

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND THE STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF DRAMA

POB

LUIS COSTA PALACIOS

The aim of this essay is to show how the description techniques developed by what has been called discourse analysis prove to be specially useful when applied to the stylistic analysis of the dramatic text.

But before I proceed with a detailed analysis of the text, I think it will be necessary to situate the section which is object of my study in the general context of the play. The passage in question, which is added at the end of this work as Appendix A, is part of Act 1, Scene 1 of Tom Stoppard's play *The Real Thing*, first staged at the Strand Theatre, London, in 1982. It is thus what the audience is first presented with. On stage we can see a couple, Max and Charlotte, when the latter returns from a supposed journey to Switzerland. It can be said that the dialogue between them is of the type which might take place between husband and wife, but there is something in their behaviour which makes us think that the author is somehow exaggerating their characterization. In fact, they are not real husband and wife: they are acting as that in a play written by Charlotte's husband, Henry, a witty playwright who is the leading character in Stoppard's play. The passage is, in this sense, a play within a play and this literary character of the section is easily perceived by the extreme behaviour of both Max and Charlotte above mentioned. I shall try to explain later how this effect is achieved.

Characteristically, the same situation —though modified— is to be repeated in Scenes 3 and 9, but this time taking place in «the real life» the play is describing. In addition, some of the lines and details in this scene are scattered throughout the play, as when Max, the actor who play Charlotte's husband in Henry's play, complains about the irrelevance of his speech about Japanese and digital watches (see p. 20 of *The Real Thing*, Faber & Faber, London, 1983), or as when Charlotte expresses her desire to quit her part in the play because of the coincidence of her being the author's real wife (*op. cit.* p. 20), pointing out thus the differences between

a/the play and real life (pp. 21-22). In Scene 7 (p. 66) we can see Charlotte having finished an affair with an architect —Max's profession in Scene 1— whom she leaves for similar reasons to those in the section to be analysed,

Charlotte: «I came home from a job, I'd been away only a couple of days, and he said, why did I take my diaphragm? He'd been through my bathroom cabinet...»

in the same way that she leaves Max after discovering he has been through her things and has found out that she hasn't really been to Switzerland.

The play, as many others by Stoppard, makes an extensive use of recurrent lines and facts, many of them present in our extract. This makes the passage a very interesting one to analyse because of its crucial character —the situation will be contrasted with what really happens in real life in similar circumstances— and because of its being a highly stereotyped and closed situation in the sense that, in itself and in relation with the rest of the play, we are presented with most of the topics that will be developed further. It also contains a certain dénouement to the facts though and it is possible to treat it as an isolated situation. From all this it could be concluded that the play deals primarily with what is and is not real and, more particularly, with the feelings that maintain a real love relation as opposed to the falseness present in the conventions which dominate traditional marriage and the no less traditional adultery. However, my interest does not lie in providing an interpretation of the play as a whole but rather in trying to describe and analyse the passage in question as well as showing how the description techniques developed by discourse analysis, usually applied to the analysis of conversation, can be usefully applied to the analysis of drama.

The text I am using is the edition of 1983 as appears in Faber & Faber, which has some slight and insignificant variants to the first edition (Faber & Faber 1982), as «nouvelle cuisine» in our text instead of «nouveau roman» in the first edition.

It seems to me that there are two different categories of effects worth considering in this text. Firstly, as I said before, we intuitively feel that the dialogue is not very much like «real» conversation. In other words, the audience, though aware of witnessing something fictional, perceives that, in this particular situation, both characters are purposely stereotyped and that their extreme behaviour draws attention to the fact that what the audience is really watching is a play within a play. Secondly, it is clear that Max has an absolute control of the situation, that Charlotte does not seem to understand what he is saying and that all this is rather comic.

Generally speaking, the situation which takes place in the text can be described as a conversation between husband and wife in which the former

knows that she has not really travelled to Switzerland as she said, as the fact that she did not take her passport demonstrates. This implies that she might be having an affair, otherwise she would not need to invent the story of her trip to Switzerland, and Max can be seen as implicating this fact.

In an interesting text by Labov and Fanshel, *Therapeutic Discourse*, the authors formulate what they call The Rule of Delayed Request in the following terms:

«If A makes a request for B to perform an action C in role R, based on needs, abilities, obligations and rights which have been valid for some time, then A is heard as challenging B's competence in role R»¹.

If translated into our text, it is possible to reformulate The Rule of Delayed Request in the following terms: Max makes continuous requests for information, asking Charlotte details about her business trip to Switzerland. He is questioning her—in the sense used by Labov and Fanshel²—in her role and in her status, that is, both as someone doing a specific job and as his wife. All the preconditions are present. The need for the action to be performed is signalled by the act of asking the question itself. Charlotte would not give the information requested in the absence of such request. The second precondition—need for the request—is also present. She has the ability to do so as she has the information requested from her. She also has the obligation to perform that action—i.e. to give the information—because of her status as wife: in her position of wife in the social structure she can be seen as having this general obligation of providing information when requested by her husband. For the same reason, Max's status as husband, he has the right to request such information. All these preconditions have been valid for some time, that is, as long as they have been married. Then Max is heard as challenging Charlotte's competence in her role as wife.

But the approach developed by Labov and Fanshel does not explain many of the effects outlined before, that is, it can explain the general characteristics of the conversation between Max and Charlotte, «the mood», but it does not take account of the comic effects that the audience perceives.

A more useful approach is the framework provided by discourse analysis theory as developed by Sinclair and Coulthart which Deirdre Burton adapts to the analysis of the dramatic text in her book *Dialogue and Discourse* (1980). Following the layout she uses in her analysis of a passage from Pinter's *The Dumb Waiter*. I have attempted something similar with Stop-

¹ Labov, William and Fanshel, David, *Therapeutic Discourse*, 1977, p. 94.

² *Ibidem*, p. 97.

pard's text. Her method has proved to be extremely useful in explaining some of the effects present in the text but it also raises a number of problems which I will pinpoint while commenting on my analysis.

The first problem appears in Max's first words,

Max: «Don't slam...»
(the front door slams)
«...the door».

Has there been interaction here? Can we consider it as an exchange? Following Burton's terminology, there has been certainly an Act, a Directive, and Charlotte's lack of appropriate corresponding Act, React, could be considered as a Challenge. Coulthart and Brazil define «Exchange» as follows:

«The Exchange is the unit concerned with negotiating the transmission of information»³.

In this sense, Max's Directive and Charlotte's lack of React, cannot be regarded as an Exchange. Burton, on the other hand, treats similar situations as Transactions and, therefore, as Exchanges; for instance, transactions 2, 4, 5 and 7 in her analysis of *The Dumb Waiter* (pp. 161-64). In all the cases, Ben's silence is treated as a Challenge Move. But let us look in more detail at her description of Challenge Moves. Burton argues that recognition of Challenge Moves depends on three different concepts, having thus three types of Challenge: discourse framework, discourse-topic steps, as presented in Keenan and Schieffelin's «Topic as a Discourse notion» (1976) and, thirdly, an expansion of the necessary preconditions for interpreting any utterance as a request for action, as suggested by Labov (1970). In the first type, a Challenge is made either by withholding an expected or appropriate reciprocal Act (in our text the pair would be Directive-React) or by supplying an unexpected or inappropriate Act where the expectation of another has been set up. According to this argument, Charlotte's lack of response to Max's command could be seen as a Challenge. In the second type, Burton reformulates Keenan and Schieffelin's discourse-topic steps in the following terms:

«... the listener may do one of four types of Challenge; again either *hostilely*, or because of *poor recipient design* in the first place:

1. He may refuse to give his attention.
2. He may ask for a repetition of the utterance.

³ Coulthart, Malcolm and Brazil, David, «Exchange Structures», in *Studies in Discourse Analysis*, Coulthart and Montgomery (eds.), 1981, p. 101.

3. He may ask for clarification of information about the identification of objects, persons or ideas in the discourse topic.
4. He may ask for more information concerning the semantic relations that obtain between the referents in the discourse topic» (p. 151).

The third type deals with Labov's rules of interpretation and Burton describes up to 14 possibilities of Challenge Move. I will treat Labov's case as my concern now lies in the first two types. Burton characterizes all of Ben's silences in the Transactions above mentioned as KS1, that is, Ben is seen as refusing to give his attention to Gus's speech. Such as it is formulated by Burton, there seems to be a certain degree of intentionality on the listener's part, that is, we can interpret Ben's silence as follows: Ben has certainly heard Gus but refuses to give his attention. It seems to me a little bit subjective to interpret the intentionality of a fictional character. Can it not be the case that Ben is no longer in the conversation, that is, that he has «disconnected» from Gus and thus he is not actually engaged in conversation? If that is the case, Ben's lack of response can be seen not just as a Challenge to the preceding Move but as something worse: Ben is a participant in the dialogue and his silence cannot be treated as a contribution (though negative) to it. In my view, the problem is too complex to venture an answer and my only wish is to point to the ambiguity of some of the methods and concepts used by Burton.

The case of Discourse Framework does not help much either. According to Burton, «a simple kind of Challenging Move is made by withholding an expected or appropriate reciprocal Act, where the expectation for this Act was set up in a preceding Initiatory Move» (Burton, *op. cit.*, p. 150). Again, this formulation seems to imply that there must be a contact between both conversationalists and that failure to produce the expected reciprocal Act is thus seen as a Challenge. In our text, Charlotte does not seem to hear Max's command and for that reason I have not included it as part of the Interaction. In fact, a «real» contact will not be established until Max looks up to her in Transaction 2, between Acts 2 and 3. The comic effect of the scene lies in the fact that this failed Directive has a rather visible result: the viaduct of cards that Max has been building collapses.

In my opinion, the first real exchange occurs when contact has been established by means of a Marker reinforced with a proxemic non-verbal item: Charlotte's kiss on Max's head. Now there is no doubt that Max is aware of her presence and his lack of response can be seen as a Challenge; he is in fact refusing to give his attention (KS1, following Burton's terminology). When Charlotte re-opens communication her Summons is apparently followed by the expected reciprocal Act, Accept, thus maintaining the discourse framework, but this is in fact a Challenge as the following exchanges seems to prove. The problem is that it is not possible to situate this Challenge in

any of the categories described by Burton. To understand what is going on here, we need a different approach: that of Conversational Implicature as formulated by H. P. Grice⁴.

Grice's theory is based on the fact that conversation is a cooperative activity. Each participant in a conversation assumes of each other that, in general, they obey the following principle: «Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged» (Grice, p. 45). More specifically, Grice argues that participants in a conversation assume of each other that they are following certain Maxims:

QUANTITY: Don't provide more or less information than is required for current purposes of the exchange.

QUALITY: Speak the truth.

RELATION: Be relevant.

MANNER: Be clear.

There is always the possibility of violating or flouting one of the maxims. What happens then? In order to preserve the assumption that the Cooperative Principle and Maxims are being obeyed we infer a proposition. In this sense, a Conversational Implicature is a proposition which makes it possible to preserve this assumption, even when it is apparently violated or flouted: it was violated or flouted for some reason, to convey a «point». In order to make an inference, the utterance interacts with context and background knowledge and it is the conversational context and background knowledge, which includes a set of social norms and conventions plus a belief system, which makes it possible to work out the correct inference.

How does this apply to our text? In my opinion, Max can be seen here as flouting the second Maxim, in particular the second of the specific Maxims: «Do not say what you believe to be false». We must assume that he knows that it is his wife who has just come into the room. He has heard her voice. He heard someone opening the door and tried to tell her not to slam it, something which can only be said to someone who usually slams the door. What point is then he trying to convey in order to preserve the assumption that he is obeying the Cooperative Principle? From the point of view of the audience, or macrocosm, he is seen as introducing a reference to extramarital relations, pointing to a semantic field relating to adultery, infidelity, etc. Retrospectively, the audience can deduce that this allusion to a «lover» has surely something to do with the fact that he knows that she did not take her passport and that one possible explanation to her falseness

⁴ Grice, H. P., «Logic and Conversation», in *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3, Cole and Morgan (eds.), pp. 41-58.

is that she might be having affair. From the point of view of Charlotte, the other participant in the ongoing conversation going on in the microcosm —i.e. on the stage—, she is unable to grasp the implicature in Max's utterance, unaware of his knowing what he knows. The comic effect of the scene lies in the fact that Charlotte and the audience are in different situations with different background knowledge and, therefore, different capability to work out what Max implicates.

The next two utterances (see Appendix B at the end of this essay), stress the impression that their relationships are not nowadays as they used to be. Utterance 7, with the form «used to», points to a time when things between them were certainly going better. The same can be said of utterances 7-8; it is in utterance 7 when Max finally looks at her and acknowledges Charlotte's Initiation (utterance 1) but, at the same time, it can be considered as a Challenge Move related to one of Labov's rules of interpretation which Burton reformulates as follows:

«If A informs B of an item of information P, A's utterance will be heard as a valid Informative only if the following preconditions hold: B believes that A believes that (it is an A-B event that) A is in a position to inform B of P» (Burton, p.152).

Before translating this into our text it should be mentioned that, as Burton argues, in conversation, speakers can support or challenge a previous piece of text rather than a previous speaker. In our text, Charlotte informs Max of utterance 6, but he does believe Charlotte in a position to inform him of utterance 6 because, purportedly or not, he makes believe that he thinks it is his lover who has just walked into the room. Thus regardless whether Max really believes that the person he is talking to is his lover and not Charlotte, he treats her as if she was his lover, disqualifying her as the informant of 6, and thus challenging her preceding utterance. In utterance 8, he rephrases utterance 4, repeating the implicatum which, again, Charlotte fails to grasp.

From this point, all the Challenge Moves present in our text, will be on Charlotte's part, with the exception of one in Transaction 2, utterance 14. Burton argues that a transcript which frequently utilized the left-hand column (Challenge Moves) would be a more competitive conversation than one which utilized the right-hand column (Supporting Moves) (Burton, p. 170). This is possibly true of *The Dumb Waiter*, where most of the Challenges on Ben's part are simply because whether he refuses to give his attention or imply a Challenge to Gus's ability or right to do something (L5, L10). In our text, most of the Challenges are of the type KS2 or KS3, that is, when the listener ask for a repetition of the utterance or for clarification of information in the discourse topic. This means that Max is in control of the

conversation and that Charlotte does not grasp the implications in his utterances, implications that, as we shall see, refer to the possibility of her having an affair.

This is a possibility that Max drops again in utterance 5, «Done you good». Max here flouts the Maxim «Be relevant» as Charlotte's reply indicates. She has been away only a couple of days and in this sense Max's remark does not seem relevant. The proposition conveyed here seems clear from the sentence: «Done you good» with a strong sexual innuendo. Again Charlotte shows her inability to understand what he is implicating. In utterance 7, Max flouts the Maxim of Quantity: «Make your contribution as informative as required». «Something» is such an ambiguous response as to be open to almost any meaning. In the general context of what he is implicating, «something» could mean a lover or an affair.

In the next utterance, 8, Max flouts the Maxim of Manner: «Be clear», as he does not try to avoid obscurity of expression. Using the spelling Ba'l or assimilating the pronunciation of Basel to that of the masculine proper name «Basil», he can be seen implicating, again, the possibility of Charlotte's having a lover by that name. Charlotte, in fact, though she does not quite grasp the situation, falls in the trap and replies «Who?», taking for granted that he is talking about a man and not about a town.

It is interesting to note that utterance 13 is not a reply to number 8 but to utterance number 11, and that will give Max the opportunity to repeat the question in Transaction 4, line 1 and 2, this time in a more explicit way.

There are two points worth noting in Transaction 3. First, it helps to maintain and reinforce the conversational context that the audience has been presented with in the first exchanges. It becomes clearer for the audience that the stage-talk is that typical of a married couple conforming to a recognizable system of socio-cultural assumptions proper of the marriage status; this is achieved by Charlotte's role as the solicitous wife, caring to her husband («Fancy a drink?»). Curiously enough, the real Charlotte rejects this role when, as Henry's wife, she says to him:

Charlotte: «Oh, yes, without you I'd be like one of your women. 'Fancy a drink?', 'Let me get you a drink', 'Care for a drink?' That's Henry's idea of women's parts. Drinks and feeds» (*The Real Thing*, p. 21).

What is important in our text is that these lines help to establish a perfectly distinguishable background against which the audience will draw the inferences necessary to fill in Max's flouting of the Cooperative Principle and the Maxims derived from it.

The second point is a theoretical one and concerns the labelling of the utterances «Fancy a drink?» and «Another drink?» as Elicitations. According to the general theory of discourse analysis, an Elicitation is realized by a

question and its function is to request a linguistic response. This can be the case of the first utterance, «Fancy a drink?», that requests a linguistic response of the type «please», «no, thanks», or something in that line, along with a non-linguistic response as holding up the glass etc. The second utterance, in the context where it occurs in our text, is far more problematic. Are we to interpret Max's non-linguistic response as a Challenge to the previous Elicitation or is the case that the previous utterance is not in fact an Elicitation? In my view, the definition of the Acts are very general but as Coulthard has pointed, «as a descriptive system within the Hallidayan framework it allows the concept of delicacy»², and general classifications can at a secondary stage be more finely distinguished.

If we think of Max's response (taking the glass that Charlotte is giving him) as a React, is then Charlotte's utterance a Directive? It seems to me that there are certain Acts which cannot be labelled either as Elicitations or Directives, whose response may be linguistic, non-linguistic or both, according to the context in which they are uttered. In our text, Max's response could have been a linguistic one, and the fact that it is not does not presuppose that it is a Challenge. Maybe the term «solicitation» could be used for this type of Acts.

In Transaction 4, utterance 1, Max repeats his question about Basel (unanswered in Transaction 2), using the term «then» as a link to the conversational topic that he has been creating by means of his implicatures, and reconducting thus the conversation into his ground. In addition, the effect created before is stressed by the use of the adjective «old» as a prenominal of «Basel», which seems to indicate a certain degree of familiarity towards the supposed lover or at least with the situation. The ambiguity of the question, that is, the flouting of the Maxim of Manner, creates the implicature. The same can be said of the next utterance, where the flouting of the Maxim of Relation —«Be Relevant»—, and the ambiguity of the expression «keeping fit?», which may refer to the fitness of «old Basel» as a sexual partner, implicates again Max's suspicion about Charlotte's infidelity.

Charlotte does not hear his question as a sensible one (Labov, 10), but again she is unable to understand what Max is trying to convey. The audience, on the contrary, is in a different situation, aware of the implications of the belief system which Max and Charlotte share and against which it is possible to make sense of the apparent nonsense of Max's speech. Charlotte, on the other hand is but a fictional character in the fictionality of the microcosm —the stage— and this fact makes credible her patent inability to understand what Max implicates.

It would be interesting to know the exact pronunciation of «Basel» in

² Coulthard, Malcolm, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (1977), 1983, p. 104.

Charlotte's utterance «I didn't go to Basel», since the form /ba:zɪ/ would not be very clearly distinguishable from /b zɪ/, that is, Basil, and the connotations of the sentence would corroborate Max's implications and could be seen as an opportunity for him to go on with the game. As he, in fact, does. He repeats the same structure when he asks «How's old Geneva, then?», which immediately reminds us of the previous «How's old Basel, then?». The pattern will be repeated with «old Christie» and «old Sothers». Both this repetition and its apparent lack of relevance in the context where it occurs (lack of relevance stressed by the misplacement Marker «by the way») are heard as a new implicature in the same line Max has been creating since the exchange began.

He stresses his challenge when he introduces an new masculine name, Franc/Frank, both the Swiss currency and the proper name of the same pronunciation, flouting thus the Maxim of Manner —«Be Clear»—. He seems to be guessing the name of Charlotte's lover, taking for granted the existence of such a lover, and even showing a certain interest in his quality as a lover, since «doing well», may have the similar sexual connotations of the previous «keeping fit». Once more, Charlotte's reply will add to the impression that she might, in fact, have a lover.

The next exchanges have, in my opinion, two different functions in our text. On the one hand, Charlotte will assume again her role as caring wife («How have you got on?») defining for the audience the socio-cultural context and the belief-system derived from it in which the conversation takes place. It will also give the audience additional information, Max's profession. On the other hand, it will serve as a preamble for further inquires on Max's part about Charlotte's journey. With the displacement Marker «by the way», Max reintroduces the overall topic, surprising Charlotte with his sudden change of subject and regaining control on the conversation at the same time. Max's speech, full of puns and play words, has a similar function. Besides some latent references difficult to pinpoint, this digression seems totally irrelevant (as I mentioned before, Max suggests to Henry he could try one night without it, *The Real Thing*, p. 20), but Max will use as a means of taking Charlotte by surprise («Good sale?»). In the rest of the scene the same patterns will be used again and again: «How's *old* Christie, *by the way?*», «How's *old* Sothers, *by the way?*», «How's the skiing, *by the way?*». As I pointed out before, it is interesting to note the use Max makes of the expression «by the way» everytime that he reintroduces the topic of her supposed journey to Switzerland. Schegloff and Sacks comment on the misplacement:

«Misplacement markers... display an orientation by their user to the proper sequential-organization character of a particular place in conversation, and a

recognition that an utterance that is thereby prefaced may not fit, and that the recipient should not attempt to use this placement in understanding their occurrence»⁶.

Thus in our text Max can be heard to indicate to Charlotte that she should not look to the previous talk for the relevance of his requests for information about «the lake», «old Christie», «old Sothers» or «the skiing» but the repeated use of the device together with Charlotte's inability to react quickly enough to the sudden change of topic, produce the comic effect.

The motivated prominence of these features, resulting in an extreme behaviour of both Max and Charlotte, draws attention to the fact that the scene in question is a farcical remake of the traditional topic, common in bourgeois modern drama, of the «eternal triangle»: husband, wife and lover. These touches of exaggeration in the character's behaviour make the audience realize that what they are watching is not «the real thing» but a literary caricature of a topic they are familiar with.

Burton's approach to the analysis of drama using the techniques developed by discourse analysis proves to be a very useful one, especially her use of Challenging and Supporting Moves instead of the Feedback and Follow-up Moves described by Sinclair and Coulthard but it leaves some aspects of the text unexplained and raises a number of problems which I have tried to pinpoint. The use of Grice's concept of Conversational Implicature to be derived from the contextual background created through the characters' interaction covers somehow these gaps. Finally, the description techniques used by Labov and Fanshell serve the function of giving a general picture of what is going on in any conversation, literary or not, to which they are applied.

⁶ Schegloff, E. A. and Sacks, H., «Opening up Closings», in *Semiotica*, 1973, vol. 8, n. 4, pp. 289-327.

CHARLOTTE: What lake?

(He affects surprise.)

MAX: Lake Geneva. You haven't been to Virginia Water, have you? Lake Geneva. Is it at Geneva? It must be. They wouldn't call it Lake Geneva if it was at Ba'l or Basel. They'd call it Lake Ba'l or Basel. You know the Swiss. Utterly reliable. And they've done it without going digital, that's what I admire so much. They know it's all a snare and a delusion. I can remember digitals when they first came out. You had to give your wrist a vigorous shake like bringing down a thermometer, and the only place you could buy one was Tokyo. But it looked all over for the fifteen-jewelled movement. Men ran through the market place shouting «The cog is dead». But still the Swiss didn't panic. In fact, they made a few digitals themselves, as a feint to draw the Japanese further into the mire, and got on numbering the bank accounts. And now you see how the Japs are desperately putting hands on their digital watches. It's yodelling in the dark. They can yodel till the cows come home. The days of the digitals are numbered. The metaphor is built into them as a self-destruct mechanism. Mark my words, I was right about the skate-board, I was right about «nouvelle cuisine», and I'll be proved right about the digital watch. Digitals have got no class, you see. They're science and technology. Makes nonsense of a decent pair of cufflinks, as the Swiss are the first to understand. Good sale?

(CHARLOTTE stares at him.)

CHARLOTTE: What?

(He affects surprise.)

MAX: Good sale. Was the sale good? The sale in Geneva, how was it? Did it go well in Geneva, the sale?

CHARLOTTE: What's the matter?

MAX: I'm showing an interest in your work. I thought you liked me showing an interest in your work. *My showing.* Save the gerund and screw the whale. Yes, I'm sure you do. I remember how cross you got when I said to someone, «My works for Sotheby's or Christie's, I forget which». You misjudged me, as it happens. You thought I was being smart at your expense. In fact, I had forgotten. How's old Christie, by the way? (Strikes his forehead.) There I go. How's old Sothers, by the way? Happy with the Geneva sale, I trust?

(CHARLOTTE puts her glass down and moves to stand facing him.)

CHARLOTTE: (To call a halt.) All right.

MAX: Just all right? That's the bloody Swiss for you. Conservative, you see. The Japs could show them a thing or two. They'd have a whaling fleet in Lake Geneva by now. How's the skiing, by the way? Plenty of snow?

CHARLOTTE: Stop it — stop it — *stop* it. What have I done?

MAX: You forgot your passport.

CHARLOTTE: I did what?

MAX: You went to Switzerland without your passport.

CHARLOTTE: What makes you think that?

MAX: I found it in your recipe drawer.

CHARLOTTE: (Quietly.) Jesus God.

MAX: Quite.

<i>Trans. 1</i>	<i>Challenging move</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Opening move Frame</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Supporting move</i>	<i>Act</i>
Boundary Challenge 2	M: Ø (KS,1) (lack of response)	1	CH: It's me	m		
Re-Opening Challenge 4	M: Hello, lover	3 acct 3	CH: Hello	sum.		
Re-Opening Challenge 7	M: Oh, it's you (L, 5) M: I thought it was my lover	5 6 ack 1 adv 7	CH: That's nice CH: You used to call me lover	Qual 4 I		

<i>Trans. 2</i>	<i>Challenging move</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Opening move Focus</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Supporting move</i>	<i>Act</i>
Opening Challenge 3	CH: Weren't you listening? (Ks, 3)	1 com 2	M: Where is it you've been?	el 2	CH: Well, Switzerland, of course	rep 1
Re-Opening Challenge 6	CH: What, since yesterday? (KS, 3)	4 5 el	M: You look well M: Done you good	I rest 4		
Re-Opening B-Opening Challenge 9	CH: Who? (KS, 3)	7 8	M: Well, something has M: How's Ba'l	rep 6 el		
Re-Opening Challenge 14	M: «Lets call the whole thing off» (DF)	10 11 12	M: I Meant Ba'l M: Do you say «Basel» M: I say Ba'l	rep 9 el 13	CH: Oh... yes, I say Basel	rep 11

<i>Trans. 3</i>	<i>Challenging move</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Opening move Frame</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Supporting move</i>	<i>Act</i>
		1 2	CH: Fancy a drink? CH: Another drink?	el el/d 3	M: Ø	rea

<i>Trans. 4</i>	<i>Challenging move</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Opening move Focus</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Supporting move</i>	<i>Act</i>
Challenge 3	CH: Are you a tiny bit sloshed? (L, 10)	1 2 el	M: How's old Basel, then? M: Keeping fit?	el el		
Re-Opening		4	M: Certainly	rep 3 5	CH: I didn't go to Basel	rep 1
B-Opening		7	M: Where did you go, then?	6 el	M: No?	ack 5
B-Opening		10	M: How's old Geneva, then?	8 9 el	CH: Geneva M: Geneva!	rep 7 ack 8
Challenge 12	CH: Who? (KS, 3)	11	M: Franc doing well?	el		
Re-Opening		13	M: The Swiss Franc	rep 12		
Challenge 15	CH: Are you all right? (L, 10)	14 el	M: Is it doing well?	el		
Re-Opening		16 17	M: Absolutely CH: How have you got on?	rep 16 el		
B-Opening		20 21	CH: What about the thing you were working on? CH: What is it?	18 19 el 22 23 24 25 26 27	M: Not bad M: My best... out of cards M: An hotel CH: Yes... CH: You were two elevators short M: I've cracked it CH: Good M: I'm turning... shallow end	rep 17 add 18 rep. 21 ack 22 com 22 add 22 ev 25 I

<i>Trans. 5</i>	<i>Challenging move</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Opening move</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Supporting move</i>	<i>Act</i>
Opening Challenge 2	CH: What lake? (KS, 3)	1 el	M: How's the lake, by the way?	el		
Re-Opening B-Opening Challenge 5	CH: What? (KS, 2)	3 4 el	M: Lake Geneva... the first to un- derstand (Narra- tive 1) M: Good sale?	rep 2 el		
Re-Opening B-Opening Challenge 10	CH: What's the matter? (KS, 3)	6 7 8 9 el	M: Good sale M: Was the sale good? M: The sale in Ge- neva, how was it? M: Did it go well in Geneva, the sale?	rep 5 el el el		
Re-Opening		11	M: I'm showing... I had forgotten (Narrative 2)	rep 10		

<i>Trans. 6</i>	<i>Challenging move</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Opening move</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Supporting move</i>	<i>Act</i>
Challenge 6 Re-Opening	CH: All right (L. 10)	1 2 3 4 dir 7 8	M: How's old Christie by the way? M: There I go M: How's old Soth- ers, by the way? M: Happy with the Geneva sale, I trust? M: Just all right? M: Well, that's the... Geneva by now	el cv 1 el el cv 6 corn 6		

<i>Trans. 5</i>	<i>Challenging move</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Opening move</i>	<i>Act</i>	<i>Supporting move</i>	<i>Act</i>
Challenge 3	CH: Stop it-stop it-stop it (DF)	1 2 dir	M: How's the skiing, by the way? M: Plenty of snow?	el el		
Re-Opening		4	CH: What have I done?	el		
Challenge 6	CH: I did what? (KS, 2)	el		5	M: You forgot your passport	rep 4
Re-Opening		7	M: You went to Switzerland without your passport	I		
Challenge 8	CH: What makes you think that? (KS, 4)	el				
Re-Opening		9	M: I found it in your recipe drawer	I 10 11	CH: Jesus God M: Quite	ack 17 com 18