UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA

CURSO DE PÓS- GRADUAÇÃO EM INGLÊS

DIALOGUE IN FICTIONAL NARRATIVE - A SOURCE OF CONFLICT

Dissertação submetida à Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina para a obtenção do Grau de Mestre em Letras- Opção Inglês e Literatura Correspondente

ANA ABELIN WILLEKER

Florianópolis

1987

Esta dissertação foi julgada adequada para a obtenção do grau de

MESTRE EM LETRAS

Opção Inglês e Literatura Correspondente e aprovada em sua forma final pelo Programa de Pós-Graduação.

Profº Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard,
Ph.D. (em Tese)
Orientadora

Profº José Luiz Meurer - Ph.D.
Coordenador do Curso de Pós-Graduação
em Letras - Opção Inglês e Literatura
Correspondente

Apresentada perante a Comissão Examinadora composta dos Professores:

Profº Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard
Ph.D. (em Tese)

Profº Suzana Bornêo Funck, Ph.D.

Prof. Malcolm Coulthard, Ph.D.

Dedicação

À memória de meu avô Malaquias

AGRADECIMENTOS

- À profª Carmen Rosa Caldas Coulthard pela orientação e constante incentivo.

- Aos professores Malcolm Coulthard e Suzana Bornéo Funck pelas sugestões.

- À Michele pela boa-vontade e pronto atendimento na secretaria do Pós-Graduação.

- À Ivani pelo excelente trabalho de datilografia e pela paciência de refazer sempre que necessário.

- À Amanda, que me cedeu a sala de estudos para reclusão e produção.

- Ao Walton, a quem eu denomino co-autor por toda a dedicação, paciência e trabalho aqui investidos.

- Aos meus pais, João e Heloísa, por tudo que fizeram para que eu chegasse até aqui.

- À Helô, ao tio mano, à tia Shirley, à Bisa e à Nana, que se revezaram nos cuidados da nossa Carolina para que eu pudesse atingir essa meta.

- À minha filha Carolina, para que mais tarde possa entender o porquê das nosas muitas separações.

- A todos que de alguma forma me auxiliaram e acreditaram no meu trabalho.

R E S U M O

Esta dissertação discute basicamente algumas maneiras através das quais o conflito é apresentado no diálogo de ficção. O propósito deste trabalho é provar que o diálogo é uma grande fonte de conflito na narrativa.

Este trabalho está dividido em quatro capítulos. O primeiro capítulo examina os relacionamentos das personagens e seus problemas pela aplicação da teoria do Princípio Cooperativo de Grice e suas máximas para esse princípio. O segundo capítulo trata das rupturas na estrutura, desenvolvida por Coulthard e Brazil para uma 'troca' em conversação. Nesse capítulo, ainda é considerada a não-observância das regras de Sacks, Jefferson e Shegloff para o Sistema de Turnos em Conversação. O terceiro capítulo analisa alguns elementos da glosa ou interpretação do narrador e ilustra como eses elementos podem indicar para o leitor a presença de conflito. No quarto capítulo, é apresentada uma pesquisa sobre a reação do leitor à ausência da glosa ou TE, numa tentativa de provar que os leitores são usualmente capazes de criar entre-textos para preencher as lacunas deixadas pelo narrador. A pesquisa também mostra que, quando o conflito está claro no próprio diálogo, os leitores também o assinalam nos seus próprios entre-textos.

Como conclusão, as linhas teóricas utilizadas para análise são relacionadas, e a sua utilidade para o objetivo proposto é discutida.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation basically discusses some ways through which conflict is conveyed in fictional dialogue. The main purpose of this work is to prove that dialogue is a great source of conflict in the narrative.

This work is divided into four chapters. The first chapter examines characters's relationships and their problems by the application of Grice's Cooperative Principle for Conversation and his maxims for the Cooperative Principle. The second chapter deals with the breaks in the structure devised by Coulthard and Brazil for an exchange, as well as the non-observance of the rules in Sacks, Jefferson and Shegloff's Tur-taking System for Conversation. The third chapter analyses some elements of the narrator's gloss, illustrating how these elements can signal for readers the presence of conflict. In the fourth chapter, there is the presentation of a research on the reader's reaction to the absence of the TE, in an attempt to prove that readers are usually capable of creating inter-texts to fill in the gaps left by the writer. The research also shows that when conflict is clear in the dialogue itself,readers also mark it in their own TEs.

As a conclusion, the theoretical lines used for analysis are related once their usefulness for the proposed goal is discussed.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Human relations have always been complex and conflictive. The complexity of such relations has been greatly exploited by writers of literature who usually portray people's struggle to understand each other.

I am particularly interested in finding out some of the ways by which conflict among characters may be portrayed by writers. By conflict I understand situations in which some kind of problem is evident. As it would be very difficult to analyse the presentation of conflict in all the elements of a fictional text, I decided to make an analysis of speech presentation. My study will then concentrate on the presentation of direct speech in narrative.

It is a narrator's option to 'tell' us what happened or to 'show' it. When the narrator tells us she/he uses Indirect Speech.

> She told me that she had spent an hour standing by the open window before I came, and that she had been tempted to jump.
>
> An American Dream
> Norman Mailer (p.70)

The narrator 'shows' us when she/he lets the characters 'talk' in Direct Speech.

> 'What drink is that?' the gypsy asked.
> 'A medicine', Robert Jordan said.
> (FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS)
> ch III Ernest Hemingway

Direct Speech has as one of its variants Free Direct Speech, a way of reporting in which according to Leech and Short (1981) "the characters apparently speak to us more immediately without the narrator as an intermediary"(p.322) and which is characterized by the absence of a reporting clause.

> "What did he want to kill himself for?"
> "How should I know?"
> "How did he do it?"
> "He hung himself with a rope."
> "Who cut him down?"
> "His niece."
> A clean, well-lighted place
> Ernest Hemingway
> p.

This study will focus on the kind of text which 'shows' rather than 'tells' because I am interested in interaction among characters.

In an analysis of dialogue we can look at two distinct elements: the dialogue itself, i.e., what the character says in direct speech, and everything that comes together with the character's speech, what Dahli (1981) calls the Textual Environment from now on referred to as TE. The proposed analysis will investigate the existence of conflict both inside and outside the dialogue.
This work will consist of the following steps:

1- Analysis inside the dialogue

Chapter 1

The application of Grice's Cooperative Principle for Conversation (1977) and his rules for the CP. I want to show that conflict is expressed through characters' breaking of the rules.

Chapter 2

The consideration of the structure of the dialogue. In this part I intend to apply Coulthard and Brazil's Exchange Structure Theory (1981) and Sacks, Jefferson and Schegloff's Theory for the Turn-taking System

(1978) in order to show that conflict is evident when characters break the expected Exchange Structure sequence and when they do not observe the rules for the Turn-Taking System.

2- Analysis outside the dialogue

Chapter 3

In this section I will look at how writers express conflict through the way they gloss their characters' speeches.

Chapter 4

I will also present a short research to show how TEs created by readers provide signs of conflict.

The theories I intend to work with were originally developed for the analysis of natural conversation. I believe that although we find differences between natural and fictional dialogue, the similatities are evident. It is also an observable fact that writers, by giving the floor to characters,exploit real conversation techniques to present speech. I have considered the similarities between natural and fictional conversation more important than the differences because I believe that most features of natural conversation are present in fictional dialogues.

My choice of theoretical lines is based on the assumption that there is not such a division as literary and non-literary discourse.

Some scholars acknowledge the existence of a discourse which they attribute special characteristics like 'poetic', 'fictional', 'literary', being therefore viewed as a separate kind of discourse different from other kinds. Vasconcelos da Silva, in his article 'Para uma Teoria do Texto Lírico' (1975) in DESCONSTRUÇÃO/CONSTRUÇÃO NO "TEXTO LÍRICO" say that:

> Uma teoria da literatura só poderá surgir, quando se pensar a especificidade do discurso literário em relação a uma tipologia geral dos discursos. O papel da Teoria da Literatura será definir a especificidade do discurso literário. (p.8)

Others, however, defend the existence of a division not between Literary and Non-Literary Discourse but between Written/Spoken Discourse. M. Louise Pratt (1977) who talks about 'The Poetic Language Fallacy'argues against the existence of a discourse which is literary and poetic, in opposition to other kinds of discourse, including ordinary language, which are non-poetic. She believes that poetic language is very similar to everyday language because the language poets deal with is the same we speak. Writers, no doubt, make greater use of elements like methaphor, irony, ambiguity.These devices of language, however can be used by anyone, in any kind of discourse. In Pratt's opinion, there is no logical reason why literary language should be viewed as a distinct kind of language.

> ...so far, no motivation has been found for viewing literary discourse as generically distinct from other linguistic activities or as exploiting any kind of communicative competence other than that which we rely on in nonliterary speech situation. (p.153)

Pratt attempts to integrate literary discourse with other discourses, especially natural spoken discourse. For the purpose of such integration she applies linguistic theories to the analysis of literary texts. She mentions some aspects of literary discourse which can be said to distinguish it from other discourses. The fact that literary discourse has some special traits, does not mean however, that it has to be dealt with separately. I agree with Pratt that linguistic studies and literature are so tied up that there is no possibility of dissociation. I think that a linguistic analysis helps readers to understand and appreciate the artistic possibilities of

the text, so I decided to choose the theories previously mentioned as guidelines for my analysis.

I still want to quote Levinson (1977) in Pragmatics to reinforce why I have decided to analyse conversation to find signs of conflict. Levinson justifies the choice of conversational analysts saying that

> '...conversational is clearly the prototypical kind of language usage, the form in which we are all first exposed to language- the matrix for language acquisition. (p.284)

I used in my analysis texts from various writers. My selection was done based on the criterion of usefulness, i.e., I read several texts and selected those which would be useful to illustrate my point.

Chapter 1

The dialogue: Grice and the Cooperative Principle

1.1. Grice and the Cooperative Principle

I want to start my analysis by applying Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) for conversation and his Maxims for the CP (1977) to fictional conversation. I believe that this theoretical line will be useful to help me find out some ways in which conflict is conveyed.

In his analysis of the 'conditions governing conversation' Grice discusses the concept of Implicature. He introduces the verb 'implicate' which is associated with say'. When a speaker says something, the listener has to decode what was said for the sake of understanding. Very often, what people say in conversation has an extra meaning, other than the literal one. Listeners have to get to this extra meaning, the suggestion or the Implicature in Grice's terms, if they want to succeed in interpreting what the speaker says. Grice provides an example to clarify the meaning of Implicature. He imagines that two friends A and B are having a conversation and talk about C, a friend of theirs who is at present working in a bank.

The dialogue would be like this:

A- How is C getting on in his job?
B- Oh quite well, I think; he likes his colleagues, and he hasn't been to prision yet.

According to Grice, A could question B about the meaning of this utterance. What does B want to imply or suggest by saying that C has not been to prision yet? A could simply not ask anything about B's reply if he knew by a previous contextual clue what the implication of such an answer was. It is important to point out, therefore, that, whatever the implicature, what B said is quite different from what he implied.

Grice argues that conversationalists work on the assumption that their fellow conversationalists are generally willing to be cooperative, i.e., to give information which is demanded, answer questions, ask questions, etc. He says that conversations are basically 'Cooperative Efforts'. He describes a set of maxims which people are expected to obey. These maxims fall into four categories: Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner. The category of Quantity refers to the Quantity of Information a person is supposed or expected to provide in a conversation. For this category the maxims are:

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange)
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

For the category of Quality,Grice establishes a maxim 'Try to make your contribution one that is true' and two sub-maxims:

1. Do not say what you believe to be false
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

The category of Relation expects participants to 'Be Relevant'. The category of Manner, which is related to

'How something is said' includes the following maxims:

1. Avoid obscurity of expression
2. Avoid ambiguity
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
4. Be orderly

Participants in real conversation however often break maxims. Levinson in his book Pragmatics (1977) after reviewing Grice's set of maxims for the Cooperative Principle says that:

> To this view of the nature of communication there is an immediate objection: the view may describe a philosopher's paradise, but no one actually speaks like that the whole time. (p.102)

As I will, in this chapter, distinguish speaker's breaks of rules that cause conflict from those that do not bring problem, it is important at this point to review Grice's description of speakers's violations.

Grice describes the ways in which speakers may fail to observe the maxims. A person may, for example, 'quietly and unostentatiously VIOLATE a maxim.'(p.49), leading to misinterpretation. Or one may purposefully refuse to obey a maxim, or to be Cooperative at all, as when someone declares that she/he is not willing to provide some required information. It is also possible that a participant in a conversation faces a problem, named by Grice as clash. One may not be able to obey the maxim of Quantity because in observing the maxim of Quantity, one might be violating the maxim of Quality. The example provided by Grice for this violation is: Two friends, A and B are planning to spend a holiday in France. They know that A wishes to see his friend C, in case the journey was not extremely prolongued. When A asks 'Where does C live?' B replies 'Somewhere in the South of France.' According To Grice, B gives A less information than he requires. This violation of the maxim of Quantity might be

explained by the supposition that B knows if he gave more information he might say something which would infringe the maxim of Quality, 'Don't say that for which you lack adequate evidence. In other words, we suppose that B gives an evasive answer because he does not know C's complete address.

The last option a participant in a conversation has to violate maxims is by Flouting them. A speaker exploits a maxim. She/he assumes that the hearer will be able to deduce the meaning. Methaphor and Irony, figures of speech greatly exploited by writer of literature, fall under this kind of violation. Grice provides an example of Irony, a case in which the first maxim of Quality is flouted, 'Do not say that which you believe to be false'. Two friends A and B have always been on close terms. However A has told one of B's secrets to a business rival. B and his audience know about it. B says "A is a fine friend". The speaker in this case is not being non-cooperative, and she/he is aware that her/his listener will not suffer with this violation. When B says 'A is a fine friend' he knows that he means the opposite. His listeners know the situation and are able to pick up the Irony in B's speech.

1.2. Cooperation and Non-cooperation in fictional dialogues.

I want in this section to make the following distinction: There are characetrs who, although breaking rules can not be seen as being non-cooperative. Sometimes the circunstance in which they find themselves drives them to the non-observance of conversational rules.On the other hand , there are characters who obviously break rules with

the purpose of causing some kind of problem to her/his partner in conversation. My point in making such distinction is to make clear that one can not say all dialogues in which we find people breaking conversational rules are likely to reveal people in conflict.

I will now present examples of Cooperation in fictional dialogues. Initially I analysed an excerpt from Steinbeck's Of Mice and Men (1949):

> 'We gonna get a little place', George began. (p.86)
> 'We'll have a cow', said George,
> 'An' we'll have maybe a pig an'chickens... an' down the flat we'll have a ...little piece alfafa...
> 'You...an'me. Every body gonna be nice to you.
> Ain't gonna be no more trouble. Nobody gonna hurt nobody nor steal from 'em. (p.87)

The climax of Steinbeck's story is when George meets Lennie, after Lennie has killed a woman. Both characters talk for a time and George breaks the maxim of Quality. He knows that the men from the ranch are after Lennie and that when they catch him, they will certainly kill him in a violent way. George tells Lennie several things which he knows to be false. George is aware that when he says 'Everybody gonna be nice to you' he is saying sometihing false. No one intends to be nice to Lennie, after he has killed the woman. George's violation of the maxim of Quality is not an indication that he is being non-cooperative. On the contrary, by the violation he cooperates, he helps his friend in the only way he can think of. George sees there is only one path for Lennie's liberation which is death. He loves Lennie and does not want him to suffer, so he prepares Lennie for a smooth death. He uses language to deceive his friend and to protect him at the same time. Lennie escapes from reality and it seems that the sound waves of George's speech are able to take him to another world, dreamlike and fanciful-

the utopian world conveyed by George's false statements.

Ernestina in The French Lieutenant's Woman (1969) by John Fowles breaks Grice's maxim of Quantity. Tina, in a piece of conversation with Charles, the man who will be her husband, gives less information than she is required to give.

> "Is she young?"
> "It's too far to tell."
> "But I can guess who it is. It must be poor Tragedy."
> "Tragedy?"
> "A nickname. One of her nicknames."
> "And what are the others?"
> "The fishermen have a gross name for her."
> "My dear Tina, you can surely-
> "They call her the French Lieutenant's.... woman." (p.13)

Her reluctance to answer Charles's question is connected with epoch and social patterns. Victorian women had to be delicate and timid. The narrator tells us that'theirs was an age when the favored feminine look was the demure, the obedient, the shy'. (p.14) The couple talk about a woman they see at a distance. Ernestina only informs Charles about the woman's nickname, after he assures her that she can do so. She seems to feel shame for uttering the word. This violation of the maxim of Quantity can be noticed in other pieces of conversation,and I assume that Ernestina's breaking of a conversational rule is justified by the restrictions which Victorian society imposed on women. In another example, the reader can also observe her vacilation before speaking.

> "But I'm intrigued. Who is this French lieutenant?"
> "A man she is said to have...."
> "Fallen in love with?"
> "Worse than that. (p.13)

Charles wants information about the woman they are talking about. Ernestina seems to fear his reaction in case she, the delicate, educated girl of a good family opens her

mouth to utter certain expressions one does not expect to hear from a sweet, timid girl. Charles has to infer what happened between the woman and the French lieutenant. He understands that Ernestina is implying the couple had an intimate relationship. The question he asks immediately after he receives the information from Ernestina, proves that he has really implicated what she meant.

> "And he abandoned her? There is a child?" (p.14)

Charles understands what Ernestina means, in spite of her incomplete information, and there is no problem in communication.

In one of the dialogues between Clifford and Connie, the couple of Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover (1928), an implicature is detected in Clifford's speech. Connie talks to him about a trip she may take.She wants to hear his opinion, as to whether he thinks she should go or not.

> "I had a letter from Father this morning", she said. "He wants to know if I am aware he has accepted Sir Alexander Cooper's invitation for me for July and August to the Villa Esmeralds in Venice." (p.161)

Clifford's response is simply a repetition of the months she intends to stay away.

> "July and August?" said Clifford. (p.161)

But Connie understands the implicature i.e., she understands that he really means is 'It is a very long time.'

> "Oh, I wouldn't stay all that time. Are you sure you wouldn't come?" (p.161)

We have then an Implicature which is worked out by the listener, therefore communication is succesful between the two characters.

In Hemingway's short story Indian Camp a boy is introduced to problems of adulthood and some of the

discoveries he makes shock him. The boy, called Nick, goes with his father to an Indian Camp where a woman is having problems in giving birth.Nick sees the caesarian performed by his father on the Indian woman and, he also watches the woman's husband comit suicide. He is impressed by both happenings: the delivery of the baby and the man's suicide. He asks his father a series of questions. The boy wants to be informed of things which belong to the world of adults, which have been presented to him. He is deprived of part of his innocence and he demands from his father a compensation for this fact. I see the piece of conversation which I will reproduce below as an illustration of a child's curiosity when facing new and essential facts of life.

> 'Do ladies always have such a hard time having babies?' Nick asked.
> 'No, that was very, very exceptional.'
> 'Why did he kill himself, Daddy?'
> 'I don't know, Nick. He couldn't stand things, I guess.'
> 'Do many men kill themselves, Daddy?'
> 'Not very many, Nick.'
> 'Do many women?'
> 'Hardly ever.'
> 'Don't they ever?'
> 'Oh, yes. They do sometimes.'
> 'Daddy.'
> 'Yes.'
> 'Where did Uncle George go?'
> 'He'll turn up all right.'
> 'Is dying hard, Daddy?'
> 'No, I think it's pretty easy. Nick. It all depends.'

The father is cooperative, in Grice's terms, because he does not leave any question unanswered. Readers might wonder whether Nick's father breaks Grice's maxim of Quality or not. When the boy asks 'Is dying hard, Daddy?' the father answers 'No, I think it's pretty easy. Nick. It all depends.' Does he really think dying is easy, or is he saying so because he does not want the child to be

frightened? The father might be wanting to soften the blow suffered by the boy at the sight of so much pain.

So far I have dealt with fictional dialogues in which the effect of characters's breaks is not harmful to their partness in conversation. The examples analysed here can be summed up in the following way:

a- examples in which the characters have special motives for violating a conversational rule (Steinbeck's, Fowles's and Hemingway's texts)

b- example in which the character does not provide complete information because he knows his partner will be able to fill in the missing part in his speech.

Now I want to focus on the most significant kind of break for my analysis: breaks which show conflict.

In Lawrence's The Fox (1923) Henry breaks the maxim of Quantity. He intends to tell Banford about the decision he and March have made to get married. Before delivering the information Henry plays a kind of game with Banford. He lets questions go unanswered and his attitude in the conversation creates an atmosphere of suspense over what is to come. By refusing to give Banford the information she needs, he breaks the maxim of Quantity. He answers questions whith more questions,in order to postpone the information.

'Do you know what, Miss Banford,'
'Well, what?' said the good-natured,
nervy Banford.
He looked at March who was spreading
jam on her bread.
'Shall I tell?' he said to her.
'Yes, if you mean Jill', she said.
.....
'Whatever's coming? said Banford...
'Why, what do you think?' he said,
smiling like one who has a secret.
'How do I know?' said Banford?'
'Can't you guess?' he said...
'I'm sure I can't. What's more I'm not
going to try!

> 'Nellie and I are going to be married.' (p.116)

Henry humiliates Banford. He tries to show that Nellie hides things from Banford and in this way he attacks Nellie and Banford's relationship. One of Banford's subsequent speeches portrays the effect caused by Henry's words.

> 'I'll never believe it, Nellie', she cried. 'It's absolutely impossible.' (p.117)

The conversations of the couple in Ring Lardner's The Love Nest (1925) are very interesting for analysis in terms of Grice's maxims. Most of their speeches reveal false concepts about their relationship. The reader is initially deceived by the frequent breaks of conversational maxims. The couple constantly break Grice's maxim of Quality, by saying things they know to be false. Gregg boasts too much and seems almost ridiculous,wanting others to see him as a prototype of the happy millionaire who lives 'la dolce vita'.

> "I'm going to take you right to my home and have you to meet the wife and family; stay to dinner and all night. We've got plenty of room and extra pyjamas, if you don't mind them silk." (p.392)

This speech is directed to a character called Bartlett, who is a reporter, and who intends to write about Gregg and his family for a magazine. I assume Gregg sees Bartlett as the representative of the public. Gregg's main interest is to build up the image of a perfect family. For this purpose, Gregg and his wife Celia violate Grice's maxim which says 'Dont say that which you believe to be false.' They want to assure the hearer they are a happy couple, but in fact they are two maladjusted people. The way they treat each other turns to be even comic.Dozens of 'sweethearts' are spoken as if they were produced by children who memorize speeches to present at a school

celebration. Nothing can be forgotten. The lights are on; the audience is waiting; the show must begin. Their speeches, however, are empty. Readers feel there is no communication at all.

> "Sweetheart".
> "Hello sweetheart."
> "Come down sweetheart." (p.394)
>
> "All right sweetheart."
> "Well sweetheart."
> "This is Mr. Bartlett, sweetheart." (p.395)

Celia is an alcoholic, a fact which is revealed to the reader through the conversation but not in the beginning of the narrative. In one of their exchanges Gregg and Celia break the maxim of Quality for the CP. They know that Celia often drinks, and that she drinks in excess.The reader will be informed of this fact through a later dialogue. At the public's eyes represented by Mr.Bartlett, they both talk as if she were the kind of person who rarely touches hard drinks. Gregg also breaks the maxim when he attributes to one of the servants the act of drinking the whisky which is missing. Both know that she has drunk the whisky. He, however, gives her a hint to start a 'let's pretend game'. She accepts his suggestion and goes on violating the maxim of Quality.

> "Listen, sweetheart", said her husband.
> "One of the servants has been helping himself to this Bourbon. I mean it was a full bottle last night and I only had one little drink out of it. And now it's less than half full.
> "Who do you suppose has been at it?"
> "How do I know, sweetheart? Maybe the groceryman or the iceman or somebody." (p.395)

Another of Celia's speeches can certainly be considered an irony. She wants to hurt Gregg because he makes her act as if she were a foolish, obedient wife. Nevertheless, she helps to build up the false image by stating her happy condition as Gregg's wife and as a mother.

> "I'm no longer an artist; merely a happy wife and mother." (p.395)

The hypocritical world of false values built up through conversation is also destroyed through conversation. Celia reveals herself as an alcoholic to Mr. Bartlett and to readers as well, through one of her dialogues with Mr. Bartlett.

> "It is too bad, Mr. Bartlett", said Celia when Gregg had gone.
> "What's too bad?" asked Bartlett.
> "That you have to drink alone. I feel like I wasn't being a good hostess to let you do it. In fact, I refuse to let you do it. I'll join you in just a lettle sip."
> "It's never too soon! I'm going to have a drink myself and if you don't join me, you're a quitter."
> .....
> "And besides it's time for a drink."
> "I've still got more than half of mine."
> "Well, you had that wine at dinner so I'll have to catch up with you." (p.p.400-01)

Celia performs a kind of catharsis telling Bartlett the truth about her pseudo perfect marriage. She obeys the rules of the CP and, with the aid of alcohol, she uses language to release her tension. She exposes both to Mr. Bartlett and to the reader the falseness in which she lives.

> "Well off, am I? I'd change places with the scum of the earth just to be free! See Baker? And I could have been a star without any help if I'd only realized it. I had the talent.
> .....
> "Well, he's made me all right; he's made me a chronic mother and it's a wonder I've got any looks left." (p.401)

After this moment, where tension has reached its climax, everything returns to the way it was in the beginning. The two last speeches of the couple indicate that the problem has not been solved. They are once more breaking conversational rules and playing the hypocrites. The show

does go on and it is through speech that readers are informed of the situation.

"Good-by, sweetheart." (p.403)

Although the two protagonists try to make their dialogues express the image of a couple living a very good relationship, one in which there is no conflict, the truth eventually turns up. It is interesting to notice that at the moment Celia is cooperative, i.e., at the moment she decides to obey the maxim of Quality, she is able to aliviate her tension. We can say that perhaps the act of saying things which she knew to be false represented something negative for her. The breakage of the rule for Celia bears negative conotations, like her dependence on Gregg, Gregg's domineering character and her nihilism in the relationship.

In Hemingway's The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber, Margaret in one of her speeches,breaks the maxim of Quality. She tells her husband that she has gone out to get a breath of air and she knows that her information is not true. However, I assume the break is not very significant because her partner in conversation is not deceived by her misleading information.He does not believe her; he does not suffer therefore the harmful consequences which might affect people who are deluded in conversation.

"Where have you been?"
"I just went out to get a breath of air."
"You did, like hell."
"What do you want me to say, darling?"
"Where have you been?"
"Out to get a breath of air."
"That's a new name for it. You are a bitch." (p.1537)

When she answers his question with 'Out to get a breath of air', she is lying. Macomber, however, is able to perceive, perhaps due to the tone she uses that she is not really answering his question; she is just trying to avoid the truth. The speech 'That's a new name for it. You are a bitch' shows the reader that he is not deceived; he

recognizes the lie. One might wonder how Macomber is able to recognize Margaret's lie. The narrator orients the reader to what is going to happen before the dialogue starts. He describes Macomber's state of mind at the moment he notices that his wife has left the tent.

> ...he realized that his wife was not in the other cot in the tent. He lay awake with that knowledge for two hours. (p.1537)

A little further in the characters' conversation readers can be sure that Macomber and Margaret's relationship is conflictive. Macomber however is not deceived by his wife's break of a conversational maxim because he knows she has been unfaithful several times.

> "There wasn't going to be any of that. You promised there wouldn't be."
> "Well, there is now." she said sweetly.
> "You said if we made this trip that there would be none of that. You promised." (p.1537)

Henry, the male character in Lawrence's The Fox, breaks two conversational maxims: Manner and Quantity. Henry wants to stay in the farm with the women. Instead of asking them to stay there, or instead of manifesting his wish openly, he makes a statement in which his request is implicit, breaking in this way the maxim of Manner.

> 'There wants a man about the place', said the youth softly. (p.97)

His request, however, is not taken by the women,especially by Banford, who makes fun of his statement and tells him that they have a different opinion.

> 'Take care what you say', she interrupted. 'We consider ourselves quite efficient.' (p.97)

Henry also breaks the maxim of Quantity which tells participants of conversation not to give more nor less information than they are required, or than is necessary to clarify the speaker's intention to the hearer. After he has spent one night in the farm, he tells the women many

things they probably already know about the situation in town due to the war. He does not inform them of his intention to remain longer in the farm.

> 'Where am I going to find a place in the village to stay?' he said
> 'I don't know', said Banford. 'Where do you think of staying?'
> 'Well'- he hesitated - 'at the "Swan" they've go the soldiers who are collecting the hay for the army: besides, in the private houses, there's ten men and a corporal altogether billeted in the village, they tell me. I'm not sure where I could get a bed. (p.101)

The narrator signals for us that Henry is still making a request. Although he does not ask them directly, he waits for an answer.

> He left the matter to them (p.101)

In The Fox, March by not observing the maxim of Manner creats a problem for Henry to communicate with her. March starts talking and what she says is unclear. She does not observe Grice's maxim which tells participant of conversation to 'BE CLEAR'. Her speeches are obscure, and this prevents Henry from understanding.

> 'No' she said at last, 'I'm a fool. I know I'm a fool.'
> 'What for? he asked
> 'To go on with this business.'
> 'Do you mean me?' he asked.
> 'No, I mean myself. I'm making a fool of myself, and a big one.'
> 'Why, because you don't want to marry me, really?'
> 'Oh, I don't know whether I'm against it, as a matter of fact. That's just it. I don't know.' (p.138)

The narrator provides the reader with information about Henry's confused state.

> He looked at her in the darkness, puzzled. He did not in the least know what she meant. (p.139)

The reader then is informed that March's non-

observance of the maxim of Manner caused Henry a problem. He is 'puzzled' and can not decode successfully March's message.

In Hemingway's The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber, Wilson and Margaret hold a conflicting dialogue in which Wilson breaks Grice's maxim of Quality. Wilson uses this breakage to torture Margaret. He knows that she has killed Macomber, an idea he expresses in one of his speeches. After stating that he is aware of what really happened, he acknowledges the incident as an accident. He knows his second statement is false. He is in control of the situation and wants Margaret to suffer. Conflict becomes clear in the dialogue in the repetition of the expression 'Stop it' uttered by Margaret. This repetition gives an idea of her despair facing this situation and holding such a dialogue.

> "That was a pretty thing to do," he said in a toneless voice. "He would have left you too."
> "Stop it," she said.
> "Of course it's an accident", he said "I know that".
> "Stop it", she said.
> "Don't worry", he said. "There will be a certain amount of unpleasantness but I will have some photographs taken that will be very useful at the inquest. There's the testimony of the gun-bearers and the driver too. You're perfectly all right."
> "Stop it", she said. (p.1547)

In my review of Grice's theory I discussed the concept of Implicature. Writers of literature frequently exploit this concept when presenting character's speeches.

The two waiters in Hemingway's A clean, well lighted Place are talking and one of them tells the other something the meaning of which the listener has to implicate. It is late at night and the younger waiter is

in a hurry. He tells his workmate, the older waiter several times that he wants to go home. The reply of the older waiter is apparently unrelated to what his partner in conversation has expressed previously. The younger waiter, who hears shows that he has implicated therefore understood the question as an offense.

> 'And you? You have no fear of going home before your usual hour?'
> 'Are you trying to insult me?'
> 'No, hombre, only to make a joke.' (p.473)

At the moment the younger waiter states that he considered the question 'And you? You have no fear of going home before your usual hour?' offensive, we can understand it as a reference to his wife's faithfulness. The second speech of the older waiter reinforces the idea. He excuses himself and labels his question as a 'joke', i.e., he is trying to say he didn't really mean to be offensive, although of course he is lying. The older waiter, who says 'And you? You have no fear of going home before your usual hour?' is not being clear because what he says has an extra meaning which is picked up by the listener as an offense. The conflict in this case is diminished because the older waiter, who was offensive excuses himself.At the moment he excuses himself, however he breaks the maxim of Quality because he is aware of the falseness in his speech: he did mean to be offensive.

I discussed initially some ways in which characters break Grice's maxims for the CP and can still be considered cooperative. Secondly, I illustrated how characters break conversational rules, causing some kind of problem in the conversation and are therefore non-cooperative.

Chapter 2

The dialogue: Exchange Structure and the Turn-Taking System

2.1. Coulthard and Brazil's Exchange Structure Theory

In this chapter I intend to analyse the dialogue proper in structural terms. It is my intention to make an analysis of the form by which writers organise and distribute the speeches of their characters. I want, by the examination of selected pieces of conversation, to evidence that conflict among characters is conveyed also through the organization of dialogue. I propose to begin with a brief review of Coulthard and Brazil's(1981) notion of Exchange Structure. Then I will proceed to apply the Exchange Structure Theory for Classroom Interaction to the analysis of fictional interaction.

Coulthard and Brazil analyse spoken discourse and classify its elements. Their purpose is to organise and describe the units of discourse.The elements of spoken discourse are listed below, in an ascending scale from the right to the left.

TRANSACTION <- (SEQUENCE) <- EXCHANGE <- MOVE <- ACT

A move is a single contribution by one speaker, as for

example a greeting 'Hello'. One move may consist of one or more acts as in 'Hello' 'Have you seen my English book?' We have a greeting which is one act, followed by a request for information which is another act. Both constitute, however, a single move. An exchange involves the participation of two speakers. A question-answer sequence is an exchange. A transaction is a big semantic chunk or topic, made up of exchanges.

In their analysis of classroom discourse (1981), the authors describe the structure of an exchange (participation of two speakers, like question-answer sequence) as follows:

INITIATION -> RESPONSE -> (FOLLOW UP)

In classroom discourse, the teacher almost always initiates. The student responds. The follow up element is in parentheses because it may or may not be present, though it is often necessary and is sometimes called feed-back, i.e., the evaluation the teacher has to provide for a student's answer. The absense of follow-up in classroom interaction may signal negative feed-back.

A description of exchange structure as such can be used to analyse other kinds of interaction. When people talk, there is always someone who initiates, either by asking a question or making a comment which calls for another comment. Sometimes the structure is broken, like when someone asks a question and gets no answer.In fiction we frequently find incomplete exchanges. The breakage of an exchange usually signals conflict among characters. The report of silence is relevant to signal problems, especially if it comes after a question.

Levinson (1983) says that silence has two significances: no 'channel contact' (for example two people speaking different languages trying to comunicate) or evidence of a problem. I believe that we can apply the description of

exchange structure to fictional dialogue.I have an example of exchange extracted from Steinbeck's Of Mice and Men (1949) which fits perfectly the model under discussion. The characters Lennie and George are talking and we find a typical classroom discourse exchange, where the character Lennie plays the role of the student, who needs feed-back for his response. George is the teacher, i.e., he is in charge of the discourse by initiating and passing the floor to Lennie.

> 'What you gonna say tomorrow when the boss asks you questions?'
> 'I... I ain't gonna say a word.'
> 'Good boy! That's fine, Lennie! (p.18)

The structure for this exchange can be outlined as follows:

> I 'What you gonna say tomorrow when the boss asks you questions?'
> R 'I... I ain't gonna say a word.'
> Follow-up (Feed-back) 'Good boy! That's fine, Lennie!'

I will now illustrate how characters can break the structure of dialogues and point out the effects of such breaks.

In Lawrence's The Fox, in the first piece of conversation between March and Henry,the greeting-greeting sequence is broken.

> 'Hello!'
> 'What do you want?' she cried in a sharp voice.
> 'Hello! What's wrong!'
> 'I shall shoot!' cried March. 'What do you want?' (p.92)

Henry is trying to initiate the conversation; March, however, refuses to play her part. He wants to start communication. March, on the other hand, is aggressive and non-cooperative.In this way we have an initiation which is constituted by a greeting (I: 'Hello') followed by a question ('What do you want?') which is not the response for the initiation. There is a break in the normal

expected sequence which for this case would be:

I Hello

R Hello (or any other expression semantically analogous)

Another structural break occurs when the question-answer sequence is broken by Henry who does not answer March's question 'What do you want?' We notice then a breakage in the I R sequence. If the initiation is a question, the expected sequencial element is an answer to such a question. This expected sequence however can not be detected in this exchange.

I (question) 'What do you want?'she cried in a sharp voice.

R (no answer)'Hello! What's wrong!'

Henry is trying to think about what he is going to say. In order to give himself some time to conceive of a way to break the barrier March has put between them, he keeps repeating 'What's wrong? What's wrong?instead of answering her question.

> 'I shall shoot!' cried March. What do you want?'
> 'Why, what's wrong? What's wrong?' came the soft, wondering, rather scared voice and a young soldier, with his heavy kit on his back, advanced into the dim light.' (p.92)

The breakage is again in the I R sequence because a question-question sequence appears, instead of a question-answer one. These breakages are very significant in the sense that they make evident the conflict between the characters Henry and March. Their dialogues are full of evidence that theirs is not a successful comunicative situation. Readers feel the presence of tension and lack of cooperation on the part of both participants.

A bit further into the narrative, March also uses the technique of throwing another question when it is time to answer. As Henry did before, she wants time to

think about the answer. We have then a question-question sequence.

I (question) 'What made you jump like that this evening?'he asked
R (another question) 'When did I jump?' she retorted looking at him (p.113)

We have in fact in this exchange, an I in the R position. March has broken the sequence with the intention of getting round his question. By asking him a question for whose answer she does not feel any interest, she just wants time to think and perhaps control her emotions.

I assume that conversationalists often use the technique of throwing a question back to another question, in order to get time to prepare a way to get round the undesired question. If we observe, for example, people being interviewed, especially politicians who are experts in the art of convincing hearers, we may notice that they frequently leave questions unanswered by throwing a question back. Writers of fiction exploit this technique of real interaction to present their characters'speeches.

There are other examples of breakages in Henry and March's exchanges. Henry insists on receiving an answer to a question. March is particularly interested in ignoring the question, or at least postponing the moment of answering it. She breaks the structure by not answering and uses a time saving technique, pretending she does not know what he refers to.

'But won't you answer my question?' he said, lowering his voice still more.
'I don't know what question you mean.' (p.114)

Later, she clearly states that she is being noncooperative and is deliberately violating Grice's maxim of Quantity. The dialogue which follows shows that the characters are making reference to the metalinguistic level when they mention and specify. the question.

> 'Yes, you do. Of course you do. I mean the question of you marryng me.'
> 'No, I shan't answer that question', she said flatly. (p.114)

There follows a series of initiations by Henry not followed by any kind of response by March. She simply refuses to take part in the conversation. We almost have the impression that Henry is performing a monologue.

> 'Won't you?' The queer young laugh came on his nose again. 'Is it because I'm like the fox? Is that why?' And still he laughed.
> 'I wouldn't let that put you against me', he said, 'Let me turn the lamp now', and come and sit down a minute!
> 'You'll stay a moment', he said.
> 'Just a moment'...'I'm sure you don't really think I'm like the fox', he said...
> 'Do you now?'
> 'Won't you answer my question? Won't you now?' came his soft lingering voice. (p.p. 114-115)

None of these speeches makes March take part in the conversation. We only get information about her muteness, and some kinesic information as well,through the discourse of the narrator. Her first speech, after a long silence,is not a response to all of Henry's appeals. She responds to Banford's call.

> 'There's Jill! cried March, starting and drawing erect. (p.115)

At this moment Henry and Banford start pressing March for a response. Henry keeps on asking his initial question,the one which March has already refused to answer, and Banford calls from upstairs.

> 'You will, won't you? You will?' he insisted softly.
> 'Nellie! Nellie! What ever are you so long for?'
> came Banford's faint cry from the outer darkness.
> 'You will, won't you? Say yes! Say yes! (p.115)

March finally submits to Henry's persuasion and answers his question.

> 'Yes! Yes! Anything you like! Anything you like! Only let me go! Only let me go! Jill's calling!' (p.115)

In Steinbeck's Of Mice and Men, Lennie and George's dialogues often present broken exchanges. George sometimes is dominated by fits of anger towards Lennie's idiocy and in explosions of rage, breaks the question-answer sequence.

> 'Where we going George?'
> 'So you forgot that already, did you? I gotta tell you again, do I? Jesus Christ. You're a crazy bastard.' (p.9)

Lennie's initiation, which is constituted by a question 'Where we going, George?' does not have the expected response. George breaks the structure by not answering and is non-cooperative towards his partner in conversation. This kind of exchange normally indicates conflicting relationships. In the case of the example above, the conflict is diminished because of Lennie's softness. He is like a child afraid of his parents's reprimend and excuses himself, instead of having an aggressive reaction towards George, what would normally be expected.

> 'I forgot', Lennie said softly' (p.9)

Some exchanges reveal a significant aspect for readers's full appreciation of Steinbeck's narrative: Lennie's dependence on George. George is the one who dominates in the relationship. He is in control of the discourse, initiating and passing the floor to Lennie, whenever he wants a response from the other.

> 'Ok. Now when we go in to see the boss, what you gonna do?'
> 'I...ain't gonna say nothin'. Jus' gonna stan' there.
> 'Good boy. Thats swell. You say that over two, there times so you won't forget it.' (p.11)

We have: George I Q, Lennie R answer and George evaluates Lennie's response with a positive follow-up. Lennie fears that he may disappoint George by making a mistake. Perhaps Lennie feels that if he makes a mistake George will not protect him anymore.This may be the reason why he obeys George and behaves like an insecure student who is frightened that the teacher may provide a negative evaluation for his answer.

In Ring Lardner's The Love Nest, we find a character who frequently breaks the structure of exchanges. Gregg is dominating, a characteristic which a manifested in conversation. He always initiates and sometimes he asks people questions and before he allows them time to answer, he goes on stating what he would say if the question was directed to him. In other words he breaks the structure of exchanges, as in the example below, when he inhibits his guest from saying what he really would like to. The narrator's gloss of Bartlett's speech tell us that Bartlett feels obliged to imitate Gregg.

> "Will you have yours straight or in a high ball?" Gregg inquired of his guest.
> "Personally I like good whisky straight. I mean mixing it with water spoils the flavor.
> I mean whisky like this, it seems like a crime to mix it with water."
> "I'll have mine straight", said Bartlett, who would have preferred a high-ball. (p.395)

In a passage of Lawrence's Sons and Lovers, we have a clear illustration of conflict in Paul's mother's refusal to give a response to his initiations. The mother was cross with the son because of his love affair with Miriam. One of the aspects greatly emphasized by Lawrence In this novel is the almost Oedipal relationship of Paul with his mother. Mrs.Morel feels an extreme Possessiveness in relation to Paul. She can not think of losing him to

another woman who is going to get hold of him. She sees other women, especially Miriam, as rivals. Each time the son tries to discusss Miriam or anything related to her, the mother shows her aversion for the subject.

In the passage I will quote below, Paul starts to tell his mother that Miriam and her brother Edgar will come to tea. The narrator signals for us the character's break of exchanges by reporting her silence.

> "Edgar and Miriam are coming to tea to-morrow."
> She did not answer.
> "You don't mind?"
> Still she did not answer. (p.191)

The conversation continues with Paul's mother talking, however not contributing explicitly for the completion of the exchange. He insists on getting from her an answer for 'Do you mind if they come?'

> "Do you?" he asked
> "You know whether I mind or not."
> "I don't see why you should. I have plenty of meals there." (p.191)

Although Paul's mother does not state explicitly that she wouldn't like Miriam and Edgar to come, Paul understands that she really means it. We know an implicature was worked out when we read the beginning of Paul's subsequent speech 'I don't see why you should.'

The conflictive scene is frequently detected. One night when Paul comes home later than usual from Miriam's house, his mother treats him very bitterly and he does not even feel like defending himself. Mrs. Morel's initiations are left without response.

> She glanced at the clock and said, coldly and rather tired:
> "you have been far enough to-night".
> His soul, warm and exposed from contact with the girl, shrank.
> "You must have been right home with her", his mother continued.
> He would not answer.

> "She must be wonderfully fascinating, that you can't get away from her, but must go trailing eight miles at this time of night." (p.161)

Mrs. Morel seems to be performing a monologue in this beginning of conversation. It is just after three initiations that Paul gives her a response.

The Miriam of Sons and Lovers rebels against her brother's chauvinist attitudes. They want women to be submissive and servile. Miriam's mother accepts her sons' attitude and tries to persuade Miriam to accept it as well. We find the two women discussing and breaking the sequence of exchanges by answering to qestions with other questions.

> "....But how often I asked you not to answer Edgar back? Can't you let him say what he likes?"
> "But why should he say what he likes?"
> "Aren't you strong enough to bear it, Miriam, if even for my sake? Are you so weak that you must wrangle with them?" (p.147)

In The French Lieutenant's Woman, by John Fowles, Charlie and Sarah finally meet after a long period in which he looked desperately for her.He finds her living in a nice house and apparently, she has a special sort of relation with the man who owns the house. Sarah however avoids to talk about it and even refuses to confirm Charlie's suspicion. A very interesting exchange is found in the conversation they have. Charlie makes a statement which has the function of a question. Sarah, responds to his initiation however she lets his question unanswered, a fact which is picked up by the character Charlie.

> "But you have found newer and more pressing affection."
> "I did not think ever to see you again."
> "That does not answer my question."
> "I have forbidden myself to regret the impossible."
> "That still does not _____". (p.350)

At this point the narrator states that the character's speech was interrupted. Only now Sarah will answer Charlie's question and complete the exchange which up to here was left incomplete.

> "Mr. Smithson, I am not his mistress." (p.350)

Connie and Clifford in Lady Chatterley's Lover discuss the conflict between the ruling class (the bosses) and the people who work for the ruling class and have to submit to the will of the boss. Clifford is seen as a representative of the ruling class and Connie condemns him for being in this position. She does not accept the dominance of people over other people; in other words she criticizes and rejects her own husband who dominates economically. In their dialogue, they both let questions unanswered as a clear sign of conflict.

> "...Everything is sold. You don't give one hearbeat of real sympathy. And besides, who has taken away from the people their natural life and manhood, and given them this industrial horror? Who has done that?"
> "And what must I do?" he asked, green.
> "Ask them to come and pillage me?"
> "Why is Tevershall so ugly, so hideous? Why are their lives so hopeless?" (p.195)

Connie accuses Clifford and he understands what she means with her first question. Clifford however refuses to take any responsability and just throws her another question. Connie goes on with her criticism and keeps asking him questions. He finally provides an answer whose meaning she has to work out. He is once more refusing to take responsability for the problem and the way of living of the people in Tevershall. Clifford states that there is nothing he can do because it is not his fault.

In another instance, Connie and Clifford, have a dialogue in which both are irritated. She has been away

from home for a long time and he has sent the servants after her. Clifford asks her several questions without giving her time to answer. He is so infuriated that one can compare his talk to 'thought'. It is as if the narrator was presenting the character's thought instead of talk. The speech resembles the 'stream of consciousness' because the ideas flow in a continuous. Connie challenges him by answering to all his questions with another question.

> "Where have you been, woman? You've been gone hours, hours, and in a storm like this! What the hell do you go to that bloody wood for? What have you been up to? It's hours even since the rain stopped, hours! Do you know what time it is?
> You've enough to drive anybody mad. Where have you been?" What in the name of hell have you been doing?"
> "And what if I don't choose to tell you?" (p.251)

When Clifford receives a letter from Connie in which she tells him that she won't come back and asks for divorce, he suffers a terrible blow. He is not actually surprised, but he dreads to see the realization of his suspicion. Mrs. Bolton finds him in a state of shock and gets no answer for her initiations.

> "Why, Sir Clifford, whatever's the matter?"
> No answer! .....
> "Is there a pain? Do try and tell me where it hurts you. Do tell me!"
> No answer (p.314)

Silence has in this situation special significance. It marks the character's incapacity to overcome the shock suffered by the news he received. Clifford's breaks of the expected question-answer sequence indicates his anguish and the conflict here established between him and Connie by means of the letter. The letter stands for Connie.He feels as if Connie herself

was there telling him she would run away from him.

From the group of boys lost in the desert island of Golding's Lord of the Flies (1954), Jack and Ralph, the ones who have tendencies for leadership are usually in conflict along the narrative.There is a passage in which the boys's attempt to communicate proves disastrous. Ralph thinks about making a fire for a ship to find and rescue them. Jack is in a delirium thinking about hunting. In Ralph's speeches, fire is the topic. We have then an apparent initiation-response sequence. The break however is perceived when the sequence seems meaningless and when the character Ralph himself points out the discordance in their dialogue.

> "They're put on green branches", muttered Ralph.
> "I wonder"
> He screwed up his eyes and swung to search the horizon.
> "Got it!"
> Jack shouted so loudly that Ralph jumped.
> "What?Where? Is it a ship?"
> But Jack point to the high declivities that led down from the mountain to the flatter part of the island.
> "Of course! They'll lie up there-they must, when the sun's too hot-"
> Ralph gazed bewildered at his rapt face.
> "-they get up high. High up and in the shade, resting during the heat, like cows at home-"
> "I thought you saw a ship!"
> "We could steal up on one-paint our faces so they wouldn't see- perhaps surround them and then Indignation took away Ralph's control.
> "I was talking about smoke! Don't you want to be rescued? All you can talk about is pig, pig, pig,!" (p.49)

As the examples above illustrate, a break in the expected sequence in the structure of exchanges in fictional conversations may signal the existence of conflict. A character may reveal aggressive behavior towards another by leaving a question unanswered (for example throwing back another question or simply keeping silent). This is basically the kind of break which I found in the data analysed.

2.2. The turn taking system

I want to apply the theory for the Turn-Taking System together with Coulthard and Brazil's Exchange Structure Theory because both focus on the organization of the dialogue, i.e., they analyse oral discourse in terms of form. As I have previously stated, I believe that writers of literature base on the way natural conversation is processed to present their character's speeches.

Sacks, Jefferson and Shegloff (1978)base their theory for the turn-taking system in a very simple assertion: that in every conversation a basic and observable fact is that the roles of speaker and listener change. No one can talk all the time, nobody can only listen. People naturally engage in conversations and they want to talk as well as to listen. Another rule of conversation is that each participant talks at a time. These are rules; we know, however, they are not always followed in normal conversation. People frequently interrupt each other, talk at the same time, and there are persons who do not want to pass the floor, i.e., to let others have a chance to talk. I believe that writers take characteristics of conversation into account when they present direct speech of the characters. It is certainly

hard to express in written form things like hesitations, overlaps, silences. Writers have to gloss for the reader to understand. There is no way we can infer when a person looks down, keeps silent or stands up. The writer has to tell us.

In Melville's Bartleby we have a very good exemple of rule breaking in the main character's refusal to answer questions. A question is normally followed by an answer. We generally have a question-answer pair sequence, which Sacks, Jefferson and Shegloff call adjacency pair. Melville's character breaks the rule when he simply keeps silent after a question addressed to him. He does not take a turn which is offered to him, therefore he interferes in the normal organization of conversation. However, the attitude of Bartleby has a special significance in the narrative. He is an introvert; he finds it difficult to trust anyone or anything outside his inner world. Bartleby's silence does not mean he is impolite or rude. It conveys all the sadness of a person who is not able to talk, to reveal anything about himself to anyone. The narrator tries to make Bartleby trust him by treating him in a gentle way, almost as a father deals with a stubborn child, tenderly trying to persuade.

> 'Bartleby', said I, gently calling to him behind his screem. (p.79)
> 'Bartleby' said I, in a stil gentler tone, 'come here; I am not going to ask you to do anything you would prefer not to- I simply wish to speak to you. (p.80)

This last passage perfectly resembles the way an adult appeals to a child, wanting the child to believe that he, the adult is dominated rather than dominator.The narrator tries again to get answer from Bartleby.

> 'Will you tell me, Bartleby, where were you born?'
> 'I would prefer not to.' (p.80)

Bartleby's answer is in a way equivalent to silence. We

can not say that we have got here a question-answer pair, because the 'answer' does not provide the information demanded. Similar sequences are repeated with questions followed either by silences or stated refusals.

> 'Will you tell me anything about yourself?'
> 'I would prefer not to.'
> 'But what reasonable objection can you have to speack to me? I feel friendly towards you.'
>
> ---
>
> 'What is your answer, Bartleby' said I, after waiting a considerable time for a reply, during which his countenance remained immovable, only there was the faintest conceivable tremor of the white attenuated mouth.
> 'At present I prefer to give no answer', he said, and retired into his hermitage.(p.80)

We could get similar data from oral conversation.In normal conversation aspects like the kinesics- the body movements of the persons- help to understand better. We can observe the eyes, the lips, the hand gestures, etc. In written conversation the help comes from the writer. In Bartleby, the narrator tells us when Bartleby keeps silent 'no reply' (p.80); he informs about Bartleby's eye movements 'he did not look at me while I spoke, but kept his glance fixed upon my bust of Cicero, which, as I then sat, was directly behind me, some inches above my head.' (p.80); and he chooses lexical items which perfectly signal Bartleby's introspection'...and retired into his hermitage'.(p.80)

We also have an example of rule breaking in conversation by the narrator. After he dismisses Bartleby and asks him to leave, without being obeyed he gets irritated. His attitude changes from calm and persuasive to explosive and infuriated. He gives up being gentle and falls into an agitated mood, asking one question after the other, without allocating the turn for Bartleby to answer. He needs desperately an explanation, any reply to

pluck him out of the terrible state of ignorance in which he finds himself. He lets questions come to his mouth in a continuous like the flow of thought.

> Are you ready to go on and write down? Are you eyes recovered? Could you copy a small paper for me this morning? Or help examine a few lines? or step round to the post-office? In a word, will you do anything at all, to give a coloring to your refusal to depart the premises? (p.87)

Bartleby remains silent even before this obvious demonstration of nervousness and loss of control. It seems he is really made out of another material which differentiates him from humans. The narrator himself compares him to 'The last column of some ruined temple...' (p.84)

In The fox readers can perceive the conflict in the character's conversation, especially by the organization of turns. When Henry tells Banford that he and March intend to marry, a tense atmosphere is felt. Banford refuses to believe, or to accept the idea. She inquires March about the veracity of the news. At the moment she asks March a question she definitely allocates the turn for her to talk. Henry, however takes the turn and answers the question himself.

> 'I'll never believe it, Nellie', she cried. 'It's absolutely impossible!'
> .....
> 'Why? Why shouldn't you believe it? asked the youth, with all his soft, velvety impertinence in his voice.

From the time when Henry takes the turn, he and Banford go on talking and all their speeches reveal insults and offenses. The narrator glosses one of Banford's subsequent speeches with said Banford, with that straying, mild tone of remoteness which made her words even more insulting. (p.117)

The narrator also informs the reader of Henry's emotional

state, what confirms our idea of a verbal duel.

> He sat stiff in his chair, staring with hot, blue eyes from his scarlet face. An ugly look had come on his brow. (p.117)

In another passage we find an interesting problem in the allocation of fictional turns. There is a conversation involving the three characters. They are discussing whether March should go with Henry to Canada, or if she should stay and wait for him. Henry asks a question which is apparently directed to March.

> 'Don't you think', said the youth,' We ought to get married before I go- and then go together, or separate, according to how it happens?'

Banford takes the turn and answers it.

'I think it's a terrible idea', cried Banford. By looking only at what Henry said in the dialogue, it is not possible to know if he was directing the question to Banford or to March. Once Banford was taking part in the discussion, he could be asking her opinion. We need here help from the narrator to get information from the kinesics of conversation. When we are informed that'...the boy was watching March'p.127 we know that Banford took a turn which was not hers.

In this section I looked at how writers organise their characters's exchanges and make characters break the expected sequences for conversation.

The application of Exchange Structure Theory (2.1) and of Turn- Taking System (2.2.) to the literary texts, as has been amply illustrated, allows us to make the following considerations:

Usually, breaks in the expected sequence of the exchange and the non-observance of the basic rules for the turn-taking system indicate problem in the characters's interaction. These problems might be of different kinds, like difficulty in communication (for

example in Bartleby) and relations of dominance among characters (for example George and Lennie in Of Mice and Men and Lou Gregg in The Love Nest).

Chapter 3

Outside the dialogue - The Textual Environment

3.1. Stylistic variations in the presentation of TE

I will in this chapter proceed to a discussion of TEs which suggest the existence of conflict. In this section I will be looking at the context outside dialogue; therefore, I will point to signs of conflict provided by the narrator. The analysis presented here differs from the study in the two previous chapters, in the sense that now I will not focus on character-character interaction. My purpose is to exemplify TEs which can signal for readers that the characters who are talking are in conflict. The analysis will be divided in three parts: 1- TE- the verb 2- TE- the adverb 3- TE- the long sentence. I will initially look at the verb in the textual environment and try to point what kind of information it can give the reader. The same procedure will be followed in relation to the adverb in the TE and to TEs which are made up of long sentences.

Two different writers may have a different style of reporting speech directly.The gloss is everything

that comes together with the character's speech as in 'I don't know', she said loudly. For example,Ernest Hemingway's direct speech is generally glossed with neutral verbs like 'said' or 'asked'.

'What drink is that?' the gypsy asked.
'A medicine', Robert Jordan said.
'Do you want to taste it?'
'What is it for?'
'For everything', Robert Jordan said...
'Let me taste it', the gypsy said;
(For Whom The Bell Tolls, Ch III)

This way of reporting does not provide the reader with information about the character's relationships, emotions, etc.

D. H. Lawrence, in contrast with Hemingway, is fond of glossing speech in elaborate and different ways. Several different verbs can be found in his reports of direct speech.

he persisted (p.106)
she wailed (p.107)
challenged Banford (p.108)
ejaculated March (p.109)
she retorted (p.118)
he jerked out (p.117)
The Fox

When Lawrence uses a verb like 'said' which is neutral, he dresses it up, so to speak, with different complements. The result of this choice is that he expresses very successfully suprasegmental elements os speech acts like intonation, tone of voice, etc, as well as the characters' emotions and or feelings at the moment they 'speak'. This kind of TE tells the reader how characters feel about what they say. It may inform us about the existence of conflict between two characters. In some passages of The Fox I found several different complements for the verb say which are signs of conflict.

said Banford sarcastically (p.110)
she said crossly (p.11)
said Banford fretfully (p.113)
he said insidiously (p.115)

It is obvious that the authorial choices for glossing speeches are extremely significant to the reader at the moment that she/he tries to appreciate and understand the character's attitudes. The reader has to make more inferences in a Hemingway knid of text than in a Lawrence one. The information readers get through the TE will very according to the writer's style.

For my purpose in this section I have selected TEs which give readers information about the characters' relationships and their problems. The TE, as part of the dialogue, is by extension an element of narrative in which one can detect conflict.

3.2. The verb in the TE

I found, in my data, several different verbs which I classified as:

3.2.1. Verbs that label the character's voice

We have information about elements of speech like tone, intonation. The character's voice is analysed by the narrator, and in an indirect way readers get information about characters' feelings. If a narrator tells us 'he exploded',we can build several considerations about the character who did so. His voice was certainly high, his tone was harsh and it is obvious that he was angry, irritated or whatever. This kind of verb explicitly states conflict.

Connie and Clifford, in Lady Chatterley's Lover have a discussion in which both characters are angry. Connie has been away from the house longer than normal and Clifford sends the servants lo look for her.

His attitude irritates her. He is exasperated by her delay, and the climax of this irritation is marked by the verb exploded.

> "I must say, I don't think you need send the servants after me"! she burst out
> "My God!" he exploded "Where have you been woman?" (p.251)

A verb like 'explode' usually expresses an ultimate step in the gradation of an emotion. A character starts to show her/his anger somewhere early in the conversation. The anger is frequently shown to be raising in intensity and when it seems to get to the point of being uncontrolable, the narrator signals this climax for the reader by glossing a character's speech with the verb 'explode'.

In Cyrus Colter's A Man in the House, the male character Jack Robinson feels jealous of his niece's friends. He shows contempt for the idea that his niece will go out with a friend. His anger is glossed with: a verb (scowl), a sentence, another verb (spit) and finally with the verb explode. The reader can clearly perceive the gradation in the character's emotion.

> "Honey", Ruby said, this directing the wheedling tone at her husband, "I told you on the phone- Verna's got a date. She can't come."
> "Yeah, I know", Jack Robinson scowled. He turned on Verna. "Date with who?"
> "With Stanley".
> "Where you going?"
> "Over to a friend of his- to listen to records."
> "Who is this 'friend'?" Jack Robinson's voice was getting high and hoarse.
> "I've never met him- at least, I don't remember him. Stanley says I met him once at a dance, though-when I first came. His name is Julius."
> "Where's Julius's place?" He spat the words
> .....
> "I don't know any such thing! Jack Robinson exploded. "To me, all them little reefer-smokers are alike!" (p.p.534,5)

Clifford, the crippled husband in Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover, is annoyed by a problem with his wheel chair. The verb in the TEs of his speeches reveals how Clifford expresses verbally his irritation. Mellors is called to help and he asks Clifford a question about the chair. The narrator then, signals that Clifford is enraged by means of a verb which characterizes his voice.

> "...Has she gone wrong?"
> "Apparently!" snapped Clifford.

The same verb appears further in the conversation. Mellors wants to push the chair and Clifford refuses to accept this solution.

> "If I give her a push, she'll do it",
> said the keeper going behind.
> "Keep off!" snapped Clifford. "She'll do
> it by herself."

Here however, the reader can also perceive Clifford's irritation in the directive 'keep off'. The glossing verb reinforces the idea of conflict. And Clifford keeps on in his obstinacy, still showing his aggressive behavior and insisting on the fact that the chair will do it by itself.

> "Let her try!" snarled Clifford, with
> all his emphasis. (p.202)

In this section I analysed a group of verbs and classified them as verbs that label the character's voice. These verbs clearly indicate the character's mood. In the examples presented. it is possible to perceive that the narrator uses the verb in the TE to inform the reader of a character's anger, irritation, or any analogous feeling towards his partner in conversation.

I will now describe the kinds of adverbs which will be illustrated in the progress of the discussion.

3.3. The adverb in the TE

3.3.1. Adverbs that mark the character's voice

These adverbs, as the verbs exemplified previously furnish information about tone of voice, intonation. If the narrator labels a character's voice sarcastic, abrupt or sharp, she/he passes to the reader information about the character's feeling in an indirect way. The reader then has to make some inferences to know the character's state of mind. One who speaks abruptly is not likely to be calm, nor is a person who speaks sharply.

I will describe the second type of adverb classified before presenting and discussing examples of both.

3.3.2. Adverbs that indicate the character's state of mind.

I assume that this kind of adverb reveals the character's feelings directly. If we have, for example, 'he said angrily', we can certainly say that 'he is angry'. Adverbs like angrily, sarcastically, insultingly, etc., clearly express situations where conflict is likely to occur.

In The Fox, although the narrator provides us with some information about Banford's and March's state of mind, he avoids this kind of interference in Henry's speeches. We know only through the adverb that Henry is soft and courteous, characteristics which are most of the time attributed to his voice.

'You can', he said softly (p.107)
'But perhaps', he said softly and courteously
'Come and sit down a minute', he said softly (p.113)

The narrator does not tell us whether Henry is sarcastic, vague, disconsolate, etc, as he does for the female characters. The female characters' emotions are more exposed to the reader through the way the narrator glosses

their speeches. In the gloss of March's speeches, the textual environments, especially adverbs, show an indifferent, absent and laconic character.

> 'Yes, I suppose so', said March laconically (p.113)
> 'Are they Jill?' said March absently. (p.110)
> 'You say so anyway', said March laconically. (p.116)

Banford is the character whose emotions are more clearly revealed through TE. Adverbs are especially significant to signal to readers how the character feels at the moment she speaks. We know when Banford is ironic, when she is not feeling comfortable, etc.

> 'Cut a bit of bread, Nellie', said Banford uneasily. (p.102)
> 'I thought you'd gone lost', said Banford disconsolately. (p.107)
> 'A penny for them', said Banford sarcastically, (p.111)

When the narrator tells us that Banford says something 'sarcastically', she/he passes on to the reader through the TE, the character's intention of showing dislike for something. By labeling the way she speaks 'uneasily' and disconsolately', the narrator tells that something disturbs the character.

The narrator seems to unfold the women's minds to the reader, at the same time that he hides the man's. One wonders what purpose such technique could serve. I assume that he wants to evidence the superiority of the male character, in the sense that he is secure enough not to reveal his emotions.

March's speeches, as I have already said, are generally glossed with said or answered, followed by a complement which indicates mainly indifference, lack of interest in the conversation. Sometimes, when pieces of conversation involving the three characters are displayed, the reader has the impression that March is

paradoxically present and absent. She seems to be plunged into another world, a world of dream and fancy, and the only link with reality is her 'nonchalant' voice, coming out as answer to questions, as if she were an automaton.

> 'Oh, it's quite all right as far as I'm concerned, said, said March vaguely.(p.103)
> 'Yes, I suppose I have', she said nonchalantly. (p.127)

Another important information which can be perceived through the TE is that March answers indifferently only when the three of them are together, i.e., when she is in the presence of Banford and Henry. The fact that she feels attracted by Henry disturbs her, and she wants to hide this attraction from Banford. When she is alone with Henry, her indifference is substituted by fear. She starts to talk as a frightened woman who struggles helplessly not to be conquered by the youth's softness. These feelings are communicated to the reader by the narrator's TE. Here not only the adverb is important; adjectives (semi-conscious, half-articulate) are also significant to show the character's emotion.

> 'Oh, I can't, she wailed helplessly, half-articulate as if semi-conscious, and as if in pain, like one who dies. (p.107)

Banford express her challenging attitude towards Henry when she questions him about the arrangements for his marriage with March.

> 'Oh, go along', she cried petulantly.
> 'You must have some idea what you are going to do, if you ask a woman to marry you. Unless it's all a hoax. (p.126)

John Steinbeck's most impressive feature in reporting speech is the use of adverbs in the TE. This characteristic, very similar to Lawrence's style, provides us with a lot of information. In Of Mice and Men, it is possible to know some features of the two main characters, George and Lennie, just by looking at the adverbs which

follow mainly the verb say. George relates to anger, violence, aggression, domination, malice. Lennie, on the other hand, is soft, frightened, timid, patient.

> George sat up 'Aw right', he said brusquely.
> 'Ge'me that mouse! (p.12)
>
> Lennie looked sadly up at him. 'They was so little', he said apologetically. (p.13)
> Lennie watched him from over the fire. He said patiently 'I like 'em with ketchup.' (p.14)
>
> 'Be a damn good thing if you was', said George viciously. (p.24)
>
> 'We jus' come in', said Lennie softly (p.26)
>
> Lennie asked timidly: 'You ain't mad, George?' (p.29)
>
> George said brusquely: 'Well, he ain't now.' (p.30)
>
> George looked quickly down at him and then he took him by an ear and shook him. 'Listen to me, you crazy bastard', he said fiercely. (p.31)

The conflict in this case is effaced by Lennie's softness.

In the same work, in a piece of conversation between George and Curley one can feeel, especially by analysing the adverb in the TE, the presence of tension and conflict. Curley is looking for his wife, who had already been to the boys's place. George does not like Curley very much, neither does he like Curley's wife. He wants to show indifference, which irritates Curley.

> 'You seen a girl around here?' he demanded angrily.'
> George said coldly: 'bout half an hour ago maybe.'
> George stood still, watching the angry, little man. He said insultingly: 'She said- she was lookin' for you.' (p.34)

We have a picture of both men's irritation in the adverbs. Curley is initially angry at his wife; however, he directs his anger to Georg: when he asks his first question.George

gives his voice a cold tone, and when he answers to Curley's second question, the narrator signals that he was 'insulting' Curley. The insult is also marked in the pause marked by the narrator in 'She said-she was looking for you.' Tehre is an implication she only said she was looking for her husband, however her real aim was not this.

Mrs. Morel and her son Paul in Lawrence's Sons and Lovers are in one of a series of discussions in which Miriam is the pivot. Paul was in charge of taking care of some bread in the oven and he forgot about his chore because he was involved with Miriam. Mrs. Morel was irritated and Paul got exasperated with his mother's reprimand. The adverbs used in the gloss of both Paul's and his mother's speeches mark the conflictive scene.

> "I should have thought", said Mrs. Morel bitterly, "that she wouldn't have occupied you so entirely as to burn a whole ovenful of bread."
> "Beatrice was here as well as she."
> "Very likely. But we know why the bread is spoilt."
> " Why?" he flashed
> "Because you were engrossed with Miriam", replied Mrs. Morel hotly.
> "Oh very well- then it was not!" he replied angrily.
> .....
> "You'd better go to bed before your father comes in", said the mother harshly. (p.p.210-11)

Dick and Mary, the couple of Doris Lessing's novel The Grass is Singing often discuss over the problem of servants. On these occasions they are both exasperated because Dick thinks Mary demands too much from the natives. Mary, on the other hand, thinks it is natural that she calls her servants' attention whenever she is not satisfied with what they do.

> "I hope you are being careful with them", he said anxiously. "You have to go slow with them these days, you know. They are

all spoiled."
"I don't believe in treating them soft", she said scornfully.
"If I had my way, I'd keep them in order with the whip."
"That's all very well", he said irritably, "But where would you get the labor?"(p.131)

Mary aims her 'scorn' both at the servants and at her husband as well. Dick, as the listener, is also the aim of the woman's contempt. The narrator marks in the TE that Dick also shows aggravation by labeling his speech 'irritably'.

The discussion over servants show that the characters repeatedly find themselves in conflict, due to their different point of view in relation to the subject.

"How dare You!" she said, her voice stifled.
"If you must do these things, then you must take the consequences", said Dick wearily.
"It's my house" said Mary. "He's my boy, not yours. Don't interfere."
"Listen to me", said Dick curtly...(p.85)

If we consider the last two speeches: Mary's 'He's my boy, not yours. Don't interfere' and Dick's 'Listen to me', we perceive that the narrator chose to provide information in the TE just for Dick's speech. Mary's is clear enough to reveal that she is also angry.

After analysing two elements of the TE, I want now to consider TEs which are constituted by sentences.

3.4. Expanded TE: the long sentence

I have considered in this section mainly two types of sentences. Each one is described and examplified below.

3.4.1. Descriptive sentences

Under this terminology, were considered sentences that describe different aspects like: tone, mood, voice, physical features (mainly face expression). Such descriptions are usually done by the narrator to mark the existence of a problem.

In Lawrence's Women in Love, the narrator reveals Ursula and Birkin's exasperation towards each other by means of descriptive sentences in their speech gloss. Ursula is irritated because Birkin tells her he will go home to meet Hermione. She is jealous and he does not want to accept his attitude. They start to talk in exasperated and aggressive tones which are marked in the sentences.

> "Hermione is there", he said, in rather an uneasy voice.
> "She is going away in two days. I suppose I ought to say good-bye to her. I shall never see her again."
> .....
> "You don't mind, do you?" he asked irritably.
> "No, I don't care. Why should I? Why should I mind?"
> Her tone was jeering and offensive
> "That's what I ask myself", he said, "Why should you mind! But you seem to". His brows were tense with violent irritation. (p.297)

The narrator signals,by means of description of the tones used, the characters's displeasure.

Banford and Henry (The Fox), once again in antagonic positions in conversation, reveal their mutual dislike. The topic this time is March and Henry's probable marriage. The sentences glossing their speeches clearly illustrate the characters' anger towards each other.

> 'My word, she doesn't know what she's letting herself in for' said Banford, in her plaintive, drifting, insulting voice.

> 'What has it got to do with you, anyway?' said the youth in a temper.
> 'More than it has to do with you, probably', she replied, plaintive and venomous.(p.117)

In Hawthorne's The Scarlet Letter, the main conflict relates to a guilt which is not shared by the two so considered 'guilty ones'. The heroine Hester Prynne is condemned to wear the letter 'A' which stands for adultery sewed on her garment. Her partner in the 'guilty action', however, a minister of the Puritan community, hides his guilt throughout the narrative. It is just at the end that the revelation will take place. There are several indications in the narrator's gloss that the two characters suffer or get tense in relation to the idea of a 'stigma' on their breast. Hester gets worried when her little Pearl, in her intelligent innocence tries to linck a gesture of the minister with her mother's letter A.

> "Dost thou know, child, wherefore thy mother wears this letter?"
> "Truly do I!" answered Pearl, looking brightly into her mother's face. "It is for the same reason that the minister keeps his hand over his heart!"
> And what reason is that?" asked Hester, half smiling at the absurd incongruity of the child's observation; but on second thoughts turning pale. (p.196)

The change in the character's emotional state is marked in the TE, and her tension well illustrated in 'but on second thoughts turning pale'.

The mother even talks harshly to her child, something she did not use to, for fear that the girl by insisting forced her to reveal the minister's secret.

> "Mother! - Mother! - Why does the minister keep his hand over his heart?"
> "Hold thy tongue, naughty child" answered her mother, with an asperity that she had never permitted to herself before. (p.199)

3.4.2 Sentences which provide kinesic information

Sentences in which the narrator marks in the gloss the character's body movements can be very helpful for the reader to inderstand and detect the presence of some kind of conflict.

The relationship of the Morels in Lawrence's Sons and Lovers displays hostility, and the couple is frequently seen as antagonists. This can be understood mostly in the narrator's gloss. Mrs. Morel seems to play an imperious role. She is stronger and her speech glosses show it. Mr. Morel, on the other hand plays an insecure and dominated role in conversation. Mrs. Morel loves her son William's hair. Mr. Morel cuts it without asking her whether she would agree with it or not. The incident drives her very angry and she attacks him verbally. The sentences which gloss his speech show his inferior position. We have in fact a descriptive sentence (in a frightened tone) and a kinesic information sentence (bending his head to shield his eyes from hers).

> "I could kill you, I could" she said.
> "Yer non want to make a wench on 'im",
> Morel said, in frightened tone, bending his head to shield his eyes from hers. (p.15)

The narrator's indication that Mr. Morel did not want to look at Mrs. Morel is very significant.According to Morris in Men Watching

> To understand why the rules of human 'glancing' are so complex, it is necessary to appreciate that there is not one, but several reasons why we may want to look at someone, and several other reasons why we may want to look away. (p.71)

Mr. Morel is in this case wanting to avoid Mrs. Morel's eyes because he fears her.

Just when he is drunk, Mr. Morel stops talking and acting as the dominated. Alcohol provides him with

a power which he generally lacks and then he becomes aggressive and rude. The reader knows that he is being violent both verbally and physically. Mrs.Morel's position in these situations is of one who suffers and cries for the incident.

> "You're a liar!" he yelled, banging the with his fist.
> .....
> "The house is filthy with you", she cried.
> "Then get out on it-it's mine. Get out on it!" he shouted.
> .....
> "And I would", she cried, suddenly shaken into tears of impotence.
> .....
> "Go", he cried thickly, lifting his fist. (p.p.22-23)

In another passage, the Morels and their son William find themselves in conflict because William has ripped the collar of a boy from the neighborhood. Mr.Morel is enraged and he wants to punish the boy. Mrs.Morel, once again proves her strenght and defeats her husband in conversation.

> "He'll look ridiculous before I've done wi'him!" shouted Morel, rising from his chair and glaring at his son.
> "Go out!" Mrs. Morel commanded her son.
> .....
> "I'll gi'e him 'go out'!" he shouted like an insane thing.
> "What!" cried Mrs. Morel, panting with rage.
> "You shall not touch him for her telling, you shall not!"
> .....
> "Don't you dare!" she cried. "What!" he shouted, baffled for the moment. "what!"
> .....
> "Only dare!" she said, in a loud ringing voice. (p.51)

Here we also have sentences which provide kinesic information (rising from his chair, glaring at his son) and a set of descriptive sentences (like an insane thing, panting with rage, baffled for the moment, in a loud

ringing voice). The descriptive sentences illustrate both characters's exasperation. After this set of speeches, the narrator tells us that Mrs. Morel had her victory over Mr. Morel. The narrator informs the reader that 'He was afraid of her. In a towering rage, he sat down' (p.51) and so we can say that the woman was once again stronger. Although both were angry and the glosses of their conversation displayed their mutual acrimony, she won.

Mrs. Morel is a rude man with no capacity to maintain a discussion, so he frequently resorts to physical violence. In an incident between Mr. Morel and his son Paul, the narrator uses, in the speech glosses, sentences indicating the father's aggressive behavior and the son's rudeness in an attitude of self-defense. Mr. Mr. Morel has taken a piece of pork-pie which Mrs. Morel had bought for Paul. At the moment he is told the pork-pie was not for him, Mr. Morel furiously flings it into the fire and both father and son start a violent dialogue.

> Paul started to his feet.
> "Waste your own stuff!" he cried
> "What-what!" suddenly shouted Morel, jumping up and clenching his fist. "I'll show yer, yer young jockey!"
> "All right!" said Paul viciously, putting his head on one side.
> "Show me."
> .....
> "Ussha!" hissed the father, swiping round with a great stroke just past his son's face.
> "Right!" said Paul, his eyes upon the side of his father's mouth, where in another instant his fist would have hit. (p.214)

In Melville's Bartleby, a story I have mentioned in the second chapter, the narrator's irritation towards Bartleby's refusal to do what he is asked to is signaled to the reader by means of sentences in which kinesics information are relevant to help interpret the character's attitude.

> "Prefer not to", echoed I, rising in high excitement, and crossing the room with a stride.
> "What do you mean? Are you moonstruck? I want you to help me compare this sheet here-take it", and I thrust it towards him. (p.107)

We clearly perceive that the narrator's gestures are an indication of his anger and also a sign that he feels like punishing Bartleby.

In this section I exemplified how elements of the TE can signal for readers the existence of conflict among characters. I considered three distinct elements of the narrator's gloss: the verb, the adverb, and the sentence.

I want at this point to describe how we can put together the analysis developed in chapter two with the one developed in the progress of this chapter. The internal structure of the dialogue is in most cases sufficient to denounce conflicting scenes. As we could see, narrators manipulate the structure of the dialogues by making their characters break expected sequences. The reader, who is familiar with the organization of conversation once she/he has been exposed to the experience of conversation thoughout her/his life is then able to perceive the existence of conflict. The outside features of the dialogue, i.e., the so called TE generally reinforce the notion that the reader had already captured in the internal structure. The outside features can be helpful especially because, it is very difficult, in written conversation to give information about the suprasegmental elements of speech acts which are perceived in spoken dialogues. The narrator then uses the gloss as an elements to help express what can not be transmitted in the character's speech. I want to emphasize that both the internal structure and the outside features of the dialogue proved to be a source of conflict in the narrative.

Chapter 4

The reader and the absense of TE- A mini research

4.1. Description of the experiment with Hemingway's text

In the previous chapter, I discussed the textual environment and stylistic variations in its presentation. In Hemingway's texts, as I have already stated, we can notice very little or no interference of the narrator in the character's speech, i.e., Hemingway usually does not tell us his characters's attitudes about what they say. We can take for analysis eight lines of conversation where the characters 'talk' in Free Direct Speech.

> "Where have you been?"
> "I just went out to get a breath of air."
> "You did, like hell."
> "What do you want me to say, darling?"
> "Where have you been?"
> "Out to get a breath of air."
> "That's a new name for it. You are a bitch."
> "Well, you're a coward." (p.1537)
>
> **The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber**

Macomber and his wife have a discussion and,although their speeches are not glossed at all, it is not very difficult

to conceive of complements for say or ask in textual environment. Readers can infer that she is ironic and she mocks his seriousness. He is serious and infuriated, especially by her indifference. Each reader can think of a textual environment according to his/her own imagination, I myself would think of something like:

> "Where have you been?" he demanded
> from her.
> "I just went out to get a breath of air",
> she answered in an amusing tone.
> "You did, like hell", he shouted
> "What do you want me to say, darling?"
> she smiled provokingly
> "Where have you been?" came his angry
> voice.

I want in this chapter to present two experiments os readers' reactions to the absence of TE. I want to show that readers are capable of perceiving the existence of conflict even if there is no interference from the narrator, i.e., even if the narrator does not provide any gloss for a character's speech. I worked initially, with a group of 24 people. The people who took part in the experiment were students and teachers from 'Curso de Letras' of UFSM. Their age varies from 18 to 45. The students were from the fourth, fifth and eighth semester. The group was given a story to read. Then, they were to concentrate on a piece of conversation for which the writer had not provided any gloss, and to write TEs of their own to that dialogue. My expectation was that people would make similar inferences, i.e., they would create similar TEs, signaling that the characters in the dialogue were in conflict. They would, I assumed, either by means of the reporting verb, an adverb or even a long sentence indicate the presence of conflict. I have worked with the piece of conversation I have presented initially from Hemingway's The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber. I will proceed listing the TEs created by the participants

in the experiment.

4.2. Analysis of the TEs created by readers for Hemingway's text

For the first speech "Where have you been?" I have got:

1. he demanded brusquely
2. he asked her sharply
3. he asked angrily
4. Francis asked. His voice showed aggravation
5. he asked nervously
6. asked Macomber suspiciously
7. the husband asked angrily
8. he inquired
9. he asked irritably
10. he queried grimly
11. he asked nervously
12. said Macomber furiously
13. asked Macomber irritated
14. shouted Macomber
15. asked Macomber sharply
16. asked Macomber with an angry voice
17. he asked with his head under the sheet.
18. he asked a little bit angry
19. his voice showed irritation
20. he asked furiously
21. asked Macomber a little suspicious
22. .....
23. he asked her
24. .....

All the TEs created by readers indicate that Macomber is agitated and agressive. He is seen in an angry mood, as a furious and suspicious character. Several adverbs that convey a severe tone were repeatedly used: angrily (2) furiously (2) sharply (2). One TE provides kinesic information (with his head under the sheet) that in this case is not related to body movements expressing physical violence. Not one of the added TEs shows a calm character.

For the second speech 'I just went out to get a breath of air' which reveals the character Margaret, the

TEs created by readers were:

1. she answered disguisedly
2. she answered indifferently
3. she said indifferently
4. Margaret answered in a casual tone
5. .....
6. answered the woman calmly
7. Margaret answered, trying to avoid a discussion
8. she answered
9. Margaret assured him
10. murmured Margaret
11. she said calmy
12. replied Margaret absent-mindedly
13. she asked as if she wasn't understanding the motive of his irritation
14. she asked softly while she brushed her long hair
15. she asked
16. she asked softly
17. she said innocently
18. she asked ironically
19. .....
20. she asked calmly
21. she said ironically
22. she said curiously
23. she asked
24. she answered impassively

Margaret is viewed by most readers as calm and indifferent. She is not worried about Macomber's nervousness and agitation. One says that she pretends not to understand why Macomber is irritated. Another portrays in his/her gloss a futile Margaret who seems to regard more seriously the act of brushing her hair than the act of answering to her husband's question. Readers in general see her 'calmness' 'irony' and'softness'. She does not lose her temper.

With the information provided by the TEs for these two first speeches, the characters can be seen in a clearly contrastive mood.

	AGGRESSIVE		CALM
HE	NERVOUS	SHE	INDIFFERENT
	AGITATED		CASUAL

Macomber's second speech 'You did, like hell was glossed as follows:

1. he said crying
2. he said angrily
3. he said tense
4. At this point, his face was getting dark with anger
5. he cried
6. he said sharply
7. he replied, not hiding his anger
8. he shouted
9. he said sharply
10. he said abruptly
11. he said trembling
12. cried Macomber
13. he said furiously
14. he shouted leaping out of bed
15. he said impatiently
16. .....
17. he cried, taking the sheet off his head
18. he yelled strongly
19. he shouted
20. he shouted
21. Macomber said louder, looking at her
22. he cried
23. he said with sadness
24. he cried

Macomber's anger, as described by the subjects is so intense that I visualize an image of a bull,in a bullfight just ready to attack. His actions show how much he is affected by his partner's 'pseudo-answer' (He leaps out of bed). There is a clear uneasiness in his movements. His verbalizations show that he externalizes his need of aliviating his tension. He 'yells strongly' 'cries', 'says louder and furiously' and shouts'. All the TEs account for Macomber's intense anger and for the tension which dominates him. This agitaded state, which prevents him from controlling his emotions, makes him 'tremble','shout' and speak 'sharply', 'abruptly', 'angrily'.

For Margaret's speech 'What do you want me to say, darling?' the following TEs appeared:

1. she asked ironically
2. she asked him ironically

3. she asked ironically
4. she was trying to calm him down
5. she asked calmly
6. she asked with a smile
7. she knew she was being ironic but she didn't care
8. she asked ironically
9. she said ironically
10. she asked sarcastically
11. .....
12. asked Macomber's wife softly
13. she answered calmly
14. she said laconically
15. she replied as she began to get undressed
16. she said
17. she answered calmly in a disguised way
18. .....
19. she said
20. she answered
21. she said calmly
22. she answered softly
23. .....
24. she said

Most TEs were identical, picturing Margaret as an ironic speaker. The TE which says 'she asked with a smile' implicitly states her sarcasm by the way she smiles at his anger. The reader who wrote that she might be trying to calm him down, perhaps meant that Margaret has not changed in relation to her first speech. She is still calm; she keeps control. He is the one who needs to be told to calm down.

Macomber's repeated question 'Where have you been?' was glossed with:

1. he demanded furiously
2. he insisted impatiently
3. he asked furiously
4. he insisted
5. he repeated slowly
6. insisted Macomber out of control
7. he insisted like mad
8. he insisted
9. he shouted stupidly
10. he insisted angrily
11. he told her angrily
12. he asked struggling with his anger
13. he repeated again

14. he insisted now walking heavily from one side to the other of their small tent.
15. he asked again
16. he asked again
17. he said sitting on the bed
18. he insisted a bit angrier
19. he insisted
20. he asked madly
21. he insisted impatiently
22. Macomber asked again
23. Macomber asked anxiously
24. he asked anxiously

Macomber's question was glossed mostly with expressions which emphasize its repetition (repeated, insisted, asked again). Macomber's anger rises in intensity. Readers see him speaking 'furiously' and getting 'out of control',like a 'mad' person. The gloss which says 'he repeated slowly' might be explained as an attempt of Macomber to overcome his anger which is getting uncontrollable and almost prevents him from talking. That is why he 'speaks slowly'; to be sure that Margaret listens to what he says.

Margaret's response 'Out to get a breath of air', which is only a repetition of the answer she has provided him initially had the TEs listed below:

1. she answered indifferently
2. she repeated
3. she said calmly
4. but this time she did not make any effort to have her words sound as if they were true
5. .....
6. she walks to him
7. Oh my God, she thought, here we go again
8. she replied calmly
9. she answered emphatically
10. she repeated with a feeble smile
11. she reaffirmed stupidly
12. she answered again with irony
13. she said with ingenuity
14. she answered naturally
15. she repeated, now getting nervous
16. she answered again
17. she repeated
18. she said ironically
19. .....

20. she said getting nervous
21. she answered with calm
22. she said again, now more nervously
23. she said softly
24. she repeated calmly

For this speech, slight differences in interpretation are detected by means of analysis of TEs. Most readers still see Margaret indifferent and calm, as well as ironic. One reader believes she lacks intelligence due to the fact that she reaffirms she has gone out to get a breath of air (she reaffirmed stupidly). This reader interpreted that Margaret was trying to make Macomber believe her,therefore she was not very smart just repeating the answer provided before, with no result. Another reader conceived a long TE (nº 4) presenting an interpretation directly opposed to the one discussed previously. This reader interpreted that Margaret was not trying to convince Macomber. She/he thought Margaret was being indifferent and just repeating her own words, in an act of boredom, showing no concern for Macomber's reaction. I believe there is still some agreement on how readers see the character. Not one of the added TEs conveys change in Margaret's attitude towards her partner in conversation. She does not care for him and is not willing to be cooperative in Grice's terms. She knows that 'Out to get a breath of air' is not an answer to his question, however she keeps repeating it.

Macomber's speech 'That's a new name for it. You are a bitch' has got the following TEs:

1. he said aggressively
2. he exploded
3. he shouted
4. he shouted
5. he shouted
6. he fulminated her with these words
7. he snarled at her
8. he shouted furiously
9. he said roughly
10. he shouted furiously
11. he cried desperately

12. he cursed wildly
13. he said ironically
14. he cried as he pushed her
15. he roared
16. he said furiously
17. he cried furiously
18. he yelled furiously
19. .....
20. he shouted
21. he shouted
22. he cried
23. he said furiously
24. he asked with irony and irritation

Here Macomber's anger has reached its climax.It seems that readers see him using words as if they were real weapons, capable of hurting Margaret physically. He wants to punish her and he tries to do it by the use of striking words which are uttered, certainly in an aggressive and violent tone. The lexical items chosen by most readers to gloss this speech reveal Macomber's intention.

fulminated her	shouted furiously
cursed wildly	exploded

The verb explode is used here, as I have exemplified in the previous chapter, to indicate the climax of an emotion. Macomber's anger is so great that he can not help calling his wife a 'bitch'. Five readers have used the adverb 'furiously' to describe the way Macomber spoke. Three different reporting verbs were used with the adverb furiously (Say, cry, yell). One TE shows the kinesic aspect of conversation (Macomber pushes his wife) still emphasizing his infuriated reation.

For Margaret's response 'Well, you're a coward', readers have added the following TEs:

1. she said remaining indifferent but injuring him
2. she retorted coldly
3. she said securely
4. she spoke with irony
5. she said ironically
6. she refuted carelessly and went out again
7. her reply was soft and ready

8. she concluded
9. she said vehemently
10. she tittered with a spasm of delight
11. she said in a tone of challenge
12. Margaret said sarcastically
13. she said with disdainfulness
14. she said, now crying
15. she cried
16. she answered ironically
17. she declared simply
18. she yelled a little bit nervous
19. .....
20. she said furiously
21. she said in a normal voice
22. she said with disdain
23. she said ironically
24. she answered firmly

Most readers still see Margaret as a secure partner in conversation. She keeps on playing the role of an 'indifferent', 'cold' and 'sarcastic' person who does not lose control, nor lets any kind of emotion dominate her. TE nº 10 portrays the image of a character who is almost satanic in her delight at the other's humiliation. This TE gives readers the impression of a diabolic figure who delights at the ruin of other people. She savors the effect of her words with pleasure, as if she were savoring a delicious dish. She is an ironic character who express her scorn for her husband's cowardice (disdainfully, with disdain, ironically). One reader accounts for a characteristic of hers already pointed in other TEs: her ability to keep calm (in a normal voice). Just one reader visualizes Margaret speaking furiously and one reader sees the character starting to lose control.

I believe that TEs created by the subjects of this experiment clearly revealed that they perceived the existence of conflict between the characters. Most of the readers made similar inferences and the images of Macomber and his wife built through speech glosses resemble one another. The TEs are therefore redundant because the

readers already had in their minds the image of the characters who were talking. If the narrator had written TEs for the set of speeches they would not be of any help for readers, once they were able to draw inferences. In this case, the dialogue itself provides the reader enough information.

4.3. Description of the experiment with Ruben Braga's text

I have taken for analysis another text by Rubem Braga, entitled 'Os Bons Ladrões'. The people who participated in this second experiment belong to the same group described in the first part of this chapter. I have reduced the number of participants to eight,because I just want to reinforce the point made in the first experiment. I thought that to present once more 24 TEs would be tiresome and sometimes redundant. These people were also given a complete text and then asked to concentrate on a piece of conversation for which the narrator had not provided any gloss and, then were asked to create TEs for the characters' speeches. My expectation was that, this group would creat, as the first group did, TEs similar to one another and that these TEs would portray the tension and strangeness of the situation lived by the characters. The text 'Os Bons Ladrões' has a title which already orients the reader towards what she/he is supposed to read about. It is an obvious irony to say that there might be a kind of 'good thief', unless one refers to the legendary Robin Hood. The reader is then prepared to find a satirization of some social aspect.

The peculiarity of the dialogue (a conversation between a lady whose purse was stolen with all her jewls inside, and the thief who has committed the robbery and proposes to give everything back) can help

readers imagine how the two characters would behave in such situation. There follows the piece of conversation proposed for analysis:

-É a senhora de quem roubaram a bolsa ontem?
-Sim
-Aqui é o ladrão, minha senhora.
-Mas como o .... senhor descobriu meu número?
-Pela carteira de identidade e pela lista.
-Ah, é verdade. E quanto quer para devolver meus objetos?
-Não quero nada, madame. O caso é que sou um homen casado.
-Pelo fato de ser casado, não precisa andar roubando. Onde estão as minhas jóias, seu sujeito ordinário?

The thief's speech 'É a senhora de quem roubaram a bolsa ontem?' was glossed with:

1. com cara de quem está aprontando mais uma
2. a voz era calma e gentil
3. ressoou uma voz grave ao telefone
4. perguntou uma voz rouca do outro lado da linha
5. uma voz sussurrante lhe perguntou
6. falou uma voz anônima
7. uma voz calma perguntou ao telefone
8. uma voz meio rouca e calma soou ao telefone

Perhaps because readers are told by the narrator that what follows is a telephone conversation, all of them, with one exception mentioned 'a voice' and not a person. Three readers labeled the voice calm.

The lady's 'SIM' had the following glosses:

1. respondeu com curiosidade
2. respondeu a mulher esperançosa
3. disse com aparente calma a senhora
4. respondeu rapidamente a mulher
5. respondeu-lhe com surpresa
6. disse a senhora aflita
7. mas... quem está falando, e o que sabe?
8. do outro lado esperançosa responde

The lady is portrayed by readers basically in three

different ways:

1. curious and surprised
2. hopeful of discovering anything about her lost objects
3. worried

Although the lady is seen in different moods, we can not deny that any of them is acceptable for the situation.

When the thief spoke again 'Aqui é o ladrão, minha senhora' readers created the TEs:

1. responde com voz de engraçadinho
2. agora a voz era atrevida
3. disse ele com calma
4. disse o homen calmamente identificando-se
5. afirmou-lhe ironicamente
6. falou novamente com certa petulância
7. continuou calmamente
8. o fora da lei se identifica

Three readers think the thief's voice does not show aggravation; it is calm as in the first speech. Three readers see the thief starting to act as is he was in a superior position in relation to the lady, what conferred him the right to speak com petulância and ironicamente.

-Mas como o ...senhor descobriu meu número?

Here the lady was seen in the following ways:

1. perguntou espantada
2. perguntou aflita
3. perguntou espantada a senhora
4. surpreendeu-se a senhora
5. entre dúvida e pesar perguntou-lhe tremulamente
6. disse a senhora confusa
7. disse pasma a mulher
8. a senhora gaguejou engolindo a saliva

The majority of readers see 'surprise' in the lady's voice. One reader still thinks she is worried (aflita) and another sees her both worried and in doubt perhaps about the truth of what she is listening to (entre dúvida e pesar).

The next speech 'Pela carteira de identidade e

pela lista' was glossed with:

1. responde em tom irônico
2. respondeu o ladrão com certa irritação
3. respondeu o ladrão
4. explicou o homen imediatamente
5. respondeu o homen
6. respondeu ele ironicamente
7. explicou o ladrão
8. a resposta foi lógica

Two readers see the thief speaking ironically. One reader sees the thief answering with irritation, perhaps because the answer is so obvious that he thought the lady's question was unnecessary.

-Ah, é verdade. E quanto quer para devolver meus objetos?

1. perguntou consolada a mulher
2. perguntou a mulher, já mais calma
3. perguntou novamente a senhora, já um pouco nervosa
4. perguntou ansiosamente a mulher
5. aliviada disse displiscentemente
6. disse a senhora com certa calma
7. perguntou desesperada
8. a senhora entrou direto no assunto

The TE for this speech reveal that readers saw the lady in different ways. In this case there was more controversy than agreement. Two readers see the lady 'calm'. In opposition, one sees her getting nervous and another thinks she is desperate. One reader thinks the lady is a person who wants to solve the problem quickly, therefore she wants to avoid wasting time and asks directly what the thief's price was.

- Não quero nada madame. O caso é que sou um homen casado.

1. falou explicativo
2. respondeu o ladrão, com certa apreensão
3. respondeu estranhamente o ladrão
4. respondeu vagamente
5. respondeu tristemente
6. disse ele com alguma intenção
7. explicou o ladrão
8. a voz do homen soou meio preocupada

Now the thief changes from an initial state where he was ironic, petulant and daring to one in which he is worried, sad. This transformation is seen by three readers (com certa apreensão, tristemente, a voz soou meio preocupada).

> -Pelo fato de ser casado, não precisa andar roubando. Onde estão minhas jóias, seu sujeito ordinário?
> 1. responde bravamente
> 2. perguntou ela exasperada
> 3. disse a senhora em alto grau de irritação
> 4. falou asperamente a mulher
> 5. retorquiu indignadamente
> 6. falou a senhora furiosamente
> 7. replicou a mulher furiosa
> 8. Ora, o que ela tinha a ver com aquilo! responde com raiva

All readers, without exception see an infuriated lady who can not refrain her indignation.

The results could perhaps be different, had I taken other texts by different writers. I am aware that with only two texts one can not generalize. I assume however, that in this case, the writers' careful choice of language, their not very complex style and simple syntax, assure the reader's possibility of making similar inferences. Dahli (1981) says that

> '... the segmental elements of the acts of speech, are sometimes sufficient to convey the necessary information. But this depends first on the reader's capacity to infer, on his intuition in supplying the suprasegmental and non-verbal elements of the acts of speech, and secondly on the discursive techniques which though developed for actual acts of speech, would elicit information from fictional dialogues. Finally, it depends also on the author's capacity to create conversational situations. (p.16)

This experiment proved basically that readers are perfectly able to complete the gaps left by the absence of TE, i.e., readers interact with the text. They

play sometimes the role of the narrator by imagining and creating part of the text. The results of the research were also helpful to reinforce the notion of dialogue as a source of conflict, once most readers were successful in perceiving and revealing in the TEs which they devised the conflicting situations.

CONCLUSION

An inherent feature of the human condition is that people cannot live in solitude. Sharing experiences is vital for people to grow, to learn and to mature. The act of sharing experiences, although important is far from being easy. People express, by means of dialogue, their struggle to understand one another, in which they are frequently unsuccessful.

The present work aimed at analysing fictional dialogue in order to show that it is a source of conflict in the narrative. I assume the theoretical lines used mainly in the two first chapters helped me to reach this objective.

Grice and his Cooperative Principle,the theory underlying my analysis of the dialogue in semantic terms proved helpful to determine aspects like Cooperation and Non-Cooperation, characters's break of rules and the characteristics of such breaks. The breakage of a rule, as I have exemplified and developed in chapter one, might have different significance according to the situation involving the characters and their relationship. Usually these breakages mark the presence of a problem among characters.

Coulthard and Brazil's description of an exchange, as it was used helped me to detect incomplete

exchanges, according to the model. The consequences of incompleteness almost always lead to conflict and by breaking the expected sequence of exchanges, a character generally shows dislike, anger, sadness, sometimes a superior position in relation to another,and several other feelings that might signal problem In the relationship.

The analysis presented in chapter three is not based on a specific approach. Except for using Dahli's terminology for the narrator's gloss (TE),I do not mention any other study on which I have based to develop this section. The analysis consisted of pointing out, in the TE, elements which mark the presence of conflict. By looking at the narrator's gloss, readers can perceive several different sorts of problems in the characters's relationships. Aspects like aggressiveness, irritation, anger and many others are clearly portrayed in some TEs. Sometimes readers are informed about the kinesic aspect of conversation. Usually narrators mark the presence of conflict in the character's body movements by expressing violent gestures, or even attempts and real physical aggression.

The last chapter provided an illustration of how TEs created by readers also convey conflict. In other words, the analysis aimed at showing that readers are capable of building a mental image of the characters who are 'talking' and as Dahli says of 'filling in the gaps left by the writer.'

I believe the analysis developed in this dissertation exemplifies one of the infinite number of ways one can approach a narrative text and appreciate it. How you approach a piece of discourse, considered literary or not, is in my assumption, a free choice of the reader. I think that the theoretical lines I have applied to the analysis of a set of fictional narratives have worked well

in this particular case and helped me to build a few consideration about the characters and their conflicts.

The analysis presented here was an attempt to apply theories originally developed for analysis of linguistic data to literary discourse. Spoken and written narratives seem to bear many more similarities than differences. This fact may be attributed to the innate capacity humans have to tell stories, either by reporting them orally, or by writing them down. I want at this point to quote Moody (1968) who defines Literature as something closely related to human experience. He traces the origin of literature to the narrative capacity of humans. I believe he is right because Literature is narrative 'par excellence'.

> 'Literature springs from our inborn love of telling a story, of arranging words in pleasing patterns, of expressing in words some special aspect of our human experience.' (p.2)

I recognize the limitation of the present study as an investigation. One has to be aware that if she/he is to persevere in her/his attempt to get as closer as possible to the ideal, one has to agree with T.S. Elliot that

> We shall not cease from exploration
> And the end of all our exploring
> Will be to arrive where we started
> And know the place for the first time
> Little Gidding

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCE

Brazil, David and Coulthard, Malcolm, Exchange Structure in 'Discourse Analysis Monographs'. English Language Research. Birmingham, 1931.

Braga, Rubem. Os Bons Ladrões in "Para Gostar de Ler" Vol. 1 . Câmara Brasileira do Livro, São Paulo, 1977.

Burton, Deirdre. Dialogue and Discourse. A sociolinguistic Approach to Modern Drama, Dialogue and Naturally Occurring Conversation. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1980.

Chatman, Seymour. Story and Discourse. Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film. Cornell University Press Ltd. London, 1978.

Dahli, F. Speech in Narrative 'Discourse Analysis Monographs' English Language Research, University of Birmingham, 1981.

Elliot, T.S. Little Gidding in "The Norton Anthology of Modern Poetry". W.W. Norton and Company, INC, New York, 1973.

Fowles, John. The French Lieutenant's Woman. The New American Library, Inc, 1969.

Genette, Gérard. Narrative Discourse. Cornell Iniversity Press Ltd. London 1980.

Golding, William, Lord of the Flies Perigee Books, N.Y. 1954

Grice, H.P. "Logic and Conversation" in Cole, P. and Morgan (ed) Syntax and Semantics Vol III Speech Acts, N.Y. Academic Press, N.Y. 1975 : 41-58

Hatch, Evelyn and Long, Michael H. "Discourse Analysis, what's that?" in Larsen-Freeman, Diane Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research. School of International Training. The Experiment in International Living. Brattleboro, Vermont Newbury House Publishers, Inc, M.A. 1980.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel The Scarlet Letter in "The Scarlet Letter and Selected Tales" Penguin English Library, New York, 1970.

Hemingway, Ernest. The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber in "The American Tradition in Literature" Bradley, Beatty, Long Perkins, Random House, New York, 1956.

Hemingway, Ernest. Indian Camp in "The Essential Hemingway, Granada Publishing Limited, New York, 1977: 271-275

Hemingway, Ernest. For Whom the Bell Tolls, Granada Publishing Limited, New York, 1941.

Lawrence, D.H. Lady Chatterley's Lover, Bantam Books, New York, 1928

Lawrence, D.H. Sons and Lovers, Penguin Books, Middlesex, England 1933.

Lawrence, D.H. "The Fox" in Three Novellas Penguin Books, Middlesex England, 1923.

Labov, W. and Waletz, J. "Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience" in Hold. H. (ed) Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967: 12-41

Lardner, Ring. The Love Nest in "American Short Stories" by Eugene Current Garcia and Walton T. Patrick. Scott, Foresman and Company, Illinois 392-403

Leech, Geoffrey N & Short, Michael H. Style in Fiction - A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose Longman, London, 1981.

Leech, Geoffrey N. Priciples of Pragmatics Longman. London 1983.

Levinson, Stephen C. Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press. N.Y. 1977.

Mailer, Norman. An American Dream Dell Publishing Co., Inc, New York, 1934.

Melville, Herman. Bartleby in "Billy Bud, Sailor and Other Stories" Penguin English Library, New York, 1948.

Moody, H.L.B. Literary Appreciation Longman Group Ltd. London, 1968.

Pratt, M.L. Towards a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse Bloomington University Press, Indiana, 1977.

Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff Emanuel and Jefferson Gail" A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation" in Schenkein Jim (ed) Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction. N.Y Academic Press, 1978: 7-47

Silva, Anazildo Vasconcelos da. Para uma Teoria do Texto Lírico in "Desconstrução/Construção no Texto Lírico". Livraria Francisco Alves Editora S.A., Rio de Janeiro, 1975: 7-13

Steinbeck, John. Of Mice and Men in "Of Mice and Men and Cannery Row" Penguin Modern Classics, Middlesex, England, 1949.

Sinclair, J. Mc H & Coulthard, R.M. Towards an Analysis of Discourse Osford University Press, London, 1975.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Pratt, Mary Louise Linguistics for Students of Literature Harcourt Prace Jovanovich, Inc, 1980.