

Politeness Theories in Conversations with Special Reference to Cather's Short Story "On the Gulls' Road": A Pragmatic Analysis.

Angham Abdul Kadhem
College of Education
Al-Qadisiya University

Abstract

The current study addresses politeness theory, which is one of the salient pragmatic theories in addition to Speech Acts and Implicature theories. According to a number of linguists, this theory is branched into different theories, three of which are tackled in this study : Politeness Principle Theory, Face Theory, and Politeness Systems Theory by Leech(1983), Brown and Levinson(1987),and Scollon and Scollon(2001),respectively. Therefore, this study aims at investigating linguistically, how polite or impolite styles are measured in conversations? their impact on these conversations, and how politeness theories affect the addresser's intended meaning? It is hypothesized that politeness theories of Politeness Principle, Face theory, and Politeness Systems work together to decide on polite/impolite style. The violation of some politeness rules does not necessarily lead to impoliteness due to some social relations. To validate these hypotheses, the study falls into two parts. It begins by briefly over viewing the theoretical framework underlying politeness, in particular discussing some definitions of politeness and Politeness Principle and its maxims, exploring the Face theory and its strategies by Brown and Levinson, and how far these strategies affect polite style then, dealing with Politeness systems theory by Scollon and Scollon. The other part displays a practical application of what has been presented theoretically. Cather's short story On the Gulls' Road is analyzed. This part experiences seven levels and about thirty sub-levels to be analyzed

The study concludes by exploring that the three politeness theories are frequently integrated and interrelated to each other in social communications.

1.POLITENESS THEORIES

1.0 Introductory Notes:

Frequently, in every day conversations it is normal to hear that someone's style is polite or impolite, or even some style is more polite than another.... etc. Linguistically speaking, according to which criteria can one decide what is polite or impolite? And are there any theoretical frameworks in taking these decisions? Politeness is the expression or the behavior one adopts in order to mitigate a social interaction. Different theories have tackled this topic during the last two decades.

Modals of linguistic Politeness have been generated from a considerable number of empirical studies, like, Leech's (1983) 'Politeness Principle Theory', Brown and Levinson's (1987) 'Face Theory', and Scollon and Scollon (2001) 'Politeness Systems Theory'. The study sheds lights on these theories indicating the main fields each one has dealt with.

1.1 What is Politeness?

Different definitions are presented for politeness by linguistic scholars. Lakoff (1990:34) and Leech (1983:82) define

politeness as the forms of behavior which facilitates personal and social interaction to obtain an atmosphere of harmony between interlocutors via minimizing the inner inherent conflict in all human interactions.

The linguistic modal of politeness was put forward by Brown and Levinson (1987: 61). They define politeness as "forms of behavior used to maintain and develop communication between potentially aggressive partners". They maintain that positive and negative strategies are employed to minimize threat and to accomplish linguistic politeness. This view is reinforced by Scollon and Scollon (1995: 35) to identify two types of politeness the 'involvement' which coincides with the positive strategy, and the 'independence' which goes with the negative strategy.

Spencer-Oatey (2000) presents a distinct viewpoint; she excludes Brown and Levinson's notion of negative face. The notion of politeness intensifies the analyzing of socio-cultural behavior in social interaction. It concentrates on one's want to be perceived as a member of the group, i.e., the positive face is set forth.

Mills (2003: 6) hardens the previous definition to define politeness as the employing of a certain behavior to lessen the imposition between the parties in a social interaction. Additionally, Holtgraves and Yang (1992:246) define politeness as "phrasing one's remarks to minimize face threat." It can be said that Mills and Holtgraves and Yang's definitions differ from Spencer-Oatey one's in that they

concentrate on the negative face rather than the positive one.

The free encyclopedia Wikipedia (2007: 1) defines politeness as the manipulating good behavior or etiquette, whose goal is to make the participants of an interaction feel comfortable and relaxed to each other.

Fraser (1990: 232) and Watts (2003: 20) have a similar viewpoint about politeness. Fraser states that there are some obligations and rights, which are considered by the addresser and the addressee of any conversational contract, which govern the negotiation of that contract. Also, there is always a possibility to renegotiate during the course of time as regards the situational context progressing. Watt (2003,20), on the other hand, defines politeness as the appropriate (linguistic or non-linguistic) behavior the participants handle in an ongoing interaction. It may be made prior to entering the interaction, but during the course of time, there is always a possibility for a re-negotiation of the construction of that behavior. It is clear that both of these definitions focus on the progressing of an interaction and how it may affect the procedures the parties adopt from the beginning of an interaction upward.

The definitions above, do not differ much from each other, they all imply that politeness is the behavior that is employed to overcome conflict and aggression (the negative politeness) in order to enhance smooth interaction (the positive politeness).

1.2 Politeness Theories

1.2.1 Politeness Principle theory:

Leech (1983:7) proposed the Politeness Principle (PP), which is a way or procedure to explain how politeness works in social interactions. This principle, which gives rise to six maxims, is motivated in respect to pragmatic scales of cost-benefit for the addressee as well as the indirectness scale of politeness.

The six maxims; Tact maxim, Generosity maxim, Approbation maxim, Modesty maxim, Agreement maxim, and Sympathy maxim, diverge of their value in relation to the colossal effect on the situation at hand. (Terkourafi, 2001: 56).

The breaching of the first-order Politeness Principle leads to a second-order Irony Principle (IP) or a third-order Banter Principle. (IP) "enables [the addresser] to be impolite while seeming to be polite," (Leech, 1983:143). That is, the addresser's behaviour is apparently polite, but actually it is not so, for instance, failing in answering a question, the addresser says How clever you are! To indicate the opposite, i.e., the addresser is not smart in the situation at hand.

Banter Principle, on the other hand, refers to the addresser's act which seems impolite but it does not so. For instance, a difficult math question is raised by a mother to the children, the youngest one answer it at once correctly, the mother said: How stupid boy you are.

Meaning exactly the opposite, i.e., you are really the cleverest one.

Both the IP and the Banter Principle are unserious reflecting the solidarity with the addressee. Consequently, the IP "is an apparently friendly way of being offensive," whereas, banter principle "is an offensive way of being friendly," (Leech 1983: 144). The considerable difference between them is that the IP is over politeness, i.e., indicates superiority or ironic distance. But, the banter one indicates under politeness, i.e., expresses familiarity and intimacy. Consequently, the IP and banter principle are opposite in their implicatures, for example:

1- you behave Very well!

This sentence can entail the following

-You don't behave well. (IP)

-You behave well but the addresser tries to appear impolite. (Banter Principle) (Ibid)

Before dealing with the Politeness maxims in detail, the types of illocutions to which they apply are demonstrated first.

1.2.1.1. Types of Illocutions:

A number of illocution types can be obtained according to the function they perform in relation to two goals the illocutionary and social. These types are:

1. Competitive: There is a competition between the illocutionary goal and the social one, like asking, ordinary, commanding, begging, demanding, etc.
2. Convivial: A concord and coincidence between the two goals the illocutionary and then social ones can be attended. For

example: thanking, congratulating, inviting, greeting, offering, etc.

3. Collaborative: A neutral relation between the illocutionary goal and the social one, like: reporting, announcing, asserting, instructing, etc.

4. Conflictive: A conflict can be noticed between the two goals, illocutionary and social, like: cursing, reprimanding, threatening, accusing, etc. (Leech, 1983: 104)

Searle's (1975 in Leech, 1983:105-6) on the other hand, state another set of illocution categories:

1. Assertives: The acts of this kind seem to be neutral as regard politeness behavior, like, asserting, stating, suggesting, complaining, claiming, reporting, etc. It is seen that such a kind links up with the collaborative type.

2. Directives: Leech (1983) changes directives into impositives, the illocutions of this kind coincides relatively with the competitive one, like: ordering, commanding, requesting, advising, etc. The addressor, via performing these acts, wants to obtain something by the addressee.

3. Commissives: like, promising, vowing, offering, inviting. This category goes with convivial category. The acts are made for the addressee's interest.

4. Expressives, e.g., thinking, congratulating, blaming, cursing, etc. it is obvious that some of the expressive illocutions like, thinking, congratulating, etc, are made for the addressee's interest, therefore, this

kind of illocutions harmonizes with the convivial type. Illocutions like, cursing, blaming, ...etc., tie up with the conflictive category.

5. Declarations, e.g., naming, christening excommunicating, sentencing, appointing, resigning, etc. Those who have authority, like, judges, ministers, etc, normally perform these illocutions.

1.2.1.2 Politeness Maxims:

. Tact and Generosity Maxims

Tact maxim is:

a. Minimize cost to other [(b) Maximize benefit to other]

While Generosity maxim is:

a. Minimize benefit to self [(b) Maximize cost to self]. (Leech, 1983:132)

Obviously, each, tact and Generosity maxims (above) and the next two maxims (Approbation and Modesty) are complemented by sub-maxims between square brackets, to manifest their sub-important as regards politeness maxims. The super maxims are negative as opposite to the sub-ones, which are positive which, reflects that the negative politeness, seeking autonomous, is more important than positive Politeness, seeking group relations. (Ibid: 132-149 and Cutting, 2002).

The two maxims, Tact and Generosity, apply to impositives, and commissives illocutions. The pragmatic scale of cost-benefit is centred in these maxims, where the tact maxim is other-benefit-centred, while the generosity maxim is self-cost-centred.

One can induce, as regards these maxims, the following dichotomies:

- cost to other→impolite
- cost to self→polite
- benefit to other→polite
- benefit to self→impolite

The asymmetry of the following examples can be explained in terms of the previous relation:

2- a- Hand me the newspaper.

B- I will hand you the newspaper.

3- a- I can visit you whenever I like.

B- you can visit us whenever you like.

The (a_s) of these two examples are presumed to be impolite for the reason that they demonstrate cost to other but benefit to self, respectively. Contrary to this, the (bs) are inferred to be polite inasmuch as they elucidate cost to self-benefit to other, respectively. (Ibid)

Moreover, sometimes although the content is relatively the same, yet the scale of politeness is different. Indirectness, in this case, plays an impact role to these two maxims. One can say that indirectness has a forward relation with politeness regarding impositives, i.e., the more the addresser is indirect in ordering, commanding, requesting, advising, etc., the more polite he/she is. For example

4- a- Shut your mouth.

b- Would you please keep quite?

Or

5- a- Carry the cases.

b- Could you possibly carry the cases?

Examples (4-a) and (5-a) are both direct

since the addressee has no alternatives but to perform the action, i.e., the addressee is forced to do it. Such examples, maximize cost to the addressee, consequently, they are impolite.

(bs), on the other hand, are indirect impositions because the addressee has a free will to say no, then, these example minimize cost to the addressee by the use of options. Appropriately, they are polite propositions. (Ibid)

Backward relation is presumed in respect of indirectness and commissives like, offering, inviting, etc.

For instance:

6-a- Have another slice of meat.

b- Would you mind having another slice of meat.

(6-a) is direct but still it is performed in the interest of the addressee. In accord with, it maximizes the benefit to the addressee, therefore, it is polite. But (6-b) is different, the indirectness infer that these slices are putrid or inedible. This proposition implicates something against the addressee's interest, i.e., it is impolite. (Ibid).

Hence, impositives and commissives are distinct in the interest, so, if the act is performed for the addressee's interest, it is commissives. Impositives, actually, threatens the addressee's benefit all the time throughout maximizing cost to him/her. That is why there is urgent need for framing this kind of illocutions indirectly to lesson the addressee's cost. The vice versa is true with the commissives. (Ibid: 120)

Another considerable distinct between impositives and commissives is the use of

the first or second person pronouns with illocutions. Impositives can be alleviated and be more polite if reference is omitted to the addressee's cost. For example,

7-a. can I take this book?

Instead of saying:

b- Can you give me this book?

(7-a) is more polite than (7-b) because there isn't any reference to the addressee's cost in (7-a)

The case with commissives is different, it is observed that these illocutions can be softened and be more polite by the omission of the reference to the addresser's cost. For instance:

8-a- Would you like more sandwiches?

Is more polite than

b-would you like me bringing you some sandwiches?

Because (8-a) indicates no reference for the addresser's cost, but (8-b) shows that the addresser sacrifices for the sake of the addressee's. (Ibid)

2-The Approbation and Modesty Maxims:

• Approbation maxim

a- Minimize dispraise of other [(b) Maximize praise of other]

• Modesty Maxim

a-Minimize praise of self [(b) Maximize dispraise of self] (Leech, 1983: 132)

These maxims apply to expressive and assertive illocutions. To criticize somebody is really something uncomfortable because it, in one way or another, demonstrates a sort of impoliteness. Besides, praising ourselves (as addressers) is also unfavorable by others, then, it is impolite.

Like the previous two maxims (Tact and Generosity) one can soften the dispraise and criticism of others via the use of different Strategies of indirectness.

For instance:

9-a- How kind you are?

b-How inconsiderate you are?

And

10-a- How kind I am with you?

b- How inconsiderate I am with you?

In comparing (9-a) to (10-a), it is manifested that (9-a) represents greater politeness than (10-a). The same thing is correct with (9-b) and (10-b). In consequence, praising others or obtaining praising by others is more polite than praising ourselves or sending unpleasant and uncomfortable message to others. (Ibid)

3-Agreement and Sympathy maxims:

• Agreement maxim:

a-Minimize disagreement between Self and other.

b-Maximize agreement between self and other.

• Sympathy maxim:

a-Minimize antipathy between Self and other.

b-Maximize sympathy between self and other. (Leech, 1983: 134)

Assertives are the illocutionary type, which are used with these maxims. Magnifying agreement or lessening disagreement with the addressee reflects the addresser's desire to be more polite. For instance:

11- Linguistic topics are rather difficult, aren't they?

Consider the following answer for this tag question:

a-No, they are straightforward topics.

b-Yes, they are

c-Yes, but pragmatics is very interesting.

(a) displays obvious and direct disagreement with the addresser. While, (b) exhibits agreement with the addresser. The third answer (c) reflects a partial disagreement with the addresser. Accordingly (b and c) are more polite than (a).

About sympathy maxim consider the following instances:

12-a- I'm sad about your fail the exam.

b-I'm sad about the exam.

c-I'm happy about your fail the exam.

12-(a) and (b) are more polite than (12-c) since they reveal empathy toward the addressee.

(12-b) is assumed to be more polite than (12-a) even if the unfortunate event is not mentioned, it is induced that something unpleasant happened and the addresser, because of sympathy and to be more polite, do not mention it directly. (Leech (1983: 138-139)

To end with these maxims, it is important to say that in addition to the salient role played by these maxims, still the context, especially the situational context, plays an impact go over these maxims, i.e., what seems polite in a situation could be impolite in another or the vice versa, what is impolite now could be polite, then. This is what is called "metalinguistic aspects of Politeness" (ibid, and Terkourafi, 2001: 56)

1.2.2. `Face Theory`

1.2.2.1. The Concept of `Face`

`Face` is first created by Erving Goffman in (1963). It metaphorically means "the public self-image" which is the "way we want other to see and treat us" (Brown and Levinson, 1978: 61 Thomas, 1995 and Yule 1996). It refers to a suitable mask one selects in an interaction. The addressee and

the social situations control choosing or selecting the mask.

Scollon and Scollon (1995: 35) define face as " the negotiated public image, mutually granted each other by participants in communicative event." Therefore, by designating ideas about the other participant, one can set up an interpersonal identity.

The notion of `Face` mainly consists of two types of wants (face-wants): the negative and the positive faces. The former refers to the need not to be unimpeded in an interaction. The latter, on the other hand, refers to the need to be preferred and accepted by others (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 62)

Scollon and Scollon (1995: 36-41) state that positive and negative faces as defined by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) are confusing inasmuch as they are considered to be universal. Thus, they separate between two specific aspects of face relying on cultural specification like personal style. In their modal so called the society-based model, positive face is called `involvement` whereas; negative face is called `independence` (see 1.2.3 for details).

One may think that in a certain social conversation, one can make use of either one of these two faces: negative (independence) or positive (involvement), but, in fact, both are estimated simultaneously in any conversation (ibid)

1.2.2.2.Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs)

Beside `face-wants`, Brown and Levinson pay attention to two other basic notions: Face threatening Acts (FTAs) and Politeness strategies. The FTAs can be brought off either in an unmitigated way or by redressive actions. Consequently, FTAs are of two types FTAs threaten negative

face which means that the addresser doesn't prevent the addressee's freedom from imposition, i.e., the addresser imposes the addressee. (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 65)

Therefore, an order like Don't be late or advice like you should stand for year parents are danger to one's 'independence'. The other type is the FTAs threaten the positive face which refer to the acts indicating that "the [addresser] does not care about the addressee's feelings, wants, etc." Therefore, criticism or showing straightforward discord and objections put the addressee's 'involvement face' in danger. (Ibid: 65-67)

Consequently, to triumph over and to avoid the FTAs` challenging, a wide range of strategies are set forth.

1.2.2.3. Politeness Strategies by Brown and Levinson:

Brown and Levinson (1978,1987) evolve what is called politeness strategies, in order to avoid bothering or displeasing other's face, i.e., saving one's face by showing respect whether in public or in private interaction. The strategies are: bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record (indirect) strategies. Before accounting with these strategies in detail it is essential to consider the nature of the relationship between the addresser and the addressee, otherwise one may think that there is an embarrassment or some sort of displeasing for the addressee.

1. Bald on-record strategy:

This strategy is commonly used in the environments where the relation between the addresser and the addressee is intimate like the relation between a family's members, or close friends. For instance when one ask for help in an emergency situation, he/she will say `help`, or requesting the addressee to do something like clean the house, or even alerting the

addressee to do something he/she has to do like Do your homework, etc.

2- Positive politeness strategy:

This strategy, in contrast with the bald on-record strategy, seeks for minimizing the FTAs via showing the addressee some respect. This strategy tries to decrease the social distance between those who know each other very well like, friends throughout:

a- 'Avoiding disagreement' in:

13- A- you have to attend my marriage.

B- yes, yes, in fact I'm busy, but I'll do my best to come.

b- 'Assuming agreement' in:

14- You'll get a high mark in Math, aren't you?

c- 'Hedging opinion' like:

15- "You really should sort of try harder"

d- 'Attend to the [addressee]':

"You must be hungry, it's long time since break-fast. How about some lunch?"

3-Negative Politeness strategy:

This strategy shows some sort of social distance between the addresser and the addressee. Like relations between teachers and students, boss and employees, father and son.... etc. There is an imposition on the addressee. For example:

a- Be indirect

16- There was my book on that table.

The addresser in this example, does not want to impose the addressee's freedom or privacy, therefore, the addresser indirectly asks for help in finding that book.

b- 'Forgiveness' in

17- "you must forgive me but..."

c- 'Minimize imposition'

18- I was wandering if I could do it?

19- I don't want to annoy you, but can I go with you?

The addresser tries to lessen the imposition in (18 and 19) examples.

d- 'Pluralize the person responsible' like:

20- We forgot telling you about the appointment.

We here doesn't necessarily refer to the first person plural pronoun but to the first person singular pronoun, i.e., only one person is responsible.

4-Off-record (Indirect): The addresser tries to remove him/herself from any imposition. For example:

a- 'Give hints':

21- "It's cold is here."

to implicate that the addresser wants the addressee to close the door.

b- 'Be vague':

22- "perhaps someone should have been responsible."

c- 'Be sarcastic, or joking':

23- "Yeah, he's a real rocket scientist!"
(Ibid)

1.2.3 The Politeness Systems Theory:

In this theory Scollon and Scollon (2001) designate three politeness systems:

deference (a system that equates the addresser with the addressee, but still there is a deferential deference between them). Solidarity (a system which equates the addresser with the addressee without any recognizable deferential distance), and hierarchy (a system in which the participants are not symmetrical putting one in a super ordinate position another on the subordinate position). These systems refer to the broad and stable regularities in face relationships. Each one of them is related to some factors or components, two of which (Power (P) and distance (D)) are relatively stable in the social interactions; another (weight of imposition (W)) varies from one situation into another (Guodong and Jing, 2005: 6).

The researcher summarizes the relations between the systems and the factors in the following table:

Basic components (Factors)

		<u>Power</u>	<u>Solidarity</u>	<u>Weight of Imposition</u>	
Politeness Systems	Deference	-	+	+/-	- Class mates - Professors of different college or universities
	Solidarity	-	-	+/-	- Friends - Husband and wife
	Hierarchy	+	+	+/-	- Teacher and students - Parent and son or daughter - Boss and employee

Table (1)

1.2.3.1 Linguistic Politeness Strategies by Scollon and Scollon:

Scollon and Scollon (2001: 46) propose a social interaction modal relying on the face relationships in communication. They adopt two terms 'Involvement' and 'independence'. Involvement, on the one

hand, refers to the addresser's need to be considered an active and backing member of society via paying attention to the other party (parties). 'Independence', on the other hand, refers to discourse strategies, which highlights, in contrast to

'involvement', the participant's indirectness and individuality.

Accordingly, Scollon and Scollon (ibid) present two lists of tables of linguistic politeness strategies, one for the 'involvement' strategies to create positive relations with others. Another for the 'independence' strategies to lessen and decrease impositions to others. They are as follows:

1-Involvement strategies:

1. Notice or attend to [the addressee], e.g. I like your presentation.
2. Exaggerate (interest, approved, sympathy), e.g. you always ...
3. Claim in-group membership with [the addressee], the use of 'we', 'us', 'our', etc.
4. Claim common point of view, opinion, attitudes, knowledge, e.g. I agree that...
5. Be optimistic.
6. Indicate [the addresser] knows [the addressee's] wants and is taking them into account.
7. Assume or assert reciprocity.
8. Use [first] names.
9. Be voluble.
10. Use [the addressee's] language or dialect.

2-Independence Strategies:

1. Make minimal assumptions about [the addresser's] wants e.g., I don't know if you want to ...
2. Give [the addressee] the option not to perform the act.
3. Minimize threat.

4. Apologize.
5. Be pessimistic.
6. Dissociate [the addresser] and [the addressee] from the discourse.
7. State a general rule.
8. Use family names and titles.
- 9- be taciturn. Use own language or dialect.
- 10- Use own language or dialect. (Ibid)

2. AN ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS IN "On the Gulls' Road"

2.0. The Scope of the part:

This part is an application of what has been presented theoretically in part one. It is devoted to clarify what is polite or impolite in conversations. Hence, Chather's "On the Gull's Road" is selected to be analyzed.

The practical part relies on three theories of politeness: Leech's 'Politeness Principle Theory', Brown and Levinson's 'Face Theory', and Scollon and Scollon's 'Politeness Systems Theory'. The analysis seizes the following levels:

(Level -1-) Leach's Maxims of Politeness:

- 1- Tact maxim
- 2- Generosity maxim
- 3- Approbation maxim
- 4- Modesty maxim
- 5- Agreement maxim
- 6- Sympathy maxim

(Level -2-) Illocutionary Functions and types:

- #### A- Functions
- 1- Competitive
 - 2- Convivial

3- Collaborative

4- Conflictive

B- Types:

1- Assertives

2- Directives (Impositives)

3- Commissives

4- Expressives

(Level -3-) Brown and Levinson's Politeness strategies:

1. Bald on-record strategy like,

a- Emergency b-Request

2- Positive politeness strategy:

a- Attend to the addressee

b- Avoid disagreement

c- Assume agreement

d- Hedge opinion

3- Negative politeness strategy:

a- Be indirect

b- Forgiveness

c- Minimize imposition

d- Pluralize the person responsible

4- Off-record (indirect)

a- Give hints

b- Be vague

c- Be sarcastic, or joking

(Level -4-) Face Threatening Acts:

1- FTAs threaten the negative face.

2- FTAs threaten the positive face.

(Level -5-) Scollon and Scollon's politeness strategies:

1- Involvement Strategies.

2-Independence Strategies.

(Level -6-) Politeness systems and the related factors:

1- Systems.

a. Deference b- solidarity

c- hierarchy

2- Factors

a- power b- social distance

c- weight of imposition

(Level -7-) Irony principle and Banter Principle.

Thus, seven main levels and about thirty sub-levels are analyzed in this section.

2-1 "On the Gulls' Road"

2.1.1 A Brief Literary Analysis of "On the Gulls' Road":

Willa Sibert Cather the American novelist, short story writer, and poet, was born on December 7,1873 in Back Creek Valley in Virginia. She was one of the greatest American novelists in the first half of the 20th century because of her great works. She entered the University of Nebraska in (1891) and graduated in 1895. Her first collections were a poetry collection called 'April Twilights' (1903), a short story collection called 'The Troll Garden' (1905). After that she worked for the McClure's Magazine in New York to be the managing editor. In 1912 she left this magazine to focus on her own writings, starting with Alexander's Bridge (1912). Her writings, frequently, drew on her memories and past relations of Nebraska. Cather published many books like O Pioneers (1913), My Antonia (1918), and A Lost Lady (1923). By 1923 she won the Pulitzer Prize for fiction for the work "One of Ours". Cather died on April 24,1947, to be buried in New Hampshire; in Red Cloud. (Grade Saver, 2007:1-3).

"On the Gulls' Road" is one of the greatest twenty American short stories (Ezis, 2006:Online). It revolves about the love of a young man (a painter) to a beautiful young married woman Mrs. Ebbing (Alexandra) who he first met on a traveling ship and immediately attracted his attention with her beauty, loveliness, and melancholy. A deep strange sadness left its dark shadows on the beautiful lines of

her face. She, therefore, represented for him a mystery, which he liked to solve. Her husband, who is older than her, was always busy, indifferent or careless to her. He looked at her as any of his possessions. He had many affairs with the women on the boat regardless of his wife's feelings, who was suffering a bad heart-valve. She was having a journey of convalescence on this boat.

The painter (the narrator) therefore, was the first man to treat Mrs. Ebbing with kindness, giving her the love and sympathy she did not get from her husband. He offered to paint her and she started to sit in front of him for hours. He had a sad apprehension of losing her for she seemed to wither day after day like a flower. Yet, he succeeded in giving her some zeal for life and she started to mix with people in parties. His love to her developed into a deep passion and devotion. She herself started to develop the same passion for the first man who gave her what she wanted. But when he made to her his offer of joining him in love and to live with him away from that cold life and husband, she rejected this offer because she took his love for pity and she does not want to be pitied. Before she left, she gave him a little box, which she asked him not to open until he received a letter from her. After a tearful farewell, the young painter lives on the sad memory of that love. One day he receives a letter from her father telling him about her death. There is also, a letter written by her, few days before her death, giving him the permission to open the box. When opens the box he finds a lock of her fair hair, a withered magnolia flower, and two pink seashells. They are all what is left of Alexandra, and for twenty years, he has been living on the sad memory of this love. The story starts at the end and then goes

back retrospectively, (Cather's Archive, 2007:Online)

2.1.3 "On the Gulls' Road" A Pragmatic Analysis:

In this analysis the researcher tries to determine what is polite or not according to the levels above. Therefore, some extracts are taken from the short story "On the Gulls' Road" to manifests how these levels affect the politeness of these extracts.

Now, consider the following:

Extract (1):

"May I come and talk to you tomorrow?"
I asked. (The painter=the narrator).
(Appendix(1),p:22)

The painter (narrator) feels in love with a beautiful young married woman Mrs.Ebbing (Alexandra), who he first met on a travelling ship. Hence, he wants to start a relation with her. This example manifests an asking for permission, i.e., the illocution goal competes with the social one, there is, then, the competitive function, which means there is an imposition to the addressee (Mrs. Ebbing). But the FTAs do not threaten the negative face of the addressee because the addresser (the narrator) tries to avoid impeding the addressee's freedom, making use of the indirectness scale. Apparently, the addressee has a chance not to give the addresser a permission to come, i.e., there is an opportunity to say 'no'. The addresser minimizes the cost to the addressee, that is, the first part of the tact maxim is observed. In addition, 'minimize threat' and 'minimize imposition' are the 'independence' and negative linguistic strategies which are adopted by the addresser to lesson imposition. The

'deference' system of politeness is experience since there is no power (-p) between the addresser and the addressee, but the social distance is existed (+D) as regarding their new relation between the narrator and Mrs. Ebbing. As the addresser watches the politeness maxims and strategies, there is a polite imposition in this case.

Extract (2):

"you are better today."(The narrator)(Ibid)

It exhibits that the painter (the narrator) wants to harden that relation by good wishes toward Mrs.Ebbing. It is, again, the tact maxim of maximizing benefit to the addressee, so, the illocution goal is in line with the social goal, it is, then, a convivial function of commissive type performed for the interest of the addressee. The addresser avoids the, FTAs, which threaten the positive face to set up a tactful illocutionary act by the embracing of the involvement strategy of being optimistic and the positive politeness strategy of assuming agreement. As regards the Scollon and Scollon (2001) politeness systems theory, the deference system, again, is observed because there is no power (-P) but distance (+D).

Extract(3) displays an agreement between the addresser (Mrs. Ebbing) and the addressee (the painter), which exhibits a positive progress in their relation:

Extract (3):

- "I shall never go to Sardinia." (Mrs. Ebbing) (Appendix, p: 23)

- "Neither shall I." (The narrator) (Ibid, p: 24)

The second part of the agreement maxim of maximizing agreement between self and other, is magnified which accords

with Brown and Levinson's positive strategy of assuming agreement. An 'assertive' act is performed, here, to concord with the illocution function of collaborative in which the illocution and social goals are neutral. Because of this agreement between the addresser and the addressee a new politeness system is aroused, that is, the solidarity system where neither power (-P) nor social distance (-D) are noticed between the interlocutors. Additionally, FTAs of positive face are not existed because of agreement.

Moreover, a significant type of illocution, that is, expressive, appears in:

Extract(4):

"you have been very kind to talk to my wife." (Mr. Ebbing)(Appendix,p:24)

Mr.Ebbing notices that the painter takes care of his wife, therefore, he thanks him about that caring This example maximizes praise to other, i.e., it is the second part of the approbation maxim of politeness (Leech, 1983:132). Since it is praising so the illocution goal coincides with the social goal to express convivial function. The involvement strategy of 'exaggerate approval' and the positive politeness strategy of attending to the addressee, are adopted. It is noticed that FTAs threaten the negative face of the addresser rather than the addressee because of the admitting of gratitude toward the addressee. Hence, the 'deference' politeness system is watched because no one of the interlocutor (Mrs. Ebbing and the narrator) is more advanced than the other, i.e., (-P) but still there is a social distance (+D) between him or her.

The painter, to harden the relation, starts to praise Mrs.Ebbing.This is clear in the simile presented in:

Extract(5) :

"We have a yellow vine at home.' ...
'That is very like your hair,'" (the narrator)
(ibid)

It is like the preceding example of 'maximize praise of other'. So, it is an expressive of convivial function since it happens for the interest of the addressee (Mrs. Ebling). To account with a positive public self-image the positive politeness strategy by Brown and Levinson (1987) 'attend to [the addressee]' and the Scollon and Scollon's (2001) involvement strategy of 'Notice or attend to [the addressee]' are used. The FTAs do not threaten the positive face of the addressee for this reason. This example clarifies (-P) and (-D) which indicate the solidarity factor between the interlocutors.

Consider another extract:

Extract(6)

She [Mrs. Ebling] whispered to me [the narrator], "you must go and walk now, and don't think about me."

(ibid:24)

Mrs. Ebling, suffering a bad heart-valve, fears that the painter's love is only a kind of pettiness. So, she asked him to leave and not to think of her any more. There is, then, an asking to do something; it can be analyzed in two different ways considering the progress in their relation (Mrs. Ebling and the narrator). So it can be imposition or assertive. If it is imposition this means Mrs. Ebling (the addresser) does not observe the tact maxim of minimizing the cost to the addressee, i.e., the addresser violates that maxim; the FTAs threaten the negative face of the addressee's freedom action. Obviously, it is a direct mand and the addressee does not have a chance not to do it, otherwise, by refusing that mand, the addressee will violate the second part of the

tact maxim, that is, 'maximize benefit to other.' (Leech, 1983). If the intimate relation is considered between the addresser and the addressee, at that point, the bold on-record strategy of 'request' is embraced, which does not consider the saving of one's face from threatening. So, the illocution goal competes with the social one to obtain competitive function. Another explanation, which can be much more acceptable as regard this extract. There is a breaching to one of the politeness maxims, i.e., the tact maxim as a result, the addresser does not watch the politeness principle (pp), which leads to the appearance of either the Irony principle (IP) or the banter principle. The banter principle is observed in this case because what seems offensive and impolite is said in a friendly way, which reflects familiarity and intimacy between the interlocutors. (Leech, 1983: 142-145). This happens as a result of the solidarity system with (-P) and (-D) factors.

If the example above is assertive, it indicates that the addresser (Mrs. Ebling) watches the tact maxim of minimizing cost to other, because it is not a direct mand, instead, it is a proposition or a mere suggestion to do something and the addressee (the narrator) has the opportunity not to do it. But, if he does it, this means he watches the tact maxim of maximizing benefit to other. The addresser observes the negative politeness strategy of minimizing the imposition and the independence strategy of minimizing threat is also experienced in this case.

Since, the illocution is assertive, it coincides with the collaborative function where the illocution and the social targets are neutral. The solidarity system (-P, -D) is watched.

Moreover, the assertive in:

Extract(7):

I (the narrator) forward and looked at her (Mrs. Ebbing) "We could live almost forever if we had enough courage. It's of our lives that we die. If we had the courage to changes it all, to runaway to some blue coast like that over there, we could live on and on, until we were tired." (Ibid: 25)

Shows that because Mrs. Ebbing is desperate for her illness, the painter tries his best to encourage and pick her up from that darkness to live normal life. This extract adds up to the sympathy the addresser (the narrator) has toward the sick woman, Mrs. Ebbing (the addressee). Such an assertive manifests that the addresser perceives the maxim of sympathy of 'maximizing sympathy between self and other'. This polite proposition is obtained throughout the positive strategy of 'attend to the addressee's interest (Brown, and Levinson, 1987). The narrator makes use of pronouns like 'we', 'our', ...etc, to emphasize the group relation between the interlocutors, that is, the involvement strategy of 'claim in –group membership with [the addressee]' is seen (Scollon and Scollon, 2001). The reaction of the addressee is not the addresser's first concerning, i.e., he only wants to encourage Mrs. Ebbing to go on in her life. Therefore, the collaborative function is shown in this illocution since the illocution and the social goals are neutral. Hence, whatever the addressee's (Mrs. Ebbing) reaction is, it will not of that great importance.

It is assumed that the addressee (Mrs. Ebbing), in the given example, observes that the addresser is polite, that is why Mrs. Ebbing tries her best to react politely via

minimizing the antipathy between her and the narrator, by saying:

'I am afraid I should never have courage enough to go behind that mountain, at least. Look at it, it looks as if it hid horrible things.'

It is shown that there is not a direct antipathy between the addresser (Mrs. Ebbing) and the addressee (the narrator) this is only to save the other's face from threatening. The negative strategy 'indirectness' and the independence strategy of being pessimistic are noticed, (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Scollon and Scollon, 2001).

Or, this example can be understood as a strategy of off-record (indirect), i.e., the addresser tries to save her own face from any imposition via giving hints to be indirect in the antipathy with the addressee. Still the solidarity system dominates the interlocutor's conversation.

The intimacy and familiarity comes to be more and more obvious concerning the painter and Mrs. Ebbing in the following:

Extract(8):

"And who are you and I to define the realities?" (The narrator) (Ibid)

Which focuses on the involvement strategy of claiming in group membership with [the addressee] (Scollon and Scollon, 2001) the expressive illocution, here, indicates the conflictive function, that is, by uttering this utterance a conflict between the illocution goal and the social one is aroused. The addresser keeps on the modesty maxim of minimizing praise of self, but violates the approbation maxim of minimizing dispraise of other (Leech, 1983).

The (PP) is breached, the banter principle is aroused because the addresser is not serious in his offensive. This can be

explained in terms of the Scollon and Scollon (2001) politeness system of solidarity, which equates between the addresser and the addressee without any recognizable deferential distance. In this system neither power difference (-P) nor social distance (-D) are existed.

After a long extended party, the narrator asks Mrs.Ebbling to stay with him to talk about their relation. Again, the two maxims: 'minimize cost to other' and minimize benefit to self, tact and generosity maxims, respectively, are violated in:

Extract(9):

"Don't go down," I (the narrator) begged "Stay up here, I want to talk to you."(Appendix 1,p: 26)

These maxims are breached in the sense that such imperatives are direct. The addresser (the narrator) does not observe the tact or the generosity maxims and wants the addressee (Mrs. Ebbling) to watch them by obeying the mand. The addressee is obliged to do it because there is no other choice. It is an impositive illocution type of competitive function because there is a competition illocution and the social aims. Such thing leads to a fact, which is, this direct imperative is impolite because the FTAs threaten negative face of the addressee's freedom. But, is this the real case? Although the (PP) is breached, still, these requests or mands are polite because the third-order banter principle is experienced. Therefore, the addressee does not consider them impolite or offensive requests for the familiarity and intimacy between the interlocutors.

By accounting the politeness systems and the basic components related to, a new explanation could be encountered. The solidarity (-P, -D) can resolve this direct request. Because of this solidarity the

weight of imposition is neglected (-W) in this case. Accordingly, the bald on-record strategy of 'request' is adopted which reflects highly the intimacy.

Then, the painter complains of Mrs.Ebbling's intention to leaving him:

Extract(10):

"And you meant to leave me day after tomorrow, to say Good by to me as you will to the other people on this boat? You meant to cut me adrift like this, with my heart on fire and all my life unspent in me?" (Appendix, p: 26)

The assertive of complaining is used in this example to criticize the addressee (Mrs.Ebbling), to reflect the conflict between the illocution and the social goals, i.e., conflictive function is perceived. Criticism threatens the other's negative face of individuality. There is, considerably, a violation of the approbation maxim of 'minimize dispraise to other' (Leech, 1983). But, if the politeness system of solidarity is regarded, which equates between interlocutors with the absence of power and social distance (-P, -D), this criticism can be softened if the weight of imposition is not perceived, there is, then, (-w).

But, Mrs. Ebbling tries to prove the opposite in saying:

Extract(11):

"I am willing to suffer-whatever I must suffer- to have had you," (ibid)

In saying I am willing to suffer-whatever I must suffer. The generosity maxim of maximizing cost to self is tasted (Leech, 1983). This action, being performed for the interest of the addressee (the narrator), is of convivial function and of commissive type, i.e., offering. The positive strategy and the linguistic involvement strategy of attending to the addressee are

recognized in this sense (Brown and Levinson, 1987, and Scollon and Scollon, 2001)

The solidarity system is, again, recognized. The expression to have had you implies, via PP, an implied praise of the addressee. So, the approbation maxim of maximizing praise to the addressee is watched. How polite the addresser (Mrs. Ebling) in her reaction toward a criticism, this is because the addressee knows that the weight of imposition component with solidarity system govern the narrator's criticism.

Then, the painter asked Mrs. Ebling if she wished him to do anything in order not to leave him, but the maxim of agreement is violated in her answer:

Extract(12):

"Don't ask me"... "There is nothing that we can do" (ibid)

So, instead of minimizing disagreement, it is maximised. The breaching of that maxim is expressed by the assertive type of illocution whose function is collaborative. Still, the addresser (Mrs. Ebling) tries to lesson the toughness of that violation, which leads to negative face threatening, by the involvement linguistic strategy of claiming in-group membership with the addressee (the painter) making use of the first person plural pronoun 'we'.

Mrs.Ebling tries to convince the painter that she loves him but there is no opportunity to give birth for that love as she is sick.Obviously,the addresser (Mrs. Ebling) keeps on trying to lesson face threatening by means of maximizing praise to the addressee, as it is manifests in:

Extract(13):

"Every night I have watched the sea for you, as if it were mine and I had made it and I have listened to the water rushing by

you, full of sleep and youth and hope. And everything you had done or said during the day came back to me, and when I went to sleep it was only to feel you more. You see there was never anyone else; I have never thought of any one in the dark but you." (Mrs. Ebling).

(Appendix, p: 27)

The maxim of approbation is obviously used, since there is a direct maximizing of praise to other. (Leech, 1983). No FTAs threaten the positive face of the addressee (the narrator) using the positive and involvement politeness strategies of attending to the addressee's wants and exaggerating approval to the addressee. The action of praising is expressed by the expressive illocution of convivial function because every thing is made for the addressee's interest.

Although Mrs. Ebling works hard to be more and more polite with the narrator, yet, a violation of the approbation maxim of minimizing dispraise for other can be noted in the narrator's speech:

Extract(14):

"And yet you will do nothing," I groaned, "You will dare nothing. You will give me nothing." (Ibid)

The addresser blames the addressee (Mrs. Ebling) and criticizes her in this expression. To utter something unpleasant, this will threaten the other's face, so, it is impolite. The action of blaming is indicated by the `expressive` illocution, but the function is not convivial in this case; it is rather conflictive, which mirrors the conflict between the illocution and the social goals.

As there is breaching in the politeness maxims, in consequence, the politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson (1987) on the one hand, and Scollon and Scollon

(2001) on the other, are not observed. Regarding the Politeness System by Scollon and Scollon (2001), the solidarity system is encountered with the absence of power (-P) and social distance (-D). The absence of these factors is relatively stable with this system but the weight of imposition (w) is not. So that, the impoliteness is because of the presence of the weight of imposition in this case (+w).

But the intimate relationship is indicated between the interlocutors in this example, the bald on-record strategy, which does not observe the removing from the FTAs, is experienced. Accordingly, it cannot be said that this proposition is impolite or it make imposition to the other (Mrs. Ebbing). This is because the addressee (Mrs. Ebbing) knows that all that speech is because of love. That is why she answered the painter politely when saying:

Extract(15):

"...I shall have given you all my life. I can't tell you how, but it is true. There is something in each of us that does not belong to the family or to society..."

(Ibid)

The addresser watches the generosity maxim of maximizing cost to self, and the tact maxim of maximizing benefit to other, (Leech, 1983). The commissive, which commits the addresser to do something for the addressee's sake, is obvious. It is of the convivial function because the illocution and social goals are on consistency. The Positive politeness strategy of attending to addressee's wants and the involvement strategy of noticing the addressee's wants and 'claim in-group membership' are easily mirrored. Solidarity, again, is the politeness system that is embraced.

Before leaving Mrs. Ebbing wants to give the painter a box asking him not to open it until he receives a letter from her. Mrs. Ebbing continues observing the (PP) to be polite with the addressee (the painter). She says:

Extract(16):

"I want to give you something..."
"You will not want it now, so I shall ask you to keep it until you hear from me...some day I shall write to you and ask you to open this..."(Appendix, p: 27)

It is commissive illocution of convivial function because it is something for the addressee's own sake. The addresser observes the tact maxim of maximizing benefit to the addressee, by attending to the addressee's wants, i.e., the positive politeness and the involvement strategies are experienced. Still, neither power (-P) nor distance (-D) are recognized, that is then the solidarity politeness system.

After departure the painter receives a letter from Alexandra's (Mrs. Ebbing's) father telling him about her death. There is also another letter written by her, few days before her death, where she gives him the permission to open the box. She writes:

Extract (17):

"My friend:
you may open now the little package I gave you." (Appendix, p: 28)

This proposition displays the tact maxim of maximizing benefit to the addressee. Consider, I gave you this reflects how precious the thing to the addresser (Mrs. Ebbing). So, she maximized cost to self for the addressee's interest, i.e., the generosity maxim is experienced by the means of commissive act of convivial function. This commissive act is reflected by

the offering she presents to open the package. The positive politeness strategy of hedging opinion, and attending the addressee's wants are death with. (Brown and Levinson, 1987, Scollon and Scollon, 2001)

The polite style is continued to write:

Extract (18):

"May I ask you to keep it?" (Mrs. Ebbling) (Ibid)

There is some sort of cost toward the addressee (the narrator), but the addresser tries to minimize that cost via the indirectness scale of politeness. Hence, to lessen the imposition in this request, the addressee is given the alternatives to refuse doing the action of keeping the package. So that, the FTAs do not threaten the negative face of the addressee's freedom because the independence politeness strategy of giving the addressee the option not to perform the act and minimizing threat, as well as the negative politeness strategy of minimizing imposition are obviously determined in this example. (Ibid).

Mrs. Ebbling adds:

Extract (19):

"I gave it to you because there is no one else who would care about it is just that way. Even since I left you I have been thinking what it would be like to live a lifetime caring and being cared for like that..., I have been living it ever since I first knew you." (Ibid)

The addresser keeps on watching the PP, accordingly, the approbation maxim of maximizing praise to the addressee is undergone. The illocution of praising is of expressive type whose function is the interest of the addressee, i.e., convivial function. Attending to the addressee and exaggerate approval are the positive and

the involvement strategies that are presented.

A new kind of politeness maxim, i.e., agreement maxim is noted in the following:

Extract (20)

"of course you understand now why I could not go with you" (ibid)

The addresser (Mrs. Ebbling) assumes agreement with the addressee, i.e., positive politeness strategy is presented. She announces that the addressee understood her situation, this announcing belong to the assertive kind of collaborative function where the illocution and social goals are neutral (Leech, 1983).

She ends her letter by thanking the narrator, writing:

Extract (21):

"Thank you for everything. I hold this to my heart, where I once hold your hand." (Ibid)

The addresser (Mrs. Ebbling) recognizes the imbalance between what the addressee

(the painter) presents and what she receives, therefore, by thanking, she aims at creating or restoring the balance and the equilibrium between the addresser and the addressee (Leech, 1983: 124-5). Maximizing praise to other is the approbation maxim observed. Praising illocution act is of the expressive type which is made for the addressee's own sake.

In consequence, the two goals of illocution and social are in an agreement, that is, the convivial function is observed. With this illocution, that is, praising the positive face of the addressee can not be threatened because the Brown and Levinson's (1987) positive strategy of attending to the addressee's interest and the Scollon and Scollon (2001) involvement

strategy of exaggerate interest are reinforced.

All the content of Mrs. Ebbing's letter is dominated by the solidarity politeness system where power and social distance factors are not existed. In addition the weight of imposition (w) is not observed in this letter. So. Mrs. Ebbing's style is polite.

CONCLOSIONS

It is evident that:

1- The three politeness theories: Leech's 'Politeness Principle theory', Brown and Levinson's 'Face theory', and Scollon and Scollon's 'Politeness Systems theory' are all interrelated to each other and their works are integrated.

2- the violation in one maxim of politeness means the breaching of the linguistic politeness strategies, whether those by brown and Levinson strategies, or those by Scollon and Scollon.

3- the politeness strategies: negative strategies and Positive strategies, on the one hand, and involvement and independence ones, on the other, frequently meet each other to represent similar representations.

4- the negative Politeness and the independence strategies coincide with the negative parts of the politeness maxims.

5- some speech acts seem impolite as regards politeness principle and strategies, but they are polite regarding Politeness system of solidarity where, in addition to (-P, -D), the weight of imposition (w) is not experienced or encountered it is then, (-w).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1978) "Universals in Language Use: Politeness Phenomena", in Esther N. Goody (ed.)

Questions and Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

----- (1987) Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cutting, J. (2002) Pragmatics and Discourse. London: Rutledge.

Ezis, R.A. (2006) Twenty Great American Short Stories.

<http://www.americanliterature.com/SS/SSINDX.HTML>

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on Politeness. Journal of Pragmatics, 14, 219-236.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction. Psychiatry, 18, 213-231.

Grade Saver. Classic Note: Biography of Willa Cather. Free Online Study Guides. <http://www.gradesaver.com/>

Guodong, L. and Jinvig, H. (2005) A contrastive Study on Disagreement Strategies for Politeness between American English and Mandarin Chinese. Vol.7. <http://www.asian-elf-journal.com/March-05/lghj.pdf>

Holtgraves, T., & Yang, J. (1992). Interpersonal Underpinnings of Request Strategies: General, 62 (2), 246-256.

Lakoff, R. (1990). Talking Power. New York: Basic Books.

Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman.

Mills, S. (2003). Gender and Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R and Scollon, S. (1995). Intercultural Communication: A discourse approach. Oxford: Blackwell.

----- (2001). Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach (2nd edition). Oxford: Blackwell.

- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2002). *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures*. New York: Cassell.
- Terkourafi, M. (2001) *Politeness in Cypriot Greek: A frame-Based Approach*. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation): University of Cambridge.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction*. New York: Longman.
- Watts, R.J (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wikipedia. (2007) Encyclopedia Britannica. Online. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/politeness>.
- Yule, G. (1996a). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

APPENDIX

"ON THE GULLS' ROAD"

BY

WILLA CATHER

I

IT often happens that one or another of my friends stops before a red chalk drawing in my study and asks me where I ever found so lovely a creature. I have never told the story of that picture to any one, and the beautiful woman on the wall, until yesterday, in all these twenty years has spoken to no one but me. Yesterday a young painter, a countryman of mine, came to consult me on a matter of business, and upon seeing my drawing of Alexandra Ebbing, straightway forgot his errand. He examined the date upon the sketch and asked me, very earnestly, if I could tell him whether the lady were still living. When I answered him, he stepped back from the picture and said slowly:

"So long ago? She must have been very young. She was happy?"

"As to that, who can say -- about any one of us?" I replied. "Out of all that is supposed to make for happiness, she had very little."

We returned to the object of his visit, but when he bade me goodbye at the door his troubled gaze again went back to the drawing, and it was only by turning sharply about that he took his eyes away from her.

I went back to my study fire, and as the rain kept away less impetuous visitors, I had a long time in which to think of Mrs. Ebbing. I even got out the little box she gave me, which I had not opened for years, and when Mrs. Hemway brought my tea I had barely time to close the lid and defeat her disapproving gaze.

My young countryman's perplexity, as he looked at Mrs. Ebbing, had recalled to me the delight and pain she gave me when I was of his years. I sat looking at her face and trying to see it through his eyes -- freshly, as I saw it first upon the deck of the Germania, twenty years ago. Was it her loveliness, I often ask myself, or her loneliness, or her simplicity, or was it merely my own youth? Was her mystery only that of the mysterious North out of which she came? I still feel that she was very different from all the beautiful and brilliant women I have known; as the night is different from the day, or as the sea is different from the land. But this is our story, as it comes back to me.

For two years I had been studying Italian and working in the capacity of clerk to the American legation at Rome, and I was going home to secure my first consular appointment. Upon boarding my steamer at Genoa, I saw my luggage into my cabin and then started for a rapid circuit of the deck. Everything promised well. The boat was

thinly peopled, even for a July crossing; the decks were roomy; the day was fine; the sea was blue; I was sure of my appointment, and, best of all, I was coming back to Italy. All these things were in my mind when I stopped sharply before a chaise longue placed sidewise near the stern. Its occupant was a woman, apparently ill, who lay with her eyes closed, and in her open arm was a chubby little red-haired girl, asleep. I can still remember that first glance at Mrs. Ebbing, and how I stopped as a wheel does when the band slips. Her splendid, vigorous body lay still and relaxed under the loose folds of her clothing, her white throat and arms and red-gold hair were drenched with sunlight. Such hair as it was: wayward as some kind of gleaming seaweed that curls and undulates with the tide. A moment gave me her face; the high cheek-bones, the thin cheeks, the gentle chin, arching back to a girlish throat, and the singular loveliness of the mouth. Even then it flashed through me that the mouth gave the whole face its peculiar beauty and distinction. It was proud and sad and tender, and strangely calm. The curve of the lips could not have been cut more cleanly with the most delicate instrument, and whatever shade of feeling passed over them seemed to partake of their exquisiteness.

But I am anticipating. While I stood stupidly staring (as if, at twenty-five, I had never before beheld a beautiful woman) the whistles broke into a hoarse scream, and the deck under us began to vibrate. The woman opened her eyes, and the little girl struggled into a sitting position, rolled out of her mother's arm, and ran to the deck rail. After putting my chair near the stern, I went forward to see the gang-plank up and did not return until we were dragging out to sea at the end of a long tow-line.

The woman in the chaise longue was still alone. She lay there all day, looking at the sea. The little girl, Carin, played noisily about the deck. Occasionally she returned and struggled up into the chair, plunged her head, round and red as a little pumpkin, against her mother's shoulder in an impetuous embrace, and then struggled down again with a lively flourishing of arms and legs. Her mother took such opportunities to pull up the child's socks or to smooth the fiery little braids; her beautiful hands, rather large and very white, played about the riotous little girl with a quieting tenderness. Carin chattered away in Italian and kept asking for her father, only to be told that he was busy.

When any of the ship's officers passed, they stopped for a word with my neighbor, and I heard the first mate address her as Mrs. Ebbing. When they spoke to her, she smiled appreciatively and answered in low, faltering Italian, but I fancied that she was glad when they passed on and left her to her fixed contemplation of the sea. Her eyes seemed to drink the color of it all day long, and after every interruption they went back to it. There was a kind of pleasure in watching her satisfaction, a kind of excitement in wondering what the water made her remember or forget. She seemed not to wish to talk to any one, but I knew I should like to hear whatever she might be thinking. One could catch some hint of her thoughts, I imagined, from the shadows that came and went across her lips, like the reflection of light clouds. She had a pile of books beside her, but she did not read, and neither could I. I gave up trying at last, and watched the sea, very conscious of her presence, almost of her thoughts. When the sun dropped low and shone in her face, I rose and asked if she would like me to move her chair. She smiled and thanked me, but

said the sun was good for her. Her yellow-hazel eyes followed me for a moment and then went back to the sea.

After the first bugle sounded for dinner, a heavy man in uniform came up the deck and stood beside the chaise longue, looking down at its two occupants with a smile of satisfied possession. The breast of his trim coat was hidden by waves of soft blond beard, as long and heavy as a woman's hair, which blew about his face in glittering profusion. He wore a large turquoise ring upon the thick hand that he rubbed good-humoredly over the little girl's head. To her he spoke Italian, but he and his wife conversed in some Scandinavian tongue. He stood stroking his fine beard until the second bugle blew, then bent stiffly from his hips, like a soldier, and patted his wife's hand as it lay on the arm of her chair. He hurried down the deck, taking stock of the passengers as he went, and stopped before a thin girl with frizzed hair and a lace coat, asking her a facetious question in thick English. They began to talk about Chicago and went below. Later I saw him at the head of his table in the dining room, the befrizzed Chicago lady on his left. They must have got a famous start at luncheon, for by the end of the dinner Ebbing was peeling figs for her and presenting them on the end of a fork.

The Doctor confided to me that Ebbing was the chief engineer and the dandy of the boat; but this time he would have to behave himself, for he had brought his sick wife along for the voyage. She had a bad heart valve, he added, and was in a serious way.

After dinner Ebbing disappeared, presumably to his engines, and at ten o'clock, when the stewardess came to put Mrs. Ebbing to bed, I helped her to rise

from her chair, and the second mate ran up and supported her down to her cabin. About midnight I found the engineer in the card room, playing with the Doctor, an Italian naval officer, and the commodore of a Long Island yacht club. His face was even pinker than it had been at dinner, and his fine beard was full of smoke. I thought a long while about Ebbing and his wife before I went to sleep.

The next morning we tied up at Naples to take on our cargo, and I went on shore for the day. I did not, however, entirely escape the ubiquitous engineer, whom I saw lurching with the Long Island commodore at a hotel in the Santa Lucia. When I returned to the boat in the early evening, the passengers had gone down to dinner, and I found Mrs. Ebbing quite alone upon the deserted deck. I approached her and asked whether she had had a dull day. She looked up smiling and shook her head, as if her Italian had quite failed her. I saw that she was flushed with excitement, and her yellow eyes were shining like two clear topazes.

"Dull? Oh, no! I love to watch Naples from the sea, in this white heat. She has just lain there on her hillside among the vines and laughed for me all day long. I have been able to pick out many of the places I like best."

I felt that she was really going to talk to me at last. She had turned to me frankly, as to an old acquaintance, and seemed not to be hiding from me anything of what she felt. I sat down in a glow of pleasure and excitement and asked her if she knew Naples well.

"Oh, yes! I lived there for a year after I was first married. My husband has a great

many friends in Naples. But he was at sea most of the time, so I went about alone. Nothing helps one to know a city like that. I came first by sea, like this. Directly to Naples from Finmark, and I had never been South before." Mrs. Ebbing stopped and looked over my shoulder. Then, with a quick, eager glance at me, she said abruptly: "It was like a baptism of fire. Nothing has ever been quite the same since. Imagine how this bay looked to a Finmark girl. It seemed like the overture to Italy."

I laughed. "And then one goes up the country -- song by song and wine by wine."

Mrs. Ebbing sighed. "Ah, yes. It must be fine to follow it. I have never been away from the seaports myself. We live now in Genoa."

The deck steward brought her tray, and I moved forward a little and stood by the rail. When I looked back, she smiled and nodded to let me know that she was not missing anything. I could feel her intentness as keenly as if she were standing beside me.

The sun had disappeared over the high ridge behind the city, and the stone pines stood black and flat against the fires of the afterglow. The lilac haze that hung over the long, lazy slopes of Vesuvius warmed with golden light, and films of blue vapor began to float down toward Baiae. The sky, the sea, and the city between them turned a shimmering violet, fading grayer as the lights began to glow like luminous pearls along the water-front, -- the necklace of an irreclaimable queen. Behind me I heard a low exclamation; a slight, stifled sound, but it seemed the perfect vocalization of that weariness with which we at last let go of beauty, after we have held it until the senses

are darkened. When I turned to her again, she seemed to have fallen asleep.

That night, as we were moving out to sea and the tail lights of Naples were winking across the widening stretch of black water, I helped Mrs. Ebbing to the foot of the stairway. She drew herself up from her chair with effort and leaned on me wearily. I could have carried her all night without fatigue.

"May I come and talk to you to-morrow?" I asked. She did not reply at once. "Like an old friend?" I added. She gave me her languid hand, and her mouth, set with the exertion of walking, softened altogether. "Grazia," she murmured.

I returned to the deck and joined a group of my countrywomen, who, primed with inexhaustible information, were discussing the baseness of Renaissance art. They were intelligent and alert, and as they leaned forward in their deck chairs under the circle of light, their faces recalled to me Rembrandt's picture of a clinical lecture. I heard them through, against my will, and then went to the stern to smoke and to see the last of the island lights. The sky had clouded over, and a soft, melancholy wind was rushing over the sea. I could not help thinking how disappointed I would be if rain should keep Mrs. Ebbing in her cabin to-morrow. My mind played constantly with her image. At one moment she was very clear and directly in front of me; the next she was far away. Whatever else I thought about, some part of my consciousness was busy with Mrs. Ebbing; hunting for her, finding her, losing her, then groping again. How was it that I was so conscious of whatever she might be feeling? that when she sat still behind me and watched the evening sky, I had had a

sense of speed and change, almost of danger; and when she was tired and sighed, I had wished for night and loneliness.

II

Though when we are young we seldom think much about it, there is now and again a golden day when we feel a sudden, arrogant pride in our youth; in the lightness of our feet and the strength of our arms, in the warm fluid that courses so surely within us; when we are conscious of something powerful and mercurial in our breasts, which comes up wave after wave and leaves us irresponsible and free. All the next morning I felt this flow of life, which continually impelled me toward Mrs. Ebbing. After the merest greeting, however, I kept away. I found it pleasant to thwart myself, to measure myself against a current that was sure to carry me with it in the end. I was content to let her watch the sea -- the sea that seemed now to have come into me, warm and soft, still and strong. I played shuffleboard with the Commodore, who was anxious to keep down his figure, and ran about the deck with the stout legs of the little pumpkin-colored Carin about my neck. It was not until the child was having her afternoon nap below that I at last came up and stood beside her mother.

"You are better to-day," I exclaimed, looking down at her white gown. She colored unreasonably, and I laughed with a familiarity which she must have accepted as the mere foolish noise of happiness, or it would have seemed impertinent.

We talked at first of a hundred trivial things, and we watched the sea. The coast of Sardinia had lain to our port for some hours and would lie there for hours to come, now advancing in rocky promontories, now retreating behind blue bays. It was the naked south coast of the

island, and though our course held very near the shore, not a village or habitation was visible; there was not even a goat-herd's hut hidden away among the low pinkish sand hills. Pinkish sand hills and yellow head-lands; with dull-colored scrubby bushes massed about their bases and following the dried water-courses. A narrow strip of beach glistened like white paint between the purple sea and the umber rocks, and the whole island lay gleaming in the yellow sunshine and translucent air. Not a wave broke on that fringe of white sand, not the shadow of a cloud played across the bare hills. In the air about us, there was no sound but that of a vessel moving rapidly through absolutely still water. She seemed like some great sea-animal, swimming silently, her head well up. The sea before us was so rich and heavy and opaque that it might have been lapis lazuli. It was the blue of legend, simply; the color that satisfies the soul like sleep.

And it was of the sea we talked, for it was the substance of Mrs. Ebbing's story. She seemed always to have been swept along by ocean streams, warm or cold, and to have hovered about the edge of great waters. She was born and had grown up in a little fishing town on the Arctic ocean. Her father was a doctor, a widower, who lived with his daughter and who divided his time between his books and his fishing rod. Her uncle was skipper on a coasting vessel, and with him she had made many trips along the Norwegian coast. But she was always reading and thinking about the blue seas of the South.

"There was a curious old woman in our village, Dame Ericson, who had been in Italy in her youth. She had gone to Rome to study art, and had copied a great many pictures there. She was well connected, but

had little money, and as she grew older and poorer she sold her pictures one by one, until there was scarcely a well-to-do family in our district that did not own one of Dame Ericson's paintings. But she brought home many other strange things; a little orange-tree which she cherished until the day of her death, and bits of colored marble, and sea shells and pieces of coral, and a thin flask full of water from the Mediterranean. When I was a little girl she used to show me her things and tell me about the South; about the coral fishers, and the pink islands, and the smoking mountains, and the old, underground Naples. I suppose the water in her flask was like any other, but it never seemed so to me. It looked so elastic and alive, that I used to think if one unsealed the bottle something penetrating and fruitful might leap out and work an enchantment over Finmark."

Lars Ebbing, I learned, was one of her father's friends. She could remember him from the time when she was a little girl and he a dashing young man who used to come home from the sea and make a stir in the village. After he got his promotion to an Atlantic liner and went South, she did not see him until the summer she was twenty, when he came home to marry her. That was five years ago. The little girl, Carin, was three. From her talk, one might have supposed that Ebbing was proprietor of the Mediterranean and its adjacent lands, and could have kept her away at his pleasure. Her own rights in him she seemed not to consider.

But we wasted very little time on Lars Ebbing. We talked, like two very young persons, of arms and men, of the sea beneath us and the shores it washed. We were carried a little beyond ourselves, for we were in the presence of the things of

youth that never change; fleeing past them. To-morrow they would be gone, and no effort of will or memory could bring them back again. All about us was the sea of great adventure, and below us, caught somewhere in its gleaming meshes, were the bones of nations and navies nations and navies that gave youth its hope and made life something more than a hunger of the bowels. The unpeopled Sardinian coast unfolded gently before us, like something left over out of a world that was gone; a place that might well have had no later news since the corn ships brought the tidings of Actium.

"I shall never go to Sardinia," said Mrs. Ebbing. "It could not possibly be as beautiful as this."

"Neither shall I," I replied.

As I was going down to dinner that evening, I was stopped by Lars Ebbing, freshly brushed and scented, wearing a white uniform, and polished and glistening as one of his own engines. He smiled at me with his own kind of geniality. "You have been very kind to talk to my wife," he explained. "It is very bad for her this trip that she speaks no English. I am indebted to you."

I told him curtly that he was mistaken, but my acrimony made no impression upon his blandness. I felt that I should certainly strike the fellow if he stood there much longer, running his blue ring up and down his beard. I should probably have hated any man who was Mrs. Ebbing's husband, but Ebbing made me sick.

III

The next day I began my drawing of Mrs. Ebbing. She seemed pleased and a little puzzled when I asked her to sit for me. It occurred to me that she had always been

among dull people who took her looks as a matter of course, and that she was not at all sure that she was really beautiful. I can see now her quick, confused look of pleasure. I thought very little about the drawing then, except that the making of it gave me an opportunity to study her face; to look as long as I pleased into her yellow eyes, at the noble lines of her mouth, at her splendid, vigorous hair.

"We have a yellow vine at home," I told her, "that is very like your hair. It seems to be growing while one looks at it, and it twines and tangles about itself and throws out little tendrils in the wind."

"Has it any name?"

"We call it love vine."

How little a thing could disconcert her!

As for me, nothing disconcerted me. I awoke every morning with a sense of speed and joy. At night I loved to hear the swish of the water rushing by. As fast as the pistons could carry us, as fast as the water could bear us, we were going forward to something delightful; to something together. When Mrs. Ebbing told me that she and her husband would be five days in the docks in New York and then return to Genoa, I was not disturbed, for I did not believe her. I came and went, and she sat still all day, watching the water. I heard an American lady say that she watched it like one who is going to die, but even that did not frighten me: I somehow felt that she had promised me to live.

All those long blue days when I sat beside her talking about Finmark and the sea, she must have known that I loved her. I sat with my hands idle on my knees and let the tide come up in me. It carried me so swiftly that, across the narrow space of deck between us, it must have swayed her, too, a little. I had no wish to disturb or distress her. If a little, a very little of it reached her, I was satisfied.

If it drew her softly, but drew her, I wanted no more. Sometimes I could see that even the light pressure of my thoughts made her paler. One still evening, after a long talk, she whispered to me, "You must go and walk now, and -- don't think about me." She had been held too long and too closely in my thoughts, and she begged me to release her for a little while. I went out into the bow and put her far away, at the sky line, with the faintest star, and thought of her gently across the water. When I went back to her, she was asleep.

But even in those first days I had my hours of misery. Why, for instance, should she have been born in Finmark, and why should Lars Ebbing have been her only door of escape? Why should she be silently taking leave of the world at the age when I was just beginning it, having had nothing, nothing of whatever is worth while?

She never talked about taking leave of things, and yet I sometimes felt that she was counting the sunsets. One yellow afternoon, when we were gliding between the shores of Spain and Africa, she spoke of her illness for the first time. I had got some magnolias at Gibraltar, and she wore a bunch of them in her girdle and the rest lay on her lap. She held the cool leaves against her cheek and fingered the white petals. "I can never," she remarked, "get enough of the flowers of the South. They make me breathless, just as they did at first. Because of them I should like to live a long while -- almost forever."

I leaned forward and looked at her. "We could live almost forever if we had enough courage. It's of our lives that we die. If we had the courage to change it all, to run away to some blue coast like that over there, we could live on and on, until we were tired."

She smiled tolerantly and looked southward through half shut eyes. "I am afraid I should never have courage enough to go behind that mountain, at least. Look at it, it looks as if it hid horrible things."

A sea mist, blown in from the Atlantic, began to mask the impassive African coast, and above the fog, the grey mountain peak took on the angry red of the sunset. It burned sullen and threatening until the dark land drew the night about her and settled back into the sea. We watched it sink, while under us, slowly but ever increasing, we felt the throb of the Atlantic come and go, the thrill of the vast, untamed waters of that lugubrious and passionate sea. I drew Mrs. Ebbing's wraps about her and shut the magnolias under her cloak. When I left her, she slipped me one warm, white flower.

IV

From the Straits of Gibraltar we dropped into the abyss, and by morning we were rolling in the trough of a sea that drew us down and held us deep, shaking us gently back and forth until the timbers creaked, and then shooting us out on the crest of a swelling mountain. The water was bright and blue, but so cold that the breath of it penetrated one's bones, as if the chill of the deep under-fathoms of the sea were being loosed upon us. There were not more than a dozen people upon the deck that morning, and Mrs. Ebbing was sheltered behind the stern, muffled in a sea jacket, with drops of moisture upon her long lashes and on her hair. When a shower of icy spray beat back over the deck rail, she took it gleefully.

"After all," she insisted, "this is my own kind of water; the kind I was born in. This is first cousin to the Pole waters, and the sea we have left is only a kind of fairy tale. It's like the burnt out volcanoes; its day is over.

This is the real sea now, where the doings of the world go on."

"It is not our reality, at any rate," I answered.

"Oh, yes, it is! These are the waters that carry men to their work, and they will carry you to yours."

I sat down and watched her hair grow more alive and iridescent in the moisture. "You are pleased to take an attitude," I complained.

"No, I don't love realities any more than another, but I admit them, all the same."

"And who are you and I to define the realities?"

"Our minds define them clearly enough, yours and mine, everybody's. Those are the lines we never cross, though we flee from the equator to the Pole. I have never really got out of Finmark, of course. I shall live and die in a fishing town on the Arctic ocean, and the blue seas and the pink islands are as much a dream as they ever were. All the same, I shall continue to dream them."

The Gulf Stream gave us warm blue days again, but pale, like sad memories. The water had faded, and the thin, tepid sunshine made something tighten about one's heart. The stars watched us coldly, and seemed always to be asking me what I was going to do. The advancing line on the chart, which at first had been mere foolishness, began to mean something, and the wind from the west brought disturbing fears and forebodings. I slept lightly, and all day I was restless and uncertain except when I was with Mrs. Ebbing. She quieted me as she did little Carin, and soothed me without saying anything, as she had done that evening at Naples when we watched the sunset. It seemed to me that every day her eyes grew more tender and her lips more calm. A kind of fortitude seemed to be

gathering about her mouth, and I dreaded it. Yet when, in an involuntary glance, I put to her the question that tortured me, her eyes always met mine steadily, deep and gentle and full of reassurance. That I had my word at last, happened almost by accident.

On the second night out from shore there was the concert for the Sailors' Orphanage, and Mrs. Ebling dressed and went down to dinner for the first time, and sat on her husband's right. I was not the only one who was glad to see her. Even the women were pleased. She wore a pale green gown, and she came up out of it regally white and gold. I was so proud that I blushed when any one spoke of her. After dinner she was standing by her deck-chair talking to her husband when people began to go below for the concert. She took up a long cloak and attempted to put it on. The wind blew the light thing about, and Ebling chatted and smiled his public smile while she struggled with it. Suddenly his roving eye caught sight of the Chicago girl, who was having a similar difficulty with her draperies, and he pranced half the length of the deck to assist her. I had been watching from the rail, and when she was left alone I threw my cigar away and wrapped Mrs. Ebling up roughly.

"Don't go down," I begged. "Stay up here. I want to talk to you."

She hesitated a moment and looked at me thoughtfully. Then, with a sigh, she sat down. Every one hurried down to the saloon, and we were absolutely alone at last, behind the shelter of the stern, with the thick darkness all about us and a warm east wind rushing over the sea. I was too sore and angry to think. I leaned toward her, holding the arm of her chair with both hands, and began anywhere.

"You remember those two blue coasts out of Gibraltar? It shall be either one you choose, if you will come with me. I have not much money, but we shall get on somehow. There has got to be an end of this. We are neither one of us cowards, and this is humiliating, intolerable."

She sat looking down at her hands, and I pulled her chair impatiently toward me.

"I felt," she said at last, "that you were going to say something like this. You are sorry for me, and I don't wish to be pitied. You think Ebling neglects me, but you are mistaken. He has had his disappointments, too. He wants children and a gay, hospitable house, and he is tied to a sick woman who can not get on with people. He has more to complain of than I have, and yet he bears with me. I am grateful to him, and there is no more to be said."

"Oh, isn't there?" I cried, "and I?"

She laid her hand entreatingly upon my arm. "Ah, you! you! Don't ask me to talk about that. You -- " Her fingers slipped down my coat sleeve to my hand and pressed it. I caught her two hands and held them, telling her I would never let them go.

"And you meant to leave me day after tomorrow, to say goodbye to me as you will to the other people on this boat? You meant to cut me adrift like this, with my heart on fire and all my life unspent in me?"

She sighed despondently. "I am willing to suffer -- whatever I must suffer -- to have had you," she answered simply. "I was ill -- and so lonely -- and it came so quickly and quietly. Ah, don't begrudge it to me! Do not leave me in bitterness. If I have been wrong, forgive me." She bowed her head and pressed my fingers entreatingly. A warm tear splashed on my hand. It occurred to me that she bore my anger as she bore little Carin's importunities, as she bore Ebling. What a circle of pettiness she had about

her! I fell back in my chair and my hands dropped at my side. I felt like a creature with its back broken. I asked her what she wished me to do.

"Don't ask me," she whispered. "There is nothing that we can do. I thought you knew that. You forget that -- that I am too ill to begin my life over. Even if there were nothing else in the way, that would be enough. And that is what has made it all possible, our loving each other, I mean. If I were well, we couldn't have had even this much. Don't reproach me. Hasn't it been at all pleasant to you to find me waiting for you every morning, to feel me thinking of you when you went to sleep? Every night I have watched the sea for you, as if it were mine and I had made it, and I have listened to the water rushing by you, full of sleep and youth and hope. And everything you had done or said during the day came back to me, and when I went to sleep it was only to feel you more. You see there was never any one else; I have never thought of any one in the dark but you." She spoke pleadingly, and her voice had sunk so low that I could scarcely hear her.

"And yet you will do nothing," I groaned. "You will dare nothing. You will give me nothing."

"Don't say that. When I leave you day after tomorrow, I shall have given you all my life. I can't tell you how, but it is true. There is something in each of us that does not belong to the family or to society, not even to ourselves. Sometimes it is given in marriage, and sometimes it is given in love, but oftener it is never given at all. We have nothing to do with giving or withholding it. It is a wild thing that sings in us once and flies away and never comes back, and mine has flown to you. When one loves like that, it is enough, somehow. The other things can

go if they must. That is why I can live without you, and die without you."

I caught her hands and looked into her eyes that shone warm in the darkness. She shivered and whispered in a tone so different from any I ever heard from her before or afterward: "Do you grudge it to me? You are so young and strong, and you have everything before you. I shall have only a little while to want you in -- and I could want you forever and not weary." I kissed her hair, her cheeks, her lips, until her head fell forward on my shoulder and she put my face away with her soft, trembling fingers. She took my hand and held it close to her, in both her own. We sat silent, and the moments came and went, bringing us closer and closer, and the wind and water rushed by us, obliterating our tomorrows and all our yesterdays.

The next day Mrs. Ebbing kept her cabin, and I sat stupidly by her chair until dark, with the rugged little girl to keep me company, and an occasional nod from the engineer.

I saw Mrs. Ebbing again only for a few moments, when we were coming into the New York harbor. She wore a street dress and a hat, and these alone would have made her seem far away from me. She was very pale, and looked down when she spoke to me, as if she had been guilty of a wrong toward me. I have never been able to remember that interview without heartache and shame, but then I was too desperate to care about anything. I stood like a wooden post and let her approach me, let her speak to me, let her leave me. She came up to me as if it were a hard thing to do, and held out a little package, timidly, and her gloved hand shook as if she were afraid of me.

"I want to give you something," she said. "You will not want it now, so I shall ask you to keep it until you hear from me.

You gave me your address a long time ago, when you were making that drawing. Some day I shall write to you and ask you to open this. You must not come to tell me goodbye this morning, but I shall be watching you when you go ashore. Please don't forget that."

I took the little box mechanically and thanked her. I think my eyes must have filled, for she uttered an exclamation of pity, touched my sleeve quickly, and left me. It was one of those strange, low, musical exclamations which meant everything and nothing, like the one that had thrilled me that night at Naples, and it was the last sound I ever heard from her lips.

An hour later I went on shore, one of those who crowded over the gang-plank the moment it was lowered. But the next afternoon I wandered back to the docks and went on board the *Germania*. I asked for the engineer, and he came up in his shirt sleeves from the engine room. He was red and dishevelled, angry and voluble; his bright eye had a hard glint, and I did not once see his masterful smile. When he heard my inquiry he became profane. Mrs. Ebbing had sailed for Bremen on the *Hobenstauffen* that morning at eleven o'clock. She had decided to return by the northern route and pay a visit to her father in Finmark. She was in no condition to travel alone, he said. He evidently smarted under her extravagance. But who, he asked, with a blow of his fist on the rail, could stand between a woman and her whim? She had always been a wilful girl, and she had a dotting father behind her. When she set her head with the wind, there was no holding her; she ought to have married the Arctic Ocean. I think Ebbing was still talking when I walked away.

I spent that winter in New York. My consular appointment hung fire (indeed, I

did not pursue it with much enthusiasm), and I had a good many idle hours in which to think of Mrs. Ebbing. She had never mentioned the name of her father's village, and somehow I could never quite bring myself to go to the docks when Ebbing's boat was in and ask for news of her. More than once I made up my mind definitely to go to Finmark and take my chance at finding her; the shipping people would know where Ebbing came from. But I never went. I have often wondered why. When my resolve was made and my courage high, when I could almost feel myself approaching her, suddenly everything crumbled under me, and I fell back as I had done that night when I dropped her hands, after telling her, only a moment before, that I would never let them go.

In the twilight of a wet March day, when the gutters were running black outside and the Square was liquefying under crusts of dirty snow, the housekeeper brought me a damp letter which bore a blurred foreign postmark. It was from Niels Nannestad, who wrote that it was his sad duty to inform me that his daughter, Alexandra Ebbing, had died on the second day of February, in the twenty-sixth year of her age. Complying with her request, he inclosed a letter which she had written some days before her death.

I at last brought myself to break the seal of the second letter. It read thus:

"My Friend: --

You may open now the little package I gave you. May I ask you to keep it? I gave it to you because there is no one else who would care about it in just that way. Ever since I left you I have been thinking what it would be like to live a lifetime caring and being cared for like that. It was not the life I

was meant to live, and yet, in a way, I have been living it ever since I first knew you.

"Of course you understand now why I could not go with you. I would have spoiled your life for you. Besides that, I was ill -- and I was too proud to give you the shadow of myself. I had much to give you, if you had come earlier. As it was, I was ashamed. Vanity sometimes saves us when nothing else will, and mine saved you. Thank you for everything. I hold this to my heart, where I once held your hand. Alexandra."

The dusk had thickened into night long before I got up from my chair and took the little box from its place in my desk drawer. I opened it and lifted out a thick coil, cut from where her hair grew thickest and brightest. It was tied firmly at one end, and when it fell over my arm it curled and clung about my sleeve like a living thing set free. How it gleamed, how it still gleams in the firelight! It was warm and softly scented under my lips, and stirred under my breath like seaweed in the tide. This, and a withered magnolia flower, and two pink sea shells; nothing more. And it was all twenty years ago!

Copyright © 1995.

الخلاصة:

نظريات التأدب في المحادثة: تحليل تداولي مع الإشارة إلى
القصة القصيرة "على طريق النوارس" لكاتر.

تناولت الدراسة الحالية نظرية التأدب، والتي تعد واحدة من أهم النظريات التداولية إضافة إلى نظري الأفعال ونظرية مبدأ التعاون.

وبحسب عدد من اللغويين تتفرع هذه النظرية إلى عدد من النظريات، تناولت الدراسة ثلاث منها: نظرية مبدأ التأدب للبيج (١٩٨٣)، ونظرية الوجه لبراون وليفنسن (١٩٨٧)، وثلاثة لسكولن وسكولن (٢٠٠١) هي أنظمة التأدب. تهدف الدراسة إلى توضيح كيفية قياس ما هو مؤدب أو غير مؤدب بصورة دقيقة، وكيف أن الأسلوب المؤدب أو غير المؤدب يؤثر في التفاعلات الاجتماعية، وكيف تتعامل أحكامه، واستراتيجياته أو حتى أنظمتها مع المعنى الذي يقصده المخاطب. لذلك، افترضت الدراسة أن هناك توافق بين تلك النظريات الثلاث بحيث يمكن الاعتماد عليها في تحليل أي تفاعل اجتماعي.

انقسمت الدراسة إلى قسمين: اشتمل الأول على تقديم إطار نظري مختصر عن التأدب مستعرضاً بعض التعريفات التي تناولته، ومبدأه وأحكامه، ونظرية الوجه واستراتيجياتها، ومن ثم نظرية أنظمة التأدب، بينما يقوم القسم الثاني على دراسة عملية لما قدم في القسم الأول وفيه حللت القصة القصيرة "على طريق النوارس". لكاتر اخذين بعين الاعتبار تحليل سبعة مستويات رئيسية وأخرى، ما يقرب الثلاثين مستوى، فرعية.

خلصت الدراسة إلى عدة استنتاجات منها أن نظريات التأدب الثلاث غالباً ما تكون مكملّة و مترابطة لبعضها البعض في التفاعلات الاجتماعية.