

**Bangor University**

## **DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

### **When what you want is not what you need**

Batty, Craig

*Award date:*  
2009

*Awarding institution:*  
Bangor University

[Link to publication](#)

#### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**‘When What You Want is Not What You Need’**

**An Exploration of the Physical and Emotional Journeys  
Undertaken by a Protagonist in a Mainstream Feature Film**

**A PhD in Creative Writing**

**by**

**Craig Batty**

**Supervised by Professor Graeme Harper**

**January 2009**



\*\*\*\*\*

The following material has been **excluded** from the digitised copy due to 3<sup>rd</sup> Party  
Copyright restrictions:

NONE

Readers may consult the original thesis if they wish to see this material

\*\*\*\*\*

## SUMMARY

Films are not only visual, they are visceral; they allow an audience to feel the unfolding drama, and psychologically connect with the characters. Even for the screenwriter, the experience of writing a film can be deeply moving, where a range of character emotions are assimilated and then poured back into the narrative. The most important thing to remember, for both the audience and the screenwriter, is this: something can only be felt *outside* of the text if enough work has been done *within* the text. As such, this PhD explores the idea that the narrative journey undertaken by a protagonist is also one that the audience is invited to take. More specifically, a protagonist undertakes a journey that is comprised of two individual yet interwoven threads, the physical journey and the emotional journey, and it is the complete narrative experience generated by the two that invites an audience to feel.

The screenplay for this PhD explores the idea of the physical and emotional journey by offering a narrative that follows one man's struggle to form a gay football team. Although he appears to be following a physical path to achieve this physical want, what becomes clear is that he is also following an emotional path to embrace his emotional need. The critical commentary for this PhD explores the fabric, form and function of a protagonist's physical and emotional journey, and the relationship that they share. Using the specific model of the Hero's Journey, the critical commentary also offers a framework that aims to define and map-out the physical and emotional journey, which can then be used as a basis for writing or deconstructing a screenplay.

Like a protagonist, this PhD takes a journey; a journey to improve both a skill in and an understanding of screenwriting. It enhances creative and critical awareness of screenwriting: a creative artefact with a critical commentary; a creative artefact informed by critical reading; a critical commentary informed by creative writing.



## CONTENTS

Prologue	i
<b>Part One: Creative Artefact</b>	
Synopsis: A Short Outline of <i>Offside</i>	i
Screenplay: <i>Offside</i>	1
<b>Part Two: Critical Commentary</b>	
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Exploring the Duality of a Screenplay Narrative	9
Chapter Two: Mythology and the Hero's Journey	41
Chapter Three: Exploring the Hero's Journey and Re-Defining it into a New Model for Screenwriting	57
Chapter Four: Applying the Re-Defined Hero's Journey to the Screenplay <i>Offside</i>	105
Bibliography	149
Filmography	156
Appendix: Research Undertaken for the Writing of <i>Offside</i>	161

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to offer special thanks to my supervisor, Professor Graeme Harper, for the wealth of knowledge, support and enthusiasm that has made this PhD what it is. Without him, I do not think that I would be writing this page. I would also like to thank Dr Steve May, for supporting the early development stages of this PhD, especially in the storylining of the screenplay. Gratitude is also owed to Robin Mukherjee, who has acted as a benevolent mentor to the protagonist of this PhD. Without him, the screenplay would not exist in its current form.

I would also like to thank the many people who have offered subject advice, writing guidance, script notes etc. during the four year journey of this PhD. The accumulation of this has certainly enhanced my knowledge of and skill in screenwriting, infinity-fold.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to offer thanks and love to my family and friends. They have listened; they have understood; they have cared.

## **PROLOGUE**

# 1.

The Brown family is in total disarray: six children cause mayhem and madness in and around the house as widower Mr Brown tries to hold down a full-time job. As the seventeenth nanny leaves the house screaming, fearing the children have actually eaten their baby sister, hope is at a loss. The Brown children listen to nobody and respect nothing. They tie-up and gag the cook, and with a kitchen full of sharp knives and boiling pans, disaster is imminent. The cook shrieks and squirms, her face purpling with fear.

Enter Nanny McPhee:

INT. KITCHEN. EVENING

As SIMON prepares his weapon, there is another electrical crackle.

Thunder rumbles.

The door creaks.

A thunderclap.

Suddenly, the figure of NANNY MCPHEE appears.<sup>1</sup>

The entrance of this eponymous character is central to the narrative drive of the film *Nanny McPhee* (Jones, 2005), and works as a useful, though perhaps curious, starting point to the investigation of this PhD.

When Nanny McPhee appears, she represents the catalyst of the narrative. Strange looking, eccentrically dressed and materialising mysteriously, she is the turning point at which the narrative will take a new direction; she initiates and shapes the rest of the plot. She is Vogler's 'call to adventure' (1999: 15-16); McKee's 'inciting incident' (1999:

---

<sup>1</sup> The only script publicly available for *Nanny McPhee* is a transcript. Therefore, the text from this has been taken and applied to a professional screenplay layout.

189-194); Aronson's 'disturbance' (2001: 41). She is the motor of the narrative which will see the Brown children develop from current utter vileness to eventual peace, harmony and respect. Nanny McPhee is also the engine driving the dramatic growth of Mr Brown, who is still grieving his late wife and avoids his children at all costs. What she brings to him is the promise of being a better father, one who can eventually find love in the arms of another. This may seem a standard formula to a mainstream, linear film; indeed, it is. However, what is important about the narrative structure of *Nanny McPhee*, and the reason why this PhD begins with its reference, is that it appears to be fully aware of itself.

The film not only adheres to a familiar pattern of storytelling, it uses the pattern as part of its storytelling. It is a self-knowing, reflexive film which does not disguise its narrative intentions: it is purposefully about the development or growth of characters, both externally and internally. Nanny McPhee explains to the Brown children:

INT. CHILDREN'S BEDROOM. NIGHT

NANNY MCPHEE

There is something you should understand  
about the way I work.

(beat)

When you need me but do not want me, then  
I must stay.

(beat)

When you want me but no longer need me, then  
I have to go.

(beat)

It's rather sad, really, but there it is.

SIMON

We will never want you.

NANNY MCPHEE

Then I will never go.

Understanding *Nanny McPhee*'s narrative pattern lies in the use of two key words, stressed in the above exchange and repeated throughout the film: 'want' and 'need.' Nanny

McPhee tells the children that she will stay as long as they need her, and go when they do not; at the same time, as long as the children do not want her, she will stay until they do. Throughout the film, the words 'want' and 'need' are stressed no fewer than thirteen times, occasionally in tandem (as above) but moreover with focus upon the word 'need.' 'Need' is used by a variety of characters in a variety of situations, each time alluding to the Brown family, and Mr Brown in particular, possessing a lack which needs to be fulfilled. For example, a mysterious voice tells Mr Brown that he needs Nanny McPhee; Mr Brown tells Nanny McPhee that his children need her; Nanny McPhee tells Mr Brown that she will give his children what they need; Aunt Adelaide tells Mr Brown that he needs a wife. On such occasions, 'need' is used to reinforce to the audience that character transformation (fulfilling the need) is essential to a narrative understanding of the film. With the word being repeated throughout the film, and with the combination of 'want' and 'need' (as above) used to frame the film (the beginning and the end), then we can assume that the intention is to arouse the audience's curiosity to the meaning of the words, and through an exploration of their similarities and differences, invite the audience to understand them in relation to the developing narrative. In short, the audience desires to understand the relationship between 'want' and 'need,' and it is this desire that keeps them engaged in the film's narrative.

Screenwriting theorist Laurie Hutzler writes about 'want' and 'need,' suggesting that they encompass two distinct yet interwoven threads of a screenplay narrative. She writes: 'What does your character want: what is their concrete physical objective in the story? What does your character need: what is the deeper human longing that they ignore, deny or suppress [...]?' (2005: 7). From this we can see that each word seems to possess a

different meaning, yet in the context of a screenplay narrative, they appear to share a meaning and work together. Hutzler goes on to say that screenplay characters ‘obtain’ their want and ‘embrace’ their need (ibid.), a further indication that not only do the two words have similarities and differences, together they are part of a character’s objective: the end result of the journey travelled. As such, ‘want’ and ‘need’ can stand for individual threads of character movement across a screenplay narrative, threads which nevertheless also complement one another. In *Nanny McPhee* ‘want’ and ‘need’ are specifically used in opposition, drawing attention to a possible dual meaning. As Nanny McPhee herself suggests, one will eventually turn into the other: need into want; un-want into un-need.

As an initial question, then, ‘what is the difference between character want and character need?’ serves as the driving force to this PhD. As will be explored, what lies at the centre of this research is a deeper understanding of the relationship between ‘what a character wants’ and ‘what a character needs.’ This will be argued to form the basis of a dual narrative journey for the mainstream feature film protagonist: the physical journey and the emotional journey. Understanding these two journeys will help to map the movement of a protagonist across a screenplay narrative, both physically and emotionally. The results of this, addressing both my own and an audience’s desire to understand how ‘want’ and ‘need’ function in a complete narrative, will appear in a two-fold way: more traditionally, as a piece of critical research presented in a scholarly way; and more innovatively, as a piece of creative work, a screenplay, which both responds to and feeds into the critical discussions presented. Creative and critical artefacts thus work together in symbiosis, just like ‘want’ and ‘need’ in a screenplay, offering a complete PhD narrative experience.

## 2.

Although concerned with ‘product,’ not ‘creation,’ of cinematic experiences, the broad articulation of Murray Smith’s *Engaging Characters: Fiction, Emotion, and the Cinema* offers insights into emotion that are pertinent to this research. Stating that ‘[c]haracters are central to the rhetorical and aesthetic effects of narrative texts,’ Smith countermands research that has devalued the role of character, instead scrutinising the importance that characters play in an audience’s experience (1995: 4). For him, ‘[e]ven if we acknowledge the massive determining power of material and ideological structures, our immediate experience of the social world is through agency – agents filling the roles assigned to them by these structures’ (ibid.: 18). In fictional representations of such structures, characters are thus the agents guiding us through the narrative; the familiar and plausible ‘transparent myth’ that is film (ibid.: 45). This notion of ‘myth’ is important because it recognises film as working on a subconscious level; an appeal to universal human emotions brought about by ‘surface’ components (characters, action, visual grammar, dialogue etc.). Smith writes:

We watch a film, and find ourselves becoming attached to a particular character or characters on the basis of values or qualities roughly congruent with those we possess, or those that we wish to possess, and experience vicariously the emotional experiences of the character: we identify with the character (ibid.: 2).

This indicates that agency is crucial to the affective success of a film; if the audience does not connect with a character and feel his emotion, the narrative is merely one containing a series of hollow actions. That said, in order for an audience to experience character emotion, ‘it is not necessary to identify with the protagonist’; rather, one ‘need only have a sense of why the protagonist’s response is appropriate or intelligible to the situation’ (Noel Carroll, cited by Smith, 1995: 78-9). An audience is thus ‘sympathetic,’ not ‘empathetic,’



creating a process of connection in which an audience understands and assimilates character emotion rather than actually 'feels' it from the same perspective (Smith, 1995: 85).

Smith's model for deconstructing the emotional response of an audience to a character, the 'structure of sympathy,' has three stages: 'recognition,' 'alignment' and 'allegiance' (ibid.: 73). 'Recognition' sees 'the spectator's construction of character: the perception of a set of textual elements, in film typically cohering around the image of a body, as an individuated and continuous agent' (ibid.: 82). Although perhaps obvious, it is important that an audience understands exactly who the characters are in a film, especially the main characters, and the relationships that exist between them. For example, character names are not always obvious from the outset, and so perhaps an audience will recognise characters by what they look like and how they sound. Recognition of a character thus culminates from a set of visual and verbal components, and for Smith 'we assume that these traits correspond to analogical ones we find in persons in the real world' (ibid.). 'Alignment' is 'the process by which spectators are placed in relation to characters in terms of access to their actions, and to what they know and feel' (ibid.: 83). This is the audience's ability to understand what a character is doing and how they are feeling, and in the main this comes in the form of plot (surface action). Seeing an attempt to gain or the failure to obtain something in action, for example, is a manifestation of internalised character: their dramatic want; their personality; their success and failure. Alignment may also come from dialogue, either as a simple exchange with another character where plot is described, or by understanding how a character is feeling through the subtext found beneath spoken words, or even as interior monologue. Either way, alignment positions an

audience in relation to a character and allows for an understanding of what is happening and what is being felt. 'Allegiance,' finally, 'pertains to the moral evaluation of characters' undertaken by an audience (ibid.: 84). The closest to an overall sense of identification, this asks the audience to actively participate in the making of meaning, and depending upon one's individual background and positioning to the film, the character will be bestowed with a feeling of sympathy or non-sympathy. Having undergone this three-stage process, an audience has cognitively assessed the narrative situation of the character and made a decision about their subsequent emotional attachment: 'Allegiance depends upon the spectator having what [he] takes to be reliable access to the character's state of mind, or understanding the context of the character's actions, and having morally evaluated the characters on the basis of this knowledge' (ibid.).

In summary, Smith's work tells us that engaging with fiction is 'a species of imaginative activity'; we make use of cognitive skills, such as making inferences, formulating hypotheses and categorising representations, and go through the prompting of a 'quasi-experience' to grasp the situations and emotions presented (ibid.: 74). Nevertheless, we are guided and somewhat constrained by fiction's techniques of 'narration' (plot): 'the storytelling force that, in any given narrative film, presents causally linked events occurring in space across time' (ibid.). In other words, however much emotion has the potential to be felt on an individual's basis, it is always guided by the narrative's existing plot, as conceived by the screenwriter. Thus, plot and emotion work together to create the complete narrative experience; they are individual threads, yet they must combine in order to work effectively.

Luke Hockley shares similar concerns with Smith, namely that film theory to date has neglected the pivotal role that character plays in the emotional experience between audience and story. He writes that 'it is not unreasonable to suggest that the topic of emotions is positively avoided and when they do make an appearance, film theorists tend to present them as if they were in some way undesirable' (2007: 35). Rather, for Hockley emotion is something to be celebrated; an appreciation of the interplay between fictional characters and their real audiences. He sees the emotional connection between character and audience as one rooted in psychological attachment, writing that a way of interpreting the narrative space of film is 'as an expression of the inner state of the central identification figure'; the protagonist (ibid.: 43). In this way, the protagonist's 'inner psychological concerns and attitudes take on a visual form within the film – story space becomes psychological space, if you will' (ibid.). This suggests that although manifested in visual (and aural) form, films are primarily concerned with inner, psychological narratives; and by association, the emotional connection of audience and character. 'Inner' qualities of character are thus extrapolated and woven into 'outer' components of film narrative, the two threads fusing together to create the complete narrative experience. This experience is one an audience has come to expect; fictional plot and characters, yet sutured with real emotional connections. It is the nature of such connections that is important for Hockley, who goes on to suggest that one's personal psychology can be activated through a film. An audience is able to not only connect and sympathise with a character's on-screen situation, more crucially, '[o]ne of the psychological functions of the cinematic experience is to offer us the potential to know ourselves more and to come to a fuller understanding of who we are' (ibid.: 45). If we are able to 'know ourselves more' and attain a 'fuller understanding

of who we are' through film narratives, then as the references to *Nanny McPhee* suggest, this can only take place in symbiosis with the protagonist's own journey. If a film narrative explores a character's emotional need, and presents a 'path' towards embracing it (the plot), then can it be said that an audience too desires such a trajectory of development?

Here, Anthony Giddens' work on the individual and self-identity (1991) is useful because it places emphasis upon emotion and emotional transformation. By deconstructing Janette Rainwater's *Self Therapy: A Guide to Becoming Your Own Therapist* (1989), Giddens provides insights into the inner workings of the self which can be applied to the inner workings of character. He considers that as part of therapy, individuals assess their lives, past, present and future, in a reflexive manner; the self is a 'project' for which the individual is responsible (1991: 75). He argues that 'therapy can only be successful when it involves the individual's own reflexivity [...] it is an experience which involves the individual in systematic reflection about the course of her or his life's development' (ibid.: 71). This suggests that for individuals desiring to move forward and 'succeed' in their future, they must look inside themselves and consider the life path they have taken thus far. Relating this to the narrative of a screenplay, reflexive thinking is reminiscent of characters undergoing inner, emotional developments which are closely related to undertaking and reflecting upon the undertaking of physical action. To clarify:

The 'art of being in the now' generates the self-understanding necessary to plan ahead and to construct a life trajectory which accords with the individual's inner wishes. Therapy is a process of growth, and one which has to encompass the major transitions through which a person's life is likely to pass (ibid.: 71-72).

The 'art of being in the now' is the screenplay plot, and referring back to Hutzler, the character's want; the individual is placed in a scenario and given choices, the results of

which dictate the direction of their future. The 'life trajectory' is the journey of character transformation, a process driven by need; the individual's 'inner wishes' dictate the choices made, where mind manifests into matter.

Character action, because of its visual and physicalised presence on the screen, can be understood in relation to the material body. Giddens describes the body as 'part of an action system' of reflection, one which is 'basic to 'grasping the fullness of the moment', and entails the conscious monitoring of sensory input from the environment' (ibid.: 77). The body is thus 'material' in the physical world of screen fiction, collecting and processing information which, as a consequence of reflection, stimulates the character's internal transformation. Carl Plantinga summarises this well, writing that '[w]hat we are oriented *towards* (sic), and respond to, are characters in narrative situations. Emotional response both inside and outside the theatre depends in part on our evaluation of a situation or scenario' (cited by Gorton, 2006: 76). This tells us that the body in action is a physical encounter which, depending on its reactions to and interactions with the story world, works to fuel emotional development. As such, through a series of physical encounters that are coupled with a process of reflection and 'autobiographical thinking' (Giddens, 1991: 72), we can suggest that a relationship exists between events taking place and the emotional consequences they have upon a character (the individual). As two threads working together, they enable us to understand how inner and outer components of life, both in reality and fiction, combine to form a trajectory or journey which defines who we are and who we want to be. Giddens writes that '[t]he trajectory of the self has a coherence that derives from a cognitive awareness of the various phases of the lifespan. The lifespan, rather than events in the outside world, becomes the dominant 'foreground figure' (ibid.:

75-76). As such, for Giddens the internal, emotional trajectory assumes primary importance; the two threads work together in symbiosis, but the actions and events used to define the trajectory are a means to their end.

### 3.

These theoretical insights provide a strong starting point for the creative and critical scope of this PhD. However, it is not enough to merely understand the academics of how narrative threads of film work. Instead, they must be practiced; drafted in numerous forms and experimented with. Films must be watched and screenplays read in order to ‘feel’ the narrative in action, sensing what works and what does not. The views, methods and ‘realities’ of screenwriters and industry professionals must also be read, in order to immerse the screenwriter in a culture of writing where the creative endeavours of film are explored. An author who bridges the gap between academic and writerly research is Kristyn Gorton, whose article on screen emotion draws upon interview material from screenwriter Kay Mellor.<sup>2</sup> Gorton suggests that emotion is crucial to the (television) text: emotional engagement is assessed by the audience in comparison to other dramas, and the emotional journey experienced is used as a marker of how ‘good’ the drama is (2006: 72-77). Considering the position of the audience in relation to the dramatic text, she writes that ‘[emotion] allows for a way of seeing that is different from other viewing. It allows viewers a chance to acknowledge their neediness whilst also feeling connected to something outside themselves’ (ibid.: 78). I suggest that it could be useful here to

---

<sup>2</sup> Selected credits for Mellor, ‘undoubtedly a major television phenomenon’ (Gorton, 2006: 73), include: *Just Us* (1994), *Band of Gold* (1995-1997), *Playing the Field* (1999-2000), *Fat Friends* (2000-2005), *Girls’ Night* (1998) and *The Chase* (2006-).

reconsider this statement and re-situate the word 'feeling': the difference in this 'way of seeing' is that it also offers a 'way of feeling.' As such, the 'way of feeling' is a marker of how good the drama is; a successful connection to the protagonist's emotional journey.

The interview with Mellor attempts to offer a more practical understanding of emotion, which is useful in uncovering issues that are worked through in real screenwriting practice. Mellor states that she feels cheated when not moved by a film or television drama, highlighting the importance (in her view) of emotional connection between an audience and the text (ibid.: 72). Furthermore, she states: 'I want that journey [...] good television is engaging, it is as relevant to today as yesterday ... it should involve an emotional journey and that should include laughter and tears' (ibid.: 72-74). Subsequently, emotion is defined by Gorton as an aesthetic quality which can be identified, and for the writer deployed, in narrative fiction. For Mellor as a screenwriter, Gorton writes that 'she must use formal devices to construct [emotion] within her work, and [...] to create empathy [sic] between characters and viewers which facilitate their understanding and interpretation of the programme' (ibid.: 73). Clearly, emotion plays a vital role in the screenwriter's armoury, and should be considered when crafting fictional narratives. However, what is disappointing about Gorton's article is that it fails to give any detail about what these formal devices are, and how they can be applied by the screenwriter.<sup>3</sup>

The importance of character, emotion and its relationship to audience experience is highlighted by other screenwriters and industry professionals. When asked about pulling writers' strings in a screenplay, writer Lee Hall states quite simply: 'I try to push the emotion because films are all about emotion' (cited by Owen, 2003: 50). This is almost

---

<sup>3</sup> Gorton writes that 'emotion is what endows characters with meaning and allows us, as viewers, to make sense of their significance to the story being told' (2006: 79). This goes so far in saying that characters are components of a narrative that bestow emotion, but exactly how these qualities are bestowed is overlooked.

identical to the advice given by screenwriter Darren Aronofsky, who argues that ‘audiences are so sophisticated now they just want to get to the meat of the emotional story, and you can hit them with emotion after emotion’ (cited by Scott, 2006: 143). Screenwriters Neal Purvis and Robert Wade, in response to a question about what comes first, plot or character, maintain that ‘[y]ou have to start with character, otherwise you have no way in [...] You get to know a character better if they have a backstory, and it also lays the plot on the table from the outset’ (cited by Owen, 2003: 175). Not only does this suggest that understanding character allows story to emerge, it suggests that character actually dictates the shape of plot. As within the discussion of Giddens, action is borne out of the inner fabric of character; want comes out of need. This is also highlighted by Ted Tally, who tells us that when writing *The Silence of the Lambs* (Demme, 1991), he was fascinated with Clarice’s inner struggle of living and working in a man’s world, and her relationship with various father figures; it was this that functioned as ‘the emotional heart of the whole story’ (cited by Scott, 2006: 19).

In a similar way, BBC Northern Ireland Head of Drama, Patrick Spence, believes that good drama comes from how emotion is developed into plot, not the other way around. Critiquing Steven Johnson’s *Everything Bad is Good For You: Popular Culture is Making Us Smarter* (2006), which argues that ‘good’ TV series should have a greater number of story strands, Spence writes that ‘narrative complexity comes not so much from how many plots can be woven into one hour, but more from how deep emotionally these plots can take us’ (2006: 6). As an example, he writes about the hugely successful TV series *NYPD Blue* (Bohco & Milch, 1993-2005), stating that it was not the multi-layered, fast-paced storylines that brought about its acclaim, rather ‘[w]hat made it different were the risks



[writer David] Milch took with the inner lives of the characters [...] and how he dramatised their emotional journeys' (ibid.: 6-7). Once more this gives clear reference to character emotion, and a term that will later be explored in more depth, the 'emotional journey.'

Reminding us that screenplays tell stories of humanity, screenwriter and producer

John Brice writes:

Whereas science investigates the measurable aspects of reality, art explores the eternal aspects of human life: morality (how people treat each other), emotion, perception and beliefs. It does so by isolating a specific aspect of life and putting a 'frame' around it in order to probe that part's 'meaning' or to advocate a certain interpretation of it (2008a: 17).

The frame is the plot (character want) and the meaning is the story (character need); together, they work in symbiosis to create the complete screenplay narrative. In a later article, Brice also writes:

Keep in mind that important journeys are about much more than a change of scenery in life and much more than a change of character status in stories. Profound changes can transform an individual's understanding of life, of their inner and outer worlds, forever (2008b: 52).

As well as screenplays affecting both inner and outer worlds of character, we are reminded that this also transposes into an audience. Just as Smith and Hockley claim that emotion is stirred-up between character and audience, 'psychological space,' Brice reminds us that emotional connection can be carried forward into life beyond the film; a post-text continuum. As Hutzler articulates, human feelings are what an audience desires, taken forward from a film and used in generating a greater understanding of how life works:

Creating likeable, one-dimensional roles robs the audience of the emotional satisfaction of real character transformation. It cheats the audience of the agonising suspense of a treacherous emotional journey unfolding [...] Audiences go to the movies to discover the humanity of others because, in doing so, they rediscover the

humanity in themselves. They go to the movies to feel because it is human feeling that unites us all (2004: 44).

#### 4.

Tracking character emotion within a physical context (plot) will, in the critical commentary, be traced as far back as ancient mythology and as far forward as contemporary Hollywood. The aim is to identify a narrative pattern and then define it in terms useful for the working screenwriter. Campbell states how ‘the human kingdom, beneath the floor of the comparatively neat little dwelling that we call our consciousness, goes down into unsuspected Aladdin caves’ (1993: 8); Vogler notes how characters assume a new emotional balance, ‘one that will be forever different because of the road just travelled’ (1999: 221). These pointers of the archetypal Hero’s Journey, to be discussed later, are even evident in the work of self-help. Rainwater writes:

The risks of self-growth involve going into the unknown, into an unfamiliar land where the language is different and customs are different and you have to learn your way around [...] the paradox is that until we give up all that feels secure, we can never really trust the friend, mate, or job that offers us something (cited by Giddens, 1991: 78).

This has strong allusions to the idea of a journey; the leaving of a place familiar to a place alien, for the desire of self-betterment and inner transformation. Giddens goes on to propose that ‘[t]o be true to oneself means finding oneself, but since this is an active process of self-construction it has to be informed by overall goals – those of becoming free from dependencies and achieving fulfilment’ (1991: 79). Suggesting that the overall goal of a journey is emotional, yet only achievable by undertaking action, connections can be made to Hutzler’s praxis of ‘want’ and ‘need’ (2005: 7): embracing the need can only be

achieved by obtaining the want. The journey a protagonist undertakes, which is underpinned by want and need, is thus the core of the investigation that follows.

Not only is such an investigation useful for developing an enhanced critical knowledge of screenwriting, it enhances the act of screenwriting itself. By examining what various writers have said about the two narrative threads of film, and then compiling the information into a model of a journey that can be mapped across a screenplay, I am in fact developing my skills as a screenwriter. The accompanying creative artefact to this PhD, *Offside*, is as much a part of the critical research as traditional academic reading. Through the process of writing and re-writing, I have come to understand more about the subject of screenwriting as the act of screenwriting itself. Simultaneously, reading and analysing texts with a critical mind has informed creative practice. Through a detailed reading of screenwriting theory, and by becoming involved in discussions about character action and emotion, I have been privileged by seeing the screenplay with fresh eyes; seeing what I write in the context of how others say you 'should' write. As such, the symbiotic relationship of writing and reading, of expressing and examining, has culminated in a PhD that mirrors its research focus: a two-part journey, which although comprising of two separate concerns, is bound together seamlessly to generate one overall experience.

**PART ONE:**  
**CREATIVE ARTEFACT**

**Title:** *Offside*  
**Format:** Feature film, approx. 100 minutes  
**Genre:** Rite of passage; sport; situation comedy; satire  
**Logline:** "If you can't join 'em, beat 'em!"

#### **Audience:**

Although the theme of homosexuality is prominent in *Offside*, the overall character arc and story world is anticipated to attract a mainstream audience, with an age range of circa sixteen to sixty. The prevailing British, aspirational, feel good, rites of passage style and genre is comparative to films like *Billy Elliot*, *East is East*, *Bend it Like Beckham*, and to some extent, *Calendar Girls* and *Grow Your Own*. Therefore, the same kind of audience is anticipated, with the same international (especially American and Australasian) appeal. In terms of the film's sports-meets-rites-of-passage genre, it could be compared to the likes of *Cool Runnings*, *Dodgeball* and *Run Fatboy Run*. The style, theme and audience appeal would be well-suited to production companies like Working Title, Tiger Aspect, BBC Films, FilmFour, and ITV (Granada) Films.

#### **Story Outline:**

Paul and Robert Stokes are twenty-year-old twins; Paul is gay, Robert is straight. Although their sexualities are different, they both share a passion for football. They both used to play for Newbury Rovers juniors, but circumstance forced Paul to quit. For Robert, however, the journey continued and he now finds himself star player for the adult Newbury Rovers, who are only a season away from being promoted to the Southern Conference. For widowed father Frank, this is a dream come true. He once played for Newbury himself, 'dynamic duo' with Bobby White, and ever since he missed a fatal penalty thirty years ago, costing the team promotion, he's fantasised that his son will do the honour and become the pride of the town. Paul is still an avid fan, but lacks the courage to play now that everyone knows about his sexuality.

Following an impressive Saturday win by Newbury, where Robert and sleazy co-player Simon are heralded men of the match, Paul has a night out with his faghag friends Clare (also Robert's girlfriend) and Melanie. He complains about being single, wondering if he'll ever meet the right man. In a state of desperation, he goes home with Toby, a camp man who happens to be available that night. The next day however, Paul is full of regret. He goes home only to be greeted by Robert, who wants to know all the juicy details. Tension mounts as Robert goads Paul, Frank tries to block it out by talking football tactics, and Aunt Sheila tries to cook the Sunday roast. Paul feels uncomfortable with the whole situation: he just wants to play football, or at least help Robert, and is ashamed of his previous night's shag. The next day this is fuelled even more when sleazy Simon, who Paul works with, gloats about his performance and questions Paul's 'inadequacies.' Tensions rise as Paul is reminded of his 'disappointment' to his father, his inability to play football, and his inferiority to Robert. An eventual climax is reached where Simon jokingly suggests that Paul should set-up a gay football team. For Paul, however, this is no joke; he feels he has something to prove.

Frank is distraught, suffering jibes from workmates and locals about the damage that the gay team will do to the town. Robert, however, is excited; he can't wait to help Paul 'spot the talent' and jokes that Paul's sex life will be renewed. Paul doesn't see this as fun; he wants to prove himself and, deep down, earn the genuine love of his father. He struggles to find suitable players, most of them there for the eye candy, but eventually with the help of Clare and Aunt Sheila manages to consolidate a

team of ten (including, ironically, Toby.) Paul vows to battle on no matter how many men they have. Following a tense Newbury Rovers match, Simon ridiculing Paul and making the players mock his team, Robert comes to his brother's defence. A fight breaks out and, following some nasty jokes and reminders about his dead mother, Robert quits the team; only to then join Paul and his team. Frank is even more distraught: not only have both his sons made a fool of themselves, Robert has abandoned any chance of redeeming the family name. A mystery donor fuels the fire by giving Paul sponsorship, and when announced that Newbury Rovers' rival club Winnersh Wanderers are bankrupt, the club's identity is bought and the new Green Giants are placed in the league. The town is split; some support Paul's plight, but the truly indigenous Rovers supporters feel threatened by their arrival and try their hands at sabotage.

As the season progresses, matches are both won and lost for the Green Giants. Paul and Robert overcome ignorance, arrogance and sabotage, all the while becoming more removed from their father. Strongly supporting Newbury Rovers, and taking sleazy Simon under his wing (almost as a surrogate son), Frank can't bear what's happening to him. He detaches himself from his sons and becomes embroiled in the Rovers culture. He blocks out advice from Aunt Sheila, refusing to acknowledge that his dead wife would've wanted him to support Paul and Robert. Even on their twenty-first birthday, Frank struggles to partake in the celebrations. Robert is angry, but for Paul it goes deeper; he's devastated.

The drama builds to a climax when Newbury Rovers are pitted against the Green Giants. It's a high-stakes match: Rovers need to win in order to be promoted to the Conference; Green Giants need to win in order to stay in the league. Paul confronts Frank one last time, opening his heart about how he feels, how he wants to be loved, but Frank cannot budge. Paul is left feeling like all hope has been lost, and all he can do now is play football to 'succeed.' Frank leaves for the match, supporting Rovers, but there is a sense that something has to change. This is fuelled further when Aunt Sheila confronts him one last time, begging him to accept the situation for his wife's sake.

The match begins and tensions are very high. Rovers' players, Simon in particular, play dirty to try and seal their fortune. The pressure mounts for Frank as he hears, and for the first time understands, the nasty comments about his sons. Simon dirty tackles Paul who trips and sprains his ankle. This is it, Frank can take no more. At half time Paul, now out of the match, tells his players that they've lost; there's no point any more. Then, from the doorway, Frank speaks out in support. Everyone is surprised, not least Paul and Robert. He begs for forgiveness, and takes Paul's place on the team. Paul then has an epiphany: he knows that everyone expects 'gay,' so that's what they're going to get. He rips the sleeves off everyone's shirt, and the whole team go out looking extremely camp – just the way they should do. Paul tells the players to play exactly how they want to play; to be themselves.

After a gruelling second half, the Green Giants are the surprise winners; and it's all thanks to Frank. Tired and flagging, he inadvertently deflects a ball which goes straight into the net. The team is ecstatic: Paul is in disbelief. The victory is short-lived however when the referee tells them that because Frank was never registered with the team, they're disqualified. All seems lost for a very bleak moment, but Paul just laughs; what did they expect? Simon gloats, taking all the credit for their win, and when he ridicules Paul and Robert, Frank knocks him out in one fell swoop. They are the true winners because they have learned so much; the family rift is healed, and in a strange kind

of way they have collectively grieved for their wife/mother's death. Just as they are about to head off, the Green Giants' mystery donor appears. Frank is shocked to see that it's his old Newbury Rovers team mate Bobby White, now donning a pseudonym, and is even more taken aback when he learns that he too is gay. He reveals that he was inspired by Paul, and that he has helped him to be his true self. As Aunt Sheila tells Clare that she used to fancy him, and how typical, Frank leads the way to celebrations at the pub.

OFFSIDE

An Original Screenplay

by

Craig Batty



## "OFFSIDE"

1 BLACK SCREEN: (5 YEARS AGO)

The sound of TEENAGE LAUGHTER as a GROUP OF BOYS get ready for a football match: "Champions!"; "We're gonna whip their arses" etc. Lots of laughter, excitement, encouragement.

To one side, a TEENAGE SIMON's taunting voice (to Paul).

TEENAGE SIMON

You make me wanna puke.

A TEENAGE ROBERT calls from the noisy crowd.

TEENAGE ROBERT

Paul, come on!

Back over on the other side ...

TEENAGE SIMON

You're not wanted.

TEENAGE ROBERT

(calling over)

Paul! Mum and dad want a photo.

TEENAGE SIMON

(to Paul)

Why don't you fuck off?

(beat)

You can't do it.

We are subsumed back into the noise of the GROUP OF BOYS as they charge out onto the pitch.

FADE IN:

2 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - PRESENT DAY

Blend into the noise of the football CROWD. A dreary Saturday afternoon. Home team Newbury Rovers are playing Farnborough Flyers, to a crowd of about five hundred.

An ice-cream van is parked-up, no customers. The ICE-CREAM MAN looks out of his hatch, puzzled. He sees, next to him, a line of cold and hungry customers queuing for hotdogs.

ROBERT STOKES (20, rugged yet handsome) skilfully dribbles the ball up the pitch.

On the sideline, FRANK STOKES (late 40s, function-not-fashion, middle-age spread), cheers on Robert, his son. Next to him, Robert's girlfriend CLARE (18, vivacious, fashion-not-function).

FRANK

Go on, son! Make it a hat trick!

Two OLDER MEN look at Frank, knowingly. As ROBERT continues his skilful control of the ball, Frank shouts out with pride.

FRANK

He's a wonder boy!

OLD MAN 1

(sarcastic)

What, like his dad?

OLD MAN 2 sniggers at this, but FRANK doesn't hear - his focus is on the match. CLARE clings to FRANK, excited.

CLARE

He's my boy!

She turns to PAUL, Robert's twin brother (not as rugged, dressed almost too well). He watches the match with focus and determination.

CLARE

What you reckon, Paul?

PAUL

(shouting out)

You can do it!

(beat, to himself,  
more poignant)

You can do it.

ROBERT passes the ball to team mate SIMON (21, handsome yet on the verge of being porky) ... but he loses it.

The CROWD deflates, but PAUL has a look of sheer determination on his face.

3

EXT. NEWBURY TOWN CENTRE - A BUSY STREET - DAY

Outside Primark. TYLER (very thin, very camp), dressed as Dorothy from 'The Wizard of Oz.' Another man, dressed as an OSTRICH. They're part of a GROUP of forty gay men and women, about to start a rather naff-looking 'gay pride' march.

BRIAN (30s, chubby) proudly lifts a placard: "Say No To Steriotypes" (spelling mistake). DONNA (butch lesbian, wearing a football kit) rolls her eyes. The GROUP marches on.

4 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

The PLAYERS are now dirtier and sweatier - the match is really hotting-up.

ROBERT has control of the ball again. As TWO FARNBOROUGH PLAYERS approach, almost gaining possession of the ball, he makes a beautiful pass to SIMON.

FRANK

Work together. Don't lose it!

CLARE grabs onto PAUL, excited, but he hardly notices her.

PAUL

Straight up the line!

ROBERT runs up the line to allow SIMON to pass him the ball, but a FARNBOROUGH PLAYER intercepts him. The CROWD jeers.

PAUL

Take him out!

FRANK

Don't lose it now.

PAUL

Take him out!

PAUL's face is fierce.

5 EXT. NEWBURY TOWN CENTRE - STREET - DAY

The GROUP of gay paraders march defiantly through town. The SHOPPERS are more interested in a BEARDED LADY, juggling potatoes on a unicycle.

Banners are swayed alongside chants of "gay nights, equal rights." Some LADS laugh at them, but then look at each other suspiciously when the banner "1 in 10" is raised.

As the GROUP passes Superdrug, a large poster in the window is advertising "2 for 1 on all hair care."

One MAN and the OSTRICH drop their banners and run in.

EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

The REFEREE looks at his watch. FRANK expresses concern.

FRANK  
(to himself)  
Come on, son. Do it for us.

PAUL's focus is on the pitch. CLARE can't bear to watch, so buries her face in PAUL's shoulder.

PAUL  
(to himself)  
For me.

ROBERT and SIMON steam up the pitch magnificently. SIMON passes the ball to ROBERT who quickly shoots it ... goal!

The CROWD erupts as the final whistle is blown.

FRANK is elated, beaming with pride to the two OLDER MEN.

PAUL cringes as CLARE plants a big kiss on his forehead.

ROBERT and SIMON strip off their shirts and run around the pitch. Another PLAYER jumps onto ROBERT's back, waving his arms about. PAUL looks on, admiring the player's body, but then quickly looks away.

As the Newbury Rovers PLAYERS cavort and run about hugging, the ever-defiant GROUP of gay paraders passes the fence. Seeing this 'homoerotic' behaviour, they all grind to a halt.

TYLER (DOROTHY)  
Now this *is* me!

Banners drop as the GROUP of paraders ogle the players. They shout out: "sexy legs"; "check that physique" etc.

PAUL cringes with embarrassment, seeing his 'associates' climb over the fence and onto the pitch.

SIMON spots the unfolding action, grimacing nastily. He throws a knowing look to Paul.

PAUL is unsure what to do for a second. He starts to head over to the Rovers CROWD, but TYLER spots him.

TYLER  
(suggestive)  
I should get back into the game!

PAUL fakes a smile, looking in the corner of his eyes for the other supporters' reactions. They're whispering.

CLARE

Only one set of balls you're good  
with, love!

TYLER

Best midfielder in school, me.

CLARE looks surprised yet impressed. PAUL is unsure.

TYLER

(to Paul)

You out later? Beach party!

Before he can answer, ROBERT heads over with his shirt off.

ROBERT

Trying to find the Emerald City?

TYLER strokes ROBERT's chest.

TYLER

I need protecting from the Wicked  
Witch.

ROBERT plays, flirtatiously.

PAUL is uncomfortable. He smiles through gritted teeth as  
FRANK hesitantly heads over.

FRANK

Fantastic game, son.

TYLER

Didn't you play for Newbury Rovers,  
Mr Stokes?

FRANK doesn't know where to look, uncomfortable with Tyler's  
appearance.

FRANK

A few years ago now.  
(beat, more  
discomfort)  
Call me Frank, anyway.

TYLER

You can call me Dorothy!

FRANK smiles but quickly turns away and gulps.

PAUL is about to say something, but CLARE jumps in.

CLARE  
 (re: Frank)  
 He wa' a superstar, our Frank. Just  
 like my sexy man here.

FRANK looks at everyone, awkward. PAUL and ROBERT look at each other, also awkward - they need to change the subject.

PAUL  
 Right, de-briefing?

TYLER nudges ROBERT at this innuendo.

Across the pitch, SIMON throws dirty looks at the scene.

PLAYER 1  
 Didn't he go to our school?

SIMON  
 Freak.

PLAYER 1  
 Funny how people can ... turn.

SIMON  
 Turns my stomach!

PLAYER 1 is startled, but then nods in agreement when SIMON looks at him sternly.

Back with the others, FRANK tries to steer the conversation.

FRANK  
 Brilliant team work. You did me  
 proud.  
 (beat)  
 Your mum, too.

PAUL flashes a look at ROBERT. They both look at FRANK with a slight sadness.

CLARE  
 She's watching, kiddo.

FRANK smiles but he's obviously affected. ROBERT pulls CLARE closer - they hug. PAUL is uncomfortable with the silence.

PAUL  
 I reckon she'll be thinking the same  
 as me ... you still need to work on  
 your angles.

ROBERT

Oi, I nearly scored a hat trick!

FRANK

He's right. Almost perfect, but not there yet.

ROBERT gives a deflated look.

TYLER

A handsome little birdie tells me you're tipped for promotion.

ROBERT flicks TYLER's ponytail (wig) at this comment. He becomes intrigued by how it's put together, touching and feeling it etc.

FRANK

Nationwide Conference. Real man's league.

ROBERT

Don't get him started.

PAUL

We're gonna get you there.

SIMON walks over, blanking everyone but Robert.

SIMON

Come on, Rob. You're creating the wrong impression.

FRANK

He's playing eye-candy to this lot.

PAUL looks at FRANK, surprised by the comment. FRANK looks surprised himself.

SIMON pulls ROBERT's hand away from TYLER's wig.

SIMON

Leave that to your brother.

PAUL looks down. CLARE isn't impressed.

FRANK

Good game, Simon.

TYLER

You know we prefer straight boys?

SIMON

I should do, eh Paul?

CLARE goes to say something but PAUL stops her.

FRANK  
 (painfully)  
 You'll need all the support you can  
 get in the Conference.

PAUL  
 I'll go get the car.

SIMON  
 (sarcastic)  
 Don't wanna join the lads for a  
 drink?

PAUL ignores the comment. FRANK doesn't see the dig, and his face tells us that he's tempted by the offer.

PAUL shakes ROBERT's hand.

PAUL  
 Have one for me.

FRANK looks, not quite sure what's going on.

ROBERT kisses CLARE as SIMON drags him off. CLARE can't contain herself.

CLARE  
 What a flaming creep!

TYLER  
 He thinks we're lepers!

PAUL looks at FRANK, then looks over at the GROUP of paraders who are now having a kick around with the football.

The scene is farcical. One MAN, in full drag, trips over in very high heels.

TYLER  
 Better go round-up the Munchkins!

FRANK  
 Watch out for the ...  
 (beat, too late now)  
 Wicked Witch?

He quickly feels silly for saying this. PAUL walks away.

CLARE puts her arm around FRANK, laughing.

CLARE  
 You try too hard!



## 7 INT. STOKES HOUSE - PAUL'S BEDROOM - EVENING

PAUL is looking at a photograph hanging on the wall: him and Robert, both in football kit, with arms around each other. They look happy, innocent. PAUL smiles, faintly.

A beat, then the sound of a text message. PAUL comes out of his contemplation and reads the text. It's from Clare: 'Be there in 5, sexy! xx'

PAUL stares at the text momentarily, then back to the picture. He snaps out of it, then picks up a bright-coloured carrier bag and pulls out a smart new shirt.

## 8 INT. STOKES HOUSE - FRANK'S BEDROOM - EVENING

FRANK puts the match programme in a tin, and goes to put it back on the shelf in the wardrobe. On the shelf, he sees another tin, which is much older. He takes the tin, goes over to the bed, and opens it.

Cuttings of newspapers from 1979: Newbury Rovers' attempts to get into a proper league. Frank appears as front man of the team, along with fellow star BOBBY WHITE. Then, one picture of Frank with his head held in shame, the headline: 'Header Ache: Stokes Scuppers Promotion.'

FRANK is melancholy, but then looks up as he hears giggling from Paul's room next door.

## 9 INT. STOKES HOUSE - PAUL'S BEDROOM - EVENING

CLARE and MELANIE (older than Clare but clearly the underdog) sit on Paul's bed, drinking cheap wine. They're dressed for a big night out.

PAUL

(OOV)

I'm expecting Philip Olivier for the price it cost me.

CLARE

Paul, you're gorgeous - you don't need a shirt to sell you.

PAUL enters in the shirt he took from the carrier bag. He twirls. CLARE and MELANIE are clearly impressed.

PAUL

I'm running out of other ideas.

MELANIE

A real bobby dazzler.

PAUL and CLARE look at MELANIE - 'what?'

PAUL

Mel, that's what the orange guy says  
to describe antiques. Not some ...  
young ... successful ...

CLARE

... gorgeous ...

PAUL

... desirable ...

CLARE

(with actions)

... extremely shaggable ...

MELANIE

... single ...

Halt. PAUL and CLARE look at MEL again.

PAUL

(to Clare)

Top her up, will you?

MELANIE reacts - 'did I say something wrong?'

10 INT. STOKES HOUSE - FRANK'S BEDROOM - EVENING

FRANK has now spread the newspaper cuttings across the bed.  
He stands to one side scanning the articles, looking for  
something. Suddenly he spots it.

He takes hold of the 'special feature' of him and Bobby White.  
The headline: 'Dynamic Duo.'

Just as he opens it up, he hears the downstairs door being  
slammed closed. He peers out of the window to see PAUL, CLARE  
and MELANIE walking down the street.

11 EXT. STREET - EVENING

PAUL, CLARE and MELANIE are tipsy. CLARE and MELANIE grab  
PAUL's bum, which sends him running off and them chasing.

As they run, we see FRANK looking out of his bedroom window.  
He closes the curtains.

12 EXT. YELLOW BRICK ROAD CLUB - NIGHT

PAUL, CLARE and MELANIE link arms, walking towards the club.

MELANIE

One of the Rovers players, they  
might be gay.

PAUL

Too weird. Robert'd be asking  
allsorts.

CLARE

He'd have hooked you up by now  
anyway. Always looking out for ya!

PAUL

(awkward look)

Not always ...

CLARE

Nah, I reckon tonight's the night,  
cock.

MELANIE

You've got a new shirt ... pulling  
power aftershave ... and who could  
forget, your two beautiful  
chaperones.

PAUL looks around - 'where?' CLARE slaps him playfully.

They approach the club's entrance.

CLARE

Here's to finding you a dashing  
classy ...

MELANIE

... all-strings-attached ...

CLARE

Super-masculine bit of tush ...

HARD CUT TO:

13 INT. YELLOW BRICK ROAD - BAR - NIGHT

Three camp, sour-faced, bitchy 'QUEENS' scowl as they look  
someone up and down at the bar.

PAUL, CLARE and MELANIE down shots of Sambuka.

PAUL  
I'll join a monastery!

CLARE  
Err ... small matter of entry  
requirements?

PAUL  
I'd be well in if that's the case!

They all crack up at this innuendo.

The three QUEENS knock past PAUL as they trot off.

PAUL  
Oi!

The QUEENS look PAUL up and down, scathingly. A beat.

PAUL  
Sorry?

QUEEN 1  
For what? Offending mankind with  
that fashion faux pas?

They mince off. MELANIE stops PAUL from saying something, and CLARE from getting violent.

CLARE  
The little bitch!

MELANIE  
Issues. Probably works in a call  
centre.

PAUL  
He'll be calling an ambulance.  
(beat)  
Jumped up little twat.

MELANIE  
Ignore him, he's nobody.

PAUL  
Why is it the nobodies get  
boyfriends?

They head off, passing a group of DRAG QUEENS who are tormenting a naïve BARELY LEGAL LAD.

14 INT. STOKES HOUSE - HALLWAY - NIGHT

ROBERT, dressed in beachwear, heads for the door. FRANK follows him with the 'Dynamic Duo' cutting.

FRANK  
It might spur you on.

ROBERT  
Cool. I'll look tomorrow.

FRANK  
Where you off to?

ROBERT dramatically puts on some sunglasses.

ROBERT  
Where d'you think? See you later.

And he's gone. FRANK pauses for a moment, then locks the door, pulls the curtain, and turns off the hallway light.

15 INT. YELLOW BRICK ROAD - DANCE FLOOR - NIGHT

PAUL, CLARE and MELANIE dance to one side of the dance floor. TYLER, in Speedos and flip flops, sees them from afar and waves. PAUL smiles politely, then turns away.

CLARE  
Guy in the red top?

PAUL looks intrigued, then his face drops.

PAUL  
He's got better eyebrows than both of you.

MELANIE feels her eyebrows, taking the comment literally.

CLARE  
Nice pecs though.

PAUL  
Look at him, slutting the floor, knowing everyone's watching him.

MELANIE  
Like us you mean?

PAUL pulls a face at her.

CLARE  
I dunno ... they're either too ugly, or too pretty.

PAUL

I just want a *man*. Not a walking cliché.

MELANIE

(tongue-in-cheek)

I know the perfect someone.

PAUL and CLARE look, intrigued.

MELANIE

Manly, very manly. Likes football.  
Same age.

CLARE

Urgh, incest!

MELANIE

Simon!

PAUL and CLARE revolt.

PAUL

If he wasn't such a lazy,  
homophobic, general all-round-twat,  
then yeah, perfect.

CLARE catches the eye of someone - TOBY.

PAUL

I'll just be celibate. I'm sure  
it's got some advantages.

MELANIE looks like she's trying to think of some.

CLARE waves at TOBY, smiles, and points at PAUL.

CLARE

Mr Stokes, you are so being watched.

PAUL looks around, not really enthusiastically. TOBY, a camp guy in shorts and a sleeveless green vest, waves. PAUL waves, but with a semi-fake smile.

PAUL

(through gritted  
teeth)

He's got more off than on.

CLARE

(under her smile)

He's fit and he's after you. Now  
get yourself over there.

PAUL

Maybe we should call it a night?

CLARE takes Paul's drink, puts it in his hand, and pushes him towards TOBY. They begin to dance. PAUL glares back over at CLARE.

As CLARE sticks her thumbs up with enthusiasm, ROBERT enters. He puts his arms around her and kisses her neck.

MELANIE looks at them - she's just figured something out ...

MELANIE

(re: celibacy)

I guess it means cleaner sheets.

CLARE looks at her, dumbfounded - ROBERT too.

On the dance floor, PAUL smiles politely as TOBY performs lap-dance moves around him.

16 INT. STOKES HOUSE - KITCHEN - MORNING

A newspaper is dropped onto the kitchen table. On the back, a large picture of a triumphant ROBERT and SIMON from the day before's match. Headline: 'A Match Made in Heaven?' FRANK beams with pride.

AUNT SHEILA (50s, short, dark and fiery) is cooking breakfast in the background.

FRANK

This is ... this is ...

SHEILA

One egg or two?

FRANK

Fantastic. More than fantastic.

(beat)

Two.

(beat)

It's superb! When people see ...

SHEILA brings over a plate of cooked breakfast. FRANK frowns as there's only one egg.

SHEILA

Cholesterol.

FRANK sits down.

FRANK

It's been a long time coming, but by God it's going to be worth it.

FRANK begins to eat. SHEILA picks up the newspaper.

SHEILA

(reading)

Emotions ran high yesterday as Newbury Rovers took another step closer to being promoted to the Nationwide Conference.

FRANK

First step Conference - next step Premiership.

SHEILA

Usual stars of the match were dynamic duo Simon Lockheart and Robert Stokes, who performed magnificently together in the four-nil defeat.

FRANK

Should've seen it in '79. Me and Bobby White. Dynamic Duo. Diane was ... she loved it.

SHEILA

Aye, always bragging about her golden boy.

FRANK raises his toast, glad of that comment.

SHEILA goes to water the plants in the window.

FRANK

He'll be worth a fortune when he's famous. ITN, BBC ... News of the World!

(beat)

Proper talent scouts poking around.

SHEILA

Like father, like son, eh?

FRANK

Phone calls. Begging letters. Snapped up by Arsenal, the pair of 'em.



SHEILA

You'll be able to get that conservatory you always promised Diane.

FRANK

There'll be more than a conservatory, woman.

SHEILA frowns as she inspects a drooping spider plant.

SHEILA

Just don't push him too hard.

17 INT. TOBY'S BEDROOM - MORNING

PAUL wakes with a start. He nervously eyes the ceiling before slowly moving his head.

We see regret on his face as he realises where he stayed - quite a tacky room, with pictures of naked men and Shakira.

PAUL's eyes widen as, on the side table, he sees a bottle of baby lotion and handcuffs.

TOBY enters in a dressing gown, carrying the newspaper. He walks with a slight gait.

TOBY

I knew you were a whiz with balls,  
but ...

PAUL is alarmed. TOBY passes him the newspaper. On the back he sees the picture of Robert.

PAUL smiles awkwardly at TOBY.

18 INT. STOKES HOUSE - KITCHEN - MORNING

FRANK is still brandishing the newspaper. SHEILA is cutting vegetables for the lunch.

ROBERT walks in. He kisses Sheila, and goes to make himself a cup of tea.

FRANK

Better watch Winnersh. Sneaky gits,  
according to this.

SHEILA

Hasn't their manager just quit?

FRANK

I've been thinking ... you and Simon need to work on your cross-coordination more. When me and Bobby were ... [team mates ...]

ROBERT

It's Sunday, a day of rest.

FRANK stands, getting a pad of paper and a pen.

FRANK

Trick is to team-build. Trust.

ROBERT looks up at the clock.

ROBERT

Might ask Paul if he wants a pint.

SHEILA

Don't think he's in, love.

FRANK begins to write out an agenda, excited.

FRANK

We'll start with a dinner. He can come here.

SHEILA

I expect you'll be asking me to put on a side of beef ...

ROBERT

Where's he gone?

FRANK

(to Sheila)

You love it really.

SHEILA

Didn't he come home with you?

ROBERT

(cheeky grin)

The sly dog!

FRANK

Maybe you should start going to the gym together.

ROBERT

(excited)

Bet he's in that guy's bed as we speak!

FRANK

Work up a real sweat. Man and man  
synchronisation.

ROBERT puts his arms around SHEILA's waist.

ROBERT

Working up an appetite for your  
roasties, eh?!

SHEILA

We're having mash.

FRANK begins to use items on the table to set-up a football  
match configuration: coasters, salt grinder etc.

FRANK

We'll pen-in some extra training.  
I'll supervise. Evenings.

The front door opens (OOV). ROBERT folds his arms in mock  
unimpressed anticipation. FRANK continues to lay out the  
items on the table.

PAUL walks in wearing last night's clothes, his hair sticking  
up everywhere. ROBERT raises his eyebrows.

PAUL

Something smells nice.

ROBERT clears his throat - 'excuse me?'

PAUL

I hear congratulations are in order.

FRANK

You've seen it then?

ROBERT

I'm more interested in what you  
scored last night.

PAUL is diffident. He looks with interest at Frank's setup.

ROBERT begins to prod PAUL, delighting in his squirming.

FRANK

I'm planning some training. Cross-  
coordination. See if we can't get  
that hat trick.

ROBERT

Paul pulled a gay boy, Paul pulled a  
gay boy.

PAUL pushes ROBERT away.

PAUL  
(to FRANK)  
Mid-field, or attack?

ROBERT  
What did you do?  
(beat)  
Was he well hung?

FRANK  
Getting a better angle to shoot.

PAUL is now having a small scuffle with ROBERT.

SHEILA  
Robert, will you leave your brother  
alone?

ROBERT  
He was very fit, you'd like him  
auntie Sheila.

SHEILA  
We may have some technical problems.

PAUL  
Dad's trying to help you here. All  
you can think about is my ... [sex  
life] ... what I ... [do in bed.]

PAUL looks at FRANK. There is a knowingness that nothing else  
needs to be said.

PAUL  
(to Frank)  
You should talk to Andy, see if  
there's anything you can help with.

SHEILA  
He can start by peeling these spuds.

ROBERT  
Did he have a ... you know ... he looked  
quite gifted to me!

PAUL is visibly torn between brushing ROBERT off and speaking  
with FRANK.

FRANK can't bear it. He starts to dismantle his efforts on  
the table. He stands.

FRANK  
They'll be at the pub now.

PAUL  
I'll get changed, come with you.

Awkward silence. PAUL relinquishes.

PAUL  
I'll stay and do the spuds.  
(beat)  
And shut this one up.

FRANK leaves, quietly. PAUL takes the pan of potatoes from Sheila.

ROBERT looks at PAUL, a huge smile - 'so ...?'

PAUL  
(short, end-of-  
story)  
Eight inch cock. Arse like a peach.  
Let me fuck him all night.

SHEILA drops a pan in the background.

ROBERT's face says it all - 'you little devil!'

PAUL  
(apathetic)  
Not my type.

19 INT. STOKES HOUSE - LOUNGE - EVENING

PAUL, ROBERT and CLARE sit on the sofa watching TV. FRANK is in a chair across, polishing his old medals. The *Emmerdale* theme tune plays.

FRANK  
(to Robert)  
Andy says we should have a meeting.  
Get a schedule going.

No response. PAUL looks at ROBERT.

FRANK  
(re: *Emmerdale*)  
This is a woman's programme!

ROBERT curls into CLARE - he doesn't want to move.

CLARE  
Don't be so sexist.

SHEILA walks in, buttoning up her coat to go.

SHEILA

There's three packed lunches in the fridge and the Parkin's on the side, cooling.

CLARE

You spoil 'em.

SHEILA

They need looking after.

PAUL gets up from the sofa. Almost instantly, ROBERT and CLARE stretch out.

PAUL

Need a lift?

SHEILA

I'm all right. Long as I'm home for *Wild at Heart*.

PAUL gives SHEILA a hug.

SHEILA

Be careful, you.

SHEILA goes over and kisses ROBERT and CLARE.

SHEILA

And you, look after your brother.

SHEILA nods to FRANK.

SHEILA

See you next week.

And she's gone. FRANK looks at PAUL then at ROBERT.

FRANK

I'll finish these upstairs.

Nobody responds. FRANK gets up and leaves the room. PAUL looks at ROBERT and CLARE, now stretched out. He sits in Frank's chair.

20 INT. MARKETING OFFICES - MORNING

A busy morning in the council's marketing offices. Newspapers are turned to the football pages. An air of excitement.

PAUL is already stressed, rifling through a pile of papers.

LATER:

PAUL frantically types on a computer. He looks at the clock, worried, then looks towards the door, angry.

LATER:

More EMPLOYEES are now filing into the office. PAUL is on the telephone, at the same time scrolling through computer files.

PAUL  
 (on phone)  
 Half an hour?  
 (beat)  
 Twenty minutes.  
 (beat)  
 You have my word.

CLARE and MELANIE come in as PAUL slams down the phone.

CLARE  
 Morning, stud.

PAUL doesn't move from his desk.

PAUL  
 Gorgeous as I may be, can you give me twenty minutes?

MELANIE  
 (re: Toby)  
 Then we want to hear everything!

PAUL reacts - 'don't remind me!'

LATER:

PAUL is at the printer - it's jammed. He tussles with it, looking at the clock in panic.

CLARE and MELANIE watch from across the office.

MELANIE  
 Pull it out, give it a shake, then push it back in again.

CLARE reacts - 'oh really?'

PAUL  
 Have I got mug written across my face?

21 INT. MARKETING OFFICES - CORRIDOR - MORNING

SIMON drops a sausage roll wrapper into the bin. He stops at a mirror and tweaks his hair. Two FEMALE PASSERSBY smile flirtatiously, giggling. He grins.

22 INT. MARKETING OFFICES - MORNING

PAUL pulls the last of the report from the printer. He sits, quickly flicking through it.

SIMON saunters in, holding up his arms as if for worship.

PAUL stops reading and slowly raises his head - he's not impressed.

SIMON 'dances' past other EMPLOYEES. He spots a newspaper and turns to the back page. He tears the picture out and walks towards a large, tacky display - 'Star of the Month.'

PAUL rises slowly, the report in hand.

SIMON starts to take down the current photo - a cheesy picture of Mr Weisman, an over-tanned old guy with a bad toupee.

SIMON  
Say hello to Mr February.

PAUL gets close. He's about to interject when the MANAGER walks in - a slim, greasy type with a slight limp.

SIMON  
I'm being selfish.

He turns and hands the picture to the MANAGER.

SIMON  
You are the boss, after all.

PAUL can't believe it. He looks at CLARE and MELANIE, who pull faces of disgust.

MANAGER  
Good game, my son, good game!  
Everyone's talking about it! Had  
the mayor on the phone first thing.

SIMON gloats as the MANAGER swaps over the pictures.

MANAGER  
Proud to have you on the team.  
Working hard as ever, I see.



SIMON snatches the report from PAUL and passes it to the MANAGER. PAUL's lost for words.

MANAGER

(to Paul)

And your brother. What a star.  
What a pair.

SIMON

Be star-of-the-year when we're in  
the Conference.

PAUL goes to say something but the MANAGER pushes him back, out of the way. He admires Simon's 'mug' on display.

MANAGER

I want it signed later.

The MANAGER pats him on the shoulder, kisses the report and heads off.

MANAGER

(remote)

Fantastic game.

PAUL and SIMON are left facing each other. SIMON smiles but PAUL is deadly serious.

SIMON

Sorry I'm late.

23 INT. MARKETING OFFICES - MORNING

PAUL is busy replying to e-mails. SIMON is lounging in his chair, admiring his picture.

SIMON

I've been thinking about having  
highlights. Maybe one of your  
friends could do them?

PAUL doesn't react.

SIMON takes a doughnut out of his drawer and starts to eat it, fingering out the jam first. PAUL hears the squelching noise and looks over.

SIMON, finger in mouth, raises his eyebrows - 'what?'

The MANAGER walks in again, humming happily.

SIMON quickly puts the doughnut away, reverting to his e-mail.

MANAGER

Well done both of you for the  
Parkside contract. Really good for  
PR!

SIMON

(winks at Paul)

You know my views on team work.

The MANAGER grins, almost laughing as he walks away. He claps his hands.

MANAGER

This man ... this ... team work!

PAUL is blank. He calmly turns back to his computer. SIMON does the same.

SIMON

(reading an e-mail)

One from your dad here!

PAUL ignores him.

SIMON

Cross-coordination.

(reads on)

Ha! "See you at Old Trafford!"

PAUL screws up some paper and throws it towards the bin. He misses.

SIMON takes the doughnut back out of the drawer.

SIMON

(eating)

Bet you wish you'd never given up  
playing.

PAUL

We need to start planning the bus  
campaign.

SIMON

You were quite good at one point ...  
before ...

PAUL stands and heads to the bin.

SIMON

(smarmy)

Shame you had to leave the junior  
team, but ...

PAUL turns, serious.

PAUL  
I hope to God you never have a kid  
who dares to be different.

SIMON laughs.

SIMON  
Not from my genes!

PAUL picks up the paper and drops it into the bin.

SIMON's about to go back to work when he has a thought.

SIMON  
What if ... all you gays joined  
together and started playing? You  
could try it on with anyone then.

PAUL doesn't respond.

SIMON  
'Football for fags.' Could be  
entertaining.

PAUL  
(playing the game)  
Like a circus you mean?

SIMON  
With more freaks, naturally.

PAUL moves closer to SIMON, rising to the intimidation.

PAUL  
Yeah, with a *big top* and ...  
ringmasters with whips ... tight  
leotards ... shooting from a big black  
cannon ...

SIMON's slightly uncomfortable with all of this.

PAUL  
That'd get you going, wouldn't it?

SIMON scoffs. He goes back to his work but senses that PAUL's still staring at him. He looks up. PAUL's glaring, deadly.

24 EXT. - MARKETING OFFICES - GARDEN - DAY

PAUL, CLARE and MELANIE sit eating lunch. CLARE is laughing out loud.

PAUL

You're right. And anyway, how many gays know how to play?

MELANIE

My dream, a gay straight man.

(beat, she frowns)

No, a straight gay man.

PAUL

It scared him though, me thinking about it.

CLARE

There's one thing - if you did do it, it'd make your dad happy.

CLARE turns to MELANIE and they continue to laugh at the thought. PAUL, however, is pensive - something's hit him.

25 INT. STOKES HOUSE - LANDING / FRANK'S BEDROOM - EVENING

PAUL walks up the stairs, taking off his tie. He sees FRANK in his room, packing away the tin of cuttings.

PAUL goes into the bedroom.

PAUL

Fed him the propaganda?

FRANK shakes his head - 'no.' He's slightly distant.

PAUL

You know what it's like when Clare's round.

FRANK

Just thought it might help.

PAUL

Him or you?

FRANK is slightly taken aback, quickly closing the tin. PAUL feels guilty for the comment.

PAUL

Talk me through it.

FRANK

You don't have to be interested.

PAUL

I am interested.

FRANK still puts the tin away.

FRANK

I was the blue-eyed boy, just like Robert. A star, they called me.

PAUL

Must run in the genes.

FRANK

We soared up the table. Playoff semi final, playoff final. It was magic. The atmosphere. The town. Your mum, she was ... it was magic.

(beat)

And then ... [I screwed up.]

Awkward silence.

FRANK

I just thought all this, it might ... [help.]

PAUL

Nobody blames you, dad.

FRANK smiles, but he's not convinced. A beat.

FRANK goes to the window and looks out.

FRANK

You were good. Very good. Better than Robert, probably.

PAUL looks down - he doesn't know what to say.

FRANK

Ironic, really.

PAUL

I tried, but ... [I couldn't.]

FRANK

(upbeat)

Life happens. It's all for the best, no matter how bad it seems.

PAUL goes to say something, but FRANK jumps in.

FRANK

Well I fancy a bit of that Parkin. Want some?

PAUL smiles but shakes his head. FRANK leaves the room.

As PAUL stands, he notices a medal left on the bed. He picks it up and looks closely - it's engraved: "1979 Playoff Finalists - Newbury Rovers." He holds it in his hand, tight.

26 INT. STOKES HOUSE - PAUL'S BEDROOM - NIGHT

PAUL sits at his computer - he's on the Stonewall FC website.

ROBERT enters the room. Without any communication between the two, he goes over to Paul's desk and takes some moisturiser. He starts applying it to his face and leaves the room.

PAUL continues to read the website. He clicks on the 'how we were formed' page. There's an image of the team, arms round each other - they all look happy.

27 EXT. PLANT POT FACTORY - DAY

EMPLOYEES walk into the factory, some carrying newspapers. Most of them are wearing Newbury Rovers scarves.

ROBERT runs up to the entrance. He takes his iPod earphones out. The EMPLOYEES are pleased to see him, patting him on the back etc.

28 INT. PLANT POT FACTORY - DAY

Inside the factory where Frank and Robert work. Quite a masculine environment - machinery, grime, rugged men etc.

FRANK wears different coloured overalls to the men - he's in charge. He inspects a stack of plant pots.

ROBERT is busy working as GAV and TED (stocky, shaven heads - tweedledum and tweedletwat) skive, reading the newspaper.

GAV

(re: an advert)

Playing football?

TED

In Newbury?

FRANK has overheard. He walks over, intrigued. ROBERT is oblivious to it all.

GAV

Is it April Fools?

TED

Funny place to advertise.

FRANK leans in to see the advert.

GAV  
Funny thing to advertise.

FRANK seems a little unnerved. He wanders back to the stack of plant pots, in a slight daze.

By now, quite a few of the EMPLOYEES have gathered around. ROBERT is still working.

GAV  
There's an e-mail.

TED  
And a number.  
(beat)  
281469.

FRANK drops and smashes a plant pot in the background.

GAV, TED and the EMPLOYEES look over. For the first time, ROBERT looks up.

29 EXT. MARKETING OFFICES - CAR PARK - DAY

PAUL closes his car boot. SIMON sneaks up behind him.

SIMON  
You did it then?

PAUL gets into his car. SIMON looks in through the window.

SIMON  
Was it the leotard, or the whips?

PAUL just ignores him and begins to pull away.

SIMON bangs the top of PAUL's car, smirking.

SIMON  
If you need a talent spotter ... !

CLARE and MELANIE walk out of the building, arm in arm. They give SIMON a dirty look. SIMON pulls a smug face. CLARE sticks her middle finger up.

30 INT. STOKES HOUSE - PAUL'S BEDROOM - DAY

PAUL is changing into a football kit. ROBERT is sitting on the bed, looking through a gay lifestyle magazine.

ROBERT  
 (re: FRANK)  
 Said he had a big order to sort.

PAUL  
 He's probably avoiding me.

PAUL looks at himself in the mirror.

PAUL  
 I'm surprised these still fit.

ROBERT holds up the magazine, open on a double-page feature about 'men in uniform.'

ROBERT  
 You could model for this!

ROBERT reacts - 'not sure about that.'

PAUL  
 God knows what'll happen.

ROBERT points to a picture in the magazine of two young guys wearing school uniform, kissing.

ROBERT  
 Hands off the twink!

PAUL grabs the magazine and throws it into the bin.

ROBERT  
 Doesn't matter if you do.

PAUL  
 I'm here to play football, not ...

ROBERT  
 Just balls?

PAUL's not amused. ROBERT holds his hands up in surrender.

ROBERT  
 It'll be fine.  
 (beat)  
 You might be surprised who's there.

PAUL  
 That's what I'm worried about.

31 EXT. SCHOOL FIELD - EVENING

PAUL and ROBERT set up equipment for the trial. PAUL's nervous, constantly looking about to see who might be coming.



ROBERT  
I'm here to serve. Do as you wish.  
Filter out the chaff.

He salutes. PAUL pushes him, then passes him some cones.

PAUL  
We'll start with some dribbling.

ROBERT raises an eyebrow. PAUL holds up his hand - 'no.'

ROBERT begins to set the cones out on the grass.

ROBERT  
You've gotta have a bit of fun.

PAUL  
You're lucky, you play for a team.

ROBERT  
(naive)  
You didn't have to leave.

PAUL gives a reality check look - 'oh didn't I?' ROBERT's expression changes, as if he's just remembered.

Suddenly, the sound of a megaphone ...

SHEILA  
(remote, through a  
megaphone)  
I'm missing Kirsty and Phil for this  
- it better be good!

SHEILA and CLARE march towards PAUL and ROBERT. ROBERT smiles but PAUL is agog.

32 INT. STOKES HOUSE - LOUNGE - EVENING

FRANK flicks through the TV with the remote. He's distracted. The telephone rings. He heaves himself up and answers.

FRANK  
(on phone)  
Hello?  
(beat)  
No, he's ... what trial? I'm not ... I  
don't know.  
(beat)  
I think you've got the wrong number.  
Don't call again.

FRANK quickly cuts off the call. He looks down, terrified.

33 EXT. SCHOOL FIELD - EVENING

The PLAYERS have arrived and are warming up. They jog around, but it's clear that some of them are in it for the eye candy: eyeing-up, brushing past etc.

PAUL and ROBERT are getting their scoring sheets ready.

PAUL

Maybe I shouldn't have advertised so widely.

A CAMP GUY dramatically falls down on the pitch from exhaustion - already!

CLARE and SHEILA drag him to his feet - 'don't be such a wimp!'

As PAUL and ROBERT jog onto the pitch, SIMON appears, eating a porkpie. He smiles smarmily at Clare. CLARE scowls back at him and then nudges SHEILA to tell her.

PAUL goes to blow his whistle when he sees SIMON. His expression changes - 'oh no ...' He blows the whistle anyway.

The PLAYERS gather round PAUL. SIMON rubs his hands - 'this is gonna be fun!' PAUL takes a deep, nervous breath.

34 EXT. SCHOOL FIELD - EVENING - SERIES OF SHOTS:

- A) PLAYERS struggle to control balls around cones. One of them pretends to perform a sexual act on a particular cone.
- B) ROBERT mouths encouragement to the PLAYERS.
- C) CLARE and SHEILA shout on, sharing the megaphone.
- D) PAUL covers his eyes in embarrassment - SIMON smirks.
- E) Two PLAYERS slide into one another, almost crying when they see the state of their dirty kits.
- F) The GOAL KEEPER shies away from the ball, scared that it'll hurt.
- G) Now PAUL has the megaphone. He screams through it.
- H) Two PLAYERS are too polite that they gesture for each other to take possession of the ball.
- I) FRANK arrives, reluctantly. He tries to remain unnoticed but SIMON sees him and sticks-up his thumbs. PAUL is pleased to see FRANK, who just smiles back, nervously.

- J) One PLAYER misses a pass, too busy tucking in his shirt.
- K) ROBERT cringes - PAUL is blank.
- L) CLARE looks at SHEILA, who is thinking hard ...
- M) The PLAYERS now look a mess - mud and tears.
- N) PAUL strikes a big cross through his score sheet.

35 EXT. SCHOOL FIELD - EVENING

A PLAYER dribbles the ball up close to the net. CLARE and SHEILA look on in anticipation. Even FRANK seems interested.

The GOAL KEEPER is poised, until ... SIMON whips-off his top. The GOAL KEEPER glares at his body, and so the goal is scored.

PAUL blows the whistle furiously. SIMON responds with a fake sorry, using a limp wrist.

PAUL  
What you doing here anyway?!

SIMON  
Competitive shop.  
(beat)  
Great clearance bargains!

PAUL is about to storm over, but ROBERT stops him. SIMON saunters off, laughing.

FRANK  
(almost glad)  
It's not the end of the world.

CLARE  
It would be for you.

FRANK begins to gather-up the cones.

SHEILA  
Don't pull the plug just yet.

PAUL  
The bath's not even half full.

A PLAYER shouts over from the pitch in a camp voice.

PLAYER  
Someone mention a bath?!

SHEILA  
I might be able to help.

FRANK laughs as he stacks the cones neatly.

FRANK

Beating up a batch of Parkin's not going to make miracles.

SHEILA

I didn't spend fifteen years as an auxiliary nurse for nothing.

PAUL looks intrigued by this.

ROBERT

What, get the patients to play?

CLARE

Team full of stiffies?!

SHEILA

Ward full of queens, more like.

FRANK's eyes widen. He drops a stack of cones. PAUL helps him to pick them back up.

SHEILA

I've worked with more gays than you've had hot dinners.

FRANK

They push wheelchairs, not peddle balls.

SHEILA gives a look - 'you'd be surprised.'

ROBERT

Think you can get some good players? Convince them to join the team?

PAUL's face shows that he's far from convinced.

SHEILA

The number of comings-out, boyfriend troubles and hair dying I've done, I think I'm owed a few favours.

FRANK can't believe what he's hearing. He turns away, and in the distance sees SIMON walking away. He looks on, longingly.

PAUL is still not convinced. ROBERT, however, is. He goes to high-five PAUL, but all he gets is PAUL's floppy hand.

INT. SCHOOL - CHANGING ROOMS - EVENING

The PLAYERS are almost dressed. PAUL is distracted by a HUNKY PLAYER, but quickly regains his composure.

PAUL

I took you out there today 'cos I wanted to prove that gay men can play football. Play the game, not play the field.

A few PLAYERS look embarrassed.

PAUL

There's people out there who don't believe in us ... think we're a laughing stock. And there's people out there trying to destroy us.

(beat)

Some of you just ... add to the stereotype. You bring it on yourselves!

The PLAYERS don't know what to say or where to look. ROBERT notices this ...

ROBERT

What Paul's trying to say ... [is ...]

PAUL

Is that if you don't really want to be here ... then go off and get some cock!

Awkward silence before MOST OF THE PLAYERS leave.

PAUL looks them in the eye as they leave. A FLAMBOYANT GUY stops and faces him.

FLAMBOYANT GUY

How very dare you!

PAUL doesn't even react - he's seen it all before.

There are just FIVE MEN left in the changing room.

PAUL

We'll do this.

EVERYONE shakes hands and leaves, but it's rather sullen - nobody really knows what'll happen next.

A moment, then TWO GUYS come out of the shower area, zipping up their trousers. They're surprised to see everyone gone.

37 INT. STOKES HOUSE - LIVING ROOM - NIGHT

PAUL, ROBERT, CLARE and SHEILA sit around the table. FRANK is making a pot of tea.

PAUL

If we want to enter a league then we're gonna need a sponsor.

FRANK doesn't turn round as he speaks.

FRANK

Who in their right mind's going to sponsor a team with only five men?

SHEILA

Confidence, as ever.

ROBERT

He'll get more.

CLARE

(to Frank)

Sounds like you're embarrassed.

SHEILA

Doesn't it just.

FRANK can't answer. He brings the tea over.

FRANK

(to Robert)

You've got an important few weeks ahead. Don't forget that hat trick.

CLARE

(to Robert)

Maybe you could help?

ROBERT

Don't think plant pots look too good on football shirts.

FRANK laughs nervously at the thought. He picks up his cup.

SHEILA

What about a nude calendar?

FRANK stops in his tracks, the cup frozen in mid-air.

SHEILA

It worked for them cancer women.

PAUL isn't impressed by this idea at all. ROBERT, on the other hand, is.

38 INT. PUB - DAY

The ROVERS SUPPORTERS are having a pre-match drink. FRANK is dealing out his round.

FRANK  
His skills are all inherited.

SUPPORTER  
Better not give him the headers  
then!

The SUPPORTERS laugh. FRANK smiles, nervously, and takes a large gulp of his beer.

GAV  
What about Paul's skills? They  
inherited too?

Tension. Suddenly, TED comes charging in, excited.

TED  
Hold the headline for the *best* news  
ever.

GAV  
Jordan's left that Aussie runt and  
asked you to move in?

SUPPORTER  
On the understanding she never wears  
more than a see-through bra and  
knickers?

TED  
Winnersh.  
(beat)  
Bankrupt.

The SUPPORTERS are flabbergasted.

TED  
Wanderers are well and truly out!

The SUPPORTERS raises their glasses in cheer.

39 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

PAUL and CLARE are on the sideline, waiting. CLARE flicks through the programme.

CLARE  
Probably drowning his sorrows.

PAUL looks at his watch, concerned.

40 INT. NEWBURY ROVERS' CHANGING AREA - DAY

The PLAYERS jog out towards the pitch. SIMON and some OTHERS turn around and laugh at ROBERT.

41 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

FRANK, tipsy, has arrived. He takes the programme from CLARE.

FRANK  
I'd hardly be late to see my number  
one son play the game ... oh, no, my  
son play the number one game. Is  
that right?

PAUL reacts - 'you're drunk.'

CLARE  
Smells like you've been celebrating  
- else commiserating.

FRANK  
Winnersh. Bankrupt. They're out of  
the league!

PAUL  
If they can't keep a sponsor, what  
chance do we have?

The PLAYERS come out - the CROWD cheers.

FRANK  
These lads are on their way up.

As ROBERT jogs by, he winks at CLARE. FRANK and PAUL give him the thumbs up.

SIMON jogs by and also winks at CLARE. She scowls and turns to PAUL. PAUL looks away, noticing that ROBERT saw the look.

FRANK  
Make me proud!



42 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY - SERIES OF SHOTS:

- A) The REFEREE blows the whistle and the match begins.
- B) ROBERT dribbles the ball. SIMON shouts for the ball, but he passes it to another PLAYER. SIMON is annoyed.
- C) SIMON tries to shoot from quite a distance, even though ROBERT is closer. He misses. ROBERT glares at him.
- D) Rovers' manager, ANDY, jumps and shouts in annoyance.
- E) The OPPONENTS score a goal. Rovers can't believe it.
- F) ROBERT has control of the ball. He glides up the pitch.
- G) PAUL, CLARE and FRANK shout for ROBERT.
- H) ROBERT is getting close to the net, fending off players. SIMON gets close to him and takes the ball. ROBERT chases him, resulting in them both tripping up.
- I) FRANK gives a look of confusion.
- J) ANDY is now getting really angry as the score is flashed up: HOME 1 - AWAY 2. The half-time whistle is blown.

43 INT. NEWBURY ROVERS' CHANGING AREA - DAY

ANDY has lined up SIMON and ROBERT - he's angry.

ANDY

What the fuck is wrong with you?

ROBERT shrugs his shoulders.

Silence as ANDY, ROBERT and SIMON all look at each other with daggers.

44 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

FRANK, PAUL and CLARE are concerned.

FRANK

'Dynamic Duo.' That's what they're supposed to be.

CLARE

Simon's a twat! It's about time ...  
[people realised.]

FRANK

It's all these funny ideas ... he's  
lost focus.

PAUL is offended - 'are you blaming me?'

45

INT. NEWBURY ROVERS' CHANGING AREA - DAY

As the PLAYERS eat oranges, SIMON tries to get them onside.

SIMON

If we lose, you know who to blame.

(beat)

Think how hard you've worked.

(beat)

The conference, gone. All for him?

(beat, louder now)

What d'you expect though? A family  
of losers.

ROBERT turns, deadly. SIMON looks over at him.

SIMON

Dad. Brother.

ROBERT goes over to him - they're head-to-head.

SIMON

They either *fuck* up a team ... or try  
to *fuck* the team.

Most of the PLAYERS laugh. ROBERT is very close to launching  
a punch, but he turns away.

SIMON

Their mother's best rid.

ROBERT turns and punches SIMON. As they fight, the other  
PLAYERS show a mixture of encouragement and discouragement.

ANDY comes in and sees the carnage. With great difficulty, he  
splits ROBERT and SIMON up.

ANDY

(to Robert)

I want you away from that team of  
faggots!

ROBERT

Fuck off!

SIMON

Ditch the cocksuckers, dude!

ROBERT goes to punch SIMON, but ANDY intervenes.

ROBERT  
That's my fucking brother!

ANDY  
You've already got one football  
disaster in the family.

ROBERT can't believe what he's hearing. He stares at them both intensely. A moment, then he storms out of the door.

46 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

FRANK's pacing about - 'something's not right.'

ANDY and the PLAYERS file out - but no ROBERT. FRANK frantically looks around, trying to see him.

A REPORTER and PHOTOGRAPHER from the local paper hover in the background, intrigued by the situation.

FRANK  
He's got forty five minutes to  
redeem himself.

Suddenly, ROBERT comes out, only now he's wearing tracksuit bottoms and is carrying his football boots.

PAUL and FRANK look at each other, totally shocked.

FRANK  
He can't do that ... people ... they're  
counting on you ...

FRANK tries to go over to ANDY, but ROBERT stops him.

ROBERT  
It's my decision.

FRANK  
The promotion ...

PAUL  
Your decision?

The REPORTER and PHOTOGRAPHER are now closing-in.

ROBERT  
I've left. Quit.  
(beat)  
It's not 1979 any more.

FRANK is aghast. He almost falls over.

REPORTER

Is it true you've been approached by  
a Premiership club?

FRANK tries to push them away, covering up the camera.

FRANK

(to Robert)

I'm taking you back inside.

PAUL

Let's all calm down and ... [talk.]

It all gets too much. ROBERT raises his hands.

ROBERT

Will you all shut up?!

Stunned silence.

ROBERT

I've left. I can't stand the  
fucking team. I'm not playing.

FRANK is crushed. He looks over to the SUPPORTERS, who are  
looking on, angry.

REPORTER

What about the Conference?

ROBERT

It's not the end of the world ...  
playing the game with passion's what  
it's all about ...

REPORTER

Will there be another team?

ROBERT puts his arm around PAUL.

ROBERT

You've got passion. More than I'll  
ever have.

PAUL is confused.

ROBERT

I stole that passion from you ...

The REPORTER frowns.

CLARE

He outed him when he wa' sixteen.

The REPORTER scribbles, frantically. FRANK doesn't know where to look.

PAUL  
It wasn't really ... [your fault.]

REPORTER  
And so, now ...?

ROBERT  
I'm going to play real football.

For a moment they are all confused. Then it suddenly dawns on FRANK - 'oh no ...'

ROBERT  
(to Paul)  
I ain't no gay, but I've seen enough to know how it's done.  
(beat)  
Bro, will you have me on your team?

FRANK's world comes crashing down.

CLARE  
An honorary gay!

PAUL looks at FRANK, then at ROBERT. He can't believe it. He struggles to speak.

ROBERT  
Without me you're ...  
(beat)  
Buggered?!

PAUL laughs. ROBERT strips off his Rovers shirt and jumps onto PAUL's back. Click, a photograph is taken.

DISSOLVE TO:

47 INT. STOKES HOUSE - KITCHEN - DAY

PAUL and ROBERT have papers, schedules etc. spread over the kitchen table. They're planning.

FRANK walks in with a used mug. He puts it in the sink, thinks momentarily about saying something, but just leaves.

PAUL watches him leave. ROBERT eagerly lays down Polaroid pictures that they've taken of the players.

48 INT. STOKES HOUSE - HALLWAY - DAY

The PLAYERS are sitting on a line of chairs as CLARE hands out drinks. ONE PLAYER comes out of the living room, zipping up his jeans. He motions for ANOTHER PLAYER to go in.

49 INT. STOKES HOUSE - LIVING ROOM - DAY

PAUL is measuring up the next PLAYER. He comically tries not to look at or feel him in a sexual manner - difficult, when he's stripped down to pants and t-shirt.

50 EXT. STOKES HOUSE - DRIVEWAY - DAY

FRANK is washing the car. He watches as the PLAYERS come out of the house and walk down the drive.

ONE OF THE PLAYERS points to a spot on the car - 'missed a bit.' FRANK smiles, weakly.

As the PLAYERS head off in a car, FRANK just stares. He accidentally kicks over his bucket of water, and is then embarrassed as he sees CLARE standing at the door.

51 INT. STOKES HOUSE - PAUL'S BEDROOM - DAY

PAUL is inputting the players' measurements onto a spreadsheet. ROBERT watches over with a cheeky grin.

ROBERT

Sure this isn't a scam to get the best-bodied boyfriend?

PAUL quickly stands up and pushes ROBERT over onto the bed. He throws various items at him.

52 INT. STOKES HOUSE - UPSTAIRS HALLWAY - DAY

FRANK walks past the bedroom, hearing the noise and seeing the 'fight' through the gap in the door. He daren't stop.

53 EXT. SCHOOL FIELD - DAY

The PLAYERS gather round for a training session. PAUL looks at his watch, nervously.

ROBERT

Since when has aunt Sheila let us down?

Just then, TYLER and TOBY approach, squabbling.

TOBY

Get one for that much on e-bay and  
I'll give you every twelve inch  
vinyl I own.

PAUL drops his clipboard in shock.

TYLER

Prepare to box them up, bitch!

They reach the rest of the team and smile. TOBY seems a little embarrassed - PAUL doesn't give him eye contact.

TYLER

(to Paul)

Told you I should get back into the  
game.

ROBERT

(jokingly)

Talent spotting was last week.

TYLER

Much going?

PAUL

No. Yes. Well ... look, this is a  
football team.

(beat)

Partly.

TOBY

I told you I liked football.

ROBERT makes the connection and smirks. PAUL is embarrassed and tries to usher them away.

PAUL

Trials were last week. This is the  
team - wheat from the chaff.

TYLER

(elaborate hand  
gestures)

Kerching!

PAUL

But how did ... [you know?]

SHEILA's voice can be heard from a distance. She's brought TWO OTHER MEN with her: BRIAN (from before) and JOHN.

SHEILA

(remote)

I use Cillit Bang. Even on the dog bowl.

PAUL's eyes widen. He looks at the new PLAYERS, looks at SHEILA smiling proudly, then at the PLAYERS again.

SHEILA

Bryanston Woods Hospice, wards one to six.

(beat)

Let the ball games begin!

PAUL is still dumbfounded. He looks at ROBERT, who just smiles back, devilishly.

54 EXT. SCHOOL FIELD - DAY

The PLAYERS dribble balls around cones. They're actually not bad. PAUL is visibly surprised, but feigns grumpiness when ROBERT looks over.

LATER:

BRIAN and JOHN are playing flamboyantly, yet skilfully. PAUL blows the whistle and does a 'cut throat' sign. BRIAN and JOHN roll their eyes.

LATER:

BRIAN, JOHN, TOBY and TYLER huddle around a cute dog that has run onto the pitch. They pat it, kiss it etc. The OWNER is afraid to go near.

PAUL is unimpressed. He is about to blow the whistle again when the ball hits him in the groin, hard.

LATER:

PAUL, limping slightly, leads the PLAYERS back to get changed. TOBY and TYLER are linking arms. BRIAN carries a tired JOHN. PAUL slowly closes his eyes.

In the distance, a MAN in a black coat, hat and sunglasses (PETER GREENOFF) watches them.



55 EXT. HIGH STREET - SPORTS SHOP - DAY

PAUL comes out of a sports shop with carrier bags. There's a huge sign in the window: 'Bankrupt Stock.' PAUL hesitates for a moment, looking suspiciously at the sign, but then shrugs his shoulders and carries on walking.

56 INT. MARKETING OFFICES - DAY

PAUL is talking on the phone, with a list of companies in front of him. Suddenly he realises that he's been cut off. He crosses the last one off the list and sighs.

57 INT. STOKES HOUSE - LIVING ROOM - NIGHT

PAUL and ROBERT are pairing together football kits. It's clear that they don't all match: different colours, uneven patterns, some shirts clearly too small etc.

FRANK watches the TV - football on the local news, with the Newbury Rovers logo in the background. He watches, uneasy.

58 INT. PLANT POT FACTORY - MORNING

FRANK and ROBERT walk into work. Some of the EMPLOYEES whisper and throw looks at Robert, but he ignores them. FRANK smiles, desperately trying to keep the peace.

59 INT. MARKETING OFFICES - MORNING

PAUL and SIMON stand by the water fountain at the same time. SIMON goes first, taking the last of the water. PAUL walks off as SIMON drinks, smugly.

60 INT. PLANT POT FACTORY - DAY

The newspaper picture of Paul and Robert has been posted up on the wall - with some very crude additions.

ROBERT looks at it, then looks around warily at the EMPLOYEES.

61 EXT. SCHOOL FIELD - EARLY EVENING

The PLAYERS are in their new kits - they're very ill-fitting. They practise taking penalties.

TOBY scores and gives ROBERT a high-five. PAUL looks away, slightly jealous.

62 INT. PLANT POT FACTORY - EARLY EVENING

FRANK, alone, is about to lock up. He takes the crude picture from the wall and looks at it for a moment. His face is sad.

He folds up the picture, puts it into his pocket, and turns out the lights.

DISSOLVE TO:

63 INT. STOKES HOUSE - HALLWAY - DAY

PAUL holds a pair of football boots - they're clearly his old ones. He examines them, contemplating what it means to wear them. As he thinks, he brings the boots close to his face and breathes-in the smell of the leather.

The noise of the others' voices breaks his spell. He puts the boots in his bag.

ROBERT pushes in front of the mirror to groom himself. SHEILA and CLARE struggle through with bags and a picnic basket.

CLARE

I know it's only the map reading group, but at least it's a match.

PAUL

We've not even got a name yet! Or a sponsor. This might be our only match.

ROBERT

Chill out.

SHEILA

Bryanston boys doing well?

PAUL nods, reluctant - 'so so.'

CLARE puts a large bag of oranges into the picnic basket.

CLARE

(re: Frank)

Is he still offside?

64 INT. STOKES HOUSE - FRANK'S BEDROOM - DAY

FRANK slowly puts on his Rovers scarf. He can hear the others talking downstairs.

He goes to the window and looks out. He sees a FATHER and SON playing with a ball.

A moment, then FRANK goes to the mirror. He looks at himself and takes the scarf off.

65 INT. STOKES HOUSE - HALLWAY - DAY

SHEILA takes the basket to the car. CLARE puts her arms around ROBERT and PAUL, encouraging.

PAUL  
We're going to be a laughing stock.

CLARE  
It's what you always wanted.

ROBERT  
Better, in fact.

FRANK appears on the stairs.

CLARE  
It's cold, you'll need your scarf.

FRANK  
Maybe I should ... [stay.] I think  
I've got a cold coming on.

CLARE  
Don't be such a wimp!

FRANK looks slightly disappointed. SHEILA re-enters.

SHEILA  
Come on, show 'em what we're made  
of.

FRANK  
(almost glad)  
You don't expect many to turn up, do  
you?

66 EXT. MEYRICK PARK - FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

PAUL steps out of the car. His face drops ... hundreds of SPECTATORS are already gathered.

ROBERTS steps out and sees them. He nudges PAUL, pleased. CLARE gets out and laps it all up.

67 INT. MEYRICK PARK - CLUB HUT - DAY

PAUL is fully-kitted, now in his football boots. He addresses the PLAYERS, who are applying creams, filing nails etc.

PAUL  
 Don't let it faze us. Keep calm.  
 Professional.

SHEILA and CLARE run in with a bottle of Scotch and plastic cups. PAUL turns to face them.

PAUL  
 I don't really think that's ... [a  
 good idea.]

He turns back to see that the PLAYERS have already lined-up for the Scotch. He goes to say something, but just gives up.

68 EXT. MEYRICK PARK - FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

FRANK stands alone, fiddling with Sheila's camera. He sees SIMON and some ROVERS SUPPORTERS arrive. He drops the camera.

69 INT. MEYRICK PARK - CLUB HUT - DAY

The PLAYERS jog on the spot as they congregate around the door, ready to head out.

PAUL  
 And just ... do yourselves proud.

The PLAYERS cheer, and head out to the pitch.

ROBERT looks and winks at PAUL. PAUL takes a deep breath.

70 EXT. MEYRICK PARK - FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

The PLAYERS run onto the pitch to a mixture of cheers and jeers. They begin to kick the ball around as the MAP READING TEAM jogs onto the pitch.

SIMON, GAV, TED and other ROVERS SUPPORTERS jeer.

GAV  
 What about ... Berkshire Benders?

They laugh. JOHN hears them and blows a sarcastic kiss.

FRANK tries to look away from the ROVERS SUPPORTERS.

SIMON  
 Southern Shirt Lifters? What about  
 that, eh Frank?

FRANK gives a look, pretending that he didn't hear. SHEILA and CLARE join him with the leftover Scotch.

SHEILA  
(pouring Scotch)  
Just like the old times, eh?

FRANK quickly snatches a Scotch and downs it in one.

The REFEREE blows the whistle and the teams line-up, ready to start the game.

CLARE and SHEILA link arms, excited. They toast with their Scotch. FRANK looks up - 'please, dear God ...'

- 71 EXT. MEYRICK PARK - FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY - SERIES OF SHOTS:
- A) The whistle is blown and the MAP READERS score a goal straight away.
  - B) SIMON, GAV and TED toast beer cans.
  - C) FRANK looks to the ROVERS SUPPORTERS from the corner of his eye. CLARE and SHEILA top up the Scotch.
  - D) PAUL has control of the ball, but quickly loses it to TWO MAP READERS.
  - E) ROBERT is close to the net, but as he shoots the ball, it goes to one side and misses.
  - F) FRANK reacts - 'this is a nightmare.' He looks over to a laughing SIMON. They catch each other's eye - FRANK quickly looks away.
  - G) The MAP READERS score another goal. As they run around with joy, PAUL shouts instructions to some of his players.
  - H) SHEILA pours yet more Scotch. She loses her balance and falls into a less-than-impressed FRANK.
  - I) PAUL passes the ball to ROBERT, who takes it and steams up the pitch. He gets closer to the net.
  - J) SIMON, GAV and TED make abusive gestures.
  - K) FRANK is on edge. He watches ROBERT eagerly, but keeps looking to the ROVERS SUPPORTERS for fear of being seen.
  - L) ROBERT shoots the ball ... but it misses by an inch. He crashes to the grass. PAUL and other PLAYERS come up to console him.
  - M) SHEILA and CLARE are deflated. FRANK is too - we can see it in his eyes.

72 INT. MEYRICK PARK - CLUB HUT - DAY

PAUL and the PLAYERS are refuelling their energy. One or two are re-applying make-up, creams, lip gloss etc.

PAUL  
We've got the talent and we can show  
it. Just ... keep the tone down.

The PLAYERS pack away their bits.

PAUL  
Let's get out there and show 'em we  
can handle a ball.

TYLER  
Both types!

The PLAYERS stand and unite, but PAUL just rolls his eyes at the comment. ROBERT remains seated.

ROBERT  
(re: balls)  
What about me?

73 EXT. MEYRICK PARK - FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY - SERIES OF SHOTS:

- A) A MAP READER loses the ball to TOBY. He looks surprised as TOBY and TYLER steam up the pitch with it, skilfully.
- B) SHEILA and CLARE, now quite drunk, are ecstatic as a goal is finally scored.
- C) SIMON, GAV and TED throw beer cans to the ground.
- D) PAUL claps his hands and looks towards FRANK. There is an unsaid 'well done' as FRANK just raises his head.
- E) The game continues. BRIAN is fouled. The REFEREE holds up a yellow card to a MAP READER.
- F) CLARE and SHEILA shout 'boos' and make gestures. They try to encourage FRANK, but he feels silly.
- G) ROBERT takes the penalty. It's very tense. PAUL looks at ROBERT, then at FRANK. FRANK looks away, uneasy. A moment, then ... goal! The PLAYERS erupt.

74 EXT. MEYRICK PARK - FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

PAUL is running up the sideline. SIMON sees an opportunity to goad him.

SIMON

Enjoy the game, gay boy. It'll be your last.

PAUL flickers his eyes towards SIMON as he is passed the ball. He is about to pass the ball to someone else, but pauses for a second.

He looks at FRANK, who just stares - he wants to encourage, but can't.

TYLER

(OOV, distant)

Over here, I'm covered.

PAUL looks at FRANK again, then at SIMON. SIMON is laughing. This is it - PAUL decides to keep the ball.

He single-handedly guides the ball up the pitch, avoiding the tackle of TWO MAP READERS. He scores a magnificent goal.

As the SUPPORTERS erupt, PAUL just stands there in amazement. He can't quite take it in. ROBERT jumps on his back, waving his arms about. As he does, his shorts split.

The final whistle is blown and the rest of the PLAYERS flock to PAUL and ROBERT. They are ecstatic, displaying it in a variety of camp and non-camp ways.

SIMON, GAV, and TED shake their heads in disbelief.

SHEILA and CLARE do a little dance, polishing off the last of the Scotch. FRANK has a distant look on his face as he takes a photo with the camera.

In the stand, the same MAN in dark clothes (GREENOFF) takes off his sunglasses and looks on at the action.

75 INT. STOKES HOUSE - HALLWAY - DAY

The family comes into the house, a buzz of excitement. SHEILA is very drunk, propped up by FRANK.

SHEILA

You'll be the next Wayne Sleep!

ROBERT

Rooney.

PAUL just looks like he's walking on air.

SHEILA

What you reckon, Frank? Your son?

FRANK  
Tea everyone? Beer?

FRANK heads to the kitchen as the others go into the lounge.

CLARE  
(OOV, re: Sheila)  
This woman is class!

SHEILA  
(OOV)  
Thankyou, my darling.

Paul's mobile rings. He stays in the hallway.

PAUL  
(on phone)  
Paul Stokes.  
(beat)  
Sorry, no, I don't think I ...  
(his eyes widen as  
he listens)  
But you're ... really?  
(beat)  
Definitely. Thank you. Thank you!

PAUL ends the call. He is both shocked and excited.

SHEILA  
(OOV)  
Paul, we're checking teletext!

PAUL comes back to reality and heads into the living room.

76 INT. MARKETING OFFICES - MORNING

CLARE and MELANIE blu-tack a picture of Paul and Robert over Simon's in 'Star of the Month.' They high-five.

PAUL is on his phone, talking quite secretly.

PAUL  
(on phone)  
No. In fact, I don't think money's  
going to be a problem at all.

He sits further back in his chair - he's planning something.

77 INT. BROWNIE HUT - CHANGING ROOMS - EARLY EVENING

PAUL is addressing the PLAYERS before a training session. They're in a new venue - it's not great, but it's nice.



TYLER

So, if this lovely ... ish ... place is  
surprise number two, what's three?

PAUL smiles - 'ahh ...' He pulls a football shirt out of a big bag. It's brand new, and sports a flashy 'Green Giants' name and logo. He smiles, expectant. The PLAYERS are blank - they're confused.

PAUL

He's called Greenoff. Peter  
Greenoff.

The PLAYERS look at each other, not sure who that is.

PAUL

You must've heard of him. He's a  
local millionaire.

TYLER

And we're ... giants?

PAUL

This is fantastic, right?

PAUL empties the big bag - it's full of shirts, shorts and socks. Seeing all of this, the PLAYERS suddenly begin to realise what it all means. They cheer and hug each other.

Paul's about to tell them to tone it down when his mobile rings. He goes to one side to answer it.

TYLER

It's true, things come best in  
threes.

TOBY

I heard you were more into fours ...

TYLER smacks him lightly. TOBY reacts - 'I quite liked that.'

PAUL hangs up the call, smiling. He returns to the PLAYERS.

PAUL

Seems it's fours these days ...

TYLER and TOBY laugh, nudging each other.

ROBERT

This Greenoff guy's bought us a club  
house with jacuzzi?

PAUL

No, a team.

BRIAN  
You're replacing us already?

PAUL  
Winnersh Wanderers.

ROBERT  
But they've gone bust.

PAUL  
And now we're them.

The PLAYERS don't understand.

PAUL  
When a club goes bust, a third party  
can bid for its identity.  
(beat, matter-of-  
fact)  
We're in the league. We're in the  
Nationwide South League!

It takes a second, but soon the PLAYERS jump up and down.

ROBERT grabs PAUL, spins him around, then plants a kiss on his forehead.

78 INT. PUB - EVENING

Some ROVERS SUPPORTERS are having a drink. They are talking quite aggressively, but quieten down when FRANK approaches with a drink and some nuts.

Some smile - some take a gulp of beer. It's obvious they've been talking about him, but FRANK decides to ignore it.

Silence, then ...

FRANK  
Looking forward to the match on  
Saturday.  
(beat)  
We still meeting here?

FRANK smiles, and offers out his nuts.

79 EXT. BROWNIE HUT - EVENING

PAUL, ROBERT and the PLAYERS are heading back to the hut. There's still an real air of excitement.

PAUL

You see - that's what a bit of belief can do.

TOBY

It seems so surreal. The kit, the sponsor ... a decent training session!

TYLER

It's like a deep sexual fantasy ... but real.

PAUL

Tyler, remember what I said ... [about that.]

TYLER

(joking)

Lighten up. We all know you've got a dark, kinky side.

The PLAYERS laugh. PAUL and TOBY exchange quick, knowing looks.

ROBERT looks up and sees something on the hut. He stops, and holds out his arm to stop the others.

PAUL looks, and sees it too. Graffiti is daubed all over: FAGGOTS, BENDERS and FOOTBALL SHIRT LIFTERS.

80 INT. STOKES HOUSE - LOUNGE - EVENING

PAUL is sitting down. ROBERT is pacing about.

PAUL

Did I think we could pull it off?

ROBERT punches the wall, then sits down.

PAUL

That's one or two people - what does the whole town think?

The front door is heard opening (OOV).

ROBERT

If I get my fucking hands on them ...

FRANK

(OOV, tipsy)

Can't be in the league ...

FRANK enters the lounge, startled to see PAUL and ROBERT.

FRANK  
Thought you'd be celebrating?

ROBERT  
They've scrawled graffiti all over  
the hut.

FRANK  
The Brownies?

ROBERT  
(sharp)  
Benders, faggots ...

PAUL  
(dazed)  
Football shirt lifters.

FRANK lets slip a slight laugh, but quickly realises his mistake. ROBERT gives him a sharp eye.

PAUL  
Quite the wordsmiths, really.

Short silence.

PAUL  
We're laughing stocks.

FRANK  
They're having a bit of fun.

ROBERT can't believe it. He points to PAUL.

ROBERT  
Look at him, dad. Is he laughing?

FRANK can't look at PAUL. He goes to leave.

FRANK  
I need a piss.

And he's gone. ROBERT looks at PAUL, who stands, pensive.

ROBERT  
And they're making us clean it up!

PAUL  
It'll wash off.

ROBERT  
Yeah, until the next time.

PAUL

Then ... then we wash again.

ROBERT is not so sure. He's about to say something more when PAUL grabs his hand and holds it tight.

PAUL

(serious)

We're going to do this.

81 EXT. MEYRICK PARK - FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

The Green Giants are playing against another team from the Nationwide Southern League. PAUL and ROBERT are buzzing.

82 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

SIMON steams up the pitch and scores a magnificent goal. FRANK and the other SUPPORTERS cheer.

83 INT. MARKETING OFFICES - DAY

SIMON laps-up the attention as the MANAGER puts a new picture of him in 'Star of the Month.'

Nearby, PAUL tries to remain unaffected as he pulls yet another report from the printer.

84 INT. STOKES HOUSE - HALLWAY - EVENING

FRANK heads to the living room but stops as he sees SHEILA and CLARE making banners for the Green Giants.

He hesitates, then heads back in the direction he came from.

85 EXT. MEYRICK PARK - FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

The Green Giants concede a goal. The GOALKEEPER is mad, throwing down his gloves dramatically. PAUL glares at him.

86 INT. PLANT POT FACTORY - DAY

FRANK stands next to the work bench with some fellow EMPLOYEES. They're having a laugh, but all goes quiet when ROBERT comes in. FRANK looks down and continues his work.

87 INT. STOKES HOUSE - KITCHEN - MORNING

PAUL and ROBERT are talking over breakfast. PAUL is animated, excited.

FRANK enters with a cup, wearing his Rovers scarf. He goes to the sink and rinses the cup, saying nothing, then walks out.

PAUL and ROBERT look at each other - they're miffed, but have accepted it.

88 EXT. CAMBERLEY - FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

The REFEREE blows the final whistle. We see the score:  
Camberley United 2 - Green Giants 0

PAUL claps his hands to keep up the team's spirits. ROBERT pats him on the back, consoling.

89 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

Newbury Rovers are on great form, skilfully manoeuvring past the other team and scoring a goal. The CROWD erupts.

GAV and TED jump up and down, bringing FRANK into the throng as they do.

90 EXT. MEYRICK PARK - FOOTBALL PITCH - EVENING

PAUL is shouting at the PLAYERS, who are clearly flagging.

PAUL  
Don't hang around! Jesus!

TYLER and TOBY look at ROBERT - 'is Paul ok?'

PAUL  
How many times? Can't you just be  
less ... ?

TYLER  
Less me?

PAUL doesn't answer, but that's exactly what he means.

ROBERT goes over to calm PAUL, but he gently pushes him away.

91 EXT. FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

PAUL misses the chance of scoring a goal. As the other team's SUPPORTERS cheer, PAUL contemplates.

A TITLE CARD shows Green Giants a few places from bottom of the league.

92 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

The final whistle is blown for Newbury Rovers, who have won 3-1 over Dorchester Town.

A TITLE CARD shows Newbury Rovers teetering on the cusp of automatic promotion.

93 INT. STOKES HOUSE - PAUL'S BEDROOM - MORNING

PAUL is looking at himself in the mirror, styling his hair.

PAUL

We're gonna win. We've got to win.  
We're gonna win.

He looks at himself. A beat, then he messes up his hair. He smiles - 'more manly.'

94 INT. STOKES HOUSE - HALLWAY - MORNING

PAUL walks down the stairs. ROBERT and CLARE are waiting by the door, kissing. CLARE sees PAUL and ends the kiss.

ROBERT

(re: Frank)

Is he coming?

PAUL shakes his head.

CLARE

Anybody'd think you'd killed someone.

They leave the house. As they do, PAUL looks back up the stairs. He takes a deep breath, then heads out and pulls the door closed.

95 EXT. MINIBUS - DAY

BRIAN proudly peels off a large vinyl sticker covering the minibus. EVERYONE cheers until they notice the spelling: 'Green Gaints.'

JOHN goes to hug BRIAN, but BRIAN can't see what's wrong.

A bottle of champagne is popped.

96 INT. MINIBUS - DAY

The sound of the engine trying to be turned over. PAUL stands at the front of the minibus, addressing the TEAM as they finish their champagne.

The driver, DONNA, continues to try and start the engine.

PAUL  
I'm confident we can bag this one.  
Are you with me?

The TEAM cheers.

PAUL  
Nothing's stopping us now!

DONNA turns around to PAUL. She grunts and so he turns. She pulls a face - 'slight problem.'

97 EXT. MINIBUS - DAY

DONNA is looking under the minibus bonnet. PAUL is anxious and annoyed.

PAUL  
Leads can't just go walkabouts.

DONNA raises her eyebrows - 'exactly.'

PAUL goes over to the bonnet and tries to do something.

DONNA  
Got to have been here this morning.

PAUL frantically tries to do something. He seems to be pulling every switch and lifting every available surface. DONNA is visibly concerned by his behaviour.

ROBERT jumps off the minibus, with CLARE and SHEILA in tow.

ROBERT  
Bro, what's going on?

PAUL slams down the bonnet. His hands are black with grease.

PAUL  
Sabotage!

ROBERT, CLARE and SHEILA look at each other, alarmed.



98

EXT. ALDERSHOT TOWN FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

SIMON, GAV and TED are in the away stand, eating pies. They look at their watches.

SIMON

Diddums to the hairy Marys. Looks like they've bottled it.

GAV

Maybe it all got too much in the Little Chef toilets.

They laugh and pull faces of disgust.

On the pitch, the ALDERSHOT TOWN PLAYERS stop their warm-ups and start to head back to the clubhouse.

SIMON, GAV and TED gather their things and begin to walk away.

SIMON

Slight technical hitch?

He looks at GAV, smirking. They laugh crassly, and high-five.

Suddenly, a dark shadow encroaches - the sound of a helicopter. The CROWD looks up, intrigued. SIMON shields his eyes to try and work it out.

A green helicopter swoops down onto the pitch and lands. As the door opens, PAUL, ROBERT and the TEAM run out.

A mixture of cheers and 'boos.' PAUL and ROBERT hold hands high, proud. They begin their formation on the pitch.

SHEILA and CLARE step off the helicopter. SHEILA looks a little queasy.

CLARE

Thank God for this Greenoff bloke.

SHEILA

Thank God for TravelEase tablets!

They link arms and CLARE leads them away, once again lapping-up the atmosphere.

99

INT. MARKETING OFFICES - DAY

PAUL pulls open a double-page spread from the local newspaper: 'Green Giants Slaughter Aldershot.' In it, a picture of a beaming Paul and Robert.

CLARE and MELANIE dash over and put their arms around PAUL.  
He grins from ear to ear.

100 EXT. PLANT POT FACTORY - DAY

FRANK walks out of work, looking rather forlorn. He walks out of the main gate and looks at the sign: 'Pocock and Son Plant Pots: The Roots of Newbury Tradition. Est. 1930.'

FRANK thinks about this for a second, then walks on.

101 INT. STOKES HOUSE - KITCHEN - DAY

SHEILA is framing the picture of Paul and Robert from the newspaper. She cloths the front of the frame and holds it up. She smiles - 'perfect.'

The back door opens. As SHEILA lowers the picture, FRANK's face appears. He seems surprised to see her.

FRANK  
It's not Sunday.

SHEILA  
I'm not on a timer.  
(beat)  
I went shopping.

FRANK  
I need some paracetamol.

SHEILA  
You can help me hang this.  
(beat)  
Top cupboard.

FRANK downs two tablets, then comes to see what Sheila's bought. He seems to get a bigger headache when he sees it.

SHEILA  
She was always proud of those boys.

FRANK  
Was.

SHEILA offers the hammer to FRANK, but he doesn't take it.

SHEILA  
D'you ever think about what she  
might want?

FRANK

Don't patronise me.

SHEILA looks at FRANK, deep. He's uncomfortable with this.

SHEILA

I know I come and help out, probably interfere too much, and that's ... but what she would've done ... how we make sure the boys still feel her ... that's got to come from you.

FRANK takes another tablet. He thinks for a second but it's all too much. He heads out of the door.

SHEILA

They're doing so well.

FRANK (OOV)

They can help you hang it, then.

SHEILA goes to say something but thinks better of it. She looks at the framed picture and sighs.

102 INT. MARKETING OFFICES - TOILETS - DAY

PAUL's standing at a urinal. SIMON enters.

SIMON

Before you get any ideas, I'm not looking to cottage this afternoon.

PAUL

Just as well - we've only got an hour.

PAUL zips-up his flies.

SIMON

Good game, by the way.

PAUL doesn't respond. He starts to wash his hands.

SIMON

Don't you get lonely, fighting a corner with no-one to support you?

PAUL ignores him, drying his hands. SIMON zips-up his flies.

SIMON

Must be a nice thought though? Win a match then celebrate with a love-fuelled fuckathon.

PAUL

Which gutter d'you come from?

SIMON smiles. He goes to leave, not having washed his hands.

SIMON

You're committed, I'll give you that. Never thought you'd try and pull this off properly.

PAUL

I'm not a loser.

SIMON

(sarcastic)

Just a failure. Ironic really. You're trying to make it up to your dad and show that you can win - but he's no better.

(beat)

A family of failures?

SIMON holds his hand out to shake.

SIMON

To fathers and sons?

PAUL

Fuck you.

SIMON shrugs his shoulders and heads off, whistling.

PAUL is left alone in the toilets. He quickly turns to the mirror and contemplates Simon's words. His face says it all - 'what if he's right?'

103 INT. STOKES HOUSE - KITCHEN - EVENING

PAUL and ROBERT are finishing dinner. Frank's empty plate is left on the table.

ROBERT flicks through the newspaper as he eats. PAUL is thinking, deeply.

A moment, then FRANK comes in wearing his coat and a Rovers scarf. He picks up his plate and puts it by the sink. Without saying anything, he leaves. PAUL watches, closely.

104 INT. STOKES HOUSE - ROBERT'S BEDROOM - EVENING

A dated version of Paul's room - not quite so up-to-date with décor etc.

ROBERT is setting-up his games console. PAUL is picking up some of Robert's clothes from the floor and hanging them, buttoning them up etc.

ROBERT  
(re: computer)  
You know I'm gonna thrash you?

PAUL  
I can't cope with many more games.

ROBERT  
This is escapism.

PAUL continues to sort the clothes as ROBERT loads the game.

PAUL  
D'you think dad's ok?

ROBERT  
Probably just drinking.

PAUL  
I mean generally. The game, the team ... us.

ROBERT  
He's being a total asshole, but he cares. He's just ... worried what people think.

PAUL  
I'm his embarrassment.

ROBERT  
He doesn't know how to cope.  
(beat)  
No mum here to show him ...

PAUL  
(light)  
He should listen to aunt Sheila.

ROBERT  
I think he's scared to.

PAUL goes over and sits by ROBERT. He's intrigued.

ROBERT  
Not scared, scared, but ... it's like, if he always does what she says or takes her advice, then it's giving in. Admitting that ... mum's gone and this is how it's gonna be.

PAUL is taken aback by this thought.

PAUL  
I didn't ... d'you think ...?

ROBERT passes him a control pad. He nods.

For a moment, PAUL is overwhelmed by the situation.

The computer game starts up and they begin to play.

PAUL  
Wonder what she'd have thought of  
all this?

ROBERT  
She'd have loved it!

ROBERT gets excited as he's beating PAUL at the game.

PAUL  
I hope I've done the right thing.

ROBERT  
What he loves most is football, and  
if it happens to be a load of poofs  
playing, then so be it.

PAUL  
A load of poofs and you.

ROBERT smiles.

ROBERT  
We're twenty one next week. A  
turning point in our lives.

PAUL  
Yeah, and look at the mess.

ROBERT  
Give it time.

PAUL  
What if he abandons us?

ROBERT looks at PAUL, comforting.

ROBERT  
She's here, always. Don't doubt  
that.

PAUL contemplates.

ROBERT

And she'll be there next week.  
Seeing her boys grow into men.

Again, PAUL is overwhelmed.

PAUL

I miss her, Robert.

ROBERT takes hold of PAUL's hand and squeezes it tight.

ROBERT

I know.

PAUL

She never got to see the real me.

They look at each other. There isn't an answer.

105 INT. PLANT POT FACTORY - DAY

FRANK is checking a stack of plant pots. On the benches are ROBERT, GAV, TED and other EMPLOYEES. The radio is on.

RADIO PRESENTER

(on radio)

Thousands of supporters are expected to flock to the Newbury Rovers stadium this Saturday as they play their crucial last match to decide their big-league future.

The EMPLOYEES cheer.

RADIO PRESENTER

With Winnersh Wanderers out of the league due to bankruptcy, newly-formed team Green Giants will form the opposition for Rovers, themselves also looking for a win to avoid immediate relegation out of the league.

GAV

You hear that, Frank? The town's up against your own flesh and blood.

FRANK ignores the comment.

GAV

Your lifelong passion, or those failure sons of yours?

ROBERT

Fuck off.

GAV is angered by this and turns to ROBERT.

GAV

What did you say?

ROBERT

I said, fuck off.

FRANK lowers his head - 'please, no.' GAV looks at TED, then the WORKERS, then suddenly leaps up and heads for ROBERT.

GAV

Faggot lover!

ROBERT

Fuck you, sadistic bastard!

FRANK

Get back to work!

It's no use. ROBERT and GAV are fighting, the other EMPLOYEES cheering them on. FRANK drops his clipboard and tries to break them up.

Punches fly, blood is splattered, and plant pots are broken.

ROBERT

You're making a fool of yourself.  
Newbury Rovers? Wankers!

FRANK

Robert!

ROBERT

A bunch of no hoppers!

GAV

You've let the whole fucking town  
down!

FRANK

Robert, just stop it.

ROBERT manages to pull away from GAV. FRANK holds GAV back, but with great difficulty.

ROBERT

(to Frank)

Whose side are you on?

FRANK can't answer.



TED

Yeah Frank, whose side are you on?

FRANK

I don't need a side.

ROBERT looks at FRANK, fierce. GAV looks at FRANK, expectant.

FRANK bends down to pick up his clipboard. He's very uncomfortable - he just wants to walk away.

GAV

(to Robert)

Think you got your answer.

ROBERT

(to Frank)

Don't walk away from us!

But FRANK does. He feels gutted, but can't bring himself to say anything in support.

ROBERT is genuinely hurt. He stares at the EMPLOYEES, then at FRANK.

FRANK goes back to checking the plant pots, not looking at anyone.

ROBERT

(like a child)

Dad?

FRANK is visibly crushed, but carries on with his checks. He almost shakes as he works.

ROBERT runs out of the factory, a mess.

106 INT. STOKES HOUSE - KITCHEN - EVENING

PAUL is bathing ROBERT's wounds. ROBERT is clearly upset. PAUL listens, also clearly upset.

107 INT. PUB - EVENING

FRANK is with the ROVERS SUPPORTERS, which includes SIMON, GAV and TED. They're drinking and having a laugh. FRANK joins in, but has something on his mind - he's uncomfortable.

108 INT. STOKES HOUSE - LOUNGE - EVENING

PAUL, ROBERT and CLARE watch TV. There's an air of tension.

The back door opens as FRANK returns home. PAUL and ROBERT look at each other, expecting him to enter, but all they hear is him walking up the stairs.

CLARE

A sure sign of guilt.

PAUL and ROBERT exchange looks of dismay.

DISSOLVE TO:

109 INT. STOKES HOUSE - HALLWAY - EVENING

PAUL opens the door to AUNT SHEILA, who is dressed-up very glamorously. PAUL almost doesn't recognise her.

SHEILA

No need to look so surprised!

SHEILA gives PAUL a big hug and a kisses him on the forehead.

SHEILA

Happy Birthday, darling. Where's Robert?

Before PAUL can answer ...

ROBERT

(OOV)

Is that the cleaner again?

ROBERT enters, grinning. SHEILA hugs and kisses him too, but sees his wounds. Before she can say anything, ROBERT takes her hand and guides her into the lounge.

110 INT. STOKES HOUSE - LOUNGE - EVENING

SHEILA drinks a G&T, shaking her head from hearing the news.

SHEILA

It's your twenty-first birthday, one of the biggest days of your life. You should be enjoying it.

PAUL

It's hard when we know dad won't stick up for us.

ROBERT

He won't even acknowledge us.

SHEILA puts her glass down - she's serious.

SHEILA

That man loves the bones of you both. He might not say it much, but he does.

PAUL

Even if we've let him down?

SHEILA

You've done him proud!

PAUL and ROBERT are not so sure.

SHEILA

You've shown him that you're capable of living your own life and making your own decisions ... that you don't care what people think, you do what you know's best ... and you've ... you've managed to pull together from the dreadful, dreadful situation of losing your mother ...

She's getting emotional. PAUL and ROBERT go to comfort her.

SHEILA

It's alright, let me finish ...

(beat)

You've done her proud. You've done me proud. My sister ... she'd be the happiest, most fulfilled mother you could ever meet.

(beat, teary)

You're not boys now. You're men.

SHEILA begins to cry, but with a happiness to it. She pulls PAUL and ROBERT close.

FRANK enters, zipping up his cardigan. He sees the scene.

FRANK

(baffled, innocent)

Someone died?

111 INT. RESTAURANT - NIGHT

A celebration meal. PAUL, ROBERT, FRANK, SHEILA and CLARE sit, awaiting their main course. SHEILA and CLARE are a little tipsy already.

SHEILA

It's true. Paul in lemon, Robert in baby blue.

(beat)

Proper little twins. Even though people did think Paul was a girl ...

They laugh. ROBERT pulls a face at PAUL - 'haha.'

CLARE

So Frank, it's all your fault?!

She laughs. FRANK smiles but is uneasy. PAUL notices this.

SHEILA downs more wine.

SHEILA

What you got the boys ... err, men ... then?

FRANK

I haven't ... I couldn't find anything, not yet.

PAUL

He gave us a cheque.

FRANK

Just to put them on.

ROBERT

It was a nice cheque!

SHEILA

A necklace, I got. Silver, very expensive. In fact...

SHEILA starts looking down at her chest.

CLARE

There's nowt like a special present.

FRANK is slightly embarrassed.

SHEILA

(re: her necklace)

Oh no, this is from that shopping channel. Much cheaper, but looks the biz ... Clare?

CLARE

Gorgeous.

CLARE has a closer look, impressed by what she sees.

PAUL and ROBERT begin to talk separately.

ROBERT  
All ready for Saturday then, bro?

PAUL takes a rather hesitant gulp of his drink.

FRANK catches their eye, but just looks away.

ROBERT  
We'll show those Rovers bastards who  
kicks arse best.

ROBERT clinks PAUL's glass - he's positive, but PAUL's not so sure.

SHEILA  
Remember that bracelet of Diane's,  
Frank?

FRANK just nods.

SHEILA  
She wanted a necklace but they  
thought she'd prefer something more  
... we fought like cat and dog for  
weeks!

PAUL  
She wore that at their wedding,  
didn't she?

FRANK  
Chose the dress to match.

SHEILA  
She looked like a princess.

FRANK  
(uncomfortable)  
I wish the food would hurry up.

CLARE  
I've seen pictures. Hair wa'  
perfect.

FRANK shuffles about, uneasy. He pours some water.

SHEILA  
I did that.

CLARE  
You never did?

SHEILA  
Way before the days of GHDS.

CLARE  
Ooh, I couldn't live without mine.

SHEILA  
Could've trained with Nicky Clarke,  
me, given half the chance.

FRANK gulps his water.

ROBERT  
Maybe we should all have our hair  
and stuff done before Saturday?

FRANK's eyes widen.

CLARE  
Great idea!

PAUL  
It's not a fashion parade!

ROBERT  
Never know who'll be there.

FRANK starts to play with his cutlery.

CLARE  
Newspapers. Magazines.  
(beat)  
A future boyfriend, Paul.

ROBERT gets excited by this - PAUL's embarrassed.

A TEENAGE BOY comes to the table with some paper and a pen.

TEENAGE BOY  
Are you the football players?

CLARE  
They sure are!

TEENAGE BOY  
Can I have your autographs?

PAUL and ROBERT are taken aback, almost embarrassed. FRANK is uncomfortable.

CLARE  
Aww!

SHEILA

Such a sweet boy! Hello, love.

FRANK

(to teenage boy)

Robert left Rovers. Are you confusing him with Simon?

ROBERT pulls a face. PAUL looks hurt.

TEENAGE BOY

Green Giants! Mum and dad say you're both really brave, and deserve to win on Saturday.

PAUL

(truly grateful)

Thankyou, so much.

TEENAGE BOY

You're heroes in our house.

FRANK can't quite grasp this.

The autographs are completed and the TEENAGE BOY begins to walk away.

TEENAGE BOY

By the way ...

(beat, he grins)

My uncle fancies you both!

The TEENAGE BOY dashes off. ROBERT can't help but laugh, but PAUL is uneasy.

CLARE

Get in!

FRANK is now really uneasy. He looks behind to see where the TEENAGE BOY has gone - what's their family like, etc.?

SHEILA

He said it ... there's some right talent in that team.

FRANK feels like he needs to say something, but continues to fiddle with the cutlery instead.

SHEILA

(to Paul)

What's the name of that one with the shaved head? Really nice bum?

PAUL goes to answer then looks at FRANK, who's now becoming more agitated.

CLARE  
Kyle, I think. Robert?

ROBERT  
Nah, Kyle's got the long fringe.

FRANK suddenly throws his cutlery onto the table.

An awkward beat as everyone looks at him. Then ...

FRANK  
I'll go and ask where it is.

Once again, PAUL feels disappointment. FRANK heads off.

A beat.

ROBERT  
You're thinking of Sam.

SHEILA and CLARE exchange gestures - 'yes, he's very nice.'

PAUL comes back to the conversation, rather hazy.

PAUL  
Sam? Yeah ... Nice arse.  
(takes a drink)  
Very nice arse.

He smiles but it's fake. He rearranges Frank's cutlery.

DISSOLVE TO:

112 EXT. NEWSAGENT - MORNING

The newspaper placard is placed outside the front door. The headline: 'Weekend Match - Which Way Do You Swing?'

113 INT. MARKETING OFFICES - MORNING

The office is divided pretty much into two. HALF OF THE EMPLOYEES crowd around SIMON and the OTHER HALF around PAUL.

SIMON and PAUL catch each other's eye - they stare each other out.



114 INT. PLANT POT FACTORY - MORNING

ALL OF THE EMPLOYEES are crowded around a work bench, drinking beer and passing around Newbury Rovers paraphernalia. FRANK is getting some new bits: pin badge, hat etc.

ROBERT eats sandwiches on his own, across the room. FRANK looks over, but then quickly looks back.

115 EXT. ROUGH PUB - DAY

A sign is placed in the window: 'Rovers 'vs' Giants, live here!' This is followed by another sign: 'Vote BNP.'

116 EXT. YELLOW BRICK ROAD CLUB - DAY

An elaborate banner is hung above the door: 'Watch BOTTOM give TOP a good licking - live!'

117 EXT. MARKETING OFFICES - DAY

EMPLOYEES leave the building. CLARE and MELANIE link arms with PAUL, walking him to his car. SIMON walks out and to his car, the MANAGER squirming around him.

118 EXT. PLANT POT FACTORY - DAY

EMPLOYEES leave for the weekend. FRANK is with the ROVERS SUPPORTERS - there's a real air of excitement. He momentarily looks back to try and see ROBERT, but he's not there.

119 EXT. CLUB HUT - CAR PARK - EVENING

The final training session has ended, and PAUL waves goodbye to some of the PLAYERS. He puts cones, balls etc. in his car boot. He stops and looks ahead, pensive.

A moment, then ROBERT comes over and massages his shoulders. PAUL snaps back to reality.

DISSOLVE TO:

120 INT. STOKES HOUSE - FRANK'S BEDROOM - MORNING

It's the morning of the big match. FRANK is finishing getting dressed, putting on his new Rovers paraphernalia. There's a knock at the door.

PAUL enters. FRANK smiles weakly in the mirror.

PAUL  
The big day ...

FRANK just nods. A moment of uneasiness.

PAUL  
Seems strange - two teams, one town.

FRANK  
Takes me back.

PAUL  
Of course.

FRANK  
Got a few more lines since '79, but  
it's pretty much how it was ...

PAUL sits on FRANK's bed.

FRANK  
Me in the mirror, your mother ...

Beat. FRANK starts to put his shoes on.

FRANK  
Quite tight. Hardly worn them,  
mind, so ...

PAUL  
We want you to come with us.

FRANK  
The number of shoes your mum had.  
Never worn. I used to tell her ...

PAUL  
(childlike)  
Dad?

FRANK sits up. He stares for a moment then turns to PAUL.

FRANK  
I'm sorry, son.

PAUL really wasn't expecting this response. He doesn't know where to look.

FRANK  
It's Newbury. Thirty years can ...  
[really hurt.]

PAUL  
We're your sons.

FRANK looks away.

PAUL  
You're our dad.

FRANK looks at PAUL. He is clearly pained about his decision, but he can't do it.

PAUL stands. He puts his hand into his pocket and takes out the medal he took at the start. FRANK's eyes light up.

PAUL  
You left this out.

FRANK  
You didn't put it back in the box?

PAUL  
I'm not quite sure why. I knew it was special. I knew what it was.

FRANK  
Second place isn't that special. We were robbed.

FRANK tries to take the medal, but PAUL pulls it away.

PAUL  
I thought maybe I could learn something from it. Gain some kind of inspiration ... your inspiration. But I don't think I've learnt anything.

FRANK is confused. PAUL looks at him, quite matter-of-factly.

PAUL  
When I saw this, I thought about what it means to come first. To win, and not be a failure. Cos that's what I am, aren't I?

FRANK tries to say something, but he can't.

PAUL  
The day I came out ... the day Robert ... Robert told you what I was ... something changed.

FRANK  
It takes time.

FRANK stands and walks to the window.

PAUL

I was a better player than Robert.  
You said it yourself.

FRANK can't react.

PAUL

Then giving it up ... the thing I  
loved more than anything in the  
world, because some pathetic kids  
would bully me ... BULLY me until I  
had no choice but to leave ...

FRANK looks at PAUL - this is all news to him.

PAUL

I'm not giving up.

PAUL throws the medal onto the bed. FRANK looks at it.

PAUL

If there's one thing I've learnt  
from you, it's that winning isn't  
about winning. It's about trying,  
and having no regrets.

FRANK is visibly shocked by it all. PAUL is blank. He heads  
to the door.

FRANK

Son, I ... [didn't mean to ...]

PAUL

(without looking  
back)  
It's too late.

PAUL slams the door shut. FRANK is shaken.

121 INT. STOKES HOUSE - LANDING - MORNING

PAUL stops in his tracks. He feels dizzy so holds onto the  
wall. Thoughts flash across him before he cries, silently but  
painfully.

122 INT. STOKES HOUSE - FRANK'S BEDROOM - MORNING

FRANK stares at himself in the mirror. He takes the Rovers  
pin badge from the side and looks at it.

123 EXT. ROAD - MORNING

The Newbury Rovers coach is travelling down the road, covered in streamers, banners etc. EVERYONE sings (OOV) 'Three Lions on the Shirt.'

124 INT. NEWBURY ROVERS COACH - MORNING

A real buzz of excitement, fuelled by drinking.

FRANK sits in the throng of it all, but he doesn't seem himself. He looks out of the window, pensive.

As the words 'Football's coming home' are sung, GAV and TED hang over their seat and jostle FRANK with excitement. FRANK smiles, trying to agree with their enthusiasm about football certainly coming home - but something's changed.

125 INT. GREEN GIANTS MINIBUS - MORNING

A similar situation, but much more camp. The PLAYERS sing 'Reach for the Stars,' instigated by SHEILA, who stands in the aisle waving her arms about.

ROBERT and CLARE sing, at the same time laughing at the seriousness by which TOBY and TYLER are performing the song.

ROBERT glances over to PAUL, who's not singing. Instead, he looks out of the window, deep in thought.

126 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL GROUND - DAY

The ROVERS PLAYERS and SUPPORTERS pile out of the coaches, almost hyperactive. FRANK steps down slowly.

127 INT. NEWBURY ROVERS' CHANGING ROOM - DAY

The PLAYERS pile in, excited and sure of victory. SIMON, eating a chocolate bar, rubs his hands, excited.

128 INT. GREEN GIANTS' CHANGING ROOM - DAY

The GREEN GIANTS PLAYERS go into their changing room, excited.

JOHN places down bunches of fresh flowers.

BRIAN opens out a 'Good Look' banner, proud.

TYLER and TOBY quickly run for the best bench. They get there at the same time and play fight to get it. It begins to look quite coupley - lots of touching etc. PAUL looks on, ever so slightly jealous.

ROBERT puts a hand on PAUL's shoulder, almost making him jump.

ROBERT  
No going back now.

129 INT. NEWBURY ROVERS' GROUNDS - DAY

A bar and food area has been set-up to cater for the huge crowds. FRANK is standing with a pint, in amongst all the ROVERS SUPPORTERS. He listens, but seems uneasy.

GAV  
Take you back, Frank?

FRANK smiles uneasily, gulping his beer.

TED  
Bobby White. Dynamic Duo.

GAV  
Could've been Simon and Robert ...

The SUPPORTERS agree. Again, FRANK is very uncomfortable. Further away, SHEILA and CLARE stand with fancy cocktails.

SHEILA  
(re: cocktail)  
Didn't think a place like this would have umbrellas, let alone glace cherries.

CLARE  
Bet there's loads of hidden secrets among that lot.

SHEILA nods in agreement as they look on to the mainly macho SUPPORTERS. They spot FRANK, who spots them too.

SHEILA  
Oh aye, here he is.

FRANK senses that he should head over. He does.

CLARE  
He looks lost.

He arrives, tail between his legs.

SHEILA  
Just look at you!

FRANK is slightly shocked. He looks at himself, then at his scarf, pin badge etc.

SHEILA  
They're your sons!

FRANK  
It's not that simple.

SHEILA  
Oh it is, Frank. It's very simple.

FRANK  
What d'you know?

SHEILA  
Cos I'm here, seeing it. Living as if they were my own.

CLARE  
She's like a surrogate mum.

This comment hits FRANK. He tries to defend himself but ...

SHEILA  
You look me in the eye and tell me this is not about you. You and your failures.

FRANK  
I'm not a failure.

SHEILA  
Wake up, Frank.

FRANK's had enough of this. He walks away.

SHEILA  
(shouting to him)  
Don't hold onto the past 'cos it's going to strangle you!

FRANK keeps walking but the words hit him like rocks. He pushes his way past CROWDS OF PEOPLE to get back to his comfort zone with the ROVERS SUPPORTERS.

On his way back, he overhears the TWO OLD MEN from the start.

OLD MAN 1

(remote)

Could've been the Premiership if it weren't for you know who.

OLD MAN 2

Don't know he can stand here.

FRANK is hurt. He stays where he is and within seconds is consumed by CROWDS OF PEOPLE.

130 INT. GREEN GIANTS' CHANGING ROOM - DAY

The PLAYERS are now changed and doing rather camp warm-ups.

PAUL is pacing about, searching for the right words.

TYLER

I've dreamed about this since I was twelve.

TOBY

What, locker room full of sweaty footballers?

TYLER smacks TOBY on the bum. TOBY reacts - 'I liked that.'

PAUL

What you playing at?

TYLER / TOBY

It was him!

PAUL can't believe what he's seeing. He shakes his head, angry.

ROBERT

(jokey)

He's only jealous.

PAUL gives him a look. ROBERT gives one back - 'joke!'

PAUL

(to Robert)

It's happening all over again.

ROBERT

Calm down.

PAUL

Me wanting something badly. You joking about. Sexuality getting in the way.



ROBERT  
Whoa, Paul, I ...

PAUL  
That game was my life. And you cut  
it short.

ROBERT is embarrassed. By now the PLAYERS are looking on.

ROBERT  
You ... chose to leave.

PAUL  
You outed me! Think it left me with  
any choice?

ROBERT is concerned. He tries to get close but PAUL just  
pushes him away.

PAUL  
Simon, the others ... the names,  
threats ... and now this. And dad.

ROBERT  
I never realised ... I did this  
because ...

PAUL  
Realise this!  
(he turns to the  
players)  
All of you. We're here to play and  
we're here to win. Whatever you  
wanna ... do ... out of here, keep it  
out of here.

Nobody knows what to say. Stark silence.

PAUL  
Well? Are we going to win?

The PLAYERS look at each other but there's still awkwardness.

PAUL walks out. The PLAYERS are confused. ROBERT gestures  
for them to go out onto the pitch. They do, but the spirit's  
gone.

ROBERT is left standing on his own. He's visibly confused and  
concerned.

131 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

Both TEAMS run out onto the pitch. The CROWD erupts.

NEWBURY ROVERS are hard, determined. GREEN GIANTS aren't themselves.

FRANK is in the Rovers stand with GAV and TED. SHEILA and CLARE are at the front of the 'away' stand with banners, streamers ... and LOTS OF GAY MEN.

MR GREENOFF is once again in the crowd, incognito as ever.

As both teams' PLAYERS run about the pitch, SIMON and ROBERT come close to each other. SIMON smirks but PAUL is fierce. He stares at him, deadly. For the first time, SIMON seems a little uneasy. He continues running.

FRANK sees this confrontation from the stand. He looks across and sees SHEILA and CLARE having fun.

GAV

(to Ted)

They're bound to have orgies.  
That's what faggots do.

FRANK's eyes widen in horror. He looks over to the pitch, to see ROBERT put his arm around PAUL. PAUL pushes him away.

132 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY - SERIES OF SHOTS:

- A) The whistle is blown and the match begins. SIMON takes instant control of the ball.
- B) TOBY tries to tackle a ROVERS PLAYER but he isn't quite good enough - he seems forlorn. The PLAYER smirks.
- C) GAV and TED are shouting with encouragement. FRANK is quiet.
- D) SHEILA and CLARE are waving banners, screaming with encouragement. SHEILA has her megaphone.
- E) ROBERT has the ball but SIMON tackles it off him. ROBERT flashes a look to PAUL, as if to apologise, but PAUL just looks away.
- F) SIMON skilfully scores a goal for Rovers. Their SUPPORTERS cheer. He lifts his shirt over his head, revealing the makings of a bit of a gut. Another ROVERS PLAYER jokily pats SIMON's stomach.
- G) SHEILA shouts 'boo' down her megaphone. CLARE makes abusive gestures aimed at SIMON.
- H) PAUL takes control of the ball and attempts a shot, but misses. He's annoyed, but remains positive.

- I) GAV and TED laugh and jeer. FRANK is visibly almost at boiling point.
- J) TYLER has the ball but rather easily loses it to SIMON. SIMON winks at TYLER, smarmily. TYLER just shrugs his shoulders.
- K) SHEILA and CLARE scream out tactics. A nearby DRAG QUEEN grimaces at all the noise.
- L) JOHN makes a silly mistake and loses the ball. Within seconds, another goal is scored by Rovers, causing misery for Green Giants.

133

EXT. FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

It's approaching half time and it's two-nil. ROBERT has the ball and is about to run up the pitch with it, but sees that PAUL's in a good position. He passes it to him.

PAUL takes the ball and charges towards the net.

In the stand, FRANK's eyes show that he's taking an interest.

SIMON sees the threat of PAUL and so steams towards the net. He seems worried, so quickly runs towards PAUL.

Just as PAUL is about to take a shot, SIMON dirty-tackles him. PAUL falls to the ground and lands on his ankle in agony.

The CROWD jeer and boo, a SUPPORTER DRESSED AS CHER taking off his wig and making abusive gestures.

FRANK doesn't know how to react in the middle of GAV and TED, who are just laughing and congratulating SIMON.

The PHYSIO (MARK) runs on. To everyone's shock, the REFEREE only gives a yellow card. SIMON bows, smarmily.

The GREEN GIANTS SUPPORTERS boo. SHEILA and CLARE are extremely fierce in their gestures.

PAUL is taken off on a stretcher, trying to hold back tears. ROBERT tries to run after him but TYLER and TOBY hold him back - they need to play.

FRANK is distraught, and GAV and TED aren't trying to be discreet in their enjoyment of Paul's agony.

FRANK has reached boiling point. He quickly whips off his Rovers hat and scarf and runs off.

134 INT. GREEN GIANTS' CHANGING ROOM - DAY

Half time. The PLAYERS are pacing about, concerned. SHEILA and CLARE are pouring out small glasses of Scotch.

ROBERT  
I think it's my fault.

CLARE rubs his back in comfort.

SHEILA  
I'm not having this!

Suddenly, PAUL hobbles in, supported by MARK. Everyone rushes up to them.

TYLER  
What's the verdict?

TOBY  
Can he play?

PAUL  
(matter-of-fact)  
I'm out.

Nobody can believe it. SHEILA and CLARE down extra Scotch. JOHN begins to cry.

ROBERT  
Isn't there anything ... [you can do?]

MARK  
It's a definite fracture.

Strangely, PAUL seems ok about it all.

PAUL  
Two-nil down ... but you can still do this.

The PLAYERS look at each other - 'we're not so sure.'

TYLER  
I don't know if we can ...

TOBY  
I'm not playing, after this farce!

PAUL  
If we pull out now we've not just lost the match ... what about our dignity?

ROBERT  
We've got no subs.

PAUL  
You need to go on.

The PLAYERS are still unsure.

SHEILA  
He's right. You've come this far.

PAUL  
We're not failures. Look around.  
(beat)  
Look how much you've learned! Go  
out there and do yourselves proud.

BRIAN  
What about you?

All of a sudden, from the entrance, FRANK's voice.

FRANK  
(OOV)  
We can do it.

EVERYONE turns and is shocked to see FRANK. He looks  
desperate for forgiveness.

FRANK  
I don't deserve you ... I want to  
help. I can play.

PAUL and ROBERT don't know how to react.

FRANK  
(sincere)  
I love you. Both of you.

Silence as nobody knows what to say or do. PAUL looks at  
ROBERT and then back at FRANK. SHEILA looks at PAUL. CLARE  
looks at ROBERT.

PAUL  
We love you too.

FRANK is relieved, almost overwhelmed.

CLARE  
It's about time!

SHEILA runs up and kisses him on the forehead.

SHEILA  
You bloody fool!

PAUL  
We'd better hurry up.

ROBERT  
Shit. Quick. A kit.

TYLER quickly rummages through the kit bag and sizes up Frank.  
TOBY undresses him.

FRANK is oblivious to what's happening - he just smiles at  
PAUL and ROBERT, proud.

PAUL suddenly has a thought. He struggles in pain to bend  
over. He takes off his boots and offers them to FRANK.

PAUL  
Same size.

FRANK  
Must run in the genes.

ROBERT takes the boots, and bends down to put them on FRANK.

SHEILA  
We'll show 'em it's the Queen that  
rules this land!

As TYLER and TOBY continue to dress FRANK, PAUL has a thought.

PAUL  
You're right. That's what they  
expect ... of course!  
(beat)  
Queens, fags, mincing about ...

BRIAN and JOHN start to sing 'I Am What I Am' in synch. They  
suddenly stop and look at PAUL, apologetic.

PAUL  
How could I be so blind?

EVERYONE is confused.

PAUL quickly hobbles towards FRANK. He takes hold of one of  
the shirt's sleeves and rips it off.

EVERYONE looks at him in disbelief. PAUL proceeds to rip off  
the other sleeve. TYLER winces at the thought of destroying  
the kits. PAUL smiles.

PAUL

This is exactly what they expect!

EVERYONE is confused.

PAUL

I've tried to change you all ... and  
stop you from being who you are.

The PLAYERS look at each other - 'well, yes ...'

PAUL

We can't join them, so you know  
what? We may as well just fucking  
beat them!

EVERYONE cheers. BRIAN and JOHN continue their song. Soon,  
OTHERS join in the song as they rip each other's sleeves.

PAUL smiles and looks at MARK, who smiles back. There's a  
connection ... but PAUL's embarrassed.

135 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

The CROWD erupts with laughter as the GREEN GIANTS PLAYERS run  
on, all of their shirts looking like camp sleeveless tops.

FRANK runs on last, much to the CROWD's surprise.

GAV / TED

What the ...?

They both turn to where FRANK was standing - his hat and scarf  
are on the floor.

PAUL sits with MARK on the sideline. SHEILA and CLARE join  
them.

SIMON goes over to FRANK, laughing.

SIMON

Making another fool of yourself?

FRANK stares at him, blankly, then jogs away to join ROBERT.

The GREEN GIANTS PLAYERS are now more elaborate, playing how  
they want to play.

The REFEREE blows his whistle.

136 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY - SERIES OF SHOTS:

A) SIMON and ROBERT tackle, ROBERT taking control of the ball.

- B) PAUL, SHEILA and CLARE shout from the sidelines.
- C) TOBY camply passes the ball to ROBERT who scores a goal. He is ecstatic. FRANK puts his arm around him.
- D) PAUL is jubilant. SHEILA elbows MARK, hinting at him and PAUL getting it together - he doesn't know where to look.
- E) TOBY and TYLER play the ball camply, like a dance, but still manage to tackle some ROVERS PLAYERS.
- F) SIMON takes a shot at a goal but loses the ball to FRANK. FRANK winks. He continues with the ball but sees a ROVERS PLAYER heading towards him. He passes it to TYLER.
- G) GAV and TED are angry. They make aggressive gestures.
- H) TYLER shoots the ball at the net ... he scores! He's so shocked that he dramatically drops to the floor. TOBY goes over and hugs him, followed by the other PLAYERS.
- I) PAUL tries to show his jubilation, but it makes his pain worse. He winces. MARK takes hold of him to support him. They both realise that he is holding PAUL's bum. They exchange looks, but embarrassed, quickly look away.
- J) It's 2-2 and only a few minutes left. FRANK's flagging now - he misses a pass.
- K) ROBERT and SIMON are still at loggerheads. SIMON tries to take the ball but ROBERT succeeds.
- L) The REFEREE looks at his watch.

137 EXT. NEWBURY ROVERS' FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

There are only seconds left. All of the PLAYERS are exhausted. FRANK is really beginning to flag - he stays in his position because he's got no energy to run.

ROBERT has the ball and passes it to TYLER. TYLER runs towards the goal but sees some ROVERS PLAYERS.

FRANK turns away from the action to conceal his fatigue.

ROBERT sees FRANK, thinking he may be able to take the ball. TYLER has no choice but to quickly pass the ball.

ROBERT

Dad!



FRANK turns around. As he does, the ball hits him on the head, hard. It deflects and, miraculously, goes in the net. Goal! FRANK falls to the ground.

All the GREEN GIANTS PLAYERS go over and jump on FRANK, who just lies there in complete shock. The final whistle is blown.

SHEILA and CLARE hug PAUL, and jump up and down. They dash onto the pitch and help to pull FRANK up from the ground.

The ROVERS SUPPORTERS boo and jeer. The ROVERS PLAYERS run to the REFEREE in anger.

MARK helps PAUL onto the pitch. EVERYONE hugs and cries.

SHEILA  
(to Frank)  
You did it!

FRANK  
I did?

The jubilation continues as the REFEREE comes over. SHEILA grabs him too, but he's having none of it. She pulls a face behind his back.

REFEREE  
Paul?

PAUL  
I know, you didn't think we had it in us!

REFEREE  
Paul ... I'm afraid I'm going to have to disallow the goal.

ROBERT  
Don't talk rubbish.

CLARE  
What's he on?!

REFEREE  
In fact, the match.

PAUL laughs nervously. The PLAYERS are confused. FRANK is distraught.

SHEILA  
Don't you dare ... [spoil this.]

REFEREE

Frank was never registered with the team. It's in the rules.

EVERYONE looks at FRANK. He doesn't know what to say.

REFEREE

By default, I've no alternative but to award a win to Rovers.

Shock and silence. Disaster. For FRANK, it's all happening again ...

The REFEREE goes over to inform Newbury Rovers and within seconds the ROVERS SUPPORTERS are in uproar. SIMON takes the lead in a lap of honour.

FRANK

I'm sorry, son. I ...

Suddenly, PAUL starts to laugh. Before long EVERYONE is in hysterics; losing the match doesn't matter.

As the ROVERS PLAYERS run past in a lap of honour, SIMON pulls off and goes over to the GREEN GIANTS PLAYERS.

SIMON

Can't even score a goal and keep it!

PAUL

We don't care.

CLARE

They've got dignity, fatty!

SIMON

You should really stick to Judy, and Kylie ...

The GREEN GIANTS PLAYERS are offended, almost rising to the challenge.

PAUL

Or Owen ... and Fritz ... and Henry ...  
and any other fit fucker we care to  
fantasise about!

PAUL smiles. SIMON grimaces and heads off. FRANK has one last task ...

FRANK

I can't do this.

(beat)

Simon.

EVERYONE exchanges looks - 'is he going back to them?!'

FRANK approaches SIMON. As SIMON turns around, FRANK smiles meekly - then punches him in the face. SIMON falls to the ground.

The OTHERS cheer. FRANK goes back over to PAUL and ROBERT.

FRANK  
I'm really sorry.

PAUL takes FRANK's hand - 'there's no need.'

ROBERT  
(to Paul)  
And I'm sorry. For everything I did when you weren't ready.

PAUL  
I think it's time we stopped saying sorry, don't you?

PAUL, FRANK and ROBERT group together and hug. It's a very tender moment.

SHEILA is crying. She pulls out some tissues and passes them out to CLARE, TYLER and TOBY, who are also crying.

MR GREENOFF walks over, still in black and wearing sunglasses. PAUL spots him and quickly wipes his eyes.

PAUL  
Everybody, I think there's someone we need to thank.

EVERYONE looks at MR GREENOFF as he and PAUL shake hands. FRANK looks at him, suspiciously.

PAUL  
This ... is Peter Greenoff. The one who's made all of this happen.

EVERYONE is very excited to see him. FRANK frowns but then something clicks ...

PAUL  
I think we should all ... [say ...]

FRANK  
That's not Peter Greenoff.

MR GREENOFF takes off his glasses and smiles at FRANK.

MR GREENOFF

I see you used your head properly  
this time, Frank.

EVERYONE is confused, but PAUL knows.

FRANK

Bobby White - the Dynamic Duo.

Gasps of shock. FRANK is stunned. They shake hands.

FRANK

I don't understand ... how did you ...  
what ...?

CLARE

Don't tell us you're gay, an' all?

FRANK laughs, but suddenly stops as the truth hits him.

MR GREENOFF

Sorry I never kept in touch, Frank.  
And that I never told you.

FRANK

How long ... when you were in the  
team?

MR GREENOFF

(nodding)

After the match, the profile that  
came, the move to Arsenal ... I  
couldn't.

FRANK

And now you can?

MR GREENOFF looks at PAUL.

MR GREENOFF

Your son's an inspiration. To us  
all.

ROBERT

Runs in the genes.

MR GREENOFF

(to Frank)

Hope I haven't disappointed you.

FRANK

(flabbergasted)

No, I'm fine. I ... bloody hell!

FRANK puts his arm around MR GREENOFF. He looks around at EVERYONE.

FRANK

I think drinks are on me!

EVERYONE cheers and starts to head off.

TYLER

I always said, me. No straight man has eyebrows like that.

PAUL and ROBERT head off, arms over each other, with MARK supporting. SHEILA and CLARE link arms as they walk away.

SHEILA

(remote, sullen)

I always fancied him, an' all.

DISSOLVE TO:

138 INTERCUT WITH CREDITS:

139 EXT. BARNESLEY FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY (1 YEAR LATER)

ROBERT is playing professional football.

CAPTION: "Robert did get a proper trial ... for Barnsley."

CLARE is in the VIP area, watching. She's pregnant, but still as animated and brash.

CAPTION: "They're expecting their first addition to the Stokes family."

140 EXT. NEWBURY TOWN CENTRE - DAY

SHEILA, with her megaphone, is leading a now very busy and spectacular gay pride march through town.

CAPTION: "Sheila found another mothering role."

TOBY and TYLER, dressed as sailors, walk hand-in-hand.

141 EXT. HUGE BACK GARDEN - DAY

FRANK is putting the finishing touches to a bed of flowers.

CAPTION: "Frank gave up plant pots  
and turned his hand to garden  
design."

He stands back to look at the magnificent garden he has  
created.

CAPTION: "Sheila said he always did  
have a feminine side."

142 EXT. FOOTBALL PITCH - DAY

PAUL is on the sideline, encouraging a GROUP OF YOUNGSTERS who  
are playing football.

CAPTION: "Paul decided to spread his  
inspiration."

MARK brings down a tray of oranges. He winks at PAUL.

143 INT. GARDEN CENTRE - DAY

SIMON, now quite chubby, is being dragged around the garden  
centre by his MUM.

CAPTION: "Following instant  
relegation from the Conference, and  
reports of peer bullying, Simon now  
spends his Saturday afternoons  
elsewhere."

A CHILD pushes open a door which hits SIMON in the face.

FADE OUT.

THE END

**PART TWO:**  
**CRITICAL COMMENTARY**

# **INTRODUCTION**



# 1.

Duality of a screenplay narrative is the central research focus of this critical commentary: how 'want' and 'need,' 'inner' and 'outer,' or 'emotional' and 'physical' can be identified as narrative threads, understood to operate in a mainstream feature film, and then applied to practice. By 'mainstream,' what is meant is a film written with commercial success in mind, which uses a traditional, linear model of storytelling: narrative causality, from beginning to middle to end.<sup>1</sup> This type of 'conservative storytelling' (Dancyger & Rush, 2007: ix) is a staple of contemporary Western screenwriting, and unlike in independent film, where often 'screenplays differ in significant ways from the formulaic rules promulgated by [screenwriting] manuals' (Murphy, 2007: 15), is primarily concerned with narrative pleasure. As argued by Batty and Waldeback, narrative pleasure, 'a key feature of mainstream film' (2008: 129), is recognised as 'a mechanism by which audiences judge the success of a dramatic text, seeking to find plot points and dramatic junctures which adhere not only to their expectations, but their ability to understand the story told' (ibid.: 149). Therefore, unlike screenwriters working in independent film, such as Sofia Coppola, Charlie Feldman and Alan Ball (Dancyger & Rush, 2007: ix), who often 'choose to take a more innovative approach to their scripts rather than mimic the tried-and-true formulas' (Murphy, 2007: 15-16), the mainstream screenwriter works with traditional models of linear narrative in order to create a screenplay that has a higher chance of commercial success. Dancyger and Rush use *The Verdict* (Lumet, 1982) and *She's Gotta Have It* (Lee,

---

<sup>1</sup> Another definition of mainstream, opposed to independent film, refers specifically to production contexts: the reliance upon bigger budgets, and higher production values generated by major studios (Murphy, 2007: 2). Here, Hollywood's monopolistic control of production and consumption (ibid.: 4) tends to favour projects 'less concerned with producing quality [...] than in orchestrating the next megablockbuster' (ibid.: 2). Mixed views of what mainstream actually means does make it tricky to formulate one definition. However, for the purposes of this investigation the definition must relate to the act of writing and creating narrative patterns.

1986) to highlight how storytelling in mainstream and independent film can differ in the giving of narrative pleasure. In the former 'there is a clear progression, a developing connection between the acts,' whereas in the latter 'the structure is coiled' (non-linear) and the resolution contradicts the rest of the film (2007: 16-17). Mainstream and independent film both use structure, but often use it in opposing ways:

In *The Verdict*, the structure contains the meaning of the story [...] Everything in the script works to develop [the protagonist's] movement. In *She's Gotta Have It*, the structure doesn't contain the meaning of the story [...] the expected connection is blatantly violated and we are invited to look elsewhere for the meaning of the film (ibid.: 17).

The acknowledgement of 'meaning' here reinforces the purpose of the protagonist's journey; how mainstream audiences seek emotional resolution within the frame of physical action. This investigation will thus focus directly upon the screenwriter working in mainstream film; the screenwriter choosing to deploy familiar narratives, not 'challenging narratives' (Murphy, 2007: 2), which although do not specifically replicate already-existing ones, do adhere to their generic linear pattern.

The role of the screenwriter is thus at the centre of this investigation; a negotiation between creative and critical, practice and theory, doing and thinking. Although creative and critical artefacts are separated in presentation, they combine to produce a singular understanding of the research question: what is the relationship between the physical and the emotional journey undertaken by a mainstream feature film protagonist, and how can this be mapped-out onto narrative structure? Like a screenplay itself, the overall PhD research suggests a synthesis of two narrative threads: the transformational journey of the screenplay protagonist, and that of the screenwriter himself, my journey. As Nelmes argues, '[t]he ideas explored and the characters created [in a screenplay] have, to some

extent, to be an extension of the writer and the writer can often make the most of this when pursuing a story' (2007: 111). In *Offside*, the 'extension of the writer' is the critically inquiring mind, seeking to explore and express in a creative medium the question of a protagonist undertaking physical and emotional journeys within one contained narrative.

**Chapter One** of this critical commentary will consider what is already written about the two narrative threads of a screenplay. It will chronologically chart some of the key ideas and terminologies available to writers who wish to understand how the screenplay narrative works. Diverse in style, approach and perhaps even credence, a series of theorists' perspectives will be collated in a comparative, developmental way, arguments building upon one another to gain a firmer understanding of how the screenplay works. As will be apparent, there is a lack of clarity, conviction and consistency in writing on the subject, so it is necessary to gain as much information from what *is* said in order for something more concrete and useful for the screenwriter to be formulated.

**Chapter Two** will explore ideas of mythology and mythic storytelling, focussing specifically upon the work of Joseph Campbell and Christopher Vogler. These two authors are discussed together for a variety of practical reasons, though most of all in order to offer a deep, rigorous understanding of the origins and application of mythic storytelling, from fairy tale to film. The chapter will outline the variations of the archetypal model of the Hero's Journey proposed by both writers, mapping of how they correlate with each other.

**Chapter Three** will then thoroughly detail the narrative stages of the Hero's Journey, highlighting how within the model, two narrative threads can be seen to operate. Interlaced into the discussion of the narrative stages will be a re-defined version of the Hero's Journey, based upon the original model but specifically acknowledging a distinction

between physical and emotional journeys. It is crucial that a deep understanding of the mythic structure proposed by Campbell and Vogler is offered, so that enough useful information is available for re-defining the Hero's Journey. In simple terms, the narrative structure of the Hero's Journey must be extrapolated as much as possible so that a generic, baseline structure can be offered onto which the two narrative journeys can be presented; a space where the protagonist's physical and emotional journey can be mapped-out. As such, the re-defined Hero's Journey then offers further knowledge than in the original texts, providing creative benefits for the screenwriter and analytical benefits for the critic.

Chapter Four will draw upon the screenplay *Offside* and consider how research into the duality of a screenplay narrative has supported the practice of writing a screenplay. A deconstruction of *Offside*, using the model of the re-defined Hero's Journey, will explore how the protagonist, Paul, undergoes both a physical and an emotional journey throughout the course of the screenplay. It will be suggested that research into and creation of the re-defined Hero's Journey has provided a critical framework that has enabled a better practice for writing. Conclusions will also be drawn about the interwoven nature of the complete PhD: how creative and critical artefacts have developed in symbiosis, not in separation.

## 2.

The eclectic range of texts used in the critical commentary is deliberate. Not only are there few screenwriting texts specifically relevant to the research, screenwriting itself draws inspiration from a variety of sources.<sup>2</sup> The newest form in the lineage of creative writing, when compared to prose, poetry, stage and radio scriptwriting, screenwriting is still a

---

<sup>2</sup> The academic approaches outlined in the Prologue are useful as an introduction, but are only concerned with theoretical concepts. Texts of greater use to the screenwriter focus specifically on practice: 'writerly' texts.

young academic discipline. Few screenwriting texts exist in the ‘academic canon’ because they are either somewhat recent, or adopt a simple ‘how to’ approach.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, some of the works drawn upon are from mythology and more general dramatic writing, as well as articles from screenwriting publications aimed specifically at industry professionals. However, because ‘the literary critic does not draw upon the vast sites of knowledge that the creative writer draws upon’ (Harper, 2006b: 162), this range of sources is entirely appropriate for a discipline that is both process-based (the act of screenwriting) and product-based (the screenplay itself) (ibid.).

As Harper suggests, creative writing should seek to create its own ‘site of knowledge’ (2006a: 3) which has its concerns in process and practice, not ‘post event’ speculation. This critical commentary, therefore, is enriched by a wide range of sources, appropriate for such a creative-critical investigation. This is not a Film Studies PhD which offers an historical exploration of screenwriting, nor is it an English PhD which deconstructs the work of a specific screenwriter; it is a Creative Writing PhD which seeks to advance knowledge about a structural model of screenwriting, and apply it to practice. ‘[C]reative writing research deals with human agency, human intention, behaviour, reasons and meanings’ (2006b: 162), therefore research which intends to help the screenwriter with his intentions, and to enhance his writing processes, is absolute. Subsequently, the research undertaken will seek to advance a body of ‘creative theory’ (Melrose, 2007: 110) which will help screenwriting, ‘a form which is complex, has a language of its own yet is driven by the demands of the medium of film’ (Nelmes, 2007: 113), in pursuit of its own site of knowledge.

---

<sup>3</sup> Some screenwriting theorists, however, such as Syd Field, Robert McKee and Christopher Vogler, are very well-known, and their books are recognised worldwide and appear on many screenwriting reading lists.

Analysing the screenplay and the process of its writing, Nelmes shares the view that 'creative theory' needs to be developed in an appropriate way. She writes that 'the screenplay is a form worthy of study rather than being viewed as merely the precursor to the completed feature length film' (ibid.: 107). Similarly, Spicer's (2007) work on 'Restoring the Screenwriter to British Film History' argues that the role of the screenwriter should be acknowledged in the filmmaking process, not one that is absolved once a director has been taken on board and the screenplay put into production. Therefore, although the screenplay is the blueprint to the film production process, 'the first cog in a very large wheel' (Nelmes, 2007: 107), it should not be denigrated; critically, it should be celebrated. Screenwriter Rupert Walters' view about the screenplay as 'artefact' goes some way in justifying Nelmes' desire to create further, more distinct knowledge about the screenplay and its formulation:

Everyone talks about the script being a blueprint – and it is, in the sense that it gets turned into something else – but it also has to be a piece of writing which stands up on its own, because the producer who's deciding whether to pay for it and the actor who's deciding whether to be in it want to be transported by the experience of reading it (cited by Owen, 2003: 9).

The screenplay is thus a text in itself: an artefact with its own agenda, be that commercial or artistic, with its own form and function. Nelmes rightly argues that 'screenwriting is an almost invisible process and whilst the script may be the blueprint for the film, it is rarely admired in itself' (2007: 108). Therefore, this critical commentary addresses the 'lack' of attention paid to the screenplay and its creation. As already suggested, the process of writing a screenplay can be closely linked to the critical knowledge required to write a screenplay, connecting screenwriting and screenplay, writer and artefact. The 'rarely admired' screenplay will thus be brought into the limelight in the research that follows,

considering both its creation and its form. The purpose of the research, in relation to the screenplay, is 'to assist the writer in the construction of further new creative work [...] as well as assisting the writer in comparing and contrasting their work with that of other writers, post the act of writing' (Harper, 2006b: 162). This appears 'in process' (ibid.), before, during and after writing the screenplay, and can thus be understood as 'responsive critical understanding': applied knowledge 'that can be outlined either separately to the creative work of a writer, or incorporated into the modes and methods of creative practice' (ibid.: 165). Therefore, both purpose and product of creative writing research are found embodied in what follows, combining to add originality to screenwriting as a developing site of knowledge: 'to find the subject approached as if it is not a site of knowledge in its own right creates a situation in which the chances of achieving a 'justified true belief' are considerably diminished' (Harper, 2006a: 3). "Justified true belief" in this sense can only come from recognition of screenwriting as practice; or, as Joseph Campbell posits, the need to work with a text in whatever form is appropriate to the way in which it is presented:

Wherever the poetry of myth is interpreted as biography, history, or science, it is killed. The living images become only remote facts of a distant time or sky [...] the life goes out of it, temples become museums, and the link between the two perspectives is dissolved (1993: 249).

The life cannot go out of screenwriting, otherwise it is no longer writing. Instead, it becomes preservation and post-event analysis. Screenwriting is active in form and active in process, and even when in a critical space it must breathe, move and develop.

**CHAPTER ONE:**  
**EXPLORING THE DUALITY OF A SCREENPLAY**  
**NARRATIVE**



# 1.

Aristotle's *Poetics* outlines some of the key principles in the creation and performance of dramatic texts. It is regarded a seminal title, appearing as reference to the 'origins' of drama in many screenwriting books (Seger, 1994; McKee, 1999; Vogler, 1999; Moritz, 2001; Field, 2003; Egri, 2004 et al.), and highly thought of in the canon of academic theory. Although *Poetics* is viewed in a highbrow light, close inspection of the text (discounting editors' translation notes that appear in all published versions) reveals that it is a simple 'how to' guide. It is formulated predominantly by rules, practices and suggestions of how drama is 'supposed to work,' and when considering screenwriting in particular, gives little variation in style and approach than the texts that reference him in the first place. In an interview for BBC Radio 4's *Front Row* series (Stock, 2003, March 19), Richard Walters, Professor and Co-Chair of Screenwriting at UCLA, argues that Aristotle is the most influential person in cinema to date.<sup>4</sup> He recalls being told by his own Professor: 'this is it; [*Poetics*] is the real screenwriting book.' Frictions may exist between Aristotle's work as seminal academic writing or 'how to' guide appropriated by mass culture, but either way, it provides both historical and practical value to today's study of screenwriting.

Aristotle writes:

[Drama] is an imitation of an action that is admirable, complete and possesses magnitude; in language made pleasurable, each of its species separated in different parts; performed by actors, not through narration; effecting through pity and fear the purification of such emotions (1996: 10).

---

<sup>4</sup> UCLA is regarded as one of the world's most prestigious institutions for the study of screenwriting.

Drama, then, is defined as having a set of identifiable components which can be judged as successful or unsuccessful. By association, an understanding of these components will allow a writer to deconstruct his work in order to determine whether the elements are working, and reconstruct it by using the components as building blocks to model a more successful piece of work. Having a drama which is 'admirable' infers that the audience must be connected to the unfolding action, involved in the narrative, where resonance and 'magnitude' must be bestowed upon them. The idea of 'complete' alludes to the necessity of dramatic structure: telling the story with the right amount of information so as to follow the characters and their journeys, and where there is a clear feeling of closure at the end. 'Purification' can also be understood as 'catharsis,' the moment where a character ends his journey and gains physical and/or emotional release.<sup>5</sup> This notion of catharsis draws an interesting reading here. For Aristotle, character action (behaviour brought about by choices made) is the primary component of drama. If 'rhythmical language is a tragedy's medium; it is a means to tragedy's end, that end being the imitation of an action' (ibid.: xx), then good drama has its roots firmly planted in the physical action of character: they should act-out their personalities, beliefs and states-of-mind, not simply recall them through dialogue.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, action should manifest into a 'series of events which constitutes a well-formed plot [which] is therefore closed at both ends, and connected in between' (ibid.: xxiii). In other words, plot should be structured effectively to generate a

---

<sup>5</sup> Heath (xxxv-xliii) discusses at length the problem of catharsis (or katharsis) in Aristotle's writing. Seen by many as a medical term, questions still remain of what Aristotle actually meant by using the word. For Heath, it is not something to be construed as alleviating a physical condition, but rather a process of disposing oneself of an excess of emotions in order to attain a state of balance. For example, seeing a character spend most of the drama battling against obstacles would require a moment where he is rewarded for such efforts. This could also be an important moment for an audience, relieved from the tension of witnessing the events.

<sup>6</sup> This notion is still held today. See, for example: Syd Field (2003), 'Passive Active,' Chapter 5; Robert McKee (1999), 'Structure and Character,' Chapter 5; Linda Seger (1994), 'From Motivation to Goal: Finding the Character Spine,' Chapter 9.

developing physical journey, where events move from beginning to middle to end to map out the character's literal journey from start to finish.

What needs to be considered more fully, however, is the extent to which plot (action) is primary, and character (emotion) secondary. Aristotle writes that '[w]ell-being and ill-being reside in action, and the goal of life is an activity, not a quality' (ibid.: 11). This suggests a belief in plot-driven narratives; the words 'action,' 'goal' and 'activity' are used to highlight a sense of plot and physicality over character and emotion. However, it could be argued that there actually is a strong allusion to character and emotion, which has perhaps been underestimated. 'Well-being' and 'ill-being' describe someone's state within a given situation, not the situation itself; therefore, it could be suggested that at the time of writing, Aristotle was aware of the more emotionally-driven narrative thread of character, yet its importance was never developed.<sup>7</sup> If catharsis is required by an audience to end the pity and fear experienced in the drama, then this almost certainly relates to their internal senses; an audience may see the act of purification taking place, but they feel its effects in mind and body.<sup>8</sup> In Aristotle's own words, characters 'achieve well-being or its opposite on the basis of how they fare' (ibid.); therefore, at the very least, a direct link can be made between the external, physical plot of a drama (how they fare) and the internal, emotional development of its character (well- or ill-being).

---

<sup>7</sup> Even Egri notes that Aristotle's writing was most probably incomplete. He is confident that 'our scholars are mistaken today when they accept his rulings concerning character. Character was the great factor in Aristotle's time, and no fine play ever was or ever will be written without it' (2004: 100).

<sup>8</sup> This is reinforced by Torben Grodal, discussing the psychosomatic experience of screen drama: 'The film experience is made up of many activities: our eyes and ears pick up and analyze image and sound, our minds apprehend the story, which resonates on our memory; furthermore, our stomach, heart, and skin are activated in empathy with the story situations and the protagonist's ability to cope' (1997: 1).

Lajos Egri's *The Art of Dramatic Writing* first appeared in 1942 as *How To Write A Play*, and has undergone revisions and reprints even after Egri's death. Unlike most other 'how to' texts concerned with drama, Egri's specifically focuses upon the idea of character function rather than simply offering techniques to bring execute already-developed characters on the page. In fact, one of the first things that Egri says on character is:

It is not enough, in your study of a man, to know if he is rude, polite, religious, atheistic, moral, degenerate. You must know why. We want to know why man is as he is, why his character is constantly changing, and why it must change whether he wishes it or not (2004: 34).

This reinforces the approach taken for the study of character here: understanding how and why they change, and the relationship between what they want and what they need. In other words, Egri's statement promotes the exploration of how the fabric of character is intrinsically linked to the fabric of plot.

Positing that '[a]ll emotion has physical effects' (ibid.: 41), Egri suggests that the external, physical choices made by a character are a result of his internal, emotional drive. Such emotion can be assigned to three inter-connecting elements: physiology, sociology and psychology (ibid.: 67). These characteristics 'force him into a new decision and a new conflict' (ibid.), and are understood as the driving force in making him act and react. In screenwriting terms, the internal fabric of character thus has a significant impact upon the external shaping of plot: whenever a character is presented with a choice, the decision he makes, driven from within, spins out a new thread to the plot in the form of a new conflict. In other words, as the character reacts the plot takes further, exponential shape. Characters in drama always react to change, and for Egri, '[t]he smallest disturbance of his well-ordered life will ruffle his placidity and create a mental upheaval, just as a stone which

slides through the surface of a pond will create far-reaching rings of motion' (ibid.: 47). If the stone is the inner fabric of character, then the rings taking shape are the drama's plot; they form as a reaction to the decision made, action driven by emotion.

Character growth is an integral part of great drama for Egri: 'he *must* grow, if he is a real character' (ibid.: 77). Character growth is a 'reaction to a conflict in which he is involved' (ibid.), again suggesting that a character grows internally as he actively takes part in an external plot. It could then be suggested that plot development also allows a character to grow: because the character's involvement with plot affects how he reacts emotionally, character and plot are part of a symbiotic relationship, each giving to and taking from the other with the intention of shaping action and shaping emotion. This relates to Egri's idea that 'you must know [a character] not only as they are today, but as they will be tomorrow or years from now' (ibid.: 62). This suggests a definite movement or growth of character within a dramatic narrative, so knowing a character internally (physiological, sociological, psychological) and how he is likely to react to external conflict allows the writer to carefully map the growth that character will undergo.

Much of Egri's writing on character is geared towards the chapter 'Plot or Character?' Reading the initial chapters about character environment, character growth and strength of will, it would appear that a chapter asking 'plot or character?' would pull these ideas together and provide a well-argued, perhaps definitive, answer. This is not the case, however; in fact, most of what is deduced about plot or character comes from the earlier chapters, as detailed. Nevertheless, some references are relevant to the question, even if the reader himself has to make his own connections to the question. For example, Egri states that 'the so-called "inwardness," the seemingly unpredictable soul, is nothing

more nor less than character' (ibid.: 93). This asserts that character construction in drama is linked to one's own internal make-up: physiological, sociological and psychological. From these three strands, a character is created and everything that follows (personality, appearance, action, dialogue etc.) is a product of this. Linking this directly to plot, it could be argued that the shape of a drama is intrinsically informed by its, predominantly main, character. Situations and actions are not created to cultivate a character's development; character development itself dictates how situations and actions take shape. For Egri, the internal fabric of character is the primary component of drama, which then manifests into the external. He argues that writers should not fabricate situations for characters to explore because the plot is forced into being by the drive and will of character: 'we do not find it hard to think of situations. *The situations are inherent in the character*' (ibid.: 94).<sup>9</sup> Egri's core belief is that character is the central spine around which a drama revolves; the plot is crucial, but it emanates from the superiority of the individual:

What would the reader think of us if we were to announce that, after long and arduous study, we had come to the conclusion that honey is beneficial to mankind, but that the bee's importance is secondary, and that the bee is therefore subsidiary to its product? (ibid.: 103).

Linda Seger writes about the 'character spine'; the thread of a screenplay that 'impinges on the story, dimensionalizes the story, and moves the story in new directions' (1994: 149). In other words, character influences plot because everything physically taking place (action) relates to a character undertaking his journey. Giving the story dimension and moving it in new directions suggests that plot does not just take place naturally; it is causally linked to

---

<sup>9</sup> Egri's analogy reinforces his views on this: if 'you try to force a character into a situation where he does not belong, you will be like Procrustes who cut the feet off the sleeper to make him fit the bed' (2004: 98).

character, surfacing, shaped and adjusted according to his drive. Writing specifically how this is manifested in a screenplay narrative, Seger proposes that:

The spine of the character is determined by the relationship of motivation and action to the goal. Characters need all of these elements to clearly define who they are, what they want, why they want it, and what actions they're willing to take to get it (ibid.: 150).

We can understand from this that external and internal journeys are linked because what a character wants (the goal) comes from a relationship with his motivation (his need: inner drive as well as outer catalyst) and the action (movement) he takes as a consequence. If motivation pushes the character forward, 'a catalyst at the beginning of the story that forces the character to get involved' (ibid.), then there is a clear link between character emotion and character action; why he feels the need to get involved, followed by how he actually does get involved. Simultaneously, however, emotion and action cannot be viewed as entirely separate entities. Seger writes that when setting-up motivation, 'character is best revealed through action that advances the story. Scenes that only reveal character fail to give the necessary motivational push to the character' (ibid: 154). In other words, although emotion may be the source of motivation, it requires physical action to bring it to life and make it plausible for an audience. Here, we are reminded of the relationship between emotion and action; two narrative threads tied into the same event, working symbiotically.

Seger writes that '[w]ithout a clear goal in mind, the story will wander and become hopelessly confused [...] it will be impossible to find the spine of the story' (ibid.: 156). Particular attention is thus paid to warn against motivation without goal; emotion without action, or need without want. This is important for the screenwriter, because although emotion can be the quality that remains with an audience once the film has ended, it is

nothing without a physical plot to guide it. Plot does not just direct action, it allows feeling to be structured and imparted. In theatre, the writer is allowed to express characters' feelings through monologues and asides, but in a screenplay this must be instilled in action: 'Motivation pushes the character. The goal gives direction to that push' (ibid.: 155). As such, structure is necessary to direct all sense of emotion through action, this being the 'method by which the character achieves the goal' (ibid.: 157). The goal itself should consist of three elements:

Something must be at stake in the story that convinces the audience that a great deal will be lost if the main character does not gain the goal [...] a workable goal brings the protagonist in direct conflict with the goals of the antagonist [...] and] the goal should be sufficiently difficult to achieve so that the character changes while moving toward it (ibid.: 156).

Within this requirement is a strong sense that a character's goal embodies both outer, physical and inner, emotional qualities. On the one hand, the goal is physically important because if it is not achieved, the character stands to lose a great deal. Not only that, the goal brings together protagonist and antagonist, where a series of physical battles is likely to occur. On the other hand, the necessity for emotional development is highlighted by the suggestion that having undertaken a journey to achieve the goal, the character changes: 'The strongest characters will achieve some extra dimension by this journey. In some way they'll be transformed' (ibid.). Although discussion of this transformation is limited, it is evidently an integral component to the narrative. Seger does state that '[w]ithout achieving some kind of character change, the goal would not be possible' (ibid.: 157), suggesting that it is actually due to emotional transformation that the physical goal is able to be achieved. Subsequently, there is a sense of emotional transformation complementing the physical journey, the two being inextricably linked to the narrative as a whole. Whether a character



takes a different course of action because of an inner lesson learned, or whether he decides that in fact the goal is no longer what he wants, the physical end of the narrative (goal) can itself transform just as the character has done so along his journey. Seger notes: 'The stronger the actions and the stronger the barriers to achieve the goal, the stronger the character' (ibid.). This means that the more a character struggles through the action of a screenplay, the bigger the emotional transformation he will experience. As such, where action may have dominated the screenplay (a goal-oriented narrative), emotion may be the component that supersedes at the end and possesses sustained longevity.

Having worked as a story consultant and screenplay analyst for some of America's most successful studios, including Disney and Warner Brothers, Christopher Vogler was involved with a wealth of film development projects. The observations he made in the thousands of screenplays he read for Hollywood eventually lead him to sketching out a short guide detailing how traditional film stories are told: *A Practical Guide to 'The Hero with a Thousand Faces'*.<sup>10</sup> Not only was this guide employed by himself in his own work, it came to be used by a great many other script professionals around Hollywood. It was Vogler's subsequent work developing films such as *Beauty and the Beast* (Trousdale & Wise, 1991), *Aladdin* (Clements & Musker, 1992) and *The Lion King* (Allery & Minkoff, 1994) that enabled him to apply the ideas proposed in the guide, which he then expanded into a full book: *The Writer's Journey: Mythic Structure for Storytellers and Screenwriters*.

Justifying the use of mythological approaches to contemporary storytelling, Vogler asserts:

The pattern of the Hero's Journey is universal, occurring in every culture, in every time. It is as infinitely varied as the human race itself and yet its basic form

---

<sup>10</sup> This refers to the work of Joseph Campbell's, which Vogler had read and become a fan of whilst at the University of Southern California.

remains constant [...] Stories built upon the model of the Hero's Journey have an appeal that can be felt by everyone, because they well up from a universal source in the shared unconscious and reflect universal concerns (1999: 10-11).

This indicates that storytelling is both specific and generic: stories are told in varying ways, with different characters, plots, settings etc., but at heart they are all the same because they share a universal connection between character and audience, art and life, fiction and fact. Vogler even states that in his search for the principles of film story design, he 'found something more; a set of principles for living. [He] came to believe that the Hero's Journey is nothing less than a handbook for life, a complete instruction manual in the art of being human' (ibid.: ix). This acknowledges a screenplay's ability to encompass both an external, physical experience, and an internal, more personal one; if story design can be applied to life, then it is both an outward and an inward experience.

*The Writer's Journey* thus appropriates the work of Joseph Campbell into a specific guide for the contemporary screenwriter, providing a map that is 'flexible, durable and dependable' (ibid.: 13). Outlining the character journey in brief, Vogler writes:

It may be an outward journey to an actual place: a labyrinth, forest or cave, a strange city or country, a new locale that becomes the arena for her conflict with antagonistic, challenging forces.

But there are as many stories that take the hero on an inward journey, one of the mind, the heart, the spirit. In any good story the hero grows and changes, making a journey from one way of being to the next: from despair to hope, weakness to strength, folly to wisdom, love to hate, and back again (ibid.).

Noteworthy here is the use of the word 'but.' In this quotation, Vogler seemingly suggests that a story can be about an outward (physical) journey *or* it can be about an inward (emotional) one. This means that either type of story has the potential to work, and furthermore, that the two types do not have to work together. His subsequent view that

'[i]n any good story the hero grows and changes' becomes somewhat lost because it is not clear whether he is referring solely to a story taking the 'inward' approach, or whether the hero must also grow and change in 'outward' stories. This oversight is further complicated by Vogler's comment that it is 'emotional journeys that hook an audience and make a story worth watching' (ibid.). This suggests that all stories need an emotional thread in order to make them 'worth watching,' but of course it does not relate to what was previously suggested about the two types of story working on their own. Such a lack of consistency is what makes Vogler's work difficult to negotiate in parts. For example, the idea of emotion is again alluded to when he discusses stage twelve of the Hero's Journey, 'Return with Elixir': 'Sometimes the Elixir is treasure won on the quest, but it may be love, freedom, wisdom, or the knowledge that the Special World exists and can be survived' (ibid.: 25). Similarly, when detailing the archetypal function of the hero he writes that they are 'propelled by universal drives that we can all understand: the desire to be loved and understood, to succeed, survive, be free, get revenge, right wrongs, or seek self-expression' (ibid: 36). This suggests the significance of an inward, emotional journey over that of an outward, physical one, and although this reinforces Vogler's belief in the importance of the inward journey, read out of sequence or only in part, the text would appear rather confusing and potentially contradictory.

Vogler complicates the notion of character journeys once more by using two potentially contradictory statements. Firstly, discussing how writers can raise the dramatic question of a drama in order to 'heighten the stakes,' he writes: 'Some questions relate primarily to the action or plot [... o]ther questions are dramatic and have to do with the hero's emotions and personality' (ibid.: 87). Although this may be an understated way of

alluding to the importance of emotion, the wording is somewhat cursory. Again, Vogler separates the two journeys and makes them appear as if they do not necessarily work together. Furthermore, the statement 'other questions are dramatic' is quite nonsensical, the suggestion being that anything relating to action or plot is not deemed dramatic; only emotion and personality can be described in this way. These complications are surely unintentional on Vogler's part, but simply poor precision in writing; nevertheless, they are important flaws to outline because of the impact they may have upon a reader / writer.

It is only later in his book that Vogler clearly asserts what he really thinks about the two narrative threads of a screenplay. In the section 'Inner and Outer Problems,' he posits that '[e]very hero needs both an inner and an outer problem' (ibid.: 87). Although only a short statement, the impact for the reader / writer is crucial. For the first time, Vogler states with clear intent that a screenplay should have both an inner journey and an outer journey, necessary to fulfil the dual narrative problem of the hero. He goes on to say that '[c]haracters without inner challenges seem flat and uninvolved, however heroically they may act. They need an inner problem, a personality flaw or a moral dilemma to work out. They need to learn something in the course of the story' (ibid.: 88). Now confident that inner, emotional development is crucial to the narrative, he outlines how this is understood in the twelve stages of the Hero's Journey. In this, we see a mapping of the 'character arc':

- 1) limited awareness of a problem; 2) increased awareness; 3) reluctance to change;
- 4) overcoming reluctance; 5) committing to change; 6) experimenting with first change; 7) preparing for big change; 8) attempting big change; 9) consequences of the attempt (improvements and setbacks); 10) rededication to change; 11) final attempt at big change; 12) final mastery of the problem (ibid.: 212).

Although this should alert the reader to the importance of emotional development alongside physical action, it does appear late in the text, almost as an afterthought. There is no cross-

reference to the earlier discussion of 'Inner and Outer Problems,' which itself only consists of a hundred and sixty one words of text. Needless to say, if Vogler does believe that the screenplay hero must undergo both inward and outward development, the justification of this on paper is clearly lacking.

Stuart Voytilla's book *Myth and the Movies* can be seen as a 'companion' to Vogler's: not only does it apply his storytelling model to ten film genres, Vogler himself writes the foreword. He tells us that '[e]very story can be interpreted in a multitude of ways, and myths are bottomless' (cited in Voytilla, 1999: xi), which justifies Voytilla's application of the Hero's Journey paradigm to five films in each of the ten genres considered: action adventure, western, horror, thriller, war, drama, romance, romantic comedy, comedy, and sci-fi and fantasy. In Voytilla's own words, 'the paradigm guides us to an understanding of why a story resonates on a universal level by answering our deepest mysteries' (ibid.: 1). This purports that Vogler's model (importantly, inspired by Campbell) facilitates an understanding of our emotional, spiritual and / or psychological connection to cinema. Voytilla's intentions here are important to highlight, because as demonstrated with some of the authors so far, there is often a tendency to suggest a method of exploring emotion and an audience's connection to story, which is then unsuccessfully followed-up. As such, Voytilla emphasises the importance of the character arc (emotional transformation) by referring to Vogler's writing on it. He argues that the twelve stage model 'can easily mislead us into seeing the paradigm as representing a purely physical journey [...] But the Hero's Journey is as important an emotional or psychological journey as it is physical' (ibid.: 7). He goes on to replicate Vogler's map of the character arc, highlighting the

importance that emotional development plays alongside the physical journey, but then in the genre analyses he allows this to be subsumed back into the model as a whole. There is therefore an underplayed and inconsistent focus upon how emotion develops alongside action, which is somewhat misleading from what was promised in the outset.

When discussing action adventure, Voytilla argues that heroes undertake two journeys: the 'Higher Cause' plot journey, and the internal journey of 'Personal Growth' (ibid.: 20). In some cases, 'the Hero's Personal Journey becomes the Higher Cause by the journey's end' (ibid.), suggesting that not only do two narrative journeys exist, they are able to alternate importance. This points towards the fluidity of narrative: focus can change between external and internal goals. *Die Hard* (McTiernan, 1988) is quoted as a useful example because protagonist John McClane 'travels two Journeys' (ibid.: 35): stopping the terrorists, and reconciling with his wife. However, lacking from Voytilla's analysis is a sense of how John McClane actually develops emotionally as well as physically within the twelve stages of the Hero's Journey model. The film's plot is detailed and allows us to understand the narrative as a whole, but there is no sense of how the twelve stages of the character arc correlate to the twelve stages of the general Hero's Journey. This problem occurs across all of Voytilla's analyses; although early in the book he highlights the importance of emotional transformation, even outlining the map of the character arc, he fails to follow it through in his exploration of the ten genres.

Of the genres that are said to have important emotional journeys as part of their fabric, inconsistency in their discussion confuses, if not flaws, the argument. For example, Voytilla asserts that a key ingredient of the western is the hero facing a personal journey (ibid.: 49). Here, 'personal' is used over 'emotional,' which potentially differentiates them

in meaning for the reader. Later, discussing the genre of drama, Voytilla writes: 'All Journeys involve transformation. In other genres, the transformation may be secondary or happen as a result of the overriding motivation or Outer Problem the Journey needs to solve. The Journeys of Drama are often the transformation' (ibid.: 156). Rather than retaining already defined terms such as physical and emotional journeys, or outer and inner journeys (ibid.: 36), Voytilla uses the word 'journeys' to encompass all. Furthermore, the word 'transformation' alludes to the emotional journey, but because a different word is used, clarification is left lacking. It could be implied from the above that transformation cannot be physical, only emotional; whether or not that is true, the use of inconsistent terms confuses rather than enlightens the reader.

As a final example, Voytilla characterises the romantic comedy:

the comic side of love should not be taken lightly; it takes great commitment and courage to pursue love. The greatest obstacles we face will be our own fear of rejection and our insecurities, which is why the Hero may need plenty of coaxing and support (ibid.: 210).

This general narrative description of the genre neither makes sense nor provides the reader with an understanding of its fabric. In terms of unpicking the narrative, there is a clear amalgamation of outer, physical qualities and inner, emotional ones. 'Commitment,' 'courage,' 'fear of rejection,' 'insecurities' and 'support' all embody the emotional features of a narrative, where the hero calls into question his inner self. 'Obstacles' and 'coaxing' can embody emotional qualities, but moreover they represent physical elements which the hero may face. As such, we are once more presented with useful, workable information, but information that fails to fully explore the dual nature of a screenplay narrative in a way purported from the start. Furthermore, symptomatic of the whole book, a lack of precision

and consistency in the terms used never allows us to truly understand what the two narrative threads are and how they can be understood in application. That said, Voytilla's work does offer some useful terms of reference, the 'physical journey' and the 'emotional journey,' which by name do infer some understanding of the two narrative threads.

Robert McKee argues that the screenwriter cannot view character and structure as separate entities because 'structure *is* character. Character *is* structure' (1999: 100). Although he does not make a specific point of defining the two elements, his observations are useful. For him, neither character nor structure is more important than the other (ibid.), and the true nature of character is revealed by the choices he makes: 'As he chooses, he is' (ibid.: 101). A summary of *Hamlet* is used to demonstrate how character and structure together form the character arc (ibid.: 104-105). The point being made here is that the core of a successful screenplay is to create a story which progressively follows a character's journey through action *and* emotion, which by the resolution demonstrates a fundamental change in that character's inner being. McKee states: 'The finest writing not only reveals true character, but arcs or changes that inner nature for better or worse, over the course of the telling' (ibid.: 104). Thus, *Hamlet* highlights how its eponymous protagonist, 'melancholy and confused, wishing he were dead' (ibid.: 105) progresses through the play to eventually reveal his true self, and because this revelation is brought about by action (learning that his father was murdered by Claudius, seeking revenge, having to halt the revengeful killing until the right moment), he is able to end his woeful misery:

By the climax of the story, these choices have profoundly changed the humanity of the character: Hamlet's wars, known and unknown, come to an end. He reaches a peaceful maturity as his lively intelligence ripens into wisdom: "The rest is silence." (ibid.).



Having offered a glimpse of how character and structure operate in story terms, McKee goes on to briefly summarise what the two elements actually mean. Arguably, it would have been more useful if these definitions appeared at the start of the chapter, instilling in the reader a clear sense of what they mean from the outset. This would have made the reader more aware of the intention of the chapter: to discuss the relationship between character and structure; how they work as individual yet interwoven threads of the same narrative. Nevertheless, the definitions when offered highlight the individual identity of each narrative thread, and how they can be applied in practice:

The function of STRUCTURE is to provide progressively building pressures that force characters into more and more difficult dilemmas where they must make more and more difficult risk-taking choices and actions, gradually revealing their true natures, even down to the unconscious self.

The function of CHARACTER is to bring to the story the qualities of characterization necessary to convincingly act out choices. Put simply, a character must be credible: young enough or old enough, strong or weak, worldly or naïve, educated or ignorant, generous or selfish, witty or dull, in the right proportions (ibid.: 105-106).

McKee's definition of 'character' seemingly lacks something when we consider what he had asserted previously. The term fails to identify that character, in his sense, embodies 'inner being,' not merely 'surface' traits of characterisation. Though the traits listed may relate to how a specific character behaves, elements that drive him from within, they in fact form part of a bigger, more abstract notion of the internal fabric of character. Presented as is, readers could mistake the guidance as relating to simple 'characteristics,' which in this vain would also include height, weight, hair colour and physical posture. What McKee goes on to say after these definitions is perhaps more important for the screenwriter:

Structure and character are interlocked. The event structure of a story is created out of the choices that characters make under pressure and the actions they choose to take, while characters are the creatures who are revealed and changed by how they choose to act under pressure. If you change one, you change the other (ibid.: 106).

This provides a concise yet clear notion of how, for McKee, structure and character work with each other and for each other; it acknowledges that a screenplay is structured by the way of two threads, or journeys. Even though McKee does not use such specific terminology in his writing, there is a distinct sense that a screenplay can be identified as comprising two narrative threads: the structural journey (physical, external, action) and the character journey (emotional, internal, growth).

Linda Aronson's *Screenwriting Updated: New (and Conventional) Ways of Writing for the Screen* is an innovative text which, 'stepping back from the dramatic conventions that are promoted in the classroom' (2001: xi), interrogates shifting cinematic narrative structures and explores 'new' ways of storytelling. The book positions the traditional model of storytelling as the spine from which newer narrative techniques have emerged, outlining theories, practical examples and development strategies available to the screenwriter and his work. The result is a book which explores the alternative narrative forms of flashback, parallel / tandem and sequential structure, and the multiple protagonist / antagonist story.

Aronson's work is, on the surface, perhaps the most relevant to this research as it specifically promotes the idea that a screenplay is comprised of two narrative threads. It details how inner and outer components of character and plot work together, creating the complete narrative experience. In discussing this duality of narrative, Aronson uses the

terms 'action line' and 'relationship line.'<sup>11</sup> Acknowledgement is made to other terms used in screenwriting, such as 'main plot' and 'foreground story' for the action line, and 'subplot' and 'background story' for the relationship line, but 'action' and 'relationship' are chosen on the grounds that the words clearly embody the external (plot driven) and internal (character driven) components of a narrative. In choosing these terms, Aronson has removed any notion of weight or status given to either thread. 'Main plot' and 'foreground story' by their very wording take prominence over 'subplot' and 'background story.' Therefore, Aronson's shift in terminology implies that neither narrative thread has importance over the other; they function on equal terms.

Before detailing the fabric of the two narrative threads, Aronson details why a screenplay should have both, and how they work together to create the complete narrative. She argues that 'in many films the main plot or action line only exists to permit the relationship line [...] to happen' (ibid.: 54). Moving away from a sense of both threads sharing equal weight, this indicates that whatever the external action taking place on screen, it is really the character's internal development that possesses the most importance. This points to the need for a strong emotional story which connects with an audience. However, Aronson's use of the word 'only' is questionable. It may be that the true heart of a drama is what develops internally in the protagonist, but should the fact that the action is structured in such a way (the plot) to bring about this internal development allow action to be seen as secondary? Referring back to McKee, for example, actions are a result of the inner structure of character; therefore, although for Aronson actions are a primary device to

---

<sup>11</sup> Although dotted around the text, the main place of explanation is Chapter 6, 'Development Strategies for a Three-Act Film,' pp. 51-104.

guide the all-important emotional journey, it could be argued that actions themselves are an outward manifestation of character (emotion) and are thus as worthy of consideration.

Regarding the actual fabric of the two narrative threads, Aronson cites *The African Queen* (Huston, 1951) as a case study: the action line is in the form of a river trip, which physically works to develop the relationship line of the brewing romance between Rose and Allnut. A detailed explanation of how the two narrative threads work together across the narrative is missing; nevertheless, Aronson's views on the subject do provide some value:

The relationship line will not work properly unless it is pulled along by a strong action line, that is, a scenario that not only forces the relationship line characters together but keeps challenging them individually and incrementally *in different ways* (2001: 56).

This quotation highlights that for a screenplay to work well, action and relationship lines must be interwoven, developing in tandem: 'every incident in the action line must be chosen, not only for its relevance to the story told in the action line, but for its capacity to take the relationship line another step forward' (ibid.). Furthermore, the action and relationship lines progress 'inextricabl[y], each enriching the other' (ibid.: 57), and the increased energy of the two brings them to a mutual climax. Put simply, the protagonist's journey of physical action symbiotically develops the protagonist's journey of emotional transformation, concluding in a resolution that interlocks the two and provides closure:

In the climax of the action line [the protagonist] will encounter the climax of the relationship line, that is, they will encounter the moment of truth for their relationship which is the point to which the whole film has been leading them (ibid.: 59).

For Laurie Hutzler:

The greatest challenge and art of storytelling is to reveal the universal in the personal. The most powerful stories depict an individual culture, society or

community with all of its idiosyncrasies, distinctiveness and peculiarities described in rich and truthful detail. Then, within that narrow setting or milieu, these stories go on to explore the universal human emotions at work within the lives of characters (2005: 6).

Writing about the challenge of 'reaching world-wide audiences,' Hutzler sees emotion as the prevailing component of a screenplay. From a story-defined plot that operates within a specific story world, emotion is the universal quality which connects with audiences across the globe, crossing 'time, distance, culture, class, language, religion and politics' (ibid.).<sup>12</sup> This is reminiscent of McKee's argument, primarily that an 'archetypal story unearths a universally human experience, then wraps itself inside a unique, culture-specific expression' (1999: 4). Like Hutzler, McKee sees the screenplay as a text that captures universally human experiences, just like myth, and uses specific screenplay components such as plot, character and setting to explore and uncover universal feelings and emotions. Therefore, it can be suggested that character emotion and physical action operate within the same context (the screenplay narrative), albeit possessing different individual functions. Hutzler clarifies this: 'Order or structure is a principle of organisation that pulls us through a story from beginning to end but it is our emotional experience that makes a film memorable' (2005: 6). This suggests that of the two narrative threads, emotion is the most important for an audience: 'Great stories speak to our emotions first' (ibid.). Although it has been argued that physical action can be viewed as equally important to emotion, in that emotional development is guided or framed by physical action, the claim that emotion is more important can be understood in the context of an audience 'leaving the text' with

---

<sup>12</sup> As Dancyger and Rush state with reference to Ingmar Bergman, 'his insight into human behaviour transcends national boundaries' (2007: 198). This, like Hutzler's claims, suggests that character (as the emotional thread of a screenplay) has the universal power to appeal to a global audience; plot, on the other hand, may be confined to or better understood by a particular culture, class, race, milieu etc.

universal feelings that can be carried forward into their own lives. This relates neatly to later discussions of psychoanalysis (Chapter Two), where for some patients, dreaming is a physical manifestation of an internal problem. Through recounting the 'plot' of the dream, and the doctor unearthing its subsurface meaning, patients are able to overcome their problem and live more happily. To turn these ideas back on themselves, another way to understand the importance of the emotional experience is as such: 'You can only reach the universal through the personal' (ibid.: 8). Hutzler here reminds us that the only way to reach emotion is by using physical action: a combination of all the surface components of a screenplay. As such, action and emotion work together and, as outlined in the Prologue, character 'want' and character 'need' share a space in the developing narrative.

In another article, Hutzler pays particular attention to the character arc: the transformation of the protagonist from one state to another across the space of the narrative. The character arc is seen to involve a significant transformation for the protagonist, relating more specifically to his emotional change than his physical change. Hutzler writes: 'This protagonist's successful emotional journey is one from withdrawing to embracing, from alienation to conviction. This journey is painful but ultimately rewarding' (2004: 42). This tells us that a screenplay presents polar opposites of character from start to finish, and although the journey to initiate his change may be difficult, it does eventually bestow him with a 'better' life. Hutzler uses *The Day After Tomorrow* (Emmerich, 2004) to illustrate how a film narrative can be fatally flawed, resulting not only in a lack of connection with an audience, but commercial failure. The identified flaw of the film is the lack of a big enough emotional arc that captures human emotion:

Jack Hall's emotional journey is from a concerned, loving parent to a more concerned, loving parent. His character is a flat line. There is no emotional drama,

no emotional suspense and little opportunity for emotional transformation. The character never learns or discovers anything emotionally significant that he didn't already know at the beginning of the film (ibid.: 44).

To avoid this type of flaw, Hutzler advises that 'the bigger and more dramatic the physical journey, the bigger and more dramatic the emotional journey should be' (ibid.). This is important in two ways: firstly, it reiterates the need for a screenplay to provide its audience with an important and stimulating emotional journey; secondly, it brings together the two narrative threads of a screenplay and positions them in a symbiotic relationship. The physical journey and emotional journey are part of a whole, and as Hutzler suggests, they develop with each other in parallel across the unfolding narrative.

## 2.

From the texts discussed, it is evident that praxis exists whereby the screenplay protagonist undertakes two journeys which function as individual yet interwoven threads of a complete narrative. What is unclear, however, is how specifically these two threads progress within the course of the narrative, working alongside each other, for each other and against each other. Not only that, the terminology used to define the threads are as far ranging as the writers themselves, which presents an overall lack of cohesion and synthesis on the subject. This is not to say that each text should adopt the same terminology; rather, an acknowledgement of each other's writing would present a body of knowledge which is developmental as well as chronological. 'How to' texts do not traditionally make reference to each other, so more often than not there is such a lack of lineage in the assertion of ideas. What has been necessary here, to develop screenwriting as a site of knowledge, is the

bringing together of writers and writing; in this way, the knowledge being developed can be contextualised within the already-existent, and progressive in its findings.

For Aristotle the emphasis is on action, but implicit in his work is a suggestion of the importance of character emotion: 'well-being' and 'ill-being.' Egri purveys clearly that the inner fabric of character informs the outer fabric of structure, and without character, there is no story. For him, plot is formulated through character choice. Seger notes the importance of the 'character spine,' arguing that plot is shaped into being through a relationship between a character's goal, his motivation, and the subsequent action he undertakes. This adds 'dimension' to the plot, preventing it from becoming hollow and meaningless. Although brief, somewhat vague and sometimes contradictory, Vogler and Voytilla conceive that screenplay heroes must have inner and outer problems; as such, screenplays must have inward and outward journeys as part of their fabric. McKee feels similarly, using the terms 'character' and 'structure' to refer to two threads of a narrative that are individual yet interlocked. This is supported by Hutzler, who sees character 'want' as the shape of the plot, and character 'need' as the shaping of the plot; the drive comes from emotion, yet the result comes out as action.

It would be easy to accept Aronson's terminology of 'action line' and 'relationship line' when deconstructing the dual narrative of a screenplay. Not only are the ideas of all the authors discussed embodied in terminology specific to screenwriting, they clearly denote the external and the internal, and purvey a sense of movement; the journeys taken. However, although 'action line' does capture the idea of characters physically acting, reacting and externalising choices, it does possess possible signification to action-based films: chases, fights, explosions etc. Similarly, 'relationship line' has possible connotations



with love and romance. Although many films operate on a romantic level, this part of the story is not always what is meant by the relationship line. Therefore, accepting Aronson's terminology is not as simple as first conceived, her definitions clearly presenting possible complications for the reader and writer.

Throughout the discussions of the texts above, the words 'physical' and 'emotional' have surfaced in various places. Hutzler uses them in relation to 'want' and 'need,' telling us that the narrative threads relate to journeys which are physical and emotional. Although transitory and rather loose, 'physical' and 'emotional' are also offered by Voytilla. They are not asserted as definitive terminology, evidenced by the fact that he mixes words ('inward' and 'outward,' 'higher cause' and 'personal growth' etc.), but they are used and seem to be useful for the screenwriter. Elsewhere, in a text not discussed, Syd Field uses the two words (2003: 29-30), but again their reference is fleeting and not followed-up sufficiently for them to be fully asserted as definitive. In a slightly different way to Voytilla, he writes that '[t]here are two kinds of action – *physical* action and *emotional* action' (ibid.: 29). Although his successive delineation of the words is useful, that '[p]hysical action is holding up a bank [...] a car chase [...] a race or competition [...] Emotional action is what happens inside your characters during the story' (ibid.), the word 'action' here may not be so useful. As explored, action has strong affiliations with outward physicality and is understood as the result of a choice made by a character: a character decides to do something (internal) and the result is an action undertaken (external). Therefore, calling the emotional thread of the narrative 'emotional action' may be an oxymoron: can emotion ever be an action, or merely the cause or consequence of an action? 'Action' itself is somewhat problematic because it represents a moment in time,

not a progressive movement through a narrative like the words 'line' or 'journey.' However, as with reference from Voytilla and Hutzler, the adjectives themselves, 'physical' and 'emotional,' are useful for the screenwriter, more so perhaps than Aronson's 'action' and 'relationship.'

I therefore propose to assert the terms 'physical journey' and 'emotional journey' as part of a developing understanding of the duality of narrative in a screenplay. 'Physical journey' is more useful than 'action line' because of its non-signification to genre. Furthermore, although all screenplays do have 'action' at some level, the word 'physical' is more inclusive because it alludes to plot, not a character in hard pursuit to achieve their goal. 'Emotional journey' is more useful than 'relationship line' because of its specific relation to character drive, not theme or genre. 'Emotional' still embodies screenplays with a romantic inner drive, but is more inclusive of those with otherwise abstract concerns. The word 'journey' is used for both threads to give a sense of progression that we follow throughout the screenplay; a 'journey' moves and creates change, not static like a 'line.'

'Physical journey' and 'emotional journey' are thus proposed as necessary for developing an understanding of the duality of a screenplay narrative. The writerly terminology can be applied in practice and used in criticism. However, the terminology adds nothing to practice nor means anything in theory unless it can be mapped onto a screenplay narrative and enable an understanding of how exactly the two journeys take shape. What is required to achieve this is a tool which separates the physical and emotional journey of a narrative, creating understanding of how each thread develops individually and symbiotically over the course of a screenplay. Although both Vogler (1999: 212) and Voytilla (1999: 7) suggest that the emotional journey (character arc) can be mapped across

a complete narrative, neither author actually offers a specific way of doing this or detailed examples to illustrate. I therefore suggest that in order to fully understand the duality of a screenplay narrative and the relationship between a protagonist's physical and emotional journey, we need to pay more attention to individual narrative events and how they function for the whole. As Batty and Waldeback argue, whereas the main writing currency in fiction is prose style, 'the main currency in screenplays is structure' (2008: 171). In order for a story to be successfully told, much work has to be done on developing a tight and cohesive narrative that 'creates pace, rhythm, atmosphere, narrative flow, point of view, a context for meaning and a fundamental way to interweave subtext' (ibid.: 29). Prose and poetry assert much of their meaning through actual words and imagined scenarios created through words; screenplays, on the other hand, assert much of their meaning through the shape and form of the narrative, where scenes and sequences connect and contrast. In fact, many screenplays are 'sold' on the basis of their narrative structure, where a feeling for the sequence of events (and their combined overall meaning) takes precedence over a love of the actual written script. Therefore, the most useful way to examine the journey taken by a mainstream film protagonist is by using a model which guides the shaping of screenplay structure. The model used is entirely dependent upon personal preference; the argument is that physical and emotional journeys can be mapped onto any model. For example, Aronson's 'nine-point plan' (2001), Batty and Waldeback's 'tentpole structure' (2008) or Gulino's 'eight-sequence approach' (2004) are all viable ways of conducting such an examination. However, for the purpose of this research, Vogler's interpretation of Joseph Campbell's 'monomyth,' the Hero's Journey found in *The Hero's with a Thousand Faces*, will be used. The primary reason for choosing

Vogler's model is that, as well as being an internationally recognised screenwriting text, it has been appropriated similarly by Voytilla and therefore offers scope for even further development. Voytilla suggests that writers should 'consider the Hero's Journey as a writing tool, an extremely malleable paradigm, that expands your intellectual and creative thinking, opening you to new avenues of exploration' (1999: 3); as such, its use here is also that of a writing tool. It is important to understand that what is being proposed is a tool, not an absolute method of working; or worse, a specific paradigm to be replicated without creative freedom. Voytilla's own rationale for using Vogler's work is that it enables us 'to understand the universality of the Hero's Journey across many genres, to inspire your own writing, and to provide answers to your story problems' (ibid.: 294). His subsequent genre models are offered to inspire, to be used as a way of moving forward when writing feels stuck; nowhere does Voytilla suggest that his articulations must be followed rigidly. In the same way, the model to be proposed here is meant to inspire, not to inhibit; afterall, 'each [screenplay] is a unique story, integrating the Hero's Journey tools to support its character and story needs' (ibid.: 294), not dictate them in an unyielding way.

### 3.

Just as Voytilla reacted to Vogler's model of the Hero's Journey by exploring its influence on genre (ibid.: 2), film interpreted 'through the lens of myth' (Vogler, cited in Voytilla, 1999: x), I am reacting in a similar way by exploring the structure of the physical and emotional journey in a screenplay. As Vogler's model is an interpretation of Campbell's own model of mythological storytelling, it will be necessary to undertake a thorough exploration of the Hero's Journey provided by both authors. This is important because, in

combination with the screenwriting-specific advice offered by Vogler, understanding the origins of the mythological Hero's Journey will offer the depth required to fully understand its fabric, form and function. Campbell's work has in fact been well documented in relation to screenwriting, namely through association with screenwriter and director George Lucas. Upon seeing the film *Star Wars* (Lucas, 1977), Campbell declared that Lucas had put the newest and most powerful spin upon the classic story of a hero (Campbell and Moyers, 1988: xiv), making clear connections between myth and film. Other writers have noted this connection too. Lawrence highlights the common view that a 'spiritual appeal' (2006: 22) existed between Lucas and Campbell, and after years of speculation from *Star Wars* fans, Lucas 'began publicly to declare that the writings of Campbell had rescued him during his attempts to create his first *Star Wars* script' (ibid.). The power of the monomyth was such that:

In Joseph Campbell the evangelically inclined Lucas had found a kindred spirit, since the younger man also felt a mythic decline that left youth drifting without the moral anchor sensed in the heroic genre films of his own youth (ibid.: 23).<sup>13</sup>

This connection led Lucas, in 1983, to invite Campbell to his Skywalker Ranch and share with him a viewing of the completed *Star Wars* trilogy. Here they discussed the mythical structure employed in the films' narratives, which eventually lead to the creation of the PBS series *The Power of Myth* (1985-1986), filmed at Lucas' ranch. In a similar way to Lawrence, Palumbo outlines the importance that Campbell's work plays in Science Fiction narratives: 'Campbell's monomyth occurs in meticulous detail in several of the most successful SF [Science Fiction] novels and series and in numerous additional SF films from

---

<sup>13</sup> Lucas did, however, outgrow the 'limitations' of the monomyth and became much more aware of the political possibilities of narrative. Indeed, it could be argued that Lucas was spurred 'to surpass the master by using myth as a palette for painting contemporary issues more directly' (Lawrence, 2006: 30).

the second half of the twentieth century' (2008: 115). Discussing *Star Trek* films in particular, he argues that far beyond a general underlying of myth to plot structure, 'each *Star Trek* movie follows the monomyth's essential quest pattern in its entirety' (ibid.), although it is often seen through the eyes of a composite, ensemble hero (*The Enterprise* crew) rather than one single hero. In his chapter, Palumbo details each stage of the Hero's Journey in relation to the ten films produced so far, using the rubric of departure, initiation and return (ibid.: 120-134). Furthermore, and pertinent to this research, he provides a table outlining the seventeen stages of the Hero's Journey, mapping onto each which characters (as part of the heroic ensemble) appear (ibid.: 132-133). The table, supplemented by a detailed discussion of its stages as applied to specific films, amounts to a clear argument that the monomyth certainly underpins the *Star Trek* film narratives; furthermore, that the work of Campbell has come to be used and recognised widely in relation to screenwriting.

Clayton also notes the importance of Campbell's work to screenwriting, arguing that not only has it 'found favour [...] with film-makers such as George Miller, Stephen Spielberg and George Lucas, but also with teachers of screenwriting via the work of Campbell's protégé Christopher Vogler' (2007: 210).<sup>14</sup> Although Clayton has a practical reason to be sceptical about such narrative 'modelling', namely that 'the exponents of the universal hero's journey' have in some ways 'limited the creative possibilities of working with myths, not by constraining their manifest content, but by limiting their form of address in the context of prescribing narrative structure' (ibid.: 221), this is arguable. As will be discussed at the end of Chapter Two, the Hero's Journey is adaptable to non-traditional forms of storytelling and can be readily used in whatever way is appropriate to the

---

<sup>14</sup> The connection between Campbell and Vogler, echoing a universal view from screenwriting trainers across the globe, is yet another sign that the two should to be studied together.

screenwriter. In fact, as Clayton later outlines with reference to her own work, 'mythic material itself becomes continually new by being reused in different contexts and alongside other sources' (ibid.). Therefore, although the model of the Hero's Journey may be seen as formulaic, it actually lends itself well to creative freedom and writerly rearrangement. I am suggesting that within the screenplay both a physical and an emotional journey are travelled by the protagonist. The way in which this will be mapped follows the traditional trajectory of one protagonist, moving from beginning to middle to end, but that is purely to enable a clear, lucid understanding and offer simplicity in presentation. The extent to which an emotional journey is travelled alongside a physical one, and the actual narrative structure that they take, is unquestionably specific to the screenwriter and his project.

**CHAPTER TWO:**  
**MYTHOLOGY AND THE HERO'S JOURNEY**



# 1.

At any given moment, all over the world, hundreds of millions of people will be engaged in what is one of the most familiar of all forms of human activity. In one way or another they will have their attention focused on one of those strange sequences of mental images which we call a story (Booker, 2004: 2).

Christopher Booker writes here about the ‘phenomenon’ that is story; the strange ritual that appears in familiar forms and patterns in cultures worldwide. He writes that late-nineteenth century figures such as Johnson, Goethe and Frazer tried to ascertain who so many familiar story types appeared; their shared response ‘was to suggest that somehow all these stories, myths and legends were simply attempts to explain and dramatise natural phenomena, familiar to all mankind’ (ibid.: 9). One theory, associated with Friedrich Max Muller, categorises stories where the central character literally or figuratively dies and is reborn as ‘solar myths’ (ibid.: 10), conjuring-up an image of the setting and rising of the sun. However categorised or theorised, there is a sense that stories bind humanity; the mythological qualities they possess have the power to capture an audience, take them on a journey both physical and emotional, and bestow them with meaning and resonance.

Writing of the Greek Gods, Moyers asserts that we need mythology in our lives in order to feel fully connected to the cosmos, and successfully live out our life narrative. He writes that ‘the remnants of all that “stuff” [mythology] line the walls of our interior systems of belief, like shards of broken pottery in an archaeological site. [And] as we are organic beings, there is energy in all that “stuff”’ (Campbell and Moyers, 1988: xiv). This ‘energy’ gives mythology its purpose within a story; the binding force between subject and audience. According to Travers, myths are truths; they are guiding principles by which we know who we are and how to live. Operating in fairy-tales and folklore, myths, ‘far from

being out of date and unscientific, are the true facts of that inner world, unseen but nearer than a man's neck vein, that interpenetrates our lives at every level and fructifies our dreams' (1999a: 187). The 'inner world' here is human psychology; the way of understanding our place in the whole and our reactions to it. Booker feels that the myths of story 'are far and away one of the most important features of our everyday existence' (2004: 2), which although bold, concurs with Travers' view that they interpenetrate our lives at every level: 'myths and traditions are in our blood' (1999a: 188).

Not only do myths appear in stories, naturally finding attachment with an audience, myths, it is suggested, are actively sought. Campbell believes that we purposefully probe stories to extract a meaning which will help us to move forward in bettering our lives; we actively seek the myth within the manifestation. He tells Moyers that 'what we're seeking is an experience of being alive, so that our life experiences on the purely physical plane will have resonances within our innermost being and reality, so that we actually feel the rapture of being alive' (Campbell and Moyers, 1988: 5). This sense of 'being alive' comes from the resonance a myth can bestow upon its audience; an emotional response to a physical scenario. Booker relates myth to Jung's theory of the unconscious, asking whether myths are 'the very basis of the way we unconsciously perceive the world: to the inner patterns of our psychic development as individuals' (2004: 11). If the human psyche 'is the inward experience of the human body, which is essentially the same in all human beings, with the same organs, the same instincts, the same impulses, the same conflicts, the same fears' (Campbell and Moyers, 1988: 51), then this positions myth in direct relation to emotion. Furthermore, the suggestion is that myth has an emotional strength which is not only *carried forward* within us, but which *carries us forward*; the development of our

psyche. Travers posits that '[e]ven fairy-tale from the beginning of time has been a small explosion, full of healing if man would be healed' (1999b: 208). This clearly suggests the emotional (psychic) power of myth, which Campbell puts into a simple imperative: 'Read myths. They teach you that you can turn inward, and you begin to get the message of the symbols' (Campbell and Moyers, 1988: 6).

These views provide a clear sense that myth-through-story is an integral part to the fabric of humanity, and the basis of our desire to move forward in life, for the better. Travers develops this idea by suggesting that the only trajectory of myth is to move from the inside out: from human emotion to physical manifestation. She asks: 'From where is the spring, where are the hearth and home of myth, tradition, and symbol? Where else could these be but in man himself? How could they be outside him?' (1999a: 195). Therefore, myth is emotion; a truth which bestows resonance within us. The myth's manifestation may be in outer, physical action (as in the structure of Hero's Journey), but it is always driven from within; created from human emotion.

Myth is not merely found in religion, history or traditional literature. In popular mass media, 'far from being dead, myth – though in a degraded form – is still vigorous and alive and actively willed and wished for' (Travers, 1999a: 190-191). Using popular novels and detective stories as an example, Travers argues that basic components such as hero, heroine and villain are far from incidental to narrative; rather, they represent the age-old need for 'mythological worlds and times' (ibid.: 191). For Hockley, Jung's acceptance that technology has the ability to possess archetypal qualities confers that 'the technical world of mass media communications comes to be part of a mythological space, a space which is as likely to be the recipient of unconscious projections as any other person, object, place

and so on' (2007: 115). Even in a contemporary, technological world, mass media relies upon mythological qualities to attract an audience and bestow its participants with meaning. In our world of global communication and instant media messaging, we could rightly ask: why is myth still important? What is it that makes myth such an integral quality to our experience of the world? Booker's thoughts are important here:

We are in fact uncovering nothing less than a kind of hidden, universal language: a nucleus of situations and figures which are the very stuff from which stories are made. And once we become acquainted with this symbolic language, and begin to catch something of its extraordinary significance, there is literally no story in the world which cannot then be seen in a new light: because we have come to the heart of what stories are about and why we tell them (2004: 6).

This reinforces the idea that all stories, despite their form, have at root a universal myth; moreover, the myth is likely to be 'hidden' or subsumed within the plot. The notion of a 'universal language' represents the emotional heart to a narrative; meaning that lies beneath its physical manifestation. As has been explored, the protagonist's emotional journey is equally, if not more, important than their physical journey; as such, myth (the meaning) becomes integral to the success of any narrative. This idea is as prevalent in film as it is in any other story form; from novel to poem to computer game. Booker concurs to this, arguing that 'there is in fact no kind of story, however serious or however trivial, which does not ultimately spring from the same source: which is not shaped by the same archetypal rules and spun from the same universal language' (2004: 6-7). The 'universal language' of myth thus lies at the root of film, its form embracing the same story patterns seen in other mediums. Stating that stories are 'shaped by the same archetypal rules,' Booker suggests that no matter what form the story takes, it is always structured by a universal pattern; in the case of a screenplay, this can be the Hero's Journey. This, then,

can be used to answer Clayton's screenwriting-specific question: 'is there a kind of universal narrative and an underlying set of narrative principles suggested by mythological material?' (2007: 208). Although this is posed with negative intent, Clayton sceptical about the use of the Hero's Journey, the only answer can be 'yes.'

Considering film specifically then, Vogler celebrates myth's centrality to the narrative of a screenplay. He argues that '[w]ith movies, we found a medium ideal to represent the fantastic world of myth. Movies embraced myth, both for storylines and for a deeper influence in structure, motifs, and style' (cited in Voytilla, 1999: vii).<sup>15</sup> Campbell even goes as far as suggesting that film is like a training ground for embracing and understanding myth, where an audience is encouraged to access inner caveats of life by watching the characters on screen. To clarify: 'When you get to be older, and the concerns of the day have been attended to, and you turn to the inner life – well, if you don't know where it is or what it is, you'll be sorry' (Campbell and Moyers, 1988: 3). His suggestion is simple: film allows an audience to understand the form, function and power of myth, 'training them' to think beyond the self and feel beyond the surface. In doing so, the audience is given a set of mythical characters, questions and journeys which in time may give meaning and direction to their own life. Or, as Voytilla summarises:

Movies today are as much a part of our mythmaking tradition as were the first storytellers who enthralled their audiences by the light of the campfire. Today's audience is bathed in the light of the cinematic screen, but the storyteller's role is no less magical or important (1999: 293).

As already highlighted, the Hero's Journey is one way of exploring the use of myth in film; through its universal narrative pattern of the protagonist's movement across a narrative, it

---

<sup>15</sup> By 'a medium ideal,' he likely means that film can reach millions of people, not only on one occasion (the cinema visit) but in longer-lasting ways (video, DVD etc.).

also relates to pattern of living undertaken by humans. For Campbell, '[t]he whole sense of the ubiquitous myth of the hero's passage is that it shall serve as a general pattern for men and women, wherever they may stand along the scale' (1993: 121), and for Travers, '[f]airy-tale is at once the pattern of man and then chart for his journey. Each of the stories unwinds from its core the navel-string of an eternal idea' (1999b: 200). The latter indicates that not only is the mythical journey important in story, the journey taken is a product of an 'eternal,' core idea that is driven from within: emotion. It is thus fair to say that the narrative pattern of the Hero's Journey grows out of myth; it is a way of ordering 'truth' to make it accessible and meaningful. The Hero's Journey itself is a trajectory of hope, fear and renewed hope. Campbell writes that 'after the first thrills of getting underway, the adventure develops into a journey of darkness, horror, disgust, and phantasmagoric fears' (1993: 121), and that 'at the bottom of the abyss comes the voice of salvation. The black moment is the moment when the real message of transformation is going to come. At the darkest moment comes the light' (Campbell and Moyers, 1988: 39). The mythical journey, therefore, is full of ups and downs, twists and turns, concealments and revelations, which combine in a narrative that pulls the protagonist along a path of learning, growth and change. This is myth: the transformation undertaken by the protagonist; a universal language which an audience connects with. The myth is the emotion of the film; all that is conjured-up internally by those listening and watching. 'When we quit thinking primarily about ourselves and our own self-preservation, we undergo a truly heroic transformation of consciousness' (Campbell and Moyers, 1988: 126); consciousness is the myth, and the way for it to be transformed is the narrative pattern of the Hero's Journey.

## 2.

It would not be too much to say that myth is the secret opening through which the inexhaustible energies of the cosmos pour into human cultural manifestation. Religions, philosophies, arts, the social forms of primitive and historic man, prime discoveries in science and technology, the very dreams that blister sleep, boil up from the basic, magic ring of myth (Campbell, 1993: 3).

For Campbell, myth is at the centre of the human experience; a way of living, feeling, knowing. Myth is an 'opening' through which humans understand life and how to live it; a way of reaching beyond the manifestation of the everyday scenario, and locating at its heart an emotional experience that connects all of humanity as one. The 'ring of myth,' the force behind human action and interaction, is story; the underlying meaning of a given narrative, existing 'beneath its varieties of costume' (ibid.: 4), plot. Campbell's suggestion is that although the surface may be presented in a multitude of ways, the underlying myth is always universal. With this, any attempt to see myth as rigid, formulaic and not open to interpretation is discredited. Campbell asserts, rather, that although myth is one guiding force serving the same purpose in any given narrative, the fact of it being a guiding force, not a rule, means it is fluid, interchangeable and open to appropriation:

Mythology has been interpreted by the modern intellect as a primitive, fumbling effort to explain the world of nature (Frazer); as a production of poetical fantasy from prehistoric times, misunderstood by succeeding ages (Müller); as a repository of allegorical instruction, to shape the individual to his group (Durkheim); as a group dream, symptomatic of archetypal urges within the depths of the human psyche (Jung); as the traditional vehicle of man's profoundest metaphysical insights (Coomaraswamy); and as God's Revelation to His children (the Church). Mythology is all of these [...] mythology shows itself to be as amenable as life itself to the obsessions and requirements of the individual, the race, the age (ibid.: 382).

Early in his book *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Campbell outlines the importance of psychoanalysis to mythology, writing that the:

bold and truly epoch-making writings of the psychoanalysts are indispensable to the student of mythology; for, whatever may be thought of the detailed and sometimes contradictory interpretations of specific cases and problems, Freud, Jung, and their followers have demonstrated irrefutably that the logic, the heroes, and the deeds of myth survive into modern times (ibid.: 4).

This reminds us that even in 'science,' mythology is important. Writing about Freud in particular, Campbell sees the psychoanalyst as an integral agent in the discussion of mythology; the 'modern master of the mythological realm, the knower of all the secret ways and words of potency' (ibid.: 9). He argues that 'there is a basic mythological theme there even though it is a personal dream' (Campbell and Moyers, 1988: 40); furthermore, that 'myth is the public dream and the dream is the private myth' (ibid.). Just as tribes people tell stories around campfires, and the shaman recounts fascinating tales to the many, the psychoanalyst can tease out the emotional problem of a scenario described from dream. In this way, the psychoanalyst works with a structure of physical manifestations, igniting from them a meaning which will help to unburden the patient's emotional dilemma. We are thus given a sense that the physical and emotional experiences of a patient are linked; a duality exists. Combinations of words used by Campbell support this. Firstly, discussing patients and their dreams conjures-up allusions to 'body' and 'soul'; problems from within (soul) are physicalised by encounters in dream (body). Secondly, he talks about 'myth' becoming 'manifest'; an internal force surfacing into external experience. Such words also relate to screenwriting ideas of 'story' and 'plot'; an external form (structure) used to tell an internal idea (meaning). This duality is further extrapolated when Campbell writes that:

The unconscious sends all sorts of vapors, odd beings, terrors, and deluding images up into the mind – whether in dream, broad daylight, or insanity; for the human kingdom, beneath the floor of the comparatively neat little dwelling that we call our consciousness, goes down into unsuspected Aladdin caves (ibid.: 8).



Although this does not explicitly make reference to two narrative threads, it does suggest that the unconscious (soul, myth, story) has a profound effect upon the conscious (body, manifest, plot). Furthermore, as the psychoanalysis of dream suggests, conscious and unconscious work symbiotically to generate a fuller understanding of the self. In this way, emotional problems can have an affect upon physical actions; therefore, experiencing physical actions and understanding them as results of emotion can be a tool used to develop (solve) the problem lying within. As Campbell notes:

These are dangerous because they threaten the fabric of the security into which we have built ourselves and our family. But they are fiendishly fascinating too, for they carry keys that open the whole realm of the desired and feared adventure of the discovery of the self (ibid.).<sup>16</sup>

Campbell's work reinforces the central investigation of this critical commentary. Protagonists in a screenplay are dreamers in a psychoanalyst's chair: both undertake an journey of emotional development at the same time as a journey of physical action, and their combination results in transformation and a new state of balance. If '[d]ream is the personalized myth, myth the depersonalized dream' (ibid.: 19), then dream is the physical journey, the structure-specific path which a protagonist follows, and myth is the emotional journey, the underlying meaning which universally resonates with an audience. Campbell, believing that '[i]t has always been the prime function of mythology and rite to supply the symbols that carry the human spirit forward, in counteraction to those other constant human fantasies that tend to tie it back' (ibid.: 11), provides us with another word combination: 'symbol' and 'spirit.' Like body and soul, manifest and myth, plot and story,

---

<sup>16</sup> Hockley notes, however, the danger in thinking that all manifestations have latent meaning (2007: 117). Accordingly, 'it remains important not to lose sight of the complexity of the psyche and to remember that meanings should be negotiated not imposed' (ibid.: 118).

the suggestion here is that human agents can only be carried forward and enlightened by experiencing action. 'Symbols' are physical components of the narrative: action, plot structure, physical characteristics. Only through these, by formulating a narrative (dream), can the human agent (character, subject) develop emotionally (spirit). Like riding a rollercoaster, a physical encounter beyond normality is required to stir-up the emotions within. Campbell argues that actions (initiatory images, symbols) are 'so necessary to the psyche that if they are not supplied from without, through myth and ritual, they will have to be announced again, through dream, from within,' leaving our energies 'locked in a banal, long-outmoded toyroom, at the bottom of the sea' (ibid.: 12). Therefore, undertaking physical action is necessary to overcome the emotional problem driving the narrative. The then completed experience, from problem to resolution, Campbell sees as 'rebirth,' a process which 'consists in a radical transfer of emphasis from the external to the internal world, macro- to microcosm, a retreat from the desperations of the waste land to the peace of the everlasting realm that is within' (ibid.: 17). In order to explore this process of rebirth, Campbell proposes an archetypal narrative model, the 'monomyth.' Comprising 'separation,' 'initiation' and 'return' (ibid.: 30), the model provides a narrative framework in which a protagonist can experience rebirth, and is summarised as such:

A hero ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are there encountered and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from this mysterious adventure with the power to bestow boons on his fellow man (ibid.).

The monomyth is universal, representing all characters in all situations from all corners of the world. As Campbell asserts:

Whether presented in the vast, almost oceanic images of the Orient, in the vigorous narratives of the Greeks, or in the majestic legends of the Bible, the adventure of the

hero normally follows the pattern of the nuclear unit above described: a separation from the world, a penetration to some source of power, and a life-enhancing return (ibid.:35).

What is important to note is the monomyth's strong emphasis upon the emotional journey. Although the protagonist battles through an alien environment and encounters various obstacles, the reason for this seems to be the emotional transformation that is achieved. Duty-bound with 'the unlocking and release again of the flow of life into the body of the world' (ibid.: 40), the monomyth suggests that successfully completing the Hero's Journey creates meaning within the protagonist, which is then shared with others.

The nineteen stages of Campbell's monomyth will be outlined later,<sup>17</sup> for now, its summary, *The Keys*, is offered as a way of understanding the shape and purpose of the archetypal Hero's Journey: separation, initiation and return:

The mythological hero, setting forth from his commonday hut or castle, is lured, carried away, or else voluntarily proceeds, to the threshold of adventure. There he encounters a shadow presence that guards the passage. The hero may defeat or conciliate this power and go alive into the kingdom of the dark (brother-battle, dragon battle; offering, charm), or be slain by the opponent and descend to death (dismemberment, crucifixion). Beyond the threshold, then, the hero journeys through a world of unfamiliar yet strangely intimate forces, some of which severely threaten him (tests), some of which give magical aid (helpers). When he arrives at the nadir of the mythological round, he undergoes a supreme ordeal and gains his reward. The triumph may be represented as the hero's sexual union with the goddess-mother of the world (sacred marriage), his recognition by the father-creator (father atonement), his own divinization (apotheosis), or again – if the powers have remained unfriendly to him – his theft of the boon he came to gain (bride-theft, fire-theft); intrinsically it is an expansion of consciousness and therewith of being (illumination, transfiguration, freedom). The final work is that of the return. If the powers have blessed the hero, he now sets forth under their protection (emissary); if not, he flees and is pursued (transformation flight, obstacle flight). At the return threshold the transcendental powers must remain behind; the hero re-emerges from the kingdom of dread (return, resurrection). The boon that he brings restores the world (elixir) (ibid.: 245-246).

---

<sup>17</sup> There are, in fact, only seventeen stages to Campbell's original monomyth. However, in order to simplify the crossover with his own model, Vogler has added the stage 'World of Common Day' and split 'The Crossing of the Return Threshold' into 'Crossing the Threshold' and 'Return.'

The monomyth literally does apply to the hero with a thousand faces; it can mean any type of protagonist, appearing with any physical trait, yet the underlying mythology tying all such protagonists together is their embodiment of the archetype 'hero.' The hero is the myth, the protagonist is the manifestation; the hero is the spirit, the protagonist is the symbol. Highlighting a progression from folklore, fairytales and legends of the past, Campbell sees contemporary stories as serving the same purpose of what were once considered descendents of a higher order. He writes that the 'cosmogonic cycle is now to be carried forward [...] not by the gods, who have become invisible, but by the heroes, more or less human in character, through whom the world destiny is realized' (ibid.: 315); the figure of the hero no longer transcends humanity, but embodies humanity. Protagonists in prose, theatre, film and television are symbols in which an audience invests emotion, and with which connections can be made in order to understand the allegories of life: 'Now is required no incarnation of the Moon Bull, no Serpent Wisdom of the Eight Diagrams of Destiny, but a perfect human spirit alert to the needs and hopes of the heart' (ibid.: 317).

Christopher Vogler, a Hollywood 'protégé' of Campbell (Clayton, 2007: 210), uses the monomyth as the basis for his own interpretation of the Hero's Journey. For him, the screenplay protagonist always undergoes a character arc: 'a term used to describe the gradual stages of change in a character: the phases and turning points of growth' (1999: 211). He points out that protagonists must grow gradually, not abruptly (ibid.), deeming the complete journey necessary in logically and credibly teasing-out their development. As already discussed, alongside his re-interpreted twelve-stage model of the Hero's Journey (see below), Vogler maps-out how the character arc is embodied through gradual character

transformation. Although his guidance on this is short on detail and lacking in concrete evidence, its very existence is useful in offering at least some sense of how the protagonist develops emotionally within the context of the wider narrative journey. Character arc seen through character transformation is suggested as:

- 1) limited awareness of a problem; 2) increased awareness; 3) reluctance to change;
- 4) overcoming reluctance; 5) committing to change; 6) experimenting with first change;
- 7) preparing for big change; 8) attempting big change; 9) consequences of the attempt (improvements and setbacks); 10) rededication to change; 11) final attempt at big change; 12) final mastery of the problem (ibid.: 212).

Given that each of these stages relates to the twelve general stages of Vogler's model of the Hero's Journey, this indicates that action is intrinsically linked to character development, or emotional transformation. As with Campbell's ideas concerning psychoanalysis, Vogler sees the Hero's Journey as a narrative structure that essentially embodies the universal patterns of human behaviour; symbolising timeless accounts of identity searching and bringing knowledge back to the family or tribe (ibid.: 35). Vogler's model of this archetypal Hero's Journey has five fewer stages than Campbell's, but the overall trajectory is the same:

Heroes are introduced in the ORDINARY WORLD where they receive a CALL TO ADVENTURE. They are RELUCTANT and at first REFUSE THE CALL, but are encouraged by a MENTOR to CROSS THE FIRST THRESHOLD and enter the Special World where they encounter TESTS, ALLIES AND ENEMIES. They APPROACH THE INMOST CAVE, crossing a second threshold where they endure the ORDEAL. They take possession of their REWARD and are pursued on THE ROAD BACK to the Ordinary World. They cross the third threshold, experience a RESURRECTION, and are transformed by the experience. They RETURN WITH ELIXIR, a boon or treasure to benefit the Ordinary World (ibid.: 26).

The narrative trajectory of the protagonist is shared in both authors' work: each proposes a clear sense of him entering a Special World, which although contains battles, obstacles, and

progressively difficult tests, promises a renewed (reborn) sense of self and the ability to live better than before. Combined physical and emotional development is encountered, resulting in a complete, 'successful' journey overall. What must be explored further, however, is the way in which the physical and emotional threads of the narrative function; they need to be separated so that their fabric, form and function can be understood, and then evaluated to discover how they work individually and collectively. What thus follows is an examination of the Hero's Journey drawn from the writings of Campbell and Vogler, detailing each stage of the journey to the extent that they can then be extrapolated in physical and emotional terms, and used to offer a re-defined model of the Hero's Journey in order to understand the duality of a screenplay narrative.

Vogler's mapping of the Hero's Journey (ibid.: 12) incorporates the variations of his and Campbell's work, placing them together on paper to show their differences and similarities. This mapping correlates as such:

**Christopher Vogler:**  
*The Writer's Journey*

**Act One**

Ordinary World  
Call to Adventure  
Refusal of the Call  
Meeting with the Mentor  
Crossing the First Threshold

**Act Two**

Tests, Allies, Enemies  
Approach to the Inmost Cave  
Ordeal

**Joseph Campbell:**  
*The Hero with a Thousand Faces*

**Departure, Separation**

World of Common Day  
Call to Adventure  
Refusal of the Call  
Supernatural Aid  
Crossing the First Threshold  
Belly of the Whale

**Descent, Initiation,  
Penetration**

Road of Trials  
Meeting with the Goddess

Reward

**Act Three**

The Road Back

Resurrection

Return with Elixir

Woman as Temptress  
Atonement with the Father  
Apotheosis  
The Ultimate Boon

**Return**

Refusal of the Return  
The Magic Flight  
Rescue from Within  
Crossing the Threshold  
Return  
Master of the Two Worlds  
Freedom to Live

Chapter Three thus explores and then re-defines each of these stages in the format that they are mapped here. Although the title of this research employs the word 'protagonist' to name the central character of a narrative, throughout Chapter Three's analysis of Campbell and Vogler's work, the word 'hero' will be used. This is because Campbell consistently uses the word, and combining hero with protagonist could cause confusion as well as inconsistent style. Not only that, Vogler consistently switches between the terms 'character,' 'protagonist' and 'hero,' and so it is more productive to stabilise this by employing one single term. In the re-defined model of the Hero's Journey, however, the word 'protagonist' will be reverted back to for uniformity with the rest of the critical commentary. Finally, although for reasons of consistency the hero is referred to as male throughout the research, the intention is not to subordinate the female; 'he' could quite easily be replaced by 'she.'

**CHAPTER THREE:**  
**EXPLORING THE HERO'S JOURNEY AND RE-DEFINING**  
**IT INTO A NEW MODEL FOR SCREENWRITING**



# 1.

The basic motif of the Hero's Journey is that of 'leaving one condition and finding the source of life to bring [one] forth into a richer or mature condition' (Campbell and Moyers, 1988: 124). Campbell sees it as a symbol of rebirth, consisting of 'a radical transfer of emphasis from the external to the internal world, macro- to microcosm, a retreat from the desperations of the waste land to the peace of the everlasting realm that is within' (1993.: 17). The Hero's Journey, then, is more than the sum of its parts: it is a physical encounter with a world that actually serves to emotionally transform the protagonist; and where he 'had thought to travel outward,' instead he 'will come to the center of [his] own existence' (ibid.: 123). Both physical journey and emotional journey interlock, creating the complete narrative. As Campbell highlights: 'Trials and revelations are what it's all about' (ibid.: 126); this puts physical action and emotional transformation together as the combination of what the Hero's Journey is 'all about.' Put another way, physical trials generate emotional revelations, and it is through their symbiotic relationship that the complete narrative is created. 'The adventure is symbolically a manifestation of his character' (ibid.: 129), and so inner character manifests into outer adventure; emotion manifests into physical action.

Although lengthy, combining the work of Campbell and Vogler will enable a solid, comprehensive guide to understanding the 'map' of the Hero's Journey. The resulting detail offers greater critical depth which can be applied to Vogler's practical approach, and greater awareness of practical techniques which can be applied to Campbell's theoretical approach. I disagree with Clayton who, writing about archetypal structures, argues:

The monolithic nature of these theories makes them hard for writers to work with in a specific and personal way; and there is also the inference, especially with Campbell *et al.* that working with myth is an unconscious process, embedded in our acculturation and not something we make conscious choices about (2007: 208).

The monomyth is very usable for writers, and very adaptable in its form. For example, although the stages of the Hero's Journey will appear in the order presented, there is no reason why manoeuvrability is not possible. Narratives that employ flashback structure, for example, may use the same stages, albeit in a different sequence (see, for example, Aronson, 2001; Gulino, 2004; Batty & Waldeback, 2008). Similarly, stories with two or more protagonists inevitably use a different overall structure, but when considering the protagonists' individual journeys within that structure, the pattern of the Hero's Journey may indeed be evident (see Aronson, 2001; Batty & Waldeback, 2008). A misconception of the Hero's Journey, especially if Vogler is considered alongside Campbell, is that specific narrative content is being imposed: '[it offers] prescriptive formulas for screenwriting while having little to say about the actual process of writing' (Clayton, 2007: 208).<sup>18</sup> Rather, what should be evident from the Hero's Journey is that an archetypal story pattern is suggested, not prescribed, within which the writer can employ the specific content that best suits his story. Arguably, there is no 'product' generated by the use of the Hero's Journey because it does not prescribe the specific components of a screenplay; action taking place, characters appearing, dialogue delivered etc. Instead, it is 'idealistic,' providing the writer with guidance about the narrative pattern, and how this pattern can be used to create meaning within the complete narrative.

To make the Hero's Journey even more useful for the practicing screenwriting, a re-definition of the model, which considers how physical action and emotion specifically work within each of its stages, will be offered. As such, the re-defined Hero's Journey will

---

<sup>18</sup> Clayton's suggestion that little is said about the writing process is very misconceived; structuring a story into a workable narrative is a big part of the writing process, especially during early stages of development.

separate physical action and emotional transformation into units which specifically consider how the protagonist moves through each stage of a narrative both physically and emotionally. The purpose is to progress from the current indistinct relationship that exists between physical action and emotion by creating a framework that can be used to deconstruct the narrative of a mainstream feature film. The resulting physical-emotional journey framework is a tool that enhances, not replaces, the model of the Hero's Journey.

As already highlighted, the Hero's Journey model used as a basis for mapping the specific physical-emotional journey framework is that proposed by Vogler. Two key reasons exist for this. Firstly, because Vogler proposes five fewer stages than Campbell, it is easier to incorporate the latter into the former; the opposite of this would leave gaps where only Campbell would be drawn upon. Secondly, because Vogler's work is targeted specifically at the screenwriter, application to the screenplay *Offside* in Chapter Four is more appropriate and in-keeping with former writing on film, such as that by Stuart Voytilla. As such, although Campbell's version of the Hero's Journey can be, and has been, applied directly to film, it makes more sense to use the model proposed specifically for the screenwriter.

## 2.

### i. *Ordinary World / World of Common Day (Limited Awareness of a Problem)*

Campbell begins in the 'commonday hut or castle' (1993: 245), a place where the hero lives in a 'familiar life horizon [... with] old concepts, ideals, and emotional patterns'

(ibid.: 52). This kind of Ordinary World is where the hero goes about ordinary business, establishing a routine, everyday situation from which there will be a moving on, a journey of change. For Vogler, it is essential to offer a baseline comparison between the Ordinary World and the Special World: 'The Special World of the story is only special if we can see it in contrast to a mundane world of everyday affairs from which the hero issues forth' (1999: 85). Similarly, Campbell writes that 'destiny has summoned the hero and transferred his spiritual center of gravity from within the pale of his society to a zone unknown' (1993: 58), suggesting the necessity of establishing such an initial 'society' so the 'zone unknown' can be just that. Thus, when Vogler states that the Ordinary World 'has some special burdens to bear' (1999: 81), we can see why: the screenwriter must effectively establish the hero, his life and his story world, building the beginning of the narrative and, at the same time, interesting and engaging an audience enough to watch.

For Vogler, an 'important function of the Ordinary World is to suggest the dramatic question of the story. Every good story poses a series of questions about the hero' (ibid.: 87). Relating to either the physical or the emotional goal, it is the task of the screenwriter to ensure that an audience not only identifies the dramatic question of the screenplay, but understands how and why it has been posed: through recalling backstory, an expository sequence, the interaction with other characters etc. Central to this, if character-audience sympathy is to be made, is an audience's first actual experience of the hero (ibid.: 88). The way in which this is achieved throughout the early moments of the Ordinary World is crucial: 'In a very real sense, a story invites us to step into the hero's shoes, to see the world through his eyes' (ibid.: 89). Therefore, the function of the Ordinary World is to enable this. Vogler advises to '[c]reate identification by giving heroes universal goals,

drives, desires, or needs. We can all relate to basic drives such as the need for recognition, affection, acceptance, or understanding' (ibid.: 90). Establishing the dramatic stakes, such as 'what does the hero stand to gain or lose in the adventure? What will be the consequences for the hero, society, and the world if the hero succeeds or fails?' (ibid.: 94), is another function of the Ordinary World. Dramatic stakes are relational to a film's type (genre, style, form), but often, high stakes such as 'life and death, big money, or the hero's very soul' (ibid.) are useful in capturing an audience's full attention of and connection with the narrative. The dramatic stakes may relate to the screenplay's theme, the 'main idea' (ibid.: 96) behind the narrative, and as Vogler's example suggests, they can be physical (life, death, money) or emotional (the hero's soul).

According to Vogler, it is 'a good idea [...] to make the Ordinary World as different as possible from the Special World, so the audience and hero will experience a dramatic change when the threshold is finally crossed' (ibid.: 86). Screenwriting being a visual medium, this can be interpreted to mean the hero's physical action and the story world's physical presentation should be markedly different between Ordinary World and Special World. The opening image of a film, sometimes a precursor to the Ordinary World, can be used by the screenwriter to symbolise the Special World that lies ahead:

It can be a visual metaphor that, in a single shot or scene, conjures up the Special World of Act Two and the conflicts and dualities that will be confronted there. It can suggest the theme, alerting the audience to the issues your [hero] will face (ibid.: 83).

Similarly, a visual or verbal prologue in the film 'may give an essential piece of backstory, cue the audience to what kind of movie or story this is going to be, or start the story with a

bang' (ibid.: 84). Once more, this models the Ordinary World against the Special World, 'foreshadowing its battles and moral dilemmas' (ibid.: 86) that lie ahead.

Overall, Vogler's summary of the Ordinary World allows us to understand the hero's position with a familial location, and physical and emotional journey lying ahead:

You're uncomfortable, feeling you no longer fit in with this drab, exhausted place. You may not know it, but you're soon to be selected as a hero, to join the select company of the Seekers, those who have always gone out to face the unknown. You'll undertake a journey to restore life and health to the entire Home Tribe, an adventure in which the only sure thing is that you'll be changed (ibid.: 82).

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero's Journey:

Physically, the protagonist is located in an Ordinary World, a place where he goes about his ordinary business and experiences familiar concepts, ideals, routines and patterns of living. Negative associations are made between the protagonist and his physical world; he may be trapped by rules, regulations or people. A physical goal related to this negative situation is explicitly stated or implicitly hinted at, which raises the central plot-related question of the screenplay: his physical want.

An opening image or line of dialogue may be used as a symbol of what lies ahead in the Special World; that is, a world physically different from the Ordinary World. A visual sequence or voiceover may also be used as a prologue to the screenplay, physically highlighting elements of the protagonist's backstory that will later be seen in stark contrast. Essentially, this stage sets-up a baseline physical comparison between Ordinary World and Special World, not only showing their differences, but highlighting the different ways that the protagonist acts within them.

Emotionally, the protagonist experiences negative familiar patterns of living. He feels that he no longer belongs in the drab, exhausted place, emotionally trapped by his surroundings. An emotional desire related to this negative situation is explicitly stated or implicitly hinted at, raising the central emotion-related question of the screenplay: his emotional need. This need has a universal fabric; it can apply to anyone, in any situation.

If a visual sequence or voiceover is used, it highlights the protagonist's emotional backstory and creates a connection between him and the audience. As such, this stage sets-up an overall baseline comparison between the protagonist's emotional state in the Ordinary World, and his changing emotional state in the Special World.

## **ii. *Call to Adventure / Call to Adventure (Increased Awareness)***

'A blunder – apparently the merest chance – reveals an unsuspected world, and the individual is drawn into a relationship with forces that are not rightly understood' (Campbell, 1993: 51). This highlights a common pattern in stories: from the Ordinary World or Common Day, the hero is called upon to undertake a journey which will allow a transformation from his current state to a new state. The apparent blunder is not really a blunder, however; it is a submerged emotional need that pushes to the surface and is manifested as a want of physical action. As with earlier reference to psychoanalysis, Campbell uses the work of Freud to make sense of this: 'blunders are not the merest chance. They are the result of suppressed desires and conflicts' (ibid.); '[t]hat which has to be faced, and is somehow profoundly familiar to the unconscious – though unknown, surprising, and even frightening to the conscious personality – makes itself known' (ibid.: 55). Call to Adventure can also be understood in a religious sense, where what occurs is 'a

mystery of transfiguration – a rite, or moment, of spiritual passage, which, when complete, amounts to a dying and a birth’ (ibid.). Again, the main idea presented here is that of an emotional transformation.

Vogler suggests that as the Ordinary World plants the seeds of change, what is now required is a ‘new energy to germinate them [... to] get [the] story rolling’ (1999: 99). Call to Adventure, as such, comes consciously in the form of ‘a message or a messenger,’ or unconsciously in the form of ‘dreams, fantasies, or visions’ (ibid.: 100). No matter how presented, according to Campbell ‘the same archetypal images are activated, symbolizing danger, reassurance, trial, passage, and the strange holiness of the mysteries of birth’ (1993: 52). In other words, the Call is always a moment where an adventure is summoned, a passage created or a rite suggested, which at the time possesses positive and negative implications for the hero. Practically speaking, for Vogler, Call to Adventure must be, above all, a turning point in the narrative where the Ordinary World is called into question and the Special World highlighted as an opportunity:

The Call to Adventure is often delivered by a character in a story who manifests the archetype of the Herald [... They] may be positive, negative, or neutral, but will always serve to get the story rolling by presenting the hero with an invitation or challenge to face the unknown (1999: 101).

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero’s Journey:

**Physically**, an event or set of plot-related circumstances calls the protagonist to undertake a journey; a physical crossing from Ordinary World to Special World. The event or set of circumstances, whether manifested in reality, fantasy or dream, acts as a message to the protagonist, willing him to take the steps necessary in order to leave his Ordinary World. As such, the Call to Adventure summons the protagonist away from his current



existence. It is a turning point where the physicality of the Ordinary World is called into question: why stay in the familiar and exhausted when you can enter the fresh and new?

Emotionally, the event or set of circumstances draws upon the protagonist's need to transform into someone more than he currently is. The journey into a different physical domain suggests that he will become the improved, refreshed and emotionally satisfied being that he wishes to be. As such, calling the emotions of the Ordinary World into question offers the protagonist hope that his negativity will be extinguished once he enters new terrain. In essence, the protagonist's emotional need is manifested physically, where the literal journey presented pledges to aid his internal transformation.

### *iii. Refusal of the Call / Refusal of the Call (Reluctance to Change)*

Accepting the Call to Adventure is not easy; the hero realises that although a world of fortune may await him, leaving normality for something merely suggested, even promised, is difficult: 'Put yourself in the hero's shoes and you can see that it's a difficult passage. You're being asked to say yes to a great unknown, to an adventure that will be exciting but also dangerous and even life-threatening' (Vogler, 1999: 107). If Call to Adventure is a positive turning point in the narrative, alluding to a wondrous journey of possible change, then Refusal of the Call temporarily suspends this into a negative. According to Campbell, '[w]alled in boredom, hard work, or "culture," the [hero] loses the power of significant affirmative action and becomes a victim to be saved' (1993: 59). The hero can only become so by the respect gained for his 'heroic' actions, so now he must mull-over his options and decide whether he can invest so much in himself. Considering the potential ahead, he realises that the journey called upon is not 'a frivolous undertaking but a danger-

filled, high-stakes gamble in which [he] might lose fortune or life' (Vogler, 1999: 107). The hero is asked to leave his comfort zone, therefore 'the refusal is essentially a refusal to give up what one takes to be one's own interest' (Campbell, 1993: 60). Implicit here is that the Call asks the hero to abandon all sense of the self and the individual, to undertake a journey which will benefit the wider world. As such, the hero must pause and consider the implications of this: stay or go; fail or succeed; always wonder, or actually find out? Vogler suggests that the hero experiences emotional as well as physical trepidations, forced to consider mind over matter in turning refusal into acceptance: 'Like many heroes of story, we receive conflicting Calls, one from the outer world, one from our insides, and we must choose or make compromises' (1999: 110). Nevertheless, for he who accepts the Call and undertakes the journey, the power of transformation is of great importance and drives the consequent narrative development. The hero is carried to a new place and eventually becomes a new person: 'if the personality is able to absorb and integrate the new forces, there will be experienced an almost super-human degree of self-consciousness and masterful control' (Campbell, 1993: 64).

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero's Journey:

Physically, the protagonist shows reluctance to commit to the journey called upon. Leaving the Ordinary World for promises or mere suggestions is difficult, so temporarily he holds onto the world that he knows. He expresses a deep fear of the unknown; leaving the physicality of the Ordinary World is a gamble, where new rules, regulations and people will present challenges. As such, the positive momentum of the Call is suspended, and negative attitudes about the Special World are physicalised through action and dialogue.

Emotionally, the protagonist is torn between the two worlds, suspending the positive potential of transformation and replacing it with a negative outlook. He expresses emotional trepidation, deliberating whether to stay or go; fail or succeed; always wonder or actually find out. He loses power of the affirmative, and is left with an emotional dichotomy: on the one hand, although imperfect, the Ordinary World offers safety and familiarity which he can be complacent about; on the other hand, he feels the need to absorb and integrate new forces that will refresh his emotional attitude towards life. He also feels the pull between selfishness and selflessness: does he remain where he is, or should he venture into new territories so that he can also restore emotion in others?

#### *iv. Meeting with the Mentor / Supernatural Aid (Overcoming Reluctance)*

Campbell notes the importance of the Supernatural Aid, a figure 'who provides the [hero] with amulets against the dragon force he is about to pass' (1993: 69), enabling the transformation of Refusal of the Call into Crossing the First Threshold. Vogler calls this figure the 'Mentor,' someone (or something) 'critical to get the story past the blockades of doubt and fear' (1999: 123), 'whose many services to the hero include protecting, guiding, teaching, testing, training, and providing magical gifts' (ibid.: 117). In ancient myth, legend and folklore, the Supernatural Aid / Mentor has appeared in many guises. Campbell discusses the East African tribesman Kyazimba, visited by a decrepit old woman who provides the magical passage required for his journey to begin: 'she wrapped her garment around him, and, soaring from the earth, transported him to the zenith, where the sun pauses in the middle of the day' (1993: 69). In European folklore, common is the helpful

crone or the fairy godmother, appearing as if by magic to help the hero progress on his journey. For Campbell:

What such a figure represents is the benign, protecting power of destiny. The fantasy is reassurance – a promise that the peace of Paradise, which was known first in the mother womb, is not to be lost; that it supports the present and stands in the future as well as in the past (1993: 71-72).

This suggests an emotional relationship between hero and Mentor, linked to generational wisdom and protection which Vogler argues is essential in creating engagement and empathy with an audience (1999: 118). This can be seen from what the Mentor supplies to the protagonist: sometimes it is a physical tool or weapon (in preparation for the physical journey); sometimes it is advice or reassurance (in preparation for the emotional journey). As Campbell sees, '[i]n fairy lore it may be some little fellow of the wood, some wizard, hermit, shepherd, or smith, who appears, to supply the amulets and advice that the hero will require' (1993: 72). Here, realistic and fantasy figures serve both physical and emotional necessities of helping the hero move forward. Notable about the Mentor, according to Vogler, is that they too have been a heroic figure, in a previous story, and as such possess the experience and wisdom sought by the reluctant hero in the current story. The Mentor 'may seek out the experience of those who have gone before' or, moreover, 'they may look inside themselves for wisdom won at great cost in former adventures' (1999: 118). In this instance, the Mentor has 'been down the road of heroes one or more times, and they have acquired knowledge and skill which can be passed on' (ibid.: 123). The hero is thus made aware of the knowledge and skill that may be brought back from his own journey, for him to become a Mentor to others.

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero's Journey:

**Physically**, an actual figure, or something surfacing within the protagonist himself, appears, representing the benign, protecting power of destiny. This Mentor is required to push the protagonist past the physical blockades currently being experienced, willing him to undertake the journey called upon. The Mentor provides physical tools or weapons necessary to accomplish the journey, trains the protagonist in how to use them, and imparts crucial knowledge, advice or skill that he may require later in the story. The Mentor assures the protagonist that his current dilemma is being supported, and that the support will continue throughout the journey.

**Emotionally**, the Mentor's protecting powers of destiny are required to push the protagonist past the emotional blockades currently being experienced. Emotional tools necessary to accomplish the journey are provided by the Mentor, who also guides, teaches and imparts knowledge that will support his emotional development throughout the journey. Wisdom is offered as a form of protection, and because the Mentor may have experienced a similar journey himself in the past, advice or reassurance encourages the protagonist to go forth and enter the Special World. The Mentor also assures him that his emotional well-being will be supported throughout the journey, not just here.

#### ***v. Crossing the First Threshold / Crossing the First Threshold;***

##### ***Belly of the Whale (Committing to Change)***

The adventure is always and everywhere a passage beyond the veil of the known into the unknown; the powers that watch at the boundary are dangerous; to deal with them is risky; yet for anyone with competence and courage the danger fades (Campbell, 1993: 82).

Having met the Mentor and abandoned doubt about why the journey should not be undertaken, the hero is ready to Cross the Threshold into the Special World. On approach to the threshold, the hero is pulled both physically and emotionally, eventually amounting to an act of final commitment to the journey. For Vogler, 'final commitment is brought about through some external force which changes the course or intensity of the story' (1999: 128), which might be meeting the Mentor or might even be a moment of catalytic physical action. Or, in some cases:

Internal events might trigger a Threshold Crossing as well. Heroes come to decision points where their very souls are at stake, where they must decide "Do I go on living my life as I always have, or will I risk everything in the effort to grow and change?" (ibid.).

For Campbell, Crossing the First Threshold is 'the entrance to the zone of magnified power' (1993: 77), a zone which enables growth and change. He sees the Special World promised through the Crossing as 'the sacred zone of the universal source' (ibid.: 81), inferring it to be an elite place into which only the worthy can pass. The 'worthy' in this sense is the hero; he who is willing to give-up his ego, relinquish his normal life, and brave the unknown for the sake of himself and mankind. Crossing the First Threshold is therefore a crucial stage in the journey of the hero, one that signals commitment to the physical and emotional encounters that lie ahead: 'we have reached the border of the two worlds. We must take a leap of faith into the unknown or else the adventure will never really begin' (Vogler, 1999: 130). A mythological image of the Crossing is 'the clashing rocks [...] that crush the traveler, but between which the heroes always pass' (Campbell, 1993: 89), which again suggests that only the brave, worthy hero can succeed. In a screenplay, this image is maintained by 'physical barriers such as doors, gates, arches,

bridges, deserts, canyons, walls, cliffs, oceans or rivers' (Vogler, 1999: 130). Whatever the form taken, 'the audience will still experience a noticeable shift in energy at the Threshold Crossing' (ibid.).

For Campbell, Crossing the First Threshold is a movement into the 'Belly of the Whale,' an image alluding to a spiritual sense of death where the hero is effectively given the chance of rebirth, to become a superior being. The journey ahead promises a path to becoming reborn; for now, he must accept death and be 'swallowed' by the whale:

the passage of the magical threshold is a transit into a sphere of rebirth symbolized in the worldwide womb image of the belly of the whale. The hero, instead of conquering or conciliating the power of the threshold, is swallowed into the unknown, and would appear to have died (1993: 90).

Examples of this motif include Irish hero Finn MacCool, who is swallowed by a monster of indefinite form; Red Ridinghood, who is swallowed by a wolf; and Maui, who is swallowed by his great-grandmother (ibid.: 91). However this notion of being swallowed appears, it is important for Campbell that the hero understands, above all, the emotional self is what must be transformed (reborn), albeit through undertaking a physical journey: 'This popular motif gives emphasis to the lesson that the passage of the threshold is a form of self-annihilation [... but] instead of passing outward, beyond the confines of the visible world, the hero goes inward, to be born again' (ibid.).

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero's Journey:

Physically, the protagonist commits to the journey by Crossing the Threshold into the Special World. By crossing physical barriers or undertaking new physical experiences, he relinquishes the physical complacency and routine of the Ordinary World and abandons

all doubt as to why a new world should not be entered. His commitment to the journey is exemplified by a physical force which changes the course or intensity of the story, giving him the physical challenge of braving the new, unknown world. Upon entering the Special World, he knows that he has been bestowed with the chance to physically change or grow.

Emotionally, Crossing the First Threshold is a symbol of the protagonist's commitment to inner change, abandoning all doubt as to why the journey should not be undertaken. He commits to giving-up his current emotional state, however negative or unfavourable that may be, and braves the unknown in the hope that he will be given the opportunity of emotional rebirth. Crossing into the Special World is a symbol of the protagonist giving up his ego, venturing forth for the sake of others, which will eventually result in him becoming a superior being; becoming heroic.

#### *vi. Tests, Allies, Enemies / Road of Trials (Experimenting with First Change)*

Crossing the First Threshold, the hero has now committed to his journey and entered a 'mysterious, exciting Special World' (Vogler, 1999: 135). The path he takes is not simple, but laden with obstacles, tests and meetings that force him to consider his actions and the consequences they have upon his learning of inner lessons, and understand how the journey taken generates a sense of rebirth. Campbell writes that 'the hero moves in a dream landscape of curiously fluid, ambiguous forms, where he must survive a succession of trials' (1993: 97), which suggests that the journey is one that poses various levels of threat to him, both physically and emotionally. Undertaken in the Special World, the journey 'should strike a sharp contrast with the Ordinary World' (Vogler, 1999: 135), affirming that



the hero's mundane, repetitive life has been left behind, and a new one thrust upon him. Writing that '[a] Special World, even a figurative one, has a different feel, a different rhythm, different priorities and values, and different rules' (ibid.: 136), Vogler indicates that the journey is 'outward' as well as 'inward,' the hero having to cope with a set of new physical experiences. Along this demanding journey, the Road of Trials, the hero is 'covertly aided by advice, amulets, and secret agents of the supernatural helper whom he met before his entrance into this region' (Campbell, 1993: 97). This suggests that although he may feel alone, perhaps isolated, in this new world, the hero is carefully watched over or guided by the very forces that brought him here.

A crucial feature of the journey is that the obstacles faced are progressive; they develop, transform and grow, allowing the hero to reach his full potential by stretching his abilities: 'Storytellers use this phase to test the hero, putting [him] through a series of trials and challenges that are meant to prepare [him] for greater ordeals ahead' (Vogler, 1999: 136). Campbell, furthermore, suggests:

After he has wandered through dark forests and over massive ranges of mountains, where he occasionally comes across the bones of other shamans and their animal mounts who have died along the way, he reaches an opening in the ground. The most difficult stages of the adventure now begin, when the depths of the underworld with their remarkable manifestations open before him (1993: 100).

Psychologically, this stands for 'the process of dissolving, transcending, or transmuting the infantile images of the hero's personal past' (ibid.: 101), giving him the emotional strength to go forward and be reborn; a 'better' self. If past images can be transformed into future projections, then the hero can guide his future destiny and bring back knowledge to the Ordinary World for the benefit of others. Vogler suggests that although the hero may enter the Special World looking for information, he 'may walk out with new friends or Allies'

(1999: 137). Although this suggests a sense of achievement in bringing back something positive from the journey, perhaps it is underplayed. Friends may be made, but it may be what they give to the hero, physically and emotionally, that is important in understanding the complete narrative trajectory.

Towards the end of this stage, there is a sense that as well as becoming more difficult, obstacles become more dangerous. For Campbell, '[t]he original departure into the land of trials represented only the beginning of the long and really perilous path of initiatory conquests and moments of illumination. Dragons have now to be slain and surprising barriers passed – again, again, and again' (1993: 109). As the treasure (goal) is closer to being reached, the guardians protecting it become more adamant to stop the hero. A moment is reached where the hero, 'whether god or goddess, man or woman, the figure in a myth or the dreamer of a dream, discovers and assimilates his opposite (his own unsuspected self) either by swallowing it or by being swallowed' (ibid.: 108). This suggests him coming into battle not only with a dark, enemy force, but with himself; the physicality of antagonism represents the darkest and deepest fear within. If '[t]he hero's appearance in the Special World may tip the Shadow to his arrival and trigger a chain of threatening events' (Vogler, 1999: 138), then at some stage along the path the Shadow will appear in full, preparing a battle that the hero must win in order to succeed, even survive.

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero's Journey:

**Physically**, the protagonist undertakes the course of the journey. His path is laden with physical tests, obstacles and the meeting of new people, and all of these become progressively difficult as the journey goes on. The Special World has a different look and

feel to the Ordinary World, with different spaces, faces and rules. There are also different priorities in this world, for the protagonist and its inhabitants. The physical environment is therefore very alien, yet the protagonist does gradually become accustomed to it.

As the physical journey progresses, the protagonist's life literally or metaphorically faces danger; physical tests and obstacles have become so difficult that he comes head-to-head with dark, enemy forces. Nevertheless, he must remember that the physical tools provided by the Mentor will help him in some way.

Emotionally, the journey is laden with mental tests and obstacles. Meeting new people is challenging, but this gradually aids the protagonist's emotional transformation. By undertaking tests, overcoming obstacles and integrating with new people, then, he begins to understand the necessity of the journey to his learning of emotional lessons. He begins to dissolve, transcend or transmute the emotions of his past, now embracing the new ones that this world is allowing him to experience.

As the emotional journey progresses, the increasingly dangerous tests and obstacles stir-up such a feeling that the protagonist's former emotional state is called into question. In a symbolic threat to life, he is forced to battle with himself and his deepest, darkest fears. Nevertheless, he must remember that the emotional tools provided by the Mentor will help him in some way.

## **vii. *Approach to the Inmost Cave (Preparing for Big Change)***

The hero eventually approaches the Inmost Cave, the stage in the journey where he will 'pass into an intermediate region between the border and the very center of the Hero's Journey. On the way [he will] find another mysterious zone with its own Threshold

Guardians, agendas, and tests' (Vogler, 1999: 145). The Approach to the Inmost Cave is directional towards the climax of the narrative, where a crisis 'in shaman's territory, on the edge between life and death' (ibid.: 151) tests the hero's inner and outer limits. Vogler sees this crisis as 'an event that separates the two halves of the story' (ibid.: 163): it picks-up the dramatic pace and pushes the narrative towards its climax, eventually driving it to resolution. 'After crossing this zone, which is often the borderland of death, the hero is literally or metaphorically reborn and nothing will ever be the same' (ibid.), suggesting that this stage defines a hero's physical want (literal) or his emotional need (metaphorical); or both. 'Past experience on the journey may be the hero's passport to new lands. Nothing is wasted, and every challenge of the past strengthens and informs us for the present' (ibid.: 148); at this moment, then, what has thus far been acquired physically and learned emotionally is brought into focus. Practically speaking, Vogler suggests that '[g]ood structure works by alternately lowering and raising the hero's fortunes and, with them, the audience's emotions' (ibid.: 165). Approach to the Inmost Cave thus prompts an audience to remember the hero's dramatic position, up against high stakes: 'The audience may need to be reminded of the "ticking clock" or the "time bomb" of the story. The urgency and life-and-death quality of the issue need to be underscored' (ibid.: 152).

A useful analogy is used by Vogler: the experience of a theme park ride. By this, we are reminded that 'good' narrative experience depends upon a feeling of near-death, or failure, strongly raising tension before allowing one to be assuaged (ibid.: 165). So, for the hero in a screenplay, the journey must provide a bleak moment where it seems that he will fail his objective, perhaps even experience death. Approach is thus a movement towards this bleak moment, an 'Ordeal [which] is some sort of battle or confrontation with an

opposing force. It could be a deadly enemy villain, antagonist, opponent, or even a force of nature' (ibid.: 167). Vogler sees this as the moment where the physical and emotional components of a narrative come to the fore, one potentially overtaking the other: 'The action may move from the physical arena to a moral, spiritual, or emotional plane' (ibid.: 169). Although short, this statement flags-up the interchangeability of physical and emotional focus, suggesting that it forms part of the complete narrative experience. If, '[f]or most people [the Ordeal] is death, but in many stories it's just whatever the hero is most afraid of: facing up to a phobia, challenging a rival, or roughing out a storm or a political crisis' (ibid.: 175), then this is a crucial narrative moment where the hero is brought face-to-face with his deepest fear. Vogler's examples of the Ordeal encompass both physical and emotional qualities, reinforcing that physical action and emotional transformation in the Hero's Journey are certainly needy of specific exploration.

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero's Journey:

**Physically**, the protagonist is lead into the Inmost Cave, a bleak place where he comes face-to-face with dark, enemy forces. High stakes reside in the Inmost Cave; physically, the protagonist has everything to lose. This moment of crisis physically pushes him to his limits, forcing him to call upon the physical tools provided by the Mentor, and everything thus far acquired from the journey, in order to survive. It is in the Inmost Cave that the protagonist may experience physical rebirth, changing so much that he comes out of it a changed person. As such, the Approach to the Inmost Cave picks-up the physical pace of the narrative, driving the audience's anticipation towards the Ordeal.

Emotionally, the Inmost Cave is a bleak place where the protagonist comes face-to-face with his deepest, darkest fear. He believes that he will fail in his desire to undergo emotional transformation; he feels emotionally dead. This crisis tests the protagonist's emotional limits, and if he can come out of it having learned something about himself, he will experience emotional rebirth. Providing he has the will to do so, the emotional tools provided by the Mentor, along with the lessons learned on the journey, will help him to succeed the wrath of the Inmost Cave.

It is at this stage of the screenplay that the audience may notice a change of focus, between the protagonist's physical and emotional drive. So far, the protagonist has been driven by a physical *want*; the literal thing that he has been seeking. However, the Inmost Cave gives him an understanding of the real reason why the journey is being undertaken. As such, emotion may surface as the primary driving force of the screenplay from here on in; the *need* for emotional transformation.

**viii. *Ordeal / Meeting with the Goddess; Woman as Temptress; Atonement with the Father; Apotheosis (Attempting Big Change)***

The Ordeal in myths signifies the death of the ego. The hero is now fully part of the cosmos, dead to the old, limited vision of things and reborn into a new consciousness of connections. The old boundaries of the Self have been transcended or annihilated. In some sense the hero has become a god with the divine ability to soar above the normal limits of death and see the broader view of the connectedness of all things (Vogler, 1999: 177).

Without doubt, this quotation is imbued with a strong suggestion that the Ordeal is the stage in which the hero truly experiences change. His identity is fluid, and so the Ordeal brings about a shift from old to new; wounded to healed; lacking to fulfilled. The change,

however, must be generated by a confrontation with dark forces (the Ordeal), whether that be the actual antagonist or a deeply antagonistic energy: 'the hero stands in the deepest chamber of the Inmost Cave, facing the greatest challenge and the most fearsome opponent yet' (ibid: 159). Inside the Inmost Cave, the Ordeal may be a confrontation of the hero's own emotional turmoil, understanding the problem that has thus far stopped him from achieving inner stability. Vogler writes that in this sense, heroes face 'their greatest fears, the failure of an enterprise, the end of a relationship, the death of an old personality' (ibid.). This is suggestive of internal affirmation, albeit taking place within the external scenario of the Ordeal, and supports the notion of the hero experiencing emotional transformation through the undertaking of a physical journey. If the secret of the Ordeal is that '[h]eroes must die so that they can be reborn' (ibid.), then this indicates a death of the past (problem, lack, need) and birth of the future. Thus, the Ordeal is where the greatest transformation can take place, or is at least seeded to take place. If Vogler suggests that this stage is 'a major nerve ganglion of the story. Many threads of the hero's history lead in, and many threads of possibility and change lead out the other side' (ibid.: 160), then this is where past meets present, and through a process of recognition and reconciliation, becomes future.

For Campbell, the Ordeal represents much more; he discusses at great length under the headings 'Meeting with the Goddess,' 'Woman as Temptress,' 'Atonement with the Father' and 'Apotheosis.' A more spiritual and psychological view is adopted by him, which is important in providing a deep understanding of emotion and emotional transformation. He describes the ultimate adventure, 'when all barriers and ogres have been overcome,' as a moment 'commonly represented as a mystical marriage [...] of the triumphant hero-soul with the Queen Goddess of the World' (1993: 109). Like Vogler's

idea of the hero brought face-to-face with fear, Campbell sees the Ordeal as a reuniting with the Goddess: 'She is the paragon of all paragons of beauty, the reply to all desire, the bliss-bestowing goal of every hero's earthly and unearthly quest' (ibid.: 110-111). 'Reply' and 'desire,' 'earthly' and 'unearthly,' are understood as the physical and the emotional; they represent the hero's external and internal journey, combining in a story moment his former troubles and future opportunities. If the Goddess is 'the incarnation of the promise of perfection; the soul's assurance that, at the conclusion of its exile in a world of organized inadequacies, the bliss that once was known will be known again' (ibid.: 111), then she makes her appearance to take the hero by the hand and prepare him for his Reward to follow.

Campbell describes this stage of the Hero's Journey as a 'fantasy' moment, one which appears spontaneously for the hero (ibid.: 113). It is not planned: the hero may be surprised at his meeting with the Goddess, yet nevertheless a strong bond is created. Accordingly, 'there exists a close and obvious correspondence between the attitude of a young child towards its mother and that of the adult toward the surrounding material world' (ibid.). This is thus a moment of submission for the hero, who will allow the 'powers' of the motherly figure to advise and heal; the Goddess 'encompasses the encompassing, nourishes the nourishing, and is the life of everything that lives' (ibid.: 114). A sense of duality lies in the figure of the Goddess, linking together notions of past and future, good and evil, physical and emotional: 'She is the womb and the tomb: the sow that eats her farrow. Thus she unites the "good" and the "bad" [...] The devotee is expected to contemplate the two with equal equanimity' (ibid.). Therefore, the hero is presented with a



range of possibilities that must be assessed before making his decision to move beyond the Inmost Cave; the Goddess represents his teaching.

Campbell writes:

Woman, in the picture language of mythology, represents the totality of what can be known. The hero is the one who comes to know [...] She lures, she guides, she bids him burst his fetters. And if he can match her import, the two, the knower and the known, will be released from every limitation (ibid.: 116).

From this comes a strong suggestion that the hero and the Goddess unite, becoming one; she knows, and he comes to know by absorbing her. As such, the Ordeal is a highly emotional stage where the hero must fully succumb to the Goddess' knowledge and power, allowing himself to be transformed. She represents the commitment to change; if he commits, he will be granted his Reward. Or: 'The meeting with the goddess (who is incarnate in every woman) is the final test of the talent of the hero to win the boon of love [...] which is life itself enjoyed as the encasement of eternity' (ibid.: 118). The Goddess is not always positive, however. Campbell writes that occasionally we see 'Woman as Temptress,' who although in female form 'represents the hero's total mastery of life; for the woman is life, the hero its knower and master' (ibid.: 120), tries to stop him from moving forward and experiencing rebirth. The hero may feel at peace in the Inmost Cave with the Goddess, willfully absorbing her teachings, but he must realise that he needs to ascend her and become 'more' than she is. As such, the hero 'experience[s] a moment of revulsion' (ibid.: 122) and is dramatically reminded of reality, finding within him a need to move on and achieve the Reward that he came in quest of: 'The seeker of the life beyond life must press beyond her, surpass the temptations of her call, and soar to the immaculate ether beyond' (ibid.). 'Life beyond life' suggests the attainment of a higher standing; an

emotional epiphany above the current physical scenario of remaining with the Goddess. Once achieved, the hero looks back and sees that she has turned into something else, something inferior: 'No longer can the hero rest in innocence with the goddess of the flesh; for she is become the queen of sin' (ibid.: 123).

'Atonement with the Father' sees the hero meeting and finding atonement with the fatherly figure before he can move on; the Ordeal of union before 'bliss' can be reached. Here, the hero experiences a realisation and enlightenment about his relationship with not only the father, but father and mother. Campbell writes:

For if it is impossible to trust the terrifying father-face, then one's faith must be centred elsewhere (Spider Woman; Blessed Mother); and with that reliance for support, one endures the crisis – only to find, in the end, that the father and mother reflect each other, and are in essence the same (ibid.: 131).

Thus, father and mother figure combine to give the hero a sense of fulfillment, where he incorporates both masculine and feminine qualities in order to become 'whole' and promote 'a radical readjustment of his emotional relationship to the parental images' (ibid.: 136). This notion of balance is likened to the overall sense of conflict and connection within the Hero's Journey: the hero faces tests, allies and enemies, dealing him obstacles and trials (conflict) necessary to develop the inner self, and support and advice (connection) necessary to provide hope and belief. Campbell writes: 'In most mythologies, the images of mercy and grace are rendered as vividly as those of justice and wrath, so that a balance is maintained, and the heart is buoyed rather than scourged along its way' (ibid.: 128). Furthermore:

The magic of the sacraments [...] the protective power of primitive amulets and charms, and the supernatural helpers of the myths and fairy tales of the world, are mankind's assurances that the arrow, the flames, and the flood are not as brutal as they seem (ibid.: 129).

Therefore, coming face-to-face with mother and father figure in the Inmost Cave, Campbell asserts a strong sense that the hero must pause, consider all that has happened on his journey, and make crucial decisions about the future before he can then proceed. 'The need for great care on the part of the father, admitting to his house only those who have been thoroughly tested, is illustrated by the unhappy exploit of the lad' (ibid: 133); so, the hero may enter the Inmost Cave with dread and a feeling of defeat, but what he does not know is that the forces of the Inmost Cave, the mother and father relationship, will set him free and enable him to achieve his goal.

However, these forces are not to be reckoned with; they do not pass easily. From the perspective of physical action, Atonement with the Father may be an unhappy experience, as with the Woman as Temptress. If 'the ogre aspect of the father is a reflex of the victim's own ego – derived from the sensational nursery scene that has been left behind, but projected before' (ibid.: 129), then the hero may face antagonistic, dangerous forces which function to draw out and destroy his (harmful) ego, for his own good. Such forces are positioned spiritually within the fatherly domain because 'the father is the initiating priest through whom the young being passes on into the larger world' (ibid.: 136). In other words, the father is the dominant force possessing the ability to raise the hero from his past and propel him into his future. Subsequently, the hero becomes the father himself, because having experienced the journey and forces of the Inmost Cave, he is given the ability to guide and initiate those who follow him: 'He is the twice-born: he has become himself the father' (ibid.: 137). The hero undergoes a personal, emotional epiphany which enables him to become the guide; the initiator; the knower. Having ventured through a

journey of ghastly rituals and ordeals, he is brought face-to-face with the father and 'transcends life with its peculiar blind spot and for a moment rises to a glimpse of the source. He beholds the face of the father, understands – and the two are atoned' (ibid.: 147). The physical battle which once seemed soul destroying now takes on a new light; emotionally, transformation bestowed by the father supercedes action and allows the hero to accomplish an inner transformation. Campbell summarises: 'For the son who has grown really to know the father, the agonies of the ordeal are readily borne; the world is no longer a vale of tears but a bliss-yielding, perpetual manifestation of the Presence' (ibid.: 148).

'Apotheosis' is the culmination of male and female qualities, and the movement from present stasis (contemplation, reflection, learning) to future Reward. The hero now fully understands himself and is aware of how to move forward. A comparison is made by Campbell to the Bodhisattva tribe, because like the hero now, 'this godlike being is a pattern of the divine state to which the human hero attains who has gone beyond the last terrors of ignorance' (ibid.: 151). The potential of release is thus posited to all, suggesting that anyone who enters the Inmost Cave and comes face-to-face with Goddess and father can ascend to a new level of life. This is represented no clearer than in the image of the Bodhisattva God, whose bi-gendered nature suggests that 'both the male and the female are to be envisioned, alternately, as time and eternity. That is to say, the two are the same, each is both, and the dual form (*yab-yum*) is only an effect of illusion' (ibid.: 170). This is suggestive of the relationship between the physical and emotional journey: at once, they appear as separate entities and are identified as possessing different qualities, yet at the same time, they are one. Campbell describes 'the devolvement of eternity into time, the breaking of the one into the two and then the many, as well as the generation of new life

through the reconjunction of the two' (ibid.: 153-154). Reconnection of the two, splitting them apart and then reuniting them, is the essence of the emotional and physical journey; they meld together to create one complete narrative. Emotional transformation and physical action are two sides of the same coin; they work for and with each other, and once the Inmost Cave has been entered and learning has taken place, the hero leaves with knowledge of how the two combine and, united, possess potent direction for his future. Now, having stood at the brink of death and realising for the first time his true identity, the hero's ego is enlarged and 'instead of thinking of only himself, [he] becomes dedicated to the world of *his* society' (ibid.: 156). Thus, 'death was not the end. New life, new birth, new knowledge of existence' (ibid.: 162) have emerged from the Inmost Cave, giving the hero his title. Now he has understood and conquered, he can venture forth for his Reward.

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero's Journey:

The Ordeal highlights the shift in focus from physical to emotional drive. Here, the protagonist understands the superior importance of emotional need over physical want.

Physically, the protagonist experiences a big change, from old self to new self. He goes from physically wounded to physically healed; physically lacking to physically fulfilled. The Ordeal puts him in direct confrontation with the darkest physical force he can imagine, and it is here that he must assess the physical possibilities available to him (no longer limitations) before deciding to move beyond the Inmost Cave. The Ordeal thus represents the death of the protagonist's physical past, with its physical problems and deficiencies, and from here on in we see the birth of his new physical future. The forces of

the Inmost Cave challenge the protagonist to the hilt, but provided that he comes out alive, he is set free and given the opportunity to attain the physical treasure he has been seeking.

Emotionally, old boundaries of the self are transcended during the Ordeal. The protagonist undergoes inner growth, from old self to new self. He goes from emotionally wounded to emotionally healed; emotionally lacking to emotionally fulfilled. He is put in direct confrontation with his own emotional darkness, and through experiencing this murky inner force, he finds atonement with himself. The protagonist thus experiences emotional affirmation: positioned within a physical encounter, his emotional past meets the emotional present, and through a process of fusion, becomes his emotional future. He thus submits to spiritual powers, understanding and conquering his emotional problem; and moving back towards the Ordinary World, he can guide and initiate those who follow *his* advice.

The Ordeal thus highlights the differences between the protagonist's physical and emotional journeys. It splits them apart in a narrative moment, emphasises their individual fabric, and then rejoins them back into the whole. In this, we can see that the protagonist's emotional affirmation takes place within the containment of a physical scenario; yet, the physical scenario actually allows the emotional affirmation to take place. As such, the two journeys come into the Inmost Cave as one, momentarily divide in order to signify their individual focus, and then fuse back together to rejoin the developing narrative.

#### **ix. *Reward / The Ultimate Boon (Consequences of the Attempt (Improvements and Setbacks))***

During this stage, 'heroes now experience the consequences of surviving death. With the dragon that dwelt in the Inmost Cave slain or vanquished, they seize the sword of victory

and lay claim to their Reward' (Vogler, 1999: 181). For he who has survived a progression of tests and ordeals, physical or emotional compensation is reaped. The Reward is thus a celebration of the journey undertaken, where 'energy has been exhausted in the struggle, and needs to be replenished' (ibid.: 182). For Campbell, The Ultimate Boon bestows the hero with both physical and emotional reward: having faced the mythical figures of mother and father, he gains his true 'boon' not just by feeling and understanding, but by having and being. During the Inmost Cave's emotional epiphany, 'the mind feels at home with the images, and seems to be remembering something already known. But the circumstance is obstructive too, for the feelings come to rest in the symbols and resist passionately every effort to go beyond' (Campbell, 1993: 177). What is thus required is a moment of physical reward, 'where the symbols give way and are transcended' (ibid.). In other words, the hero undergoes an emotional transformation but craves a physical boon to outwardly represent it. If the 'gods as icons are not ends in themselves' (ibid.: 180), then something more than enlightenment is required. The Gods may promise and deliver to the individual (emotion), but he must ascend them and become 'more than' them: 'Their entertaining myths transport the mind and spirit not *up to*, but *past* them, into the yonder void' (ibid.). Furthermore:

What the hero seeks through his intercourse with them is therefore not finally themselves, but their grace, i.e., the power of their sustaining substance. This miraculous energy-substance and this alone is the Imperishable; the names and forms of the deities who everywhere embody, dispense, and represent it come and go (ibid.: 181-182).

The hero ascends the Gods to become a mortal who possesses their qualities; their grace. If the guardians of the Reward 'dare release it only to the duly proven' (ibid.: 182), then only he who has confirmed himself on the journey and accepted the fate of the Inmost Cave can succeed and obtain it. This idea is shared by Vogler, who argues that '[h]eroes don't really

become heroes until the crisis; until then they are just trainees' (1999: 183). Therefore, the hero can only be a hero once he has proven himself and had approval from the Gods.

Both Vogler and Campbell write that the Reward / Ultimate Boon is appropriate to the story and its hero. If the emotional reward is abstract, and can be universally applied to any narrative, then the physical reward is specific to the hero and his situation. In other words, for Vogler: 'Treasure hunters take the gold, spies snatch the secret, pirates plunder the captured ship, an uncertain hero seizes her self-respect' (1999: 184); and for Campbell: 'The boon bestowed on the worshipper is always scaled to his stature and to the nature of his dominant desire: the boon is simply a symbol of life energy stepped down to the requirements of a certain specified case' (1993: 189). Vogler suggests that as the Reward is embraced, '[o]thers may see in their changed behaviour signs that they have been reborn and share in the immortality of gods [...] an abrupt realization of divinity' (1999: 188). The hero, then, may act, react, or speak in a different way, don an alternative appearance, or even display an alternative attitude to a person or problem. In this way, the hero has fully transformed as a result of the journey taken, and emerges from his Ordeal and Reward as 'special and different, part of a select few who have outwitted death' (ibid.: 186).

Perhaps Campbell summarises this stage of the Hero's Journey most succinctly. Here, he brings in the idea of physical action and emotion by suggesting that the physical Boon is an expression of emotional transformation, and at the same time, emotional transformation allows itself to be expressed physically:

The agony of breaking through personal limitations is the agony of spiritual growth. Art, literature, myth and cult, philosophy, and ascetic disciplines are instruments to help the individual past his limiting horizons into spheres of ever-expanding realization. As he crosses threshold after threshold, conquering dragon after dragon, the stature of the divinity that he summons to his highest wish increases, until it subsumes the cosmos. Finally, the mind breaks the bounding sphere of the



cosmos to a realization transcending all experiences of form – all symbolizations, all divinities: a realization of the ineluctable void (1993: 190).

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero's Journey:

**Physically**, in celebration of the journey travelled, the protagonist seizes the sword of victory and collects his Reward. The physicality of the gain is compensation for travelling the challenging terrain, from Crossing the First Threshold to leaving the Inmost Cave, and as such it gives the protagonist physical catharsis. The Reward itself is of a specific nature to the protagonist and his want, and in scale with the journey that he has travelled. Although his true reward may be emotional, he still craves this physical representation; an outward sign of his success. Now having collected the Reward, he may from here on in act, look or even speak differently. This is another physical sign of achievement, from the journey that he has not only travelled, but survived.

**Emotionally**, the Reward celebrates the journey travelled and compensates the emotional transformation that the protagonist has undergone. The reward is abstract and universal, appropriate in substance and in scale with the journey that he has travelled. Emotional transformation is understood by the protagonist as the superior Reward, but he still desires an outward sign of this so that others can share his achievement. Emotional transformation allows ascension to the Gods, where the protagonist becomes an heroic figure, with divine qualities. From here on in, he may show different emotional attitudes towards people or problems, in direct contrast with those shown in the Ordinary World.

During this stage of the screenplay, the protagonist's physical Reward acts as an outward expression of his emotional transformation; yet, at same time, emotional transformation requires physical expression. As such, the protagonist's emotional strength

of being able to survive the Inmost Cave not only enables him to come out of it alive, but able to collect the Reward he initially came seeking.

*x. The Road Back / Refusal of the Return; The Magic Flight; Rescue from Without; Crossing the Threshold; Return (Rededication to Change)*

When the hero-quest has been accomplished, through penetration to the source, or through the grace of some male or female, human or animal, personification, the adventurer still must return with his life-transmuting trophy (Campbell, 1993: 193).

Having gained the Reward, the hero must leave the Special World and go back to the Ordinary World in order to share the tale of his journey to others. Campbell writes that:

Even the Buddha, after his triumph, doubted whether the message of realization could be communicated, and saints are reported to have passed away while in supernatural ecstasy. Numerous indeed are the heroes fabled to have taken up residence forever in the blessed isle of the unaging (ibid.).

As this suggests, the hero may believe that his journey, with its Tests, Allies, Enemies and Ordeal, is unable to be recounted; who would believe him? Moreover, why would he leave such a pleasant state to return to mundaneness and ordinariness? For Vogler, 'this stage represents the resolve of the hero to return to the Ordinary World and implement the lessons learned in the Special World' (1999: 195). In other words, he has become a hero as a result of the adventure undertaken, and now it needs to be recalled in the hope that others, too, will learn valuable lessons from it. The hero thus becomes selfless; rather than reside comfortably in 'supernatural ecstasy,' he feels compelled to share his adventure and the meaning bestowed: '[heroes] have seen the eternal plan but return to the world of the living

to tell others about it and share the elixir they have won' (ibid.). For Campbell, the passage of Return corresponds to the hero's ascension to God, and is as much emotional (spiritual) as it is physical. He argues that if the hero has been blessed by the Gods and commissioned to return home with the elixir given to him, then 'the final stage of his adventure is supported by all the powers of his supernatural patron' (1993: 197). As well as following a physical path back, then, the hero is propelled and guided by his emotion; spiritual growth gives him the strength to overcome any final obstacles that he may face. For Vogler:

A story about achieving some goal becomes a story of escape; a focus on physical danger shifts to emotional risks. The propellant that boosts the story out of the depths of the Special World may be a new development or piece of information that drastically redirects the story (1999: 195).

Although this does not directly specify a change in narrative drive from physical to emotional, it can be inferred from 'physical danger' shifting to 'emotional risks,' and the suggestion that the story is drastically redirected. This suggests that during this stage, the physical and emotional narrative threads are brought together, combined in a story moment, and then pushed back apart, each carrying a new meaning.

As such, The Road Back forges a new narrative drive for the hero – emotion – which, nevertheless, is represented through physical action. Seen by Campbell as a 'Magic Flight,' 'the last stage of the mythological round becomes a lively, often comical, pursuit' (1993: 197) which is 'useful for torquing up a story's energy' (Vogler, 1999: 197). If the story pace has slowed through the Ordeal and the Reward, then this is 'a time when the story's energy [...] is now revved up again' (ibid.: 193). Campbell notes that '[a] popular variety of the magic flight is that in which objects are left behind to speak for the fugitive and thus delay pursuit' (1993: 200), which suggests that physical objects are shed in favour

of retaining emotional possession. This highlights not only the supremacy of emotion over physical action during this stage of the journey, but how the physical can represent the emotional. Objects thrown down as obstacles to delay the pursuer are symbolic of new emotional strength and power over something or someone previously feared and in control. Not only that, what 'the hero throws down in a chase may also represent a sacrifice, the leaving behind of something of value' (Vogler, 1999: 197). The hero thus disposes of physical objects that were once significant because he knows that, in comparison to his emotional transformation, they are now useless; he retains wisdom over possession.

Campbell's 'Rescue from Without' provides further thoughts on how the passage of return finds manifestation in physical action. He writes that '[t]he hero may have to be brought back from his supernatural adventure by assistance from without. That is to say, the world may have to come and get him' (1993: 207). Therefore, because the hero may be lulled into the 'supernatural ecstasy' of the Special World, he requires a physical pull (from without) back into the Ordinary World. Alternatively, the hero may want to return to the Ordinary World, but is just slow in doing so. This, again, requires a force to ensure that he does indeed make his way: 'if the summoned one is only delayed [...] an apparent rescue is effected, and the adventurer returns' (ibid.). Sometimes, the hero's unconscious may '[supply] its own balances' (ibid.: 216), returning him to the Ordinary World. This reminds us of the emotional narrative thread that may have taken precedence over the physical; he *wants* to stay in the Special World, but he *needs* to return to the Ordinary World. Whatever way, the hero journeys back to his original world with knowledge and experience that will help his own people to improve their lives and increase their understanding of life itself. As Campbell asserts: 'Whether rescued from without, driven from within, or gently carried

along by the guiding divinities, he has yet to re-enter with his boon the long-forgotten atmosphere where men who are fractions imagine themselves to be complete' (ibid.).

Returning with knowledge and experience to bestow upon others is important for Campbell, who describes in detail the process of returning to the Ordinary World: 'Crossing the Threshold.' To begin with, Campbell reminds us of the journey undertaken by the hero so far, clarifying the essence, or meaning, of such a journey:

The hero adventures out of the land we know into darkness; there he accomplishes his adventure, or again is simply lost to us, imprisoned, or in danger; and his return is described as a coming back out of that yonder zone. Nevertheless – and here is a great key to the understanding of myth and symbol – the two kingdoms are actually one. The realm of the gods is a forgotten dimension of the world we know (ibid.: 217).

Suggested here is that although Ordinary World and Special World are presented as entirely separate entities, at heart they are part of the same myth, functioning for the same story purpose. Combining the worlds together, the hero has experienced an almost 'out-of-body' journey, rooted in one idea: emotion. The journey has physically challenged and tested him, but all the while it has functioned for the emotional purpose (his inner problem) outlined from the start. For Campbell, 'values and distinctions that in normal life seem important disappear with the terrifying assimilation of the self into what formerly was only otherness' (ibid.); or, what seemed unachievable at the start of the narrative has now been achieved, by he who thought it unachievable. With this epiphinal realisation, a dilemma does exist: how can the hero go back and convince people of what has taken place? How can the incredible emotional transformation he has undergone be put into words? 'How render back into light-world language the speech-defying pronouncements of the dark?

How represent on a two-dimensional surface a three-dimensional form, or in a three-dimensional image a multi-dimensional meaning?' (ibid.: 218).

Just as 'Crossing the First Threshold' was important, so is 'Crossing the Return Threshold.' In simple terms, it must be evident that the hero has returned from an adventure and re-entered a world which now appears very different. In more complex terms, the hero, 'who has plunged to touch [destiny], and has come up again – with a ring' (ibid.: 228), deserves a special entrance in which others see him as worthy. Campbell's examples of such remind us that the hero is no ordinary man, but the deserving one who has proven himself across the journey travelled: 'Montezuma, Emperor of Mexico, never set foot on the ground; he was always carried on the shoulders of noblemen [...] Within his palace, the king of Persia walked on carpets on which no one else might tread' (ibid.: 224).

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero's Journey:

**Physically**, the protagonist must leave the Special World and return to the Ordinary World. On the Road Back he overcomes further physical obstacles, and may even leave behind objects or people 'collected' from the journey. The protagonist may experience physical pursuit on his way back to the Ordinary World, but if so, he will be helped by the tools provided by the Mentor. Pursuit suggests that the protagonist may wish to remain in the Special World, but the physical environment can no longer accommodate him; so, he must leave. The Road Back physically challenges and tests the protagonist, but his will to overcome further obstacles is evident. What previously seemed physically unachievable is now fully achievable, thanks to the physical transformation that he has undergone.

Emotionally, the protagonist feels a duty to return to the Ordinary World with the life-transmuting trophy that he can bestow upon others. Having a renewed sense of emotional balance, the overcoming of further obstacles is done with great emotional determination. Similarly, objects left behind in the Special World symbolise the emotional sacrifice to the world he is leaving. The Road Back emotionally challenges and tests the protagonist, but he is helped by the emotional tools given by the Mentor. The resolve of the protagonist is to implement the lessons learned on the journey to those in the Ordinary World. The Road Back thus represents a further shift in narrative focus, from physical want to emotional need; although the moment is physicalised through action, the drive is emotional. Subsequently, he feels that what previously seemed emotionally unachievable is now fully achievable, thanks to the emotional transformation that he has undergone.

#### *xi. Resurrection / Master of the Two Worlds (Final Attempt at Big Change)*

Vogler believes the Resurrection to be 'one of the trickiest and most challenging passages for the hero and the writer' (1999: 203). This is because of the need to show that that an emotional as well as physical change has taken place; not only that, these changes should be bestowed upon others. Campbell writes that there is a fine line between the two worlds that the hero has experienced, and although the principles of the Special World should not 'contaminate' the Ordinary World, they should be used in a sense of 'mastery' now that he has returned (1993: 229). The hero may 'have to undergo a final purging and purification before reentering the Ordinary World' (Vogler, 1999: 203), physically leaving the Special World behind, but emotionally, knowledge and wisdom are carried forward. Vogler

describes this as a cathartic moment, 'relieving anxiety or depression by bringing unconscious material to the surface' (ibid.: 210); the unconscious material here is emotion surfacing over action. Once more this highlights the relationship between physical action and emotional transformation: the literal, external world is left behind, yet spiritual, internal growth is brought forward to benefit the self and others. 'Just as heroes had to shed their old selves to enter the Special World, they now must shed the personality of the journey and build a new one that is suitable for return to the Ordinary World' (ibid.: 203-4); the hero who accomplishes this is the Master of the Two Worlds.

The symbolic nature of the Resurrection / Master of the Two Worlds is what concerns Campbell. Specific cases or moments of transition are unimportant to him in comparison to the universal, symbolic value that they possess; the emotional or spiritual supercedes the physical or factual. Indeed, he goes as far as saying that 'we are concerned, at present, with problems of symbolism, not of historicity. We do not particularly care whether Rip van Winkle, Kamar al-Zaman, or Jesus Christ ever actually lived. Their *stories* are what concern us' (1993: 230). This reinforces the importance of story substance over plot shape; emotion over physical action. Campbell emphasises this further by discussing the mythical Universal God Vishnu, 'with many faces and eyes, presenting many wondrous sights, bedecked with many celestial ornaments, armed with many divine uplifted weapons; wearing celestial garlands and vestments, anointed with divine perfumes, all-wonderful, resplendent, boundless, and with faces on all sides' (ibid.: 231), who presented himself to Prince Arjuna. The suggestion is that the Resurrection is of great importance for the hero, just as it was for Prince Arjuna, because he comes face-to-face with a symbol of rebirth and divinity, and knowledge that he has lived through a testing



experience but come out of it a hero. Vishnu as a symbol of home-coming, he promises an enhanced existence not just for the hero, but for his fellow man: 'To learn something in a Special World is one thing; to bring the knowledge home as applied wisdom is quite another' (Vogler, 1999: 205). A Master of the Two Worlds who is able to live in normality yet 'retain the lessons of the ordeal' (ibid.: 204), the hero will become Vishnu, displaying optimism through a God-like persona, and promising fortune to others. He is no longer concerned with personal fate, 'but the fate of mankind, of life as a whole, the atom and all the solar systems, has been opened to him' (Campbell, 1993: 234). The hero learns to accept his role as mentor to others, and is now at peace with himself, having exorcised his demons and accepting what life sends his way (ibid.: 237):

The individual, through prolonged psychological disciplines, gives up completely all attachment to his personal limitations, idiosyncrasies, hopes and fears, no longer resists the self-annihilation that is prerequisite to rebirth in the realization of truth, and so becomes ripe, at last, for the great at-one-ment (ibid.: 236-237).

Overall, Resurrection proves that the Special World has been left behind and the Ordinary World penetrated again. This is not always as straight forward as it seems, however, as some heroes deliberate upon whether or not to accept their fate. Giving the hero a difficult choice to make, Vogler argues, will test his acceptance of this new fate, and give an audience proof of Resurrection: 'Will he choose in accordance with his old, flawed ways, or will the choice reflect the new person he's become?' (1999: 207). This notion of providing proof 'is a major function of the Resurrection' (ibid.: 216), where both audience and hero are reminded of the emotional significance of the physical action undertaken. One example of such proof is sacrifice: if '[s]omething must be surrendered, such as an old habit or belief' (ibid.), then this represents the hero's decision to change; a physical shift

that is driven by emotion. This reinforces the idea that '[t]he real treasure from travelling is not the souvenirs, but lasting inner change and learning' (ibid.), again suggesting the ultimate significance of emotional transformation over physical action. Specifying that the true meaning of the narrative is thus to be found in the Resurrection, Vogler articulates:

The higher dramatic purpose of Resurrection is to give an outward sign that the hero has really changed. The old Self must be proven to be completely dead, and the new Self immune to temptations and addictions that trapped the old form (ibid.: 217).

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero's Journey:

**Physically**, the protagonist must demonstrate that he has changed, and that his change can benefit those living in the Ordinary World. As such, he may bring back a trophy from the Special World that he can show-off, or use to great effect. However, it is important that the physicality of the Special World does not contaminate the Ordinary World, so he may be forced to make a sacrifice that shows him surrendering his old self and the physical journey he has travelled. A final physical test or hurdle may be set, seeking proof of the protagonist's true resurrection: a physical sign of his emotional transformation.

**Emotionally**, the protagonist must demonstrate that he has transformed, not just for himself but the benefit of others. This is a symbolic moment of universal transformation, where the retaining of emotional over physical reward is important. As such, the emotional journey assumes superiority over the physical journey here, the protagonist proving that he has given-up his personal limitations, as witnessed in the original Ordinary World. A difficult choice given to the protagonist tests his emotional strength, providing final proof

that he truly has transformed. Sacrifice is thus significant for the Resurrection, where renouncing an old habit or attitude symbolises the emotional transformation undergone.

## **xii. *Return with Elixir / Freedom to Live (Final Mastery of the Problem)***

'The goal of the myth,' writes Campbell, 'is to dispel the need for such life ignorance by effecting a reconciliation of the individual consciousness with the universal will' (1993: 238). This outlines the need for the hero to be absorbed back into society and share his experiences with others. He becomes a guide, a mentor, a way forward, selflessly offering 'something with the power to heal a wounded land' (Vogler, 1999: 221). As suggested by the Resurrection, a true hero is one who brings back knowledge and wisdom for the sake of others, providing them with the Elixir of life, the Freedom to Live. According to Vogler, '[i]f a traveller doesn't bring back something to share, he's not a hero, he's a heel, selfish and unenlightened' (ibid.: 228). Rather, having undertaken the journey, he should bring back treasure (physical or emotional) which can be used to 'save' others: 'the wisdom which heroes bring back with them may be so powerful that it forces change not only in them, but also those around them' (ibid.). In this way, the hero's emotional transformation has shifted the balance from himself to others; from me to you, or us: '[his] center has moved from the ego to the Self, and sometimes expands to include the group' (ibid.). Common in screenplays are heroes who 'always proceed with a sense that they are commencing a new life, one that will be forever different because of the road just travelled' (ibid.: 221); life will never be like it was in the original Ordinary World. Campbell writes that '[t]he hero is the champion of things becoming, not of things become' (1993: 243); he

has moved-on from his initial dramatic problem, and now looks ahead, to the future. The Elixir brought back to the Ordinary World may be emotional (or spiritual) in form, such as wisdom or advice; or, it may be physical, such as a trophy or treasure. Often the physical represents the emotional, items and objects symbolising abstract and personal qualities.

Considering the hero's positioning back in the new Ordinary World, with an elixir to bestow, Vogler writes:

Whether it's shared within the community or with the audience, bringing back the Elixir is the hero's final test. It proves she's been there, it serves as an example for others, and it shows above all that death can be overcome (1999: 227).

Therefore, elixir is a necessary component in the screenplay narrative. Whether physical or emotional in form, it provides an audience with the sense that a road has been travelled, and that the hero has come home a 'better,' developed person. Elixir as proof-of-change demonstrates 'the circular or closed form, in which the narrative returns to its starting point' (ibid.: 223), and works to 'draw a comparison' (ibid.) for an audience between start and finish. As a result, an audience knows that the life of the hero and his people will go on, for the better: 'a circle has been closed, and a new one is about to begin' (ibid.: 224).

Vogler returns to the subject of emotion, writing that Return with Elixir 'is your last chance to touch the emotions of the audience. It must finish your story so that it satisfies or provokes your audience as you intended' (ibid.: 225). The 'intended' is the theme or the meaning that resonates with an audience, manifested through emotion. Such emotional magnitude may not come from a definite statement or meaning, but rather from stirred-up emotions that an audience is left to contemplate. Vogler writes:

In the open-ended point of view, the storytelling goes on after the story is over; it continues in the minds and hearts of the audience, in the conversations an even

arguments people have in coffee shops after seeing a movie or reading a book (ibid.: 224).

Not only this, '[s]ome stories end not by answering questions or solving riddles, but by posing new questions that resonate in the audience long after the story is over' (ibid.: 225). As such, emotion plays a crucial part in the screenplay narrative, so much so that the stories told and meanings offered are transposed into everyday life; the text lives beyond its literal form. If the story 'should end with the emotional equivalent of a punctuation mark' (ibid.: 232), then the emotional experience should outlive the physical journey portrayed; physical action frames emotion, but emotion breaks the frame and takes on a life of its own.

Vogler writes that in many screenplays, 'an image or line of dialogue flatly making a declarative statement' (ibid.: 233) concludes the narrative. For example, lines such as 'life goes on,' 'love conquers all,' 'good triumphs over evil,' 'that's the way life is' and 'there's no place like home' (ibid.) all indicate the writer's ability to cement the end of his screenplay in a physical way: a line of dialogue. Such a sense of closure may be required in a mainstream screenplay, but its physical form is as much to do with emotion. 'Life goes on' *feels* as much as it *means*; 'there's no place like home' tells us as much about someone's state-of-mind as it does their physical state. Therefore, although it can be argued that emotion prevails over physical action in the resolution of a screenplay (and beyond), that very emotion is created by physical action. So, as the circle of the narrative completes, we see here a reuniting of physical action and emotion; they become one.

\*\*\*

For the purposes of re-defining the Hero's Journey:

**Physically**, the protagonist is located firmly back in the Ordinary World, and perhaps even in the same scenario that the audience previously found him. The difference this time is that he has brought back physical treasure, and his emotional transformation is manifested through physical action or reaction. Re-visiting a scenario from the original Ordinary World suggests that a journey has been travelled, and the bringing back of something physically new makes it different this time; the scenario is better. The very end of the screenplay may be punctuated by a physical representation of change, perhaps in the form of a visual image or a line of dialogue, giving final physical closure to the narrative.

**Emotionally**, the Return with Elixir demonstrates a reconciliation of the individual consciousness with the universal will. The protagonist returns to the original Ordinary World, but with a renewed state of emotion. He brings back emotional wisdom to heal others as well as himself, and because of the circular narrative form, a feeling is created that life will start again. Here is where an emotional punctuation mark is brought to the screenplay, the emotional journey superseding the physical journey. Physical action frames emotion, but emotion breaks the frame and takes on a life of its own. Nevertheless, both journeys work symbiotically to create one narrative; the screenplay whole.

### 3.

The re-defined model of the Hero's Journey enables the screenwriter or screenwriting critic to unpick the twelve narrative stages of a mainstream feature film, understanding how physical action and emotion feature and then progress in each. Examining physical action and emotion as individual narrative threads of a complete screenplay facilitates an understanding not only of the fabric, form and function of each, but the relationship that

they share. Furthermore, re-defining the Hero's Journey creates a better understanding of how the protagonist's emotional transformation is generated, in direct relation to his undertaking of physical action.

What is evident from the model, however, is that mapping physical and emotional journeys is not as straight forward as it may seem. Although it has been possible to separate the two narrative threads, it has become clear that they in fact enjoy a strong symbiotic relationship. In many of the twelve narrative stages, it is difficult to fully define and separate physical and emotional because they are inherently interwoven. The symbiotic nature of their relationship, as well as their ability to shift narrative focus, means that there are many similarities in both threads; the only difference is how that similarity is actually physicalised or emotionalised. Some moments in the Hero's Journey thus combine physical action and emotion as one; an action, for example, that is manifested physically yet driven by the protagonist's emotion. Physicality, then, is perhaps always underpinned by emotion, and vice versa, making the separation of the two difficult to fully complete. Nevertheless, it has been important to divide the Hero's Journey into its two narrative threads, going beyond what has already been written about the model and offering an understanding of how the threads function separately, and in combination.

The re-defined model of the Hero's Journey presented thus offers a more effective exploration of each of its twelve stages, providing a specific understanding of the fabric, form, function and relationship of physical action and emotion, useful for both the screenwriter and the critic. In the specific case of this PhD, the result comes in the form of a more significant awareness of and capacity in storytelling technique, which has been directly applied to the writing of an original screenplay: *Offside*.

**CHAPTER FOUR:**  
**APPLYING THE RE-DEFINED HERO'S JOURNEY TO**  
**THE ORIGINAL SCREENPLAY *OFFSIDE***



## 1.

Writing the screenplay *Offside* has been a long and enduring, yet highly enjoyable, experience. From drafting the first treatment to polishing the final draft, the intention was always to tell a story with resonance, which an audience would *feel*. When developing the central characters and constructing the narrative framing them, the consideration was always to produce a story that would ignite emotion, not only in the film's protagonist, but in the audience too. Using the model of the Hero's Journey and its subsequent re-definition has been used to accomplish this. The model has functioned as a way of guiding my creative thoughts, bringing them together in a formalised way and shaping them into a workable narrative structure. Through the research undertaken for the critical commentary, too, *Offside* has progressively developed. Gaining a greater understanding of how the protagonist's journey is structured through physical action and emotion has enabled *Offside* to develop from a mere idea to a completed screenplay. The journey of the protagonist, Paul, drives the film, and through its eight drafts the screenplay has become increasingly focussed and structurally controlled. Therefore, through an oscillating interaction between creative work and critical work, Paul's journey has been pared down to its core elements and then built-up from the theories of the physical and emotional journey as discussed.

In this final chapter, the screenplay *Offside* will be deconstructed in relation to the pattern of the re-defined Hero's Journey. As already highlighted, it is difficult to fully separate and define the physical and emotional qualities in each stage of the journey because they are so greatly interwoven. Therefore, although specific reference will be made to physical and emotional qualities, the deconstruction will bring them together and discuss each stage as a whole. Although the process of developing the screenplay has been

lengthy and detailed, the deconstruction that follows is concerned with the final product of the drafting process: the final screenplay.<sup>19</sup> However, the deconstruction will be presented in present tense (the character *is* and the character *does*), because until the film is actually made, the development process is always ongoing. For the purpose of this PhD, the screenplay is finished; for the purpose of the film industry, it has only just begun.

### i. *Ordinary World*

The screenplay begins with a sound-only scene, which is set five years prior to the present day. The idea behind this is to establish backstory crucial to the film: the resentment felt for Paul (protagonist) by Simon (antagonist). Although the audience is not yet aware, Paul has been 'outed' to everyone by his twin brother, Robert. Simon is sickened by the thought of homosexuality, and wants Paul to leave Newbury Rovers Juniors, the football team that all three of them play for. He tells Paul: 'Why don't you fuck off? You can't do it.' This exchange is crucial to the emotional drive of the narrative, because shame is what Paul now fears and reacts to. Not only that, variations of 'you can't do it' are repeated throughout the film to chart Paul's emotional progression; later, inevitably, he 'can do it.' The scene then dissolves to the present day, where Paul, Frank (their father) and Clare (Robert's girlfriend) watch Robert play football, now for the adult Newbury Rovers team. The scene is described as a 'dreary Saturday afternoon' with 'a line of cold and hungry customers queuing for hotdogs.' The intention is to suggest that the town has no spark; it is missing something, which hopefully the unfolding narrative will provide. Frank shouting, 'Go on,

---

<sup>19</sup> Numerous third parties have offered feedback during the development of *Offside*, from general comments about the initial idea to detailed notes about the later screenplay. These parties include: Nadine Mellor, Head of Development, September Films; Catherine Oldfield, Development Producer, Greenlit Productions; Gareth Philips, Script Editor, ITV Drama; Robin Mukherjee, freelance screenwriter; Barbara Mackie, freelance screenwriter and script editor.

son! [...] He's a wonder boy!' and Clare, 'He's my boy!' is intended to position Paul as an outsider to the group, physically, and for him, emotionally. The delayed physical reveal of Paul also adds to this, building-up a sense of exclusion. Paul shouts to Robert, 'You can do it!' and then whispers the same line to himself with more poignancy. This is intended to remind the audience of the previous line, 'you can't do it,' setting-up that indeed he no longer does play football, and for this he feels sadness. Further football match scenes are then intercut with a gay pride march taking place in Newbury town centre. As well as for comic effect, these scenes are to foreshadow the revelation of a central theme to the narrative: Paul is gay. Intercutting football and the gay pride march is intended to suggest that two diametrically opposed worlds exist, within which Paul is trapped. On the one hand, he loves football and still desires to play; on the other hand, by default he belongs to a gay community, for which a set of stereotypes exists. The use of stereotypical character traits here (homage to *The Wizard of Oz*; a focus upon hairstyling) is intentional, purposely presenting a palette of recognisable gay stereotypes that represent all that Paul is trying not to be. Thus, Paul's problem is not only to try and move beyond these stereotypes, but to prove to Frank that he is still his son, and that nothing has changed.

Paul's sadness for no longer playing football is highlighted when, after Frank says 'Do it for us,' he says to himself, 'For me.' Here, Paul is using Robert and his success as a way out of his own emotional turmoil; he thinks that if Robert can make Frank and the rest of the town happy, then his own 'shame' is avoided. This sense of 'shame' is depicted throughout the film, where Paul struggles to accept who he is. For example, when 'Robert and Simon strip off their shirts' and a player 'jumps onto Robert's back waving his arms around,' Paul 'looks on, admiring the player's body, but then quickly looks away.' This is

intended to show that not only is Paul gay, he is nervous about showing it. The worst nightmare for Paul then ensues when the gay pride paraders pass, and seeing the hunky players, climb over the fence and onto the pitch. Seeing the unfolding action, Simon 'throws a knowing look to Paul.' This is important in building Paul's dramatic problem, because he fears that he is to blame for their arrival; physical action telling the audience of emotional turmoil. An interesting dynamic is added, however, when Robert joins in with the action. He 'plays, flirtatiously' with Tyler, who is dressed as Dorothy from *The Wizard of Oz*; Paul feels very uncomfortable. This is worsened when Paul tries to steer the conversation back to football: 'Right, de-briefing?' Paul's inadvertent sexual innuendo is picked-up and highlighted by Tyler, which again is intended to suggest Paul's painful split between the two worlds he currently inhabits. Across the pitch, this split is reinforced by Simon: he says that seeing the gay paraders turns his stomach, and then gives his co-player such a look that he is forced to agree. The 'normal world' ideology is thus established, suggesting Paul's uncomfortable place within it and the struggles that lie ahead.

It is established that Paul is single. This subplot is intended to act as a physical manifestation of his emotional state: he feels that he cannot yet truly express himself; he is driven by a feeling of shame and disappointment. Paul currently hides these emotions, however, by putting his energy into others, such Robert and Newbury Rovers' hard work to enter the Nationwide Conference. Paul's selflessness, however, is overpowered by the Simon's nastiness. For example, when he sees Robert talking to Tyler, who is intrigued by the wig that he is wearing, he says, cuttingly: 'Leave that to your brother.' Coupled with the fact that Frank is oblivious to the hidden bullying going on, Paul is intended to feel further isolated. Tyler's comment, 'You know we prefer straight boys?' fuels Simon to

make a cruel remark: 'I should do, eh Paul?' This is intended to remind Paul of his painful past, and when Simon drags Robert away for a celebratory pint, Paul is left feeling like a real outsider, no longer part of the Newbury Rovers community.

Paul is back at home, looking at a photograph of him and Robert as teenagers, when they played for the Newbury Rovers junior team. Physically, the photograph is intended to be a symbol of Paul's emotional dilemma, representing both his past and his present: desire to play football versus complacency to stand and watch. In his own bedroom, Frank looks through some newspaper cuttings from 1979, a time when he was playing for Newbury Rovers and they too were on the brink of promotion. A headline, 'Header Ache: Stokes Scuppers Promotion,' tells the audience that Frank has his own shame; destroying Newbury Rovers' chances of entering the league thirty years ago. As such, football success, coming second, and the need to restore the Stokes name is intended to be seen as lying at the heart of this family. Frank's desire was to see both of his sons playing for the team that he never quite made successful, and now that Paul is gay and has stopped playing, the burden has shifted to Robert. As such, Paul is supposed to be seen as the son who can never truly make his father happy; who can never restore the family name.

Paul has a night out at the local gay club with Clare, their friend Melanie, and Robert, who joins them later. Sandwiched between Newbury Rovers' football match and Frank's efforts to make Robert concentrate on the team's promotion, the positioning of these scenes is intended to show how Paul has little choice in what he does; he is passive. Being gay, rather than play football he must go to the gay club. Frank closes his bedroom curtains on Paul, Clare and Melanie as they run down the street on their way out. Although only a small action, this is intended to symbolise shutting out the truth; remaining in a

closed, insular world, where being gay is not discussed. On their way to the club, it is hinted that something undisclosed lurks in the past between Paul and Robert. When Clare tells Paul that Robert always looks out for him, he reacts with an awkward look, and the line 'Not always ...' As the audience will later find out, Paul was 'outed' by Robert at the age of sixteen, just before their mother died. Although this detail is held back for now, it is used to generate a sense of negative tension that the audience wants to know more about. The actual truth, in retrospect, is crucial to Paul's emotional journey for two reasons: firstly, because he never had the chance to accept himself, he feels that he was not ready to tell everyone at such an early age; secondly, he feels that his mother never saw the *real* him because he did not have the chance to show that being gay did not change who he was. As a result, Paul feels that he has never been given the chance to be himself. Instead, in being seen as a stereotypical gay man by others, he has been passive in the formation of his own identity, allowing himself to be consumed by his Ordinary World. The use of stereotypical gay characters is thus made for this reason. For example, 'three queens' push past Paul in the club, 'look him up and down, scathingly,' and almost start a fight with him. This is intended to highlight Paul's emotional anxiety about inhabiting a world full of gay stereotypes, and as such, the pressure that he feels to conform results in negative physical action. Ironically, Robert is much more comfortable with such gay stereotypes. He 'dramatically puts on some sunglasses' in front of Frank, and is dressed much camper than Paul. The difference, of course, is that he only knows this world from a playful point of view; he does not live in it.

That night, Paul goes home with a guy from the club, Toby. In the morning, however, the audience sees regret on his face. In a room of gay motifs, along with signs of

the previous night's sexual antics, Paul feels trapped; the physical surroundings remind him of his emotional problem, and he is not ready to accept them yet. Toby confuses a picture of Robert in the local newspaper with Paul. He jokes: 'I knew you were a whiz with balls, but ...' Although this has comedic tones, it is intended to signify Paul's dilemma of being in a world where he does not possess his own identity. This is accentuated later when tension builds in the kitchen between Paul, Robert and Frank: Frank wants to talk to Robert about football, and his and Simon's training regime; Robert wants to talk to Paul about his night with Toby; Paul wants to talk with Frank about the training regime. This complex scene is intended to position Paul in a stereotypical lifestyle, one that he does not want to be in, but he cannot confront it openly because of the discomfort that he knows Frank feels. Instead, agendas clash as each man pushes to be heard. Tensions rise physically when Paul and Robert have a scuffle; Robert is goading Paul for information about Toby. Paul's emotional limits are tested, and as the scene reaches its climax, Paul is torn between what he wants to talk about, and what he is expected to talk about. Frank, who has made a football match scene using kitchen utensils, 'starts to dismantle his efforts' and decides to go to the pub. Paul, at an emotional low point, says that he will help Sheila to peel the potatoes instead of joining Frank. This is intended to reveal his reluctance in pushing his agenda and making himself heard. Now emotionally beaten, Paul matter-of-factly gives Robert the details he has desperately been seeking: 'Eight inch cock. Arse like a peach. Let me fuck him all night.' Once more, Paul's physical ability overtakes his emotional need, and we know by his line 'Not my type' that he is very unhappy.

Having set-up Paul's emotional dilemma in the home, his emotional dilemma in the workplace is explored. This is seen as important, because as Paul works for the town

council, the workplace represents Newbury and all that it stands for. Although the audience is unaware of this yet, the idea of 'Newbury versus Paul' is what later drives the narrative, manifested specifically through the antagonist, Simon. Paul's familiar, negative normality in the workplace is taken advantage of by Simon, who comes in late, gloats about his football successes, and gets away with all of it because the manager is a big football fan. Again, the intention here is to see Paul as passive; in order to actively take control of his life, he needs to change. Simon is seen to currently 'rule the roost,' leaving Paul with the donkey work. Instead of helping with a report, for example, Simon goes to pin-up his own picture in the 'Star of the Month' display: 'Say hello to Mr February.' What is worse for Paul is that the manager actually puts the picture up himself; he never acknowledges that Simon was late, and that Paul has done all the hard work. Physically, then, the manager putting up Simon's picture is an emotional punch in the stomach for Paul, which is intensified when 'Paul goes to say something but the manager pushes him back, out of the way. He ignores Paul, instead admiring Simon's 'mug' on display.' The intention here is to show that Paul is ignored of his value, and is trapped by the people who control his Ordinary World. This is intensified even further when the manager kisses the report that Paul has completed, but gives the real praise (the football game) to Simon. Here, the audience is intended to feel that the status quo can no longer stay like it is.

For Paul's Call to Adventure to be realised, two core elements must be carefully structured: the physical way of suggesting the Call, and the emotional need to undertake it. Simon has been chosen as the ultimate antagonist to Paul, not only because he has a connection with Paul's past, but because he is a 'star player' for Newbury Rovers, the team which will later play against Paul's own team. The audience has seen Simon making snidy



remarks to Paul at the football match, and at work this is no different. Simon's remarks are petty at first, for example: 'I've been thinking about having highlights. Maybe one of your friends could do them?' This is enough to irritate Paul, but it is not enough to take hold of his emotions and push him to the limit; such a remark needs to be deeper. As such, it is intended to build the conflict so that Simon becomes much crueller. Simon, knowing that Frank has a problem with Paul's sexuality, teases Paul that Frank has e-mailed him about the training regime. The intention here is not only to upset Paul, but to remind him of his 'failure' at not being able to restore the family name by playing football. Simon knows this too, of course, and uses it as ammunition in his attack: 'Bet you wish you'd never given up playing [...] Shame you had to leave the junior team, but ...' This is intended to make Paul reach boiling point. He tries to rebuke Simon's cruel remarks, but when Paul tells Simon that he hopes he never has a child who 'dares to be different,' Simon launches the ultimate blow: 'Not from my genes.' This remark is strongly imbued with meaning because it tells Paul's exact emotional turmoil: he is gay, his father is ashamed, and his family has a goal of redemption he can never achieve.

## ii. *Call to Adventure*

The physicality of the Call to Adventure comes from Simon: 'What if ... all you gays joined together and started playing? You could try it on with anyone then.' To him, this is just a snidy remark; to Paul, it has an emotional truth. Simon's subsequent line, 'Football for fags,' is intended to be far more than a throwaway line; it is an exact expression of the Call, which invites Paul to form a gay football team. At first, Paul goes along with the jokiness, winding Simon up by playing along with the sexual innuendos. Paul turns the

joke around and makes Simon feel uncomfortable: 'that'd get you going, wouldn't it?' This is intended to show Paul shift from passive to active protagonist; from the butt of the joke to the creator of the joke. This small yet significant change in him thus suggests that such an adventure is exactly what he needs to overcome his emotional problem.

### **iii. *Refusal of the Call***

Paul's Refusal of the Call is only slight. He sits outside eating lunch with Clare and Melanie, laughing at Simon's suggestion. When he says 'It scared him though, me thinking about it,' he is acknowledging that at the time, he was serious; now, it can be seen as nothing but a joke. However, the ever-blunt Clare reminds Paul what undertaking Simon's suggestion might actually achieve: 'it'd make your dad happy.' This is intended to give Paul the epiphany he needs: playing again could bring him closer to Frank, and even restore the family name. Paul knows that this may be a gamble, but given how he is currently feeling in the Ordinary World, it is definitely worth a try.

### **iv. *Meeting with the Mentor***

Paul has an interesting mentor: Frank. Although throughout the film Paul and Frank are positioned against each other, the intention is that on an emotional level they share a connection. After all, just as Frank has issues in accepting Paul's sexuality, Paul has issues in accepting his own sexuality. As such, their relationship is one of mentor and tutee, though it could be argued that Frank is a 'reluctant' mentor. Realising that playing football could heal father and son wounds, then, Paul goes to see Frank. The intention is to show Paul almost seeking Frank's blessing; Paul metaphorically asks to be mentored when, as

Frank begins to talk about football, he says ‘Talk *me* through it.’ Unfortunately, Frank thinks that Paul is feigning interest, using it as an excuse to talk to him. Reluctantly, though, Frank does begin to open up and tell Paul about his past: ‘I was the blue-eyed boy, just like Robert ... We soared up the table. Playoff semi final, playoff final. It was magic. The atmosphere. The town.’ The intention here is inadvertent on Frank’s part: he gives Paul the inspiration he needs to form the team, even though in reality he could think of nothing worse. As the scene develops, Frank for the first time acknowledges Paul’s past, remembering that he was actually a better player than Robert. This is intended to push Paul’s emotion in driving the decision, which is fuelled even further by Frank’s inadvertent assurance: ‘It’s all for the best, no matter how bad it seems.’ Paul realises from this that he should never give up, because life *can* be changed. Frank as mentor, then, represents the wounded past and the possibility of a healed future; and although he does not know it yet, his words ignite a passion in Paul to abandon the past and improve the present. This idea finds physical manifestation in an old medal that Frank leaves lying on the bed: ‘1979 Playoff Finalists – Newbury Rovers.’ Although the audience does not yet know its significance, the intention is that the medal, left by the mentor for the protagonist, is a physical representation of the past, and of coming second; from now on, though, things will be different. Following this, Paul keeps the momentum of moving beyond the physical and emotional blockades of his gloomy present by looking at the Stonewall FC website. Seeing on there an image of a happy gay football team, the intention is to represent both Paul’s idea of happiness and Frank’s idea of hell. This then drives the physical action of forming the team, which will eventually bring Paul and Frank together, and restore the family name.

## v. *Crossing the First Threshold*

Committing to his challenge and abandoning any doubts he had, Paul now means business. Rather than worrying what people will think of him, he has advertised for players in the local newspaper. Seeing the reaction to this from those who will eventually oppose Paul is intended to be a more interesting way of showing Paul's threshold crossing. Later in the film, the Newbury Rovers players and supporters pose the biggest threat to Paul's success; so, revealing Paul's commitment to the journey through Newbury Rovers supporters Gav and Ted ('tweedledum and tweedletwat') highlights their conflict from the outset. The setting of the plant pot factory where they work (with Frank and Robert) is also intended to add significance to this moment, in that it represents a traditional sense of masculinity in contrast to that of Paul and his eventual gay team. Overhearing Gav and Ted's conversation about the advertisement, Frank 'seems a little unnerved'; he thinks that it has something to do with Paul. Then, when Ted reads out a telephone number, Frank drops and smashes a plant pot. This action is integral to the narrative: Paul has upset the balance by daring to be different and do something that juxtaposes Frank's views; so, dropping the plant pot symbolises that Frank's world is about to crumble. Later, when Simon himself confronts Paul, he asks: 'Was it the leotard, or the whips?' Not only does this show Simon's ignorance, thinking that Paul's motivation is sex, the intention is to highlight Paul's true, emotional motivation for undertaking the challenge, which is anything but sex.

## vi. *Tests, Allies, Enemies*

For the first time in the film, the audience sees Paul changing into a football kit, ready for the trials session. This physical action symbolises his commitment to a journey; he has

now entered the Special World, and he has different priorities. The audience also witnesses the first crack in Paul and Frank's relationship resulting from the challenge being undertaken. When Robert tells Paul that Frank is not home because 'he had a big order to sort,' Paul replies 'He's probably avoiding me.' Although this may be seen as a throwaway comment, it is intended to be the first in a line of truths about their fragmenting relationship. Throughout this scene, Robert flicks through a gay lifestyle magazine. He 'points to a picture in the magazine of two young guys wearing school uniform, kissing,' and jokes to Paul 'Hands off the twink!' This is used to show that Robert is comfortable with gay lifestyles, but is unaware that Paul is not. When Paul, annoyed by Robert, then throws the magazine into the bin, this is a physical manifestation of his problem in accepting himself. Once more, this is intended to highlight his true, emotional reason for forming the gay football team: it is about family, not sex. When Paul and Robert get to the playing field to begin the trials, they are joined by an excited Sheila and Clare. These two characters are Paul's allies throughout the film, and provide an important juxtaposition of family-based support with Frank, who has decided to stay at home. When the home telephone rings, in fact, the caller enquiring about Paul, Frank lies: 'I think you've got the wrong number. Don't call again.' He quickly cuts off the call, which is intended to show his inability to face the truth, and the lack of support for his own flesh and blood.

During the trials, Paul experiences a mixture of tests, allies and enemies. For example, some of the players are purely 'in it for the eye candy; eyeing-up, brushing past etc. '; one of them 'dramatically falls down on the pitch'; two of them slide into each other and almost cry when they see their dirty kits; and another 'pretends to perform a sexual act

on a particular cone.’ Once again, this use of stereotypes is absolutely intentional.<sup>20</sup> Considering Paul’s emotional journey, these stereotypical presentations function to provide the necessary conflict in making him believe that the internal cannot be ‘right’ if the external is ‘wrong.’ In other words, Paul does not yet realise that stereotypical actions are, for some, part of identity creation; for now, he sees such actions as demeaning and a sign of moral corruption. Even though Sheila and Clare help out, at one point literally dragging a fallen player back onto his feet, this is no solace for Paul; he thinks the whole thing was a bad idea. To make matters worse, Simon turns up to gloat, which puts even more pressure on Paul. The disappointment in Paul is evident when he ‘strikes a big cross through his scores sheet,’ his emotional frustration culminating in a simple yet powerful action. Later, a cruel act from Simon not only destroys Paul’s hope in the players, but physically reinforces to the audience Paul’s emotional drive. One of the players is handling the ball quite well, and even Frank, who has now arrived, seems interested. All eyes are on the goal keeper and his skills of saving. Suddenly, Simon ‘whips-off his top.’ This entices the goal keeper to glare at his body, and so the goal is scored. This act of antagonism serves a deeper resonance, reinforcing that Paul’s drive to succeed is vulnerable to the issue of him being homosexual; the goal keeper failed because Simon played-up to another stereotype.

Frank’s eyes widen in horror at Sheila’s suggestion of helping Paul to get a team together. The intention here is to provide emotional conflict for Paul, whose family have opposing views about his venture. Deep down, Frank knows that he is in the wrong, but he

---

<sup>20</sup> Here, we might consider Žižek’s work on pleasure and the idea that stereotypes contain a ‘surplus value’ which provides ‘enjoyment, or *jouissance* [and] enables us to understand the logic of exclusion operating in discourses’ (1989: xi). In other words, stereotypes are actually enjoyed because they allow us to see the contested images at play and understand their ideological implications. Therefore, whether it is a player crying because of mud splashed on his shirt, or another pretending to have sex with a cone, such an intentional stereotype is funny ‘because it is constitutively an ‘excess.’ If we subtract the surplus we lose enjoyment itself, just as capitalism, which can only survive by incessantly revolutionizing its own material conditions, ceases to exist if it ‘stays the same,’ if it achieves an internal balance’ (ibid.: 52).

cannot revert this yet. When he 'drops a stack of cones' after Sheila's offer to approach the gay nurses she works with, he is really dropping his guard; he is scared of what people will think, and how Paul's actions reflect his own credibility. To reinforce this idea, Frank 'turns away, seeing Simon walk away in the distance. He looks on, longingly.' This action is intended to physically represent an emotional turning point in Paul's journey; Frank now begins to abandon him, projecting his fatherly qualities onto Simon, the antagonist.

At the end of the trials, Paul tells those purely there for sexual reasons to leave; 'most of the players' do. Paul is left with only five players, physically intended to symbolise his ongoing feeling of failure. Later, at a Newbury Rovers game, Paul is again reminded of his failure by a tipsy Frank: 'I'd hardly be late to see my number one son play the game ... oh, no, my son play the number one game. Is that right?' This is a devastating blow for Paul, because although Frank is tipsy, he knows that this is exactly what he thinks. However, the negativity of this comment is also intended to work in opposition. Although the words are antagonistic on the surface, they bestow a deeper meaning that drives Paul to refute the claim; an emotional drive. Not only that, because Frank is Paul's mentor, they are also intended as inadvertent words of wisdom to help Paul eventually achieve his goal. This is exemplified further when Frank seemingly blames Paul for Robert's poor performance: 'It's all these funny ideas ... he's lost focus.'

During this Newbury Rovers game, tensions rise between Robert and Simon; they are no longer behaving like a 'dynamic duo.' Simon provides the external pressure for what will later become Robert's emotional desire to help his brother, and by default, help to heal the family. In the changing room, Simon taunts Robert: 'What d'you expect though? A family of losers.' A deadly comment about their dead mother makes Robert see red,

and the two begin to fight. Newbury Rovers' manager sides with Simon, and so having had enough of them all, Robert quits. This is intended to be a huge moment in the film's narrative, where the physical stakes are raised and Paul is emotionally wounded, thinking that he is to blame. However, a twist in the narrative assists Paul, giving him extra physical and emotional momentum to move forward. Knowing that Paul has a true passion for football, and that he 'stole that passion' by 'outing' him at sixteen, Robert sacrifices his chance of promotion to join Paul's team. This serves to show that a once emotional test (Paul having to recover his past) is now a physical ally (Robert helping the team). Robert's sacrifice is also intended to highlight exactly what Frank should be doing, but cannot yet. In this way, the emotional value of family is shown as more important than the physical gain of promotion. A now excited Robert 'strips off his Rovers shirt and jumps onto Paul's back.' Physically, this moment symbolises new life and a renewed energy for Paul and his team; for Frank, it symbolises the death of the family name.

Paul is later faced with the embarrassing situation of one-night-stand Toby turning up to play: 'I told you I liked football.' The intention of this is to show that although Toby is trying to help Paul, he is inadvertently causing him emotional pain. Paul is ashamed of what he did, his actions, which works to signify Paul's inability of accepting himself. The intended audience reaction is that Paul should be who *he* wants to be, not what others want him to be. As well as Toby, Tyler, Brian and John are brought along by Sheila: 'Bryanston Woods Hospice, wards one to six.' These men are camp and somewhat stereotypical, but they *can* play football. This culminates in the intention to see Paul feeling uneasy, knowing that the only way he can grow into a more confident person is to confront the fact-of-the-matter head on and embrace it. As such, the audience sees that 'Brian and John are



playing flamboyantly, yet skilfully,' and although 'Paul is unimpressed,' he will later realise that in order to find emotional balance, he must change himself.

Building a strong sense of conflict through the overcoming of obstacles is intentional in making it appear that Paul will be unsuccessful in his efforts. At this stage, Paul has to do practically everything himself. He wants to buy the team its first kit, but because so far there is no sponsor and so no money, he has to resort to buying cheap bankrupt stock. As well as adding humour to the narrative, because the kits do not match, this also physicalises Paul's current emotional state of uncertainty. The mis-matched kits also provide a contrast to later, when Peter Greenoff invests in the team and they get brand new kits. For now, however, Paul struggles to find a sponsor; an idea that Frank has already laughed at. Trying to sell the idea on the telephone, Paul 'realises that he's been cut off,' made worse by the fact that it was also the last company on his list. Robert, now functioning as an extension of Paul's efforts, also faces strong conflict. At work, he ignores other workers who whisper about him and throw dirty looks, which is later intensified by a picture of him and Paul that has been given some crude additions and pinned-up on the wall.

The day of the team's first match arrives. Paul, standing in the hallway, 'is holding a pair of football boots; they are clearly his old ones [...] As he thinks, he brings the boots close to his face and breathes-in the smell of the leather.' This is intended to be a very poignant moment: the boots physically represent Paul's past, and now uniting with his present, they take on a different meaning; they symbolise his courage and his aspiration. The actual match to be played is with the map reading group. Not only does this provide humour, it is intended to symbolise others not wanting to play with Paul and his team.

Instead, they are playing with a team who have no clout, and probably no real following. Frank, with a hidden happiness, jokes: 'You don't expect many to turn up, do you?' Paul, however, is shocked to see that 'hundreds of spectators are already gathered.' At this stage nobody knows whether these are supporters or jeerers, but the intention is to imply that they are probably here to see a 'freak show.' This is something Paul certainly does not want, and as such he is less than impressed when the players 'are fully kitted-out but still applying creams, filing nails etc.' Here, the intention again is to see Paul trying to change people, not allowing them to be their real selves. This is reinforced during half time when, seeing the men grooming themselves like women, he tells them to 'keep the tone down.' The interesting complexity to this is that Paul is faced with gay stereotypes, but gay stereotypes that have a hidden side to them; they are good at football.

Conflict during the team's match comes from Simon, Gav and Ted, who make jokes about what Paul should call the team: 'Berkshire Benders? [...] Southern Shirt Lifters?' Frank finds himself embroiled into this, with Simon taking great pleasure in manipulating his fears. This is intended to further cement the divide between Frank and Paul; although the audience may sense that at some point Frank will change his attitude, it is crucial for now to keep building the conflict and crack the family relationship. For example, when Robert nearly scores a goal, Frank is deflated: 'we can see it in his eyes.' This is intended to give a slight glimmer of hope that Frank really does care; it is only because he cannot see what is in front of him right now that he reacts the way he does. As the match picks up, Paul's team are getting better, much to the annoyance of Simon, Gav and Ted. Therefore, when Paul has the ball, Simon cannot resist a dig: 'Enjoy the game, gay boy. It'll be your last.' Hearing this reminds Paul of the past and the reason why he stopped playing, so

instead of passing the ball to another player, he keeps it so that he can take the glory himself; he becomes active. Even the blank stare from Frank, 'he wants to encourage but can't,' clarifies the emotional motivation driving Paul's actions: 'He single-handedly guides the ball up the pitch [... and] scores a magnificent goal.' This has been a long time coming, and proves to Paul that if he really considers his reason for playing, he can do it. From this, Paul is given a reward: Peter Greenoff (anonymous at this point) wants to sponsor the team. Physically, this allows the team to have a proper identity, invest in equipment, and do things properly: 'He pulls a football shirt out of a big bag. It's brand new, and sports a flashy 'Green Giants' name and logo.' Greenoff's money and contacts also allows them to take on the identity of bankrupt team Winnersh Wanderers. Emotionally, this reward works to boost Paul's confidence in himself, his team, and the faith of the wider town.

The Green Giants are now in the Nationwide Southern League, and for the town, or at least some of its inhabitants, this is detrimental. Not only does their position in the league represent a liberal attitude to a 'controversial' issue, it puts them in direct competition with Newbury Rovers. As the audience already knows, Newbury Rovers are pushing for promotion, so any threat to this is unwelcomed. What is even more critical is that Frank still supports Newbury Rovers, and is becoming even more distanced from his sons by doing so. Down at the pub, the Newbury Rovers supporters talk in an aggressive tone about the Green Giants. It is later implied that they are behind the daubing of graffiti on the Brownie hut where the Green Giants are based: 'Faggots, benders and football shirt lifters.' This comes as a blow to Paul, who has recently been feeling very positive. When he and Robert go home and tell a drunk Frank about it, he 'lets slip a slight laugh at this,

but quickly realises his mistake.’ This is an important moment, intended to re-visit the cracks in the family relationship and highlight to the audience what Frank really thinks about the team. Robert is appalled at Frank’s suggestion that the graffiti artists are ‘having a bit of fun,’ drawing parallels between them and Paul: ‘Is he laughing?’ Frank, unable to cope with the emotional truth of the situation, leaves to use the toilet. Once again, however, Paul takes spirit from Frank’s negative words; the unwitting mentor has provided yet more determination for Paul to venture forth: ‘We’re going to do this.’

Following this, developing tension is built between Paul, Robert and Frank, which is important in revealing the heart of Paul’s dramatic problem: the family shame. This drives the narrative towards its Approach to the Inmost Cave, the dangerous zone where the emotional truth of the situation is duly bound to emerge. Here, the intention is to show the contrast between Paul and Robert’s increased distance from Frank, and Frank’s deeper integration with Newbury Rovers. As an example, ‘Frank and the other supporters cheer’ when Simon scores a magnificent goal, yet Frank ‘hesitates, then heads back in the direction he came from’ when he sees Sheila and Clare making a Green Giants banner. Even when he sees Paul and Robert, who are talking tactics over breakfast, Frank ‘goes to the sink and rinses the cup, saying nothing, then walks out.’ Later, when Frank is literally pulled into the throng of the supporters’ excitement, the audience is intended to feel that he has almost become a victim of his naivety; rather than actively making a choice to abandon his sons, he passively allows himself to be consumed by those he feels closer to. Paul feels that he is to blame for this division, and his subsequent increasing self-awareness is played-out through action. For example, on the morning of a match, he is ‘looking at himself in the mirror, styling his hair.’ He says to himself: ‘We’re gonna win. We’ve got to win.’

'We're gonna win.' The intention here is to show Paul thinking that success resides in winning a football match. What is even more interesting, however, is his action following these words: 'he messes up his hair. He smiles – more manly.' This serves to highlight Paul's ongoing dilemma: in order to win and be accepted by others, he feels that he has to be a 'real man.' Or, that he has to be someone else. Although this scene is short, its meaning is intended to be powerful, adding a further understanding of Paul's journey.

The Green Giants are playing away to Aldershot Town, but their journey has been scuppered by the sabotage of their minibus. Simon, Gav and Ted, who are suggested to have been involved, 'laugh crassly, and high-five' when it seems that the match is cancelled. However, thanks to still-anonymous Peter Greenoff, all is not lost: 'Suddenly, a dark shadow encroaches [...] A green helicopter swoops down onto the pitch and lands. As the door opens, Paul, Robert and the team run out.' This physically-big scene is intended to provide the audience with a sense that the stakes are now much greater, and that Paul is deadly serious in his plight. In the previous scene, realising that the minibus had been sabotaged, Paul 'frantically' tried to do something, 'pulling every switch and lifting every available surface' until his hands were 'black with grease.' Driven by emotion, Paul is adamant not to let the team, or himself, down. In this scene, the saviour of the helicopter is not only symbolic of his determination, but symbolic of external faith in Paul; someone is looking after him. This is further exemplified the next day, when 'Paul pulls open a double-page spread from the local newspaper: 'Green Giants Slaughter Aldershot.' In it, a picture of a beaming Paul and Robert.' Although shattering for Frank, the newspaper symbolises the successful reconciliation of Paul and Robert, and acts as an important twist in circumstances from the earlier picture of Robert and Simon.

## vii. *Approach to the Inmost Cave*

Just when Paul thinks that the Green Giants are doing well, and that he will succeed in his mission, he is reminded that he is not out of the woods yet. The physicality of his journey is developing well, he and the team overcoming obstacles and reaping rewards, but now the emotional journey is re-visited to provide a downward turn to the narrative. When Paul finds himself in the work toilets at the same time as Simon, Simon's antagonism reminds him of the emotional bleakness that still lurks beneath his physical success. Paul protests that he is not a loser, to which Simon replies: 'Just a failure. Ironic really. You're trying to make it up to your dad and show that you can win – but he's no better [...] A family of failures?' This bluntness is intended to be a sharp realisation for Paul, reminding him why he is really undertaking the challenge; his and his family's failure. The scene ends with Paul looking in the mirror, contemplating Simon's words, and when he sees Frank wearing a Newbury Rovers scarf in the next scene, the truth of Simon's words hits him. Paul realises that he certainly is trying to undo both of their failings; this is the painful emotional truth behind his journey, and so far all he thinks he has done is made things worse.

The intention of the following scene is to probe this bleakness further, prising open the emotional gap that currently exists between Paul and Frank. As Paul and Robert play a computer game, Robert says that Frank is 'being a total arsehole, but he cares. He's just ... worried what people think.' This is said with a bluntness to it, but in essence it is intended to be the truth of the situation: Frank cannot yet come to terms with everything because he cannot see the wood for the trees. Paul's response, 'I'm his embarrassment,' is again intended to clarify his core emotional drive: he accepted the challenge in order to make

Frank proud of him, and to reunite the family. Paul and Robert proceed to discuss their mother, Diane, whose death it is suggested has never been fully overcome by them and Frank. Robert tells Paul that the reason Frank does not listen to Sheila is because it would be 'Admitting that ... mum's gone and this is how it's gonna be.' The audience here is intended to feel that the family's grief has never really been worked-through, meaning that Frank still desperately clings to the past. Paul, then, is a symbol of this past, and accepting him means accepting that Diane is dead. The earlier scene when Paul says that Diane 'never got to see the real me' serves to highlight the importance of his emotional journey over the physical one; he needs to prove that he has not changed, that he is still the son he was.

The pace of the film now builds towards the football match which is to take place between Newbury Rovers and the Green Giants. Both teams have a lot to lose: Newbury Rovers are one win away from automatic promotion; the Green Giants are one defeat away from relegation. In the plant pot factory, the match is announced on the radio. Gav shouts out, 'You hear that, Frank? The town's up against your own flesh and blood.' This hits a raw nerve in Frank, intended to deepen the emotional conflict between him and Paul. As the scene progresses, a fight breaks-out between Robert and Gav. This is intended to symbolise the majority of the town's disgust of Paul and the Green Giants. 'Punches fly, blood is splattered, and plant pots are broken,' reminding the audience of the bleak situation Paul has found himself in. Whereas Robert is willing to take a punch for Paul, Frank cannot even acknowledge the situation. Robert asks, 'Whose side are you on?' but Frank cannot answer; nor can he offer consolation for Robert, who is now the 'villain' of the factory. Instead, he 'carries on with his checks. He almost shakes as he works.'

The bleakness continues through Paul and Robert's twenty-first birthday celebration meal. Frank, uncomfortable with the atmosphere thus far built-up, cannot understand why Paul and Robert are acting so normal; they are excited about the forthcoming match, even if Frank has abandoned them. Robert jokes that the team should have their hair styled before the match, which as well as an intentional twist on a similar comment made earlier by Simon, works to deepen Frank's resentment. The idea of hair being styled is intended to conjure-up yet another gay stereotype, one which also possesses an emotional poignancy: the action of styling hair destroying the family's relationship. The bleakness of the situation is accentuated when a teenage boy comes over and asks for Paul and Robert's autographs. Frank's reaction, 'Robert left Rovers. Are you confusing him with Simon?' is a hard blow for Paul, suggesting that Frank really is giving-up all hope for his sons. Although Paul is mollified by the boy's words, 'You're heroes in our house,' he knows deep down that that is irrelevant because he is on the brink of losing his father's love. An emotional boiling-point is reached when the teenage boy tells Paul and Robert that his uncle fancies them both. Robert, Clare and Sheila think this is great; Paul is very uneasy; Frank is distraught: he 'looks behind to see where the teenage boy has gone; what's their family like, etc.?' The suggestion here is that, for Frank, the family cannot be normal; how can they be happy with their son announcing this, in such a blasé manner? From this, talk turns to players' bums, at which point Frank 'suddenly throws his cutlery onto the table.' This physical action serves to depict his true emotional anguish, which for Paul signifies what he really thinks about him. Paul is crushed, and because he is not yet brave enough to assert himself, he does not intervene. Instead, like in an earlier scene, he re-enters the conversation fake, complacent: 'Sam? Yeah ... Nice arse [...] Very nice arse.'



### viii. *Ordeal*

Having shifted the focus from physical action to emotion, the following sequence visually represents Paul's internal dilemma. Set between Paul, Frank and Robert's workplaces, and other local venues, the intention is not only to build anticipation towards the ensuing match, but to show it from two viewpoints: for and against the Green Giants. Paul knows that his entire future rests on the match, not just with the team's reputation, but his relationship with Frank. On the morning of the match, Paul confronts Frank one last time in an attempt to salvage any hope. Frank is in his bedroom, adorning himself with an array of Newbury Rovers paraphernalia: pin badge, scarf etc. The use of physical symbols to represent his past here serves to show Frank's feelings against Paul and the Green Giants. So, when Paul goes into the bedroom, he is entering the dark, Inmost Cave. 'Frank smiles weakly in the mirror'; he cannot even look at his son properly. He cannot even talk about the situation either, instead just nodding a response to Paul's question. Knowing that this is his last chance to change Frank's mind, Paul addresses the situation head on: 'We want you to come with us.' Frank ignores Paul's comment, instead talking about the tightness of his shoes. It is not until Paul, 'childlike,' draws his attention to the question that Frank deals the fatal blow: 'I'm sorry, son.' Although he knows that Frank deeply disapproves of his actions, Paul does not quite expect this response. His emotions now surfacing, he 'puts his hand into his pocket and takes out the medal he took at the start. Frank's eyes light up.' This is intended to be a significant moment in Paul's journey because, symbolically, he takes the tool earlier supplied by the mentor and uses it to demonstrate his change. He tells Frank that he thought he would learn something from the medal, through its representation

of Frank's past, but instead, he says 'I don't think I've learnt anything.' Paul is devastated by Frank's abandonment, but at the same time he has gathered from this the strength to finally express how he feels. He confronts Frank with the truth about his 'coming out,' seeing it as making him a failure: 'Cos that's what I am, aren't I?' Whereas Frank finds it difficult to react, Paul is emotionally on full throttle: 'Then giving it up ... the thing I loved more than anything in the world, because some pathetic kids would bully me ... BULLY me until I had no choice *but* to leave ...' In an intentionally symbolic moment, 'Paul throws the medal onto the bed'; the mentor's tool is now useless. Frank looks on as the medal, intended to represent the past and the prospect of future hope, just lies there; untouched, it symbolises the helpless situation. Paul is now at the lowest emotional point possible, so when Frank tries to reason, he simply tells him that it is too late. Paul dashes out of the bedroom and cries. Frank 'stares at himself in the mirror. He takes the Rovers pin badge from the side and looks at it.' This action is intended to physically symbolise Frank's emotional predicament with Paul: will he realise what he has done?

As the Green Giants and Newbury Rovers set off for the match, the tension of the previous scene is prolonged; a sombre aftermath. Paul and Frank are on different coaches: 'Frank sits in the throng of it all, but he doesn't seem himself'; Paul 'looks out of the window, deep in thought.' Paul's hopelessness is accentuated by jealousy when he sees Tyler and Toby acting in a couple-like manner. Even though he does not fancy either of them, he wants to have a boyfriend. Robert shouts out 'No going back now.' Although this literally relates to the match, it is also an intentional reminder to Paul that there is no going back from his confrontation with Frank; it is too late. In the supporters' area, Sheila and Clare are unhappy to see Frank with the Newbury Rovers crowd. When Sheila shouts

'Just look at you!' Frank takes this literally, looking at his Newbury Rovers paraphernalia. This is intended to symbolise his need to assess his emotional state; the paraphernalia physically represents how he is now, which in the eyes of Sheila is in need of a big change. Still not fully understanding where he has gone wrong, Frank is implored by Sheila: 'Don't hold onto the past 'cos it's going to strangle you!' This final plea is intended to make Frank think rationally, and understand Paul's emotional need for reunion.

As the tension builds, Paul's finally snaps at his players. He is angered when 'Tyler smacks Toby on the bum,' which is an intentionally important moment because this display of sexuality is exactly why Paul stopped playing football in the first place; furthermore, it is why he wants to prove that gay men can play football, professionally. The truth of this, Paul's past, surfaces when he turns on Robert and blames him for everything: 'That game was my life. And you cut it short [...] You outed me! Think it left me with any choice?' Robert 'tries to get closer but Paul just pushes him away.' Here, the intended feeling is that if Paul cannot get close to Robert, all hope is lost. Then, when Paul turns on his team again and tells them that they must act like real men, like he wants them to be, there is for the first time a sense of resentment towards him.

The tension and bleakness of the Ordeal is physically represented through the first half of the match. When Robert loses the ball to Simon, itself an intended symbol of the dire situation, 'Robert flashes a look to Paul, as if to apologise, but Paul just looks away.' Paul 'takes control of the ball and attempts a shot, but misses,' suggesting that because his emotional balance is upset, so are his actions. Then, in a symbolic moment of death, Simon dirty-tackles Paul; he 'falls to the ground and lands on his ankle in agony.' Physically, this is the ultimate lowest point for Paul, who having worked hard to achieve

his goal throughout the narrative, is taken off on a stretcher and can no longer play. Emotionally, this is intended to signal a giving-up of the need, Paul finally accepting defeat. However, with every cloud there is a silver lining: Frank, finally, realises what is in front of his nose; what his sons mean to him. Crushed that Paul is out of the game, a situation created by Simon, Frank feels sick. The one he has invested his time and energy into has now shown his true colours. Not only that, right next to him, 'Gav and Ted aren't trying to be discreet in their enjoyment of Paul's agony.' Frank physically and emotionally reaches boiling point: this is the moment the audience has been anticipating, and in an intentionally symbolic physical action, he 'whips off his Rovers hat and scarf and runs off.'

### ix. *Reward*

The Green Giants, along with Sheila, Clare and the physio Mark, are in the changing room. They are discussing how the match is unsalvageable when Frank suddenly appears and offers them the ultimate Reward. Everyone is shocked to see Frank and, for the first time, hear his words of encouragement. He stands in the doorway, desperate for forgiveness, and tells Paul: 'I don't deserve you ... I want to help. I can play.' This moment is intended to work both physically and emotionally. Physically, Frank is offering himself; he will step-in and help the team play the match. Emotionally, he is accepting Paul, his sexuality, and the whole team representing this. Frank's words, 'I love you. Both of you,' are enough to give Paul the reassurance that he needs: he is not a failure. In a drastic turn of events and attitudes, Frank allows Toby to undress him and put on a Green Giants kit. Not only that, Paul takes off his football boots and offers them to Frank: 'Same size.' Not only is this intended to represent their reunion, Paul's physical past (the boots) being taken-on by

Frank's emotional present (acceptance), it allows the journey to be symbolised through the already-used expression: 'Must run in the genes.' This time, it is Frank who uses the expression, unlike previously when others have used it as an attack against him for his and Paul's failures. Paul's journey has enabled this change in Frank; he has bestowed him with the power to change too.

Sheila's line 'We'll show 'em it's the Queen that rules this land!' is far from throwaway; it gives Paul an epiphany. Now that he has gained Frank's acceptance, he realises the mistake that he has made in forcing the team to be who *he* wants them to be, not who *they* want to be. This realisation is expressed through the physical action of ripping one of Frank's football shirt sleeves off. He explains, to a confused team, that he has tried to change them, and stop them from being who they really are; not any more. He rejoices, 'We can't join them, so you know what? We may as well just fucking beat them!' This is intended to acknowledge that they are different, and they should be proud of it. Everyone joins Brian and John when they start to sing the song *I Am What I Am*, and the whole team rip each other's shirt sleeves off. As the scene ends, there is a brewing connection between Paul and Mark, who smile at each other in a more-than-friendly way. This is intended to be yet another Reward for Paul, who having embraced his emotional need, can now begin to reap physical compensation for the journey travelled.

## x. *The Road Back*

What once seemed unachievable is now achievable: the Green Giants and Frank run onto the pitch, their tops now sleeveless and 'camp.' In a physical and emotional shift from the screenplay's opening sequence, Paul has led *his* team to play *their* game, in a way that *they*

want. Gav and Ted are shocked to see Frank: ‘both turn to where Frank was standing – his hat and scarf are on the floor.’ These Newbury Rovers objects, shed by the mentor, are intended to symbolise the change that has taken place. The Green Giants are now ready to play in their own way; and because Paul has given them the recognition they deserve, they play better: ‘Toby camply passes the ball to Robert who scores a goal’; ‘Toby and Tyler play the ball camply, like a dance, but still manage to tackle some Rovers players.’ Even Frank embraces this change, winking at Simon as he skilfully tackles the ball from him.

Frank soon begins to flag, however. He ‘turns away from the action to conceal his fatigue,’ which is intended to mark an important shift in his attitude: he does not want to be seen to let the team down because he does not want them to *fail, like his team did in 1979*. His fatigue also suggests that the narrative is drawing to a close, where having undergone a journey full of conflict and tension, Frank is ready to relax and be re-acquainted with his sons properly. It is symbolic, then, that Frank is the one who scores the winning goal for the Green Giants: ‘Frank turns around. As he does, the ball hits him on the head, hard. It deflects and, miraculously, goes into the net. Goal!’ Frank scoring the goal is intentional for two reasons. Firstly, Frank’s missed header scuppered Newbury Rovers’ promotion in 1979, so scoring here, for his son’s team, eases this pain. Secondly, it acts as a physical metaphor for the pain that he has caused Paul, which he can now relieve. Frank’s emotional drive is to now show love for Paul, so manifesting it through a seemingly-haphazard goal, proof is offered that Paul has succeeded in his plight for acceptance.

## **xi. *Resurrection***

The use of one final test is intended to prove that Paul is a real hero, and that he deserves his Reward. In a tragic-yet-comic twist, Frank's goal is voided by the referee: he never registered with the team. Not only that, the whole match is voided for the same reason: 'By default, I've no alternative but to award a win to Rovers.' This is a deeply low point for Paul, whose efforts have now been destroyed. Frank feels guilty, and tries to console Paul. However, the final test is passed when 'Paul starts to laugh,' and before long, 'everyone is in hysterics; losing the match doesn't matter.' Paul's response to Simon's 'Can't even score a goal and keep it!' is simply 'We don't care.' This suggests a sacrifice on Paul's part; he realises that winning the match is immaterial compared to the family healing that has taken place. As such, this sacrifice is intended to highlight that the emotional need has overtaken the physical want, giving to the audience a clear sense of what the film is really about. Paul's reaction also shows that not only is he standing-up to Simon's taunts, he is defending his gay friends. He even refers to them as 'we,' which suggests that for the first time, he is publicly positioning himself in the same category as them; he is proud.

## **xii. *Return with Elixir***

A false twist occurs when Frank says 'I can't do this [...] Simon.' For a moment, it seems that Frank will go back to Simon. Luckily, however, Paul's Elixir can also be found in Frank: 'Frank approaches Simon. As Simon turns around, Frank smiles meekly – then punches him in the face. Simon falls to the ground.' This physical action is intended to reinforce the emotional change, not just in Frank, but in the Stokes family as a whole. As 'Paul, Frank and Robert group together and hug,' the suggestion is that the family is now healed. There is even an implied closure for the grief of Diane, too.

At this moment, the anonymous Mr Greenoff walks over. Paul introduces him as 'The one who's made all of this happen.' In a further twist, Frank suddenly announces: 'That's not Peter Greenoff.' He is, in fact, Bobby White, the other half to Frank's 1979 'Dynamic Duo.' It is revealed that Bobby/Greenoff is also gay, but has never been able to find the courage to 'come out.' However, witnessing Paul's courage and determination has given him this strength. He tells Frank: 'Your son's an inspiration. To all of us.' Here, because Paul's physical journey has propagated Bobby/Greenoff's emotional arc, the Elixir is momentarily donated to Bobby/Greenoff. This is then donated back to Frank, who tells Bobby/Greenoff 'No, I'm fine. I ... bloody hell!' and then puts his arm around him. An overwhelmed Frank offers to buy everyone a drink, and so they all leave.

The intention of the final sequence is to take the audience to the future and show how life has moved-on, for the better. This technique provides physical and emotional closure 'proper,' offering reassurance that everything does work out well. Robert is shown now to play for Barnsley; he and Clare are expecting their first child. Sheila is shown now to have a prominent role as the 'voice' of gay rights. Frank is shown now to have taken an interest in garden design, Sheila reporting that 'he always did have a feminine side.' Paul is shown with Mark; they have opened a football training academy. The final scene shows a quite chubby Simon being dragged around the garden centre by his mother; the caption reads: 'Following instant relegation from the Conference, and reports of peer bullying, Simon now spends his Saturday afternoons elsewhere.' The final image of the screenplay is that of a child pushing open a door, which then hits Simon in the face. This is intended to give absolute closure to the narrative, not only in a physical way, but because Simon has been the ultimate antagonist to Paul, in an emotionally satisfying way.



## 2.

If the screenwriter understands the fabric and function of the physical and emotional journey, and the relationship between the two, he is able to shape his narrative into an effective and workable form: the narrative structure. As Waldeback outlines, screenplays are built from an understanding that two levels of structure are in operation: 'order of events (plot); emotional character arc (story)' (2006: 21). Physical and emotional journeys, or the plot and the story, combine to create the complete screenplay narrative, one that Smith argues guides an audience in 'the reorganization of the plot into the story, or the construction of the story on the basis of the plot' (1995: 74). This reminds us that in some screenplays, plot may be dominant over story, or story may be dominant over plot; or, moreover, that the two combine and, during particular moments in the narrative, alternate and shift focus. *Nanny McPhee* was used in the Prologue to exemplify how a mainstream feature film works in this way. It was highlighted that its narrative structure is almost self-conscious, referencing itself as a story specifically about transformation. The words 'want' and 'need' are used deliberately throughout the film to suggest a focus upon the physical and emotional journey, not least by the much-repeated phrase 'When you need me but do not want me, then I must stay. When you want me but no longer need me, then I have to go.' Essentially summarising the film's structural trajectory, this key phrase confirms that the narrative will develop, turning need into want, un-want into un-need. Laurie Hutzler's exploration of 'want' and 'need' was referenced in relation to their use in *Nanny McPhee*, confirming that they embody two distinct narrative threads which, combined, produce the complete screenplay: 'What does your character want: what is their concrete physical

objective in the story? What does your character need: what is the deeper human longing that they ignore, deny or suppress [...]?' (2005: 7).

Another aspect of *Nanny McPhee* relating to the ideas explored in this critical commentary is its use of the transforming body. The character Nanny McPhee has a strange look about her, enhanced by facial disfigurements such as warts, a crooked nose and a protruding front tooth. Her appearance at the start of the film startles the Brown children, acting as a physical reminder of the disturbance she has made to their Ordinary World. As the narrative develops, however, her facial disfigurements magically disappear. As the children begin to learn lessons, and feel that they *want* Nanny McPhee in their lives, we see Nanny McPhee's appearance soften and become more human-like; first her warts disappear, then her nose straightens, and then her tooth recedes. This works to physically symbolise the transformation taking place within the Brown family, which above all adds to the emotional transformation of the protagonist, Mr Brown. As the children travel a physical journey which enables emotional change, and as Mr Brown undergoes a character arc due to the physical changes taking place in his household, Nanny McPhee physically changes because of the emotional satisfaction achieved from knowing that her teachings are having the desired effect. As such, the film is a further example of how physical action and emotion are individual yet inseparable; they each have their own fabric, but react to each other and feed a combined, symbiotic relationship.

Nevertheless, it is the emotional punctuation mark at the end of a film that can bear the most significance for an audience, especially if the narrative is to carry meaning 'beyond the text.' As Chapter Three has outlined, a fine line exists between emotional resonance and physical manifestation, so it can be difficult to give overall importance to

just one of them. However, if a screenplay is to live 'beyond' itself, then it is only through emotion that this can be achieved. The success of *Nanny McPhee*'s narrative rests upon the trajectory of Mr Brown and his family's emotional transformation. This is something promised from the very start, with the image of an empty chair symbolically needing to be filled, and use of the key phrase: 'When you need me but do not want me, then I must stay. When you want me but no longer need me, then I have to go.' This sense of emotional transformation thus underpins the whole narrative, giving the screenplay the resonance that its audience will feel. Travers suggests that all good stories need resonance, and considering children's audiences in particular, that such resonance is likely to be better understood in later years, when hidden meaning lurking behind the plot can be appreciated:

As a child listens, the story goes in simply as a story. But there is an ear behind the ear which conserves meaning and gives it out much later. It is then that the listener, if lucky, understands the nature of the dragon, the necessity for the hero's labors and *who* it is that lives happily ever after (1999b: 202).

The analogy of 'an ear behind the ear' suggests that it may take time and contemplation to fully understand the emotional resonance of a story; yet, it is always there, and always accessible. Furthermore, the image of two ears is suggestive of a filtering process, whereby an audience first absorbs information (the physical journey) and then processes it in order to create meaning (the emotional journey). It is the creation of meaning that gives a film its longevity, where an audience takes away themes and feelings that may be applied to real life: morals, attitudes, points of view. *Nanny McPhee* is clear about her role in the world of the Brown family, telling them she has five lessons to teach, and 'what they learn is entirely up to them.' Once more this gives us two words which relate directly to the physical and emotional journey: 'teach' and 'learn.' *Nanny McPhee* will *teach* the children

and (by association) Mr Brown, but it is down to them to *learn*. In other words, she will give the physical tools necessary for them to discover their own emotional transformation; she will provide the action, they the emotion. She even states that whether she wants to or not, she ‘cannot interfere with affairs of the heart.’ This again signifies the film’s structural self-consciousness, providing us with a sense that emotional transformation is something that emerges from the action taking place: one allows the other to happen.

As Brice notes, ‘structure, characters, dialogue and action are important but even if they are brilliant they are, nonetheless, just tools in the service of the essential thing: theme. The theme, what stories are about, is what moves us most’ (2008a: 15). The physicality of a film narrative (the plot) can thus be understood as a ‘tool’ which enables emotion (the story) to surface. Emotion, the story, theme or meaning, is what holds a screenplay together; it is the quality that everything the screenplay is physically made of is geared towards. Emotion is primary, action secondary; as such, it is the emotional substance of the protagonist that drives a narrative, pulling the screenplay into a shape that serves its core purpose. The screenwriter must consider this when developing a narrative, always aware of the emotional drive. The protagonist should not be shoehorned into a set of predetermined situations; a well-orchestrated narrative structure ‘is all about character and emotion, and grows from the character’ (Waldeback, 2006: 20). Therefore, ‘when we see characters in action, we are really watching ideas in action’ (Brice, 2008b: 47). These ‘ideas,’ the thematic and emotional resonance, are integral to a film’s captivation of its audience, a view shared by Booker. He notes a preference of the ideas of Jung, who unlike Freud and his preoccupation with sexuality and problems of the individual, embraces ‘the much wider question of how, at a deeper level, we are all psychologically constructed in

the same essential way' (2004: 12). What is thus of importance to Booker is a story's appeal to the subtextual, to generate the emotional meaning; story over plot. He writes:

If we are looking for an explanation of why certain images, symbols and shaping forms recur in stories to an extent far greater than can be accounted for just by cultural transmission, we must look first to those deeper levels of the unconscious which we all have in common, as part of our basic genetic inheritance (ibid.).

Our unconscious connects us to the narrative; images and symbols are tools deployed for this to take place. In a screenplay, characters, plot, dialogue and visual imagery are tools deployed to create thematic meaning; physicality permits emotion. In *Nanny McPhee*, Mr Brown, his children, Evangeline and Aunt Adelaide are agents in a plot, dramatically constructed alongside dialogue and visual imagery to enable an audience to possess emotional feelings about moral growth, loss, grief and love. If we go back to Smith's view that that all fiction is 'narrated fiction' (1995: 41), we can see that the screenwriter plays a critical part in ensuring that emotion is experienced, and the desired narrative outcome felt. The screenwriter is the invisible narrator, using the narrative tools available to him in order to manipulate the audience's emotion. Hockley provides some useful thoughts on this:

Our sense of who we are and what we are doing is temporarily dissolved by, and into, the flow of cinematic images and sounds as viewers we are momentarily stitched into the story – sutured by, and into, the on-screen diegesis that is the momentarily believable world of the fiction film (2007: 35).

The use of the word 'into' is crucial here: an audience is stitched *into* the story, not merely seeing it from a world that exists beyond the screen. The invisible hand of the screenwriter thus physically guides an audience through its emotional journey, where action is used to manipulate feeling. The screenplay can generate such an emotional bond that an audience not only recognises and reasons with the narrative situation, it assimilates it.

### 3.

'When What You Want is Not What You Need: An Exploration of the Physical and Emotional Journeys Undertaken by a Protagonist in a Mainstream Feature Film' has explored the purpose and pattern of the protagonist's journey. As evident from both the screenplay *Offside* and its accompanying critical commentary, 'the issue of character change remains the essence of the protagonist's role in creating compelling stories and themes' (Brice, 2008b: 47). The role of the protagonist is to guide an audience through the emotional experience of a narrative; the tool used to generate this experience is physical action, for which the protagonist is the agent. The physical journey and emotional journey work together, building a narrative that produces the protagonist's transformation; his movement from one physical and emotional state to another. According to Brice, this is understood as the 'principle of the protagonist': 'the change being caused by the central conflict that acts upon the protagonist like an alchemist's crucible to transform his or her character principle from base metal into gold' (ibid.). This analogy suggests a process of augmentation; a narrative trajectory which sees a 'bettering' of the protagonist, or an 'improvement' in his circumstances. This is clearly evident in *Offside*, Paul transforming both physically and emotionally for the better. Through his actions, his emotional position transforms from dreamer to doer; from scared to brave; from passive to active. Simultaneously, through his emotional transformation he achieves physical improvements: from spectator to player; from silent to spoken; from single to with a partner.

Investigating the journey undertaken by a protagonist from a critical perspective has unquestionably influenced the writing of *Offside*. From examining a range of theories

about physical and emotional journeys, and through synthesising them in order to create a greater understanding, a more advanced way of writing has been discovered. At the same time, the process of writing *Offside* has facilitated a greater understanding of critical theories, bringing to life what they mean in practice. Like a screenplay protagonist, then, this PhD has undertaken a journey: from research question to answer; from problem to solution. As Brice points out, however, such a journey can only be identified when tools are applied to its planning, and it is known what is required to garner the end result:

Character journeys in stories are just like journeys in real life: one must know certain things if one is to arrive at one's destination successfully. A traveller or writer must know their trip's starting point and have an idea of what necessities to take along or else they may become drifters (ibid: 48).

Considering the notion of a journey having to be planned, Spence highlights what he sees as the biggest difference between successful US and UK television drama series:

In California, if you're not in therapy, there's something wrong with you, and if you're not in one of the Twelve Step programmes, you're simply not in the club; Californian film and television writers sit at the heart of a culture that demands people grow into better versions of themselves and that society rewards this inner journey (2006: 7).

What this suggests, more than perhaps appears on the surface, is that storytelling relies upon the emotional gratification achieved by an audience. Like Giddens' concept of life-planning, the audience likes to see where a protagonist is going and the steps being taken to achieve this. Whether such a journey is constructed by twelve steps (as in Vogler) or otherwise, the universal goal remains: to connect an audience to the protagonist, and by following his physical journey, to experience his emotional transformation. The journey undertaken by this PhD has not been 'therapy,' to quote Spence, but it has developed

critical knowledge of a mainstream feature film protagonist's journey, and generated creative insights into the practice of writing a mainstream feature film.

Watching the work of other screenwriters has helped to understand critical theories and inspire creative practice, making the process both reflective and reflexive. *Muriel's Wedding* (Hogan, 1994), for example, explores Muriel's emotional journey in two very specific physical ways. As well as moving from Porpoise Spit to Sydney, landing herself a new job and a new look, the wedding dress / image of the wedding dress and the playing of ABBA music are specifically used to chart Muriel's emotional journey. The wedding dress is used as a symbol of what Muriel wants to be, a signification of her dreams of happiness, and so putting one on or looking at an image of one restores her emotional balance when she is feeling depressed and worthless. Similarly, the playing of ABBA music during crucial moments of the narrative charts Muriel's emotional journey. The music is played when she is feeling low, when she is dreaming of being somebody else, and even when she finally is getting married. Costume and music are thus physical symbols that are laced into the narrative in order to externalise Muriel's emotional journey; from dowdy-looking pessimist who desperately clings to her friends, to confident optimist who is chosen as a friend, by Rhonda. The use of costume to trace the protagonist's emotional journey is also evident in films such as *Mrs Doubtfire* (Columbus, 1993), *The Adventures of Priscilla, Queen of the Desert* (Elliott, 1994) and *Connie and Carla* (Lembeck, 2004), where the physical act of dressing the body represents emotional development. In all three films the costume in question is drag, where adorning the clothing of another gender helps the characters to learn something about themselves. Each film poses the 'threat' of the characters' true identities being revealed, which when put into a narrative context, is a



physical sign of the real, emotional self being not yet ready for exposure; doing so would jeopardise their chance of emotional transformation. In other films, the physical terrain is used to represent the physical journey; it is upon this terrain that the emotional journey develops. In *Stand By Me* (Reiner, 1986), the protagonist Gordie undergoes an emotional transformation through his journey to find a dead body. With his three closest friends he sets-out to find the body of missing child Ray Brower, the hope being that they will all be heralded as heroes. The real journey of the film, however, is Gordie's emotional one; he learns that he is a 'somebody,' that he is not useless, and he is finally able to grieve for his dead older brother, Denny. The physicality of this film, which moves Gordie through the land and sees him overcoming natural and manmade obstacles, bears hallmarks of a road movie; the difference is that Gordie and his friends travel by foot, not car. If we view the film as a hybrid of the road movie and the coming-of-age drama, then *Stand By Me* has similarities with the films *Finding Nemo* (Stanton & Unkrich, 2003) and *Cars* (Lasseter & Ranft, 2006). The narratives of these films use the physicality of the road in different ways, but are derived from the same idea that reaching a destination by following a path offers a physical manifestation of the emotional journey. In *Finding Nemo*, Marlin swims across the ocean from America to Australia in order to find his son, Nemo. He faces various physical obstacles on the journey, and at the end when Nemo actually saves Marlin, Marlin learns to believe in his son's capabilities and stops being over-protective. In *Cars*, arrogant racing car Lightning McQueen becomes stranded on his way to the Piston Cup, the season finale he has been working towards. He stumbles across the town Radiator Springs, and because of the damage that he has caused to their road and is thus forced to fix, he is forced to stay there for a few days. Whilst there, McQueen learns the value of

true friendship and teamwork for the first time, and when he finally does get to the Piston Cup finale, he sacrifices a win in order to help an ageing opponent racing for the last time.

Using films that have inspired me to write, even before I knew what writing really was, this research has a strong personal connection. Re-visiting films that were part of my growing-up in the 1980s and 1990s, and considering films that have influenced my study and career direction in the 2000s, I have been able to understand why I wanted to be a writer, and why I was, and still am, fascinated with stories. The journeys offered in all of the films are not confined to the screen protagonist, but as the critical theories outlined have suggested, reach out and *connect* with the audience. Throughout my personal and professional development, I have not only been watching protagonists undertake their journeys, I have been watching myself undertake mine; I have not only been watching Gordie or Muriel or Lightning McQueen, I have been watching myself. Such awareness has only been made possible from the research undertaken, and going back to Brice's idea of the tools necessary to dissect a journey, can only now be understood as a result of events that have taken place since the films were first watched: thinking; writing; reading; writing.

The storytelling model of the Hero's Journey has been used as a basis for both practice and research in this PhD. This is by no means the only model available to the screenwriter; rather, for the reasons outlined, the work of Joseph Campbell and Christopher Vogler was chosen to provide a sufficient enough exploration of the fabric, form and function of the protagonist's journey in relation to a screenplay. The result has been an exploration of the various writings about the duality of narrative in a screenplay, its consolidation into definitive terminology, an extrapolation of this within a newly-defined model of screenplay structure, and most important of all, its application to the writing of an

original screenplay. Within all of this, creative and critical artefacts have developed symbiotically, just like the narrative threads of the screenplay that have been in question.

If physical and emotional journeys work with each other and for each other, in hope that they will find the strength to enable the protagonist's transformation, then screenplay and critical commentary have worked with each other and for each other, in hope that they have found the result they have been seeking.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Aristotle (1996) *Poetics*, Trans. Malcolm Heath, London: Penguin

Aronson, L (2001) *Screenwriting Updated: New (and Conventional) Ways of Writing for the Screen*, California: Silman-James Press

Batty, C & Waldeback, Z (2008) *Writing for the Screen: Creative and Critical Approaches*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Booker, C (2004) *The Seven Basic Plots: Why We Tell Stories*, London: Continuum

Brice, J (2008a) 'How to Write a Compelling Story, In 4 Easy Steps' in *ScriptWriter Magazine*, No. 39, pp. 15-20

Brice, J (2008b) 'How to Write a Compelling Story, Step Two: Getting Across to Others What's Important – The Role of the Protagonist' in *ScriptWriter Magazine*, No. 40, pp. 56-52

Campbell, J (1993) *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, London: Fontana

Campbell, J with Moyers, B (1988) *The Power of Myth*, New York: Doubleday

Clayton, S (2007) 'Mythic Structure in Screenwriting' in *New Writing: The International Journal for the Practice and Theory of Creative Writing*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 208-223

Dancyger, K & Rush, J (2007) *Alternative Scriptwriting: Successfully Breaking the Rules* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), Oxford: Focal Press

Egri, L (2004) *The Art of Dramatic Writing*, New York: Simon & Schuster

Field, S (2003) *The Definitive Guide to Screenwriting*, London: Ebury Press

Giddens, A (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Cambridge: Polity

Gorton, K (2006) 'A Sentimental Journey: Television, Meaning and Emotion' in *Journal of British Cinema and Television*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 72-81

Grodal, T (1997) *Moving Pictures: A New Theory of Film Genres, Feelings, and Cognition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Gulino, P. J (2004) *Screenwriting: The Sequence Approach*, New York: Continuum

Harper, G (2006a) 'Introduction' in Graeme Harper (ed.) *Teaching Creative Writing*, London: Continuum, pp. 1-7

- Harper, G (2006b) 'Research in Creative Writing' in Graeme Harper (ed.) *Teaching Creative Writing*, London: Continuum, pp. 158-171
- Hockley, L (2007) *Frames of Mind: A Post-Jungian Look at Cinema, Television and Technology*, Bristol: Intellect
- Hutzler, L (2005) 'Reaching World-Wide Audiences' in *ScriptWriter Magazine*, No. 23, pp. 6-8
- Hutzler, L (2004) 'Reason Overwhelmed: The Emotional Journey in Three Films' in *ScriptWriter Magazine*, No. 18, pp. 42-44
- Lawrence, J. S (2006) 'Joseph Campbell, George Lucas and the Monomyth' in Matthew Wilhelm Kapell and John Shelton Lawrence (eds.) *Finding the Force of the Star Wars Franchise: Fans, Merchandise and Critics*, New York: Peter Lang, pp. 21-33
- Melrose, A (2007) 'Reading and Righting: Carrying on the 'Creative Writing Theory' Debate' in *New Writing: The International Journal for the Practice and Theory of Creative Writing*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 109-117
- McKee, R (1999) *Story: Substance, Structure, Style, and the Principles of Screenwriting*, London: Methuen

- Moritz, C (2001) *Scriptwriting for the Screen*, London: Routledge
- Murphy, J. J (2007) *Me and You and Memento and Fargo: How Independent Screenplays Work*, New York: Continuum
- Nelmes, J (2007) 'Some Thoughts on Analysing the Screenplay, the Process of Screenplay Writing and the Balance Between Craft and Creativity' in *The Journal of Media Practice*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 107-113
- Owen, A (ed.) (2003) *Story and Character: Interviews with British Screenwriters*, London: Bloomsbury
- Palumbo, D. E (2008) 'The Monomyth in *Star Trek* Films' in Lincoln Geraghty (ed.) *The Influence of Star Trek on Television, Film and Culture*, Jefferson, N.C: McFarland, pp. 115-136
- Scott, K.C (ed.) (2006) *Screenwriters' Masterclass: Screenwriters Talk About Their Greatest Movies*, New York: Newmarket Press
- Seger, L (1994) *Making a Good Script Great* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), California: Samuel French
- Smith, M (1995) *Engaging Characters: Fiction, Emotion, and the Cinema*, Oxford: Oxford University Press



Spence, P (2006) 'Complexity and Emotional Depth' in *ScriptWriter Magazine*, No. 26, pp. 6-8

Spicer, A (2007) 'The Author as Author: Restoring the Screenwriter to British Film History' in James Chapman, Mark Glancy and Sue Harper (eds.) *The New Film History: Sources, Methods, Approaches*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 89-103

Stock, F (Presenter) (2003, March 19), *Front Row: Aristotle's Poetics* [Radio broadcast], London: BBC Radio 4

Thompson, E (2005) *Nanny McPhee: Film Transcript*, available at [http://www.script-orama.com/movie\\_scripts/n/nanny-mcphoe-script-transcript-emma.html](http://www.script-orama.com/movie_scripts/n/nanny-mcphoe-script-transcript-emma.html) (accessed 12th April, 2007)

Travers, P. L (1999a) 'Myth, Symbol, and Tradition' in Ellen D. Draper and Jenny Koralek (eds.) *A Lively Oracle: A Centennial Celebration of P. L. Travers, Magical Creator of 'Mary Poppins'*, New York: Larson, pp. 186-199

Travers, P. L (1999b) 'The Fairy-Tale as Teacher' in Ellen D. Draper and Jenny Koralek (eds.) *A Lively Oracle: A Centennial Celebration of P. L. Travers, Magical Creator of 'Mary Poppins'*, New York: Larson, pp. 200-209

Vogler, C (1999) *The Writer's Journey: Mythic Structure for Storytellers and Screenwriters* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), London: Pan Books

Voytilla, S (1999) *Myth and the Movies: Discovering the Mythic Structure of 50 Unforgettable Films*, California: Michael Wiese

Waldeback, Z (2006) 'The Purpose of Structure' in *ScriptWriter Magazine*, No. 29, pp. 20-25

Zizek, S (1989) *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, London: Verso

## FILMOGRAPHY

Allers, R & Minkoff, R (Directors) (1994) *The Lion King* [Motion Picture], USA: Walt Disney

Ardolino, E (Director) (1992) *Sister Act* [Motion Picture], USA: Touchstone

Bohco, S & Milch, D (Creators) (1993-2005) *NYPD Blue* [Television Series], USA: Fox Television Network

Clements, R & Musker, J (1992) *Aladdin* [Motion Picture], USA: Walt Disney

Columbus, C (Director) (1993) *Mrs Doubtfire* [Motion Picture], USA: Twentieth Century Fox

Daldry, S (Director) (2000) *Billy Elliot* [Motion Picture], UK / France: Working Title

Demme, J (Director) (1991) *The Silence of the Lambs* [Motion Picture], USA: Orion

Elliott, S (Director) (1994) *The Adventures of Priscilla, Queen of the Desert* [Motion Picture], Australia: PolyGram

Emmerich, R (Director) (2004) *The Day After Tomorrow* [Motion Picture], USA: Twentieth Century Fox

Herman, M (Director) (1998) *Little Voice* [Motion Picture], UK: Miramax

Hogan, P.J (Director) (1994) *Muriel's Wedding* [Motion Picture], Australia: CiBy 2000

Hurran, N (Director) (1998) *Girls' Night* [Motion Picture], UK: Granada

Huston, J (Director) (1951) *The African Queen* [Motion Picture], UK / USA: Horizon

Jenkins, P (Director) (2003) *Monster* [Motion Picture], USA / Germany: Newmarket Films

Jones, K (Director) (2005) *Nanny McPhee* [Motion Picture], USA / UK / France: Universal

Lasseter, J & Ranft, J (Directors) (2006) *Cars* [Motion Picture], USA: Walt Disney / Pixar

Lee, S (Director) (1986) *She's Gotta Have It* [Motion Picture], USA: 40 Acres & A Mule  
Filmworks

Lembeck, M (Director) (2004) *Connie and Carla* [Motion Picture], USA: Spyglass

Lucas, G (Director) (1977) *Star Wars* [Motion Picture], USA: Lucasfilm

Lumet, S (Director) (1982) *The Verdict* [Motion Picture], USA: Twentieth Century Fox

Mackenzie, D (Director) (2007) *Hallam Foe* [Motion Picture], UK: Film4

Mc Tiernan, J (Director) (1988) *Die Hard* [Motion Picture], USA: Twentieth Century Fox

Mellor, K (Creator) (2006-) *The Chase* [Television Series], UK: BBC1

Mellor, K (Creator) (2000-2005) *Fat Friends* [Television Series], UK: ITV

Mellor, K (Creator) (1999-2001) *Playing the Field* [Television Series], UK: BBC1

Mellor, K (Creator) (1995-1997) *Band of Gold* [Television Series], UK: ITV

Mellor, K (Creator) (1994) *Just Us* [Television Series], UK: ITV

Mendes, S (Director) (1999) *American Beauty* [Motion Picture], USA: DreamWorks

Reiner, R (Director) (1986) *Stand By Me* [Motion Picture], USA: Columbia

Reitman, J (Director) (2007) *Juno* [Motion Picture], USA / Canada: Fox Searchlight

Shelly, A (Director) (2007) *Waitress* [Motion Picture], USA: Night and Day Pictures

Soderbergh, S (Director) (2000) *Erin Brockovich* [Motion Picture], USA: Jersey Films

Stanton, A & Unkrich, L (Directors) (2003) *Finding Nemo* [Motion Picture], USA: Walt Disney / Pixar

Trousdale, G & Wise, K (Directors) (1991) *Beauty and the Beast* [Motion Picture], USA: Walt Disney

**APPENDIX:**

**RESEARCH UNDERTAKEN FOR THE WRITING OF *OFFSIDE***

5



As highlighted in Chapter Four, numerous third parties from the film and television industry have been instrumental in the creative research undertaken to write *Offside*, each one being generous enough to offer their time for one or more face-to-face meetings to discuss the project. In their own way, each individual has offered invaluable advice and feedback on the various elements of the screenplay throughout its development, from first treatment to final draft. These elements include character development and characterisation, story structure, genre, theme, dialogue and visual grammar. Chronologically, these third parties have been: Nadine Mellor, head of development at September Films (London); Catherine Oldfield, development producer at Greenlit Productions (London); Charles Harris, screenwriter and script trainer at Euroscript (London); Gareth Philips, script editor at ITV Drama (Manchester); Robin Mukherjee, screenwriter (Winchester); and Barbara Mackie, screenwriter and script editor (Isle of Wight). Talking in-depth with these people, and in some cases working through their notes, has proven to be a very rich and effective source of creative research for this PhD.

Attending writing workshops also played a vital part of the research involved in writing *Offside*, each one enabling me to concentrate on particular areas of screenwriting (as per the above list) and applying the ‘results’ of the workshop to my own writing. In 2005, I attended two workshops: *A Modern Masterclass with Syd Field* (two-day workshop with the American screenwriting authority), and *Soap Opera Writing Masterclass* (one-day workshop with television producer Stuart Doughty). Although the latter was concerned specifically with television soap operas, it did provide a wealth of information about the necessity of conflict in drama. In 2006, I attended the workshop *Right-Brain Scriptwriting with Jurgen Wolff*, a one-day masterclass which enabled participants to open-up their

creativity and apply the results to a project they were working on. Finally, in 2008, I attended the *Screenwriting and Genre* workshop presented by Euroscript, which gave me greater insights into the realms of writing for film genres; specifically for *Offside*, writing a rites of passage sports film.

Research into gay football teams and national football leagues also had to be undertaken for the writing of *Offside*, each being deemed instrumental to the development of story structure and the creation of credibility. To start with I began investigating the presence of gay football teams in the UK, and found out that not only does a national team exist, Stonewall FC ([www.stonewallfc.com](http://www.stonewallfc.com)), a whole league of gay football teams exists: the Gay Football Supporters Network ([www.league.gfsn.org.uk](http://www.league.gfsn.org.uk)). This led me to discover that a gay football team local to me, Gay Football Club (GFC) Bournemouth ([www.gfcbournemouth.co.uk](http://www.gfcbournemouth.co.uk)), was also in existence, providing further opportunities for research. I decided to visit the team during a training session in 2006, where I was able to meet the then team captain Clive Foley and discuss the whole idea of gay football teams. It was here that I discovered, rather ironically, that even in the spirit of trying to play a 'real man's sport,' gay stereotypes in fact *did* exist within the team. For example, the scene in the screenplay where the players suddenly stop the game and make a fuss of a white fluffy dog actually happened; similarly, Clive told me that some of the players were 'found' through what might be deemed stereotypically gay means: clubbing, gay internet chat rooms, and one-night stands. Research like this drastically opened my eyes to the 'realities' of a gay football team, where even though the players were attempting to 'fight back' at stereotypes, they were in fact reinforcing, perhaps adding to, them. Visiting the location of GFC Bournemouth's training and playing ground, Meyrick Park in

Bournemouth, was also useful as research because it provided a clear backdrop to one of the locations used in the screenplay. Ironically, perhaps, Meyrick Park is a renowned gay cruising ground.

Much of *Offside*'s story focuses upon the notion of small clubs joining 'proper' leagues, and as such research into this had to be undertaken. This led me to discover that the first (lowest) official English league is the Football Conference, sponsored at the time of research by Nationwide ([www.footballconference.co.uk](http://www.footballconference.co.uk)). This Conference is divided into three divisions: North, South and Premier. North and South divisions feed into the Premier, so it was obvious that *Offside* would be set around the aspiration of the South division, where Newbury Rovers, and eventually the Green Giants, would be battling it out to finally enter a 'proper' league. Research into the Football Conference also gave me ideas about the kind of teams that would be playing against the teams in *Offside*; small 'home counties' and south coast towns such as Wokingham and Dorchester.

Finally, throughout the writing of *Offside* there have been numerous instances where I have conducted research in the form of undertaking creative exercises. Whether writing a monologue in the voice of a character, alternating the narrative sequence to see what happens to meaning, or telling part of the story using visuals only, such exercises are the epitome of creative research; they are an active space where the screenwriter can probe an idea further or follow a different path for a while, using the results to inform the final product. Although these exercises are largely undocumented and exist in numerous forms, they have been integral to my writing; indeed, such exercises are part of the ongoing research for any screenwriter who is looking to find out more about the world he is creating.