

Some Reflections on the Analysis of Discourse and Dramatic Text: Stoppard's *Jumpers*

Jesús-Manuel Nieto García
Universidad de Jaén

ABSTRACT

Our proposal in this paper is basically to analyse dramatic texts according to the structure of those parts whose purpose is mainly dialogic in nature, mainly monologic, or, finally, those parts that emphasise the connection between writer and reader (or producer) from the organisational point of view. At the same time we also intend to study some basic pragmatic points such as reference, the informative nature of discourse, the kinds of illocutionary acts present in the text and the conversational norms broken. With this purpose in mind, we propose the application of a method of analysis of dramatic discourse to the play *Jumpers*, by Tom Stoppard.

1. Introduction and general layout of the analysis

In recent years there have been many inherently discursive approaches to the analysis of drama, for instance, by Burton, Elam, Sherzer (“Dialogic Incongruities in the Theater of the Absurd” and “Langage litteraire et langage social”), Widdowson, Noguchi, Gautam, Gautam and Sharma, Golopentia-Eretescu, Simpson, Herman, Short and Bennison.¹ All these approaches somehow seem to miss the various interactive actions carried out by the text. From that point, we intend to evolve towards a method of analysis of drama covering this aspect. With this purpose in mind we cannot simply ignore other previous points which are essential to the analysis of any kind of discourse, and which are basically pragmatic in nature, but in any case the interactive purpose of the text itself is first and foremost and affects the analysis as a whole, and this is why our analysis of the dramatic text is presented in six columns, each corresponding to a different aspect concerning the pragmatic and interactive nature of the dramatic text. We could basically speak about three large areas that we might subdivide these columns into. In the first one, we would simply have the text of the play, which is divided in what Sinclair and Coulthard call acts,² or other structures of a similar nature, depending on the kind of discourse activity being

carried out, and numbered according to the position they take in the play, act, scene, etc. The purpose of using this system is mainly for later reference in the stylistic exploitation of the analysis, and for some other uses which will become clear later on. As the nature of this column is mainly of an organisative kind and necessary for the presentation of all the other columns, we will make no further references to it in the rest of the article.

In the second large area we can mainly find a great variety of pragmatic points in the analysis of discourse. We think these aspects must be previous to the analysis of the structures of discourse that we will find in the third large area for several reasons. In the first place, we could say they provide a good general makeup of what Sinclair and Coulthard (9) call situation and tactics, and that in other models of analysis following their division in structures of discourse were somehow missing and therefore did not permit a proper explanation of many relevant factors in discourse. In the second place, all these aspects help us understand many of the points which are included in the third area and at the same time make us see that what had been seen as an initial weakness of other similar models of analysis is not really so but rather that previous essential information was missing. This second large area covers the second to the fifth column.

In the third large area we can find a column corresponding to modes of discourse, and therefore covering the analysis of the structures of dialogue, monologue and stage directions in dramatic discourse. For the analysis of dialogue and monologue we talk about different levels of structures, from the largest ones to the smallest ones. We understand that the purpose and function of these three modes of discourse are inherently different, and this difference must also be reflected in the kinds, and number, of structures employed for each. In this sense we have hardly appreciated a real need to talk about wider categories in the analysis of stage directions, which are, with some exceptions, functional and punctual, and thus do not require a proper organisation in large and small structures. However, in the case of both dialogue and monologue a proper structuring for the organisation of information must be an initial need that conditions the form and disposition of the message.

2. Pragmatic factors

In the second column we intend to include a series of pragmatic aspects which are of primary importance for the play being analysed. From our point of view, there is no universal analysis that could be employed in this column, since this very much depends on the nature of the text. In the case of Stoppard's play we noticed there was a clear pattern of referentiality which clearly had stylistic consequences to the understanding of the play as a whole, and, more particularly, to the means of characterization employed by the author. As we say, this could never be a universal application, since we can clearly appreciate how in other plays, for example, it is much more worth noticing the use of modality to realize power and authority relationships between characters, and we might still say the same about such other aspects as presupposition and inference denoting a more or less straightforward channel of communication between characters as far as familiarity and shared knowledge of information are concerned.

Therefore, in our particular case we marked the use of reference, or in other words, the capacity every utterance has of referring to, and appearing in connection with, some other utterance, group of utterances or outside reality. In this case we employed the numbers mentioned above for the first column and the system was just that of writing in this second column the number of the nearest previous act, or any other structure, to which a given act established a point of reference. Ideally, the pattern of reference should be close and explicit enough to permit both characters and readers a perfect understanding of the topics of discourse, but in the case of *Jumpers* we can appreciate this is not always so, as we can see in the following example:

929 It's just been the most awful day.	837
930 (He comforts him- self with the tortoise.)	
931 Cr: I quite under- stand,	321
932 sir.	
933 I'm upset myself.	321

Here we find a chain of five discourse acts in a dialogue between George and Crouch, with a clear pattern of reference³ in which George is talking about the death of his goldfish, which was recently mentioned in act 837, but which Crouch simply ignores because he was not present at the moment. By contrast, Crouch is talking about Professor McFee's murder, mentioned long before, in act 321, totally unknown to George and not explicitly referred to by Crouch until act 1001. This clearly vague and ambiguous pattern of reference is repeated at least six times in the second act of *Jumpers*, and in all these cases George is one of the characters present. It comes as no surprise, then, that he has been traditionally considered the typical absent-minded professor, since he is made the victim of ambiguous referentiality (see, for instance, Roberts 87; Dean 63-64; Hunter 78; 88, Jenkins 85; and comments by the author himself, Michael Hordern and Diana Rigg, who first played the parts of George and Dorothy Moore 35-39).

3. Informativity and interactants

In this third column we intend to analyse the informative nature of the acts in the play, for which we have basically followed the system of communicative events employed by Labov and by Labov and Fanshel, in which we have A events, known by or concerning the speaker, B events, concerning the listener, AB events, known by speaker and listener, D events, which are dubious, and O events, which are roughly an extension of AB events, being known by everyone present in the conversation, not just by speaker and listener. To all these conversational events we could add what we have termed C events, which are those concerning a third person who is neither speaker nor addressee at the moment of utterance. This category may not have a very clear reflection in everyday language but

could be quite significant in dramatic discourse, basically as one of the means of marking dramatic irony, if the character speaking does not know the third party is listening, or as showing a scornful attitude towards some characters, if they are present and not spoken to directly, so somehow treated as if they could not speak for themselves.

The most relevant point we can mention about this third column in Stoppard's play is the great amount of A and B events. These two kinds clearly have an informative function, by contrast to AB and O events, which are obviously non-informative, and D events, which are at least dubious. This might explain the "literary," "wordy" or "static" nature of Stoppard's plays (Hunter 34), specially if we try to compare them to those written by Pinter, who includes in his plays a lot of uninformative events. This might explain again many of the differences between these two authors, even if they can be both included in the second wave of modern British drama, since the former tends to highlight the informative nature of dramatic discourse whereas the latter seems to defamiliarise it by presenting a much more conversationally mimetic text.

4. Illocutionary speech acts

In this fourth column we intend to reflect what global kind of action a given speaker is carrying out by producing an utterance in discourse. For this purpose we are concentrating on the definition of illocutionary acts as devised by Austin and completed by Searle, using the classification employed by the latter that is generally seen as a thorough exploitation of the ideas initially presented by the former. Therefore, we can distinguish five kinds of illocutionary acts: representatives, used to state that something is the case (e.g. *describe*), directives, to elicit a physical or verbal response from the listener (*ask*), expressives, to express the speaker's psychological state (*congratulate*), commissives, by means of which the speaker commits him/herself to doing something (*promise*), and declaratives, used to bring about the state of things expressed in the act itself (*bet*). Of course, by mentioning some of the verbs that may be used to produce these illocutionary acts we do not mean that they will always be present in them or that the use of these verbs necessarily entails the kind of act mentioned, as J. Searle clearly demonstrated when he wrote about the conditions for the production of speech acts (Searle ch. 3). The main problem then was how to apply this classification of illocutionary acts to our method of analysis. The system employed follows quite closely S. Petrey's reflections on speech act theory, in which there is a clear emphasis on the function of context, the social nature of language and conventionality rather than intentionality for the analysis of illocutionary acts (Petrey chs. 1 and 5).

After applying this classification in our fourth column, we again drew some conclusions on Stoppard's use of language in the play. First of all, we can talk about the large presence of representative and directive speech acts over expressive, commissive and declarative ones. This fact somehow takes us back to a previous reflection that we have already mentioned, that is, the literary or wordy nature of the play, in which facts and actions (mainly carried about by representative and directive speech acts) take a much more important role than genuine communication between characters (expressive speech

acts), with those acts that tend to appear in more formal situations (commissives and declaratives) having a much lower importance in percentual terms. As a second conclusion, we might mention, in spite of the low appearance of declarative speech acts, their relative importance in the coda of the play, in which a symposium is represented as a trial in the fiction of the play. As we know, in both of these speech situations some obvious power relationships are established (chairperson to speakers and audience in the former, judge to jury, lawyers, witnesses and other people present in the latter), so that we can talk about the adequacy of the speech acts to the discourse situation being depicted in the play, or, in other words, that the only way of representing a formal situation in drama is by making the language employed match the context of utterance.

5. Norms of interaction

In this column we intend to deal with the flouting of a series of norms which are basically and essentially respected in everyday interaction. The breaking of these norms can be quite significative of interaction in which one or several speakers behave in a "devious" manner. We would like to put a special stress on the idea of "deviance," since we believe there are many different ways of breaking these norms, and not all of them are intentional. That is why, besides marking the above mentioned flouting of these norms, we also signalled the strategy followed by the speaker for this purpose. Essentially we are following in this column H. P. Grice, who talked about the cooperative principle that included a total of four maxims or norms: quantity, which implies that a speaker should say neither more nor less than is necessary, quality, concerned with the truth value of a speaker's assertions, relation, which states that a speaker's words should be relevant, and manner, about perspicuity in a speaker's message.⁴ Probably the main problem in Grice's theory is that, rather than a proper interactive reality, he described an ideal situation in which he was mainly concerned with the speakers' individual contributions to discourse. So, in order to solve this possible setback, at least partially, we also included in this fifth column the flouting of two maxims which are much more social and interactive in nature. In the first place, we reflected those breaking of the norms for turn taking in conversation, for which we followed Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson. In the second place, we studied the flouting of a series of sociocultural norms related to face keeping in social interaction, for which we followed Brown and Levinson from a wide perspective, since we only signalled those face threatening activities (FTA's) that could be considered abusive or insulting to the listener, or, in other words, those activities which are very clearly threatening, as the threat implicit in a question, for example, is obviously a lesser one, even if this is one of the FTA's included by Brown and Levinson in their study. Indirectly, we associated the existence of these FTA's to the presence of challenging moves in discourse (for this notion, see section 6.1 below).

We have already mentioned briefly the importance of the strategies followed to flout these norms, specially in terms of characterisation, since an intentional breaking of a norm obviously differentiates a character's attitude from an unintentional one. In this respect, besides showing the flouting of the norms by means of initials, *qun* for quantity, *qul* for

quality, *rel* for relation, *man* for manner, *tur* for turn taking and *FTA* for face threatening acts, we also signalled different strategies by means of numbers: 1 for an unintentional flouting, 2 for a possible clash between two maxims which makes the speaker decide which one to flout and which one to respect, 3 for the creation of a conversational implicature, that is, basically, meaning more than you say, 4 for an intentional but not very obvious flouting, and 5 for a flouting of both a norm and the cooperative principle. Quite obviously, in cooperative terms we could speak about a gradation in the importance each strategy has, which means that the higher the strategy marked the more damaging it is to the cooperative principle and the less fluent communication between characters is.

In the flouting of these conversational norms we again find a process of characterisation in the play, basically in terms of power and conflict relationships. If in section 2 we saw how George Moore was the victim of referentiality, in this column we can see how Archie is the ruler of discourse,⁵ a tendency that will be confirmed in another respect in section 6.2. For example, if we take the coda of the play as a manageable piece of text and we study this column in detail, we can see how Archie flouts each of these maxims, quite often by using an uncooperative strategy. We can illustrate this point by means of these two examples:

56 looking at count- less other worlds known and unknown, each of them being possibly a home of one kind of life or another, with certain customs or perhaps none,	54	D	dir	<i>qun5</i> <i>man5</i> <i>tur5</i> <i>qu15</i>
141 I mean now that I am Archbishop of Canterbury...	133	A	rep	<i>qun1</i>
142 Ar: Will no one rid me of this turbulent priest!	141	C	dir	<i>tur5</i> <i>FTA2</i> <i>rel2</i>

As we can see, these norms can be flouted in a number of ways, for different reasons and not necessarily one by one but some of them together. We would like to say something about the context of these utterances because otherwise we do not think our analysis could be understood properly. In the first case, Archie is acting as astronaut Captain Scott's lawyer, but the form his cross-questioning takes is quite surprising, since he is just putting his own words into his defendant's mouth. This makes us speak about a clearly intentional, uncooperative breaking of four maxims: firstly, quantity, since he is presenting his contribution, which should be dialogic in form, as a monologue and therefore providing too much information at a time. Secondly, manner, since he is not being brief besides. Thirdly, turn taking, since again the form of his speech is not question-answer, as it should

be for this occasion. Finally, quality, since by putting his own words into somebody else's mouth as if they were his own, he is saying something for which he lacks adequate evidence.

The second example is quite different. In this case, Clegthorpe, a former supporter of Archie's policies, is now showing a clear opposition to him. He has been presenting a series of arguments to which Archie has responded with other floutings of the norms (acts 105-40 of the coda), but he still insists. So, his last option is to order the physical elimination of his opponent. This is done by, in the first place, intentionally flouting the norm of turn taking by means of an interruption in mid turn (notice Clegthorpe's unintentional breaking of the maxim of quantity). As a second point, he is producing a face threatening activity by calling the Archbishop of Canterbury "turbulent priest" and presenting this as a C event (see section 3 above). Finally, he is breaking the maxim of relation by observing just his own, not Clegthorpe's conversational goals. Probably our marking of strategy 2 for these last two floutings requires some explanation. In this case we speak about the breaking of two maxims to respect another as we think the norm of quantity is clearly at work here, that is, Archie feels a greater urgency to order his opponent's physical elimination than to respect his face or his conversational goals, and this is imminent.

6. Modes of discourse

In this column we intend to analyse the structures employed in constructing discourse, with the previous distinction of modes of discourse that we referred to in the introduction. If we distinguish between dialogic parts, monologic parts and those parts in which discourse is used for direct communication between writer and reader, the first thing to do then is to provide a way of differentiating between these three modes of discourse. In the case of direct communication between writer and reader, by convention we already know what stage directions are and that they are graphologically marked in the text. So, the only extra-dialogic stage directions⁶ that are not included in the analysis are the ones employed for turn assignment to the characters, which are purely mechanic and initially not relevant for the analysis of the text, whereas all the others can have an importance of their own, as we shall see in section 6.3.

For the analysis of indirect communication between writer and reader, that is, the discourse between the characters, we have distinguished two different modes, dialogue and monologue, depending on the kind of interaction carried out by the participants in discourse. In this case we have talked about monologue in all those occasions on which a given speaker takes an extended turn at talk. This extended turn generally coincides with activities which are not purely conversational in themselves, such as a speech being dictated or delivered, a story being told or just a rather lengthy commentary on a topic whenever there is no proper change of turns at talk, even if they are included within longer stretches of dialogue. On the other hand, we understand that dialogue implies a frequent change of turn.

6.1. Dialogue

For the analysis of dialogue we basically followed the system formerly presented by Burton, with the division of discourse in transactions, exchanges, moves and acts.⁷ As with some of the other approaches to discourse analysis, some specifications are necessary before we say anything about our application of the model to the play.

Probably the first and most important point to notice about the model is the impossibility of applying it very strictly, since many of the combinations found in the play would be theoretically impossible in a narrow interpretation. From our point of view, this is not due to a wrong understanding of the nature of discourse, as Levinson (290-94) seems to imply about discourse analysis as opposed to conversational analysis. We rather tend to think that a previous analysis of situation and tactics can help us explain many of the “deviations” from the “normal” structure of discourse, as we have already tried to show in sections 2 to 5. Two examples of this situation would be the presence of opening moves without a proper follow-up by means of either a supporting or a challenging move and the nature of some moves which were initially considered challenging. We would like to illustrate these points by means of two examples:

800 a psychiatrist is akin to a priest taking confession.	799	A	rep	(comment)
801 Do: Well, 802 it wasn't me.	321	A	rep	<i>rel2</i>
803 Ar: Absolute priv- acy, absolute trust.	800	A	rep	

TRANSACTION 34
Opening Exchange
Open. move (marker)
(informative)
TRANSACTION 33
Reopening Exchange
Reop. move (comment)

In this example, with George as Archie’s addressee, transaction 33 is interrupted by transaction 34 and reopened in act 803. In this case, we can speak about successful or unsuccessful transactions, depending on whether they have an immediate follow-up or not. Of course, there would be another possibility, that of marking acts 801-802 as a challenging move, but we think the system we employ reflects discourse as production rather than as result, since we cannot know whether a transaction is going to be successful or not until we go on reading, besides reflecting better a situation in which more than two characters are interacting. In other words, by flouting the norm of relation, Dorothy is trying to open a new transaction, but Archie does not allow her to do so and reopens a previously interrupted transaction, which happens to be one of the all too frequent ways of interacting between Dorothy and either Archie himself or George, giving a clear dominance relationship as a result.

59 The appalling	44	A	rep	<i>man1</i> (informative)
------------------	----	---	------------	---------------------------

pressure of being a star.				
60 Ge: Was your brother a star?	55	B	dir	Supporting move (elicitation)

In this second example, we can see how the use of an elicitation as a follow up of a previous discourse act does not necessarily entail a challenging move, as it was suggested by Burton, if we understand a challenge as a way of curtailing another speaker's development of discourse. We rather tend to think that a challenging move should take the form of a flouting of the maxim of relation and/or an FTA, which do not occur in this case since George is both keeping the listener's conversational goals and his social face.

Apart from these two considerations basically concerning the nature of moves, we could also mention the free nature of markers, which were initially defined as acts defining boundaries in discourse. This free nature is mainly due to the interactive rather than properly meaningful uses of these structures. This is something we can appreciate in the following example:

42 Bo: A consummate artist,	41	A	rep	Reopening move (starter) (marker)
43 sir.				
44 I felt it deeply when she retired.	41	A	rep	(informative)

As we can see, act 43 is void in all respects except in column 6, since it does not really have referential relevance, it is not informative in itself and could not be said to fit into any of the categories of illocutionary acts. At the same time, it cannot be properly considered a summons since in the situation there is no need to claim the listener's attention, which was the function of this discourse act. Therefore, this, together with many other utterances, has been considered a marker in the sense that it is used to mark stages in discourse but not necessarily the boundaries of larger structures, and used for example to give oneself time to think or just for stressing connections with the listener (notice again the immediate and social nature of spoken discourse).

We could mention at least two important conclusions we can draw from the way dialogue is presented in the play. The first one concerns the nature of the acts mainly employed by the characters. At a very quick glance at this column, we can appreciate a high proportion of informative and eliciting acts, which confirms a previous point already mentioned in sections 3 and 4, that is, the literary nature of Stoppard's theatre.

The second conclusion concerns the nature of moves, and more particularly, the moves in the exchanges between Archie and Cleghorpe in the coda. In the interaction between these two characters we can find a whole chain of challenging moves by one and the other, which clearly defines the latter as the only real opposition to the former in the play, since George also tries to challenge his authority but only for a brief time and then he is never successful in his opposition.⁸

6.2. Monologue

For the analysis of monologue we applied a method which is presented in full in Coulthard and Montgomery's "The Structure of Monologue" and which consists in dividing monologue in transactions, sequences and members. This model of analysis of monologue distinguishes between what they call focusing members and informative members, the function of the former being that of directing the listener's attention to a coming or nearly closed topic whereas the latter are employed for the main function of informing the listeners.

Most of the monologues in the play are produced by George Moore, which is not surprising since he is preparing a speech to be delivered at a symposium. The other character who is assigned a reasonable number of monologues and therefore the extended use of the word for a relatively long time is, again, Archie. We can appreciate a great difference between the way in which both produce their speeches, since in the case of the first his arguments may be debatable and his utterances eccentric but we find a proper course of action and a logic of itself. By contrast, Archie's speeches, specially the one at the beginning of the coda, have some features which set them apart from many other properly formed monologues. The main trait of this speech is that it presents externally a perfect form because of the use of members of subsidiary discourse, employed in this case to mark stages in the production of the speech itself, as if a proper argument were presented, but actually its primary members do not develop this argument. Rather, focusing members are absurd and nonsense and informative members simply do not exist. We would like to illustrate this point by showing our analysis of the first four members of his speech:

19 Ar: Mr. Crouch, ladies and gentlemen	11	B	dir	<i>Subsidiary sequence</i> (procedure aside)
20 "Man, good, bad or indifferent?"	11	O	rep	<i>Primary sequence</i> (prospective focus)
21 Indeed, if moon mad herd instinct, is God dad the inference?	20	A	rep <i>man</i> ³	(prospective focus)
22 to take another point:	20	A	rep	<i>Subsidiary sequence</i> (procedure aside)

As we can see, the beginning of his speech is made up of two procedure asides in two subsidiary sequences and merely two prospective focuses in the primary sequence, without any properly informative members, that is, we only find the presentation of the topic followed by the next point in his speech, even if in a formally perfect way. As we saw in section 5, Archie is again being presented as the ruler of the word and through it of the world, as his speech is responded to by "shattering applause." By contrast, George, after

preparing his speech during most of the play, finally does not deliver it, being again a failure in a world dominated by radical liberal politics.

6.3. Stage directions

If we think of drama as a system which includes two levels of communication between the writer and the reader of the text, one indirectly through the characters' interaction, to which both dialogue and monologue belong, and the other directly through extradiologic stage directions or didascalies, we can see how very much importance has been given to the former in many recent studies of dramatic discourse while somehow neglecting the latter. In our analysis we considered proper attention to this second aspect of dramatic discourse had to be observed by including it in the analysis of plays. This basically takes the form of a taxonomy of stage directions which somehow tries to establish their function or purpose and which affects the parametres employed for the other columns. For example, in the case of the column of pragmatic factors, we considered their function was essentially exophoric and therefore not particularly worth including, and this is why this column is to be left empty in all the cases of direct communication between writer and reader. By contrast, in the third column we considered they all belong to the category of C events, since the author is effectively presenting information concerning a third party, even if a fictional one, the characters, to the reader. In the fourth column we classified all stage directions as representative speech acts since the author is acting as a narrator who tells his/her readers what characters do and how they behave. Finally, in the column devoted to the analysis of norms of interaction, we could observe no breaking of these since ideally stage directions should be informative, true, relevant and concise.

The classification offered includes some aspects previously mentioned by Poyatos ("Nonverbal Communication in the Theater") and Aston and Savona (*Theatre as Sign-System* ch. 5), and pays attention to the difference between paralinguistic, kinesic and contextual features. Paralinguistic stage directions signal "nonverbal voice qualities, modifiers and independent sounds... determined by anatomical, physiological, psychological, social and cultural factors" (Poyatos 86). There are three kinds: those expressing primary permanent qualities in a character's speech (prp), qualifying stage directions, related to a character's control over his/her speech organs at a given moment in the play (qup) and differentiating, reflecting some non-linguistic activities at the moment of speech, such as coughs and sighs (dip). Kinesic stage directions reflect non-verbal communication between characters, and might include gaze direction and significant gestures (kin). In the group of contextual stage directions we have included those that do not affect interaction between characters so directly, not denoting communication by means of verbal or gestural signs, but which are nevertheless relevant for the discourse established between the author and the reader. We could distinguish the following: proxemic, which reflect distance between characters and/or objects (prc), aspectual, referring to a character's external aspect (asc), scenic, reflecting such aspects as objects present and general disposition of the stage (scc), visual, which cover the function of lights on stage (vic), sounding, which reflect sounds other than vocal ones (soc), and organisational, which are mechanic and are used for a proper organisation of the

play in terms of end and beginning of acts and scenes (orc). Finally, we might also include in this group those stage directions that can hardly, if at all, be shown on the stage but are nevertheless present in the written text (ccc) and those marking pauses and silences in the action, studied by Teodorescu-Brinzeu and defined as the verbal zero-sign (0).

In our analysis of the play *Jumpers* we could appreciate a number of features in Stoppard's use of stage directions, which are basically of two kinds: quantitative and qualitative. By quantitative we obviously mean to what extent stage directions are used. In this respect, we could say that their frequency of occurrence is quite high. If we take the coda as an example, we can see how 65 out of the 258 units in it belong to this mode of discourse, which makes up a total of slightly over 25%. This might explain his tendency to control every possible aspect in his plays, including information about the stage and about non-linguistic behaviour of the characters (see, for instance, his comments on this topic in Hayman 7).

In a more qualitative analysis of the kind of stage directions employed, we can notice a clear tendency to use mainly those denoting contextual and kinesic aspects rather than paralinguistic ones, specially those affecting proxemics, kinesics, sounds and the aspect of the stage itself. This again might illustrate his special inclination to reflect the scenic nature of drama, admitted by the author himself (Hayman 8-9) and later analysed by Kelly (387).

7. Conclusions

In our approach to the play *Jumpers* we have tried to test the viability of a number of aspects of discourse analysis employed for applied stylistics. We think the consequences of the application of these methods are varied and somehow affect not only the nature of dramatic discourse but also, indirectly, the nature of spoken discourse in general. For example, we have seen how some of the points formerly established for face to face interaction between two speakers are probably not so clearly applicable when more than two are present, as we saw in the case of the existence of C events and of unsuccessful transactions, which had not been understood as such before. As a second large group of conclusions we might mention the most directly stylistic aspects of our analysis. In this second field we could mention how some aspects of the generally pragmatic factors we marked in the first part of our analysis have clear consequences on the ways the different modes of discourse are presented, so that, without a previous explanation of some of these points, many of the odd aspects of interaction cannot be properly accounted for. Finally, we hope we have shown that an analysis of discourse between the characters in a play can also be useful for an analysis of discourse between writers and readers and explain some of the features that mark a writer's production.

Notes

1. Thanks are due to doctors Martínez-Dueñas, McLaren and Wahnón, from Granada University, Díaz, from Seville University, Zaro, from Malaga University and to an anonymous referee for his/her comments on a previous draft of this paper. I would also like to thank very specially professor Serrano from Granada University, without whose permanent help and encouragement this article would simply not have been possible.

2. We here propose the term "discourse acts," which we think is a much more precise one, since this is a means of distinguishing them from the term "speech act" as employed by Austin and Searle. This first reference to speech acts is probably basic to understand the following reference to "discourse act" but we can say they reflect essentially different concepts, as the latter can be defined as the smallest meaningful units in discursual terms whereas the former also allude to the problem of meaning but in a much more restricted sense. For example, markers (*oh, well, etc.*), as we shall see, are essential for a proper understanding of the interactive nature of discourse, whereas from a locutionary, illocutionary or perlocutionary perspective they do not seem to have a clear significance.

3. Acts 930 and 932 basically have an exophoric nature, making reference to the outside reality, and in this case have no proper relevance to the analysis of this dialogue.

4. Although the maxims of quantity, quality and manner are quite explicit in themselves, we could not say the same about the maxim of relation, which is quite ambiguous as it stands. In this case, starting with Leech's rich commentaries on this topic (Leech 93-96), we evolved towards a position in which we connected the maxim of relation to the speaker's observing both his own and the listener's conversational goals in at least one of the possible discourse worlds (for the notion of discourse world, see Edmondson 201-205), since we consider that relevance clearly has a negotiated nature which would not be respected if we just observed one but not the other.

5. We can find references to Archie as a dominating, manipulative figure in Cohn (116), Hunter (201) and Jenkins (87).

6. For the notion of intra- and extra-dialogic stage directions, see Aston and Savona (72-78).

7. These structures are presented from large to small. Transactions are marked thematically and phonologically, that is, they must have a uniform topic with an internal coherence and appropriate cohesive ties and they start in a high key ending in a low one. Exchanges are defined as informative and semantic units, and their purpose is presented by an initiation and completed by any other expression employed to qualify this initial idea, normally coming from the other interactant(s). Moves are cognitive units of production that reflect an individual speaker's contribution to discourse with a structural, opening, supporting or challenging nature. Finally, discourse acts were briefly defined in note 2 above as the minimal units with a meaningful function. For examples of all these categories, see below in this section.

8. Incidentally, in the third edition of the play Crouch also makes use of a few challenging moves in the coda, which might indicate an evolution in Stoppard's drama towards a more committed position in a later phase of his production, since in this case Crouch would be the only really opposing character who manages to survive at the end of the play, as both McFee and Clegthorpe have been murdered.

Works Cited

- Aston, E., and G. Savona. *Theatre as Sign-System: A Semiotics of Text and Performance*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1962.
- Bennison, N. "Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics and the Dramatic 'Character': Tom Stoppard's *Professional Foul*." *Language and Literature* 2.2 (1993): 79-99.
- Brown, R., and S. Levinson. "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena." *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*. Ed. E. N. Goody. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1978.
- Burton, D. *Dialogue and Discourse*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.
- Cohn, R. "Tom Stoppard: Light Drama and Dirges in Marriage." *Contemporary English Drama*. Ed. C. W. E. Bigsby. London: Arnold, 1981.
- Coulthard, R. M., and M. Montgomery. "The Structure of Monologue." *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. Ed. R. M. Coulthard and M. Montgomery. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Dean, J. F. *Tom Stoppard: Comedy as a Moral Matrix*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1981.
- Edmondson, W. *Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis*. London: Longman, 1981.
- Elam, K. *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. London: Methuen, 1980.
- Gautam, K. K. "Pinter's *The Caretaker*: A Study of Conversational Analysis." *Journal of Pragmatics* 11 (1987): 49-59.
- _____, and M. Sharma. "Dialogue in *Waiting for Godot* and Grice's Concept of Implicature." *Modern Drama* 29.4 (1986): 580-86.
- Golopentia-Eretescu, S. "Toward a Semiotic Analysis of Greetings: Searle or Ionesco?" *Semiotica* 61.1/2 (1986): 1-11.
- Grice, H. P. "Logic and Conversation." *Syntax and Semantics III: Speech Acts*. Ed. P. Cole and J. Morgan. New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- Hayman, R. *Tom Stoppard*. London: Heinemann, 1982.
- Herman, V. "Dramatic Dialogue and the Systematics of Turn-Taking." *Semiotica* 83.1/2 (1991): 97-121.
- Hunter, J. *Tom Stoppard's Plays*. London: Faber and Faber, 1982.
- Jenkins, A. *The Theatre of Tom Stoppard*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.
- Kelly, K. E. "Tom Stoppard Journalist: Through the Stage Door." *Modern Drama* 33.3 (1990): 380-93.
- Labov, W. "Rules for Ritual Insults." *Studies in Social Interaction*. Ed. D. Sudnow. New York: The Free P, 1972.
- _____, and D. Fanshel. *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic P, 1977.
- Leech, G. N. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman, 1983.
- Levinson, S. C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- Noguchi, R. R. "Conversational Interaction, Verbal Strategies, and Literary Response." *Language and Style* 18.2 (1985): 192-204.
- Page, M., ed. *File on Stoppard*. London: Methuen, 1986.
- Petrey, S. *Speech Acts and Literary Theory*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Poyatos, F. "Nonverbal Communication in the Theater: The Playwright-Actor-Spectator/Relationship." *Multimedial Communication II: Theatre Semiotics*. Ed. E. W. B. Hess-Luttich. Tubingen: Gunter Narr, 1982.

- Roberts, P. "Tom Stoppard: Serious Artist or Siren?" *Critical Quarterly* 20.3 (1978): 84-92.
- Sacks, H., E. A. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation." *Language* 50 (1974): 696-735.
- Searle, J. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1969.
- Sherzer, D. "Dialogic Incongruities in the Theater of the Absurd." *Semiotica* 22.3/4 (1978): 269-85.
- _____. "Langage litteraire et langage social." *Language and Style* 12.4 (1979): 228-44.
- Short, M. H. "Discourse Analysis and the Analysis of Drama." *Language, Discourse and Literature: An introductory reader in discourse stylistics*. Ed. R. Carter and P. Simpson. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Simpson, P. "Politeness Phenomena in Ionesco's *The Lesson*." *Language, Discourse and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Discourse Stylistics*. Ed. R. Carter and P. Simpson. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Sinclair, J., and M. Coulthard. "Towards an Analysis of Discourse." *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. Ed. M. Coulthard. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Teodorescu-Brinzeu, P. "The Verbal Zero-Sign in Theatre." *Poetics* 13.1-4 (1984): 47-56.
- Widdowson, H. G. "Othello in Person." *Language and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Stylistics*. Ed. R. Carter. London: Unwin Hyman, 1982.