Conversational Principles, Structure and Prosody in *Silent Hill 2*: A Case Study of Video Game Dialogue

Julius Soini
MA Thesis
English, Degree Programme for Language Teaching and Learning
School of Languages and Translation Studies
Faculty of Humanities
University of Turku
April 2020

The originality of this thesis has been checked in accordance with the University of Turku quality assurance system using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.

UNIVERSITY OF TURKU
School of Languages and Translation Studies / Faculty of Humanities

SOINI, JULIUS: Conversational Principles, Structure and Prosody in *Silent Hill 2:* A Case Study of Video Game Dialogue

MA Thesis, 49 pp., 6 pp. appendices
English, Degree Programme for Language Teaching and Learning
April 2020

This research was conducted in order to investigate the dialogue in the video game *Silent Hill 2* from a discourse analytical perspective. More specifically, the research questions posed for the purpose of this study pertain to explaining why the dialogue in the video game seems peculiar considering conventions and principles of language use. In addition to examining these features of the dialogue, the study takes interest in how the developers of *Silent Hill 2* might have, either consciously or unconsciously, manipulated these principles in order to convey an effect of uncanniness and unconventionality. As a secondary objective, the case study attempts to address the academic worth of video games and reinforce their position adjacent to other forms of art and media such as books and films.

The theoretical approach adapted in this study to analyzing the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* is versatile, including pragmatic, conversation analytical as well as phonological dimensions. Pertaining to these subfields of linguistic research, the paper applies the concepts of cooperative principle, adjacency pairs and prosody in examining and explaining features contributing to the peculiarity of the dialogue. Furthermore, the methodological approach of the present paper is specified to utilize qualitative methods of data analysis, enabling detailed description and observation of extracts showing deviation from conventional use of language among the dialogue. The analysis aims, more specifically, at pinpointing indirect and vague expressions, nonadherence to conventional sequence of utterances as well as pauses and word-level stress in conversations between the characters of the narrative.

The findings yield essential results in terms of the research questions posed in the beginning of the paper. Based on the analysis, the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* builds on, as hypothesized, unconventional interactive sequences e.g. through questions and greetings not being reacted to, indirect and ambiguous verbal expression as well as inconvenient pauses and stressing. It remains uncertain whether these conversational properties have been deliberately seized by the developers of *Silent Hill 2*: Nevertheless, it is plausible to conclude that the interactive patterns between the characters of the narrative essentially contribute to the renown of the video game as one of the most profound video games of all time in terms of characterization and subtext.

keywords: adjacency pair, cooperative principle, conversation analysis, discourse analysis, implicature, phonology, pragmatics, pause, prosody, stress, video games, video game dialogue

Table of contents

1 Introduction 1

2 Background 3

2.1 *Silent Hill 2* 3

2.2 Theoretical frameworks 5

2.2.1 Discourse (analysis) 6

2.2.2 Video game dialogue 7

2.2.3 Grice's cooperative principle 10

2.2.4 Conversation analysis and adjacency pairs 12

2.2.5 Phonology and prosody 14

3 Data and methods 16

4 Analysis 18

4.1 James and Angela 18

4.2 James and Eddie 26

4.3 James and Maria 29

4.4 James and Laura 33

4.5 Maria and Ernest 37

5 Discussion 42

6 Conclusion 45

References 47

Appendix 1: Transcription signs

Appendix 2: Finnish summary

1 Introduction

Video games as a medium have developed substantially during their over half a century of existence. What started as a minimal compound of moving pixels and beeping sounds on tiny screens soon after the first half of 20th century has, in the 2010s, become an important and influential medium of entertainment that seems to reach larger and larger audiences. As video games have developed from a technological standpoint immensely from being simple and quick entertainment on portable devices such as *Game & Watch* to the photorealistic 4K games of *PlayStation 4* and *Xbox One* through decades, so has their narrative presentation and storytelling. In fact, it seems more and more acknowledged that video games are, or at least can be, equivalent to movies and books in terms of storytelling. The writing process in the video game industry of the present day is managed by professional and established writers as opposed to the video game development in the 20th century when development did not necessarily involve any writing at all.

The turn of the millennium marked the dawn of a then-new video game console generation when Sony's *PlayStation 2*, Microsoft's *Xbox* and Nintendo's *GameCube* were released on the market. The new home console generation also brought about generally more complex storytelling than ever before. In 2001, the survival horror video game *Silent Hill 2*, developed by Konami Corporation's development group Team Silent, was released on *PlayStation 2*, *Xbox*, and *Microsoft Windows*. Today, *Silent Hill 2* is widely considered one of the greatest and most influential video games of all time, especially for its writing, sound design and exploration of heavy themes and taboos, such as sexual frustration, incest and guilt. The video game has also been compared e.g. to the works of film directors such as David Lynch and Alfred Hitchcock. The story of *Silent Hill 2* is a mystery that people interested in the video game are still, after nearly twenty years since the game's release, attempting to unravel. The fascination with the story is likely in no small part due to the uncanny nature of the narrative, following several forms in which "disturbance of the familiar" (Bennett and Royle 2009, 35) may manifest itself, including doppelgängers and other kinds of repetition, fated encounters, silence and death drive (Bennett and Royle 2009, 36-9). While the uncanny takes several forms in *Silent Hill 2*, the paper at hand aims to inspect the peculiar conversations between the characters of the narrative.

The main objective of this paper is to investigate the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2*, including both its main storyline as well as its subscenario titled *Born from a Wish*, from a discourse analytical perspective. While the survival horror video game in question has been widely discussed in terms of its unique characters, story and atmosphere mainly from a literature perspective, the present research aims at examining *Silent Hill 2* regarding its dialogue and discourse elements. Although the study includes a brief overview and analysis of the characters from a narrative viewpoint, the main focus of the research is on the verbal interaction between the characters and how the developers of the video game utilize the dialogue to convey an impression of peculiarity. The principal linguistic field applied in this study comprises discourse analysis and, most importantly, its subfields of pragmatics and conversation analysis (e.g. Cameron 2001, Schiffrin 1994 and Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva 2011). Additionally, the research includes a phonological approach to the dialogue as it is analyzed also in terms of the end result of the work by the voice actors and voice direction, focusing on prosodic elements such as pauses and stressing. Inspired by the critical acclaim of *Silent Hill 2* and its significance and impact on video game storytelling, I consider the dialogue worth investigating from a discourse approach and attempt to justify the contribution of the dialogue to the uncanny and surreal atmosphere of the video game. Overall, little research appears to have been done on the subject of examining a work of fiction through discourse analytical approaches, exceptions including studies by Hayat, Akhter and Iqbal (2015), Cui (2016) and Condrat (2009). It is perhaps justifiable to claim that the present paper is, therefore, evidently relevant.

The research questions formulated for the purposes of this study are as follows:

- Considering Paul Grice's (1975) cooperative principle, adjacency pairs and prosodic features of speech, why might the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* seem peculiar?
- How have the game developers, consciously or not, manipulated conversational principles and structures in the dialogue in order to render it inconvenient?

I hypothesize that the dialogue seems peculiar due the characters breaking or flouting specific conversational principles and structures that underlie the cooperative aspect of language use in general, such as the conversational maxims of Paul Grice's cooperative principle and adjacency pairs as basic interactional patterns. Moreover, I assume that the developers have, throughout the video game narrative, utilized unconventional structures of conversation and that which is left unsaid in order to convey meaning that is perceivable only through profound analysis and interpretation. Finally, prosodic features

such as long pauses and stressing induced by frequent voice quality and volume shifts are likely to contribute to the unconventional nature of the dialogue. The paper is organized as follows: first, I will provide a brief overview of the plot and characters of *Silent Hill 2* as well as some popular conceptions regarding them and continue with discussing video game dialogue as a subject of research in general. Next, I will introduce the theoretical concepts and tools applied in this study. I will then describe the methodological approach to the inspection of dialogue in this research and conduct the analysis of the dialogue in a dedicated section. Finally, I will discuss the findings of the study and conclude the paper by summarizing the main arguments as well as suggesting further research.

2 Background

In this section, I will provide a short overview of the plot and characters in *Silent Hill 2* and introduce the theoretical frameworks used for the purposes of the present study. The presentation and discussion of the background matter of this paper is divided into two separate subsections.

2.1 *Silent Hill 2*

Silent Hill 2 tells the story of James Sunderland who, after receiving a letter from his supposedly dead wife, Mary, goes to the town of Silent Hill looking for her. In the letter, Mary claims to be waiting for James in Silent Hill where the married couple used to spend time several years ago, but Mary is nowhere to be found in the deserted town, and instead, James runs into Angela Orosco and Eddie Dombrowski who have come to the town with their own troubled pasts. Later on, James meets Laura, an eight-year-old girl who claims to have known Mary and seen her in the hospital when she was still alive, and Maria, a doppelgänger of Mary with a substantially more sexual and seductive appearance and conduct towards James as opposed to his deceased wife. Laura is the youngest of all the characters of the narrative and also seems to be the only one who has not experienced any life-changing or traumatic events in the past. Her mental stability is also reflected in that she appears to be the only one oblivious to the threatening environment and monsters that the other characters encounter in Silent Hill. It is implied that Laura merely sees the town as an abandoned place with no other people in it than her, James and Eddie. Laura's mental stability is, arguably, also reflected in her dialogue which seems to be the most

coherent and sensible of all the characters, often consisting of teasing and criticizing James due to her knowing that James was absent from Mary's side on her deathbed.

As opposed to Laura, all the other characters in *Silent Hill 2* are haunted by traumatizing events of their past life, which becomes apparent at several points during the course of the narrative. For instance, Angela, who is only 19 years old according to a supplementary story-related document provided by the game developers, is heavily implied to be a victim of physical and sexual abuse from his father and brother. She seems to be much older in terms of her physical appearance and voice, however, which may have been intended to reflect the fast maturing she has had to gone through due to her trauma. Eddie Dombrowski, on the other hand, is a carefree but cowardly 23-year-old man who struggles with the fact that he has been bullied for his entire life for being overweight and, consequently, killed a dog and shot its owner in the knee. At several points, Eddie jokes around about having killed a person both before and after coming to Silent Hill but always ends up denying having killed anyone. The traumatic past of both Angela and Eddie are likely to contribute, in part, to their distorted and incoherent discourse.

As for Maria, who James meets after his first encounter with both Angela and Eddie, she is implied to have worked as a striptease dancer at a local night club, accounting perhaps for both her somewhat suggestive attire and attitude towards James. Maria comes across as a confident yet rather sensitive woman from the beginning, and in her dialogue, Maria seems to alternate between these two traits from end to end, at one point trying to seduce James and another being upset for having been left alone by James even for a short while. In the subscenario to the main storyline titled *Born from a Wish*, available in the *Director's Cut* edition of *Silent Hill 2*, Maria plays the role of the protagonist, wandering alone in the town of Silent Hill before meeting James. During her search for other people in the town, Maria encounters a man named Ernest Baldwin who refuses to let Maria see him, but instead, the two have several conversations through a closed door between them. Maria seems more stable in her dialogue in this subscenario as opposed to the main storyline, having not yet met James but, oddly enough, implying to know him when brought up by Ernest.

Regarding the narrative and characters in *Silent Hill 2*, it is a popular conception that Maria is not, in fact, an actual person but rather a projection of James's psyche and his desire of what he wanted his wife, Mary, to be when she was still alive. The assumption that Maria does not exist outside of James's mind is supported by the fact that

at no point in the narrative does anyone else than James meet her in person. For instance, Maria conveniently avoids an encounter with Eddie and Laura in a bowling alley by staying outside instead due to her dislike for bowling. As is the case with Angela and Eddie, James likely goes to the town of Silent Hill because of his desire to punish himself: for Mary's death and his feelings, or lack thereof, towards her, creating the Maria person in the process. Moreover, Maria's discourse throughout the narrative is full of not only sexual implications and allurement, but also resentment and accusations towards James's actions, perhaps reflecting his own frustration and need to blame himself. An example of Maria's ambiguous behavior is a scene where James finds her in a jail cell in an underground prison, Maria first acting as though she was Mary and sharing the deceased wife's memories and talking about their last trip to Silent Hill. Regarding this scene, in a making-of document of *Silent Hill 2*, drama director Suguru Murakoshi states the following:

> When we wrote the story of Silent Hill 2, we immediately imagined this scene. In this scene, Maria is talking to James, but this Maria looks like Mary. The point was to confuse the game players, to get them thinking that maybe after all, she was Mary. […] Usually, in all the other scenes, Maria is sexy. But for this scene I tried to make her less sexy. (*Making of Silent Hill 2*, 2001)

Founded on such scenes as well as the commentary by the game developers, the present study assumes that any conversation in the narrative may be ambiguous and potentially imply something else than is explicitly said.

2.2 Theoretical frameworks

The main theoretical background applied for the purpose of this research comprise the linguistic fields of pragmatics, conversation analysis as well as phonology, all of which are considered through discourse analytical lens in this research. More specifically, the study applies the concepts of *cooperative principle*, *adjacency pairs* and *prosody* in analyzing and explaining the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2*. The research applies these concepts complementing and overlapping each other rather than being entirely separate approaches. In this theoretical section, I will first briefly discuss the concepts of discourse and discourse analysis that are fundamental to the present study. I will then proceed by introducing video game dialogue from a rather general perspective as well as the relationship between fictional and non-fictional dialogue. In the latter subsections, I will present the main linguistic approaches used in this research.

2.2.1 Discourse (analysis)

In the field of linguistics, the concepts of *discourse* and *discourse analysis* form a vast area of research and premise to the study of language in general. For discourse analysts, it is a general assumption that people are able to produce language without any notable effort: However, it is the principles and patterns behind language use, often taken for granted, that discourse analysts are most interested in and strive to make apparent through academic research (Cameron 2001, 7). Discourse analysis is a remarkably interdisciplinary approach in the sense that it strives at examining and explaining the use of language pertaining to other academic fields and branches such as sociology, psychology, philosophy, education, media studies and legal research, to name a few (ibid.). Some conceptions of discourse analysis see the linguistic field as divided into *structuralist* and *functionalist* dimensions, the former focusing on identifying and determining constituents, regularities and principles related to language use while the latter takes interest in intercultural, social and personal meanings derived from it (Schiffrin 1994, 42). Despite this division, the two approaches to discourse analysis may be complementary in the sense that "dealing with both can take us into two different analytical worlds that are often difficult to integrate" (ibid.). Based on the perception of discourse analysis dividing into structuralist and functionalist dimensions, the present study attempts to benefit from both of these aspects as it strives to examine both principles as well as meaning behind language use.

Furthermore, the concept of discourse itself seems to be as multifunctional and profound as the field examining it. The term is sometimes considered to be interchangeable with the words *talk* and *conversation* although semantic differences between the three exist: *Talk* is mostly used when referring to spoken interaction whereas *conversation* may occur in spoken or written form (Cameron 2001, 10). *Discourse*, on the other hand, is a more technical and field-dependent term, and from a linguistic perspective, the concept refers most often to "language above the sentence" or "language in use" (ibid.). The two perspectives on discourse may be considered, more or less, to adhere to the aforementioned structuralist and functionalist approaches, i.e. putting emphasis on either the relation of discourse to other language systems such as grammar or syntax or the meanings involved in language use (Cameron 2001, 10-11; 13). As was mentioned above, the strict division into these two aspects inhibits the recognition of both form and function of language. Therefore, this paper combines these perceptions and

considers discourse to be not only the foundation of language use on a structural level, but also the *raison-d'être* behind various personal, social or culture-dependent ways of expressing meaning.

A more recent notion of discourse perceives the concept in relation to *intertextuality*. While the term essentially has to do with the conception that all texts are connected in one way or another, these texts are not limited to ones in written form, and e.g. films, visual art and music may be considered to be texts (Tannen, Hamilton and Schiffrin 2015, 42-3). Regarding intertextuality and its relation to discourse, it has been claimed that "any text is woven out of previous pieces of discourse that are merely stitched together into a new patchwork of coherence" (Tannen, Hamilton and Schiffrin 2015, 44). Therefore, it is justifiable to state that not only does *Silent Hill 2* draw inspiration from other sources of art and media in its storytelling and visual and auditory representation, but also it essentially influenced as for its dialogue by previous texts. From this premise, the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* composes its own identity as a text among others that, in turn, is bound to shape texts to come. Ultimately, from the multiple different adaptations of discourse and discourse analysis, the notion is applied in the present study for the purpose of examining fictional, spoken dialogue of a video game. Furthermore, video game dialogue involves its own specific features that will be further discussed in the following subsection.

2.2.2 Video game dialogue

As stated earlier in this paper, video games are a relatively nascent subject in academic research. While this is likely in part due to the still relatively short existence of video games in general, it is probably also due to the medium, unlike e.g. books and films, not being acknowledged as a form of art. Since the turn of the millennium, however, video game studies have more or less stabilized their position as an academic discipline under the name *ludology*, involving several fields and disciplines that have contributed to the research on video games, such as history, anthropology, psychology as well as literary and art studies (Mäyrä 2008, 11). In an attempt to promote ludological research and contribute to its multidisciplinary nature, the present study intends to add the linguistic field of discourse analysis into the mixture of academic fields taking interest in video games. The role of discourse analysis in video game studies has been described as "discussing games as texts, or in textual terms as complex and multimodal signs that are constituted by other signs" (Mäyrä 2008, 157). While this research does not attempt to

take any Saussurean approach to video game dialogue through inspection of signs in particular, it is nevertheless important to note that the present study considers video game dialogue, as was already implied above, as a text that is as adequately analyzable as any other.

When inspecting video game dialogue from a discourse analytical point of view, it must first be recognized that video game dialogue is fictional, and there exist some fundamental differences between fictional and non-fictional dialogue: For instance, naturally occurring speech is accompanied by repetitions, false starts, reparations, interruptions and overlaps (Mildorf and Bronwen 2017, 4) which seem to be, to some extent at least, absent from fictional dialogue. Nevertheless, the concept of dialogue in itself, whether fictional or non-fictional, does not seem to be as clear as one would think. A term *constructed dialogue* is used to describe fictional or preconstructed sequences of speech, even though it may be observed that the concept of constructed dialogue applies, in fact, to non-fictional genres such as reports, autobiography and journalistic writing as well (ibid.). Indeed, the line between realistic and fictional, or constructed, dialogue appears to be sometimes unobvious and hard to determine, and disagreements among disciplines exist (Bronwen 2012, 17). A crucial feature of fictional dialogue is that it is "often highly *stylized*" (Bronwen 2012, 15; italics added) and that dialogue in a narrative that passes as "realistic" is, in fact, merely a "linguistic hallucination" that the reader or listener embraces without doubt (ibid.). In the context of the present study, the concept of stylization as an integral part of creating fictional dialogue is important in determining how the developers of *Silent Hill 2* have rendered fictional dialogue "real" and applicable to productive linguistic analysis altogether.

Furthermore, in narratology, the terms *mimesis*, or "showing", and *diegesis*, or "telling", are applied in order to define the nature of dialogue (Bronwen 2012, 16). Whereas *mimesis* is more often associated with dialogue in which its creator, i.e. the author, is technically invisible, *diegesis* pertains to narration where the presence of the author as a dictating force is much more important and obvious (ibid.). Nevertheless, it would seem that the two approaches to narration are not exclusive: While the majority of a narrative may follow the principles of "showing" rather than "telling", there may well be sequences where the narrator directly addresses the reader or listener one way or another, for example discussion of the events of the narrative thus far or yet to come, an omniscient presentation of the characters' thoughts and feelings or any type of so-called "fourth-wall breaking". Pertaining to the question of fictional versus non-fictional

dialogue and "showing" versus "telling", narration in *Silent Hill 2* does not reveal the thoughts or feelings of the characters through an author or narrator's explicit description, but rather they become apparent through interaction with other characters. In this way, narration in *Silent Hill 2*, and arguably most other video games, resembles more "showing" than "telling" and thus real-life interaction as opposed to dialogue involving explicit narration, as is the case with e.g. novels and other works of fiction in written form.

Furthermore, an important thing to note is that the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* is entirely prescripted, meaning that the player is not able to choose as to the content or direction of what the characters say, but rather the dialogue plays out during cutscenes in an automatic fashion. While many video games feature dialogue that is player-dependent and requires the player's input and interaction, the progression of dialogue in Silent Hill 2 resembles that of a movie or a book. The apparent lack of interactivity due to utilization of prescripted dialogue and course of the plot may reflect the developers attempt to focus on coherent characterization. Dialogue may serve multiple different purposes in a work of fiction (Mildorf and Bronwen 2017, 4), and it seems plausible that it is the dialogue between the characters in *Silent Hill 2* upon which the developers have attempted to build plenty of the narrative, leaving the role of the player themselves and their contribution purposefully less significant. In conclusion to the discussion on video game dialogue, pertaining to the peculiar dialogue of *Silent Hill 2*, player involvement in its unfolding as well as the previous discussion on fictional versus non-fictional dialogue, the following quotation makes a prominent statement:

> A particular problem with notions of realism with regard to fictional dialogue is that all too often the focus is on isolated utterances and not on the flux and process of conversational interaction. Thus, […] while others […] have provided thoroughgoing typologies for the range of devices for representing speech available to novelists, for me the fascination of fictional dialogue has never been about measuring its accuracy or authenticity but rather about trying to understand why the experience it offers me as a reader is so unique and so exhilarating. (Bronwen 2012, 18)

Indeed, while the present study aims at examining linguistic or conversational unconventionalities in the dialogue of *Silent Hill 2* on both utterance as well as discourse level, it also acknowledges the role of player experience and expectation in evaluating the dialogue: It is ultimately not so much how real the conversations may seem to the player

as how they appeal or resonate with the player by stylization and other narratological means.

2.2.3 Grice's cooperative principle

An important discourse analytical concept for the purposes of this research is the linguist H. Paul Grice's *cooperative principle* falling under the linguistic field of *pragmatics*. An influential subfield of linguistics, pragmatics is concerned with the use of language in context, taking interest in implied meanings that might be hidden behind utterances instead of their direct or obvious referent. One definition of pragmatics states that "it deals with three concepts (meaning, context, communication) that are themselves extremely vast and unwieldy" (Schiffrin 1994, 190). Another, albeit broad, perception of the field claims that "*pragmatics* is the field of enquiry that deals with how language can be used to do things and mean things in real-world situations" (Cameron 2001, 68; italics as in the original). With meaning things in real-world situations, the latter definition essentially encompasses applications of Grice's cooperative principle which will be explained below in more detail. Contrary to semantics, as already implied, pragmatics strives to discover that which is not perceivable through the adoption of mere literal meaning of utterances. Pragmatics, in other words, has plenty to do with indirectness, inference and *implicatures*, all of which are important concepts for the purposes of this research that will be further elaborated in this subsection.

Linguists use the term Gricean pragmatics to refer in particular to the notions of *speaker meaning*, concerning the division between semantic and pragmatic meaning as well as the concept of intention, and *cooperative principle* (Schiffrin 1994, 191). The latter pertains to the idea that underlying all rational communication is the interlocutors' mutual interest in both conveying meaning as well as arriving at its successful interpretation (Cameron 2001, 75-6). Grice defines the essence of the cooperative principle as follows: "Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice 1975, 45). Furthermore, Grice divides the cooperative principle into four *maxims* that are "rational and logical for people to observe if their goal is to communicate meaning" (Cameron 2001, 75). These four maxims include the maxims of *quantity*, *quality*, *relation* and *manner* that are defined by Grice (1975, 45-6, adaptation by Cameron 2001, 75) as follows:

1. **Quantity:** make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange). Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
2. **Quality:** do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
3. **Relation:** be relevant.
4. **Manner:** avoid obscurity of expression. Avoid ambiguity. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity. Be orderly.

Following the maxims in a straightforward way results in conveying so-called *conventional meaning*, i.e. meaning of the utterance in accordance with its literal interpretation (Schiffrin 1994, 192). While these maxims and their obeyance serve the purpose of steering conversation towards meaningful and efficient communication, it is quite obvious that they are not strictly observed at all times. As will be explained next in this paper, however, the non-observance of the conversational maxims does not necessarily result in meaningless conversation or the cooperative principle being abandoned *per se*.

Two pertinent examples of non-observance of the maxims of the cooperative principle are their *flouting* and *violation*. A maxim is violated when the speaker does not intend the interlocutor to become aware that the maxim in question is being breached (Cameron 2001, 78). Lying is a common instance of a maxim, in this case the maxim of quality, being violated as the speaker purposefully attempts to mislead the interlocutor and neglects the underlying principle of "do not say what you believe to be false". On the other hand, when a maxim is being flouted, it is breached in such a way that the interlocutor is able, and intended, to infer what is being meant (Cameron 2001, 76). An example of flouting the maxim of quality, then, would be conveying a sarcastic remark about the weather being lovely even if it was raining heavily, and the maxim of quantity is, essentially, flouted in many cases of colloquialism and idiom expressions such as 'war is war' or 'boys will be boys'. In other words, the non-observance of Grice's maxims gives rise to *implicatures*, provoking the interlocutor's feeling that "the speaker's 'deviant' behavior is itself intended to be meaningful; that the speaker is trying to convey something to us […] – something s/he cannot or will not say directly, but expects us to *infer*" (Cameron 2001, 76; italics as in the original). When purposefully conveying an implicature by flouting a maxim, the speaker invites the interlocutor to recognize it and arrive at an interpretation of what is being said (Schiffrin 1994, 195-6). This also allows the speaker to avoid any possible responsibility of their words, and it is for this reason why e.g. politicians tend to make ambiguous and unclear statements.

The essence of Grice's cooperative principle, as its name implies, bases on the perception that interlocutors assume that each participant in a conversation strives at cooperating and conveying meaning that may be, either through conventional meaning or various forms of implicatures, successfully interpreted (Schiffrin 1994, 196). Violating the maxims of the cooperative principle, therefore, may be considered to confront the very cooperative aspect of communication, and it is important to note that "hearers will only look for implicatures if something prompts them to do so" (Cameron 2001, 78). Consequently, a conversation may be quite easily dictated and manipulated by the speaker if they so wish by simply breaching the maxims and the cooperative principle altogether one way or another. In addition to the intention of avoiding responsibility through breaching of the maxims, implicatures are often exploited in an attempt to evoke politeness so as to redress utterances and avert offending anyone with direct or otherwise excessively blurt statements. In fact, in response to Grice's cooperative principle, Geoffrey Leech (1983) proposes a *politeness principle* that, while not attempting to establish rules for exploitation of linguistic politeness, accounts for some fundamental motives behind polite interaction (Leech 2014, 34). Leech's politeness principle is similar to Grice's cooperative principle in that it applies the concept of maxims in describing its variable features and that "[l]ike the CP, […] the PP is a principle that can be observed, breached, suspended, or flouted" (Leech 2014, 35). Nevertheless, politeness as its own approach to explaining language use is, apart from the brief description of the analogy between the two pragmatic principles, left outside the scope of this study.

2.2.4 Conversation analysis and adjacency pairs

As opposed to the pragmatic approach and its focus on meaning discussed in the preceding subsection, *conversation analysis* represents the linguistic field that is concerned with *structures* of conversation (Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva 2011, 69). The approach emphasizes the significance of *interactivity* in chains of utterances produced by two or more speakers, and some academics even prefer to use the term 'talk-in-interaction' over 'conversation' (Cameron 2001, 87). Issues such as patterns in turn-taking sequences or difficulty in the production and perception of speech in a conversation are examples of conversation analytical study (Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva 2011, 69). Conversation analysis has its roots in sociological disciplines and approaches (Schiffrin 1994, 232-3), which may not strike as a surprise given that the approach is likely difficult to apply to monologues or other forms of discourse involving only one interlocutor *per*

se. One of the most fundamental concepts of conversation analytical research is the notion of *adjacency pair*, which will be explained and discussed for the remainder of this section.

While conversation analysis is not primarily concerned with meaning in the way pragmatics is, conversation analysts consider meaning to be conveyed and understood through successful interpretation of what was just said and, even more importantly, what needs or is expected to be said next (Cameron 2001, 87). The perception of what was just said and how it needs or is expected to be reacted to pertains to the concept of adjacency pair, i.e. two consecutive utterances produced by different interlocutors that relate, or at least should relate, to one another (Schiffrin 1994, 236). An example of adjacency pair is a question followed by an answer to the question: In a question-answer pair, the sequence includes *first part* (a question) that requires and is followed by *second part* (an answer) (e.g. Cameron 2001, 96). Moreover, the second part of an adjacency pair may be categorized as either preferred or dispreferred: For example, a request may be either accepted or refused, the former being the preferred second part to the adjacency pair while the latter represents the dispreferred response. Dispreference is often marked with syntactic and prosodic features such as delays, prefaces and hesitations in speech due to politeness and face-work intentions (Leech 2014, 31). As suggested above, adjacency pairs are, in fact, tied in with meaning and cooperative aspect of language use, and their social and linguistic role has been addressed e.g. in the following way:

> Their sociological importance is that they provide a normative framework for actions that is accountably implemented […]. Their linguistic importance is that they provide an environment in which inferences about relevance can be assigned across utterances […] and a sequence in which expectations about form and meaning can be specified across utterances. (Schiffrin 1994, 236-237)

The concept may thus be connected and even thought of as an extension to Grice's cooperative principle discussed earlier in this paper. The adjacency pair at hand determines the underlying principle of what is expected to be said next in a conversation and, consequently, likely exposes any potential non-observance of Grice's maxims: If a question is not answered or an offer is not accepted or refused in a manner that would be obvious to both participants, the recipient's will to cooperate in the communicative situation in general may be questioned.

Little research seems to have been done on the subject of adjacency pairs, or conversation analysis in general, in video game dialogue. Nevertheless, a study on adjacency pairs occurring in two literary works by Virginia Woolf (Cui 2016) has shone

light on how the concept may be applied to the analysis of a work of fiction, in the case of the study in question the interactive consciousness of characters in two different narratives. While the research in question considers the minds of fictional characters through the perception of the characters' thoughts as turns in a conversation, however, the present study strives to describe the structure of character interaction through dialogue between them. Pertaining to the properties of fictional dialogue discussed earlier in this paper, another study exploiting conversation analytical aspect in the analysis of a literary work, namely *Hills like White Elephants* by Ernest Hemingway, reveals that fictional dialogue is not independent of conventions regarding structure and function despite its "polished" nature (Condrat 2009, 109-110). The research in question also discusses the perception that dialogue between characters in a work of fiction may play a major role in establishing the character dynamics as well as the overall stylistic tone of the work, which resonates essentially with the present study.

2.2.5 Phonology and prosody

Distinguished from the field of phonetics, which is concerned with how sounds and articulation are produced and perceived from a physiological perspective, *phonology* "establishes a system of sound distinctions relevant to a particular language […] and seeks to determine how the elements of this abstract system behave in actual speech" (Giegerich 1992, 31). Phonological research and discourse, then, often focus on examining a particular language and its sound system instead of inspecting or comparing common features among several languages. Nevertheless, all languages share some similarities, and it has been claimed that human beings share an innate capability to learn any language based on the assumption that "phonologies of different languages are variations on the same theme" (Gussenhoven and Jacobs 1998, 35-6). Despite these varying conceptions of the interlingual dimension of phonology, the present study considers in its analysis phonological features present in English language only as the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* is voiced in English and, more specifically, performed in its variation of North American dialect.

In addition to individual sounds in a language, or languages, there are other aspects that define their phonological systems. An essential concept of phonology is *prosody*, which includes such speech phenomena as stress and intonation. Prosodic features of a language are suprasegmental, meaning that they exist above the level of individual sounds, or segments, and may be inspected on multiple different suprasegmental stages

including phrasal and utterance (Jensen 1993, 123). In terms of this study, one subject of interest regarding prosody is the notion of *stress*. Acoustically, stress manifests in a word as "greater loudness, increased duration and often […] a change of pitch" (Giegerich 1992, 179). While word stress in English does not generally have a differentiating role in terms of the meaning of words, as is the case in some other languages, stress may not be placed on whichever syllable a speaker desires as it has a rhythmic function (Giegerich 1992, 180-1). Closely related to the concept of stress, *intonation* has to do with variation in pitch on utterance level that is "determined by a variety of grammatical, semantic, situational and context factors" (Giegerich 1992, 251). In English, for example, pitch in speech often rises at the end of interrogative utterances, and while English does not use variations in pitch to distinguish meanings at the word level (as opposed to e.g. Mandarin Chinese), the same sequence of words may have a different meaning depending on the intonational pattern used. Spoken English in particular distinguishes between a statement (or command) and a question merely through variation in pitch, as in *You're going to school!* and *You're going to school?* Other examples of intonational variation in English include the use of tag questions (*isn't it*), parenthetical expressions as well as non-restrictive relative clauses (*my mother, who doesn't like dogs, has a cat*) (Jensen 1993, 142). Nevertheless, while the concept of intonation essentially relates to stress, the present research is concerned with the prosodic phenomenon mainly for the purpose of indicating, with appropriate punctuation, the pitch trajectory at the end of utterances: Rather, regarding stress, the present study takes interest in inspecting the manner in which stress occurs through shifts in voice quality and volume, essentially involving raises and decreases in pitch and loudness that clearly deviate from the surrounding speech.

Another prosodic concept that is relevant for the purposes of this study is *pause*. Interestingly, the speech phenomenon seems to be a rare subject of interest in the literature or research concerning prosody. It might be that pauses are ignored in phonological research due to their nonverbal, or nonlinguistic as some would perhaps argue, nature that does not contribute to the analysis of acoustically perceptible properties of spoken language *per se*. Despite the apparent negligence of pauses in the field of phonology, the present study considers them to be as substantial part of prosodic features as e.g. stressing is. A previous study claims that pauses are more frequent in spontaneous discourse as opposed to scripted speech, they occur the most often in the middle of a sentence as well as that the slower the speech is, the more there seems to occur pauses between utterances (Krivokapi 2007, 2-3). Additionally, pause length seems to be affected by whether or not

the topic of speech changes: pauses appear to be longer preceding a topic shift as opposed to their occurrence elsewhere (Krivokapi 2007, 3). When studying video game dialogue that is, essentially, scripted speech performed in an attempt to reflect spontaneous discourse, it is interesting to see how these observations of pause occurrence and length may apply.

3 Data and methods

In this section, I will discuss the data collected for the purposes of this research in more detail as well as explain the methodological aspects exploited in this study. I will begin by discussing the data of the present study as well as some general principles regarding the selection of relevant material among the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* and then present the methods of analysis utilized for examining the dialogue.

The data of this research consists of dialogue between the seven characters altogether in *Silent Hill 2*. The conversations in the narrative never involve more than two characters interacting at one time, rendering the discourse purely dialogic in the sense that only two participants are actively responding and reacting to each other's verbal contribution. Additionally, the narrative includes instances of monologue by James in the main storyline and Maria in the *Born from a Wish* subscenario that are excluded from the analysis due to their lack of cooperative aspect of language use: That said, it is important to note that, while the characters do not interact during these monologues with one another, interaction still exists between the protagonist and the player. The present paper considers, albeit as a secondary subject of interest, the player-character interaction in the dialogue between the characters in terms of any noteworthy insights. The scope of collected data extends from the beginning of the main storyline to the end of the narrative, including dialogue in all six of the possible endings in the main storyline of *Silent Hill 2*, as well as the dialogue in the subscenario. Among the conversations throughout the narrative, the selected extracts of dialogue represent data that are considered important in terms of the present study and its objectives: In other words, the analysis only includes instances of dialogue where the discourse is justifiably deviating, in one way or another, from conversational principles and conventions. The selection process for determining the relevant extracts of dialogue is conducted according to subjective intuition and experience.

Altogether, *Silent Hill 2* includes 32 instances of spoken dialogue, 29 of which occur between James and the other characters during the main storyline and the remaining three between Maria and Ernest in the *Born from a Wish* subscenario. The length of the individual instances of dialogue ranges from approximately seven seconds to four minutes and 20 seconds. In order for the analysis to be as consistent, and relevant in terms of the objectives of this paper, as possible, it will only consider instances of spoken and captioned dialogue between the characters: E.g. James's captioned thoughts, item menus and all other non-spoken descriptions are thus left outside the scope of analysis. Again, while they are directed towards the player to promote player-character interaction, these instances are excluded due to their incapacity to contribute to the analysis of the cooperative dimension of language use between the characters of the narrative. Regarding the dialogue of *Silent Hill 2*, it is also noteworthy to mention that the voice work was redone with a new cast for the HD-remastered rerelease of the video game in 2012 due to copyright issues. While *Silent Hill 2* was developed entirely by the Team Silent game development group in Japan, the HD-remastered version of the video game was managed by North American developers also responsible for the new cast and voice direction. Thus, in order to maintain the analogy between the original vision of Team Silent and language use in *Silent Hill 2,* the present study wholly ignores the voice acting of the remastered version and solely considers the voice work of the original cast in the 2001 version of the video game.

The methodology of the present research employs conventions of *empirical* collection and analysis of data, suggesting that "data [is] collected one way or another, by employing one or more […] procedures and instruments" (Jucker, Schneider and Bublitz 2018, 40-1). The study is data-driven rather than theory-driven, and it assumes that the data in its entirety, including the finest perceivable details, may be significant for analysis (Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva 2011, 69). Moreover, as opposed to quantitative procedures of data collection and analysis seizing statistical and numerical methods, the methodological approach in this study is *qualitative* in nature, prioritizing the notion of *understanding* the phenomenon under study rather than establishing generalizations (Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva 2011, 19-20). As is the case with the present study, qualitative research is also often context-dependent, following principles of analyzing data in such way that the findings may be considered as *trustworthy*: Contrary to reliability or validity that are more prominently features of quantitative research, trustworthiness is measured according to whether the results and analysis are justified and reflecting the author's

understanding of the phenomenon (Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva 2011, 22). The objectives of the present study are likely better served, consequently, through exploitation of qualitative measures as the questions posed in the beginning of this paper pertain, above all, to explaining and understanding *why* language use in *Silent Hill 2* seems peculiar.

Finally, for the purpose of enabling phonological analysis of the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2*, some rudimentary transcription tools are applied in this research. The analysis exploits transcription signs for pointing out notable shifts in pitch and intonation, pauses, stretching of sounds, notable shifts in volume related to adjacent segments, shifts in voice quality as well as interruption of words. In addition to indicating pauses shorter than five seconds, the punctuation denotes the intonation of the preceding utterance: a full stop signifying falling intonation, comma designating no perceived intonation and question mark equating rising intonation. Additionally, some remarkable actions and nonverbal sounds produced by the characters during the dialogue are indicated with asterisks, such as gasps, laughing and some notable gestures. Adapted from Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva (2011, 86-7), the transcription signs are listed separately in a dedicated section in Appendices.

4 Analysis

This section comprises of the analysis of the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* exploiting the theoretical and methodological approaches introduced above. The analysis is conducted in such manner that interactions between the protagonist James and each of the other characters are analyzed in their dedicated subsections. The last subsection examines the dialogue between Maria and Ernest in the *Born from a Wish* subscenario. Furthermore, instead of dividing the analysis into subsections according to the different theoretical concepts introduced above, the extracts of dialogue are examined in terms of all of the frameworks in one integrative discussion.

4.1 James and Angela

After James's arrival in Silent Hill and his introductory monologue, the first conversation in *Silent Hill 2* occurs between James and Angela in the town cemetery. The dialogue begins as James approaches Angela who is examining a grave and is startled by James's presence:

(1) James: excuse me I,

Angela: *gasps* oh, I- I'm sorry, I, I, I was just,

James: no it's okay. I didn't mean to scare you, I'm kind of lost.

Angela: lo:st?

James: yeah. I'm looking for Silent Hill, is this the right way?

Angela: u:m, yeah? it's hard to see with this fog but, there's only the one road, you can't miss it.

James: thanks.

Angela: but,

James: yes?

Angela: I think you'd better stay away. this u:h. th- this town? there's something wrong with it, it's kind of hard to explain but,

James: is it, dangerous?

Angela: maybe. and it's not just the fog either. it's,

James: okay, I got it, I'll be careful.

Angela: I'm not LYING,

James: no, I believe you. it's just, I guess I really don't care. if it's dangerous or not. I'm going to town either way.

Angela: but why.

James: I'm looking for, someone.

Angela: who, who, who is it.

James: someone, very important to me. I'd do anything if I could be with her again,

Angela: me too. I'm looking for my mama. I- I mean my mother, it's been so long since I've seen her. I thought my father and brother were here but, I can't find them either. I- I'm sorry, it's not your problem.

The first point of interest in this extract is Angela's reaction to James's polite apology when approaching her. The apology is not addressed with a distinct second part of a complete adjacency pair, i.e. acceptance or rejection of the apology, but rather Angela reacts with an apology herself. In most of Angela's turns, the maxim of manner is clearly

flouted due to the notable amount of hesitation and stuttering. Moreover, Angela, and likely the player as well, is quick to interpret James's interruption in his seventh turn as a violation of the maxim of quality: he does not believe the danger is real, but he also does not intend to make it obvious. The assumption is, however, immediately redressed by James when he claims to believe Angela.

Arriving at an abandoned apartment building later on, James runs into Angela again in a room with a large mirror wall. Lying on the floor with her back turned on James, Angela is staring at a knife in her hand:

(2)	Angela:	oh it's you.
	James:	yeah. I'm James.
	Angela:	**sighs** Angela.
	James:	Angela. okay. I don't know what you're planning, but, there's always another way,
	Angela:	really. but, you're the same as me. it's easier just to run. besides, it's what we deserve.
	James:	no. I'm not like you.
	Angela:	@are you afraid.@ @I, I'm sorry.@
	James:	it's okay.

Here, the first sequence of interest is Angela's reaction to James introducing himself. Angela is clearly aware of James introducing himself and, in her turn, introduces herself, but the maxim of quantity is flouted as she responds by only uttering her name. The implicature of Angela introducing herself is apparent, however, as the introduction-introduction adjacency pair is still perceptible. Moreover, James's second turn clearly flouts several of the conversational maxims, or at least the maxims of quality, relation and manner. Seeing Angela lying on the floor with a knife in her hand, James obviously knows what she is planning, yet he indirectly tries to convince her not to harm herself. The reaction by Angela flouts the maxim of quality as it is likely meant to be sarcastic in tone, conveying an implicature of not believing or willing to believe James's words. Furthermore, the maxims flouted in Angela's last turn include the maxims of relation and manner as the utterances are somewhat obscure in terms of their referent. Additionally, the voice quality in Angela's last turn shifts notably from her preceding dialogue from

monotonous to varying through a rise-fall-rise pitch trajectory and stressing. Interesting is also the fact that while Angela's last turn does not seem to link to anywhere as for its meaning, James still seems to understand the implicature by uttering an acceptance as a response. Again, it might be a sarcastic utterance that is supposed to flout, or in this case perhaps even violate, at least the maxim of relation. Having asked several questions about her mother to which he receives vague answers, James is suddenly interrupted by a question posed by Angela:

(3) James: so, all you know is she lived in this town.

Angela: what did you say?

(five-second pause)

@how do you know that?@

James: well, I just figured, cause this is where you're looking for her. how else would I know.

Angela: yeah.

James: am I right?

Angela: I'm so tired.

In this sequence, most obvious is the lack of convenient adjacency pairs on several occasions: a question is reacted to with a question, and a question is not answered at all. The question posed by James in his second turn is never answered, but it is likely intended to be a rhetorical question that is not supposed to be answered *per se*, as is the case with the first question posed by Angela in her first turn as well. Similar to sarcastic utterances that purposefully convey an implication deviating from its conventional meaning, rhetorical questions flout the maxim of quality. However, what is interesting in Angela's first turn is that she never gives a direct answer to James's question, but rather answers the question with a question of her own. Additionally, following a five-second pause, Angela's voice quality changes, again, from tired and monotonous to loud and excited. The last four turns produced here comprise of James asking questions from Angela that she does not answer. It is quite apparent that at least the maxims of relation and manner are violated as there is little meaning, even in terms of implicatures, involved in this sequence. The sequence that immediately follows contains, once more, very apparent flouting of several maxims and lacks coherent succession of adjacency pairs:

(4) James: so, why did you come to this town anyway?

Angela: I, **sighs** I'm sorry. did, did you find, the person you're looking for?

James: not yet. her name's Mary. she's my wife, **shows Mary's picture**

Angela: I- I'm sorry.

James: it's okay. anyway, she's dead. I don't know why I think she's here,

Angela: she's dead?

James: don't worry, I'm not crazy. least, I don't think so,

Angela: I've gotta find my mama.

James: should I go with you? this town's dangerous. now I know what you meant back there in the cemetery.

Angela: I'll be okay by myself, besides, I'd just slow you down.

James: what about, that. **points at knife in Angela's hand**

Angela: will you hold it for me?

James: sure. no problem.

Angela: if I kept it, I'm not sure what I might do. **James approaches** NO, I'm sorry, I've been bad, please DON'T,

During this sequence, the turns taken by Angela flout most obviously the maxims of quantity and relation: e.g. when James shows a picture of his wife to Angela, Angela conveys an implicature of not having seen her by merely apologizing. Likewise, in her first turn, Angela completely ignores James's question by apologizing and, instead, poses a question of her own. James and Angela's last two turns consist of a question answered with a question, but despite the seemingly inconvenient adjacency pair, meaning is still conveyed successfully as the maxims, most importantly the maxim of relation, are obeyed here. What is perhaps most notable in this sequence is, quite obviously, the violation of the maxims of quantity and relation towards the end of Angela's last turn. As the dialogue ends here and there does not seem to be any link to anything that has been said before, it is left undefined what Angela is referring to with her final contribution.

Much later on in the plot, James arrives at an underground prison in Silent Hill where he meets again several of the characters. Towards the end of this section of the game, James runs into Angela in a small room, who is terrified by the sight of a monster lying on the floor. James defeats the monster, presumably a manifestation of Angela's deceased father, and asks:

(5) James: are you okay?

The question is never reacted to, thus leaving a question/answer adjacency pair without its second part, but instead Angela starts kicking the body of the monster on the floor. James intervenes:

(6) James: Angela. relax,

Angela: DON'T ORDER ME AROUND.

James: I'm, not trying to order you.

Angela: @so what do you want then.@ o:h I see. you're trying to be nice to me. right? I know what you're up to. it's ALWAYS the same. you're only after one thing.

James: no. that's not true at all.

Angela: you don't have to LIE. go ahead and SAY it. or you could just force me. **sobs** beat me up like, h- he always did. you only care about yourself anyway. you disgusting pig.

This conversation between James and Angela differs notably from the previous dialogues between two. Again, Angela is the one breaching the conversational maxims, this time those of quantity, relation and manner. Despite the apparent disobedience of the maxims, they are all flouted rather than violated, resulting in strong conveyance of implicatures. While the maxims are obviously flouted, implying Angela's impression of James trying to abuse her one way or another, conversational structure seems to follow the logic of complete adjacency pairs, i.e. turns are reacted to in a consistent manner. After an eleven-second pause during which Angela lingers on the floor on all fours retching, the dialogue continues as James approaches Angela:

(7) James: Angela.

Angela: DON'T TOUCH ME. you make me sick.

(17-second pause) **Angela stands up slowly**

Angela: @you said your wife Mary was dead. right?@

James: yes. she was ill,

Angela: LIAR. I know about you. you didn't want her around anymore. you probably found someone else. °huh.°

The prosodic features in the extract that concludes the conversation between James and Angela, including shifts in volume and voice quality by Angela and an unusually long 17-second pause, are perhaps the most notable property of unconventional conversation. However, Angela also flouts the maxim of quality, and arguably the maxims of quantity and relation as well, through claiming to know James and his ill past with Mary even though James has not, at any point in the narrative, said or implied anything that would suggest so.

James and Angela's final conversation takes place at the end of the game in Lakeview Hotel where James has arrived still in search of Mary. James finds himself in a burning staircase and runs into Angela standing midway on the stairs. She notices James and approaches him with enthusiasm:

(8) Angela: MAMA. mama I was looking for you, now you're the only one left, maybe then, maybe then I can rest. mama? why are you running away.

(six-second pause) **Angela touches James's face**

**gasps* you're not my mama? it's, it's YOU. oh, I, I'm sorry,

James: Angela no.

(10-second pause)

Angela: @thank you for saving me.@ but, I wish you hadn't. even mama said it. I deserved what happened.

James: no Angela. that's wrong.

(seven-second pause)

Angela: no. don't pity me, I'm not worth it.

(five-second pause)

@or maybe.@ you think you could save me. will you love me? take care of me? heal all my pain?

(seven-second pause)

snorts @that's what I thought.@

(nine-second pause)

James? give me back that knife.

James: °no I, I won't.°

Angela: saving it for yourself?

James: °me? no. I'd never kill myself,°

(21-second pause)

it's hot as hell in here.

Angela: you see it too? for me, it's always like this.

When examining the final conversation between James and Angela, it is obvious that several conversational principles and structure are, again, breached in one way or another. Angela violates the maxims of relation and, arguably, manner during most of the dialogue, failing to establish any significant connection of what she says to the circumstances or anything that has come up in the previous conversations between the two. Furthermore, the dialogue appears almost like a monologue by Angela as James's contribution to the entire conversation is marginal. Therefore, it is not only Angela who breaches the conversational maxims, but also James by saying very little and thus flouting the maxim of quantity. Arguably, the maxim of quality is violated in James's last turn as well depending on whether he, in fact, resolves to take his own life at the very end of the narrative, resulting in the player achieving the 'In Water' ending. Several of the initiated adjacency pairs also seem to lack second part as Angela's turns are mostly ignored altogether by James, and the few turns that are reacted to receive vague responses. As for the prosodic properties of the conversation, several long pauses and shifts in voice quality and volume are features that contribute to the peculiar characteristic of the last dialogue between James and Angela.

4.2 James and Eddie

While exploring the apartment building near the beginning of the narrative of *Silent Hill 2*, James discovers a body in a refrigerator in an abandoned room. There, James meets Eddie Dombrowski for the first time, Eddie leaning over a bathroom toilet and vomiting when James enters the bathroom:

(9)	Eddie:	it wasn't me, I didn't do it,
	James:	do what.
	Eddie:	I didn't do anything. I- I swear. he was like this when I got here.
	James:	my uh, my name is James. James Sunderland.
	Eddie:	u:m Eddie. **vomits**
	James:	°Eddie°. who's that dead guy in the kitchen.
	Eddie:	I didn't do it. I swear I didn't kill anybody.

In this sequence of turns, the notable feature in terms of pragmatic analysis is the flouting of the maxim of relation by Eddie, implying that he did not kill the person in the adjacent room. Additionally, the maxim of quality is potentially violated depending on whether or not Eddie speaks the truth, which is never distinctly determined in the narrative. The exchange also conveys an impression of Eddie's manner of conversing through the lack of introduction and the strict denial of having done anything wrong even when there are no accusations: Consequently, adjacency pairs are left incomplete throughout the conversation as Eddie neglects to attend to contributions by James except for his introduction.

The second conversation between James and Eddie occurs as James arrives at a bowling alley. Eddie is sitting at a table and eating pizza while Laura is talking to him. Laura runs away as soon as James enters the room. James approaches Eddie:

(10)	James:	Eddie?
	Eddie:	oh. u:m, you're,
	James:	James. we met in the apartment building?
	Eddie:	yeah. I remember, but,

(five-second pause)

James: are you alone here Eddie?

Eddie: u:m no:?

The most visible breach of conversational principles here is the violation of the maxims of quantity and manner by Eddie: Despite adhering to the sequence of question/answer adjacency pairs, he suspends his sentences midway and does not give any apparent cues to look for implicatures. In this sequence of turns, Eddie not only hardly contributes to the conversation content-wise, but also the prosodic features of his dialogue, e.g. stretching of sounds and rising intonation even though there is no question involved, give rise to peculiarity.

Arriving at the underground prison much later on in the narrative, James finds Eddie in the prison cafeteria. Eddie is sitting on the floor with a gun in his hand:

(11) Eddie: **smiling** killing a person ain't no big deal. just put the gun to their head, pow.

James: you, you killed him?

Eddie: @b-, b-, BUT IT WASN'T MY FAULT, h-, HE MADE ME DO IT.@

James: calm down Eddie. tell me what happened.

Eddie: THAT GUY, he, he HAD IT COMING. I DIDN'T DO ANYTHING. HE JUST CAME AFTER ME. besides, he was MAKING FUN OF ME WITH HIS EYES, LIKE THAT OTHER ONE.

James: just for that you killed him?

Eddie: WHAT DO YOU MEAN JUST FOR THAT.

James: Eddie, you can't just kill someone, cause of the way they looked at you,

The extract includes some obvious flouting of the maxims of relation and manner by Eddie. As James notices him on the cafeteria floor, Eddie starts the conversation with an utterance that, while not entirely unrelated as it refers to a body lying by a table next to Eddie, seems unconventional for an opening turn of a conversation as it does not acknowledge James's presence in any way. Later on, Eddie tries to justify him having

killed the man by the table by contributing to the conversation with utterances that are vague and ambiguous. Eddie's second and third turn not only flout the aforementioned maxims of relation and manner, but they also violate the maxim of quantity through the exploitation of short and unelaborated assertions. Additionally, Eddie's voice quality shifts notably during the conversation from the initially calm and relaxed expression to loud and stuttering between his first and second turn. After quarreling for a short while, Eddie continues:

(12) Eddie: **chuckles** @I was just joking James.@ he was dead when I got here. honest. anyway. I gotta run.

The sudden shift in tone and volume of Eddie's dialogue to resemble his first turn in the conversation is notable, and it is left unclear whether he is violating the maxim of quality here or in his previous contribution about killing the person lying next to him. Despite the prosodic and pragmatic singularities in this sequence, however, adjacency pairs seem to be complete and follow one another in a conventional succession through the entire conversation.

The final encounter between James and Eddie occurs as James is about to leave the underground prison. James runs into Eddie in a room resembling a freezer with Eddie holding a gun in his hand and dead bodies lying on the floor around him:

(13) James: Eddie? what are you doing.

Eddie: WHAT DOES IT LOOK LIKE. HE ALWAYS BUSTED MY BALLS. you FAT DISGUSTING piece of SHIT, you MAKE ME SICK. FATASS, YOU'RE NOTHING BUT A WASTE OF SKIN. YOU'RE SO UGLY, EVEN YOUR MAMA DON'T LOVE YOU. well maybe he was right. MAYBE I AM NOTHING but a FAT DISGUSTING piece of SHIT. but you know what, it doesn't matter if you're smart, dumb, ugly, pretty, IT'S ALL THE SAME ONCE YOU'RE DEAD. @and a corpse can't laugh.@ FROM NOW ON, IF ANYONE MAKES FUN OF ME, I'LL KILL EM. JUST like that.

James: Eddie. have you gone nuts?

Eddie: @I knew it. you too.@ YOU'RE JUST LIKE EM JAMES?

James: hey. I didn't mean anything.

Eddie: DON'T BOTHER. I UNDERSTAND, YOU'VE BEEN LAUGHING AT ME ALL ALONG, HAVEN'T YOU. EVER SINCE WE FIRST MET. I'LL KILL YOU JAMES,

Here, Eddie delivers his dialogue in an aggressive manner similar to the previous conversation between him and James. While conversational structure seems to be maintained through adherence to the logical succession of adjacency pairs, Eddie quite obviously flouts the maxim of quantity: his first and last turns are not only long and resemble monologue rather than interactive discourse, they effectively lack pauses during which James would have an opportunity to react. The prosody of the conversation is prevailed by the loud expression as well as some voice quality shifts by Eddie. However, no remarkably long pauses occur during the conversation.

4.3 James and Maria

Arriving at Rosewater Park on the lakefront shortly after having met both Angela and Eddie in the apartment building, James runs into Maria for the first time. Seeing her from afar with back turned towards him, James mistakes Maria for Mary:

(14) James: Mary?

(seven-second pause) **Maria turns around**

James: no. you're, not.

Maria: do I look like your girlfriend?

James: no, my, late wife.

Regarding conversational sequence, the first interaction between James and Maria seems peculiar due to Maria not replying to James's first turn at all: There is no second part to form an adjacency pair. The maxim of relation also appears to be flouted as Maria, as her very first contribution, asks whether she looks like James's girlfriend even though nothing explicitly suggests she does. Having been told Mary would be waiting for James in their special place according to the letter he received, Maria asks James:

(15) Maria: is this your, only special place?

(nine-second pause)

James: well, there's the hotel too I guess.

Maria's question is followed by a peculiarly long nine-second pause before James finally replies. After pondering Mary's whereabouts and deciding to head for the Lakeview Hotel on the other side of the lake, James starts to walk away. Maria accompanies him:

(16)	James:	you're, coming with me?
	Maria:	you were gonna just leave me?
	James:	no, but,
	Maria:	with all these monsters around?
	James:	no I, just,
	Maria:	I'm all alone here. everyone else is gone. °I look like, Mary? don't I? you loved her right? or maybe°, you hated her.
	James:	don't be ridiculous.
	Maria:	so it's okay?
	James:	yeah, fine.

In this sequence, the maxims of quality and quantity are both flouted as James tries to politely convey that he does not want Maria to accompany him. The flouting is made apparent through the last two turns that conclude James and Maria's first conversation, when James finally consents to Maria's request to join his search. Peculiar is also the decrease in volume during Maria's third turn, putting stress on the end part of the utterance.

The next fruitful conversation between James and Maria in terms of this research takes place at Brookhaven Hospital when James and Maria, having been separated for a while after arriving at the hospital, run into one another. Again, James mistakes Maria for Mary and continues:

(17)	James:	anyway, I'm glad you're alive.
	Maria:	ANYWAY. WHAT DO YOU MEAN ANYWAY. you don't sound very happy to see me, I WAS ALMOST KILLED BACK THERE. why didn't you try to SAVE me. all you care about is that DEAD WIFE of yours. I've never been so SCARED in my WHOLE LIFE, you couldn't care less about me. could you.
	James:	no, I, just,

Maria: then STAY with me. don't ever leave me alone, you're supposed to take care of me. **sobs**

Aside from the obvious increase in volume during Maria's dialogue in the extract, both Maria and James violate the maxim of quantity here: Maria by saying likely too much for James, or the player, to successively follow and James by saying too little to add anything of substance following Maria's accusations. The maxim of manner is violated by James as well due to the vagueness of his contribution: However, as could already be seen in the first conversation between James and Maria, it also seems that he is not given the opportunity to contribute in a way that would not breach the maxims, at least that of quantity, as Maria tends to interrupt James. In addition to Maria constantly interrupting James as he attempts to contribute to the conversation, her turns lack pauses during which Maria's assertions could be reacted to. On the other hand, Maria's entire first turn could be perceived as a single first part of an adjacency pair (assertion) that James attends to with his turn that follows immediately (objection). A brief subsequent exchange between James and Maria supports the dynamic where Maria's questions are not answered by James, even if her questions tend to be mostly rhetoric and thus flout the maxim of quality. James tries to open a refrigerator tipped on the hospital floor and asks Maria for help. Maria replies with a squeaky voice:

(18) James: Maria. gimme a hand here.

Maria: **squeakily** come on. you're supposed to be the big man around here. how's a little girl like me supposed to help.

The next conversation between James and Maria occurs much later on in the narrative in the underground prison. Assuming Maria had died in the hospital, James is shocked to find her calmly sitting on a chair in a prison cell, the two being separated by the bars between them. James starts the conversation:

(19) James: you're alive. Maria, I thought that thing killed you. are you hurt bad?

Maria: not at all silly.

James: Maria? that thing, it stabbed you. there was blood everywhere.

Maria: stabbed me? what do you mean.

James: it chased us to the elevator. and, then,

Maria: James? what are you talking about.

James: JUST BEFORE. don't you remember?

Maria: James honey, did something happen to you? after we got separated in that long hallway? are you confusing me with someone else? **laughs** you were always so forgetful. remember that time in the hotel.

James: Maria?

Maria: you said you took everything. but you forgot that videotape we made. I wonder if it's still there.

James: how do you know about that. aren't you Maria?

Maria: @I'm not your Mary.@

James: so, you're Maria.

Maria: @I am.@ if you want me to be,

James: all I want from you is an answer.

Maria: it doesn't matter. who I am. I'm here for you James. see? I'm real. don't you wanna touch me?

James: I, don't know.

Maria: come and get me. I can't do anything through these bars,

James: okay. stay right there. I'll be there soon.

The interesting aspect of this lengthy conversation in terms of the objectives of this study is that, while the dialogue certainly is peculiar from a narrative standpoint, it does not breach conversational principles or structure in any significant way. The potential oddity of the dialogue stems from prosodic features that are observable in the conversation, mainly comprising of voice quality shifts by Maria, but principles and structure of conventional discourse are otherwise obeyed. In fact, among the dialogue between James and Maria, this particular extract likely adheres to the principles and structures of conventional conversation most prominently.

At the very end of the narrative, James and Maria converse for the last time, and depending on the players' actions during the game, one of six different endings takes

place. The final dialogue between James and Maria, Maria now having taken the physical form of Mary entirely, differs depending on the ending the player achieves. Among the six different endings that the player may achieve, one is intriguing in terms of this study and its objectives: namely, the one dubbed 'Rebirth'. Preceding the final battle with Maria and James's closing monologue for the narrative, the dialogue of the 'Rebirth' ending unfolds as follows:

(20)	Maria:	**smiling** James.
	James:	Maria. I'm finished with you.
	Maria:	WHAT? but, I'm what you wanted. MARY'S DEAD. DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND? she's NOT coming back. but I can be yours, I'll be here for you forever. I'll never hurt you like she did. so WHY DON'T YOU WANT ME.
	James:	because, you're not Mary. without Mary, I just, can't go on.
	Maria:	@o:w James.@ @COME ON JAMES.@ YOU MUST be joking.

Albeit the shortest of all the possible ending dialogues of *Silent Hill 2*, 'Rebirth' is likely the most fruitful as for noteworthy conversational features. While the dialogue does not seem to feature incomplete adjacency pairs *per se*, the conversation ends abruptly and without any proper conclusion: After Maria's taunting in her last turn, James never says anything in reaction to it. Perhaps more interestingly, however, conversational maxims are once again breached, and it is Maria who flouts the maxims of manner and, to a degree, relation as well. The maxim relation seems to be flouted here as Maria's second turn, though clearly conveying an implicature of emotions stemming from jealousy and hate, does not relate or refer to any immediate claims between the two. The maxim of manner, on the other hand, is flouted through Maria altering between sympathetic and angry in her expression in a likely attempt to mock James after his final rejection of Maria. Pertaining to the vague and obscure delivery by Maria, the prosody of her dialogue includes shifts in both voice quality and volume that further support her incoherent expression.

4.4 James and Laura

While James meets Laura for the first time in the apartment building near the beginning of the narrative and briefly runs into her again just before first meeting Maria at Rosewater Park, the first notable conversation in terms of the objectives of this study occurs at

Brookhaven Hospital. James enters a room and sees Laura playing with a toy by herself. The two discuss Mary, who Laura claims to know from a year ago when they were both hospitalized, and the conversation ends in the following lines:

(21) James: but, last year. Mary was already,

(eight-second pause)

James: I'm sorry Laura, anyway. let's go. we can talk about this later. this is no place for a kid, there are all sorts of strange this around here. I can't believe you haven't even gotten a scratch on you.

Laura: why should I.

The extract includes two objects of interest: the eight-second pause among James's dialogue as well as the question posed by Laura that is never answered. The maxims of manner and quantity are flouted here as James ends his sentence midway, but the implicature of James referring to Mary's death is nevertheless clear. Additionally, James never reacting to Laura's turn at the end of the conversation leaves the sequence without the second part of an adjacency pair.

The following conversation occurs near the end of the game narrative when James runs into Laura for the second to last time in the Lakeview Hotel dining room. Laura is hiding behind a piano and hits the keys, startling James:

(22) Laura: did I scare you?

James: yeah. you did,

(seven-second pause) **Laura walks across room**

Laura: you're here to find Mary. aren't you James? well, have you?

James: no. is that why you're here too?

Laura: she's here isn't she. if you know where she is, tell me. I'm tired of wa:lking.

James: I wish I knew,

Laura: but she said it in her letter.

James: @what letter.@

Laura: wanna read it? but don't tell Rachel okay?

James: @who's Rachel.@

Laura: she was our nurse, I took it from her locker.

James reads Laura's letter

James: Laura? how old are you?

Laura: u:m, I turned eight last week.

James: so, Mary couldn't have died. three years ago. could, could she really be here? is this the quiet beautiful place she was talking about?

Laura: me and Mary talked a lot about Silent Hill, she even showed me all her pictures. she really wanted to come back. that's why I'm here. maybe you'll get it if you see the other letter. the one, Mary, huh? I must've dropped it.

James: Laura,

Laura: I gotta FIND it.

James: LAURA.

Despite the fact that both James and Laura pose questions during the dialogue, all of the questions are either rhetorical or tag questions that do not necessarily require answer as the second part in order to compose a coherent adjacency pair. Moreover, not a single conversational maxim seems to be breached during the entire conversation even for the purpose of conveying implicatures. A few noticeable prosodic features occur, however, such as the seven-second pause near the beginning of the conversation when Laura walks across the room, two instances of James's voice quality shifting from neutral to surprised and the slight increase in volume by both near the end of the dialogue.

Shortly after, James finds his way into the room he and Mary stayed in when they visited Silent Hill. In the room, he watches a videotape and realizes having killed the sick Mary himself. Laura enters the room:

(23) Laura: so there you are James. did you get the letter? did you find Mary? if not. let's get going already. okay?

James: °Laura.°

(eight-second pause)

°Mary's gone. she's dead,°

(five-second pause)

Laura: LIAR THAT'S A LIE.

James: no, that's not true.

Laura: she, she died cause she was sick?

James: no. I killed her,

(13-second pause)

Laura: YOU KILLER. WHY'D YOU DO IT. I HATE YOU. I WANT HER BACK. GIVE HER BACK TO ME. I KNEW IT. YOU DIDN'T CARE ABOUT HER, I HATE YOU JAMES. I HATE YOU I HATE YOU I HATE YOU.

(six-second pause)

she was always waiting for you, why. why.

(12-second pause)

James: I'm, sorry.

(five-second pause)

the Mary you know. isn't here.

In terms of the objects of interest of this study, the most notable feature of the final conversation between James and Laura comes in the form of the lengthy pauses that occur between almost every turn. Also featuring decreases and increases in volume, the prosodic properties here render the conversation its peculiar characteristic. While Laura's dialogue includes questions that are not answered *per se*, they are clearly rhetorical in nature and thus, again, do not necessitate answer as the second part in order to comprise a coherent sequence of turn taking. Overall, the conversations between James and Laura, despite some lengthy pauses and volume shifts occurring in the last exchange, represent perhaps the most conventional in terms of conversational norms and principles. However, in order to establish the difference between dialogue adhering to conventional structure and principles of conversation as opposed to that deviating from them, analysis of dialogue between James and Laura is likewise necessary.

4.5 Maria and Ernest

The subscenario for *Silent Hill 2*, titled *Born from a Wish*, takes place before the events of the main game and depicts Maria's journey in the town of Silent Hill prior to meeting James at Rosewater Park. She arrives at an empty house downtown and runs into a man named Ernest Baldwin. Maria nor the player never sees Ernest, but rather each of the conversations occur with Maria talking to Ernest through a closed door between them. The first conversation takes place as Maria, exploring the house, opens a door that is suddenly drawn shut:

(24) Maria: is somebody, there? open up. hello? **knocks on door**

(nine-second pause)

Ernest: stop it. you're disturbing me.

Maria: **sighs** thank god. I finally found somebody. can you open the door?

Ernest: no.

Maria: but why.

Ernest: **sighs** is it really necessary for me to answer all your tedious questions,

Maria: yes?

Ernest: @oh. I didn't know that.@ I want to be alone. other people just irritate me.

Maria: I just want to see another human face. do you know what's happening in this town? there's no one here. just monsters.

Ernest: yes, I know. but, so what. it has nothing to do with me. no one here, means there's no one to disturb me.

Maria: you want to be alone in this insane asylum?

Ernest: yes exactly.

(eight-second pause)

but, how can you say that it's this town that's insane, perhaps it's we who are insane. °both of us. hopelessly insane.° are you satisfied, would you leave me alone,

Maria: °my name, is, Maria. what's your name.°

(eight-second pause) **knocks on door again**

Ernest: Ernest,

Maria: Hemingway?

Ernest: Baldwin.

Maria: Ernest? I'll be back.

While the prosodic features do not seem to stand out remarkably in the first dialogue between Maria and Ernest except for a couple of lengthy pauses, there are some noteworthy properties in terms of adjacency pairs as well as the conversational maxims. The initiated adjacency pair in Maria's first turn is never properly completed, but rather Ernest reacts to it by expressing his unwillingness to converse with her altogether. Moreover, Maria never answers or attends otherwise Ernest's plead in his sixth turn to leave him alone, but rather goes on to introduce herself. In terms of the conversational maxims, perhaps most notable are the sarcastic remarks made by both Maria and Ernest, Maria in her fourth and second-to-last and Ernest in his fourth turn, thus flouting the maxim of quality. Arguably, the maxim of relation is also violated by Maria when she ignores Ernest's request to leave him alone in her seventh turn and instead introduces herself.

The next conversation between Maria and Ernest occurs as Maria tries to open another door inside the house but finds it locked. Maria, having found a birthday letter in the house a little while ago, asks:

(25) Maria: do you know a little girl named Amy?

Ernest: why do you ask me that.

Maria: this letter. to my dearest daddy. it's from a girl named Amy Baldwin? you're daddy?

Ernest: yes, where did you find that.

Maria: up in the attic.

Ernest: @oh,@ what a fool. now. when it's too late. I finally understand why. **sobs** why she was there. why she was holding that empty envelope when she, when she fell.

Maria: Ernest. Amy. sh:e isn't. I'm sorry. I'm sorry I reminded you.

Ernest: no need to apologize, you didn't remind me. I've never forgotten. Maria, some things we forget, and some things we can never forget. it's funny. I'm not sure which one is sadder. it's been ten years. but I still,

Maria: Ernest. I'm sorry. I didn't know.

Ernest: no it's, it's fine. Maria, that letter.

Maria: I'll leave it here.

Ernest: thanks.

In the first half of the dialogue, all of the conversational maxims apart from the maxim of quality are apparently flouted. The maxims of quantity and manner are flouted by Maria as she speaks in short sentences and ends them midway, likely in attempt to maintain discretion and politeness while the two discuss Ernest's presumably late daughter. On the other hand, Ernest flouts the maxims of relation and manner by discussing the fate of his daughter in seemingly unrelated and vague utterances while never explicitly confirming that she is, in fact, dead. The conversation continues after a lengthy pause during which Maria slips the letter under the door:

(26) (13-second pause) **Maria slips letter under door**

Ernest: Maria? so, you must be, that's why. that's why you could see me.

Maria: huh?

Ernest: so, perhaps that means that. maybe I can hope for a miracle as well.

Maria: what do you mean.

(12-second pause)

Ernest: in the apartment next door, there's a bottle containing a white liquid. I don't know exactly where it is. but I know it's in there somewhere. I must have it.

Maria: you, want me to. get it for you?

Ernest: please.

Maria: why don't you just get it yourself.

Ernest: if I could believe me I would. but I,

(seven-second pause)

Maria: wh:ite?

Unlike the first half of the conversation, the second half not only breaches the conversational maxims, but also it features some incomplete adjacency pairs. Maria's each turn comprises of a question, some of which are attended by Ernest while some are clearly not. Moreover, conversational maxims, namely those of quantity, relation and manner, are clearly violated by Ernest: Despite Maria's requests for clarification, his utterances lack elaboration and end midway. It is left unclear what Ernest ultimately refers to with his first, second and third turn as they do not seem to relate to anything said previously or afterwards in the conversation. As for the prosodic features of the whole dialogue, notable are the lengthy pauses that occur during the second half of the conversation.

Bringing the narrative of the *Born from a Wish* subscenario to a close, the final conversation between Maria and Ernest takes place as Maria, having obtained the white liquid as per Ernest's request, approaches the door from before:

(27) Ernest: thank you Maria, that's the only item. I couldn't get by myself. by the time I found out about it. I could no longer leave this house, @so long.@

Maria: yes, but, will,

Ernest: Maria, the gods are here. you know it too. you were born in this town.

Maria: I'm not sure god is the right word.

(14-second pause)

Ernest: do you, believe in fate?

Maria: n:ot really.

Ernest: that's fine then.

Maria: Ernest, can I open this?

Ernest: this is a dead end. there's nothing beyond here.

Maria: I know. so, what if I had said I believed in fate.

Ernest: that James. he's a bad man,

Maria: James.

(19-second pause)

°y-, ye:s. I know.°

Ernest: he's looking for the you. that isn't you.

Maria: °because he's kind?° do you, know something?

Ernest: yes, Maria, you're,

Maria: anyway. that's just what you think. you don't really know anything. that's fine.

Ernest: okay.

Inspecting the last dialogue of the subscenario, it is obvious that it includes a notable amount of breaching of the conversational maxims, unconventional sequence as well as peculiar prosodic features. To begin with, not only are voice quality and volume decreases noteworthy properties of the phonological aspect of the conversation, but also the two remarkably long pauses contribute to the unconventionality of the dialogue. Furthermore, conversational structure of the dialogue is breached through several incomplete adjacency pairs as can be observed e.g. in Ernest ignoring Maria's question, and another initiated question, in his sixth and second turns respectively. Ernest is not the only one of the two averting the formation of complete adjacency pairs, however, as Maria, in her last turn, interrupts Ernest as he attempts to answer a question posed by Maria herself. Additionally, and perhaps most remarkably, apparent is the breaching of conversational maxims that occurs from the beginning to the end of the dialogue. Here, maxims are clearly violated rather than flouted. The maxim of relation is perhaps most obviously violated as almost all of the turns seem to be unrelated not only to one another but also to anything previously discussed. Pertaining also to the aforementioned incomplete adjacency pairs, Ernest changes the subject twice during the dialogue following questions posed by Maria, both violating the maxim of relation as well as rendering the adjacency pairs incomplete. Although both characters violate the maxim of manner to some degree, Maria is more

visibly breaching it especially towards the end of the conversation: She not only becomes more cryptic through the notable decrease in her speech volume, but also she is vague as for whether or not she tempts to know more about James or herself. Finally, the maxim of quality is arguably violated by Maria in her last turn when she asserts that Ernest does not know anything and, apparently, opts to live in denial.

5 Discussion

In this part of the paper, I will discuss the results and observations made based on the analysis of the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* in both character-specific as well as a more general fashion. The discussion attempts to establish connection between the analysis findings and the research questions posed in the beginning of this paper, namely:

- Considering Paul Grice's cooperative principle, adjacency pairs and prosodic features of speech, why might the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* seem peculiar?
- How have the game developers manipulated conversational principles and structures in the dialogue in order to render it inconvenient?

As is apparent when examining the dialogue between the characters in *Silent Hill 2,* conversational dynamics and expression differ from character to character on both superficial as well as more analytical level. Moreover, some of the characters are clearly more prone to breach or deviate from conventional structures and principles of conversation than others: For instance, while Laura's dialogue represents perhaps the most conventional in terms of pragmatic and sequential unambiguity, Angela quite obviously breaches the maxims and is often unable to react in a way that would observe logical succession of adjacency pairs in most of her contributions. Indeed, among all of the characters of *Silent Hill 2,* Angela's dialogue appears to be the most fruitful as for the objectives of the present paper. The maxim of manner in particular seems to be constantly breached by Angela throughout each of the conversations between her and James as her dialogue is full of repetitions, stuttering, disjointed sentences and unnecessary apologies that impede fluent conversation. A noteworthy feature as for the long pauses in Angela's dialogue, and most of the other dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* in fact, is that they do not seem to occur in any specific surroundings, opposing the earlier claim in this paper that long pauses mainly indicate topic shifts. Furthermore, as was already established in this paper, both Laura and Angela's dialogue seems to reflect their personality and background as Laura is generally depicted as pristine and innocent in the narrative, whereas Angela is

the victim of multiple kinds of abuse. As the analysis of the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* has indicated, however, Laura's more conventional or principle-adhering contributions form a minority when compared to everyone else.

In order to sum up the conversations between James and Eddie in *Silent Hill 2*, it is necessary to note that each conversation between the two characters is very different not only in terms of Eddie's behavior, but also his expression and conversational features. Eddie tends to violate the conversational maxims, especially those of quantity and manner, instead of flouting them, resulting in ambiguous and bare contribution content-wise. His speech is also governed by impulsive shifts in voice quality and volume, altering from calm and playful to angry and hostile and back again during the same conversation. In fact, similar impulsiveness and borderline behavior is also visible in the dialogue involving Maria in the main storyline: Nevertheless, her discourse has its own distinct features when compared to the others. Maria often exploits sarcasm and rhetoric questions to point out James's flaws, thus flouting the maxims of quality and manner as well as fluctuating her voice quality and volume to a significant degree. As is the case with Eddie as well, Maria tends to interrupt and dismiss James throughout the conversations, rendering James's contributions often lacking in substance while her own turns appear overwhelming on many occasions. However, conversational sequence between James and Maria seems mostly to adhere to the formation of complete adjacency pairs as each turn, except for James's very first turn in the first conversation with Maria, is attended to: questions are mainly answered, requests receive an unambiguous second part and so on.

Furthermore, the three instances of dialogue between Maria and Ernest in the *Born from a Wish* subscenario place among the most fruitful extracts of all the conversations in *Silent Hill 2*. While the prosodic features follow similar trends as most of the other conversations in the narrative, including remarkably long pauses and sudden shifts in voice quality and volume, the conversational maxims seem to be the most heavily breached throughout the exchanges between Maria and Ernest. The maxims seem to be both flouted and violated to equal degree, inducing, on the one hand, frequent conveyance of implicatures and, on the other, obscurity and uncertainty as to what, if anything, is being implied. Additionally, the exchanges between Maria and Ernest appear to feature slightly more incomplete adjacency pairs than most of the conversations in the main storyline. Noteworthy is also the fact that Maria's dialogue and manner of conversing with Ernest is remarkably different from that between her and James: Maria is much more stable in terms of the volume and quality of her speech, and she is, in fact, breaching the

conversational maxims less as opposed to her interaction with James. While the reason for Maria's different linguistic behavior is more than likely plot-related, it is interesting to note that the protagonist, i.e. James in the main storyline and Maria in the subscenario, tends to be less active and more in the role of observer during the conversations: Consequently, the protagonist is also less likely to breach conversational principle or structure as they are provided less opportunities to do so. It might be that the developers have attempted, due to the limited appearance of the side characters during the course of the narrative, to define these characters through the brief, yet intensive, encounters as efficiently as possible.

With its frequent breaching of conventions of language use in general, the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* comes across as surprisingly humane. As was suggested earlier in this paper, real-life dialogue is by no means immune to misunderstandings or redressed delivery: Rather, they are likely as often present in everyday communication as direct or straightforward expression of things. That said, when examining the dialogue of *Silent Hill 2*, it is essential to recognize that the player and the characters, as recipients of what is being said, are not the same. The choice of aspect may influence e.g. determining whether maxims are, in fact, flouted or violated: e.g. whether the dialogue seems sensible to the characters but not the player. For example, towards the end of the subscenario, Maria gradually becomes aware of Ernest suggesting that she may, in the end, merely be a product of James's imagination or fantasy. Nevertheless, the player may remain unaware of Ernest's implication even after the obscure yet, for Maria, implicature-driven conversations of the subscenario. Therefore, as is the case with all of the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2*, or any work of fiction, the use of language is dictated through stylization and should be interpreted as such. Ultimately, much of the dialogue of the narrative is left for the player to interpret not only from storytelling or characterization perspectives, but also for its linguistic implications. As has been indicated by the analysis of the dialogue of *Silent Hill 2* in the present paper, the juxtaposition of character-versus-player knowledge thus contributes essentially to the concept of fictional and real-life dialogue being fundamentally different.

Finally, it is justifiable to claim that the developers of *Silent Hill 2*, for the purposes of stylization of this particular work of fiction, seize the maxims of Grice's cooperative principle to a significant degree by breaching them one way or another. The breaching not only to serves to confuse the player with seemingly meaningless dialogue, but also to render the narrative more sensible through a more detailed or interpretation of what the

characters imply beyond the conventional meaning of their words. In addition to the conversational principles being regularly breached, the dialogue exploits unconventional structure and turn-taking sequence through routine negligence of adjacency pairs, resulting in neither preferred nor dispreferred sequence in terms of expectations or desire but rather absence of turns relating to one another altogether. Moreover, prosodic properties that prevail nearly all of the dialogue in the narrative include lengthy, five to 21-second pauses that occur independently of its topical surroundings as well as phonological stressing involving frequent tone and volume changes. Based on these observations, it is adequate to state that *Silent Hill 2*, exploiting conventions of "showing" rather than "telling" in its narrative unfolding, develops and presents its wounded characters perhaps the most importantly through dialogue. Doubtless, the peculiarity of the dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* is the sum of these linguistic and narratological qualities.

6 Conclusion

While the medium of video games continues to advance from a technological perspective and become increasingly ambiguous in terms of their storytelling as well as Hollywood-like presentation, the present study takes interest in examining the narrative and style of a video game that was released nearly two decades ago. Despite the rapid and contiguous development and bigger-than-ever budgets of the current industry, this paper has attempted to indicate that the narrative potential of video games was already established in the turn of the millennium. Namely, the present study was conducted in order to examine the dialogue in the video game *Silent Hill 2* from a linguistic perspective. The more precise objectives of this research concerned the peculiarity and uniqueness of the dialogue, aiming at inspecting what features of the dialogue may be derived in explaining why the dialogue may seem surreal through discourse analytical approach. Moreover, the study attempted to construe how the developers of *Silent Hill 2* have, consciously or not, exploited principles of conventional conversation in order to render the dialogue as such.

Based on the discourse analytical inspection of the dialogue, it is apparent that the dialogue breaches some fundamental principles of human communication. While the dialogue frequently exploits implicatures in order to convey meaning that is not explicitly apparent, these implicatures do not result in meaningless conversation as their purpose is to enable the recipient to infer, despite the indirectness, what is meant. In addition to the heavy reliance on indirect expression of things, the dialogue equally neglects the very

cooperative aspect of language use from time to time by contributions that are too brief, too long, untrue, unrelated, ambiguous or otherwise inadequate in order for them to be sensible. That said, the perception of sensibility in itself is questionable as the characters sometimes seem to be more knowledgeable of the various implications than the player. As the player is the ultimate recipient of the obscure yet naturally stylized dialogue, however, it is appropriate to conclude that the dialogue remains vague despite the characters' potential awareness of its relevance. The omission of the cooperative aspect of language use is also reflected in the structure of the conversations in *Silent Hill 2* as the turns often seem to succeed one another in a manner that do not relate or attend to the preceding turn as for their content. Finally, the phonological peculiarity of the dialogue stems from long and inconsistent pauses throughout the conversations as well as sudden and frequent fluctuations in volume and tone of the characters' speech.

In addition to examining a particular video game in terms of its dialogue, this case study attempted to indicate the academic validity and value of video games in general. While e.g. books and films, albeit much older forms of media, have been studied to a significantly greater degree in the past, video games still seem to be, especially from a linguistic approach, relatively little researched. The interactive nature of video games renders them unique when compared to most other media, player input enabling unprecedented dimensions and phenomena available for research in academia. Ludology profits, as has been established earlier in this paper, from approaches of e.g. psychological, anthropological as well as linguistic research, and it is apparent that the influence is reciprocal: Video games as a subject of research would seem plausible to be further exploited in such fields as language learning and teaching, various forms of medical rehabilitation as well as literary education and criticism. While the uncanny dialogue in *Silent Hill 2* is entirely prescripted and mostly independent of player action except for the alternative endings, it features such significant amount of underlying subtext and meaning that I deem it worthy of academic inspection, first and foremost, as a work of art.

As is the case with all research, the present study has its shortcomings and limitations. While the theoretical approach utilized in the present paper is certainly valid and effective for gaining meaningful results, the research could be rather easily furthered by expanding the individual frameworks: e.g. through considering more prosodic properties or pragmatic approaches, such as speech acts, in analyzing the dialogue. Furthermore, the frameworks applied here could be utilized in an even more in-depth

manner, and e.g. the transcription of the dialogue could be, with a closer phonetic inspection, more detailed. A similar study could also benefit from implementing quantitative methods of data collection and analysis: Charts and tables could be exploited in order to display various statistical properties of the dialogue such as the number of instances of the maxims being breached, visual depiction of volume or pitch shifts in prosodic analysis or quantitative comparison of dialogue among the characters. Additionally, further research could consider the other titles in the *Silent Hill* franchise, examining similarities and differences between them and *Silent Hill 2* in terms of the dialogue. Particularly intriguing would be analysis of the titles of the franchise developed by the original development group Team Silent, i.e. *Silent Hill* through *Silent Hill 4: The Room*, in order to see whether or not parallel exploitation of linguistic style and conventions is observable.

References

Bennett, Andrew, and Nicholas Royle. 2009. *An Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory*. 4th ed. Harlow: Pearson.

Bronwen, Thomas. 2012. *Fictional Dialogue : Speech and Conversation in the Modern and Postmodern Novel*. Lincoln: UNP - Nebraska. Accessed 25 March 2020. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Cameron, Deborah. 2001. *Working with Spoken Discourse*. London: Sage.

Condrat, Viorica. 2009. "CONVERSATION ANALYSIS IN "HILLS LIKE WHITE ELEPHANTS" BY ERNEST HEMINGWAY." *Limbaj Si Context* 1, no. 2: 109-114. Accessed 25 March 2020. https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.utu.fi/docview/1010416508?accountid=14774.

Cui, Yaxiao. 2016. "Adjacency Pairs and Interactive Consciousness in Virginia Woolf's Novels." *Style* 50, no. 2: 203-222. Accessed 25 March 2020. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/618452/pdf

Giegerich, Heinz J. 1992. *English phonology: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grice, H. Paul. 1975. “Logic and conversation.” Syntax and Semantics 3, Speech Acts: 41-58. New York: Academic Press.

Gussenhoven, Carlos, and Haike Jacobs. 1998. *Understanding Phonology*. London: Arnold.

Jensen, John Tillotson. 1993. *English Phonology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Jucker, Andreas H, Klaus P. Schneider, and Wolfram Bublitz, eds. 2018. *Methods in Pragmatics*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. Accessed 25 March 2020. https://doi-org.ezproxy.utu.fi/10.1515/9783110424928

Kalaja, Paula, Riikka Alanen, and Hannele Dufva. 2011. *Kieltä tutkimassa: Tutkielman laatijan opas* [Studying Language: Researcher’s Guide]. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.

Krivokapi, Jelena. 2007. “Prosodic Planning: Effects of Phrasal Length and Complexity on Pause Duration.” *Journal of phonetics* 35, no. 2: 162–179. Accessed 25 March 2020. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2131696/

Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

———. 2014. *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Making of Silent Hill 2. 2001. DVD. Directed by Nicolas Beuglet. Fun TV.

Mildorf, Jarmila, and Thomas Bronwen, eds. 2017. *Dialogue across Media*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Accessed 25 March 2020. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Mäyrä, Frans. 2008. *An Introduction to Game Studies: Games in Culture*. London: Sage Publications.

Schiffrin, Deborah. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Silent Hill 2. 2001. DVD. Directed by Masashi Tsuboyama. Konami Corporation.

Tannen, Deborah, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin. 2015. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. Accessed 16 April 2020. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Appendix 1: Transcription signs

. falling intonation at the end of an utterance or preceding micro pause

, no intonation at the end of an utterance or preceding micro pause

? rising intonation at the end of an utterance or preceding micro pause

: stretching of sound

() pause of five seconds or longer

° decrease in volume

CAPS increase in volume

@ shift in sound quality

- interrupted word

Appendix 2: Finnish summary

1 Johdanto

Videopeliteollisuus on kehittynyt kuluneiden vuosien ja vuosikymmenten aikana merkittävästi. Jatkuvasti uudistuvan teknologian myötä erityisesti videopelien tekninen kehitys on ollut merkittävä, mutta myös niiden tarinankerronta on aikaisempaa monipuolisempaa ja monitasoisempaa. Suuremmat budjetit ja asiantuntijoiden hyödyntäminen ovat nykypäivänä merkittävässä roolissa videopelien käsikirjoituksen kehittymisessä, ja teollisuus tavoitellee yhä suurempaa yleisöä Hollywood-tyyppisen tarinankerronnan myötä. Tästä huolimatta painotus monikerroksiseen juoneen ja henkilöhahmoihin ei vaikuta olevan täysin uusi ilmiö videopelien keskuudessa, sillä vuonna 2001 julkaistua *Silent Hill 2*:ta tunnutaan edelleen pitävän yhtenä videopelien tarinankerronnan kulmakivistä. Kyseistä videopeliä on usein verrattu muun muassa David Lynchin ja Alfred Hitchcockin kaltaisten elokuvaohjaajien tuotantoihin, ja sen surrealistinen tunnelma kumpuaa osaltaan oletettavasti myös hahmojen välisestä dialogista.

Tämän tutkimuksen tavoitteena on tarkastella *Silent Hill 2* -videopelin dialogia diskurssianalyysin näkökulmasta. Tarkempina tutkimuskohteina ovat kysymykset siitä, miksi pelin dialogi vaikuttaa kummalliselta tavanomaisen keskustelun periaatteisiin nähden ja mitä tavanomaisen keskustelun periaatteita pelin kehittäjät ovat joko tiedostaen tai tiedostamattaan rikkoneet. Hypoteesi on, että pelin dialogi vaikuttaa kummalliselta siinä toistuvan tavanomaisen keskustelun periaatteiden rikkomisen ja uhmaamisen vuoksi. Kyseiset tavanomaisen keskustelun periaatteet liittyvät pääasiassa erilaisten piilomerkitysten välittämiseen, vuorovaikutuksen yhteistyönäkökulmaan, keskustelun rakenteelliseen jäsentyneisyyteen sekä puheen prosodisiin ominaisuuksiin. Tutkimus pyrkii myös osaltaan osoittamaan, että videopelit mediana ovat akateemisen tutkimuksen ja kiinnostuksen arvoisia ja verrattavissa muihin kirjallisuuden ja taiteenlajeihin kuten kirjoihin ja elokuviin.

2 Teoriakehys

Tutkimuksessa hyödynnettyjä teoriakehyksiä sovelletaan ennen kaikkea diskurssianalyyttisista lähtökohdista käsin. Analyysissa sovelletut käsitteet liittyvät erityisesti pragmattiseen, keskusteluanalyyttiseen sekä fonologiseen kielentutkimukseen. Keskeiset kielitieteelliset tutkimuskäsitteet ovat H. Paul Gricen (1975) kehittämät

keskustelun periaatteisiin liittyvät *maksiimit*, keskustelun sisällöllistä jäsentyneisyyttä ilmentävät *vierusparit* sekä puheen äännetason yläpuolella vaikuttavat ominaisuudet eli *prosodia*. Yläkäsitteenä toimivalla *diskurssilla* ja *diskurssianalyysilla* on kielitieteessä monta merkitystä (esim. Cameron 2001, 7; 10-1; 13 ja Schiffrin 1994, 42), mutta tässä tutkimuksessa sitä hyödynnetään soveltamalla sekä sen rakenteellista että toiminnallista ulottuvuutta: Näin ollen käsite painottaa niin puheeseen ja vuorovaikutukseen liittyviä periaatteita ja säännönmukaisuuksia kuin niiden sosiokulttuurista tehtävää.

Varsinaista *Silent Hill 2*:n diskussianalyyttista tarkastelua koskien on tärkeää tiedostaa, että videopelidialogi on luonteeltaan fiktiivistä. Fiktiiviseen dialogiin liittyy piirteitä, jotka erottavat sen oleellisesti luonnollisesta kielellisestä kanssakäymisestä. Luonnollinen ja fiktiivinen dialogi vaikuttavat eroavan toisistaan sekä enemmän että vähemmän havaittavissa olevilla tasoilla: Siinä missä luonnolliseen puheeseen kuuluu ilmeisiä inhimillisen vuorovaikutuksen piirteitä, kuten toistoja, keskeytyksiä ja epäröintiä (Mildorf ja Bronwen 2017, 4), näitä piirteitä ei vaikuta enimmäkseen olevan fiktiivisessä dialogissa. Vähemmän ilmeistä lienee, että fiktiivinen dialogi on aina kirjoittajan näkemyksen mukaan *tyyliteltyä*, mikä pätee todenmukaiseltakin vaikuttavaan kuvitteelliseen kanssakäyntiin (Bronwen 2012, 15).

Tutkimuksessa sovelletuista teoreettisista kehyksistä ja käsitteistä keskustelun periaatteisiin liittyvät maksiimit ohjaavat merkityksellistä kommunikaatiota (Cameron 2001, 75). Gricen teoriassa maksiimeja on määritelty yhteensä neljä, jotka on nimetty *määrän*, *laadun*, *olennaisuuden* ja *tavan* maksiimeiksi. Määrän maksiimi liittyy nimensä mukaisesti määrällisesti asianmukaiseen panokseen keskustelussa, kun taas laadun maksiimi koskee ilmeisessä totuudessa pysymistä puheenvuorojen sisällön suhteen. Olennaisuuden maksiimi puolestaan määrittää keskustelun yhteyttä ja relevanssia ympäröivään kontekstiin, ja tavan maksiimi ohjaa ja yksiselitteistä ulosantia. Grice erottelee maksiimien *uhmaamisen* niiden *rikkomisesta*: Maksiimien uhmaaminen liittyy puhujan tavoitteeseen välittää piilomerkityksiä keskustelussa, kun taas niiden rikkomisen taustalla on pyrkimys tavalla tai toisella johtaa keskustelukumppani harhaan (Cameron 2001, 78). Esimerkkejä maksiimien uhmaamisesta ovat muun muassa sarkasmi ja erityyppiset sananlaskut: Sarkastisessa kielenkäytössä puhuja uhmaa laadun maksiimia näennäisesti rikkomalla sitä sanomalla epätotuuksia, ja sananlaskuissa ilmaukset ovat usein määrän maksiimin periaatteeseen nähden liian lyhyitä. Maksiimien rikkomisesta taas esimerkkejä ovat valehtelu ja puheenaiheen vaihto keskellä keskustelua, sillä

molemmissa kommunikaatio perustuu muuhun kuin puhujien väliseen merkitykselliseen ja yhteistyölähtöiseen viestintään.

Tutkimuksen toinen keskeinen teoriakehys linkittyy keskustelunanalyyttiseen kielentutkimukseen. Keskustelunanalyysi tutkii ennen kaikkea keskustelujen rakenteisiin ja jäsentyneisyyteen liittyviä ilmiöitä (Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva 2011, 69), ja sillä on puhtaasti kielellisten piirteiden analysoinnin lisäksi muun muassa sosiologisia yhtymäkohtia (Schiffrin 1994, 232-3. Tässä tutkimuksessa tärkeäksi keskusteluanalyyttiseksi käsitteeksi nousee vierusparit, joilla tarkoitetaan kahden peräkkäisen, eri puhujan tuottaman puheenvuoron toistensa täydentämistä (Schiffrin 1994, 236). Esimerkkejä vieruspareista ovat kysymys-vastaus- ja tervehdys-tervehdys -jaksot, joissa molemmissa ensimmäistä osaa seuraavan puheenvuoron odotetaan liittyvän ensimmäiseen osaan sitä täydentävästi. Keskustelun rakenteiden ja jäsentyneisyyden kautta keskustelunanalyysi pyrkii tutkimaan merkityksiä ja muun muassa sitä, ymmärtävätkö kanssapuhujat toistensa viestejä tuottamiensa reaktioiden perusteella (Cameron 2001, 87). Täten on luontevaa ajatella keskustelun periaatteiden ja maksiimien liittyvän vieruspareihin erilaisten merkitysten välitykseen perustuvien lähtökohtien kautta: Esimerkiksi olennaisuuden maksiimin rikkominen heijastuu vierusparien vajavaisuudessa, koska tällöin reaktio ei ole sisällöltään relevantti aikaisempaan puheenvuoroon nähden.

Kolmantena tämän tutkimuksen kielitieteellisenä teoriakehyksenä on fonologia. Toisin kuin fonetiikka, joka tutkii puheen tuottamista ja havainnointia fysiologisella tasolla, fonologia keskittyy yksittäisten kielten äännejärjestelmiin ja siihen, kuinka nämä abstrakit järjestelmät toimivat käytännön tasolla (Giegerich 1992, 31). Fonologiseen kielentutkimukseen liittyy prosodian käsite, jolla viitataan puheen äännetason yläpuolella vaikuttaviin ominaisuuksiin (Jensen 1993, 123). Muun muassa intonaatio ja sana- ja lausepaino ovat puhutun kielen prosodisia piirteitä, jotka esiintyvät suprasegmentaalisella eli yksittäisten äänteiden yläpuolella toimivalla tasolla (ibid.). Prosodisten puheen ominaisuuksien joukosta tässä tutkimuksessa keskitytään taukojen ja sanapainon esiintymiin. Taukojen on todettu esiintyvän pitkäkestoisina lähinnä puheenaiheiden vaihdosten yhteydessä (Krivokapi 2007, 3), ja sanapaino ilmenee usein muutoksina äänenvoimakkuudessa ja -korkeudessa (Giegerich 1992, 179). Näitä ominaisuuksia pyritään tässä tutkimuksessa kartoittamaan osana epätavallisen vuorovaikutuksen selittämistä ja analysointia.

3 Aineisto ja menetelmät

Tutkimuksen aineisto koostuu *Silent Hill 2*:ssa esiintyvästä dialogista pelin henkilöhahmojen välillä. Pelissä on yhteensä seitsemän hahmoa, ja kaikki pelin dialogi käydään kahdenvälisenä. Yhteensä 32:sta pelin keskustelusta 29 käydään päähenkilö James Sunderlandin ja muiden hahmojen välillä, ja loput kolme käydään sivuhenkilöiden Marian ja Ernestin välillä. Relevantin aineiston keruussa valitaan analysoitavaksi ne keskustelut, jotka ovat hedelmällisiä tämän tutkimuksen tavoitteiden suhteen. Toisin sanoen pelin dialogin joukosta on huomioitu keskustelut, jotka vaikuttavat rikkovan tavanomaisen keskustelun periaatteita tai myötävaikuttavan sen kummallisuuteen. Aineiston analysoinnissa hyödynnetään lisäksi puhutun dialogin litterointia prosodisten ominaisuuksien havainnollistamiseksi. Litteroinnissa sovelletaan Kalajan, Alasen ja Dufvan (2011, 86-7) mallia ja litterointimerkkejä.

Tutkimuksen metodologia noudattaa *empiirisen* (esim. Jucker, Schneider and Bublitz 2018, 40-1) ja *laadullisen* tutkimuksen periaatteita ja menetelmiä. Laadullisten menetelmien avulla voidaan ennen kaikkea kuvailla tutkimuskohdetta hyvinkin yksityiskohtaisella tasolla. Toisin kuin tilastollista kartoittamista painottavat määrälliset tutkimusmenetelmät, laadullinen aineiston analysointi on aiheellista, kun tavoite ei niinkään ole yleistää tuloksia, vaan kuvailla tutkittavaa ilmiötä sen *ymmärtämisen* lähtökohdasta (Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva 2011, 19-20). Tällöin voidaan puhua ennemmin tutkimustulosten *uskottavuudesta*, kun tutkija osoittaa erilaisten sanallisten ja yksityiskohtaisten pohdintojen kautta ymmärtäneensä niiden oleellisuuden (Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva 2011, 22).

4 Analyysi ja tulkinta

Aineistoa analysoidessa ilmeistä on, että *Silent Hill 2*:n dialogissa esiintyy kaikkien tämän tutkimuksen teoreettisten kehysten ja käsitteiden kannalta oleellisia seikkoja. Keskustelun periaatteeiden maksiimeja sekä uhmataan että rikotaan selvästi, ja erityisesti olennaisuuden ja tavan maksiimit vaikuttavat useimmiten uhmatuilta ja rikotuilta lähes jokaisessa keskustelussa. Kyseisten maksiimien uhmaaminen linkittyy osaltaan myös sekä vierusparien että prosodisten ominaisuuksien epätavanomaisiin esiintymiin: Olennaisuuden maksiimin rikkominen johtaa usein myös puolinaisiin vieruspareihin, ja tavan maksiimin rikkominen korreloi useimmissa tapauksissa pitkien taukojen ja äänenvoimakkuuden ja -korkeuden vaihteluiden kanssa. Määrän maksiimia dialogissa

rikotaan erityisesti päähenkilö James Sunderlandin lyhyiden puheenvuorojen myötä, ja usein muut henkilöhahmot niin ikään rikkovat maksiimia pitkittämällä puheenvuorojaan antamatta tilaa reagoinnille. Laadun maksiimia dialogissa enimmäkseen uhmataan erilaisten sarkastisten ilmausten muodossa.

Dialogia analysoidessa on kuitenkin syytä muistaa, että henkilöhahmot ja pelaaja eivät välttämättä ole kuulijana samassa asemassa: Hahmot voivat tietää asioita joita pelaaja ei ja päinvastoin, mikä vaikuttaa osaltaan esimerkiksi käsitykseen olennaisuuden maksiimin periaatteiden noudattamisesta. Näkökulmasta riippumatta on joka tapauksessa selvää, että *Silent Hill 2*:n dialogi rikkoo tavanomaisen keskustelun periaatteita monella eri tavalla, ja sen vuoksi pelin dialogi vaikuttaa kummalliselta. Pelin kehittäjät ovat joko tietoisesti tai tiedostamattaan käyttäneet merkittävästi hyödykseen kaikkia tutkimuksen kohteena olevia inhimillisen kommunikaation ominaisuuksia, mikä osaltaan myötävaikuttaa keskustelujen ja edelleen henkilöhahmojen omaleimaisuuteen.

5 Lopuksi

Tämän tutkimuksen tavoitteena on ollut *Silent Hill 2* -videopelin dialogin diskurssianalyyttisen tarkastelun ohella osoittaa videopelien akateeminen arvo muiden medioiden ja taiteenlajien vertaisena. Vaikka pelitutkimus eli ludologia (esim. Mäyrä 2008, 11) on tieteenalana uusi, 2000-luvun loppuun mennessä siihen on ehtinyt vaikuttaa esimerkiksi historian, antropologian, psykologian sekä taiteen ja kirjallisuuden tutkimuksen eri alat (ibid.). Tämä tutkimus pyrkii edistämään pelitutkimuksen kasvua tieteenalana soveltamalla siihen kielentutkimuksellisia näkökulmia.

Tärkeimpinä rajoitteina ja puutteellisuuksina tässä tutkimuksessa ovat olleet teoriakehysten verrattain yleisluonteinen soveltaminen ja metodologisesti suppeahko lähestymistapa aineiston keruuhun ja analysointiin. Esimerkiksi dialogin pragmaattista tarkastelua voitaisiin laajentaa soveltamalla muita kielentutkimuksen alakentän käsitteitä kuten puheakteja, ja puheenvuorojen muita prosodisia ominaisuuksia kuten lausetason painoa olisi luontevaa tutkia samoista lähtökohdista. Dialogin prosodisia piirteitä voisi niin ikään tarkastella yksityiskohtaisemmin esimerkiksi puheanalyysia varten kehitetyillä ohjelmistoilla. Lisäksi vastaavanlainen tutkimus voisi hyötyä määrällisistä aineiston analyysin menetelmistä, joilla olisi mahdollista kuvata tutkimukselle oleellisia esiintymiä tilastollisesti niiden sanallisen tulkinnan ohella.