

- **Norman Friedman – *Forms of the Plot***
- Friedman criticizes attempts to paraphrase plots and offer plot summary – this is much the same way many literary critics say paraphrasing poems is a heresy because it contradicts the whole premise of the poem: to be complex and operate both structurally and aesthetically
- Friedman says plot summary is faulty because it fails to capture the key feature of the poem, or play, or novel – namely, the summary always tends to omit the form that the writing took
 - As Friedman sees it, an essential goal of reading is determining the artistic form of the work
 - Friedman points out that summary is typically the bare recital of the events in a story and leaves out the elements which are necessary to grasp the shaping principle of the work that binds the events of the story together
 - These shaping elements include the character and motive of the protagonist, the protagonist’s state of mind, the change the protagonist undergoes, and the “crucial chain of cause and effect that lead [the protagonist] from one condition to another”
 - As an example, Friedman cites a common and straightforward plot: protagonist meets loved one, wins loved one, loses loved one
 - Even this relatively simple plot form can become many different stories, as is shown by different authors’ treatment of this same plot – for example, Thomas Hardy in *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*, D. H. Lawrence in *Sons and Lovers*, F. Scott Fitzgerald in *The Great Gatsby*, Ernest Hemingway in *A Farewell to Arms*, and George Orwell in *1984*
 - These stories tell the exact same plot – protagonist finds loved one, wins loved one, loses loved one – and yet these are radically different novels
 - Thus we need to know what is it that distinguishes these stories
 - Any reader will see that these stories are different even though they ostensibly have the same simple love plot formula – but how can we precisely articulate the distinguishing features of these plots so we do not mistakenly lump them together and claim they tell the same story (which they obviously do not)
 - This is Friedman’s goal – to find the specific language to discuss differences in plot forms

- There is a current theory of story which suggests that a narrative is organized so that its diverse elements of action, character, background, and theme are reconciled into an organic whole
 - Friedman cites how scholars have offered formulas that aim to describe how diverse story elements are fused into unity
 - One such formula describes story as: purpose, passion, perception
 - Another formula describes story as: tension, conflict, resolution
 - Friedman describes how this effort to unify elements of story leads to a framework where discerning elaborate systems of similarity and contrast among the elements of the plot is considered sufficient analysis for understanding a story
 - Friedman concedes that this is a helpful method but argues that it does not go far enough towards truly grasping how stories and their diverse parts function
 - Friedman also notes that this framework of similarity and contrast is not a method of analysis that will fit all literary works
 - Another shortcoming of this unified-whole approach is it that it tends to view the whole as emerging from co-ordinate relationships among equal parts
 - Under this theory, everything in the story is related to everything else and everything works together
 - As a result of putting all elements on equal footing with equal effect on the whole, the essential flow of cause and effect in time, Friedman argues, gets muddled
 - In other words, there is little impetus to define cause-and-effect in the storytelling when all elements are considered equal and equally integral to forming the whole
 - Not all works are organized didactically as unified wholes where the parts comprise a philosophical underpinning of the whole's universal statement of morals
 - Thus, as the sole means of understanding story this method of similarity and contrast is not sufficient
- Friedman points out that if we think of all plots and all literary works as being shaped according to the same principles then we have not gone far enough in our analysis –

we have not solved how to see and define “the many differences which common sense tells us exist among the various poems, plays, and novels we have read”

- In other words, there are too many variations among stories such that the unified theory of plot is not enough to account for them and a more robust theory is needed
 - The unified theory is too general and is able to fit all plots under its explanatory aegis – this generality doesn’t allow us to say anything meaningful about individual plots
- Friedman states that it is his goal to “construct a theory of the whole from which we will be able to derive a set of distinctions allowing us to define as closely as possible the unique form of a particular plot”
 - It is simply not enough to say that all the parts relate to all the other parts and that the whole equals this relationship
 - Rather, we must begin to think of the whole as the “end” and of the parts as the “means”
 - And using this “ends”/“means” framework we can bring a sense of “developmental progression” back into our understanding and analysis of plot
- According to Friedman, parts and devices are present in a literary work not just so that they can relate to one another, but so they can perform a job, to forward the purpose of the end or whole
 - As Friedman sees it, all literary works are intended by their author (whether deliberately or instinctually) to achieve a particular end, to effect some sort of purpose – and it is this purpose that guides the construction of the parts, that guides the creative decisions along the way to creating the whole
 - These decisions include where to begin, how much to include and in what order, where to emphasize and where to de-emphasize, where and how to end, etc.
 - In other words, stories are built with a purpose in mind and this purpose then serves as the author’s guiding principle when making decisions and constructing the parts along the way
 - Friedman is quick to point out that the intentionality he is talking about is not the kind where he assumes that the author is completely aware of his or her intentions and is able to execute those intentions without any metamorphosis between authorial mind and the finished page
 - In other words Friedman is not saying that all authors begin with a clear intention in mind and then proceed to flawlessly transcribe that intention into a finished story that perfectly bears it out

- Friedman points out how we frequently conceive of writing in just this sort of way – as having an end in mind and of trying to accomplish it via effective means
 - Often teachers will correct student writing by pointing out that the student is trying to make a certain point and then showing how certain elements in the writing detract from and muddle that intended point
 - Instruction here will often take the form of showing the student how one paragraph doesn't logically flow from the preceding one, how certain topics raised in the writing aren't pertinent to the one the student is trying to address, how the end doesn't clearly show the audience what they are supposed to do as a result of the writing, etc.
 - So, according to Friedman, “the reader interested in perceiving and defining the form of any piece of writing, so that he may use this sense of the whole to guide him in discussing the relevance and efficacy of its parts and their manner of presentation, must begin by trying to recover by inference the end effect aimed at”
- Thus Friedman says his central purpose in this essay is to “determine how far and in what ways we can go toward defining the different kinds of ends we are likely to meet in that species of imaginative literature”
 - The hope is that from this effort, we will begin to delineate a set of differentiators between various plot types which we can then apply to any new story we encounter
 - Friedman excludes polemical-type literature from this analysis, that is, literature whose aim is to inform the reader about or persuade the reader to take a certain action with respect to a “real-life” problem
- Friedman defines the term plot thusly – a group of two or more episodes effecting a completed process of change in the main character
 - This is the action that is represented in most plays and novels
- The end of the plot, then, is to show a completed process of change in the protagonist in order to arouse in the reader a sequence of emotions from the initial condition to the new condition
 - The essential quality of plots is that they are sequential flows of events in time with means and causes, effects and ends
 - In order to ever differentiate plots from one another, there must first be a clear understanding of the different kinds of changes that take place in plots and the corresponding interpretative/imaginative response these changes evoke from a reader
- According to Friedman, when we consider the changes that occur in plots we must know what causes change at the level of the character

- Friedman says three things influence a person's actions
 - 1) The way the person conceives of things (thinks about the world)
 - 2) The nature of the person's goals and purposes
 - 3) The environmental circumstances in which the person is situated
- For Friedman, these are the three components that cause change in the individual and thus lead to larger changes at the level of the plot or story arc
- Plots are built around a central change in a character and so examining these causes of personal change (protagonist's state of mind, protagonist's character and behavior, situation of the external environment) inevitably allows the reader to understand something about what caused the change in the overall plot
- As an example of this, Friedman cites the novel *Tom Jones* by Henry Fielding and argues that "much of Tim's failure to maintain his honor and reputation is due to misconceptions of various sorts on his part as well as on the part of others"
- Plot – A Composite of Action, Character, and Thought
- In continuing his understanding of what plot is, Friedman cites the work of literary critic R. S. Crane
 - Crane criticized definitions of plot that saw it as simply the incidents of a story and their variety and the amount of suspense and surprise they evoke
 - For Crane, a better definition of plot is to consider it a "composite" of action, character, and thought
 - In other words, normally plot is just considered as action – but Crane is pressing for a definition that sees those actions in relation to the attitudes of characters
 - Thus Crane wants to link the action/incidents of a plot with "the moral qualities of the characters and the operations of their thought"
- Going back to his list of the things that influence a person's action (state of mind, character/behavior, external world), Friedman says that Crane saw plot as chiefly examining a change in one of the three factors, with the other two related as a means to that end
 - So under Crane's model, a plot ought to examine a change in either the protagonist's way of thinking about the world, a protagonist's way of acting/behaving in the world, or a protagonist's relationship to the external world
 - And whatever of these three changes a plot is mainly concerned with, it means that the other two elements will be used to show how the main change occurs

- So for Crane there are plots of thought (change in conception of the world), plots of action (change in action/behavior in the world), and plots of character (change in orientation toward to the world)
- Crane goes on to argue that in order to understand the form of a plot, critics and readers must examine the imaginative responses that these unified incidents in a plot are likely to evoke
 - Friedman calls this the ultimate aim of any literary work, to arouse emotion (the desire to provoke our sympathy or aversion, our pity or indignation, and so on)
- Thus, for Crane, the form of a plot is the relationship between the incidents in the plot (the events) that show a completed process of change (whether of thought, action, or character) and the particular series of emotions aroused while reading this
 - Crane: “We may be said to have grasped the plot in the full artistic sense only when we have analyzed the interplay of desires and expectations sequentially in relation to the incidents by which it is produced.”
 - Or, put another way: “The form of the whole plot, then, is a question of ‘the capacity of its peculiar synthesis of character, action, and thought to move our feelings powerfully and pleasurably in a certain definite way.’”
- Plot – Understanding The Incidents, The Protagonist, and The Mechanism of Change
- Following Crane’s theory, Friedman says that instead of teaching readers to make plot summaries out of what they have read, it would be more fruitful to teach the reader to construct a synopsis of how the protagonist changed
 - Friedman’s method includes delivering a synopsis of “the unique combination of action, character, and thought which will include in one succinct statement the parts necessary to an understanding of the synthesizing principle binding the whole plot together”
 - This synopsis should include the kind of person the protagonist is, what the protagonist’s change is, the degree of the protagonist’s responsibility for what he or she does and undergoes, and the essential stages of cause and effect that bring about this change
 - For Friedman this a superior way to understand plot (relating the incidents, the character, and the mechanism of change)
 - What is omitted from the synopsis are the lesser elements that support the probability and vividness of the change
 - This model of understanding plot helps capture the complexities of works and how the incidents function, as opposed to simply what the incidents relate
- Friedman then announces his intention to distinguish a more specific subdivision of the kinds of plot proposed by Crane

- Friedman begins his expansion of Crane’s work on plots by proposing a methodology that will help critics and readers identify the type of plot they encounter
 - The first step of this methodology is to determine who is the protagonist
 - According to Friedman, the protagonist is the character who undergoes the “major change”
 - Essentially this is the figure around whom all else in the plot revolves, says Friedman
 - The second step is to ask what is this protagonist’s character
 - Specifically, Friedman says we must ask these questions about the protagonist’s character
 - 1) “What is his or her fortune, and do we fear it will become worse and hope it will become better?”
 - 2) “What is his or her thought, and do we feel he or she is sufficiently aware of the facts of the situation and the consequences of his or her behavior in order to be held responsible for what he or she does and undergoes?”
 - 3) “Which of these three factors (character, action, thought) undergoes a change as the plot unfolds and reaches its conclusion?”
 - Friedman insists that there must be at least one change for there to be a plot
 - He allows for the possibility of more than one change but seems to suggest that there will always be a singular, main change, and that other changes (if any) will be related but secondary
 - For example, if a plot turns on the change in a protagonist’s character, other changes (such as changes in fortune) can still be presented but are likely to be in furtherance of the main change
 - The final step in the methodology proposed by Friedman is to ask for a statement of the plot that includes cause-and-effect relationships regarding the main change
- The goal of this methodology is to not merely label the plot-type but to come away with an understanding of the “artistic organization” of the story
- Friedman then lays out three main categories of changes in plot, using the categories proposed by Crane
 - The main categories of changes in plot are, to recapitulate:

- 1) Changes in Action/Fortune
 - Changes in Action/Fortune refer to changes in the protagonist's honor, status, reputation, wellbeing, material goods, loved ones, health
 - A change in fortune is revealed through what happens to the protagonist (finding happiness or misery) and to the protagonist's plans (the success or failure of the plans)
 - 2) Changes in Character
 - Changes in Character refer to changes in the protagonist's motives, goals, behavior, purposes, habits, will
 - All of the above may be noble or base, good or bad, sympathetic or unsympathetic, mature or immature
 - A change in character is revealed when the protagonist decides voluntarily to pursue or abandon a course of action and in whether the protagonist can actually put this decision into practice
 - 3) Changes in Thought
 - Changes in Thought refer to changes in the protagonist's states of mind, attitudes, reasonings, emotions, beliefs, conceptions, knowledge
 - A change in thought tends to be revealed omnisciently, says Friedman, such as when a protagonist states a general proposition, or argues a particular point, or explains his or her view of a situation
- Friedman discusses how interwoven these categories of action, character, and thought are and says this is all the more reason to clearly know their distinction and not confuse them
 - Often one category will serve as material for another, or as the cause of another, or the occasion of another, or as a sign of the manifestation of another category, etc.
 - These categories are related, yes, but Friedman urges us to remember that they remain distinct
 - Friedman offers the following analysis of how category relationships can be presented in different ways: "The protagonist's suicide, as the culmination of a plot, may represent a noble character's decision to atone for the evil he has unwittingly done and the misfortunes he has caused to fall on his head, as in *Othello*; or it may represent the last

despairing gesture of a protagonist whose character is no longer sufficient to cope with the problems of his life, as in *The Seagull*.”

- Friedman reminds us that one category may change as result of another, but that these categories may also change independently, and in different directions
- To define plots Friedman proposes the following sequence of steps
 - 1) Determine whether the main change is in fortune, character, or thought
 - 2) Determine whether the main change is from a satisfactory state to a less satisfactory state or from a less satisfactory state to a more satisfactory state
 - 3) Determine how the remaining categories of change are related to this main change (if at all)
- Friedman argues for the necessity of this type of analysis by pointing out how different narratives require different analytical tools to understand
 - Friedman: “It is sufficiently clear, however, that a good man achieving good fortune, a good man suffering bad fortune, a bad man achieving good fortune, and a bad man suffering bad fortune, for example, produce different effects and therefore comprise different kinds of plots.”
- **Plots of Fortune**
 - **The Action Plot**
 - Friedman calls this plot the most common and also the most primitive form of the plots of fortune
 - In this plot, our main interest is “what happens next”
 - Characters and their thoughts are “portrayed minimally in terms of the bare necessities required to forward the action”
 - In other words, there are seldom serious moral or intellectual quandaries at issue in the character
 - In these plots the outcome does not seriously impact the protagonist’s fortune, character, or thought and thus the change is not permanent, leaving the character free to re-enter the cycle of this plot (perhaps in a sequel)
 - The pleasures of this plot are almost exclusively suspense, expectation, and surprise
 - Usually the plot is organized around a “puzzle and solution” cycle – there is a criminal to catch, a treasure to be found, a planet to land on
 - These plots tend to be found in novels set as adventure, detective, western, or science-fiction stories
 - **The Pathetic Plot** (Change of fortune for the worse)

- This plot involves a sympathetic protagonist who experiences misfortune through no fault of his or her own – it is usually a plot of suffering
 - It is often the case in these plots that the protagonist's will is weak or the protagonist's thought is naïve and deficient
- This plot is called “pathetic” because our long-range fears over the protagonist actually materialize – there is no letup in the character's suffering
 - There may be incremental, short-term positive arcs for the character but the general trend is toward ultimate suffering and the reader's pity for this state of suffering
 - It tends to be that in these plots the sufferer shows us human frailty and the futility of living and at the end the reader is led to pity over the “indestructibly deterministic steamroller of circumstance crushing the mewling kitten of human hopes”
- Here Friedman cites the example of Tess in Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* - our being in sympathy with her makes her execution for murder at the end of the novel all the more pitiful for the reader
- **The Tragic Plot** (Change of fortune for the worse)
 - If we have a sympathetic protagonist who also has strength of will, plus the ability to change his or her thought, then this protagonist bears more responsibility for his or her actions and their consequences
 - When this type of character suffers (sympathetic but effective), and suffers because of some serious error in judgment, which error is only discovered after it's too late to halt the consequences of the error – then this forms the basic tragic plot
 - Like the Pathetic Plot, the tragic plot involves the same fear in the reader over the prospect of the character's misfortune and the same pity when this misfortune comes to fruition – but, crucially, there is a more complicated relationship between the character's fortune, character, and thought
 - Generally in these plots our fear and pity over the protagonist's ultimate condition is accompanied by a sense of justice and emotional satisfaction because the tragic hero is partly to blame for his or her downfall (and further because the tragic hero knows she is partly to blame)

- The ensuing agony from this downfall and the knowledge of having helped cause it makes the fate of the protagonist feel somewhat deserved
 - Here, the character's ultimate death or destruction does not bring about the unalloyed pity of the Pathetic Plot but a sense that although pitiful in some respects, the destruction is deserved in others
 - This death/destruction may be the best possible end for the character, given the acts he or she has taken and the resultant suffering; the death/destruction may also be seen as necessary for any atonement or redemption of this character
 - Friedman cites *Oedipus Rex*, *Othello*, *Antigone*, *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, and *Julius Caesar* as examples of this plot
- **The Punitive Plot** (Change of fortune for the worse)
 - In the Punitive Plot we get a protagonist who is unsympathetic, meaning his or her goals and methods are repugnant to the reader, but who may nonetheless be admirable for the strength of will and intellect displayed in pursuing these repugnant goals via repugnant methods – and ultimately the downfall of the protagonist strikes the reader as deserved misfortune
 - Friedman calls this protagonist the hero-villain
 - When we first encounter this hero-villain we are curiously compelled by the character's elaborate scheme and seemingly unflagging will and craft
 - We briefly admire someone who can rise above the ineffectual and moralizing fools of society
 - Eventually, however, this character will victimize truly good people and the reader will flip his or her orientation toward the character and feel a sense of vindication upon the character's ultimate downfall
 - Now any pity we feel will be directed at the victims of this hero-villain
 - The final terminus of the reader's emotion is not the same as in the tragic plot (where there is a reserve of pity for the tragic hero)
 - Here the hero-villain is completely detested for what he or she wrought
 - Examples of this plot can be found in *Richard III* and *Absalom, Absalom!*

- **The Sentimental Plot** (Change of fortune for the better)
 - This plot involves a sympathetic protagonist who survives the threat of misfortune and ends up alright at the end
 - Like the Pathetic Plot this plot entails the protagonist suffering – but in this case the suffering is eventually overcome
 - This plot is in many ways the obverse of the Pathetic Plot
 - Here, the long-range hopes we have that the protagonist will succeed and defeat the causes of suffering ultimately come true
 - According to Friedman, in the Sentimental Plot, “the final effect [is] one of joyous relief at the sight of virtue receiving its just reward.”
 - In this plot, the protagonist remains “steadfast” throughout, Friedman says – here the protagonist is acted upon rather than acting and “neither his bad nor his good fortune depends directly upon the quality of his thought or character.”
 - Friedman cites Shakespeare’s *Cymbeline* as an example of this plot
- **The Admiration Plot** (Change in fortune for the better)
 - This plot involves a positive change in fortune for a sympathetic protagonist based on that protagonist’s nobility of character
 - In this plot the protagonist gains in honor and reputation, and this may occur even in spite of some loss suffered in the protagonist’s welfare or material circumstances
 - In this plot, as in the Sentimental Plot, our long-range hopes are fulfilled for the protagonist’s change of fortune for the better
 - The difference in this plot is that our final emotion is respect and admiration for how the protagonist has exceeded personal limits and the expectations of what a normal person is capable of doing
 - Friedman cites John Dryden’s play, *The Conquest of Grenada*, as an example of this plot
- **Plots of Character**
 - **The Maturing Plot** (Change of character for the better)
 - This is the most common Plot of Character and it involves a protagonist whose goals are either mistakenly conceived or even undetermined – coupled with a will that is “rudderless and vacillating”
 - This defect is often due to inexperience in the world, or naivete, or an “absolute wrongheadedness” in the protagonist’s belief or attitudes

- For the example of wrongheaded beliefs – something in the plot will have to change the character’s thought
- What the character needs in this plot is the strength to change his or her current trajectory – and usually this can be spurred on through a drastic misfortune, even a life-and-death one
 - Friedman cites the plot of Joseph Conrad’s novel *Lord Jim* where the protagonist embraces death as a way to show he has regained his strength and purpose
- This type of plot often deals with the coming-of-age of young people, and thus can be called a Maturing Plot
 - In this plot our long-range hopes (that the protagonist will ultimately choose the correct path) are all confirmed
 - And the reader’s response to the end of this plot is one of “righteous satisfaction”
- Friedman says that it is the element of choice that distinguishes this plot – the protagonist makes a choice to radically alter things
- Friedman cites Dickens’s novel *Great Expectations* and Faulkner’s story *The Bear* as an example of this plot
- **The Reform Plot** (Change of character for the better)
 - This reform plot differs from the maturing plot in that here, the protagonist’s thought is sufficient from the outset of the story
 - In other words, the protagonist starts out in a negative state, knowing that he or she is doing wrong – it is a weakness of will that keeps the protagonist from living the way that he or she knows to be good and just
 - At the outset of the plot the protagonist does not reveal that she knows herself to be wrong and to be living wrong, rather, she conceals everything under a mask of virtue and respectability
 - The problem for the writer of this plot is to design the circumstances that will cause the protagonist to abandon this mask of virtue and choose a better course: real virtue
 - The reader may admire this character at the beginning, and genuinely believe the character to be virtuous, but soon the reader will see through the mask of virtue and grow irritated with the character
 - This will grow into indignation and outrage as the reader observes the character deceive and hurt others

- At the end of this plot the reader feels righteous satisfaction when the protagonist makes the right choice after all – to pursue genuine virtue
 - Friedman: “In the maturing plot there is some pity for the protagonist because he acts and suffers under a mistaken view of things, but it is exactly this element which is missing in the reform plot.”
 - In some ways this plot resembles the punitive plot for how the protagonist is a charlatan and fraud and a bad person – the difference is that in this plot the protagonist is reformed at the end instead of punished (as is the case with the punitive plot)
 - Friedman cites *The Scarlet Letter* as an example of this plot
- **The Testing Plot** (Indeterminate change; depends on ending)
 - In this plot, a “sympathetic, strong, and purposeful character is pressured, in one way or another, to compromise or surrender his noble ends and habits”
 - The protagonist ultimately chooses to yield to the pressure or resist it
 - The protagonist waivers on what to do and the plot ultimately turns on the question of will the protagonist remain steadfast or not
 - Our sympathies are ambivalent in this plot – the protagonist could be truly harmed by resisting the pressure to surrender virtue; while giving in to the pressure might substantially increase the protagonist’s material welfare
 - Part of the reader believes that the protagonist should stop resisting and give in to the pressure, while simultaneously realizing that this will result in a heavy moral price where the protagonist loses self-respect (and the reader’s respect as well)
 - If the protagonist makes the proper choice at the end, we feel our faith has been justified
 - Friedman cites *For Whom the Bell Tolls* as an example of this plot
- **The Degeneration Plot** (Change of character for the worse)
 - This plot begins with a protagonist who was at one time sympathetic and full of ambition and then subjects this protagonist to meaningful loss that causes the protagonist’s “utter disillusionment”
 - At this point, the protagonist must now decide whether to pick up the pieces and resume life again on the same terms, or abandon all former goals and ambitions entirely

- If the protagonist chooses the former course (continuing to carry on after a wrecking event) then this can be seen as a yet un-named Resignation Plot
 - Friedman does not go into further detail about this newly coined Resignation Plot, except to say that Chekov's play *Uncle Vanya* is an exemplar of this type
 - The question arising from this plot is “how a person can live after all his ideals, hopes, and goals have been shattered”
 - In this plot, our short-term hopes of the protagonist re-emerging are converted into long-range fears that the shattering event will ultimately crush him or her
 - Friedman says that it is not clear whether the effect on the reader is one of pity, or contempt, or even impatience over the character's weak will and the character's allowing him- or herself to be permanently crushed by that crucial event
 - What would affect reader sentiment in this case is how convinced the reader is by the story that the protagonist couldn't help but be permanently crushed by the crucial event, how good a job the story does at showing the impossibility of trying again
 - There is, in this plot, a great deal of gloom for the reader's hope that hardship can be transcended
 - Friedman cites Chekov's *Ivanov* and *The Seagull*, as well as Fitzgerald's *Tender is the Night* as examples of this plot
- **Plots of Thought**
 - **The Education Plot** (Change in thought for the better)
 - Plots which turn on a change of thought are recent developments in the history of art, according to Friedman
 - This plot involves the protagonist experiencing a change in thought for the better
 - This plot resembles the maturing plot in that the protagonist's thought in the beginning of the story is somehow inadequate and then it improves
 - The difference is that in the education plot – the protagonist does not demonstrate the effects of this beneficial change in thought or mindset

- There is no showing the protagonist putting this thought into action; the change in thought itself is the end of the plot
 - At the beginning of this plot the protagonist has already been through a series of disillusioning experiences and is therefore cynical and pessimistic about life; or the protagonist is naïve and has simply not been exposed to alternative possibilities in life
 - If the protagonist is sophisticated it is usually the case that the protagonist has wide experience in the world but suffered some life-altering past trauma that has caused him or her to conclude that the world is *always* like that
 - If the protagonist is naïve, it is usually the case that the protagonist mistakenly believes he or she is knowledgeable about the world, but really has an ill-informed, fixed opinion about it
 - The key component of this plot is for the author to subject the protagonist to some type of conflict/threat/or trial that will serve as the catalyst for the protagonist to adopt a more comprehensive view of life
 - Put another way, Friedman quotes from Robert Penn Warren's novel *All the Kings Men*: "It is the story of a man who lived in the world and to him the world looked one way for a long time and then it looked another and very different way."
 - The reader's response to this plot involves short-range fears and long-range hopes
 - According to Friedman: "A sympathetic person undergoes a threat of some sort and emerges into a new and better kind of wholeness at the end, with a final sense of relief, satisfaction, and pleasure"
 - Friedman cites *War and Peace*, *Huckleberry Finn*, and *To the Lighthouse* as examples of this plot
- **The Revelation Plot**
 - This plot hinges on the protagonist's ignorance concerning the essential facts of his or her situation
 - Thus, this is not a plot about changing the character's attitudes or beliefs, but is rather one where the protagonist lacks a certain bit of critical knowledge at the beginning and it is then revealed to him or her at the end

- Friedman: “A definition of the whole, in sum, provides the enveloping context, the limit or control, in terms of which whatever else we may say about a plot derives its significance and its point.”
 - And so even in analyzing parts of the whole individually, one must first have a whole to refer to – and thus in comes Freidman’s analysis and theories