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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Linguistic Model

In an essay on the Saussurean system of linguistics, Rulon S. Wells delineates a set of preliminary tasks for an inquiry of any kind: (1) definition of the aims of the inquiry, which includes (2) specification of the objects to be studied and (3) description of the methods to be used in the study.¹ This chapter addresses itself to those tasks. Succeeding chapters set forth the body of the inquiry, a summary of its conclusions, and suggestions for future study.

This chapter does not give an exhaustive account, defense, or critique of the linguistic model or of its non-linguistic applications. Interested readers are referred to the many fine studies, already available and listed in the bibliography of this inquiry, that amply and effectively deal with such concerns. This chapter gives an introductory account of the linguistic model and of its non-linguistic applications in general, by way of providing background for the ensuing chapters. It also, by way of preparation, considers issues and lays groundwork that is necessarily preliminary to the application

of the linguistic model to the task of formulating a structuralist poetics of the drama.

In his study of the analysis and interpretation of play-scripts, Roger Gross considers the difficulty of identifying the parts of a dramatic utterance or the meanings of those parts by a purely inductive method. Indeed, the seeming impossibility of a purely inductive approach has been the traditional dramatic analyst's greatest stumbling block in constructing an adequate descriptive theory of the drama. The linguistic model may be of value in that respect, for it provides an inductive procedure for distinguishing discrete units—the commutation test. The very use of an already formed linguistic model, however, determines that the method of this inquiry will be hypothetico-deductive, for it is only in the light of the preconceived hypothesis of a valid applicability of the linguistic model to the drama as a language that the units and structure of the drama can be identified and described.

Michael Kirby notes the value of using the analytical systems of other disciplines and of other art forms as models in the analysis and theoretical modeling of dramatic performance. He sees such a method as providing a welcome alternative to an inductive method that is repressive of adequate theory—in that it is based solely on past facts without being able to account for future possibilities, thus

---


tending to reinforce the dramaturgical status quo. He suggests pictorial and sculptural models in addition to the linguistic model with which this inquiry will be solely concerned. 4

This study will center around a series of hypotheses to be tested against the reader's competence to determine the extent to which the hypotheses account for the facts of the dramatic system and the effects experienced within that system. 5

Hypothesis 1:

structuralist poetics : drama = linguistics : language

Corollary:
Drama is a kind of "language"

Any brief definition of language is necessarily reductive, but a preliminary working definition will provide a needed clarification of the hypothesis and its corollary upon which this inquiry will be based. With that understanding in mind, language may be defined as a system of arbitrary signs produced by human beings that facilitates social interaction by communicating meaning. The significance of each language sign is known to a number of native interpreters as well as shared by a language community, and at least some of the significance of each language sign is retained in the different situations in which it is uttered. The language system has three component sub-systems:


a semantic (meaning) system, a syntactic (combinative) system, and a phonological (minimal unit) system. Knowledge of the system and of its three sub-systems, while largely unconscious, enables native speakers to arrange signs in acceptable, effective, or appropriate patterns that may reach a high level of complexity. It also enables native interpreters to recognize and understand structures that they have never before encountered. All natural languages arrange their uttered signs in sentences and interpret sentences as primary communicative units. The sentence is, therefore, the basic unit for linguistic analysis.  

Linguistics is often defined as the scientific study of language. It is important to note, however, that although linguistics owes a good deal of its methodology and the nature of its theory-building to the physical sciences, it remains a social science by virtue of its preoccupation with the system of distinctive or differential features that give language signs their social meaning and value.

There are many approaches to linguistic study, but only three will be of concern to this inquiry: descriptive linguistics, transformational-generative grammar, and systemic linguistics. The

---


working definitions of these terms given here pretend to nothing more
than overviews of fields within the linguistic model that must, of
necessity, be elaborated as the inquiry proceeds.

Descriptive linguistics is that linguistic approach which
attempts to give the most complete and systematic account possible of
the observable individual units, features, and patterns of organiza-
tion of a particular language.\textsuperscript{8}

Transformational-generative grammar is the descriptive
linguistic approach that (1) attempts to formulate the syntactical
sub-system of a particular language in a set of abstract, recursive
rules (called "P-rules") capable, when applied mechanically to the
lexicon of the language, of generating all of and only the well-formed
sentences of the language, and (2) attempts to explicitly formulate
the implicit knowledge or competence that enables members of the
speech community in question to recognize and to interpret correctly
the signs in another set of rules (called "T-rules") that model the
systematic transformation of underlying (called "deep") relational
structures into the surface structures of the language.\textsuperscript{9}

Systemic linguistics is the descriptive linguistic approach
that emphasizes the sociological implications of language. Whereas
transformational-generative linguistics is interested in an individual
linguistic competence, systemic linguistics prefers a communal
behavior potential and is more concerned with the appropriateness of

\textsuperscript{8}Berry, pp. 1-3; Lehmann, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{9}Lehmann, pp. 43-44; Culler, pp. 20-25.
an utterance for its social occasion than with an acceptability based
on an intuitive individual knowledge of the well-formed utterance.
Systemic linguistics considers the probability of a given utterance's
occurrence in a specified social situation, examining what speakers
actually do in that situation in the light of what they might have
done, in light of their options. Where transformational-generative
linguistics attempts to model competence in sets of recursive rules,
systemic linguistics attempts to model communal language behavior
options in networks of language-choice systems available to a given
speaker in a specified social situation.¹⁰

Michael Lane, after an excellent yet concise survey of defi-
nitions from several fields, succinctly defines a structure as "a set
of any elements between which, or between certain sub-sets of which,
relations are defined."¹¹ Structure in this sense is a key concept
in the linguistics of Ferdinand de Saussure, the founding father of
modern linguistic study.¹² The linguistic notion of structure
demands that the consideration of any particular formal element be
carried out only in relation to all other elements of that

¹⁰Berry, pp. 21-32. Readers requiring a more extensive
introductory background in these three linguistic fields are referred
to Victoria Fromkin and Robert Rodman, An Introduction to Lanugage
(New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974); Jeanne H. Herndon, A
Survey of Modern Grammars, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and
Winston, 1976); Lehmann, op. cit.; Mark Lester Introductory
Transformational Grammar of English, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt,

¹¹Michael Lane, ed., Introduction to Structuralism (New

¹²Ferdinand de Saussure, Course in General Linguistics, ed:
Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye and trans. Wade Baskin (New York:
Philosophical Library, 1959).
level within the language and that the language as a whole be regarded as a self-contained system of oppositional relations that determines the delineation of its component elements and makes possible their differential meanings.\textsuperscript{13}

A lively issue with regard to the concept of structure concerns the question as to whether structure is a property of the observed phenomena or a mental model or schema for the interpretation of the phenomena and therefore a property of the human mind.\textsuperscript{14} In some respects, linguistic structure may be seen as a property of the observed phenomena. The spectographic structures studied by acoustic phonetics are cases in point.\textsuperscript{15} In most respects, however, linguistic structure must be seen as a property of the human mind.

There is a further debate as to whether the mental model of structure has a purely operational function as a mental exercise attempting to grasp phenomena by structurally relating them in formal terms,\textsuperscript{16} or whether it has an ontological reality as a structuring process underlying all human experience and knowledge, each structured phenomenon encountered being only one of an infinite number of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{13}Lehmann, p. 318.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{15}Lehmann, pp. 91-105.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{16}Eco-Segre, pp. 38-39.
\end{flushleft}
conceivable variants of a scheme of binary structural oppositions already present in our minds.\textsuperscript{17}

This inquiry will not participate directly in either of those two debates. Interested readers are referred to the literature cited in ensuing footnotes.

As a movement within linguistics itself, structuralism focuses on the concept of a hierarchically organized system of elemental units in which the units and their interrelations are inseparably correlated in such a way that the alteration of any of them will alter the entire system.\textsuperscript{18}

Outside of linguistics proper, however, structuralism may be defined as an analytical methodology with theoretical and philosophical implications, which takes from structural linguistics a set of concepts and a set of procedural operations known as the linguistic model, which it attempts to apply to the analysis of socio-cultural events and artefacts on the assumptions (1) that these events or artefacts are not simply material but also meaningful, and (2) that because they are meaningful, there must be systems of conventional distinctions and interrelations underlying them which make that meaning possible and which therefore render the systems in question


describable, in a formal sense, as non-linguistic "languages" the regularities of which may then be formulated in a manner at least analogous to the ways in which linguistics formulates the regularities of language.19

Roland Barthes was the first to put forward the case for a structuralist poetics of literature. Jonathan Culler describes the task which Barthes sets for such a poetics as an attempt "to make explicit the underlying system which makes literary effects possible." The goal of such a poetics would not be a "science of content" productive of the full range of meanings of a work, but a "science of the conditions of content, that is to say of forms" productive of "a theory of literary discourse which would account for the possibilities of interpretation, the "empty meanings" which support a variety of full meanings but which do not permit the work to be given just any meaning." Such a poetics, as Culler points out, would grant "precedence to the task of formulating a comprehensive theory of literary discourse" and assign a "secondary place to the interpretation of individual texts," that is, it would promote the "study of literature itself as an institution," and relegate interpretation to a subsidiary position.20


Within the field of structuralist poetics, the linguistic model has so far been applied only to literary texts, that is, only to cultural artefacts the raw material of which is natural language itself. But literature is not the only field which might form the subject of a structuralist poetics, although, when the linguistic model is applied to a non-literary art, it is perhaps more customary to speak of a semiotics of the art in question.

**Semiotics (Semiology)**

It was de Saussure himself who first suggested the possibility of a general science of signs of which linguistics would form only a part. He named this hypothetical science "semiology."\(^{21}\) Roland Barthes, who picked up de Saussure's suggestion and elaborated upon it, points out that semiology "aims to take in any system of signs, whatever their substance and limits; images, gestures, musical sounds, objects, and the complex associations of all these, which form the content of ritual, convention or public entertainment."\(^{22}\) Semiology would then treat all of these sign-systems "in the way linguistics treats language."\(^{23}\) Structuralism can thus be seen, in a wider context, as "the movement of thought which presses and formulates the case for semiology."\(^{24}\) Although, as Susan Wittig points out,

\(^{21}\)de Saussure, pp. 15-17.


\(^{23}\)Pettit, p. 33.

\(^{24}\)Ibid.
"semiotics is offered by its proponents as a highly self-conscious meta-theory capable of understanding and explicating itself and its own assumptions by application of its own methodologies," it nevertheless, like structuralism, "derives from a theory of languagesystems and is built upon a powerful explanatory model capable of being widely applied in a variety of disciplines," and the two terms are often considered inseparable and interchangeable.

Roger Gross makes some useful distinctions among the terms "drama," "play," and "playscript." Although his definitions may leave something to be desired, they are helpful in some respects, and his distinctions of one from another are well worth preserving in the interest of a more exact analytical and critical terminology.

The useful points of Gross's definition of drama are (1) that "drama has no 'body'" and (2) that "drama is the name of an artistic genre, the particular instances of which are called plays or dramas." Both of Gross's statements point to something more about drama, the full significance of which he does not seem to have grasped.

The first statement calls attention to an important parallel between drama and language. Robert Scholes points out that "a language system has no tangible existence. The English language is not in the world any more than the laws of motion are in the world"; however, "in order to become an object of study, a language or a model


26Pettit, p. 33; Culler, "Linguistic Basis," p. 21.

27Gross, pp. 4-5.
of it, must be constructed from the evidence of individual utterances." Emphasizing the importance of this last principle for the fields of structuralist inquiry outside of language proper, Scholes goes on to point out that "in order to become a science any human discipline must move from the phenomena it recognizes to the system that governs them."\textsuperscript{28}

The second statement calls attention to the institutional and socio-cultural aspects of drama. A language is not a set of utterances but a structural system underlying the utterances and making them possible. Those who have acquired linguistic competence have done so by internalizing this structure and not by memorizing utterances. They are thus able to form acceptable utterances they have never heard before.

If a language is not a set of utterances but an underlying structural system generating those utterances, then literature is not a set of texts but "a second-order semiotic system which has language as its basis," an institution of literature requiring of one who would understand it a distinctive literary competence in addition to the linguistic competence required to read its sentences. Likewise, drama is not a set of scripts or a history of performances but a second-order semiotic system which has performance activity as its basis. Drama is an institution requiring of its spectator a distinctive and complex dramatic competence; it is an internalized grammar permitting its spectator to convert performance activity sequences into dramatic

\textsuperscript{28}Scholes, p. 14.
structures with meaning.\(^{29}\) It is basically in this sense that the term "drama" will be used in this inquiry.

It is the existence of drama as a conventionally regulated structural system underlying performance behavior and making its effects possible which Gross seems not to take into account when he says that while "playscripts may be examined" and plays observed, drama, because it is not a thing, cannot be "examined and described factually," and that while "'drama' may mean whatever we want it to mean, we cannot prove it to be anything."\(^{30}\) For it is precisely here that the linguistic model offers the possibility that drama is the system underlying dramatic texts and performance activity, a system which may be inductively examined and described by applying to the individual surface structures of the system discovery procedures analogous to those the linguist uses to examine and describe factually the structural system of language underlying speech acts. Consideration of Gross's definitions of "play" and "playscript" is deferred to Chapter 3.

The preliminary working definitions now completed should provide a suitable introductory understanding of Hypothesis 1. The purpose of this inquiry, then, is to examine the extent to which the drama may be treated as a semiotic "language," to discuss it in terms provided by linguistics, and to analyse and describe it according to the procedures used by linguistics.\(^{31}\)

\(^{29}\)Culler, Poetics, p. 114.  \(^{30}\)Gross, p. 4.

\(^{31}\)Culler, Poetics, p. 6.
In the field of literature, the areas that structuralists have worked over most extensively are those of the narrative and of the lyric. Studies of both of those genres have proliferated along two axes of structuralist literary inquiry: (1) analysis of individual texts as "sentences" or of the works of a single author as a "universe of discourse" and (2) contributions toward the formulation of an evolving structuralist poetics of the lyric, the novel, and so on.

Structuralist literary studies of the drama have, with few exceptions, been confined to the first of these axes.\(^{32}\) The fact, however, that drama is coextensive with neither literature on the one hand, nor theatre on the other, though it partakes of both, hardly bears repeating following the admirable and extensive treatments of the point made by Allardyce Nicoll and Bernard Beckerman among others.\(^{33}\)

---


Visually, the distinction may be conceptualized as the intersection of two fields to create a central third field, as in Figure 1 below.

![Diagram showing interlocking fields of drama, theatre, and literature](image)

FIGURE 1.—Interlocking fields of drama, theatre, and literature.

The figure places drama in such a way as to sanction both the claim that it is a literary genre and the claim that it is "a special form of the art of presentation." Thus, in the terms of the linguistic model, it may be seen that the deep-structure system of the drama has two possible surface structures: one textual and the other presentational, although these do not enjoy equal status, as is shown in Chapter 3. It may also be seen that just as the extension of the literary field beyond the dramatic leaves room within the former for

---
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the other literary forms, the lyric and the narrative, the extension of the theatrical field beyond the dramatic leaves room for the other theatrical forms in which "one or more human beings, isolated in time and/or space present themselves to another or others,"\textsuperscript{35} such as the circus act or the variety show.

As J. L. Styan points out, "detailed criticism of drama which comments on the play for playing is very difficult to find,"\textsuperscript{36} and if the literary studies tend to be exclusively literary, the theatrical studies tend to be exclusively theatrical. Structuralist theatrical studies have been undertaken most notably by the "Prague school" of Czech semiologists between 1928 and 1948, although there was a revival of interest without significant elaboration or extension of the earlier work in the 1960s. Of these, the major studies are just now beginning to become available in English.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., p. 10.


The "Prague school" studies take the form of investigations into the nature of the theatrical sign and into the mutual interaction of theatrical signs within an integrated sign-system of the theatre. For the most part, they remain, unlike the structuralist literary studies of drama, somewhat abstract and removed from analyses of actual performances or of the work of particular playwrights or theatre practitioners, remaining purely theatrical and theoretical and failing to connect with a wide spectrum of contemporary and historic dramatic material. Often they focus on traditional and folk theatre forms or on highly conventionalized forms such as the Chinese theatre. They make little attempt to link the structure of an abstract theatrical sign-system with the larger socio-cultural structures with which it forms a relationship of mutual exchange. In sum, compared with the proliferation and diversification of structuralist contributions to literary theory, structuralist contributions to theatrical theory, formidable as they are, seem sketchy and preliminary.38

There have been some structuralist studies of dramatic literature, primarily of individual works or authors, and some semiotic studies of the theatrical sign-system, primarily of an abstract general nature and primarily disconnected from a wide range of actual sequences of dramatic material. Although there remains a great deal of work to be done in both of those areas, there has been no attempt to integrate the two lines of investigation within a comprehensive structuralist poetics of the drama of the kind that Jonathan Culler advocates for the lyric and the narrative when he says that "a work has a structure only

38Deak, pp. 92-94.
in terms of a theory which specifies the ways in which it functions," and that "to formulate that theory is the task of poetics." At the same time, "without a far reaching theoretical construct that will bring us to a broad and general understanding of the nature of esthetic perception and esthetic creation," as Susan Wittig points out, "we cannot hope to arrive at more than a local knowledge of particular acts of artistic activity, in some particular forms." It is toward the formulation of such a poetics or comprehensive theory of dramatic art that this inquiry proposes to make a preliminary contribution. As the word "toward" indicates, exhaustive treatment can not now be attempted. The sheer diversity of the linguistic model itself, as well as the paucity of already available applications of the various linguistic models to the field of the drama, serves to confirm that the investigation is only beginning and that much remains to be done before the development of an adequate, much less an exhaustive, structuralist or semiotic theory of the drama is completed. This study is intended to serve as a point of departure and as a source of interest, controversy, and provocation for future workers in the field. It is intended as a feasibility study for a comprehensive structuralist poetics of the drama.

Advantages and Disadvantages of the Linguistic Model as Guide in a Semiotic Inquiry

An important and active issue in structuralist activity, especially where it involves an extra-literary element, concerns the

---

39 Culler, p. 109.  
40 Wittig, p. 450.
relationship between semiology and linguistics. As already noted, Saussure saw linguistics as but one branch of a larger science of signs—semiology. Cesare Segre points out, however, that the French structuralist literary critics tended to reverse that position and to "absorb semiotics into linguistics." Barthes, says Segre, by insisting that non-linguistic substances could be understood only by their reference to the articulatory structures of language, effectively appropriated semiology to linguistics. Segre further characterizes Barthes's Elements of Semiology as "a summary of the principles of structural linguistics into which, when and where it has proved possible, comparisons with, or prophecies about, non-linguistic systems have been inserted." If such an appropriation of semiology to linguistics is valid, Segre argues, semiology has no reason for existence, since non-linguistic signs would then be "nothing more than sketchy, clumsy strivings after articulated discourse." He offers two reasons why such an assimilation of semiology might be convenient: (1) "because linguistics offers ready-made procedures and categories which semiotics up till now does not have" and (2) because "the affirmation of the primacy of language over other human activities" proclaims a renewed preeminence for those who deal with the humanities. The most compelling reason is obviously the first, and it is also the most

\[41\] Segre, p. 27; Barthes, p. 11. \[42\] Ibid.  
\[44\] Segre, pp. 54-55; Scholes, pp. 38-39.
understandable. As Susan Wittig points out, semiology "derives from a theory of language systems," namely, from the structural linguistics Saussure himself "proposed as a model for and a subset of" it.\(^{45}\) It is readily understandable that, since linguistics was well on its way to becoming established at a time when semiology was no more than a suggested possibility, there would be a strong temptation to take the more developed science and use it as a paradigm for the lesser developed. Language is obviously the most complex and exacting system of human signification. It is understandable, but, as Segre points out, it is dangerous. The procedures and categories of linguistics are applicable to language precisely because of the complexity, coherence, unity of sign substance-and-form, and arbitrary self-sufficiency of natural language systems, and it is by no means certain that linguistic categories and procedures "can be taken over bodily and applied to each and every system of signs."\(^{46}\)

Segre's warning is well taken, and it is further illuminated by Wittig's statement that from a semiotic perspective, "the functions of all languages--whether... the first-order system of natural languages or the second-order, derived systems of... art--can be understood by reference to the general theory of sign-systems," an observation which makes it clear that the semiotic model is self-sufficient, independent of even the linguistic model, its erstwhile subset-guide. "The particular laws of a specific signifying system," Wittig concludes, "must be formulated for each case."\(^{47}\) And yet,
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\(^{45}\)Wittig, pp. 441, 445.  
\(^{46}\)Segre, p. 55.  
\(^{47}\)Wittig, p. 442.
the lure of the linguistic model is very strong, as is evidenced by Wittig's own use of the word "derived" in reference to the second-order systems. Derived from what? Secondary to what if not to the first-order systems of articulated natural language?

Finally, Segre cites as evidence of the linguistic model's inapplicability to every sign-system "the failure of the ingenious attempt to find in other artistic 'languages' the 'double articulation'" of monemes and phonemes which "is so clearly the distinctive attribute, the very hallmark of language."8 Whatever the case may be with other artistic languages, however, there is double articulation in the dramatic language as is demonstrated in Chapter 5. The present inquiry, therefore, refers to both a structuralist poetics and a semiotic theory of the drama. It is true, however, that any application of the first-order linguistic model to a second-order semiotic system will have both promising advantages and disorienting limitations and, as Culler points out, it is necessary to be aware of and to be able to define both of them, but especially the limitations.49

Advantages of the Linguistic Model

The linguistic model "provides guidance for empirical inquiry. . . It. . . is at once a manifesto for semiological analyses and a review of existing analyses--implicitly semiological ones."50 It suggests the usefulness of a metalanguage, a language which uses the non-linguistic language of the semiotic system it

48Segre, p. 55.  
49Culler, Poetics, p. 4.  
50Pettit, p. 4; Wittig, p. 450.
describes as its subject or content.\textsuperscript{51} It also suggests that the semiotic analyst should "attend to the conventional basis of the phenomena he is studying" so as not to fall into the "familiar mistake of assuming that signs which appear natural to those who use them have an intrinsic meaning and require no explanation."\textsuperscript{52}

The linguistic model implies the possibility of formulating a set of operational procedures for each semiotic field that would permit two analysts working independently on the same corpus of data to achieve identical results in constructing a grammar to account for the utterances of the corpus by following an explicitly defined sequence of operations of classification, segmentation, substitution and so on.\textsuperscript{53} The model directs the analyst to concern himself not with the substantive content of the utterances in his corpus of data but with the delineation of their elemental parts, the formulation of both the distinguishing characteristics of and the formal relations and distinctions between those parts, and the formulation of the combinative regulations governing the integration of those parts within a hierarchical network of relations, a signifying structure, in such a way that both the network and its parts are explained solely in terms of the structural relations among the parts, rather than as being the result of processes of cause and effect.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{51}Barthes, p. 92; Wittig, pp. 451-454.
\textsuperscript{52}Culler, Poetics, pp. 5-6.
\textsuperscript{53}Ibid.; Segre, p. 39; Beckerman, p. 253.
\textsuperscript{54}Culler, Poetics, pp. 31, 99, 255; Lane, pp. 14, 37; Gross, p. 153; Beckerman, p. 79.
The linguistic model suggests the possibility of delineating within each semiotic system "three basic kinds of particular: the elements which correspond to words, the strings which correspond to sentences and the systems which correspond to languages." It further suggests the possibility of delineating within each semiotic system a double articulation of monemes, which correspond to words, and minimal units, which correspond to phonemes.

The transformational-generative linguistic model suggests that "what the observer sees is not the structure but simply the evidence and product of the structure," that there is a "need to postulate distinctions and rules operating at an unconscious level in order to explain" the surface facts of a semiotic system, and that the analyst or theorist should look for the "differences and oppositions which can be correlated . . . and organized as a system which generates" the surface phenomena "from a deep structure common to" several utterances within a corpus or peculiar to a particular utterance. It further suggests that what the semiotic theorist should be trying to account for in his description of the system underlying a corpus of data is the largely preconscious competence of persons "who have assimilated the rules and norms of the system" and that any description of the system must appeal for verification to such native speakers.
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55Pettit, p. 110. 56Bouissac, p. 23.
57Lane, p. 15. 58Culler, Poetics, p. 109.
59Wittig, p. 450.
The systemic linguistic model, the model that this study employs most extensively, suggests that the analyst of a given semiotic system should examine the choices made by a given native speaker within the system (1) by placing the actual choices and choice patterns represented in the elemental units of the surface structure of his utterance and their syntactical distribution upon a grid of possible alternative choices within the semiotic language's network of choice-systems and (2) by formulating the actual choice pattern represented by his utterance in a series of selection-expressions, as is exemplified in Chapter 11.

The linguistic model, while it offers "a set of concepts in which interpretations may be stated," avoids "the unseemly rush" from the individual semiotic work to the world at large by adhering to a "principle of relevance," which dictates that the analyst or theorist should observe and describe the system from the inside for as long as possible. Finally, while minimally involved with interpretation and not at all involved with evaluation of individual semiotic works, the model nevertheless suggests a descriptive base upon which such critical activities may be less impressionistically founded.
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61Berry, pp. 62-196; Gross, p. 122; Styan, Audience, p. 3.

62Culler, Poetics, p. 130; Barthes, p. 95-96.
Limitations of the Linguistic Model

The diversity within the linguistic model itself suggests that no single theoretical construct will be able to account fully for the numerous surface facts present in a given semiotic language system. The linguistic model lends a prestige that may lure the analyst into believing that "simply applying linguistic labels" to aspects of a semiotic work is valuable in itself, whereas in fact, when used outside the context of linguistic procedural activity, "such terms enjoy no privileged status and are not necessarily more revealing than other concepts which the critic might import or create." The model suggests procedures that may lure the analyst into believing that their mechanical application to any second-order semiotic system will guarantee the validity or relevance of their results, thereby causing him to forget "the basic problem of determining what [he] wishes to explain." The results of the application of any linguistic procedure to a non-linguistic sign system must be tested "by their ability to account for facts about the system" to those who have assimilated its rules and norms, its native speakers. The model is privileged in that natural language is obviously largely arbitrary in its union of sound-images and concepts and therefore blatantly conventional, as is shown in Chapter 4. Unlike natural language, however, other semiotic systems are based to some degree on at least apparently natural relations between signifier
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63 Beckerman, p. 137.
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and signified. The linguistic model provides analytical methodologies that may lure the analyst of semiotic systems into using them mechanically, thereby pressing a case for a linguistic patterning of phenomena where one is not appropriate. The analyst must continually evaluate each linguistic procedure he is using in terms of its efficiency in accounting for the facts of the system under investigation, and he "must be ready to give up the formula he is using or to replace it with another the moment he realizes that it is not really coming to grips with the subject matter he is working on." The linguistic model, designed to describe a plurality of sign surfaces or tracks may not provide a suitable guide for the analysis and description of a complex semiotic system employing a plurality of sign surfaces, each with its part to play. Natural language sounds are articulated in time only, while some semiotic language components may be articulated in time and three-dimensional space simultaneously, as is discussed in Chapter 4.

The linguistic model may be inapplicable or irrelevant to a semiotic system within which it is impossible to delineate minimal discrete units equivalent to the monemes of language, or even the strings equivalent to sentences, or indeed, any sort of syntax whatsoever based on the linguistic requirement that strings must "link up

66 Ibid., p. 14; Lane, p. 51; Segre, p. 44; E. Garroni, Semiotica ed estetica, L'etero-geneita del linguaggio e il linguaggio cinematografico (Bari, 1968) summarized in Segre, pp. 41-45.
67 Segre, p. 39.
68 Ibid., p. 41; Barthes, p. 30; Gross, p. 110.
something morphologically precise."\(^{69}\) For some semiotic systems that "something" may not exist. Further, the model may be inapplicable or irrelevant to a semiotic system within which it is impossible to delineate a double articulation equivalent to the double articulation of monemes and phonemes in natural language, a condition in which the meaningful units are composed of units that are meaningless in themselves.\(^{70}\) The linguistic model may take the analyst a certain distance in describing a semiotic system that has a first order natural language as one of its components but then fail precisely at the point "where understanding comes to depend on one's supplementary knowledge" of the rules and conventions of the second-order semiotic system in question.\(^{71}\)

The linguistic model may suggest an undue concentration upon the conventional and normative aspects of phenomena, whereas in the semiotic system of an art-form, the unconventional and non-normative may be of equal or greater importance.\(^{72}\) It does not provide a method for the interpretation of semiotic works,\(^{73}\) and, finally, it does not provide a method of evaluating semiotic works.\(^{74}\)


\(^{70}\) Metz-Segre, p. 42; Segre, p. 55; Barthes, p. 11.

\(^{71}\) Culler, *Poetics*, p. 114.


\(^{73}\) Culler, *Poetics*, p. 109.

\(^{74}\) Lane, p. 38.
It devolves upon the Structuralist to be aware of these general advantages and limitations of the linguistic model. Other advantages and limitations specific to the present study are pointed out as it proceeds. It is the analyst's or theoretician's responsibility to make the most of the advantages of the linguistic model while avoiding the pitfalls suggested by its limitations.

The Linguistic Model and the Communications Model

Consideration of the linguistic model on the one hand and of the semiotic system on the other in the light of information theory has made structuralists and semiologists alike explicitly conscious of the fact that the linguistic model implies a communications model, for the purpose of much language, though not all, is to communicate. It was observed in the section defining structure (above, pp. 6-7) that language structure has both a physical aspect and a psychological aspect and that the psychological aspect is by far the more important of the two. Saussure pointed out that language also has a physiological aspect. In the process of separating language from speech, he described a communications circuit.

Suppose that two people, A and B, are conversing with each other... Suppose that the opening of the circuit is in A's brain, where mental facts (concepts) are associated with representations of the linguistic sounds (sound-images) that are used for their expression. A given concept unlocks a corresponding sound-image in the brain; this purely psychological phenomenon is followed in turn by a physiological process: the brain transmits an impulse corresponding to the image to the organs used in producing sounds. Then the sound waves travel from the mouth of A to the ear of B: a purely
physical process. Next, the circuit continues in B, but the order is reversed: from the ear to the brain, the physiological transmission of the sound-image; in the brain, the psychological association of the image with the corresponding concept. If B then speaks, the new act will follow—from his brain to A's—exactly the same course as the first act and pass through the same successive phases... 75

Since Saussure, linguistics has tended to fragment this circuit. Thus, for example, acoustic phonetics considers the physical aspect of language sounds in isolation, while articulatory and auditory phonetics consider the physiological aspects of language sounds in isolation. Syntax and grammar tend to consider strings and sentences as isolated from their senders and receivers even though Noam Chomsky has made it clear that a language theory is "descriptively adequate" only "to the extent that it correctly describes the intrinsic competence of the idealized native speaker."76 Morphology and semantics consider the psychological aspect of language in relative isolation from the speaking-circuit.

Information theory, by way of a corrective to the linguistic fragmentation of the speaking-circuit, suggests the possibility of considering the semiotic system of the mediated artwork as a coded message in a communication process.77 The possibility has far-reaching implications for this inquiry, so a brief description of the communication process and its variables specially geared toward the inquiry which follows is in order.

75Saussure, pp. 11-12.


77Segre, p. 50.
Communication System Variables

The sender is the initiator of a communication process. For the purpose of this inquiry, a sender will be (1) an individual human being, (2) a group of human beings, or (3) something within an individual human being.

The term "source" is preferred by some theorists, but a lively issue relative to the framing of messages concerns the extent to which an individual human being may properly be thought of as the source of his messages. Structural analysis, as Culler points out, generally "refuses to make the thinking subject an explanatory cause."78 The subject is at least as much "constituted by a series of conventions, the grids of regularity and intersubjectivity,"79 as he is constitutive of his messages. Julia Kristeva, however, has recalled attention to those aspects of language which belong "not with the social contract but with play, pleasure or desire."80 The term "sender" is preferred for this inquiry because it permits the concept of an intersubjective cultural source beyond and within the sender himself, while at the same time preserving the possibility of the "estranged," "alienated," "maverick," or playful sender-as-source.81

As used in this inquiry, the term "sender" implies a human volitional aspect of the communication process. Segre notes that Eric Buysens has made an important and "rigorous distinction between 'symptoms' and 'acts of communication'" by insisting that only in the

78Culler, Poetics, p. 29. 79Ibid., p. 258. 80Kristeva, p. 1250. 81Wittig, pp. 446-447.
case of the acts of communication is the message intentionally actuated "in terms of a clearly established convention" with the aim of causing a receiver to realize its scope and not merely received as "an effect by whose means the observer can inductively arrive at the cause." Thus, for example, driving a particular car or wearing a particular outfit may be a conscious act of communication or merely an unconscious symptom. A dramatic character's symptoms may form part of an actor's communicative act and an actor's own symptoms may strengthen or undermine the communicative act that is his characterization. Although some theorists admit the concept of "unintentional messages," this study, following Buyssens and Segre, rejects "the exaggerated and misleading tendency which would extend semiology to cover everything that can be interpreted as indicating anything"—even merely itself—"when it is quite clear that the only sign-expressions which, because homogeneous, can be organized into unified wholes are those that are already intentionally such," although, of course, both communicative acts and the symptoms that may accompany and serve to confirm or contradict them are important factors in any act of interpretation. The term "sender," then, preserves an aspect of intentionality, of one human mind intending to

---
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affect another, for the communicative acts with which this inquiry is concerned.

A code is any socially employed system of signs that expresses the internal or internalized external objects or events a sender intends to communicate by articulating a medium in an at least partially conventional manner to produce an at least partially conventional meaning or response. The natural languages are, of course, the codes par excellence of human communication. As such, in the structuralist view, they provide models for all other socially adopted codes, which may then be seen to have lexicons (moneme inventories) and grammars (rules of syntactical combination) like their natural language counterparts.  

An active issue with respect to codes concerns the extent to which a code should be mathematically precise, making encoding and decoding foolproof. Culler points out that Georges Mounin wanted to restrict semiological inquiry to sign systems whose signs "have clearly defined concepts firmly attached to them" in such a way as to approach an exactitude of signification something like that of Morse code, where signals and signifiers can be looked up in a code book. Phillip Pettit goes so far as to say that "semiological acts are not generally acts of communication" on the grounds that an act of communication must achieve its desired effect through "the recognition on the part of an audience" that the effect in question is precisely "the

84Lane, p. 14.

effect which the agent intends." As Culler points out, however, the natural languages themselves offer nothing like the kind of algorithmic encoding and decoding of thought called for by Mounin and Pettit, and to restrict either semiology or communication to situations where encoding and decoding are conducted solely through fixed codes is unnecessarily and harmfully reductive. For purposes of this inquiry, then, an encoded work of art, whether literary or non-literary, will be considered as a system of signs even though one cannot speak of encoding and decoding by fixed codes.

Another active issue with respect to codes concerns the extent to which a code may be formed, elaborated, or manipulated by a deciding group rather than by a mass of native speakers, the user of such fabricated, as opposed to natural, codes drawing messages from them but having no part in their elaboration. This question is of particular concern in the consideration of art works as communicative acts because of the predominately one-way nature of artistic communication. As Barthes points out, however, "although imposed on the users, the signifying 'contract' is no less observed by the great majority of them (otherwise the user is marked with a certain 'associability': he can no longer communicate anything except his eccentricity)." He also points out that fabricated codes are not completely controlled by the deciding group but are responsive to the
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birth of new needs, the development of the society, the disappearance or appearance of available materials, the placement of ideological limitations on the invention of forms and so on. The artificial character of a work of art, then, so far as this inquiry is concerned, "does not alter the institutional nature of the communication and preserves some amount of dialectical play between the system and usage." If a communicative act employs a plurality of semic means, it is appropriate to speak of the component subcodes of its code. The process of selecting elements of a code and arranging them in an order that conventionally expresses a meaning is called encoding. Often imputed by theorists to an individual sender, the act of encoding may be regarded, by virtue of the nature of codes, as mostly conventional and marginally original. Analogic codification is carried out in terms of a code that permits a "continuous representation" in which the signs used are "in their proportions and relations, similar to the things, events, or ideas for which they stand." Digital codification is carried out in terms of a code that permits a "discontinuous representation" in which the signs used segment the continuity of nature into discrete elements put together by man-made rules based upon convention.

The encoded expression of a sender's internal or internalized external objects or events with the intent to affect a receiver is

91Ibid.
92Ibid., pp. 31-32.
93Ruesch, p. 130.
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called a statement. "A statement becomes a message when it has been perceived and interpreted by a receiver." 95

Pettit makes a distinction between communicative acts like telling someone something and other semiological acts, such as "dressing up or having a light snack." 96 These latter fail as communicative acts, Pettit tells us, because "the desired effects of such acts are not ones achieved by the recognition on the part of an audience of what they are." 97 It has been shown that such acts may be merely symptomatic, but surely they may also become acts of communication. The communicative act of someone who has deliberately dressed up for someone else or of someone who has eaten with deliberate relish the light snack someone else has fixed for him may surely be recognized. That is, such acts may or may not be statements, and, as statements, they may or may not become messages. Granted that there may be no audience other than oneself present for such acts or that a present audience may fail to experience an intended effect, such situations apply equally to the act of telling someone something, which Pettit holds above suspicion as a communicative act. A sender fails to tell a receiver something not, as Pettit says, when the receiver does not recognize the precise effect that the sender intends, 98 but when he does not recognize anything like the effect that the sender intends or when he does not recognize that the

95Ibid., p. 128.  
96Pettit, p. 36.  
97Ibid.  
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sender intends any effect at all. Even then, the sender has still made a statement, although no message has been received.99

The channel is the physical medium through which the signs of the code are conveyed. The code articulates the medium in a largely conventional way to form statements and messages. Generally, theorists point out that multi-channel communication increases the success probability of message communication, but it is also important to point out that multi-channel communication permits a more subtle and complex form of message mediation since channels may be used to interact with, undercut, subvert, or comment upon, as well as to reinforce, complement, and clarify one another.

Interference with the ability to send, encode, receive, decode, understand, or respond to statements is called "noise." Noise may be external interference in the channel, or it may be internal to the sender or the receiver. A certain amount of noise is built into every sender and receiver in the form of semantic conditioning, psychological displacement of accent, and so on. A certain amount of noise is built into every code in the form of the indigenous dissociation of signifier and signified in any sign system. In most artistic messages, for example, "an organized surface of signifiers insistently promises meaning," but "the notion of a full and determinate meaning that the work 'expresses' is highly problematic."100 Charles S. Peirce, the American pioneer in semiology, pointed out the fundamental

99Ruesch, p. 128.
100Culler, Poetics, p. 19.
incompleteness of the sign and of its seemingly infinite invocation of an interpretant in the form of another sign. 101

The process of interpreting the individual coded items of a message in the light of the entire sign-system of which they form the units and of subsequently interpreting or reconstructing the meaning of the whole message, which is always more than the sum of the meanings of its parts, is called decoding. Traditionally imputed to an individual receiver, the act of decoding, like that of encoding, may be seen to be largely conventional. That is, the subject who interprets is as much "constituted by a series of conventions, the grids of regularity and intersubjectivity" 102 as is the framer of messages.

A message may be said to have content to the extent that two or more interpreters of the coded sign-system of the message can agree as to what the message refers to or means. A message may contain information referring to the communication process itself, to where, when, how, and by whom the message ought to be interpreted. Such information is called instruction.

The receiver is the recipient of the communication process, the intended destination of a message or its unintended interceptor. The receiver may be present in the place and at the time of the


102 Culler, Poetics, p. 258.
framing of a statement or not, but, as observed earlier, the statement, while potentially a communicative act, does not become a message until a receiver perceives and interprets it. Just as with the sender, for the purposes of this inquiry, a receiver is (1) an individual human being, (2) a group of human beings, or (3) something within an individual human being.

The term "feedback" implies the coupling of a sender and a receiver in a stimulus-response hook-up, where the sender's output is the receiver's input and vice versa. The term therefore implies a multi-lateral, not a unilateral state of communicative affairs. "Feedback," then, refers (1) to the perceivable responses of a receiver of a completed or an ongoing statement or message and (2) to the control a sender is able to exercise over the meaning of a completed message or over an ongoing process of encoding to adjust the message in the light of observable information about its effects.103

It should now be possible to construct a model of the communication process on the order of that in Figure 2 below.

external factors
| internal factors
| messages (as information or expression)
| interpreted message
| internal factors
| sender coded statements
| channel
| receiver coded messages
| feedback subcodes (feedback)

FIGURE 2.--The communication process model. 104

General Implications of the Communication Model for This Inquiry

Any social organization may be considered as "a set of roles tied together with channels of communication" 105 and analyzed in communication process terms. The individuals involved in a communication system carry "the history of the system through its developing stages in time." 106 Experiences that have been intraorganismically codified and stored by an individual participant in a communicative process can be recalled and realized as feeling, knowledge, or action. Thus, conscious replaying of events from memory may be regarded as the result of a feedback process within the individual that earmarks certain events, more often those which are emotionally charged, for special re-examination. 107

---


105 Ruben and Kim, pp. 24-31.

106 Ibid., p. 197.

107 Ruesch, pp. 131-132.
The individual is not the unit of study for communication systems theory, however. The structure and function of a communication system may be observed only in the communicative behaviors of the human components of the system. The unit of study, then, is the communicative act, and since, as the above definition of feedback has shown, coupling of sender and receiver is of great importance to the model communicative process, the most important unit of study and analysis for communication systems theory is the double-interactive or transactional. The importance of this fact for a semiological inquiry lies in the way the communication model here complements the linguistic model, which tends to take the single coded statement or message as its unit of study, rather than the entire behavioral process of sending, receiving, and feeding back.

The communicative act, like all behaviors, has no enduring existence in space. The communication system, therefore, must be described in terms of the transient durations of its sequences of communicative behavior in time. The structure of a communications system, then, is not primarily defined in spatial terms, as is the structure of a physical system. It is defined primarily as a series of interaction sequences that delineate and qualify relationships between the individual human components of the system at a given point in or over a period of time.

The structure of a communication system, then, is composed of transactional (double-interactive) units that are self-corrective
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108Ruesch, p. 128; Ruben and Kim, pp. 197-198.

109Ruben and Kim, p. 199.
behaviors and that are somewhat regulated and predictable. The regularity of a system, its maintenance in a steady state, is promoted by deviation-correcting feedback loops (called negative feedback), while the evolutionary development of a system, its disequilibrium in a state of flux, is promoted by deviation-amplifying feedback loops (called positive feedback).\textsuperscript{110}

The functional duration of a communication system in time may be characterized as existing either (1) in a state of equilibrium characterized by negative feedback in which events in the communicative behavioral sequences will be predictable with a high degree of probability or (2) in a state of disequilibrium characterized by positive feedback in which prediction of events will be more difficult because the system is growing or changing.\textsuperscript{111}

The structural configuration of a communication system, while transient in space, may be of three kinds: (1) intrapersonal, where communication is carried out within the self; (2) interpersonal, where there is active sending on the part of at least one person, conscious or unconscious receiving on the part of at least one other person, and realization on the part of the sender that receiving has taken place; and (3) group, which may be of one to many, of many to one, or of many to many. When group communication is of one to many or of many to many, messages may move in a one-way direction and receivers may be unable to feed back immediately or at all.\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{110}Ibid., p. 200; Ruesch, pp. 126-127.

\textsuperscript{111}Ruben and Kim, p. 201.

\textsuperscript{112}Ruesch, p. 129.
When group communication is of many to many, language as a code loses some of its importance, giving way, at least in some degree, to a code of group activity to which each individual participant in the group encoding contributes an isolated bit that may be relatively useless to himself alone, but that when contributed to the group act, falls into place in a larger pattern of significance. Such a group-action code may become the predominant or even the exclusive code of a group-to-group communicative act, relegating language to subcode status or even excluding it from the process altogether. The message derived from such a group-to-group communicative process is more than a mere sum of its individual communicative components.\textsuperscript{113}

All socio-cultural encounters, whether between individuals, between individual and group, or between groups, are, or tend to become, structured; that is, the participants observe existing rules or establish new ones to govern who may communicate with whom under what conditions, about what subjects, and so on. Being competent to identify the social frame that applies to a given communicative situation is the key to choosing the relevant set of communication-governing rules and thus to being able to fill a participational role, understand the direction, origin, and destination of messages, understand the arrangement of the spatial environment, and interpret messages correctly.\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{113}Ibid., p. 75. \textsuperscript{114}Ruesch, p. 133.
There is a limit to the number of incoming and outgoing messages an individual or group can handle before a communication system is overloaded and tends to disintegrate.\textsuperscript{115}

Advantages of the Communication Model Complementary to Those of the Linguistic Model

The communication model suggests that the theorist should directly observe communicative behavior and derive all significance from the observable acts rather than from the psychological characteristics of individual participants that may be abstracted from the acts. It suggests that analysis should be made in interactive terms rather than in terms of a one-way chain of cause and effect. It suggests a whole-process approach rather than a message only, sender-message only, or message-receiver only focus.

The communication model suggests that individual communicative acts may be observed and analysed within their whole context of transaction sequences and not in isolation. Finally, it suggests a qualitative analysis in terms of predictability rather than a non-qualitative analysis in terms of linear causality.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{115}Ibid., pp. 129-130.

\textsuperscript{116}Ruben and Kim, pp. 201-203.
Strategies for Application of the Linguistic Model in This Inquiry

Scientific and Analogical Models

Language, inasmuch as it is not self-corrective but requires human intervention for changes to be made, is not a system in the "hard" systems theory sense. The linguistic model is not, therefore, a product of a hard science like the physical sciences, but of a "soft" social science. The linguistic model, then, is not a hardware model but an analogical and theoretical model. As an analogical model, it hypothesizes similarities between one aspect of linguistic reality and another and then tests the hypotheses; as a theoretical model, it strives to represent the main features of an aspect of linguistic reality (and the relationships between those features) as a hardware model does, but in terms of a conceptual framework of metalinguistic verbal abstractions rather than in terms of concrete substance.

Phillip Pettit believes that the linguistic model is not productive of science when applied outside of linguistics itself, since it is not productive of theory in the extra-linguistic areas to which it is applied. He therefore accords it only analogical status in those areas.

The structuralist endeavor in artistic fields is often attacked as excessively formal if carried out by structuralists who
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118 Berry, pp. 17-18.

119 Pettit, pp. 100-109, 116, 117.
are linguists and as trivially metaphorical if carried out by structuralists who are critics. This inquiry attempts to steer a middle course while taking issue with Pettit's premature decision that the linguistic model, while analogically useful, is incapable of producing interesting theory outside of linguistics proper.

**Homeomorphic and Paramorphic Applications of the Linguistic Model**

The most obvious area of application of the linguistic model to an art form of which a natural language is a component is the first-order denoted language itself. In such an application, the linguistic model acts as a homeomorph. The chief homeomorphic use of the linguistic model is for the analysis of stylistic devices, particularly in poetry as already noted. The analyst attempts to account for effects by examining the reasons for every choice represented in the strings of words in his corpus at the syntactic level, presupposing that semantic purposes could have been achieved in other ways.

At first glance, it would seem that the application of the linguistic model to the natural-language sentences of other literary forms, such as the short story, the novel, and the epic, would also be homeomorphic since the linguistic model is still being applied to linguistic material, but the units and combinatory patterns of narrative are connotators; that is, they are constructed out of the first-
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120Segre, pp. 8-9.

121Pettit, p. 40; Segre, pp. 10-11; Culler, p. 55.
order natural language sentences but are themselves non-linguistic components of the narrative—actions, characters, plot, and so on. Narrative analysts, then, are using the linguistic model as a para-morph, for it is not the first-order sentences of a natural language which are being treated on the linguistic model of the sentence but things in some way analogous to sentences—texts, performances, buildings, paintings, outfits, menus, and so on.

The fields regarded as amenable to paramorphic application of the linguistic model fall within three general categories: (1) the literary arts, (2) the non-literary arts, and (3) the customary arts. Pettit classifies drama as a literary art, revealing his own literary bias. Drama is seldom literary by primary intent, and some of its components, like music and setting, belong to the realm of non-literary arts, while others, like costume, belong to the realm of customary arts. Dramatic art, then, Pettit's classification of it notwithstanding, extends over all three areas cited for paramorphic application of the linguistic model.

The next problem comes in the area of what is to be considered equivalent to a sentence. Traditionally, as Pettit points out, literary (that is, primarily narrative) structuralists have drawn the analogy between the individual narrative text and the sentence on the grounds that (1) the text expresses an author's state of mind as a sentence expresses a speaker's; that is, each may be considered a unified utterance, (2) the meaning of the text is more than the sum of

122Pettit, p. 42.
its sentences as the meaning of the sentence is more than the sum of
its words, (3) the text is articulated of narrative units as the
sentence is articulated of verbal units, (4) alteration of the
narrative parts of the text will alter the meaning of the text as
alterations of the verbal parts of a sentence will alter the meaning
of the sentence, and (5) the meaning of every narrative part of the
text is determined by the narrative parts which could have occurred in
its place without making the whole text nonsensical, as the meaning of
each verbal part of the sentence is determined by the verbal parts
which could have occurred in its place without making the whole sen-
tence nonsensical.\textsuperscript{123}

It is significant that in the terms of the analogy there seems
to be no attempt to examine the foundations upon which the argument
could be advanced as more than analogical, that is, a careful examina-
tion of how the narrative parts develop out of the linguistic parts.
Such an examination is by-passed in the leap from the first-order
linguistic level to the second-order narrative level. In the case of
narrative, however, such a leap is relatively seemly, for the first-
order units of narrative are, after all, sentences, but even here the
jump from sentence-as-text to text-as-sentence needs to be questioned.
If a text can be considered a sentence, why cannot one chapter of a
text or one episode of a chapter or one action of an episode or one of
Propp's functions, for example, also be considered a sentence? Moving
in the opposite direction, why cannot a trilogy of which a single text
forms a part or the works of a single author or of a single literary

\textsuperscript{123}Pettit, pp. 42-43.
genre also be considered a sentence? The analogy loses some of its heuristic force when it must be seen that the text-as-sentence is composed of other narrative "sentences" nesting within each other like Chinese boxes until the smallest is composed no longer of narrative sentences but only of the first-order linguistic sentences of the natural language in which the narrative is written.

If possible sentence levels are regarded as forming a continuum from smallest to largest, it may readily been seen that structuralist analysis and description carried out on the analogy between "sentences" from the larger end of the spectrum and language sentences will produce results that apply only to the work or set of works in question. Most structuralist work in the field of narrative literature has been of that kind. Structuralist analysis and description carried out on the analogy between "sentences" from the smaller end of the spectrum and language sentences have a better chance of producing results which, like those of the linguistic model itself, will be applicable to and, in turn, capable of modeling not merely a single text or the work of a single author but the whole range of the synchronic state of the artistic "language" in question. If the linguistic model is to be used as anything more than an analogical tool, it will surely be in the interest of the structuralist enterprise to call only the smallest of the second-order units "sentences" of the "language" in question and to find other names for the larger units, for the linguistic model provides a very exacting description of a sentence, which should not be too loosely applied to structures as large as an entire text. Linguistically, there are at least
several sentences in a discourse of any considerable length, and there is no reason to assume beforehand that the same is not true at the second-order level of narrative.

The jump from first- to second-order levels in areas where a natural language does not comprise the first-order level but only a part thereof, if any part at all, such as the drama and the cinema, is premature, at least until, as mentioned above, the first-order "language" of those systems is as thoroughly described by a dramatic or cinematic theory as natural language is by linguistics. Even more inappropriate is the leap represented by the analogy between the natural language sentence and the dramatic or cinematic "text."

This inquiry applies the linguistic model as a paramorph in that, as already mentioned, natural language is not considered the primary substance of drama. The inquiry stays as close to the linguistic model as possible, however, directing itself first and foremost to the first-order language of dramatic discourse in an attempt, through the application of the linguistic model, to model the dramatic language into an equivalent dramatic model, which may then be applied as a homeomorph in its own right. Only secondarily is the inquiry directed (still remaining as close to the linguistic model as possible) to the second-order language of dramatic discourse in an attempt to determine (1) how the second-order units emerge from the first-order units, (2) what units constitute the "sentences" of the second-order dramatic language, and (3) what the rank scale of second-order units is, working always step-by-step from the smaller units toward the larger and fully integrating the former within the latter at each ascending level.
Four Paramorphic Options in Applying the Linguistic Model

Pettit describes four options for application of the linguistic model as a paramorph: (1) straight analysis, (2) systematic analysis, (3) generative theory, and (4) descriptive theory. This inquiry presses the case for a descriptive theory of the drama against Pettit's argument that if the structuralist inquiry defines the elements with which it is concerned in abstract terms, although it will be able to keep its distance from particular strings in a way in which straight and systematic analysis cannot, the abstractly defined combinations of abstract elements will not "link up sufficiently tightly with the particular strings" which they strive to illuminate. "Usually, any combination will be capable of being associated with a number of significantly distinctive strings. Thus the general theory will be of little semiological interest," since "it will not serve the primary goal of explaining how different strings produce distinctive meanings."

The extent to which this inquiry succeeds in pressing the case for a descriptive theory of the drama in the face of those objections will, once again, be determined by the inquiry's effectiveness in accounting for the reader's dramatic competence. Otherwise, the objections cited might equally well be advanced against the formulations of linguistics itself.
This section concludes the laying of groundwork preliminary to commencing the inquiry proper. Although the survey has been extensive, it is appropriate in an inquiry into dramatic theory that draws so heavily upon a field of knowledge—linguistics—with which the traditional dramatic theorist cannot be expected to be familiar.

124Pettit, p. 54.
CHAPTER II

LINGUISTICS AND POETICS

Looking at the poetics of the drama in the light of the linguistic model is of value in directing the attention of dramatic theorists towards gaps in the existing theoretical models of the drama. This chapter shows how the poetics of the drama might be organized as a field of knowledge with the linguistic model as a guide.

General or Theoretical Poetics

A general or theoretical poetics of the drama, as modeled on general or theoretical linguistics, would study the nature of drama as evidenced by what all plays have in common. The traditional poetics of the drama are of this kind. It is against such a poetics that Roger Gross inveighs when he says that "talk of the 'rules' or 'nature' of Drama describes 'what people do' and 'how people respond' not 'what Drama is' or 'what it demands.'"¹ His complaint is the usual one: that poetics is descriptive, not prescriptive.

In linguistics, though, the case for a general theory is more soundly based than in traditional poetics. General and theoretical linguistics operates at the highest level of abstraction within the

¹Gross, p. 7.
field of linguistics, but it is carefully erected upon a solid
descriptive and contrastive linguistic base. Traditional poetics of
the drama, while operating at the same high level of abstraction, has
no such objectified descriptive and contrastive base. Its conclusions
are accordingly far more impressionistic than those of general
linguistics.

A primary purpose of this study is to move toward the creation
of just such a descriptive and contrastive poetics as might serve as
the suitable basis for a more objective general or theoretical poetics
of the drama. This general poetics would then be concerned, like the
mythological studies of Claude Levi-Strauss, not only with the
meanings plays have for individuals who know only the plays of their
own society, but also with the meanings plays might have within a
global system of plays, within drama as an institution.\(^2\)

**Descriptive (Synchronic) Poetics**

A descriptive poetics of the drama, as modeled on descriptive
linguistics (defined above, p. 5), would study a particular dramatic
"language" in order to describe the systemic patterns in it at a given
point in time.

Descriptions are not true or false; they are accurate or
inaccurate. "There is no problem," David Cohen explains, "with having
quite different descriptions of the same language, as long as they are
all accurate."\(^3\)

\(^2\)Culler, Poetics, p. 50.

\(^3\)David Cohen, ed. Explaining Linguistic Phenomena (New York:
Following the linguistic model, a descriptive poetics of the drama would hold that all varieties of dramatic "language" are equally reputable and equally deserving of description; that is, it would follow a descriptive rather than a prescriptive approach.

Linguistic descriptions are characteristically synchronic. The synchronic study of a language involves "an attempt to reconstruct the system" of that language "as a functional whole, to determine... what is involved in knowing" that language "at any given time." The synchronic study of a language is like an X-ray photograph, freezing a structural moment from the flow of the language's evolution in time; it is an isolated temporal cross-section of the language modeled in metalinguistic terms. Linguistic descriptions model language systems at given points in time and not across stretches of time. On the linguistic model, therefore, poetic descriptions would model dramatic systems at given points in time.

Roger Gross goes so far as to say that "the description which accounts for the work most thoroughly is the apt interpretation." Although he does not use the term "description" in quite the way in which it is used here, Gross has given theorists a sound guideline in this statement. The statement suggests a question, however: if the study is descriptive, what is being described? In the case of linguistics, a particular natural language is being described, but what of drama? Is all drama to be considered one language, or are there separate dramatic languages within the global institution of the

---

4Culler, Poetics, p. 12. 5Gross, p. 43.
drama? In Chapter I the question was raised as to what should be considered the dramatic equivalent of a sentence. Before that question can be answered, the question as to what should be considered the dramatic equivalent of a language must be resolved. Gross's statement about description just cited plainly implies that each separate work should be considered as an independent system or, in terms of the linguistic model, as a "language" in itself. Jonathan Culler asks the question with reference to literature: "Is the individual literary work like a language or is literature as a whole like a language?"^6

"Language is concretely realized in terms of national languages or dialects," Cesare Segre points out, "each single one of which is valid for only a very small fraction of mankind." He warns that non-linguistic, semiotic systems of signs, unlike language systems, may be "intelligible to quite large numbers of individuals, often to the whole of mankind,"^7 as with the mime or the silent cinema.

In the case of the analogy between the individual work and a language, Culler points out, "a number of linguistic concepts can be applied by extension or in a metaphorical way" to individual works: "one can speak of the work as a system, whose elements are defined by their relations to one another," or, as we have already seen in Chapter I, "of sequences whose functions in the work correspond to those of nouns, verbs and adjectives in the sentence."^8
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^6 Culler, Poetics, p. 96.
^7 Segre, p. 54.
^8 Culler, Poetics, p. 96.
in such an event, becomes an end in itself. "One's task is to deconstruct and understand" the work in question "just as the linguist's task is to understand the language he is studying; and one may, to this end, draw upon whatever linguistic concepts seem useful." 9

In the case of the analogy between the global institution of the drama and a language, Culler points out, "the analogy is stronger and more interesting;" since drama itself is "a system of signs and in this respect like a language, one postulates a poetics which would study" drama "as linguistics studies language, taking its cue from linguistics wherever that seemed possible." 10 Analysis of individual works, in such an event, becomes a means to an end. "One's task is not to elucidate the meaning of individual works," as Gross's statement suggests, "any more than it is the linguist's task to study individual sentences and tell us what they mean, but to study works as manifestations" of a dramatic system "and to show how the conventions of that system enable works to have meaning." 11

One further point of clarification needs to be made before a decision is made as to the dramatic equivalent of a language. Culler makes the point with reference to the mythological studies of Levi-Strauss:

Levi-Strauss is trying to show that myths from various cultures do go together, as the parole of a general mythological language; but the linguist does not have to prove the sentences of English should be treated as a group. He knows that there is a grammar of English because speakers of the language understand one another and make use of formal differences to

9 Ibid., p. 97.
10 Ibid., p. 96.
11 Ibid., p. 97.
12 Ibid., pp. 48-49.
communicate different meanings. The linguist can discover what functional differences are correlated with and responsible for differences of meaning by comparing and analysing sequences because he has information about judgments of speakers and the meaning of sentences. Comparison of /bet/ and /bed/ reveals a functional opposition which is used to communicate two different meanings. Levi-Strauss claims that meaning is revealed by comparing myths, but the differences between two myths drawn from different cultures are not used to communicate anything. Similarly, the differences between two plays drawn from different cultures are not used to communicate anything.

The corollary to Hypothesis 1 postulates a global homology between drama and language. While language is a global phenomenon, however, there is no single global language. When linguists speak of a language, therefore, they are referring to the language of only one of the world's cultures. In the interest of staying as close to the linguistic model as possible, a single dramatic language, for the purpose of this study, will consist of the plays of a cultural group which shares one of the world's natural languages. To so designate a dramatic "language" is not as slavish to the linguistic model as might first appear. Linguistic behavior is a large enough part of the surface phenomena of the vast majority of all dramatic performance to make the plays of any given culture generally unintelligible to spectators who do not understand the linguistic behavior of that culture.

By associating the dramatic language of each culture with the natural language of that culture, this study preserves the terms "dialect," "register," "idiolect" and "text" for poetic use with meanings that are closely analogous to their linguistic meanings.

The term "dialect" is used by linguists to refer to "a variety of language that may be understood by other speakers of that language,
although they do not necessarily share the same dialect."^{13}

Dialects are generally conceived by sociolinguists as geographically regional varieties of a language. The different dialects of a language, therefore, indicate different regional groups of users of the same language. The descriptive poetics of this study are confined to the American "dialect" of the dramatic "language" of the English-speaking world of the Twentieth Century. In determining the dialects of a non-linguistic language, it is important not to confuse variations in the articulation of signs, which are the genuine indicators of dialect, with variations in the meanings of the signs. In a play, a regional linguistic dialect may signify something about a character, but the presence of such a dialect as a signifier in the play does not indicate the presence of a dramatic "dialect." A dramatic "dialect" is present only where there is a variation in the way in which dramatic signs are articulated and that variation is attributable to the geographical origin of the dramatic utterance, regardless of what dialects may be used within that utterance as signs. It is important, in other words, not to confuse the concept of dramatic "dialect" with the literary notion of "local color." Dramatic dialect refers to a style of formal articulation; local color refers to a signified content.

In the case of the analogy between the individual work and a language, any production of a play might be considered a dramatic dialect, for it is in the production that the work achieves its geographical locus, which is altogether different from its internal,
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^{13}Lehmann, p. 276.
signifying setting. In the case of the analogy between the global institution of the drama and a language, the dramatic systems of the world's geographical cultures might be considered dramatic dialects. The concept of dramatic dialect seems too restricted in the case of the former analogy and too loose in the case of the latter to be of much use. The postulation of this inquiry is that linguistic behavior is a large enough part of surface phenomena of the vast majority of all dramatic performance to insure that dialect variations in the mother-tongue of the dramatic language signal the changes in culture that signal the dramatic dialect variations of dramatic sign articulation. In this study, then, the term "dramatic dialect" refers to a kind of national or regional (at any rate, cultural) variety of dramatic production style.

The term "register" is used by linguists to refer to "varieties of language determined by use, in contrast with dialect, which is related to the user." Zumthor and Segre postulate an analogy between the linguistic concept of register and the poetic concept of genre. Culler sounds a warning, however, that "genres are not special varieties of language but sets of expectations which allow sentences of a language to become signs of different kinds in a second order literary system." What Culler says about linguistic sequences may also be said of dramatic activity sequences: the same action, whether linguistic or kinetic, can have a different meaning

14Ibid., p. 277.
15Segre, p. 64.
16Culler, Poetica, p. 129.
depending upon the genre of the drama in which it appears. J. L. Styan similarly points out that "behind the conception of the script lie the genre conventions which it adopted or refused." The implications of these statements by Culler and Styan for dramatic structuralists are that if a theory of dramatic genres is ever going to be more than a mere grouping together of works on the basis of subjectively observed similarities, it must attempt to explain which features of the works are constitutive of the functional categories that have governed the writing, staging, reading, and viewing of plays. Comedy exists as a genre by virtue of the fact that to read or view something as a comedy involves a different set of expectations from reading or viewing something as a tragedy or as a melodrama.

Although the analogy between the linguistic concept of register and the poetic concept of genre is problematic, the dramatic "language" or sign system is used by distinct social groups across geographical boundaries in various specialized forms. Broadway, Off-Broadway, regional repertory, experimental, and street theatres have all developed distinct uses of the American dramatic dialect for social situations of direct concern to them. Such varying uses of the dramatic "language" are not restricted to geographic areas, as are the dramatic dialects. Tours carry Broadway uses of the American dramatic language across the nation and even abroad. These varying uses are restricted by the presence of cultural interest groups and may be thought of as dramatic registers, varieties of the dramatic "language" determined by their specialized uses. The descriptive poetics of this
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17Styan, Audience, p. 12. 18Culler, Poetics, pp. 136-137.
study is confined to the New York commercial theatre register of the American dialect of the dramatic language of the English-speaking world.

Closely related to the concept of register is the concept of "style." Language varieties "selected in accordance with social or intellectual contexts are often referred to as styles." While the registers are determined primarily by cultural special interest groups, the styles are determined primarily by ideological special interest groups. Thus it is appropriate to speak of a naturalistic style, an expressionistic style, an agit-prop style, a Bauhaus style, and so on.

The term "idiolect" is used by linguists to refer to the language of a single user and includes the concept of an individual style, while the term "text" is used to refer to a single item of idiolect. The descriptive poetics of this study are not confined to a particular idiolect or text for two reasons: (1) most structuralist studies of the drama to date are of the text-limited or the idiolect-limited type, and (2) this study seeks to describe a dramatic "language" system broader than the idiolect.

It must be re-emphasized that mere transfer of these terms from linguistics to poetics is of dubious value unless the supporting methodology is as productive in the case of poetics as it has been in the case of linguistics. As a model, analogy "suggests a line of inquiry; it does not provide... an established fact but... a

19Lehmann, p. 278.
hypothesis to be tested."\textsuperscript{20} At this point, all that can be said is that the adoption of the linguistic terms just described might resolve much of the confusion evident among even the most reputable dramatic theorists, as when J. L. Styan, for example, refers to naturalism as a genre.\textsuperscript{21}

**Contrastive (Diachronic) Poetics**

A contrastive poetics, as modeled on contrastive linguistics, would study the differences between two or more dramatic "language" descriptions, that is, between two or more particular dramatic languages, historical periods, dialects, registers, idiolects, or texts as they had been formulated by descriptive poetics. If the contrast were to be between two historical cross-sections of a single dramatic language, the differences would show historical development which might be formulated or accounted for in terms of a set of transformational rules. Linguists call such a contrast diachronic.

In a diachronic study of a language, the linguist attempts to trace the evolution of the elements of the language through its historical stages and to formulate that evolution in terms of a sequence of transformational rules. Adoption of the synchronic/diachronic dichotomy by poetics could revolutionize both dramatic theory (poetics) and theatre history. It could eliminate many of the misconceptions of traditional poetics, such as the tendency to take texts from periods widely separated in time and treat them as written or

\textsuperscript{20}Berry, p. 18. \textsuperscript{21}Styan, *Audience*, p. 73.
staged in the same dramatic "language." Adoption of the synchronic/diachronic distinction would serve as a reminder to theorists that two different dramatic "language" systems underlie the texts of, for example, Shakespeare and Shaw. Each of those systems could be described synchronically, independently of the other, and diachronic poetics could then attempt to formulate how the earlier system was transformed into the later.

Every dramatic "language" operates at a given point in time as an independent system. The history of dramatic "languages" is synchronically irrelevant. The synchronic/diachronic distinction can only be applied with respect to periods relatively well separated in time, however, since two dramatic dialects in use at the same time may differ from one another more significantly than two diachronically distinct states of the same dramatic language. Language change is only one aspect of language variation, the dimensions of language variation being geographical, cultural, social, and ideological as well as temporal.

The idea of a dramatic language community existing at a particular place and at a particular point in time is, of course, an abstraction, an idealization, a theoretical construct. So is the uniform dramatic language system that such a community presupposes. Both concepts are based on the somewhat deliberate and arbitrary minimizing of the variations in the dramatic behavior of those who are theoretically held to share a common dramatic language.

Jonathan Culler points out that synchronic and diachronic study "must be kept separate lest the diachronic point of view falsify one's
synchronic description. He goes on to say that a "language is a system of interrelated items" the value and identity of which are "defined by their place in the system rather than by their history," while Michael Lane points out that for the structuralist, "history is seen as the specific mode of development of a particular system, whose present or synchronic nature must be fully known before any account can be given of its evolution or diachronic nature."

Such prerequisite synchronic descriptions of dramatic language systems are precisely what is lacking in traditional attempts to construct a diachronic poetics of the drama. Not to perceive this is to repeat the error of the Renaissance interpreters of Aristotle, who attempted to read the Poetics as diachronic theory rather than as synchronic description. The neo-classical concept of Aristotle thus stands in relation to the institution of the drama as classical or traditional grammar stands in relation to the institution of the English language.

It is important to diachronic study that language change, whether over time or space, be described by the structuralist not as a result of causitive factors but in terms of a transformation of one structural configuration or patterning of elemental relations into another.

The history of an artistic "language" may seem at times to be more important to the present synchronic state of that language than
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22Culler, Poetics, p. 12.
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is the history of a natural language. Robert Scholes points out, for example, the unusual importance of the diachronic dimension to synchronic studies of poetry. Many native users of a dramatic language, however, are largely, if not entirely, ignorant of the history of that language, a fact which suggests that the history is irrelevant to the system as they know it.

Diachronic structuralist study is not evaluative. As Scholes puts it, "there is no progress in languages, only change."

Some contemporary dramatic theorists have pointed toward the necessity of adopting a distinction like the synchronic/diachronic dichotomy while falling short of actually formulating the distinction. Roger Gross, for example, refers to the fact that "most unspoken content is 'spoken' only to contemporary readers" and that "readers from other times must replace themselves in the period if they are not to miss what is often crucial content." Similarly, Bernard Beckerman has pointed out that "as a play ages and travels, its world of action encounters differing grounds of audience sensibility, which may no longer overlap the background of circumstance," and that "when this happens there is danger that, unless the two worlds can be brought into correspondence with one another, the potential for rich theatrical response will be severely curtailed."

Beckerman, who more than any other dramatic theorist has anticipated a
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26Scholes, pp. 30-31.
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structuralist poetics, notes that "a play utilizes modes of activity conventionalized by the historical era in which it is written" and "shaped to the kinds of activity that the accumulated practice of a theatre age approves." He goes on to point out that "each age fosters archetypal dramatic activities" which "recur in play after play of the age . . . ," that "each dramatic period seems to stress a particular type of plot-story ratio," that "each period acts upon the premise that such-or-such is the cause of behavior," that "each historical period . . . seems to have a characteristic stance . . . or silhouette," and that "each age finds its own balance between the poetic and the colloquial in speech." and so on. J. L. Styan points out that "a play . . . is an historical event," and that "the focus of attention is the experience of that play in a particular time."

These and other references too numerous to cite here point to the necessity of a distinction in dramatic theory analogous to the distinction between the synchronic and the diachronic study in structural linguistics.

**Sociopoetics**

A sociopoetics, as modeled on sociolinguistics, would study the ways in which social and cultural situations affect the way in which a dramatic language is used.

---
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Psychopoetics

A psychopoetics, as modeled on psycholinguistics, would study the ways in which the users of a dramatic language acquire their dramatic competence.

Systemic Poetics

A systemic poetics, as modeled on systemic linguistics, would be a type of sociopoetic approach that would study the social functions of a dramatic language and the ways in which that language fulfills those functions. It would consider understanding of the functions and their fulfillment to be necessary preconditions to understanding that language. A systemic poetics would thus be especially interested in dramatic registers and social dialects as well as in the concept of the appropriateness of dramatic utterances to their occasions.

Transformational-Generative Poetics

A transformational-generative poetics, as modeled on transformational-generative linguistics, would be a type of psychopoetic approach that would attempt to model dramatic competence in terms of transformational rules that would be capable of generating all possible combinations and permutations within a given dramatic language.

The remainder of this study is limited to an attempt to establish the feasibility of a descriptive poetics of the drama, primarily of the systemic sociopoetic type.
CHAPTER III
LANGUAGE AND SPEECH

Hypothesis 2:
drama : play = langue : parole

Langue and Parole

What is it, exactly, that a descriptive poetics is attempting to describe or model in a given dramatic "language"? Saussure made the revolutionary decision that the descriptive linguist should attempt to describe not the actual utterances produced by native speakers on specific occasions but the system of structural elements and their interrelations that underlies those utterances and makes them possible. This underlying, sub-surface, or "deep structure" system of law-like regularities he called la langue to distinguish it from the "surface structure" utterances or speech acts themselves, which he called la parole.

Langue, as Barthes points out, is, "so to speak, language minus speech; it is at the same time a social system and a system of values."1 It is important to remember, however, as Merleau-Ponty has pointed out, that there is no parole outside langue, that there is

1Barthes, p. 14.
no langue without parole, and that it is only through parole that we
discover langue and only langue which makes parole possible.

Transformational-generative linguists call langue "competence"
and regard it as a form of knowing. They call parole "performance"
and regard it as a form of doing. For the transformational-generative
linguist, then,

\[ \text{competence} : \text{performance} = \text{langue} : \text{parole} \]

and

\[ \text{competence} : \text{performance} = \text{knowing} : \text{doing}. \]

Transformational-generative linguists refer to the structure of per­
formance as "surface structure" and to the structure of competence as
"deep structure."

Systemic linguists call langue "linguistic behavior potential"
and regard it as a systematized set of options from which a native
speaker's language and the culture of his speech community allow him
to select his linguistic expressions. They call parole "actual
linguistic behavior." For the systemic linguist, then,

\[ \text{linguistic behavior potential} : \text{actual linguistic behavior} = \]

\[ \text{langue} : \text{parole} \]

and

\[ \text{linguistic behavior potential} : \text{actual linguistic behavior} = \]

\[ \text{can do} : \text{does}. \]

The essential difference between the two schools in this matter
lies in the fact that while the competence concept of the

\[ ^2 \text{Berry, pp. 23-24.} \]
transformational-generative linguists is basically regarded as belonging to an individual, the behavior potential concept of the systemic linguists is basically regarded as belonging to a community. Accordingly, transformational-generative linguists, following their "knowing" concept of langue, define grammaticality in terms of the intuition of the individual native speaker or "informant," while systemic linguists, shunning the transformational-generative concept of "acceptability" to individual native speakers, and following their own "can do" concept of langue, define grammaticality in terms of the predictability of occurrence of utterances within the contexts of their occasions.

The systemic theorist thus considers what individuals do on particular occasions (parole) in the context of what they can do (langue). Hypotheses about what the individuals of a specific cultural group can do are verified by observation of what they actually do in forming utterances. The language is then represented as a set of "systems," behavioral options available in a specifiable environment.

Saussure emphasized the socially contractual and thus supra-individual aspects of langue and yet claimed its ontological reality as somehow stored in the brain of every member of a given speech community. 3 Parole, as Barthes points out, "is essentially an individual act of selection and actualization" and not pure

creation. V. Brøndal points out that "a language (langue) is. . . a set of essential types, which speech (parole) actualizes in an infinite variety of ways." Langue is a kind of precipitate sifted from the practice of parole, "a collective summa of individual imprints" that "must remain incomplete at the level of each isolated individual."

As Barthes points out, "historically, speech phenomena always precede language phenomena (it is speech which makes language evolve)" and thus langue is "at the same time the product and the instrument of" parole, and "their relationship is therefore a genuinely dialectical one."

Drama and Play

Barthes claims that it is acceptable, within the Saussurean framework, to identify the langue of linguistic theory with the code of communication theory and to identify the parole of linguistic theory with the message of communication theory. In terms of the communications model, then,

\[
\text{code : message = langue : parole.}
\]

It was M. Merleau-Ponty, Barthes says, who first broadened Saussure's langue/parole dichotomy for application to non-linguistic semiology.

---


5V. Brøndal, Acta linguistica, p. 5, as cited in Barthes, p. 15.

6Barthes, p. 16.
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8Ibid., pp. 18-19.
"by postulating that any process pre-supposes a system: thus there has been elaborated an opposition between event and structure which has become accepted." Barthes himself then postulates "that there exists a general category langue/parole, which embraces all systems of signs," so that the terms and the dichotomy they express are apt "even when they are applied to communications whose substance is not verbal." The problem faced by dramatic theorists is exactly analogous to that faced by linguistic theorists before Saussure's postulation of the langue/parole dichotomy. Just as the word "language" is loosely used to designate both the individual utterances (parole), whether as speech acts or as written texts, and the underlying language system (langue), so also the term "drama" is loosely used to designate both the individual dramatic work, as scripted or performed, and the underlying dramatic system.

As mentioned in the first chapter, Roger Gross has anticipated the need for a terminology to split the dramatic langue from the dramatic parole. He has thus postulated a distinction between drama, play, and playscript. In his study, the term "drama" is equated with the underlying dramatic system, the dramatic langue. What, then, is the parole of that system?

Roger Gross uses the term "play" to designate "the name of a kind of occurrence," pointing out that "it does not exist; it

---


10 Barthes, p. 25.
happens," that it "has no 'body'" but is "the behavior of bodies... , a specific instance of the performance of a story for an audience which is aware that it is seeing a play."\textsuperscript{11} The problem with this definition is the significant appearance within it of the term "story." Having said that "a play is a specific instance of the performance" of something, Gross could not very well go on to say that it was a specific instance of the performance of a play, so he weakened his definition by introducing the term "story," which solves the immediate difficulty but introduces a new one, the confusion of play with narrative.

In linguistics, speech (parole) can mean either linguistic behavior in the abstract or a single linguistic utterance, whereas in poetics, play means something extra-dramatic in the abstract (see Hypothesis 2 and Figure 1). In other words, while there is no speech outside of language, there is play outside of drama. The terms "production" and "performance" are unsatisfactory for the same reason. The welter of confusion over the terms "drama," "play," "production," and "performance," each of which is persistently confused with all of the others, must be resolved if the dramatic theorist is ever to have at hand an adequate terminology. This study posits the following set of definitions:

A performance is one instance of a production. A production is one instance of a play. A play is one instance of the institution of the drama. \textbf{Death of a Salesman} is a play. The play \textbf{Death of a}

\textsuperscript{11}Gross, pp. 4-5.
Salesman consists of many productions, each production consisting of one or more performances. The play, that is, consists of a performance history, but it also consists of a performance potential governed by the survival of a playscript, about which more will be said shortly.

"Play" is the most ambivalent of the terms, freighted as it is with the intersection of the fields of literature, theatre, and recreation in general so that it may refer to either of the actual manifestations of the dramatic system, the performance or the playscript. "Play" thus includes both script and performance just as "speech" (parole) includes both written text and speech act. This study uses the term "play" to designate the activity of dramatic performance, that is, actual dramatic behavior, whether in the abstract or in the particular. Play is, then, the parole of the dramatic sign system.

Thus it becomes possible to formulate a drama/play dichotomy for dramatic theory analogous to the langue/parole dichotomy of linguistics. Then and only then does it become clear, in the light of the linguistic model, that there is no drama without plays, that there are no plays outside drama, and that it is through plays and only through plays that we discover drama. Finally, it may be seen that just as langue is both the product and the instrument of parole, drama is both the product of plays and the means by which plays are generated.

Playscript

The third of Gross's terms is "playscript," which he defines as "a symbolic notation on which certain kinds of play are based,"
pointing out that it is "no more identical with the play than a set of written instructions for making a painting is a painting." It is not "'the play in another medium' nor does it 'represent' the play; it implies a play." Unlike drama and play, a playscript is a thing, "a written statement of words to be spoken by actors; it may also include instructions for use of other theatrical workers."\(^{12}\)

When the playscript-performance relationship is viewed from a transformational-generative point of view, the status of the playscript as an intermediate structure becomes immediately clear. Just as language has both a phonic (performance) substance and a graphic (textual) substance, drama has both a performance substance and a playscript substance. Just as writing, while originally following speech, may now either follow or precede it, playscript, whether originally preceding or following performance, may now either follow or precede it. Regardless of whether playscript precedes or follows performance, once it exists, it can have only two purposes: (1) to generate performances and (2) to serve as a record of a performance and perhaps thereby to substitute for the performance.

Whereas Gross says that the playscript "implies" a play, the transformational-generative model offers the more accurate explanation that the playscript exists primarily to generate productions and performances of a play and that once the playscript is in existence, and for as long as it is in existence, productions and performances based on it may be regarded as transformations of it. Drama may thus

\(^{12}\)Ibid.
be seen to have two surface structures, one literary (the playscript) and the other theatrical (the performance). From the point of view of the institution of literature, a playscript is a completed work of art and already a record of the performance of a playwright; it is a text. While the performance of language is speech and the performance of literature is text, the performance of drama is presentational enactment. From the point of view of the institution of drama, therefore, the playscript is far from being a completed work of art. It is what the transformational-generative model calls an "intermediate structure." That is, a playscript represents a transformation of the underlying dramatic system and, at the same time, serves as a controlling or commanding form in generating the productions and performances based on it.

Whereas Gross says that a playscript is a "set of instructions," the transformational-generative model once again offers the more accurate explanation that the playscript serves as a governing structure underlying performance behavior generated from it. It is important to remember that because a playscript represents a deeper level of structure than a performance, it is more general or abstract than the performance it generates and thus does not command performance precisely, as does a musical score or a recipe, but within certain tolerances, as does a linguistic structure. Thus, for example, the linguistic structure subject-predicate-complement-adjunct establishes critical criteria and not precise instructions for the generation of the sentence "John studied his grammar by night." Just as the structural element "subject" does not restrict to one
"John") the items which may be used to represent it, a playscript only loosely restricts the performance items and activities that represent it. The structural element "subject" establishes, however, certain criteria which dictate that words like "teach," "demonstrate," and "articulate" can never represent "subject" just as the playscript of Death of a Salesman, although it does not dictate the height, weight, and color of eyes and hair of the actress representing Linda, does establish criteria which dictate that Linda will not be represented by a male or as a sixteen-year-old.

Some special cases need to be mentioned. Some playscripts, often called "closet dramas," are intended and consumed solely as literary products. Those are playscripts that were written prior to performance with no intention of generating performance. Though they are called closet drama or fireside theatre, those are misnomers, and such playscripts remain dramatic literature, and not drama.

As noted above, the second purpose that a playscript can have is to serve as a record of a performance and perhaps thereby to substitute for the performance. That purpose is, from the point of view of the institution of drama, inferior to the primary purpose of a playscript, which is to generate performances. Some playscripts, however, follow performances, the structure of which they crystalize or describe with no intention to generate future performances; they are intended and consumed solely as durable records of events never to be reattempted.

Finally, it is important to realize, especially in regard to plays with playscripts which follow performance, that any performance
beyond pure improvisation (extremely rare within the confines of the institution of the drama) is "scripted" in some sense. The rehearsal process itself, in the absence of a written text, can serve as a scripting process. The pre-performance rehearsal process deposits a precipitate of structure which "governs" or "generates" the ensuing performance as much as any written text does. As Richard Hornby points out, "it makes no difference whether a playscript is in the form of words, pictures, or some other kind of coded notation," to which might be added that there is no difference between a playscript in the form of a performer-internalized precipitate of any performance-generating process and one in the form of any of the afore-mentioned performance-generating objects.

The transformational-generative viewpoint thus suggests that the playscript does not, as Gross claims, "imply" a play so much as it generates a production, a set of performances. Both the playscript and the performances belong to the play, the performances as surface structures and the playscript as an underlying intermediate structure. Further, the playscript does, in fact, "represent" the play, contrary to Gross's claim, in the sense in which the formal items at each level of a linguistic structure represent the elements of structure that underlie and generate them, and in the same way, productions and performances represent the playscripts that underlie and generate them.

---

CHAPTER IV
THE DRAMATIC SIGN

The Linguistic Sign
Form and Substance

For Saussure, the distinction between substance and form provided another linguistic dichotomy like that between synchronic and diachronic study and that between *langue* and *parole*. As Lyons points out, Saussure's distinction between substance and form "is very similar to the Aristotelian and scholastic distinction of matter and form," though "it is perhaps terminologically unfortunate that Saussure employed the expression substance rather than matter since substance is opposed to both matter and form and has a quite different sense" in the Aristotelian tradition. For Saussure, substance is "the substratum of variation and individuality" in language. "It has no existence or actuality independently of form." The classic example, used by Lyons and developed by Hornby as a model for the text-performance relationship, comes from sculpture. The sculpture's stone, the substance of the sculpture, "is potentially many things. . . . It becomes one thing rather than another by the imposition of one form rather than another on the undifferentiated substratum."1 For

---

1 Lyons, pp. 239-240.
Saussure, language is the result of the imposition of form on two different substances: sound and thought.

Signifier and Signified

Saussure defined the linguistic sign as the union of a signifier (significant) and a signified (signifie), which he modeled as the two sides of a coin or of a piece of paper. The signifier is an acoustic image, the phonological composition of a moneme (word). The signified is a concept or mental image. It is of the first importance to Saussurean structuralism that a sign is not a mere signifier but a two-sided union of a signifier and a signified. It is also important that the signified is not a thing, a piece of empirical reality, but a concept, a mental phenomenon associated with the acoustic phenomena. The signified of the word "tree" is not an actual tree but a mental image of tree which is meant by the person using the sign. For Saussure, this act of meaning the signified by the signifier guarantees semantics a berth in structural linguistics. Ever since Saussure took that position there have been differences between linguists and among the various linguistic schools as to whether or not the signifieds of signs should be objects of study for linguistics. Some feel that linguistics should be concerned with signifiers alone, that linguistic procedures should be based purely upon form without regard to meaning, and that semantic classification should be left to extra-linguistic sciences, notably to psychology. Others feel that, since signifieds are not things but other signs, semantics should play some part in structural linguistics and that evidence about the semantic
features which account for similarity and difference of meaning between two signifiers should be admitted to linguistic science and incorporated into its model of language.\textsuperscript{2}

Significant Units and Distinctive Units

Andre Martinet first developed the famous theory of the "double articulation" of language in order to account for the amazing economy of linguistic expression that permits a severely limited number of "distinctive units" (the phonemes of the language, the sounds which are used to distinguish meaningful units but which have no meaning of their own) to combine in order to produce a vast number of "significant units" (the monemes, each of which has at least one meaning.)\textsuperscript{3}

Plane of Expression and Plane of Content

Barthes calls the plane of signifiers the "plane of Expression" or E-plane and the plane of signifieds the "plane of Content" or C-plane. Just as the individual sign may be modeled as a relation (R) between a signifier (Sr) and a signified (Sd) and thus as a SrRSd or \( \frac{Sr}{Sd} \) unit, so, when signs are joined together to form a discourse, that discourse may be modeled as a relation (R) between a plane of expression (E) and a plane of content (C) and thus as an ERC or \( E \) \( C \) continuum.\textsuperscript{4} Hjelmslev points out that each of the two

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
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\bibitem{4} Barthes, pp. 89-90; Segre, p. 65.
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planes has a substance and a form so that the completed model of a discourse should show at least four levels: (1) the substance of expression (of the signifiers), which consists of (a) the raw sounds that are the objects of phonetic rather than of phonological study or (b) the random marks of which graphic representations of language sounds are made; (2) the form of expression (of the signifiers), which consists of the regulated shaping or combination of sounds or letters as phonemes or graphemes to form monemes, functional units with meaning; (3) the substance of content (of the signified), which consists of the raw ideational and affective aspects of the signifieds, the "nebulous and incoherent continuum of thought" as Lyons calls it; and (4) the form of content (of the signified), which consists of (a) the mental shaping or combination of ideational and affective aspects as sememes to form concepts and (b) the patterned systemic organization of concepts and their relations to one another within the system that is the discourse. 5

The Arbitrary and the Motivated

In language, the relationship between a signifier and its signified is arbitrary. This arbitrariness of the signifier-signified relationship accounts for the fact that nearly identical signifieds are associated with different signifiers in different languages, as "tree," "arbor," "Baum," and so on. At the same time, one must remember that the association of a signifier with a signified as an

5Ibid.
act of meaning called a "signification" is a learned association and is therefore not absolutely arbitrary in the sense that no native speaker is free to change it. Emile Benveniste therefore suggested saying that the act of signification (association of a specific acoustic image with a specific mental concept) is unmotivated rather than arbitrary with the notable exceptions of onomatopoeia and derivation, each of which shows a certain kind of motivation. Claude Levi-Strauss's way of putting it is that language is arbitrary a priori but non-arbitrary a posteriori on account of the social contract aspects of the act of signification once it has taken root in the language.

The Semiological Sign

Like the linguistic sign, the semiological sign is the result of the union of a signifier and a signified. Unlike the linguistic sign, the semiological sign often has a substance of expression the primary purpose of which is not signification but some other utilitarian function. An umbrella, for example, is primarily for the purpose of protection and only secondarily, on account of its socially conventional use, a sign of rain. In a similar manner, all objects used by a society become signs of their uses, and semiological signs of this type are called "sign-functions."

The Isological and the Non-Isological

Barthes employs the term "isology" to designate the way in which "language yields its signifiers and signifieds so that it is
impossible to dissociate and differentiate them,"\(^6\) or, as Lyons puts it, "word forms and meanings have no existence as units outside the particular languages in which they are actualized." The forms and meanings do not "exist independently of each other, for every word form is coupled with at least one meaning, and each meaning is associated with at least one word form."\(^7\) A distinction is thus made between the isological systems of the natural languages and the non-isological systems of some semiotic "languages" in which "the signified can be simply juxtaposed to its signifier."\(^8\) The non-isological systems are the "complex systems," in which different signifier substances are engaged simultaneously. Barthes' warning about these complex, non-isological systems is that it will "be premature to decide, in their case, which facts belong to the language and which belong to speech" until it can be discovered (1) "whether the 'language' of each of these complex systems is original or only compounded of the subsidiary 'languages' which have their places in them," and (2) how to analyse the subsidiary languages in the latter case. Non-isological systems are often taken up through natural language, as in the case of captions with photos, for example, making them easier to handle through the linguistic meta-language but also more dangerous because the semantic classification of the natural language may or may not coincide with the semantic classification of the semiotic system it subsumes.\(^9\)

\(^{6}\text{Barthes, pp. 43-44.}\)

\(^{7}\text{Lyons, p. 230.}\)

\(^{8}\text{Barthes, p. 44.}\)

\(^{9}\text{Ibid., p. 45.}\)
The Arbitrary and the Motivated in Semiology

"In most semiological systems," Barthes points out, "the language is elaborated not by the 'speaking mass' but by a deciding group." In such semiotic languages, "the sign is really and truly 'arbitrary' since it is founded in artificial fashion by a unilateral decision." Barthes calls such "fabricated languages" "logo-techniques," pointing out that "the user follows these languages, draws messages (or "speech") from them but has no part in their elaboration."^10

Syntactics, Semantics, and Pragmatics

Semioticians delineate three semiotic processes: (1) syntactics, the relations between signs on the surface (signifier or E-plane) level, (2) semantics, the relations of signifiers to their signifieds or of the E-plane to the C-plane, and (3) pragmatics, the relations of signs to their interpreters.^11

Semioticians, following the lead of the linguistic model, have tended to locate meaning along the syntactic axis of the sign system only, that is, to regard meaning as a function of the position of a sign within a signifying system. Attention has thus been shifted from the semantic consideration of what signs mean in isolation to the syntactic consideration of how the signs, through their formal relations to other signs within the sign context of a discourse or corpus of discourses, are capable of having the meanings attributed to

^10Ibid., p. 31.

them by those who have mastered the rules and norms of the system, the most important thing being not the meaning itself but the way in which the meaning is produced formally at the syntactic level.\textsuperscript{12}

The information theory model of communication, on the other hand, has located meaning along the semantic axis of the sign system, regarding meaning as a function of the relation of the signifier to its signified, while Charles Morris's semiotics locates meaning along the pragmatic axis of the sign system, regarding meaning as a function of the psychology of the interpreter of the sign under specified socio-cultural and environmental conditions.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{The Dramatic Sign}

The sentence is the preferred unit for linguistic analysis because all languages employ sentences. In attempting to discover the units of a drama, one must first decide which of the two dramatic surfaces should be taken for analysis. If the playscript is taken as the plane of expression, the advantages and disadvantages of a non-isological, complex system taken up into natural language immediately present themselves. Turning from the playscript as surface structure or plane of expression does not entirely eliminate the problem. Linguistics is a metalanguage, a language about language. This very study is written in a linguistic rather than wrought in a dramatic "metalanguage." Perhaps the closest thing to a

\textsuperscript{12}Wittig, p. 443; Culler, \textit{Poetics}, pp. 31, 38, 74; Segre, pp. 57-58.

\textsuperscript{13}Wittig, pp. 442, 444 and references there.
genuine dramatic "metalanguage" is Luigi Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author* in performance, since it provides us with a metadrama, a drama about the nature of the dramatic system.

In fact, as is shown later, the playscript, because of its special character as an intermediate structure, already encodes everything the analyst needs provided sufficient care is taken to compensate for its radically literary qualities. For now, however, the playscript must be put aside in favor of the preferred dramatic surface structure, the performance. The performance, because it renders visible and audible the C-plane of the playscript, is the prime dramatic surface, the finished product toward which the playscript points. As soon as the performance is chosen as the plane of expression for analysis, however, a new problem presents itself, the problem of analyzing a highly complex sign system consisting of at least thirteen component sub-systems.

**The Theatrical Sign**

It is important to remember that the fields of drama and theatre overlap but do not coincide (See Figure 1), but it is impossible to consider dramatic performance as a plane of expression for analysis without immediately acknowledging a debt to the Prague-school structuralists and to their researches into the theatrical sign. It must be kept in mind, however, that from the point of view of the dramatic system, the theatrical sign is important only as a unit in the E-plane of a play.
The finest extant survey of the theatrical sign in English is that made by Tadeusz Kowzan. He delineates thirteen "principal systems of signs used in a theatrical presentation." and distributes them among sets of distinctive features:

TABLE 1.—Kowzan's theatrical sign systems model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Spoken text</th>
<th>Auditive signs</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Auditive signs (actor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mime</td>
<td>Expression of the body</td>
<td>Actor</td>
<td>Space and time</td>
<td>Visual signs (actor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Make-up</td>
<td>Actor's external appearance</td>
<td>Visual signs</td>
<td>Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hair-style</td>
<td>Appearance of the stage</td>
<td>Outside the actor</td>
<td>Space and time</td>
<td>Visual signs (outside the actor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Costume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Accessory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Decor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Inarticulate sounds</td>
<td>Auditive signs</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>Auditive signs (outside the actor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sound effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Kowzan's segmentation of the theatrical E-plane into these thirteen systems of signification is descriptively accurate, each system should show a set of distinctive features which distinguish it from the other

---

14 Kowzan, p. 61. 15 Ibid., p. 73.
twelve. The thirteen systems may be distributed among eight distinguishing features as follows:

**TABLE 2.---Distribution of theatrical sign systems.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>Mime</th>
<th>Gesture</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Make-up</th>
<th>Hair style</th>
<th>Costume</th>
<th>Accessory</th>
<th>Decor</th>
<th>Lighting</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Sound effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mime</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make-up</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair style</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costume</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound effects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The features employed in the distribution chart differ in some respects from those used by Kowzan and require some explanation. A general principle used in making the distribution was to feature
each system as existing in its most characteristic state. It must be remembered, however, that the most revealing facts about the systems are to be discovered precisely at the points where the features do not seem to "fit."

Kowzan distinguishes between "the words pronounced by the actors during the presentation" and the way in which the words are pronounced, their intonation, rhythm, speed, and intensity. In keeping with Kowzan's distinction, the word system has been featured as [- expressive] and the tone system as [+ expressive], a distinction which his own chart does not reflect. An example of a system's being featured as existing in its most characteristic state is to be found at once in the word system, which is featured [+ actor] by Kowzan himself, notwithstanding his warning that "there is a specifically theatrical problem of the relationships between the subject speaking and the physical source of the word. Contrary to what happens in life, they do not always make one in the theatre." The classic example is, of course, the puppet show, in which "the consecutive movements of a puppet in the course of the dialogue mean that it is the puppet who 'is speaking.'" The word and its tone are featured by Kowzan as [- spatial], and yet, as anyone who has ever seen an out-of-synch film knows, verbal systems are in a sense visual through the influence of the articulation process upon the facial mime. The features "spatial" and "visual" provide a redundancy in Kowzan's distribution which has been eliminated in the chart, and Kowzan's

16Ibid., pp. 61-63. 
17Ibid., p. 62.
feature "auditive" is simply not needed in a set of features to
distinguish the thirteen systems.

Kowzan distinguishes among three movement systems: mime,
gesture and movement. By mime, Kowzan denotes facial mime or facial
expression. By gesture, he denotes "a movement or attitude of the
hand, the arm, the leg, the head, the whole body in order to create
and communicate signs."18 By movement, he denotes "the actor's
movements and his positions in the scenic space."19 In keeping with
Kowzan's distinctions, the mime system has been featured as [+ facial]
and the gesture and movement systems as [- facial]; at the same time,
the movement system has been featured as [- stationary] and the mime
and gesture systems as [+ stationary]. The weakness of this distribu­
tion is that while it distinguishes between the three systems, it does
not demonstrate the possibility that mime and gesture may accompany
movement.

Make-up is featured as [+ body] and [+ face] and costume is
featured as [- body] and [- face], a distinction which Kowzan's chart
does not make, though it is implied in his text. The best way to
distinguish the accessory system from the costume and decor system is
to feature accessory and costume as [+ actor] and decor as [- actor]
while featuring costume as [+ vestimentary] and accessory and decor as
[- vestimentary]. Thus, accessory denotes only non-vestimentary
objects and only as actually being used by an actor. A gun which is
worn is vestimentary and belongs to costume; a gun which is pointed

by an actor is non-vestimentary but used by an actor and belongs to accessory, and a gun which is lying on a table is non-vestimentary and not in use and belongs to decor. An item of costume which becomes detached from an actor (a coat over a chair) becomes an item of decor. An item of decor which is worn (lampshade as hat) becomes an item of costume. An item of decor which is used as a tool (chair as club) becomes an accessory item. An item of costume which is used as a tool (belt as whip) becomes an accessory item. Once again, one must remember the importance of concentrating on the spaces between systems (rather like the playing on the cracks between piano keys of the twelve-tone scale). Consider, for example, the case of mask. Kowzan assigns it to make-up "though, from the material viewpoint, it could be part of the costume, and from the functional viewpoint, part of the mime." The features of Figure 4 envision an organic bond between make-up and the actor's body which does not hold for costume. Hence, make-up is featured as [+ body] and [+ face] while costume is featured as [- body] and [- face]. In this context, it seems more reasonable to assign mask to costume.

Kowzan features decor as [+ temporal] but make-up, hair-style, and costume as [- temporal]. Make-up, hair-style, costume, and decor may all change in time, but they are essentially spatial rather than temporal in structure even though the spatial structures endure in time and one may be replaced by another. Therefore, decor has been featured as [- temporal] on the distribution chart in Table 2

---

20Ibid., p. 66.
although the exceptions of moving scenery and motion-picture scenography should be carefully noted. Once again the principle of featuring the system in its characteristic state has been applied.

Those requiring more detailed definition and exemplification of the signs falling within the compass of the thirteen signifying systems delineated by Kowzan are referred to his article. Kowzan's survey, interesting and vital as it is, is nevertheless very rough and shows clearly how much work remains to be done in the area of theatrical signification. More important to this study is the problem caused for the dramatic analyst by the apparently Babylonian confusion of the theatrical sign.

How can a "language" employing thirteen distinct sign systems be analyzed structurally without the analyst becoming lost in a monumental welter of complexity? Kowzan himself senses the difficulty when he calls, near the end of his article, for "determination of the significative (or semiological) unit of the spectacle," pointing out that "the significative unit for every system of signs must be determined and then the common denominator of all the signs, emitted together, must be found."21

It is important to recall Barthes' warning that the sign is not merely a signifier. The thirteen names that Kowzan gives to his sign systems are the names of the signifiers of those systems. What are the signifieds? Here the problem of the complexity of the theatrical

21Ibid., p. 79.
sign is increased by the concept of "foregrounding" described by Jindrich Honzl in "Dynamics of the Sign in the Theatre" and cited by Kowzan himself, who points out that "it is well to insist on the fact of the interchangeability of signs between different systems," by which he means not the interchangeability of signs but the interchangeability of signifiers or of signifieds. Thus a single signified, a geographical location for example, might have a signifier drawn from a single system of signification. The place of the action might be described in words, or it might be created with light, or it might be represented by a set of objects in the decor. However, a single signified, a wealthy man for example, might also have signifiers drawn from several systems of signification. The concept or mental image of a wealthy man might be simultaneously created through the use of gesture, costume, word, and tone. Finally, a single signifier may have more than one signified, as when a cane signifies that its user is a cripple and that he is wealthy (it is of costly material) at the same time.

If the thirteen theatrical sign systems are further complicated by the phenomenon of foregrounding, how is the complexity of the dramatic sign system ever to be reduced to the point at which analysis becomes a reasonable project without too reductively oversimplifying the system? Kowzan points out that situated between the polar extremes of semiological prodigality (many signifiers with few signifieds) and semiological parsimony (few signifiers with many

\[22\text{Matjecka and Titunik, pp. 74-93}\]

\[23\text{Kowzan, pp. 74-75.}\]
signifieds) lies the problem of the economy of signs. "This demands not only that they are not multiplied and repeated without any semantic or artistic necessity but also that among a large quantity of simultaneously communicated signs... the spectator can easily disengage the most important."24 This is the first indication of an order of relative importance existing among the signs.

Jonathan Culler, on the model of Noam Chomsky, points out that there is nothing for a theory to be right or wrong about unless there is something to explain, a competence. The ability of a spectator to "easily disengage the most important" dramatic signs, "those indispensable for an understanding of the work," is a fact in his competence for which theory must satisfactorily account. How is it that the spectator can easily identify the important from the unimportant dramatic signs, the indispensable from the dispensable? Two possibilities present themselves: (1) different kinds of signs are indispensable in different works or (2) the same kinds of signs are indispensable in all works, that is, within the dramatic "language" system as a whole. Again it is important to remember, however, that signs are not signifiers. Thus different kinds of signifiers or different kinds of signifieds or both may be indispensable in different works, or the same kinds of signifiers or the same kinds of signifieds or both may be indispensable in all works. If different kinds of signifiers and different kinds of signifieds may be indispensable in different dramatic works, there is no point in pursuing a

-------------------

24Ibid., p. 77.
comprehensive dramatic theory since one would then be limited to a poetics of the individual work or, at most, to the works of a single artist or artistic group. The existence of a competence to "easily disengage the most important" signs renders such a system highly improbable as it would be equivalent to a language in which the word sounds and their meanings were liable to change from utterance to utterance, requiring a constant relearning process on the part of the listener.

The prevalence of foregrounding and the semiological prodigality of the dramatic sign system render a system in which the same kinds of signifiers are indispensable in all works highly improbable. What seems, on the whole, most probable, therefore, is that the dramatic system allows different kinds of signifiers to be indispensable in different works while maintaining the same kinds of signifieds as indispensable in all works. How, then, is the indispensable dramatic sign to be found? Linguists know that the intuitive competence of native speakers can often provide the answers to such questions far in advance of adequate descriptive theory.

It is a commonplace of conventional theory that the dramatic art is an art of performer presence. Nine of the thirteen dramatic sign systems are featured as [+ actor]. It is a commonplace of conventional theory that drama is a spatio-temporal art form. Three of the nine [+ actor] sign systems are featured as both [+ space] and
These three systems are grouped together by Kowzan under the heading "Expression of the body." Appia's dictum that the moving actor expresses space in time and time in space comes to mind. Imagine a two-hour tableaux. Few with a native dramatic competence would call it drama. Drama is the imitation of an action, Aristotle tells us. The very word, Jane Harrison points out, derives from the Greek "dromenon," meaning "a thing done." Drama is doings. Something must happen. Someone must do something or cause something to do something. The essential dramatic signs, intuitive competence dictates, are incidents, doings, actions. Even the word and tone systems of language, as Beckerman points out, are "introduced through the activity of men speaking." What is essential to drama as signifier is activity; what is essential to drama as signified is action. The action may be foregrounded through any number of signifying activities in sequence or in combination.

Jan Mukářovsky, in extending the Saussurean distinction between signifier and signified for use in the field of art, suggests the analogy:

\[ \text{signifier : signified} = \text{artefact} : \text{esthetic object} \]

Otokar Zich, who was not concerned with semiotics, formulated a

\[ \text{temporal} \]

The distinctive feature "temporal" was added to the chart expressly to show this, as it is not required to distinguish between the systems.


Beckerman, p. 18.

Deak, p. 90.
technical-imaginary distinction which parallels Saussure–Mukarovsky's. His diagram is as follows.

TABLE 3.—Zich's model of the essential dramatic signs.\(^{29}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIST</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>IMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The actor</td>
<td>The actor's individual</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Dramatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>person</td>
<td>figure</td>
<td>character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of actors</td>
<td>Each actor's individual</td>
<td>Interplay</td>
<td>Dramatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>person</td>
<td>plot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zich's material/product distinction is very much like the substance/form distinction on the plane of expression (of the signifiers). Together, the material and the product make up the signifier (Mukarovsky's artefact). The image corresponds to the plane of content (of the signifieds) and is undifferentiated as to substance and form. It corresponds to Mukarovsky's esthetic object, Suzanne Langer's "virtual life,"\(^{30}\) Beckerman's "imagined act"\(^{31}\) and so on. The most interesting column is the first designating the artist as the origin of the theatrical sign. Kowzan himself points out that "the signs and their systems can also be classified according to the subjects of volition," that is, according to the artists "who create them by their will."\(^{32}\) The importance of this fact is that it

\(^{29}\)Ibid., p. 85.


\(^{31}\)Beckerman, p. 18.

\(^{32}\)Kowzan, p. 74.
provides a vantage point from which the thirteen signifying systems may all be viewed as the activity of the various artists articulating and elaborating them. Immediate actants, as in the case of the puppet show, need not even be human, but ultimately, the source of all dramatic activity is human. While Zich's model is important, however, it is even rougher in outline than Kozan's. While Zich refers to the substance of the signifier merely as "the actor's individual person," Kozan is much more detailed in including costume, make-up, hair-style, and accessory as material to be shaped into a stage figure. Furthermore, the stage figure need not consist of an actor's individual person at all. In fact, the material, as in the case of the marionette, may be wood or plastic rather than a human body and its accouterments. Similarly, the product of "each actor's individual person" need not be "interplay;" in fact, it need be no more than a collection of stage figures. Finally, the terms "character" and "plot" are freighted with confusing and needlessly restrictive meanings from their traditional usages over many centuries of theory. What is important, however, is that the model constitutes a first step in the reduction of the complexity of the dramatic sign system. Just as a linguistic utterance articulated partly in the speech code, partly in writing, partly with the beeps or flashes of Morse code, partly with semaphore flags, and partly in a gestural sign-language would still be comprised of the words that are the uniform linguistic signs common to all these systems of signification, so dramatic utterances articulated partly in words, partly with gestures, partly in
movements and so on are still comprised of the actions that are the uniform dramatic signs common to all these systems of signification.

In terms of the communication model, Zich's diagram shows the special character of the dramatic performance as organized along two axes of communication: (1) an artist-audience axis and (2) an artist-artist axis. The former is implied by Zich's use of the category "artist" in his model while the latter is implied by his designation of "interplay" as the "product" or form of the signifier on the E-plane of dramatic utterance.
Artist as sender and limited receiver

FIGURE 3.—The dual axes of dramatic communication.

The fictive events take place along the artist-artist axis while the actual events take place along the artists-audience axis. The complete set of artist-artist interacts constitutes the message of the artist-audience communicative act. Thus the message along the artist-audience axis is itself a full-fledged communication process in its own right. In this sense, a dramatic performance is a meta-communicative act.
Hypothesis 3:
activity : drama = sound : language
Hypothesis 4:
action : drama = word : language
Hypothesis 5:
signifier : signified = activity : action

Activity is thus the substance of dramatic performance, and action is its form. The dramatic action (imagined act) is the basic dramatic sign, just as the spoken word is the basic linguistic sign.

Finally, in his inductive search for the basic structure of a particular play or for the structural elements and configurational patterns of the dramatic "language" itself, the theorist is safe in citing scripts rather than performances even though the script is not an algorithm for the performance. The script provides a commanding form for the performances based on it by effectively encoding the constants which are to appear in all performances. This encoding is effective in the script because of the significant foregrounding powers of language. If it were not so, playwrights would hardly remain satisfied merely to write their plays. The fact that playwrights remain satisfied with the efficiency of the script in encoding accurately the essential action-signs of a play is sufficient evidence in itself of the safety in turning to the script for the purpose of determining its basic structure. At the same time, it must always be remembered that to analyze the complete structure of a performance, the analyst cannot go to the script since the script is not an absolute commanding form for the performance. A given theatrical sign
system is, then, only "dispensable" from the standpoint of its not being required in order for drama to take place. However, no sign actually present in a performance is "dispensable." A performance is a totally integrated sign context and must always be treated as such.
Primary Levels

The systemic model of drama, as based on the systemic model of language, represents drama as having three primary levels: substance, form, and situation.

As was discussed in the last chapter, the substance of the drama is its raw material, the behavioral activity of performer-characters, including both their verbal and their non-verbal activity, together with the scriptographic symbols that are used to transcribe them.

Form is the configuration of the substance of drama into patterns or shapes which are significant because they are recognizable as meaningful units.

EXAMPLE 1.

1. Bring the extended right hand from a position before the face to a position before the sternum.
2. Drop the extended right hand from a position before the right shoulder to a position at the right side of the body.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{For the organization of the materials presented in this chapter, I am indebted to Berry, pp. 37-50.}\]
3. Bring the extended fingers of the right hand together to form a flat palm.
4. Bring the extended right hand from a position before the sternum to a position before the left shoulder.
5. Extend the flattened right hand to a position before the sternum to a position before the left shoulder.
6. Extend the flattened right hand to a position before the face, fingers straight up parallel to the plane of the body, the plane of the palm at right angles to the plane of the body.
7. Bring the extended right hand from a position before the left shoulder to a position before the right shoulder.

The above listing of activity beats is merely a collection of a few of the many separate motions that a dramatic performer-character can articulate in time and space. In the following excerpts from two different twentieth-century American dramas, the same motions have been rearranged and given a recognizable and meaningful kinetic cultural pattern, a form.

EXAMPLE 2.

JULIAN (on his knees before the CARDINAL). Bless me?

CARDINAL (reluctantly; appropriate gestures). In the name of the Father and of the Son and the Holy Ghost ... .

---

EXAMPLE 3.

HARRIET Oh, Father Donald, bless me.

FATHER DONALD Of course. (He blesses her, holding the ball under his left arm.)

The inventory of motions in Example 1 has substance, but the blessings in Examples 2 and 3 have both substance and form.

Similarly, n, m, e, a is merely an enumeration of some of the letters that can be used in English to transcribe the sounds performer-characters are assigned to make when they speak. In the following excerpt, they have been given two different significant configurations, two different forms.

EXAMPLE 4.

CARDINAL (reluctantly; appropriate gestures). In the name of the Father and of the Son and the Holy Ghost...

JULIAN. . . . Amen. . .

Situation is the time-space frame within which a particular beat of dramatic-theatrical activity is performed. A blessing has significance all by itself out of context, but its meaning is, in a sense, completed by its use within the context of a given frame, of a particular situation. Although the blessing given by the Cardinal to

---


4Tiny Alice, p. 34.
Julian in Albee's *Tiny Alice* and that given by Father Donald to Harriet in David Rabe's *Sticks and Bones* may be kinetically highly similar as respects their substance and form, they are nevertheless somewhat different in meaning because of their different frames, because of the different situations in which they are articulated. The Cardinal's "reluctant" blessing has a sinister significance while Father Donald's serves as part of a comic effect based upon a play on words.

Similarly, Julian's "Bless me" and Harriet's "bless me" are highly similar as respects linguistic substance and form, but placement of each within its situation reveals that Julian's is an honest and fervent request while Harriet's is a comically misread exclamation.

**Subdivision of Primary Levels**

Substance can be divided into the substance of performance and the substance of scripting. The substance of performance can be further divided into kinetic substance, phonic substance, and scenic substance. Kinetic substance is the substance of bodily movement. Phonic substance is the substance of spoken language. Scenic substance is the substance of the physical environment in which the performance behaviors occur. Because of the dual-axis nature of the theatrical-dramatic communication, each of these three kinds of performance substance may be thought of as having two aspects, an inner-frame aspect and an outer-frame aspect. Thus, inner-frame kinetic substance is the substance of character movement while outer-frame kinetic substance is the substance of performer movement.
Inner-frame phonic substance is the substance of character language while outer-frame phonic substance is the substance of performer language. Inner-frame scenic substance is the substance of character environment and usually does not include the audience while outer-frame scenic substance is performance-space substance and does include the audience. The substance of scripting is scriptographic substance. Scriptographic substance is the substance of the graphic marks used to record performance behaviors.

Form can be divided into praxis, lexis, locus, and grammar. Praxis is the form of the individual beats of kinetic action in a drama and the relation of these to the slots they may fill in a pattern. Lexis is the form of the individual phonic units in the dialogue of a drama and the relation of these to the slots they may fill in a pattern.

EXAMPLE 5.

BEATRICE. . . (She answers the phone.) Hello?⁵

WHITESIDE (his eyes gleaming, immediately grabs phone). Philo Vance is now at work. Hello.⁶


In each of these stretches of dramatic action, the kinetic beat (praxis) of picking up the telephone receiver and the phonic item (lexis) "hello" occur. In each segment they occur in close proximity to each other. It is part of the behavioral patterning of the English-speaking culture that this action and this word will often co-occur and that picking up the receiver and saying "goodbye," for example, will be relatively unlikely to co-occur.

Locus is the form of the individual physical items or objects in the scenic environment of a drama and their relationship to the positions they may fill in a pattern. The telephone receiver itself in the above example is an item of locus which fills a slot in the pattern of answering the phone. Again, due to the dual-axis nature of the theatrical-dramatic communication, each of the three kinds of form discussed thus far may be thought of as having two aspects, an inner-frame (performer-performer axis) aspect and an outer-frame (performer-audience axis) aspect. Thus, inner-frame praxis is the form of character movement while outer-frame praxis is the form of performer movement. Inner-frame lexis is the form of character language while outer-frame lexis is the form of performer language. Inner-frame locus is the form of character environment while outer-frame locus is the form of performance space.

Grammar has, in a sense, already been defined by the last half of the definitions of praxis, lexis, and locus. It can be thought of as the slot-filling potential or the slot-class correlation of items of praxis, lexis, and locus. In each of the two script fragments in
Example 5, the first word is a proper name. "Beatrice" and "Whiteside" belong to the same class of linguistic item; they are both proper names. Similarly, "answers" and "grabs" both belong to the same class of linguistic item; they are both verbs. Thus "Beatrice. . . answers" has the same grammatical pattern as "Whiteside. . . grabs." The two linguistic sequences are grammatically alike but lexically different. The script is not the drama, however.

BEATRICE and WHITESIDE represent linguistically in their scripts something expressed in performance in terms of actor presence, namely, a characterization. BEATRICE and WHITESIDE, in addition to belonging to the same class of linguistic (scriptographic) item, belong to the same class of poetic item; they are both dramatic "characters," but BEATRICE, although in the same class of item as WHITESIDE, is still a different individual item from WHITESIDE. From a poetic viewpoint, therefore, BEATRICE and WHITESIDE are grammatically alike but praxically different, and the praxical difference would hold even if one actor should play both parts, since it is the fictive role (performer-performer axis) and not the actual performer (performer-audience axis) that is designated by the proper name in the script.

While "answers" and "grabs" are grammatically alike and lexically different from a scriptographic point of view, the dramatic actions they record are virtually the same in that they both represent the kinetic action of picking up the telephone receiver. Thus, from a poetic point of view, while "answers" and "grabs" are lexically (scriptographically) different, the kinetic actions they represent are praxically (poetically) alike.
EXAMPLE 6.

Stage black.
Lights up, as fully inflated orange balloon is lowered from hole in ceiling.
GIRL enters watching.
When balloon is fully visible, GIRL smiles and says, "What a beautiful day!"
BOY explodes balloon with pin.
Black-out.

Stage black.
Lights dim up, as GIRL grimly and cautiously pushes head through trap door.
Lights suddenly up and full warm.
GIRL smiles and says, "What a beautiful day!"
Big orange ball thrown from hole in ceiling hits GIRL on head, knocking her back down as trap door closes.
Black-out.

In these two versions of Ruth Krauss's poem-play *A Beautiful Day*, the coupled kinetic-verbal action of smiling and saying "What a beautiful day!" and the lowering of an orange sphere are praxically alike but grammatically different. In the first version, the GIRL's smile and line are a reaction to the sighting of the sphere which precedes them. In the second version, the lowering of the sphere is a reaction to the smile and line which it follows.

Situation can be divided into thesis, immediate situation, and wider situation. In linguistics, the thesis of an utterance is its ideational content. The thesis of the scriptographic sequence "BEATRICE. . . (She answers the phone.) Hello?" is that a female

---

human being named Beatrice picks up the receiver of her telephone in her house, puts it to her ear and mouth and says "Hello?" The dramatic action, in other words, is the thesis of the words on the scripted page, and in this sense, a performance can be said to physicalize the C-plane of its script. The concept of thesis is not eliminated by moving from page to stage, however, because the performance activity of the actress playing Beatrice still has the thesis that it is Beatrice herself who is answering the phone and that it is a real and not a prop phone with the real voice of Mr. Goodman and not silence at the other end of the line. This thesis is the outer-frame thesis (performer-audience axis) of the drama. Inner-frame thesis is the thesis of character utterance and action.

The outer-frame immediate situation is the situation in which the dramatic activity is being performed, its specific theatrical milieu and occasion (performer-audience axis). The inner-frame immediate situation is the fictive situation in which character behavior is imagined to occur, its specific scenic and environmental locus and occasion. The outer-frame wider situation includes anything in the past experience of a playwright, producer, director, designer, or performer which inclines him to make certain artistic choices or articulate certain performance behaviors embodied in the drama rather than others, together with anything in the past experience of the theatrical spectator or literary script-reader which inclines him to interpret the drama in one way rather than in another.
Part of the outer-frame wider situation of the original production of Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*, for example, was the audience's experience with the McCarthy "witch hunt" with which spectators could draw parallels to the Salem witch hunt of the inner-frame immediate situation and thus interpret its hypothetical action as topical allusion. Similarly, part of the outer-frame wider situation of *The Effect of Gamma Rays on Man-in-the-Moon Marigolds* is Paul Zindel's Staten Island childhood, about which he has said "What a great love I had of microcosms, of peering at other worlds framed and separated from me." Part of the outer-frame wider situation of the opening production of *Death of a Salesman* was designer Jo Mielziner's memory of a refrigerator:

In looking through the [Sears and Roebuck] catalogues for [1929], I found a picture of what I had remembered as a refrigerator typical of the time—cast-iron Chippendale-type legs that were rather thin and ridiculous-looking, and condensation coils covered in white enamel and perched on top of the cabinet, looking for all the world like a mechanistic wedding cake.9

The inner-frame wider situation includes anything in the imagined past experience of a fictive character which causes him to act or re-act as he does. It is the concept of an inner-frame wider situation which has led to the famous abuses of counting Lady Macbeth's children and examining Hamlet's curriculum at Wurtemberg. Theatre professionals should resist the temptation to take dramatic characters for complete personalities, the very illusion they attempt

---

8*The Effect of Gamma Rays*, p. 743.

to foster upon their audiences. A character in a drama is a configuration of given performance behaviors and the configuration of traits that can be abstracted from those behaviors. A human personality is not created to fulfill a function as a part of an artistic whole. Dramatic characters have only those traits they need for their dramatic actions. No others are introduced or developed, though they might exist in a real personality. Spectators can know a dramatic character more completely than they can know a real-life personality because a dramatic character has fewer roles to play in his dramatic action than most real-life personalities have in their lives. Dramatic characters change less, are more consistent, and are less complex than real-life personalities. They are limited packages of behaviors and attendant behavioral traits designed to fill a function in a dramatic action and must be analyzed only as such. Nevertheless, it is valid to regard earlier fictive events as part of the inner-frame wider situation of later fictive events, as is the case with foreshadowing, for example, or to regard fictive events reported within the drama as having happened before the present action begins as part of the inner-frame wider situation of fictive events taking place within the actual performance interval.

**Interlevels**

The three primary levels of drama are related to one another through a number of interlevels. Context, for example, is the interlevel which relates form to situation. Thus one of the things with which context is concerned is the relationship between individual
items of praxis, lexis, or locus and individual elements of thesis. For example, context is concerned with the relationship between the linguistic item "Beatrice" and the element of thesis, the dramatic character who is the mother of Tillie and Ruth, the daughter of a vegetable vendor, the caretaker of Nanny, and so on. Context is likewise concerned with the relationship between the kinetic item Lee J. Cobb and the element of thesis Willie Loman. It is concerned with the relationship between the scriptographic stage direction "grabs phone" and the performance behavior that is the thesis of that direction. It is concerned with the relationship between the kinetic-verbal items of Marlon Brando's heaving a red-stained package at Kim Hunter while yelling "Meat!" and the element of thesis "Stanley Kowalski is not genteel." In a sense, the meaning of a linguistic or kinetic item is its relationship to an element of thesis--its context. Sometimes the relationship is more complicated.

EXAMPLE 7.

The VENUS'-FLYTRAPS grow larger and growl.
VENUS'-FLYTRAPS (viciously). Grrrrrrrr.
(The piranha fish stares hungrily from its bowl.)
ROSALINDA THE FISH (more viciously). Grarrgh!


The non-linguistic vocal items "Grrrrrrrr" and "Grarrgh" have a relationship with the element of thesis "predatory animal" but also with the plant and fish which are now thought to have some of the qualities of predatory animals. If the growls are issued in human voice or if the Flytraps are represented in human form, the notions "predatory" and "human" become fused in a way which reflects directly upon the behavior of Madame Rosepettle.

The linguistic item "doll" has a relationship with the element of thesis "female human effigy," but in the title Guys and Dolls, it also has a relationship with a female human who is thought to have some of the qualities of a doll.

If context is concerned with the relationship between items of lexis, praxis, and locus and their elements of thesis, it is also concerned with the relationships between these items and their immediate situation. The linguistic items "ladies and gentlemen" and "guys and dolls" can both be related to the same elements of thesis, "male and female humans," but they are related to different kinds of immediate situation. Most language choices are set by the playwright in his script, and so the question of appropriateness of language to the outer-frame immediate situation is mainly a matter of the appropriateness of play selection, though cutting portions of the text, especially in some amateur groups, is often employed as a means of adjusting dramatic material to its situation. In the matters of stress, pitch, juncture, inflection, and so on, as well as in the matter of performance behaviors involving kinetic action, of course, the producer, director, designers, and performers have more scope of
choice in suiting a production to its audience and occasion. Thus a transvestite production of *Little Mary Sunshine* can be appropriate to the outer-frame immediate situation of a Gay Liberation Theatre, but will probably not be appropriate to the outer-frame immediate situation of a fundamentalist Baptist convention. Nor is the controversial nature of the material the sole index of the appropriateness of dramatic material to its outer-frame immediate situation. Generally speaking, for example, low-budget, experimental material can be related to an element of Off-Broadway or Off-off-Broadway in the outer-frame immediate situation while high-budget, flashy, musical comedy material can be related to an element of Broadway in the outer-frame immediate situation. Relations between items of praxis, lexis, and locus and elements of inner-frame immediate situation are also the province of the contextual interlevel.

**EXAMPLE 8.**

CARDINAL (silencing him by waving his ring at him; the LAWYER kneels, kisses the ring, rises).12

CAPTAIN What's your name again?

PULVER Ensign Pulver, sir. (He salutes again . . . .)13

Kissing a ring and offering a salute can both be related to the same element of thesis, "a gesture of respect." But kissing the ring can be related to a high clerical element in the inner-frame

---

12Tiny Alice, p. 4.

immediate situation while offering the salute can be related to a military element in the inner-frame immediate situation. Such praxological gestures are scripted and thus controlled, like the linguistic content of speeches, by the playwright to some extent. Even in the case of director- or actor-originated performance behaviors, in fact, the inner-frame immediate situation parameters scripted by the playwright will tend to govern production choices. Stanley Kowalski may give his wife Stella an unscripted bear hug, but he will probably not kiss her hand unless mockingly. Blanche may give Stanley an unscripted slap, but she will probably not make an obscene gesture at him.

Finally, context is also, of course, concerned with relationships between individual items of praxis, lexis, and locus and their wider situation. Paul Zindel, for example, formulated the character Beatrice at least in part because his wider situation included the fact that he had "an emotionally unstable mother who compulsively transplanted her children from one shabby, cluttered apartment to another because she could not tolerate her neighbors' disapproval." /

Writers write, producers produce, directors direct, designers design, actors act, and audiences respond out of their experiences, out of their backgrounds, and out of their outer-frame wider situations. Such relationships between items of praxis, lexis, and locus and their wider situations also apply, of course, to the inner-frame wider situation. We do not see the extent to which Jessica Tandy's artistic

\[14\] The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 743.
choice pattern in performing Blanche Dubois, for example, is related
to and governed by her background as clearly as we see the extent to
which behaviors attributed to Blanche by Tennessee Williams, Elia
Kazan, and Jessica Tandy are related to and governed by Blanche's
background as that background is reported and dramatized in the play.
Thus, for example, the segment

EXAMPLE 9.

BLANCHE (holding tight to his arm). Whoever you are— I have
always depended on the kindness of strangers.\textsuperscript{15}
is contextually related to the earlier segment

EXAMPLE 10.

STELLA . . . You didn't know Blanche as a girl. Nobody,
nobody, was tender and trusting as she was. But people like you
abused her, and forced her to change.\textsuperscript{16}
which gives the spectator a glimpse via a non-dramatized report by
another character into the inner-frame wider situation of Blanche. As
Elia Kazan put it in his notebook, "we cannot really understand
Blanche's behavior unless we see the effect of her past on her present
behavior."\textsuperscript{17} To be able to do so is to be able to relate her
present behavior to her inner-frame wider situation.

\textsuperscript{15}\textit{A Streetcar Named Desire}, p. 93.

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 83.

\textsuperscript{17}Elia Kazan, "Notebook for \textit{A Streetcar Named Desire}\" in
Toby Cole and Helen Krich Chinoy, eds. \textit{Directors on Directing} (New
EXAMPLE 11.

YANK . . . Dis is home, see?\textsuperscript{18}

LONG . . . this 'ere . . is our 'ome.\textsuperscript{19}

The formal differences between "dis" and "this" and between "home" and "'ome" are related to a difference in the inner-frame wider situations of Yank and Long in \textit{The Hairy Ape}. The form "dis" can be related to an element of Brooklynese in Yank's inner-frame wider situation. The form "'ome" can be related to an element of cockney British in the inner-form wider situation of Long. Kinetically, the "natural stooping posture"\textsuperscript{20} of the actors representing Yank and Long can be related to elements of crampedness and overworking of the muscles of the back and shoulders in the inner-frame wider situation of the two stokeholers.

EXAMPLE 12.

WHITESIDE. Um-hm. (He reads.) "Treacle face, what is this I hear about a hip fractured in some bordello brawl? . . . "\textsuperscript{21}

Kaufman and Hart, through the persona of Beverly Carlton, the fictitious author of the letter Whiteside is reading in Example 12, use the term "treacle" because Beverley's inner-frame wider situation


\textsuperscript{19}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., p. 207.

\textsuperscript{21}\textit{The Man Who Came to Dinner}, p. 325.
as a Briton and Whiteside's inner-frame wider situation as a cosmopolitan man of the world conversant with English manners and dialect include the fact that the British call molasses treacle. Audience members whose outer-frame wider situations do not include a corresponding element of Britishness or cosmopolitanism will be unable to interpret the item successfully.

Relations between items of praxis, lexis, and locus and thesis, immediate situation and wider situation have been considered, but context also relates elements of situation to the classes and patterns of grammar. In language, for example, each grammatical class can be related to an element of thesis.

EXAMPLE 13

(RUTH enters at a gallop, throwing her books down and babbling a mile a minute.)

RUTH (enthusiastically) Can you believe it? I didn't, until Chris Burns came up and told me about it in Geography, and then Mr. Goodman told me himself during the eighth period in the office when I was eavesdropping. Aren't you so happy you could bust? Tillie? I'm so proud I can't believe it, Mama. Everybody was talking about it and nobody... well, it was the first time they all came up screaming about her and I said, "Yes, she's my sister!" I said it, "She's my sister! My sister! My sister!"22

22The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 761.
From a scriptological-linguistic point of view, the "enters" of "RUTH enters" and the "told" of "Mr. Goodman told me" are both verbs and can therefore be related, like all verbs, to an element of thesis often called "action" or "process," while "Ruth" and "Mr. Goodman" are both nouns and can therefore be related, like most nouns, to an element of thesis often called "actor" or "participant in process." In moving from page to stage, however, the situation changes.

On the stage, the noun "Mr. Goodman" remains a noun, but the noun "RUTH" is transformed into actress presence; similarly, the verb "told" remains a verb, but the verb "enters" is transformed into a kinetic action performed by the actress. And, of course, "Mr. Goodman told," although they remain noun and verb, are also now performed by the actress and are transformed from graphic to phonic substance. As noted in the last chapter, the uniform substance of the drama is performance activity, but this activity is of two different orders: vocal or verbal (depending upon one's perspective, whether etic or emic\(^{23}\)) and kinetic. The importance of this is that the one can become taken up through or embedded in the other. That is, the uniform phonic substance of language can be used to substitute for or provide a vocal replacement for kinetic or other verbal behavior. Since the substance of language is sound and not kinetic action, if language is to model kinetic action, it needs the classes noun and verb, subject and predicate to indicate which discrete sound units denote participants and which denote processes, since this would not

\(^{23}\)Etic and emic viewpoints will be discussed at length in the next chapter.
be apparent otherwise. When "RUTH enters" is transformed into the performance behavior of an actress, there is no longer a need for the categories "noun" and "verb" since the character and her fictive action (C-plane participant-in-process) are physicalized kinetically rather than phonically. Actress becomes fused with action in such a way that it seems hardly necessary to make them discrete as English does (though not all languages do) by giving them separate monemes and separate grammatical classes. Indeed the tendency to separate a participant's behavior from his person may be precisely a language-based tendency. The inapplicability of the grammatical categories "noun" and "verb" to the performance behavior of the actress enacting "RUTH enters," however, does not indicate that such behavior has no grammatical categories of its own, and in fact it will be demonstrated later that something very like the linguistic grammatical categories "noun-verb" and "subject-predicate" does apply at a given layer of dramatic structure.

A member of the "protagonist" class of dramatic items, for example, can usually be related to an element of thesis which is often identified as "person whose will sustains the dramatic action." It is noteworthy that the term "protagonist" was originally the name given to the actor (outer-frame) rather than to the character (inner-frame), for, from a linguistic-model perspective, the performer is the outer-frame formal item representing the inner-frame grammatical class.
EXAMPLE 14.

PULVER (explaining). Steam-line came right out of the bulkhead. (He demonstrates) Whish!\textsuperscript{24}

PULVER Solid soapsuds. (He pantomimes walking blindly through soapsuds).\textsuperscript{25}

"He demonstrates" and "He pantomines walking blindly through soapsuds" are members of a class of kinetic items which might be called "kineticized kinetic replay", which can be related to an element of thesis which might be identified as "doing what you did."

"Doing what you said," "saying what you did," and "saying what you said" are some of the other elements of thesis that can be related to dramatic grammatical replay classes. Items of the verbalized kinetic replay and the verbalized verbal replay classes account for the vital ability of language to foreground kinetic and verbal actions which are imagined to occur out-of-frame, so that a character like Mr. Goodman, for example, although never embodied in terms of actor presence, can assume a formidable force of presence in The Effect of Gamma Rays... simply because the spectators know what he has said and done even without ever actually hearing or seeing him. Language in drama provides the essential means of foregrounding the doings of actants beyond what the traffic of the stage may economically bear in space or time. Much of the total activity of drama, in some cases even most of it, is brought into the performance through language. Hence, it is just as important for the dramatic theorist to be aware of the ways in

\textsuperscript{24}Mr. Roberts, p. 445. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{25}Ibid.
which dramatic action is subsumed or embedded in language as it is for
the linguist to be aware of the ways in which language is subsumed or
embedded in non-linguistic human behavior.

EXAMPLE 15.

Stage black.
Lights up, as fully inflated orange balloon is lowered
from hole in ceiling.
GIRL enters watching.
When balloon is fully visible, GIRL smiles and says "What
a beautiful day!"
BOY explodes balloon with pin.
Black out.

Stage barely lit.
GIRL enters covered in a dark blanket.
Huge orange balloon floats down from above.
GIRL throws off blanket and catches balloon as BOY climbs
down and jumps onstage.
GIRL walks out with BOY and balloon staring in disbelief
from one to the other.
Before exit GIRL shouts "What a beautiful day!"
Black-out.

In the performance of each of these versions of A Beautiful
Day at the Judson Memorial Church in New York in December, 1965, the
same item, the actor Charles Adams, appeared. He was the same
praxological item, the same individual poetic item, in both versions.
In both versions he could be related to the same element of thesis,
"BOY" or "SUN." However, the inner-frame item belonged to different
grammatical classes in the two versions. In the first version, he is
an antagonist, in the second a helper. Although praxically he could
be related to the same element of thesis in both versions,
grammatically he could be related to different elements of thesis. In
the first version he can be related to the element of thesis "source

26A Beautiful Day, pp. 304-305.
of opposition." In the second version he can be related to the element of thesis "ally." The total meaning of an item is a combination of its praxical, lexical, or local meaning and its grammatical meaning. The Charles Adams in the first version and the Charles Adams in the second version (outer-frame) and the Boy/Sun of the first version and the Boy/Sun of the second version (inner-frame) have partially the same meaning, since they are praxically alike, but they do not have the same total meaning since they are grammatically different.

If context relates grammatical classes to elements of thesis, it also relates grammatical classes to inner- and outer-frame immediate situation.

EXAMPLE 16.

RUTH  Can I earn a cigarette this morning?27

RUTH. . . . "Yes, she's my sister!" I said it. "She's my sister! My sister! My sister!" Give me a cigarette.28

"Can I earn a cigarette," and "Give me a cigarette" can be said to have the same thesis. But they can be related to different kinds of inner-frame immediate situation. The situation of the first has an element of political wheedling and concern for social niceties in it while the situation of the second has an element of excitement in

27The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 749

28Ibid., p. 761.
which niceties are forgotten. Linguistically, the two segments have
different grammatical patterns. The first has the rising-inflection
pattern of a question; the second has the falling inflection pattern
of a command.

EXAMPLE 17.

The sky to the east is already alight with bright color and a
thin, quivering line of flame is spreading slowly along the horizon
rim of the dark hills.29

He reverses the moon. On the other side is the sun. He
throws it into the air, making daylight.30

These two stage directions from two different plays can be
thought of as having the same thesis: sunrise, daybreak. They both
involve the manipulation of the form and substance of light, but the
first patterning of events can be related to an element of sympathetic
magic in the inner-frame immediate situation while the second can be
related to an element of naturalness in the inner-frame immediate
situation.

Similarly, two performances of the same production of The
Fantasticks, for example, one in a three-thousand-seat proscenium
theatre and the other in a one-hundred-seat theatre-in-the-round, can
be said to have the same thesis, but they can be related to two

29Eugene O'Neill, Beyond the Horizon in The Plays of Eugene

30Tom Jones and Harvey L. Schmidt, The Fantasticks in John
different kinds of outer-frame immediate situations. The spatial grammar of the large-hall proscenium performance can be related to an element of detachment in the outer-frame immediate situation. The spatial grammar of the small-hall in-the-round performance can be related to an element of intimacy in the outer-frame immediate situation.

There are also, of course, relationships between grammar and elements of wider situation.

EXAMPLE 18.

PADDY. . . . Brave men they was, and bold men surely!\textsuperscript{31}

The grammatical pattern of this line, as opposed to that of "They surely were brave and bold men," can be related to an element of Irishness in the inner-frame wider situation of Paddy. If the actor representing Paddy has no corresponding element of Irishness in his outer-frame wider situation, he may have difficulty in rendering the dialect believably. Again, such relationships between grammatical patterning and wider situation are not solely linguistic matters, however.

EXAMPLE 19.

. . . SALLY, JIM-WILSON, JESSIE and JOHN HENRY come in from the car. . . . There is sudden loud activity as everybody greets one another.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{31}Hairy Ape, p. 213.

(ZERO goes to the entrance door and opens it. Six men and six women file into the room in a double column. The men are all shapes and sizes, but their dress is identical with that of ZERO in every detail. Each, however, wears a wig of a different color. The women are all dressed alike, too, except that the dress of each is of a different color.)

MRS. ZERO (taking the first woman's hand). How de do, Mrs. One.

MRS. ONE. How de do, Mrs. Zero.

(MRS. ZERO repeats this formula with each woman in turn. ZERO does the same with the men, except that he is silent throughout.)

The grammar of guest greeting in these two segments can be related to two different kinds of inner-frame wider situation. The patterning of the second greeting rite can be related to an element of social conformity and machine-age interchangeability in the inner-frame wider situation of the characters while the patterning of the first greeting ritual can be related to an element of naturally informal and familial intimacy in the inner-frame wider situation of the characters.

Similarly, the reactions of spectators at the Living Theatre's performances to the shocks, assaults, and even batteries addressed directly to them and invading their living space betokened a new grammar along the performer-audience axis, a grammar in which the bifurcation of space (one space for performers, a separate and inviolable space for spectators) was no longer to be observed. The new grammar could be related to an element of rebellion against traditional forms in the outer-frame wider situation of the performers, and the spectator reactions could be related to a

corresponding element if the reactions were favorable or to an element of theatrical conservatism in the outer-frame wider situation of those spectators who reacted negatively.

The contextual relations may become quite complex.

EXAMPLE 20.
HENRY. . . . Indians, ready?
Indians—Rape!

(And MORTIMER springs out of his hiding place. He snatches up the astonished LUISA right before the eyes of the equally astonished MATT and starts to carry her out right. But HENRY, in a fury, interrupts him.)

No, no, Off Left, damn it!

MORTIMER  All right, all right.34

Henry's "Off Left, damn it!" can, at one and the same time, be related to both an element of theatricalism (i.e., outer-framism) in the inner-frame immediate situation and to the inner-frame wider situation of Henry's having been a career actor.

There are four interlevels which link form and substance in drama: kinesiology, phonology, scenology, and graphology (or scriptology). Phonology will be considered first, since, as a branch of linguistics, it serves as a model for the other three.

Phonology relates form to phonic substance. It relates distinctions in form to differences in sound. For example, it relates linguistic grammatical patterns in dramatic speeches as scripted to the intonation patterns and pitch movements performers use in

34 The Fantasticks, p. 204.
performing the speeches. Henry's first two sentences in Example 20, for example, have different grammatical patterns. The grammatical pattern of "Indians, ready?" is associated with a rising intonation pattern in performance. The grammatical pattern of "Indians--Rape!" is associated with a falling intonation in performance.

Phonology is also concerned with relationships between grammar and stress patterns. The classic example is "permit." With the accent on the first syllable, "permit" becomes the noun of "You must have a permit to enter." With the accent on the second syllable, "permit" becomes the verb of "He will not permit you to go inside."

Finally, phonology is concerned with relationships between lexical distinctions and variations in sound. The classic example is "pin" and "bin" which are different lexical items because each begins with a different sound.

On the model of phonology, kinesiology relates form to kinetic substance. It relates distinctions in form to differences in movement. It relates, for example linguistic grammatical patterns to the movement articulation patterns performers use when they perform.

EXAMPLE 21

... (ROSALIE smiles slightly and walks toward the master bedroom. JONATHAN freezes in fear. She puts her hand on the door knob.) WHAT ARE YOU DOING!? (She smiles at him over her shoulder. She opens the door.) STOP!! You can't go in there!!! STOP!!
ROSALIE (she opens the door completely and beckons to him to come.) Come.35

The gesture designated scriptologically by "she...beckons to him" can be articulated kinetically in performance as a request or as a command. In both cases, the gesture of crooking the finger or some similar hand gesture will be used. The function served phonetically by a rising or a falling intonation can be replaced kinetically by the movement of the muscles of the forehead and brow. Raised while the beckoning occurs, these will indicate an element of request or pleading which can be associated with the linguistic grammatical category interrogative. Lowered while the beckoning occurs, they will indicate an element of sternness and command, often expressed as "beckoning imperiously," which can be associated with the linguistic grammatical category imperative.

Similarly, violations of the bifurcation of space in the form of physical manipulation of spectators by performers (e.g., performers taking spectators by the hands and coaxing or jerking them physically into the inner-frame action) can be regarded, at least analogously, as interrogative (in the case of the coaxing) or imperative (in the case of the jerking) while adherence to the bifurcation of space with its concomitant aesthetic distance and detachment can be regarded as declarative. Further, it is not necessary to restrict such relationships to linguistic grammatical categories. The drama has a grammar of its own over and above the linguistic grammar which serves as one of its sub-system components.

35Oh Dad, Poor Dad, p. 505.
EXAMPLE 22.

(While Stella and Eunice are speaking on the porch the voices of the men in the kitchen overlap them. Mitch has started toward the bedroom. Stanley crosses to block him. Stanley pushes him aside. Mitch lunges and strikes at Stanley. Stanley pushes Mitch back. Mitch collapses at the table, sobbing.

(During the preceding scenes, the Matron catches hold of Blanches's arm and prevents her flight. Blanche turns wildly and scratches at the Matron. The heavy woman pinions her arms. Blanche cries out horsely and slips to her knees.)

MATRON These fingernails have to be trimmed. (The Doctor comes into the room and she looks at him) Jacket, Doctor?

DOCTOR Not unless necessary.

(He takes off his hat and now he becomes personlized. The inhuman quality goes. His voice is gentle and reassuring as he crosses to Blanche and crouches in front of her. As he speaks her name, her terror subsides a little. The lurid reflections fade from the walls, the inhuman cries and noises die out and her own hoarse crying is calmed.)

In this stretch of scripted dramatic action, there is a good deal of kinetic action involved for the performers representing Mitch and the Doctor. On the surface, the kinetic activity of Mitch is more desperate and violent than that of the Doctor, which is assured and gentle, and yet the manner of the articulation of that activity, the kinetic tone with which it is colored in performance makes it clear

36 A Streetcar Named Desire, p. 93.
that Mitch, notwithstanding the threatening character of his behavior, belongs to the dramatic grammatical class Helper of the Protagonist (Blanche) while the Doctor, notwithstanding the soothing character of his behavior, is only a False Helper of the Protagonist and is actually a Helper of the Antagonist (Stanley).

Again, on the model of phonology, kinesiology relates grammar to stress patterns in the articulation or execution of movements or movement sequences. Drawing the right foot backward and then thrusting it forward and up, for example, is a two-staged action called a kick. By emphasizing the drawing back of the foot, a performer can locate his action in a bluff or feigned attack class of movement item. By emphasizing the forward thrust, he locates his action in an attack class of movement item. The first stage of such an action might be called the "telegaph," the second stage the "stroke." An accented or stressed telegraph, then, would tend to indicate bluffing while an accented or stressed stroke would indicate an actual and vicious attack. A third grammatical component of such an action structure might be called the "follow through," the degree of follow through may determine the grammatical classification of an action. It would determine, for example, the difference between a pat on the cheek (little or no follow through) and a slap in the face (pronounced follow through), the former a member of a caress class of items, the latter a member of an attack class of items.

Finally, on the linguistic model of phonology, kinesiology relates praxical distinctions to differences in motion. Just as "pin" and "bin" are different lexical items because they begin with
different sounds, giving a salute and tipping one's hat are different praxical items because, although they begin with functionally identical motions, they end with different motions.

Scenology, once again on the model of phonology, relates form and scenic substance. It relates distinctions in form to differences in the physical environment of a dramatic action.

Graphology (or scriptology) relates form to graphic (or scriptographic) substance. It relates distinctions in form to differences in graphic notation (principally writing).

In Henry's lines "Indians, ready?" and "Indians--Rape!" from Example 19, for instance, the scriptographic marks "?" and "!" indicate to the performer with what inflection pattern the sequences are to be read in performance, a pattern quite different from that of "Indians, ready!/ Indians--Rape?" for example.

Like phonology and kinesiology, graphology can sometimes distinguish between a lexical or a praxical item acting as a member of one grammatical class and the same item acting as a member of a different class. It can also distinguish scenologically between items of two different classes.

EXAMPLE 23.

Scene--Exterior of the Mannon house on a late afternoon in April, 1865. At front is the driveway which leads up to the house from the two entrances on the street. Behind the driveway the white Grecian temple portico with its six tall columns extends across the
stage. A big pine tree is on the lawn at the edge of the drive before the right corner of the house. Its trunk is a black column in striking contrast to the white columns of the portico.37

The action of the entire play takes place in, and immediately outside of, the Cabot farmhouse in New England, in the year 1850. The south end of the house faces front to a stone wall with a wooden gate at center opening on a country road. The house is in good condition but in need of paint. Its walls are sickly grayish, the green of shutters faded. Two enormous elms are on each side of the house. They bend their trailing branches down over the roof. They appear to protect and at the same time subdue. There is a sinister maternity in their aspect, a crushing, jealous absorption. They have developed from their intimate contact with the life of man in the house an appalling humaneness. They brood oppressively over the house. They are like exhausted women resting their sagging breasts and hands and hair on its roof, and when it rains their tears trickle down monotonously and rot on the shingles.38

What matters dramatically about the pine tree of the first script segment and the elm tree of the second is not their distribution between separate botanical classes. For scenological purposes, it.


does not much matter whether the trees brooding over Cabot's farmhouse are elms or pines. Elm and pine are non-functional variants within the scenological system. What matters is that the trees, whatever their botanical classification, are "brooding". The functional variants, then, the distinguishing features are [+ brooding] and [-brooding]. By contrast with the pine tree of the first script segment, which stands, for the most part, as an environmental object among other environmental objects, the elm trees of the second script segment are scenologically in a different grammatical class, one at least bordering upon antagonistic character status, a quality which can be rendered scriptographically clear much more easily than it can be rendered scenographically clear.

Although elm and pine might be non-functional variants in the scenological system described in the second script segment, the same would not necessarily be true of any other botanical class. Thus, just as "pin" and "bin" are different lexical items because they begin with different sounds, the setting described in the second script segment of Example 23 and one identical in every respect except for the substitution of ornamental flowering plum trees for elms would be different scenic items because, although they would be identical in all respects save one, that one would signal a difference in meaning.

Just as writing can distinguish between sounds which can otherwise only be distinguished from context, like "grade A" and "grey day," scripting can distinguish between kinetic actions which can only be distinguished by context otherwise.
EXAMPLE 24

(Alma smiles uncertainly)\textsuperscript{40}

(John grins indulgently...)\textsuperscript{41}

(He continues to grin disconcertingly down at her...)\textsuperscript{42}

JOHN (with a gentle grin)...

(John hangs up with an incredulous grin. Alma remains holding the phone with a dazed smile...)\textsuperscript{44}

Shown these smiles and grins in isolation without reference to text or context, it is doubtful that a spectator would be able to identify them by the appropriate adjectives and adverbs used to distinguish them in the script. In fact, it is probable that the spectator would not be able to separate the smiles from the grins. Thus, just as graphology, like phonology, can distinguish between different lexical items like "pin" and "bin" by assigning different marks or letters to different sounds, scriptology, like kinesiology, can distinguish between different praxical items like smile and grin by assigning differing linguistic lexemes to differing performance behaviors involving the contractions of the facial muscles about the mouth.


\textsuperscript{41}Ibid., p. 669.

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid., p. 672.

\textsuperscript{43}Ibid., p. 674.

\textsuperscript{44}Ibid., p. 678.
Levels and Branches of 
Linguistics and Poetics

The linguistic terms "phonology," "graphology," "grammar," "lexis," and "context," as used here, each have two meanings. They are above all the names of the levels of language, and they have been treated exclusively as such thus far in this chapter. But each level of language has a branch of linguistics which is the study of that level, and the name of the level of language is usually, though not always, the name of the branch of linguistics which studies it. To the linguistic levels, as has been demonstrated, poetics adds the terms "kinesiology," "scenology," "praxis," and "locus" and one, "scriptology," which overlaps with the linguistic term "graphology."

On the model of linguistics, these levels should each become the subject of study of a separate poetic discipline. The correspondence between the levels of drama and the branches of poetics could then be shown schematically.

TABLE 4.--The Levels of Drama. ⁴⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSTANCE</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>SITUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kinetic substance</td>
<td>kinesiology</td>
<td>inner-frame thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonic substance</td>
<td>phonology</td>
<td>outer-frame thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scenic substance</td>
<td>scenology</td>
<td>inner-frame immed. situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scriptographic subs.</td>
<td>scriptology</td>
<td>outer-frame immed. situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grammar</td>
<td>inner-frame wider sit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴⁵Based on Figure 3.1, "The Levels of Language" in Berry, p. 47.
On the linguistic model, then, poetics should concern itself with the four levels of form—praxis, lexis, locus, and grammar—and with the five interlevels—kinesiology, phonology, scenology, scriptology, and context—for each of which levels it should have a separate branch of study. Note that on the linguistic model poetics should not concern itself with situation in its own right but only with the relationships (context) between situation and form. Poetics should thus include context but exclude situation as another subject. Likewise note that on the linguistic model poetics should not concern itself with kinetic, phonic, scenic, or scriptographic substance in their own rights but only with the ways in which those substances are taken up by dramatic form. Poetics should thus include kinesiology, phonology, scenology, and scriptographology but exclude substance as another subject.

Etics and Emics

On each side of Figure 5, poetics can be seen to overlap with other subjects or other subject areas. On the left side of the

---

46 Based on Figure 3.2, "The Branches of Linguistics" in Berry, p. 47.
diagram, it overlaps with the etic disciplines—kinetics, phonetics, scriptographetics, and scenographetics. The modeling member of these is phonetics. Although the name given to the linguistic interlevel is "phonology," in actuality, there is a nice distinction to be made. **Phonology** is divided by linguistic science into two parts: (1) **phonetics**, the study of speech sounds in isolation from or outside of their use within any given language system, and (2) **phonemics**, the study of speech sounds as they are actually taken up by and used in one or more of the world's natural languages.

Kenneth Pike was the first to perceive the need for a unified theory of human behavior which would embrace both verbal and non-verbal activity in one, homogeneous structural description, using one set of terms and a unified methodology. He was the first, in other words, to conceive of the possibility of a unified discipline of behaviorology, and he formulated etic and emic distinctions for such a discipline modelled upon the phonetic/phonemic distinction of linguistic science.
TABLE 6.—Differences between Etic and Emic Approaches.\(^{47}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETIC APPROACH</th>
<th>EMIC APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studies behavior from an &quot;alien&quot; viewpoint, one outside of any particular system.</td>
<td>Studies behavior from a &quot;native&quot; viewpoint, one inside a particular system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determines and organizes units and classes as creations of the analyst using criteria external to any given system.</td>
<td>Determines and organizes units and classes as discoveries of the analyst using criteria discovered from within a particular system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not distribute every smaller unit within a larger unit in a hierarchy of units-in-situation. Measures differences between units instrumentally.</td>
<td>Distributes every smaller unit within a larger unit in a hierarchy of units-in-situation. Measures differences between units in terms of the differing responses elicited by the units from individuals functioning within the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtains data early in the analytical process using partial information to postulate tentative units and classes.</td>
<td>Allows final presentation of units and classes as systematized, requiring knowledge of the total system to which the units and their meanings are relative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is of the first importance that "in the total analysis, the initial etic description gradually is refined, and is ultimately—in principle, but probably never in practice—replaced by one which is totally emic."\(^{48}\) Just as a satisfactory phonemics can only be constructed upon the foundations of an adequate phonetics, a satisfactory kinemics, scenemics, and scriptographemics can only be constructed upon the foundations of an adequate kinetics, scenetics, scenemics.

---


\(^{48}\) Pike, pp. 38-39.
and scriptographetics. Of special importance in these studies will be the identification of units which are etically the same but emically different or emically the same but etically different.

In the absence of an adequate kinetics, scenetics, and scriptographetics, the description given in the remaining chapters of this study must necessarily remain largely etic and may or may not be totally accurate emically. However, the description has two important advantages over a purely etic one: (1) the analyst is himself a "native informant" so that his emic bias works to his own advantage since he is describing his own native dramatic system, and (2) the analysis follows an adequate emic model—phonemics. It is important to appreciate, nevertheless, the necessity of developing adequate etic disciplines as foundations to dramatic analytical study.

The double articulation of language capitalizes upon the ability of a highly limited number of sounds like the "p" in "pen," the "i" in "it," and the "n" in "nap," none of which has any meaning of its own, to combine to form a large number of meaningful units like "pin," "nip" and so on. The same is true of the discrete motions of body language. The formation of a flat palm with fingers pressed together, for example, may be a component of giving a blessing, giving a salute, giving a slap, requesting payment, giving a karate chop, and so on. A great amount of work remains to be done to bring kinetics to the level of advancement of phonetics.

A drama is made up of bits of performance activity, some of which are verbal and some of which are non-verbal. The non-verbal minimal units, like the verbal minimal units, viewed discretely, mean nothing
until they become parts of a pattern which gives them their recognizable significance. Kinetic minimal units, however, are notably more numerous than phonetic minimal units. Nevertheless, just as the number of available phonetic minimal units is determined by the range of human vocal capabilities, the number of available kinetic minimal units is determined by the range of human physiological capabilities.

The relatively small number of phonetic minimal units, as compared to the relatively large number of kinetic minimal units points to the comparative economy of verbal language over non-verbal, except, of course, where there is a gesture-to-sound relationship as in the gestural language of the dumb. It must be remembered that etics is concerned with minimal units prior to or in isolation from their incorporation within a system. On the model of phonetics, then, kinetics should address itself to the minimal units of activity as independent of the cultural patterning systems that incorporate such units into significant behaviors. And since emics is concerned with minimal units as actually used in a given system of signification, kinemics should address itself to those kinetic units that are actually employed in the gestural system of one of the world's cultures.

Interestingly enough, if phonology is etically more economical than kinesiology, kinesiology seems to be emically more economical than phonology since kinetic units seem to be more universally distributed across the world's cultures than phonetic units, a fact substantiated by the international communicability of the silent cinema.
Pike's suggestion that the sentence is only a kind of behavioreme is a spin-off of Saussure's suggestion that linguistics is only one branch of the larger science of semiology. It has the advantage not only of subjugating both phonology and kinesiology to behaviorology but also of keeping a restricting human focus since behaviorology, unlike semiology, denotes a purely human science. Further, Pike's inclusion of the sentence as only one kind of behavioreme places kinesiology and phonology in a simbiotic relationship. Language acts become behaviors among other behaviors. They too, to this extent, are kinetic. Language can model and reflect the world of kinetic action, and the reverse is likewise true. Things said can be done, and things done can be said.

Just as phonetics may study vocal sounds not used in any given language system, behavioretics may study behaviors not used in any dramatic system. Thus, just as a portion of the field of phonetics may lie outside of the field of linguistics, a portion of behavioretics may lie outside of the field of dramatic activity. The relationship between general behaviorology and that branch of behaviorology employed within the dramatic system has been explored by Erving Goffman, who uses the dramatic-theatrical system as a model for extra-dramatic behavior.

Only at this point does it appear that a re-shuffling of terminology may be required. The linguistic model suggests the application

---

of the term "poetics" to the etic dramatic disciplines and the creation of a new term, "poemics," to apply to the emic dramatic disciplines. Dissatisfaction with the non-dramatic connotations of the term "poetics" might lead to the adaptation of "drametics" and "dramemics" as designating those areas of behavioretics and behavioremics that apply specifically and solely to dramatic behavior. These latter terms have the additional advantage of providing an easy term--"dramatology"--for the unified science of dramatic substance where "poetology" would tend to favor etic and "poemology" would tend to favor emic viewpoints.

Finally, a term needs to be found for the entire substance-in-form-in situation study of dramatic behavior. "Dramatics," "dramatistics," and "dramistics" present themselves as possibilities, but if the drama- root is used for the -etic, -emic, and -ology suffixes, there would be little reason not to keep "poetics" for that purpose, especially since that is the sense in which it is traditionally taken by dramatic analysts and theorists.

**Hypothesis 6:**

kinetics : kinemics
scenetics : scenemics
scriptographetics : scriptographemics

= phonetics : phonemics
= graphetics : graphemics

**Hypothesis 7:**

kinetics and kinemics : praxis
scenetics and scenemics : locsus

= phonetics and phonemics : lexis
Hypothesis 8:

dramatology (including kinesiology, phonology, scenology, and scriptographology)

: poetics = phonology : linguistics

Hypothesis 9:

kinetics and kinemics : kinesiology
scenetics and scenemics : scenology
scriptographetics and scriptographics = phonetics and phonemics : phonology

emics : scriptographology
Any stretch of dramatic action is composed of a number of bits of activity arranged one after another in a time sequence which is represented scriptographically by a horizontal line of print. The axis along which this sequence of activity occurs is called the syntagmatic axis by linguists. The concept of a syntagmatic axis is obviously a product of the horizontal linearity of written characters in the West. When dramatic performance is being considered, the syntagmatic axis must be regarded, as in the case of spoken language, as a temporal axis.

Unlike natural language, however, which has no spatial existence except in the form of invisible "waves" of sound moving between sender and receiver, dramatic performance has a visual existence in space due to its kinesiological and scenological components. As mentioned above, it was Adolphe Appia who first pointed out that it is the physical presence of the performer that fastens the time and space planes of the performance continuum together. The performer's activity imprints space upon the linearity of time in a manner made clear by examining the frames of a strip of motion picture film one at a time. Time remains, however, as Michael
Kirby has put it, "the major dimension of performance,"\(^1\) for without time there is no activity, and activity is the preferred substance of drama.

Where dramatic scripting is concerned, the syntagmatic axis may be regarded as either a temporal or a spatial axis because, although the scripted activity is encoded scriptographically, bit by bit, in time and decoded by the reader, bit by bit, in time, the encoded bits of action exist in space along the lines of the printed pages, and this spatial existence has a duration independent of whether the encoded activity is ever read or transformed into performance activity.

In the matter of its syntagmatic axis, poemics must admit to a situation not generally considered by linguistics, namely, the possibility of multiple parallel syntagmatic axes, that is, the possibility of two or more "lines" of dramatic activity occurring in unison.

EXAMPLE 25.

**BILL** (Phone.) Front desk. Yeah. Hold on. Hand me that book.

**APRIL** Morning, Millie.

**GIRL** What number?

**BILL** Let me see it.\(^2\)

1Kirby, p. 54.

Patterns occur along the syntagmatic axis. Each natural language functionalizes some of the possible patterns but not all. Each, in other words, systematically employs some patterns but not others. English, for example, has the phonological-graphological patterns "pin," "bin," "nip," and "nib" but not "pni" or "bni." It has the grammatical pattern "the glass menagerie" but not "glass menagerie the," "menagerie the glass," or "glass the menagerie." It has the lexical pattern "beyond the horizon" but not "later than the horizon." All of these patterns are made up of language bits which occur, like beads on a wire, one after another along the syntagmatic axis.

Non-verbal behaviors have similar patterning. English culture body language, for example, has the wave hello and the wave goodbye but not the Italian gesture of opening and closing the flattened hand with the palm facing the body. It has the grammatical pattern "(picks up the phone) Hello" but not "Hello (picks up the phone)." It has the praxical pattern "a wave hello" and "a kiss hello" but not "a kick hello" or "a stab hello."

At each point in an on-going pattern, there is an opportunity to choose what will come next. Natural language choices may be phonological/graphological, as when "pin" is chosen over "bin," "pan" over "pen," or "pit" over "pet," or they may be grammatical, as when "the iceman cometh" is chosen over "the icemen cometh" or "the iceman came," or they may be lexical, as when "sticks and bones" is chosen over "sticks and stones." Poemics adds to these kinesiological/scriptogaphological choices, as when the British military salute with
the palm facing away from the body and parallel with the body plane is
chosen over the American military salute with the palm perpendicular
to the body plane, and kino-grammatical choices, as when Black Bart is
chosen to rescue Pretty Polly over Tom True. Poemics also adds
praxical choices, as when "Alma smiles uncertainly" is chosen over
"Alma laughs uncertainly," and scenological choices, as when a glass
menagerie is chosen over a brass menagerie, or sceno-grammatical
choices, as when "another part of the forest" is chosen over "the
sitting room," or local choices, as when a glass menagerie is chosen
over a glass garden.

A pattern and its choices can be arranged diagrammatically
through the use of frames with empty slots. The testing of items by
trying them out in the vacant slot is known as the commutation test or
substitution test and is one of the chief linguistic tools for
determining items that are etically the same and emically different or
emically the same and etically different, as well as which variants
are functional within the system as available choices to fill a given
frame and which are not.
TABLE 7.—A selection of syntagmatic pattern choices for a line from *Death of a Salesman.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIFF, _______ down the stairs: Pop!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tripping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3*Death of a Salesman*, p. 136.
In such frames, the basic pattern is shown along the syntagmatic (horizontal) axis while the available choices are shown along the paradigmatic (vertical) axis.

As noted earlier, dramatic action admits of the possibility of splitting the syntagmatic axis into layered tracks of simultaneous dramatic activity. The scriptolexeme "rushing" in the choice environment used for Table 7 indicates that the kinetic action and the verbal action are to occur simultaneously, not in sequence. What is scriptographically represented as a single horizontal line of print, therefore, must, in performance, be thought of as having a structure that might be represented as follows.
It is of the first importance that the term "choice" as used in this context does not necessarily imply that the choices involved are either conscious or free. The degree of consciousness is relative to a sliding scale from completely or near completely unconscious to fully and explicitly conscious. In choosing the linguistic item "stairs" of "rushing down the stairs," for example, Arthur Miller surely did not pause to consciously recall that the word for is "stairs" rather than "stars," any more than the performer enacting "rushing" must consciously put one foot in front of the other in order to be able to execute that directive. In all likelihood, Miller was not even aware of having made any choice since the choice was most probably made subconsciously. On the other hand, he would most probably have been fully conscious of the choice to have Biff run down the stairs rather than Happy, just as the performer representing Biff
would be required to be fully conscious of where he was running (i.e., of his goal) though not of exactly which and how many minimal units of motion are involved in getting there.

Between the two extremes of mostly or fully conscious and mostly or fully unconscious choice lie relative shades of semi- or partial consciousness.

EXAMPLE 26.

    LINDA Forgive me, dear. I can't cry. I don't know why it is, but I can't cry. I don't understand it. Why did you ever do that? Help me, Willy, I can't cry. It seems to me that you're just on another trip. I keep expecting you. Willy dear, I can't cry. Why did you do it? I search and search and I search, and I can't understand it, Willy. I made the last payment on the house today. Today, dear. And there'll be nobody home. A sob rises in her throat. We're free and clear. Sobbing more fully, released: We're free. Biff comes slowly toward her. We're free... We're free...  

Linda's "Requiem" is characterized by a predominance of short, simple and compound sentence structures and by repetition of words and phrases, "I can't cry," "I search," "I don't/can't understand it," "today," and "We're free." The occurrence of the first person personal pronoun "I" eleven times emphasizes the highly subjective

\(^4\text{Ibid.}, p. 139.\)
character of the utterance. The prominence of the "I—you" relation and of "we" indicate the highly personal intimacy of it. The predominence of personal pronouns and verbs over common nouns emphasizes the precedence of private feelings over material things. It is unlikely that Miller paused to count pronouns, limit the lengths and types of clauses, and avoid the use of common nouns with full consciousness of choice. What is more likely is that his choices were semi-conscious. He was probably aware of a desire to choose language which would be appropriate to Linda's character as developed in the drama appropriate to the situation of deep personal grief in which she finds herself, and he probably groped toward the right choices without being explicitly aware that his pronouns were first person personal and so on.

What matters, for poetics as well as for linguistics, is what choices are made, not with what degree of consciousness they were made. The linguistic model suggests that a structuralist poetics should consider all choices as choices regardless of whether some are more conscious than others. If the degree of consciousness of choice seems to vary widely, the degree of freedom of choice does also.

Some choices seem to be absolutely conditioned, that is, determined by the situation in which they occur or by their environmental frame. If Miller is creating a situation, a syntagm in which Willy is speeding off in his car, that situation, given Willy's known suicidal bent, will determine his choice of "rushing down the stairs" rather than "sauntering down the stairs" or "ambling down the stairs." On the other hand, some choices seem to be relatively free,
It may not seem to make much difference whether Miller calls for the "Pop!" to be delivered before or after the rush down the stairs, or whether Biff shouts "Pop!" or "Pa!" or "Dad!." At least there seems to be nothing in the situation or in the frame itself determining these choices. Even such choices, of course, are limited even though they are not conditioned. Again, what matters, for poetics as well as for linguistics, is what choices are made, not with what degree of freedom they were made. The linguistic model suggests that a structuralist poetics should consider all choices as choices regardless of whether some are more conditioned than others.

If pattern is the concept associated with the syntagmatic axis, contrast is the concept associated with the paradigmatic axis. The choices available to fill a slot in a pattern differ formally from one another and thus signal differences in meaning. They are thus able to indicate differing situations.

EXAMPLE 27.

MARSDEN (staring at him wonderingly) You said that to Gordon?
MARSDEN (staring at him wonderingly) You fed that to Gordon?
MARSDEN (staring at him wonderingly) You led that to Gordon?
MARSDEN (staring at him wonderingly) You read that to Gordon?
MARSDEN (staring at him wonderingly) You wed that to Gordon?

---

These dramatic activity syntagms have the same pattern, but at one point in each of the patterns different choices have been made, as a result of which the activity syntagms have different meanings referring them to different situations. Such meaningfully differing choices occurring at a given point in a pattern are called contrasts. The contrasts illustrated in Example 27 are phonological contrasts. There are, of course, non-verbal contrasts as well as verbal ones.

EXAMPLE 28.
Marsden (staring at him wonderingly) You said that to Gordon?
Marsden (blinking at him wonderingly) You said that to Gordon?
Marsden (smiling at him wonderingly) You said that to Gordon?
Marsden (frowning at him wonderingly) You said that to Gordon?
Marsden (snorting at him wonderingly) You said that to Gordon?

The contrasts illustrated are lexical from a scriptographic point of view but praxical from a kinetic (performance behavioral) point of view.

EXAMPLE 29.
Marsden (staring at him wonderingly) You said that to Gordon?
Marsden (looking at him wonderingly) You said that to Gordon?
Marsden (squinting at him wonderingly) You said that to Gordon?
Marsden (leering at him wonderingly) You said that to Gordon?
Marsden (glaring at him wonderingly) You said that to Gordon?
The contrasts illustrated here are again lexical from a scriptographic point of view but kinesiological from a kinetic point of view.

EXAMPLE 30.

Marsden (staring at him. . .
Marsden (staring at her. . .
Marsden (staring at the ceiling. . .
Marsden (staring at the floor. . .
Marsden (staring at the audience. . .

The contrasts illustrated here are lexical-grammatical from a scriptographic point of view but kino-grammatical from a kinetic point of view. In all these examples, the contrasts illustrated signal differences in the situation to which the chosen syntagm refers.

It is important to remember that contrasts are meaningfully different and that they offer a choice between items that can occupy the same place in the same syntagmatic pattern. In any given syntagmatic stretch of dramatic activity, the choices which are actually present in particular places along the syntagm should be thought of as contrasting with all the choices which could have replaced those which are present but which remain absent. The items which might have been present but are not are just as important to poetics as the items which are present in a given stretch of dramatic activity. They contribute just as much to the signifying potential of the drama.
If O'Neill or the performer representing Marsden uses the item "said," he is using a distinct lexical item that refers to a particular element of thesis. His readers/spectators can recognize the item and can distinguish it from similar but different items like "fed" and "led" which he has not used. They know that "said" refers to a different element of thesis from these other contrasting items, and they are able to recognize it as a distinct lexical item from them because they recognize that the sounds which compose it are minimally different from the sounds which compose the contrasting lexical items. Similarly if O'Neill/Marsden uses/enacts the item "staring," he is using a distinct praxical item that refers to a particular element of thesis. His readers/spectators can recognize the item and can distinguish it from similar but different items like "squinting" or "looking" which he has not used/enacted. They know that "staring" refers to a different element of thesis from these other contrasting items/behaviors, and they are able to recognize it as a distinct lexical/praxical item/behavior from them because they recognize that the motions which compose it are different from the motions which compose the contrasting lexical praxical items.

If the /s/, /e/, and /d/ sounds never contrasted in any environmental frame with any other sounds, they could not be recognized as distinct. For example, native speakers of English do not recognize the two /p/ sounds of "Pop!" to be different sounds. Etically, they are measurably so. Linguists refer to them as aspirated and unaspirated allophones of /p/. A simple verification is to place the palm before the mouth while pronouncing "Pop!" to notice
the puff of air (aspiration) which follows the initial /p/ and the
lessening of the puff which follows the final /p/ (unaspirated).
Although etically different, these sounds are not emically different
because they do not contrast with each other. No lexeme in the
language is distinguished from another lexeme by such a contrast. In
English, therefore, (though not in Thai) these two sounds are not able
to signal a distinction between lexical items or refer to distinct
elements of thesis. Similarly, if the widening and expansion of the
muscles about the eyes and the wide opening of the eye lids which are
components of "staring" did not contrast with anything else, they
could not be recognized as distinct motions. Thus it is easier to
distinguish staring from squinting than it is to distinguish staring
from glaring. Staring and glaring are, like aspirated and unaspirated
allophones of /p/, not contrasts kinetically, though they certainly
are lexical contrasts scriptographically.

Without contrasts, the dramatic system would not be able to
function at all. Individual items of dramatic activity, like the
individual items of natural language, can only function because they
are incorporated into a system of contrasts (oppositions). It is the
items with which an item contrasts that make it possible for that item
to signify, to communicate. The syntagmatic axis is the axis that
links together the items that are actually present in a given stretch
of dramatic activity while the paradigmatic axis is the axis that
links the items that are actually present to the items that are not
present but might have been, that is, to the items with which they
contrast.
CHAPTER VII
DRAMATIC GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES

The last two chapters have laid the groundwork and introduced some basic concepts for a systemic description of the drama as modeled upon the systemic description of natural language. Each level of drama described in Chapter V and schematized in Figures 7 and 8 should have its own well-developed model within the comprehensive model of the drama, and, as noted earlier, much work remains to be done at all levels of dramatic modeling along systemic and structuralist lines. The remainder of this study addresses itself exclusively to the modeling of the grammatical level of the dramatic language, the modeling of the other levels described in Chapter V being deferred to the efforts of other scholars or to a later time.

Structures, Places, and Elements

In the model for the level of grammar, the patterns that occur along the syntagmatic axis are called "structures."

EXAMPLE 31.
You will draw your salary for the full month.\footnote{The Adding Machine, p. 105.}
I'll scratch your back later.\footnote{The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 761.}
These two dramatic lines are grammatically alike from a linguistic point of view. A patterning of units-within-sequences noticeable in the first line is repeated in the second. Because they have the same patterning, something of the first line can be said to be repeated in the second, even though they do not contain the same surface items. The same patterning can also be found in the following lines.

EXAMPLE 32.

Somebody hit me with an egg.³
We should've bought the land next door.⁴

The four lines taken together can be considered to be alike in three important ways. First, each can be easily and naturally divided into four parts.

EXAMPLE 33.

You will draw your salary for the full month
I 'll scratch your back later
Somebody hit me with an egg
We should've bought the land next door

Since each of these lines can be divided into four parts, it can be said of them that they share a linguistic structure of four "places." Second, each contains the same "elements" of structure. "You," "I,"

³Sticks and Bones, p. 566. ⁴Death of a Salesman, p. 17.
"Somebody," and "We" are lexically different but structurally alike in that each is representing the same structural element in its own syntagm, the structural element: subject. Similarly, "will draw," "(wi)'ll scratch," "hit," and "should've bought" are alike in that each is representing the structural element: predicator. "Your salary," "your back," "me," and "the land" are each representing the structural element: complement. And "for the full month," "later," "with an egg," and "next door" are each representing the structural element: adjunct ("the part of a sentence which answers any question other than 'Who or what?' after the verb\(^{5}\)). The four lines, then, are alike in that the structure of each consists of the elements: subject, predicator, complement, and adjunct.

**EXAMPLE 34.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>PREDICATOR</th>
<th>COMPLEMENT</th>
<th>ADJUNCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>will draw</td>
<td>your salary</td>
<td>for the full month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>'ll scratch</td>
<td>your back</td>
<td>later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody</td>
<td>hit</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>with an egg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>should've bought</td>
<td>the land</td>
<td>next door</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third, each contains only one "occurrence" of each of the elements of its structure.

---

\(^{5}\)Berry, p. 64.
EXAMPLE 35.

She won with all those plants over there.  

Women make me sick.  

By contrast with the four lines in Example 33, these two lines, although each has a structure consisting of four places, each contain two occurrences of one of their structural elements. The first contains two occurrences of the element adjunct, "with all those plants" and "over there," and no occurrence of the element complement. The second contains two occurrences of the element complement, "me" and "sick," and no occurrence of the element adjunct.

The important features to remember from the linguistic model, then, are the following: structures are made up of places which are filled by occurrences of structural elements. As has been repeatedly emphasized, language is only one of the component sub-systems of the drama, but it is a sub-system which may prove capable of modeling the entire dramatic system. What, then, are the structures of the drama? What places do those structures contain? And what elements of structure occur in or fill those places?

---

6The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 761.
7The Adding Machine, p. 102.
EXAMPLE 36.

TILLIE Can I go in today, Mother?  
VENUS'-FLYTRAPS (gruffly) Grrrrrr!  
BIFF. . . grasps Willy's hand.  
He (STANLEY) picks up her (BLANCHE's) inert figure. . . .

These four stretches of dramatic activity, like the lines considered in Examples 31-34, can be considered to be alike in three important ways. First, each can be divided into three parts.

EXAMPLE 37.

TILLIE (questions) BEATRICE
VENUS'-FLYTRAPS (growl at) JONATHAN
BIFF grasps Willy's hand
STANLEY picks up BLANCHE

Second, each contains the same elements of structure. "TILLIE," "VENUS'-FLYTRAPS," "BIFF," and "STANLEY" are praxically different but structurally alike in that each is representing the structural element: agent. "Can I go in today," "Mother," "Grrrrrr," "grasps," and "picks up" are each representing the structural element: action. And "BEATRICE," "JONATHAN," "Willy's hand," and "her inert figure" are

---

8The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 747.
9Oh Dad, Poor Dad, p. 502.
10Death of a Salesman, p. 106.
11A Streetcar Named Desire, p. 90.
each representing the structural element: patient. The four stretches are alike, then, in that the structure of each contains the structural elements: agent, action, and patient.

EXAMPLE 38.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PATIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TILLIE</td>
<td>(questions)</td>
<td>BEATRICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENUS'-FLYTRAPS</td>
<td>(growls at)</td>
<td>JONATHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIFF</td>
<td>grasps</td>
<td>Willy's hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANLEY</td>
<td>picks up</td>
<td>BLANCHE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third, the structure of each contains only one occurrence of each of its structural elements.

Hypothesis 10:

subject : predicator : complement = sender : message : receiver

= agent : action : patient.

Hypothesis 11


The agent-action-patient type of structure is one kind of dramatic grammatical structure. Another kind is exemplified by the underlined portions of the following actions.

EXAMPLE 39.

Big orange ball thrown from hole in ceiling hits GIRL on head. . . .

Stanley. . . sets a chair for him (WILLY).13

---

12A Beautiful Day, p. 305.  
13Death of a Salesman, p. 105.
"A chair" and "big orange ball" can each be thought of as representing an element of structure which might be called an "intermediate agent." An intermediate agent, in this context, is an instrument or other object manipulated by an agent in a transitive manner, that is, in the direction of a patient. Each of the underlined stretches in Example 39, then, can be thought of as containing two places filled by one occurrence each of two structural elements: primary agent and intermediate agent.

EXAMPLE 40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY AGENT</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE AGENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ball-thrower)</td>
<td>ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE 41.

JAMIE. . . breaks it (MR. MORSE’s pencil). . .

Alma snatches at the plumed hat.

A third type of dramatic grammatical structure is exemplified by the underlined portions of the above actions. "MR. MORSE’S pencil" and "the plumed hat" can each be thought of as representing an element of structure which might be called an "intermediate patient." An intermediate patient, in this context, is a surrogate or an object of seizure belonging to or associated with a patient. Each of the underlined stretches in Example 41, then, can be thought of as

---

14Hot l Baltimore, p. 69. 15Summer and Smoke, p. 679.
containing two places filled by one occurrence each of two structural elements: intermediate patient and primary patient.

EXAMPLE 42.

INTERMEDIATE PATIENT
pencil
hat

ULTIMATE PATIENT
MR. MORSE
MRS. WINEMILLER

A fourth kind of dramatic grammatical structure is exemplified by the following verbal actions.

EXAMPLE 43.

MILLIE Good morning, Billy; don't let me frighten you.16

MAYO You know as well as we do there ain't no cause to be feelin chipper.17

EUNICE What's the matter, honey? Are you lost?18

BEATRICE There, now, nobody's after you. Nice and easy. Breathe deeply. . . .19

The items occupying places in these stretches of dramatic activity can be thought of as being distributed across three elements of structure: lead, kernel, and extender.

A kernel is the essential core of a stretch of verbal dramatic activity, the removal of which would render the stretch dramatically unintelligible. A lead is additional verbal material introducing or leading into a kernel, and an extender is additional verbal material

---

16Hot 1 Baltimore, p. 5.  
17Beyond the Horizon, p. 95.  
18A Streetcar Named Desire, p. 52.  
19The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 756.
amplifying or leading away from a kernel. A kernel thus contains only "obligatory" items essential to the shortest variant of the type. Stretches which contain additional material of a non-obligatory nature may be called "expanded." Note that "non-obligatory" material, in this context, is not dispensable. The terms "obligatory" and "non-obligatory" are descriptive, not evaluative. It is important to recognize that expanded material is just as necessary to drama as obligatory material.

EXAMPLE 44.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAD</th>
<th>KERNEL</th>
<th>EXTENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good morning, Billy;</td>
<td>don't let me frighten you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know as well as we do</td>
<td>there ain't no cause to be feelin chipper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What's the matter, honey? Are you lost?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There, now,</td>
<td>nobody's after you.</td>
<td>Nice and easy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Breathe deeply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A fifth kind of dramatic grammatical structure is exemplified by the following non-verbal actions.

EXAMPLE 44.

THE COMMODORE clinks his glass against MADAME ROSEPETTE'S glass. The glasses break. The glasses break.

Then each produces from behind the desk a hat--ZERO, a dusty derby. The Adding Machine, p. 104.
He (YANK) . . . hurls his shovel after them (MILDRED and the ENGINEERS) at the door which has just closed.22

JAMIE takes a pencil from MR. MORSE'S pocket. . . . 23

The items occupying places in these stretches of dramatic activity can be thought of as being distributed across three elements of structure: telegraph, stroke, and follow-through. A stroke is the essential core of a stretch of non-verbal dramatic activity. A telegraph is additional non-verbal material introducing, leading into, or "winding-up" for a stroke, and a follow-through is an entropic motional carryover from the momentum of a stroke.

EXAMPLE 46.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELEGRAPH</th>
<th>STROKE</th>
<th>FOLLOW-THROUGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The COMMODORE picks up his glass and ZERO reaches behind his desk and YANK rears back with shovel and JAMIE reaches for the pencil and</td>
<td>moves it against MME. ROSEPETTLE'S glass. pulls hat into view. lets it fly. grasps it,</td>
<td>The glasses break. His arm continues its trajectory after he has released the shovel. then pulls it toward him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A sixth kind of dramatic grammatical structure is exemplified by the following action sequences:

22 The Hairy Ape, p. 226. 23 The Hot 1 Baltimore, p. 69.
EXAMPLE 47.

MORSE. . . You can't move twice.
JAMIE I'm not. 24

(She faints. They carry her quickly back, disappearing in the darkness at left, rear. . . .) 25

(The PIRANHA FISH giggles. JONATHAN turns and stares at it again. . . .) 26

FATHER DONALD. . . . Let me just give you my blessing and then we'll talk things over a little and--

(DAVID) slashes with his cane and strikes the hand moving into the position to bless.)

Ohhhhhhhhh! 27

The items occupying places in these stretches of dramatic activity can be thought of as being distributed across three elements of structure: action, reaction, and counter-reaction. An action, as described above, is something an agent does to a patient. An action can stand in isolation, or it can serve as a stimulus to provoke a reaction, an action made in response to a previous action. If the reaction elicits a further reaction, that further reaction is a counter-reaction. Thus, if A does something to B, an action has been performed; if, as a result of that action, B does something back to A, a reaction has been given. Now the action has come full circle, and A may either drop the matter, change the subject, or continue the engagement. If he chooses the latter and, as a result of B's reaction, does something back to B, a counter-reaction has been made, not a fresh action. For purposes of

24Ibid., p. 68.  
26Oh Dad, Poor Dad, p. 503.  
27Sticks and Bones, p. 558.
determining actions and reactions it is important to consider only the immediately previous action. Reactions and counter-reactions may be considered to be subordinate to the actions which prompt them.

Hypothesis 12:

action and reaction : poetics = main clause and subordinate clause : linguistics.

EXAMPLE 48.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>COUNTER-REACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MORSE. . . You can't move twice.</td>
<td>JAMIE I'm not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She (MILDRED) faints.</td>
<td>They (the ENGINEERS) carry her quickly back, disappearing in the darkness at left, rear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PIRANHA FISH giggles.</td>
<td>JONATHAN turns and stares at it again.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER DONALD. . . Let me just give you my blessing and then we'll talk things over a little and--</td>
<td>(DAVID slashes with his cane and strikes the hand moving into the position to bless.</td>
<td>Ohhhhhhh!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A seventh kind of dramatic grammatical structure is exemplified by the following action segments:

EXAMPLE 49.

HAPPY. . . I think I got less bashful and you got more so. What happened, Biff? Where's the old humor, the old confidence? He shakes Biff's knee. Biff gets up and moves restlessly about the room. What's the matter?28

28Death of a Salesman, p. 21.
BEATRICE. . . . I have a good number of exciting duties for you to take care of, not the least of which is rabbit droppings.

TILLIE Oh, Mother, please. . . I'll do it after school.

BEATRICE If we wait a minute longer this house is going to ferment. I found rabbit droppings in my bedroom even.

TILLIE I could do it after Mr. Goodman's class. I'll say I'm ill and ask for a sick pass.

BEATRICE Do you want me to chloroform that thing right this minute?

TILLIE No!

BEATRICE Then shut up.29

(. . . The Matron catches hold of Blanche's arm and prevents her flight. Blanche turns wildly and scratches at the Matron. The heavy woman pinions her arms. Blanche cries out hoarsely and slips to her knees.)

MATRON These fingernails have to be trimmed.30

STEFANOWSKI Flash Red! (The men immediately begin working in earnest as the CAPTAIN, now in khaki, enters. He stands for a moment, looking at them, and then wanders over to the group scraping the rust patch to inspect their work. Then, satisfied that they are

29The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 748.

30A Streetcar Named Desire, p. 93.
actually working, he starts toward passageway. He sees MANNION, sitting on the bit, looking through his glasses and smiling. The CAPTAIN goes over and stands beside him, looking off in the same direction. STEFANOWSKI tries frantically to signal a warning to MANNION by beating out code with his scraper. MANNION suddenly sees the CAPTAIN and quickly lowers his glasses and pretends to clean them, alternately wiping the lenses and holding them up to his eyes to see that they are clean. The CAPTAIN watches him suspiciously for a moment, then he exits by the ladder to the bridge. STEFANOWSKI rises and looks up ladder to make certain the CAPTAIN has gone.) Flash White!31

The items occupying places in these stretches of dramatic activity can be thought of as being distributed across five elements of structure: definer, intensifier, mitigator, crux, and completer. A definer is an action or a set of actions which establishes a bi-polar tension between a project and its resistance or between opposing projects. An intensifier is an action or set of actions characterized by a steady increase in the bi-polar tension established by a definer while a mitigator is an action or set of actions characterized by a steady decrease in the bi-polar tension established by a definer and any antecedent intensifiers. A crux is an action or set of actions marking the point of maximum intensification along a project-resistance axis. At such a point, intensification must be either sustained at maximum pitch or mitigated. A completer is an action or

31Mr. Roberts, pp. 421-422.
a set of actions marking the final outcome of a project or of a clash of projects and the concommitant resolution of the tension raised by the opposition between project and resistance or between project and conflicting project.32

Any project, of course, will have both an inner-frame (character project) and an outer-frame (performer project) aspect. The inner-frame aspect is of primary importance to structuralist poetics while the outer-frame aspect is of primary importance to structuralist theatrical practice.

EXAMPLE 50.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINER</th>
<th>INTENSIFIER</th>
<th>MITIGATOR</th>
<th>CRUX</th>
<th>COMPLETER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAPPY...</td>
<td>What happened,</td>
<td>He shakes</td>
<td>moves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think</td>
<td>Biff?</td>
<td>Biff's knee.</td>
<td>restlessly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less</td>
<td>Where's the</td>
<td>Biff gets up</td>
<td>about the room.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bashful</td>
<td>old humor,</td>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and you</td>
<td>the old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got more</td>
<td>confidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What's the matter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEATRICE</th>
<th>BEATRICE</th>
<th>BEATRICE</th>
<th>BEATRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>....I</td>
<td>If we wait</td>
<td>Do you</td>
<td>Then shut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a</td>
<td>any longer</td>
<td>want me</td>
<td>up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good num-</td>
<td>this house</td>
<td>to chlor-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ber of</td>
<td>is going to</td>
<td>oform that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exciting</td>
<td>ferment. I</td>
<td>thing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duties</td>
<td>found rab-</td>
<td>right this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for you</td>
<td>bit drop-</td>
<td>minute?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to take</td>
<td>pings in my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care of,</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
<td>TILLIE</td>
<td>No!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not the</td>
<td>even.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>least of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32Beckerman, pp. 44-56.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINER</th>
<th>INTENSIFIER</th>
<th>MITIGATOR</th>
<th>INTENSIFIER</th>
<th>CRUX</th>
<th>MITIGATOR</th>
<th>COMPLETER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>which is</td>
<td>TILLIE I</td>
<td>could do it</td>
<td>after Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rabbit droppings.</td>
<td>TILLIE Goodman's</td>
<td>class.</td>
<td>I'll say</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TILLIE</td>
<td>I'll do it after school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I'm ill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, Mother, please</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ask for a sick pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The matron catches hold of Blanche's arm and prevents her flight.

STEFANOWSKI wanders over to the group scraping the rust patch to inspect their work. Then, satisfied that they are actually working, he starts toward passageway. He sees MANNION sitting on the bit, looking through his glasses and smiling. The CAPTAIN goes over.

BLANCHE turns wildly scratches at the matron. The heavy woman pinions her arms. BLANCHE cries out hoarsely to her knees. These finger-nails be trimmed.

MANNION suddenly sees the CAPTAIN and quickly lowers his glasses and pretends to clean them. then he exits by the ladder to the bridge.

Flash Red! Then he Flash White!

(The men immediately begin working and then STEFANOWSKI rises and looks up the ladder to)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINER</th>
<th>INTENSIFIER</th>
<th>MITIGATOR</th>
<th>INTENSIFIER</th>
<th>CRUX</th>
<th>MITIGATOR</th>
<th>COMPLETER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in earnest as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and stands</td>
<td>The CAPTAIN</td>
<td>make cer-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the CAPTAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>beside him,</td>
<td>watches him</td>
<td>tain the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>looking off</td>
<td>suspicious-</td>
<td>CAPTAIN is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He stands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the same</td>
<td>ly for a</td>
<td>gone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>direction.</td>
<td>moment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STEFANOFSKI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tries fran-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tically to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>signal a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>warning to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MANNION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The seven types of dramatic grammatical patterning described above are neither exhaustive nor definitive. Additional patterns and elements of structure may be discovered at the various layers of dramatic structuring in the future. The present models may ultimately have to be adjusted or even replaced or discarded in the pursuit of a structuralist poetics, but they provide a preliminary schema which it will be difficult to ignore entirely.

**Algebraic Symbols for the Elements of Structure**

The elements of dramatic structure identified and exemplified above may be conveniently represented in diagrams and formulae by a set of algebraic symbols as follows:

- **D** = definer, **I** = intensifier, **X** = crux, **M** = mitigator, **C** = completer;
- **α** = action, **β** = reaction, **γ** = counter-reaction;
- **₁** = agent, **→** = action, **₂** = patient;
- **₁** = intermediate (agent or patient), **p** = primary (agent or patient);
- **₁** = lead, **k** = kernel, **e** = extender;
- **t** = telegraph, **s** = stroke, **f** = follow-through.

A simple listing of the elements contained in a given structure will be separated, as above, by commas while a description of an actual structural pattern will be written without the commas.

**EXAMPLE 51.**

MATRON. . . . (The Doctor comes into the room and she looks at him) Jacket, Doctor?
DOCTOR  Not unless necessary. 33

(RUTH comes to the top of the stairs. . . .)

RUTH  Do you have Devil's Kiss down there?

BEATRICE  It's in the bathroom cabinet. 34

Each of these structures contains the elements $\alpha, \beta$. The first is an $\alpha\beta\alpha\beta$ structure while the second is an $\alpha\alpha\beta$ structure. Parenteses indicate that a structure contains an element that occurs within another element.

EXAMAPLE 52.

GIRL. . . .This place was built--

BILL  How'd you suddenly get onto talking about--

GIRL  --in eighteen hundred and something. 34

This stretch may be said to have the structure $\alpha(\beta)$.

**Formal Items**

The actual bits of formed substance-in-situation that represent the elements of structure in their places are called "formal items."

EXAMPLES 31 and 32.

You will draw your salary for the full month.

I'll scratch your back later.

---

33A Streetcar Named Desire, p. 93.

34The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 748.
Returning to the four linguistic lines with which this consideration
of the grammar of dramatic form began, it can now be noted that each
of the lines, as a sentence, contains one occurrence of the linguistic
structural element P (for predicator). The formal items representing
P, then, are: "will draw," "(wi)'ll scratch," "hit," and "should
(ha)'ve bought."

In natural language there are a relatively small number of
structural elements and a virtually unlimited number of formal items
capable of representing them. Thus each element of structure will
have a great number of formal items capable of representing it.
Formal items are concrete; they are bits of the empirical phenomena of
the language, while the elements of structure are abstract
slot-filling grammatical categories.

EXAMPLE 53.

BOSS. ... You will draw your salary for the full month.
RUTH. ... I'll scratch your back later.
OZZIE. ... Somebody hit me with an egg.
WILLY We should've bought the land next door.

Remaining within a scriptological framework wherein all formal
items are still linguistic, a new situation is created by the addition
of the items "BOSS," "RUTH," "OZZIE," and "WILLY" to the fronts of the
lines. Immediately it becomes possible to see each of these new items
as at least functionally the subject of a structured behavioral utterance within which the entire linguistic sentence that follows becomes a kind of predicator.

The transformation of scriptographic formal items into the performance behavioral formal items of dramatic enactment presents new complexities. Here the formal items are of two empirical orders: vocal (auditory) and kinetic (visual). The character WILLY LOMAN is no longer represented by the scriptographeme "WILLY" but by Lee J. Cobb or some other performer. Similarly, characters' kinetic behaviors, such as "He shakes Biff's knee," are transformed from lexigraphic representation to kinetic representation; that is, the formal items change from linguistic (words, phrases, clauses) to kinetic (beats, actions, transactions). Linguistic behaviors, of course, change least in the transformation, graphic yielding phonic items.

The discrepancy between the two different orders of formal item in the performance surface of the drama stems from the fact that, while both verbal and non-verbal behaviors are used to encode culturally conditioned meanings, verbal behaviors are also used to encode non-verbal behaviors. It is important to remember, however, that non-verbal performance behaviors are not "real" behaviors. They remain signs among others, representative of real behaviors and thus retain their formal item status as bits of the surface phenomena in a system of signification.
**Sequences**

Formal items occur along the syntagmatic axis, one after another, in a "sequence." The place of the formal item within its sequence helps the analyst to determine which structural element the item is representing.

**EXAMPLE 54.**

**BIFF** Don't take it that way! Goddammit!

**WILLY, strikes Biff.** . . .

The formal item "Biff" occurs in each of these sequences. In the first sequence it represents the structural element 1, and in the second sequence it represents the structural element 2. The positioning of "BIFF" before the line in the first sequence is one indicator that it is representing the element 1 while the positioning of the same item after "strikes" in the second line is one indicator that in the action described, it is representing the element 2.

In moving from page to stage, it is important to note that a scriptographic syntagm, spatial as product and spatio-temporal as process, becomes a behavioral syntagm which is similarly "read" spatio-temporally. In what sense, then, can the formal item Arthur Kennedy be considered to be positioned "before" the line in the performance of the first sequence and "after" the action of striking in the second? There is a sense in which such actions may be said to be "read" spatio-temporally as sequences. The spectator's eye will

---

35Death of a Salesman, p. 113.
tend to go to the performer speaking or moving and thence to "read across" along the speaker's or doer's axis of orientation toward non-speaking or non-moving performers for reactions. In fact, turns at talking and moving are generally more respected in the drama than in real life precisely in order to facilitate such "reading" of the action by the spectator.

The identification of the element of structure that a given formal item is representing on the basis of that item's position in its sequence alone is not a foolproof procedure, however, because structural elements do not always occur in the same order. Although there is, for each type of structural patterning, an accustomed order of the elements called the "unmarked (because expected) version" of the structure, other "marked (because unexpected) versions" may occur. The unmarked version of the linguistic elements S, P, C, and A (subject, predicator, complement, and adjunct) is the SPCA version of "I'll scratch your back later," but other marked versions like the ASPC of "Later I'll scratch your back" or the CSPA of "Your back I'll scratch later" are possible.

EXAMPLE 55.

GIRL seated on chair reading.

Looks up to see and hear an empty orange balloon being blown up by BOY through a hole in ceiling.36

The unmarked version of the underlined action would position the formal item BOY, representing the structural element 1, before the

36A Beautiful Day, p. 304.
formal items "blows up," representing the structural element $\rightarrow$: "BOY blows up balloon through a hole in ceiling." In the example, that expected order is reversed, producing a scriptographically marked version.

*Vis-a-vis* natural language, drama in performance is relatively poor in marked structural versions. In performance, most dramatic structures, like the PREFIX-BASE-INFIX-SUFFIX-ENDING-ADDITION structure of the English word, are totally unmarked. In performance, when an effect precedes its cause (\(\beta \rightarrow \alpha\)), such marked patterning is usually the result of a comic intent or of a performance error, as when the gun goes off after the victim has fallen. There are at least two notable exceptions, however:

**EXAMPLE 56.**

*In the darkness we hear a shot.*

*Lights up slowly on* LYLE, *staring down at the ground.*

Temporally, actions like this one, where an agent's audience-perceivable out-of-frame behavior is followed by his appearance within frame, are "read" $\rightarrow$ 1 in performance. However, there is also an unmarked structure convention here since the audience expectation is that the first item to appear in frame after an out-of-frame $\rightarrow$ will be the 1, a convention which is often manipulated by marked "whodunit" versions. Spatially, it has long been a

---

commonplace of directing theory that on any up-down axis, the item representing 2 will be positioned down. The classic cinematic treatment of this is the over-the-shoulder two-shot. On any vertical high-low axis, the item representing 1 will be positioned high, and the item representing 1 will be positioned up, and the item representing 2 will be positioned lower (read from top down). Finally, on any left-right axis, the item representing 1 will be positioned stage right (audience's left), and the item representing 2 will be positioned stage left (audience's right). Reversals of these positionings might then be considered to be marked versions of them.38

Classes

Taxonomies of formal item may be developed on the basis of which element of structure a given formal item is most likely to represent. The linguistic items "will draw," "will scratch," "hit," and "should have bought," for example, are more likely to represent the linguistic structural element predicator (P) than any other linguistic element of structure and can therefore be assigned, along with a large number of other such items, to a "verbal class" of items.

Likewise, "for the full month," "later," "with an egg," "and nextdoor," since they are most likely to represent the linguistic structural element adjunct (A), can be assigned, along with a large

number of other such items, to an "adverbial class" of items. Not only so the linguistic structural elements P and A, then, each have a class of items usually representing them, but also the items belonging to P's class are exclusively P's and are unlikely to represent any other linguistic element of structure, and the items belonging to A's class are exclusively A's and are unlikely to represent any other linguistic element of structure. This mutual exclusivity of elements and their representing classes is not universal in language, however.

"You," "your salary," "I," "your back," "somebody," "me," "we," and "the land next door" belong, along with a large number of other such items, to a "nominal (cross-class)" of items because while "I" and "we" are most likely to represent the linguistic element subject (S) and "me" is most likely to represent the linguistic element complement (C), all of the others are equally likely to represent S or C interchangeably.

Whereas linguistic, and thus also scriptological, items are uniformly words, dramatic items, as continually noted above, are of several orders, principally persons, things, and activities. Dramatic items are thus easier to classify on the stage, where the items are performers, environmental objects, and units of motion and sound, than on the page, where the items are words and where there is a natural tendency to confuse linguistic with dramatic items.
As performed, items like "I'll scratch your back later," "strikes Biff," "seated on chair reading," and "a shot" belong to an "activity class" of items which belongs exclusively to the dramatic structural element →, while performer items and environmental object items belong to a "nominal (cross-class)" of items which may represent the dramatic structural elements 1 or 2 interchangeably. Like the place it occupies in a sequence, then, the class to which an item belongs is a clue as to which structural element it represents.

**Type**

In addition to being grouped by classes, formal items may be grouped by "type." If the ability of an item to represent a given element is the criterion by which it is grouped in a class, the structuring that exists within an item is the criterion by which it is assigned membership in a type. "Somebody hit me with an egg," "strikes," "OZZIE," "Biff," "a chair," sets," "breaks," "MR. MORSE's pencil," "snatches at," and "the plumed hat" can be distributed by classes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMINAL GROUPS</th>
<th>ACTIVITY GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OZZIE</td>
<td>&quot;Somebody hit me with an egg.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biff</td>
<td>strikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a chair</td>
<td>sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. MORSE's pencil</td>
<td>breaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the plumed hat</td>
<td>snatches at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the same formal items are distributed by type, different groupings emerge.
The internal structural type of an item constitutes a third clue as to the element of structure that item is representing.

**Function**

Each linguistic structural element has certain "functions" associated with it. The structural element $S$ (subject), for example, has the following functions associated with it: (1) expresses the actor of an action, (2) expresses the theme (topic) of a sentence, (3) expresses mood (by its position relative to the verb, indicating whether the sentence is a statement or a question), and (4) expresses number and person (determining the number and person of $P$).

**EXAMPLE 57.**

Stanley... sets a chair for (WILLY).

Somebody hit me with an egg.

As linguistic units, these sentences each have the linguistic functional pattern: actor + "action" + "goal" + "circumstance."
Again, as linguistic units, they also each have the linguistic functional pattern: theme + "rheme" (a comment made about the theme).

Further, as sentences, these units have the linguistic functional pattern: "mood marker" + "mood marker" + "support" (the remainder of the message).

Finally, as sentences, these units have the linguistic functional pattern "number and person marker" + "number and person marker" + "remainder."

It is of the first importance to the analogy between linguistics and poetics that in moving from page to stage, the functions of language become the elements of dramatic structure. It is this interchangeability of linguistic function and dramatic structural element that accounts for (1) the extraordinary
foregrounding power of the spoken language component of the drama, the power by which it is enabled to bring "out-of-frame" action into frame:

EXAMPLE 58.

RUTH. . . . And there was Tillie, cranking away, looking weird as a coot. . . . that old jumper with the raggy slip and the lightning hair. . . . cranking away while some boy with glasses was reading this stupid speech. . . . and everybody burst into laughter until the teacher yelled at them. . . . 39

and (2) the converse symbolic/allegorical power of the stage figure or staged activity to "stand for" a verbalized abstraction:

EXAMPLE 59.

Then Death appears, a death's head tapping a drum. The Warrior faces him, strikes him, but Death does not die. The Warrior strikes again and again. Death says "come with me." The Warrior drops his swords and follows Death. 40

Interaction of Patterns

As a linguistic unit, the sentence "Stanley sets a chair for "(WILLY) can be seen to integrate layers of patterning.

39The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 749.

### TABLE 8—Interaction of simple linguistic patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of formal item</th>
<th>Stanley</th>
<th>sets</th>
<th>a chair</th>
<th>for (WILLY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominal group</td>
<td>m, h, q</td>
<td>a, v, e</td>
<td>m, h, q</td>
<td>p, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of formal item</td>
<td>m, h, q</td>
<td>a, v, e</td>
<td>m, h, q</td>
<td>p, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional patterns</td>
<td>actor</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>goal</td>
<td>circumstance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mood marker&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>mood marker&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number and person marker&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>number and person marker&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>remainder</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theme</td>
<td>rheme</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a dramatic unit, the performance sequence which is a transformation of the same scriptographic sequence can likewise be seen to integrate layers of patterning.

### TABLE 9—Interaction of simple dramatic patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of formal item</th>
<th>Stanley</th>
<th>sets</th>
<th>a chair</th>
<th>for (WILLY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominal group</td>
<td>p, i</td>
<td>t, s, f,</td>
<td>p, i</td>
<td>p, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of formal item</td>
<td>p, i</td>
<td>t, s, f</td>
<td>p, i</td>
<td>p, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional/ elemental pattern</td>
<td>agent</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>patient&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>patient&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age marker&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>age marker&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>remainder</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex marker&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>sex marker&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>remainder</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role marker&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>role marker&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>remainder</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theme</td>
<td>rheme</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>41</sup>modifier, headword, qualifier  
<sup>42</sup>aux. verb, verb, extension  
<sup>43</sup>preposition, completive
Depth

Thus far, the various kinds of structural patterning have been considered one at a time, but the integration of all the patterns within an orchestrated whole can be illustrated schematically.

EXAMPLE 60

BEATRICE . . . I have a good number of exciting duties for you to take care of, not the least of which is rabbit droppings.

TILLIE Oh, Mother, please. . . I'll do it after school.

BEATRICE If we wait a minute longer this house is going to ferment. I found rabbit droppings in my bedroom even.

TILLIE I could do it after Mr. Goodman's class. I'll say I'm ill and ask for a sick pass.

BEATRICE Do you want me to chloroform that thing right this minute?

TILLIE No!

BEATRICE Then shut up.

This entire segment has the structure DIXC. The D part has the structure $\alpha \beta$. The I, X, and C parts each have the structure $\gamma(\alpha^{2,3,4}) \gamma(\beta^{2,3,4})$. The separate parts of the $\alpha \beta$ and $\gamma \gamma$ structures have the structure $1 \rightarrow 2$. The 1's and 2's all have the structure $p$ while the $\rightarrow$'s have, respectively, the structures $ke, lk, lke, ke, ke, k, k$, and one ? (unknown from the script alone).

Thus a series of cuts has been made in the segment. The first cut divided it into four parts. The next set of cuts divided each of these four parts into the parts. The next set divided each of the
resulting eight parts into three parts and so on until a set of parts emerged which seemed meaningfully indivisible, that is, below the threshold of present focus. Successive cuts revealed different kinds of structures at each level of cutting. A scale can thus be formed with the structures revealed in the first cutting at the top of
the scale and those revealed by the last set of cuttings at the bottom. This scale is what linguists call the "scale of depth." The scale of depth for a stretch can then be charted in the form of a "tree diagram."

FIGURE 6—Tree diagram of Example 50.
A structural tree is organized in "layers," the succeeding rows of characters representing structural elements from top to bottom. The points at which branching either does or could take place at each layer down to the last are called "nodes." In the segment diagram above, for example, there is one node at layer one; there are four at layer two, eight at layer three, twenty-four at layer four, and, since it is the bottom layer, none at layer five. That is, at layer five all branching stops.

The depth of an element of structure may be calibrated according to the number of nodes it stands away from the top of the tree. In the segment diagram above, for example, the element X is at a depth of one, and the element → is at a depth of three; → is thus two nodes deeper than X.

Depth is a gauge of the degree of complexity of a dramatic segment. The larger the number of layers that the tree diagram of a stretch of a dramatic text or activity contains, the more complex that stretch will be. Likewise, the larger the number of nodes per layer within the diagram, the more complex the stretch will be. Thus a stretch with eight nodes at layer four will be less complex than a stretch with eighteen nodes at layer four, and a stretch with five layers will be less complex than a stretch with eight.
CHAPTER VIII
UNITS OF DRAMA

Simple Units

The elements of dramatic structure exemplified in the last chapter are represented by formal items of varying sizes. These varying sizes of formal items are called "units." As with yards, feet, and inches, or with sentences, clauses, and words, the smaller units of dramatic grammar combine to form the larger units, and, conversely, the larger units are made up of the smaller units. Thus each unit can be identified in two ways: (1) by the way in which it combines with other units of the same size to form larger units, and (2) by its internal composition of units smaller than itself. That is, a unit can be identified by the position it fills in the structural configuration of a larger unit as well as by the configuration of smaller units of which it is composed.

The units of dramatic structural grammar include the "segment," the "transaction," the "action," the "set," and the "acteme." The first and last of these constitute special cases, so the transaction, action, and set will be considered first.

Any transaction will be representing a D, I, X, M, or C element in the structural configuration of a segment. It will have an
internal structural configuration of one or more of the elements $\alpha$, $\beta$, and $\gamma$. In the stretch

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\| \text{MORSE... You can't move twice. JAMIE I'm not.} \\
\| \text{\text{I} \text{\text{\gamma(\alpha)}}} \\
\| \text{\text{MORSE You took your hand off it. JAMIE I did not.}}
\end{array}
\]

there are two transactions while the following stretch contains three.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\| \text{\text{WILLY Not finding yourself at the age of thirty-four is a}} \\
\| \text{\text{\text{I}}} \text{\text{\beta}} \\
\| \text{\text{LINDA Shh! WILLY The trouble is he's lazy,}} \\
\| \text{\text{\text{I}}} \text{\text{\alpha}} \\
\| \text{\text{LINDA goddamit! WILLY Biff is a lazy bum!}} \\
\| \text{\text{\text{X}}} \\
\| \text{\text{LINDA They're sleeping. Get something to eat. Go on down.}}
\end{array}
\]

A pair of vertical lines marks the boundaries of a transaction.

Any action will be representing an $\alpha$, $\beta$, or $\gamma$ element in the structural configuration of a transaction. It will have an internal structural configuration of one or more of the elements $1, \rightarrow$, and 2.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\| \text{\text{OZZIE... Harriet, What's up?}} \\
\| \text{\text{HARRIET I'm calling Fr.}}
\end{array}
\]

\footnote{1Death of a Salesman, p. 16.} \footnote{2Sticks and Bones, p. 538.}
This stretch contains two actions; there are three in the following stretch:

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \quad \text{MANNION} \ldots \ldots \text{Hey, what time is it in San Francisco?} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \quad \text{INSIGNA} \ldots \text{When?} \\
1 & \quad \text{MANNION} \quad \text{Anybody ask you?} \\
\end{align*}
\]

A single vertical line marks the boundaries of an action.

Any set will be representing a 1, 1, or 2 element in the structural configuration of an action. It will have an internal structural configuration of one or more of the elements t, s, f or one or more of the elements 1, k, e or one or more of the elements p, i.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RUTH (using the backscratcher on BEATRICE, who squirms with ecstasy)} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \quad \text{RUTH and backscratcher \text{ move toward BEATRICE's back and scratch}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
s/s/s/\ldots & \\
\end{align*}
\]

This stretch has three groups. A single dotted line can be used to mark the boundaries of a set.

Any acteme will be representing one of the elements t, s, f or one of the elements 1, k, e or one of the elements p, i in the structural configuration of a set.

\[3^\text{Mr. Roberts, p. 420.}\]

\[4^\text{The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 749.}\]
ALMA  Stop it! (She stamps her foot furiously and crushes the palm
leaf fan between her clenched hands). . . . 5

Alma's line contains two actemes.

| k | e | Stop + it |

Her foot-stamping activity contains at least three actemes.

| t s f |

| raises foot + stamps down + redistributes her weight |

A plus sign marks the boundaries of an acteme.

An acteme can be defined only in relation to the part it plays
in the structural configuration of a set since it has no internal
structure of its own, there being no smaller units of which it is
composed. At the other end of the unit spectrum, a segment can be
defined only in relation to its internal configuration of the elements
D, I, X, M, and C since it represents no element of structure in a
larger configuration, it being the largest dramatic grammatical unit.
A segment's internal structural configuration, then, will consist of
one or more of the elements D, I, X, M, or C.

LINDA. . . Willy, dear. I got a new kind of American-type

D
cheese today. It's whipped. WILLY Why do you get American when I

like Swiss? LINDA I just thought you'd like the change— WILLY I
don't want a change! I want Swiss cheese. Why am I always being contradicted?

LINDA. . . I thought it would be a surprise.

WESTERN UNION BOY. . . Telegram for Miss Marie Buckholder.

LOLA She's not here. WESTERN UNION BOY Sign here. (Lola does, then she closes the door and brings the envelope into the house, looking at it wonderingly. . . . She puts the envelope on the table but can't resist looking at it. Finally she gives in and takes it to the kitchen to steam it open. Then Marie and Turk burst into the room. Lola, confused, wonders what to do with the telegram, then decides. . . to jam it in her apron pocket.

---

6Death of a Salesman, p. 17.

A triple vertical line marks the boundaries of a segment.

**Hypothesis 13:**

segment : poetics = sentence : linguistics

The dramatic segment, as defined above, is, like the sentence as defined by linguists, the largest grammatical unit and should be the typical unit of focus in poetics as the sentence is in linguistics and the sequence is in film theory. Language units larger than the sentence—the paragraph, the chapter, and the whole discourse—are generally regarded as outside the province of linguistics and subjects for rhetorical study. The structural elements at the sentence level—coordinate and subordinate elements—are operative at each higher level in the discourse. Likewise, dramatic units larger than the segment—the scene, the act, and the play—can be regarded as outside the province of a poetics of the drama (micro-poetics) and subjects for a rhetoric of the drama (macro-poetics). Micro-poetics would then deal with units smaller than a scene and macro-poetics with units larger than a segment. As with coordination, subordination, and the sentence, the structural elements at the segment level—D, I, X, M, and C—are operative at each higher level in the play. Thus the problem of what is to be considered the dramatic equivalent of a sentence, introduced in Chapter I (p. 46 above), may be resolved by taking the activity-defined segment as the primary unit of poetic analysis.⁸

⁸For an extensive definition of the activity-defined dramatic segment see Bernard Beckerman, *Dynamics of Drama*, pp. 36-56.
Complex Units

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{p} & \text{i} & \text{p} & \text{i} \\
\text{MADAME ROSEPETTLE} + \text{her glass} + \text{THE COMMODORE} + \text{his glass} & \text{toast} \\
\end{array}
\]

Since it is representing the \text{l} element in an action, MME. R. + her glass + THE C. + his glass might be considered a set. It also has an internal structural configuration consisting of one or more of the elements p, i, but it could just as well be considered as containing two separate sets of p, i elements. That is, it can be divided into two halves, each of which contains the structure of a group. MME. R. + her glass and THE C. + his glass may be called a "complex group."

EXAMPLE 62.

The MUTE hands MATT the drum sticks to MORTIMER's Indian drum, and MATT floors both the old actors with a mighty whop of the sticks.\(^9\)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{p} & \text{i} & \text{p} & \text{i} \\
\text{MATT} + \text{drumstick 1 and drumstick 2} & \text{whops/fells} & \text{both the} \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^9\)The Fantasticks, p. 204.
old actors.

Similarly, in this action, drumstick 1 and drumstick 2 could be said to be a single acteme because they are acting together as a single element in the structure of a set. At the same time, however, drumstick 1 and drumstick 2 could be said to be two separate actemes. Each separately could serve the purpose of the action. Thus, the two drumsticks are two actemes serving as one. Together they form a "complex acteme."

It is important to note that the coordinate items of linguistic complex units are always formally sequential even when they may be functionally or semantically simultaneous. As noted in Chapter VI (Figure 4), however, dramatic structuring allows of simultaneous parallel syntagms. A dramatic complex unit, therefore, may involve coordination of units both horizontally (sequentially) and vertically (simultaneously). The complex units of drama discussed thus far have all been complex in the vertical sense; that is, they have both involved an element of simultaneity in their function. The same kind of vertical complexity can be found at the action level.

1 - 7  (2)

BELLO Y ONE goes toward the bedroom at stage left. BELLBOY TWO

starts toward the bedroom at stage right. 10

---

10Oh Dad, Poor Dad, p. 486.
However, in the horizontal (sequential) sense, a transaction may also be thought of as a complex action. In fact, the internal structural configuration of a transaction \((1 \rightarrow 2; 1 \rightarrow 2)\) is more like the internal structural configurations of the complex units discussed in this part of the present chapter than it is like the internal structural configurations of the other simple units discussed in the first part of the chapter.

The parts of a complex unit are related to one another like the actions in a transaction or the clauses in a sentence. The relationship between MME. R. and THE C., between the two drumsticks, and between the movements of the two BELLBOYS is the same as that between (Lola) closes the door and brings the letter into the house. The relationship is, in linguistic terms, one of coordination. The same Greek letters used to symbolize this relationship at the transactional level, therefore, may be used to symbolize the relationships between the parts of a complex unit. Thus the complex units already discussed may be re-analyzed as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MME. R} & \quad \text{her glass} & \quad \text{THE C.} & \quad \text{his glass} \\
\text{toast} & \quad \text{toast} \\
\text{MATT} & \quad \text{drumstick 1} & \quad \text{drumstick 2} \\
\text{BELLBOY ONE crosses left.} & \quad \text{BELLBOY TWO crosses right.}
\end{align*}
\]
The appropriate parts of the structural trees for these complex unit structures can then be shown as follows.

MME. R. with her glass and THE C. with his glass

BELLBOY ONE crosses left and BELLBOY TWO crosses right

FIGURE 7—Structural trees for complex units.

Vertical (simultaneous) complexity may be found at the transaction and even, though rarely, at the segment level.

EXAMPLE 63.

(MATT) struggles with MORTIMER as HENRY grabs up the disentangled LUISA.¹¹

¹¹The Fantasticks, p. 204.
The partial tree diagram for the above stretch, then would look as follows.

FIGURE 8—Tree diagram for vertically complex transaction.

EXAMPLE 64.

BILL ... Hand me that book. GIRL What number?

APRIL Morning, Millie. BILL Two-eighteen. Just see if he's up on his bill.

MILLIE Good morning. I don't know whether to say good morning to you or good night. GIRL What does he pay--weekly?

BILL Let me see it.

APRIL Say good night to me and I'll curl up right here on the floor.

GIRL He paid half and then the rest yesterday.\(^{12}\)

\(^{12}\)Hot l Baltimore, p. 20.
BILL ... Hand me that book (to GIRL) GIRL What number? (to BILL) BILL Two eighteen. Just see if he's up on his bill (to GIRL) GIRL What does he pay--weekly? (to BILL) BILL Let me see it (to GIRL) GIRL He paid half and then the rest yesterday (to BILL). APRIL Morning, MILLIE (to MILLIE) MILLIE Good morning. I Don't know whether to say good morning to you or goodnight (to APRIL). APRIL Say good night to me and I'll curl up right here on the floor.
In the horizontal (sequential) sense, a segment is a complex transaction, just as a transaction is a complex action, by definition.

**Multivariate and Univariate Structures**

The principal difference between the simple units on the one hand and the complex units, including the segment and the transaction, on the other is that the simple units have what are called "multivariate structures" while the complex units have what are called "univariate structures." In the multivariate structures of the simple
units, the structural elements are related to one another in a variety of ways. For example, the relationship between a 1 element formal item and a $\rightarrow$ element formal item is different from that between a $\rightarrow$ element formal item and a 2 element formal item. The relationship between 1 and c is different from that between c and e; the relationship between t and f is different from that between s and f. By contrast, in the univariate structures of the complex units, the structural elements are related to one another in only one way, through coordination ($\alpha\alpha$).

**EXAMPLE 65.**

(EL GALLO snaps his fingers and everyone moves quickly into position for the action of the play. LUISA rises and crosses upstage to sit on the long bench upon the platform. BELLOMY grabs her wooden chair, carries it to the back of the platform, and sits on it, his back to the audience. HUCKLEBEE sits on the upstage side of the platform with his back to us. EL GALLO seats himself comfortably to the side, or top of the stage right prop box. And the MUTE gets a wooden stick and stands directly up center on the platform, holding up the stick—to represent the wall.  

LUISA's, BELLOMY's, HUCKLEBEE's, EL GALLO's, and the MUTE's actions form a vertically complex action with the structure $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$. The relationship between any two of these $\alpha$ elements is the same; they all coordinate with one another.

**Paratactic and Hypotactic Structures**

The univariate structures of complex units may be either "paratactic" or "hypotactic." In paratactic univariate structures, the uniform relationship between elements is one of coordination.

---

13The Fantasticks, p. 191.
Paratactic and Hypotactic Structures

The univariate structures of complex units may be either "paratactic" or "hypotactic." In paratactic univariate structures, the uniform relationship between elements is one of coordination (αα). In hypotactic univariate structures, the uniform relationship between elements is one of subordination (αβ). For example, the actions of LUISA, BELLOMY, HUCKLEBEE, EL GALLO, and the MUTE in the stretch of dramatic activity cited above, while paratactically related (αα) to one another to form a complex action in the vertical sense, are hypotactically related to EL GALLO's snapping his fingers to form a complex action (transaction) in the horizontal sense.

Finally, because of the seemingly limitless potential for proliferating αα and αβ relationships at all levels of dramatic grammatical structuring from the acteme level through the segment level, univariate structures are sometimes called "recursive" structures.
CHAPTER IX
RANK OF DRAMATIC UNITS

Rank

Since dramatic units, like linguistic units, are of varying lengths, they can be ranked according to their size on a "scale of rank." The simplest version of such a rank scale for the units of dramatic structure might then be given as follows.

- segment
  - transaction
  - action
  - set
    - acteme

If the complex units are included, a more subtle scale may be constructed as follows.

- vertically complex segment
  - horizontally complex transaction (segment)
  - vertically complex transaction
  - horizontally complex action (transaction)
  - vertically complex action
    - action
      - horizontally complex set
      - vertically complex set
        - set
          - horizontally complex acteme
          - vertically complex acteme
            - acteme
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In the case of the more subtle scale, the complex units are considered as units intermediate in size coming between the simple units, but they may also be considered as internal divisions of the smaller units of the simple version of the scale. From the point of view of the subtle scale, it could be argued that segment and transaction should be removed from the simple scale on the grounds that they are both merely special complexes of the action.

The rank scale lists the units in order of size with the largest (longest) at the top and the smallest (shortest) at the bottom in a hierarchical arrangement in which the relationships between the units listed are the same from the top to the bottom of the scale. Each unit on the scale consists of the unit directly below it on the scale and, at the same time, is a constituent of the unit directly above it on the scale. Thus segments consist of transactions, transactions consist of actions, actions consist of sets, and sets consist of actemes while actemes are constituents of sets, sets are constituents of actions, actions are constituents of transactions, and transactions are constituents of segments. Sometimes a unit will consist of several members of the class of unit listed directly below it on the scale, and sometimes it will consist of only one member of that class of unit.

Stage black.
Lights up; as fully inflated orange balloon is lowered from hole in ceiling.
GIRL enters watching.
When balloon is fully visible, GIRL smiles and says, "What a beautiful day!"
BOY explodes balloon with pin.
Black-out.

Fully inflated orange balloon + (by BOY?) is lowered from hole in ceiling (to attract GIRL?)

GIRL enters as balloon continues to be lowered (to attract GIRL?)
watching (balloon). Balloon + (by BOY?) becomes fully visible (to GIRL). (Balloon + by BOY? remains visible to GIRL) as GIRL smiles (at balloon) and GIRL What a
This drama consists of a single segment (masked off by triple vertical lines). The segment consists of three transactions (marked off by double vertical lines). Each of the transactions consists of two actions (marked off by single solid vertical lines). The second and fourth actions are vertically complex (αα under β and ααα under β respectively). Each of the actions consists of three sets (marked off by single dotted vertical lines). The first, fourth, tenth, thirteenth, twenty-second, and twenty-fourth sets each consist of two actemes (each represented by a small letter). The other sets are analyzed as consisting of one acteme each although it should be emphasized that activities such as "is lowered," "enters watching,"
"smiles," and "explodes" are difficult to analyze at acteme level from a script without recourse to actual performance behaviors because a script usually provides only a verb that describes the s portion of the activity. Thus, this kind of analysis throws into sharp relief the scriptographic ambiguities which must be resolved in performance.

The text, as analyzed here, is from director Charlip's notes and, as such, stands half way between Ruth Krauss's original:

EXAMPLE 67.

GIRL What a beautiful day!
(THE SUN falls down onto the stage.)
END

and what a spectator at the Pocket Theatre could perceive. Some of the questions revealed by the analysis but not answered even by the directorial notes include the following: Are the spectators to see the agent of the lowering of the balloon? If so, is he to have an agent-patient intent with respect to the GIRL, or is his activity of lowering to be impersonal? Is the explosion of the balloon something done to the GIRL or something done only to the balloon? What is the patient-target of the girl's smile, line, and final reaction to the explosion? If the GIRL's eyes widen to telegraph her smile, the set will be shown as consisting of two actemes rather than one; if the BOY draws back his hand to telegraph his stroke in popping the balloon, and if after popping it his arm continues in an arc downward or abruptly reverses direction, moving rapidly back toward his body, the set will consist of three actemes rather than one, and so on.
It is of the first importance that whole units alone can act as constituents of higher units. Only whole actemes, for example, can serve as the constituents of a set. A set may thus consist of one whole acteme or two or more actemes but not of a part of an acteme or of one or two whole actemes plus a part of an acteme. Further, at any given level on the scale a unit cannot include as a constituent a unit of more than one step below itself on the scale. Thus a segment may consist of one or more transactions but may not consist of one action or more transactions plus one action, set, or acteme.

**Rankshift**

Although units normally consist of members of the unit of the next lowest rank, and although a unit must not have as a constituent a part of a unit or a unit of more than one rank below itself, it may have as a constituent a unit of rank equal to or even higher than itself. The classic example of such a rankshift in dramatic literature is the play of *The Murder of Gonzago* that plays the part of an I element in the structure of the famous "mousetrap" scene in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, yet contains a DIX structure of its own. The play of Little Liza in Rodgers and Hammerstein's *The King and I* is an American example.

**EXAMPLE 68.**

(Suddenly MORTIMER and HENRY set MATT on fire— in a bright red spotlight— and LUISA gasps in horror.)
How many actions does this transaction contain? Within the context of
the definitions of dramatic units given in the last chapter, the
transaction might be divided in different ways. Some might say that
there are two actions:

\[ \text{MORTIMER and HENRY set MATT on fire.} \quad \text{LUISA gasps in horror.} \]

Others might say that there are three:

\[ \text{MORTIMER and HENRY set MATT on fire.} \quad \text{MATT reacts.} \quad \text{LUISA gasps in horror.} \]

Still others might say that there are four:

\[ \text{MORTIMER sets MATT on fire.} \quad \text{HENRY sets MATT on fire.} \quad \text{MATT reacts.} \quad \text{LUISA gasps in horror.} \]

All three answers are correct. Those who say that the transactions
consists of two actions have in mind the definition of an action as
representing an \( \alpha, \beta, \) or \( \gamma \) element in the internal structural
configuration of a transaction. They are recognizing that "MORTIMER
and HENRY set MATT on fire" is the action (\( \alpha \)) to which LUISA's gasp

1The Fantasticks, p. 220.
is a reaction ($\beta$). Those who say there are three constituent actions have in mind the definition of an action as consisting of a structure containing one or more of the elements $1$, $\rightarrow$, and $2$. They are recognizing that MORTIMER and HENRY (1) are igniting ($\rightarrow$) MATT (2), that MATT (1) must react ($\rightarrow$) to this (2), and that LUISA's (1) gasp ($\rightarrow$) is a reaction to the whole of the foregoing (2). Finally, those who say four, of course, have in mind the fact that MORTIMER's action and HENRY's are twin halves of a complex action in the vertical sense. Further, however, "MORTIMER and HENRY set MATT on fire (MATT reacts)" is a "rankshifted" transaction serving as the $\alpha$ element of a transaction in which LUISA's gasp is the $\beta$ element.

Similarly, in the following transaction, WILLY's first line constitutes the $\alpha$ element of a transaction of which the transaction
between BIFF and HAPPY forms a first $\beta$ element and LINDA's reply a second $\beta$ element.

EXAMPLE 59.

WILLY (turning to Linda quietly) You're not worried about me, are you sweetheart?

BIFF What's the matter?

HAPPY Listen!

LINDA You've got too much on the ball to worry about.\(^2\)

---

\(^2\)Death of a Salesman, p. 18.
Brackets mark the boundaries of a rankshifted unit. Single brackets mark the boundaries of a rankshifted action, double brackets, a rankshifted transaction, triple brackets, a rankshifted segment, and so on.

A rankshifted unit, although it has the internal structural configuration characteristic of a given unit on the scale of rank, functions as if it was a constituent member of a unit of the same rank or lower. Rankshifting, therefore, makes it possible for a unit to contain among the constituents of its internal structural configuration a unit of equal or higher rank than itself on the scale of rank.

Rankshifted units and complex units are alike in that each permits a unit of equal or higher rank to appear as an internal structural component of a given unit, but the two special types of units are different from one another in these three important respects: (1) rankshifted units may serve as constituents of units of equal rank or lower rank while complex units consist of units of equal rank only; (2) rankshifted units may combine with a mixture of units in the internal structural configuration of a unit while complex units
must always consist of units of equal rank; and (3) a rankshifted unit, whether it has the structure of an equal or a higher unit, is always functioning as a member of the unit next below itself on the scale of rank while a complex unit, which always has internal constituent units of equal rank, is never functioning as a member of the unit next below itself on the scale of rank.

Rank and Depth

If the scale of depth relates structures to one another diagrammatically, the scale of rank relates units to one another diagrammatically. If a tree diagram may be used to show the depth relationships among structures, it may also be used to show the rank relationships between units. Since different orders of symbols are used for the structures of different levels of unit, the rank relationships between the units may be seen in the uniformity or lack of uniformity among the symbols standing at nodes on a given layer of the tree diagram.

In the structural tree diagram in Figure 6 (page 195 above), the scales of rank and depth coincide. At each successive layer only one order of unit symbol is found so that each step down on the scale of depth also constitutes a step down on the scale of rank. In the structural tree of any stretch of dramatic action containing a complex unit or a rankshifted unit, the scales of rank and depth will not coincide at every layer. At some point there will be a looping back
looping back upon the normal progression in the rank-layer coordination before the normal order is resumed.

FIGURE 10.—Tree diagrams for rankshifted units.

The use of different symbols to represent the elements of structure of different units, then, makes it possible to graphically plot rank relationships as well as depth relationships on a structural
tree diagram, thus revealing the points at which the scales of rank and depth either coincide or diverge in a given stretch of dramatic action. Closely related as they are because of the intimate relationship between units and structure, the scales of rank and depth are nevertheless not the same since, although they often coincide at successive layers of a structural tree, they need not and indeed do not always do so.
The last three chapters have focused almost exclusively upon the syntagmatic axis of dramatic grammatical structure; the next two focus upon the paradigmatic axis.

**Systems**

Systems are the special-interest theoretical constructs of systemic linguistics. They are schematizations of the sets of choices available within the context of a given grammar. Some of the most basic of the many grammatical systems of the English language, for example, are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLARITY</td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A system is a list of semantic features between which the grammar of a language is able to distinguish paradigmatically and that therefore presents the framer of a discourse with a choice of options. Such choices may be made consciously or unconsciously.

Terms

The individual entries of a system, are called its "terms."

The terms of a system are semantic-feature labels for meanings that are identifiable within the grammatical system of the language and are distinguishable from one another using criteria drawn from within the system. Though distinguishable from one another, the terms of a system share a semantic field that unites them as a common ground. That common ground is indicated by the semantic label for the entire system. The existence of such semantic fields is the basis upon which terms are assigned to a given system, each distinguishable semantic field having its own system.

When something is named in English, the grammatical structure of the language affords the namer a choice between naming one of that thing (singular) or more than one (plural). When an action is encoded in English, the grammatical structure of the language affords the encoder a choice between encoding it as having happened before the moment of encoding (past), as happening at the moment of encoding (present), or as likely to happen after the moment of encoding
(future). Because singular and plural are semantic features that both belong to the semantic field of number, they belong to the same system even though they are distinct from one another (semantically differentiated). Because singular and past do not share a semantic field, they belong to different systems.

Tests for Systems

Systems can be tested for the accuracy of their description in terms of the three essential qualities which all systems share. (1) The terms of a system must be mutually exclusive. From a paradigmatic perspective, the option for one of the terms of a system must close out a choice of any of the others for that particular selective act. That is, two or more of the terms of a system cannot be selected simultaneously. (2) A system contains a definite, countable number of terms that are mutually exclusive with one another within its semantic field and that together, in juxtaposition to one another, exhaust the semantic potential of that field to the exclusion of any terms not mutually exclusive with the terms inside the system. (3) The meaning (semantic load) of each term in a system depends upon the meanings of all of the other terms in the system. If the semantic feature load of any of the terms is altered, the semantic feature loads of all of the terms will be altered. If a term is added to or subtracted from the system, the semantic feature loads of all of the previously existing terms in the system will be altered.
Entry Conditions

For each system of contrasting (paradigmatic) terms of choice there exists a syntagmatic grammatical environment that must be present before the set of choices for that system opens up. This particular grammatical environment is called the "entry condition" of the system. It is the surface grammatical level or layer at which the system's choices are unlocked; it is the point in time and space at which making a selection from the system's choices (terms) becomes not only possible but also necessary.

A first step in identifying the entry conditions of a system, then, is to specify at which rank of grammatical unit the system's choices open up. Each system becomes unlocked or available upon the appearance in the surface structure of a given rank of unit. At each successive appearance of that rank of unit, a new choice becomes not only possible but also necessary. In the English language, for example, every time the clause rank of unit occurs, a choice from the mood system becomes possible and obligatory. Any unit of lower rank than a clause will not have an option as to mood.

If a system's choices are activated by every member of a given rank of unit, it is not necessary to further define the entry conditions of the system. If, however, a system's choices are activated only by a member or members of a given rank of unit that are configured in the structure of a unit of higher rank, it becomes necessary to define the specific grammatical and structural environment that activates the choices of the system in addition to the rank of unit that activates them. That is, making a choice of
terms from one system may unlock the choices of additional systems. In the English language, for example, the earlier statement that each new clause necessitates a new choice from the mood system must now be amended. Each new clause serving as an \( \alpha \) element (independent or main clause) in the structure of a sentence necessitates a new choice from the mood system; clauses serving as \( \beta \) elements (dependent or subordinate clauses) in the structure of a sentence make no such choice.

If entry conditions are provided for systemic choices by a given rank of unit or element of structure, they are also provided by selections having been made from other systems. In the English language, for example, it is possible to make a choice from the mood system only after a choice of the term finite has been made from the system of finiteness.

**Some English Language Systems and Their Application to Dramatic Structure**

Because the English language is a major component of English-language drama, its already-existent and already-described systems are important not only as a linguistic analogue to the systems of the drama itself but also as already organically inherent in the dramatic systems themselves. That is, at this point, the linguistic model ceases to be merely a model of the language and becomes an integral part of the model of the drama of which the language is a subset.
Transitivity Systems

The remarkable foregrounding potential of language, its ability to encode and model human and extra-human activity and action in such a way as to bring out-of-frame events into frame, has been noted repeatedly in earlier chapters. This rankshifting or embedding of an action, whether verbal or kinetic or both, within the element of a verbal action is largely explained by the "transitivity systems" of the language. When a performer-in-character speaks in a performance, the content of the speech is normally a descriptive linguistic encoding of some type of process.

EXAMPLE 70.

RUTH She was cranking this model of something --¹

GEORGE. ... From my window up there I can just see your head nights when you're doing your homework.²

WILLY Biff is a lazy bum.³

In these dramatic lines, the process of "cranking," "seeing," and "being" are encoded. Normally such encodings distinguish between the process itself and the participants in the process. "She" (Tillie) and the "model of something" (the atom) are the participants in the process of "cranking;" "I" (George) and "your head" (Emily's) are the participants in the process of "seeing" while "you" (Emily) and

¹The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 749.


³Death of a Salesman, p. 16.
"homework" are the participants in the additional process of "doing" in the second line. Sometimes features of the environmental circumstances of the process will accompany the encoding of the process itself. George's seeing of Emily, for example, takes place at a special time (at night) and in a special place (from his window).

The grammar of the English language obligates choices between different kinds of process, different kinds of participants, different kinds of circumstances, and different ways of combining processes, participants, and circumstances, choices known collectively by systemic linguists as the "transitivity choices." Since the clause is the linguistic rank of unit to which such choices apply, and therefore the entry condition for such choices, each new clause requires its encoder to make a configuration of choices of kind of process, participant, and circumstance. It is this ability of language to model and to partially displace non-linguistic processes, their participants and circumstances that accounts for the often-cited foregrounding power of language in the total economy of dramatic structure.

Systemic linguists distinguish between three different kinds of process modelled by English and therefore available as choices within the transitivity systems of that language.

```
TRANSITIVITY
  material process
  mental process
  relational process
```
EXAMPLE 71.

WILLY I got as far as a little above Yonkers. I stopped for a cup of coffee. . . . 4

BILL They really built that old place; they're having a hell of a time getting it down.5

OZZIE. . . . No trains any longer come that way; they all go some other way. . . . 6

The clauses in these dramatic lines embody choices from the material process term of the English language transitivity system. The material process encoding and displacement of English is of essential importance to English language drama because the performance activity substance of the drama is primarily, at least in its outward aspect, of the material process type. Drama in performance is, primarily, material process in progress. The same systemic term, therefore, may be used for the process itself as well as for the linguistic modelling and displacement of the process, which modelling and displacement of the process is a process in its own right—a meta-process. Further, the dramatic modelling of the process in question likewise displaces it as surely as the linguistic modelling does. Both are transformations of an actual process which have only a floating relation to that actual process which they model and displace.

4Death of a Salesman, p. 13. 5The Hot l Baltimore, p. 6.

6Sticks and Bones, p. 550.
EXAMPLE 72.

RUTH  They said Saturday and this is just Friday and I hopes to God you ain't going to get up here first thing this morning and start talking to me 'bout no money--'cause I 'bout don't want to hear it.7

BEATRICE  You know, I really feel sorry for him. I never saw a man with a more effeminate face in my life. When I saw you talking to him by the lobster tank I said to myself, "Good Lord, for a science teacher my poor girl has got herself a Hebrew hermaphrodite."8

LAWYER  . . . Your Eminence, we appreciate your kindness in taking the time to see us; we know how heavy a schedule you. . .9

Most of the clauses in these dramatic lines embody choices from the mental process term of the English language transitivity system. The mental process encoding and externalization of English are of essential importance to English language drama because they provide an effective means of externalizing the internal aspects of the hypothetical and virtual life posited by the purely material processes of the performance activity surface structure of the drama.

7Lorraine Hansberry, A Raisin in the Sun in Dietrich, et al., p. 527.
8The Effect of Gamma Rays; p. 747.
9Tiny Alice, p. 4.
EXAMPLE 73.

LYLE Parnell, you're my buddy. You've always been my buddy. 10

WINKLEMAN Once you were in a class with Bert Lahr, Groucho Marx. 11

STANTON... We are not priests and nuns, but men and women. The world religious give up is our world, The only one we have. . . . 12

Most of the clauses in these dramatic lines embody choices from the relational process term of the English language transitivity system. The relational process encoding and juxtaposition of English is important to English language drama because it provides the means, through the subject—linking verb—subject complement structure, of establishing A = B equations, whether as description, as definition, or as metaphor.

Systemic linguists make a further division of the material process term of the transitivity system, distinguishing between material processes that are action processes and material processes that are event processes.

10Blues for Mr. Charlie, p. 56.


The agent of an action process has the semantic distinctive feature [+ animate being], while the agent of an event process has the semantic distinctive feature [- animate being].

EXAMPLE 74.

LUISA. . . They're beating a man in a monkey suit. . . 13
LINDA. . . Happy took Biff on a date tonight.14

These dramatic lines represent choices from the action process term of the material process system while those below represent choices from the event process term of that system.

EXAMPLE 75.

BEATRICE. . . This house is going to ferment.15
WILLY. . . . These goddam arch supports are killing me.16

13The Fantasticks, p. 221
14Death of a Salesman, p. 15.
15The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 748.
The terms of this system account, however, not only for the linguistic modelling and displacement of these processes but also for the kinetic modelling of them.

EXAMPLE 76.

From the right, Willy Loman, the Salesman, enters, carrying two large sample cases.17

(EL GALLO leads the FATHERS around the stage in a wild little dance as the MUSIC becomes momentarily boogie-woogie.)18

These stage directions are linguistic models of performed actions which are themselves models of non-performance activity. As such, the performance behaviors themselves represent choices from the action process term of a larger non-linguistic material process system. The same is true of the directions (linguistic)/behaviors (non-linguistic) below that represent choices from the event process term not only of the English language but also of a larger non-linguistic material process system.

EXAMPLE 77.

( . . . . A Roman candle shoots up puffs of rainbow-colored light in back of the stone angel of the fountain. . . . )19

17Death of a Salesman, p. 12.
18Jones and Schmidt/Gassner, p. 200.
19Summer and Smoke, p. 676.
(A tremendous thunder crash throws the set into shadows.)^{20}

Of critical importance is the fact that many performance happenings, although event processes from the point of view of the artist-artist or fictive events axis, are action processes from the point of view of the artists-audience or actual events axis (See Figure 3). That is, since they are scripted, their appearance as apparent events is actually the result of well-planned action on the part of performers and technicians. For example, while the fireworks and thunder cited above appear from the point of view of the fictive world to be events, they are actually the carefully intentional actions of various members of the technical crew.

In language and in actual life, it is patently clear that event processes are not intentional because we know that inanimate participants do not have volition. Action processes, however, may be either intentional or unintentional. Accordingly, clauses that represent choices of the action-process term must make an additional choice between an intention process and a supervention process.

\[ \text{action process} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{intention process} \quad \text{supervention process} \]

^{20}The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 757.
In an intention process clause, the action has the semantic feature [+ intention] while in a supervention process clause, the action has the semantic feature [- intention].

EXAMPLE 78.

WILLY, strikes Biff.21

(. . . . he seizes her crumpled skirt and throws it over her face, and smothers her to death. . . .)22

As clauses, these stage directions represent choices from the intention process term of the English language action process system. In another and broader sense, however, as performance behaviors, the corresponding activities similarly represent choices from the intentional process term of a non-linguistic action process system.

EXAMPLE 79.

(TILLIE breaks into tears. . . .)23

(RICHARD falls.)24

As clauses, these stage directions represent choices from the supervention process term of the English language action process system. In another and broader sense, however, as performance behaviors, the corresponding activities represent choices from the

21Death of a Salesman, p. 113.
22Oh Dad, Poor Dad, p. 507.
23The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 762.
24Blues for Mr. Charlie, p. 96.
supervention process term of a non-linguistic (kinetic-dramatic) action process system.

Once again it is of critical importance to note that many performance happenings—faintings, sneezings, and so on—are to be read as supervention processes from the point of view of the artist-artist or fictive events axis but are actually carefully rehearsed intention processes from the point of view of the artists-audience or actual events axis. That fact does not preclude, of course, the possibility of genuine supervention processes occurring along the artists-audience axis. In entering the magic box of the theatre, however, the superventional processes of actual life, when virtualized in the fictive world of the drama, tend to be read as intentional. An actor may sneeze in performance, for example, not as a planned character "event" but as a genuine biological performer event. The convention regarding such genuine events along the performer-audience axis, however, is that they will either be incorporated into the fictive events and "naturalized," or, if that is impossible, they will be politely ignored as below the level of focus required by the fictive events. The prime theatrical convention is that the audience will suspend its disbelief in the eventual and superventional qualities of the virtual life embodied in the fictive events and willingly accept what Erving Goffman calls a benign fabrication: that certain performer activities which it knows to be action and intention processes are to be read as event or superventional processes for the sake of the entertaining fiction.
Systemic linguists subdivide mental processes into the internalized processes, such as seeing, hearing, or thinking, and the externalized processes, such as saying.

\[
\text{mental process} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{internalized (input) process} \\ \text{externalized (output) process} \end{cases}
\]

EXAMPLE 80.

WILLY, accusing, angered: You didn't see him, did you?

BIFF I did see him!\textsuperscript{25}

TILLIE And he said this thing was so small--this part of me was so small it couldn't be seen--but it was there from the beginning of the world.\textsuperscript{26}

As clauses, the first of these lines represents a choice from the internalized process (input: seeing) term while the second represents a choice from the externalized process (output: saying) term of the English language mental process system. As performance behaviors, however, the speaking of these lines in the theatre renders them both externalized (output: saying) processes.

Of critical importance is the inclusion of mental input processes (seeing, hearing, feeling) and mental output processes (saying, liking, wanting) within the mental process category rather than within the material process category. The most critical of these

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Death of a Salesman}, p. 109.

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{The Effect of Gamma Rays}, p. 746.
categorizations is that of the act of saying, for it especially has both a material process aspect and a mental process aspect. As encoding, it is a mental process, but as speech, it is a material behavior among other material behaviors. That is, there are both cognitive and physical activity aspects to saying. The very fact that saying has both an internal mental aspect and an external material aspect accounts for the ability of language to externalize much that might otherwise remain locked within the individual human psyche.

Finally internalized mental processes are further declined by systemic linguists into perception processes (seeing, hearing, feeling), reaction processes (liking, disliking), and cognition processes (thinking, knowing, understanding).

EXAMPLE 81.

JANE. . . . I heard her call, Stephen?27
SHRDLU. . . . I wanted to go in foreign missions at first . . . .28
GIMPTY. . . . Don't you understand English?29

28The Adding Machine, p. 117.
As clauses, these dramatic lines represent choices from the perception process, the reaction process, and the cognition process terms, respectively, of the internalized process system of the English language. As delivered lines, they become externalized processes with embedded internalized processes. Further, although it is the most flexible and economical of the means of externalizing mental processes, language is not the only means of doing so.

EXAMPLE 82.

( . . . . The music swells and swells. To it is added every offstage effect of the theatre: the wind, the waves, the galloping horses, the locomotive whistle, the sleigh bells, the automobile siren, the glass-crash. New Year's Eve, Election Night, Armistice Day, and the Mardi-Gras. The noise deafening, maddening, unendurable. Suddenly it culminates in a terrific peal of thunder. For an instant there is a flash of red and then everything is plunged into blackness.)

As a sequence, these apparently superventional but actually intentional material action processes are to be read by the audience as externalized mental reaction processes of the character Zero. As such, they represent choices from the reaction process term of a non-linguistic externalized mental process system of the drama. Expressionism and impressionism are two theatrical-dramatic styles characterized by the large numbers of choices from the internalized-externalized perception, reaction, and cognition processes of the fictional characters involved.

Although Jane's line "I heard her call, Stephen?" as a clause represents a choice from a linguistic perception process term, it also encodes a small portion of the material-mental process confrontation between Mary ("her") and Stephen, the whole of which is thus foregrounded through the dialogue between Jane and her companion, Maggie, rather than represented directly through a mental-in-material process performance behavior pattern enacted by the performers representing Mary and Stephen.

Voice Systems

Once a choice of a given type of process has been made from among the transitivity options of the language, additional choices become available and compulsory in the voice systems of the language that determine how the chosen process will be represented in the structure of its stretch of language. For example, if an actor-character chooses to talk about a given process, he can choose to be explicit about the process or to imply it in the resulting stretch of language.

EXAMPLE 83.

MARY Tea, Jane?\textsuperscript{31}

This line represents a decision to make its encoded process an implied one. An alternative explicit version available to the playwright would have been as follows.

\textsuperscript{31}The Women\textsuperscript{,} p. 425.
MARY Would you bring the tea now, Jane?

The term for rendering a process explicit is "major" while the term for rendering a process implicit is "minor." Together, these two terms define a system that systemic linguists call the "majority system," which may be schematized as follows.

```
majority → {major
            [minor
```

Kinetic processes may be similarly expressed or implied, a fact which points to the existence of a non-linguistic dramatic majority system.

EXAMPLE 84.

Natural tableau: . . . MR. MORSE and JAMIE study a checker board.32

JAMIE. . . moves.33

One and the same process (playing checkers) is represented in two versions in these two stage directions, the first representing a choice from the minor and the second from the major term of a non-linguistic majority system. Just as the presence of a predicator in the surface structure of a linguistic string is an indicator of an

32The Hot 1 Baltimore, p. 63. 33The Hot 1 Baltimore, p. 63.
implicit (minor) process and the absence of a predicator an indicator of an explicit (major) process, so the presence of a $\rightarrow$ element in the surface structure of a dramatic stretch serves as an indicator of an implicit (minor) process and the absence of an $\rightarrow$ element an indicator of an explicit (major) process in a non-linguistic majority system. The absorption of MR. MORSE and JAMIE in the checkerboard implies, in fact, not only an action but also a transaction: they are playing checkers with each other. The audience reads the implied process even in the absence of any visible moves.

Kinetic actions may draw even finer distinctions in regard to majority choices than linguistic structures. In linguistic structures there are no degrees of the presence of a predicator; there is either a predicator present, or there is not. In kinetic actions, however, there are degrees of majority, that is degrees of the presence of a $\rightarrow$ element.

EXAMPLE 85.

In the darkness we hear a shot.

Lights up slowly on LYLE, staring down at the ground.  

(LYLE shoots, once.  .  .  .  LYLE shoots again.  .  .  RICHARD falls.)

These two versions of one and the same fictive event are both major in the sense that the $\rightarrow$ element is expressed in both, in the first by a

$^{34}$Blues for Mr. Charlie, p. 51.  $^{35}$Ibid., p. 96.
sound-in-darkness alone, to which the visual tableau (minor in itself) is added when the lights come up, the second by sound and sight synchronized.

In the language model of action, the participant who is the originator of process (actor) may be represented in the surface structure of the model either as a subject or as an adjunct.

EXAMPLE 86.

GIRL You blacked his eye.36

HARRIET. . . . You got stung by a bee.37

In the first of these dramatic lines, the agent-participant ("you") is represented as the subject of the clause; in the second, the agent-participant ("bee") is represented as the adjunct of the clause.

The participant who is the receiver of a process (goal) may be represented in the surface structure of the model as a complement or as a subject. In the first of the dramatic lines above, the goal-participant ("eye") ("you") is represented as the complement of the clause; in the second, the goal-participant is represented as the subject of the clause. The system delineated by this set of alternatives is the system which gives the voice systems their name with its two terms--active (actor as subject, goal as complement) and passive (actor as adjunct, goal as subject).

36The Hot 1 Baltimore, p. 71.
37Sticks and Bones, p. 566.
The linguistic model of action has the power of emphasizing the active or passive aspects of an in-frame participant's relation to the action involved by virtue of its detachment from reality, that is, because of its status as a detached model of real processes. The grammar of actual processes is not open to such a choice of emphasis. However, staged and filmed versions of actual processes employ their own means of emphasizing the active or passive aspects of a process or of a participant-in-process, means that are the equivalents of the choices cited above for language.

The classic cinematic means is by framing a subject. In framing a shot, a film maker may frame the participant who is the originator of a process as the face-on subject of focus (whether backgrounded or foregrounded) or as the rear-view foregrounded subsidiary focus object. The same is true in framing a shot of the receiver of a process. This cinematic version of voicing options is cited as an extreme version of a process distinction that can be made theatrically as well. The distinction is technically "purer" in the cinema because of the framing control of the camera in establishing an enforced point of view upon a process viewer-auditor. The theatre has its own point-of-view-limiting technologies in lighting, actor placement, and so on, even though the openness of its framings makes such distinctions more difficult to define.

The frame-emphasized subject of intended audience attention may be either the agent-participant or the patient-participant of a
dramatized process. Perhaps the most outstanding example of a passive subject in drama occurs in connection with the onstage death of a character of causes other than suicide.

EXAMPLE 87.

STANTON

Yes, we'll have that again. I'll make it up to you. I'll make it up. We'll go back home to Ireland. I'll give the Court Cafe to Jack to run, And we'll go home, and take a high-stooped house In one of them good squares, I mean, those squares... 

(STANTON loosens his embrace to look in KATHLEEN's face. Her head falls to the side.)

Why don't you answer me? Don't turn away!-- Where in the name of Jesus Christ's the doctor?38

Kathleen will probably continue to be the subject of audience focus even though Stanton is talking, at least until her head falls to the side. At that point, Stanton's speech will cease to be background music to Kathleen's dying and become the new object of primary focus. Stanton will then become the primary subject of focus even while others speak as he reacts to the death he has caused. Of course, active and passive exist in this sense only from an inner-frame point of view since everything in a performance is active relative to a passive audience along the performer-audience axis.

38Hogan's Goat, p. 183.
Because stretches of language are models of actual processes, action processes typically have animate participants and event processes inanimate participants. Since the language models of actual processes are not in any way organically connected to the actual processes they model, however, but float, as it were, free of these, it becomes possible in the model, though not in the reality, to combine action processes with inanimate participants and event processes with animate participants.

EXAMPLE 88.

(This last is addressed to a wraith-like lady of uncertain years, who has more or less floated into the room. . . .) 39

Before he can pull his chair out, it slides out under its own power. 40

The first of these stage directions has combined an event process with an animate participant while the second has combined an action process with an inanimate participant. There is thus a choice in language between a typical combination of actions and participants and an untypical one.

39 The Man Who Came to Dinner, p. 324.
40 Oh Dad, Poor Dad, p. 497.
Theatrical modelling, although it is more closely tied to actual processes through its medium of living performers in actual motion, nevertheless retains some of the detachment from the actual that permits untypical combinations of actions and participants. Although Harriet Stanley's "floating" into the room is a figure of speech, the technology of the theatre is able to make performers appear to float through the air. The Commodore's sliding chair is more than a linguistic example of untypical combinations of transitivity options. In performance, what appears to be an inanimate object will appear to move under its own power in a volitional way. Such an option is open in real life only to the trickster or practical joker, as with the talking mail-box of Alan Funt and so on, or to the spiritualist.

EXAMPLE 89.

The French windows sway unsteadily on their hinges. They tip forward. They fall to the floor.\textsuperscript{41}

Here the "inanimate" doors take on an aspect of agency, becoming an antagonistic force threatening Jonathan. Of course, sometimes such events may appear anaturalized, that is, as ordinary accidents or even extraordinary coincidences. It is only when an element of animate agency, purpose, or design is present that an untypical combination of transitivity options has been chosen from a non-linguistic voice system.

\textsuperscript{41}Oh Dad, Poor Dad, p. 495.
More Transitivity Systems

Processes combine with differing numbers of participants and kinds of participant roles in the linguistic model of actual processes. Some material processes, for example, are flexible as to the number of participants they may have while others are confined to a set number of participants. Processes like "opening," for example may have one or two participants optionally.

EXAMPLE 90.

(The doors close.)  
(BANJO. . . closes doors.)

These two stage directions show, both linguistically and kinetically, the unrestricted number of participants of the "opening" process. The first has a single participant, the doors themselves, while the second has two participants, the doors and Banjo. Other processes, like "hitting" or "throwing," have a restricted number of participants. Since hitting always involves a hitter and something hit, and since throwing always involves a thrower and something thrown, such processes will almost invariably have two participants.

EXAMPLE 91.

WILLY, strikes Biff. . . .
( . . . He throws it into the air, making daylight. . . .)

\[\text{\textsuperscript{42}The Man Who Came to Dinner, p. 360}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{43}Ibid.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{44}Death of a Salesman, p. 113.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{45}The Fantasticks, p. 206.}\]
Thus, once a choice of material process has been made from the transitivity system, a further choice of unrestricted or restricted process become compulsory.

```
material process    --- unrestricted process
                    \----- restricted process
```

Although the restricted processes cited above require two participants, an agent and a patient, there are restricted processes that require only one participant, the agent.

EXAMPLE 92.

TOM. . . strolls across the front of the stage to the fire escape.46

(The DRUNKARD comes in and walks around. Then sits down. . .)47

Thus, among restricted processes, there is a further choice as to whether two participants (agent and patient) will be required or only one (agent alone). One-participant restricted material processes are called "middle" restricted processes while two-participant restricted material processes are called "non-middle" restricted processes.

```
restricted process    --- middle
                    \----- non-middle
```


When unrestricted processes are actualized with two participants, there is a causative principle at work.

EXAMPLE 93.

(BANJO. . . closes doors.)

When unrestricted processes are actualized with one participant, the causative factor is absent, or at least submerged, implied.

EXAMPLE 94.

(The doors close.)

(The lights dim up.)

Thus a further choice is opened as to whether unrestricted processes will be actualized as causitive (two participants) or as non-causitive (one participant).

unrestricted process \[\rightarrow\] causitive

non-causitive

More Voice Systems

If non-middle processes require both an agent and a patient, the patient in such processes may be surfaced (expressed) or not surfaced (implied). That is, once a clause has chosen a non-middle process, a new choice opens up between surfacing that process as either transitive (patient expressed) or intransitive (patient implied).

non-middle \[\rightarrow\] transitive

intransitive
EXAMPLE 95.

The Captain watches him suspiciously. 48

(He strikes Gonzales with his cane.) 49

As linguistic stretches, these stage directions have chosen the
transitive term by surfacing the patients "him" and "Gonzales"; they
could, however, have been articulated without surfacing those
patients, that is, intrinsically.

The Captain watches suspiciously.

He strikes with his cane.

The vast majority of dramatic actions, like those in the stage
directions above, are transitive in the non-linguistic kinetic sense
in performance. Once a clause has chosen both non-middle and passive
processes, a further choice opens between surfacing the resultant
process as agent expressed or as agent implied.

\[
\text{passive} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\rightarrow \\
\text{agent expressed} \\
\text{agent implied}
\end{array}
\]

EXAMPLE 96.

The building is framed by the sky of turquoise. 50

Half a dozen or so volumes, which apparently have not appealed
to the Master, have been thrown onto the floor. 51

The first of these stage directions has chosen to surface the agent
("the sky") as expressed while the second has chosen not to surface

---

48 Mr. Roberts, p. 422.  
49 Summer and Smoke, p. 691.

50 A Streetcar Named Desire, p. 90

51 The Man Who Came to Dinner, p. 330.
the implied agent ("the Master" or Whiteside) in the main clause.

The classic examples of such implied agents and patients in
the non-linguistic "language" of the drama are the one-sided telephone
conversation and the off-stage sound, voice, or implied activity.

EXAMPLE 97.

BILL (Into the mouthpiece.) It's seven o'clock.
(patient implied.)

(The phone rings.) (agent implied)

BEATRICE (off stage) Will you get that please? (agent implied)

INSIGNA. . . . (Looks through spy glass) Hey, they got a
fancy hospital. . . . big windows and. . . . (Suddenly rises, gasping
at what he sees). . . . Oh, my God! She's bare-assed! . . . Taking a
shower. . . . in that bathroom. . . . that nurse. . . . upstairs window!
(implied agent)

(Instantly the others rush to hatch cover, grab binoculars and
stand looking out right.) (implied patient)

Although the causitive/non-causitive choice system has been
explained as entered from a choice of unrestricted process, the middle
type of restricted process may also make a choice from that system.
At such times the middle process will require two participants instead

---

52 The Hot 1 Baltimore, p. 73.
53 The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 746.
54 Mr. Roberts, p. 720.
of the one participant normally associated with it, and so there will be a choice between a typical middle and an untypical (marked) middle.

\[
\text{middle} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{typical} \\ \text{untypical} \end{cases}
\]

EXAMPLE 98.

With a gay laugh she whirls him around the floor.\textsuperscript{55}

(She sits RUTH down. . . )\textsuperscript{56}

These stage directions have chosen the untypical middle with a causitive factor involved. The following transformations of them have chosen the typical middle with no causitive factor involved.

With a gay laugh she whirls around the floor.

She sits down.

The kinetic actions that these linguistic stretches model themselves represent non-linguistic choices of untypical and typical middle restricted processes.

Episode Linkage Systems

Episode linkage systems present choices between different ways of joining one process to another. The rank of unit that acts as the

\textsuperscript{55}Oh Dad, Poor Dad, p. 496.

\textsuperscript{56}The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 756.
entry condition for the episode linkage systems is the complex clause (sentence) in language or the complex action (transaction or segment) in drama. The first choice pattern in the episode linkage systems may be schematized as follows.

episodes parallel

----------^  episodes tangential

episodes related

The episodes of a complex clause that actualizes the choice of episodes parallel linkage will each have the same process, or at least the same type of process, and the same participants, or at least the same type of participants.

EXAMPLE 99.

( . . . She lifts her glass. He lifts his. . . . )\textsuperscript{57}

(Two men come around the corner. . . . They stop at the foot of the steps.)\textsuperscript{58}

The episodes of a complex clause that actualizes the choice of episodes tangential linkage will have a common participant or circumstance but will be unlike in other ways.

EXAMPLE 100.

( . . . MADAME ROSEPETTLE smiles sweetly and, pulling out her chair herself, sits. . . . )\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{57}Oh Dad, Poor Dad, p. 497.

\textsuperscript{58}A Streetcar Named Desire, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{59}Oh Dad, Poor Dad, p. 497
(Two men come around the corner, Stanley Kowalski and Mitch. . . Stanley carries his bowling jacket and a red-stained package from the butcher's. . . .)\textsuperscript{60}

The episodes of a complex clause that actualizes the choice of episodes related linkage will be causally or conditionally related.

EXAMPLE 101.

She pauses when she sees that he is asleep.\textsuperscript{61}

(As \textsc{TOM} enters listlessly for his coffee, she turns her back to him. . . .)\textsuperscript{62}

Complex clauses that surface related episodes linkage make additional choices between temporal and non-temporal relation and between causal and non-causal relation.

\[ \text{episodes related} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{non-temporal} \\ \text{temporal} \end{cases} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{non-causal} \\ \text{causal} \end{cases} \]

\textsuperscript{60}\textit{A Streetcar Named Desire}, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{61}\textit{The Man Who Came to Dinner}, p. 330.

\textsuperscript{62}\textit{The Glass Menagerie}, p. 13.
She had that old jumper on—the faded one with that low collar—and a raggy slip that showed all over and her hair looked like she was struck by lightning. (non-temporal and non-causal)

... When you turned it these little colored balls went spinning around like crazy. (temporal and causal)

And there was Tillie, cranking away... while some boy with glasses was reading this stupid speech. (temporal but non-causal)

RUTH... They don't bother me anymore 'cause they think I'm crazy. (causal but non-temporal)

Finally, there may be varying degrees of explicitness in the relation between two episodes as surfaced in a complex clause/action.

And there was Tillie, cranking away... while some boy with glasses was reading this stupid speech... and everybody burst into laughter until the teacher yelled at them.

In this dramatic line, for example, the words "while" and "until" make a temporal relation explicit while the word "and" leaves a causal relation inexplicit. If the line were edited to read: "... Tillie looking weird as a coot, ... everybody burst into laughter..." the dependency of "Tillie looking weird" would make the relation

---

63 The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 748.  
64 Ibid., p. 749.  
65 Ibid.  
66 Ibid., p. 750.  
67 Ibid., p. 749.
partially explicit. Thus a system of explicitness of relation opens wherever a choice has been made of episodes related linkage.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{episodes related} & \rightarrow \\
\quad \text{-relation explicit} & \quad \text{-relation partially explicit} \\
\quad \text{-relation inexplicit} &
\end{align*}
\]

The absence of an equivalent of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions and other linguistic relational signals in the non-linguistic actions of the drama makes it more difficult to determine the explicitness of relation between actions, transactions, and segments than it is to determine that between clauses and sentences. Nevertheless, there are differences in the degree of explicitness involved in non-linguistic linkage systems.

EXAMPLE 102.

(The phone rings.)

BEATRICE (off stage) Will you get that please?68 (relation explicit)

GIRL What a beautiful day!

(THE SUN falls down onto the stage.)69 (relation partially explicit)

WILLY, strikes Biff and falters away from the table. (relation inexplicit)70

---

68Ibid., p. 746.  
70Death of a Salesman, p. 113.
Some Non-Linguistic Dramatic Systems

Keying Systems

All dramatic choices stem from a choice to transform activity that is already meaningful in an extra-dramatic context into something outwardly resembling such recognizable primary activity but viewed by the spectators of it as something else. A family meal, for example, is a strip of activity that is recognizable as of primary social significance, but as soon as such a piece of untransformed activity is scripted and set upon the stage, it is recognized by the competent theatre-goer as activity with a quite different purpose and significance. Even the highly stylized gestures of the Kabuki are transformations of recognizably primary activity and thus rooted in a behavioral reality outside the theatre. All drama, therefore, departs from the world of primary social activity by making a choice of the transformed activity term from the following system.

Erving Goffman, to whom I am indebted for the names of the terms in the following systems, calls the process of transforming a natural or social primary (untransformed) activity keying; hence, the following network of related systemic choices may be referred to

\[ \text{untransformed activity} \xrightarrow{\text{TRANSFORMATION}} \text{transformed activity} \]

\[ 71 \text{Goffman, pp. 40-82.} \]
as the keying systems of the drama. The entry conditions for the keying systems are the action. Each new action requires a new pattern of choices from the systems.

Once a choice of transformed activity has been made from the transformation system, a further choice opens up between retransformed activity and unretransformed activity.

\[ \text{transformed activity} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{retransformed activity} \\ \text{unretransformed activity} \end{cases} \]

The classic example of the re-transformed activity is the play-within-a-play. Theoretically, there is no limit to the number of retransformations a primary strip of activity can undergo, that is, there is no limit to the number of frames that can be added to a strip of basic activity. In *Man of La Mancha*, for example, an actor representing Don Miguel de Cervantes performs the adventures of Alonzo Quiada in the guise of Don Quixote de La Mancha—four levels of lamination, each representing a separate and successive keying or transformation.

A second choice system that opens immediately to the selector of transformed activity concerns the mode of the transformation. Transformed activity may be either natural or artificial.

\[ \text{transformed activity} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{natural activity} \\ \text{artificial activity} \end{cases} \]

Natural activity is activity transformed in the mode of the primary social activity that it models, that is, it approximates the primary
(untransformed) activity regardless of the time or place from which such activity is drawn. Natural activity may be only subtly performance activity in its technical aspect as well as in its inner organic state. Eating, for example, is the same activity on or off the stage. Only the significance of the act changes. Dying or going mad, on the other hand, involve very different inner actualities as primary activities and as transformations of those activities, although the surface behaviours may appear much the same. Eating on stage is a simple keying in the natural mode of transformation. Dying on stage, or eating that involves an element of deception—tea for whiskey, for example—is not merely a simple keying in the natural mode of transformation. It is also a benign fabrication, about which more will be said shortly. At one level, however, both eating and dying on stage are primary activity strips transformed in the natural mode because both transformations are normative to the primary activities of which they are transformations in their external, technical aspects.

Artificial activity, on the contrary, is blatantly performance activity. It is activity transformed in a mode that is specifically theatrical and stylizes or streamlines the primary social activity that it models to a recognizable degree, that is, it is presentational rather than representational. The masks and ritualized gestures of the oriental theatre are transformed activity in the artificial mode par excellence, but there are numerous Western examples as well, from the mask experiments of O'Neill and the expressionisms of Rice to the
falling sun of *A Beautiful Day* and the hissing, lunging flytraps of *Oh Dad, Poor Dad*.

Retransformed activity may be actualized as simple plays or as replays or preplays, and such playing may be verbal or kinetic.

\[
\text{RETRANSFORMED ACTIVITY} \begin{cases} 
\text{play} \\
\text{preplay} \\
\text{replay} \\
\text{verbal} \\
\text{kinetic}
\end{cases}
\]

**EXAMPLE 103.**

GIRL What a beautiful day! (verbal play)

*(THE SUN falls down onto the stage.)*72 (kinetic play)

RUTH I'll scratch your back later.73 (verbal preplay)

PULVER. . . . I'm going to get me some of that black powder from the gunner's mate. No, by God, this isn't going to be any peanut firecracker--I'm going to pack this old thing full of that stuff they use to blow up bridges, that fulminate of mercury stuff. And then on the night of Doug's birthday, I'm going to throw it under the Old Man's bunk. Bam--bam--bam! (verbal preplay) (Knocks on Robert's locker, opens it) (Kinetic preplay) Captain, it is I, Ensign Pulver. I just threw that firecracker under your goddam bunk.

---

72 *A Beautiful Day*, p. 297.

73 *The Effect of Gamma Rays*, p. 761.

74 *Mr. Roberts*, p. 428.
(verbal preplay) (He salutes as the lights fade out.)\textsuperscript{74} (kinetic preplay)

OZZIE Somebody hit me with an egg.\textsuperscript{75} (verbal replay)

PULVER. . . (He pantomimes walking blindly through soapsuds. . .)\textsuperscript{76} (kinetic replay)

Preplays and replays may be actual or hypothetical. The distinctive feature is verification. Actual preplays or replays are verified by experience or by report and therefore are perceived to be accurate transformations of their primary activities. Hypothetical preplays or replays are subject to discrediting, that is, they remain unverified by report or by experience.
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Ensign Pulver's preplay of the firecracker under the Captain's bunk, for example, is hypothetical. It is never actualized since the explosion occurs in the laundry instead of under the Captain's bunk. His replay of the explosion in the laundry, however, is actual.

Preplays and replays may be transformations of in-frame strips or supposed out-of-frame strips.
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\textsuperscript{75}Sticks and Bones, p. 566.

\textsuperscript{76}Mr. Roberts, p. 445.
Pulver's preplay of the firecracker under the Captain's bunk is a hypothetical transformation of an activity which is to happen out-of-frame, that is, away from the scene of the preplay itself. His replay of the explosion in the laundry is an actual transformation of an activity which is supposed to have happened out-of-frame.

EXAMPLE 104.

BENEATHA. . . And then there are all those prophets who would lead us out of the wilderness—(WALTER slams out of the house)—into the swamps! . . . (MAMA enters. . . .)

MAMA Who tat 'round here slamming doors at this hour? . .

RUTH That was Walter Lee. He and Bennie was at it again.77

Ruth's answer to Mama's question is an actual replay of an activity which has just happened in-frame.

EXAMPLE 105.

SUZY. . . Listen, I'll be right back down. I got a surprise . . . (Flushed, coming down the stairs with two bottles of champagne and a shopping bag.)78

Suzy's promise to be right back down is an actual preplay of an activity which soon occurs within frame, that is, within the scene of the preplay itself.

The hypothetical out-of-frame replay is standard fare in the whodunit or trial drama with its multiple hypothetical replays of the

77 A Raisin in the Sun, pp. 534-535.

78 The Hot 1 Baltimore, pp. 121-124.
out-of-frame crime. It can be found in the multiple replay versions of Rashomon, the audience being left to decide which unverified version is the "actual" one.

EXAMPLE 106.

(From the formless creatures on the ground in front of him comes a tiny gale of low mocking laughter like a rustling of leaves . . . Jones . . . fires. . . . ) Dey're gone. Dat shot fix 'em. Dey was only little animals--little wild pigs, I reckon. Dey've maybe rooted out yo' grub an' eat it.79

Jones's hypothetical replay of the in-frame activity of the formless little fears illustrates that even activity to which a dramatic character is present in frame can be hypothetically transformed.

Verbal replays or preplays may be laminated or non-laminated. In a non-laminated verbal replay or preplay, a character says what he or another will say or did say. That is, the primary strip--the strip to be re-done or pre-done--is verbal, so it is a verbalized verbal replay or preplay. In a laminated verbal replay or preplay, on the other hand, a character says what he or another will do or did do. That is, the primary strip is kinetic but is being laminated (transformed) in words. A laminated verbal replay or preplay is thus a verbalized kinetic activity strip.

verbal preplay or replay  
| laminated
| non-laminated

EXAMPLE 107.

RUTH  She was cranking this model of something-- (laminated replay)

TILLIE. . . . I'll say I'm ill and ask for a sick pass. (non-laminated preplay)

Fabrication Systems

Erving Goffman defines a fabrication as "the intentional effort of one or more individuals to manage activity so that a party of one or more others will be induced to have a false belief about what is going on." Unlike the keying, then, which "intendedly leads all participants to have the same view of what is going on," the fabrication admits of different views, one view on the part of the fabricators and another view on the part of the dupes. The outer-frame situation of the actor-audience confrontation makes use of "materials that are frankly keyings--open mock-ups of dramatic human actions--and at no time is the audience convinced that real life is going on up there." The keyed events in progress, however, may call upon the audience to become "collaborators in unreality," that is, to participate in an inner-frame deception (dramatic irony) or to pretend not to know what's coming even though the outcome is well known. On rare occasions, there may even be deliberate attempts made

80The Effect of Gamma Rays, p. 749.
81Ibid., p. 748.
82Goffman, p. 83.
83Ibid., p. 84.
84Ibid., p. 136.
to actually deceive the audience as to what is going on, or at least to shake the audience's confidence that what is going on is not "real life." Such eventualities point to the existence of a whole new set of fundamental non-linguistic dramatic systems, the terms of which are again drawn from Goffman. The entry conditions of these fabrication systems is the transaction, as two parties are necessarily involved in a fabrication, the deceiver (fabricator) and the deceived (dupe). The audience is usually in on the fabrication, that is, a collaborator of one or some of the characters, but there may be attempts to dupe the audience as well.

Stanley's rape of Blanche in Streetcar is a straight keying—the theatrical transformation of a well-known strip of activity from real life, but El Gallo's rape of Luisa is a fabrication that everybody but Matt and Luisa are in on, the audience participating vicariously in the plot with the two fathers, El Gallo, Mortimer, and Henry. One of the most common fabrications across the footlights is the audience plant. Indeed, such plants have been used often enough that they seldom deceive any longer. Another is the planned performance error where what looks to be a mistake in the performance of a keyed strip is actually part of the program.

A fabrication may be either benign or exploitive. The perpetrators of a benign fabrication claim that the deception is, if not in the best interests of the person deceived, at least not harmful
to him. The outer-frame or performance-audience situation often entails "some sort of voluntarily supported benign fabrication, for the audience treats disclosure somewhat as they would that which terminates a leg-pull executed in good taste and all in fun." The inner-frame or character-character situation may involve such benign fabrications or may involve exploitive fabrications, which are intentionally contrary to the personal interests of the characters deceived. Since such "exploitive" fabrications are harmful to characters rather than to actual persons, however, fabrications which are exploitive along the character-character axis are usually benign along the performance-audience axis, although there may be exceptions to this principle when an audience member is especially sensitive to the particular exploitive fabrication at hand. Inner-frame fabrications, in other words, are keyings of fabrications and as such continue to be one step removed from audience reality. The outer-frame fabrications mentioned above—the audience plant and the planned performance error—are benign. Outer-frame exploitive fabrication is, of course, possible but pushes the experience to its essential limits and perhaps beyond them, as the Living Theatre's audiences discovered when audience exploitation was affected in Paradise Now and Mysteries and Other Pieces. Robert Brustein says of these and similar performances that "in production after production, the company demonstrated its remarkable capacity to manipulate minds... The most depressing

---

85Ibid., p. 87.  
86Ibid., p. 136.  
87Ibid., p. 87.
thing of all was how easily university students, and even some of their teachers, responded to the baldest of slogans and the most simplistic interpretations of reality." The general convention would seem to be that theatre audiences must remain free to collaborate in inner-frame "exploitive" fabrications (dramatic ironies), knowing that in the end when the curtain calls are taken, all will be forgiven, but that freedom—and the essential willingness to collaborate in unreality—are forfeit as soon as the audience begins to suspect that it is being exploited in the outer-frame situation.

\[
\text{fabrication} \xrightarrow{\text{benefit}} \text{exploitive}
\]

Fabrications may also, as already noted, be inner-frame (along the character-character axis) or outer-frame (along the performer-audience axis).

\[
\text{fabrication} \xrightarrow{\text{inner-frame}} \text{outer-frame}
\]

Fabrications may be indirect or direct. The engineer of an indirect fabrication manipulates the dupe through a third party while the engineer of a direct fabrication manipulates the dupe himself.

\[
\text{fabrication} \xrightarrow{\text{indirect}} \text{direct}
\]

---

EXAMPLE 108.

(MANNION suddenly sees the CAPTAIN and quickly lowers his glasses and pretends to clean them, alternately wiping the lenses and holding them up to his eyes to see that they are clean.)\(^{89}\) (direct fabrication; Mannion manipulates the Captain himself)

GIRL Mr. Morse, you can't go in there, that's the broom closet. (Knocks.) Mr. Morse?. . . . Mr. Morse, Jamie's sorry.

JAMIE. . . I am not!

GIRL (Grabbing him, putting her hand over his mouth. . . .) He's sorry.\(^{90}\) (indirect fabrication; the Girl is engineering a definition of Jamie in order to deceive Mr. Morse with the benign objective of getting him to come out of the broom closet)

In an indirect fabrication, another can be manipulated as the third party, as is the case in the episode of Jamie, the Girl and Mr. Morse, or the fabricator can engineer a definition of himself as the third party by bearing false witness against himself, claiming to have been raped, inflicting wounds upon himself and so on.\(^{91}\)

\[\text{indirect fabrication} \rightarrow \begin{align*} \text{self as third party} \\ \text{other as third party} \end{align*}\]

EXAMPLE 109.

ABIGAIL (in an open threat) Let you beware, Mr. Danforth. Think you to be so mighty that the power of Hell may not turn your

\(^{89}\)Mr. Roberts, pp. 421-22.

\(^{90}\)The Hot 1 Baltimore, pp. 70-71.

\(^{91}\)Goffman, pp. 108-110.
wits? Beware of it! There is—Suddenly, from an accusatory attitude, her face turns, looking into the air above— it is truly frightened.

DANFORTH (apprehensively) What is it child?

ABIGAIL, looking about in the air, clasping her arms about her as though cold: I—I know not. A wind, a cold wind, has come.92 (self as third party; Abigail is engineering a definition of herself as obsessed or oppressed by the "evil spirits" of her accusers in order to discredit the testimony of Mary Warren)

Fabrications may be either limited or wide. A limited fabrication is engineered to deceive one or two individuals. A wide fabrication is engineered to deceive a wide public.

\[
\text{fabrication} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{limited} \\ \text{wide} \end{cases}
\]

The Girl's attempt to get Mr. Morse out of the closet in The Hot l Baltimore is an inner-frame limited fabrication while the manipulations of Abigail and the girls in The Crucible are inner-frame wide fabrications. Outer-frame limited fabrications are designed to contain only the present audience, as was the case with much of the Living Theatre's audience exploitation cited above. Although rare, outer-frame wide fabrication becomes possible if a theatre group systematically sets about to engineer a construction of reality extending into the society at large, as for example the many political street theatres of the late sixties attempted to do.

---

Finally, fabrications may be discredited or remain undiscredited. Of course, a fabrication must be discredited before the dupes become aware that there is a fabrication. Hence, the inner-frame and outer-frame distinction remains an important factor.

To be discredited, an inner-frame fabrication must be discredited within its inner frame and an outer-frame fabrication must be discredited within its outer frame.

\[
\text{fabrication} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{discredited}} \quad \text{undiscredited}
\]

It would be impossible in a single chapter—perhaps even in a single volume—to make an exhaustive survey of dramatic choice systems. Only an indication has been given of the most basic terms in a variety of the more essential systems. Each component sub-system of dramatic sign, however, should serve as the basis of at least one network of inter-related choice systems. An exhaustive set of choice system networks, therefore, would be extremely complex. Only a preliminary rough sketch of such a grammar of dramatic choice systems has been made in this chapter.
CHAPTER XI

SYSTEMIC DELICACY

AND DRAMATIC CHOICE NETWORKS

Delicacy

There is substantial agreement among linguists as to the imprecise quality of linguistic categories. The notion of binary opposition sets up strict categories which can sometimes "bend" the actual language phenomena in favor of simplifying the description. Sensitive to this problem, systemic linguists, in dealing with the finer shadings of language variation, employ the concept of a graduated scale in which all the marked off segments shade into one another. They call this scale the "scale of delicacy" because its segmentation is carried out in successive stages so that the first cuts are the simplest (least delicate) and the last are the most complex (most delicate).
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FIGURE 12.—Scale of delicacy (realized horizontally)
FIGURE 14. -- Dramatic transitivity and voice network
FIGURE 15.—Dramatic keying network

ACTION  \[\rightarrow\]  TRANSFORMATION  \[\rightarrow\]  

- natural activity  \[\rightarrow\]  
- artificial activity  \[\rightarrow\]  
- retransformed activity  \[\rightarrow\]  
- unretransformed activity  \[\rightarrow\]  
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\}
Placed on such a scale of delicacy, the choice systems described in the last chapter can be grouped into "networks" according to (1) their entry conditions and (2) their relation to one another within a common semantic field.

FIGURE 13.—Episode linkage systems of drama

FIGURE 16.—Dramatic fabrication network
Selection Expressions

Once such paradigmatic dramatic choice systems have been modeled in networks like those above, it becomes possible to describe a given stretch of dramatic action by stating the meanings the stretch has chosen from the relevant network or networks. Such a description of the paradigmatic choices made by a dramatic stretch is called a "selection expression" by systemic linguists. For example, the selection expression which shows the specific choices (selections) made from the dramatic voice and transitivity network by the stretch

\[ \text{WILLY, strikes Biff} \ldots \]

would be as follows:

\[
\{ \text{major} : \text{material process} : \{ \text{action process} : \text{intention process} / \\
\text{typical animacy} / \text{restricted process} : \text{non-middle} : \text{transitive} : \text{active} \} \}
\]

The selection expression that shows the specific choices made from the dramatic keying network by the stretch

\[ \text{RUTH She was cranking this model of something--} \]

would be as follows:

\[
\{ \text{natural activity} / \text{retransformed activity} : \{ \text{replay} / \text{verbal} : \text{I} ; \\
\text{laminated} : \text{I} ; \{ \text{out-of-frame} / \text{actual} \} \}
\]

The selection expression that shows the specific choices made from the dramatic episode linkage network by the stretch

---

1. Death of Salesman, p. 113.

2. The Effects of Gamma Rays, p. 749.
(As TOM enters listlessly for his coffee, she turns her back to him ...)³

would be as follows:

\{episodes related : temporal / causal / relation explicit\}

The selection expression that shows the specific choices made from the dramatic fabrication network by the stretch

DANFORTH (apprehensively) What is it child?

ABIGAIL, looking about in the air, clasping her arms about her as though cold: I—I know not. A wind, a cold wind has come.⁴

would be as follows:

\{exploitive / inner frame / indirect : self as third party / wide / undiscredited\}

In constructing these selection expressions, certain graphic conventions are used which key to the network schemas. The symbology is as follows:

: represents the network relation:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{a} \\
\text{b} \\
\end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
a \\
\text{c} \\
\end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
a \\
\text{d} \\
\end{array} \]

It indicates that the next choice expressed is dependent upon the previous choice expressed, as, for example, in the schema above, the selection of d would be dependent upon the prior selection of a. Of course, such a system may be characterized by a "complex dependency"

in which there are several points of entry possible for the next selection:

Thus, in the schema above, the selection of d would be dependent upon the prior selection of either a or b.

\[
\begin{align*}
\rightarrow [a] \\
\rightarrow [b] \\
\rightarrow [c] \\
\rightarrow [d] \\
\end{align*}
\]

It indicates that the next choice expressed is not dependent upon the previous choice expressed but is simultaneous or parallel with it, as, for example, in the schema above, the selection of d would not be dependent upon but simultaneous or parallel with the selection of a or b.

\[
\begin{align*}
\rightarrow [a] \\
\rightarrow [b] \\
\rightarrow [c] \\
\rightarrow [d] \\
\end{align*}
\]

It indicates that the next choice expressed is dependent upon a complex dependency of the both-and type as opposed to the either-or
type, as, for example, in the schema above, the selection of \( d \) would be dependent upon the prior selection of both \( a \) and \( b \) rather than upon the selection of \( a \) or \( b \).

\[
\{ \ldots \} \text{ represents the boundaries of the entire selection expression and, within those boundaries, the boundaries of any simultaneous or parallel set of systemic choices such as those schematized above behind a } \{ . \}.
\]
CHAPTER XII
CONCLUSION AND NEW DIRECTIONS

Descriptive Poetics

The poetics set forth in these chapters keeps the dramatic theorist firmly focused upon the process of dramatic language description rather than upon the more prescriptive enterprises of the critic, such as interpretation and evaluation. It provides a relatively objective set of procedures for discerning the shape of a work of dramatic art by providing a set of schemata of the underlying dramatic system that makes such utterances possible and gives them their meaning. Descriptive poetics should continue and expand upon this last project—the schematization of the dramatic system. Much work remains to be done in this area. As mentioned in Chapter X, the various dramatic networks schematized in Chapters X and XI are only a few of the many that could and should be constructed if dramatic theorists are ever going to get anything near a full composite layout of choices available to a dramatist in structuring the meanings of his work. Whole networks of systemic choices, for example, could be constructed to account for the variations in meaning among different performance-audience relationships or different decor-performance relationships or different costume-characterization relationships and so on.
Contrastive Poetics

The poetics outlined in this study makes possible on a more objective basis than has heretofore been available the structural comparison of works by a single author or by different authors within the same dramatic language, of works from different periods within the same dramatic language, of the underlying system of networks of different dramatic languages of the same period and so on. Such work will be fruitful in direct ratio to the qualitative degree of development of descriptive poetics and should focus on the differences between works, periods, and systems rather than on the similarities. Hence, the term contrastive is used in distinction to the more usualy comparative. It is conceivable that such comparative-contrastive operations could be computer programed, permitting the structural similarities and differences involved to be graphed and thus zeroing in even more effectively upon the characteristic structural preferences of a work, an author, a period, or a dramatic language. A contrastive poetics would then face its major task--formulating the generative-transformational rules that account for the differences in dramatic systems over time and space.

Applied Poetics

Finally, the poetics schematized in these pages provides a set of conceptual tools and a set of practical procedures for detailed descriptive analysis of specific dramatic works. Regardless of the qualitative progress of descriptive and contrastive poetics, the model provides for the practical analysis of dramatic texts and performances
in great detail through the application of tree diagraming and selection expressions. The structural modeling made available thereby has the advantage of being more detailed and therefore less abstract than that offered by any other analytical theory, most poetic theories dealing at the level of the segment and higher while the present theory deals at the level of the segment and lower and is therefore engaged most actively with the primary phenomena themselves. An applied poetics can and should continue to expand the enterprise of descriptively analyzing a wide spectrum of dramatic material not only as a project worthwhile in its own right but also as a springboard to the development of a descriptive poetics and, eventually, of a contrastive poetics of the drama.
GLOSSARY OF TECHNICAL TERMS

ACOUSTIC PHONETICS. The study of the physics of speech sounds, their effect on the air.

ACTEME. On the model of a phoneme, the smallest meaningful unit of a dramatic utterance. An item representing one of the elements l, k, e; t, s, f, or p, i in the structural configuration of a set.

ACTION. On the model of a clause, a unit of dramatic structure representing an , or element in the structural configuration of a transaction and having an internal structural configuration of one or more of the elements l, , , and 2. Also, the form of dramatic performance.

ACTIVITY. The substance of dramatic performance, as sound is of language.

ACT OF COMMUNICATION. A communication process in which a message is intentionally actuated in the context of a clearly established set of social conventions in order to cause a receiver to realize its scope.

AGENT. The sender, source, or subject of a dramatic action, reaction, or counter-reaction. A l element in the structural configuration of an action with an internal structural configuration of one or more of the elements p and i.

ANALOGIC CODIFICATION. Encoding carried out in terms of a code permitting a continuous representation in which the signs used are in proportion and relation similar to the things, events, ideas for which they stand (opposed to digital codification).

ARBITRARY SIGN. A sign that is founded in artificial fashion with no natural association of signifier and signified so that, for example, nearly identical signifieds are represented by widely different signifiers in different languages (as "tree," arbor," "Baum," and so on). Sometimes called an unmotivated sign.

ARTICULATORY PHONETICS. The study of the physiology of speech sound production or articulation.

AUDITORY PHONETICS. The study of the psycho-physiology of speech sound perception.
BEAT. An etic dramatic activity unit based on what appears from outside the system to be a logical division of the activity in a scene. More narrowly, an individual activity moment.

BINARY OPPOSITIONS. The structural relations most important in structural analysis and the elementary distinctions for establishing discrete items in a surface structure. Perhaps the basic principle underlying all human thought and thus all semiotic structures. The classic linguistic example is /pin/ and /bin/.

CHANNEL. The physical medium through which the signs of a code are conveyed in a conventional way to form statements and messages.

CLASS. A taxonomy of formal items developed on the basis of which element of structure a given formal item is most likely to represent.

CODE. Any socially employed system of signs that expresses the internal or internalized external objects or events a sender intends to communicate by articulating a medium in at least partially conventional manner to produce an at least partially conventional meaning or response.

COMMUTATION TEST. A linguistic discovery procedure designed to identify the meaningful items of a language through the process of establishing a syntagmatic frame and then making item substitutions in one slot of that frame, thus determining which items are etically the same but emically different or vice versa.

COMPETENCE. The transformational-generative name for langue as internalized by a native speaker. Language knowlege as modelled by its native speakers.

COMPLEXITY. The phenomenon whereby "language" units, though formally sequential, may be semantically simultaneous.

CONTENT. The agreed meaning or reference of a message as interpreted by at least two receivers.

CONTEXT. The structural inter-level that relates form to situation. The relationship of a formal item to its thesis, its immediate situation, and its wider situation.

CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS. That branch of linguistics that studies the differences between two or more of the world's languages, between two or more dialects, registers, idiolects, or texts within the same language, or between different chronological stages of the same language.
COUNTER-REACTION. A reaction to a reaction. An action representing the element in the structural configuration of a transaction and having an internal structural configuration of the elements 1, , and 2.

C-PLANE. The plane of content or of the signifieds in a string of signs.

CUT. A division made in a syntagm as a stage in a process of segmentation of the utterance for purposes of analyzing its structure by showing the elemental relations between the segmented parts within the context of the whole.

DECODING. The process of interpreting the individual coded items of a message in the light of the entire sign system of which they form the units and of subsequently interpreting or reconstructing the meaning of the whole message, which is always more than the sum of the meanings of its parts.

DEEP STRUCTURE. The structural interrelationships of the elements of a language utterance that are not overt or surface phenomena but rather the law-like regularities that lie below the surface phenomena and serve to generate them. The structure of language competence (langue).

DEPTH. The number of nodes or layers an element of structure stands away from the top of a structural tree. A gauge of the complexity of an utterance (the deeper the layering of the structure, the more complex the utterance.)

DESCRIPTIVE LINGUISTICS. That branch of linguistics that attempts to give the most complete and systematic account possible of the observable individual units, features, and patterns of organization of a particular language at a particular time.

DIACHRONIC LINGUISTICS. The science of language description over an extended period of time; it involves formulating change rules to explain how language state A (synchronic) was transformed (diachronic) into language state B (synchronic).

DIALECT. A use of language that can be understood by native speakers of the same language even though they themselves do not speak the same dialect. Generally, a geographically regional use of language.

DIGITAL CODIFICATION. Encoding carried out in terms of a code that permits a discontinuous representation in which the signs used segment the continuity of nature into discrete elements put together by man-made rules based upon convention (opposed to analogical codification).
DISTINCTIVE FEATURES. Those characteristics of system signs which are functional in the attachment of different values or meanings to them within the system.

DISTRIBUTION. The apportionment of items, units, or elements to slots in a syntagmatic structural grid.

DOUBLE ARTICULATION. The articulation of a language in terms of (1) a system of minimal units (phonemes in language) and (2) a system of meaningful units comprised of one or more of the minimal units that are meaningless in themselves.

DRAMA. The langue or system underlying dramatic scripts and performance behaviors.

ELEMENT OF STRUCTURE. The structural function that fills a given place in a structural syntagm, as "subject," "predicatot," and so on.

EMICS. The study of unit form and substance from within the signifying system in question.

ENCODING. The process of selecting elements of a code and arranging them in an order that conventionally expresses a meaning.

E-PLANE. The plane of expression or of the signifiers in a string of signs.

ETICS. The study of the form and substance of units as described from outside the signifying system in question.

EXTENDER. Additional verbal material amplifying or leading away from a kernel in an l, k, e type item.

FABRICATED CODE. A code that may be formed, elaborated, or manipulated by a deciding group rather than by a mass of native speakers the users of such codes drawing messages from them but having no part in their elaboration.

FEEDBACK. The coupling of a sender and a receiver in a stimulus-response hook-up, so that the sender's output is the receiver's input and vice versa; the perceivable responses of a receiver of a completed or an ongoing statement or message; the control a sender is able to exercise over the meaning of a completed message or over an ongoing process of encoding to adjust the message in the light of observable information about its effects.

FOLLOW-THROUGH. An entropic motional carry-over from the momentum of a stroke in a t, s, f type item.
FOREGROUNDING. The ability of a single signified to have signifiers drawn from several different systems of signification or for a single signifier to have more than one signified.

FORMAL ITEM. A unit in the surface structure of an utterance that represents an element of structure in a place in a syntagm, as "The boy" represents "subject" in "The boy ran home."

GENERAL (THEORETICAL) LINGUISTICS. The branch of linguistics that studies the nature of language as evidenced by what all languages have in common.

GENERATIVE GRAMMAR. The descriptive linguistic approach that attempts to formulate the syntactical sub-system of a particular language in abstract, recursive P-Rules capable, when applied to the lexicon of the language, of generating all of and only the well-formed sentences of the language.

GRAMMAR. The study of language substance (phonology) of substance-as-formed (morphology) and of the slot-filling potential or the slot-class correlation of the formal items in a language (syntax).

HOMEOMORPH. An application of the linguistic model to an art form of which a natural language is a component and the analysis is of the first-order, denoted language itself.

HYPOTACTIC STRUCTURE. A type of univariate structure involving coordination of elements of equal status ( ).

IDIOLECT. The language of a single user of "native speaker."

IMMEDIATE SITUATION. Outer-frame: the situation in which the dramatic activity is being performed, its specific theatrical milieu and occasion. Inner-frame: the fictive situation in which character behavior is imagined to occur, its specific scenic and environmental locus and occasion.

INNER-FRAME SUBSTANCE/FORM. That of the fictive events in the world of characters and imagined action.

INSTRUCTION. Information in a message referring to the communication process itself, to where, when, how, and by whom the message is to be interpreted.
INTERMEDIATE. Agent: a primary agent surrogate or object manipulated by a primary agent in the direction of an intermediate or ultimate patient, e.g., Punch (primary agent) hits (action) Judy (primary patient) with his slapstick (intermediate agent). Patient: an ultimate or primary patient surrogate or object owned by a primary patient that becomes the focal recipient of a dramatic action, e.g., Black Bart (primary agent) snatches (action) Pretty Polly's (primary patient) purse (intermediate patient).

INTERMEDIATE STRUCTURE. A structure between the deep structure and the surface structure when more than one transformation is required to generate a surface structure from a deep structure.

ISOLOGICAL SYSTEM. The condition of a "language" system in which sign forms and meanings have no existence as units outside the particular language in which they are actualized, the forms and meanings not existing independently of each other so that each sign form has at least one meaning and each meaning is associated with at least one sign form.

KERNEL. The essential core of a stretch of verbal dramatic activity, the removal of which would render the stretch dramatically unintelligible.

KINESIOLOGY. On the model of phonology, the structural inter-level that relates form to kinetic substance and distinctions in form to differences in movement.

KINETICS. The study of dramatic activity units as described from outside the system, as opposed to KINEMICS, the study of dramatic activity units as described from within the system. Together, kinetics and kinemics would make up kinesiology as phonetics and phonemics make up phonology.

LANGUAGE. A system of arbitrary signs produced by human beings that facilitates social interaction by communicating meaning.

LANGUE. Language minus its utterances (speech); linguistic behavior potential. A kind of precipitate sifted from the practice of parole. The deep-structure rules of a language.

LAYER. A horizontal level of structural element notation in a structural tree diagram.

LEAD. Verbal material introducing or leading into a kernel in an l, k, e type item.

LEXICON. A moneme (word) inventory of a given language.
LEXIS. The form of the individual phonetic units in the dialogue of a drama and the relation of these to the slots they may fill in a pattern.

LINGUISTICS. The scientific study of language, a social science that studies the system of distinctive or differential features that give language signs their social meaning and value.

LINGUISTIC MODEL, THE. The science of linguistics used as a paradigm for the investigation and analysis of non-linguistic sign systems.

LOCUS. The form of the individual scenic units in the setting of a drama and the relation of these to the slots they may fill in a pattern.

LOGO-TECHNIQUE. A fabricated language of arbitrary signs manipulated and elaborated not by a group of native speakers but by a deciding group; the user may follow such a language and derive messages from it but ordinarily has no part in its manipulation or elaboration.

MEDIUM. The substance of a message.

MESSAGE. A statement that has been perceived and interpreted by a receiver.

METALANGUAGE. A language about language (e.g., linguistics).

MINIMAL PAIR. Two monemes identical in every minimal constituent unit but one (e.g., "pin" and "bin" or an American military salute and a British military salute).

MONEME. A word. Basic unit of meaning in a language.

MORPHEME. Smallest meaningful unit of a language.

MOTIVATED SIGN. A sign in which there is a kind of natural relation between the signifier and the thing signified.

MULTIVARIATE STRUCTURE. Structures in which there are different kinds of relationship between the different structural elements.

NATIVE SPEAKER. A person who understands and speaks a given language and can thus serve as an informant concerning the acceptability of utterances to an investigator outside the system.

NATURAL CODE. A code that is not manipulated by a deciding group but by a mass of native speakers, as opposed to a fabricated code.
NATURAL LANGUAGE. A language resulting from a natural evolutionary process, as opposed to an artificial language (e.g., a logo-technique, computer language, etc.)

NEGATIVE FEEDBACK. Deviation-correcting feedback that promotes the regularity (maintenance in a steady state) of a given communications system.

NETWORK. A schema of system choices with a common point of entry and displaying the total sequence of selection opportunities represented by all the choice systems in that network.

NOISE. Interference with the ability to send, encode, receive, decode, understand, or respond to statements; it may be external (in the channel, the code, etc.) or internal (in the sender or receiver).

NODE. The point at which an algebraic notation representing an element of structure stands in a tree diagram.

OUTER-FRAME SUBSTANCE/FORM. That of the performance situation, in the world of performers and audience.

PARADIGM (PARADIGMATIC). The vertical axis or axis of choice; the axis along which the options that might have appeared in the place of an item in a syntagm might be imagined to be arranged.

PARAMORPH. An application of the linguistic model by analogy to an art form in which the analysis is of non-linguistic material.

PARATACTIC STRUCTURE. A type of univariate structure involving subordination of elements of lesser status to elements of greater status ( ).

PAROLE. The surface structure phenomena and patterning of a particular language; actual language behavior.

PATIENT. The receiver or object of a dramatic action, reaction, or counter-reaction. A 2 element in the structural configuration of an action with an internal structural configuration of one or more of the elements p and i.

PERFORMANCE. One instance of a production. The transformational-generative term for de Saussure's parole as generated by a native speaker, language doings or practice as modelled by its native speakers.

PHONEME. The smallest unit of sound used to distinguish between meaningful units in a language.
PHONEMICS. The branch of phonology that studies speech sounds as they are actually taken up by and used in one or more of the world's natural language systems.

PHONETICS. That branch of phonology that studies speech sounds in isolation from or outside of their use within any given language system.

PHONOLOGY. The structural inter-level that relates word forms to phonic substance; it relates distinctions in form to differences in sound. The study of speech sounds in general, composed of the two branches phonetics and phonemics.

PLACE. A position in a syntagm at which formal items representing a given element of structure stand.

PLAY. One instance of the institution of the drama. It consists of a performance history and of a performance potential governed by the survival of a playscript. It includes both script and performance, just as parole includes both written text and speech act. The activity of dramatic performance, actual dramatic behavior, whether in the abstract or in the particular; the parole of the dramatic system.

PLAYSCRIPT. A dramatic intermediate structure existing primarily for the purpose of generating productions and performances which are transformations of it; the literary surface structure of the underlying dramatic langue system and thus, from point of view of literature, a completed work of art, a record of the performance of a playwright, a text, but from the point of view of the institution of drama, an intermediate structure and thus far from being a completed work of art; a transformation of the underlying dramatic system and, at the same time, a controlling or commanding form in generating the productions and performances that will be transformations of it; a governing structure underlying the performance behavior generated from it.

POSITIVE FEEDBACK. Deviation-amplifying feedback that promotes the evolutionary development (disequilibrium in flux) of a communications system.

PRAGMATICS. The relations between signs and their interpreters.

PRAXIS. The form of the individual beats of kinetic action in a drama and the relation of these to the slots they may fill in a pattern.
PRIMARY. The prime source (agent) or ultimate recipient (patient) of a dramatic action, reaction, or counter-reaction.

PRODUCTION. One instance of a play.

P-RULE. A deep-structure formula for generating acceptable utterance given a particular inventory of items (lexicon).

PSYCHOLINGUISTICS. The branch of linguistics that studies the ways in which the users of a language acquire their language competence.

RANKSHIFT. The structural condition in which a unit includes among its constituents a unit of rank equal to itself on the scale of rank or a unit of higher rank than itself.

REACTION. An action representing the element in the structural configuration of a transaction and having an internal structural configuration of the elements 1, , and 2.

RECEIVER. The recipient of the communication process; the intended destination of a message or its unintended interceptor.

REGISTER. A specific socially or culturally conditioned use of language, in contrast to a dialect, which is determined by the geographical location of the user.

SCENOGRAPHETICS. The study of the manner in which scenic substance is made use of in dramatic form but also of scenic substance for its own sake, independently of its use in dramatic form.

SCENOLOGY. On the model of phonology, the structural inter-level that relates form and scenic substance, distinctions in form to differences in the physical environment of a dramatic action. The study of scenic substance in general, composed of the two branches scenographetics and scenographemics.

SCRIPTOGRAPHETICS. The study of the manner in which the substance of dramatic notation is used in scripting dramatic forms.

SCRIPTOLOGY. On the model of graphology, the structural inter-level that relates form to scriptographic substance, distinctions in form to differences in graphic notation (principally writing). The study of dramatic notation in general, composed of the two branches scriptographetics and scriptographemics.

SEGMENT. A unit of dramatic structure having an internal structural configuration of one or more of the elements D, I, X, C, and M.
SEMANTICS. The science of human meaning or the relationships between signs and their referents, between signifiers and their signifieds, between the E-plane and the C-plane.

SEMIC. Of the sign; sign-bearing.

SEMIOTICS (SEMILOGY). Analysis and description of non-linguistic as well as linguistic sign-systems. The mother science of which de Saussure believed that linguistics would form only one branch.

SELECTION EXPRESSION. A formulation of system term choices from a given sign-system choice network.

SENDER (SOURCE). The origin of an intended message.

SET. On the model of a phrase, a unit of dramatic structure representing a 1, , or 2 element in the structural configuration of an action and having an internal structural configuration of one or more of the elements 1, k, e; t, s, f, or p, i.

SIGN. The union of a signifier and a signified.

SIGNIFIED. The meaning or referential component of a sign, a concept or mental image.

SIGNIFIER. The sign-image component of a sign; in linguistics, the phonological composition of a moneme.

SIMPLE UNIT. A unit in which there is only one formal item representing each element of structure.

SITUATION. The time-space frame within which a particular beat of dramatic-theatrical activity is performed.

SLOT. A place in a structure. See PLACE.

SOCIOLINGUISTICS. The branch of linguistics that studies the ways in which social and cultural situations affect the way in which a particular language is used.

SPEECH. See parole.

STATEMENT. The encoded expression of a sender's internal or internalized external objects or events with the intent to affect a receiver.

STRING. A surface syntagm of formal "language" items.
STROKE. The essential core of a stretch of non-verbal dramatic activity, the removal of which would render the stretch dramatically unintelligible.

STRUCTURALISM. An analytical methodology with theoretical and philosophical implications, which takes from structural linguistics a set of concepts and a set of procedural operations known as the linguistic model, which it attempts to apply to the analysis of socio-cultural events and artifacts.

STRUCTURALIST POETICS. On the model of linguistics, the soft social science that studies the system of distinctive or differential features that give dramatic signs their meaning and value.

STRUCTURAL TREE. A pictorial diagram that schematizes the scale of depth for a stretch of language, showing the relative depths of its constituent structures.

STRUCTURE. A set of elements and the relations between these or between sub-sets of these.

SUBCODE. One of a number of codes employed simultaneously in a communicative act using a plurality of semic means.

SURFACE STRUCTURE. The generated product of a deep structure; the structural relations between the formal items of a language utterance, its overt patterning; the structure of language performance (parole).

SYNCHRONIC LINGUISTICS. The science of language description where the language is "frozen" at a given state in time.

SYNTACTICS. The relations between signs on the surface (signifier or E-plane) level, their patterning along the syntagmatic axis or axis of chain.

SYNTAGM (SYNTAGMATIC). The horizontal axis or axis of chain of a language utterance, the axis along which selected items are arranged in a time-space sequence of structural elements are arranged in places or slots.

SYNTAX. The study of the arrangement of language items along the syntagmatic axis. With phonology (the study of language substance) and morphology (the study of language substance-as formed), one of the three main branches of grammar.

SYSTEM. A set of paradigmatic choice options that are available in the grammar of a language or other signifying system.
SYSTEMIC LINGUISTICS. The branch of sociolinguistics that studies the social functions of a language and the ways in which that language fulfills those functions; it is especially interested in registers and social dialects and in the concept of the appropriateness of an utterance for its social occasion.

TELEGRAPH. Non-verbal material introducing, leading into, or "winding up" for a stroke in a t, s, f type item.

TEXT. A single item of idiolect.

THESIS. The conceptual content of an utterance.

TRANSACTION. On the model of a complex clause, a unit of dramatic structure representing a D, I, X, M, or C element in the structural configuration of a segment and having an internal structural configuration of one or more of the elements , , and .

TRANSFORMATIONAL GRAMMAR. The psycholinguistic approach that attempts to explicitly formulate the implicit knowledge or competence that enables members of the speech community in question to recognize and to interpret correctly the signs in a signifying system using T-Rules that model the systemic transformation of underlying (deep) relational structures into the surface structures of the language.

T-RULE. An abstract, recursive, deep-structure formula modeling implicit native speaker language competence to transform underlying relational structures into the surface structures of the "language" in question.

TYPE. A taxonomy of formal items developed on the basis of the internal structural configuration of the items (e.g., t, s, f type, i, k, e type, etc.)

UNIT. Formal items of different sizes, (e.g., in language, word, phrase, clause, and so on.)

UNIVARIATE STRUCTURE. A structure containing only one kind of structural relationship between the elements; it may be paratactic or hypotactic.

UTTERANCE. The linguistic equivalent of a statement in communication theory or of a performance in dramatic theory; a single item of parole.
WIDER SITUATION. Outer frame; anything in the past experience of a performer/practitioner that inclines him or her to make certain language choices or articulate certain language behaviors rather than others or anything in the past experience of an audience member or spectator that inclines him or her to interpret language utterances in one way rather than in another. Inner frame; anything in the imagined past experience of a fictive character which causes him or her to act or re-act as he or she does.
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