A Pragmatic Analysis of Directives in Osborne's "Look Back in Anger"

A derivative paper by M.A. student Muhammad Ibraheem Abbas
Supervised by Asst. Prof. Omran Moosa Mahood, PhD
College of Education – Ibn er-Rushd – Department of English

1-Abstract:

One of the functions of language is to direct other people's behaviour by using directive speech acts, such as requests and orders. In addition to everyday use of directive speech acts, one can observe fairly rich resources of this speech act in the language of drama. However, due to the complexity of pragmatic meaning, identifying and analysing directives in modern plays (especially Osborne's plays) poses some difficulties for the receiver of the text. The problem is that how one can distinguish between a directive speech act and other speech acts where there is no explicit performative verb in the given conversational turn.

The study aims at the following:

1- pointing out the impact of context in inferring the kinds of directives used in Osborne's play "Look Back in Anger",

2- identifying and analysing types of directive speech acts employed in the language of Osborne's play, and

3- investigating the complexity of meaning construction in analysing directives, both in isolation and in sequences of speech acts

Two hypotheses are proposed to achieve the aims in investigating directives.

1- The distinction between directive speech acts and other kinds of speech acts is often indeterminate, especially in the language of Osborne's play (Look Back in Anger) which heavily relies on actual conversation.

2- In dramatic dialogues under study directive speech acts usually occur with other speech acts to form a unified sequence, or a "sequence of speech acts". This notion is useful in the analysis of this play.

The following are the main findings of the study.

1-Directives can be realised in different structures, especially in interrogatives. Interrogatives score the highest value of usage (58.11%), then imperatives (32.44%), followed by declaratives (9.46%). Therefore, the interrogative sentence type is the most productive form in representing directives in Osborne's play.

2-Directive speech acts do not usually occur abruptly or separately in a dramatic dialogue. This is also true in Look Back in Anger. Rather, it is observed that a directive is often followed or preceded by another directive or non-directive speech act to support its meaning. That is, they form a speech act sequence to serve as one directive speech act.

2. Introduction

"Look Back in Anger" (1956) is a play written by John Osborne. It is about social relations involving an intelligent but disaffected young man (Jimmy Porter), his upper-middle class, impassive wife (Alison), and her arrogant best friend (Helena). Cliff is a Welsh lodger who wants to keep the peace between Jimmy and other people. This study focuses on Act 1 of the play. Act 1 opens on a Sunday afternoon in Jimmy and Alison's attic. Jimmy and Cliff are trying to read the Sunday papers. At the same time, Alison is attempting to do the week's ironing, and she is only half-listening to Jimmy and Cliff's expository dialogue. As Act 1 progresses, Jimmy becomes increasingly aggressive, transferring his contempt for Alison's family and her personality (Wikipedia, 2012).

The method of analysis worked out in this study is both function-based and character-based. It is function-based which means that the main focus is on the directive function of utterances, regardless of their mood or form. Yet, the forms (imperative, interrogative and declarative) are used to arrange the directive function into three groups for each character. The study is also character-based which means that the directive speech acts of the three main characters, Jimmy, Cliff and Alison, have been the point of focus for the analysis. The following sections tend to show how each of the three main characters use directive speech acts in one of the linguistic forms, namely imperatives, interrogatives and declaratives.

In the selected play interrogatives are expected to be the most productive type of utterance forms (or "sentence types" according to Lyons` (1977: 747) terminology), since they correspond to various functions of speech acts. Simpson (1997: 141) states that interrogatives are flexible linguistic forms. They can fulfil different pragmatic

functions, such as information elicitation, command, polite requests, offer, rhetorical questions, etc.

3. Imperatives Uttered by Jimmy

In the turn below, Jimmy begins with aggression, and then he continues with an expressive act. After that he issues a command to Cliff. The overall effect of these three acts (, the first being paralinguistic,) is that the speaker can emphasize his power over the hearer through his order.

Jimmy: (shouting) All right, dear. Go back to sleep….

But if this order is to be examined further, it has the function of criticizing both Alison`s and Cliff`s cold behaviours. Consequently, the speaker has employed a sequence of speech acts (an expressive and a directive) to incite a responsive action in his hearers. Yet, most of Jimmy's utterances do not arouse an expected pelocutionary effect in the hearers.

Jimmy`s next directive is not a sincere order. The sincerity condition on orders is that he wants the hearer to do something for him: he wants Alison to make him some more tea. Here, Jimmy simply issues an order, but when he is asked by Alison he denies his insistence on that order, which proves his insincerity.

Jimmy: Put the kettle on.
Alison: Do you want some more tea?
Jimmy: I don’t know. No, I don’t think so.

In the turn below, Jimmy’s utterance consists of three types of imperatives which, following Brown and Yule (1983: 233), constitute one kind of speech act: they are commands.

Jimmy: … Come on, let me have that one, and you take this.

Brown and Yule maintain that “several sentences (or syntactic chunks) strung together may constitute a single act” (ibid). Thus, here there are three “chunks” in one utterance with a single function of directive. The first one is an imperative without subject, “Come on.”. The second is a “directive with let”, and the third is an imperative with subject. However, the second is more complex, since a directive “let” can also take a third person subject, in addition to first person singular and plural subjects (Quirk et al, 1985: 829). According to Eastwood (2008: 145), the verb “Let” when is followed by an object and the verb “have” can show the meaning of the verb “give”, followed by an indirect object and a direct object. In this way, Jimmy`s “Let me have that one” has the meaning of “Give me that one” which is a direct order.

In the turn below, the imperative with "Let" has been used to attract attention towards the speaker.

Jimmy: … Let`s pretend that we are human beings, and
that we`re actually alive…. Let`s pretend we`re human.

Here, such a construction is used for "proposing" to do the act of pretending. As a matter of fact, proposal is weaker in illocutionary force than suggestion, and suggestion is weaker than request. However, the use of "Let`s", here, indicates indirectness in which the illocutionary point is that of a proposal (Searle, 1979: 33).

Jimmy's next turn is supposed to be an order, given to Cliff to take off his trousers in order to be fixed by Alison which is in Cliff's benefit, but this order is not a simple piece of advice. The last utterance in the turn makes it clear that Jimmy is actually threatening Cliff which is obviously not in the latter's benefit.

Jimmy: Yes, go on. Take `em off. And I'll kick your behind for you.

The act of threatening is considered as a commissive by Searle and Vanderveken (1985: 182), whereas it is an "impositive" speech act according to Leech (1983: 226). Yet if one looks more closely at the turn above and its meaning as a whole, one will find something other than ordering and threatening. It has been used by Jimmy to mock Cliff and to laugh at him rather than seriously threaten him, especially in regard to the other turns. Yet, neither Cliff, nor Alison takes Jimmy's turn seriously, and his illocutionary act has no perlocutionary effect on them, as if Jimmy has said nothing.

Since the character of Jimmy is the dominant figure in the play and he wants to take control of everything, he utters the following:

Jimmy: (to Cliff) Give me those matches, will you?

One of the best ways to ensure his authority is his extensive use of direct orders which shows and implies his power over his hearers. So, Jimmy utters the above utterance in order to take Cliff's matches to light up his pipe. The utterance in the turn above consists of two clauses: an imperative, followed by a positive tag question. Such a formula is not used for asking a question or to affirm some sort of information. It is used to emphasize the force of the directive (, or more specifically the order) in that utterance. Such an effect is achieved more than anything because of the influence of the pronoun "you" which is usually omitted in normal imperative construction (Collins, 2006: 188).

The turn below includes an imperative which, on its surface, seems like a request, but taking the whole context into consideration, it turns out to be a piece of advice to his friend Cliff to stop smoking cigarettes.

Jimmy: All right. They're your ulcers. Go ahead, and have a bellyache, if that's what you want.

In fact, what is noticed here and in similar cases is not a matter of a single speech act, but "composite" speech acts (Van Dijk, 1977: 213 ff). According to scholars like Van Dijk, the first two utterances, i.e. the expressive "All right" and the declarative sentence "They're your ulcers" (which is a warning) provide a condition for the next speech act which is a directive. In such a case, the whole turn can be said to consist of speech act sequences which serve the illocutionary act intended by the speaker to be taken as a piece of advice, not a simple order (ibid: 214-15).

4. Imperatives Uttered by Cliff

The first imperative uttered by Cliff is in the turn below.

Cliff: Leave the poor girlie alone. She is busy.

One can take this utterance either as a single act of negative directive, according to Brown and Yule (1983: 233), or as a sequence of speech acts (Van Dijk, 1977: 214) in which the second part provides a "justification" for the first one. This justification makes the utterance more "acceptable". That is, the possibility that the hearer will carry on or comply with the request will be increased (ibid: 215). Cliff's purpose of this utterance is to prevent Jimmy from annoying Alison ("girlie") whom he likes.

However, despite Cliff's warning Jimmy continues to bother Alison. This leads to Cliff's turn below.

Cliff: Leave her alone, I said.

This utterance is obviously a reiteration of Cliff's previous turn, but it had no perlocutionary effect on Jimmy. Yule (1996: 49-50) maintains that speakers sometimes describe the performance of their speech acts by using verbs such as "ask", "tell", and "say". Similarly, Cliff is describing and hence emphasizing his order to Jimmy. In this way, he draws attention to the illocutionary force of his utterance, rather than merely describing what he is doing. Furthermore, the utterance contains a speech act sequence, the first one a command and the second one a statement.

Again, in the following turn, there is a sequence of speech acts.

Cliff: (to Jimmy) Stop yelling. I'm trying to read.

In sequences like this one, according to Van Dijk (1977: 214-15), the first part is the major or main act and the second is the auxiliary act. In other words, the utterance of "I'm trying to read" counts as a condition for the utterance of "Stop yelling". It is also more polite for one to justify one's order in this way, i.e. usually by using a statement (ibid: 215).

In Cliff's next turn one can find speech act sequences where there is an order, then a statement. This is, by its turn, followed by a "let" imperative and a vocative. Then there is a direct order.

Cliff: Listen_ I'm trying to better myself. Let me get on with it, you big, horrible man. Give it me.

Here the utterance of "Listen_ I'm trying to better myself" can be regarded as a sequence of a main directive speech act which is followed and supported by the speech act of stating. Then this is followed by a let-imperative construction which is distinct from the usual form of imperative. Its function is of a friendlier and also more convincing nature, but its pragmatic force is less powerful than the normal subjectless imperatives (Collins, 2006: 190). Certainly "Give it me" belongs to the latter case, namely the normal subjectless use of imperatives in English. The pronoun "it" refers to the newspaper in Jimmy's hand: Cliff was trying to read, but Jimmy took his paper.

In the turn below, Cliff is trying to advise Alison not to pay attention to Jimmy's criticism of her father (and indirectly attacking her character, too).

Cliff: Don't take any notice of him. He's being offensive. And it's so easy for him.

This piece of advice has the typical form of a negative imperative. To Simpson (1997: 141), advising is only one function which can be fulfilled by an imperative: other functions may include offer, inviting, exclamation and exhortation, beside the usual function of issuing commands. In this connection, Cliff's act of advising, which also implies a criticism of Jimmy, is justified by the two utterances that follow it. They are statements which support the major directive speech act.

5. Imperatives Uttered by Alison

Due to the incommunicative and almost silent nature of Alison_ Jimmy's wife_ her overall number of speech acts, including the directives, are less than Jimmy's and Cliff's. Alison's first imperative is in the turn below when the request is combined with other acts:

Alison: Oh, give it to him, Jimmy, for heaven's sake! I can't think!

The above turn which altogether performs the pragmatic function of a directive speech act also contains an emotional element. The turn begins with an interjection followed by an imperative clause, then a vocative and an exclamation. The interjections "oh" and "ah" are the most frequent interjections in English (Aijmer, 2004: 102) and they are "sometimes used to initiate utterances" (Quirk et al, 1985: 853). Here, Alison employs the interjection in addition to other linguistic devices to show her complaint against the hearer's (Jimmy's) behaviour.

Furthermore, a vocative has been used by Alison in the above utterance to "remind" Jimmy of a request, in Quirk et al.'s terms (1985: 851). Vocatives, following Levinson (1983: 71), are noun phrases that refer to the addressee, but are not syntactically or semantically incorporated as the arguments of a predicate. They are divided into calls or summonses, and addresses. The word "Jimmy" in the utterance above is an address.

According to Quirk et al (1985: 482) the exclamation "for …`s sake", especially if preceded by "Oh" expresses impatience or anger. Therefore, the whole turn serves as a speech act sequence of a positive request.

Alison's next turn is a good example of a negative direct command which is elliptical and followed by a "justification", in Van Dijk's (1977: 215) terms. The justification is used by the speaker for the direct command ("Don't!") in order to sound more cooperative and reasonable, and also more acceptable.

Alison: Don't! I'll burn his shirt.

She needs to utter this utterance in this form to make Cliff stop interfering with her work. Yet, this attempt (illocutionary act) has no perlocutionary effect on Cliff.

The last imperative uttered by Alison is the following:

Alison: Oh, wake up, dear. You've heard about Madeline enough

times. She was his mistress...

The turn above combines a request as a directive with emotional elements, such as an interjection and a vocative. This begins with an interjection "Oh" which is, as mentioned before, the most widely employed type of interjection in English.

However, the interjection is followed by a direct order in addition to a vocative, but the vocative is not proper noun: it is an "epithet" (Quirk et al, 1985: 774). Moreover, Levinson (1983: 71) classifies vocatives into two types: calls or summonses, and addresses. The word "dear" used in

this text is an "address" which is parenthetical and can be removed from the sentence (ibid).

Again, the overall effect of such a combination is to reinforce and emphasize the effect of the directive speech act, though the expression "wake up" must not be taken literally. If one takes it literally, then one will flout the maxim of quality (proposed by Grice: 1975), because Cliff is already awake. But by analysing the expression more pragmatically (i.e., non-literally) it will be found out that its implicit meaning is an utterance like: "Be alert and sharp." or "Be aware of things happening around you." which is also the intended meaning.

6. Interrogatives Uttered by Jimmy

Interrogative sentences, in general, carry the "force" of a question (Akmajian, 2001: 235). The force of a question of a Yes/No question is that of requesting information about whether the case in question is true or false. Peter (2004: 452) calls Yes/No question "polar" questions, because they are questions which seek affirmative or negative answer. That is to say, when a speaker poses a Yes/No question he seeks to know whether something is or is not the case, which is either a direction question towards positive or negative facts (ibid: 430). In the following turn, Jimmy uses a question which obviously carries an abusive tone.

Jimmy: (to Cliff) Do the Sunday papers make you feel ignorant?

This question is abusive in the sense that both positive and negative answers to it presuppose that the addressee is somehow ignorant or can be so. It is also impolite, because it directly threatens the hearer's negative face. However Cliff answers in the negative, but Jimmy's next turn begins with "Well, you are ignorant." which means that the addresser already assumes the addressee to be ignorant.

In his next turn, Jimmy changes his addressee from Cliff to Alison, as follows:

Jimmy: … (to Alison) What about you? You're not a peasant, are you?

Jimmy's real purpose is to insult both Cliff and Alison. He insults them to stimulate their feelings, and ultimately to make them talk to him. That is why he uses expressions such as "ignorant", "peasant", and "not so brilliant".

In the above turn the utterance "What about you?" is a very good way of making the hearer speak, especially when it is followed by the next utterance. The following utterance "You're not a peasant, are you?" is likely to pose some influence on the hearer and it will put her in a

position to defend herself. The utterance also contains a tag question. A tag question, following Leech (2006:110), is "a short question which is added after a statement, to elicit a confirming response from the hearer." But no "conforming response" in Alison's cold answer, in her turn below, is observed.

Alison: (absently) What's that?

This, in turn, makes Jimmy more persistent to continue his verbal attack on Alison, so that he reforms and rephrases his utterance as follows:

Jimmy: I said do the papers make you feel you're not so brilliant

This is obviously a mitigation of Jimmy's previous face-threatening utterance. The great change is that the word "ignorant" has been replaced by the negative phrase "not so brilliant" to give an impression that the speaker is more cooperative this time. Expectedly, this strategy had a better result to make the addressee respond in a relevant way.

Jimmy's next turn contains two interrogatives which are tag questions.

Jimmy: Well, she can talk, can't she? You can talk, can't you? You can express an opinion.

Again, there is another instance of shift of address from Cliff to Alison here. The first question is addressed to Cliff, and the second one to Alison. These two tag questions express the same idea, and they have the same illocutionary force –to evoke the hearer's response. Quirk et. al. (1985: 811) state that the meaning of tag questions involves a statement and a question; the statement asserts something, then the question "invites the listener's response to it." In this way, the three questions have the same directive force.

Jimmy's following turn which begins with a question is a serious attack on Cliff who is trying to read a newspaper.

Jimmy: Why do you bother? You can't understand a word of it.

The question in the utterance above is a Wh-question that serves as an information elicitation interrogative. This is only the surface meaning of this question; Jimmy does not really need to know the answer. This utterance has more than one illocutionary force. The speaker's actual intention is to humiliate or belittle his hearer. Perhaps another illocutionary force is that the speaker wants the hearer to stop reading the newspaper, because the former thinks that the latter "can't understand a word of it".

In fact the second utterance which is a statement serves as an explanation to the question posed by Jimmy to Cliff. If one interprets the whole turn as a sequence of two speech acts, then one can say that its pragmatic function is that the addresser wants to insult the addressee in a very impolite way. This can become directive with regard to the speaker's intended provocation of the hearer: to simply make him talk.

Jimmy's turn below has a similar structure and meaning.

Jimmy: Why don't you get my wife to explain it to you? She's educated. (to her) That's right, isn't it?

In the above turn there is a Wh-question which is followed by a declarative sentence as a statement. The statement ("She's educated.") has occurred between two questions, and it has a complex function here. It has both functions of explaining the first question and also providing the ground for the second question which is a tag question. The importance of the utterance "She's educated." will become clear in the following way. If that declarative sentence from the turn is removed, the first question is still completely meaningful, though it lacks an (optional) explanation. Nevertheless, the statement cannot be removed if the second question is to retain its meaning, because the demonstrative "That" is also an anaphoric expression which necessarily refers back to the statement. Again, the whole turn is an attempt by the speaker to evoke responses from Alison and Cliff.

Jimmy's turn below contains a question, with a different subject matter.

Jimmy: Oh, yes, yes, yes. I like to eat. I'd like to live to. Do you mind?

This is a challenge to the addressee's will. Furthermore, this challenge is aggravated by Jimmy's question "Do you mind?". However, it is not clear if the question refers to eating or living: "Do you mind my eating?" or "Do you mind my living?". Perhaps this is the speaker's intention; to confuse, quite purposefully, his too much eating with his living. Anyway, this kind of question which seems to be Yes/No question functions like a rhetorical question with an obvious answer. The answer must be in the negative which will help avoiding confrontation between the interlocutors.

In the following turn, there is a Yes/No question.

Jimmy: … Haven't you read the other posh paper yet?

This utterance is a negative question which contains a negative attitude towards the hearer. It means that "You must have finished reading the other newspaper by now, but you haven't." By means of negative

questions speakers seek confirmation from their hearers, and hearers provide such confirmation which makes the communication between the interlocutors easier (Hewings, 2005: 100).

But the question also contains a negative attitude towards the newspaper. At the authorial level, the playwright intends to criticize the Sunday papers through his character Jimmy, by calling them "posh".

In the next turn Jimmy asks Alison an emotional question.

Jimmy: Yes, well, that's quite moving, I suppose.
(to Alison.) Are you moved my darling?

The speaker, in the above question, wants to know whether his addressee is influenced by his news or not. The news is that the Bishop wants to make a contribution in the manufacture of the hydrogen bomb. This, alone, is enough to stimulate and move anybody (or to impact the audience via its illocutionary force). In addition, the speaker uses a form of vocative which is an "address" (Levinson, 1983). The address used here is of a special kind, because it suggests that the social distance between the two participants is minimal (Simpson, 1997: 171). But the whole turn serves as a more general speech act of recommendation, directed to Alison. The meaning is this: "Since the news are quite moving, you are supposed to be influenced and moved".

The last turn with interrogatives by Jimmy contains three questions for Cliff.

Jimmy: What do think you're going to do when I'm not around to look
after you? Well, what are you going to do? Tell me?

The turn begins with a Wh-question or "information question" (Quirk et al., 1985: 817). The embedded question "…do you think…" could have been omitted from the first sentence without largely affecting the main meaning. The next utterance begins with "Well" which is a discourse marker. Discourse markers like "Well" usually occur in initial position, providing a ground for the interpretation of the following utterance (Quaglio and Biber, 2006: 710).

The next utterance in the turn above is elliptical, and this can be known from the question mark (i.e. it is not "Tell me.", but "Tell me?"). In order to make sense of the last utterance, "Will you" can be added to make it read as "Will you tell me?".

The first question has the illocutionary force of a sharp criticism which means that the hearer is unable to think or act properly when he is not with the speaker. So, it is also a piece of advice to the hearer that he should not do anything without consulting the speaker. The first question

provides the ground (or introduction) for the second and third questions. The second and third questions, in turn, combine together to make a speech act sequence of interrogating the hearer.

7. Interrogatives Uttered by Cliff

Cliff's first interrogative with a directive force occurs in the following turn.

(to Alison) Cliff: Isn't that right? Didn't I only have one cup?

The above turn contains two negative rhetorical questions. A negative rhetorical Yes/No question is like a "strong" positive assertion (Quirk et al., 1985: 825). This means that the speaker of those two questions (Cliff), in addition to the fact that he does not accept an answer from the hearer, intends to emphasize his ideas in a powerful way.

One might ask the following question: there are two negative rhetorical questions with a force of positive assertion. Where is the "perlocutionary effect" of the two questions (which scholars believe that exists in every directive speech act)? The answer is the following. Although some scholars (e.g. Searle, 1969; 1976) believe that perlocutionary effects are only present in directive types of speech act, some others (e.g. Verschueren, 1980; 45-50) contend that every speech act contains a perlocutionary effect on the hearer. However, the analysis of the above turn has revealed that a negative rhetorical interrogative sentence can function as an intensified Yes/No question which is an emphatic utterance.

Cliff's next interrogative is a one-word utterance.

Cliff: Which?

As mentioned before, ellipsis is a very common phenomenon in everyday conversations. What is relevant here is that the concept of ellipsis is closely related to the concept of shared context. Because conversation takes place in a shared (or mutual) context, the interlocutors do not have to explain every word they are speaking. Thus, conversations usually avoid elaboration of meaning (Quaglio and Biber, 2006: 705).

In the above turn, Cliff employs elliptical form to refer to Jimmy's previous question: "Haven't you read the other posh paper yet?". The first part of this insertion sequence (this turn) is followed by Jimmy's elaboration of his question in the next turn (Jimmy: Well, there are only two posh papers on a Sunday—the one you're reading, and this one. Come on, let me have that one, and you take this.). However, this shows that even an elliptic form can have appropriate responses if it can be used as a question in the given context.

In the turn below there is an indirect suggestion for Alison.

Cliff: (Grasping her hand). Why don't you leave all that, and sit down for

a bit? You look tired.

Questions are used typically with the illocutionary force of inquiries. But a question can also be used to indirectly convey a suggestion, offer or request. The form beginning with "Why don't you?" is one indirect suggestion in the hearer's benefit (Collins, 2006: 186).

The suggestion in the utterance above is followed by a statement. The statement follows as a completion to the general meaning of the whole turn, and as a 'justification' of what the speaker offers to the hearer. This sequence of two speech acts makes the directive illocutionary force of this turn more powerful than the case in which there was no statement after the suggestion.

Cliff's turn below is an impatient reaction to Jimmy's question.

Cliff: (Throws down paper.) What's that?

Instead of directly answering Jimmy's question in the previous turn (Jimmy: …Our youth is slipping away. Do you know that?), Cliff asks another question to make an insertion sequence. The form is a Wh-interrogative which is used to ask about facts. The meaning of "What's that?" here is that Cliff does not know what Jimmy is talking about, especially by using "that" which is a repetition of Jimmy's "that". Jimmy's above-mentioned utterance is a speech act sequence of questioning. The demonstrative pronoun "that" is also an anaphora here which refers back to the whole of the previous sentence, the antecedent.

Now Cliff's repetition of the demonstrative "that" in the form of question reveals his denial of the anaphoric reference, or indeed the context, to which Jimmy was referring. The pragmatic effect is that either Cliff does not care about Jimmy's invocations to make him talk, or he simply did not hear the declarative sentence (antecedent) uttered by Jimmy, because he was busy reading the newspaper.

However, the insertion sequence initiated by Cliff's "What's that?" is cancelled by Jimmy's following turn when he says: "Oh, nothing, nothing…". This means that when Jimmy observes that his question, as a directive with powerful illocutionary force, has no perlocutionary effect on Cliff he prefers to stop following its answer.

In the next turn there is another instance of sequencing.

Cliff: Let's go to the pictures. (to Alison) What do you say, lovely?

The turn begins with a "directive with let" construction (Quirk et al., 1985: 829) which has a more friendly tone than an imperative utterance.

When the verb "Let" is followed by the pronoun "us" in an appropriate context, such as the utterance above, it has the social function of advising people to act, or inviting them something together. So, Cliff here wants that all of them go to the cinema to get them out of boredom.

Then he addresses Alison with a question: "What do you say, lovely?". This is an information-seeking question, followed by a vocative. This vocative is an address (Levinson, 1983: 71) and it is used by the speaker to attract his addressee's attention towards his proposed argument of question. Furthermore, the address term used here ("lovely") is a very emotional and intimate one which signifies the close social distance or intimacy between the interlocutors.

The illocutionary force of that question depends not only on the way of expression discussed above, but also on the nature of the situational context in which they are involved. Thus, it can be said that the combination of the illocutionary forces of the initial imperative with the final interrogative serves as a sequence of directive speech act whose purpose is to convince the hearer to go to the cinema. This is done by a request in addition to the act of seeking for confirmation.

In the following turn Cliff asks two questions.

> Cliff: Oh, you're not going to start up that old pipe again, are you? It stinks the place out. (to Alison) Doesn't it smell awful? (Jimmy grabs the matches, and lights up.)

The form of the first utterance in the above turn has occurred many times in the play, namely a declarative followed by a tag question. Tag questions can be viewed as speech acts which combine assertion and interrogation (Leech and Short, 1981: 298). In this way, Cliff asserts what he believes to be true: he does not believe that Jimmy is going to smoke. For this reason his assertion is a negative one. This is followed by a positive tag question for Cliff to make sure of his negative statement. Then the question is followed by a declarative to support his expressed belief in the previous utterance. After that, he addresses Alison to ask her a negative question: "Doesn't it smell awful?". Such a question is usually utilized by the speaker to seek for confirmation from the hearer, namely a positive response.

The intended pragmatic effect of Cliff's turn above is that the combination of the first utterance (an interrogative) with the following statement (a declarative used for justification) in addition to the last negative question constitutes a sequence of directive speech act. This sequence has been arranged in a way to achieve the best result on the part of the hearer to make him refrain from his intended act (smoking his pipe).

However, when the stage direction _which is connected to situational context_ is considered, it can be realised that Cliff's directive illocutionary force had no perlocutionary effect on Jimmy. The latter continues what he wanted to do, despite the former's efforts.

8. Interrogatives Uttered by Alison

Alison's first directive in the form of interrogative is the following.

Alison: (absently) What's that?

Of course, the question in the turn above must not be taken as a mere simple Wh-question. When Jimmy, in the previous turn, asks her whether she is a peasant or not by saying: "You're not a peasant, are you?" Alison utters the turn above instead of a Yes or No answer. She inserts the question "What's that?" absently between Jimmy's question and her answer (Alison: Oh-- I haven't read them yet.), because she was not listening or paying attention to Jimmy's talking. Therefore, she demands a repetition of Jimmy's question (Jimmy: I said do the papers make you feel you're not so brilliant after all?). In short, Alison's question in the analysed turn above depicts that Jimmy's previous question had no perlocutionary effect on Alison, since she was not listening.

In Alison's next turn the question is in the form of an incomplete sentence.

Alison: (to Jimmy) Would you like to?

Of course the meaning of the above question can only be understood by reference to the previous utterances (linguistic context), as well as the dramatic situations (physical context). In doing so, it is noticed that Alison is asking Jimmy, in the turn above, whether he would like to go to the cinema or not. The illocutionary force of that question is that of a directive one which is associated with a perlocutionary effect on the hearer. As a result, Jimmy responds to the question posed by Alison: his answer is negative.

Alison's last interrogatives occur in the following turn.

Alison: …You've heard about Madeline enough times. She was his mistress. Remember? When he was fourteen. Or was it thirteen?

In the turn above, there are two Yes/No questions; the first one is elliptical, the second one is grammatically complete. Elliptical utterances are very common in the language of drama, because they reflect conversations in the real world. Thus, the expression "Remember?" should be reconstructed as "Do you remember?". However, when

participants engage in a dialogue they understand each other's intentions when ellipsis or short forms are used, because they share a common ground (Holtgraves, 2002: 131). The "Remember?" question is directed to Cliff who has forgot who "Madeline" was. Then the question is followed by a declarative to assert that Jimmy "was fourteen" when he first met Madeline. But, the next question "Or was it thirteen?" violates the illocutionary force of the assertion made in the previous utterance. The question, moreover, reveals that Alison is not sure about Madeline's age when she met Jimmy for the first time. Nevertheless, when the assertion "When he was fourteen" is followed by the question "Or was it thirteen?" they can jointly form a sequence of directive speech act whose function is enquiring about someone's age.

9. Declaratives Uttered by Jimmy

In addition to imperative and interrogative types of sentence, declaratives too can function as directive speech acts. This is related to the problem of the overlap between different functions. One utterance may simultaneously refer to more than one illocutionary act. Searle (1979: viii) gives the following example: "Sir, you are standing on my foot". Here, the representative (assertive) utterance is also an indirect directive which means something like: "Don't stand on my foot".

However, this kind of declarative utterance is less numerous, in the selected play, than the other two types, namely imperatives and interrogatives. The first one is the following.

Jimmy: … You can express an opinion.

The utterance above has the force of a directive speech act, because the speaker (Jimmy) is trying to stimulate the hearer (Alison) in order to make her talk to him. Therefore, its function is not only an assertion of some facts in the world. The speaker wants to hear something from the addressee. He does not care much about the content of what he expects to hear from the addressee: he only wants to talk. Since talking to people involves more than one person (the speaker), Jimmy expects that the other two characters (Alison and Cliff) respond to him properly, so that the talk will continue.

In Jimmy's turn below, he utters another one of this kind.

Jimmy: You can make me some more tea.

The above utterance is uttered by Jimmy to Cliff to make him some more tea. The word "more" triggers a conventional implicature which implies that the speaker has already had some tea, but he wants some more. Without taking any implicature into account, the sentence is already associated with a directive illocutionary force. Together with "more", the

pragmatic force of the utterance will be much more powerful, because the utterance commands the other two people to repeat the action. The expected reply is so that it loses its perlocutionary effect on Cliff, thus he does not comply with the command. (This makes Jimmy repeat his command in an imperative, later on.)

Jimmy's next turn is directed to Cliff, once again.

Jimmy: I thought the doctor said no cigarettes?

In the above utterance, the speaker tries to prevent the hearer from smoking a cigarette. In other words, the speaker forbids the hearer to smoke. According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985: 195), "to forbid a hearer to do something is just to order him not to do it", because forbidding is the negation of ordering. The act of forbidding in the above utterance is also associated with a kind of hedge, i.e., "I thought", which is a mitigating device. Clearly, such a device will cause the negative command to sound more polite and less direct. Nevertheless, Jimmy does not really want to soften his negative command, because this is not expected from this character: he merely tries to ridicule his addressee via using sarcasm. (Note the question mark which shoes the intonation). The speaker also attempts to show his authority over the hearer, via the act of forbidding which has a powerful negative directive force.

Jimmy's turn below contains two declaratives.

Jimmy: You sit there like a lump of dough. I thought
you were going to make me some tea.

The first declarative sentence in the above turn functions as a statement through which the speaker describes the situation. Even this description is, by itself, an attempt by Jimmy to mock his hearer, Cliff. But the main function of the sentence is to provide the ground for directive speech act in the next sentence. The second sentence is also a declarative with the expression "I thought" which is a hedge. However, as in the previous turn, discussed above, this hedge expression in the beginning of a past continuous clause contains some kind of sarcasm. In addition, the second sentence really functions as an effective utterance to make the hearer work for the speaker, because it has an undeniable directive force.

10. Declaratives Uttered by Cliff

Cliff's declarative sentences with the function of directive are limited to one. It occurs in the turn below.

Cliff: I can't stand the stink of that old pipe any longer. I must have
a cigarette.

In the above turn, Cliff is addressing both Jimmy and Alison, doing two acts simultaneously. Cliff is complaining via uttering the first sentence, and he is requesting a cigarette via uttering the second one. Here, there is an interesting case here. Although the audience of the utterances is not determined (and it is supposed to be both Jimmy and Alison), the real audience is only Alison rather than Jimmy. This is so because Cliff knows that Jimmy will not comply with his request, and it will have no perlocutionary effect on him. Moreover, the speaker's motive to use the model verb 'must' is that he wants to exercise some power on his audience. In fact, the modal verb "must", unlike "have (got) to", normally suggests that the speaker is exercising his authority over his hearer(s) (Quirk et al., 1985: 225). Therefore, the total effect of the above turn is supposed to make the audience necessarily perform what the speaker is demanding. This is an obvious directive illocutionary force.

11. Declaratives Uttered by Alison

The last case to discuss is declarative sentences with the function of directive speech acts, uttered by Alison. They are limited to two instances. The first one is Alison's turn below.

Alison: I don't think I'll be able to. Perhaps Jimmy would like to go.

Of the two utterances above, the first one functions as a refusal; it contains a commissive speech act. The second utterance serves as a directive. From the context of the play, one is able to infer the elliptical sentences above rightly. Alison first refuses to go to the cinema, then she suggests that Jimmy may want to do so.

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985: 195), the act of suggesting has both directive and representative uses. In the directive use, to suggest is to make a relatively weak attempt to get someone to do something. Thus, the act of suggesting has a comparably weaker directive force than the acts of ordering and requesting.

Finally, the following turn is another case of suggestion.

Alison: You'd better take them off.

The above utterance is directed to Cliff to take off his trousers, so that Alison can fix them. The utterance acts as a mitigated directive speech act which does not threaten the hearer's negative face. However, the use of the formula "had better + verb" implies that the speaker is suggesting what is "the best thing to do" in a particular situation. "Had better" is stronger than "should" or "ought to" (Eastwood, 2008: 105). Thus, there is a relatively powerful recommendation which suggests that what the speaker says not only does not threaten the hearer's face, but also is a

useful action to be carried out by the hearer. Therefore, it can be said that the above utterance succeeds in performing a socially acceptable directive speech act, because its illocutionary force suits both the speaker's intention and the hearer's desire.

12. Statistical Results

After analysing the data, the statistical results of the study have been put into the two following tables; the first table shows the frequency of the use of directives analysed, and the second one shows their percentage. The tables are arranged according to two factors; the sentence types including the directive speech acts, and the characters of the play using those directives. The total number of analysed utterances is 45.

Table (1): Frequency of the use of directives

Characters	Imperatives	Interrogatives	Declaratives	
Jimmy	7	12	4	
Cliff	5	7	1	
Alison	3	4	2	
Total number of directives	15	23	7	45

The following table demonstrates the percentage of directives used in the play:

Table (2): Percentage of the use of directives

Characters	Imperatives	Interrogatives	Declaratives
Jimmy	15.56%	26.67%	8.89%

Cliff	11.12%	15.56%	2.23%	
Alison	6.67%	8.89%	4.45%	
Total percentage of directives	33.35%	51.12%	15.57%	100%

In the light of the results above, the following statistical findings are observed.

1- Among the different sentence types employed in the selected data, interrogatives are the most frequent ones. Among the 45 utterances analysed, there are 23 directives realised through interrogatives, corresponding to 51.12%.

2- Directive speech acts do not occur very frequently in declarative sentence type. This type is the least frequent and the least productive one here. They constitute only 7 utterances which correspond to 15.57%.

3- Imperatives occupy a middle rank in frequency and productivity. The imperative sentence type, therefore, scores an average value in productivity, i.e. neither highly productive, nor slightly productive. They constitute 15 utterances, out of 45, corresponding to 33.35%.

References:

1. Aijmer, Karin (2004). "Interjections in a Contrastive Perspective". In Weigand.
    a. E. (ed.), ***Emotions in Dialogue Interaction***. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
2. Akmajian, A., Demers, R., Farmer, A. and Harnish, R. (2001). ***Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication***. Massachusetts: the MIT Press.
3. Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). ***Discourse Analysis.*** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Collins, J. (2006). ***Imbedded Imperatives and Conversations.*** London: Oxford
    a. University Press.
5. Eastwood, John (2008). ***Oxford's Learner's Pocket Grammar***. Oxford: OUP.
6. Grice, H. Paul (1975). "Logic and Conversation". In Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds.), ***Syntax and Semantics, vol. 3: Speech Acts***. New York: Academic Press.
7. Hewings, A. and Hewings, M. (2005). ***Grammar and Context.*** London and New York: Routledge Press.

8. Holtgraves, Thomas (2002). ***Language as Social Action***. New Jersey: Lawrance Earlbaum.
9. Leech, Geoffrey (1983). ***Principles of Pragmatics***. London: Longman.
10. _____ (2006). ***A Glossary of English Grammar.*** Edinburgh: Edinburgh
    a. University Press.
11. Leech, G. and Short, M. (1981). ***Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to***
    a. ***English Fictional Prose.*** New York: Longman Group Limited.
12. Levinson, S. (1983). ***Pragmatics.*** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Lyons, John (1977). ***Semantic 2.*** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
14. Osborne, John (1965). ***Look Back in Anger.*** London: Faber & Faber.
15. Peter, A. (2004). ***A Glossary of English Grammar.*** London: Longman.
16. Quaglio,P. and Biber, D. (2006). "The Grammar of Conversation". In Aarts, B. and Mc Mahon, A. (eds.), ***The Handbook of English Linguistics.*** Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
17. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1985). ***A Comprehensive***
    a. ***Grammar of the English Language***. London: Longman Group Ltd.
18. Searle, John (1969). ***Speech Acts***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. _____ (1979). ***Expression and Meaning***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
20. Searle, J. and Vanderveken, D. (1985). ***Foundations of Illocutionary Logic***.
    a. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Simpson, Paul (1997). ***Language through Literature: An Introduction***.
    a. London: Routledge.
22. Van Dijk, T.A. (1977). ***Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and***
    a. ***Pragmatics of Discourse.*** London: Longman.
23. Verschueren, J. (1980). ***On Speech Act Verbs.*** Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
24. Yule, George (1996). ***Pragmatics***. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

25. ***Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia, 2012***.
    a. http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Look_back_in_anger

تحليل تداولي للموجِّهات في مسرحية أوزبورن: (أنظر إلى الوراء بغضب)

بحث مستل لطالب الماجستير: محمد إبراهيم عباس
بإشراف: أ.م.د. عمران موسى ماهود
جامعة بغداد – كلية التربية/ ابن الرشد للعلوم الإنسانية

الملخّص:

إحدى وظائف اللغة توجيه سلوك الأفراد الأخرين عن طريق استعمال الأفعال الكلامية الموجِّهة، مثل الطلب و الأوامر. فضلًا عن الاستعمال اليومي للفعل الكلامي الموجِّه، يمكن للفرد ان يلاحظ كماً هائلاً من هذا الفعل الكلامي في لغة المسرح. لكن، بسبب تعقد المعنى التداولي، تشخيص و تحليل الموجِّهات في المسرح الحديث (وبشكل أخص مسرحية أوزبورن) يشكل بعض الصعوبات للمخاطب. المشكلة هنا هي كيفية التمييز بين الفعل الكلامي الموجِّه وبقية الافعال الكلامية حين لايوجد اي فعل تنفيذي صريح في الدور(الحواري) الخاضع للتحليل.

هذه الدراسة تهدف الى ما يلي:

١- تبيين تأثير السياق في تفسير أنواع الموجِّهات المستعملة في مسرحية أوزبورن

٢- تشخيص وتحليل انواع الافعال الكلامية الموجِّهة المستعملة في لغة مسرحية "أنظر إلى الوراء بغضب"

٣- تحليل تعقد المعنى اللغوي في دراسة الموجّهات، سواء كانت الموجِّهات معزولة أو في سلسلة من الافعال الكلامية

قد طرحت فرضيتان اثنان لتحليل الموجِّهات:

١- التمييز بين الأفعال الكلامية الموجِّهة و بقية الأفعال الكلامية غالباً ما هو أمر غير واضح، خاصة في لغة مسرحية أوزبورن (أنظر إلى الوراء بغضب) التي تعتمد بشكل قوي على الحوار الفعلي.

٢- في الحوار المسرحي المدروس هنا الأفعال الكلامية الموجِّهة عادة تأتي مع الافعال الكلامية الأخرى لتشكل "سلسلة من الأفعال الكلامية". هذه الفكرة مفيدة و قابلة للتطبيق في فهم و تحليل لغة هذه المسرحية.

هذه أهم النتائج التي توصلت اليها الدراسة:

١- يمكن للموجِّهات ان تتمثل في مختلف التراكيب النحوية، ولاسيما في الجمل السؤالية. لقد سجل هذا النوع من الجمل اعلى نسبة من الاستعمال (٥٨.١١%)، ثم تليه الجمل الامرية (٣٢.٤٤%)، بعد ذلك، الجمل الاخبارية (٩.٤٦%). إذن، الجمل السؤالية هي الاكثر انتاجية في تمثيل الموجِّهات في مسرحية أوزبورن.

٢- لا تأتي الموجِّهات عادة بشكل مفاجئ أو منفصل في الحوار المسرحي، وفي هذه المسرحية أيضاً. بدلاً من ذلك، قد لوحظ بأن الموجِّه غالباً مسبوق أو متبوع بفعل كلامي (موجِّه أو غير موجِّه) ليدعم معناه. هذا يعني أنها (أي مجموعة الافعال الكلامية) تشكل سلسلة من الافعال الكلامية وتعمل كفعل كلامي موجِّه واحد.