

Silence is Golden:
A Study of Sociocultural Rules of Communication
in Some Q/A Pairs in a Korean Television Drama Series

Sun Chang*

Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Background
- 3 Data Analysis
- 4 Conclusion

1. Introduction

All members of a society, if they are to be considered native speakers of the language shared by the community members, must acquire competence not only in the abstract rules of its grammar (syntactic competence) but also in the rules governing the appropriate use of the language in context, i.e., in concrete situations of everyday life (sociopragmatic competence). When people use language, they do so "in subtle ways to define their relationship to each other, to identify themselves as part of a social group, and to establish the kind of speech event they are in."

* Language Center, Soongsil University

(Fasold, 1990, p 1) In a relatively homogeneous society like Korea, where sharedness by the members of a belief system and observations of norms of the society are regarded as a very important measure of membership, acquisition and utilization of knowledge of shared contextualization cues in communicative interactions with others is a vital component of communicative competence.

This paper is an attempt to examine some patterns of communicative strategies among Korean people which show how shared knowledge of certain social and cultural norms governing the human relationships plays a crucial role in the participants' acts in speech situations. It is hypothesized that the rigid structure of social strata in Korean society dictates the behavior of its members, resulting in their specific communicative acts. The purpose of this paper is to discover and analyze some patterns and functions of communicating that organize the use of verbal and nonverbal means in communicative situations, events, and acts in the conduct of social life.

The focus of this paper is on the patterns and functions of communication which are determined by cultural and social rules of a particular society. The framework employed in this paper for analyzing the data is based on the classic study by Brown and Gilman (1960), in which they proposed that the use of address forms in many cultures was often governed by what they called 'power' and 'solidarity' and that the selection of one address form over another was dependent on the participants' social station and personal relationship with each other.

The data to be analyzed in this paper come from several scripts of a highly popular television drama series "보고 또 보고" ("See You Again and Again").¹⁾ This particular drama series was chosen due to the fact that it represents in a rather exaggerated manner a complex web of human relations involving different families, generations, sexes, jobs, etc. in the contemporary Korean society. This type of drama can provide examples of various communicative situations and rules of conduct unique to Korean culture, where even relationships among family members

1) This series was shown on MBC from March 1, 1998 to April 1, 1999 and watched daily by a record-breaking number of viewers

are often defined on the basis of power and hierarchy rather than solidarity and equality. The present data cannot be called 'natural,' but they are naturalistic in the sense that they are as close to natural conversation as any written language can be the communicative acts depicted in the scripts occur in response to immediate situational demands.

The focus of this paper's investigation is on Question/Answer pairs in the data, analyzing them to find some patterns in which particular communicative acts are governed by specific rules of sociocultural behavior. Special attention is paid to the role of silence, an example of nonverbal communication, showing the importance and meaning of such a nonverbal strategy in some cases of interpersonal relationships in Korean culture.

2. Background

2.1. Power and Solidarity: Invisible Forces

In their study of second-person pronoun usage in French, German, Italian, and Spanish, Brown and Gilman (1960, 1972) proposed that the usage, i.e., the alternation between a deferential pronoun (e.g., 'vous' in French) and a familiar pronoun ('tu' in French), was governed by two semantics, power and solidarity. According to Brown and Gilman, power semantic, like power relationship, is nonreciprocal and asymmetrical. Solidarity semantic, on the other hand, is based on equal relationship and, therefore, reciprocal. Power relationship is usually based on age difference or occupational rank difference, while solidarity relationship comes from a degree of common ground, a sharing, a degree of closeness and intimacy.

Ervin-Tripp (1972), elaborating on Brown and Gilman's research, proposed selection rules governing the use of address forms (e.g., nickname, first name, title plus last name, etc.) in America and showed how such rules could be represented in a formal model based on the theory of information processing. Her model is a

kind of flow chart, in which variables such as setting, age, relationship, rank, gender, etc., guide a speaker to follow a path leading to the final choice of an address form. A breakdown in this decision-making system results in avoidance or wrong usage of an address form.

Brown and Gilman noted that speakers of different languages seemed to pick out different factors as the favored bases for solidarity. For example, family relationships were more likely to be the determiner of solidarity for German speakers, while 'shared fate' (e.g., camaraderie such as being fellow-students or fellow-countrymen abroad) appeared to be more important for French speakers. Erwin-Tripp (1972) also stated that the dominant selectors of address forms are social determinants and vary according to the system and that "the specific nature of the categories must be discovered by ethnographic means." (p. 220)

Brown and Gilman borrowed the Guttman scale technique (Guttman, 1944) to illustrate the implicational relationships which seemed to exist among the variables determining the use of address forms. In simple terms, Guttman scaling means that endorsement of a more extreme case will always be associated with endorsement of all less extreme cases. In the case of the use of address forms, Guttman scaling works like this: anyone who addresses a lay person of the opposite sex who is not a casual friend with FN (first name) would address a lay person of the same sex who is a casual friend the same way. Similarly, if the casual friend of the same sex is not addressed with FN, then it is expected that the less intimate acquaintance of the opposite sex would not be either. Since the variables such as sex and closeness are often affected by socio-cultural factors, it is natural to expect the pattern of Guttman scaling to be sensitive to socio-cultural differences.

There seems to be a general consensus among researchers that there has been a shift away from power towards solidarity in Western societies. Brown and Gilman's data indicate that, "by the mid-twentieth century, solidarity had almost completely won out over power as the dominant governing semantic." (Fasold, 1990, p.6) Invisible forces called power and solidarity govern address forms, but the relative strength of each, how they are defined, and how to apply them to everyday

choices are not universally fixed.

Some important points of the above studies are: their emphasis on the inseparable relationship between linguistic behavior and social and cultural determinants; their theory of a person's linguistic behavior as his/her decision or choice based on his/her knowledge social, cultural, and contextual rules; their theory of linguistic changes as a reflection of social and cultural changes. The present paper owes a lot of insight to the above studies.

2.1. Why Question/Answer Pairs?

In the field of discourse analysis, the form and function of a question have been an object of extensive research. An utterance with a syntactic form of a question can function as a question, request, offer, etc. depending on "our knowledge of the general background conditions necessary for an utterance to have a particular function (to count as a particular kind of action) and the applicability of those general conditions to particular circumstances." (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 85) Generally, one can infer the function of an utterance on the basis of the hearer's response (=answer) to the utterance, which can have a variety of functions, e.g., providing information, compliance, rejection, etc. One can also infer how the response is situated in a participation framework by examining the social relationships between discourse participants. This way, the social relationships between discourse participants provide the basis for sequential coherence between utterances.

Gumperz stresses the interpretive importance of contexts, providing a framework within which to analyze the use of language during interpersonal communication. Goffman also "provides a sociological framework for describing and understanding the form and meaning of the social and interpersonal contexts that provide presuppositions for the interpretation of meaning." (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 133) For interactional sociolinguists like Gumperz and Goffman, the context of social interaction is one of the most crucial frameworks to be analyzed in order to understand the meaning of language use. A question/answer pair in discourse

provides an excellent example of social and interpersonal interaction between two or more participants, and a careful examination of such an example can reveal various communicative strategies employed by the participants to achieve certain interpersonal goals.

Question/answer sequences in interviews, for instance, can be analyzed as following certain predictable patterns displaying evidence in participants' behavior for the communicative norms and understandings, which are determined by the particular society and culture the participants belong to. In the case of reference interviews, questions are used by patrons seeking information and librarians helping obtain information for three different specific purposes: making offers, issuing queries, or seeking clarification. In this situation, both participants use questions as a way to find information, engaged in a collaborative effort to attain a shared goal. Question/answer sequences thus form cohesive pairs as required by the communicative norms.

As can be seen in many previous studies, analyzing question/answer sequences demonstrates the importance of sociopragmatic aspect of communicative acts. Studying a particular speech event such as a question/answer sequence in a particular social setting seems to be one of the most effective way to answer the question: What shared knowledge and expectations concerning appropriate social behavior including communicative act do people draw on in their everyday interaction?

A full taxonomy of questions is not a simple job, but the various terms used to categorize questions refer both to features of the surface syntax and also to those of the expected answer, representing a discourse-sensitive concept of questions. Fries argues that "the question itself is part of the frame in which the answer as an utterance operates." (Fries, 1952, p. 165)

A Q/A pair is an example of exchange. An exchange comprises an initiation, where the possibilities are open-ended, followed by responses which are pre-classified and therefore restricted. Questions are asked for specific reasons and with specific expectations, and such reasons and expectations must be understood by

the hearer through his/her sociopragmatic competence. If this condition does not meet, there occurs a breakdown of communication.

Meanings are negotiated in the course of interaction, and in this sense all communicative acts are essentially multifunctional, with their functions determined by the particular context. An exchange such as a Q/A sequence is no exception, and such communicative interaction requires a high degree of sharedness.

In this paper, the term 'answer' is used as meaning both a verbal and a nonverbal response. As the inextricable relationship between meaning and context has become clearer, the importance of nonverbal means of communication in a high-context society has been receiving more attention from many scholars studying communication. Edward T. Hall (1994) defines a high-context communication or message as "one in which most of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message." (p. 62) In a relatively homogeneous and closely-knit society like Korea, high-context messages such as silence play a crucial role in communication.

This paper differs from the classical studies of power and solidarity semantics mentioned in the previous section in two important ways: it employs a discourse-based method of analysis and includes nonverbal communication as its main target of analysis.

3. Data Analysis

3.1. General Background

보고 또 보고 (See You Again and Again) was an extremely popular television drama series, featuring two sisters marrying two brothers. The older sister 금주, an aspiring author, is feminine, vain, lazy, but favored by her mother. The younger sister 은주, a nurse, is hard-working, tough, aggressive, and not much

- 지여사: (b) [..선풍기 내드릴까요]
 "Would you like a fan?"
- 할머니: (c) [아니 지금이 몇월인데 선풍길 내? 내가 선풍기 바람 좋아하든?]
 "What are you talking about? Is this the right month for a fan? Do I like a fan?"
- 지여사: (d) (...)
- 할머니: (e) [오며 가며 시에미 눈에 뜨이는 것두 싫으냐?]
 "Don't you even want me to be seen when you go back and forth?"
- 지여사: (f) [무슨 말씀을 ..그렇게 하세요]
 "Why do you put things that way?"
- 할머니: (g) [그렇잖나, 남의 방문을 짓두 시에미 방문을 무슨 이유루 그렇게 치달어?]
 "Am I wrong? Why do you slam someone's door like that? Your mother-in-law's at that?"
- 지여사: (h) (...)
- 할머니: (I) [불편하구 싫다는거 아냐 골방에 었뎠다가 주는 밥이나 한술 먹으라는거 아냐]
 "Isn't that because you don't like me? Aren't you telling me I should just lie quietly in a den and thank for a spoonful of rice thrown at me?"
- 지여사: (j) [노래소리가 좀 시끄럽길래 닫았어요]
 "I closed the door because the music was a little too loud."
- 할머니 (k) [이젠 노래두 듣지 말라구?]
 "Are you saying I shouldn't even listen to music now?"
- 지여사: (l) (...)
- 할머니: (m) [그럼 난 무슨 재미로 살어 응, 무슨 취미로 살어? 다 맘먹기 나름이지 시에미가 맘에 안드니까 노래 소리두 듣기 싫은거야]
 "What should I live for then? What's my pleasure? Everything depends on how you look at it. Because you dislike me, you dislike my music too."

지여사 (n) [아우..] (속상해서 소파로)

(sighs and sits down on the sofa in despair)

할머니. (o) (와서 앉으시는) [정 시끄럽다 싶으면 .. 와서, 어머님! 소리 조금만 줄여주세요.. 이러면 좋잖아? 무슨 경우야? 암말암구 와서 쳐달구 가구 쳐달구 가구.]

(sits down on the sofa too) "If you thought the music was too loud, why couldn't you just come and say, 'mother, please turn down the music'? Wouldn't it have been better? What kind of behavior is that - just slamming my door again and again without a word?"

지여사 (p) (...)

할머니. (q) [니가 그런 경우 당했어 봐 며느리한테, 기분 좋겠나.. 너두 조금있으면 며느리 본다]

"Put yourself in my place. You wouldn't have liked such behavior from your daughter-in-law either. And you will have one soon."

지여사 (...)

In the above speech event, the mother-in-law uses more than 10 utterances with question forms, but the daughter-in-law responds with silence most of the time. It looks like the older woman's questions are rhetorical and do not require answers. Compare the above conversation with the following one between the mother-in-law and her daughter:

(1) 봉희 (a) (테이프 보는) [회심곡 들었수?]

(looks at the tape) "Did you listen to 'Changing Heart'?"

할머니. (b) (...)

봉희 (c) [문 활짝 열어놓구 공상맞은 음악 떠나가게 틀어놓구 그랬지?

"You were listening to that soppy song at top volume with your door wide open, weren't you?"

할머니. (d) (히똥..부인못하는 표정)

(looks sheepish without denying the accusation)

봉희: (e) [나라두 귀따거워서 문 닫았겠네..]

"I would have shut the door too"

할머니: (f) [..나가, 너까지 속 뒤집지 말구]

"Get out and stop aggravating me."

In conversation (2), the roles are reversed: now it is the older woman's turn to respond with silence. Unlike the relationship between a mother-in-law and a daughter-in-law, this mother and daughter relationship seems to be based on equality. In Korean society, where a daughter-in-law's position in her husband's family is typically at the low end of the family's hierarchical structure, she must be obedient to her in-laws. Such a disadvantaged position does not allow her to answer back to her in-laws, especially when the in-laws are expressing anger or reproof. Conversation (1) demonstrates that 지여사 perfectly understands that her mother-in-law does not expect answers from her: her answers to the propositional content of the mother-in-law's questions would be impertinent talking back as in (j) and incur more wrath. Her knowledge of Korean society and culture, her relationship with her mother-in-law, her mother-in-law's personality--- all these contextual cues make her keep quiet and refrain from answering the older woman's questions after a couple of tries. This is a good example of nonreciprocal, asymmetrical relationship. The choice 지여사 makes is based on her knowledge of the relationship.

Most likely, 할머니 expects 지여사 to answer her questions not with informative explanation but with blind apology. The fact 지여사 does not apologize shows that, while she does not challenge her mother-in-law, she still maintains her dignity. With almost everyone else, 지여사 acts superior. Silent responses, therefore, are the best compromise she would make in interacting with her mother-in-law.

When a person expects an apology and does not receive one, it makes the person unhappy. Depending on the relationship between participants, the consequence of such uncooperative behavior could be grave. The following is a conversation between a school principal and a teacher. The principal caught some students selling

other students autographed photos of celebrities popular among teenagers. The furious principal reprimands the guilty students' homeroom teacher 명원. Conversation (3) is an exchange between the principal and the teacher:

(3) 박교장 (a) [몰랐다는게 말이 됩니까, 아니 담임이란 사람이 눈앞에서 장사하는 것두 모르고 뭐하고 있었습니까 그럼? 애들 학과지도만 하는게 담임할 일 아닙니다. 애들이 담임을 필루알구 있다는 애집니까 아까 나 들어 갔을 때 신문 보구 있었죠, 신문을 집에서 보는거지 학교에서 보는 겁니까]

말 마치고 보니, 바로 탁자에 신문 펼쳐져있는
 "Does it make any sense that you didn't know? What were you, the homeroom teacher, doing when your students were selling things right under your nose? Academic advising is not the sole duty of a homeroom teacher. What does this say about how students view their homeroom teacher? When I went into your room, you were reading a newspaper, weren't you? Aren't newspapers supposed to be read at home, not at work?" (finishing his reprimand, suddenly notices a newspaper spread on his table)

명원 (b) (역시 신문을)
 (notices the paper too)

박교장 (c) (슬며시 접어 치우며) [항시 체크하구 있어야 해요 사십명이나 되는 애들, 무슨짓을 할지 알아요 당장 봐요, 싸인 버젓이 복사해다 장사를 하구, 학교에서 이게 있을 수 있는 일입니까?]

(furtively putting away the paper) "You must always keep an eye on your students. You never know what those 40 kids may be up to, do you? You see, they are selling autographed copies of entertainers. How can such a thing be allowed to go on in school?"

명원: (d) [죄송합니다 교장 선생님]
 "I am sorry, sir."

박교장 (e) [아주 깜짝 놀랐어요, 내가 이렇게 어이가 없는데 학부형들

알면 얼마나 기막힐 노릇입니까 신성한 학교에서 말야, 공부배워오는 거지 학교가, 장사 배우는 데예요? 애들이 뭘 알아요? 답임이 올바루 이끌어 나가야죠]

"I was shocked. If I am this shocked, how would the parents feel? A school is a sacred place for learning, not a business, isn't it? What do those kids know? They need guidance from a homeroom teacher."

명원: (f) [다시는 이런 일 없도록 하겠습니다]

"I will make sure this sort of thing won't happen again."

박교장 (g) [어린 녀석들이 맹랑하지 말야 어떻게 그런 생각을 해..영악한 녀석들..잠시두 눈을 떴으면 안됩니다]

"Those precocious kids! How could they think up such a scheme? Such a preposterous idea! You must never leave them alone."

명원: (h) (알겠다고..착잡)

(nods, with a mixture of emotions)

To the principal's rhetorical questions, 명원, instead of answering them, apologizes. In this situation, silence is not acceptable, for the silence would be interpreted as insolence and denial of responsibility on the part of the teacher. The power relationship between 지여사 and 할머니 and the relationship between 박교장 and 명원 are both nonreciprocal, but there seems to be some difference. Power relationship among family members is not the same as power relationship based on occupational status. In the former case, what is at stake is peace at home; in the latter, one's job and/or livelihood.

Conversation (4) is an exchange among parents and a son, who wants to marry a girl his mother does not approve of:

(1) 기정: (a) [..먼저 죄송하단 말씀드립니다 (하고 지여사를).. 어머니, 이해해주셨으면 좋겠어요]

"First, I must apologize to you. (looks at 지여사) Mother, please try to understand."

- 지여사: (b) (뺨하듯) [..떨기] (하고 남편을)
 (as if struck) "understand what?" (looks at her husband)
- 박교장: (c) (기정을)
 (looks at 기정)
- 기정: (d) [제 결혼 문제요..전 마음 굳혔습니다]
 "It's about my marriage. I have made up my mind."
- 지여사: (e) (가라앉는) [..어떻게?]
 (calmly) "how?"
- 기정: (f) [지난번 말씀드렸던..정은주요]
 "It's the girl that I mentioned before ... 정은주."
- 지여사: (g) (굳어지듯)
 (stiffens)
- 박교장: (h) [따루 사귀는 아가씨 있었나?]
 "So, you've been seeing a girl?"
- 기정: (I) [..네]
 "yes "
- 지여사: (j) (...)
- 박교장: (k) [언제부터] (끝나기도 전에)
 "How long" (before he finishes)
- 지여사: (l) [알 필요 없어요]
 "You don't need to know."
- 박교장: (m)(...)
- 기정: (n) (...)
- 지여사: (o) (차단히 누르고) [다시 생각하렴]
 (controlling herself) "Why don't you reconsider your decision?"
- 기정: (p) [충분히 생각해서 한 결정입니다]
 "I have given it enough thought."
- 지여사: (q) [더 충분히 생각해..단순히 니 안식구가 아니라, 집안의 맡
 떠느릴 들이는거야. 너혼자 좋다고 되는게 아니라구 했잖
 니, 기풍이랑은 입장이 다르다구]
 "Give it more thought, then We are not just talking about
 your wife. We are talking about the first daughter-in-law in
 our family. Didn't I say it's not totally up to you? Your
 position is different from 기풍's "

Conversation (4) shows another role reversal. The mother is in a position of power over both the father and the son. She does not like the girl her son wants to marry. In (1) she cuts off her husband's question to their son and does not allow the son to answer. This is a gross violation of conversational etiquette, but either of the men does not override her offensive behavior. Her husband's question goes unanswered: he is denied the right to have his question answered. The son does not dare answer his father's question. Both the father and the son know better than challenging 지여사. This demonstrates that 지여사, unlike with her mother-in-law, is in a superior position with regard to her husband and her older son. This also shows that in the matter of marriage, a son's mother typically has the biggest voice in Korea. Again, this is an example of how silent response acts as a compromise when a participant in a speech event decides that contextualization cues tell him/her that such a response would be the best communicative strategy under the circumstances.

Conversation (5) is an exchange between a mother and a son, where the mother again gets away with rude behavior.

- (1) 기정· (a) (잠시 보다) [혹시 은주 안다녀 갔어요 어머니?
 (after hesitating a little) "Hasn't 은주 stopped by, mother?"
 지여사: (b) [..나한테 개 얘기 꺼내지 마라] (쳐다도 안보고 욕설로)
 "Don't even mention her to me." (goes into the bathroom
 without even glancing in 기정's direction)
 기정. (..우두커니)
 (left standing blankly)

Exchange (5) is a question/refusal pair. In this case, the refusal is not only to refuse to answer the propositional content of the question but also to refuse to engage in conversation. This type of exchange usually occurs when there exists asymmetric power distribution between the participants.

The following exchange occurs when 기풍 and his bride came back from their honeymoon. 선남 is 기풍's younger cousin, and 봉희 is his father's sister and 선남's mother.

- (6) 박교장: (a) (두사람 앉으면) [잘들 지냈나?]
 (when the couple were seated) "Did you have a good time?"
- 기풍: (b) [예..] (싱글)
 "Yeah" (beams with a smile)
- 할머니: [저 웃음 언제나 들어 갈까]
 "When will you ever learn not to smile like that?"
- 기풍 (d) [지금 안 웃으면 언제 웃어요, 일부러 찡그려요?]
 "What's wrong with me smiling now? Shall I force myself to frown?"
- 할머니 (e) (에이그 표정)
 (sighs with a resigned expression)
- 선남 (f) [형 불국사 가 봤어?]
 "Did you go to Pulguk Temple?"
- 기풍 (g) [불국산 안갔다]
 "No, I didn't go to Pulguk Temple."
- 선남 (h) [석굴암은?]
 "How about Sokkuram Grotto?"
- 봉희 (I) (겹치듯) [년 빠져, 어른들 얘기하시는데]
 (almost simultaneously) "You stay out of it. It's an adult conversation."
- 기풍 (j) [석굴암두]
 "Not Sokkuram Grotto, either."
- 할머니 (k) [경주가서 불국사 석굴암 안갔으면 뭘 본거야]
 "What did you see in Kyungjoo if not Pulguk Temple or Sokkuram Grotto?"
- 기풍 (l) [경주에 불국사 석굴암 말고도 볼게 얼마나 많은데요, 제대루 웬만큼 볼려면 한달 걸려요]
 "There are hundreds of other things to see in Kyungjoo besides Pulguk Temple and Sokkuram Grotto. It would take a month to see them all."
- 할머니 (m)[그래?]
 "Is that right?"
- 기풍 (n) [예]
 "Yes."

Conversation (6) makes it possible to infer a few interesting facts: 기풍 and 할머니 are close, and he can get away with talking back (jokingly) to his grandmother as can be seen in (d). It seems that age by itself is less important than types of relationship in deciding how the participants communicate with one another. 선남 is warned by his mother not to interrupt adult conversation, but her order does not carry much force.

기풍 actually ignores his aunt and provides an answer to his young cousin's question. This could mean either that 봉희 does not wield a lot of power in the family (she is a non-member of 기풍's family due to the fact that she is married and belongs to another family) or that 기풍's personality is such that he does not pay much attention to conventional social constraints, choosing solidarity over power as the basis for his interaction with others.

Conversation (7) is a brief but complex exchange involving four participants. 지여사, unhappy with 은주, an uninvited guest trying hard to please her prospective mother-in-law, asks her in a subtle way to leave. 할머니, however, immediately shows her support for the young woman, thus aligning herself with 지여사's victim of hostility. 박교장, a henpecked husband, is hesitant to choose sides, although he likes 은주. The whole situation is very difficult for 은주, for she must please everyone. She tries not to undermine 지여사's authority, so she responds to the latter's request by getting ready to leave but at the same time recruits 박교장's support. She knows she already has 할머니's full endorsement. Of course, 할머니 knows that she can get away with undermining 지여사's authority, so 할머니 openly contradicts 지여사 in (b). 지여사 cannot contradict her mother-in-law.

(7) 지여사 (a) [너무 늦은거 아녜요?]

"It's getting rather late, isn't it?"

할머니 (b) [이제 여덟시 반이구만 뭐 늦냐, 기정이 보구가야지]

"It's only eight-thirty. You should stay and see 기정."

은주 [아뇨, 어른들 뵈었으니까 가야죠. 아버님 저 또 놀러와두 돼요?]

"It's O. K. I came to see you. It's time to go home. Father, may I come again?"

- 박교장: (d) (지역사 눈치 보는) [아, 그럼..와요]
 (tries to read 지역사's face) "Uh, of course."
 지역사: (e) (박교장을)
 (gives him a look)
 할머니 (f) [사람사는집 사람이 와야지 그럼, 아무때건 들러 대환영야]
 "Of course, what's wrong with people visiting each other?
 You are welcome anytime."
 은주: (g) (그러겠다고 웃음기)
 (nods with a smile)
 지역사 (h) (...)

4. Conclusion

Human relationship is a complex concept. In a society where the sense of group membership is highly cherished, where individual members' positions in a family are determined by certain rigid social norms, and where power rather than solidarity is often the basis of relationships, it is important to look for such variables when understanding or explaining social behavior of its members.

This paper uses discourse as its frame of analysis, taking into consideration a whole social and cultural context in its interpretation of data. The scope of analysis in this paper is, therefore, far wider than either Brown and Gilman or Ervin-Tripp conceived in their studies, which were concerned with analyzing the usage of lexical items, pronouns, or inflectional alternatives.

The data analysis in section 3.2. shows how an extremely subtle and complex interaction among people may be analyzed and explained using an ethnographic approach. It has been demonstrated that many communicative acts in various situations may be the results of the participants' conscious or unconscious utilization of their communicative competence based on their knowledge of cultural, social, and situational norms of communicative behavior. They normally act according to what they believe is appropriate or right. At the same time, if they know that they can get away with certain behavior due to their power or solidarity relationship with

other participants, they take advantage of it. Moerman states that "it seems impossible to 'just talk' without thereby also doing things such as: claiming fellowship, sharing superiority, enacting roles, insulting, forming alliances, etc." (Stubbs, p. 188) As Hymes points out, "facets of the cultural values and beliefs, social institutions and forms, roles and personalities, history and ecology of a community may have to be examined in their bearing on communicative events and patterns." (Hymes, 1977, p. 4)

As the examination of the present data illuminates, human communication requires a highly complex competence, and a language learner's task in acquiring such competence must involve a highly complex process. A native speaker must have knowledge of shared means of communication in his/her community, and such a shared competence is what makes a person a genuine member of the community.

The data analysis demonstrates how power and solidarity affects one's communicative acts and how power and solidarity relationships are defined by particular social and cultural norms. Korea still exhibits "strong emphasis on social relationships and devotion to the hierarchical family relations that are the essence of Confucian doctrines." (Luce & Summer, 1969) The data also show that, in the contemporary Korean society, there seems to be a shift away from power towards solidarity in family relationships. Age by itself is no longer a dominant selector of deference. In immediate and/or extended family contexts, younger children often exhibit highly informal and even discourteous behavior to older members and get away with it. Within a Korean family structure, however, the position of a daughter-in-law, especially the one married to the first son, is still a very much traditional one: she is supposed to be part of the husband's family but, at the same time, a perpetual outsider and never a true member of the ingroup. She is expected to be subservient to her in-laws. The oldest son in a Korean family is also an ambivalent position: he has many rights but also many obligations. When the oldest son gets married, it is more than a marriage, and it often turns into an issue of control and dominance.

It seems that in Korean society the solidarity/power dichotomy is not a

mutually exclusive concept. For instance, family relationships are often hierarchical, unequal, and complementary in many Korean families, but at the same time there exists strong solidarity among family members: parents are willing to sacrifice themselves for their children, and the children acquire a strong sense of filial responsibility as they grow up. Thus, solidarity and power often coexist in a relationship, and the dynamics of socio-cultural traditions, norms, and changes determine which exerts more influence on the behavior of those involved in the relationship. Within a Korean family, it seems that power is the more important principle governing the relationship between a mother-in-law and a daughter-in-law; the relationship between a grandparent and a grandchild, however, is more solidarity-oriented despite the enormous age difference.

Outside home too, Korea is still a highly hierarchical society. As the principal and the teacher in conversation (3) demonstrate, relationships based on occupational status prescribe behavior which is fundamentally nonreciprocal, asymmetrical, and based on power. Borrowing the Guttman scale technique, one could say that in Korea only when the relationship between a daughter-in-law and her in-laws or the relationship between a superior and his/her subordinate (e.g., at the workplace or military) becomes totally solidarity-based and reciprocal will the shift away from power towards solidarity as the major influence have been completed.

According to Brown and Gilman, power and solidarity are the basic dimensions of social behavior, and, therefore, universal. However, the ways the dimensions of power and solidarity are manifested in different societies and cultures vary according to the particular rules of behavior established in the societies and cultures. This paper deals with some examples of linguistic or non-linguistic features of communication which realize the uniquely Korean rules of behavior based on power and solidarity. This paper's focus of analysis was the use of *non-verbal* responses to questions. This type of nonverbal communicative acts, as has been shown in this paper, is as meaningful as, or even more meaningful than, linguistic ones in many contexts. Often times, especially in a high-context culture, silence, eye contact, gestures, facial expressions, and other nonlinguistic means of

communication can be much more poignant and eloquent than thousands of words. Further research is needed on specific rules and patterns of behavior in Korean society distinguishing the status or role of man and woman, derogation, respect, hostility, etc. to look for the diverse means available within both the linguistic and nonlinguistic habits of the community.

Another area of interest is the acquisition process of communicative competence by children or second language learners. As is clear from the data, selection rules governing appropriate responses to questions are highly complex and depend on numerous contextual variables. Learning when to be silent, when to apologize, or when to answer back involves much more than learning sounds, structures, and vocabulary items of a language. Such culture-learning takes time and "proceeds through interaction, observation, and imitation." (Porter & Samovar, 1994) When and how are these rules acquired by children? These rules change as social and cultural rules change. How does such change occur? How can spoiled behavior ten years ago (e.g., a grandchild using 반말, i.e., an informal, non-honorific form of speech, to his/her grandfather) be no longer considered spoiled?

There are always individual variations and exceptions to rules, but in each community there is a common thread that ties its members together. This common thread is culture. Culture is a system of ideas that underlies and gives meaning to behavior in society. Culture is reflected in every phenomenon in the community sharing it. The way members of a community communicate with each other is "constrained by culture, but it also reveals and sustains culture." (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 139) Such constraints, revelations, and sustenance of culture are shared by the members. Such sharedness is at the core of the empathy, sympathy, anger, and tears with which viewers respond to a show like *보고 또 보고*.

Works Cited

- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1972) On sociolinguistic rules: alternation and co-occurrence. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.) *The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Fasold, R. (1990) *Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Fries, C. (1952) *The Structure of English*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Guttman, I. (1944) A basis for scaling qualitative data. *American Sociological Review*, 9, 139-150.
- Hall, E. T. (1994) Context and Meaning. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (eds) *Intercultural communication*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Hymes, D (1972) Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D Hymes (eds), *The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- _____ (1974) Toward ethnographies of communication. In *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: an Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- _____ (1977). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. London: Tavistock.
- Luce, D, & Sommer, J. (1969) *Viet Nam the Unheard Voices*. Ithaca, N.Y. Cornell University Press.
- Moerman, M. (1973). The use of precedent in natural conversation. In *Semiotica*, 9, 3, 193-218.
- Porter, E. E & Samovar, L. A (1994) An Introduction to Intercultural Communication. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (eds). *Intercultural Communication*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Schiffrin, D (1994). *Approach to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Searle, J. (1975). Indirect speech acts In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds), *Syntax And Semantics, vol 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, 59-82.
- Stubbs, M (1983). *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

국문초록

한국 T.V 드라마를 통한 침묵의 사회 언어학적 고찰

장 선

언어와 문화의 밀접함은 이미 많은 연구에 의하여 증명되었다. 언어의 사용법이 특정한 문화의 규범에 따라 제약을 받고, 이런 규범을 습득하고 활용할 수 있는 능력은 그 문화 사회의 일원이 되기 위한 필수 조건중의 하나이다. 이 논문에서는 큰 인기속에 방영된 화제의 TV 드라마의 각본을 데이터로 사용하여, 시어머니와 며느리, 어머니와 맏아들, 어머니와 장래 맏며느리감등, 한국 문화권 내에서 독특하게 형성되는 인간관계의 discourse를 power와 solidarity라는 개념을 토대로 분석했다. 특히 수사적 (rhetorical) 질문과 그에 대한 대답으로서 침묵이 지니는 의미를 사회 문화적 분석 방법으로 설명하고, 한국과 같은 high-context 문화권에서 의사 소통의 수단으로서 침묵의 중요성을 부각시켰다. 또한 solidarity가 근본이 되는 가족 내에서도 여전히 수직적인 고부 관계와, 직장내의 상관과 부하 관계등은 현 사회의 전반적인 변화 경향, 즉 점차 solidarity 위주로 변하는 체계를 가장 늦게 받아들일 것이라는 예측을 Guttman scale의 개념으로 설명해 보았다.

여 백

Virginia Woolf's Portrayal of the Artists in
To the Lighthouse, *The Waves*, and *Between the Acts*

Eun-Kyung Chun*

Nature is so imperfect, as otherwise we should have had no art at all. Art is our spirited protest, our gallant attempt to teach Nature her proper place. As for the infinite variety of Nature, that is a pure myth. It is not to be found in Nature herself. It resides in the imagination, or fancy, or cultivated blindness of the man who looks at her.

(Oscar Wilde, *Intentions* 8)

What is the role of art in life and what is the role of life in art? Does art imitate life or life imitate art? Does art deal with the unreal world or does it deal with the essential world? These have been the fundamental questions which artists and critics confront without providing answers. In *Intentions* Oscar Wilde explains the relationship between art and life:

Art begins with abstract decoration, with purely imaginative and pleasurable work dealing with what is unreal and non-existent... Art takes life as part of her rough material, recreates it, and refashions it in fresh forms, is absolutely indifferent to fact, invents, imagines, dreams, and keeps between herself and reality the impenetrable barrier of beautiful style, of decorative or ideal treatment. (Wilde 8)

* Professor, Dept. of English Language and Literature, Soongsil University.

Oscar Wilde's answer to the questions reflects the diversity with which the hypothesis that art is different from actual life and that it has its own interdependent life can be debated.

Through her works Virginia Woolf continues to pursue the questions of the relationship and the interaction between the real world and the artistic world. Of the many ways to explore these subjects hers is to portray artists and the themes with which they struggle through their art.

The artists in three Woolf novels Lily Briscoe, the painter of *To the Lighthouse*, Bernard of *The Waves*, and La Trobe of *Between the Acts* are neither professional nor successful. They are not given as much focus as main characters. But they play supportive roles that establish the integrity of the novels. Two facts - that they are not successful professional artists and that they are supportive characters (except Bernard who can be, in some sense, a major figure), not main characters - are appropriate to their function as artists in Woolf's exploration of the relationship between art and life. Since they are not professional they are able to concentrate on their own view without caring about the response of others to their art. And since they are not central to the action they can keep a distance from life without being involved in it. Distance provides them with an objective view. In some sense this image of an artist as a person who has an individual but objective view is dualistic, but dualism is inevitable for the artist.

As Thomas A. Vogler suggests Woolf's artists can be compared with such other narrators as Nick in Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby*, Marlowe in Conrad's *Lord Jim*, or the unknown traveller in *Wuthering Heights*. Their insights into life are developed and matured through their observations of main characters. Thomas A. Vogler divides the characters of Woolf's novels into two types, 'one rooted in life (and death), the other in art.'

In this mode the "life" character (like Mrs. Ramsay) lives or represents the human reality of the story, and the narrator or observer (Lily Briscoe) tries to get at the form and essence of the story through art. This is most obvious when the "life" character dies and we discover that the artist and his

experience have been the central concern all along, that his commitment to form and meaning (rather than the other's commitment to action) is the real clue to whatever significance life may have. (Vogler 7)

To the Lighthouse begins with Mrs Ramsay and ends with Lily Briscoe. Much more of the novel is devoted to life than to art. Though art is ubiquitous in Part I (and also becomes a major motif in Part III), the text of Part I is (much longer than Part III) dominated by Mrs Ramsay.

In this opening section Mrs Ramsay, busy with the trivial and the important, with arranging domestic affairs, with helping the poor and the sick, and with matchmaking, is the central figure of a group that consists of her family and numerous summer guests. While Mrs Ramsay flourishes and engages in the actual actions of life Lily Briscoe stands apart 'on the edge of the lawn painting' (*To the Lighthouse* 21), contemplating. The position and pose of Lily characterizes her as an onlooker of life, an artist. Mrs Ramsay's wishes that Lily would marry William Bankes; Lily is not interested. Mrs Ramsay's concern with domestic life and immediate matters involves her in life. As Allen McLaurin observes, 'Mrs Ramsay does not want to relinquish any aspect of her immediate feelings and so she becomes absolutely identified with the thing she is looking at,' and this character trait results for in her 'a lack of choice, of distance and of form in her vision.' (McLaurin 179)

Like Lily, the poet, Mr Carmichael, has 'an aloofness about him'; he wants 'very little of other people'. (*To the Lighthouse* 221) Mrs Ramsay always tries to help him, but he rejects her intervening ways. To Mr Carmichael Mrs Ramsay has 'some quality in her which he did not much like. It was perhaps her masterfulness, her positiveness, something matter-of-fact in her. She was so direct.' (*To the Lighthouse* 222) The poet of death his poetry said 'something about death' (*To the Lighthouse* 221) can not be congruous with the life-representative. While Mrs Ramsay puts all of her efforts into making her actions effective, both Lily and Mr Carmichael have 'some notion ... about the ineffectiveness of action, the supremacy of thought.' Lily finds that Mrs Ramsay dislikes 'anything that reminded her that she has been seen sitting thinking.'

Contrasted with Mrs Ramsay's close-up view, Lily sees things as a whole. This integrated way of looking also balances her between the dichotomized characters of Mr and Mrs Ramsay. McLaurin notes that the two contradictory visions of Mr and Mrs Ramsay's are combined in Lily's artistic vision.

As an artist, she tries to combine the short-sight of Mrs Ramsay and the long-sight of Mr Ramsay Lily sees the beauty and completeness of things close at hand, but can also look into the distance and see shape and form. She has a myriad of impressions, like Mrs Ramsay, but like Mr Ramsay can distance herself and see the form of things. Her impressions are apparently free but there is an underlying pattern given to them, they are controlled (McLaurin 182)

This vision can be achieved through her detached observation of life.

Bernard as a writer is similar to and different from Lily. Like Lily, Bernard serves to connect disparate parts of the story as he observes the lives of other characters in *The Waves*. As *To the Lighthouse* ends with Lily's painting, *The Waves* ends with Bernard's long soliloquy. But he is not content with just factual truth. He tries to bring various human lives together and include them as much as possible in his artistic world. Thus he says:

I wish to go under; to visit the profound depths to hear vague, ancestral sounds of boughs creaking, of mammoths, to indulge impossible desires to embrace the whole world with the arms of understanding, impossible to those who act . . . I am not part of the street no, I observe the street. (*The Waves* 114-5).

He likes to transcend the factual world and exceed the limit for it in his less tangible but infinite and inclusive world. This tendency of Bernard's contrasts with qualities of other characters like Neville, who pursues only the exact and factual truth of life. So he 'hate wandering and mixing things together'. (*The Waves* 86) Bernard's world, in contrast, is imaginative and flexible. Bernard's view of the

outside world is also individualistic and self-centered:

This is our world, lit with crescents and stars of light; and great petals half transparent block the openings like purple windows. Everything is strange. Things are huge and very small. The stalks of flower are thick as oak trees. Leaves are high as the domes of vast cathedrals. We are giants, lying here, who can make forests quiver. (*The Waves* 23)

Neville's love of precision and his worship of facts are like those of Mr Ramsay. For Bernard 'things' can be 'huge and very small' at the same time. He lacks Neville's 'precision' and 'exactitude' which he 'admires and shall never possess.' (*The Waves* 69) But through his wide and inclusive vision Bernard can have universality.

Miss La Trobe in *Between the Acts* is similar to Lily and Mr Carmichael. They are contemplative; they observe rather than become involved in life. She is neither a participant in the play nor the main figure in the novel. Her name and figure are exotic, too. But while Lily observes life through one family and Bernard through his friends, Miss La Trobe's vehicle is the history of England. Therefore in *Between the Acts* the scope of the artist's observation becomes wider. She grasps repetitive patterns of the undercurrents of human life.

Compared with *To the Lighthouse* and *The Waves*, *Between the Acts* shows more extended form in its juxtaposition of art and life. In *To the Lighthouse* the relationship between art and life is grasped mainly through the polar opposites of Lily Briscoe and Mrs Ramsay; in *The Waves*, through the lives of Bernard's six friends. But in *Between the Acts* that relationship is constructed by the parallel of La Trobe's play and the actual life of the other characters in the novel. Compared with the other two artists vision of life the scope of the artist's vision of life in *Between the Acts* is wider. This broader view enables the artist to emphasize in her art the recurrent and cyclic pattern of life. By active participation in her play the audience becomes a part of the cyclical historical process presented by the play. There is also a deep connection between the play and the family life of the Olivers.

This family consists of two generations. When Lucy says 'Only you and me and William dressed differently'(Between the Acts 175) she recognizes through the symbolic meaning of the pageant that man has not changed in essence from his first appearance on earth and Isa thought 'they resisted Time. Heaven was changeless' (Between the Acts 174). Villagers take part in the play as historical characters, and the parallel of their actual names and their historical names provide the interchange between art and life.

Bernard's particular and characteristic insight into reality is similar to La Trobe's. Miss La Trobe's attitude toward a scandal involving Mrs Ball, one of the actors in her play, is quite different from that of other people:

In the last war Mrs Ball lived with another man while her husband was in the trenches All this Miss La Trobe knew, but refused to be mixed up in it. She splashed into the fine mesh like a great stone into the lily pool. The criss-cross was shattered. Only the roots beneath water were of use to her. (Between the Acts 64)

The artists insist on their own vision of life and try to uncover the hidden and concealed essence under the surface of life. Though the messages and the ways of presenting them are different, they are congruous in their artistic creation of life and in the recreation of life through their art.

With all their individual view of life the voice of the artist must be that of all human beings. The artist cannot be satisfied only with a separate identity. So Bernard says 'I am not one person; I am many people ...' The characteristic view of the artist must also have the potential for being merged with the view of others and furthermore it needs to be the representative voice of man. Therefore the last chapter of *The Waves* in which the lives of Bernard and his friends are summed up is presented by Bernard; the play of *Between the Acts* which deals with the whole history of England is directed by La Trobe; and Lily's vision in *To the Lighthouse* comes after the vicissitudes of the Ramsays' life. In this the artist's voice becomes the inclusive one of the nature of life.

Of these three artists, Bernard is most conscious of reality. As an observer of life and the artist who perceives a general unity and pattern in his friends' lives, he is similar to the other two artists. Like Lily and La Trobe he is an artist who tries to collect 'valuable observations upon the true nature of human life' (*The Waves* 67), and this quality distinguishes him from his friends who are busy with their single identifications and individualities. However, as a major figure in the novel Bernard is much more involved in actual life than Lily or La Trobe. Among these three he is the only person who marries and has his own family.

When he is young Bernard is quite confident about his artistic world and convinced of the validity of art in life. In their childhood, when Susan, his friend, jealous of Jinny's kissing Louis, is hurt and lonely, Bernard invents a fictitious story of the town, Elvedon to console her:

Look over the wall. That is Elvedon. The lady sits between the two long windows, writing. The gardeners sweep the lawn with giant brooms. We are the first to come here. We are the discoverers of an unknown land Do not stir; if the gardeners saw us they would shoot us. We should be nailed like stoats to the stable door. Look! Do not move. Grasp the fers tight on the top of the wall. (*The Waves* 17)

His fantasy is effective. Susan, involved in his fantastic world, says:

I see the lady writing. I see the gardeners sweeping, ... If we died here, nobody would bury us. (*The Waves* 17)

But Bernard gives Susan a relief from her sorrow and pain by 'making phrases' and they escape into an illusory world together:

"Run!" said Bernard. "Run! The gardener with the black beard has seen us! We shall be shot! We shall be shot like jays and pinned to the wall! We are in a hostile country. We must escape to the beech wood. (*The Waves* 17)

The magic validity of the artistic world Bernard gets at his early stage of life seems to fade gradually as he grows to adulthood and confronts reality. Instead of his artistic world the grim realities of life are close-up for him. His perception of the harsh reality of life becomes strongest with Percival's absurd death. John Hawley Roberts notes:

After Percival's senseless death came a turning point. Bernard began to realize that nature is irrational, life, intractable, and death, inescapable. It is against the mindlessness of nature that one must fight (Vogler 230)

Bernard has to recognize the limits of his artificial ordering over the accidental and the frailty of his illusory world before the unreasonable and ruthless life. He sees that his frail ideal, which is identified with Percival, has collapsed absurdly. His glorified fantasy cannot give any comfort against the unknown power of life or Nature, which does not always go with human will. He cries in desperation: 'Lord, how unutterably disgusting life is! What dirty tricks it plays us, one moment free; the next, this' (*The Waves* 292)

This kind of bitterness is hardly found in Lily but the harshness of life is well realized in *To the Lighthouse*, too. In *To the Lighthouse* and *The Waves* the vicissitudes of life are symbolized by Nature in terms of its impersonal enforcement and its cyclic repetitiveness. The continuous movement of rise and fall of 'waves' can be compared to the ever-changing human life.

In *To the Lighthouse* the natural setting is symbolic. The Ramsays' summer house is situated on an island facing the sea to the lighthouse. The 'spit of land' on which Mr Ramsay stands and house and garden are preserved is the locus of vulnerable and unstable human life. That human domain, cultivated and domesticated by human effort, can easily collapse and be destroyed by Nature.

In 'The Window,' the first chapter of *To the Lighthouse*, the sound of the waves is both dependable and destructive to Mrs Ramsay'

... the monotonous fall of the waves on the beach, ... seemed consolingly to repeat over and over again as she sat with the children the words of some old cradle song, murmured by nature. 'I am guarding you I am your support,' but at other times suddenly and unexpectedly, ... had no such kindly meaning, but like a ghostly roll of drums remorselessly beat the measure of life, made one think of the destruction of the island and its engulfment in the sea, ... This sound which had been obscured and concealed under the other sounds suddenly thundered hollow in her ears and made her look up with an impulse of terror. (*To the Lighthouse* 19-20)

The sound of the sea, the sound of Nature, is peaceful, but underneath it, through her keen perception, Mrs Ramsay apprehends a threat. In the second chapter of *To the Lighthouse*, in which Mrs Ramsay dies, the deserted house of the Ramsays Nature thrives most.

A similar pattern to that relating Nature and the human will that between an antagonist and a protagonist is found in *The Waves*, too. As Mrs Ramsay dies in the middle of *To the Lighthouse*, Percival dies in the middle of *The Waves*. Like Mrs Ramsay, Percival is the epitome of action and exertion of life. And in the fifth of *The Waves*, in which Percival dies, the italicized prelude of this chapter describes flourishing Nature:

The sun had risen to its full height. It was no longer half seen and guessed at, from hints and gleams, ... Now the sun burnt uncompromising, undeniable. It struck upon the hard sand, and the rocks became furnaces of red heat; it searched each pool and caught the minnow hiding in the cranny, and showed the rusty cart-wheel, the white bone, or the boot without laces stuck, black as iron, in the sand. (*The Waves* 148)

The prelude is full of revels of Nature and its celebration but contrasted with this festive Nature the chapter following presents is the turmoil of human sorrow. Human agony is at its height.

But like human fate Nature is not necessarily hostile to Man. In its repetitive cycle Nature sometimes becomes a life-force for Man. In *To the Lighthouse* the sea is a force Mr Ramsay must challenge and conquer, a life he must face and accept, an immense knowledge he must explore:

It was his fate, his peculiarity, whether he wished it or not, to come out thus on a spit of land which the sea is slowly eating away, and there to stand, like a desolate sea-bird, alone. It was his power, his gift, ... yet lost none of his intensity of mind, and so to stand on his little ledge facing the dark of human ignorance, how we know nothing and the sea eats away the ground we stand on that was his fate, his gift. (*To the Lighthouse* 51-2)

For Mr Ramsay the sea is an inevitable fate which he must fight against, it is a trial he must overcome, and the test of his will.

If there is no sea the lighthouse will not be necessary. If there is no trial the courage and the ability with which Mr Ramsay could get to lighthouse would not be brought into full play. Only in the darkness of the sea the lighthouse, which can be the symbol of human spirit, will shine. In this sense, like the contrast of black and white which are anti-colours, each needs the other to make both vivid and distinguished, as the relationship of sea and lighthouse, Nature and human will, are inseparable, each needing the other. Nature has a dualistic function to Man.

In *Between the Acts* the role of Nature in La Trobe's play is critical. When the pageant seems to be failing Nature saves it timely for the gramophone that is not working and actors who forget their lines the natural sound substitutes for human deficiency. When her pageant is over La Trobe is not satisfied; she feels it has been a failure. But Nature comes to the depressed and discouraged La Trobe and inspires her so that she finds the first words of her next play.

The dualistic quality of Nature can be found in *The Waves*, too. Manly Johnson analyzes its particular function:

... not only "out there," a force in the external world, but "inside" as well, the source of psychic energy and imaginative power. It is the ancient concept that the mind, like the sea, includes all things and so includes the sea. ... The consequence of this marine duality in nature and in man is that the rise and fall of nature's power, as represented by the sea, is paralleled in the rise and fall of resistance to that power in the internal worlds of the characters, especially Bernard. (Johnson 88-9)

As mentioned before the force of reality, life, Nature, or fate seems to be more recognized in *The Waves* than in *To the Lighthouse*. In this sense the titles of the two novels signify their implicit meaning. "Waves" is the element of Nature and it seems imply more of the vicissitude of human life, while "lighthouse," which represents human spirit, gives more emphasis to unyielding human will.

The endings of the two novels are in contrast. *To the Lighthouse* ends with the Ramsays' successful journey to the lighthouse and Lily's finishing of her painting at the same time. Both of them stress the triumph of the human will over Nature or fate. But the end of *The Waves* is quite different. For Bernard who is defiant against "Death" or absurd human fate the indifferent and merciless Nature overwhelms him. Especially in the ending of *The Waves* the contrasting tones and the amounts of Bernard's text and the brief response of his counterpart, Nature's are very impressing and also quite appropriate contrasting to show this theme. To Bernard's aggressive and ardent speaking, Nature responds disinterestedly, impersonally, coolly. Also compared with lengthy and wordy speeches, Nature's is just a few words within one sentence: 'The waves broke on the shore.' This one sentence is the last sentence of *To the Lighthouse* Through this unbalanced parallel the arbitrary and inevitable power of Nature seems to be much more stressed than human will. A. D. Moody's discontent for the rather optimistic view in the struggle of Man and Nature in *To the Lighthouse* could be mitigated by the compensation made in *The Waves*:

In *To the Lighthouse*, having recognized that in human life there is no ultimate stability or permanence, she had shifted her attention from life to art and stressed such stability and permanence as art could offer. But this obviously was too partial to be fully satisfying. The full implications had still to be faced of the fact that it is not in art that we live, but in the flux of Nature, not in the security of the lighthouse but in the uncontrollable waves. (Vogler 108)

Although life or inescapable fate, which is symbolized as Nature in Woolf's work, is indifferent and impersonal to the artist it always has been the eternal subject of the artist's work. The persons who accept life and become active participants in life whether they are alive or dead are the inspirers of the works of the artists. Though Percival dies young his physical image, Percival on horseback, the man of action and exertion, preserves the vitality of his life. Manly Johnson explains:

At the end, when the "waves rises" in Bernard, it is Percival with whom he identifies himself. He remembers him as the hero on horseback. Taking Percival as his model, Bernard conceives of himself as striking spurs into his horse and riding against Death. For Bernard, Percival has become one in the "long ranks of magnificent human beings," and Bernard is the inheritor, the continuer, "the person miraculously appointed to carry on." Thus Bernard properly invokes his spirit in the challenge to mortality. (Johnson 89)

Like Percival Mrs Ramsay dies in the middle of the novel. But Mrs Ramsay's vision serves the inspirational function for Lily's painting and allows her to complete her picture:

... slowly the pain of the want, and the bitter anger ... lessened ... a sense of someone there, of Mrs Ramsay, relieved for a moment of the weight that the world had put on her, staying lightly by her side and then (for this was Mrs Ramsay in all her beauty) raising to her forehead a wreath of white

flowers with which she went. Lily squeezed her tubes again. She attacked that problem of the hedge ... The sight, the phrases, had its power to console. Wherever she happened to be, painting, here in the country or in London, the vision would come to her, and her eyes, half closing, sought something to base her vision on. (*To the Lighthouse* 205-6)

Although there are contrasts and basic differences between the world of the artists and others, no antagonistic feeling exists between them. Though Lily does not jump into life, she is never indifferent to it, and her art is deeply related to the life of the Ramsays. But whereas art takes life as an important and inspiring subject life, does not seem to be influenced by the art. While Mrs Ramsay becomes the main subject of Lily's painting and the inspiration for her vision, she seems neither to appreciate Lily's painting and the inspiration for her vision, she seems neither to appreciate Lily's painting nor to have a sufficiently ardent sincerity. Mrs Ramsay thinks 'one could not take her painting very seriously.' (*To the Lighthouse* 21) This role of Mrs Ramsay in Lily's painting is that of catalyst though her influence is decisive and profound to her art. It is Lily, the artist, who perceives the intrinsic merit of Mrs Ramsay, and gives form to, and synthesizes all things around her. By this she transforms them into art.

In this book *the Bloomsbury Group* J. K. Johnstone indicates that art is a kind of the projection of artist's mind into life:

Sensations, objects, persons, events are the counters that the artist borrows from life and builds into a structure that is significant, not because of the counters, but because of the relations that the artist has established between them - relations which have nothing at all to do with the everyday meaning - for - life of the things represented. It is these relations that arouse the aesthetic emotion, which is, then, an emotion about form, and depends upon 'a special orientation of the consciousness, and, above all, a special focusing of the attention' in the contemplation of a work of art. (Johnstone 50)

By the imaginative power of the artists even trivialities of life or the everyday work of life can be transformed to have permanent meaning and the bare factual truth can be heightened to become permanent and essential truth. Artists look for their subject in life but life provides nothing but raw material for them. It needs to be selected and refined by the touch of artists and their artistic sensibility. It also needs to take some particular form to be presented because art needs not only artists' insight but also their techniques. Technique in art becomes another important problem. As Alice Van Buren Kelley suggests, through her alter egos, three artists, Woolf seems to struggle with 'the problem of how to imagine and how to present a world that combines finite and infinite truth that recognizes limitation and isolation, and at the same time realizes the presence of a transcendent unity encompassing all spatial and temporal existence.' (Kelley 114)

Thus Bernard is greatly concerned with craftsmanship. He shows consistent and strong interest in the use of language, the actual implement of his art. He seems to be convinced of the power of words and his vision created purely by words:

My charm and flow of language, unexpected and spontaneous as it delights me too. I am astonished, as I draw the veil off things with words, how much, how infinitely more than I can say I have observed. More and more bubbles into my mind as I talk, images and images. (*The Waves* 86)

So Bernard, 'a natural coiner of words,' continues to refine his words and to search for the words which can include all the truth of their lives because for Bernard a vision of life can be obtained through polishing words. As an artist he has to find the language which can express the whole truth of life. In his desperate effort to create sentences his 'moth-like impetuosity dashing itself against hard glass' Lily Briscoe and Miss La Trobe's struggle to create are found.

Like Nature art has the dualistic quality of a unifying and private vision of the artist since it is the essential and the artist's interpretation of life at the same time. Artists give form to chaotic life through their vision of life. As long as art is a controlled, selected, and recreated form of life it has its own independent life.

So Bernard says:

I require the concrete in everything. It is so only that I lay hands upon the world. A good phrase, however, seems to me to have an independent existence. Yet I think it is likely that the best are made in solitude. They require some final refrigeration which I cannot give them dabbling always in warm soluble words. (*The Waves*, 68-9)

Above all things in the struggle of these three artists' the divine, noble, and steadfast human soul defying destructive time and even death may be seen.

Works Cited

I. Novels by Virginia Woolf

To the Lighthouse. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1970.

The Waves. San Diego, New York, and Longon: A Harvest/HBJ Books, 1978.

Between the Acts. San Diego, New York, and London: A Harvest/HBJ Books, 1978.

II. Critical works

Johnson, Manly. *Virginia Woolf*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1973.

Johnstone, J. K. *The Bloomsbury Group*. New York: The noonday press, 1963.

Kelley, Alice Van Buren. *The Novels of Virginia Woolf: Fact and Vision*. Chicago and London: The U of Chicago Press, 1973.

Leaska, Mitchell Alexander, *The Novels of Virginia Woolf: From Beginning to End*. New York: The John Jay Press, 1977.

Lee, Hermione. *The Novels of Virginia Woolf*. London: Methuen and Co Ltd., 1977.

McLaurin, Allen *Virginia Woolf: The Echoes Enslaved*. Cambridge UP, 1973.

Vogler, Thomas A., ed. *Twentieth Century Interpretations of 'To the Lighthouse'*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Wilde, Oscar. *Intentions*. New York: Lamb Publishing Co., 1972.

Abstract

Virginia Woolf's Portrayal of the Artists in *To the Lighthouse*, *The Waves*, and *Between the Acts*

Eun-Kyung Chun

Virginia Woolf continues to pursue the questions of the relationship and the interaction between the real world and the artistic world through her works. This article attempts to explore the nature and the role of artist focusing on three of Woolf's novels, *To the Lighthouse*, *The Waves*, and *Between the Acts*. Although the three artists in these novels are neither professional nor successful they are distinguished from other characters in that they can keep distance from life without being involved in it. This distance provides them with a balanced and an integrated view of life. By grasping the recurrent pattern of life they could uncover the hidden essence under the chaotic and disorderly surface of life.

The position of the artists seems to be apart from the actual life and also their perception of the world illusory. But these do not mean that their insight of life is invalid. While the artists in *Between the Acts* and in *The Waves* find the cyclic pattern through the vicissitude of human life which is the "waves" itself, the "lighthouse," the final vision of the artist in *To the Lighthouse* represents human spirit, the unyielding human will over the incomprehensible and unreasonable life.