connor, "Two Types of Heroes in Post-war British Fiction," *PMLA*, 77 (Mar. 1962), 168-74.

⁴ V. S. Pritchett, "These Writers Couldn't Care Less," *New York Times Book Review*, 28 Apr. 1957, p. 38.

⁵ Rubin Rabinovitz, *The Reaction against Experiment in the English Novel, 1950-1960* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1969), pp. 20-21.

⁶ Robert Hewison, *In Anger: British Culture in the Cold War 1945-60* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1981), pp. 15-16.

⁷ Richard Bjornson, *The Picaresque Hero in European Fiction* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1977), p. 4.

⁸ Alexander Blackburn, *The Myth of the Picaro: Continuity and Transformation of the Picaresque Novel 1554-1954* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1979), p. 9.

⁹ Bjornson, *The Picaresque Hero in European Fiction*, p. 19.

¹⁰ Claudio Guillén, "Toward a Definition of the Picaresque," in his *Literature as System: Essays toward the Theory of Literary History* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1971), p. 77.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 82.

- ¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 83.
- ¹⁴ In *The Picaresque Saint: Representative Figures in Contemporary Fiction* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1959), R. W. B. Lewis discusses the picaresque in similar terms, describing picaresque characters as "outsiders who share . . . outcasts who enter in," and as "criminals to be pursued, escapees on the run, strangers in an alien world" (p. 33).
- ¹⁵ Pritchett, "These Writers Couldn't Care Less," p. 1.
- ¹⁶ Lindsay Anderson, "Get Out and Push!" in Tom Maschler, ed., *Declaration* (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1957), pp. 147, 149.
- ¹⁷ John Wain, *Hurry on Down* (Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books, 1953), p. 38.
- ¹⁸ Hewison, *In Anger*, p. 119.
- ¹⁹ Guillén, "Toward a Definition of the Picaresque," p. 105.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 106.
- ²¹ Pritchett, "These Writers Couldn't Care Less," p. 38.
- ²² John Wain, "Along the Tightrope," in Maschler, ed., *Declaration*, p. 83.
- ²³ Pritchett, "These Writers Couldn't Care Less," p. 39.
- ²⁴ Hewison, *In Anger*, p. 125.
- ²⁵ Stuart Miller, *The Picaresque Novel* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve Press, 1967), p. 88.
- ²⁶ Iris Murdoch, *Under the Net* (New York: Viking, 1954), p. 18.
- ²⁷ Miller, *The Picaresque Novel*, pp. 65–66.
- ²⁸ Blackburn, *The Myth of the Picaro*, p. 24.
- ²⁹ J. B. Priestley, "Thoughts in the Wilderness," *New Statesman and Nation*, 26 July 1954, p. 73.
- ³⁰ Blackburn, *The Myth of the Picaro*, p. 24.
- ³¹ Murdoch, *Under the Net*, p. 5.
- ³² Miller, *The Picaresque Novel*, p. 71.
- ³³ Blackburn, *The Myth of the Picaro*, p. 22.