CHAPTER IV

DRAMA

4.1 Drama as a Literary Genre: A Survey

Some of the earliest systematic work in literary criticism is that of Aristotle. It is systematic in that literature\(^1\) (though they had no specific name for it) has been considered objectively as a body with a view to finding out and systematising the particular qualities which go to make up literary genres like a tragedy, an epic etc. Incidentally, this has also led to the prescription of norms which had to be followed to make a piece of literary endeavour (mainly drama and poetry) 'perfect'. Some of the schools of literary criticism which have followed have accepted and worked with these norms set up by the Greeks, e.g. the Neoclassicists like Dryden and Pope. Or, alternatively, they have used this as a base for their criticism and either disagreed with or presented a modified version of the canons of

1. "There is an art which imitates by language alone without harmony, in prose or in verse, and if the latter, in some one or plurality of metres. This form to this day is without a name." (Aristotle; I, p.4)
criticism, e.g. the Romantics and some Modern critics.

It is interesting to note here that when it was considered as literature\(^2\), drama was seen as part of poetry.

We have been using the term "tragedy" almost as if it were synonymous with "poetry". Aristotle does the same.... Not only had tragedy evolved.... through several phases to its entelechy or full form, but this same evolution was in a broader sense the evolution of poetry to its fullest form, which was no other than that of tragedy. ....... The Aristotelian poetics is the poetics of drama...

(Wimsatt & Brooks : 1957:35-36)

Till perhaps Ibsen and the age of modernism in drama, the Aristotelian legacy regarding what drama is [Tragedy(drama)the imitation of an action.] has remained in the consciousness of literateurs and critics. Most agreed about what drama actually was. What was argued about was what sort of imitation it was. This idea of drama 'holding a mirror upto nature' continued for a long time, from dignified Greek tragedies through

2. Plato considered dramatists and actors as part of society and evaluated their functions in society as part of the system. Hence his disapproval of actors who would be 'third in descent from the sovereign and the truth' (Plato : Republic : p.597) Aristotle's concern was with people as moral beings and their characterization as such.
full-blooded Elizabethan drama to the elegant eighteenth and nineteenth century theatrical productions. Aristotle's pronouncement on 'mimesis' has been the basis for judging the response to dramas: "Epic poetry and Tragedy, as also Comedy, Dithyrambic poetry, and most lute-playing and lyre-playing, are all, taken as a whole, modes of imitation". (Aristotle: 3)

It is only the modern drama critic who has begged to differ with the views expressed by Aristotle. As Esslin (1987:15) says: "Our own experience has shown that these assumptions by Aristotle, which dominated the practice of drama in so many places for such long periods are incorrect, at least as far as present-day audiences are concerned...."

This view of drama as imitation is relevant to the study of drama for two reasons. One, imitation is seen not only as a verbal art but a visual one too when it comes to drama. Hence the 'realism' of sets and costumes. Two, metaphor, which is so important in literature, is translated into symbolism on stage, and this is an important aspect for consideration when drama is criticised.

It would be supposed that the strong visual
element in drama would lead the critics to regard drama more as theatre than as a purely literary genre. But surprisingly, this has not been so. Dryden, Pope, Johnson and even the Romantics considered drama as a piece of literature, and all of them had the classical tenets in their mind while criticising drama. This tradition of considering drama as literature - a poem or fiction - continued for quite some time.

Dramatic criticism of the forties, fifties and sixties was a text-based study which treated plays rather like poems, analysing metaphors, strands of imagery and so on, often lifting parts of plays (e.g. soliloquies) out of context in order to treat them more or less as poems in their own right. It is not surprising that such a criticism arose when we remember that analysis of poetry was (and still is) the most developed of Anglo-American critical apparatus.

(Short : 1981 : 180)

A survey of dramatic criticism shows that there are two distinct streams of dramatic criticism - one which treats drama as theatre and the other which treats drama as literary text. The critics who see drama as theatre are mainly directors of plays. The role of the director has changed over the years and his importance too. As Hinchliffe (1979:11) says ".... the improvement of stage lighting and machinery, naturalistic plays
and the consequent under-acting made rehearsal more important, and the actor-manager was gradually replaced by the director.

Because of this dimension introduced into dramas, critics maintain that theatrical experience is fundamental to the study of drama. But they have also realized that drama is not just one thing or the other, and that "....... drama still requires a mixture of talents: it is both literary and spectacular". (p.11) The quotations given below give an insight into the attitudes of these critics.

We can study a written play, and state a response to it, and that statement is, or intended to be, literary criticism. Alternatively, we can study an actual performance of a play, and state a response to it; and that statement is, or is intended to be, theatrical criticism. For legitimate purposes of emphasis, the study of a text may fail to include any detailed consideration of the way in which the text would be performed, as the author intended it should be performed. Similarly, the study of a performance may isolate the details of performance alone, without particular consideration of the play. These methods have their uses, but, ultimately, dramatic criticism must proceed beyond them.

(Williams : 1972 : 3-4)

It is one solution to suggest that dramatic criticism is written in the study with the text in front of you,
while theatre criticism looks at the performance. But such a division is arbitrary and confers more upon a text that recent writers would allow.

(Hinchliffe : 1979 : 11)

...... drama is not made of words alone, but of sights and sounds, stillness and motion, noise and silence, relationships and responses. Yet: these relationships and responses are not those between characters, rather those between actor and audience. Drama study insists, therefore, that we think of a particular social situation, a here-and-now or (imperious demand !) a there-and-then recreated in the imagination to be here-and-now.

(Styan : 1975 : vii)

It is evident from the foregoing that drama is seen as both performance and literary text. The responses to performance deals with things like the stage, acting, lighting, audience response etc. The other type of response is very much a literary one. Such a response is usually made by people trained in canons of criticism - whatever the school. Typical examples are given below:

Criticism of drama as literary text:

The assurance of Macbeth has behind it, is indeed based on, a deeply imagined resolution

3. Such criticisms are found in newspapers and magazines reviewing films and dramas. It is interesting to note that in such reviews the director comes in for a fair share of attention.
of perplexities inherent in any full exposure to life. Freedom from the tyranny of time and illusion is finally related, at the deepest levels of consciousness, to the central affirmations of the spirit; and conversely, the obsessed awareness of time without meaning, like the subjection of mind to appearance, is revealed not simply as consequential on false choice but intrinsic to it: for 'the eye altering alters all'. There is a similar assurance in the use of 'nature', in that aspect of the play's imaginative structure that impels us to say not merely that Macbeth's crime is unnatural (i.e. inhuman) but that the values against which evil is defined are in some sense grounded in nature. To suggest how this is so, to relate the insights operative here to those already touched on, it is necessary to step back from the play and see it in the wider context of Shakespeare's development as a whole.

(Knight : 1959 : 225)

Criticism of drama as performance:

Reality and fantasy are combined in the stage-setting which is, on the one hand, "An old house in North London", but on the other hand a spacious hall or throne room. Pinter effects this double setting by an unusual direction:

A large room, extending the width of the stage. The back wall, which contained the door has been removed. A square arch type remains. Beyond it, the hall.

It is hard to imagine this structural alteration being made in any large, and already draughty, old house in North London; but for the play's action the effect is important.

(Brown : 1984 : 38-39)

The third category of criticism is one which uses semiotic categories for analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theatrical subcodes</th>
<th>Cultural codes</th>
<th>Dramatic subcodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decoding of perform-</td>
<td>Syntatic</td>
<td>Interpretation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ance on basis of</td>
<td>semantic</td>
<td>drama on basis of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constitutional rules</td>
<td>phonological</td>
<td>constitutive rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>constitutive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions govern-</td>
<td>Pragmatic rules</td>
<td>Conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ing modes of</td>
<td>(conversation</td>
<td>governing the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performer-audience</td>
<td>and relating</td>
<td>rules, context-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address (in theatre</td>
<td>to the</td>
<td>ical rules, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al context)</td>
<td>interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of interper-</td>
<td>interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sonal com-</td>
<td>communication (in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>munication)</td>
<td>dramatic context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules of pronuncia-</td>
<td>Rhetorical</td>
<td>Dramatic rhetorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tion (delivery)</td>
<td></td>
<td>and stylistic con-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ventions (de-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>corum, figural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>modes, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoding of voice</td>
<td>Paralinguistic</td>
<td>Paralinguistic con-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>straints on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>character inter-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pretation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of 'local'</td>
<td>Dialectal</td>
<td>Geographical and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or 'regional' factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>class constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>on characteriza-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors imposition of</td>
<td>Idiolectal</td>
<td>Syntactic, rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal traits in</td>
<td></td>
<td>al and personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>idiosyncrasies of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>characters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Theatrical Communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theatrical subcodes</th>
<th>Cultural codes</th>
<th>Dramatic subcodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Conventions**
- General kinetic codes
  - Rules for interpretation of movement in terms of character, etc.

**Spatial conventions**
- Proxemic codes
  - Constraints on reading of spatial arrangements in terms of inter-relationships in dramatic space, etc.

**Rules for theatrical Vestimentary codes**
- Rules for interpreting costume in terms of status, character, etc.

**Make-up conventions**
- Cosmetic codes
  - Conventions relating make-up to dramatic types, etc.

**Scenic subcodes**
- Pictorial codes
  - Constraints on the construction of the dramatic scene

**Restrictions on Musical codes**
- Norms regulating the inference of dramatic information from 'significant' music, etc.

**Stage and playhouse**
- Architectural codes etc.
  - Stage and playhouse as sources of dramatic information, etc.

(ELAM : 1980 : 56-57)
4.2 Discourse Analysis and Drs

Before going any further, for reasons of clarity, the term 'literary text' should be glossed. When critics talk of literary texts, they refer to 'content' rather than structure or form. This content is equated to the story, character, plot etc. The text per se is evaluated in terms of its 'literary' attributes. Esslin's description explains this rather neatly:

More attention, for example, was, at one time devoted to the analysis of say, the characters of Shakespeare, as though they were real people, than to the mundane problem of how Shakespeare actually delineated the character. This ultimately amounted, and still amounts, to a concentration on the content of drama.....rather than on the 'means' and 'methods' by which drama conveys its contents.

(Esslin : 1987 : 16-17)

For a linguist, on the other hand, a text means:

a piece of spoken or written language. A text may be considered from the point of view of its structure and/or its functions, e.g. warning, instructing, carrying out a transaction.

A full understanding of a text is impossible without reference to the context in which it occurs.

In this thesis the term 'text' will refer to any printed matter presented as a concrete example of language manifestation.

The first person to attempt an analysis of drama in linguistic or stylistic terms is Coulthard (1977). Drama is to all intents and purposes dialogue. A discourse analyst who has proposed a model of discourse analysis will naturally turn to drama to test the hypotheses implied in the proposed model. Coulthard does this with a fragment from Shakespeare's 'Othello'.

He begins with questions and the underlying assumptions, in fact, a series of them, which a questioner makes when he asks a question. If these assumptions are correct then he receives the answer he seeks. With this as a base, he lists out eight assumptions and using these, analyses fragments of dialogue between Othello and Iago, Othello and Desdemona and Iago and Cassio. The eight assumptions are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Response Denying Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Addressee is listening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Speaker questions at appropriate time</td>
<td>Othello: Not now sweet Desdemona, some other time (III iii 56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Addressee hears the question</td>
<td>Iago: Go to, farewell....... do you hear Roderigo? Rod: What say you? (I iii 376-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Addressee understands the question</td>
<td>Othello: Is he not honest? Iago: Honest my lord? (III iii 104-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Addressee accepts speaker as a person allowed/empowered to ask the question</td>
<td>Iago: Though I am bound to every act of duty, I am not bound to that all slaves are free to; Utter my thoughts: (III iii 139-41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Addressee thinks the speaker does not know the answer</td>
<td>Rod: Wilt thou be fast to my hopes? Iago: Thou art sure of me... I have told thee often and I tell thee again and again. (I iii 363-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Addressee is willing to answer</td>
<td>Iago: Are all doors locked? Brabantio: Why, wherefore ask you this? (I i 85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Addressee knows the answer</td>
<td>Iago: What had he done to you? Cassio: I know not. (II iii 277-8) (171-2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two points are to be noted here, about the analysis which works so well for the play chosen. One, the model is not used with any other drama and two, the analysis is only of a fragment and
not of the whole play.

The other person to use a discourse analysis framework to analyse a dramatic text is Short, (1981). In his article "Discourse Analysis and the Analysis of Drama" he discusses the issue of text vs. performance, or drama to be read vs drama to be seen, and argues that it is not necessary to see a drama to appreciate it. Drama can be read as a text. He further discusses the innate knowledge of social behaviour and the social hierarchical system possessed by people and how this helps in the understanding of drama. Later he goes on to describe Grice's model of the Co-operative Principle in Conversation and the conventions.

Grice has called 'maxims':

1. The maxim of quantity: make your contribution as informative as required - don't give too much or too little information.

5. The knowledge of language as it operates in social context, which is innate, and the understanding of how the social hierarchical system works, which is almost intuitive in native speakers cannot be taken for granted when dealing with the L2 situation. Hence, it could become necessary to teach explicitly some of these norms in an L2 situation if students are to understand the point of the drama studied.
2. The maxim of quality: make your contribution one that you believe to be true.

3. The maxim of relation: be relevant

4. The maxim of manner: avoid unnecessary prolixity, obscurity of expression and ambiguity, and be orderly.

(p. 190)

Grice has also outlined four cases in which these maxims can be broken:

i) A speaker may unostentatiously violate a maxim. This accounts for lies and deceits.

ii) He may opt out of the co-operative principle, as for example members of government do when they refuse to answer questions on the grounds that the information required is classified.

iii) He may be faced with a clash, and will have therefore to break one maxim or another.

iv) He may ostentatiously flout a maxim, so that it is apparent to his interlocutors.

(p. 190)

Using the above model, Short attempts an analysis of Harold Pinter's sketch, Trouble in the Works. The sketch has just two characters Mr. Fibbs, the manager and Wills, the shop steward. The absurdity of the situation is brought about by the flouting of the norms of social interaction where normally, the status of participants does not undergo a total change. This is achieved by
Pinter through the use of language by the characters, and their flouting of the maxims. For example Wills' flouting of the maxim of manner (lines 19-24). The analysis is insightful and shows how tools of discourse analysis can be used to analyse and understand drama.

Two points are to be noted here again; one, the analysis is of a short sketch, and two, only one piece is examined. One thing which Short does mention is the fact that there are many other parameters to consider in discourse analysis, some of which are not very clear because of imperfect knowledge:

It is not clear how many speech acts there are or if they can be defined such that each is distinguishable one from another, particularly when we seem to be able to subdivide within speech act types, c.f. requesting, begging, pleading etc. Do all speech acts have to have names already existing in our vocabulary? What speech act is performed by the normal utterance of 'Here's your tea, dear'? There are also problems in distinguishing presuppositions from logical implication, and the types of presuppositions that I have discussed do not seem to be discrete categories any more than those for speech act analysis are.

(p. 199)
Burton (1980) recognises the weak areas in the Discourse Analysis models proposed so far, but has done two full length analyses of absurd plays - Ionesco's *The Bald Prima Donna* and Pinter's *The Dumb Waiter*. She uses insights provided by different socio-linguists and discourse analysts to analyse these plays. She also analyses a Pinter sketch, *Last To Go*. Given below is an example of the type of analysis she does using different insights. She has divided the play *The Bald Prima Donna* into episodes.

1. **Mr & Mrs Smith's evening at home**
   - Grice's principle of 'Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence'. The flouting of this maxim.
   - Yngve's concept of backchanneling in a conversation: e.g. husband-wife dialogue with the husband not really listening. Sacks' concept of 'membership categorization'.

2. **Conversation about doctors**
   - Grice's Co-operative Principles. The flouting of the maxim of Quantity.

3. **Conversation about the Watsons**
   - Schegloff & Sacks: 'misplacement markers'; Austin and his categorization of *Constatives* and *Performatives*

4. **The Pseudo-Epigram section**
   - Sherzer and his description of the properties of 'gnomic' utterances.
The above 4 examples of the 11 episodes Burton divides the play into and the resources she has tapped illustrate her method. A similar procedure is followed with The Dumb Waiter. Though she draws upon the work of Sacks, Schegloff, Abrahams and others, she concentrates mainly upon the Sinclair and Coulthard model of teacher-pupil talk and unequal speaking rights embodied in the two complementary roles. She then lists out instances in the play where Ben monitors Gus's non-verbal behaviour. When this list is studied, it becomes clear how Ben controls Gus almost throughout the play. She lists out the ways in which Gus is monitored under three main heads: Directives, Mitigated Directives and Evaluation. She also points out the implicit censure indicated in stage directions. All these, in contrast to Gus's subordinate position as evident in his turns in the conversations show clearly the relationship between the characters. This is something one perceives intuitively when reading the play: the unequal statuses of the two participants, where"..... Ben is undoubtedly the dominating and superior interactant, and Gus is
equally undoubtedly the dominated and inferior one." (Burton : 1980 : 70)

Burton also analyses a short sketch of Pinter, *Last to go*. Here again, she uses Labov's theory of shared knowledge, Jefferson's theory of the function of repetition and John Laver's description of phatic communion to show the sheer absurdity of the exchange between the newspaper seller and the barman.

Burton's work is interesting on two counts: one, she is eclectic in her approach and two, she is the first person to have tried the analysis of a complete play. But she is very critical of her work as she views her methods from a rigorous linguistic analyst's point of view:

..... there are more serious problems that should be considered carefully by anyone involved making stylistic analyses of texts....it is essential to be aware of the peculiar problems of a discursive study, for, whilst insightful observations can be both illuminating and useful in a general literary-critical descriptive way, they are assuredly unhelpful...if they are outside any rigorous, systematized, complete descriptive and theoretical framework.... this is precisely why the accounts in Chapters 2 and 3 are labelled 'studies and not 'analyses'. (studies of *The Bald Prima Donna & the Dumb Waiter*)

(p. 93)
Burton is also aware that there is no one model of discourse analysis which can be applied 'rigorously' to the reading of texts. She is aware that as a linguist-stylistician, her studies can be criticized. But she (p.8) feels that "... if we want to consider play-talk and its degree of similarity to real-talk..... The only possible linguistic level to use as a basis for such analysis is discourse, or even more specifically, conversation as an aspect of discourse."

These are points to keep in mind as they are relevant to the proposed research on drama, especially in terms of teaching methodology.

In his paper, 'Literature as Act' Ohmann (1973 : 81-107) uses Austin's model of felicity conditions to discuss literature in general and drama in particular. He uses Austin's definition of felicity conditions, viz. (i) the participants are qualified and appropriate, (ii) the circumstances are right, (iii) the verbal formula is spoken accurately and completely, (iv) the speaker's beliefs and feelings are required for the performance of the act in good faith and (v)
the participants conduct themselves appropriately afterwards. He relates these to the illocutionary force of utterances.

He analyses a piece from Major Barbara (Act II: 105–7) to illustrate the illocutionary acts performed by the characters; in particular, Undershaft and Mrs Baines, with Barbara and Bill as onlookers.

He concludes saying that, "Grammar deals with the well-formedness of locutions, and rhetoric with the effectiveness of perlocutions. .... In a play, the action rides on a train of illocutions".

(p. 82–83)

4.3 Drama in the Classroom

4.3.1 The Student as Audience

The two models of criticism - both drama as theatre and drama as literature - have not taken into consideration another type of spectator/reader, viz. the undergraduate student who studies drama as a subject. This group is a

4. Widdowson (1975: 2) makes the following distinction between subject and discipline: "..... subjects must be defined at different educational levels in terms of pedagogic objectives, whereas disciplines are defined in terms of theoretical requirements."
large one, yet very little has been said about how they respond to drama.

In a country like India, this sizeable population of students study drama as part of their syllabus, and also do an exam on the basis of the syllabus - which means that the drama studied is an important part of the English curriculum.

It becomes relevant here to mention the two streams of students who do English. One stream does the general English course, which is compulsory for all students. The students who study this are a mixed group, with different socio-cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

One thing which is common is that English for almost all of them is a second language which has to be learnt, and which is not acquired. The other stream consists of students who take up English as an optional subject. The students

5. 'Acquisition' is the unconscious or subconscious development of a language as in a first language situation. 'Learning' is the conscious development of a language, such as that learnt or studied in a school or college environment.
here are slightly better equipped linguistically. But again, for most of them, English is a second language.

It is necessary to pause here and examine the socio-cultural and linguistic background of these students, especially when discussing drama. Drama, more than any other genre, requires the reader to bring in a lot of his/her own experience of life into the reading of the play. All the tacit knowledge of social interaction comes into play here. Most students do not use English other than functionally, and therefore do not have a tacit understanding of the norms of social interaction which is required for an insightful reading of drama. Further, their use of the language is in collaborative consensus type of situation, so the students are not called upon to really exercise their linguistic and communicative abilities in a variety of situations. Such demands are not made on them by society either.

It is this student population that is exposed to drama. The interesting point here is that drama is a part of the English syllabus whatever the stream. The Optional English students may do
a full length play - say Shakespeare - whereas the General English students do one-act plays by a more modern author. But the fact remains that most courses include drama as part of their language syllabus.

The rationale for including drama as part of the language syllabus is that drama as a genre can be exploited for various purposes; dialogue, conversation or spoken English. The rationale is indeed sound when it is thought to be a sample of 'authentic' or 'real' spoken language from the point of discourse analysis. As Burton (1980:96) says "Drama dialogue which sounds like naturally-occurring conversation.... if used and analysed as if it were a transcript of real conversation, is an extremely powerful heuristic device for the discourse analyst trapped into a way of seeing by other styles of data."

Burton goes on to say that drama is different from the material collected under some mandate, especially collaborative-consensus material. For example, in a 'media discussion' or 'patient-doctor consultation' some conversational options are precluded. People arguing, ignoring each
other, being unhelpful or perverse do not normally occur in such situations. The reason for this is that such material or data does not show any radical shift in the structure of talk, as is possible when available options are exercised in some situations and types of conversation.

The point made here will be further elaborated in later sections when the teaching of drama is discussed. But what is to be noted here is that drama as a genre has immense pedagogic and educational possibilities and is capable of being exploited for various purposes in various ways.

But how exactly is drama taught? What are the expected learning outcomes? We know that the analysis of drama as theatre is of little relevance as the majority of students have no exposure to English Theatre. Those who take up Optional English and who live in an urban environment may have better opportunities of seeing English dramas enacted, but that too is not very certain. Except in a few places, the majority of colleges here do not have things like the 'afternoon theatre' or any theatre festivals or shows in English. Most of the drama seen and
enjoyed is in regional languages. And drama in regional languages has its own distinct personality, its own metaphor and its own language. So we really cannot compare the regional theatre with the English Theatre.

If students do not have easy access to English Theatre, it would be futile to expect them to be able to respond to drama as theatre, to explore audience responses in a theatre, to see, judge and evaluate the setting, lighting or acting in a theatre. At best, they could only draw on their knowledge of English cinema and try an evaluation, which would not be appropriate at all.

What sort of responses are students expected to give when they approach a drama as a literary text? is the next logical question. The model which is adopted most frequently is that of the Romantics like Coleridge and Hazlitt i.e., the model represented by critics like Bradley. Since this sort of criticism believes that "...... plays

4. Bradley's Shakespearean Tragedy has been described as 'thinly disguised gossip about the private lives of the dramatic personae'. (Bradbrook : 1932 : 82 - 7) L.C. Knight has continued this attack in his essay 'How Many Children Had Lady Macbeth?'.
were (are) real life and the characters human beings for whom the plays remained the only record". (Hinchliffe : 1979 : 15) What the students are very often made to do is look beyond the play and not at the play. An example from Bradley will illustrate the sort of criticism they are exposed to:

What is the peculiarity of 'Othello'? What is the distinctive impression that it leaves? Of all Shakespeare's tragedies, I would answer, not even excepting 'King Lear', 'Othello' is the most painfully exciting and the most terrible. From the moment when the temptation of the hero begins, the reader's heart and mind are held in a vice, experiencing the extremes of pity and fear, sympathy and repulsion, sickening hope and dreadful expectation. Evil is displayed before him.....

(Bradley : 1904 : 143)

Language when it is mentioned, is only as a further support to the delineation of character. The finer points of the verbal medium are ignored, unless it is to support some observation about the character as a 'real' person with identifiable idiosyncratic habits, like Bradley's views on the use of language by Hamlet.

The questions which are asked about these dramas reinforce this type of criticism. A few
examples are given below:

1. Allison and Brown were not the real names of the executioner and the boy who was executed. Why do you think did (i) Allison not reveal his real name? (ii) Brown not reveal his real name?

2. Allison is referred to as a 'murderer'. Can doing one's duty be described as 'murder'?

(The Other Side by Jack Stuart Knapp prescribed for Class XI)

How far would it be correct to say that Hamlet's Tragedy was brought about by his own incapacity to accept the facts of life? (B.A I yr.)

Given the linguistic level of the students and their socio-cultural background, one can visualize the sort of responses they develop. This sort of response is convenient in another way - paucity of knowledge about the cultural, social and often political life portrayed in plays makes it 'safer' to respond to characters as romantically 'real'.
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This means that the students do not relate to the text but to the criticism of it. If this is the case, then the question arises - what is the role played by the text? Should not guides and criticisms be prescribed instead? Would they not do the job better?

The result of this absence of clear aims and objectives and the means to achieve them is that students do drama neither as literary texts nor do they study it as theatre. Since most students are lectured to about the play on hand, the students are not real 'audiences' of the play. The plays are not exploited fully for language either (especially the more modern ones). Neither is a drama studied as representative of the spoken form of English, nor is it read for understanding the discoursal features of the language (which is a good way of seeing how English, which is a foreign language, functions, and of understanding some of the finer points of discourse).

4.3.2 Stylistic Studies of Drama and the Teaching of Drama as Literature:

As can be seen from the foregoing sections,
analysis of drama in discoursal terms is rather recent. In fact, Burton is perhaps the first person to consider drama as a genre different from poetry and prose, and to attempt a stylistic analysis of drama. There could be a reason for this - discourse analysis which can be applied to the analysis of drama is itself a new field of language studies. A lot of work is being done in this area, and a lot still has to be done before it becomes as rigorous a field as other branches of linguistics.

Stylistic analysis of poetry is perhaps the best developed in the field of stylistics. If a survey is made, it can be seen that when the analysis of poetry was attempted at first, the aspect concentrated upon was the particularly deviation in form in poetry. This aspect, which was called foregrounding, was exploited to analyse poetry. Fairley (1981:123-135) takes a poem by e.e. cummings and demonstrates the pattern inherent in the deviations present in his poems. Levin (1969) takes 'normal' patterns of English and shows how poetic language deviates from this. Leech (1969) again talks of the deviance in the
language of poetry which comes about by making original use of the established possibilities of language or going beyond it to create new communicative possibilities. The poems chosen for analysis too are in consonance with the idea of deviance - most people prefer poets like cummings or Dylan Thomas, poets who are highly idiosyncratic in their original use of language.

This aspect of stylistic analysis of poetry viz. preoccupation with deviant structures is relevant when it comes to the stylistic analysis of drama too. Drama is now seen as a different genre, capable of being analysed in its own terms. Experimental analysis of dramas is going on. Again, the feature of style which these analysts have focused upon is deviance and foregrounding. The approach is that of discourse analysis, so the aspects dealt with are those of dialogue and verbal interaction. Again, the 'normal' patterns of discourse are taken and deviances present in the play under discussion highlighted. The analysis undertaken by Short and Burton of Pinter's and Ionesco's plays show how one maxim or the other of normal interaction as spelt out by
Grice is flouted, and the resultant effect of this flouting is discussed. This flouting of rules creates the feeling of dis-jointedness, which is the hall-mark of the theatre of the Absurd. The analysis highlights the fact that the foregrounding here is not of a syntactic pattern, metaphor or figure of speech, but takes the form of a systematic breaking of the rules of co-operative behaviour.

It is not surprising that the theatre of the Absurd is preferred by analysts. This is very much like the preference shown for obviously 'original' users of language in poetry by early stylisticians. The deviance in the language used makes it possible for analysts to show very clearly how the flouting of rules creates the effects of dis-jointedness. Though it is only recently that drama has been studied in stylistic terms the basic approach remains the same, as also the concepts. The only difference is the frame of reference; where once it was linguistic features like syntax and lexis, it is now features of discourse like the co-operative principle and the role of performatives.
Two points arise out of this study of the stylistic analysis of drama. One, how can a play which uses the 'normal' features of interaction be analysed? What happens if there is very little deviance in the use of language? Two, except Burton, most analysts take excerpts from plays to illustrate their point. What would happen if the norms or the framework were to be applied to the whole play? Would it still work? Or would something else be needed?

After discussing the analysis of drama from a researcher's point of view, the next question one would ask is - How relevant is all this to a classroom situation? Has any work been done about the teaching of drama using stylistic analysis? Unfortunately, very little work has been done about the teaching of drama in a classroom. And this point is here being considered from a practical and not a theoretical point of view. Those books which deal with 'literary studies', and which aim to help students/teachers get an insight into literature, rarely, if ever, deal with drama as a genre. Those of a more traditional school deal with the classical
framework within which drama is considered. e.g. in *Approaches to Literature* (1969) Lemon discusses both Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* and Shakespeare's *King Henry IV, Part I* with reference to Oedipus and the Tragic flaw, and Theme and History in *Henry the IV*.

It is only in books like *Literature: a Close Study* by Burns & McNamara (1983) that excerpts from drama are dealt with in some detail. Shakespeare is considered with reference to Imagery, Characterization and the Use of Prose and Poetry. Excerpts from *Romeo & Juliet*, *Othello*, *Hamlet* and *King Lear* are given for study. Excerpts from David Williamson's *The Club* and *The Removalists* are studied for Crude Language, The Language of Disagreement, Humour in Language and Language that reveals Character. The preface says that "We believe that this book will enrich students' understanding and appreciation of what has been done - and can be done - with the English language." (p. vii)

It is surprising to note that in their book Cummings & Simmons (1983) do not consider any excerpt from drama for stylistic analysis or
study. The concentration is all on prose and poetry.

When it comes to the theoretical aspects of the teaching of drama, one finds that there is even less material. Most books dealing with the teaching of literature, like Brumfit's _Teaching Literature Overseas: Language Based Approaches_ (1986) or _Literature and Language Teaching_ (1986) or for that matter even Widdowson's _Stylistics and the Teaching of Literature_ (1975) do not deal with the teaching of drama or even the place of drama in the general scheme of literature teaching. It is true that in _Literature and Language Teaching_ drama is mentioned by Boyle, (p: 204-205) but only with reference to testing. Drama can be used, the author says, to test listening comprehension and to do a cloze dictation in what the author calls a Dicto-Comp type task, where students listen to a radio drama and fill in the gaps. But this is hardly the type of drama which is being discussed here. If ever drama is considered, it is treated more like poetry. And most often, the drama considered is that of Shakespeare.
But there is one area where drama is considered seriously and that is language teaching. But here drama is clearly not considered for literary values - it is considered purely functionally. Lott in *A Course in English Language and Literature* (1986) frankly says that he is using literature to teach language. For example, an excerpt from Wole Soyinka's *Swamp Dwellers* is used to discuss Yes/No questions. As he says in his preface: "My ..... aim in this choice of texts is to make each of them serve as a basis for practice in the use of the English language". (p.vi) When considered functionally, as a basis for practice in language use, drama can help one teach students 'How to Greet', 'How to make Excuses', 'How to Accept Suggestions' etc. Drama is here seen as conversation, very much like Burton suggests, but the similarity stops here. Whereas persons considering drama as literature go on to discuss literary aspects, language teachers concentrate more on the purely functional aspects of conversation. This aspect of drama in language teaching has been made clear by Maley and Duff (1978 : 7)
Many of the skills we most need when speaking a language, foreign or not, are those which are given least attention in the traditional textbook: adaptability (i.e. the ability to match one's speech to the person one is talking to), speed of reaction, sensitivity to tone, insight, anticipation; in short, appropriateness. ....... It is most important therefore to encourage students from the start to become sensitive to the way in which our built-in views of our own roles and those of others are clarified through language.

A lot of work has been done in this area and there are many excellent books available as resource material for teachers. Other than Maley and Duff (1978), other books on using drama as a resource for language teaching are available; Holden (1981), Livingstone (1983), Evans (1984) and Dougall (1987). But, however good the material and however varied the exercises, they cannot be considered for the teaching of literature. One regrets the fact that comparable material has not been developed for the teaching of drama as literature, especially from a stylistic/linguistic perspective.

4.4 Teaching Drama

With very little or no literature about how to teach a drama, a method using mainly discoursal
features would have to be evolved. This method would have to be eclectic, using both linguistic and discoursal features.

Two techniques of discourse analysis which could be easily incorporated would be:

a. dividing the play into episodes on the lines of the division made by Burton of Ionesco's The Bald Prima Donna. Students should find this task well within their abilities, as in addition to the content of the play which would help them do this task, the entrances and exits of characters would act as episode markers.

b. identifying the illocutionary acts performed by the characters. The linguistic description of illocutionary acts like questions and their discoursal characteristics could be used.

c. through using (a) and (b) the characters could be delineated, especially in terms of a hierarchy of social positions and dominant-subordinate roles. This would throw light on the types of characters in the play.

The main thrust here would be to avoid beyond-the-text teaching, and concentrate on whatever is in the text. Interpretation and
personal responses would follow the study of the text. The study of the play would be done on the basis linguistic categories and discoursal features as they occur in the interaction between characters. The conversational set-up, the speech acts themselves, the adhering to or the flouting of maxims of the Co-operative Principle would indicate the individual traits of the characters and their relationship to each other.

4.5 Proposed Methodology

Before the Reading

As the analysis would be based on discoursal features, the students would be asked to identify certain linguistic features (e.g. question forms) and do some tasks. This would prepare them to read and analyse the play later.

During the Reading

A. The students would be asked to do a scanning task to pick out relevant linguistic/discoursal features. This, in the play would be dividing the play into episodes and categorising types of features like questions in each episode.
B. The next step would be the analysis of the linguistic and discoursal data collected. The results of the analysis would then be interpreted. After the Reading

After interpreting textual data, the students would be asked to indicate their responses to the play. Personal responses if substantiated would be accepted even if they were not the 'accepted' reaction to the text. The responses could be given orally or in writing.

4.6 Procedural Details

4.6.1 The Text

The play chosen was The Rising of the Moon, a one-act play by Lady Gregory. It was first performed in Dublin in 1907. This play is not very 'modern', that is, it does not include references to aspects of life which are totally alien to the students. Neither is it a 'classic' like a play by Jonson or Beaumont and Fletcher, requiring a lot of explanation of both the social mores of that time and the language used. The students, it was expected, would be able to read this play easily as it was well within their
linguistic ability. No modern slang is used in this play to make it difficult for them to comprehend the dialogue; there are no archaisms either which require glossing.

4.6.2 The Class

Std.XII students of the Kendriya Vidyalaya ASC Centre were the students who were taught this play. They belonged to the science group and were the best section of that class.

Only two periods were made available by the school authorities as they were busy otherwise. This same class had been taken for the short story the previous year, so the teacher could establish immediate contact with the class.

The other class where this play was tried out was with II year B.Com. students at Vijaya College. These students at present have no regular English Classes. The English they will do later this year is likely to be ESP - i.e. English for Commerce.

4.7 Analysis of the text

Given below is the play, The Rising of the
Moon. The division of the play into episodes by the teacher is also indicated here.

CHARACTERS

SERGEANT

POLICEMAN X

POLICEMAN B

A RAGGED MAN

The Rising of the Moon was first produced at the Abbey Theatre, Dublin, on 9th March 1907.

THE RISING OF THE MOON

Lady Gregory

SCENE. Side of a quay in a seaport town. Some posts and chains. A large barrel. Enter three policemen. Moonlight. Sergeant, who is older than the others, crosses the stage to right and looks down steps. The others put down a pastepot and unroll a bundle of placards.

(EPISODE 1)

Policeman B. I think this would be a good place to put up a notice. (He points to barrel).

Policeman X. Better ask him. (Calls to Sergeant)
Will this be a good place for a placard? [1] (No answer)

POLICEMAN B. Will we put up a notice on the barrel? (No answer)

SERGEANT. There's a flight of steps here that leads to the water. This is a place that should be minded well. If he got down here, his friends might have a boat to meet him, they might send it in here from outside.

POLICEMAN B. Would the barrel be a good place to put a notice up?

SERGEANT. It might; you can put it there (They paste the notice up)

SERGEANT. (Reading it) Dark hair - dark eyes, smooth face, height five feet five - there's not much to take hold of in that - it's a pity I had no chance of seeing him before he broke out of jail. They say he's a wonder, that it's he makes all the plans for the whole organization. There isn't another man in Ireland would have broken jail the way he did. He must have some friends among the jailers.

POLICEMAN B. A hundred pounds is little enough for the Government to offer for him. You may be sure any man in the force that takes him will get promotion.

SERGEANT. I'll mind this place myself. I wouldn't wonder at all if he came this way. He might come slipping along there (points to side of quay) and his friends might be waiting for him there (points down steps), and once he got away it's little chance we'd have of finding him; it's may be under a load of help he'd be in a fishing boat, and not one to help a married man that wants it to the reward.

POLICEMAN X. And if we get him itself, nothing but abuse on our heads for it from the people, and maybe from our own relations.

SERGEANT. Well, we have to do our duty in the force. Haven't we the whole country depending on us to keep law and order? It's those that are down would be up and those that are up would be
down, if it wasn't for us. Well, hurry on, you have plenty of other places to placard yet, and come back here then to me. You can take the lantern. Don't be too long now. It's very lonesome here with nothing but the moon.

POLICEMEN B. It's a pity we can't stop with you. The Government should have brought more police into the town, with him in jail, and at assize time too. Well, good luck to your watch. (They go out)

(EPISODE 2)

SERGEANT. (Walks up and down once or twice and looks at Placard). A hundred pounds and promotion sure. There must be a great deal of spending in a hundred pounds. It's a pity some honest man not to be the better of that.

(A ragged man appears at left and tries to slip past. Sergeant suddenly turns)

SERGEANT. Where are you going?  

MAN. I'm a poor ballad-singer, your honour. I thought to sell some of these (holds out bundle of ballads) to the sailors. (He goes on).

SERGEANT. Stop! Didn't I tell you to stop? You can't go on there.

MAN. Oh, very well. It's a hard thing to be poor. All the world's against the poor!

SERGEANT. Who are you?  

MAN. You'd be as wise as myself if I told you, but I don't mind. I'm one Jimmy Walsh, a ballad-singer.

SERGEANT. Jimmy Walsh? I don't know that name.

MAN. Ah, sure, they know it well enough in Ennis. Were you ever in Ennis, Sergeant?  

SERGEANT. What brought you here?
MAN. Sure, it's to assizes I came, thinking I might make a few shillings here or there. It's in the one train with the judges I came.

SERGEANT. Well, if you came so far, you may as well go farther, for you'll walk out of this.

MAN. I will, I will; I'll just go on where I was going (Goes towards steps).

SERGEANT. Come back from those steps; no one has leave to pass down them to-night.

MAN. I'll just sit on the top of the steps till I see will some sailor buy a ballad off me that would give me my supper. They do be late going back to the ship. It's often I saw them in Cork carried down the quay in a hand-cart.

SERGEANT. Move on, I tell you. I won't have any one lingering about the quay to-night.

MAN. Well, I'll go. It's the poor have the hard life! Maybe yourself might like one, Sergeant. Here's a good sheet now. (Turns one over) Content and a pipe - that's not much. The peeler and the Goat - you wouldn't like that. Johnny Hart - that's a lovely song.

SERGEANT. Move on.

MAN. Ah, wait till you hear it. (Sings)
'There was a rich farmer's daughter lived near the town of Ross;
She courted a Highland soldier, his name was Johnny Hart;
Says the mother to her daughter, "I'll go distracted mad if you marry that Highland Soldier dressed up in Highland plaid".

SERGEANT. Stop that noise. (Man wraps up his ballads and shuffles towards the steps).

SERGEANT. Where are you going?[11]

MAN. Sure, you told me to be going, and I am going.
SERGEANT. Don't be a fool. I didn't tell you to go that way; I told you to go back to the town.

MAN. Back to the town, is it?[12]

SERGEANT. (Taking him by the shoulder and shoving him before him) Here, I'll show you the way. Be off with you. What are you stopping for?[13]

(EPISODE 3)

MAN. (Who has been keeping his eye on the notice, points to it) I think I know what you're waiting for, Sergeant.

SERGEANT. What's that to you?[14]

MAN. And I know well the man you're waiting for - I know him well - I'll be going (He shuffles on.)

SERGEANT. You know him?[15] Come back here. What sort is he?[16]

MAN. Come back is it, Sergeant?[17] Do you want to have me killed?[18]

SERGEANT. Why do you say that?[19]

MAN. Never mind. I'm going. I wouldn't be in your shoes if the reward was ten times as much. Not if it was ten times as much (Goes off stage to left)

SERGEANT. (Rushing after him) Come back here, come back. (Drags him back) What sort is he?[20] Where did you see him?[21]

MAN. I saw him in my own place, in the County Clare. I tell you, you wouldn't like to be looking at him. You'd be afraid to be in the one place with him. There isn't a weapon he doesn't know the use of, and as to strength, his muscles are as hard as that board. (slaps barrel).

SERGEANT. Is he as bad as that?[22]

360
MAN. He is then.

SERGEANT. Do you tell me so?[23]

MAN. There was a poor man in our place, a sergeant from Ballyvaughan - It was with a lump of stone he did it.

SERGEANT. I never heard of that.

MAN. And you wouldn't Sergeant. It's not everything that happens gets into the papers. And there was a policeman in plain clothes too.... It is in Limerick he was ...... It was after the time of the attack on the police barrack at Kilmallock .... Moonlight... just like this... waterside. Nothing was known for certain.

SERGEANT. Do you say so?[24]It's a terrible country to belong to.

MAN. That's so, indeed ! You might be standing there, looking out that way, thinking you saw him coming up this side of the quay (points) and he might be coming up this other side (points) and he'd be on you before you knew where you were.

SERGEANT. It's a whole troop of police they ought to put here to stop a man like that.

MAN. But if you'd like me to stop with you, I could be sitting down this side. I could be sitting up here on this barrel.

SERGEANT. And you know him well, too?[25]

MAN. I'd know him a mile off, Sergeant.

SERGEANT. But you wouldn't want to share the reward?[26]

MAN. Is it a poor man like me, that has to be going the roads and singing in fairs, to have the name on him that he took reward?[27]But you don't want me. I'll be safer in the town.

SERGEANT. Well, you can stop.
MAN. (Getting up on barrel) All right, Sergeant. I wonder now, you're not tired out, Sergeant, walking up and down the way you are.

SERGEANT. If I'm tired I'm used to it.

MAN. You might have hard work before you to-night yet. Take it easy while you can. There's plenty of room up here on the barrel, and you see farther when you're higher up.

SERGEANT. Maybe so. (Gets up beside him on barrel, facing right. They sit back to back, looking different ways). You made me feel a bit queer with the way you talked.

MAN. Give me a match; Sergeant. (He gives it and Man lights pipe) Take a draw yourself? It'll quite you. Wait now till I give you a light, but you needn't turn round. Don't take your eye off the quay for the life of you.

SERGEANT. Never fear, I won't (Lights pipe. They both smoke) Indeed it's a hard thing to be in the force, out at night and no thanks for it, for all the danger we're in. And it's little we get but abuse from the people, and no choice but to obey our orders, and never asked when a man is sent into danger, if you are a married man with a family.

MAN (Sings)
As through the hills I walked to view the hills and shamrock plain,
I stood awhile where nature smiles to view the rocks and streams
On a matron fair I fixed my eyes beneath a fertile vale,
As she sang her song it was on the wrong of poor old Granuaile.

SERGEANT. Stop that; that's no song to be singing in these times.

MAN. Ah, Sergeant, I was only singing to keep my heart up. It sinks when I think of him. To think of us two sitting here, and he creeping up the quay, maybe, to get to us.
SERGEANT. Are you keeping a good look-out?[3]

MAN. I am; and for no reward too. Amn't I the foolish man?[30]But when I saw a man in trouble, I never could help trying to get him out of it What's that?[31] Did something hit me?[32](Rubs his heart.)

SERGEANT. (Patting him on the shoulder) You will get your reward in heaven.

MAN. I know that, I know that, Sergeant, but life is precious.

SERGEANT, Well, you can sing if it gives you more courage.

MAN. (sings)

'Her head was bare, her hands and feet with iron bands were bound, Her pensive strain and plaintive wail mingled with the evening gale, And the song she sang with mournful air, I am Old Granuaile Her lips so sweet that monarchs kissed....'

SERGEANT. That's not it..... 'Her gown she wore was stained with gore.'..... That's it - you missed that.

MAN. You're right, Sergeant, so it is; I missed it. (Repeats line) But to think of a man like you knowing a song like that.

SERGEANT. There's many a thing a man might know and might not have any wish for.

MAN. Now, I dare say, Sergeant, in your youth, you used to be sitting up on a wall, the way you are sitting up on this barrel now, and the other lads beside you, and you singing Granuaile?[33]

SERGEANT. I did then.

MAN. And the Shah Bhean Bhocht?.....[34]

SERGEANT. I did then.
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MAN. And the Green on the Cape.

SERGEANT. That was one of them.

MAN. An maybe the man you are watching for to-night used to be sitting on the wall, when he was young, and singing those same songs.... It's a queer world....

SERGEANT Whisht!.....I think I see something coming .....It's only a dog.

MAN. And isn't it queer world? Maybe it's one of the boys you used to be singing with that time you will be arresting today or to-morrow, and sending into the dock....

SERGEANT. That's true indeed.

MAN. And maybe one night, after you had been singing, if the other boys had told you some plan they had; some plan to free the country, you might have joined with them.... and maybe it is you might be in trouble now.

SERGEANT. Well, who knows but I might? I had a great spirit in those days.

MAN. It's a queer world, Sergeant, and it's little any mother knows when she sees her child creeping on the floor what might happen to it before it has gone through its life or who will be who in the end.

SERGEANT. That's a queer thought now, and a true thought. Wait now till I think it out. If it wasn't for the sense I have, and for my wife and family, and for me joining the force the time I did, it might be myself now would be after breaking jail and hiding in the dark, and it might be him that's hiding in the dark and that got out of jail would be sitting up where I am on this barrel.... And it might be myself would be creeping up trying to make my escape from himself, and it might be himself would be keeping the law, and myself would be breaking it, and myself would be trying may be to put a bullet in his head, or
to take up a lump of a stone the way you said he did .... no, that myself did.... Oh! (Gasps. After a pause) What's that?[37] (Grasps Man's arms)

MAN. (Jumps off barrel and listens, looking out over water) It's nothing, Sergeant.

(EPISODE 4)

SERGEANT. I thought it might be a boat. I had a notion there might be friends of his coming about the quays with a boat.

MAN. Sergeant, I am thinking it was with the people you were, and not with the law you were, when you were a young man.

SERGEANT. Well, If I was foolish then, that time's gone.

MAN. Maybe, Sergeant, it comes into your head sometimes, inspite of your belt and your tunic, that it might have been as well for you to have followed Granuaile.

SERGEANT. It's no business of yours what I think.

MAN. Maybe, Sergeant, you'll be on the side of the country yet.

SERGEANT. (Gets off barrel) Don't talk to me like that. I have my duties and I know them. (Looks around) That was a boat. I hear the oars. (Goes to the steps and looks down)

MAN. (Sings)
'0, then, tell me, Shawn O'Farrell,  
Where the gathering is to be  
In the old spot by the river  
Right well known to you and me!'  

SERGEANT. Stop that! Stop that, I tell you!

MAN. (Sings louder)
'One word more, for signal token,  
Whistle up the marching tune,  
With your pike upon your shoulder,
At the Rising of the Moon'.

SERGEANT. If you don't stop that, I'll arrest you
(A whistle from below answers repeating the air)

SERGEANT. That's a signal. (stands between him
and steps). You must not pass this way .... step
further back.... Who are you?[22] You are no ballad
singer.

MAN. You needn't ask who I am; that placard will
tell you. (Points to placard).

SERGEANT. You are the man I am looking for.

MAN. (Takes off hat and wig. Sergeant seizes
them). I am . There's a hundred pounds on my
head. There is a friend of mine below in a boat.
He knows a safe place to bring me to.

SERGEANT. (Looking still at hat and wig) It's a
pity! It's a pity. You deceived me. You
dceived me well.

MAN. I am a friend of Granuaile. There is a
hundred pounds on my head.

SERGEANT. It's a pity, it's a pity!

MAN. Will you let me pass, or must I make you let
me?[39]

SERGEANT. I am in the force. I will not let you
pass.

MAN. I thought to do it with my tongue.(Puts hand
in breast) What is that?[40]
(Voice of Policeman X outside) Here. This is
where we left him.

SERGEANT. It's my comrades coming.

MAN. You won't betray me ..... the friend of
Granuaile (slips behind barrel).

(Voice of Policeman B) That was the last of the
placards.
(EPISODE 5)

POLICEMAN X (As they come in) If he makes his escape, it won't be unknown he'll make it.
   (Sergeant puts hat and wig behind his back).

POLICEMAN B Did anyone come this way?

SERGEANT. (After a pause) No one.

POLICEMAN B. No one at all?

SERGEANT. No one at all.

POLICEMAN B. We had no orders to go back to the station, we can stop along with you.

SERGEANT. I don't want you. There is nothing for you to do here.

POLICEMAN B. You bade us to come back here and keep watch with you.

SERGEANT. I'd sooner be alone. Would any man come this way and you making all that talk? It is better the place to be quiet.

POLICEMAN B. Well, we'll leave you the lantern anyhow. (hands it to him).

SERGEANT. I don't want it. Bring it with you.

POLICEMAN B. You might want it. There are clouds coming up and you have the darkness of the night before you yet. I'll leave it over here on the barrel (Goes to barrel.)

SERGEANT. Bring it with you, I tell you. No more talk.

POLICEMAN B. Well, I thought it might be a comfort to you. I often think when I have it in my hand and can be flashing it about into every dark corner (doing so) that it's the same as being beside the fire at home, and the bits of dogwood blazing up now and again.
   (Flashes it about, now on the barrel, now on
sergeant).

SERGEANT. (Furious) Be off, the two of you, yourselves and your lantern. (They go out. Man comes from behind barrel. He and Sergeant stand looking at one another).

(EPISODE 6)

SERGEANT. What are you waiting for?

MAN. For my hat, of course, and my wig. You wouldn't wish me to get my death of cold? (Sergeant gives them).

MAN. (Going towards steps) Well, good night, comrade, and thank you. You did me a good turn to-night and I'm obliged to you. Maybe I'll be able to do as much for you when the small rise up and the big fall down... When we all change places at the rising (Waves his hand and disappears) of the moon.

SERGEANT. (Turning his back to audience and reading placard) A hundred pound reward! A hundred pounds! (Turns towards audience). I wonder, now, am I as great a fool as I think I am?

The play can be divided into six episodes, as marked in the text. Some episodes, like the first, fifth and sixth are clearly marked. The entries and exits of characters are the markers. There may be more than one way of looking at the other episodes. For example, episode three can begin with the man taking the initiative and commenting on the poster, or, it could begin when the Sergeant calls the man back as he shuffles...
The questions in the text were divided into 'true' questions and attitudinal questions. Again, the classification cannot be done very strictly, as there can be questions which are neither wholly attitudinal nor totally information seeking. For example, the very first question: "Will this be a good place for a placard?" can be a genuine question or a question just seeking confirmation from a superior. There are many more such questions later on in the play which do not totally belong to either category. But since the analysis had to be kept at a simple level, no other categories were included. The break up of question types would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Policemen</th>
<th>Sergeant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T questions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A questions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Haven't we ...for law and order?)
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(EPISODE 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sergeant</th>
<th>Man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T questions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A questions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Order, Confirmation) questions

(EPISODE 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sergeant</th>
<th>Man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T questions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A questions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(mainly (rhetorical questions, confirmation echo questions, & acknowledgment confirmation questions, generally in control of the interaction)

(EPISODE 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sergeant</th>
<th>Man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T questions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A questions</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(EPISODE 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Policemen</th>
<th>Sergeant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EPISODE 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sergeant</th>
<th>Man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A questions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be noticed from the above that the number of questions, both eliciting information and expressing attitudes, is maximum in Episode III. It is in this episode that the main part of the interaction between the man and the Sergeant takes place and the man comes through as the dominant character, skilfully channelling the conversation to his advantage. ("I meant to do it with words" is what the man confesses towards the end of the play.)

In stylistic terms the illocutionary force of attitudinal questions is more significant than that of information eliciting questions. A question like 'Do you say so?' is more indicative
of the character of the person asking the question (here, the real curiosity of the Sergeant) than a 'true' question which gets the required information and really very little more. ('Who are you?': 'I'm Jimmy Walsh'.)

The hierarchical relationship between the characters is also signalled by these questions - the Sergeant is invested with authority to ask questions and wherever the situation demands it, he asks such questions. He further signals his authority by ignoring the questions put to him by the two policemen in the first episode. Yet, after his interaction with the fugitive, he finds it difficult to answer an information eliciting question by the policeman.

4.7.1 The Lesson (1)
Std. XII student of Kendriya Vidyalaya, ASC Centre, Bangalore.
Two forty-five minute classes were taken.
Before the Reading

Question types were discussed; both the formal and functional aspects were considered. After eliciting from the students the basic
functions of questions, some 'questions' were put on the blackboard.

E.g. May I leave now?

Do you dare call me a liar? You've got the explosives?

You've forgotten your homework, am I right?

Shut up, can't you?

A. Are you going to see that movie again?
B. What else is there to do?

--------

A. Is that your baby?
B. What do you think?

The class was more responsive than expected, and the teacher could go ahead very quickly. The students, despite being in the science stream, showed a remarkable range of linguistic/functional vocabulary. The following is an excerpt from the tape script:

T: Yes, May I leave now? Question form.
S: Permission

T: Do you dare call me a liar?
S: Threat.
T: Threat. You've got the explosives?
S: Appeal

Imperative,
Statement,
Enquiry,

The above excerpt shows that without any
formal exposure to/training in discourse analysis or linguistics, they could get the illocutionary force of the utterances and find terms and labels from their vocabulary to describe the act performed. This was a confirmation of the hypothesis that students can do a preliminary discourse analysis deploying whatever language they have.

Yet in other places, the students needed help. As in:

T: Let the form be just like that. How do you make that into a question?
Ss: Add a question mark.
T: (Voices)
T: A very simple thing. We all do this.
S: Adding a question mark.
T: The tone. It rises. You got it? The voice goes up.

This task, which concentrated on highlighting the discoursal aspect, here, the question-functions, did its job. The students' attention was focussed on the concept of rise-fall in the questions/statements.

It had been decided that the term 'attitudinal' would not be given, but another term would be negotiated. But it was a pleasant surprise to see the students supply the term on
their own; the relevant tape-script excerpt is given below:

T. I'm asking for confirmation. Questions which tell you something about....
S. Attitude.

At another point, two possible interpretations of questions were given by the students:

Ss.: That's an order, ma'am. (with reference to the question: Shut up, can't you?)
S : Command.
S : Annoyance.

During the Reading

A skimming exercise was given. The students had to go through the play quickly and divide it into episodes. This task was to help them perceive the plot and structure of the play. The division into episodes would be convenient for further analysis.

This task was done quite easily, except at one point - Episode III - where one student said that the arrival of the Man on the scene was one episode and the Man and the Sergeant getting friendly was another, though the same two characters continue through these episodes. After discussion, most of it among students, where a lot of code-switching took place, the class accepted
this episode division.

Basically, the student who proposed this division was sensitive to the tone of the dialogue and the shift in relationship between the characters and their roles (from Suspicious Policeman to Friendly Policeman) as evidenced in the discoursal features.

The students divided the play into 5 episodes.

The next task was a scanning task, where all the questions had to be listed. This was done easily by the students.

Stylistic Analysis

Questions were to be categorised using two terms, viz. 'true' questions, or questions whose function was information-seeking and attitudinal questions, whose function was to indicate the attitude of the speaker. The attitudinal questions would indicate the character traits of the dramatis personae.

The students could categorise the questions quite easily, though some questions which did not belong to either category in any clear way gave rise to discussions. For example, the question:
Now I dare say Sergeant, in your youth, you used to be sitting up on a wall, the way you are sitting up on the barrel now, and the other lads beside you, and you singing Granuaile?

This, the students felt, could be treated as a true question, since the Man and the Sergeant are strangers. Yet it could also be a question seeking confirmation of an educated guess.

After classifying the questions, a rough graph was drawn on the blackboard, showing the occurrence of the two types of questions in the play. The drawing of the graph was done at the instance of the students, who perceived an identifiable pattern in the questions as they occurred in the play. Being science students, they wanted to see this pattern represented graphically.

After the graphs were drawn, the questioning pattern could be seen clearly. Though not planned by the teacher, this activity aided perception of the structure of the play.
Interpretation

On the basis of the data collected, the students were asked to interpret the results. They were encouraged to do this on their own as far as possible, and the teacher acted just as a facilitator.

The following points were made by the class on analysing the question patterns:

a. The Sergeant dominates the first two episodes, using his authority and generally 'throwing his weight around'.

b. The third episode, according to them, belonged to both the Man and the Sergeant.

c. They had no doubt about the dominance of the Man in the last two episodes.

During interpretation, a discussion sprang up about how and why a person dominates another. With examples relevant to the students' experience, the teacher could illustrate the fact that this phenomenon can be seen in almost all interaction among human beings in a society.

The manifestation of this type of dominance among 'civilized' human beings is mainly verbal.
After the Reading

To consolidate the gains of the lesson and to get the students to respond personally to the play, the following questions were asked:

1. Write a brief summary of the play, 'The Rising of the Moon'.
2. Draw a character sketch of
   a. the Sergeant
   b. the Man

Use evidence from the play to support your answer.
3. The Sergeant lets the Man go in the end. Give your comments on this.

Question number 1 was done orally by the students. They obviously had understood the plot of the play, and this task was done willingly and well.

Question number 2 was abandoned in favour of question number 3, as there was time for only one written task. With some reluctance the class undertook to do this task. There was an interesting cross-section of responses as the table below shows:
no. of scripts submitted : 28  
no. of scripts used       : 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sgt, foolish</th>
<th>Sgt, noble</th>
<th>not clear/ not done fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scripts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the class was very responsive, the teacher introduced a bit of unplanned teaching - discussing the structure of the play. The episodes lent themselves so well to the division of the play into Introduction/ Setting the Scene/ Introduction of the Main Characters (Episodes 1 & 2); Development/Interaction (Episode 3); Problem/ Suspense (Episode 4); Solution/Resolution (Episode 5). The students also saw how the play began with three characters and ended with almost the same characters, but with a difference. The certainty of the Sergeant had been replaced by doubt and questioning.

4.7.1.1 Observations

The personal responses show how individual reactions are conditioned by the age/times, the society and the milieu in which one lives. A
'rebel' did not have any romantic connotations to many students. The reasons could be:

a. Terrorism and rebels are very much a reality these days, so the students are aware of the brutal side of killing and murder.
b. This school is mainly for children of defence personnel, so death and loss are more immediate to these students. They obviously do not approve of disruptive forces in society.
c. Corruption is seen as part of the mainstream national life, and the results of corruption are being focused on by the media. So most probably, the Sergeant letting the Man go is seen as dereliction of duty and not a noble gesture.

Those who said that the Sergeant did right in letting the Man go talked of the Sergeant belonging first to the country and then to the Police Force. They also mentioned 'right causes', like fellow-feeling towards a person from the same district and the nobility of the gesture which disregards the 100-pound reward. Interestingly, the other group of students also
considered the pragmatic aspects of getting a hundred-pound reward.

It was very heartening to see the students give different opinions and not parrot what is considered the 'correct' answer.

Students' comments.

Since this was a stylistic methodology tried out without much other data to back it up, the teacher felt that the students could be asked their opinion of such a method. It was felt that if they had relevant points, they could be incorporated into the next lesson and the methodology modified.

Some of the points made by the students are given below:

a. More time should be given to reading. (This was a valid point; they were given the task simultaneously with the play and no time was given for silent reading).

b. They comprehended the play, but were uncomfortable because the teacher 'explained' so little. When asked whether they had any problems of comprehension, they replied in the negative and said that they were considering
'weaker' students in other sections.

c. They were sceptical about whether they would be allowed to really express their views in regular classes and wondered what would happen to their grades if they did so.

4.7.2 The Lesson (2)

II Year B.Com. students of the Vijaya College, Basavanagudi Bangalore. Two one-hour classes were given by the college authorities to do the drama.

Before the Reading

As with the Kendriya Vidyalaya students, the forms and functions of questions were discussed. The students said that 'wh' questions sought information. Unlike the students of Kendriya Vidyalaya, these students took some time to arrive at the notion of questions which do not seek information, but which express attitudes.

During the Reading

Keeping in mind the point made by the other class about adequate time not being given for reading, this class was given fifteen minutes to read through the play.
A skimming exercise was given, and the students were asked to divide the play into episodes. They divided it into six episodes. At this juncture there was some discussion about where episode III began and ended. Given below is the excerpt from the tape script:

S. It starts with the Sergeant and the Man and it goes on till page 9.
T. Page number nine?
S. I think it could be till page number four. It ends with this "I'll be going" (repeats)
S. Why do you say that? (so.....)
T. "I'll be going" What about you? what do you feel? Page four. Do you agree with --- the second section ends there?
S. No ...
T. Till where?
  Why do you divide it until that?
S. Because this is the part in which he reveals he knows the man.
T. Why did you go up till page nine?
S. Because it is just a conversation between the Sergeant and the Man.
T. Right. But is the conversation of the same sort through out? Drama is after all conversation
S. Same scene.
T. It's the same scene.
T. Scene is allright but is the conversation carried out in the same manner throughout? Or is there some difference?
S. There is difference....
T. What is the difference what is being introduced here?
S. ...(inaudible)
S. But it is one scene....
T. The whole drama is one scene.
S. inaudible
T. Yes. But when he is shuffling off he calls "Come back".

Next a scanning exercise was given, and
students were asked to categorise questions.

Stylistic Analysis / Interpretation

Next the questions were categorised. There was a lot of discussion generated at this stage, with the students arguing about whether the questions were attitudinal or information-seeking. The discussions led to an awareness of the shift in relations between the Sergeant and the Man.

In this class, the interpretation and stylistic analysis went parallely; there was no clear demarcation between the two. As the questions were discussed, the characters became clearly delineated and the plot structure also emerged. Since the students were interested in knowing what the implications of the questions were, the teacher did not separate the analysis from the interpretation.

At the end of the class, there was a clear blackboard summary of question-types in the different episodes worked out for the students to refer to.

After the Reading

Personal Response

The students were asked to comment on the
Sergeant's last question: "Do you think he was a fool to let the man go?"

The oral response showed that most of the students felt that the Sergeant was a noble man to have done what he did. Others felt otherwise. Some of their answers are given below:

I feel that the Sergeant was right in letting the man go. As he said in page 2, even the people who were in support of the prisoner, as described in page 9, Sergeant himself was one of the crews. He had no particular ambition to become an officer of law. As he says in page 8, that he joined the police only for his wife and family. If the his friends had told him about their plan he too would have become one of them. As he says he is not interested in the hundred pounds. I feel he did the right thing by letting the man who was his friend go, as he is fighting for a cause supported by people by letting the man go he has done sure that he would not be hurt.

As the man says that he would kill the person and his family, unless under oath of the person who catches him. This way he did not know the weight of his prisoner.
I concluded that the sergeant is foolish because as an sergeant he was responsible for catching the criminal by suspecting those who all passed by so that he may not be deceived. Even though he spoke for a long time with the criminal (man) he could not suspect the man. He was very selfish of getting the reward so he did not even tried to suspect that the man to whom he was talking is the criminal himself and so he himself got convinced that whatever the man said is all true and did not even try to cross question.

The other sergeant was sharing the authority over the man in the II episode but later when the man said that he knew the criminal very well the sergeant loses his authority and in the III episode we find that the man has more authority over the sergeant itself.

Yes, I consider the sergeant to be a fool. I feel he should have arrested the man and done his duty as an officer. Instead he finds himself sharing the views of man and becomes sentimentally involved. In a profession where sentiments are not welcomed he breaks those rules and gets involved.
the Sergeant let the man go. Comment:

when the man and the Sergeant started discussing about the last man on whom there was a reward of $100, the Sergeant was very clever in identifying the man. This is very clear when he says "you see the man I am looking for". But the man is very bold and courageous enough to face the Sergeant. This is also clear when the man tells "will you let me escape I must go make you tell story". Thus, the conversation between the man and Sergeant goes on immediately when the voice of policeman 'X' is heard. At that moment the man very cleverly says "you want to take me - the best of policemen?" and then he slaps from the breast. Suddenly, the policeman 'X' tells that they would know by the man tries to escape and that they can find him very easily.

The main stands the conversation between the policeman and the Sergeant, taking the advantage of the situation, the man tries to quick from there. The policeman and Sergeant who were busy in their talking neglected (did not notice) the man. The man with all his efforts tells "for my hat! if someone, and my bag! you wouldn't wish me to get my death of cold?" Even at this point the policeman and the Sergeant fail to catch hold of the man. Finally the man sells good night and leaves from there as quickly as possible.

Thus the Sergeant and the policeman miss the man forever. Thus we can finally conclude that both the policeman & the Sergeant were so irresponsible to catch the man who was the real crime. Instead the man changed their minds by his clever words and escaped finally.
The sergeant was really a foolish because he was one who saw the notice to help the police to post the notice in a right place. The sergeant talked for a long time with the man and asked about his life. He became as a friend of that man. The man saw his own notice. He did not want to be caught. So he talked with the sergeant as a unknown person wanted him posted him. The sergeant was fooled may be due to hard light in the street it may also be due to mist. He did not see the notice properly.

I think what the sergeant did was quite natural. Any other man in his place would have done the same thing after realizing that the man and he belonged to the same place, had been friends in their youth. Please refer to page 7 where the man says "And maybe one night .....", and the sergeant says "Well who knows .....". This shows that the sergeant would rather have been like the prisoner but perhaps circumstances had kept him on the right side of law. Besides, he had become very friendly with the man without realizing the truth. He had perhaps developed a soft corner for this young man. So he let him go in spite of the hundred pounds on his head.
4.7.2.1 Observations

This class of students needed more time to get down to the analysis of the play. They would perhaps have been happy if the teacher had told them what to look for. But once they found that they had to do the work they settled down to it. They requested the teacher to allow them to study the play at home and categorise the questions. They were earnest and interested and so the second class went off smoothly because they had done their homework. More time was spent therefore on discussing the meaning of the questions.

4.8 General Observations

The use of discoursal features to analyse drama seems to work effectively in putting across the meaning and structure of the play. Since discoursal features refer, very often to social interaction, and since this can be related to real life situations, students in both classes found it very easy to comprehend and use this tool. This made them relate to the play better. The Vijaya College students even thought/started to think in terms of the actual production of the play on the
stage. (When the teacher asked them what the possibilities of the production of such a play were, they said that the 'audience' they had would not understand the subtleties of the language!)

It was both surprising and encouraging to see how, given an opportunity, the students could come out with their own ideas. It was also very encouraging to see the confidence with which they put forward their opinions. There was very little faltering, for the simple reason that working closely with the text had made them sure of the opinion they were advancing. A further evidence of this was the way they referred to the play, often referring to a point which they felt their companions had missed.

There was a lot of peer group interaction too, which unfortunately the tape-recorder could not record. The pedagogic aspects of peer group interaction are too well known to need repetition. The great advantage of this method manifested itself in the amount of productive peer group interaction which took place in all the classes.

The hypothesis that the teacher should not take either the knowledge or ignorance level of
the students for granted has been validated in both the groups taught. One never knows how much they know or how they perceive the text. For example, the sentence 'Shut up, can't you?' was perceived by the students of Kendriya Vidyalaya as being a command and an order, and also something which expressed annoyance. The B.Com. students of Vijaya College saw it as nothing more than an order. On the other hand, these students were interested in the correctness of structures, as is evident from this tape-script excerpt:

S. But then the fourth line - "They say this a wonder, that it's he makes all the plans." Shouldn't it be "he who makes all the plans"?

The students' perception of the episodes too was different. The B.Com students went strictly by the script and divided the play into 6 episodes, whereas the students of the Kendriya Vidyalaya school felt that once the Sergeant had made up his mind to let the Man go, there really was no episode after that. Surprisingly, though they did not consider the last part of the play to be the sixth episode, they took the last question by the Sergeant seriously, because they felt it was relevant.
The decision to keep the framework flexible paid handsome dividends in terms of student response and also involvement.