

War of the Words: A Pragmatic Study of the Characters' Confronted Discourse in Pirandello's "WAR"

Assist. Prof. Amin Ukaal Ghailan (PhD.)

College of Education for Human Sciences,

University of Basrah

Mobile number: 07703148438

Email: amin.ghailan@uobasrah.edu.iq

Abstract:

The novelty of this research is that it links pragmatic markers with the study of discourse, with a specific attention on the characters' roles and speech in showing discourse strategies. So, the research paper tackles pragmatic markers, quotation markers, question markers, general extenders and evidential markers in the characters' discourse in Pirandello's text.

The objective of this paper is to show how the study of pragmatic markers can be of great importance for showing discourse practices. The analysis will also demonstrate the benefits of the amalgamation of pragmatic markers and discourse analysis research. This short story should be seen as a text focusing on a political discourse. Such a text is told by politically powerless actors.

There is also a discussion of such pragmatic markers and how they contribute to the characteristics of the discourse of characters in the story. The study of pragmatic markers should be associated with the manipulative manifestations in a discourse. One of the important findings of this study is that any single pragmatic marker may have some important manipulative functions. The present study builds

on the findings arrived to in the analysis of Pirandello's story, according to the pragmatic functional spectrum. It considers the findings from the perspective of influential pragmatic intent.

Key Words: Pragmatic marker, quotation marker, general extender, question marker, evidential marker, discourse.

حرب الكلمات :دراسة تداولية لخطاب الشخصيات المتقابل في قصة "حرب" للكاتب برانديلو

أ.م.د. أمين عكال غيلان

كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية / جامعة البصرة

رقم الموبايل : 07703148438

البريد الالكتروني : amin.ghailan@uobasrah.edu.iq

الملخص :

أن الجديد في هذا البحث هو أنه يربط بين دراسة الدلالات التداولية ودراسة الخطاب، مع الاهتمام الخاص بأدوار الشخصيات وكلامها لتبيان استراتيجيات الخطاب. ولهذا فإن البحث يستعرض الدلالات التداولية وعلامات الاقتباس وعلامات الاستفهام والإضافات العامة والعلامات الدليلية لخطاب الشخصيات في قصة برانديلو.

أن الهدف من الدراسة هو بيان كيف يمكن للدلالات التداولية أن تكون ذات أهمية كبيرة في أظهر تطبيقات الخطاب. ويسعى البحث الى إثبات فوائد دمج العلامات الدليلية مع تحليل الخطاب في هذه الدراسة. ولعل من الضروري النظر الى هذه القصة القصيرة على أنها نص يركز اهتمامه على الخطاب السياسي الذي يروى من خلال شخصيات مغلوب على أمرها سياسيا.

فضلا عن ذلك، فإن البحث يهتم بالعلامات الدليلية وكيفية أسهامها في أظهر الخصائص الخطابية لشخصيات هذه القصة القصيرة. أن دراسة العلامات الدليلية يجب أن يترافق مع التجليات المرادفة في هذا الخطاب. ومن

النتائج المهمة للدراسة هو أن كل علامة دلالية مفردة يمكن أن تحتوي على عدة وظائف مترادفة ومهمة في الوقت نفسه. هذا وقد بُنيت الدراسة الحالية على النتائج المستخرجة من تحليل قصة "حرب" للكاتب برانديلو وفقا لنطاق البحث الوظيفي التداولي، وهي أيضا تدرس النتائج تبعا للغرض التداولي المؤثر في هذه القصة القصيرة. **الكلمات المفتاحية:** العلامة التداولية، علامة الاقتباس، الإضافات العامة، علامة السؤال، العلامة التداولية، الخطاب .

Pragma-Discourse Study

Baker and Ellege(2011:100) mention that " pragmatics focuses more on how we achieve meaning in particular contexts, by taking into account things like how, where and when something is said, who says it, what the relationship is between the speaker and hearer, and how we make sense of ambiguous uses of language". Pragmatics accounts for a variety of topics including conversational implicatures, speech acts theory, deixis, presuppositions and so on. Burr(1995:163) mentions that discourse analysis is a term that is "an umbrella which covers a wide variety of actual research practices with quite different aims and theoretical backgrounds. All take language as their focus of interest". Discourse analysis and pragmatics have the same interest in language use. Discourse analysis deals with the structure of discourse, particularly written texts and talk whereas pragmatics pays attention to isolated utterances. For Allott, discourse is "a more general and more technical term than 'conversation', 'discourse' can be defined as a series of connected utterances, although on some conceptions it is more global"(2010:65).

Discourse is used in a linguistic study to relate to a continuous string of language above the sentence- level. It contains a stretch of utterances for making any speech event such as a dialogue, an interview, a sermon, etc. Allot(2010:65) thinks that discourse analysis is:

"an approach in which data from talk exchanges and written texts are collected and closely analysed, with the aim of shedding light on the ways people do things with words. Discourse analysis studies the use of language as a social practice or a set of social practices. Practitioners of discourse analysis see participants in discourse as constructing it through their speech acts, and they also see talk as a way (or perhaps, the way) that social arrangements are constructed".

Also, Maynard thinks that "discourse analysis is usually defined in two related ways. First, discourse analysis examines linguistic phenomena of real-life communication beyond the sentence level. Second, discourse analysis views functions of language as primary rather than its form" (in Natsuko Tsujimura, 2017:425-443). G. Brown & Yule (1983:1) write that discourse analysis is "the analysis of language in use", and "it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which those forms are designed to serve in human affairs". The main link of pragmatics and discourse analysis consider linguistic utterances as socially situated. Such utterances are contextually created and function for any human cognition. There are important topics of discourse analysis such as text arrangements, the language in use, the interactional event within a specific context, etc. The study of any discourse function should be generally a pragmatically oriented. Also, any pragmatic study can become an important result in any discourse study.

Development in the Field: An Overview

In the study of discourse, there is a tendency to understand functions of language. Study of discourse analysis and pragmatics can be traced back to the Prague school. Such a school has influenced a lot most of the works concerning

functionalism in linguistics. Also, text grammar during the 1970s(e.g. Van Dijk 1972) has resulted from the study of text but it suffered some weakness for its inability to cope with the non-formal aspects of different texts. In fact, the important model in studying functions of language is the systemic functional grammar led by M.A.K. Halliday. Such a type of study considers text analysis their main interest (for more information see Peter Fries 1983, Halliday and Hassan1994 and others).

In fact, discourse analysis and pragmatics go more than the study of mere surface connection. Also, in the United States, specifically in the field of sociolinguistics, many studies such as (Sacks et al 1974, Gumperz 1982) had affected in the development of conversation analysis. Topics like turn-talking, question –answer, adjacency pair and others had appeared to be preferred and studied in the current conversation analysis. Others have extended the conversation analysis, among them is Tannen(1984) who gave a great attention to the linguistic expressions and strategies used by the interactants in any speech event. "In recent years, however, there has been a slow increase of interest in the use of pragmatic markers in political discourse"(Furko,2017:4).

There is a little of research about the features pragmatic markers have in a discourse analysis, for the majority of the analyses attempt to concentrate on the importance of content words in the discourse (for more information, see Wodak1989 and Van Dijk 1993 on conceptual items; Van Leeuwen 1996 on syntactic processes such as active/passive forms of verbs; Fowler, et al.,1979 and Billig 2008 on nominalization, etc.).

Schiffrin(1987) paid a lot of attention to the analysis of verbal chunks in any verbal interaction. He concentrates on the study of conversational markers in various interactional contexts. His works (1987, 1994) had a lot of influence on

discourse analysis in the United States. Another development in the study of discourse had concentrated on social and political importance. Such a European interest focused on political debates, direct conversational interactions, interviews in mass media and etc. Van Dijk (1995) in his critical discourse analysis refers to " a special approach to the study of text and talk, with an aim of discovering discourse structure and strategies of dominance and resistance in social relationships (of class, gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, religion, age, nationality, etc.)(in Senko Maynard,2017 :428-429).

Confrontation in Discourse

The term "Discourse" refers to a written and spoken communication created in a certain social and cultural context. It is different from the term "text" which refers specifically to the written form of communication. In this sense, "text" relates to the studies made in text linguistics. The aim of discourse analysis is to have a catalogue for the speech so as to understand the background of the participants in a discourse to know the process of the speech. This needs knowing how these participants start and end a discourse, how they exchange roles in a dialogue, how to agree or disagree on a certain topic, how they attempt to emphasis some points in a topic, etc. Allott(2010:65) states that "since utterances(in the technical sense used in pragmatics) may be written or spoken, a discourse can be a written text or a spoken exchange. The utterances in a discourse may overlap, particularly in spoken discourse: speakers interrupt and speak over each other". In the same way, Fairclough(1995:51) thinks that "conversationalisation is a type of marketization of ideologies and has a specific(hidden) consensus- building effect".

Discourse is a "term with several related and often quite loose meanings.(1) Perhaps in its most general usage, it can refer to any form of 'language in use' or naturally occuring language" (Brown and Yule 1983 in Baker and Ellege,2011:30).

Stubbs(1983:1) defines discourse as "language above the sentence or above the clause" and would lend itself to the analysis of text structure and pragmatics. Discourse can also be used to refer to particular contexts of language use, and in this sense it becomes similar to concepts like genre or text type. For example, we can conceptualize political discourse(the sort of language used in political contexts) or media discourse(language used in the media)". For Foucault(1972:49), discourse refers to "practices which systematically form the objects of which they speak".

Potter and Wetherell (1987) think that "people often appear to voice conflicting opinions around a topic, which they argue is due to them accessing a range of competing discourse in their talk. Discourses are; therefore, contradictory and shifting, and their identification is necessarily interpretative and open to contestation, particularly as it is difficult to 'step outside' discourse and view it with complete objectivity"(in Baker and Ellege, 2011:31). Also, Blakemore and Gallai (2014:111) mention that "the speaker's utterances will be understood as an interpretation of a thought which is itself an interpretation of an attributed thought". Also, Wilson (2001) defines political discourse "in terms of a variety of general issues such as power, conflict, control, and domination".

Methodology of the Study

Pragmatic markers represent a functional part of linguistic study. A study of any pragmatic markers involves showing the structure and organization of a discourse. Such markers also make clear the characters (or speakers) viewpoints to the topic implied within the text.

The pragmatic markers such as evidential markers, quotation markers, general extenders and etc., display the features of meaning and differences of

viewpoints. By using them, characters can express various aspects of the discourse process and reflect them to the audience. Fetzer (2000:1) thinks that it is better to limit Gumperz's concept of pragmatic markers as "indexical expressions which are categorized with regard to their micro-contextual references for example, metacommunicative lexical items with interpersonal, interactional, and sequential functions". However, in "recent years, there has been a slow increase of interest in the use of pragmatic markers in political discourse"(Furko,2017:4)

The study focuses on the arrangement and function of pragmatic markers of the characters' conversation. Such markers are to be considered as frames of reference about the characters' intentions in a literary discourse.

This study is based on the characters' political discourse in Pirandello's *War*. This short story shows the war as a very important topic in the life of societies. The writer transfers the war topic from the battlefield to the carriage of a train, in which several passengers discuss their lives and the situation of their children as soldiers. They seem to have different attitudes and each character attempts to portray his suffering for having a war affecting their families and sons. There is a special focus on the character of an old woman who keeps silent till the end of the story. Analysis of the characters' speech will be carried out on a basis comprising their political discourse.

Any pragmatic discourse analysis should adopt the analytical method. So, instead of studying utterances, discourse study considers the components of interaction such as turns, giving new information, etc, and the way of organizing them in a conversation. Therefore, the interaction in any conversation is usually

arranged as connected pairs e.g., a question should be followed by its answer, or a direct speech of one character to be completed by an opponent one.

In this regard, a sequence of information should have a place in the conversational sequencing in which any certain response (or answer) becomes relevant to the other responses. Schegloff (1968:1083) ascertains that "given the first, the second is expectable; upon its occurrence it can be seen to be a second item to the first; upon its non-occurrence it can be seen to be officially absent- all this provided sheerly by the occurrence of the first item". So, the key point for the analysis of conversational interaction is to study the sequenced and situated action (or speech).

In fact, discourse structure differs from one text to another, and from one conversational mode to another. The analysis of face-to-face conversation in this story will lead to the investigation of certain modes of talk among the characters. Several discussions between the characters lead to very interesting results, all are moving around the topic of war and its effect on the families (especially parents) of the soldiers. So, we should pay attention to the strategy of opening the topic of discussion, how the talk distributed among the characters, and etc. Sandova (2010) observes that politicians use conversational style in an effort to impress their audience, and to be able to influence them more easily"(in Furko, 2017:16).

In this way, it is better to study the talk and cross-talk of the characters through the analysis of each talk, interpret this talk, and compare it with other characters' talk. So, the interactants used to take short turns and to distribute these roles among the participants. This distribution of turns will continue to happen till the end of the conversation regardless to the idea of who had begun the topic. Of course, the discussion will be more difficult with the arising of cross-talks through the

mutual interaction of participants in the talk. This arises from their different viewpoints concerning the topic of their children being soldiers, wounded, and dead as a result of the war.

The main objective of this analysis is to identify occasions of conflict in this conversation. A very important case to notice is that within the discussion, the interactants seem to agree with each other (except the mother) on the topic of their children being soldiers in the war. This proves the impossibility of the participants to dispute with each other along the conversation. Thereby, they resort to use parallelism and repeated talks so as to be in a case of harmony with each other, and agree on the same topic of war. The following pragmatic markers will be studied in Pirandello's short story:

General Extenders

General extenders "usually appear at the end of lists, and thus indicate additional members of a list, and/ or imply the fact that there is a set or category which is exemplified by the items preceding them"(Furko,2017:13). General extenders can be used manipulatively in two ways: first, the use of general extenders might imply that there is more to be said on a certain topic than the interactants have said. Second, general extenders may be used to downplay other characters' opinions and viewpoints; therefore, they supply other ways to manipulate the same environment shared by other characters within the same context of the play. Furko(2017:13) states that "general extenders(GEs) comprise a subset of pragmatic markers that usually occur in utterance final position and have the basic form of conjunctive(and) or disjunctive(or) plus noun phrase, for example, and stuff (like that), and the like, and what not, and so on, etcetera".

Quotation Markers

Lauerbach(2006:199) states that represented discourse is " a figure other than the speaker is being animated without the speaker being understood to be either the author of the words or to be responsible for them".

Quotation markers are mostly ambiguous pragmatic markers. Quotation markers have several functions such as making a certain point emphatic or as a background. Quotation markers have a strategic use for subjective opinions or objective stance making to be certain or uncertain. The manipulative use of quotation markers occur when there are ideological differences due to the use of the pragmatic markers.

Question

Markers

It is important to mention that questions can make several functions. So, asking about any information or giving information, and the dominance of the questioner or respondent on the speech are some of them. The different kinds of questions can be characterized by different functions which indicate the type of relationship existing between the questioner and the listener. It also shows the intimacy, social distance, and authority.

The importance of questions is dependent on the rules controlling social interaction between the speakers of the same environment. We can know the intention of the questioner through the context of situation and the speaker's attitude from what he is asking about. So, Athanasiadou (1990:108) mentions that " the meanings given to questions are determined by the status of the speakers involved in the question act and the way they convey intention". He continues that " questions are not only about information. Looking at different types of corpus (different from the point of view of people involved in it and the kinds of

interaction), one is led to wonder about the complex nature of questions"(1990:119).

Evidential Markers

The evidential markers are a class of pragmatic markers which are known to "signal the degree of confidence, positive or negative, weakly or strongly, held by the speaker about the truth of the basic message"(Fraser, 1996:167). Also, evidential markers "indicate a speaker's attitude regarding the validity of certain information, for example, whether it is certain, probable, or untrustworthy (Nuckolls, 1993:235). Such markers mark the source and the reliability of information and knowledge (Ifantidou, 2001:3).

Pragmatic Markers in Pirandello's *War*

The beginning of the story shows the sourness of several families because of the war. Each character in the compartment of a train stands for a different family case. The following justifies this feeling of the characters:

" At dawn, in a stuffy and smoky second-class carriage in which five people and already spent the night, a bulky woman in deep mourning was hosted in- almost like a shapeless bundle. Behind her- puffing and moaning, followed her husband- a tiny man; thin and weakly, his face death-white, his eyes small and bright and looking shy and uneasy.

And he felt it his duty to explain to his traveling companions that the poor woman was to be pitied for the war was taking away from her her only son, a

boy of twenty to whom both had devoted their entire life".

" You should thank God that your son is only leaving now for the front. Mine has been sent there the first day of the war. He has already come back twice wounded and been sent back again to the front."

The above excerpt shows the melancholy of the characters concerning their sons whose fate is unknown for their families. These characters unfortunately fall in a situation to appreciate and depreciate the man depending on the matter of the war. Hooti(2012:4308) writes that "Pirandello in his war gives a vivid picture of the worries of war. He tries to divulge the hidden agony of the parents, whose sons are either shedding blood or getting killed in the battle fields. They know the futility of the war. Indeed, they are well aware of the politicized connotations of the fossilized normative terms, like martyrdom, honor, heroism and patriotism, but still keep quiet and try to console themselves with these honey coated phrases". This study identifies the characters' pragmatic markers (evidential markers, quotation markers, other general extenders, etc.). It is needful to mention that a pragmatic marker may have different functions, so that a variety of pragmatic markers can be realized in the story:

The general extender (almost like a shapeless bundle) adds to the description of the woman to be like a (bundle) with no definite shape. This extender is used here to imply the bad situation of the mother who pays no attention to her shape (though she is a woman) because of her grief on her son. Another extender is the conjunctive (and + noun phrase) or (and + adjective) which is used in the text to add more new information about the puffing and moaning husband. This is clear in the expression:

"Behind her– puffing and moaning, followed her husband– a tiny man; thin and weakly, his face death– white, his eyes small and bright and looking shy and uneasy"

All the use of (and) for four times in two lines is for having a full and suitable description of the husband who has unhealthy, thin and weakly face. A third extender is about the husband who seems to care about his wife, trying to tidy her clothes and asking about her being well. In this extender, we read:

" Having at last taken a seat he politely thanked the passengers who had helped his wife and who had made room for her; then he turned round to the woman trying to pull down the collar of her coat and politely inquired":

" Are you all right, dear?"

A very good evaluative quotation mark is said by the husband who tries to show his viewpoint on the world they are living in. The quotation " Nasty world" is said by the husband with a sad smile on his face. This expression shows the bad and terrible world of the husband and wife during the wartime. The general extender reads:

"And he felt it his duty to explain to his traveling companions that the poor woman was to be pitied for the war was taking away from her her only son, a boy of twenty to whom both had devoted their entire life, even breaking up their home at Sulmona to follow him to Rom, where he had to go as a student, then allowing him to volunteer for war with an assurance, however, that at least six months he would not be sent to the front and now, all of a sudden, receiving a wire saying that he was due to leave in three days' time and asking them to go and see him off."

This extender explains a situation of these parents and how their son was listed in the army. This extender is full of information about their only son. He was still a young boy of 20 years old. They left their home, and followed their son to Rome, for he went there to be a student. He became a volunteer for war with an assurance not to go to the front before six months. Unexpectedly, he should leave within three days to the front and they follow to see him off. All such information is said within one extender to explain how the suffering of the parents is. The extender is full with relative clauses which are important for adding more information about the parents. Each clause has new details about the parents to make their situation clear to the other travellers. It is noticeable that these general extenders are noun phrases preceded by commas to make the information in these extenders complete each other and so make clear the situation of the parents with their son.

The evidential marker (feeling certain) expresses the woman's attitude regarding the explanations given by her husband about their situation. She is certain that no one of the passengers will feel sympathetic with them concerning the matter of their son going to the front. Another evidential marker is the expression (most likely) which shows that the passengers were in the same plight as the woman's situation. Since all the travellers pass through the same suffering of a war, and their children most likely were going to the front, it is very possible for them to be suffering like the woman. These markers are found in the following:

"The woman under the big coat was twisting and wriggling, at times growling like a wild animal, feeling certain that all those explanations would not have aroused even a shadow of sympathy from those people who– most likely– were in the same plight as herself."

After this passage, the speech of the travellers will come suitable to the expectation of the mother. Each one of them tells his plight of the war because their sons participated in the war. The following quotation explains the situations of two passengers whose sons were sent to the front. The quotation reads:

"You should thank God that your son is only leaving now for the front. Mine has been sent there the first day of the war. He has already come back twice wounded and been sent back again to the front."

"What about me? I have two sons and three nephews at the front," said another passenger."

This quotation marker, said by two of the passengers, explain how the plight of the war is worse for them than the woman and her husband. One passenger said that his son was wounded twice and went back again to the front. The other passenger has two sons with three nephews fighting in the front. So, the quotation is important to express the amount of the problem of these fathers as a result of their sons being soldiers at a wartime. Another important thing is the rhetorical question "What about me?" by the passenger. Such a question is not for asking to get an answer. Rather, it is used by the asker to persuade the listener with his viewpoint. Sometimes, the speaker intends to give emphasis to a certain point of topic through asking a question. "Rhetorical questions express wonder in an exclamative way"(Athanasiadou, 1990:109).

Another quotation marker is said by the husband when he points out that his case may be different because this is their only son. The husband thinks that he and his wife's problem is bigger than the others' problems since they have only

one son and if they loss such a son, there will be no compensation for their loss. This becomes clear from the speech of the husband below:

"May be, but in our case it is our only son," ventured the husband."

This husband's speech is answered by a question directed by the passenger *"What difference can it make?"*. Of course, such a question does not need any answer from the other side. But, it is said in a rhetorical way to make the listener accept the viewpoint of the speaker. The passenger, who asked the question, wants to say that he saw no difference in having one or more sons. For him, the parental love is not a bread to be split among the children. Athanasiadou (1990:119) thinks that "in asking a question, a speaker intends not only to get information or to communicate an experience or an event, but also to impose his influence on his hearer or to undergo the hearer's influence".

The passenger's speech expresses a very important fact about the parental love which is given to all the children whether it be one or ten, and; therefore, his grief is doubled for he has more than one child. Such a quotation marker seems enough to convince the husband that the others have more suffering than he and his wife. The quotation marker reads:

"What difference can it make? You may spoil your only son by excessive attentions, but you cannot love him more than you would all your other children if you had any. Parental love is not like bread that can be broken to pieces and split amongst the children in equal shares. A father fives all his love to each one of his children without discrimination. Whether it be one or ten, and if I am suffering now

for my two sons, I am not suffering half for each of them but double..."

This husband seems not to be convinced with the speech of the man; therefore, he tries to look at the matter from a different side. He tries to tell the passenger that if the father has two sons and one of them dies, the father has another son to live for. He uses the words "True..true..." at the beginning of his reply to convince the man with speech, but later he produces another suggestion for the man with two sons which makes him different from that with only one son. This is clear from the husband's quotation marker below:

" True...true..." sighed the embarrassed husband. "but suppose (of course we all hope it will never be your case) a father has two sons at the front and he loses one of them, there is still one left to console him...while..."

Another quotation marker is made by another passenger who agrees with the husband's speech that a man can also die in distress for the death of his only son. The other passenger attempts to make a comparison between two cases of a father with two sons and one of them die, and another father who has only one dead son. He ends his speech with two rhetorical questions through which he attempts to convince the husband with his speech. This is shown clearly through the following questions:

" Which of the two positions is worse?"

Don't you see how my case would be worse than yours?"

The answer to these questions came not from the husband but from another passenger and represented through the word "Nonsense" which is repeated, by the man, three times in the following:

"Nonsense," interrupted another traveler, a fat, red-faced man with bloodshot eyes of the palest gray."

"He was panting. From his bulging eyes seemed to spurt inner violence of an uncontrolled vitality which his weakened body could hardly contain. " Nonsense," he repeated, trying to cover his mouth with his hand so as to hide the two missing front teeth." Nonsense. Do we give life to our own children for our own benefit?"

He ends his quotation marker with a very important and realistic question which reads like: *"Do we give life to our own children for our own benefit?"*. This question is given answer by the man who had a son at the front from the beginning of the war. This answer is the following:

"You are right. Our children do not belong to us, they belong to the country..."

This speech of the man is not completely accepted by all of the travellers. Rather, one of them refused this speech by talking about the amount of their love to their son, which is bigger than themselves. A very important question is raised by that fat man at the beginning of his speech. The question reads:

"Do we think of the country when we give life to our children?"

His question represents a rejection to the other traveller's speech when he mentioned that they grow children and they belong to the country, not to them. So, the question above shows that the parents usually raise up their children without thinking of the country. Also, according to his opinion, they belong to their children, but not the other way round i.e., their children don't belong to them because there are other things like money, woman, cigarettes, new relations in their lives in addition to their loyalty to the country. Depending on this opinion, the love of country is still strong, but the love of children is stronger; therefore, the fat man directs a very important question to any father. The question marker reads:

" Is there any one of us here who wouldn't gladly take his son's place at the front if he could?"

Of course, such a rhetorical question doesn't need an answer. So, the fat man tries to say indirectly that he and all the fathers are ready to replace their sons at the front if they could. Athanasiadou(1990:117) writes that "as a general remark one could say that in rhetorical questions the speaker is unmistakably affirmative towards the proposition i.e., the sentence is assertory". The speech of this fat man contains a quotation marker with questions so as to convince other passengers with his speech. For this reason, all the other passengers are nodding to approve their acceptance to replace their sons at the front. This fat man continues his argument by asking other questions so as to convince the listeners; saying that their children at the age of twenty love their country bigger than their parents. Another point raised by the man is that the country is a necessity like bread for the human life and; therefore, someone should defend it.

For this reason, the man considers that if the sons died for their country, they don't want tears or cries for their death. For him, if the sons die in this way, they'll die inflamed and happy, and parents should be satisfied with this. He says that the reason of not even wear mourning for the death of his son was for his son sending him a letter writing that he is satisfied to end his own life in such a way. All such information is given by the fat man through a mixture of question marker, quotation markers, general extender, and even evidential marker. Words like (because, and) represent very important speech extenders for the man to continue his argument so as to convince the listeners (or passengers). Also, the evidential markers (as I do, as I do, as you see) are used to express his viewpoint on the matter of their sons' death at the wartime. This becomes clear in the following argument by the fat man:

" Why then," "continued the fat man", " should we consider the feelings of our children when they are twenty? Isn't it natural that at their age they should consider the love for their Country (I am speaking of decent boys, of course) even greater than the love for us? Isn't it natural that it should be so, as after all they must look upon us as upon old boys who cannot move anymore and must sit at home? If country is a natural necessity like bread of which each of us must eat in order not to die of hunger, somebody must go to defend it. And our sons go, when they are twenty, and they don't want tears, because if they die, they die inflamed and happy (I am speaking, of course, of decent boys). Now, if one dies young and happy, without having the ugly sides of life, the boredom of it, the pettiness, the bitterness of disillusion...what more can we ask for him? Everyone should stop crying: everyone should laugh, as I do...or at least thank God- as I do- because my son, before dying, sent me a message saying that he was dying satisfied at having ended his life in the best way he could have wished. That is why, as you see, I do not even wear mourning..."

"He shook his right fawn coat as to show it; his livid lip over his missing teeth was trembling, his eyes were watery and motionless, and soon after he ended with a shrill laugh which might well have been a sob."

As a result to the man's attempt, all other passengers wholly agreed with his speech. This is represented through the use of the quotation marker:

"Quite

so...quite

so..."

This shows the amount of the effect of the fat man's speech on other passengers and his success in convincing them with his viewpoint. Up to this moment of argument among the passengers on the matter of their sons being soldiers at the front during a wartime, and the possibility of being wounded or dead as a result of fight with the enemy, the woman didn't say any word or voice her viewpoint to other passengers. The general extenders (for the last three months) and (Yet) are used to show that not even a word or expression by her husband or other passengers could console her in her deep sorrow. Also, the evidential marker (as she thought) expresses her loneliness within this company with other passengers because no other passenger could share her feelings of motherhood for the loss of her only son. The following passage includes these general extenders and evidential markers:

" The woman who, bundled in a corner under her coat, had been sitting and listening had– for the last three months– tried to find in the words of her husband and her friends something to console her in her deep sorrow, something that might show her how a mother should resign herself to send her son not even to death but to a probable danger of life. Yet not a word had

she found amongst the many that had been said...and her grief had been greater in seeing that nobody– as she thought– could share her feelings."

This mother started feeling her loneliness and wrong doing for keeping silent without saying any word. The evidential markers (But, realized, even) with the pragmatic marker (suddenly) show the despair of the mother from the participation of other passengers with her grief. She decides that she should say something to stop those fathers, from sending their sons to the front and losing them for the king and his country. The following passage witnesses the change in the attitude of the mother:

"But now the words of the traveler amazed and almost stunned her. She suddenly realized that it wasn't the others who were wrong and could not understand her but herself who could not rise up to the same height of those fathers and mothers willing to resign themselves, without crying, not only to the departure of their sons but even to their death."

She lifted her head, she bent over from her corner trying to listen with great attention to the details which the fat man was giving to his companions about the way his son had fallen as a hero, for his king and his Country, happy and without regrets. It seemed to her that she had stumbled into a world she had never dreamt of, a world so far unknown to her, and she was so pleased to hear everyone joining in congratulating that brave father who could so stoically speak of his child's death."

Also, the mother felt that she had stuck in a world unknown to her because it didn't feel her sorrow for the departure of her son. On the contrary,

every passenger in the cart congratulated the father for the death of his son at the front. This makes the woman feel as if she lives a dream and tries to stop this dream by turning to this proud man for asking:

" Then...is your son really dead?"

This question marker represents the only speech said by the old woman. Along the argument, she was listening to the fathers' speech and pride for their sons going to the front and exposed to wounds or even death. This very simple question comes suddenly from a mother who kept silent from the beginning of the play till this moment. Of course, such unexpected question marker finishes all of the argument made by the fathers. It is asked, by the woman, to remind the fat man of the amount of loss he had as a result of the death of his son. Athanasiadou(1990:115) states that "in asking questions with certain kinds of intentions, a person intends not only to communicate meaning but also to actively influence the hearer in some way". Unfortunately, it seems that the fat man up to this moment didn't imagine the loss of his son. Therefore, all passengers seemed astonished and stared at her. Of course, the most difficult thing is for the fat man to answer her unexpected question; therefore, he turned to her with his sad watery eyes and the answer failed him.

Another important point about the fat man is that the mother's question suddenly made him realize that he lost his son forever. The general extender (gone forever, forever) had awakened the grief of the father for the death of his son; therefore, he broke into heart- breaking and uncontrollable sobs. The evidential marker (to the amazement of everyone) shows the unexpected reaction of the

fat man from the simple question of the mother. Her question made him realize the eventual loss of his son as a result of war. The description of the fatman's reaction and his break into harrowing cry are seen in the following passage:

" Everyone stared at her. The old man, too, turned to look at her, fixing his great, bulging, horribly watery light gray eyes, deep in her face. For some time he tried to answer, but words failed him. He looked and looked at her, almost as if only then— at that silly, incongruous question— he had suddenly realized at last that his son was really dead— gone forever— forever. His face contracted, became horribly distorted, then he snatched in haste a handkerchief from his pocket and, to the amazement of everyone, broke into harrowing, heart— breaking, uncontrollable sobs."

Discussion of the Results

Pirandello deems the characters in this story as obliterated human beings. The characters enmesh in diverse attitudes and seem to be in a mental perplexity towards themselves and their sons who are soldiers in the war. This perplexity makes the characters seek a rest of mind in a very troublesome situation of war. Hooti and Mahoudi(2013:1210) think that:

"Pirandello in the story tries to protrude the malignant impacts of wars on subservient people's lives, especially the bourgeoisie, by dramatizing the real life and utilizing quasi—visionary characters. The schizophrenic characters in a compartment, as if are entangled in a limbo, oscillating between reality and chimerical world, feeling a fatal shadow of melancholy and skepticism like the sword of Damocles hanging over their family lives."

They continue (Ibid:1211) "Truthfully, Pirandello utilized a train to show the world which is heading to a predominated destination that ultimately leads to extermination". Macabre variations of cureless discourse emanate from different attitudes of characters concerning the matter of war; this may result in creating the ill-fated war case and the obfuscated thinking of the future which is the centre of the problems of the present war. Such a war represents the morass which has to breakout the society to undergo a kind of metamorphosis to exacerbate the perplexity of the characters concerning this war. Noticeably, the contemporary human being is continuously facing terrible cases of war that are to have anti-social context.

A Pragmatic analysis of the characters' discourse shows the demeanor of personalized characters as a result of the policy makers tricks to formulate the human essence. Such policy tricks show mutilating war as a safe journey in which soldiers seek integration. This is clear when policy makers attempt to indoctrinate the bloody war with terms of identity and sacridity. This will make the people to carry out the pre-arranged programs concepts which are fixed in human head. Hooti and Mahmoudi (2013:1210) mention that " the modern man can be known as the epitome of an entity with lots of unmet expectations that aimlessly wanders in the stampede of dismayed world. Man seems to be the slave of the rotten thoughts of the authorities, who dramatize the soulless beings in an invidious ending drama". In this regard, Curtis (2006:1) writes that "on face value this fragment proposes that war is the determining principle in the flux of the cosmos; that life is in essence a conflictual struggle".

Those characters are burnt in the stove of this damned war. They seem to be in an alienable trepidation of the war in the story. The writer can successfully portray the character of the man as an escapist one under a very perpetual tensive situation of the war. This makes him delve into unreal life style to have a sense of equanimity so as to deracinate the difficult mental and real world. Hooti and Mahmoudi (2013:1211) assert that "it may seem that Pirandello wishes to presage that man is drowning into the mire of the disparaging wars. The enervated mankind that alleges to fight terrorism by doing terrorist actions, the manner that does not correspond with reality, and so if he is watching the world by a blind fold".

Pirandello provides a clear representation of those troubled people. There is a constant attention to the distressed souls of suffering characters. These characters clearly suffer from confusion and; therefore, strife to convince themselves with suitable replies. The focus is on the point when Pirandello attempts to describe an absurdity of different beliefs through portraying furious characters that pretend, beneath terror and anguish, to convince themselves in self-sacrifice. This is very clear in the following lines from Pirandello's short story:

"True...true..." "sighed the embarrassed husband", " but suppose (of course we all hope it will never be your case) a father has two sons at the front and he loses one of them, there is still one left to console him...while..."

" Yes," "answered the other, getting cross", " a son left to console him but also a son left for whom he must survive, while in the case of the father of an only son if the son dies the father can die too and put an end to his distress. Which of the two positions is worse? Don't you see how my case would be worse than yours?"

" Nonsense," interrupted another traveler,.....

" Nonsense, he repeated, trying to cover his mouth with his hand so as to hide the two missing front teeth. Nonsense. Do we give life to our own children for our own benefit?"

"The other travelers stared at him in distress. The one who had had his son at the front since the first day of the war sighed: " You are right. Our children do not belong to us, they belong to the country..."

It is clear that the discourse in this text follows an organization design of " quasi- inductive". Thereby, in the quasi-inductive design, the main idea mostly comes out at the end of a text. Also, the presentation of the interactants' purpose from the conversation is delayed. Another important feature of this text is that the items of information included in this text are linked relatively to the main points of this text.

In fact, in this text, the concluding remark does not directly pursue the order of the previous statement. Hinds (1990:89) states that "inductive writing is characterized as having the thesis statement in the final position whereas deductive writing has the thesis statement in the initial position". Noticeably, the purpose of writing such a text is to introduce several observations and attitudes related to the general topic. This will allow the readers to evaluate such observations depending on their understanding of the text.

The story setting in which the characters' discourse is produced delineates the characters' roles, their functions and underlying purposes of this discourse. The writer's role, in this discourse, is to represent the text (or speech) arrangement with

a specific care for impartiality and integrity of the text. Also, the characters' role is to represent a political, social, or even individual attitude with a relation to the whole topic of the text. A very important point to notice is that the characters (interactants in a discourse) strive to satisfy each other hunger for acceptance of their attitudes, which can be done through maximising their own attitudes to the listeners.

The importance of the characters' political discourse entails two important frames of interaction to occur at the same time. The first frame of interaction happens between the characters themselves whereas the second frame of interaction happens between the characters (interactants in a discourse) and the readers. So, the character will act as an animator of the readers' opinions so as to be influential and overheard by the men in charge. This happens despite the fact that the characters and readers are not engaged in a face to face conversation.

In fact, the characters' political discourse is a dyadic by nature. It is said by the participant in a discourse and directed to the readers so as to send a certain message. Because of the literary texts' specific conventions and the indirect interaction on the part of the readers, the discourse of the characters (in the story) seems to be relevant. This indirect relation is duly noted by the writer which marked it to be different from the familiar mechanism of other daily natural conversations.

Conclusion

Pragmatics and discourse study usually use data-based analyses. Language in general has a life when it is used in a real communication. So, it is important to study language as interaction among characters which should happen within a certain context. Research in pragmatics and discourse necessitates the understanding of the literary text as context. So, the understanding of the text is an

important point in the study of the characters' interaction. Understanding the literary text in this form can point to the perception of the characters' discourse from the pragmatic viewpoint.

It is truthful that over the pragmatic study of the characters' discourse one can notice that discourse itself produces a background for itself. Pragmatic markers make sharp the form of context. Another important point is that pragmatic research of a discourse should not be an end in itself. Rather, it goes beyond discovering the peculiarity and uniqueness of the text itself. But, still, the study of the whole topic of the short story requires the discovery of the acts of the individual utterances for each character. In this way, expanding the study of individual utterances for each character will provide an entire understanding of the discourse and the traits of the language in this literary text.

It is noticed that a certain manipulative handle of pragmatic markers is salient in this literary discourse. This is revealed by considering the manifestation of such pragmatic markers. This analysis of interactional texts (such as the text in study) requires a study of pragmatic markers in this text.

References

- Aijmer, K.(1997). " *I think*– An English Modal Particle". In Swan, T. and Westvik, O. J.(eds.). *Modality in Germanic Languages. Historical and Comparative*

Perspective. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp.1-47.

Allot, N. (2010). **Key Terms in Pragmatics.** London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Athanasiadou, A. (1990). "The Discourse Function of Questions"(revised edition). **Journal of Applied Linguistics.**Vol.9, pp.15-21. Greece:Halkidiki.

Baker, P. and Ellege, S. (2011). **Key Terms in Discourse Analysis.** London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Billig, M. (2008). "The Language of Critical Discourse Analysis: The Case of Nominalization". **Discourse and Society.**19(6). pp.783-800.

Blakemore, D. and Gallai, F. (2014). "Discourse Markers in Free Indirect Style and Interpreting". **Journal of Pragmatics.**60. pp.106-120.

Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). **Discourse Analysis.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burr, V. (1995). **An Introduction to Social Constructionism.** London: Routledge.

Curtis, N. (2006). **War and Social Theory World, Value and Identity.** London: Palgrave Macmillan. Available at:
interdisciplinary.net/ptb/www/www4/Boll%20paper.pdf

Fetzer, A.(2000). "Contextualization Cues: More-and Less-Fuzzy Hedges, Discourse Markers and Interpersonal Markers. Discourse Particles, Modal and Focal Particles and all that Stuff". **An International Conference on Particles.** Linguistic Society of Belgium: Brussels.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.

Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G. and Trew, T.(1979). *Language and Social Control*.

Routledge: London.

Fraser, B.(1996)." Pragmatic Markers". *Pragmatics*. Vol.6(2).pp.167–190.

Furko, P.(2017). "Manipulative Uses of Pragmatic Markers in Political Discourse".

Journal of *Palgrave Communication*. Vol.3,17045. Available at:

<http://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2017.54>

Hinds, J.(1990). "Inductive, Deductive, Quasi–Inductive: Expository Writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai". In U. Connor and A. M. Jones(eds.), *Coherence in Writing Research and Pedagogical Perspectives*. pp.89–109.

Alexandria VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Hooti, N.(2012). "The Suppressed and Overlooked Sobs of the War under the Shame

Shield of Honor, Heroism and Patriotism". Journal of *Basic and Applied Scientific Research*. Vol.2,N.4. pp(1308–4311).

Hooti, N. and Mahmoudi, Y.(2013). "Identity Discordianism under the Trepidation and Duplicity of Human Essence: A Trenchant Investigation on Luigi Pirandello's War". Journal of *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*.Vol.3, No.7, pp.1209–1213.

Ifantidou, E.(2001). ***Evidentials and Relevance***. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.

Lauerbach, G.(2006). " Discourse Representation in Political Interviews: The Construction of Identifiers and Relations through Voicing and Ventriloquizing". ***Journal of Pragmatics***.Vol.38(2).pp.196–215.

Maynard, S. (2017). "Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics". In ***The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics***. Natsuko Tsujimura(ed.). pp.(425–443). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405166225.ch15>

Norrby, C. and Winter, J.(2002). "Affiliation in Adolescents' Use of Discourse Extenders". ***Proceedings of the 2001 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society***. Available at: http://www.als.asn.au/proceedings/als2001/winter_norrby.pdf

Nuckolls, J.(1993). " The Semantics of Certainty in Quechua and its Implications for a Cultural Epistemology". ***Language in Society***. Vol.22(2).pp.235–255.

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1987). ***Discourse and Social Psychology. Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour***. London: Sage.

Sandova, J.(2010). ***Speaker's Involvement in Political Interviews***. M.A. thesis, Masarykova University: Brno.

Schegloff, E.(1968). ***Sequencing in Conversational Openings***. American Anthropologist. 70, 1075–95.

Simon– Vandenberg, A., White, P. and Aijmer, K.(2007). " Presupposition and 'Taking– for– Granted' in Mass Communicated Political Argument: An Illustration

from British, Flemish and Swedish Political Colloquy". In Fetzer, A. and Lauerbach, G.(eds.). ***Political Discourse in the Media***. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.pp31–75.

Stubbs, M. (1983). ***Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language***. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

van Dijk, T.A.(1993). "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis". ***Discourse and Society***. 4(2). pp.249–283.

van Leeuwen, T.(1996). " The Representation of Social Actors". in Caldas– Coulthard

CR and Coulthard M (eds.). ***Texts and Practices. Readings in Critical Discourse***

Analysis. Routledge: London, pp.32–69.

Wilson, J.(2001). "Political Discourse". In Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. and Hamilton, H.E.(eds.). ***The Handbook of Discourse Analysis***. Blackwell: Malden, MA, pp.398–414.

Wodak, R.(1989). ***Language, Power and Ideology***. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, The Netherlands/ Philadelphia, PA.

Appendix

This study is based on Pirandello's story **WAR**. Luigi Pirandello was an Italian dramatist, novelist, poet and short story writer. He was awarded the 1934 Nobel Prize in Literature.

WAR by Luigi Pirandello

The passengers who had left Rome by the night express had had to stop until dawn at the small station of Fabriano in order to continue their journey by the small old-fashioned local joining the main line with Sulmona.

At dawn, in a stuffy and smoky second-class carriage in which five people had already spent the night, a bulky woman in deep mourning was hosted in—almost like a shapeless bundle. Behind her—puffing and moaning, followed her husband—a tiny man; thin and weakly, his face death-white, his eyes small and bright and looking shy and uneasy.

Having at last taken a seat he politely thanked the passengers who had helped

his wife and who had made room for her; then he turned round to the woman trying to pull down the collar of her coat and politely inquired:

"Are you all right, dear?"

The wife, instead of answering, pulled up her collar again to her eyes, so as to hide her face. "Nasty world," muttered the husband with a sad smile.

And he felt it his duty to explain to his traveling companions that the poor woman was to be pitied for the war was taking away from her her only son, a boy of twenty to whom both had devoted their entire life, even breaking up their home at Sulmona to follow him to Rome, where he had to go as a student, then allowing him to volunteer for war with an assurance, however, that at least six months he would not be sent to the front and now, all of a sudden, receiving a wire saying that he was due to leave in three days' time and asking them to go and see him off.

The woman under the big coat was twisting and wriggling, at times growling like a wild animal, feeling certain that all those explanations would not have aroused even a shadow of sympathy from those people who—most likely—were in the same plight as herself. One of them, who had been listening with particular attention, said:

"You should thank God that your son is only leaving now for the front. Mine has been sent there the first day of the war. He has already come back twice wounded and been sent back again to the front."

"What about me? I have two sons and three nephews at the front," said another passenger. "Maybe, but in our case it is our *only* son," ventured the husband.

"What difference can it make? You may spoil your only son by excessive

attentions, but you cannot love him more than you would all your other children if you had any. Parental love is not like bread that can be broken to pieces and split amongst the children in equal shares. A father gives *all* his love to each one of his children without discrimination, whether it be one or ten, and if I am suffering now for my two sons, I am not suffering half for each of them but double..."

"True...true..." sighed the embarrassed husband, "but suppose (of course we all hope it will never be your case) a father has two sons at the front and he loses one of them, there is still one left to console him...while..."

"Yes," answered the other, getting cross, "a son left to console him but also a son left for whom he must survive, while in the case of the father of an only son if the son dies the father can die too and put an end to his distress. Which of the two positions is worse? Don't you see how my case would be worse than yours?"

"Nonsense," interrupted another traveler, a fat, red-faced man with bloodshot eyes of the palest gray.

He was panting. From his bulging eyes seemed to spurt inner violence of an uncontrolled vitality which his weakened body could hardly contain.

"Nonsense," he repeated, trying to cover his mouth with his hand so as to hide the two missing front teeth. "Nonsense. Do we give life to our own children for our own benefit?"

The other travelers stared at him in distress. The one who had had his son at the front since the first day of the war sighed: "You are right. Our children do not belong to us, they belong to the country..."

"Bosh," retorted the fat traveler. "Do we think of the country when we give life to our children? Our sons are born because...well, because they must be born and when they come to life they take our own life with them. This is the truth. We belong to them but they never belong to us. And when they reach twenty they are exactly what we were at their age. We too had a father and mother, but there were so many other things as well...girls, cigarettes, illusions, new ties...and the Country, of course, whose call we would have answered—when we were twenty—even if father and mother had said no. Now, at our age, the love of our Country is still great, of course, but stronger than it is the love of our children. Is there any one of us here who wouldn't gladly take his son's place at the front if he could?"

There was a silence all round, everybody nodding as to approve.

"Why then," continued the fat man, "should we consider the feelings of our children when they are twenty? Isn't it natural that at their age they should consider the love for their Country (I am speaking of decent boys, of course) even greater than the love for us? Isn't it natural that it should be so, as after all they must look upon us as upon old boys who cannot move anymore and must sit at home? If Country is a natural necessity like bread of which each of us must eat in order not to die of hunger, somebody must go to defend it. And our sons go, when they are twenty, and they don't want tears, because if they die, they die inflamed and happy (I am speaking, of course, of decent boys). Now, if one dies young and happy, without having the ugly sides of life, the boredom of it, the pettiness, the bitterness of disillusion...what more can we ask for him? Everyone should stop crying; everyone should laugh, as I do...or at least thank God—as I do—because my son, before dying, sent me a message saying that he was dying satisfied at having ended his life in the best way he could have wished. That is why, as you see, I do not even wear mourning..."

He shook his light fawn coat as to show it; his livid lip over his missing teeth was trembling, his eyes were watery and motionless, and soon after he ended with a shrill laugh which might well have been a sob.

"Quite so...quite so..." agreed the others.

The woman who, bundled in a corner under her coat, had been sitting and listening had—for the last three months—tried to find in the words of her husband and her friends something to console her in her deep sorrow, something that might show her how a mother should resign herself to send her son not even to death but to a probable danger of life. Yet not a word had she found amongst the many that had been said...and her grief had been greater in seeing that nobody—as she thought—could share her feelings.

But now the words of the traveler amazed and almost stunned her. She suddenly realized that it wasn't the others who were wrong and could not understand her but herself who could not rise up to the same height of those fathers and mothers willing to resign themselves, without crying, not only to the departure of their sons but even to their death.

She lifted her head, she bent over from her corner trying to listen with great attention to the details which the fat man was giving to his companions about the way his son had fallen as a hero, for his King and his Country, happy and without regrets. It seemed to her that she had stumbled into a world she had never dreamt of, a world so far unknown to her, and she was so pleased to hear everyone joining in congratulating that brave father who could so stoically speak of his child's death.

Then suddenly, just as if she had heard nothing of what had been said and almost as if waking up from a dream, she turned to the old man, asking him:

"Then...is your son really dead?"

Everyone stared at her. The old man, too, turned to look at her, fixing his great, bulging, horribly watery light gray eyes, deep in her face. For some time he tried to answer, but words failed him. He looked and looked at her, almost as if only then—at that silly, incongruous question—he had suddenly realized at last that his son was really dead—gone forever—forever. His face contracted, became horribly distorted, then he snatched in haste a handkerchief from his pocket and, to the amazement of everyone, broke into harrowing, heart-breaking, uncontrollable sobs.