**The myths inside the play:**

**Through Jimmy’s alienation, his feeling of being out of place, his idealizing of the past and his use of memory as a defense against meaninglessness, the dramatist drives the myths in the play as none of this happens in emptiness.**

**Jimmy’s personal way of looking back is similar with his country’s way of looking back. Both share assumptions (expectations) about explaining current miseries by contrasting them with an idealized past.**

**The dramatist typically (naturally) opposes the dominant myths of his day with their repressed opposites. Compared to Colonel Redfern’s idea of two people marrying for love which assumes love is an unselfish or noble emotion. Jimmy embodies the idea that marriage is a battle between two animals meaning that you can only be honest by being hurtful. Both myths are romantic.**

**Society can be changed by doing something — against the feeling of disillusionment — which provides a reason for doing nothing. Two images pervade (spread) the play: one is Alison silently ironing (she is made to find meaning through humiliation); the other is Jimmy talking himself into a corner (he is made to seek truth through masochism (feeling happy through torturing others). Within an example defined by the tension between conformity and transgression, therefore, Osborne offers no solutions. The play is rich ground for myth because it is worked by this tension between opposites.**

**In this play nothing can be happened as people are unable to do anything about their lives. The characters complain about the boredom of a life in which nothing changes. Ironically, it may be this absence of a myth of change allowed the play to be seen less as a story about a troubled marriage and more about society.**

**The myth of anger resolves these contradictions. So the play is considered as an expression of a dramatic revolution not in form but rather of content.**