



Grammatical patterning in literary texts and Linear Unit Grammar in the dialogue of *Hills like White Elephants* by Ernest Hemingway

Lucy Stone

Introduction

Fiction writers have long imitated the nuances of informal conversation, but to analyse the dialogue of a literary work is it necessary to apply the conventions of a spoken or a written grammar? Linear Unit Grammar (LUG), proposed by Sinclair in 2006 claims to cope with all types of text providing that it is based on an interaction: ‘a record of a communicative event’ (Sinclair: 49). This essay will consider the short story *Hills like White Elephants* by Ernest Hemingway, and the extent to which LUG can provide a useful framework to explore how grammatical patterning contributes to the meaning of the text. Other approaches such as McCarthy and Carter (2006), Biber (2004), and Short (1996) offer alternative and non-linear ways of exploring grammatical patterning. In addition, this essay will draw on the work of other linguists as required.

Approaches to Grammatical Patterning, and LUG

Patterns exist in language, which at points can be predictable and repetitive. If an individual speaks only half of the utterance ‘I need to go to’ whilst holding an empty bottle of milk, we might assume the rest of the speech would comment on buying more milk. Such intuitive observations are possible because the interpersonal information conveyed by such a phrase is what a listener is likely to have encountered before, meaning that the verb ‘to go’ will anticipate the specification of a destination. The grammatical patterns that emerge from corpora and written texts can be grouped and analysed in regards to how they create meaning within their specific contexts.

One such approach is stylistics, which investigates literary works using a linguistic approach, where the symbiotic relationship of the linguistic and the literary affect one another. Spitzer characterises this process as ‘a cyclic motion whereby linguistic observation stimulates or modifies literary insight, and whereby literary insight in its turn stimulates further linguistic observation’ (qtd. in Leech and Short, 1981: 13).

However, some texts may appear to be highly literary, such as a novel, whereas a newspaper could contain less of these ‘literary’ markers. As such, Carter (2004) argues for a ‘cline...of literariness’ (67) in distinguishing between what might constitute as a creative work, and the degree to which it should be identified as creative.

Corpus stylistics is a branch of stylistics, which focuses on the patterns of speech identified in corpora of literary works. Mahlberg’s (2007) research shows that by identifying ‘Creative patterns of a literary text’ (48) from large corpora ‘stylisticians and corpus linguists’ (47) need not be polarised in the linguistic research they undertake. Fischer (2010) also recognises that ‘it allows for decoding meanings of literary texts’ (1).

Other linguists have also recognised the importance of recurrent patterns in language. Stubbs (1996) suggests that ‘patterns are not in the individual words, but in the grammar, and

they therefore require abstract descriptive categories to state them' (92). Biber's (2004) lexical bundles and Carter and McCarthy's (2006) word clusters each provide descriptive categories that identify the function of types of patterns. These two approaches provide a range of interpersonal functions of patterns in spoken and written language, with a focus on interactional aspects. Therefore, language spoken and written, literary and non-literary, is formulaic in structure, featuring patterns that are repeated.

A combination of these approaches is useful when considering a text with a high proportion of dialogue. Research into the TV sitcom *Friends* (Quaglio, 2009) and of Shakespeare's plays (Short, 1996) has shown parallels between patterns of natural conversations and fictional works involving dialogue. Conversation turn taking theory (Short, 1996) can also be applied to the speech of literary texts since to a certain extent created dialogue also mirrors techniques used by speakers in everyday life. Short (1996) outlines the benefits of investigating speech acts as 'that we can use this context-boundness to infer important unstated aspects of context, including social relations between characters, when we read literary texts' (200). This shows that speech acts supply information about the interpersonal relationships of the characters that contribute to the meaning of the piece. Previous studies such as Ohmann (1971) investigated speech acts in literary texts acknowledging that 'a novel is mimetic of a narrative account, rather than simply *being* a narrative account' (14). Ohmann (1971) claims this distinction is what allows the reader to make judgements about what 'is true or false' (14) in a text. However, beyond raising awareness for that concept of what is literary, Carter (2004) suggests that Ohmann's research is limited since identical speech acts can, and do, occur in everyday language outside of creative texts (61).

Similarly, Linear Unit Grammar (Sinclair, 2006) focuses on texts that involve an interaction, including literary works. However LUG differs in the sense that it avoids an item-spotting approach towards linguistic patterns in favour of a linear investigation of texts. Subsequent studies have not yet built upon LUG, and the example of the literary analysis of *Ulysses* provided by Sinclair. However, Short (1996) also analysed the texts of James Joyce in regards to Direct Speech (298-304) including the 'freer forms of DS' (304), which is comparable to the 'stream of consciousness' that Sinclair (2006: 122) identifies. Thus in analysing a literary work with LUG, particularly one resonant in dialogue, drawing on other research in literary and conversational patterns can be useful to the discussion.

Methodology

The text is a short story by Ernest Hemingway *Hills like White Elephants*, chosen because of the importance of the dialogue within the narrative. The story works on the basis of sub-text where 'characters often *say* one thing but *mean* another' (Short, 1996: 180). The two characters are referred to as *the girl* and *the man*. Although the conversation appears commonplace enough, the subtext (Short, 181) implies the girl is pregnant and the couple are discussing whether she should have an abortion. Reading through the narrative, it is possible to see how it is similar to a transcript of a spoken exchange since the man and the woman observe the rules of cooperative conventional conversation. However, due to the medium of its production, it is necessarily influenced by literary considerations. As such any linguistic analysis will have to recognise these factors when constructing meaning from the text.

As a result, for the purpose of this investigation the analysis will focus solely on the dialogue and exclude the description elements. This is not to say that other elements have not been tested under the framework but that this essay recognises the significance of conversational techniques provides a more fruitful discussion.

For this analysis, the process of LUG is replicated up to Step 4. The text is broken down into PUBs (Provisional Unit Boundaries) (Sinclair, 2006: 54), and then these elements

are classified into their respective O and M categories and sub-categories. The identification of such categories is useful for ascertaining how the text is constructed by relating these to the functions of the classified PUBs. This process is evident in Appendix B. Appendix B consists of numbered lines of the PUBs and element type, showing only those which are the direct speech of the characters. Where line numbers are used in the analysis they refer to the PUBs of Appendix B. Although the LUMs (Linear Units of Meaning) (Sinclair, 2006: 54) have not been fully constructed, the analysis does refer to which elements in the linear string of text would constitute the LUM, in places where this augments the discussion.

In Sinclair's (2006) study of LUG, a literary text is analysed: *Ulysses* by James Joyce. Although a constructed literary piece, Sinclair looks at *Ulysses* 'as if it were the transcript of a real monologue' (2006: 122). In the same way, this analysis will treat the dialogue of *Hills like White Elephants* as if it were a real transcript of spoken conversation. Unlike the *Ulysses* example but similar to the transcripts of conversation examined by Sinclair, this short story involves interaction between two characters. In part, the meaning of the text is likely to arise from the depiction of their relationship. Just as in natural conversation, fictional interactions will employ speech acts (Short, 1996), lexical bundles (Biber, 2004) and word clusters (Carter and McCarthy, 2006) to construct these relationships. By applying both LUG and the other frameworks, the literary meaning of the interaction can be analysed.

Analysis

The majority of *Hills like White Elephants* consists of dialogue, and parallel to Sinclair's analysis of *Ulysses* 'it might be interesting to compare authentic speech with the fabricated variety' (2006: 120). Hemingway presents the dialogue of *Hills like White Elephants* as an informal conversation. We can list the elements of how many of each chunk type occurs according to LUG.

OT	49
OI	28
M	106
MF	1
+MF	1
M-	24
+M	22
+M-	1
MS	25
MR	15
MA	0

The patterns of the distribution broadly show that the dialogue functions according to what might be expected from informal naturally occurring speech. The number of simple Ms to other M types is roughly equal which suggests the speech is relatively well planned, perhaps expectedly, as Hemingway crafts it. However, there are a significant enough proportion of other M elements to suggest the topic increments mirror the, often fast-paced, and more fragmentary nature of casual speech.

The MS elements add a level of complexity to the dialogue since they 'provide specifications or expansions to the preceding M unit, and have the effect of chaining increments into larger wholes' (Sinclair, 2006: 116). Resultantly the conversation appears more 'content-oriented' (Sinclair, 2006: 114) that it actually is, showing the MS elements are instrumental in creating the effect that the characters are speaking in depth, although the phrases do not refer to anything specific. These MS elements are often associated with the

female character's questions, which 'give[s] the impression of afterthoughts rather than planned speech' (Sinclair, 2006:1 21), e.g. lines 188-194:

And	OI
if I do it	M-
you'll be happy	+M
and	OT
things will be like they were	MS
and	OT
you'll love me?	MS

Often the MS units form the latter PUBs of questions directed to the male speaker, as in the above example. This is also evident in Lines 103-108, and Lines 140-147. Combined with the M- and +M units it extends the LUM to create a sense of urgency in the speech of the female character suggesting she is anxious to resolve the tension that exists between her and the man. This is further emphasised by the *if*-clause the female speaker uses as 'a classic example of the *if-then* relationship in argumentation' (Sinclair, 2006: 88). The addition of the MS elements after this M-, +M structure, as part of a question, lessens the argumentative quality. The questions seem to seek a response from the male more fervently, highlighting the collaborative nature of the exchange. However, the *if* elements also cause prospection and 'sets the parameters with which the next utterance is evaluated' (Sinclair 2004: 88), i.e. the response from the male. The questions are somewhat leading and the female, as well as the reader, has an expectation of the desired response.

The male speaker more frequently uses completeness (Sinclair, 2006: 136) than prospection showing reasoned conversational turns, and particularly in answering the questions. In the dialogue assigned to the male, there is often an M- where the latter +M is introduced with *if*, e.g. lines 226-29:

You've got to realize,	M
that	OT
I don't want you to do it	M-
if you don't want to.	+M

This is a reversal of the *if* M- structure used in the females character's questions. The M- is '*complete* as a potential unit of meaning, but not *finished* as an actual topic increment' (Sinclair, 2006: 136) The *if* +Ms lessen the illocutionary force of the M- which could have seemed like a statement, and shows the male speaker as wanting to reassure the female of his affection. The M+, -M and MS units combine to form part of LUM units, and as such they also appear to be somewhat unplanned, again reinforcing the idea of a cooperative exchange where the two characters are attempting to find the best solution together.

Sinclair claims the MR and OI elements are not necessary for the output of the LUG process: 'There are also intermediate units, which are MR (message fragments) and OI (interaction organiser). These do not appear in the output, but they may give rise to accompanying roles' (Sinclair, 2006: 155). Yet in this investigation the identification of the OI and MR elements, and the subsequent roles they play in the exchange are paramount for understanding the literary meaning. It is uncharacteristic for a written text, although it adheres to naturally occurring conversation, to contain the amount of MR elements that exist in this text. The following section is key for analysis of the MR elements (lines 185-205):

'What did you say?'	M
'I said	OI
we could have everything.'	M
'We can have everything.'	M

‘No,	OI
we can’t.’	M
‘We can have the whole world.’	MR
‘No,	OI
we can’t.’	MR
‘We can go everywhere.’	MR
‘No,	OI
we can’t.	MR
It isn’t ours any more.’	MS
‘It’s ours.’	M
‘No,	OI
it isn’t.	M
And	OT
once they take it away,	M
you never get it back.’	MS
‘But	OT
they haven’t taken it away.’	M

These MR elements show that viewing the dialogue as simply a collaborative exchange is too simplistic. The MR’s of the male and female speakers are polarised as the man uses positive phrases while the woman speaks negatively. There is a definite we can/we can’t binary showing the opposition between the two characters below the figurative and seemingly trivial surface talk. Sinclair (2006) labels such repetitions as a type of matching whereby the characters are ‘registering an objection to the line of argument’ (139), and each character tries to claim their opinion as what should be the accepted one. They are also ‘important elements in the rhetorical architecture of a discourse’ (Sinclair, 2006: 139), exploited here for literary effect to make the conflict more apparent, and show a division between the two characters.

The number of O elements which organise the discourse, 77 in 272, as with the Joyce text *Ulysses* is quite high, showing a similarity to everyday conversational norms in terms of how speakers organise their dialogue and provide emotional responses. Particularly useful to the current investigation are the elements classified as OI to denote the interactional aspects of the exchange. They are used ‘to express stance (*I’m not sure, I know, I think*)’ (Sinclair, 2006: 116) showing the tension between the speakers which characterises the narrative. The OI elements are very prominent during the fast exchange of the section reproduced above. The pattern of occurrence of the OI units shows the female speaker expresses more uncertainty in her attitudinal stances than the male character: *I don’t know* (L27), *I know* (L217), *maybe* (L224). The man also uses *I think* (L126), and *I know* (L109, L124), which are commonly OI elements, but instead employs them as ‘firm expressions of the speaker’s persona views’ (Sinclair, 2006: 78) resulting in M elements. This suggests the male speaker has quite a clear agenda and viewpoint he wants to express, but through structural lexical choices is simultaneously giving the girl the impression that he is being cooperative and supportive.

Overall, Hemingway carefully constructs the dialogue in *Hills like White Elephants*, yet it also shows characteristics of casual speech. In particular the OI and MR elements, which are not usually associated with a written text, imply that applying other linguistic frameworks will further an understanding of the text. LUG is focused on ‘assigning meaning to stretches of text’ (Sinclair, 2006: 143) because of ‘the tendency of speakers and listeners to chunk language into manageable units as they participate in language-mediated interaction’ (Sinclair, 2004: 62). However, by considering alternative perspectives with ‘recurrent aspect of chunks’ (Sinclair, 2004:62), further meaning can be gleaned from the text.

Another linear method of investigating the dialogue of *Hills like White Elephants* builds on Short's (1996) research into turn-taking and topic control in plays. Looking at the turn lengths of the male's and female's speech during the short story shows that the amount of dialogue assigned to each character is roughly equal. There is also a clear structure to when the male or female character dominates the conversation, and when they are both providing input:

Line Numbers	Description
1-32	Trivial talk; drinks
33-68	Woman dominates; avoidance of issue
68-73	Trivial talk; drinks
74-89	Male dominates; broaches subject of operation
90-129	Male dominates; prompted by female questioning
130-147	Female dominates in long questions
148-185	Equal discourse; medium length turns
186-203	Equal and fast paced exchange with short turns
204-253	Equal discourse; medium length turns
254-272	Trivial talk; drinks and train

As the table shows, Hemingway creates the pattern of turn-taking to reflect the action of the story. Framing the conversation with trivial talk has the effect of suggesting, on a surface level, that by the end the couple have discussed nothing of importance. Intuitive readers will realise that the deictic references to drinks and the hills are simply used to create the impression that there are larger issues being avoided, although the man only makes reference to an *operation* twice (L75, L77). The other issues under discussion are abstract concepts such as: *us* (L100), *love* (L136), and *the whole world* (L191). These create the impression that the characters are speaking symbolically rather than specifically.

Also, the fact that the female and male speakers each dominate in turn, before speaking more collaboratively intensifies the girl's avoidance of the topic, since her own deictic ramblings are followed by a lack of feedback to the man's speech from Lines 74-89. Thus, the structure of the turn suggests important interpersonal relationships that exist between the characters, although these are masked by the trivial talk to allow the reader to infer the subtext.

Short (1996) claims that 'All other things being equal, powerful speakers in conversations have the most turns, have the longest turns, initiate conversational exchanges, control what is being talked about and who talks when, and interrupts others' (206-7). Hemingway's depiction allows both characters to assume the role of a powerful speaker during the story, and resultantly the topic varies throughout the piece. As Carter (2004) finds in a similar context 'the constant topic-switching create[s] a sense of surface incoherence' (105). Resultantly the 'coherence' (Carter, 2004: 105) is 'largely interpersonal rather than topical' (105) which accords with the trivial talk. Since the character avoiding talking about the issue directly, it means that the interpersonal clues become more important to understanding the meaning of the exchange. To a certain extent the vague language here is resonant of 'solidarity and membership' (Carter, 2004: 107) depicting that the characters are familiar enough with each other to understand what is being referred to without explicit specification. However, the table above supports the fact that the characters are engaged in a

dispute. Certainly between lines 186-203, the fast exchange suggests there is conflict. Previous LUG analysis of the yes/no binary within this section further supports this claim.

To build further on the previous LUG analysis of this essay, it is possible to see the female speaker as more powerful than the male speaker. The general tone of the writing implies the male character is dominant; he orders the drinks in Spanish and takes care of the luggage. Yet linguistically the female seems to ‘control what is being talked about and who talks when, and interrupts others’ (Short, 1996: 207). She interrupts the conversation (L214, L222), determines topic drift (L17, L218), and closes a conversational topic (L223-225, L249). Conversely, the male character is also shown as willing to start up the same conversation again after she has requested to end the topic. As has already been discussed, the male character has a clear agenda even though the female character is more linguistically forceful. The interpersonal norms of their relationship and conversational habits are clearly responsible for creating meaning within the text. As they are not explicit, the reader must make an educated assumption as to what these might be.

Investigating these indications of interpersonal relationships further, Carter and McCarthy (2006) identified the most common clusters in spoken and written texts. In the dialogue of the characters the instances of the top twenty two-words clusters is quite significant, as shown below:

1. you know	3	11. I was	3
2. I mean	0	12. on the	0
3. I think	1	13. and then	2
4. in the	1	14. to be	1
5. it was	0	15. if you	5
6. I don't	13	16. don't know	1
7. of the	1	17. to the	1
8. and I	0	18. at the	0
9. sort of	0	19. have to	2
10. do you	3	20. you can	0

Considering this is a fictional conversation, finding at least one example in 13/20 of the top twenty two-word clusters shows great similarity to everyday speech. The function of these clusters according to Carter and McCarthy (2006) are rather interpersonal to make ‘assumptions about common ground between themselves and their listeners’ (835) which is evident from the vague language, which reduces the need for explicit semantic content. It also portrays the characters as ‘hedg[ing] their assertions and express degrees of certainty about the world’, another feature shown already by LUG and that highlights the avoidance of coming to a clear conclusion of their issues.

Looking specifically at the thirteen occurrences of *I don't*, using Biber's (2004) lexical bundles approach, we can see that 6/13 form part of the phrase *I don't want you to* which Biber's classifies under the category of attitudinal/modality stance somewhere between desire and an obligation/directive. This suggests that the phrases are more leading in their suggestion of what the female should do than they might appear to be. This is supported by the fact the associated collocations in two cases are *you don't want to*, and *you don't have to* in a further case, which are both classified as obligation/directives. These personal expressions of stance, ‘direc[t] the listener to carry out actions that the speaker wants to have completed’ (Biber, 2004: 390). Thus it can be suggested that in the subtext of the man's speech he is trying to get the girl to agree to have an abortion, although this is obscured by the desire bundles of *I don't want you to* which ‘frame self-motivated wishes and desires’ (Biber, 2004: 390).

By using the approach of both Biber (2004) and McCarthy and Carter (2006) it is evident that the grammatical patterns supply information about the interpersonal relationships between the characters. The characters use the patterns commonly associated with naturally occurring speech to indicate their levels of certainty and personal stance about the topic under discussion. The lack of specific semantic content aside from *operation* means the understanding of the exchange arises mainly from these interpersonal and stance clues. Additionally, Short's (1996) framework allows an overview of conversational structure, and how the trivial talk frames the conversation. In turn, we can identify the points during this conversational structure at which the pair are engaged in the highest level of conflict, even if the actual issues are left unstated.

Conclusion

In conclusion, LUG acts as a suitable basis for literary analysis by providing a useful method of incrementing the text and classifying the roles of such increments. However, the categories that LUG proposes to be the least important MR's and OI's are particularly crucial to the understanding of *Hills like White Elephants*. This is because the short story relies heavily on the subtext of what the characters are saying. Resultantly, using the work of other linguists allows the identification of further, and non-linear, grammatical patterns which are important for deciphering the interpersonal relationship of the characters. Short (1996) shows how the conversational turns are structured, and the work of Biber (2004) and McCarthy and Carter (2006) indicates the stance of characters during that structure. Together these models highlight the grammatical patterns that convey such interpersonal information.

The fact that LUG provides useful insights into the meaning of *Hills like White Elephants* demonstrates that breaking the text into chunks that increment the meaning is a worthwhile approach. However, the requirement of linearity can restrict the applicability of the model. This text is markedly similar to a naturally occurring conversation, and as has been evidenced, examining the dialogue with the exclusion of the narrative voice provides a worthwhile examination of the meaning of the text. Treating the dialogue as though it were a spoken exchange allows LUG to process the text more easily, whereas other approaches such as Short (1996) can also account for the narrative voice. Looking specifically at the current discussion, all the frameworks have demonstrated their usefulness to understanding the text. However, to gain a fuller analysis, the linearity of LUG needed to be augmented by other methods of identifying grammatical patterns.

Bibliography

Biber, D., Johansson, S. Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.

Biber, D., Conrad S., and Cortes, V. (2004) 'If you look at ..Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbook.' *Applied Linguistics*, 25.3: 371-405.

Carter, R. (2004). *Language and creativity. The art of common talk*. London: Routledge.

Carter R. and M. J. McCarthy. (2006). *Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide to Spoken and Written Grammar and Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fischer-Starcke, Bettina (2010) *Corpus and Discourse: Corpus Linguistics in Literary Analysis*. London, Continuum.

Leech G. & M. Short. (1981). *Style in Fiction. A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional prose*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Mahlberg, M. (2009). 'Corpus stylistics and the Pickwickian watering-pot'. In P. Baker (ed.). *Contemporary Corpus Linguistics*. London: Continuum, 47-63.

Ohmann, R. (1971). 'Speech acts and the definition of literature', *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 4: 1-19.

Quaglio, Paulo. (2009) *Television Dialogue: The Sitcom Friends vs. Natural Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Sinclair, J. McH. (2004). *Trust the Text. Language, Corpus and Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Sinclair, J. McH. & A. Mauranen. (2006). *Linear Unit Grammar. Integrating Speech and Writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stubbs, Michael. (1996). *Text and Corpus Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Appendix A

Ernest Hemingway, *Hills like White Elephants* in *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: The Finca Vigia Edition* (Scribner: New York, 1998), pp. 211-214

On this side there was no shade and no trees and the station was between two lines of rails in the sun. Close against the side of the station there was the warm shadow of the building and a curtain, made of strings of bamboo beads, hung across the open door into the bar, to keep out flies. The American and the girl with him sat at a table in the shade, outside the building. It was very hot and the express from Barcelona would come in forty minutes. It stopped at this junction for two minutes and went on to Madrid.

‘What should we drink?’ the girl asked. She had taken off her hat and put it on the table.

‘It’s pretty hot,’ the man said.

‘Let’s drink beer.’

‘Dos cervezas,’ the man said into the curtain.

‘Big ones?’ a woman asked from the doorway.

‘Yes. Two big ones.’

The woman brought two glasses of beer and two felt pads. She put the felt pads and the beer glasses on the table and looked at the man and the girl. The girl was looking off at the line of hills. They were white in the sun and the country was brown and dry.

‘They look like white elephants,’ she said.

‘I’ve never seen one,’ the man drank his beer.

‘No, you wouldn’t have.’

‘I might have,’ the man said. ‘Just because you say I wouldn’t have doesn’t prove anything.’

The girl looked at the bead curtain. ‘They’ve painted something on it,’ she said. ‘What does it say?’

‘Anis del Toro. It’s a drink.’

‘Could we try it?’

The man called ‘Listen’ through the curtain. The woman came out from the bar. ‘Four reales.’

‘We want two Anis del Toro.’

‘With water?’

‘Do you want it with water?’

‘I don’t know,’ the girl said. ‘Is it good with water?’ ‘It’s all right.’

‘You want them with water?’ asked the woman.

1. River in the north of Spain.

‘Yes, with water.’

‘It tastes like licorice,’ the girl said and put the glass down. ‘That’s the way with everything.’

‘Yes,’ said the girl. ‘Everything tastes of licorice. Especially all the things you’ve waited so long for, like absinthe.’ ‘Oh, cut it out.’

‘You started it,’ the girl said. ‘I was being amused. I was having a fine time.’

‘Well, let’s try and have a fine time.’

‘All right. I was trying. I said the mountains looked like white elephants. Wasn’t that bright?’

‘That was bright.’

‘I wanted to try this new drink. That’s all we do, isn’t it—look at things and try new drinks?’

‘I guess so.’

The girl looked across at the hills.

‘They’re lovely hills,’ she said. ‘They don’t really look like white ele-

phants. I just meant the coloring of their skin through the trees.’ ‘Should we have another drink?’

‘All right.’

The warm wind blew the bead curtain against the table.

‘The beer’s nice and cool,’ the man said.

‘It’s lovely,’ the girl said.

‘It’s really an awfully simple operation, Jig,’ the man said. ‘It’s not really an operation at all.’

The girl looked at the ground the table legs rested on.

‘I know you wouldn’t mind it, Jig. It’s really not anything. It’s just to let the air in.’

The girl did not say anything.

‘I’ll go with you and I’ll stay with you all the time. They just let the air in and then it’s all perfectly natural.’

‘Then what will we do afterward?’

‘We’ll be fine afterward. Just like we were before.’

‘What makes you think so?’

‘That’s the only thing that bothers us. It’s the only thing that’s made us unhappy.’

The girl looked at the bead curtain, put her hand out and took hold of two of the strings of beads.

‘And you think then we’ll be all right and be happy.’

‘I know we will. You don’t have to be afraid. I’ve known lots of people that have done it.’

‘So have I,’ said the girl. ‘And afterward they were all so happy.’

‘Well,’ the man said, ‘if you don’t want to you don’t have to. I wouldn’t have you do it if you didn’t want to. But I know it’s perfectly simple.’

‘And you really want to?’

‘I think it’s the best thing to do. But I don’t want you to do it if you don’t really want to.’

‘And if I do it you’ll be happy and things will be like they were and you’ll love me?’

‘I love you now. You know I love you.’

‘I know. But if I do it, then it will be nice again if I say things are like white elephants, and you’ll like it?’

‘I’ll love it. I love it now but I just can’t think about it. You know how I get when I worry.’

‘If I do it you won’t ever worry?’

‘I won’t worry about that because it’s perfectly simple.’

‘Then I’ll do it. Because I don’t care about me.’

‘What do you mean?’

‘I don’t care about me.’

‘Well, I care about you.’

‘Oh, yes. But I don’t care about me. And I’ll do it and then everything will be fine.’

‘I don’t want you to do it if you feel that way.’

The girl stood up and walked to the end of the station. Across, on the other side, were fields of grain and trees along the banks of the Ebro. Far away, beyond the river, were mountains. The shadow of a cloud moved across the field of grain and she saw the river through the trees.

‘And we could have all this,’ she said. ‘And we could have everything and every day we make it more impossible.’

‘What did you say?’

‘I said we could have everything.’

‘We can have everything.’

‘No, we can’t.’

‘We can have the whole world.’

‘No, we can’t.’

‘We can go everywhere.’

‘No, we can’t. It isn’t ours any more.’

‘It’s ours.’

‘No, it isn’t. And once they take it away, you never get it back.’

‘But they haven’t taken it away.’

‘We’ll wait and see.’

‘Come on back in the shade,’ he said. ‘You mustn’t feel that way.’ ‘I don’t feel any way,’ the girl said. ‘I just know things.’

‘I don’t want you to do anything that you don’t want to do—’

‘Nor that isn’t good for me,’ she said. ‘I know. Could we have another beer?’

‘All right. But you’ve got to realize—’

‘I realize,’ the girl said. ‘Can’t we maybe stop talking?’

They sat down at the table and the girl looked across at the hills on the dry side of the valley and the man looked at her and at the table. ‘You’ve got to realize,’ he said, ‘that I don’t want you to do it if you don’t want to. I’m perfectly willing to go through with it if it means any-thing to you.’

‘Doesn’t it mean anything to you? We could get along.’

‘Of course it does. But I don’t want anybody but you. I don’t want any one else. And I know it’s perfectly simple.’

‘Yes, you know it’s perfectly simple.’

‘It’s all right for you to say that, but I do know it.’

‘Would you do something for me now?’

‘I’d do anything for you.’

‘Would you please please please please please please stop talking?’

He did not say anything but looked at the bags against the wall of the station. There were labels on them from all the hotels where they had spent nights.

‘But I don’t want you to,’ he said, ‘I don’t care anything about it.’

‘I’ll scream,’ the girl said.

The woman came out through the curtains with two glasses of beer and put them down on the damp felt pads. ‘The train comes in five minutes,’ she said.

‘What did she say?’ asked the girl.

‘That the train is coming in five minutes.’

The girl smiled brightly at the woman, to thank her.

‘I’d better take the bags over to the other side of the station,’ the man said. She smiled at him.

‘All right. Then come back and we’ll finish the beer.’

He picked up the two heavy bags and carried them around the station to the other tracks. He looked up the tracks but could not see the train. Coming back, he walked through the barroom, where people waiting for the train were drinking. He drank an Anis at the bar and looked at the people. They were all waiting reasonably for the train. He went out through the bead curtain. She was sitting at the table and smiled at him.

‘Do you feel better?’ he asked.

‘I feel fine,’ she said. ‘There’s nothing wrong with me. I feel fine.’

Appendix B

Dialogue analysed according to LUG

'What should we drink?' M

'It's pretty hot,' M

'Let's drink beer.' M

'Dos cervezas,' M

'Big ones?' M

'Yes. OI

Two big ones.' M

'They look like white elephants,' M

'I've never seen one,' M

'No, OI

you wouldn't have.' M

'I might have,' MR

'Just OT

because OI

you say I wouldn't have M-

doesn't prove anything.' +M

'They've painted something on it,'

M

'What does it say?' M

'Anis del Toro. M

It's a drink.' MS

'Could we try it?' M

'Four reales.' M

'We want M-

two Anis del Toro.' M+

'With water?' M

'Do you want it with water?' M

'I don't know,' OI

'Is it good with water?' M

'It's all right.' OI

'You want them with water?' M

'Yes, OI

with water.' M

'It tastes like licorice,' M

'That's the way with everything.' M

'Yes,' OI

'Everything tastes of licorice. M

Especially OT

all the things M-

you've waited so long for, +M

like absinthe.' MS

'Oh, OI

cut it out.' M

'You started it,' M

'I was being amused. M

I was having a fine time.' MS

'Well, OI

let's try and have a fine time.' M

‘All right. OI
 I was trying. M
 I said OT
 the mountains looked like white ele-phants. M
 Wasn’t that bright?’ M
 ‘That was bright.’ MR
 ‘I wanted to try this new drink. M
 That’s all we do, M-
 isn’t it— +M
 look at things MS
 and OT
 try new drinks?’ MS
 ‘I guess so.’ OI
 ‘They’re lovely hills,’ M
 ‘They don’t really look like white ele-phants. MS
 I just meant M-
 the coloring of their skin +M
 through the trees.’ MS
 ‘Should we have another drink?’ M
 ‘All right.’ OT
 ‘The beer’s nice M
 and OT
 cool,’ MS
 ‘It’s lovely,’ M
 ‘It’s really an awfully simple operation, M
 Jig,’ M
 ‘It’s not really an operation M
 at all.’ OI
 ‘I know you wouldn’t mind it, M
 Jig. M
 It’s really not anything. M
 It’s just to let the air in.’ MS
 ‘I’ll go with you M
 and OT
 I’ll stay with you M
 all the time. MS
 They just let the air in M
 and then OT
 it’s all perfectly natural.’ M
 ‘Then OT
 what will we do M
 afterward?’ MS
 ‘We’ll be fine M
 afterward. MS
 Just OT
 like we were before.’ M
 ‘What makes you think so?’ M
 ‘That’s the only thing M-
 that OT
 bothers us. +M

It's the only thing M-
 that's made us unhappy.' +M
 'And OT
 you think OT
 then OT
 we'll be all right M
 and OT
 be happy.' MS
 ' I know we will. M
 You don't have to be afraid. M
 I've known lots of people M-
 that OT
 have done it.' +M
 'So have I , ' M
 'And OT
 afterward OT
 they were all so happy.' M
 'Well,' OI
 'if you don't want to M-
 you don't have to. +M
 I wouldn't have you do it M-
 if you didn't want to. +M
 But OT
 I know it's perfectly simple.' M
 'And you really want to?' M
 'I think it's the best thing to do. OI
 But OT
 I don't want you to do it M-
 if you don't really want to.' +M
 'And OI
 if I do it M-
 you'll be happy +M
 and OT
 things will be like they were MS
 and OT
 you'll love me?' MS
 'I love you now. M
 You know I love you.' MR
 'I know. OI
 But OT
 if I do it, M-
 then OT
 it will be nice again +M
 if I say M-
 things are like white elephants, +M
 and OT
 you'll like it?' MS
 'I'll love it. M
 I love it now MR
 but OT

I just can't think about it. M
 You know how I get M-
 when OT
 I worry.' +M
 ' If I do it M-
 you won't ever worry?' +M
 ' I won't worry about that M
 because OT
 it's perfectly simple.' M
 'Then OT
 I'll do it. M
 Because OT
 I don't care about me.' M
 'What do you mean?' M
 ' I don't care about me.' MR
 'Well, OI
 I care about you.' M
 'Oh, yes. OI
 But OT
 I don't care about me. MR
 And OT
 I'll do it M
 and then OT
 everything will be fine.' M
 'I don't want you to do it M-
 if you feel that way.' +M
 'And OT
 we could have all this,' M
 she said. OT
 'And OT
 we could have everything M
 and OT
 every day M-
 we make it more impossible.' +M
 'What did you say?' M
 'I said OI
 we could have everything.' M
 'We can have everything.' M
 'No, OI
 we can't.' M
 'We can have the whole world.' MR
 'No, OI
 we can't.' MR
 'We can go everywhere.' MR
 'No, OI
 we can't. MR
 It isn't ours any more.' MS
 'It's ours.' MR
 'No, OI
 it isn't. MR

And OT
 once they take it away, M-
 you never get it back.’ +M
 ‘But OT
 they haven’t taken it away.’ M
 ‘We’ll wait and see.’ M
 ‘Come on back M
 in the shade,’ MS
 ‘You mustn’t feel that way.’ M
 ‘I don’t feel any way,’ M
 I just know things.’ M
 ‘I don’t want you to do anything M-
 that you don’t want to do—’ +MF
 ‘Nor M-
 that OT
 isn’t good for me,’ +M
 ‘I know. OI
 Could we have another beer?’ M
 ‘All right. OI
 But OT
 you’ve got to realize—’ MF
 ‘I realize,’ M
 ‘Can’t we M-
 maybe OI
 stop talking?’ +M
 ‘You’ve got to realize,’ M
 ‘that OT
 I don’t want you to do it M-
 if you don’t want to. +M
 I’m perfectly willing M-
 to go through with it +M-
 if it means any-thing to you.’ +M
 ‘Doesn’t it mean anything to you? M
 We could get along.’ MS
 ‘Of course it does. M
 But OT
 I don’t want anybody but you. M
 I don’t want any one else. MR
 And OT
 I know it’s perfectly simple.’ M
 ‘Yes, OI
 you know it’s perfectly simple.’ M
 ‘It’s all right for you to say that, M
 but OT
 I do know it.’ MR
 ‘Would you do something for me M
 now?’ MS
 ‘I’d do anything for you.’ M
 ‘Would you please please please
 please please please please stop

talking?' M
'But OT
I don't want you to,' M
'I don't care anything about it.' M
'I'll scream,' M
'The train comes M
in five minutes,' MS
'What did she say?' M
'That OT
the train is coming M
in five minutes.' MS
'I'd better take the bags M
over to the other side MS
of the station,' MS
'All right. OI
Then OT
come back M
and OT
we'll finish the beer.' M
Do you feel better?' M
'I feel fine,' M
'There's nothing wrong M
with me. MS
I feel fine.' MR