

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет
Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

КУРСОВА РОБОТА

з мовознавства

на тему: **Непрямі мовленнєві акти в сучасному
англомовному дискурсі**

Студентки 4 курсу групи МЛп 05-20
Факультету германської філології і перекладу
Напряму підготовки 035 “Філологія”
Спеціальності Германські мови та літератури
(переклад включно), перша – англійська
Бугель Юлії Василівни
Керівник **Березенко В. М.**,
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент

Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів: ____ Оцінка: ЄКТС _____

Члени комісії

_____	_____
(підпис)	(прізвище та ініціали)
_____	_____
(підпис)	(прізвище та ініціали)
_____	_____
(підпис)	(прізвище та ініціали)

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Kyiv National Linguistic University
Department of Germanic and Finno-Ugric Philology

COURSE PAPER

Indirect speech acts in Modern English discourse

BUHEL YULIIA

Group MLa 05-20

Germanic Philology and Translation Faculty

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. **VICTORIIA BEREZENKO**

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv 2024

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS.....	6
1.1. Speech Act Theory: Foundations and Developments.....	6
1.2. Classification and Functions of Indirect Speech Acts.....	7
1.3. Pragmatic Principles Governing Indirect Speech Acts.....	10
Conclusions to Chapter 1.....	12
CHAPTER 2. INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS IN VARIOUS DISCOURSES.....	13
2.1. Indirect Speech Acts in Political Discourse.....	13
2.2. Indirect Speech Acts in Social Media Discourse.....	14
Conclusions to Chapter 2.....	16
CHAPTER 3. PRAGMATIC IMPLICATIONS OF INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS.....	17
3.1. Understanding and Misunderstanding Indirect Speech Acts.....	17
3.2. The Role of Indirect Speech Acts in Politeness Strategies.....	19
Conclusions to Chapter 3.....	21
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	22
PE3IOME.....	24
LITERATURE CITED.....	25
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIALS.....	26

INTRODUCTION

Indirect speech acts, a nuanced and intricate aspect of communication, serve not only as a linguistic phenomenon but also as a window into the socio-pragmatic fabric of language use. The significance of this study lies in its aim to unravel the complexities of how indirectness shapes, and is shaped by, the dynamics of modern discourse, thereby offering insights into the interplay between language form, function, and context.

The novelty of the research of this research is its comprehensive focus on Modern English discourse across various platforms and contexts, including digital communication, media, literature, and everyday conversations. By adopting a cross-disciplinary approach that integrates insights from pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis, this thesis endeavors to shed light on the multifaceted roles that indirect speech acts play in communication. This investigation is particularly timely, given the evolving landscape of English language use in an increasingly digital and globalized world.

Historically, the study of speech acts has predominantly centered on their direct forms, with seminal works by Austin and Searle laying the groundwork for understanding how actions are performed through words. However, the subtleties of indirect speech acts, where the literal meaning diverges from the intended communicative function, demand a nuanced analysis that accounts for the inferential processes involved in their interpretation. This gap in speech act theory, where the interconnection between linguistic form and pragmatic function in indirect speech acts remains underexplored, motivates the current research.

The topicality of this study is underscored by the increasing importance of effective communication in a diverse range of settings. Understanding the strategic use of indirectness can enhance communicative clarity, foster positive interpersonal relations, and mitigate conflict. Furthermore, this research contributes to the pedagogical field by providing insights that can inform the teaching of pragmatics and discourse analysis, particularly in ESL/EFL contexts where non-native speakers navigate the complexities of indirectness in English.

The object of research is the manifestation and function of indirect speech acts within Modern English discourse.

The subject of research delves into the pragmatic mechanisms that govern the interpretation and production of indirect speech acts, examining how context, speaker intentions, and sociocultural norms influence their realization.

The aim of research is to dissect the nominative and pragmatic aspects of indirect speech acts in Modern English discourse, offering a comparative analysis across different communicative contexts to highlight patterns of use and interpretation. This objective encompasses several key **tasks**:

1. To review existing literature on speech act theory, with a focus on indirect speech acts, to establish a theoretical framework for analysis.

2. To identify and categorize instances of indirect speech acts in a corpus of Modern English discourse drawn from varied sources.

3. To analyze the pragmatic functions of these indirect speech acts, considering factors such as politeness strategies, context-dependency, and speaker-hearer dynamics.

4. To compare and contrast the use and interpretation of indirect speech acts across different contexts to uncover underlying principles and variations.

Accordingly, to fulfill the tasks set we used the following theoretical and practical methods of research:

- theoretical analysis of the reference literature according to the chosen topic;
- method of linguistic text analysis;
- descriptive method to characterize and estimate the linguistic facts.

In fulfilling these objectives, this research aspires to contribute to a deeper understanding of the strategic use of language in conveying subtlety, managing social interactions, and navigating the complexities of modern communication.

CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS

1.1. Speech Act Theory: Foundations and Developments

A speech act is a fundamental component of linguistic communication. It is expressed through a person's words. Phrases and sentences, which are fundamental pieces of a speech act, get lexical content in human speech and serve as bearers of specific information.

For clarity of understanding, it is necessary to define what a speech act, direct and indirect speech act are. A speech act is a purposeful speech action carried out in accordance with the principles and rules of speech behavior accepted in this society; the minimum unit of normative socio-speech behavior considered within the limits of a pragmatic situation (Smith, 1990, p. 97). A direct speech act is an act in which the illocutionary goal of the addressee is directly expressed with the help of speech markers specially intended for this purpose – illocutionary indicators (Smith, 1990, p. 98). An indirect speech act is a speech act (oral utterance, expression, sentence, speech act, speech act of the addressee (author)), the meaning of which is derived not literally, but based on subtext, hidden meaning (Smith, 1990, p. 100).

J. Austin (Austin, 1981, p. 113), an English philosopher, made the first comprehensive findings on the structure of speech actions in lectures in 1955. In his perspective, the cornerstone of the speech act is the speaker's purpose, that is, the desire to realize which will result in particular actions. The intention might be visible (open) or latent (hidden). Indirect speech actions are associated with displaying purpose, but this relies on the genre and conditions of communication.

Building upon Austin's ideas, American philosopher John Searle further developed speech act theory in the 1960s and 1970s. In his book "Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language" (Searle, 1976, p. 94), Searle proposed a systematic framework for analyzing speech acts and introduced the concept of speech act types, such as assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.

Searle (Searle, 1976, p. 101) defined the criteria for specifying speech acts and the context in which they are considered functional. He began by explaining that regular communication circumstances must exist, such as the speaker and hearer sharing a same language, both being able to hear, and so on.

Overall, speech act theory remains a foundational concept in the study of language and communication, providing valuable insights into how language is used not only to convey information but also to perform actions and shape social interactions.

1.2. Classification and Functions of Indirect Speech Acts

According to J. Austin (Austin, 1981, p. 124), the speech act can be considered at three levels:

- locution (an act of speech);
- illocution (an act consisting in speech);
- perlocution (an act carried out with the help of speech).

Locution is an aspect of a speech act in which something is voiced. This is about the sound itself. It doesn't matter in what context, in relation to what, and with what expectations it was said. When a speaker says "It's hot here!" or exclaims "Oh!", he (or she) first of all makes a sound.

Illocution is an informative aspect of a speech act. Every speaking act contains some information. Saying "It's hot here!" conveys the information that the location where this line was said is hot. Exclaiming "Oh!" indicates that we are hurt, surprised or terrified. Making sound (a locution) differs from conveying knowledge (an illocution). When someone slams a door, for example, they produce a sound, yet that sound has no information because it is made without the goal of saying something.

Perlocution is an aspect of the speech act associated with expectations of a certain reaction to the transmitted information. When the addressee says: "It's hot here!" he (or she) expects, for example, that the addressee will open the window. By shouting "Oh!", you can hope that someone will come to help. If there are no expectations, then there is no speech act. Even Aristotle (Smith, 1990, p. 47)

believed that the purposeful cause is the main one among the four causes he deduced, since no action takes place without a purpose.

According to John Searle (Searle, 1976, p. 117), another co-creator of the theory of speech acts, a locution consists of an act of utterance (corresponding to Austin's phonetic and phatic acts) and a propositional act (corresponding to Austin's rhetorical act) (Austin, 1981, p. 138). The propositional act includes reference and predication.

Indirect speech acts are studied not only by the theory of language communication, but also, in particular, by stylistics, which studies such phenomena as allusion and hint, allusion, word play, etc. These language means were considered only as stylistic techniques and only after development of the theory of speech acts received new coverage.

The main difference between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts lies in the former's focus on achieving a planned communicative goal, which is implemented in accordance with conventionalized patterns established in a certain culture, which determine culturally determined norms of behavior.

Thus, the rules of illocution are in the plane of pragmatics, not linguistics, and the intentional and conventional components of the illocutionary act illustrate the contradiction between the subjective as the speaker's intention and the objective as the speaker-independent ways of recognizing the intention by the communication participants.

The study of illocution as the intention and/or purpose of speech allowed John Searle to create a classification model of speech acts, in which the scientist distinguished five classes (Searle, 1976, p. 121):

- 1) representative (informative speech acts);
- 2) directives;
- 3) commissives (acceptance obligations);
- 4) expressives (acts that clearly express the emotional state of the speaker);
- 5) declaratives (acts like establishment).

The author refers representatives to speech acts that are characterized by the truth and consistency of the content of the statement, for example, statements of facts, descriptions, judgments, statements, which are evaluated on the scale "true-false" (Searle, 1976, p. 122).

Directives are "imperative" speech acts, they have an imperative illocutionary orientation", that is, they try to force the listener to do something. By implementing them, the speaker actually forces (orders, forces) the addressee to implement (or not to implement something). The specificity of directives is that they oblige the interlocutor to take into account the wishes or needs of the speaker (Searle, 1976, p. 123).

Declaratives are represented by speech acts, the purpose of which is to encourage the recipient to act. Declaratives are implemented in invitations, offers, demands, etc (Searle, 1976, p. 123).

Commissives are speech acts, the purpose of which is to impose an obligation on the speaker to perform a certain action or force him to follow certain rules in the future (Searle, 1976, p. 124).

Expressives express the speaker's emotional state, so they do not involve the speaker's adaptation to the communicative situation. With the help of expressives, the speaker expresses his attitude, mood, wishes, evaluation or maintains social contacts (through greetings, congratulations, sympathy, etc.) with other participants of communication according to the rules of social etiquette (Searle, 1976, p. 124).

The author refers to declaratives as speech acts, which are the embodiment of the correspondence between the content of the statement and non-speech reality. The main feature of speech acts of the declarative type is that their successful implementation changes the status or conditions of the specified objects. Declaratives require the speaker to possess appropriate professional competence and are implemented in such conventionalized speech acts as baptism, wedding, public appointment to a position, sentencing, awarding of prizes and awards, official and ceremonial opening of conferences, etc.

1.3. Pragmatic Principles Governing Indirect Speech Acts

The principles of communicative-pragmatic governing indirect speech are most fully formulated in the work of Paul Grice “Logic and linguistic communication” (Grice, 1975, p. 67) and in the work of Brown and Levinson “Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage” (Brown, Levinson, 1987, p. 74).

In his theory, P. Grice (Grice, 1975, p. 70) proposes the concept of "communicative implicatures", the main principle of which is the Principle of Cooperation. Observance of the latter is expected from the participants of the dialogue for its successful conduct. Justifying this principle, the researcher notes that, usually, dialogue is to one degree or another a joint activity of participants, each of whom recognizes a common goal (or direction of dialogue) for both of them.

A goal or direction of this kind can be set from the very beginning (for example, when the subject of discussion is named), or it can be revealed in the process of communication. The goal can be clearly defined, but sometimes it is so vague that the interlocutors are left with a wide space for talking about "nothing" (any not important topic, for example, about weather).

So, P. Grice (Grice, 1975, p. 75) assumes the presence of a large number of rules (*maxims*), assumptions that regulate the course of language communication. These maxims arise on the basis of generally accepted rational considerations and are guidelines for the effective use of language for cooperative purposes.

The principle of cooperation has its specific statements, which the scientist divides into four categories (Grice, 1975, p. 80): Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relation and Maxim of Manner. These maxims are the key to effective, rational dialogue.

The Maxim of Quantity is related to the amount of information that needs to be transferred. It should be guided by the following statements (Grice, 1975, p. 82):

- “Your statement should contain no less information than necessary”;
- “Your statement should not contain more information than necessary”.

To the Maxim of Quality Grice includes the statement "Try to make your statement true", which leads to the following statements (Grice, 1975, p. 84):

- "Don't say what is false in your opinion";
- "Don't say what you don't have sufficient grounds for".

With the Maxim of Relation, Grice connects only one statement – the statement of relevance: "Do not deviate from the topic." The researcher considers that this maxim causes serious difficulties (namely, regarding the types and foci of relevance, because they can shift in the process of language communication and change the subject of conversation).

The Maxim of Manner refers not to **what** is said (like other maxims), but to **how** it is said. The researcher attributes one general statement to this maxim: "Speak clearly." But he supplemented it with the following statements (Grice, 1975, p. 88):

- "Avoid unclear expressions";
- "Avoid ambiguity".

However, the researcher notes (Grice, 1975, p. 90) that the Principle of Cooperation can be avoided. Communicators only orient themselves to these principles in most normal dialogues in such a way that even if the communication violates these principles, most are aware that this orientation is necessary.

There is also Politeness theory, developed by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (Brown, Levinson, 1987, p. 80), which suggests that people use language to maintain positive social relationships and mitigate potential threats. In indirect speech acts, speakers often choose politeness or indirect language to convey requests, orders, opinions, or refusals. Listeners consider politeness strategies such as positive politeness (emphasizing solidarity) or negative politeness (emphasizing difference) when interpreting indirect speech acts.

Using these pragmatic principles, we may efficiently negotiate the complexities of indirect speech acts and infer the speaker's intended meaning. Understanding the pragmatic rules controlling indirect speech actions is critical for effective communication and deciphering the implicit signals provided by language.

Conclusions to Chapter 1

1. Speech act theory has been created and modified throughout time by researchers from different fields. Researchers have explored the importance of context, intention, social norms, and cultural elements in speech act interpretation, resulting in a better understanding of how language is used to carry out activities and achieve communicative goals.
2. In the course of the study, we studied the difference between the concepts of "speech act", "direct speech act" and "indirect speech act". A speech act is a purposeful speech action; a direct speech act is an act in which the illocutionary goal of the addressee is directly expressed with the help of speech markers (illocutionary indicators); an indirect speech act is a speech act, the meaning of which is derived not literally, but based on subtext, hidden meaning.
3. Such researchers as J. Austin, J. Searle tried to classify all speech acts. That is, the empirical method was used in their theories. But unfortunately, the concept of speech acts (in particular, indirect ones) is too vague and has many nuances that are still the subject of research by other scientists. Nowadays, we have only rough sketches of each of the types of speech acts.
4. The principles of communicative-pragmatic governing indirect speech are most fully formulated in the work of P. Grice "Logic and linguistic communication" and in the work of Brown and Levinson "Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage". Each of their work shows us a theory about indirect speech and its features. Grice proposes the Principle of Cooperation, and Brown & Levinson proposes Politeness Theory. These works of theirs are still the foundation of many studies.
5. In general, an indirect speech act is recognized within the scope of a given communication act, taking into account all of its components without exception. The communicative ability of the communication partners, as well as the environment and setting in which the communication occurs, are all important considerations.

CHAPTER 2. INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS IN VARIOUS DISCOURSES

2.1. Indirect Speech Acts in Political Discourse

So, we remember that in indirect speech acts the addressee is not the actual addressee. In them, addressing a specific person is symbolic. This is just a way to influence the audience as a whole or one of those present during the speech act.

An indirect speech act happens when a speaker says something but intends to convey something other than or in addition to the literal meaning of his words. In politics, it is used for a following purposes (Fairclough, 2013, p. 66):

- Plausible denial. Politicians utilize indirect speech to make remarks that they may later retract or claim were misinterpreted (for example, if they spark controversy).
- Softening criticism. By critiquing indirectly, politicians may address delicate subjects without looking harsh, resulting in a more diplomatic or optimistic image.
- Indirect speech helps politicians to deliver themes that connect differently with different groups, allowing them to reach a larger audience while avoiding alienating others.
- Avoiding clear answers. Indirect language allows politicians to avoid giving clear answers to difficult topics, so avoiding commitments or contentious positions.

If we are talking about an indirect speech act in political discourse (in particular, in political speeches), then it is worth separately distinguishing a **metaphor** as the use of words in an indirect sense (as a metaphor) (Генералюк, 2009, с. 41).

J. Lakoff (Lakoff, 1992, p. 206) in his theory claims that when the speaker uses metaphors, he transforms "initial information" into "final information", that is, that which will form the recipient's opinion. The subject of this "ultimate" information is unfamiliar to him, and the metaphor compares unfamiliar information with something already known. Theoretically, every metaphorical statement is an

indirect speech act. It establishes or more often helps to establish a connection between familiar and unfamiliar topics for the recipient of information.

Metaphor, as a stylistic device employed in political speech texts, allows the audience to understand what is said and provides an alternate perspective of the problem presented by the politician (Самойлова, Подвойська, 2016, с. 54). Metaphor, relaying the properties and features of real-life objects to political phenomena, creates images and constructs in people's minds that become templates in their political views and behavior.

2.2. Indirect Speech Acts in Social Media Discourse

Indirect speech actions in media discourse are crucial for affecting public opinion, communicating narratives, and framing stories. These speech acts allow media outlets and journalists to communicate information, ideas, and critiques in subtle, suggestive, or coded ways rather than direct and overtly. This method has the potential to impact how the audience perceives and interprets events, situations, and persons (Van Dijk, 2006, p. 149).

There are several reasons why is indirect speech employed in media discourse (Richardson, 2007, p. 47):

1. Media professionals might employ indirect speech to provide the impression of neutrality while discreetly influencing the viewer to a specific perception or perspective.
2. Indirect speech can assist the media in avoiding potential legal implications for disinformation or defamation, as well as navigating censorship or limits on press freedom.
3. Using suggestion and allusion, the media may inspire the audience to read between the lines, so increasing engagement through active interpretation.
4. When discussing contentious or sensitive matters, indirect communication can soften the tone and alleviate unfavorable emotions or concerns.

Considering, in particular, media discourse in the format of social networks, the above-mentioned aspects are even more stable than in official publications,

newspapers or magazines, because social networks do not have a clear list of rules for mastering a certain style of language.

If we are talking in particular about news channels in social networks (or any news that is submitted from a certain account of a certain person), then we have the following features of using indirect speech acts (Farzana, Ummul, 2017, p. 17):

- Media stories may indicate a connection between two events or persons without explicitly expressing it, enabling the viewer to derive the desired conclusions. For example, mentioning a someone's (politician or celebrity) visit to a country that was shortly followed by policy changes, without outright stating which caused which.
- Journalists frequently cite sources indirectly when reporting controversial ideas or remarks without adopting those views as the publication's viewpoint. This strategy can introduce disputed ideas while keeping the media source separate from them.
- Indirect speech is frequently employed in media to frame tales in certain ways, catching the reader's attention or directing their perception before they ever read the piece. A title may indicate a story or pose a question ("*Is this the end of Britney Spears' career as we know it?*" (23)) without making a clear assertion. This can encourage readers to interpret the material in the article via a specific perspective.
- Editorial nuance: Indirect speech is regularly used in editorials and opinion articles to quietly criticize or defend prominent people and policies. An op-ed may ask rhetorical questions or hypothetical scenarios that indicate a viewpoint or consequence, enabling readers to arrive at a conclusion without being overtly informed what to believe.

Indirect speech acts are used quite widely not only in news channels of social networks, but also in online stores located in those networks. In advertising, they often perform various literary functions, such as representative (product information) or expressive (admiration of product qualities). But the pragmatic goal of product advertising is only one: "*Buy it right now.*" (22) (Ильгаев, 2019, с. 39)

Basically, slogans in advertising have an indirect instruction or order, which, in turn, are hidden behind either a representative function or a promise and carry an imperative subtext. For example: “*Skittles – Taste the Rainbow.*” (22) (Шуґаев, 2019, с. 41)

Therefore, the reasons for the use of indirect speech acts can be different. It is a softening of the communicative intention, and the removal of responsibility for one's words, and the performance of an improper communicative task, etc.

Conclusions to Chapter 2

1. The use of indirect speech enables politicians to negotiate complicated social and political settings, but it may also lead to allegations of evasion, non-commitment, or manipulation.
2. When we analyzing political speech, we understood how language is strategically used to shape messages, influence public opinion, and manage political relationships. Indirect speech actions, when employed correctly, may play an important part in the complex realm of political communication.
3. The purposeful use of indirect speech in media discourse may have a considerable influence on how the public interprets news and events. It enables media outlets to traverse difficult social, political, and legal landscapes, providing a means to interact with delicate themes, critique without confrontation, and suggest narratives without making outright assertions.
4. Indirect speech acts in media discourse are a very ambiguous phenomenon. Used properly and professionally, they can improve journalism, promote critical thinking, and get the fine line between objectivity and propaganda. However, they require a delicate balance to avoid misinterpretation and maintain authority and trust with the audience.

CHAPTER 3. PRAGMATIC IMPLICATIONS OF INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS

3.1. Understanding and Misunderstanding Indirect Speech Acts

Speech act misunderstandings arise when two participants have different understandings of the discourse role of a given speech. For example, one speaker could interpret a statement as an assertion, but another interprets it as a request. Although many scholars have explored the difficulty of preventing misunderstanding (for example, by correcting misconceptions), no one has previously addressed the problem of discovering and resolving misunderstandings that have happened (Бабич, 1996, с. 108).

Indirect speech actions occur when a speaker says one thing but means another, or more, depending on context and common knowledge to deduce the true intended. This subtle mode of communication may improve conversations while also leading to misunderstandings if the suggested message is not obvious to all those involved.

Understanding indirect speech actions entails recognizing the literal meaning, the context, the relationship between the speakers, and cultural norms that may impact interpretation. Misunderstandings arise when any of these factors are mismatched or when assumptions about common knowledge are inaccurate (Гладуш, 2005, с. 41).

We can encounter the understanding or misunderstanding of an indirect speech act everywhere, including in everyday life. As already noted, indirect speech acts are often used to show politeness (indirectness can be a way to soften a request or criticism, making it more socially acceptable), to comply with certain social norms (certain cultures or situations prefer or require indirectness to maintain harmony or respect), or emphasizing ambiguity (this allows the speaker to maintain a plausible objection without making a direct statement or request).

When we talk about understanding and misunderstanding, it is worth mentioning the work of the scientist who was already mentioned in our study – John

Searle (Searle, 1976, p. 168). As already mentioned in the theoretical part of the work, speech acts are classified in the following way: locution, illocution and perlocution. John Searle claims that a locution consists of an act of expression and a **propositional act** (Searle, 1976, p. 170). The propositional act, in turn, includes **reference** and **predication**. Reference is a speech act by which something is defined by a certain term. Predication is a speech act that describes the properties of something.

The sentence "*The cup is ceramic*" is a propositional act. The part of the sentence in which the thing was called the word "cup" is a reference. Connecting it with the word "*ceramic*", that is, a property of a thing, is a predication. The object of reference (the thing it is about) is called the **referent**. The referent does not have to be a material thing. These can be actions, events, fictional things, etc.

The practical use of reference can entail certain problems in everyday language. For example, in the sentence "*Kardashian released a new collection*" (23), we can't immediately correctly understand which celebrity from the entire Kardashian family we're talking about (without additional context). This can cause misunderstanding in the further conversation. To avoid such problems, the **reference** has several requirements (Marina, 2002, p. 55):

- the function of the statement is the presentation of some specific thing (when we use the word "Kardashian", we know exactly which of them we are talking about);
- the function of reference is to present to the addressee some specific thing;
- the addressee should use only those expressions that, in his opinion, meet the previous requirements;
- each addressee can make a mistake regarding the understanding of the addressee (even when someone uses the word "*Kardashian*" among other celebrities, without clarifying the meaning, there is no certainty that he was understood correctly);
- each addressee can also make a mistake.

According to J. Searle (Searle, 1976, p. 178), predication is not a separate speech act, but only a part of a propositional act. Therefore, in order to avoid misunderstanding, it is important to have a clear reference so that the receiver understands you correctly.

3.2. The Role of Indirect Speech Acts in Politeness Strategies

Many indirect speech acts are on the way to standardizing speech expressions in typical situations. For example, phrases like "*May I offer you a glass of water?*" (24) are more often perceived as a suggestion rather than a question or request for permission.

Formal interrogative sentences "*Don't you have a lighter?*" (24), "*Don't you know what date it is today?*" (24) are standard expressions of request. In the field of indirect speech acts, the most fruitful is the study of persuasive illocutionary acts. Because due to the accepted requirements of politeness in speech communication, it is often inappropriate to use direct imperative sentences like "*Get out of the room!*" (24) or explicit performative sentences like "*I command you to get out of here!*" (24), and therefore we look for indirect means to realize our illocutionary goals (Ellis, 1992, p. 71).

Polite addresses are very common in English discourse, and because of this, it is enriched with unacceptable speech acts. For example, "*Could you pass me the sauce?*" (24) instead of "*Pass me the sauce!*" (24). Politeness is used to reduce tension in communication and maintain harmony between interlocutors.

Most of us may give vote to indirect speech acts. The occurrence of the imperative in orders or requests is misreferred in many languages, including English, despite its status as the 'genuine' expression of the speech act 'order' or 'request' (). Levinson (Levinson, 1983, p. 37) remarks that most usages of requests are indirect, whereas imperatives are rarely used to command or request.

There are many reasons why we tend to use indirect speech acts, especially for requests and commands. Leech (Leech, 1983, p. 88) proposed six maxims known as the principle of politeness in terms of "cost" and "benefit" in the broadest sense:

1. Maxim of Tact.
2. Maxim of Generosity.
3. Maxim of Approbation.
4. Maxim of Modesty.
5. Maxim of Agreement.
6. Maxim of Sympathy.

This implies that most of the time, people adhere to such rules in ordinary interactions, whether consciously or subconsciously, and we know that people communicate in an attempt to "minimize" their own "benefit" and "maximize" the other's "cost" in order to be more courteous. It is mutually accepted as the more acceptable and anticipated social behavior of both parties in a pleasant discussion or interaction. Anyone who breaks such norms will be deemed impolite.

These maxims explain why certain statements are comparably polite, some are not so polite, and others are rude, as evidenced by unusual language use. The first maxim is the most basic of the six. It is because the tact maxim is applied to commands, which can best convey politeness (Leech, 1983, p. 89). Let's consider some examples (24):

- 1) Would it be possible for you to take me some time?
- 2) Could you take me some time?
- 3) Will you take me some time?
- 4) Listen to me!
- 5) You have to listen to me.

By intuition, we can tell that the chain of requests conveying the same message becomes increasingly disrespectful from top to bottom. The first example is the politest, while the fifth is the most disrespectful. The auxiliary verb "would" and the possibility word "possible" in Example 1 allow the audience to make their own decisions. Example 5 depicts an order with the auxiliary word "must".

This list of expressions is organized from one that reduces the expense of another to one that maximizes the benefit of another. There is a huge number of phrases from which to pick depending on the occasion or context. Under diverse

conditions, we cannot ignore "appropriateness of language" (Smith, 1990, p. 29). The polite ones are comparably more desired statements for most circumstances; yet, even among the polite utterances, we must pick the optimal decision based on the speech context.

Conclusions to Chapter 3

1. Understanding indirect speech acts includes recognizing the literal meaning, context, speaker relationships, and cultural norms that may influence interpretation. Misunderstandings occur when any of these characteristics are misaligned, or when assumptions about common knowledge are incorrect.
2. The objective of any conversation is mutual comprehension. Recognizing the importance of indirect speech actions and knowing how to use them effectively may improve interpersonal communication and lessen the possibility of confusion.
3. We learned that a locution consists of an act of expression and a propositional. The propositional act, in turn, includes reference and predication. Reference is a speech act by which something is defined by a certain term. Predication is a speech act that describes the properties of something.
4. The object of reference is called the referent. The referent does not have to be a material thing (these can be actions, events, fictional things, etc), but it is a very important part. To avoid misunderstandings, we highlighted several requirements to the right reference.
5. The use of indirect speech acts in English-language discourse reflects cultural norms and values societies where directness is often perceived as impolite or offensive. Also, authors are able to convey complex emotions and ideas while maintaining a sense of politeness and respect.
6. Polite addresses are frequent in English conversation, which has resulted in an increase of improper speech behaviors. Politeness is used to minimize stress in conversation and promote harmony among interlocutors.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Concluding our research, we can highlight the following points:

1. The problem of a specific final typology of indirect speech acts is still relevant in linguistic research and does not have a final form. To date, no works (analyses or researchers) have been found in which an in-depth analysis of illocutionary acts was carried out.
2. It was determined that an indirect speech act performs not only the function of transmitting information and demands or requests of the addressee, but also outlines the direct attitude of the addressee to this issue. Indirect speech acts are heterogeneous in nature.
3. We also studied the definition of the concepts of "speech act", "direct speech act" and "indirect speech act". So, a speech act is a purposeful speech action; a direct speech act is an act in which the illocutionary goal of the addressee is directly expressed with the help of speech markers (illocutionary indicators); an indirect speech act is a speech act, the meaning of which is derived not literally, but based on subtext, hidden meaning.
4. As already mentioned, despite the fact that there is no single classification of indirect speech acts, and there are only separate small classifications of scientists, there are many means of transmitting different types of indirect speech acts. These tools were discovered on the basis of a detailed study of examples, as well as on the basis of their own examples from real communicative situations. Existing methods and transformations do not help to solve the problem of the typology of indirect speech acts.
5. The style of human communication varies in everyday situations (this happens for various reasons). Someone prefers direct requests, and someone prefers indirect communication (through subtext).
6. We also studied the principle of politeness (through six Maxims) of Leech: Maxim of Tact; Maxim of Generosity; Maxim of Approbation; Maxim of Modesty; Maxim of Agreement; Maxim of Sympathy. All of them are present

in our daily interactions most of the time, consciously or subconsciously. Thanks to them, we know that people communicate in an attempt to "minimize" their own "benefit" and "maximize" the other's "cost" in order to be more courteous. This is mutually accepted as the more acceptable and expected social behavior of both parties in a pleasant discussion or interaction. Anyone who violates these rules will be considered impolite.

7. It is generally accepted that the more indirect a speech act, the more polite a person is among strangers or acquaintances (although, on the contrary, it can often seem strange among close friends). As a result, their interpretations are critical to improving communication skills and maintaining happy social relationships.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Дослідження на тему «Непрямі мовленнєві акти в сучасному англomовному дискурсі» присвячене вивченню теорії мовленнєвих актів, зокрема, непрямих, у сучасному англomовному дискурсі. Курсова робота складається зі вступу, трьох розділів, загальних висновків, списку літератури та списку ілюстративних джерел.

Перший розділ «**Theoretical Foundations Of Indirect Speech Acts**» («Теоретичні основи актів непрямой мови») – теоретичний. У ньому розглядаються основні положення непрямих мовленнєвих актів, вивчається їх історичне походження та класифікація.

Другий розділ «**Indirect Speech Acts In Various Discourses**» («Непрямі мовленнєві дії в різноманітних дискурсах») – теоретично-аналітичний. У ньому представлено аналіз особливостей вираження непрямомовленнєвого акту зокрема у сучасних політичному та медійному дискурсах, на основі ілюстративного матеріалу дібраного з сучасних англomовних статей, новин та політичних виступів.

У третьому розділі «**Pragmatic Implications Of Indirect Speech Acts**» («Прагматичні наслідки непрямих мовленнєвих актів») розглядається принцип (та випадки) розуміння та неправильне розуміння непрямих мовленнєвих актів, а також роль непрямих мовленнєвих актів у стратегіях ввічливості.

Ключові слова: теорія мовленнєвих актів, непряма мова, політичний дискурс, медіа дискурс, стратегія ввічливості.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Бабич, Е. Н. (1996). Рефлексія у діалозі та проблема істинності та хибності висловлювання. *Вісник Харківського державного університету*. № 386. Харків: Константа.
2. Генералюк, І. І. (2009). Метафора як засіб маніпулювання у політичному дискурсі. *Проблеми сучасної психології*. Збірник наукових праць КПНУ імені Івана Огієнка, Інституту психології ім. Г. С. Костюка АПН України. Випуск 6. Київ.
3. Гладуш, Н. Ф. (2005). Основи прагматичної таксономії непрямих мовленнєвих актів. *Вісник Сумського держ. Університету*. №5 (77). Серія: «Філологічні науки».
4. Самойлова, І. В., Подвойська, О. В. (2016). Лексичні особливості політичних промов. *Наукові записки НДУ ім. М. Гоголя*. Філологічні науки.
5. Шугаєв, А. В. (2019). Медіа-дискурс крізь призму когнітивної лінгвістики. Житомирський державний університет ім. І. Франка.
6. Austin, J. L. (1981). *How to Do Things With Words*. Second Edition. *Harvard: University Press*.
7. Bell, A. (1996). *The language of news media*. *Oxford: Blackwell*.
8. Brown, P., Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge, *Cambridge University Press*.
9. Chilton, P., Schaffner, Ch. (2002). Introduction: Themes and Principles in the Analysis of Political Discourse. *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
10. Ellis D. G. (1992). *From Language to Communication*. *Lawrence Erlbaum Associate Publishers*. New Jersey.
11. Fairclough, I., Fairclough, N. (2013). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London & New York: Routledge.

12. Farzana, M., Ummul, K. (2017). Directives in English language newspaper editorials across cultures. *Discourse, Context & Media* (20).
13. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics*, Volume 3. New York: Academic Press.
14. Lakoff, G. (1992). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. *Cambridge University Press*.
15. Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. New York: *Longman*.
16. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press*.
17. Marina, S. (2002). Speech acts in context. *Language & Communication* (22).
18. Richardson, J. E. (2007). Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis. London: *Palgrave Macmillan*.
19. Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society* 5.
20. Smith, B. (1990). Speech Acts, Meanings and Intentions. Critical Approaches to the Philosophy of John R. Searle. Berlin/New York.
21. Van Dijk, Teun A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse and Society*. 17 (2).

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

22. Рекламні слогани: 55 найвідоміших брендів світу. (2023). Proidei. Retrieved from: <https://www.proidei.com/55-slogans-0504/>
23. Direct and indirect speech. (2024). Wall Street English. Retrieved from: <https://www.wallstreetenglish.com/exercises/direct-and-indirect-speech-exercises>
24. Brown P. (2015). Politeness and Language. Institute of Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, the Netherlands. Retrieved from: https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_1719314_10/component/file_2152013/content