Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (KUJHSS)

Language as a tool to mask hidden agendas in David Mamet's Oleanna

Pshtiwan A. Mira

Department of English Language, Faculty of Social Sciences and humanities, Koya University,
Koya 44023, Kurdistan Region – F.R. Iraq

ABSTRACT

As a prominent American playwright, director, and screenwriter, David Mamet has made significant contributions to American theater. Mamet's style of writing dialogue which is referred to as Mamet-speak has distinctive features of dramatic writing such as repetition, blunt profanity, highly stylized form of speech marked by overlapping and fragmented sentences. Within the scope of Mamet's playwriting, language plays a distinctive role. This role is not to express feelings or simply transfer of factual information but to be dramatic action; as an instrument of action, power, and manipulation. This paper discusses language in David Mamet's drama and his well-known play Oleanna. The ultimate goal of this paper is to show that Mamet pays great attention to the vitality of language, as it could be more effective than a weapon and it could be used as a tool to mask hidden agendas by characters. This is well-shown in Oleanna when characters, notably John and Carol, use language not to express feelings and convey factual information but to mask what they intend to accomplish: their hidden agendas. Mamet, through Oleanna, portrays the world as a battlefield where people battle with language; this battle is waged at the level of language. His characters mask their true selves with words and try to control and manipulate others through language. Ultimately, the power of language is well-explored in the play when beneath what characters utter lie hidden agendas. This paper presents a stylistic and qualitative textual analysis of David Mamet's Oleanna, applying theories of semantics and pragmatics.

KEY WORDS: Tool, Agenda, Language, Mask, Characters.

1. [1] INTRODUCTION

David Mamet as an American author and playwright asserts the importance and the power of language in most of his plays including *Oleanna*. He gives priority to the language of his works; he uses verbal intensity to have great power and influence on his readers. Mamet has a great affection for language and believes in the vitality of the dramatic language. As Mamet reiterated, he got such a belief from his early influences, people, literary works, and the environment, which all together, with the passage of time, made him the playwright he is today. Therefore, he has been able to create his impact on the contemporary American theater. In this regard, he states "My goal is to increase the frequency and quality of productions of my plays in smaller communities across America" (Whatley, 2011, P36). For Mamet, words and the quality of writing are important. Therefore, he critiques the quality of his own words, and compares his assessment with scholars' perspectives about his stage dialogue. His belief in the power of language and varied forces made him an artist; such forces include, his family, his father and other writers who exerted influence upon him. Mamet says, "My dad was a, a labor lawyer, a one-man labor lawyer, and [*Hoffa*] was really a movie about him. I didn't know Hoffa, but it was about my dad and the way he spoke and the way he comported himself". In this regard, the majority of characters in Mamet's plays have the same language of his father and talk like him (Ibid).

Mamet studies the process of change in men due to social surroundings including what people have become and the language they use is well reflected in his plays. As a playwright, his strength and reputation lie in the way he uses language. Language controls and structures his plays. In this regard, he confirms this as he said, "… It's just words. One way to look at it is that the theatre is a study in stoicism … … you have to live in a world where you can do such a thing, and endeavor to train yourself to discount them"(Das, 2012, P7). In his plays, Mamet gives a secondary role to plots or narratives while gives priority

[1]. Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (KUJHSS) Volume 9, Issue 2, 2026.
Received 10 September 2026; Accepted 1 October 2026
Regular research paper: Published 20 October 2026
Corresponding author's e-mail: pshtiwan.arf@koyauniversity.org

Copyright ©2026 Pshtiwan A. Mira. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.

to dialogue. In other words, language comes first as he draws the public eye on it. He goes against a sort of philosophy by Aristotle that argues what reveals humans is their actions. His view and philosophy reiterate that humans reveal themselves via language. Mamet's characters speak a language that includes variety of linguistic antecedents suggestive of Spanish, Italian, Jewish and African-American origin. His speak dialogue embraces incorporating the pace of city life into his dialogue. Brevity of expression by his characters is very important. Moreover, his characters leave out words which are inessential and redundant to the sentences they utter; if they want to express or convey something they do so in a short time possible. In other words, they do not spend much time on a message they want to convey as they pay great attention to the time and most of the times they speak in codes (Ibid).

David Mamet relies on the type of language which is complicated and not easy to understand; he heavily relies on verbal intensity. Therefore, directors, readers and spectators face difficulty to fully grasp the meaning. Mamet's plays especially *Oleanna* reflects the postmodern perspective about language that words precise meaning in the outer world. This is because they rely on context for meaning. Mamet in *Oleanna* introduces the audience to a number of dialogic devices which include diverse levels of difficulty. Among these difficulties come multiple phone calls that they interrupt characters' conversation, eventually hinder clear meaning and leading characters not to have mutual understanding. Language as a source of joy in both content and sound is well reflected in Mamet's description of it. He loves the existence of diversity in language. Hence, he states that residents of New York speak differently than people from Chicago. He expresses his affection and love for such a difference: "I was just on the West Coast, and I was hanging around with Joey Mantegna, whom I hadn't seen for a while, and just to hear the rhythms and cadences of the old speech, of the old country, it made me smile. It was wonderful to hear that" (Bigsby, 2004, P12). His affection and appreciation for language resulted from his deep respect for the impact it could have on people and readers in the real world. He relies on the dramatic language for sustenance on the stage, and it is there that his love for language reaches its climax.

According to Mamet, the enjoyment one could get from any activity could be increased by the language which works as an ingredient for this purpose. In other words, the amount of enjoyment readers could get from his plays heavily depends on the type of language and words he uses, as he says. "a garnish adorning and embellishing activities like hunting, waiting in an elevator or attending meetings. Hence, he deeply loves language to the extent that he prizes the utterances of others like someone else might do with expensive jewelry (Ibid). Mamet makes a comparison between the craft of writing with other crafts as woodworkers, weavers, and potters. Then he concludes that writing is magnificently a solitary occupation like the above-mentioned crafts. What writers are interested in is chaotic details and minute in the creation of their crafts (Ibid). In Mamet's speak dialogue, characters speak out not to express themselves but to acquire something form each other, in other words, to serve their hidden agenda. "Why do people speak in real life like we do now? They speak to get something from each other. It might seem like they speak to express themselves, but, as I understand it, that's not true. They only express themselves to get something from one another" (Roudane, 2021, P3).

He states that once what a character wants are revealed, then the audience will know what his/her dialogue should be. Furthermore, what characters desire do not necessarily need to match the sentences they utter. Hence, in addition to the type of language he uses, for Mamet the purpose of language is also vital as one of his contributions to the stage is his type of language. In an interview with Mamet, Matthew C. Roudane asks: "I think one of your major contributions to the stage is your "language": clearly you have an ear for the sounds, sense, and rhythms of street language. Could you discuss the role of language in your plays?"

Mamet: It's poetic language. It's not an attempt to capture language as much as it is an attempt to create language. We see this in various periods in the evolution of American drama. And when it's good, to the most extent it's called realism. All realism means is that the language strikes a responsive chord. The language in my plays is not realistic but poetic. The words sometimes have a musical quality to them. It's language which is tailor-made for the stage. People don't always talk the way my characters do in real life, although they may use some of the same words. Think of Odets, Wilder. That stuff is not realistic; it is poetic. Or Philip Barry: you might say some part of his genius was to capture the way a certain class of people spoke. He didn't know how those people spoke, but he was creating a poetic impression, creating that reality. (Roudane, 2021, P5)

Thus, Mamet's aim is to create language; in other words, he has his own dramatic language on stage. The words he uses in *Oleanna* are poetic; his character's words enjoy certain musical quality. It's a tailor-made language. Mamet reiterates that people in the American society use some of the same words his characters use in *Oleanna* and other plays of him.

METHODOLOGY

This research paper employs a qualitative framework combined with stylistic analysis to examine how David Mamet uses language as a primary source of dramatic

action. It examines how language functions as a tool for power and manipulation between the characters John and Carol, analyzing language as dramatic action by treating words as physical weapons that characters use to accomplish hidden agendas rather than to express genuine feelings.

By integrating these principles, the paper provides clear interpretations of formal elements of texts and their broader semantic implications and investigates how Characters in Oleanna utilize language as a source of linguistic deception. Furthermore, it applies theories of semantics and pragmatics in the communication between the two main characters in the play through analyzing what their words literally mean versus how those words are actually used and understood within their specific context. Hence, it works on decoding texts beyond their literal meaning and uncover hidden meanings, and how David Mamet uses rhetorical devices to persuade, impress, or produce a specific effect rather than just to convey literal information.

Language in *Oleanna*

As a provocative play, *Oleanna* heavily goes around the intricate dynamics of power and communication in a professor - student relation. The plot unfolds via interactions between both, Carol as a troubled student who seeks assistance and John as a university teacher who is about to get a permanent employment. Through the narrative of the play, conflicting interpretations of language and power have been navigated in both characters. Among primarily important questions raised by Mamet comes the question about the role of language in the portrayal of relationships. In *Oleanna* language operates as a tactical tool. Hence, characters use specialized terminology to dominate and exploit hierarchy (Kellman and Magill, 2006).

Mamet wrote *Oleanna* in a language that is distinctive in order; such a language provides direct and indirect knowledge about characters. The audience and readers would be able to unlock the tracks of characters and Mamet's ideas. As the vitality of language is evident in every piece of writing, Mamet uses a language and stylization which provides clues about the insight of his characters, how they behave, how they think, and what agendas they have beneath words they utter. For example, Christopher Bigsby states, "Mamet's characters possess scatological language and fractured syntax. This kind of language illuminates the character's inner mind. The fragmented dialogue between Carol and John – it can be named as non-communication – is an indication of self-aggrandizement" (Kalay, 2018, P8).

As the matter of fact, Carol refers to women and femininity and John refers to virility and man. Mamet's play is not only about teacher-student relationship and the system of education in America but also sheds light on the connection between men and women, how they depend on language, the way they talk to hide their personal agendas and how they use language as a tool to mask their real intentions. There is always a struggle between Carol and John with the presence of power balance; the language they use encapsulates this perspective. Hence, it's via language that one could reveal and fully grasp the hidden layers of the play and the characters hidden agendas as well. This point emphasizes the necessity for a broader and theory-driven exploration of the linguistic strategies and tactics used by John and Carol, which result in their increased alienation (Ibid).

Moreover, *Oleanna* heavily deals with intricacies of language and it is written to show the power of language. All the characters in the play build, preserve, and lose power via language. It is language that draws their position and ability to convince, and hide their hidden agendas and acquire what they intend to. The play's motives could be uncovered through inspecting and having a proper and deep interpretation of language (Mahdavinejad, Nevisi, and Moghaddam, 2024). As far as the power of language is concerned, Heather Braun states that *Oleanna* is one of the major plays by David Mamet that intends to prove that language can be used as a weapon and a tool to accomplish speakers' hidden agendas. He further states that using language as a weapon is more dangerous than using guns (Abboud and Ayad, 2025).

William DeMastes states that Mamet in *Oleanna* portrays language as a tool for many purposes like deceiving one another and to accomplish specific hidden agendas. He further states that Mamet creates characters out of language rather than out of action. Characters in *Oleanna* speak with a language that functions as a mask; they hide behind this mask while exploiting and dominating others for the sake of their agenda. At the same time, most of the characters in the play use language so as not to ruminate about their past experiences. In other words, they lie about what builds their identities. Thus, language becomes a tool to mask their real identity and constitute an identity that suits their hidden agenda, like John who masks his real identity from a person who desires his student Carol to a university teacher who is eager to see her pass the course. (Whatley, 2011) Dennis Carroll states "Especially in the 'Chicago' plays, the verve of the dialogue which comes from the impulse to self-assertion and justification has the secondary function of typecasting various 'associates' into cartoons" (Ibid, P45). What Carrol says is that characters in Oleanna rely on a type of language to give themselves a definition which is beneficial only for themselves while they deny other characters who are easy to defeat.

Mamet makes it clear that in both the world of the play and in reality people use language as a tool to hide their agendas. They tell lies, and say words about themselves

to promote their personal agenda. They lie about someone else and flatter to get what they intend to. Mamet provides an example from a salesperson who lies about his product and uses a descriptive language to praise his product to hide the bad quality of the product and ultimately to sell it which is his personal agenda (Whatley, 2011).

Each character endeavors to exhibit his/her power via language control. Language is their ultimate weapon to impose power over who are not wise enough to uncover their motives. One of the important matters Oleanna investigates is the problem of communication and the audiences' ability to exert enough effort to interpret meaning. The play demonstrates the consequences of ambiguity and using language to accomplish certain personal and hidden results (White, 1997).

Mamet picks up characters from an academic setting where each party endeavors to exploit the weak point of the other. John enjoys the fact that his student struggles to understand the course as this draws her closer to him. On the other hand, Carol intends to get extra and private explanation and simplification about the course while she masks her hidden goal to deprive John of his permanent employment. In addition to that, Carol is sometimes disappointed on numerous occasions when she is not granted enough space to speak to John as he keeps talking with a descriptive language about himself. John speaks a language that draws attention to accomplish his hidden agenda which is Carol herself. He asserts that she will not fail the course, on the contrary she will receive an "A" for her grade; in order to make that happen she has to agree to have a private meeting with him so as to discuss the subjects included in the course (Kellman and Magill, 2006). Moreover, to further draw her attention he mentions that he came across a similar situation and got frustrated when he was a student like her. Then Carol responds as if she is aware of John's intention:

Carol : . . . The language you use, a verbal or physical caress, yes, yes, I

know, you say that it is meaningless. I understand. I differ from

you. To lay a hand on someone's shoulder.

John: It was devoid of sexual content.

Carol: I say it was not. I SAY IT WAS NOT. Don't you begin to see . . . ?

Don't you begin to understand? IT'S NOT FOR YOU TO SAY. (Mamet, 2001, P.70)

Thus, John's agenda and motive is hidden beneath his good will; what is known is his use of language as a tool to accomplish that motive. This could indicate his good will to help her understand the course and give her a kind of comfort and an inappropriate advance to her. As a result, the way John speaks pushes her to believe this as a sexual harassment. Hence, John is about to lose his credibility as a respectful professor due to Carol's allegation; he will lose most of privileges that he has been worked for (Larasati, 2022).

In a similar occasion, John uses the language he knows to accomplish another agenda so as to get the charges against him dropped by Carl. He does not directly ask her to withdraw the accusations. John defines human for Carl; he says "we are both humans and humans are imperfect and subject to making mistakes" (Mamet, 2001, P35). His definition results from his personal agenda. John provides Carol with something which is real and undeniable. By saying some words about humans, he hides his real intention. He wants to draw Carols intention about the reality of humans and through this to get advantage from the way she feels about humans (White, 1997).

Then, John quotes that he is the opposite of "cold, rigid automaton of an instructor which I had encountered as a child" (Mamet, 2001, P12). At this point, Mamet's educational philosophy is well reflected in his explanation of this quote when he states that anyone who describes himself is lying. In other words, when John describes himself as the opposite of the such a teacher, he chooses words form his own language to mask the fact that he is defiantly that type of teacher. Again, he intends to hide his agenda which is about getting closer to Carol. He hides his essence behind some descriptive words while showing a desirable personality (Whatley, 2011).

Not only John uses language as a tool but also Carol who is portrayed as a radical feminist. In this regard, she formed a group of females to enjoy social power and strength; in other words, she established alliances with those who she named as her group. She intends to tell the society through her words that she faced sexual harassment by John. She victimizes herself through the language she knows best. Her agenda, in the first place, is to pass the course with John's help and to remove his teachings at university. She pretends that she is not after retribution but she rather conveys her groups demands. So as to accomplish her agenda, she and her group agree to withdraw their complaint if John agrees to prevent a list of books from university. Most of these books are written by him. She knows that will be impossible for John to accept; therefore, she pretends that she and her group make it easy for John but the agenda is to remove his teachings and presence permanently. Beneath the masked agenda, Carol and her group want John out of teaching for ideological reasons not for the sexual harassment she claimed (Larasati, 2022). Carol confesses to John that each one of them has an agenda "You have an agenda; we have an agenda" (Mamet, 2011, P33). She intends to deprive John of his own agenda. Hence, the banning of his books which represents an item of power becomes a tool by which to destroy that postmodern

agenda (Kulmala, 2007). Furthermore, Carol's hidden agenda to get power is masked by aspirations for feminism. Ultimately, the real feminism does not matter as long as the path towards her desire and agenda is granted. In *Oleanna*, Mamet transforms the relationship between two equal ideological partners into power in which Carol exploits language to manipulate the other one, her partner. In the final act, Carol says to John: "I came here to instruct you. . . . You have an agenda, we have an agenda" (Silverstein, 1995).

Undoubtedly, Carol maneuvers through language and the aim is to control John. The rape accusation is indefinitely her outrageous one. Language is manipulated, used as a tool to mask reality, and used to distort the reality. As a matter of fact, there is not such a casual conversation in the play. Each verbal contact between characters, especially Carl and John, bears the usage or acquisition of linguistic power. Each word Carol utters from the beginning to the end of the play makes her to get closer to her objectives (MacLeod, 1995).

As long as Carol masters language exploitation, she well-realizes John's agenda, therefore she believes that her professor took advantage out of her needs as a student and his status as a teacher. She sees an agenda hidden behind his words. Hence, both characters wear masks to conceal their real objectives. Metaphorically speaking, Carol and John act as greedy animals (Abed, 2023).

Thus, the play is a battle field where John and Carol meet; they battle with language, it is waged at the level of language. John uses his jargons to make Carol a subject. Carol dose the same thing. They both could be victims of language and its arch-manipulators. John is a man who instinctively has condescension and elitism. In order to present a fine picture of him in front Carol, he has to mask such condescension and elitism (Kane, 2011). In his speech below, John deploys some high pedagogical framing such as structure, dissatisfaction and inquiring mind. He does so to provide justification about why he singled Carol and why he offers her private tutoring. While there is a hidden desire and agenda under his academic terminology; he wants to play the role of benevolent tutor. He masks the boundary crossing nature; in other words, his academic language masks his intention to eliminate all the boundaries between him and Carol. "JOHN: I took the liberty. In my own mind. Of... grouping you. Because of your... I don't know. Your passion. Your apparent... dissatisfaction with the... the structure of the class. Which I took to be an... an active... an inquiring mind" (Mamet, 2011, P21).

On the other hand, Carol fights back somewhere in their conversation when she says, "You signed a paper. 'The Committee.' The Tenure Committee. They require a statement. From me. Regarding your... your suitability" (Mamet, 2011, P87). Carol hides behind some anonymous administrative words like the committee. She mentions this word to tell John that there will be a questioning and such a clinical jargon makes it easy for her to do a pre-planned destruction of John. While on the surface she pretends to be an objective instrument of procedural compliance.

Moreover, Carol throughout the play has weaponized semantics. For example, when she opens the play by asking her question, "What is a term of Art?" (Mamet, 2011, P6). She pretends her full ignorance of the academic phrase. This could be regarded as a linguistic trap that masks her agenda. She aims to destabilize John's authority when she puts him on defense. Also, by posing the question she wants to draw John's attention that she needs special tutoring (Amani, 2021).

John is well-aware of Carol's discomfort about his behavior. His is aware that if he wants to accomplish his agenda, he has to eliminate such a discomfort. Again, as usual, he resorts to certain abstract terminology to mask his agenda. He hides his agenda behind high minded phrase like "the essence of all human communication". This is to mask his disagreement with her toughness. Also, to manipulate her into responding to his conversational rules.

JOHN: You said "Good day." I think that it is a nice day today.

CAROL: Is it?

JOHN: Yes, I think it is.

CAROL: And why is that important?

JOHN: Because it is the essence of all human communication. I say

something conventional, you respond, and the information we

exchange is not about the "weather," but that we both agree to

converse. We agree that we are both human. (Mamet, 2011,P59).

His agenda is to bridge the existing gap between them. He is unable to directly demand so. By saying the above-mentioned phrase, he justifies the necessity of transferring thoughts, emotion, and connection between people as well as having a shared understanding. He uses language in a clever way to get closer to Carol under the justification of care.

The most evident proof that John uses language as a tool to mask his agenda is his strike on Carol. When he stops talking, as he is disappointed, he strikes out physically. Thus, he reveals his real identity which has been hidden under the mask ever since he met Carol. In this way, it turns out that John is not the man who defined himself with some descriptive words to Carol. This is John's real face under the mask of language and false identity that made his self-designations uncovered via his speech patterns. Similarly, Carol's agenda and intention is revealed as she stops uttering the words of her. Instead,

she keeps repeating slogans and dogma she got from unseen radical student group. Furthermore, her intention grows larger with each meeting. She used to ask for a better grade but with the passage of time demands that John must be fired and put an end to his promotion, as well his text books to be banned (Whatley, 2011).

CONCLUSION

This study found that David Mamet wrote Oleanna to comment on some important matters like politics, sexuality, violence, and language. Among these matters language comes first. Mamet in Oleanna explores the importance and the influence of language on the individuals. In his theatrical world, language has been used as a tool to manipulate, control and accomplish certain agendas. Hence, language could be used as a dangerous weapon and a means to get advantage out of someone. He has clearly shown that what could mask real faces of people is language itself. Mamet through his play, on one hand, warns the society that people use words to cover their real intention and accomplish certain results. On the other hand, he shows the reality of the society that people deceive one another through language.

John and Carol are best examples in Mamet's theatrical world who exploit language in accordance to their hidden agendas. Hence, *Oleanna* which is written as a commentary on society is a battle ground where characters battle with language. Mamet's delivered message is that in the modern world individuals fight with words and they are well-specialized in using language to mask their hidden agenda.

Thus, Oleanna explores language as a weapon to creates an atmosphere that reflects wider social matter surrounding gender and communication. Hence, language is vital as it is shown in the communication between characters and the phone call John gets which evidently shows a representation of the influence of language and the ability to disrupt, intervene, interpose, or silence the discourse of the less significant student, brings forth the real subjects of *Oleanna*, namely language, limitations of language, authority, and authority through language.

So, in Mamet's world people say something, use certain terminologies but the purpose is to reach certain agendas which are hidden beneath these terminologies. Ultimately, for Mamet language has not been merrily a play of words in his drama but it serves as more important tool. Such a tool helps hidden agendas to come true and drive message back home.

REFERENCES

Amani, B. (2021) 'David Mamet's Oleanna' PhD thesis, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran. P.p 43-45.

Abboud, Z., Ayad,A.C. (2025) 'A Discourse- Stylistic Study of Power, Manipulation, and Self-Assertion in David Mamet's 'Oleanna' in Terms of Speech Act Theory', Journal of Studies, Valume7, Issue 7. P.p. 16-18.

Abed, H.H. (2023) 'David Mamet's Oleanna: A Contravention of University Ethics Through Controversial Defamation, Journal of Human and Social Sciences, Volume 50, Issue 1. P.p 16-18.

Bigsby, C. (2004) The Cambridge Companion to David Mamet, Cambridge University Press, USA. P11.

Das, S. (2012) 'Laying Language, Playing Fear in David Mamet's The Cryptogram' Salesian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol. 3, Issue. 1, Pp.1-8

Dan Kulmala, D. (2007) 'Let's take the mysticism out of it, shall we?": Habitus as Conflict in Mamet's Oleanna', Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism, Volume 3, Issue 101. Pp1-24.

Kane, L. (2001) David Mamet in Conversation, University of Michigan Press. Pp.13-15.

Kalay, F. (2018) A Gender Study or Shift of Balance in David Mamet's Oleanna, Atatürk University. Pp.7-8.

Kellman, S. Magill, N.F. (2006) Magill's survey of American literature, USA. Pp.13-17.

Larasati, S. (2022) Power Manipulation in David Mamet's Oleanna; A Genetic Structuralism Analytics Thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. P.p 39-47, 78.

Mamet, D. (1992) Oleanna, New York: Vintage Books.

Mahdavinejad, M, Nevisi, R., Moghaddam, A. (2024)' Mastering the "Term of Art": Linguistic Avoidance in David Mamet's Oleanna', Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances, Volume 12, Issue 2. Pp.1-18.

MacLeod, C. (1995) 'The Politics of Gender, Language and Hierarchy in Mamet's Oleanna', Journal of American Studies, Vol. 29, Issue. 2. P 16.

Roudane, C. M. (2020) An Interview with David Mamet, USA.

Silverstein, M. (2015) 'We're Just Human: Oleanna and Cultural Crisis', South Atlantic Modern Language Association Stable, Vol. 60, Issue 2. Pp. 103-120.

Whatley, R. (2021) 'Mamet Speak: David Mamet's Theory on the Power and Political of Dramatic Language', PhD thesis, USA. Pp. 36,14,40-41.

White, E. (1997) The Reception of David Mamet's Oleanna; The Politics of Interpretation and Received Opinion, MA Thesis, The College of Wiliam and Mary in Virginia. P.p 46-48, 13,17,29.

زمان وەک ئامرازێک بۆ داپۆشینی ئەجێندا شاراوەکان لە ڕۆمانی ئۆلیانای دەیڤید مامێتدا

پوختە

دەیڤید مامێت وەک شانۆنامەنووس و دەرهێنەر و سیناریۆنووسێکی دیاری ئەمریکی بە وە ناسراوە کە ڕۆڵێکی گرنگی هەبووە لە شانۆی ئەمریکیدا. شێوازی نووسینی ئاخافتنی مامێت کە بە Mamet-Speak ناودەبرێت، تایبەتمەندی جیاوازی نووسینی شانۆیی هەیە وەک دووبارەکردنەوە، وتەی ڕەق و ناشیرن لەرووی ماناوە، فۆرمی ئاخافتنی زۆر ستایلدار کە ڕستەکانی بەزۆری پارچە پارچەن و بەسەریەکدا کەوتوون. لە نووسینە شانۆییەکانی نووسەردا، زمان ڕۆڵێکی جیاواز دەگێڕێت. ئەم ڕۆڵە دەربڕینی هەستەکان یان گواستنەوەی سادەی زانیاری ڕاستەقینە نییە بەڵکو بۆ ئەوەیە کە وەک کردارێکی شانۆیی ڕۆڵ بگێڕێت؛ وەک ئامرازێک بۆ هێز و کردار و بەکارهێنان و قۆستنەوە. ئەم توێژینەوەیە باس لە زمان دەکات لە شانۆی دەیڤید مامێت، و شانۆنامە ناسراوەکەی بەناوی ئۆلیانا Oleanna. ئامانجی کۆتایی ئەم توێژینەوەیە ئەوەیە کە نیشانی بدات کە نووسەر گرنگییەکی زۆر بە زیندووبی زمان دەدات چونکە زمان دەتوانێت لە چەک کاریگەرتر بێت و دەتوانرێت وەک ئامرازێک بۆ داپۆشینی ئەجێندا شاراوەکان لەلایەن کارەکتەرەکانەوە بەکاربهێنرێت. ئەمەش لە ئۆلیانادا بە باشی دەردەکەوێت کاتێک کارەکتەرەکان، بەتایبەتی جۆن و کارۆل، زمان بەکاردەهێنن نەک بۆ دەربڕینی هەست و گەیاندنی زانیاری ڕاستەقینە بەڵکو بۆ داپۆشینی ئەوەی کە بەنیازن بەدیبهێنن، ئەجێندا شاراوەکانیان. مامێت لە ڕێگەی ئۆلیانا جیهان وەک مەیدانێکی شەڕ نیشان دەدات کە مرۆڤەکان زمان بۆ جەنگان لەگەڵ یەکتری بەکاردێنن، ئەم جەنگانە لە ئاستی زماندا بەڕێوەدەچێت. کارەکتەرەکان ڕووخساری ڕاستەقینەی خۆیان بە وشە دەمامک دەکەن و هەوڵ دەدەن لە ڕێگەی زمانەوە یەکتری جڵەو بکەن و بۆ بەرژەوەندی خۆیان بەکاریانبێنن. لە کۆتاییدا لە هێزی زمان لە شانۆنامەکەدا بە باشی دەکۆڵرێتەوە کاتێک لە ژێر ئەوەی کارەکتەرەکان دەیڵێن ئەجێندای شاراوە هەیە. ئەم توێژینەوەیە شیکاری دەقی ستایلیستی و چۆنایەتی لە ئۆلیانای دەیڤید مامێت دەخاتە ڕوو، بە بەکارهێنانی تیۆرییەکانی ماناسازی و پراگماتیکی.

کلیلە وشەکان: ئامراز، ئەجێندا، زمان، دەمامک، کارەکتەرەکان.

اللغة كأداة لحجب أجندات خفية في مسرحية «أوليانا» لديفيد ماميت

الملخص

يُعد ديفيد ماميت كاتبًا مسرحيًا ومخرجًا وكاتب سيناريو أمريكيًا بارزًا، ويُعرف بإسهاماته الكبيرة في المسرح الأمريكي. ويتميز أسلوب ماميت في كتابة الحوار -الذي يُشار إليه أحيانًا باسم "لغة ماميت" (Mamet-speak)- بسمات درامية فريدة، مثل التكرار، واستخدام الألفاظ النابية الصريحة، ونمط كلامي متقن للغاية يتسم بتداخل الجمل وتقطعها. وتؤدي اللغة دورًا مميزًا في أعمال ماميت المسرحية؛ إذ لا يقتصر دورها على التعبير عن المشاعر أو مجرد نقل المعلومات الواقعية، بل تتجاوز ذلك لتصبح "فعلًا دراميًا" وأداةً للممارسة الفعل والتأثير وممارسة السلطة والتلاعب بالآخرين. تتناول هذه الورقة البحثية دور اللغة في أعمال ديفيد ماميت المسرحية، مع التركيز بشكل خاص على مسرحيته الشهيرة "أوليانا" (Oleanna). وتهدف الورقة في المقام الأول إلى إبراز مدى اهتمام ماميت بحيوية اللغة وقوتها؛ فهي قد تكون أكثر فاعلية من السلاح، كما يمكن استخدامها أداةً لإخفاء النوايا المبيتة (أو الأجندات الخفية) للشخصيات. ويتجلى ذلك بوضوح في مسرحية "أوليانا"، حيث تستخدم الشخصيات -ولا سيما "جون" و"كارول"- اللغة لا للتعبير عن المشاعر أو نقل الحقائق، بل للتستر على ما ينوون تحقيقه فعليًا وعلى مآربهم الخفية. ومن خلال هذه المسرحية، يصور ماميت العالم كساحة معركة يتصارع فيها الناس باستخدام اللغة؛ فهي معركة تُخاض في ميدان الكلام. إذ تخفي الشخصيات حقيقتها خلف الكلمات، وتسعى للسيطرة على الطرف الآخر والتلاعب به عبر اللغة. وفي الختام، تبرز قوة اللغة بوضوح في المسرحية، حيث تكمن النوايا الخفية للشخصيات خلف ما ينطقون به من كلمات. تقدم هذه الورقة التحليل النصي الأسلوبي والنوعي لرواية "أوليانا" لديفيد ماميت، مع تطبيق نظريات علم الدلالة و التداولية.

الكلمات مفتاحية: أداة، أجندة، لغة، قناع، شخصيات.