

# The Dramatic Character's Identity Mirrored in Language: A Pragma-stylistic Study of Judith Thompson's *Palace of the End*

Hajir Mahmood Ibrahim

English Department / College of Arts/ Ahlulbait University/ Iraq  
[hajiralbayati90@gmail.com](mailto:hajiralbayati90@gmail.com)

## ARTICLE INFO

Submission date: 27/6 /2020

Acceptance date: 16/7 /2020

Publication date: 16/8/2020

## Abstract

The present study aims at investigating dramatic characters' language as identity mirroring, focusing on the three main characters in *Palace of the End* by Judith Thompson; the American Soldier, David Kelly and Nehrijas. The play interestingly presents three totally different discourses; each character uses different linguistic notions with different artistic impulses to provide traces for his/her identity. The study is set on a ground between two interdisciplinary fields; PRAGMATICS and STYLISTICS whose main interest is meaning and its effect. The pragma-stylistic domain is intended to serve well as a means to reach the intended findings, consequently, fulfilling the aims of the study.

**Key Words:** Language Identity, dramatic language, pragma-stylistics, dialect, speech act theory.

## هوية الشخصية الدرامية كما تعكسها اللغة:

### دراسة أسلوبية تداولية لمسرحية جوديث تومبسون "قصر النهاية"

هاجر محمود ابراهيم

قسم اللغة الانكليزية/ جامعة اهل البيت/ كلية الاداب/ العراق

## المستخلص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية الى تقصي لغة الشخصيات الدرامية بصفتها انعكاسا للهوية في مسرحية (قصر النهاية) للكاتبة المسرحية جوديث. والشخصيات هي: المجدة الامريكية و ديفيد كيلي و نرجس. تقدم المسرحية ثلاث خطابات مختلفة تماما؛ حيث تستخدم كل شخصية في هذه المسرحية ادوات لغوية مختلفة عما تستعملها الشخصية الاخرى، كلا وفقا لدوافع متنوعة؛ الأمر الذي عبّر عن اثار دفيئة داخل هوية كل متحدث. تنجر هذه الدراسة بين مجالين متعددي الاختصاصات: التداولية والاسلوبية وهما مجالان مهمهما الاكبر "المعنى وتأثيره". يعد المجال التداولي-الاسلوبي الوسيلة الناجعة للوصول الى النتائج المرجوة وبالتالي تحقيق اهداف الدراسة.

**الكلمات الدالة:** اللغة هوية، لغة المسرح، التداولية-الاسلوبية، اللهجة، نظرية افعال الكلام.

## 1. Introduction

Language unveils a lot about the speakers and, in drama, characters are shaped and absorbed by their language. On the bases that stylistics is the "meeting ground for linguistics and literature" [1,p.2], the study takes a branch of stylistics, pragmastylistics, as its main field of investigation. Pragmastylistics deals with the pragmatic notions of a given literary text; Speech Act Theory, Cooperative Principle, Conversational Implicature and Politeness Theory. Accordingly, the study tries to answer the following questions:

1. What are the speech acts used by each character and how do they add to the characters' identification?
2. How does dramatic characters' violation of Grice's Maxims contribute to unveiling their identity?

## 2. Language as Identification

Language can effectively serve as identity-mirroring, especially in literary texts. It is illustrated [2,p.280] that every speech act of an individual performs an act of identity, i.e. "with every speech act all individuals perform, to a greater or less extent, 'an act of identity', revealing through their use of language their sense of social and ethnic solidarity and or difference". Thus language, even on the stage, makes speakers different and shape their character.

## 3. Dramatic Language

Dramatic language analysis falls into investigating the manipulation of different linguistic organizations. The language of drama differs from that of newspapers, magazines, TV shows or even novels. Dramatic language is complex and elaborate; sometimes readers need to be among the audience to grasp the meaning, for it is a conversational exchange. The cooperative principle and Grice's [3] maxims work well in making the correct inferences, though the audience is expected to work out the inference even when the dramatic characters fail to pick it up. This fundamental truth is addressed by Mick Short [4] about drama texts; he argues that a drama is based on three aspects: text, production and performance. Both "production and performance" depend on inferences drawn from the readings of the text. "It is only on the stage that drama can be revealed in all its fullness and significance"[5, p.98].

Moreover, power and social distance are two important aspects in drama texts. Any manipulation in power, social class, or any linguistic code leads the reader to figure out what the characters want to say and what their motivation is.

## 4. Pragmatic Stylistics

Pragmatics is defined as "the study of speaker meaning" [6,p.3]. It is interested in what people do with language, a speaker then, chooses his/her linguistic features to direct what he/she wants his/her words to mean. Such a process of choice refers to style, as [7,p.215] gestures: "what a writer writes is his diction and style". This leaves no doubt concerning the overlap between pragmatics and stylistics, since both deal with more than what is merely said. Stylistics as [8,p.275] notes that has been moving towards pragmatics to explain aspects of language-use. According to him [8] such overlap is "expedient" and "theoretically justified".

Pragmatics considers choice as the means to perform actions, stylistics, on the other hand, considers choice as the means that shows the effect on the hearer on the

linguistic level [8,p.578]. Pragmastylistics is, therefore, the marriage of the two disciplines; it is stylistics with a pragmatic component. It involves the distinction between the abstract theoretical meaning from its usage or effectiveness in a specific situation and from what the speaker means or intends to achieve by using it [8].

This is the reason why pragmastylistic can offer more accurate and complete explanations for many unsolved problems in both disciplines; pragmatics as well as stylistics as [9, p.106] argues. He [9] assures that "recent treatments of stylistics have moved on from the study of the form of linguistic utterances to a wider interest in pragmatics or, as it is sometimes called, pragmastylistics"

Pragmatic models like speech act theory, Grice's maxims, the "cooperative principle", politeness and Implicature are all among the pragmastylistic approaches to dramatic text as suggested by Black[10]. In dramatic discourse, characters' appearance, speech acts and even their conversational behaviour count as hints to recognize the pragmatic structure of the characters' speech. It is argued [11, p. 42] that the application of such approach reveals the social, power and interpersonal relation among the participants in a dramatic text.

Black, E [10] intensely states that pragmatics and stylistics are in strong chain. She illustrates that "since pragmatics is the study of language in use, it is understandable that stylistics has become increasingly interested in using the insights it can offer" [10]: the language used in literary discourse can, as she [10] notes, "[contribute] to the meaning of the utterance through the generation of weak Implicatures". For instance, [1,p.9] illuminates that ever since the fifteenth century, Standard English, has been the most privileged dialect among authors. Hence, Thompson [12] uses a unique "discourse tone" in her drama to identify each character as an individual as well as a member of a group. The tone of a discourse refers to "whether the text is colloquial or formal, familiar or polite, personal or impersonal, and so on" [1]. This brings us to one of the important notions in pragmastylistic analysis that is "Foregrounding".

Furthermore, Page [13,p.51] argues that in the modern fiction, dialogue becomes a substitute for explicit analysis of fictional character. Generally, speech is said to work in two directions either identifying the character socially, regionally, or other class, or distinguishing the character as a distinctive individual. On that basis, writers use language to offer two kinds of information. The first relates the character to identifiable group "works outwards", the second denotes individuality "works inwards", in other terms "dialect and idiolect" [13].

## 5. Pragmatics and the *Palace of the End*

Though conversation in literature is no environment for an unformal language such as slang for it is verbal and localized; a characteristic of a group, it appears highly functional in *Palace of the End*, especially in portraying the identity of the Female Soldier. Slang is defined by many scholars, and they all seem to agree that slang is a jargon characterized by the use of informal lower than today's Standard English for the sake of being identified as a member of a specific group<sup>1</sup>. Slang is described linguistically as having a different phonological, morphological, grammatical, semantic and pragmatic perspectives from Standard English.

From the phonological point of view, words have different pronunciations or they are assimilated; for instance, in this play, the word "pregnant" is pronounced and written as "PRENINT".

<sup>1</sup> See (Galperin,1971); (Allen, 1990); (Eble,1996); (Spolsky, 1998).

From the morphological point of view, speakers of a slang tend to use different formation processes: inversion (I flagged the test) here the word flag is used as a verb [14,p.39].

From the pragmatic perspective, some individuals tend to use 'dirty', 'swear' or 'taboo' words to show power and strength (well damn, it's your turn soldier)<sup>2</sup>. [2] He names different types of deviation; 'lexical deviation, grammatical deviation, phonological deviation, graphological deviation, semantic deviation, and dialectical deviation. Hence, there are many ways by which a writer may deviate from the norms of the Standard English. However, the use of this deviation serves a number of Implicature.

Pragmatics deals with how, where, when and under what circumstances an individual speaks. On that basis, the study of dramatic characters would work well in terms of the pragmatic analysis of their conversations. The three characters; "a young American soldier imprisoned for her misconduct at a prison camp in Iraq, a microbiologist-cum-weapons inspector who exposes the false justifications and commits suicide after his confessions regarding war on Iraq, and a mother/political opponent of Saddam Hussein" have distinct three monologues.

The three monologues represent the voice of each character, therefore the analysis would detect each character one by one; Lynndie England, Dr. David Kelly, and Nehrjas al-Saffar, in terms of an eclectic model. The study tries to conceive and understand their identities in terms of their language. The shortest way to such analysis is through an eclectic model that comprises: Grice's Cooperative principle, and the Speech Act Theory. The reason behind adopting such model is that the dramatic language is similar to everyday conversation and participants use different speech acts to keep their conversations as alive as possible and so does the pragmatic character. Moreover, it is the speech acts that reveal the true identity of any speakers.

### 5.1 Grice's Cooperative Principle

To understand the strategies that motivate the stylistic choice in a conversation, Grice's [3] contribution must be traced. In his article "Logic and Conversation", he [3] has introduced four conversational maxims that govern the linguistic choice in a talk:

- 1.Quantity: Make your contribution as informative as is required.
- 2.Quality: Do not say what you believe to be false or that for which you lack adequate evidence.
- 3.Relevance: Be relevant.
- 4.Manner: Be clear, orderly and avoid obscurity, ambiguity of expression [3,p.45-6].

However, speakers rarely follow these maxims; they may violate, opt out, flout, or be unable to fulfill a maxim. According to him [3, p. 49], this gives rise to a Conversational Implicature. Grice states that everyday conversations are cooperative to the extent that participants recognize a mutual purpose or direction. This is what is called the cooperative principle; "Make your conversational contribution 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" [3,p.45].

Though the speaker is being cooperative in an ideal exchange drawn by Grice, s/he may flout or violate the maxims to communicate an implicature. Based on the four maxims, their violation would produce a misunderstanding, their flouting, on the other hand, is made by the speaker to persuade the listener to infer the hidden meaning as being sarcastic, humorous, friendly.... etc.

<sup>2</sup> See Leech (1996)

Black, E. [10,p.24] highlights that the conversational maxims are not always observed; they can be opted out, violated, flouted or clashed.

## 5.2 Speech Act Theory

Speech Act Theory is of a great usefulness to dig deep into the identity of a dramatic character. Much has been said about this theory since J.L. Austin's "How to Do Things with Words" emerged. In this theory, he embarks on the idea that people perform different types of acts when they speak. Austin introduces his trichotomy "locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary" acts with the illocutionary act as having the main focus.

However, it is Searle's classification that remains untouched by the criticism of many scholars unlike the Austin trichotomy. Searle moves Austin's idea from a mere theory to a theoretical framework with a detailed structure to the Speech Act Theory<sup>3</sup>. Searle (1975) classifies speech acts as "assertives, directives, commissives, expressives and declaratives".

The fact that drama combines language and behaviour together, portrays a lead to characters' identity in terms of speech acts. Considering Short's [5,p.194] statement that "through recognizing the act people perform, one can infer things about them and their social relations", leaves no doubt that speech acts are the mirrors of speakers. Therefore, one who habitually performs the speech act of threat, might be seen as a bully, likewise identifying the speech acts in a text will certainly show some clues about the identities of the characters. This means that any consistency in using the speech acts will definitely reveal some insights of the dramatic character.

## 5.3 Characters' Identities

Stanislavski's statement [6, p.98; in #3 above] that the stage is the typical place where the 'fullness and significance' are best revealed, generally agrees with Mick Short's proposition that drama is based on "text, production and performance". In the same way, Styan [15,p.14] elaborates on this notion when he states that "[g]ood dialogue words throw out a 'subtextual stream of images'...Even if the effect lies in the barest or the simplest of speeches, we may expect to hear the text humming the tune as it cannot in real life." It is, therefore, clear that the "agents of perception" that are expected to achieve communication and interrelation are the 'eye' and the 'ear'. Both of them, however, contribute to shaping the grounds for the transformation of words/scripts eventually into production/performance. But, these words are not 'mute': when uttered, these words are rendered into clues that bring about "effects". Nevertheless, what is essential is not what these words are; but more crucial is indeed how to say them. In drama, such paralinguistic elements are equally significant to identify the characters on the stage.

No one single element of the drama, however indispensable it is, can properly function in vacuum and in isolation of the rest of the elements. The dramatic process is a highly artistic combination of all linguistic and paralinguistic aspects interrelatedly contributing to fulfill the play's aim: the playwright's idiolect, dialect, knowledge and language attributes intermingle with those of the reader/audience and are displayed through the character's dialogue and language behaviours.

It is considerably noteworthy to state that English drama has markedly departed from the traditional employment of Standard English as a medium of communication on the stage since the 1940's, when the common everyday language became much more familiar to characterize one figure's identity, besides one's idiolect

<sup>3</sup> For a more detailed comparison between Austin's and Wells' theory, see Smith, Barry.2003. John Searle: From Speech Acts to Social Reality.

and/or dialect. Indeed, most modern and contemporary playwrights resort to employ common language to portray their personas' characters. Judith Thompson is really not an exception whatsoever: her three characters in *Palace of the End* use discourses that suit not only the identity of the speaker, but also the dramatic situations and crucial crises they meet. This explains why each character's idiolect and tone of discourse vary in accordance with situation, motive, social power and status.

### 5.3.1 The American Female Soldier

The play opens with the American Female Soldier who seeks refuge from martial penalty for her ill-reputed military misconduct and abuse of Iraqi prisoners in Abu Ghraib jail. First it is obvious that her speech demonstrates a deviation from the classical/traditional modes of discourse. She is seen using both a poor foreign language (French) and a considerably low slang. Unexpectedly, she addresses the Quebecois landlady as "Madame Frenchie". It is, however, true that Quebec is the area of French culture and language, but it does not necessarily mean that the lady is French. Most likely, the Female Soldier is unconsciously occupied with "Madame Frenchie Burlesque" in Blue Heaven Bordello that is a set in 1930's and associated with nightlife: gambling houses, brothels and Champagne inns. Hence, the audience/readers are aware of an unjustifiable 'situational' deviation: a young pregnant with a West Virginian accent speaks in French: "Bon jour, Madame Frenchie. J'm'appelle Evangelique. Commen vous appelez vous?"[1,pp.7]. As the landlady is only imaginary, the audience certainly seeks an explanation why such deviation occurs and for what effect. As the discourse tells nothing more than the Female Soldier's intent to rent an "une chamber ici pour forty dolleurs per nuit" for a 'lost soldier' [1], the audience/reader endeavours to look for a justification of her act. Most likely, the deed is deliberately done to cover the truth about her identity, and to alienate herself from the 'actual' person she indeed is.

The Female Soldier's discourse is, therefore, understood to portray her individuality; hence a soldier who is not only confused but also 'lost' and very cheap. The individuality of this character is exhibited by her inclination to use slang that is presented much lower, 'dirtier' and more obscene. Besides her West Virginian accent, she likewise utilizes suitable terms related to her job, let alone the excessive use 'swear', 'obscene', 'dirty' and 'taboo' phrases and descriptions: "..... She's ugly. I'd put my *wang* in her *ass*..... I'd rather *cut* her head *off* and *fuck* her neck hole, show her a *fucking donkey*..... She's a trailer *whore*....., cut her *buttocks* into four parts....."[1, pp. 8-9], and 'I like the way he called me he always said 'Private Sexy' like that? With his wicked smile make me melt- so we started doing *it up down and sideways*, yes something in front of the Rakees! Just to *fuck'em* up, it made." [1,pp.20] (*Italics mine*).

Furthermore, another deviance that identifies the Female Soldier's individually is Thompson's phonological deviation wherein the character is pictured as pronouncing some terms quite differently, unlike the common ways of pronunciation. For instance, she pronounces the following words: pregnant, Iraqis, That's, and Saddamists as PRENINT, Rakees, Thas, and Saddamite respectively. Undoubtedly, such element of deviance singles the Female Soldier out among the rest of her fellows: the playwright intends to uniquely show her as a figure who individually hunts to veil her confusion and failure. It is obvious that the character's language fails her: she never succeeds in seeing herself other than what she really is; ugly, foolish and cheap. Despite the fact that the use of slang is common among soldiers as one specific group who shares similar attributes, Thompson displays the Female Soldier's language as much lower in order to highlight how hollow and cheap she really is. Her

deviance, however, distinguishes her among the other soldier group, for she well realizes that she is merely a scapegoat, and she may be "sentenced to jail for eight years like Charley". [1,p.12] For this reason, and to escape the likely end that "they gonna make an example" of her, she starts fantasizing that she will be a 'war hero'." [1,p.13]. Such deviation techniques are indeed well employed to represent the Female Soldier's character and identity. Thompson dramatically utilizes such language characteristics to help the reader/audience visualize what kind of woman she is.

It is clear that when the Female Soldier first addresses the imaginary landlady as 'French', she is still haunted by ceaseless dreads in relation to martial sentence for his misconducts and abuse of the Iraqi prisoners. Despite the fact that she only soliloquizes, it is virtually assumed that the American Female Soldier does imagine either a fictional addressee (the landlady), or a real one (the audience). In either case, however, she has flouted Grice's Maxims of the Cooperative Principle. She first resorts to use in-group French jargon as a positive politeness strategy notwithstanding, she has failed to maintain any face-saving. The American Female Soldier has attempted to recognize the addressee's power and social distance by utilizing honourific terms: "Madame", "Bonjour", and "S'il vous plait", but she has equally missed the mark due to her violation of the cooperative principle. Hence, her failure in social interaction.

Abruptly, she embarks on an apparently irrelevant topic, when she delivers an elaborate speech about her experience with cockroaches, her pregnancy and her army fellow, baby's father, imprisoned for the Iraqi prisoners' abuse. It is however, clear that the 'interactional aspect' of the American Female Soldier's discourse is utterly neglected, not only because the hearer is only an 'imaginary' figure present in the speaker's mind, but also because there is no regard of any other strategy that makes possible the relevance of her discourse. Such stylistic strategies contribute to the representation of the Female Soldier as fully distracted and highly disoriented.

As far as Speech Act Theory is concerned, the Female Soldier issues (10) questions distributed at the very beginning of her speech in an attempt to start a conversation, though most of her questions were not answered; only (7) answers were detected. This is of course due to the fact that she is speaking to an imaginary landlady and, further, it shows how helplessly she is eager to start her trial to defend herself. The Female Soldier expresses herself thoroughly through using statements and expressive speech acts, 'both with equally high percentage of occurrence', about herself and her misconduct most likely expecting that she incites the American listener/reader to change his/her mind in relation to the US-Iraq War and its aftermath. Repeatedly, she confesses and presents excuses for her act near the end of her soliloquy with (16) speech acts of confession. Her intricate use of the representative speech act of stating and the expressive speech act of feeling with (25) for each, surely shows her desperate need to affect the reader/listener and alter their judgment regarding her misconduct. Besides, she gives very little details with only (2) speech acts of description throughout her whole speech. It is also her assertions that show a clear fragility of her speech.

The vows she makes are aimed to direct the reader/listener to hallow her "heroic [sic!]" acts; "I will take the fall for my country", "I'mona be in the history books. *You wait and see*", "I am going to be *remembered*" with which she asserts that she is not guilty rather she considers herself to be a hero; "this was SERIOUS-INTELLIGENCE-WORK" (PE: 15). The act is assertive; it seeks to affect thoughts and feelings, and helps to provoke the audience to perform a 'perlocutionary' act that defends her cause. The Female Soldier is doing her best to utilize the post 9/11 mood

to win the American audience's approval of the US ill-reputed military policies in Iraq. Explicitly and implicitly, the Soldier seeks to change minds, persuading the readers/audience to approve of her/army individual/collective claims that the Iraqis were terrorists; "They was prisoners of War", "I was the BIG boss of these BIG TERRORIST guys who had KILLED AMERICANS. GUYS WHO WERE PLANNING ANOTHER 9/11 AND YOU ARE UPSET THAT I laughed AT THEIR WILLIES?" [1,p.18].

The typological pattern of her 'shattered' discourse is a representation of her disoriented mind and troubled psyche. Her excessive use of 'gobbledygook', 'pleonasm', and 'tautology' yields no positive effect. It is just an army of pompous phrases moving across the landscape in search of an idea<sup>4</sup>. Finally, the American Female Soldier ends her soliloquy picturing herself as an eagle flying over her deeds which draws the attention to a powerful symbol of nation and it is no doubt that the rising of an eagle shows a powerful act and that was her closing aim; "I said you don't MESS with the eagle.....and I flew, man, for just that night I flew through Abu G. ....And I soared through the air" [1,p.24].

Table (1)The Distribution of the Speech Acts of "the Female Soldier"

Speech Act Type	Frequency	Percentage
Representative of answering	7	6.49%
Representative of stating	25	23.14%
Representative of asserting	5	4.64%
Representative of description	2	1.85%
Representative of confession	16	14.81%
Directive of asking	10	9.25%
Directive of order	7	6.49%
Expressive of Feeling	25	23.14%
Commissive of vow	6	5.55%
Commissive of promise	5	4.64%
Total	108	100%

### 5.3.2 David Kelly

Unlike the American Female Soldier, David Kelly is neither 'lost' nor even 'confused'. He is the very peaceful moment of 'revelation' that ensues his period of conflict due to guilt feelings: "Can you imagine....knowing that a man is torturing a child in your basement, and just going on with your life? ....he is cutting off her fingers one by one, pulling out her eyes, her teeth.... And you don't tell anyone because you might lose something if you do." [1,p.30-1] What hastens Kelly's determination to redeem himself off his unpardonable guilt is the dire murder of his friend's family in Baghdad by the American soldiers: "The killers climbed the stairs and one of them said, 'I've killed them. They are all dead'. And then the sour soldiers throw Sahar to the floor, raped the child. Put a bayonet through the child, and shot her in the face." [1,p.36].

Kelly's arrival at this poignant self-recognition reinforces the idea that he does not actually seek refuge to escape for life; on the contrary, he decisively endeavours to 'lose' his life whatsoever the cost is: "To hell with vows of secrecy, professional

<sup>4</sup> This is the description given by the Democratic leader William McAdoo to identify President Warren Harding's speeches.

confidentiality. To hell with my pension. To hell with my life as I know it. The truth the truth must out." [1,p.37] Contrary to the American Female Soldier, David Kelly, notwithstanding, discloses pronounced serenity and equanimity: he seems to have contently realized that his death is now meaningful. Hence, he will be remembered. Macbeth-like, he fully confesses that he is not ashamed to tell the World that the Americans have 'bullied' him, then they "threw me to the bounds.... I was lashed, I was blasted." [1,p.38].

Thompson characteristically utilizes the persona's language and discourse to display traits of his/her character. During the whole time he appears on the stage soliloquizing, Kelly resorts to use a highly refined language: never does he ever use 'slang' or colloquial discourses. In most incidents, he expresses himself well in Standard English, that is always free from swears, obscene, or 'low' connotations. It is very interesting that he earnestly undertakes to keep himself aloof of the 'cheap' and 'low' soldiers' language; even when he finds himself obliged to harshly criticize the American soldiers who used to ravenously watch Sahar, his disapproval of those soldiers is civilly uttered. He addresses Jalal, Sahar's father, that those soldiers "were probably bored young hicks from Alabama who couldn't put two words together." [1,p.35] Kelly's refined and civil discourse, and his commitment to the decorum of his language emphasize how imposing his identity really is.

On the other hand, Kelly is equally aware that his discourse is addressed to no 'physical' figure before him: he understands that he only 'thinks' aloud; there is none but the 'other inside 'him'. He essentially anticipates to make the common human conscience listens to him and understands the truth; consequently, reformulating people's fair opinions about him, and resorting the 'good' image of the man 'he is'.

**I'll be remembered. The mousey scientist who set off  
A storm. Another casualty of the War in Iraq. After  
All, what is one 59-year old slightly potty scientist?  
Hundreds of British lads have been killed already  
a noise? Many men don't make it to my age anyhow.  
I've had a good go.** [1,p.29].

Kelly's self-possession does not necessarily imply that he is heartless and unfeeling. It is true that only when he reads news about his Iraqi friend's family incidents that he instantly speeds up to tell the truth, but in fact, the paralinguistic features clearly identify how bitter Kelly's suffering indeed is. The discourse is remarkably rich in pauses and stage directions that blend the 'uttered' and the 'perceived', which are the theatrical 'agents of perception' that help the process of communication in drama. Statically speaking, there are thirty-seven pauses and interruptions in Kelly's soliloquy: on the stage, these are signs that help identify the character's mood and psychological structure. It is doubtless that Kelly's reactions to dramatic situations are the manifestations of his internal suffering. Kelly fluctuates in his feelings in accordance with situations, exactly as all human beings do. Be they brief or long, the pauses indicate such variations. Hence, the play's rhythm aesthetically varies: the ebbs and flows of the tempo intriguingly enhance the strains of Kelly's discourse, and vividly unveil his temperaments.

Despite his difficult situation, Kelly appears as quite determined: he is free from fear, attaining full conviction that the one remedy and redeeming is death. Like most tragic heroes of drama, Kelly regains the glamour he has lost and his internal self-worth: "And one day they will see clearly that although I look as though I've lost, I have won. I have solved the riddle." [1,p.39].

Characteristically, it is most likely that Kelly's discourse seldom deviates from the common refined features of educated figures. Such scarcity of linguistic deviations may be considered a sign of monotonous tempo; but, it is not quite so. Kelly's discourse is aesthetically rich in internal rhythmic pulsations that increase the text's power to display the character's diverse moods, when he undergoes various experiences. Kelly's monologue cannot be viewed as linear in structure: the apparently smooth flow on the surface conceals turbulent surges of fear, regret and anger.

Stylistically, Kelly's discourse brilliantly highlights a tuneful stream of impulses; for instance, the monologue begins with the celebrated Welsh "Ash grove how graceful" lyric, whose melody has been used in "Thanksgiving Hymns", hence been included in a variety of albums since the beginning of the Twentieth century. Given the fact that the song is a morning hymn, its rhythm is expected to be slow with heavy melodic beats. Nevertheless, the discourse itself varies both structurally and rhythmically: Kelly's opening speech after the song is understood to be conversational: he addresses the imaginary 'other' inside him a bit aloud with interesting paralinguistic signals: "Oh! Look at that. (*shows leg*) Quite nasty." [1, pp. 25]. On the other hand, he resorts to brisk tempo through short sentences and expressions: "I am sure it'll be like that./Yes./ So it's not so bad for me. It's them./ My wife. My daughters. My sister./ The shock./ The....shock./ The loss, I suppose. The grief./ The tawdry.....talk, all the bloody nattering./ [1,p.27]; but just afterwards, he is engaged by a relatively long episode [1,p.33-6]: it is slow beating, and rich in pause. The discourse keeps changing in rhythm until Kelly chooses to sing again with drum-like beats announcing the moment when he passes away, for "Breathing is quite difficult now. My organs are failing." [1,p.39]. Kelly, like the Female soldier also addresses flying "I always did love to fly" [1,p.27]. It is, however, definite that Thompson has dramatically employed Kelly's interest in speaking formal and refined discourses to show how determined and self-possessed the character is. Equally interesting is Thompson's manipulation of the internal temp of Kelly's discourse, for such melodic variations unveil his states of mind.

Given the fact that Kelly's optimal concerned is to enhance and affect 'thought' among the audience in relation to the US invasion of Iraq and the abusive conducts exercised by the American soldiers, and that he is aware that he indeed only soliloquizes (hence expecting no addressee), David Kelly mainly resorts to Assertive, directive 'questions' and expressive 'feeling' Speech Acts. He issues a large number of questions in an attempt to clarify his situation and the reason behind his yet to come suicide. Moreover, Kelly highly uses the representative speech act of description; mainly describing death, whether his or that of others', as if there are no enough words to describe one's end. Kelly depends on the speech act of asserting to assure the audience the soundness of his cause; "*When I finally talked, told the truth, I knew that I was risking my life. And I knew, absolutely, that it was worth it*"[1].

In an attempt to plead guilty before putting an end to his misery, Kelly resorts to issue a number of confessions for; '*the truth must be out*', during which he repeats the word "truth" sixteen times. Kelly's statements were loud too, introducing facts about his life, his friends and his family. Two types of commissive speech acts are voiced in Kelly's monologue, simply because he is unable to bound himself to a future act; "warning and promise". Kelly issued only one warning in an e-mail addressed to his friend; "*My friend there are many dark actors playing games*"[1]. As for the speech act of promise, Kelly presents only four; most of them are direct promises. They were promises to ease the pain and perhaps to end his feelings of guilt.

Table (2) The Distribution of the Speech Acts "David Kelly"

Speech Act Type	Frequency	Percentage
Representative of answering	5	4.13%
Representative of stating	19	15.70%
Representative of asserting	17	14.04%
Representative of description	20	16.52%
Representative of confession	13	10.74%
Directive of asking	20	16.52%
Expressive of Feeling	22	18.18%
Commissive of warn	1	0.82%
Commissive of promise	4	3.35%
Total	121	100%

### 5.3.3 Nehrjas

Unlike the American Female Soldier and David Kelly who are plainly displayed as victimizers, Nehrjas is rather different, for she quite early appears as both self-centered and idealistic; and through the course of the play, she is envisioned as both a victim and a victimizer. When David Kelly withdraws to the "unobtrusive spot" where the American Female Soldier stays in "blackout", Nehrjas is spotlighted as beautiful and high-spirited despite her suffering. She is also happy and conceited that her name in Arabic means "daffodil". It makes her delighted that her name implies a "flower", whose purpose is to attract a bee [1,p.42]. Unexpectedly, Nehrjas is engaged in addressing the audience with detailed accounts, all of which contribute, very little if none, to the main issue of her monologue that exhibits her hideous experiences of being savagely abused, repugantly tortured and demeaned inside the dark dungeons of the regime's secret security forces. Her opening discourse deviates from the most likely "torture scenes" the audience certainly expects on such occasions, hence the dissipation of his/her focus off the crucial theme.

Given the fact that Nehrjas is a cultured female, who is committed to the Communism, Thompson is keen on boosting up her discourse with a highly refined and intellectual language. Irrespective of the fact that the opening episodes of her monologue are indeed no more than elaborate highlights of her individual character, the accounts are nevertheless graciously rich in locale and universal reference. Nehrjas's monologue discloses interesting knowledge about her native culture and religio-philosophical insights. The harmony between her cultural domains and the type of language she employs as a medium of expression is characteristically interesting: her discourse is aesthetically rich and sophisticate. Most likely, Thompson endeavours to make the audience aware of Nehrjas's power to use the language that matches her cultural heritage. Such process is meant to shed more light on Nehrjas's awareness of her beauty and knowledgeability, a matter that enhances her self-centeredness:

This tree, a date palm or the *Nakhla*. (*italics mine*) So tall, elegant proud and beautiful..... A fully-grown tree, like a fully-grown woman does not need much of anything, save a little rain now and then. Like me:

Some people feel sorry, "she is old, she is over fifty now, can't attract a man," are you joking with me? *You think I want to attract a man..... I am not lonely; I am fully-grown tree* [but] I have committed the greatest sin of all. [1,p.42-3].

As she proceeds with her monologue, Nehrjas increasingly discloses more about her identity and individual character. The elegance of her speech and the

sophisticated bearings of her discourse are intended for identifying her intellectual and cultural frames of mind. Moreover, Thompson accredits Nehrjas's character with traits of crucial significance of her national religio-cultural setting. Nehrjas embarks on a discourse that deals with a controversial religious question considered precarious by then; it is the issue of belief in God; she frankly admits that:

I want to tell you a secret. Before I had babies I *didn't really believe in God*.

I said that I did. Everyone *thought me very religious*.

I went to the *mosque*. I *prayed five times a day*. I observed all the *rituals; the food, the dress* and all of it. (*italics mine*) [1,p.45].

It is very obvious that Thompson employs language to dramatically drift downward into the very depth of Nehrjas's psych. It seems that the playwright seeks an excuse for Nehrjas's idealistic dispositions as well as justifications for her political commitments that will eventually bring about all the dire agonies. The discourse above illustrates that Nehrjas who seeks approval of her societal norms and is endowed with marvelous traits equally suffers from some contradictions imposed upon her by her societal frames of mind; for she confesses that "pretending" forces her not to tell anyone, even her husband who is supposed to be a liberal and a free thinker, simply because "an infidel has no friends". And the outcome of such conflict is ominous as her "soul was an empty space" [1]. It is only when she has had her first child that Nehrjas changes her mind: astonishingly she declares that when she looked at her son "I saw Allah". I cannot explain this \_ it is beyond words [1,p.46]. Indeed it is difficult to explain:

"My faith came back like a great river which has been dry. And begins again to flow and every time I felt it drying up because of the terrible the unspeakable things that were happening to my people. I looked at the face of my son, and my faith returned" [1].

Despite the fact that such philosophically sophisticated discourse in relation to belief and disbelief may seemingly appear as irrelevant to the one question of Nehrjas's crisis, Thompson's intent of foregrounding it can be attributed to the playwright's endeavor to unveil Nehrjas's contradictory and too idealistic identity.

Linguistically speaking, the detailed accounts about Nehrjas's cultural and intellectual attributes are considered deviation from at least three of Grice's Maxims; most likely, such deviation is justified by the playwright's quest to vividly portray the persona's character as well prepared for the hideous experiences of abuse and torture. Equally significant, is Thompson's resort to picture Nehrjas closely attached to her socio-cultural setting: besides giving her knowledge about minute national and local incidents, Thompson characteristically utilizes some Iraqi and Arabic words transliterated within the discourse. The use of such words as *Nakhla*, *Mullah*, *Umm Al-Maarik*, *Allah*, and *Qarsal-Nihaya* [1,p. 24,44,50] does not stylistically imply the use of "slang": there is indeed a great difference between the use of slang and/or colloquial language that denotes a lower status of education and that of originally national standard Arabic words that function otherwise. Such employment of national standard Arabic reinforces the use of highly refined language.

Having had almost half way-way with her monologue, Nehrjas however, progresses to embark on the main crisis of her family and country. It is in this part that her "too" idealistic understanding of politics and commitment to faith is underlined. If the first part of Nehrjas's discourse is devoted to spotlight her self-centeredness, the other episode is entirely given to the treatment of her own (as well as all Iraqi prisoners') detainees in the Palace of the End.

Thompson clearly varies the language employed by Nehrjas in her torture experiences: there is an outstanding shift from the "individual" domain into the general one. The first person pronoun is heavily used in the previous discourse is replaced by the plural pronoun wherein the experiences are more general. Nevertheless, in the first episode, Nehrjas frankly confesses that she has committed "the greatest sin of all", but the discourse does not emphatically determine what the "sin" may be, which clearly flouts the maxim of quantity.

As far as speech acts are concerned, Nehrjas's discourse witnesses such speech acts: stating, asserting, confession, feeling and many others since Nehrjas has the largest discourse among the three. Some of the speech acts utilized by Nehrjas have the illocutionary force of politeness; praising and thanking (*see the table 3*) which relate to Searle's expressive speech acts. "He had been well trained....He smiled at me. He kept smiling to give me courage" [1,p.55]. This highly suggests that Nehrjas tries to express her identity through language; using a cautious language that is the very far from any low language, though she uses a single insult that is directed to her torturers "They are half men" [1,p.53].

In addition to the expressive speech acts and their power in a conversation, Nehrjas employs different representative speech acts; this leads to the one fact that she is willing to be committed to the truth of her expressed proposition. Nehrjas highly depends on the representative speech act of description; describing the power of woman as a tree, describing her country, her torture and that of her son. Other interesting representative speech act are accusation, insulting; Thompson also creates a powerful illocutionary forces through the use of irony under the umbrella of speech acts; her son who was the reason behind her return to belief dies, yet her belief strengthens. Nehrjas keeps professionally playing with language to produce the most effect on the reader/hear. Unlike the other two characters, Nehrjas does not start her discourse with a question; rather she remembers herself drawing a flower with her blood which implies that this woman is a strong woman born from the womb of torture and suffering "One of my earliest memories is drawing in my own blood. Drawing a flower, a daffodil..."[1,p.41]. She even refers to her torture jail as a "fairytale"; wherein the "Palace of Flowers" became the "Palace of the End" [1,p.50].

The battle between stating and describing, where the words fit the world, within Nehrjas's discourse is at its highest; no other speech act can compete with these two. Nehrjas, hence, resort to describing her world and provides such description with statements to empower her situation. Nevertheless, her discourse bursts with different speech acts, asserting is one of them, all but one were used near the end of her discourse smartly to back up her statements and description; "I was quite certain they would not kill us because it was so deeply in my culture never to harm a pregnant woman or a child" [1,p.57].

What is interesting is that all three characters end up with the concept of fly; the Female Soldier resorted to the idea of the eagle in a desperate hope for salvation; again Dr. David Kelly he says that he loves to fly [1,p.27] and imagines himself to be on a high hill above the world and is able to see the world from there [1,p.40]. Similarly, Nehrjas envisions herself flying with her son over Bagdad "her paradise" and ironically her son takes her down with the other "ghosts" for "worst is yet to come" [1,p.60].

Table (3) The Distribution of the Speech Acts "Nehrjas"

Type of Speech Act	Frequency	Percentage
Representative of answering	3	1.87%
Representative of stating	39	24.37%
Representative of asserting	10	6.25%
Representative of description	38	23.75%
Representative of confession	5	3.12%
Representative of predicting	6	3.75%
Representative of insulting	1	0.62%
Representative of accusing	1	0.62%
Directive of asking	16	10%
Directive of ordering	2	1.27%
Directive of suggesting	2	1.27%
Directive of request	1	0.62%
Expressive of Feeling	16	10%
Expressive of Praise	10	6.25%
Expressive of thanking	3	1.87%
Commissive of vow	7	4.37%
Total	160	100 %

With regard to Grice's maxims, the following table (4) is put forward to detect the violations committed by the three characters along with their percentage of occurrence to best support the result of the characters' analysis.

Table (4) The Distribution of Grice's maxims violation in the *Palace of the End*

The Maxim Violated	The Female Soldier		David Kelly		Nehrjas	
Quantity	5	19.23%	9	47.36%	4	50%
Quality	11	42.32%	2	10.54%	1	12.5%
Relevance	8	30.76%	4	21.05%	1	12.5%
Manner	2	7.69%	4	21.05%	2	25%
total	26	100%	19	100%	8	100%

## Discussion of Results:

with regard to speech act theory, The American Female Soldier tends to use the representative speech act of stating with (23.14%) percentage of occurrence and the expressive speech act of feeling with the same percentage to indicate that she is a person that desires to be taken for her word; she tries hard to express herself and justify her misconduct with a limited number of commissives "only 11 were detected"; the commissive speech act of vow with (5.55 %) percentage of occurrence and the commissive speech act of promise with (4.64%) percentage of occurrence, for she is not in a place that gives her the space to be bound by a future action. Nonetheless, the character issue a good number of questions in an attempt to start a conversation with (9.25%) percentage of occurrence among which she answers 7 only; this surely highlights her psych. Finally she describes only two incidents, with (1.85) percentage of occurrence, both of which are used to somehow support her allegations of being a good character serving her country. In the light of Grice's Maxims, however, it is probable that her discourse flouts the conversational principle.

Neither quantitatively nor qualitatively does her discourse help in setting any conversational maxim. Her speech is both dissipating and non-informative. Having addressed the landlady as French, she asks her about her name, a situation that sounds irrelevant, for it is a question that has been ignored by the addressee. She frequently violates the maxim of relevance (30.76%) as in her inconsistent account about cockroaches, roaches and suddenly moves to talk about her child then replies to an unissued question. This makes it clear that the conversation is one-sided and the conversational principle is fully lost. The soldier is exclusively viewed as a liar; she tends to regularly violate the maxim of quality (42.32%) which takes the highest percentage of occurrence "I don't nor have I ever laughed at a man's.... I had a smile on my face but this was SERIOUS-INTELLIGENCE-WORK" [1,p.15].

David Kelly on the other hand, uses as many representative speech acts as he can to express himself, statements with (15.70%), asserts with (14.04%) and descriptions with (16.52%). In his discourse, the battle between descriptions (16.52%), questions (16.52%) and expressing feelings (18.18%) is on its highest, though expressing his feelings takes the whole cake; this highly proves that he is a very sensitive man and a man that wishes to be taken for the truth of his expressed discourse. Yet again, he avoids issuing a large number of commissives "he only issues 5 commissives; a warning (0.82%) and 4 promises (3.35%)"; which leaves no doubt that this character wishes not to be taken for a future action for he is yet to commit a suicide. However, as far as Grice's maxims are concerned, it is likewise evident that Kelly's discourse fully abides by the four maxims, a matter that evidences Kelly's strong will to redeem his guilt. In respect of both Quality and Quantity, Kelly's discourse is by and large informative; furthermore, it neither false nor inadequate. Such attributes are related to the fact that Kelly is after one specific 'objective': he knows it well, and directly heads toward it. As his 'aim' is decisively obvious, Kelly finds no difficulty in making it clear and devoid of ambiguity. In terms of Manner, however, Kelly's discourse is orderly set: nothing in his speech is obscure; the audience effortlessly arrives at the discourse's gist. The British scientist's speech decorum is rendered much more potentially effectual by its Relevance; every single part of it is naturally and thematically related to the one 'central *motif*': the presentation of a 'locutionary' statement in that he may be able to bring about an 'illocutionary' act. In this case, it is a message delivered to the American audience as to the 'mousey' and 'devious' means exercised by US in its War in Iraq. Undoubtedly, Thompson does not intend to merely 'disclose' such policies, but certainly, Kelly's 'perlocutionary' discourse is hoped to perform an effect on the American audience mind. Moreover, Kelly is very cautious about the truth of his expressed proposition; for the least maxim to be violated is the maxim of quality with only 10% of his speech of which he lacks evidence.

Nehrjas resorts to use 160 different speech acts of different types, a matter that significantly evidences her strong will as a character. Statements (24.37%) and descriptions (23.75%) are of the highest percentage of occurrence which, most probably verifies her desperate need to be accounted for the truth of her expressed discourse. Unlike the other two characters, Nehrjas, tends to perform directive and commissive speech acts in her discourse; it really helps to see through her well. She issues 21 directive speech act out of 160 about 14% total; this empowers the traits for her strength and power. Moreover, Nehrjas is the only character that issues an insult and an accusation and that clearly verifies her strong position as a character. In the light of Grice's Maxims, the detailed account of her discourse puts her in a situation that targets her to be violating the maxim of quantity with 50% total she is either

portrayed as being too informative with regard to describing her torturers or less informative with regard to her guilt. In some occasions, she abruptly jumps into another topic leaving the audience confused about the truth she was about to tell; making her discourse unordered nor coherent "those who supposedly came to liberate us....it reminds me of a young woman I know who had been taken off the street one day by officials and raped many many times" [1, p.47-8].

## Conclusion

Investigating the dramatic character identity in *Palace of the End* through pragmatic, as well as stylistic, theories proves that language can convey a lot about the speakers, be they on stage or on paper. Real identities are portrayed, developed and shaped through discourse. In terms of speech acts, indeed, they occupy a large portion of the characters' discourse to uncover the truth who they really are. The results proved that the three characters are heavily identified through their significant use of different speech acts. Each character is distinct from the other in terms of the types of speech act he/she tends to issue. Hence, the analyses of the dramatic characters' discourses in terms of pragmastylistics show that real identity can be portrayed through speech on different levels.

Upon Grice's maxims analysis, it is clear that the characters reveal a lot about themselves through violating or adhering to one maxim rather than the other. Notably, all of the three characters are too informative, and many violations were detected in their discourse with regard to relevance maxim; in a hopeless effort to change the subject of being judged as well as to quantity and quality maxims. The manner maxim was least to be violated which gives the conclusion that all characters were cautious in ordering their speech to enhance their language effect on the reader.

The use of language is most likely not haphazard: it is based on a wisely-formulated design, for example, the first character "The Female Soldier" is portrayed as using a very low language deviating from grammar, pronunciation and every other aspect of language. On the other hand, David Kelly is displayed as endeavouring to avoid such deviation, making use of a formal, sophisticated language even in critical times "near his suicide". Nevertheless, Nehrijas undertakes to highlight her Arabic identity by the use of special errors that only an Arabic speaker would commonly utter "the successive use of *and*" for example.

## CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

**There are no conflicts of interest**

## Abstract

1. Leech, Geoffrey N. "A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry". London: Longman. 1969.
2. Le Page R. B. and Andree Tabouret. *Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1985.
3. Grice, H. P. "Logic and Conversation", in Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics3: Speech Acts*. London: Academic Press, 1975.
4. Short, Mick. *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. Harlow: Longman, 1996.
5. Stanislavski, C. *Building a Character*, translated by Hapgood, E. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.
6. Yule, G. "Pragmatics". Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1996.

7. Wells, R. "Nominal and Verbal Style", in Sebeok (T.), ed., *Style in Language*. New York: M.I.T. Press, PP. 213-222. 1960
8. Hickey, Leo. "Stylistics, Pragmatics and Pragmastylistics". *Langues et littératures modernes - Moderne taal- en letterkunde*. pp. 573-586. 1993.
9. Davies, A. *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
10. Black, E. *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
11. Norgaard, N., Busse, B., and Montoro, R.. 'Key Terms in Stylistics'. London: Continuum. 2010.
12. Thompson, Judith. *Palace of the End*. London: Oberon Books. 2010.
13. Page, Norman. *Speech in the English Novel*. London: Longman, 1973.
14. Eble, C. "American College Slang". In E.W. Schneider (Ed.), *Focus on the USA* pp. 289-296. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1996.
15. Styan, J. L. *The Elements of Drama*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1960.