

A Conversation Analysis of Some Excerpts from Montgomery's *Anne of Green Gables*

Nawal F. Abbas; Raja Rozina Raja Suleiman; Shakila Abdul-Manan

*School of Humanities
Universiti Sains Malaysia, Pulau Pinang
Malaysia*

Abstract

Conversation analysis (CA) has been defined as that field of study concerned with the norms, practices and competences underlying the organization of social interaction (Bhatia, 2008). We converse to maintain the social ties among ourselves and create the ones that do not exist (Brown and Yule, 1983b; McCarthy, 1991). The central sociological insight of CA is that it is through conversation that we conduct the ordinary, and perhaps extraordinary, affairs of our life (Bhatia, 2008).

This paper is of two directions: first it aims to demonstrate how the approaches and principles basically developed by the conversational analysts for the systematic study of naturally occurring conversation can be applied illuminately to the stylistic and structural study literary texts. Second, it aims to show how the aspect of conversation analysis helps in tracing character development.

*To achieve the above aims, Short's (1995) model has been adopted and applied on Montgomery's **Anne of Green Gables**.*

The analysis shows that fiction, just like drama, is viable to be analyzed according to the CA approach since the turn-taking system can account for both the conversational side as well as the narrative side, i. e., the speech and the narrative form a conversational whole in which some of the turns in the conversation are realized not by speech, but by actions described in the narrative. It also shows the process of character development represented mainly by the child "Anne", her social life inside and outside her foster family.

Keywords: Turn-taking system, adjacency pairs, speech acts, implicature, politeness

Introduction

Conversation is a form of connected speech. It has been viewed differently by different linguistics. Speier (1972) defines conversation as "a communicative act of speech among face – to – face interactants. They exchange their speech with each other." Richards (1980) argues that conversation is an activity bound by rules, norms and conventions that are learned as part of the process of acquiring competence in a language.

As for Edmondson (1981), conversation refers to any interactional stretch of talk involving at least two participants and taking place in a non-formalized setting such that no special rules or conventions may be said to operate.

To Goffman (1975), conversation involves more than verbal and non verbal aspect of communication-physical doings unconnected with the speech stream are also involved – acts which for want of a better name are called non-linguistic (as cited in Ochs, 1979).

CA, on the other hand, can be defined as "the analysis of natural conversation in order to discover the linguistic characteristics of conversation and how it is used in ordinary life". This includes how speakers decide when to speak during conversation, i.e., turn talking; how sentences of two or more speakers are related, i.e., adjacency pairs and the function that conversation is used for (Richard, 1985).

Literature review

CA of the sort that will be described and analyzed in this study has been pioneered by a break-away group of sociologists, often known as ethno-methodologists (Levinson, 1983). Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) described the kind of systematic procedures that participants were using to conduct turn transfer. The system they identified has turn construction components and a set of procedures for turn allocation (Wooffitt, 2005). In addition to grammatically complete sentences, turns can be built from single words, non-lexical utterances ('huh'), single phrases and clauses.

Conversation analysts seek to explain how conversation takes place. Therefore they investigate "how pairs of utterance relate to one another (the study of adjacency pairs), how turn-taking is managed, how conversational openings and closing are affected, how topics enter and disappear from conversation, and how speakers engage in strategic acts of politeness, face-preservation, and so on" (McCarthy 1991).

A growing interest in CA over the last four decades is reflected in the substantial body of research that has been undertaken. However the bulk of studies have focused on the application of the subject on Drama rather than on Fiction. That is the great majority of research has been on the ways in which and the extent to which CA has been applied in the area of Drama. There are only few studies that have investigated the applicability of CA to the world of Fiction. Not surprisingly, the bulk of studies with CA have concentrated not on the analysis of conversation according to Sacks Model (1978), but rather on other models far away from the application of the turn-taking system and adjacency pairs. In other words, CA is a wide field understood differently according to the method of analysis adopted. For instance, and among such studies, Burton's (1980) adaptation of Sinclair and Coulthard's (1976) model which was basically geared for the analysis of classroom interaction in which the 'move' is the basic unit of analysis (Carter & Simpson, 1989). Toolan (1989) analyzed James Joyce's **Portrait of the artist as a Youngman** by applying Burton's five conversational moves. Leech & Short (1981) analyzed E. M. Forester's Short Story 'The Celestial Omnibus' following Austen's Speech Act Theory and Grice's Conversational Implicature. Page (1988) proposed a model for the analysis of 'speech presentation', stating that the advantage of the novel-medium is being able to present both dialogue and much or less complementary and supplementary description. To him, direct speech is generally accompanied by some or all of the following: attributions to speakers, stage directions, reference to paralinguistic qualities and finally many novelists find it tempting to interpolate comment or moralizing into dialogue passages. Fillmore (1986) elaborates more that "these comments are more than 'stage directions' giving indications of the behavior of the speakers; cumulatively, they add an emotional coloring from the narrator's analysis of the relationship between the characters" (p.119).

Methodology

The researchers' interest, in this study, is to develop a stylistics of fictional conversation, drawing eclectically on the work of Short (1995) and Toolan (1990) who manipulated the turn-taking system and the adjacency pair mechanism not in isolation, but in relation to some other approaches to conversation, namely Politeness, Implicature and Speech Acts.

Montgomery's **Anne of Green Gables** is chosen to be analyzed according to the above eclectic method. The methodology is as the following:

1. Four chapters from the novel are chosen for the analysis, namely chapters 2&3 in which the child Anne is introduced for the first time, chapter 9 in which Anne is still through the process of development, and chapter 37 which introduces Anne as a fully mature young lady.
2. Certain extracts from each chapter are chosen and analyzed after being numbered for ease of reference.
3. The turn-taking system is introduced, through the analysis, in relation to the other approaches mentioned above, and not separated from them as this works better in reflecting character development.
4. The speech and the narrative are analyzed simultaneously since they both form a conversational whole in which some turns are not realized but by speech, but by the actions described in the narrative (Short, 1995).

The Analysis

Two points should be taken into consideration before we start our analysis of Anne of Green Gables.

1. Stylistic analysis is not interested primarily in coming up with new and startling interpretations of the text it examines, but it also aims at explicating how our understanding of a text is achieved by examining in detail the linguistic organization of the text and how a reader needs to interact with that linguistic organization to make sense of it. Such a detailed organization usually doesn't reveal new aspects of interpretation, but rather shows how the interpretation is achieved (short, 1995).
2. Both the direct speech of the characters and the narrative side description will be analyzed using the same methodology simply because the speech and the narrative form a conversational whole in the excerpts analyzed. In other words, some of the turns in the conversation are realized not by speech, but by actions described in the narrative itself.

From the beginning of chapter two, we get to know that Anne's appearance in the Cuthbert's life is a mistake which becomes "reality" later on. Matthew and Marilla Cuthbert (the foster parents) send for a boy, but unluckily (that becomes ironic at the end) they get a girl who inspires Matthew the first moment she appears in turn (7):

(7) Anne: "I suppose you are Mr. Matthew Cuthbert of Green Gables? I'm very glad to see you"

Anne, here, produces a very long turn which counts as a first pair-part starting with a question for which she needs no second pair part as she knows who he is, therefore, is it not to be regarded as a real question, but a proposition or statement. Then she goes on describing and quoting from her imaginative mind which attracts him a lot and let him feel sorry for being late for her:

(8) Matthew: "I'm sorry I was late. Come along. The horse is over in the yard. Give me your bag."

Matthew's turn, as a second pair-part, is very short in comparison with that of Anne and it carries an apology and offer at the same time. So Matthew's politeness and kindheartedness are quite clear from the very beginning.

Let's now consider the following chunk:

(10) Anne: "Isn't that beautiful? What did that tree ... make you think of?"

(11) Matthew: "Well now, I dunno"

(12) Anne: "Why, a bride of course- a bride all in white with a lovely misty veil ... and what does make the roads red?"

(13) Matthew: " Well now, I dunno."

(14) Anne: " Well, that is one of the things to find out sometimes... isn't it splendid to think of all the things that are to find out about? There would be no scope for imagination then, would there? But am I talking too much...? If you say so, I'll stop. I can stop when I make up my mind to it, although it's difficult."

(15) Matthew: " Oh, you can talk as much as you like. I don't mind."

(16) Anne: " I'm so glad.... And people laugh because I use big words. But if you have big ideas you have to use big words to express them, haven't you?"

(17) Matthew: " Well now, that's seems reasonable."

(18) Anne: " Mrs. Spencer said that my tongue must be hung in the middle Is there a brook anywhere near Green Gables?"

(19) Matthew: " Well now, yes, there is one right below the house"

(20) Anne: " Fancy! It's always been one of my dreams to live near a brook.... What colour would you call this?"

(21) Matthew: " It's red"

(22) Anne: " What is an alabaster brow? I never could fine out. Can you tell me?"

(23) Matthew: " Well now, I'm afraid I can't."

(24) Anne:" Have you ever imagined what it must feel like to be divinely beautiful?"

(25) Matthew:" Well now, no, I haven't."

(26) Anne:" I have, often. Which would you rather be if you had the choice- divinely beautiful or dazzlingly clever or angelically good?"

(27) Matthew:" Well now, I- I don't know exactly."

From the above exchanges, it is clear that the adjacency pair "question /answer" is the one domineering in chapter two. This tells us that there is a sort of mutual understanding and acceptance on both parties. There is a sort of give and take. Anne on her part is given the chance, and may be for the first time in her life, to speak and question freely. Matthew, on the other hand and much to his surprise, is enjoying Anne's company. He has never expected to enjoy the society of a little girl. What is really amazing in this chunk is that Anne talks freely using very long turns, some of them exceeds the (50) lines, then she ends her long turns with a question, partly to enjoy the society of Matthew, whom she likes the minute she sees him, and partly to find answers to open questions or subjects in her imagination. Here below some examples to show this point.

In turn (10) she asks him a question which embraces two interrogatives; a " yes/no" question followed by "What did that tree make you think of?" When he answers negatively, she elaborates with the help of her imaginative mind to give a "58 line" response, which ends up with a question "What does make the roads red?" To which he also has no answer.

In turn (14) Anne asks a rhetorical question, "But am I talking too much...?". To Freed (1994) a rhetorical question "refers to information the speaker already knows" and "orients the hearer to the speaker's point of view" (p. 631). That's why she says " I can stop when I make up my mind to it, although it's difficult.", and he replies " you can talk as much as you like".

In Turn (16), Anne asks Matthew a tag question to get his approval to go on with her talkative nature. It is well known that tag questions are not real questions but mere attempts to instigate the other party to agree positively or negatively, and to confirm our viewpoint, i.e., to elicit agreement from the other party. Here she asks a negative question to let him confirm the idea that "big ideas need big words to express them" and in doing so, she gets his consent to go on.

Another example is turn (20) when she asks about the color of the rose. The minute he answers, she comments " Yes, it's red.", and then the narrative tells us that she says it resignedly which means accepting something that is unpleasant and cannot be changed and here there is a good reference to her red hair which she abhors a great deal.

In other situations, Anne's questions are real seeking answers from Matthew, like in turn(13) which ends up with the question " What does make the roads red?", for which she gets no answer as Matthew himself doesn't know why, unlike her question at the end of turn(18) when she asks " Is there a brook anywhere near Green Gables?", for which Matthew answers positively " Well now, yes, there is one below the house" and in saying so , one of Anne's dreams is achieved. Another situation in which Anne seeks an answer is when she asks "What is an alabaster brow?". Anne goes on, with her imaginative mind, asking Matthew about his preference in what she is saying "Which would you rather if you had the choice- divinely beautiful or dazzlingly clever or angelically good?", turn (26). Then, here comes the most important question that Anne has ever asked" Has Mr. Barry any little girl?", and this girl, Diana, will be the only girl Anne will befriend later in the coming chapters of the novel.

Shooting of questions by Anne is quite normal since it is part of the child's language development to ask questions and seek answers. In other words, children, usually when given the chance, have a strong desire to hold turns and to ask endless questions especially with their parents or intimates.

The conversation between Matthew and Anne goes on smooth through the technique of question and answer, through which we get a lot about them both, but towards the end of chapter two, Anne interrupts Matthew breathlessly, and for the first time, when he is telling her:

(46) Matthew:"We are pretty near home now. That's Green Gables over-----".

(47) Anne:"Oh, don't tell me. Let me guess. I'm sure I'll guess right."

This breathless interruption, as the narrative calls it, doesn't constitute any breach to the conversational current since Anne's imaginative world intermingles with the real world she is observing for the first time in her life. The most general principle governing turn-taking in a conversation is that "one and only one person speaks at a time" (Wardhough 1985). But one more one time, this doesn't put con-

versation into danger. Then, for the first time in chapter two Anne is seen speechless giving vent to her eyes to taste the beauty of the whole scene.

What is interesting in Matthew's responses, in his second pair-parts, is the use of the linguistic marker "well", which is nearly repeated in every response in chapter two. The marker "well" here is used to show a reluctance to give a clear answer, especially when it is followed by another marker, namely "no". This illustrates part of his character as being more ready to listen than to talk.

In the previous chunk, and in later chapters, there is a great deal of topic shift. Topics change very quickly, and in fact, one topic is dealt with in the space of two exchanges or turns. This, by itself, develops the conversation and the relation among characters, namely Anne and Matthew, to the extent that at the end of chapter two, he becomes ready to accept her as a daughter.

As far as the Grice's Maxims are concerned, it is said that the Maxim of quantity has been at risk many times due to Anne's long turns and responses, but her imaginative nature and Matthew's interest in her talk, especially when he gives her the green light or the floor to talk saying "you can talk as much as you like. I don't mind", kept the Cooperative Principle at work all the time.

When we move to chapter three, still we have Anne with her first experience, but now with Marilla Cuthbert, Matthew's sister, who shows her resentment and refusal of Anne from the very beginning, especially when she starts her first appearance in turn (1) with a vocative in initial position in order to catch his attention:

Marilla: "Matthew Cuthbert, who's that? Where is the boy?"

Matthew: "There wasn't any boy. There was only her."

Marilla: "No boy! But there must have been a boy. We sent word to Ms. Spencer to bring a boy."

Matthew: "Well, she didn't. She brought her.... She couldn't be left there, no matter where the mistake had come in."

The above represents two adjacency pairs of the type "question/ answer", which adds nothing to the plot development, since readers are, in a way, prepared to this before this time in chapter two, but it adds a lot to the character development- namely that of Anne who remains silent, unlike her nature in chapter two, with her eyes roving from one to the other. When Anne grasps the meaning of what is being said, she suddenly, and for the first time, burst out saying:

(6) Anne: "You don't want me! You don't want me because I'm not a boy! I might have expected itOh, what shall I do?"

(7) Marilla: "Well, there is no need to cry so about it"

(8) Anne: "Yes, there is need!"

(9) Marilla: "Well, don't cry any more What's your name?"

(10) Anne: "Will you please call me Cordelia?"

(11) Marilla: "Call you Cordelia! Is that your name?"

(12) Anne: "No-o-o, it's not exactly my name, but I'd love to be called Cordelia."

(13) Marilla: "... If Cordelia is not your name, what is it?"

(14) Anne: "Anne Shirley...."

By allowing the characters to present themselves in conversation rather than the narrator passing the information, Montgomery gives the reader the chance to be more involved in the novel. One more time, what is domineering the turn- taking system here is the adjacency pair of "question/ answer". Through this sort of give and take, Marilla, as well as the readers, gets to know more about Anne and her nature when she asks about Anne's name. The couple hasn't been introduced to this before. Anne's polite request in turn (10) is followed by a two- move turn, exclamation and a question showing a slight interest, and for the first time, in Anne. The adjacency pair in turns 13 and 14, "question / answer", is based on the notion of "repair". Repair is used in CA as a generic term to cover various phenomena ranging from corrections to mending problems in the way participants take turns at talk. The repair mechanism is made up of an initiation, the act of indicating the source of trouble, and the repair itself (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977; Schegloff, 2007). So, Anne's correction of her name in (1) comes as a result of Marilla's initiation.

Then Anne reaches a critical point when she asks Marilla:

(21) Anne: "Why didn't you tell me at the station, that you didn't want me and leave me there? If I hadn't seen the White way of Delight and the Lake of Shining Waters, it wouldn't be so hard"

(22) Marilla: "What on earth does she mean?"

(23) Matthew: "She-she's just referring to some conversation we had on the road."

Anne's question is not real, but rather a rhetorical question in which she is lamenting Matthew for not leaving her in the station facing her destiny instead of giving her the chance to see the beauty of the White Way of Delight and the Lake of Shining Waters. Here instead of having a response on the part of Matthew, Marilla issues a question, first pair-part, asking him to clarify Anne's blame. The second pair-part in the adjacency pair "question/ answer", Matthew refers to a previous long conversation with Anne on their way to Green Gables in which she has dreamt a lot of her future life in this area.

Another short conversation takes place between Anne and Marilla while they are having supper which shows a little concern on the part of Marilla for Anne, especially when Anne is seen not eating anything:

(28) Anne: "I can't. I'm in the depth of despair. Can you eat when you are in the depth of despair?"

(29) Marilla: "I've never been in the depth of despair. so I can't say."

(30) Anne: "Weren't you? Well, did you ever try to imagine you were in the depths of despair?"

(31) Marilla: "No, I didn't."

Here we have another couple of "question/ answer" adjacency pairs through which Montgomery introduces her characters. Through the first pair parts, Anne is trying to show Marilla the amount of despair she is living in and Marilla on her part shows not having experienced such a thing. Anne is trying indirectly through such questions to gain Marilla's sympathy, but in vain!

Towards the end of chapter three, a conversation takes place between Matthew who is willing to keep Anne and his sister, Marilla, who stubbornly refuses such a proposition to keep the child:

(43) Matthew: "Well now, she's a real nice little thing, Marilla. It is kind of a pity to send her back when she's so set on staying here."

(44) Marilla: "Matthew Cuthbert, you don't mean to say you think we ought to keep her!"

(46) Marilla: "... What good would she be to us?"

(47) Matthew: "We might be some good to her."

(48) Marilla: "Matthew Cuthbert, I believe that the child has bewitched you!...."

(49) Matthew: "Well now, she is a real interesting little thing, you should have heard her talk coming from the station."

Turn (43) constitutes the first pair -part of a "request/ refusal" type of adjacency pairs. This request is introduced in a form of indirect speech act to which Marilla reacts negatively supporting her refusal with a question in turn (46). This can be taken as an example of another notion of conversation which is that of "preference". Marilla's indirect refusal counts as a "dispreferred alternative" softened by her rhetorical question in (46). Matthew's (47), which is the second pair-part to Marilla's (46) first pair-part, though apparently shows a violation of the Maxim of quality, it carries the implication that not necessarily they make use of her, let them be of some help to her since they can hire a French boy to help in the farm, as will be explained in their following conversation. Marilla one more time uses the vocative "Matthew Cuthbert", in utterance (48), as the first pair-part, and the non-factual verb "believe" to propose that the child has already bewitched him. The second pair-part of the adjacency pair (48) and (49), namely "proposition/ acceptance" shows acceptance and willingness on the part of Matthew for keeping the little girl in which he sees an interesting imaginative world.

The chapter ends with Matthew's recognition of Anne's admirable qualities and Marilla's willingness to dispatch Anne straight way back to where she came from because of, in addition to her being not a boy, her talkative nature though Anne in this chapter doesn't use her imagination when responding to Marilla. In other words, though this chapter is based on the adjacency pair "question/ answer", Anne doesn't expand a lot in her responses with Marilla, unlike in the previous chapter with Matthew.

In chapter nine, we find a good acceptance of Anne by Marilla with the latter responds:

(3) Rachel: "It was too bad there was such a mistake. Couldn't you have sent her back?"

(4) Marilla: "I suppose we could, but decided not to. Matthew took fancy to her. And I must say I like her myself- although I admit she has her faults. The house seems a different place already. She's a real bright thing."

In the second move of the first adjacency pair-part(3), Rachel asks a negative "yes/no" question in the hope of getting "yes", as negative questions are asked by participants to get positive answers. Marilla's positive answer, in the second adjacency pair-part (4), comes to confirm this idea with the non-factual verb "suppose", but to Rachel's surprise, they both, Matthew and Marilla, decide to keep the girl as they like her in spite of her faults. The second pair-part produced by Marilla puts the Maxim of quantity in danger as she said more than is required, but she does this flout to save the maxim of manner by being clear to Rachel why they have kept Anne.

Later in chapter nine Rachel asks to see Anne and the minute she sees her, the following chunk takes place:

(8) Rachel: "Well, they didn't pick you for your looks that are sure and certain. She's terrible skinny and homely, Marilla. Come here child, child, and let me have a look at you. Lawful heart, did anyone ever see such freckles? And hair as red as carrots! Come here, child, I say."

(9) Anne: "I hate you-I hate you. I hate you. How dare you call me skinny and ugly? How dare you say I'm freckled and redheaded? You are a rude impolite unfeeling woman!"

(10) Marilla: "Anne!"

(11) Anne: "How dare you say such things about me? I don't care if I do hurt your feelings by saying so! I hope I hurt them"

(12) Rachel: "Did anyone see such a temper?"

(13) Marilla: "Anne go to your room and stay there until I come up."

If we take the first adjacency pair here (8 and 9), statement/ refusal, we find that Mrs. Rachel starts with the linguistic marker "well". To Francesca (2001), 'well' appears to have two functions; it signals the opening to a topic or the modification of a challenging opinion. So in the case presented in (8), 'well' initiates an explosion in the face of Anne, a bitter criticism of Anne's looks, to which Anne responds first "non- verbally" as the narrative tells us by approaching Mrs. Rachel and second " verbally" in which she shows a great deal of impolite behavior, at least, to Mrs. Rachel. Anne, and may be for the first time in the novel, shows her real temper when she gets irritated like this. She is calm and nice, but when she is ill-treated or humiliated, she shows a real loss of temper like all other children in similar situations. The repetition of "I hate you" constitutes an assertion of hatred on the part of Anne.

In the second adjacency pair (10, 11), Marilla pretends to be unsatisfied with Anne with little surprise alluding to her to stop, but once again Anne puts the Politeness Principle and the Cooperative Principle in danger when she goes on reproaching Mrs. Rachel. But no collapse in conversation is seen since Rachel is still responding by issuing a "yes/ no" question exclaiming such a temper on the part of Anne to which Marilla responds by issuing an order to Anne asking her to go to her room and to stay there, partly to satisfy Mrs. Rachel and partly to have a good chance to scold Anne for her impolite behavior in private, not before Mrs. Rachel. This by itself tells that Marilla cares a lot about Anne and her feelings in spite of her rude conduct towards Mrs. Rachel who gets what she deserves, for being so hardhearted and this is clear in the following pair" question/ answer":

(16) Rachel: "Marilla Cuthbert, you don't mean to say that you are upholding her in such a terrible display of temper as we've just seen?"

(17) Marilla: "No.... She is never taught what is right. And you were too hard on her, Rachel."

So for Anne being untaught and for Mrs. Rachel being inconsiderate saves the politeness principle and the cooperative principle and puts them back to work again.

Then here comes the time for Anne to be taught:

(20) Marilla: "Anne, get off that bed this minute and listen to what I have to say to you"

(21) Marilla: "This is a nice way for you to behave, Anne! Aren't you ashamed of yourself?"

(22) Anne: "She hadn't any right to call me ugly and redheaded."

(23) Marilla: "you hadn't any right to fly into such a fury and talk the way you did to her, Anne."

Turn (20) along with the narrative following constitute an adjacency pair of the type "order/reply". This is followed by another adjacency pair of the type "question/answer", but Anne instead of answering Marilla plainly, she opts up giving her excuse by blaming Mrs. Rachel for her misbehavior and this leads Marilla to make a sort of follow up move, feedback, to what Anne has just mentioned by not giving her the right to be so furious and to talk like that. The previous adjacency pair is actually to be extended into an "adjacency triplet" as Francesca calls it (2001). This was first identified by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) in their analysis of classroom conversation.

In the following "order/refusal" pair:

(27) Marilla: "... You must go to her and tell her you are very sorry for your bad temper and ask her to forgive you."

(28) Anne: "I can never do that. You can punish me in any way you like, Marilla. You can shut me up in a dark, damp dungeon"

Anne shows her total willingness to be punished severely than to apologize to Mrs. Rachel. To this Marilla responds later saying that they are not in the habit of shutting people in dark damp dungeons. So, it is through language Marilla tries to teach Anne what's right and what's wrong. Halliday (1978, as cited in Knowles and Malmkjar, 1996) points out that language is a powerful socializing agent, because it is through language that the child learns about the social world, about the social customs, institutions and the hierarchies. This is an implied invitation to parents showing how children should be brought up.

Towards the end of chapter nine, there is another adjacency triple in the form "proposition/refusal/feedback" on the part of Marilla for Anne:

(29) Marilla: "But apologize to Mrs. Lynde you must and shall and you'll stay here in your room until you can tell you're willing to do it."

(30) Anne: "I shall have to stay here forever then I can't even imagine I'm sorry."

(31) Marilla: "perhaps your imagination will be in better working order by the morning."

Marilla's (31) feedback here is of twofold : it shows that the purpose of conversation is principally to be interactional used for socializing as stated by Francescav(2001, p. 25), and it also shows Marilla's belief in Anne's imagination and romanticism to lesson her anger and to go through the process of socialization.

As the novel approaches its end, and in chapter (37), Anne is seen to be in good terms with nearly everybody, as the following exchange shows:

(4) Anne: "Mrs. Lynde, you don't think- you can't think Matthew is-is-" {Mrs. Lynde is the same Rachel in chapter nine}.

Rachel: "Child, yes, I'm afraid of it. Look at his face"

Anne's statement and Rachel's acknowledgment show that they are in good terms now, enjoying each other's company.

Diana: "Anne dear, would you like to have me sleep with you tonight?"

Anne: "thank you, Diana. I think you won't misunderstand me when I say that I want to be alone."

Anne's second pair-part carries a negative dispreferred response (or a "minus response" in Shegloff's terminology, 2007) to Diana's "yes/no" question. Diana, being Anne's closest friend, expects a positive response. The non-factual verb "think" introduces the reason behind Anne's wish to be alone in this critical situation in her life. They are so intimate to understand each other.

What is really interesting in chapter (37) is the intimacy between Anne and Marilla which reaches its utmost level in:

Marilla: "There- there- don't cry so, dearie. It can't bring him back. It-it-isn't right to cry so. I knew that today, but I couldn't help it then. He'd always been such a good, kind brother to me- but God knows best."

Anne: "Oh, just let me cry, Marilla. The tears don't hurt me like that ache did. Stay here for a little while with me and keep your arm round me- so Oh, Marilla what will we do without him?"

Marilla: "We've got each other, Anne Oh, Anne, I know I've been kind of strict and harsh with you may be- I love you as dear as if you were my own flesh and blood and You've been my joy and comfort ever since you came to Green Gables."

Marilla's turn in (8), which constitutes the first pair-part in a "proposition/refusal" exchange, carries an implied suggestion for Anne to take it easy. It is a big loss for both of them, Anne and Marilla. To this implied suggestion, Anne produces a turn that starts and ends with the linguistic marker "oh" which functions differently in both positions. At the beginning of the utterance, it prepares the reader for a remembered idea which is that "the tears don't hurt me like that ache did", so this constitutes a refusal on the part of Anne to stop crying. While the one at the end introduces a new topic which is that of "being alone". This question constitutes the first pair part to Marilla's response in (10), the second pair part.

This question is called an "open question", for which there is no limit. That's why Marilla is not to be accused of violating the Maxim of quantity for having such a long turn."

Anne and Marilla's intimacy reaches its peak when heading to the end of chapter (37) when Marilla tells Anne about the biggest secret in her life:

(23) Marilla: "... John Blythe was a nice boy. We used to be real good friends, he and I. People called him my beau."

(24) Anne: "Oh, Marilla- and what happened? -Why didn't you-?"

(25) Marilla: "We had a quarrel. I wouldn't forgive him when he asked me to."

(26) Anne: "So you've had a bit of romance in your life, too?"

(27) Marilla: "yes, I suppose you can call it that"

Marilla in turn (23) is revealing to Anne an important part of her life. But this revelation is followed by a two move turn, i.e., two "wh" questions on the part of Anne who seems to be so eager to know about the subject, but before Anne finishes her second question, Marilla interrupts to give the answer to both questions. This interruption doesn't count a flout putting the conversation at risk. On the contrary, it pushes it forward to more revelation triggered by Anne's question in (26), " you've had a bit of romance in your life, too?", and confirmation or acknowledgment that starts with " yes... you can call it that", on Marilla's part in the (26-27) adjacency pair. The connective "and", which precedes the question, in turn 24, marks a continuation of the addressee for enlightenment (Schiffrin, 1987).

Conclusion

The present study investigated the applicability of CA, which was basically originated for the analysis of naturally occurring conversation, to literary discourse, fiction ad hoc. It also examined how the turn-taking system helps in depicting how characters develop through social interaction; especially Anne who develops through funny occasionally sad and terrifically hopeful journey from a naïve child into a fully matured young lady. Politeness, conversational implicature and speech acts were of great help in giving a comprehensive analysis of the novel under study. The findings are hoped to add to the body of literature in stylistic pragmatics, if allowed to say so.

References

- Bhatia, V.K., Flowerdew, J. and Jones, R. H.(ed.), (2008). *Advances in Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, G. & Yule, D. (1981). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, D. (1980) *Dialogue and Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Carter, R. and Simpson, P., eds.,(1989). *Language, Discourse and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Discourse Stylistics*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Edmondson, W. (1981). *Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis*. London: Longman.

- Halliday, M. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Knowles, M. and Malmkjar, K. (1996). *Language and Control in Children's Literature*. London: Routledge.
- Leech, G. N. & Short, M. (1981). *Style in fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B. b., eds. (1979). *Developmental Pragmatics*. New York: Academic press.
- Page, N. (1988). *Speech in the English Novel*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Richard, J. P and Weber, H. (1985). *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman group Ltd.
- Richards, J. C. (1980). Conversation, *TESOL Quarterly*, XIV(4), 413-431.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, G., and Jefferson.(1974). A Simplest Systematic for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation, *Language*, 50(4), 596-735.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. (1977). "The Preference for self Correction in the organization of Repair. In Conversation", *Language*, 53(2), 361-82.
- Shegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversational Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (19987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Short, M. (1996). Understanding Conversational Undercurrents in 'The Ebony Tower' by John Fowles. In Verdonk, P. and Weber, J. J. (Eds), *Twentieth- Century Fiction from Text to Context*. London: Routledge.
- Speier, M.(1972). Some Conversational Problems for Interactional Analysis. In Sudnow, D. (Ed), *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press.
- Toolan, M.(1989). "Analyzing Conversation in Fiction: An Example from Joyce's *Portrait*", in Carter, R, and Simpson, P.(ed.), *Language, Discourse and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Discourse Stylistics*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Toolan, M. J. (1990). *The Stylistics of Fiction: A Literary- Linguistic Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis and Discourse analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.