-THE ROLE OF INTERSENTENTIAL CONNECTIVES IN COMPLEX NARRATIVE DISCOURSE: KATHERINE MANSFIELD'S "THE GARDEN PARTY"

-

Pilar ALONSO RODRIGUEZ
Universidad de Salamanca

In an article on the role of interclausal connectives in narrative structuring, Segal, Duchan and Scott (1991) reconsidered the function of connectives in discourse. They revised four different approaches to the subject, which include: what they termed "an empty view" where interclausal connectives are assigned "no meaningful semantic role" (1991: 27); "a local cohesion view" which sees connectives "as functioning to create ties between clausal units in the text" (1991: 30); "a global marker view" where connectives are said to "serve as discourse markers which integrate or separate global units of discourse" (1991: 30); and finally, "a mental model-deictic shift view." This last view moves beyond the local and global perspectives, and assigns to connectives a role in the construction of a mental model as formulated by Johnson-Laird (1983).

Segal, Duchan and Scott carried out an experiment with 84 subjects to test the accuracy of these views. Their investigation provided enough evidence to conclude that "interclausal connectives carry meaning, they connect textual meanings at both local and global levels and they mark discourse con-

Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies 17 (1996): 17-38.

tinuity and discontinuity both in the text and as inferred by the reader" (1991: 47). This confirms the fact that discourse connectives do not only help construct textual structure at the micro and macro levels, but they also function as indexical markers of continuity or discontinuity in the subjects' mental representations. However, when questioning the generalizability of their results, Segal, Duchan and Scott found their study limited by the following factors: "First, the subjects did not create these narratives. . . . Second, the discourse genre being studied [was] that of simple narratives told by a 5-year-old" (1991: 51). In the following pages, I will attempt to provide more evidence in support of their thesis by analysing the role played by intersentential connectives in Katherine Mansfield's short story "The Garden Party." This text has been chosen because it combines all the characteristics required for our purpose. It is a complex literary narrative, written by an original, remarkable writer, and with an interesting and very efficient use of connective devices. In this way the two factors that limited the results of Segal, Duchan and Scott's study will be neutralized.

The research will be centered on intersentential connectives. Interclausal connectives will be disregarded, because the main point will be to investigate the nature and extent of the cohesive function of these markers, not the coordinating one.

1. THE DATA

"The Garden Party" is a 16-page story.[1] It consists of approximately 554 sentences, 84 of which have as first element a connective of the conjunct type. Their variation and frequency of appearance are distributed throughout the story as follows:

AND 31
BUT 28
ONLY.....5
OF COURSE.....5
NOW.....4
PERHAPS.....2
THEN.....2
JUST.....2
SO.....2
RATHER.....1
SOON AFTER THAT.....1

A consideration of the data reveals the salience of the conjuncts *AND* and *BUT* as an evident feature. Their recurrence in the text seems to signal some kind of intentional use on the part of the writer. In order to determine and evaluate the possible significance of this recurrent use, I will explore some of the theoretical approaches to the function and meaning in discourse of both conjuncts. The conclusions obtained will then be contrasted against the actual role performed by *AND* and *BUT* in "The Garden Party." The rest of the conjuncts will not be considered specifically because their low frequency of appearance does not seem to confer them a prominent status in the global structure of the story, neither do they seem to be related to any relevant extent to the two recurrent ones.

2. SOME THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Whether their scope be local or global, most discourse theories agree that *AND* and *BUT* are the most elementary markers of the additive and adversative relation respectively (See, for example, Halliday and Hasan 1976; van Dijk 1977, 1985; Schiffrin, 1988; Hyde, 1990, etc.). However, before we start comparing these basic concepts with the way these conjuncts are used in Mansfield's short story, I would like to consider two aspects related to them which could be relevant for an understanding of their function.

In their book *Cohesion in English*, Halliday and Hasan introduce the section on the relation established by the cohesive connective *AND* saying that

> the 'and' relation is felt to be structural [that is to say, coordinating] and not cohesive, at least by mature speakers; this is why we feel a little uncomfortable at finding a sentence in written English beginning with *AND*, and why we tend not to consider that a child's composition having *and* as its dominant sentence linker can really be said to form a cohesive whole. (1976: 233)

Though immediately afterwards Halliday and Hasan go on to explore the uses of *AND* as additive cohesive marker, it is nonetheless remarkable that they choose to open that chapter by making explicit reference to an apparently general reluctance (at least as far as mature speakers of English are concerned) to accept the use of *AND* as sentence initial conjunct. It is also worth mentioning that, when describing the type of adversative relation *BUT*

establishes, Halliday and Hasan present it as semantically related to the additive *AND*. They say:

> in addition to the meaning 'adversative', *but* contains within itself also the logical meaning of 'and'; it is a sort of portmanteau, or shorthand form, of *and however*. . . . The fact that 'but' contains 'and' is the reason why we cannot say *and but* , although we can say *and yet* , *and so* , *and then* , etc. (1976: 237).

These considerations set the mind to work in two directions. First of all, and once the general view has been taken into account, we feel inclined to assume that the use of *AND* as a recurrent additive connective in the production of a masterly creative writer, like Mansfield, must carry some significance and serve some aim, or else it would be in danger of being rejected as careless style or, as Halliday and Hasan suggest, childish. Secondly, taking into consideration their comments on the meaning of *BUT* we also feel inclined to view the scope within which this conjunct operates as embedded in the semantic field created and developed by *AND* .

It is true, of course, that *AND* and *BUT* are not the only cohesive linkers in Mansfield's story. There are many other devices—for example lexical reiteration (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 274ff.)—which intensively contribute to the building of the cohesion and coherence of the story. However, the frequency of their appearance as cohesive markers is, as has been said, an invitation to investigate the characteristics of their function. To this should be added the fact that the story itself opens with *"And after all* the weather was ideal" (emphasis added)—which is unusual by normal standards of regularities and expectations. In fact the use of anaphoric relators in discourse initial position is found to be quite rare in written texts (Hyde 1990: 208). This is a question to which we will return immediately; but, for the time being, let us concentrate on the relevance that this unconventional use of the additive and continuative conjuncts has for our thesis.

When discussing the process of discourse thematization, Brown and Yule say:

> What the speaker or writer puts first will influence the interpretation of everything that follows. Thus a title will influence the interpretation of the text which follows it. The first sentence of the first paragraph will constrain the interpretation not only of the paragraph, but also of the rest of the text. That is, we assume that every sentence

> forms part of a developing, cumulative instruction which tells us how to construct a coherent representation. (1983: 133-4)

The fact that Mansfield chose to convert the connectives *AND AFTER ALL* into the theme (left-most constituent or starting point) of her discourse cannot be considered, therefore, arbitrary. This prominent and unusual position is supposed to mark not only the structural development of the story, but also the process of reception by the speaker.

Bearing in mind the two questions discussed above: the recurrent use of *AND* and *BUT*, and the thematic prominence conceded to the additive conjuncts in this narrative, I will attempt to establish the actual role of these connectives in the processes of production and comprehension of Katherine Mansfield's "The Garden Party," as well as their range of influence in the construction of the cohesion and coherence of the story, be it local, global or contributing to the construction of a mental model.

3. THE METHOD

The notion of summary has been repeatedly associated by van Dijk with the semantic macrostructure of a discourse (1977; 1980; 1985). The difference between both concepts is that the first is based on an intuitive account of the information contained in the discourse, while the second covers the reconstruction of this information at a theoretical semantic level. Given its intuitive pretheoretical nature a summary should reflect the mental representation (Garnham 1987: 16) a specific discourse has created in the reader's mind at the very early stage of reception and comprehension of the text. The mental representation will also open the way to the writer's or reader's mental model, understanding by this a derivation from the semantic information contained in the text and the inferences generated in the process of reading in combination with his/her own knowledge and experience of the world (Johnson-Laird 1983; Garnham 1987).

To carry out the analysis, data from 36 summaries of "The Garden Party" have been examined. One of these summaries, the author's (as set down in a letter she wrote to William Gerhardi), will be reproduced in its entirety. The other 35 are summaries written by 35 fourth-year students of English at the Universidad de Salamanca who volunteered to participate in the process as part of a required course. They were instructed to carry out an intensive reading of the short story (it was recommended that the story should be read at

least twice) and to write an intuitive summary of it. No theoretical hints or literary introduction were given to them.

The reason for this procedure is that, as Johnson-Laird and Garnham proposed (1980), "speaker and hearer [here writer and reader] synthesize separate discourse models during conversation [here communication]" (Garnham 1987: 46). Consequently, if the function of certain cohesive elements is to be explored in terms of local and global structures and mental models, sufficient knowledge of all participants' mental representations, or at least of their textbase, should be available.

The cotext where the conjuncts *AND* and *BUT* appear will be studied so as to evaluate their function and interpret the scope of their meaning. I will work with the story divided into semantic blocks, according to actual evidence provided by the text (changes of topic, scenery, participants…) as reflected in the evidence found in the 35 summaries. The recognition of such blocks by so many readers and the identification of the nature of their content will guarantee the objectivity of the procedure, removing, to a certain extent at least, the risk of a subjective interpretation that might lead the analysis towards predetermined and not sufficiently contrasted conclusions. The analysis will conclude with a consideration of Mansfield's own view of "The Garden Party."

4. THE ANALYSIS

4. 1.- 35 summaries

A close analysis of the 35 summaries provided by my students showed that all summary-writers had, with slight variations, identified a number of episodes or semantic blocks in the text. Examples of each of them have been extracted from the summaries. The authors of the summaries have been given a number which appears in brackets. These are the different episodes:

1. Introduction:

A warm summer morning, Laura her mother and her sisters Meg and Jose are at home hurriedly working on the preparation of the garden party they are holding that afternoon. (2)

2. The workmen episode:

While the Sheridans [Laura's family] are having breakfast, Laura is supervising the workers who have to put up the marquee. She addresses the

workers in an authoritative way, in an attempt to imitate her mother. She likes one of the workers and because of this she thinks they are charming and nice guys. But she seems to be very superficial. Then she takes a very big bite of her bread and butter to prove that she is with them, that she doesn't care about conventions. But in fact she forgets them when she is making the arrangements for the garden party. (7)

3. News of the accident:

Later they learn that a man who lived in one of the poor houses near Laura's house has died in an accident. Laura feels very sad and she wants to stop the party, but her sister and her mother consider this an absurd idea. So the preparations for the party go on and finally it takes place. (32)

4. Laura's errand to the dead man's house:

When everything is over, Mrs. Sheridan suggests that they could take the left-overs to the dead man's family. Laura thinks that this is not a good idea but she accepts and does as her mother suggests. When she arrives at the dead man's house, everybody looks at her and she just wants to get away. When she manages to see the corpse she feels much better because the man looks as if he were dreaming. His sleeping face gives her the impression of peace and calmness. (10)

The frequency with which these episodes were registered in the summaries was distributed as follows: 35 mention the introduction (17 as a separate episode, 4 linked to the workmen episode, 14 linked to the accident episode); 16 mention the workmen episode (all mention the preparations for the party as part of this episode); 35 mention the accident; 31 mention Laura's errand to the dead man's house (17 of them say explicitly that Laura saw the corpse).

It is important to note that between the workmen episode and the reception of the accident news, there are 5 pages of the story (248-253) devoted to describing the preparations for the party. These pages have to do basically with the description of Laura's personality both through narration and action; but no mention is made of this aspect in the 35 summaries, only 3 refer briefly to some of Laura's actions (e.g. she answers a telephone call; she helps some servants and her mother and sisters to put everything in order…). At the same time, the actual celebration of the party (GP 257) is not recorded in the summaries either, except through indirect references of the type "the party

was successfully held." An important conclusion to this would be that only those episodes where the contrast between social classes was reflected occupied a prominent place in the subjects' mental representation of the story.

It is also a significant fact that although the use of conjuncts in the summaries was irregular (some subjects used them frequently, some not at all), the number of adversative connectives was still overwhelmingly superior to any other type (46 *BUT* ; 9 *NEVERTHELESS* ; 7 *THEN* ; 5 *ONCE* ; 4 *THEREFORE* ; 4 *SO* ; 3 *FIRST* ; 1 *LATER*). Again no additive connective was found. This evidence would seem to suggest that in their mental representations of the text receivers overtly retain the contrastive information conveyed by the adversative connectives; but they do not respond equally to the additive ones.

4.2. The writer's mental representation

> And yes, that is what I tried to convey in *The Garden Party*. The diversity of life and how we try to fit in everything, Death included. That is bewildering for a person of Laura's age. She feels things ought to happen differently. First one and then another. But life isn't like that. We haven't the ordering of it. Laura says, 'But all these things must not happen at once.' And Life answers, 'Why not? How are they divided from each other.' And they *do* all happen, it is inevitable. And it seems to me there is beauty in that inevitability. (Katherine Mansfield, letter to William Gerhardi [1977: 259]. Italics and capital letters in the original.)

Mansfield's intuitive summary of the story, or of its topic, is highly revealing. The same intersentential connectives (*AND / BUT*) are once more found to add weight to the thesis that their role in the text cannot be casual or superficial, but rather is deeply involved in the construction of the textual structure of discourse (Schiffrin 1988: 320). Their frequency of appearance also reinforces this: four additive continuative *AND* conjuncts, one of them paragraph-initial, and two adversative contrastive *BUT* in a totality of ten sentences clearly point to the relevance both semantic relations must have in the writer's mental representation.

It could be argued that this recurrent use might be a characteristic of Mansfield's style. A rapid skimming through both her creative writing and her personal letters and journals will show that, although she has a certain tendency to use conjuncts as intersentential connectives, this tendency is never so strong as in "The Garden Party." For example, out of her 88 stories

only two others begin with *AND*. This low but still significant frequency could be interpreted in terms of rhetorical control (Adams 1985: 59ff.), as an indirect resource the writer uses to influence the reader through the selection of the lexical items and their arrangement in the surface text.

As far as "The Garden Party" is concerned, the key seems to be in relation to her concept of life. If we attend to the explicit signals contained in the writer's summary, we discover that "life" is the only word repeated 3 times in the whole stretch, and its role in the semantic structuring gains importance as the paragraph evolves. When the term "life" appears for the first time ("The diversity of life and how..."), it plays a secondary role as modifier of the topic of the proposition. The second time, ("But life isn't like that") it is already the topic, while in the third case ("And Life answers…") it not only maintains the primary topic position, but it is also graphically emphasized by the rhetorical selection of a capital initial.

Some further exploration at cotext level will also reveal information essential to what we have been saying so far in relation to the writer's and reader's mental representations. It must be noted, first, that when life is being used as a secondary concept it is being subordinated precisely to the concept of "diversity" which will later be expanded as "everything, Death included" and qualified as "bewildering." All these lexical items contain in their semantic domain the idea of contrast/adversative and may be linked to the meaning projected by the connective *BUT*. The second thing that deserves mention is that although in the other two cases in which "life" appears ("But life isn't like that" / "And Life answers…") it is the topic of the propositions, it is not the theme (or left-most constituent). The thematic salience goes instead to the conjuncts *BUT* and *AND*. In this way a strongly cohesive and coherent quality is given to the structure of the discourse.

In the following section the actual appearance of *AND* and *BUT* in "The Garden Party" will be investigated in an attempt to shed some light on the differences detected so far between the writer's and the reader's mental representations. We will try to find a reason for the different way in which both participants in the communicative process deal with the additive connective relation while on the other hand they assign an equal role to the contrastive adversative one.

5. INTERPRETING THE DATA

1. The additive connective *AND*

We will start by discussing the first connective elements the reader encounters in "The Garden Party": the conjuncts *AND AFTER ALL* with which Mansfield chooses to open the story. Previous to the analysis, two theoretical aspects introduced above should be recovered. On the one hand, at discourse level, the theme—the lexical items which occur in discourse initial position—has both local and global relevance. That is to say, the meaning and the type of textual relation the theme establishes has an active influence on the macrostructural organization of the information contained in the text (Brown and Yule 1983). With this in mind, our research on the function of these conjuncts will not be limited to the immediate cotext. We will look as well for the possible cohesive relations they might initiate from their prominent semantic position.

On the other hand, it should be remembered that conjuncts, being essentially connective elements between parts of discourse, are not likely candidates for initiating discourse. The *in medias res* device with which Mansfield opens her story does not explain their presence either, for the effect would have been the same had she chosen to omit them (*"The weather was ideal…"). In this connexion it is interesting to note the reasons Hyde gives for the unexpectedly frequent appearance of conjuncts in discourse initial position in the type of text he investigates, newspaper editorials:

> Conjuncts . . . are anaphoric—they establish a logico-semantic relation with a presupposed, immediately preceding, portion of discourse. This would seem to imply that it would, by definition, be impossible to encounter a conjunct . . . in absolute discourse-initial position, that is to say, either in the headline or in the first sentence of an editorial. And yet, it is not unusual to find certain ISR [intersentential relation] signals in this position.
>
> Such discourse-initial use of anaphoric ISR signals would seem to be quite rare in written texts. The fact that they appear with some regularity in newspaper editorials is an important defining characteristic of this discourse type (at least in daily newspapers). Editorials are normally comments on immediately preceding events in the world and knowledge of those events is presumed to be still salient in the normal reader's knowledge base. This text type is very closely tied to the present moment. (1990: 208).

Hyde explains this particular use of conjuncts by making them relate the textual world they create to the events happening in the outer real world. Of course, for a type of text like editorials which are about current affairs, the

connexion between the two worlds is both logical and real. The state of things is not so simple for a work of fiction such as the story we are analysing. However, our case could be argued on grounds similar to those given for editorials, bearing in mind that the way to attain a certain effect in fiction, as opposed to the type of straightforward communication achieved in journalism, tends to be indirect and through rhetorical control (van Dijk 1976, 1981; Adams 1985).

There is a cultural convention in literary communication (Coleridge's "willing suspension of disbelief"), according to which the reader assumes from the very beginning that the textual world s/he is entering is autonomous and independent of outer reality. This is an indispensable condition for the semantic and pragmatic functions of literature (van Dijk 1976, 1981; Levin 1976; Banfield 1987) and a rule intuitively observed at all stages of the communicative process. There seems to be no reason why Katherine Mansfield's "The Garden Party" should be an exception. When the reader reads the first paragraph and enters the world of the story, ("And after all the weather was ideal. They could not have had a more perfect day for a garden party if they had ordered it.…" GP 245) s/he knows that the entities and states mentioned there do not relate in any sense to the entities and states that conform his/her "real" situation.

In a previous analysis of "The Garden Party," I contended that the use of the conjunctive combination *AND AFTER ALL* in discourse initial position was effective, economical and efficient

> for two reasons: first, because it produces in the reader the immediate effect of making him a part of the world created, even if he is at this early stage totally ignorant of it; second, because it saves the narrator the time and space consumed in a description of the situation. (Alonso 1991: 76)

These reasons are valid when we look at the story within the self-contained textual reality of the fictional world. My proposal now is that we look at it from the wider perspective of the communicative situation where writer and reader become active participants and essential constituents of the process (de Beaugrande 1980, de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981), even if it is impossible for them to interact (van Dijk 1976; Garnham 1987).

In this more ample scenario, we have a situation (local, temporal, social, cultural) external to the text, but which must be shared by or at least known to both the text receiver and the text producer, if the communicative act is to

be considered successful or felicitous (Austin 1962; Searle 1969, 1979; Levin 1976). In this context the role of the connectives *AND AFTER ALL* acquires a new dimension. To begin with and following Hyde (1990) we presume that conjuncts are anaphoric and presuppose the existence of some previous portion of discourse to which they can relate. The fact that this condition is not satisfied in "The Garden Party" makes us search for some type of conceptual content to which the conjuncts may be co-referring. The only previous information or experience that can be found has necessarily got to be external to the text. I would like to venture a risky but logical interpretation of this unusual situation.

By using an additive continuative combination of connectives as the first elements in her text, Mansfield might be explicitly signalling the reader to connect the textual reality s/he is entering with the actual reality s/he is a part of. The writer might be thus implying that the world she is creating is governed by the same rules that govern the outer world. It is presented as an addition and continuation of what the reader already knows. In this way and by converting the conjunct *AND AFTER ALL* into the theme of her discourse Mansfield might be partially cancelling the rule that instructs readers to separate fiction from reality. Instead, she might be attempting to guide them in the opposite direction, creating a counter-order:

> <apply to my text the same (socio-cultural) parameters you apply to reality>

This interpretation would be in relation to and supported by Mansfield's own words on "The Garden Party," which were quoted and discussed above. The analysis showed that the dominant concept in her mental representation of the story was "[the diversity of] life**.**" Life, with a capital letter as Mansfield chooses to write it in her paragraph, is a generic concept, not subject by definition to textual variations. Hence the life and/or situation to which the reader is introduced in "The Garden Party" should not be taken as different or unrelated to the social context that surrounded the writer and the readers of her moment, who would after all be the first to receive her text. In this reading, the conjuncts do not have to renounce their anaphoric nature, because they would be establishing a connection with the cultural and social reality that pertains to the world in which the text was created. Actually they would be fulfilling an exophoric indexical function, in the double sense described by Schiffrin when she says that "markers provide **contextual coordinates** for

utterances: they index an utterance to the local contexts in which utterances are produced and in which they are to be interpreted" (1988: 326).

If we pursue this reasoning a little further, the other 30 additive connectives which appear regularly and consistently woven into the text could also be taken as explicit markers for the continuation and addition of information on the same grounds. In essence, the additive conjuncts are not informative in themselves, in the sense given to the word by de Beaugrande (1980) and de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). The relation they establish (cf. Appendix) does not add any new or different conceptual information to the text. Their role is intensively cohesive and continuative, but not primarily thematic. For example, out of the 31 *AND*s encountered in "The Garden Party" only 7 (including the initial *AND AFTER ALL*) start a paragraph, and just one is found initiating the contribution of one of the characters (Laura, the protagonist) to the dialogue. On the other hand, the fact that in many cases *AND* could have been supressed altogether (10 of them do not appear alone, but as part of a combination of conjuncts: *AND AFTER ALL, AND NOW, AND JUST, AND SOMEHOW, AND AGAIN, AND THIS TIME*) or replaced by a more meaningful additive conjunct (e.g. *besides*) proves that its recurrent use by the writer is intentional and purposeful.

All these reasons would explain why readers do not explicitly record the existence of these recurrent additive connectives in their summaries. In fact, readers interpret the function of these conjuncts correctly, as instructions from the writer which they intuitively interiorize while simultaneously incorporating their continuative semantic value. The actual consequence of this, as far as the function of conjuncts in the construction of the writer/reader's mental models is concerned, is that *AND* can be said to have a global scope and a pragmatic role to play in both the text producer's and text receiver's mental representation of the story. In both cases it is a marker for continuity and addition—necessarily explicit for the text producer (writer) who is instructing the reader to proceed in a direction which might seem unconventional for literary communication; implicit for the text receiver (reader) who acknowledges the validity of these markers by automatically incorporating the instructions received to the development of his/her own mental representation.

5.2 The adversative connective *BUT*

The case of *BUT* is slightly different but in a complementary sense. It explicitly signals contrast. And as we have seen, this concept is intimately related to the idea of "diversity of life" that is presumably the core of the story, if we

attend to the evidence provided by the summaries of both writer and readers. If we contrast the data (cf. Appendix), we find some interesting points. For instance, contrary to what was observed with reference to *AND*, *BUT* initiates 15 discursive units within the text (9 paragraphs and 8 dialogue contributions) which gives it quite a powerful thematic relevance. Besides, only 6 out of the 28 *BUT*s appear in combination with another cohesive element (*NOTHING BUT, BUT AT THE MOMENT, BUT NOW, BUT OH, BUT AT THAT MOMENT, BUT ALL THE SAME*). This implies that the presence of *BUT* in the discourse is semantically more informative than the presence of *AND,* which is basically more continuative and connective. It could be deduced then that the role played by the adversative conjunctive *BUT* is explicitly to establish a tight semantic relation built around the concept of contrast. Although the more immediate projection of this relation might be local, the recurrence of the device involves a wider scope which spreads over the global macrostructure.

The specific function of *BUT* does not contradict what we said about *AND* above. We have already quoted Halliday and Hasan when they say that the adversative *BUT* contains the additive *AND* (*BUT = AND YET*). Accordingly, from the point of view of meaning, each time *BUT* occurs it signals not only contrast, but also continuation. In this sense *BUT* should be seen as compatible with *AND*, reinforcing and completing its meaning. It should not be considered its opposite. The alternate use of both conjuncts definitely contributes to the formation of a tightly cohesive and coherent whole. Mansfield's mental image of "the diversity of life and how we try to fit in everything, Death included" is achieved in "The Garden Party" by the lexical and situational selection contained in the narrative descriptions, the dialogues, and the actions. There is no doubt however that the reiterative use of the connectives *AND* and *BUT* is an economic and highly effective way of guiding the construction of the reader's mental representation in that direction.

A schematic reproduction of the extracts from "The Garden Party" where *AND* and *BUT* appear will be given in the Appendix. An overview of their occurrence and distribution will further support our point.

6. THE SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC ROLES OF CONNECTIVES

T. A. van Dijk distinguishes two planes of conjunctive relations: the semantic and the pragmatic (1977: 86-7, 210-13). These two planes are related to

Halliday and Hasan's differentiation between the external and internal functions of connectives (1976: 237-41). In Hyde's words,

> external [van Dijk's semantic] ISR's are related to the content of what is being said and are located in the ideational or experiential function of language"; while "internal [van Dijk's pragmatic] ISR's are related to the speaker's organisation of his [her] discourse and are located in the interpersonal function of language. (1990: 199)

In all cases, it is admitted that the difference or distinction between the two functions is frequently a difficult one -and I would add, an unnecessary one if we consider the interactive nature of linguistic communication as the essence of the pragmatic component (de Beaugrande: 1979, 1980, 1985; de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981). Schiffrin sheds some light on the complexity when she defines "the semantic role [of conjunctive markers] as their textual meaning, and their pragmatic role as their interactional effect" (1988: 190).

As for the scope of this double function of connectives, both van Dijk and Halliday and Hasan explain it in terms of relations between short stretches of text, as corresponds to their basically local approach to the phenomenon. For example, van Dijk says: "The semantic function of connectives is to relate facts, whereas pragmatic connectives relate sentences (or propositions), as for instance, in inferences" (1977: 86). Hyde focuses on the local and global scope of connectives but finds no real differences in meaning or in the type of relation they establish:

> This distinction between short-range and long-range scope of particular signals obviously reflects the division into micro and macro factors of discourse. A signal which scopes only to the immediately preceding sentence will obviously express a very local, micro relation. A signal which scopes over one, two or even more paragraphs . . . will express a major, macro relation. . . . This makes it possible to divide ISR signals into so-called micro-connectives and macro-connectives. However . . . as far as conjuncts are concerned, at least, there are no formal differences between micro-connectives and macro-connectives. (1990: 206-7)

In "The Garden Party" the high frequency of the connectives *AND* and *BUT*, makes their relational function active at all levels of discourse: propositional, microstructural and macrostructural. A look at the Appendix will support this point. At local level, both conjuncts serve all kinds of purposes. For example, *AND* is used to indicate addition or continuation (1, 5, 9, 13,

14, 17, 18, 20, 23, 25) to change the topic or perspective of the previous sentence (2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 19, 24, 27, 29), to enumerate actions or facts (3, 10, 21, 26, 28, 30, 31), and to relate different speech acts (4, 15, 22). In some of the cases the meanings interact and the differences are not really clear-cut. Much the same could be said about *BUT* which sometimes denotes an additive adversative relation (13, 14, 15, 17, 24, 28), an unexpected consequence (2, 7, 8, 9, 10), an unfulfilled condition (1,4), a change of perspective through contrast (5, 6, 11, 12, 25), contrast proper (3, 21, 22, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27), or a dismissive relation (26).

At a more local level the strong presence of both *AND* and *BUT* in all the semantic blocks distinguished in the text gives sufficient evidence to support the notion that conjucts are an effective means of connection between ideas which cover stretches of text longer than a proposition.. For instance, all uses of *AND* in "the workmen episode" signal Laura's frame of mind and the continuity of her thoughts in relation to what she observes at the moment. On the other hand, in the "news of the accident" section, uses of *BUT* point to the contrast existing between Laura's opinion and the opinion of some members of her family (her mother and her sister Jose).

But perhaps the most interesting findings inferred from the use of the two connectives in "The Garden Party" concern the macrostructural level, where they help to introduce and maintain—through emphatic thematization and consistent recurrence—one of the main topics of the discourse: life as a continuum and its contrasts. The first consequence that can be drawn from these data is that *AND* and *BUT* actually have a clear semantic role in the structural organization of "The Garden Party." Their meanings are intimately related to the central idea that runs throughout the text. At propositional level they mark each character's (including the narrator's) subjective perspective. At macrostructural level they serve as explicit, though indirect, indicators of the writer's own topic.

As for their pragmatic function, the analysis of Mansfield's paragraph on "The Garden Party" demonstrated that both *AND* and *BUT* are essential elements in the writer's organization of her discourse because the presence of the two connectives is mantained in her summary and is even foregrounded. The interpersonal function associated with conjuncts also applies, but needs some adjustment. Literary communication is a type of asymmetrical linguistic communication. As Garnham says, "when reading a book it may be necessary to take the beliefs of the author into account, but it is not possible to have much effect on authors' beliefs by reading their books" (1987: 47). Thus, the interpersonal function in a literary text has to be seen as a one-way function,

where the writer instructs the reader in a certain direction. The fact that all 35 readers seemed to follow these intructions easily and without deviation, and read the text according to the lines marked by the writer, supports the idea that the interpersonal projection marked by the conjuncts *AND* and *BUT* worked both effectively and efficiently (de Beaugrande 1980; de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981).

6. CONCLUSION

In the introduction to this paper we stated that the basic aim was to explore the role of intersentential connectives in complex narrative discourse. Some recent trends of investigation support different roles for these connectives in the construction of discourse (see Segal, Duchan and Scott 1991). Our aim was to evaluate and measure their findings against data more complex than that usually found in theoretical studies of these phenomena. For this purpose, Katherine Mansfield's short story "The Garden Party" was selected, because it combined the characteristics of textual complexity and free elaboration, together with an interesting use of these connective devices.

The analysis of the prominent position and intensive recurrence of these connectives indicated the existence of specific values intentionally assigned to them by the writer. *AND* and *BUT* have been shown to be functioning in "The Garden Party," first as a means of attaining local and global cohesion and coherence, second and most important as explicit signals for the development and construction of all the participants' mental models.

The fact that these functions have to do with the semantic (meaning or topic) and the pragmatic (structural organization and interpersonal relation) planes of discourse has led to the conclusion that an intentional and repetitive use of intersentential connectives in discourse may activate their semantic and pragmatic properties in combination and with a global scope. We have also found that a creative use of connectives provide the text producer with the means to create multiple effects. First and most frequently, they are used to give "texture" (Halliday and Hasan 1976) to the text, but their contribution can go far beyond that. They can shape the actual meaning of the text, they can also serve as efficient markers for instructions in the communicative process established between writer and reader. Although more texts should be analysed before any general claims could be made, it is hoped that this analysis of Mansfield's "The Garden Party" offers an interesting point of departure for further research.a

APPENDIX

The data has been organized following the same semantic blocks that were used for the 35 summaries. However, the episode of the preparations for the party has been added as a separate microstructure because it carries enough evidence for our analysis of connectives.

AND

INTRODUCTION (GP 245-6):
1. *And after all* the weather was ideal (GP 245).

THE WORKMEN EPISODE (GP 246-248):
2. What nice eyes he [a workman] had, small, but such a dark blue! *And now* she looked at the others . . . (GP 246)
3. How nice workmen were! *And* what a beautiful morning! (GP 246)
4. *And* she pointed to the lily lawn … (GP 246)
5. Then the karaka trees would be hidden. *And* they were so lovely . . . (GP 247)
6. It's all the fault, she decided, . . . of these absurd class distinctions. Well for her part she didn't feel them. Not a bit, not an atom… *And now* there came the chock-chock of wooden hammers . . . (GP 248)

PREPARATIONS FOR THE PARTY (GP 248-253):
7. One moment—hold the line. Mother's calling. *And* Laura sat back… (GP 248).
8. The green baize door that led to the kitchen regions swung open and shut with a muffled thud. *And now* there came a long, chuckling absurd sound. (GP 249)
9. Little faint winds were playing chase in at the tops of the windows, out at the doors. *And* there were two tiny spots of sun . . . (GP 249)
10. I was passing the shop yesterday, and I saw them in the window. *And* I suddenly thought . . . (GP 249)

11. 'The flags for the sandwiches, Sadie?' echoed Mrs. Sheridan dreamily. *And* the children knew by her face that she hadn't got them. (GP 251)
12. 'Let me see.' *And* she said to Sadie firmly… (GP 251)
13. Do you hear me children . . . *And, and ,* Jose, pacify cook… (GP 251)

NEWS OF THE ACCIDENT (GP 253-257):
14. 'They were taking the body home as I come up here.' *And* he said to the cook . . . (GP 253)
15. *'And* just think of what the band would sound like to that poor woman,' said Laura. (GP 254)
16. 'What's given you such a colour? *And* Mrs. Sheridan turned round from her dressing table . . . (GP 255)
17. 'Look at yourself!' *And* she held up her hand mirror. (GP 255)
18. 'People like them don't expect sacrifices from us. *And* it is not very sympathetic to spoil everybody's enjoyment…(GP 255)
19. Is mother right? she thought. *And now* she hoped her mother was right. (GP 256)
20. I'll remember it again after the party is over. *And* somehow that seemed quite the best plan. (GP 256)
21. If Laurie agreed with the others, then it was bound to be all right. *And* she followed him into the hall. (GP 256)
22. *And* Laura, glowing, answered softly. (GP 257)
23. *And* the perfect afternoon slowly ripened. (GP 257)

LAURA'S ERRAND TO THE DEAD MAN'S HOUSE (GP 257-261):
24. 'Why will you children insist on giving parties!' *And* they all of them sat down . . . (GP 257)
25. 'Don't you agree? *And* she's sure to have neighbours calling in . . .'
26. 'Only the basket, then. *And* Laura . . . '(GP 258)
27. She stopped a minute. *And* it seemed to her that kisses, voices, tinkling spoons . . . (GP 259)
28. How her frock shone! *And* the big hat with the velvet streamer . . . (GP 259)
29. What was it all about? *And* the poor face puckered up again. (GP 260)
30. *And* again she began, 'You'll excuse her, miss . . . (GP 260)
31. *And* this time she didn't wait for Em's sister . . . (GP 261)

BUT

INTRODUCTION (GP 245-246):
1. *But* Meg couldn't possibly go and supervise the workmen. (GP 245).

THE WORKMEN EPISODE (GP 246-248):
2. 'Good morning,' she said copying her mother's voice. *But* that sounded so fearfully affected . . . (GP 246)
3. Laura's upbringing made her wonder for a moment whether it was quite respectful for a workman to talk to her of bangs slap in the eye. *But* she did quite follow him. (GP 247)
4. 'A corner of the tennis-court,' she suggested. '*But* the band is going to be in one corner.' (GP 247)
5. Perhaps he wouldn't mind so much if the band was quite small. *But* the tall fellow interrupted. (GP 247)

PREPARATIONS FOR THE PARTY (GP248-253):
6. It was the heavy piano being moved on its stiff castors. *But* the air! If you stopped to notice . . . (GP 249)
7. There, just inside the door, stood a wide, shallow tray full of pots of pink lilies. No other kind. *Nothing but* lilies . . . (GP 249).
8. *But at that moment* Mrs. Sheridan joined them. (GP 249)
9. *'But* I thought you said you didn't mean to interfere.' (GP 250)
10. *But* at the word 'Goodbye', and although the piano sounded more desperate than ever, her face broke into a brilliant, dreadfully unsympathetic smile. (GP 251)
11. *But now* Sadie interrupted them. (GP 251)
12. *But* the back door was blocked by cook, Sadie, Godber's man and Hans. (GP 253)

NEWS OF THE ACCIDENT (GP 253-257):
13. *But* Godber's man wasn't going to have his story snatched from under his nose. (GP 253)
14. *But* Jose was still more amazed. (GP 253)
15. *'But* we can't possibly have a garden party with a man dead just outside the front gate.' (GP 254)
16. When the Sheridans were little they were forbidden to set foot there because of the revolting language and of what they might catch. *But* since they were grown up, Laura and Laurie on their prowls sometimes walked through. (GP 254)

17. They came out with a shudder. *But* still one must go everywhere… (GP 254)
18. *'But* listen, mother,' said Laura.(GP 255)
19. *'But* my dear child, use your common sense . . .' (GP 255)
20. *'But* , mother, ' Laura began again. (GP 255)
21. Just for a moment she had another glimpse of that poor woman and those little children, and the body being carried into the house. *But* it all seemed blurred, unreal, like a picture in the newspaper. (GP 256)
22. 'Yes, it's been very successful. *But oh*, these parties, these parties!' (GP 257)

LAURA'S ERRAND TO THE DEAD MAN'S HOUSE (GP 257-261):
23. *'But* , mother, do you really think it's a good idea? said Laura. (GP 258)
24. 'Are you Mrs. Scott?' *But* to her horror the woman answered, 'Walk in, please, miss . . .' (GP 260)
25. *But at that moment* the woman at the fire turned round. (GP 260)
26. *But all the same* you had to cry . . .' (GP 261)
27. 'No,' sobbed Laura.' It was simply marvellous. *But* Laurie—' (GP 261)
28. 'Isn't life,' she stammered, 'isn't life—' *But* what life was she couldn't explain . . . (GP 261)

NOTE

1. In the Penguin edition of *The Collected Stories of Katherine Mansfield.* References to this edition will be abbreviated hereafter as "GP."

WORKS CITED

ADAMS, J. K. 1985. *Pragmatics and Fiction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
ALONSO, P. 1991. "The literary text type: notes on a method of analysis based on Text Linguistics and a practical application to Katherine Mansfield's *The Garden Party* ." *Atlantis* 13: 65-92.
- - -. 1992. "Towards a Semantic Representation of Saul Bellow's Textual World." *Revista de Filología Moderna de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha* 2-3.
AUSTIN, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. London: Oxford UP.

BANFIELD, A. 1987. "Describing the Unobserved: Events Grouped around an Empty Centre." In *The Linguistics of Writing* . Ed. N. Fabb, D. Attridge, A. Durant, and C. McCabe. New York: Methuen.

BEAUGRANDE, R. de, 1980. *Text, Discourse, and Process*. Norwood (NJ): Ablex.

BEAUGRANDE, R. de, and W. Dressler. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics.* London: Longman.

BROWN, G., and G. YULE. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

CHAFE, W. L., 1976. "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Point of View." In *Subject and topic* . Ed. C. N. Li. New York: Academic Press. 25-56.

CLARK, H. H., and S. E. HAVILAND. 1977. "Comprehension and the Given-New contract." In *Discourse Production and Comprehension* . Ed. R. O. Freedle. Norwood (N.J.): Ablex. 1-40.

ECO, U., M. SANTAMBROGIO and P. VIOLI, eds. 1988. *Meaning and Mental Representations*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.

GARNHAM, A. 1987. *Mental Models as Representations of Discourse and Text.* Chichester (West Sussex): Ellis Horwood.

HALLIDAY, M. A. K., and R. HASAN. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

HYDE, J. 1990. *Aspects of Discourse Analysis: The Explicit Signalling of Intersentential Relations in English*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Universidad de Salamanca.

JOHNSON-LAIRD, P. N. 1983. *Mental Models*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

JOHNSON-LAIRD, P. N., and A. GARNHAM. 1980. "Descriptions and discourse models." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 3: 371-393.

LEVIN, S. R., 1976. "Concerning what Kind of Speech Act a Poem is." In *Pragmatics of language and literature*. Ed. T. A. van Dijk. Amsterdam: North Holland. 141-60.

MANSFIELD, Katherine. 1977. *Letters and Journals* . Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- - -. 1981. "The Garden Party." In *The Collected Stories of Katherine Mansfield.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

SCHIFFRIN, D. 1988. *Discourse Markers*. New York: Cambridge UP.

SEARLE, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts* . London: Cambridge UP.

- - -. 1979 *Expression and meaning* . Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

SEGAL, E. M., J. F. DUCHAN, and P. SCOTT. 1991. "The Role of Interclausal Connectives in Narrative Structuring: Evidence from Adults' Interpretations of Simple Stories." *Discourse Processes* 14: 27-54.

STODDARD, S. 1990. *Text and Texture: Patterns of Cohesion*. Norwood (NJ): Ablex.

DIJK, T. A. van, ed. 1976. *Pragmatics of Language and Literature*. Amsterdam: North Holland.

- - -. 1977. *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse* . London: Longman.

- - -. 1980. *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction and Cognition* . Hillsdale (NJ): Erlbaum.
- - -. 1981. *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse* . The Hague: Mouton.
- - -. 1985. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 4 vols. London: Academic Press.
DIJK, T. A. van, and W. KINTSCH. 1982. *Strategies of Discourse Comprehen-sion.* New York: Academic Press.

a