МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ

**Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології
імені професора Г. Г. Почепцова**

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики

на тему: «НЕПРЯМІ МОВЛЕННЄВІ АКТИ ЯК ЗАСОБИ ВПЛИВУ В СУЧАСНОМУ АНГЛОМОВНОМУ ДІАЛОГІЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ»

Допущено до захисту

«___» _____ *року*

студента групи Мла 52-19
факультету германської філології
освітньо-професійної програми
Сучасні філологічні студії (англійська мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика та перекладознавство
за спеціальністю 035 Філологія
Говорухи Сари Миколаївни

Завідувач кафедри

германської і фіно-угорської

філології

_____

(підпис)   *(ПІБ)*

Науковий керівник:
Кандидат філологічних наук,професор
Волкова Лідія Михайлівна

Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів _____
Оцінка ЄКТС _____

КИЇВ – 2020

Master's Qualification Paper

INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS AS MEANS OF INFLUENCE IN MODERN ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE

SARAH HOVORUKHA

Group MLa 52-19

Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser

Professor

LIDIYA M. VOLKOVA

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv – 2020

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Communication plays an essential role in our everyday lives. It fulfills a lot of functions and one of the main ones is the ability to influence, control and have power over other people. Indirect speech acts are considered to be among the important means of such influence. Particular motives are often behind such utterances.

A thorough study of the language as the most important means of communication is impossible without appealing to the communicative-pragmatic aspect of its functioning. The problem of indirect realization of speech acts is one of the central problems of modern pragmatics.

The **topicality** of the Diploma Paper lies in the need to study language communication and ways of influencing a person with words implicitly. The significance of the classification of indirect speech acts and the lack of thorough and comprehensive research in this field also define the Paper's topicality.

The **object** of this Diploma Paper is indirect speech acts in Modern English dialogical discourse.

The **subject** of the Diploma Paper is specific features of indirect speech acts in Modern English dialogical discourse.

The main aim of the Diploma Paper is to investigate and to classify indirect speech acts.

To achieve the aim, the following **objectives** should be fulfilled:

1) to investigate communication and its main functions;

2) to identify the notion of discourse;

3) to study dialogical discourse and its main features;

4) to investigate pragmatics as the study of the relation of linguistic units to people who communicate;

5) to identify spheres of interest of pragmatics;

6) to study speech act theory;

7) to explore performative verbs and three levels of action beyond the act of utterance;

8) to investigate classification of speech acts;

9) to identify syntactic form, functions and major characteristics of indirect speech acts;

10) to discover reasons for speakers to use indirect speech acts;

11) to reveal possible structures of indirect speech acts;

12) to investigate indirect speech acts with positive and negative meanings;

13) to study decoding the meaning of indirect speech acts;

14) to analyze communicative failures;

15) to work out classification of indirect directives.

Methodology of this paper presupposes the usage of both general scientific and specific linguistic methods. The method of generalization is applied to analyze the literature and the obtained materials. The descriptive method is used to describe the phenomena of "indirect speech acts", characterize their place in communication and also their specific features and possible effects in everyday interaction. Different discourse analysis methods are used to investigate reasons of using indirect speech acts. Intentional method is used in order to reveal and analyze the speaker's intention in uttering indirect speech acts. Conversational and contextual methods are applied in order to investigate specific features of indirect speech acts in different contexts in modern dialogical discourse.

Theoretical significance of the Paper lies in the fact that its practical results may contribute to the study of indirect speech acts in communication in Modern English dialogical discourse.

Practical value of the work consists in further usage of its results in the courses of theoretical and practical grammar and speaking practice. In addition, it will enlarge the knowledge about the nature of the notion "indirect speech acts" in communication and the importance of decoding them in the right way.

Materials for the investigation served the abstracts from Modern English literature texts and TV-episodes which present the examples of indirect speech acts in communication.

Structurally the Paper consists of introduction, two chapters, conclusions to each chapter, general conclusions, resume, the list of references and the list of illustration materials.

Chapter One is concerned with the theoretical description of communication functions, the notion of discourse and dialogical discourse. It also deals with pragmatics and its spheres of interest. Special attention is paid to the Speech Act theory.

Chapter Two deals with specific features of indirect speech acts. Various reasons of using indirect speech acts are singled out. Possible structures of indirect speech acts and indirect speech acts with positive and negative meanings are analyzed. It is also concerned with decoding the meaning of indirect speech acts and cases of communicative failures. Classification of indirect directives is also offered.

In **General Conclusions** we sum up the results of our investigation.

CHAPTER ONE. DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE AS THE BASIS FOR ANALYZING INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS

1.1. Communication and its main functions

Already at birth, children have vocal cords, which should produce sounds. As they grow, they learn how to form these sounds into words. Some words may be just imitation of natural sounds, but others express emotions. It is believed that words alone have no meaning. It is people, who put meaning into them. As meaning is assigned to words, the language develops, which leads to the development of speaking. People, who speak are, as a matter of fact, initiators of communication.

Communication plays a vital role in human lives. It is almost impossible to live without it. Why do we need communication? We need it to share some information, to comment on something, to express our wants and needs, to ask questions, to develop our social relationships and social etiquette etc. (Русанівський et al. 2000, c.28). The information conveyed can include different facts, ideas, opinions, beliefs, concepts, instructions, attitudes or even emotions. It is said that certain pleasure from communication affects our psychological comfort, lifts the spirits and dissatisfaction from communication also influences our state – it kills the mood, provokes depression or even declines our health.

Let us consider the notion of **"communication"** and examine it from different perspectives. Generally, communication is interpreted as a process interaction between two or more individuals, which is based on the information exchange and has a cognitive or emotionally-evaluative character. The scientist Stepanov claims that the term "to communicate" means "to support mutual relations, business or friendly relations and unite for common action" (Степанов 2006, c.111).

Another scientist Moskalenko V. interprets the concept of "communication" as an extremely important characteristic of the human world. According to her, it is not just a component of human life, but vital activity (Москаленко 2005, c.55).

The authors of the manual "Business Ethics communication" (2007) claim that communication is the basic form of human being and of almost all human

actions. They state that communication is vital for establishing relationships and cooperation. The authors of the book pay also our attention to the ability of a person to communicate. They see this trait as one of the most important human qualities. (Гриценко et al. 2007, с.38). Generally speaking, communication is a complex special type of activity, the form of a human interaction, the opportunity to exchange thoughts, feelings, etc.

What are the most important **functions of communication**? Scientists provide different classifications of communication functions. But in most cases they point out the same purpose of communication – the informational one: exchanging certain messages, intentions, considerations, dreams, comments, reflections etc. So information is considered to be one of the most valuable human resources (Почепцов 2000, с.46). The next function of communication is a motivational one. People motivate and encourage one another. Psychologists also single out the emotive function. It consists in expressing people's feelings and emotions. Last but not the least is a control function. We tend to control our behaviour and behavior of other people.

Scientists Honcharuk, Rybalka et al. (Гончарук, Рибалка et al. 2000, с.34) distinguish three groups of communication functions – informational-communicative (it covers the process of formation, transmission and perception of information), regulatory – communicative (it regulates behavior: thanks to communication a person does not regulate only his/her own behavior, but also the behavior of other people), emotive-communicative (characterizes the emotional human sphere).

Social psychologist Stepanov (Степанов 2003, с.107) identifies three main communication aspects: communicative (exchanging information between the individuals who started communication), interactive one (organization of the interaction between partners in communication) and perceptual (it is perception of the interlocutor's communication). Each of them has its own characteristics. However, "there exist also universal strategies of communication, the use of which is effective in various spheres of human life: friendliness, the tact, sincerity, etc". (Levinson 1987, p.85).

In conclusion, communication is an integral part of our lives. Generally, communication is interpreted as a process interaction between two or more individuals, which is based on the information exchange. It performs a lot of useful functions, namely the informational, the motivational, the emotive and the control one.

1.2. The notion of discourse

Before considering the issue of dialogical discourse it would be relevant to address the notion of "discourse" itself. There are different perspectives on this definition.

Generally, the notion of "discourse" is not so easy to interpret due to the fact that it has turned out to be investigated in a number of scientific disciplines, such as linguistics, anthropology, literary criticism, ethnography, sociology, sociolinguistics, philosophy, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology. And it is quite natural that the polysemy of the term "discourse" and its use in various fields of Humanistic background gives rise to different approaches to the interpretation of the meaning of this concept (Демьянков 1995, c.29).

The polysemy of the term "discourse" is recorded in the "Concise Dictionary of Text Linguistics Terms" by T.M. Nikolaeva: "Discourse is a polysemantic term in the linguistics of a text. The most important meanings of the word are: 1) a coherent text; 2) the spoken form of the text; 3) a dialogue; 4) a group of utterances which are related to each other in meaning" (Николаева 1978, c.49).

In modern linguistics, the notion of "discourse" is also interpreted ambiguously. There are several approaches to defining it:

1. Communicative (functional) approach: discourse is defined as "an integral phenomenon, a communicative activity (both its process and result), that includes the extra linguistic and the lingual aspects (in which preposition and context (pragmatic, social, cognitive) determine the choice of linguistic means".

The lingual-communicative aspect of discourse can be seen in the definition of G.A. Orlov, who considers discourse as a category of (natural) speech,

materialized in the form of an oral or written speech work, which is complete in a semantic and structural respect. The length of the discourse is potentially variable: starting from a single statement (sentence) and continuing to a meaningful work (a story, a conversation, a description, an instruction, etc.) (Орлов 1991, с.14). The concept of "discourse" is characterized by coherence and cohesion. It is seen as both a process (taking into account the impact of socio-cultural, extralinguistic and communicative-situational factors), and as a result in the form of a fixed text (Silverman 2001, p.26).

2. Structural-syntactic approach: discourse as a fragment of a text. It is understood as two or more sentences that are in a semantic connection. Coherence is considered as one of the main features of discourse (Степанов 1995, с.107).

Within the formal approach, discourse is defined as an oral or written text, which is logically and sequentially structured. And in order to realize certain issues of an author, it is "combined by linguistic connections of both the local and the global contents".

According to Borbotko (Борботько 1981, с.86), "discourse is a text, which consists of sentences and larger units, which are coherent". Borbotko emphasizes the fact that the text as a linguistic material does not always represent coherent speech, that is, discourse. Text is a more general concept than discourse. Discourse is always the text, but not every text is discourse.

Russian researcher Makarov (Макаров 2003, с.25) proposes to use the terms "text" and "discourse" as synonyms. According to his point of view, these terms can be often used interchangeably.

3. Socio-pragmatic approach: discourse as a text immersed in a situation of communication, in life, or as a social or ideologically limited type of utterance.

Some scientists define the term "discourse" as a type of speech communication, conditioned by a critical examination of the values and norms of social life.

This classification makes it possible to understand that the nature of discourse is threefold: its first side is addressed to pragmatics – to typical situations of

communication, another aspect − to the processes taking place in the minds of the communication participants and the third side is devoted to the text itself.

The renowned Dutch scientist T. van Dijk (Dijk 2012, p.43) proposes to "distinguish between two definitions of discourse − the broader and the narrow one". The linguist defines the broad meaning of discourse as a communicative event that takes place between the speaker and the listener in the process of communication in a particular temporal, spatial and other contexts. According to him, communication can be of spoken or written nature, can have both verbal and non-verbal components. Typical examples of such communication are an everyday conversation with a friend, a dialogue between a doctor and his/her patient etc. In the narrower sense, discourse is understood as a text or a conversation. It is a finished "product" of communicative action (Dijk 2008, p.22).

Ukhvanova-Shmigova I.F., Belarussian philologist and specialist in discourse research, summarizes the main aspects we should take into account, when we deal with the term "discourse". So the "discourse" is:

1) a verbal communicative event;

2) a set of statements that organize this or that type of activity;

3) a socially and culturally predetermined system of rationally organized rules of word use and interaction of separate utterances;

4) the text (oral or written) in a social context, which provides insight into the participants and conditions of communication;

5) a type of communication which is focused on discussing some actions, events, facts, statements on significant aspects of social reality (Ухванова-Шмигова 2013, с.64).

The analysis of approaches to the definition of the concept of "discourse" made it possible to conclude that there are several approaches to defining the term "discourse". In communicative (functional) approach discourse is defined as "an integral phenomenon, a communicative activity (both its process and result), that includes the extra linguistic and the lingual aspects. According to the Structural-syntactic approach, discourse is a fragment of a text. It is understood as two or more

sentences that are in a semantic connection. As for the socio-pragmatic approach, discourse is a text that is immersed in a situation of communication, in life, or as a social or ideologically limited type of utterance. Apart from this, we can claim that the term "discourse" in modern linguistics is close in the meaning to the concept of "a text", but it emphasizes the dynamic nature of linguistic communication unfolding in time. The text, on the other hand, is considered to be a static object, the result of a linguistic activity. Some researchers interpret discourse as the term that includes two components: the dynamic process of a linguistic activity and its result (that is, the text).

1.2.1. Dialogical discourse and its main features

Dialogical discourse, one of the types of discourse, is the result of a common communicative activity between two or more individuals, which includes not only speech process, but also a set of extra linguistic factors that provide adequate understanding of the message (Орєхова 2000, c.29). These extra linguistic factors may comprise the knowledge of the world, people's different views, addresser's aims etc.

Individuals are participants of a dialogical discourse. They take on certain communicative roles. Speakers report, describe something, state something, prove something and persuade someone, ask questions and give answers, promise and do not keep promises, insult or flatter their interlocutors, ironize or evaluate their interlocutor's behaviour. So they choose speech tactics and strategies of cooperative or non-cooperative nature (Сусов 2009, c.218).

Scholars define such communicative features of dialogical discourse as:
- the presence of both the speaker and the interlocutor. In the process of dialogue two or more participants are engaged (Strauss, Corbin 1990, p.91).
- the change of communicative roles (the addresser may become the addressee and vice versa (Колокольцева 2001, c.21);
- common theme that determines the size of the dialogue;
- prevailing spontaneous speech;

- possible use of implicit language meanings;

- in most cases oral form of communication;

- the significant role of facial expressions, gestures (graphs in the case of written forms) and other non-verbal means;

- national specificity.

All in all, dialogical discourse is the result of a common communicative activity between two or more individuals, which includes not only speech process, but also a set of extra linguistic factors that provide adequate understanding of the message. Dialogical discourse possesses such features as two or more participants involved, the change of communicative roles, common topic, prevailing spontaneous speech, implied meanings, in most cases oral form of communication, the use of non-verbal means and national specificity.

1.3. Pragmatics as the study of the relation of linguistic units to people who communicate

In modern linguistics, considerable attention is paid to communicative and pragmatic aspects of language that involves great interest in anthropocentricity and communicative direction of a discourse whereby the human being, his/her characteristics and behaviour is considered to be a focus of scientific theories (Матвеева 2010, с.28).

Pragmatics is an area of interdisciplinary research and sub-discipline that studies language, namely functioning of linguistic signs in speech, the use of language by speakers in different communicative situations paying attention to a close cooperation of the speakers (Арутюнова 1990, с.67).

Pragmatics is considered to be an important linguistic field. It studies the use of language as determined by the rules of a society (Mey 1993, p.98). The language people use heavily depends on the societal conditions where they live (Dijk 1976, p.13).

Apart from this, pragmatics is regarded as the study of the speaker's meaning (Yule 1996, p.3). That is why, when the speaker's message is not inferred by the

hearer, the real meaning of it also cannot be understood (Рождественский 1997, с.94).

Yule (Yule 1996, p.4) claims: "the advantage of studying language through pragmatics is that we can speak about speaker's intended meanings, their goals and purposes, and the actions they are performing while speaking". It is deeply connected with understanding the notion of indirect speech acts, since it is the study of recognizing the speaker's intention or purpose behind their utterance.

The most important aspects of a linguistic pragmatics study are connected with the speakers (in particular speech tactics they use, dialogue rules they follow, the illocutionary force, pragmatic presupposition, empathy etc.) (Simons 2006, p.28) and their interlocutors (the rules of understanding the implied meanings, perlocutionary effects, types of speech reactions etc.) (Lakoff 1975, p.91). Also they are connected with the relationship between communication participants (namely types of speech communication etc.) and with a communication situation itself (the influence of speech situation on the topic of conversation).

In conclusion, pragmatics is an area of interdisciplinary research and sub-discipline that studies language, namely functioning of linguistic signs in speech, the use of language by speakers in different communicative situations paying attention to a close cooperation of the speakers and aspects connected with a relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor.

1.3.1. Spheres of interest of pragmatics

There are different areas of interest of pragmatics. First of all, pragmatics studies the speaker's meaning focusing not on the grammatical form of the utterance, but on the speaker's intentions (Osisanwo 2003, p.52).

Apart from this, pragmatics deals with the study of the meaning in context and the influence of a context on the message itself (Schlenker 2008, p.82). Not only particular knowledge of the speaker's identity is important, but also the place and time of the utterance (Leech, Thomas 1990, p.38).

Also, the study of pragmatics is connected with the study of implicatures. (Levinson 2000, p.111). These are important things that are communicated but are not explicitly or directly expressed.

Moreover, pragmatics focuses on the study of relative distance between speakers, both social and physical, in order to understand what determines the choice of what is said and what is not said.

Furthermore, pragmatics relates to the study of what is not meant, what is unsaid and unintended, or unintentional.

It also deals with information structure, the study of how utterances are marked to manage the common ground of referred entities efficiently between the speaker and his/her interlocutor.

The analysis of explicit and implicit objectives of the speech, the ability of an interlocutor to understand the content of the message, the study of such communicative behavior types as communication strategy and tactics, rules for dialoging and application of "indirect" speech acts are in the scope of interests of pragmatics as a science.

To conclude, spheres of interest of pragmatics include speaker's intentions, the notion of implicatures, the study of distance between speakers, the ability of an interlocutor to understand the content of the message, the study of such communicative behavior types as communication strategy and tactics, rules for dialoging and application of "indirect" speech acts and the influence of a context on the message.

1.4. Speech act theory

Speech act theory is considered to be a subfield of pragmatics which studies how words are used not only to give some sort of information but also to commit acts. This theory was introduced by a famous Oxford philosopher J.L. Austin in "How to Do Things With Words" (Austin 1962, p.46).

John Austin coined the term *"speech act"*. Speech acts are considered to be things people do through language. Speakers can, for instance, apologize, make a

promise, request somebody to do something, make a threat, order somebody to do something, and so on.

According to speech act theory, speakers who make meaningful utterances of elementary sentences relate propositional contents with a certain illocutionary force. (Searle, Vanderveken 1985, p.77). People perform in different contexts elementary illocutionary acts such as assertions, orders, questions, declarations. Furthermore they contribute to conversation with other collective illocutionary acts such as greetings, exchanging, giving news, making a deliberation.

J. L. Austin analyzed performative utterances (e.g. to promise to find something, to pronounce someone man and wife), the assessment of which should be determined by felicity-conditions (conditions by which one should take into account appropriateness, background context, sincerity, intention, etc.).

Apart from this, Austin (Austin 1962, p.18) introduced a threefold distinction among speech acts: locutionary acts (acts of saying something), illocutionary acts (it can be stating, warning, promising, performed in saying something), and perlocutionary acts (persuading, amusing, annoying, convincing, performed by saying something).The theory was later developed by Searle (Searle 1969, p.60).

Speech act theory has become influential in different spheres. Not only philosophy, but also linguistics, legal theory, psychology, literary theory, artificial intelligence and other scholarly disciplines have special interest in it (Демьянков 1986, c.83).

All in all, speech act theory was introduced by a famous Oxford philosopher J.L. Austin. John Austin coined the term "speech act". Speech acts are considered to be things people do through language (apologizing, requesting somebody to do something, making a threat etc.). J. L. Austin analyzed also in his work performative utterances (e.g. to promise to find something, to pronounce someone man and wife) and also specified the circumstances required for their success as felicity conditions. Apart from this, Austin introduced a threefold distinction among speech acts: locutionary acts (acts of saying something), illocutionary acts (it can be stating,

warning, promising, performed in saying something), and perlocutionary acts (persuading, amusing, convincing, performed by saying something).

1.4.1. Performative verbs and three levels of action beyond the act of utterance

The term "Performative verbs" was also introduced by J. Austin (Austin 1962, p.56). He defined such verbs as utterances which are used not to give some information, but to perform an action. The British philosopher also compared them to "constative utterances". They are considered to be just statements of facts.

Here are some examples of performative verbs: promise, name, swear, agree, predict, declare, order, insist, bet, warn, refuse or declare (Апресян 1986, с.81). After using such verbs the world changes. Consider Austin's examples (Austin 1962, p.58):

a) *"I do (I take this woman to be my lawful wedded wife)"*

b) *"I name this ship the Queen Elisabeth"*.

According to John Austin speech acts can be analyzed on three levels:

1. A locutionary act: that is uttering a sentence and producing a meaningful linguistic expression. It is comprised of its social, verbal and rhetorical meanings, all they correspond to the syntactic, verbal and semantic aspects of a meaningful utterance. In simple words, it is the act of saying something;

2. An illocutionary act: it's our definite communicative intention. For instance, if we take locutionary act *"Is there any salt?"*, the implied illocutionary request is *"Can you pass the salt to me?"*. In other words, it is what one does in saying something and with which function in mind he/she says something.

3. A perlocutionary act: it is what one does by saying something. It is the actual effect of the locutionary and illocutionary acts. These can be, for example, persuading, convincing, inspiring or scaring someone. (Austin 1962, p.67).

One should also note that illocutionary acts relate to the speaker only, but perlocutionary acts are connected to his/her interlocutor. Generally, perlocutionary acts always have a "perlocutionary effect" − the effect a speech act has on a particular listener. This can affect not only the listener's emotions or thoughts, but also their physical actions (Birner, Betty 2013, p.48). A good example of this

could be if someone uttered the sentence *"I am so hungry"* and after hearing such an utterance, he/she could, for instance, make a soup for the speaker.

Here is another example of analyzing the utterance from the perspective of three basic components with the help of which a speech act is formed:

"Would you close the door, please?"

In the quoted fragment of discourse, the surface form, that is the locutionary act, is in the form of a question. The illocutionary act conveys a request to his/her interlocutor and the perlocutionary act expresses the speaker's desire that the hearer should go and close the door.

Next example is, for instance, of the promise. If someone says *"I promise to do my homework"* to his/her teacher, the locutionary force lies in the meaning of the words *"I promise to do my homework"*. The illocutionary force lies in the speaker's intention to make a promise; the perlocutionary force lies in the teacher's acceptance of the promise. So in this sentence, when someone said *"I promise to do my homework"* (it is just locution), he/she wanted his/her teacher to believe him/her (that is illocution), and the teacher believes (it is perlocution).

In summary, the term "Performative verbs" was introduced by J. Austin. He defined such verbs as utterances which are used not to give some information, but to perform an action. Some examples of performative verbs include: to promise, to name, to swear, to agree, to predict, to declare, to order, to insist, to bet, to warn, to refuse. Apart from this, according to John Austin speech acts can be analyzed on three levels: a locutionary act (uttering a sentence and producing a meaningful linguistic expression), an illocutionary act (our definite communicative intention) and a perlocutionary act (the actual effect of the locutionary and illocutionary acts on the interlocutor).

1.4.2. Classification of speech acts

Speech act <u>distinctive features</u> were generalized by the linguist V. Demiankov in one of his major articles on speech act theory. According to him speech acts (Демьянков 1986, с.37):

1. Allow us to interpret the implied meaning of an utterance;

4. Are closely connected to the term "frame" from the point of view of speech activity modeling. There are, so to say, "ritual" orders of speech acts, that are interpreted on the basis of a mental picture of the world (and that depends, in its turn, on the frame we had chosen). They rely on past, present and future actions of people who communicate with each other;

2. It also establishes a connection between non-verbal and verbal behaviour;

5. The process of understanding of an utterance in which a speech act takes place is specific. It depends on the process of deductive conclusion in daily thinking, which sheds light on a new aspect of the problem of opposition of grammar rules of a particular language and other mental processes;

6. It is inappropriate to mention the understanding of an utterance only in its direct meaning: one should point out the purpose of speech act. Consequently, the recognition of illocutionary force of the utterance is incorporated in the description of the language itself.

The speaker's intention to influence the hearer in a desired way is considered to be the basis of a speech act (М'ясоєдова et al. 2014, с.46). Scientists distinguish between manifested and latent intentions. According to Georgii Pocheptsov, latent intentions cannot be linguistically analyzed whereas manifested intentions are divided into evident and inferable. The illocutionary intention of indirect speech acts is regarded as inferable (Почепцов 2000, с.45).

Speech act classifications are based on different principles. Some of them are based, for instance, on semantic and grammatical differences, others – on the purpose of an utterance and its illocutionary force .

John Austin was the founder of the Speech Act theory. That is why it would be appropriate to begin with his classification. He distinguishes the following kinds of speech acts: expositives, verdictives, exercitives, behabitives and commissives.

According to general classification, which was offered by John Searle (Searle 1965, p.66), speech acts can be generally of two types: informative and non-informative (phatic). Informative are aimed at expressing proposition or gaining

particular information. Non-informative (phatic) are intended for establishing and then maintaining the contact. Each of mentioned types also fall into particular communicative and semantic groups:

Representatives describe the state of affairs and we deal with situation that presupposes expressing personal opinion. These are assertions, claims, statements, descriptions, suggestions and hypotheses.

Directives are aimed at inducing the subject of communication to particular actions. In this category we can distinguish acts of commands, requests, challenges, invitations, orders, summons, entreaties, dares.

Commissives are used by the speaker in order to commit oneself to do or not to do particular actions; they presuppose addresser to have relative intention. This group includes: promises, oaths, pledges, threats, vows.

Expressives are aimed at expressing the speaker's mental state (it is feeling of gratitude, happiness, regret etc.).

The first two classifications (by J. Austin and by J. Searle) are, for the most part, similar in their terminology. They also both rely on the illocutionary forces of the utterances. J. Austin did not acknowledge the existence of indirect speech acts in his theory, but it was made later by J. Searle (Searle 1980, p.86).

G. Potcheptsov, a Ukrainian scholar, introduced another classification of speech acts. His classification includes six basic speech acts which are defined as constatives (the speaker states that, for example, that the Earth is round), promisives (the speaker promises that he/she will be at night), menasives (the speaker menaces the hearer by saying that he/she gets even with someone), performatives (The speaker performs an action by saying *"I apologise"*), directives (the speaker wants someone to do something and says, for example, *"Go away"*) and quesitives (the speaker asks for particular information: *"How much does it cost?"*).

Speech Acts are vital for communication. They are used in everyday interaction and in different contexts. Here are some vivid examples of speech acts:

The utterance *"You are fired!"* expresses both the employment status and the action which presupposes that the addressee's employment is over.

The utterance *"I appoint you as director"* expresses both the status of the person as a director, as well as is the action which promotes this person to this position (Grice 1975, p.77).

The utterance *"We ask that you extinguish your cigarettes during this period"* describes not only the requirements of an airplane, but also it is considered to be the command to stop smoking at the airplane (Kurzon 1986, p.19).

The utterance *"Would it be too much trouble for me to ask you to hand me the tool?"* functions as an indirect speech act. The first point is asking the interlocutor if he/she is capable of passing the tool. The second point is an actual request.

The utterance *"Well, would you listen to me?"* functions as a question, requesting that the interlocutor considers what is being said by the speaker, but at the same time it is regarded as an exclamation of shock (Grice 1989, p.79).

All in all, speech acts were classified by John Austin, John Searle and George Potchepsov. The first two classifications (by J. Austin and by J. Searle) are, for the most part, similar in their terminology. They also both rely on the illocutionary forces of the utterances. Potchepsov's classification is based on purely linguistic principles. The main criterion for pragmatic classification of utterances is the grammatical and lexical way of expressing communicative intention.

Conclusions to Chapter One

1. Communication is an integral part of our lives. Generally, communication is interpreted as a process interaction between two or more individuals, which is based on the information exchange. It performs a lot of useful functions, namely the informational, the motivational, the emotive and the control one.

2. The analysis of approaches to the definition of the concept of "discourse" made it possible to conclude that there are several approaches to defining the term "discourse". In communicative (functional) approach discourse is defined as "an integral phenomenon, a communicative activity (both its process and result), that includes the extralinguistic and the lingual aspects. According to the Structural-syntactic approach, discourse is a fragment of a text. It is understood as two or more sentences that are in a semantic connection. As for the socio-pragmatic approach, discourse is a text that is immersed in a situation of communication, in life, or as a social or ideologically limited type of utterance. Apart from this, we can claim that the term "discourse" in modern linguistics is close in the meaning to the concept of "a text", but it emphasizes the dynamic nature of linguistic communication unfolding in time. The text, on the other hand, is considered to be a static object, the result of a linguistic activity. Some researchers interpret discourse as the term that includes two components: the dynamic process of a linguistic activity and its result (that is, the text).

3. Pragmatics is an area of interdisciplinary research and a sub-discipline that studies language, namely functioning of linguistic signs in speech, the use of language by speakers in different communicative situations paying attention to a close cooperation of the speakers and aspects connected with a relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

4. The analysis of explicit and implicit objectives of the speech, the ability of an interlocutor to understand the content of the message, the study of such communicative behavior types as communication strategy and tactics, rules for

dialoging and application of "indirect" speech acts are in the scope of interests of pragmatics as a science.

5. The term "Performative verbs" was also introduced by J. Austin. He defined such verbs as utterances which are used not to give some information, but to perform an action. According to John Austin speech acts can be analysed on three levels: A locutionary act (that is uttering a sentence and producing a meaningful linguistic expression), an illocutionary act (it's our definite communicative intention) and a perlocutionary act (it is what one does by saying something or an actual effect of the locutionary and illocutionary acts).

6. Speech acts were classified by John Austin, John Searle and George Potchepsov. The first two classifications (by J. Austin and by J. Searle) are, for the most part, similar in their terminology. They also both rely on the illocutionary forces of the utterances. Potchepsov's classification is based on purely linguistic principles. The main criterion for pragmatic classification of utterances is the grammatical and lexical ways of expressing communicative intention.

CHAPTER TWO. INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS AND THEIR SPECIFIC FEATURES

2.1. Syntactic form, functions and major characteristics of indirect speech acts

The aim of communication can be identical to the syntactic form of the utterance. When, for example, a stranger asks, *"How old are you?"* our task is just to answer the question, telling him/her our age. So direct speech acts are those, which are expressed by the constructions that are designed specifically for those acts. For instance, as we know, an interrogative construction is designed to ask a question, a declarative construction is meant to make a statement, and an imperative construction is created for issuing orders.

The meaning of direct speech act is easier to be understood by an interlocutor, because what the speaker says equals to what he/she does. In the utterance *"Today the class is dismissed"* the speaker performed a direct speech act, as the utterance is included to declaration sentences and the speaker's intention was to declare this particular information.

Direct speech acts always have an explicit performative in their structure. Indirect speech acts, in their turn, do not have it. Indirect speech acts are *"cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another"* (Searle 1969, p.178). The meaning of such cases is not literal. That is why, in order to interpret the message of an utterance one should take into account the implied sense. The illocutionary force of indirect speech acts can only be inferred and guessed by the interlocutor by taking into account such concepts as context, common sense and inference.

When we analyze an indirect speech act, its syntactic form does not correspond to its function. The illocution of an indirect speech act (the intention or the goal we wish to achieve by using a particular phrase) is what is implied but not seen through the form of the utterance. Consider the following example:

"Daddy, hi," Casey told him pushing herself up in bed.

"What are you doing still in bed?" he pivoted around on his heels and stared at Casey with disapproval (Fielding 2009, p.111).

In the quoted fragment of discourse, although the sentence *"What are you doing still in bed?"* is presented in the form of a question, the girl is not supposed to answer it. As a matter of fact, the interrogative utterance changes its illocutionary force and becomes an indirect directive. It has the meaning – *"Get up!"*.

When there is no direct relationship between the structure and the form but rather an indirect one, we can speak about indirect speech acts. Here are more examples of a discrepancy between the syntactic form and its function:

"Can you clean up your room? - Sure, I will do it in a minute". In this example an indirect request is used. *"You're standing in front of the TV"*. In this case a declarative is used to express a request to move aside. The remark *"You are standing on my foot"* should normally be taken as a demand that you should change your position. If a person is asked whether he/she intends to quit smoking, it might be taken as a suggestion to quit.

Imagine another situation, when the girl Ann is out with her friend Alice for a long time and her mother calls Ann late at night and asks: *"When do you plan to come home?"* We should interpret this interrogative as an indirect speech act. Although the question presupposes the answer about certain time, this utterance should be regarded as a request to come home. So we see that the form of an utterance differs from its function.

It is important to mention that one and the same intention can be fulfilled in different forms of an utterance. For example, the question *"When do you plan to tidy your room?"* is considered to be an indirect request. Another utterance with same intention, but another form of a question: *"Would you mind tiding up your room?"* is also regarded as a request, as it calls attention to the condition that the interlocutor must be willing to do the certain action or must be even under an obligation to do it. Next form of the utterance: *"It is your turn to tidy up the room"* would also call attention to the interlocutor's obligation. All these three utterances are indirect

requests, which have different forms, but the same intention to make someone tidy the room. The direct request would be *"Tidy the room up"*.

The interrogative mood, for instance, can be often used to:

request: *"Can you pass the sauce?"*;

question: *"Do you know the time?"*;

assert: *"Do you know that Ally got married?"*, *"Do you know that Sam is in the city?"*;

warn: *"Did you see the tiger behind you?"*;

promise: *"Would I miss our meeting?"*.

We can distinguish major characteristics of indirect speech acts from linguistic and philosophical perspectives.

First of all, it is essential to dwell upon multiplicity of meanings (Allan 1997, p.14). While direct speech acts have just one meaning (or illocutionary force), indirect speech acts always have more than one meaning. For example, in uttering *"It's raining cats and dogs"* as a direct speech act, a speaker means just *"I assert to you that it is raining cats and dogs"*. But in uttering, for instance, *"This dish needs salt"*, a person may mean both *"I assert to you that this dish needs salt"* and *"I request you to pass the salt."* Let us consider the next example. In this case, we can define two meanings – the literal (direct) meaning and the indirect (conveyed) one.

It is important to mention also about logical priority of meanings. These several meanings of an indirect speech act are not in fact conveyed in parallel. In uttering *"This dish needs salt"*, the meaning of assertion is "logically prior" to the meaning of a request. But just because this meaning is logically prior, it does not necessarily imply that it is prior to the meaning of a request in a psychological sense.

There can be more than two meanings in a chain. For instance, by uttering *"Haven't you forgotten to wash your clothes?"*, the speaker can use his/her literal question to assert that the interlocutor has forgotten to wash his/her clothes, and he/she can use the indirect speech act to request to wash the clothes now, or even to scold his/her interlocutor for not having washed the clothes before.

Another significant trait of indirect speech acts is rationality. The logic between any meanings of an indirect speech act, according to Searle (Searle 1979, p.39), and Lakoff (Lakoff 1975, p.29) has a rational basis. To utter *"This dish needs salt"* and to intend both the meaning of an assertion and the meaning of a request, the speaker must firstly assume that he/she and his/her interlocutor "mutually know" certain background facts. They may share the knowledge, for instance, that they are at a restaurant, that the speaker has just tasted the dish, that there is a salt-shaker near him/her etc.

Apart from this, the speaker must follow definite principles of cooperative conversation (Grice 1975, p.12). At least his/her utterance must be relevant to what is going on at that moment. Only then the speaker can be certain that the interlocutor will be able to infer both meanings.

Furthermore, there exist conventions about which sentences can be used for which indirect speech acts. We can take, as an illustration, one of the conventions of the English language. The speaker can indirectly request his/her interlocutor to do a certain act by questioning his/her ability to do that act. In such a way, he/she can request the salt, with *"Are you able yet to pass me the salt?"* and *"Is it possible for you to pass me the salt?"*. The interrogative *"Can you help me?"*, is also an indirect speech act. It has both the the literal meaning *"I ask you if you have the ability to help"* and an indirect one *"I request that you help me"*. Another example, *"Can you move the sofa?"* can be interpreted directly to question the interlocutor's ability to move the sofa and at the same time this utterance represent an indirect speech act requesting the hearer to move it. Let us take another utterance. Two friends are sitting in the room and one of them utters: *"Can you switch on the computer?"*. It should be interpreted as a question with a direct meaning about a person's physical ability and at the same time it has an indirect sense of a request to merely switch on the computer. We can call this type of convention "a convention of means", as it specifies a semantic device by which an indirect speech act can be performed.

There can also be "conventions of form" – these are conventions about the wording of indirect speech acts (Morgan 1978, p.86). Consider the following

examples: *"Can you pass me the salt?"* and *"Could you pass me the salt?"*. These requests are regarded as highly conventional or idiomatic forms of the English language for requesting the salt. *"Is it possible for you to pass me the salt?"* and *"Are you able to pass me the salt?"* are seen as less idiomatic, and the question *"Is it the case that you have the ability to pass the salt?"* is considered to be not at all idiomatic. So idiomaticity, in other words, conventionality of form, can be treated as a matter of degree (Sadock 1972, p.79).

Purposefulness is another important specific feature of indirect speech acts. (Asher, Lascarides 2001, p.121). Generally, speech acts are intended to have a specific effect on the addressee (to get him to believe that something is true (assertions) or to get him to do something (requests). The vital point is that speakers usually have goals they want to achieve while uttering indirect speech acts. Listeners, in their turn, are intended to infer these indirect speech acts in part by recognizing certain goals of the speakers.

Apart from this, indirect speech acts are closely connected to etiquette and politeness. The ability to infer the communicative intention and to interpret and decode the message also plays an important role.

The indirect meaning of some utterances is the result of socio-cultural conventions: the tradition of their use, peculiar agreements between participants. Let us consider the following example, where there is a conversation between the hotelkeeper and his client:

"I would like to come in, please." - *"This is our private room. I told you my daughter is having a nightmare."*

In the following fragment of discourse, the speaker and the interlocutor use indirect speech acts. The utterance *"I would like to come in, please"* is not just an assertion. In fact, it is an indirect request. And the interlocutor's utterances *"This is our private room. I told you my daughter is having a nightmare"* should be regarded as an indirect rejection.

All in all, indirect speech acts are "cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another". When we analyze indirect

speech act, its syntactic form does not correspond to its function. The illocution of an indirect speech act (the intention or the goal we wish to achieve by using a particular phrase) is what is implied but not seen through the form of the utterance. We can distinguish major characteristics of indirect speech acts from linguistic and philosophical perspectives. First of all, it is essential to dwell upon multiplicity of meanings. Indirect speech acts always have more than one meaning. In uttering, for instance, "This dish needs salt", a person may mean both "I assert to you that this dish needs salt" and "I request you to pass the salt". In this case, we can define two meanings – the literal (direct) meaning and the indirect (conveyed) one. Another significant trait of indirect speech acts is rationality. Apart from this, the speaker must follow definite principles of cooperative conversation. Furthermore, there exist conventions about which sentences can be used for which indirect speech acts. The speaker can indirectly request his/her interlocutor to do a certain act by questioning his/her ability to do that act. In such a way, he/she can request the salt, with "Are you able yet to pass me the salt?". Purposefulness is another important specific feature of indirect speech acts. Speakers usually have goals they want to achieve while uttering indirect speech acts.

2.2. Reasons for speakers to use indirect speech acts

First and foremost, it is important to say that as we live in a speech community, we should follow the rules and regulations of the language that our speech community uses. Within the bounds of the speech community there are things that are regarded as appropriate and inappropriate, acceptable and unacceptable, pleasant and unpleasant, decent and indecent. Specific traditions and customs of the community definitely impinge upon our linguistic behaviour (both the speaker's and interlocutor's). It goes without saying that indirect speech acts are also considered to be **a part of our particular speech habits** and the ability to use them in a right time and to interpret them correctly is definitely vital.

One of the major reasons for people to use indirect speech acts is **to show their politeness** (Thomas 1995, p.87). According to the politeness theory, speakers try to

avoid threats to the "face" of interlocutors by different forms of indirectness, and in this way "implicate" their meanings rather than state them explicitly. A direct speech act is regarded as an act where there is no need to save the face of the addressee. It is a plain and simple way of saying something. An indirect speech act, in its turn, is a kind of circumlocution, a desire and an attempt to save the face. For example, an indirectly formulated request of a son to his father *"Are you using the motorcycle tonight?"* is considered to be a face-respecting strategy because it leaves some room for father to refuse by saying: *"Sorry, it has already been taken"* rather than the face-threatening: *"You may not use it"*.

The adherence to politeness often results in the use of different types of indirect speech acts. Such speech acts can be frequently used when a person of a lower social status addresses a person of a higher or superior social status. In the process of communication indirectness can be often taken as a lack of closeness between people and usually signals distance or denotes power. Consider the following two examples:

1. Open the door.

2. May I ask you to open the door?

The first example seems to be addressed to a friend. It is rather direct. Because it does not give options, it assumes that the speaker has a close relationship with a listener. The second utterance is very polite and signals distance and a feeling of inferiority.

Pretty often such indirect speech acts may contain certain additional politeness markers (for example, apologies). Consider the example:

"Sorry, could you gave me that dress?".

When people want to express orders or requests, they often use interrogative rather than imperative sentences. Most such cases are connected with people who are not on familiar terms with one another. In such cases direct addresses appear to be impolite. Consider the example: *"Lend me some money!"* instead of *"Would you lend me some money?"* We see that the direct directive would be absolutely unacceptable in such contexts. Imagine another situation. Two friends are walking around. One of them is complaining that her jeans do not fit her anymore. And another friend asks:

"Sweetie, why don't you try to lose some weight?" This question is regarded as an indirect suggestion. It goes without saying that it sounds politer than the direct one.

In order to be polite, speakers also ask questions that imply their desire to gain some information, but do not contain a direct motivation for a response. Consider, for example, the question: *"Do you know how to play this computer game?"* In this particular context, the speaker indirectly asks the listener to tell him the rules of the game. In fact, it is not a literal question about whether the interlocutor has some cognitive information; it is an indirect request to tell him/her how to play this game on the computer.

Within the limits of negative politeness the most common are the following strategies: the use of questions, indirection, pessimistic stylistics of speech *("Could you possibly give me your notebook?")*, minimization of possible harm *("I am just wondering whether I could possibly have your notebook?"),* readiness to apologize *(I'm sorry to bother you, but I am just wondering whether I could possibly have your notebook for a moment?).*

Some features of indirect politeness strategies include the interruption of speech; providing not the real request, but only a hint of it; using the elliptical sentences *("Can I just?")* and the pursuit to be ironic.

Let us turn to some examples of politeness scale, which was proposed by Leech. (Leech 1983, p.84):

1. Open the door.

2. I want you to open the door.

3. Will you open the door?

4. Can you open the door?

5. Would you mind opening the door?

6. Could you possibly open the door?

All these utterances are regarded as indirect requests, which have different degrees of politeness.

There are a lot of contexts, where the speaker's decision to use indirect speech acts can influence certain aspects of politeness (Sadock 2008, p.71). First and

foremost, politeness and the use of indirect speech acts is considered to be one of the common means in workplaces in many cultures (Dana 1993, p.52). For instance, in Japan and China, people tend to emphasize the principles of "cooperative society". That is why they often resort to indirectness (Blum-Kulka, Olshtain 1997, p.228).

Furthermore, the results from Chen's (Chen 1996, p.7) research suggest that the concept of "Confucianism" in Taiwan implies the use of indirect communication. More specifically, the staff members in the study were saying "no" unwillingly when responding to some requests. "They also tried to avoid expressing some confrontational traits as it is regarded as a harmful action to working environment" (Chen 2001, p.8).

Continuing the theme of the cultures and politeness, indirect speech acts are usually applied to professional setting so as to soften the cause of humiliation that could probably happen when working and communicating with people who are from different cultures and carry diverse beliefs (Hofstede 2001, p.16). Directness can result in the high risk of conflicts, disagreements, etc. (Morand 2000, p.39).

Keeping with the theme, in workplaces, people often use deliberately indirect speech acts in order to sound polite. It goes without saying that at work, making a request directly can indicate a threat which causes negative face for listeners, while disagreements can also threaten the positive face. That is why, if a person needs to reject something or turn down any invitation requested by his/her coworkers, he/she should not say the word "no" explicitly. This person should rather say, for example, that he/she must join the family in that evening (Brown, Levinson 1978, p.65).

People tend to use indirect speech acts in different educational institutions too. Let us take a situation, where a teacher used an indirect speech act to be polite. So the teacher gave the students an assignment and said: *"It is better to bring me the assignment tomorrow if you want to have a good mark"*. In this fragment of discourse, the situation seems to be very traditional, as it is an ordinary interaction between the teacher and his/her students where he/she is just asking them to do the assignment for the next day. However, the given utterance carries an indirect act of threatening.

To soften the words, the teacher resorts to politeness and performs the utterance indirectly probably to avoid being imperative on his/her students. Furthermore, by using the indirect speech act, the teacher avoids any risk of having face-threatening act in his/her interaction.

If we analyze this situation, we can define two politeness strategies the teacher used. The first one is giving suggestion (*"It is better for the students to do the assignment"*). The second strategy is connected with assuming reciprocity – the teacher asked the students to do something for him/her so that he/she does something for them in return. These are strategies that can be used to be polite and to avoid FTA while communicating with others.

Moreover, one of the reasons why people use indirect speech acts is that **they do not want to impose themselves on other people.** To sound milder and politer, they regulate the size of imposition. That is why, when speakers, for example, request something important, they say it very often indirectly.

Besides, people resort to using indirect speech acts because they want **to be friendly as far as possible.** The speaker, using indirect utterances to achieve his/her own illocutionary goal (the communicative intention) in dialogic communication, freely directs his/her speech activity to gain trust, sympathy of the interlocutor. For instance, many British restaurants and petrol stations display the sign *"Thank you for not smoking"*. It is an indirect speech act, as instead of the imperative directive *"No smoking"* they use the expressive thanking speech act, which sounds more polite and kinder than the latter.

Another reason to be indirect is **to hide a negative evaluation.** A negative evaluation is believed to be a speech act that evaluates some situation or a person through an utterance that almost always carries a negative semantic load. One of the types of negative evaluation is an indirect complaint. An indirect complaint is defined as an expression of dissatisfaction to an interlocutor about something or someone. Indirect speech acts are often used to diminish the unpleasant speaker's message. Consider, for instance, the following text passage, where the speaker expresses his negative evaluation implicitly using the interrogative sentence.

"Do you trust these lawyers?" Jankle asked, not for the first time.

"We've covered this before," Fitch answered.

"We can certainly cover it again if I choose" (Grisham 2006, p.201).

In the quoted fragment of discourse, it can be seen that the speaker takes the particular lawyers negatively and does not rely on them. He has some reasons not to trust them, but presents this kind of information indirectly.

Consider another case, where the speaker resorts to using an indirect negative evaluation, which has the form of an interrogative:

"Did you ever see the green flash," she asked him after classes, "down at Ocean Beach?"

He had not, he had already told her. Then she explained that it was an optical effect at sunset, when rays from the top of the sinking sun turned green. She had never seen it, she said.

"Are you sure it is not the story cooked up by the Irish drunks who lived out there?" (Kushner 2018, p.67).

Let us consider another situation, where the father expresses his negative evaluation indirectly:

I hear this and I don't know what to say.

"Craig?"

"What's he doing in that school yard, anyway? It's summer".

(Everett 1983, p.70).

In the following fragment of discourse, parents are talking about their son. The father wants his son to relax, not to go to school, because it is summer and summer is considered to be the time for the rest. That is why, he expresses his negative attitude.

As it was mentioned above, people resort to using indirect answers to express the negative evaluation. As it is known, in this way they have to violate certain principles of relevance.

Let us take some examples:

Speaker 1: *What do you think about my presentation?*

Speaker 2: *It is not easy to give a good presentation, you know.*

In this particular context, the Speaker 2 avoided the direct answer and used an indirect speech act of negative evaluation.

Here is another similar example, where the Speaker 2 hesitated to express his/her opinion directly:

Speaker 1: *Did you enjoy Sam's party?*

Speaker 2: *It is hard to give a good party, isn't it?*

Negative evaluation often sounds ironically. Consider the following example:

"Harry jumped up to his feet.

"I know what day it is," sang Duddley waddling towards him.

"What?" asked Harry.

"I know what day it is," Duddley repeated, coming up right to him.

<u>*"Well done," sneered Harry. "So at last you have learned the days of the week."*</u> (Rowling 2002, p.177).

In the following example, Harry Potter uses an indirect speech act and ironically taunts his interlocutor's mental capacity. Taking this utterance without a context, it sounds positively. But in this particular situation, Harry has the intention to mock at Duddley.

Consider another example of an indirect negative evaluation with an ironical slant:

<u>*"I like your outfit"*</u>. *–"Thank you, I do try to look perfect" (the same speaker addresses a hostess speaking in a whisper): "I feel delighted she is looking so ugly". –"Thanks for coming," – she answered.*

In this particular situation, the speaker makes a mock of a certain person, using an indirect negative evaluation with an ironical slant. His interlocutor tries to save her face by answering: *"Thank you, I do try to look perfect"*. Then the speaker tries to discuss this situation with the hostess. But the hostess does not react to the negative tone of discourse and thanks him for the visit with the intention to end this conversation. So the hostess resorts to using an indirect refusal.

It is believed that utterances that contain indirect evaluation are characterized by various stylistic devices and high emotional intensity. This suggests that the indirect way makes the expression of evaluation as effective as possible.

When we do not want to directly refuse something and insult a person, we may also resort to indirectness. Indirect speech acts help us to reject proposals. For instance, a speaker asks, *"Would you like to meet me for a tea?"* and the interlocutor replies, *"I have a lot of work to do"*. In this case the speaker has used an indirect speech act to reject the proposal mildly. It is considered to be indirect because the literal meaning of the answer *"I have a lot of work to do"* does not entail real rejection. It is an implied one.

Sometimes people are indirect, because they **do not want to be open to other people.** In order to keep the information private, they may resort to an Answer-evading strategy. In such cases, they may also "flout" Grice's maxims or deliberately violate some of them. When a junior addresses a senior or when there is a socio-psychological distance between the speakers, it would be better to avoid questions concerning the personal life of an interlocutor, his/her age, marital status, income, occupation or judging other people. In such situations, the interlocutor has the right to give indirect answers, such as: *"Where would you go? "I know a place."*

Let us consider another few examples, where speakers use Answer-evading strategy to keep the information private:

"What you got there? Where'd you get that child?"

"Never mind." (Robinson 2014, p.129).

Here is another example of an Answer-evading strategy:

They walked on like that, past the store. She asked, "Why?"

He laughed again. "You ask such interesting questions."

"And you don't answer theem!" He nodded. It felt very good to have him walking beside her (Robinson 2014, p.68).

As it was mentioned above, the psychological basis of indirect speech acts can also be the reluctance of speakers to reveal their intentions. This reluctance stems from various reasons: intentions can be unpleasant for the interlocutor (which is

considered to be the specific feature of manipulative influence); they may be also perceived by the interlocutor as not preserving the dignity of others, (we can compare the use of hints instead of direct orders, apologies, requests); intentions may contradict etiquette behavior and accepted speech rules between communicators. It is important to mention that a lot of things depend on the communicative situation.

An answer-evading strategy on the provocative question is the interlocutor's defense mechanism that can be realized through the tactics of expanded explanation in order to save the face. Let us consider the following example:

Speaker 1: *You find this sort of rootless existence appealing, don't you?*

Speaker 2: *Well... it is a big world, and I want to see it in its full beauty before I go. My father was always talking about going to see the ocean. He died in the town he was born in. Also, you can't wait around, because you never know what you're going to get dealt next. See, I was sixteen, and I've been on the road since. Something like this teaches you to take life as it comes at you and to make each day count.*

In this fragment of discourse, the dialogue does not unfold in a cooperative manner. The communicative situation takes place within the aristocratic community and, asking the question, the speaker's intention is to humiliate interlocutor's pride (as the interlocutor's social status is lower). The interlocutor's purpose in this fragment of discourse is to soften his life situation in the eyes of the elites, to show the advantages of his way of living and to save his face.

Here is another example, where the saleswoman resorts to an Answer-evading strategy which is realized by the implicit tactics of hostility because of her client's slovenly appearance:

Client: *You have very beautiful things (no reply). How much does it cost?*

SALESWOMAN: *I do not think it would fit you.*

Client: *I didn't ask if it would fit. I asked how much it was.*

SALESWOMAN: *It is very expensive.*

The client's body tenses as she looks at the Saleswoman.

Client: *I'm going to spend money.*

SALESWOMAN: <u>I do not think we have anything for you here. You're definitely in the wrong place.</u>

Another motivation for indirectness is personal. It is the wish to **make the image and speech more interesting and unique**. The use of indirect speech acts sometimes aims to increase the expressiveness of speech. It is obvious that indirect speech acts, which often contain a hint, irony, sarcasm enrich the communication process and at the same time, in most cases, they do not interfere with understanding of the meaning of the utterance.

One cannot deny that the choice of the language instruments is always determined by some specific features of the speaker's idiolect. Different extra linguistic factors may influence our choice. This can be not only the level of the speaker's lingual competence, but also his speaking habits and the manner of expressing feelings and ideas. Also, when people want to reach goals different from their interlocutors, in particular to increase the force of the message communicated, they resort to indirect strategies (Thomas 1995, p.143).

It is said that speakers sometimes use indirect speech acts also because they want **to express uncertainty** – situations that involve unknown information. Examples could be: *"I would like to know which...", "Could you please help me with.. ?", "I do not know which...".*

Apart from this, people use indirect speech acts **to avoid embarrassment and awkwardness, or to reduce some sort of social tension**. It is said that questions concerning professions, namely the wage level and the level of professional education, make people with a low social status worry and put them in an awkward position. In such situations, interlocutors often use an Answer-evading strategy and avoid a direct answer to such questions. Let us consider the example, where the interlocutor uses the tactics of repeating the question in order to reduce discomfort:

"So, what do you do in your life?"

"I work at the lumber yard. Mainly milling and receiving logs...."

"Oh, that is lovely, dear."

"Thank you."

"If you don't mind my asking, how much money do you make at your job?".

"Uh, how much money do I make? Mm-hmmm.

In this particular fragment, the interlocutor resorts to an indirect answer – he just repeats the question. In fact, he does not make a lot of money. So in order to save his face, he resorts to an Answer-evading strategy.

Let us consider another example, where there is a conversation between a person, who belongs to the upper class and another person – a homeless artist, who just won a ticket on a cool boat:

Speaker 1*: And where exactly do you live?*

Speaker 2: *Well, right now my address is this Titanic. After that, I 'm on God's good humor.*

In the following fragment of discourse, the artist gives an indirect answer and hiddens the truth. His main intention is to lessen criticality concerning his lack of a permanent place to stay.

Consider another example, where the child answers to her mother indirectly to avoid some embarrassing information:

Mother: How are your grades this semester?

Daughter: I don't think our teacher grades fairly.

Generally, indirect utterances can be made when, for instance, the speaker does not want to harm the interests of his/her communicative partner or when he/she believes that his/her direct utterance can be perceived as tactless, and the perlocutionary effect (the interlocutor's reaction to what he/she heard) can be indignation etc.

People tend to use indirect speech acts **to influence others**. But some indirect speech acts can often seem to be rude, like *"Didn't I tell you yesterday to clean up your room?" or "Shouldn't you tell me who will come to the party tomorrow?", "The lawn has to be mowed till five o'clock"*. Such indirect requests count as manipulative.

In the political sphere indirect speech acts are also very common. Speakers often use indirect directives. Here are, for instance, examples of indirect commands politicians may use:

"It's time for this country to join hands and to address this issue".

"It's important to tackle our enemy".

Such political utterances are considered to be a good means of indirect manipulative strategies.

Indirect speech acts are also widely recognized as powerful persuasive tools. They are widely used not only in some messages in marketing advertisements, but also in recruitment ads.

In conclusion, it is important to say that as we live in a speech community, we should follow the rules and regulations of the language that our speech community uses. One of the major reasons for people to use indirect speech acts is to show their politeness. According to the politeness theory, speakers try to avoid threats to the "face" of interlocutors by different forms of indirectness, and in this way "implicate" their meanings rather than state them explicitly. Politeness and the use of indirect speech acts is considered to be one of the common means in workplaces in many cultures. People tend to use indirect speech acts in different educational institutions too. Moreover, one of the reasons why people use indirect speech acts is that they do not want to impose themselves on other people. To sound milder and politer, they regulate the size of imposition. Besides, people resort to using indirect speech acts because they want to be friendly as far as possible. For instance, many British restaurants and petrol stations display the sign "Thank you for not smoking". Another reason to be indirect is to hide a negative evaluation. When we do not want to directly refuse something and insult a person, we may also resort to indirectness. Indirect speech acts help us to reject proposals. For instance, a speaker asks, "Would you like to meet me for a tea?" and the interlocutor replies, "I have a lot of work to do". In this case the speaker has used an indirect speech act to reject the proposal mildly. Sometimes people are indirect, because they do not want to be open to other people. In order to keep the information private, they may resort to an Answer-evading strategy. In such cases, they may also "flout" Grice's maxims or deliberately violate some of them. Interlocutors have the right to give indirect answers, such as: "Where would you go? "I know a place." Another motivation for indirectness is personal. It

is the wish to make the image and speech more interesting and unique. The use of indirect speech acts sometimes aims to increase the expressiveness of speech. It is said that speakers sometimes use indirect speech acts also because they want to express uncertainty – situations that involve unknown information. Examples could be: "I would like to know which...", "Could you please help me with...?", "I do not know which...". Apart from this, people use indirect speech acts to avoid embarrassment and awkwardness, or to reduce some sort of social tension. People tend to use indirect speech acts to influence others. But some indirect speech acts can often seem to be rude, like "Didn't I tell you yesterday to clean up your room?" or "Shouldn't you tell me who will come to the party tomorrow?", "The lawn has to be mowed till five o'clock". Such indirect requests count as manipulative.

2.3. Possible structures of indirect speech acts

In the English language there exist some common structures of indirect speech acts. One of the easiest forms of indirection are "whimperatives" and "hedged performatives". Whimperatives are considered to be indirect requests with the forms: "Can you...?" and "Will you...?". Sentences with such forms would often be understood not as interrogative sentences about the interlocutor's ability to do something, but as requests (Bach, Harnish 1979, p.174).

Another form of indirection is called "hedged performatives". They have the form of explicit performatives with a modal verb. Sentences *"I must ask you to go away", "I can promise you I shall be in time", "I would suggest you remember it"* appear to be a request, a promise and a suggestion. In these cases speech acts are performed. It has a meaning: *"I ask you to go away", "I promise you I'll be in time" and "I suggest you try remember it"*.

Embedded performatives are somewhat more difficult to interpret (Sadock 1974, p.88). They contain the proposition to which, as a rule, they refer indirectly, but that proposition may be embedded arbitrarily deep within the literal expression. For instance, sentences *"I regret that I must inform you of your big mistake", "May I*

remind you that your time is over?", "I would like to congratulate your sister" perform the acts of informing, reminding, and congratulating respectively indirectly.

In the next example it can be discerned that the presence of the word "please" may reveal the hidden illocutionary force of a request. In the interrogative sentence *„Will you take off your hat please?"* the word "please" can help us to see an indirect request (Maugham 1980, p.154).

There are particular possible structures of indirect speech acts which are related to certain maxims. And the first one we are going to analyze is the Maxim of Necessity. The Maxim of Necessity says that we should act only when necessary and that we should avoid extraneous actions.

A speaker can convey an indirect request just by asserting. For instance, *"I have to ask you to close the door"* is an indirect request of such a type, or when a speaker says *"It's really too dark to read my book"*, it is also should be regarded as an indirect speech act and a way to make a request to turn on the light or to go to another place.

The next rule is called "Necessary-ask". It means that the speaker can ask whether the intended speech act is in fact necessary. The utterance *"Do I need to ask you to close the door?"* is a good example of such type of indirect request.

The next possible structure is connected with the future effect. A speaker uses strategy of asking whether the intended effect can be expected to occur. For instance, one may use an indirect request, asking: *"Are you planning to wash the dishes?"*.

A speaker can use the structure that is connected with the past effect. He/she should ask whether the intended effect of the speech act has already occurred. The indirect request *"Have you washed the dishes?"* can be a good example of such type.

There exist also some rules that are connected to the Maxim of Desirability. This Maxim says that one should initiate actions for which some desirable result (results) can be expected and avoid actions with undesirable result (results).

For instance, a speaker asserts that *"I'll be happier when you wash the dishes"*. In fact, it is an indirect request. Here, the desirable result is the happiness of

the speaker, and the intended effect of the request is that the interlocutor washes the dishes.

When a speaker wants to state something he/she can use different forms too. For instance, he/she can use the interrogative: *"Do I need to tell you that you are really beautiful?"*. It is, in fact, an indirect assertion. Next type can be connected to the future effect. A speaker may ask "Will you hear that...?" and "Will you know that ...?"). The next structure is connected with the past effect. The question *"Did you hear that her favourite colour is red?"* is an illustration of an indirect assertion.

In conclusion, we should mention that there exist particular structures and forms of indirect speech acts. As for the forms of indirection, one of the easiest are considered to be "whimperatives" and "hedged performatives". Whimperatives are regarded as indirect requests with the forms: "Can you...?" and "Will you...?". Another form of indirection, which is called "hedged performatives", has the form of explicit performatives with a modal verb. For instance, sentences "I must ask you to go away", "I can promise you I shall be in time", "I would suggest you remember it" appear to be a request, a promise and a suggestion. As for indirect requests, a speaker can convey them just by asserting, by strategy of asking whether the intended effect can be expected to occur or by asking whether the intended effect of the speech act has already occurred. Also, the presence of the word "please" may reveal the hidden illocutionary force of a request. When a speaker wants to state something he/she can use different forms too (for instance, the interrogative or particular past forms).

2.4. Indirect speech acts with positive and negative meanings

Generally, there exist indirect speech acts with positive meanings and they include the following speech acts: an indirect speech act of **positive evaluation**, an indirect **offer**, an indirect **advice**, an indirect **compliment**, an indirect **apology** and an indirect speech act of **agreement**.

If we consider an indirect <u>positive evaluation</u>, it provides an expression of the speaker's attitude to a particular object of reality as to a model that needs his/her

attention and will have a positive impact on him/her. When a speaker says, *"This is a good movie"*, he/she not only encourages the interlocutor to watch the movie, but also assumes that he/she will like it. The interlocutor understands: this is an indirect advice, and if he/she accepts it, his/her choice will bring him/her enjoyment (Ноуэлл 1985, c.78).

There are numerous structures of an indirect <u>offer</u>. For instance, the speaker may use a question: *"Do I need to offer you a ride to the centre?"*. Next structure can be connected with the past effect. For example, *"Have you already accepted a ride to the centre?"*. A speaker may also assert: *"I would feel a lot better if you would accept a ride to the centre"* and this assertion would count as an indirect offer.

Indirect <u>suggestions</u> are often used by the speakers. There are some markers as to how one can interpret them. For example, the question "Why don't…" indicates an indirect suggestion. Here are some examples of an indirect advice:

"Why don't some of you take up botany?...With all the legs and arms why does not one of you...?" **(**Woolf 2002, p.27).

"But why repeat this over and over again? Why be always trying to bring up some feeling she had not got?" (Woolf 2002, p.106).

"It was extraordinary how Pete put her into this state just by coming and standing in a corner. It was idiotic. But why did he come, then, merely to criticise? Why always take, never give? Why not risk?" (Woolf 1993, p.181).

Here is another good example of an indirect suggestion:

He said, <u>"Is there anything I can do about that?"</u>

And she said, "Nothing I can think of. I don't trust nobody."

He said, "No wonder you're tired (Robinson 2014, p.59).

Some cases of indirect suggestions are realized with the help of modal verbs. Consider the following example:

"They must find a way out of it all. There might be some simpler way, some less laborious way" (Woolf 2002, p.39).

To suggest indirectly, the speaker resorts to using modal verbs "must" and "might". It sounds more straightforward and indicates the close relationship between the speakers (Наумук 2012, с.98).

To advise something indirectly, a speaker can also use an interrogative. The question *"Need I suggest that you join us tomorrow?"* would be a good example of an indirect speech act. Apart from this, one can use an indirect suggest with the future effect. For example, *"Are you thinking about joining us tomorrow?"* or *"Could you think about joining us?"* A speaker can also use an utterance with the past effect. The interrogative *"Have you considered joining us?"* would be a good example of indirect suggest. Furthermore, a speaker may assert: *"I'd be pleased if you'd consider joining us tomorrow"* or *"You could think about joining us"* and these utterances would also count as indirect suggestions.

In the English language there exist also some other common types of indirect speech acts. For instance, indirect <u>compliments</u> are very common. The main reason for speakers to use them is their desire not to violate the norms of polite communication (to be moderate, to be modest, etc.). For example, the utterance *"What a delicious cake!"* should be regarded as an indirect compliment to the hostess who cooked it.

 Indirect compliments are often used in the form of rhetorical questions too. Consider the following examples:

"How did you get to be so smart?", *"You of all people know this issue"* are good illustrations of indirect compliments.

Some researchers argue that indirect compliments are more sincere (Кокойло 1995, с.77), and the rejection of clichés and patterns can convince that the interlocutor is sincere. V. Mishchenko notes that although, on the one hand, indirect compliments make it difficult to recognize messages, on the other hand, they "help the addressee to have almost no doubts about the sincerity of the speaker" (Міщенко 1999, с.6).

People also resort to using indirect speech acts to <u>apologize</u> or to agree on something reluctantly. Traditionally, when people apologize, they use the phrases "I

am sorry", "Excuse me", "Forgive me", "Pardon me". However, in everyday communication, an apology can be expressed by indirect speech acts with the help of some explanations, requests, promises or some messages. Indirect apologizes, are the speech acts, the semantic and pragmatic components of which do not coincide. Such speech acts should be interpreted on the basis of a particular communicative situation. For example: "I did what I could to solve this problem", "Don't take it personally", "Don't get mad".

Consider another interesting example:

"I had wanted to free you earlier", the servant apologized, "but it was impossible with the police. You understand, don't you?" (Brown 2003, p.68). In the following fragment of discourse, the speaker apologizes indirectly.

Let us consider another situation, where the speaker resorts to using an indirect apology:

"So I want to put a question to you. All right?"

"Go ahead."

"I feel I didn't do right by you. I wasn't a good father to you." (Robinson 2008, p.126).

Here is another example:

"Crossed signals?" he demanded.

"You know damn well"

"It was my fault," Richard said, "If I had known.." (Brown 2000, p.134).

In the following passage, the speaker admitted his guilt, provided the explanation for his offensive actions and repented for what he did with words: "If I had known…". So indirect apologizing is also one of the means of saving the speaker's face.

There exist also indirect speech acts of <u>agreement</u>. Indirect agreement is represented by such linguistic units that do not actualize grammatical and lexical statements directly (Борисенко 2015, с.59). This can be exclamations, some negative means (negative-rhetorical questions, double negation), interrogative sentences, rhetorical questions, conditional constructions (Гурко 2018, с.29). Consider the

example of an indirect agreement: *"- Let us go today to the cinema? "Ow! Great idea!"* Let us take another interesting example: *"Shall we go in, Webst?"* Doctor Webster smiled grimly. *"Do I have a choice?"* (Walters 1993, p.67). So the speaker resorted to using indirect speech act to show his reluctant agreement.

Sometimes an indirect agreement is expressed by the repetition. It is realized by certain intensification or, conversely, understatement, which makes the agreement clearer. For instance: *"Will you miss me?" "Oh, yes," she said nodding her head "I will miss you terribly"* (Bushnell 2003, p.162).

Indirect speech acts are often used in the situations not so positive. Such indirect speech acts have negative meanings, these include indirect speech acts of **rejection**, indirect **disagreement**, indirect forms of **accusation**, indirect speech acts of **complaining**, indirect **threatens** and indirect **reproaches**.

As for an indirect speech act of rejection, it is regarded as a negative response to the request.27. By rejecting indirectly, the speaker lessens the perlocutionary effect, or informs the communicative partner about the circumstances that motivate him/her to react positively (Осовська 2003, с.66): *"Will you come to me on Saturday? "I have a lot of work to do"; "Please, don't talk so loud". "There is no one here", "Can you lend me some money? - I haven't got my wages yet"*.

Indirect speech acts of rejection are characterized, according to the study (Сокирська 2012, с.60), by the use of idiomatic means in certain communicative situations, exclamations, interrogative or imperative statements, interrogations and ironic statements that convey reproach or dissatisfaction. Apart from this, the means for the transfer of the content of the indirect refusal are considered to be the means that lexicalize four differentiated classes: "I do not want", "I can not", "I want but I can not", "I can but I do not want".

There are a lot of other cases that represent indirect rejections. Consider the situation, where the interlocutor, using an expressive (thanking) intends to reject the suggestion:

Speaker 1: *I could recommend you to go to the Carpathians.*

Speaker 2: *Especially during this period... With the man found dead yesterday...*

Speaker 1: *I would keep you safe!*

Speaker 2: *Thanks... but I think I would like to travel on my own.*

The direct expression of the utterance *"Thanks...but I think I would like to travel on my own"* is thanking. Thanking is classified as an expressive, as it includes the speaker's feeling. But it is not the primary illocution. The primary illocution of this utterance is definitely rejecting.

Here is another example with an indirect rejection:

Speaker 1: *Do you want to talk about it?*

Speaker 2: *It is not worth talking about...*

Speaker 1: *I think it is.*

"It is not worth talking about" is considered to be an indirect speech act. When the S.2 conveys this utterance, his/her intention is not just stating an assertion, but also the rejecting of the speaker's suggestion. In this context, assertion is regarded as the secondary illocution, and the primary illocution is in fact rejection.

Let us consider another case of an indirect rejection:

"Why would you go to Western Kentucky?" asked Oliver Lambert.

"That is simple. They offered me a full scholarship to play football. Had it not been for that, college would have been impossible."

"Tell us something about your family."

"Why is that important?"

"It's important to us, Mitch," the journalist said warmly.

(Grisham 1991, p.54).

In the following fragment of discourse, the interlocutor does not want to tell particular information to the journalist, because family issues are considered to be the private life. As a matter of fact, it is not of the journalist's business. That is why, the interlocutor resorts to using an indirect rejection by using the interrogative.

We sometimes use indirect speech acts to withdraw the requests but to sound polite as far as possible too. Consider the following example:

Speaker 1: *Can I get a ride home with you?*

Speaker 2: *Oh, sorry, I took the trolleybus to work today.*

Here is another example with an indirect rejection, which is motivated by politeness principles:

"Today is my son's birthday."

I put the picture down, to show him what a beautiful child Jackson was. No one ever said he was not beautiful.

He looked at the photo.

"This is him," I soldiered on. "I am giving this picture to you. I really want you to have it."

"I know you do, but it is not right. Save it for yourself." (Kushner 2018, p.87).

People resort to indirect speech acts when they want to express <u>disagreement</u>. A speech act of disagreement contains different types of negative reactions: refutation, denial, condemnation, expression of dissatisfaction and disapproval. From the standpoint of modern communication theory, disagreement is a reactive act that reflects the position of the speaker that is opposite to the position of the interlocutor. It is an informative or evaluative statement with different emotional tones (condemnation, disapproval, etc.) (Семенець 2006, с.81).

Indirect disagreement can be expressed by such a syntactic means as the repetition. In other words, repetition can be used in the negative form with the aim of providing an indirect disagreement. Consider the following examples with an indirect disagreement: *"Beautiful, isn't it?", "I don't think it is beautiful."* (Walters 1993, p.49). *"Are we going to a party?", "We are not going to a party,"* he said, raising his eyebrows (Bushnell 2003, p.203).

Indirect disagreement can also be realized through a rhetorical question, which expresses the speaker's dissent from the interlocutor's actions, as well as provides additional information about his/her attitude to them. For example: *"So do you think he will call?"* Emmy asked with genuine concern. *"Why wouldn't he?"* (Walters 2004, p.115).

As it was mentioned above, speakers often use an indirect objection instead of a direct one in the form of a rhetorical question, which implicitly conveys disagreement. Consider the example:

Speaker 1: *Just getting a divorce?*

Speaker 2: *Yeah. Two and a half years ago.*

Speaker 1: *Woo.*

Speaker 2: (embarrassed) *It's been a process.*

Speaker 1: *Here is the good news. In three more years you will actually begin to feel normal again.*

Speaker 2: *In three more years I will begin to feel normal? Why am I having trouble seeing that as good news?*

Speaker 1: *Maybe it was just my own experience.*

Consider another example, where an indirect disagreement is expressed by a rhetorical question, which functions as a conventional, negatively-emotionally marked formula for denying the interlocutor's opinion:

MICH: Okay, calm down: I promise to hold down the fort for one night.

DAVE: Are you joking? You worked at my job for some days and you almost got arrested! What are you going to do to my family?! (Quinn 2020, p.127).

Indirect disagreement can also be often expressed by affirmative sentences, containing arguments to affirm the expressed point of view. Here is an example:

HELEN: Well, I figured as you do not have any experience that you may get overwhelmed by events of that caliber.

ANNY: Helen, I'm pretty capable. I think I can handle it. (Mumolo 2011, p.214).

In the following fragment of discourse, the last Anny's utterance expresses an indirect disagreement.

Some communicators tend to express disagreement in a veiled way. They act as manipulators and try to hide the essence of their plans. So they use some indirect means to express disagreement. Indirect speech acts of disagreement are generally

expressed by language forms, the illocutionary force of which is not a part of their semantics. Consider the following example:

- I'd like Peter to live with Anny. I think it will be better for him.

- <u>Are you a fool? Sam, you are crazy.</u> (Parsons 2002, p.116).

In the following fragment of discourse, the author uses the utterances *"Are you a fool? Sam, you are crazy"*, which are regarded as contextual-situational indirect speech acts of disagreement. If we take these expressions isolated from the context, they will have another function. These expressions will generally refer to the mental quality of a human. But in this particular context, these utterances indicate the disagreement of the interlocutor with the speaker. They carry an implied meaning. Here is another example:

- She is a good girl. She is very charming and attractive. And furthermore she is really wise.

<u>- Do you really think so?</u>

The phrase *"Do you really think so?"* is also an indirect speech act of disagreement. It contains additional implicit meaning (Серафимова et al. 1997, c.82).

Consider another example, where an indirect disagreement is expressed by an interrogative:

Speaker 1: *Oh. It's loud in here!*

Speaker 2: *<u>What are you talking about?</u>*

There exist also lexical means of expressing disagreement − a set of certain lexical units and expressions that help communicators to express their disagreement. The lexical means of expressing indirect disagreement may include the following lexical units: Nonsense !; You are crazy; Rubbish !; You must be joking !; Are you a fool?. Consider an interesting example:

- Naggy, I decided to return Peter to Kate. It will be better for him.

- <u>You must be joking! You are crazy.</u> You should not do it because we are going to win the process and the judge is really on our side (Parsons 2002, p.128).

In the following dialogue, two lexical expressions are used to express disagreement: *"You must be joking"* and *"You are crazy"*. They help the author to strengthen the indirect negative reaction of the interlocutor.

Implicitly expressed disagreements imply often declarative sentences that contain the opposite idea to the speaker's utterance: *"-Today is an awesome weather"*. *"Personally I don't like the snow."*

There are a lot of other illustrations of indirect disagreement. For example, *"I would say you are at least seventy-five per cent Welsh, Mr. Tent.", "That is rubbish," said the man crossly* (Walters 2004, p.102).

Consider another example: *"He is a psychiatrist. He does not judge people on appearance."* Her face lit with amusement. *"Everyone does, Charly. It is how the world works"* (Walters 2008, p.50). Here is another convincing example:

"She is really a remarkable girl."

"Remarkable?" Jenny asked. "I would hardly call her that" (Bushnell 2003, p.206).

Here is another example of an indirect disagreement: *"Except if Akland did strike Waltter, it is possible the blood splatters may have replicated the fight last." "And pigs may fly, Nick"* (Walters 2008, p.111).

In the following fragment of discourse, to indirectly disagree, the speaker uses a humorous saying, which has an illocutionary force of a disagreement.

Indirect disagreement helps to soften the negative message and to save the speaker's face (Yin, Kuo 2013, p.68).

People resort to using indirect speech acts also to indirectly accuse someone of doing something. Indirect forms of accusation can be of different types. We can single out:

1) Indirect speech acts of accusation on the basis of comparison with the norms of behavior that is accepted in the society: *"Mrs. Kavendish − a mother, but rather unfair to her another stepson"* (Christie 1975, p.46);

2) Indirect speech acts with a negative connotation: *"Liar! You did it only for money"*;

3) Indirect speech acts with generalization: *"Most of the boys smoke. And you, try to give it up"*.

One can use indirect accusation with the help of modal verbs. Here is an example:

"You ought to know that a child of this age can not be left alone".

Apart from this, speakers may use indirect accusation, which is presented in the form of a question: *"Have you lost our little girl?"*.

Moreover, indirect accusation can be used with the help of rhetorical questions. Consider the following example: *"Don't you understand that you have no right to dictate me something?"* (Christie 1975, p.105);

Let us consider another example of an indirect accusation, where the speaker uses the assertion to indirectly accuse:

– *"You're very late" said his mother. "You were to have taken Peter to Cam"*
– *"My fault," answered he.*

In the following example, the utterance *"You're very late"* is regarded as an indirect accusation. In our case, the mother draws the son's attention to his mistake and unmet request.

Let us consider another example of an indirect accusation, expressed by assertion:

"Some people are so unscrupulous about money, they borrow, but never repay them in time" (Christie 1975, p.164).

In the following fragment of discourse, the utterance is addressed to the real addressee (the object of an accusation) – to a person who does not pay debts on time. As a matter of fact, he speaker indirectly accuses the interlocutor.

To express the communicative intention of an indirect accusation the speaker may use in addition to the words with negative-evaluation, a variety of phraseological units, some comparisons or proverbs, etc. Here is an example:

"No doubt, this woman has got a tongue like vinegar. And her husband has to suffer from it" (Christie 1975, p.24).

Apart from this, to express the negative evaluation of the accusation speakers often use the words from positive vocabulary list, which acquire a negative meaning in a particular context. Let us consider the following example:

"Well, John, you are a great fellow, you definitely made our conversation damnable" (Christie 1975, p.77).

"Yes, this Northon, the gentle-natured loving man, is a real secret sadist." (Christie 1975, p.86).

In the following examples, adjectives with positive semantics "good", "gentle-natured", "loving" express an indirect negative evaluation of accusation and a contrasting word "sadist" helps to reveal the real emotional state of the speaker and his real attitude to the object of evaluation. The indicative pronoun "this" before the proper name also expresses the negative attitude of the speaker towards the interlocutor.

Here are another examples of an indirect accusation:

"Didn't you see that the child was sleeping?" (Cheever 1980, p.121). In the following fragment of discourse, with the help of an interrogative the speaker expresses an indirect accusation.

It is important also to mention some non-verbal means which often accompany an indirect accusation. Among them the most typical are: prosodic (namely, the voice characteristics of communicators, which are explicated in the author's narrative): *He paused and then added on a deep note of reproof: "Hastings?"*; kinetic: eye contact *("You've been turning me against her" Anger flashed in his eyes; facial expressions and gestures ("Leave this." Mother pointed an accusing finger at him)*.

Indirect speech acts of accusation help to save the "face" of the speaker and to reduce the threat to the social "face" of the interlocutor. It is a mitigating technique that significantly diminishes the negative evaluation.

People also often use indirect speech acts to <u>complain</u>. In such a way they lessen the negative meaning and diminish responsibility for their words. Consider the following examples continuing the theme of indirect complaining:

Speaker1: – *I am really annoyed with my householder.*

Speaker2: – *Why?*

Speaker 1: <u>*He is constantly forgetting to fix the refrigerator.*</u>

Speaker 2: *Have you spoken to him about it?*

Speaker 1: *Actually not.*

Speaker 2: *I do not understand. If his forgetting to fix the refrigerator bothers you so much, why do not you mention it to him?*

Speaker 1: *I know I should. But I do not want to complain.*

In the fragment above, the utterance *"He is always forgetting to fix the refrigerator"* is considered to be ab indirect complaining. Let us look at another example:

Speaker 1: *Tom got drunk again today.*

Speaker 2: *Awful. <u>Can you find at least one person in the world, who doesn't drink alcohol at all?</u>*

In this case, the Speaker 2 used indirect complaining in the last utterance.

Consider the situation, where two mothers of young children discussing the school issues:

Speaker1: <u>*It seems the more you pay the less you get.*</u>

Speaker 2: *Agree.*

In this context, Speaker 1 used indirect complaining.

Speakers use indirect speech acts also to <u>threaten</u>. Let us illustrate an example, in which one of the speakers demands from the interlocutor to repay the debt and threatens him in case of non-compliance:

Prizzy grabbed him by the throat. "Listen, you little prick, you will give me the money, or I will feed you to the fish" (Kershaw 1999, p.43).

The illocutionary force of the threat together with non-verbal actions *("grabbed him by the throat")* affects the listener in an appropriate way – he is scared. That is why we can infer that the perlocutionary effect is successfully achieved.

Speakers tend to use indirect speech acts in order to <u>reproach</u> oneself with something. Conventional indirect reproaches are characterized by lexical and grammatical structures that can be represented by words and constructions with neutral meaning, which can informally or contextually express a negative evaluation. For instance, an indirect conventional reproach may be expressed by rhetorical or disjunctive questions. Consider the following examples:

1. Couldn't you like to do somebody a good turn when you have the chance?

2. You believe me, don't you?

To reproach speakers may also use modal verbs "should", "ought to", "might", "could + Infinitive". It will express a duty that belongs to the past – a person should have done something, but did not do. It is regarded as "bad". Consider the example, where the speaker uses "ought to" to reproach and to emphasize the fact that the interlocutor's behaviour is unacceptable:

"Either you ought to be much more careful or you oughtn't drive at all".

Self-criticism is also considered to be one of the ways of unconventional expressions of an indirect reproach. Let us take the example, where Daisy is unhappy that she married Tom. She could reproach him directly. But she resorts to indirectness and says that her man did not live up to her expectations of a happy marriage:

"I knew right away I made a mistake".

Consider another example with an indirect reproach:

"<u>Now, look what you have done, Sister,</u>" says Mama. "Go and apologize."

"I'm leaving," I say.

In the following fragment of discourse, the first phrase is regarded as an indirect expressive with an illocutionary force of a reproach, which is rendered in the imperative mood. Let us consider another example, where the question does not imply the answer:

"So that's your opinion of your uncle Rono, is it?" he says. "I look like a fool, do I?"

In this example, the rhetorical question is in fact an indirect reproach. The illocutionary act is not gaining some information, but pointing out the interlocutor's erroneous behavior.

All in all, a speaker may use such indirect speech acts with positive meanings as an indirect speech act of positive evaluation, an indirect offer, an indirect advice, an indirect compliment, an indirect apology and an indirect speech act of agreement. Apart from this, indirect speech acts are often used in not so positive situations. Such indirect speech acts have negative meanings, these include indirect speech acts of rejection, indirect disagreement, indirect forms of accusation, indirect speech acts of complaining, indirect threatens and indirect reproaches.

2.5. Decoding the meaning of indirect speech acts

It goes without saying that if we want to understand how an utterance can have two illocutionary forces (intentions), we must understand how it has an illocutionary force at all. The connection between an utterance and its illocutionary force is peculiarly a matter of linguistic convention. For example, they are encoded within sentence mood: interrogatives (e.g. *"How old are you?"*) express questions; declaratives (e.g. *"It is five o'clock"*) express assertions; and imperatives express requests. For J. Searle and others, illocutionary forces can be also encoded in the lexicon: sentences express warnings (e.g. *"I warn you that she won't be a good mother"*), promises (e.g. *"I promise I'll be in time"*) as defined by performative verbs.

As in indirect speech acts the speaker does not explicitly state the intended meaning behind the utterance, it is the interlocutor's task to decode the real meaning. Successful communication depends on such particular factors as **knowledge of the language, general knowledge, communicative maturity and common background.**

The important question is: "How should the interlocutor decide what to respond?". Usually, he/she should firstly try to understand what the speaker meant. And various interpretations will lead to different moves in his/her response. Indirect

speech acts have more than one meaning. Therefore, their expected responses may also contain more than one "move". If we take an interrogative *"Can you tell me what time it is?"*, it may elicit *"Yes, I can–it's five"*. *"Yes, I can"*, will be an answer to the first meaning of this question – the ability to tell the time, and the second move, *"It's five"*, is a response to the second meaning of an indirect speech act – a request to tell the time. Another indirect speech act, such as *"Do you know what the temperature is in Lithuania?"* also contains both the direct illocutionary force (in our case, inquiring whether the interlocutor has a certain piece of information), and also has an indirect meaning (here, requesting the interlocutor to tell the speaker what the temperature is). Consider another example:

– *Do you know when the Lviv train leaves?*

– *Yes, at 16:35.*

The interlocutor deduced, first of all, that the speaker wanted to know whether he/she knew the departure time. That is why, the first utterance the interlocutor said was *"Yes"*. The second move was an indirect one. The interlocutor inferred that the speaker wanted to know the departure time. That is why, the second utterance he/she said was *"At 16:35"*. The point is that the two moves correspond directly to the two meanings of an indirect speech act – the literal and the indirect one.

Moves can be of different types. The first type is called "Expected moves". These are moves that deal with both meanings of an indirect speech act. The second type of moves is known as "Added moves". As an illustration we can take a question *"Where is Tom?"*. It has just one meaning. But the interlocutor can respond *"In the garden. He has been there for 20 minutes"*. The move *"In the garden"* is regarded as an expected one while the second move *"He has been there for 20 minutes"* is an added move. Another example is an interrogative *"Can you tell me what time it is?"* and the answer to it is *"Yes, I can. It is six p.m. We would better hurry"*. The first two utterances are considered to be expected moves, the last one is an added one.

With how many moves is it better to answer? If we take, for example, the interrogative *"Can you tell me what time it is?"* the interlocutor's response can often be with only one move *"It is five"* – the answer on an indirect meaning. But a

response with two moves, like *"Yes, I can – It is five"* is commonly taken to be more polite. The interlocutor decides whether he/she wishes to be cooperative, polite or obstructive and rude.

As it was mentioned earlier, it is vital for an interlocutor to understand the intention of a speaker. Consider the following question: *"Do you have a cigarette?"* In most cases this question is regarded as an indirect speech act, as it is a request for information and at the same time it is a request for the interlocutor to give the speaker this cigarette.

But if we take another example, where someone asks: *"Do you have a Mercedes?"*, it should be interpreted in a different way. In previous case, the given object (the cigarette) was inexpensive and small, the speaker could give it to the interlocutor. In the second context, we are talking about an expensive thing. That is why we should consider this question as a direct one, just as a request for information, which presupposes two variants of answers: *"Yes"* or *"No"*.

Special markers also play an important role in decoding indirect speech acts. In the English language, for example, the words *"please"* and *"for me"* can often be used to mark some utterances as requests, as in *"Could you open the window for me?"*.

The context should be also of a great help in decoding indirect speech acts. If a speaker, for instance, stops a stranger on a busy street and asks him/her: *"Will you please take me to the centre?"*, it would be counted as a strange situation. In this case, the circumstances and the context will be of little help, since such a request is considered to be quite unexpected. But if another speaker is stepping into the taxi and says the same thing, it would be quite normal and expected. In fact, even if the speaker would say to a taxi driver the minimal *"To the centre"*, the taxi driver will infer that the speaker is requesting him/her to take the speaker to a certain destination.

As it was mentioned above, to decode the message, an interlocutor should always take into account the context. For example, the utterance *"There is a fly in your juice"* may be both an assertion and a warning not to drink the juice. It is all about the situation and the context. The question *"What's the time?"* may be

understood in a particular context as the request to do something, as a warning or a suggestion for an unwelcome person to leave. The utterance *"The apartment is very dark"* can have both direct and indirect meaning. Literally, the speaker just can state the fact that the apartment is very dark, but indirectly the meaning is different. According to the situation or a context, it can be interpreted that the speaker commands the hearer to draw the curtain, to turn on the light, or even somehow to support him. The utterance *"I can not close the door"* can also perform different speech acts, depending on the context. It can be in one situation a warning, in another − a reproach or a request etc. If we take the utterance "I'm out of gas", it is regarded as an indirect speech act. The meaning of this utterance is almost always the same – the speaker needs some gas for his/her car. But there can be different contexts. In one situation, where the driver says these words to a stranger, he/she uses an implicit request, as the proposition which is expressed by the utterance can explain why the speaker needs help and what sort of help he/she needs. And the interlocutor needs to recognize this to respond adequately (i.e., to help somehow the speaker to obtain gas). In order to recognize the request for help, he/she must understand the agent's state. But in another context, if a son, for instance, asks his father to use the car, it can be an indirect rejection.

Continuing the theme of the context, let us take the situation when a person injures his/her leg and visits a doctor. First of all, he/she comes to the doctor's office and the doctor says that he/she would like to know about the extent of the injury. So the doctor asks: *"Can you run?"*. In this particular context, the utterance is an interrogative and the doctor asks about the patient's capability. When the doctor determines that the patient can run, he/she wants to test the extent of the patient's injury. After asking for some other important information, the doctor takes a patient to a treadmill in the exercise room and asks: *"Can you run?"*. In this particular case, the utterance is obviously a request that the patient begin running. We see that the utterance is identical in both situations, but the context is different.

There are some important cues as to how to interpret the utterance *"Can you run?"*. First of all, it is location. In the office it seems really strange to

begin running, while it is natural to run on a treadmill. The next clue is the task. In the first context, the main task is to collect particular information about the injury. In the second context, testing physical capability is the chief task. Last but not the least, is the history. In the second context the patient has already answered the question and the doctor has diagnosed that it was okay for the patient to run. All in all, all this suggests that the utterance in the first context has the meaning of asking about the ability, and the utterance in the second context is connected with requesting an action. So the first utterance has a literal (direct) meaning and the second one – indirect one. (of an indirect request).

We should be aware of the fact that one and the same utterance can have different illocutionary forces (or meanings), depending on the situation. The declarative *"The door is there"* can be understood at least in two different ways. For example, it can be a direct reply to the question *"Where is the door"*, or *"How can I walk out of here?"*. In another contextual situation it can be an indirect request to ask someone to leave.

As it was mentioned above, one and the same utterance can have different intentions and implications. For instance, the phrase: *"It is raining now!"* one can interpret in different ways depending on the situation. It can be not only just assertion the information, but also:

1) The message that one should stay home;

2) The message that the speaker likes or does not like the weather;

3) The message that one should carry an umbrella.

In order to understand an implicit utterance it is also necessary to realize the communicative situation that may be related to any occasion in which a speech act takes place. It includes the social setting and the status of both the speaker and the interlocutor. In some situations, to understand the indirect speech act the interlocutor resorts to analyzing it.

Interlocutors should also rely on a particular **intonation pattern** in order to arrive at the right understanding of a speaker's utterance. Such factors as **sex, age**

and interpersonal relations should also be taken into account while interpreting an utterance with an indirect speech act.

In conclusion, as in indirect speech acts the speaker does not explicitly state the intended meaning behind the utterance, it is the interlocutor's task to decode the real meaning. Successful communication depends on such particular factors as knowledge of the language, general knowledge, communicative maturity and common background. The important question is: "How should the interlocutor decide what to respond?". Usually, he/she should firstly try to understand what the speaker meant. And various interpretations will lead to different moves in his/her response. If we take an interrogative "Can you tell me what time it is?", it may elicit "Yes, I can–it's five". "Yes, I can", will be an answer to the first meaning of this question – the ability to tell the time, and the second move, "It's five", is a response to the second meaning of an indirect speech act – a request to tell the time. Special markers also play an important role in decoding indirect speech acts. In the English language, for example, the words "please" and "for me" can often be used to mark some utterances as requests, as in "Could you open the window for me?". The context should be also of a great help in decoding indirect speech acts. For instance, if the speaker would say to a taxi driver the minimal "To the centre", the taxi driver will infer that the speaker is requesting him/her to take the speaker to a certain destination. Let us take another example, where one and the same utterance can have different meanings in different situations. The question "What's the time?" may be understood in a particular context as the request to do something, as a warning or a suggestion for an unwelcome person to leave. In order to understand an implicit utterance it is also necessary to realize the communicative situation that may be related to any occasion in which a speech act takes place. It includes the social setting and the status of both the speaker and the interlocutor. Interlocutors should also rely on a particular intonation pattern in order to arrive at the right understanding of a speaker's utterance. Such factors as sex, age and interpersonal relations should also be taken into account while interpreting an utterance with an indirect speech act.

2.6. Communicative failures

Indirection is generally agreed to be one of the main ways in which the semantic content of an utterance can fail to determine the full meaning and force of the illocutionary act. One of the main reasons of misinterpretation is **when the interlocutor focuses only on the structure of the utterance.**

It is worth mentioning that, **when the interlocutor does not recognize the speaker's communicative intentions** in the right way, a communicative failure will follow. For instance, asking, *"Where is the shopping centre?"* one can hear: *"The shopping centre is closed"* in the situation when one needs the shopping centre only as an orientation point. Let us take, for example, another situation at a disco when a girl says to her beloved: *"Oh, it is my favourite song!"*. The real meaning of an utterance is not just telling about the favourite song. In fact, her statement is an indirect request. It should have the effect of a directive and should cause the situation where the boy invites his girl to a dance. But if the interlocutor has not understood the intention of the speaker, or is not able to do this, or just does not want to satisfy the speaker's desire, the utterance will not have the needed effect. He may answer: *"Yes, this song is nice"*. It will count as a communicative failure. Consider another example. Someone is making a phone call and asks a person who picked up the phone: *"Is Sam at home?"* and another person answers literally: *"Yes, he is"*. In this case, communication failure occurs. In fact, this interrogative is an indirect speech act. That is why, it can elicit some other possible ways of responses, like *"Just a minute"*, or *"I will get her"*. They respond to the indirect meaning of the speech act.

Communicative failures may also occur **in cases with children**, because they sometimes perceive only one illocutionary force of a speech act. For example, a five-year-old daughter is carrying home a toy mother just bought her. On their way home she often drops it. Her mother says: *"You let your toy fall a hundred times!"* meaning a directive: *"Be more careful!"* The girl, however, takes her words literally and replies: *"Of course not, mom. I dropped it only five times!"* So an indirect speech act is a true criterion of the speaker's communication maturity.

Let us look at a funny example, which suggests that not only children sometimes perceive only one illocutionary force of a speech act:

Friends are chilling out in a café.

- Hold on… is there ketchup on the table? (points to the table that is near the interlocutor).

- Yes, there is. Here some fun fact. Ketchup is a general term for sauce, typically made of mushrooms with herbs and spices. Some popular main ingredients include blueberry, oyster and grape.

- No, that's okay. I'll get it.

In the following fragment of discourse, the speaker uses an indirect request, but the interlocutor, Sheldon, interprets the utterance directly. That is why a communicative failure occurs.

Sometimes communication failures occur **between people of different sex**, as they are supposed to have different mindsets. Let us take the situation in the office, where two colleagues have a conversation. The speaker (the man) utters an interrogative asking how the woman's day was. The woman takes his question literally and begins giving him too many details. She says that the day was awful, that she couldn't find some necessary documents, that her boyfriend was not paying much attention to her and some other unnecessary information. Her interlocutor, in his turn, is really surprised and reminds her carefully that she was only supposed to say "Fine, thank you". In this case, the man obviously meant his question just as a polite conventional formula. He did not want to know any details. But his colleague obviously did not understand the intentions behind his words. The illocutionary act he uttered was not recognized by her. That is why communication failure occurred.

Communicative failures are also common **in relation to other cultures**. The usage of indirect speech acts and their right interpretation cannot be expected to be universal. In the English language, for example, the restrictions on the use of the imperative and a large number of interrogative forms in performing acts other than questions comprise linguistic reflexes of the Anglo-Saxon socio-cultural attitude. It is a common fact that the imperative is usually used for orders and commands in

English. In other kinds of directives the speakers often avoid the imperative or tend to combine it with an interrogative or a conditional form.

Intercultural miscommunication can pretty often arise from the assumption that the language strategies appropriate to one language can be used with equal force in another language. As a matter of fact, in different societies people speak differently, their ways of using language are also different. If one do not pays attention to these differences, it may often lead to a communication failure between the speaker and the interlocutor from different social groups. That is why, studying different cultural traditions is vital for effective communication. By studying different cultural customs and traditions manifesting themselves in various ways of speaking, one can improve the ability to communicate with others and find some ways to understand the message of an utterance.

Communicative failures may also occur **in translation** – transmitting information from one language/culture into another one. As it is known, an important aspect of translation skills is the ability to properly convey illocutionary functions. The study of different cultural ways of speaking is called "Contrastive Pragmatics". According to this study, all people speak with what may be called a pragmatic accent. The study reveals that there are certain communicative aspects of our conversation that should be understood without being said. For a translation to be equal to the source text, a translator or an interpreter needs to realize and keep in mind the illocutionary force of an utterance. "The translator will seek to render the illocutionary force of each speech act from a source text into a target one" (Hatim, Munday 2004, p.8). For example, the utterance *"Is Mr.Brown there, please?"* is not a question but an indirect request meaning *"Запросіть до телефону пана Брауна?"*. If one translates *"Чи пан Браун тут?"*, a communicative failure will occur. It goes without saying that the interlocutor will not understand what the speaker means.

It is said that communication failures may also occur when we address **people with certain diseases.** Scientists focused, for example, on people with right-hemisphere damage and found out that such individuals' core linguistic abilities are

usually intact. Still they have some difficulties interpreting different types of non-literal meanings. So they often have direct interpretation of utterances even where the context encourages an indirect one.

Apart from this, it is important to mention that in unexpected circumstances people tend to use questions with a strong expressive force. But these questions are regarded as a negative evaluation of the situation that is taking place. As a matter of fact, they do not have an interrogative function. Interlocutors may not understand the real message of such expressive questions. That is why, in such situations often communication failure occurs.

Let us take an example, where a mother sees her dirty dress, that her daughter without permission wore some days ago. The mother says: *"What the hell is this?"*. In fact, it is an indirect speech act of negative evaluation. But the daughter did not catch the meaning behind the utterance. She takes the question literally, feels quite puzzled and answers: *"Mum, it's your dress!?"* In this situation communication failure occurs.

Imagine another example, where a mother and her daughter are sitting in a restaurant. And the mother asks her: *"How can you act so casual, when you are dressed like this?!"* and her daughter answers: *"It makes me comfortable"*. We can infer an implicit negative judgment implied by the question with the meaning *"You should not act so casual when you are dressed like this, sitting in a restaurant"*. But the mother's negative evaluation is in fact ignored by her daughter.

Sometimes interlocutors may misinterpret the force of indirect speech acts and then communication failure may occur. Let us take the situation when the teacher threatens the students indirectly by saying *"It is better to bring your homework every day"*. The students interpret this utterance by accident as a suggestion. They just do not bring their homework. The teacher, in his/her turn puts bad marks. This indicates that the students did not understand the teacher's intentions and the real force of the indirect speech act of threat.

All in all, one of the main reasons of misinterpretation is when the interlocutor focuses only on the structure of the utterance. For instance, questions with a strong

expressive force are regarded as a negative evaluation of the situation that is taking place. As a matter of fact, they do not have an interrogative function. But interlocutors may not understand the real message of such expressive questions. Let us take an example, where a mother sees her dirty dress that her daughter without permission wore some days ago. Mother says: "What the hell is this?". In fact, it is an indirect speech act of negative evaluation. But daughter did not catch the meaning behind the utterance. She takes the question literally, feels quite puzzled and answers: "Mum, it's your dress!?" In this situation, misinterpretation occurs. The next reason of communicative failures is when the addressee does not recognize the speaker's communicative intentions. For instance, when asking, "Where is the shopping centre?" one can hear: "The shopping centre is closed" in the situation when one needs the shopping centre only as an orientation point. Intercultural miscommunication can also pretty often arise from the assumption that the language strategies appropriate to one language can be used with an equal force in another language. Communicative failures may also occur in translation – transmitting information from one language/culture into another one. For example, the utterance "Is Mr. Brown there, please?" is not a question but an indirect request meaning "Запросіть до телефону пана Брауна". If one translates "Чи пан Браун тут?", a communicative failure will occur. A communicative failure may occur in cases with children too, because they perceive only one illocutionary force of a speech act. For example, a five-year-old daughter is carrying home a toy mother just bought for her. On their way home she often drops it. Her mother says: "You let your toy fall a hundred times!" meaning a directive: "Be more careful!" The girl, however, takes her words literally and replies: "Of course not, mom. I dropped it only five times!" Sometimes communication failures occur between different genders, as they are supposed to have different mindsets. In relation to other cultures, communicative failures are also common. Moreover, we should speak about communication failures when we speak about people with certain diseases. They often have direct interpretation of utterances even where the context encourages an indirect one.

2.7. Classification of indirect directives

Finally, I have come up with my own classification of indirect directives, because they are used by speakers who attempt to get their interlocutors to carry out an action. As a matter of fact, such indirect speech acts are often used as means of influence. The most common indirect directives in our everyday lives include: indirect requests, indirect suggestions and an indirect inviting. In the table below, you will see their specific characteristics and some illustrations from Modern English literature.

Table 1

Indirect Speech Act	Characteristics	Illustration
Indirect request	*Group 1:* Sentences concerning the hearer's ability to perform an action.	Can you pass the salt? Could you be a little quieter? You can go now. Are you able to reach the book on the top shelf? *The doctor smirked. "All right, funny guy. <u>And can you tell me your name?"</u>* *"I can,"* Doc said. (Kushner 2018, p.55).
	Group 2: Sentences concerning the speaker's wish or desire that the hearer will do an action.	I would like you to go now. I want you to do this for me. I would appreciate it if you would do it. I hope you'll do it.

		I wish you wouldn't do that.
		I would be grateful if you would help us.
		"Would you mind telling me something about where this platinum comes from, and if you can get any more of it?" asked Tom, after a pause, following the strange statement made by the Russian (Appleton 1912, p.156).
		"Craigie."
		"Yeah, Ma?"
		She looked at Martin and then at Daddy. "I'd like to be alone with Craig." Her eyes moved again to me (Everett 1983, p.88).
	Group 3: Sentences concerning the hearer's doing an action.	Would you kindly get off my foot?
		Won't you stop making tat noise soon?
		Aren't you going to eat your cereal?
		"Why don't you just write them a letter, keep me out of it?"
		"I will, if that's what you

		want. But you'll be involved at some point because I swear I'm going to convince the FBI. We'll cut our deal, and I'll say good-bye. You'll be here for the logistics." (Grisham 2012, p.76). *At exactly twelve-thirty, Nicholas said from across the room, "Hey, Herman, where's our lunch?"* (Grisham 2006, p.82).
	Group 4: Sentences concerning the hearer's desire or willingness to do an action.	Would you be willing to write a letter for me? Do you want to handle me that hammer? Would it be too much trouble for you to pay me the money today? *He cleared his throat. "You could do that now."* *"Yes, I could. <u>Do you want to help me choose one?"</u>* *"Not really. I'll wait here." He laughed. "I've already spent about an hour in there looking at them. They all seem to*

	Group 5: Sentences concerning the reasons for doing an action.	*work."* (Robinson 2008, p.39). It might help you if you shut up. If you bring me a cup of coffee, it would make me happy! *Everly stood in the doorway.* *"Oh, Everly, <u>can't you go without the glasses, just for today? They make you look cross-eyed."</u>* *"I am cross-eyed, Mother."* *"But it's so much more noticeable with those Coke bottles over your eyes. You can see without them, and it won't kill you. Just until we get through customs."* (Kushner 2008, p.46).
Indirect suggestion	Predominantly, indirect suggestions are expressed by interrogatives. The most common indirect suggestions have the structure "Why don't we…". Apart from this, they are expressed with the	*"What's the homework situation? <u>Do you want some help?"</u>* *"My mom is going to help me when she gets home."* (Franzen 2010, p.116). *<u>"Believe me, I have no plans for the evening."</u>*

	declaratives, which contain hints.	*He laughed. "Deal!"* *"Would you like some coffee?"* *"Coffee? Sure.* (Robinson 2008, p.57). *He said, <u>"Is there anything I can do about that?"</u>* *And she said, "Nothing I can think of. I don't trust nobody."* *He said, "No wonder you're tired"* (Robinson 2008, p.55). „What d'you say to a battle of pop to celebrate?" he said. (Maugham 1980, p.108). *"Maybe we can work something out," he said.* *"Really?" I asked.* *"I can't promise anything but <u>why don't we go have a drink up the street at the casino and talk about it?"</u>* *"Talk about it?"* *"There might be something we can do. I'll at least buy you a drink."* (Kushner 2013, p.201).
Indirect inviting	Indirect inviting can be	*The room clerk returned to*

	also expressed by interrogative and declarative utterances.	*the front counter* <u>*"Everything is ready, sir."*</u> *Curtis O'Keefe nodded.* (Hailey 1978, p.60). *So she asked him, "Are you going to marry her?" He was very pale. He smiled — that strange, hard shame of his — and said, "You've seen her." She said, "Well, what is Papa going to do—" "Do to me? Nothing. I mean, he's going to forgive me." He laughed. "And now I have a train to catch."* <u>*"You won't even stay for supper?"*</u> *He said, "Poor Pigtails," and smiled at her and walked out the door* (Robinson 2008, p.57).

Conclusions to Chapter Two

1. Indirect speech acts are "cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another". When we analyze an indirect speech act, its syntactic form does not correspond to its function. The illocution of an indirect speech act (the intention or the goal we wish to achieve by using a particular utterance) is what is implied but not seen in the form of the utterance. We can distinguish major characteristics of indirect speech acts from linguistic and philosophical perspectives. First of all, it is essential to dwell upon multiplicity of meanings. Indirect speech acts always have more than one meaning. In uttering, for instance, "This dish needs salt", a person may mean both "I assert that this dish needs salt" and "I request you to pass me the salt". In this case, we can define two meanings – the literal (direct) meaning and the indirect (conveyed) one. Another significant trait of indirect speech acts is rationality. Apart from this, the speaker must follow definite principles of cooperative communication. Furthermore, there exist conventions about which sentences can be used for certain indirect speech acts. The speaker can indirectly request his/her interlocutor to do a certain act by questioning his/her ability to do that act. In such a way, he/she can request the salt by saying "Are you able yet to pass me the salt?" Purposefulness is another important specific feature of indirect speech acts. The speakers usually have goals they want to achieve while uttering indirect speech acts.

2. It is important to say that as we live in a speech community, we should follow the rules and regulations of the language that our speech community uses. One of the major reasons for people to use indirect speech acts is to show their politeness. According to the politeness theory, speakers try to avoid threats to the "face" of interlocutors by different forms of indirectness, and in this way "implicate" their meanings rather than state them explicitly. Politeness and the use of indirect speech acts are considered to be one of the common means in workplaces in many cultures. People tend to use indirect speech acts in different educational institutions too. Moreover, one of the reasons why people use indirect speech acts is that they do not

want to impose themselves on other people. To sound milder and politer, they regulate the amount of imposition. Besides, people resort to using indirect speech acts because they want to be friendly as far as possible. For instance, many British restaurants and petrol stations display the sign "Thank you for not smoking." Another reason to be indirect is to hide a negative evaluation. When we do not want to directly refuse something and insult a person, we may also resort to indirectness. Indirect speech acts help us to reject proposals. For instance, the speaker asks, "Would you like to meet me for a tea?" and the interlocutor replies, "I have a lot of work to do." In this case the speaker has used an indirect speech act to reject the proposal mildly. Sometimes people are indirect, because they do not want to be open to other people. In order to keep the information private, they may resort to an Answer-evading strategy. In such cases, they may also "flout" Grice's maxims or deliberately violate some of them. Interlocutors have the right to give indirect answers, such as: "Where would you go? "I know a place." Another motivation for indirectness is personal. It is the wish to make the image and speech more interesting and unique. The use of indirect speech acts sometimes aims to increase the expressiveness of speech. It is said that speakers sometimes use indirect speech acts also because they want to express uncertainty – situations that involve unknown information. Examples could be: "I would like to know which...", "Could you please help me with...?", "I do not know which...". Apart from this, people use indirect speech acts to avoid embarrassment and awkwardness, or to reduce some sort of social tension. People tend to use indirect speech acts to influence others. But some indirect speech acts can often seem to be rude, like "Didn't I tell you yesterday to clean up your room?" or "Shouldn't you tell me who will come to the party tomorrow?", "The lawn has to be mowed till five o'clock". Such indirect requests are regrded as manipulative.

3. There exist particular structures and forms of indirect speech acts. As for the forms of indirection, one of the easiest are considered to be "whimperatives" and "hedged performatives". Whimperatives are regarded as indirect requests with the forms: "Can you...?" and "Will you...?" Another form of indirectness, which is called "hedged performatives", has the form of explicit performatives with a modal verb.

For instance, the sentences "I must ask you to go away", "I can promise you I shall be in time", "I would suggest you remember it" appear to be a request, a promise and a suggestion. As for indirect requests, the speaker can convey them just by asserting, by strategy of asking whether the intended effect can be expected to occur or by asking whether the intended effect of the speech act has already occurred. Also, the presence of the word "please" may reveal the hidden illocutionary force of a request. When the speaker wants to state something, he/she can use different forms too (for instance, the interrogative or particular past forms).

4. The speaker may use such positive types of indirect speech acts as an indirect positive evaluation, an indirect offer, an indirect advice, indirect compliments, indirect apologies and indirect speech acts of agreement. Apart from this, indirect speech acts are often used in not so positive situations. Such indirect speech acts have negative meanings, these include indirect speech acts of rejection, indirect disagreement, indirect forms of accusation, indirect speech acts of complaining, indirect threatens and indirect reproaches.

5. As in indirect speech acts the speaker does not explicitly state the intended meaning behind the utterance, it is the interlocutor's task to decode the real meaning. Successful communication depends on such particular factors as knowledge of the language, general knowledge, communicative maturity and common background. The important question is: "How should the interlocutor decide what to respond?". Usually, he/she should firstly try to understand what the speaker meant. And various interpretations will lead to different moves in his/her response. If we take an interrogative "Can you tell me what time it is?", it may elicit "Yes, I can–it's five". "Yes, I can", will be an answer to the first meaning of this question – the ability to tell the time, and the second move, "It's five", is a response to the second meaning of an indirect speech act – a request to tell the time. Special markers also play an important role in decoding indirect speech acts. In the English language, for example, the phrases "please" and "for me" can often be used to mark some utterances as requests, as in "Could you open the window for me?" The context should be also of a great help in decoding indirect speech acts. For instance, if the speaker says to a taxi

driver the minimal "To the centre", the taxi driver will infer that the speaker is requesting him/her to take the speaker to a certain destination. Let us take another example, where one and the same utterance can have different meanings in different situations. The question "What's the time?" may be understood in a particular context as the request to do something, as a warning or a suggestion for an unwelcome person to leave. In order to understand an implicit utterance, it is also necessary to realize the communicative situation that may be related to any occasion in which a speech act takes place. It includes the social setting and the status of both the speaker and the hearer. Hearers should also rely on a particular intonation pattern in order to arrive at the right understanding of the speaker's utterance. Such factors as sex, age and interpersonal relations should also be taken into account while interpreting the utterance with an indirect speech act.

6. One of the main reasons of misinterpretation is when the interlocutor focuses only on the structure of the utterance. For instance, questions with a strong expressive force are regarded as a negative evaluation of the situation that is taking place. As a matter of fact, they do not have an interrogative function. But the hearers may not understand the real message of these expressive questions. Let us take an example, where a mother sees a dirty dress that her daughter without permission wore some days ago. The mother says: "What the hell is this?" In fact, it is an indirect speech act of negative evaluation. But the daughter did not catch the meaning behind the utterance. She takes the question literally, feels quite puzzled and answers: "Mum, it's your dress!?" In this situation, misinterpretation occurs. The next reason of communicative failures is when the addressee does not recognize the speaker's communicative intentions. For instance, asking, "Where is the shopping centre?" one can hear: "The shopping centre is closed" in the situation when one needs the shopping centre only as an orientation point. Communicative failures may also occur in translation – transmitting information from one language/culture into another one. For example, the utterance "Is Mr. Brown there, please?" is not a question but an indirect request meaning "Запросіть до телефону пана Брауна". If one translates "Чи пан Браун тут?", a communicative failure will occur. A communicative failure

occurs in cases with children too, because they perceive only one illocutionary force of a speech act. For example, a five-year-old daughter is carrying home a toy mother just bought her. On their way home she often drops it. Her mother says: "You let your toy fall a hundred times!" meaning a directive: "Be more careful!" The girl, however, takes her words literally and replies: "Of course not, mom. I dropped it only five times!". Sometimes communication failures occur between different genders, as they are supposed to have different mindsets. In relation to other cultures communicative failures are also common. Moreover, we should speak about communication failures when we speak about people with certain diseases. They often have direct interpretation of utterances even where the context encourages an indirect one.

7. We have come up with our own classification of indirect directives, because they are used by the speakers who attempt to get their interlocutors to carry out an action. As a matter of fact, such indirect speech acts are often used as means of influence. The most common indirect directives in our everyday lives include: indirect requests, indirect suggestions and an indirect inviting. They have their own specific characteristics.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

One cannot deny that communication is an integral part of people's existence. That is why, the awareness of its fundamentals will definitely contribute to a better quality of our lives.

In this Paper we have provided the analysis of communication functions, the notion of discourse and dialogical discourse. We have also investigated the notion of pragmatics and its spheres of interest. Our special attention was paid to the Speech Act theory, namely to indirect speech acts.

We found out that indirect speech acts are cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another. The form and the function of such utterances do not coincide. We also identified major characteristics of indirect speech acts, such as multiplicity of meanings (they have the literal meaning and the indirect one), rationality (speakers "mutually know" certain background facts) and purposefulness (speakers usually have goals they want to achieve while uttering indirect speech acts).

We have proved by the examples from literature and serials, that the main reasons for using indirect speech acts are affiliation to speech community, politeness principles and the desire to mask a negative evaluation. Another motivation for indirectness is the wish to make the image and speech more interesting and unique. We found out that the speakers also use indirect speech acts because they want to express uncertainty or simply because they do not want to be open to other people. In addition, indirect speech acts are used to avoid embarrassment and awkwardness, to reduce some sort of social tension and to influence others.

In the practical part of our research we have analyzed possible structures of indirect speech acts and established that there exist indirect speech acts with positive and negative meanings. The speaker may use such positive types of indirect speech acts as an indirect positive evaluation, an indirect offer, an indirect advice, indirect compliments, indirect apologies and indirect speech acts of agreement. Indirect speech acts, which have negative meanings, are indirect speech acts of rejection,

indirect disagreement, indirect forms of accusation, indirect speech acts of complaining, indirect threatens and indirect reproaches.

We have also found out that there exist some "clues" as to how decode the meaning of indirect speech acts. If such "clues" are not used, communicative failures may occur. In addition, we have established our own classification of indirect directives.

We may conclude that the aims of the research have been achieved, and the tasks we have set have been fulfilled. We truly hope that the results of our research will contribute to the background knowledge on this topic and will be useful for language learners.

RESUME

До найпростіших випадків вираження значення в мові належать такі, відповідно до яких мовець, промовляючи певне висловлювання, має на увазі буквально те, що він говорить. Проте більш престижним видом вербальної комунікації вважається спілкування на імпліцитному рівні.

Непрямий мовленнєвий акт – це вираз, смисл якого виводиться не буквально, а з опертям на прихований зміст. У непрямому мовленнєвому акті мовець передає слухачеві більше змісту, ніж той, який він реально повідомляє, спираючись на фонові знання, а також на загальні здібності розумового міркування. Головними ознаками таких вислодktym є множинність значень, цілеспрямованість, раціональність, ситуативна обумовленість, інтерпретаційна діяльність адресата і креативність. Основною причиною використання непрямих мовленнєвих актів є принцип ввічливості і збереження "обличчя" мовця.

Варто також зазначити, що існують непрямі мовленнєві акти з позитивним і негативним значенням. До позитивних відносяться такі типи непрямих мовленнєвих актів, як непряма позитивна оцінка, непряма пропозиція, непряма порада, непрямі компліменти, непрямі вибачення та непряма згода. Непрямі мовленнєві акти, що мають негативні значення − це непрямі відхилення, непряма незгода, непрямі форми звинувачення, непрямі мовленнєві акти скарги, непрямі погрози та непрямі докори.

У майбутньому результати роботи можуть окреслити шляхи подальшого дослідження психологічного та соціокультурного аспектів непрямих мовленнєвих актів в сучасному діалогічному дискурсі, а також можуть бути корисними для тих, хто вивчає англійську мову.

За теоретичну основу взято праці британського філософа, засновника теорії мовленнєвих актів Джона Остіна та праці його послідовника, що запропонував поняття "непрямі мовленнєві акти" – Джона Серля.

Дипломна робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів та висновків. У списку використаної літератури нараховується 75 джерел теоретичного матеріалу.

У першому розділі роботи увага зосереджується на функціях спілкування, понятті дискурсу та діалогічного дискурсу. Також в роботі обґрунтовано поняття "прагматика" та висвітлено сфери її інтересів. Крім цього, досліджується теорія мовленнєвих актів.

У другому розділі представлені особливості непрямих мовленнєвих актів. Виокремлені різні причини використання непрямих мовленнєвих актів. Проаналізовані можливі структури непрямих мовленнєвих актів та непрямі мовленнєві акти із позитивним та негативним значеннями. Досліджується декодування значення непрямих мовленнєвих актів та випадків комунікативних невдач. В роботі також пропонується класифікація непрямих директивів.

Ключові слова: теорія мовленнєвих актів, непрямий мовленнєвий акт, імпліцитність, декодування значення, комунікативні невдачі, англомовний діалогічний дискурс.

REFERENCE LITERATURE

1. Апресян, Ю. Д. (1986). *Перформативы в грамматике и словаре.* Винница: Новая Книга.

2. Арутюнова, Н. Д. (1990). *Прагматика.* Москва: Рефл-бук.

3. Борботько, В.Г. (1981). *Элементы теории дискурса.* Грозный: Чечено-Ингуш.

4. Борисенко, Н. Д. (2015). *Висловлення згоди та відмови в дискурсі британської драми: комунікативно-прагматичний аспект.* Київ: Либідь.

5. Гончарук, П.А., Рибалка, В.В. (2000). *Психологія.* Київ: Либідь.

6. Гриценко, Т. Б., Іщенко Т. Д. (2007). *Етика ділового спілкування.* Київ: Центр Учбової літератури.

7. Гурко, О.В. (2018). *Функційно-семантична категорія ствердження в українській літературній мові.* Київ: Академвидав.

8. Демьянков, В.З. (1986). *Теория речевых актов в контексте современной лингвистической литературы: (Обзор направлений).* Москва: Прогресс.

9. Демьянков, В.З. (1995). *Доминирующие лингвистические теории в конце XX века // Язык и наука конца XX века.* Москва: Институт языкознания РАН.

10. Кокойло, Л.А. (1995). *Комплиментарные высказывания в современном английском языке : (структура, семантика, употребление).* Киев: Лебедь.

11. Колокольцева, Т.Н. (2001). *Специфические коммуникативные единицы диалогической речи.* Волгоград: Издательство Волгоградского университета.

12. Макаров, М.Л. (2003). *Основы теории дискурса.* Москва: Гнозис.

13. Матвеева, Т.В. (2010). *Словарь лингвистических терминов.* Ростов-на-Дону: Феникс.

14. Міщенко, В.Я. (1999). *Комплімент в мовленнєвій поведінці представників англомовних (британської та американської) культур.* Вінниця: Нова Книга.

15. Москаленко, В.В. (2005). *Соціальна психологія.* Київ: Центр навчальної літератури.

16. Мясоєдова, С.В., Ткач, П.Б. (2014). *Місце мотиваційної складової у формуванні спонукального значення непрямих висловлень сучасної української мови.* Одеса: Міжнародний гуманітарний університет.

17. Наумук, О.В. (2012). *Мовні засоби вербалізації поради : когнітивний та прагматичний аспекти.* Луцьк: Волинський національний університет імені Лесі Українки.

18. Николаева, Т.М. (1978). *Краткий словарь терминов лингвистики.* Москва: Прогресс.

19. Ноуэлл-Смит, П.Х. (1985). *Логика прилагательных. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Лингвистическая прагматика.* Москва: Прогресс.

20. Орєхова, Л.І. (2000). *До питання про діалог.* Київ: Либідь.

21. Орлов, Г.А. (1991). *Современная английская речь.* Москва: Высшая Школа.

22. Осовська, І.М. (2003). *Висловлювання-відмова: структурно-семантичний та комунікативно-прагматичний аспекти.* Київ: Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка.

23. Почепцов, Г.Г. (2000). *Коммуникативные технологии двадцатого века.* Москва: Рефл-бук.

24. Рождественский, Ю.В. (1997). *Теория риторики.* Москва: Добросвет.

25. Русанівський, В., Тараненко, О. (2004). *Українська мова. Енциклопедія.* Київ: Українська енциклопедія ім. М. П. Бажана.

26. Семенець Ю.С. *Мовленнєві акти незгоди.* URL: http://www.essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/Semenets.

27. Серафимова, М.А., Шаевич, А.М. (1997). *Тематические диалоги.* Москва: Просвещение.

28. Сокирська, О.С. (2012). *Статус, ознаки та особливості функціонування висловлювань відмови в англійському діалогічному мовленн.* Київ: Академвидав.

29. Степанов, О.М. (2003). *Основи психології і педагогіки.* Київ: Академвидав.

30. Степанов, О.М. (2006). *Психологічна енциклопедія.* Київ: Академвидав.

31. Степанов, Ю.С. (1995). *Альтернативный мир, Дискурс, Факт и принцип Причинности.* Москва: РГГУ.

32. Сусов, И.П. (2009). *Лингвистическая прагматика*. Винница: Новая Книга.

33. Ухванова-Шмигова, И.Ф. (2013). *Дискурсные методики в профессиональной деятельности гуманитария*. Минск: БГУ.

34. Allan, K. (1997). *Indirect Speech Acts.* In: Peter V. Lamarque (Ed.). Concise Encyclopedia of Philosophy of Language (pp. 401-403). United Kingdom: Elsevier Science Ltd.

35. Asher, N., & Lascarides, A. (2001*). Indirect speech acts.* Synthese, 128, 183-228.

36. Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

37. Bach, K. & Harnish, R. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

38. Birner, Betty J. (2013). *Textbook In Linguistics.* London: Oxford University Press.

39. Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1984). *Request and apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP).* London: Oxford University Press.

40. Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1978). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

41. Chen, H.J. (1996). *Cross-cultural comparison of English and Chinese Metapragmatics in refusal.* Bloomington: Indiana University.

42. Chen, H.J. (2001). *Toward transcultural understanding: A harmony theory of Chinese communication.* In V. H. Milhouse, M. K. Asante, & P. O. Nwosu (Eds.), Transcultural realities: Interdisciplinary perspectives on cross-cultural relations (p. 55–70).

43. Dana, R.H. (1993). *Multicultural Assessment Perspectives for Professional Psychology.* Boston, MA, USA: Allyn and Bacon.

44. Dijk, T.A. van (1976). *Pragmatics, presuppositions and context grammars.* In: S.J. Schmidt (Ed.). Pragmatik (pp. 53-82). Munich: Fink.

45. Dijk, T.A. van (2008). *Discourse and Context: A Socio-Cognitive Approach.* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

46. Dijk, T.A. van (2012). *Discourse and Knowledge*: In J.P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), Handbook of Discourse Analysis (pp. 587-603). London: Routledge.

47. Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and conversation.* In: P. Cole, & J. Morgan (Eds.). Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

48. Grice, H.P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

49. Hatim, B. & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation.* London: Routledge.

50. Hofstede, G.H. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors. Institutions and Organizations Across Nations.* London, UK: Sage.

51. Kurzon, D. (1986). *It Is Hereby Performed.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

52. Lakoff, G. (1975). *Pragmatics in Natural Logic.* In: E. Keenan (Ed.). Formal Semantics of Natural Language (pp. 253-286). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

53. Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* London: Longman.

54. Leech, G.N., & Thomas, J. (1990). *Language, Meaning and Context: Pragmatics.* In: N.E. Collinge (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language* (pp. 173-206). London: Routledge.

55. Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Minimization and conversational inference.* In: M. Bertuccelli Papi, & J. Verschueren (Eds.). The pragmatic perspective: Selected papers from the 1985 International Pragmatics Conference (pp. 61-129). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

56. Levinson, S.C. (2000). *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

57. Mey, J.L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction.* Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.

58. Morand, D.A. (2000). *Language and power: An empirical analysis of linguistic strategies used in superior-subordinate communication* (pp. 235-248). USA: Allyn and Bacon.

59. Morgan, J. (1978). *Two types of convention in indirect speech acts.* In: P. Cole (Ed.). Syntax and semantics: Pragmatics (pp. 261-281). New York: Academic Press.

60. Osisanwo, W. (2003). *Introduction to discourse analysis and pragmatics.* Lagos: Femolous Fetop Publishers.

61. Sadock, J.M. (1974). *Towards a Linguistic Theory of Speech Acts.* New York: Academic Press. Hatim, B. & Munday, J. (2004). Translation. London: Routledge.

62. Sadock, J.M. (1972). *Speech act idioms.* In: P. Peranteau, J. Levi, & G. Phares (Eds.).

63. Sadock, J.M. (2008). *Speech Acts in the book: The Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 53-73). New York: Academic Press.

64. Schlenker, Ph. (2008). *Be articulate: A pragmatic theory of presupposition.* Theoretical Linguistics, 34, 157-212.

65. Searle, J.R. (1965). *What is a Speech Act?* (pp. 221–239). London: Allen and Unwin. Bach, K. & Harnish, R. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

66. Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

67. Searle, J.R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

68. Searle, J.R. (1980). *What Is a Speech Act?* In: A. Pugh, J.V. Leech, & J. Swann (Eds.), Language and Language Use (pp. 312-327). London: Heirman Educational Book & Open University Press.

69. Searle, J.R., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

70. Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text, and interaction.* London: Sage Publications.

71. Simons, M. (2006). *Foundational issues in presupposition.* Philosophy Compass, 1 (4), 357-372.

72. Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research.* Newbury Park, London: Sage Publications.

73. Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics.* New York: Longman Group Ltd.

74. Yin, P., & Kuo, F.Y. (2013*). A study of how information system professionals comprehend indirect and direct speech acts in project communication* (226-241). New York: Academic Press.

75. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* London: Oxford University Press.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

1. Appleton, V. (1912). *Tom Swift And his Air Glider.* Louisiana: LSU Press.

2. Brown, D. (2000). *Angels and Demons.* New York: Pocket Star.

3. Brown, D. (2003). *The Da Vinci Code.* New York: Doubleday.

4. Bushnell, C. (2003). *Trading up.* London: Everyman's Library.

5. Cheever, J. (1980). *Selected Short Stories.* Moscow: Progress Publishers.

6. Christie, A. (1975). *Curtain.* New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.

7. Everett, P. (1983). *Suder.* New York: Delta.

8. Fielding, J. (2009). *Still Life.* New York: Atria Books.

9. Franzen, J. (2010) *Freedom.* NewYork: PenguinBooks.

10. Grisham, J. (1991). *The Firm.* New York: Doubleday.

11. Grisham, J. (2012). *The Racketeer.* New York: Doubleday.

12. Grisham, J. (2006). *The Runaway Jury.* New York: Delta.

13. Hailey, A. (1978). *Hotel.* New York: Bantam Books.

14. Kershaw, G. (1999). *Nothing but the Truth.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

15. Kushner, R. (2008). *Telex from Cuba.* New York: Delta.

16. Kushner, R. (2013). *The Flamethrowers.* New York: Delta.

17. Kushner, R. (2018). *The Mars Room.* New York: A Dell Book.

18. Maugham, W. (1980). *Theatre.* NewYork: PenguinBooks.

19. Mumolo, A. (2011). *Bridesmaids.* New York: Doubleday.

20. Parsons, T. (2002) *Man and boy.* London: Harper Collins Publishers.

21. Quinn, M. (2020). *The Change-Up.* New York: A Dell Book.

22. Robinson, M. (2008). *Home.* New York: Picador.

23. Robinson, M. (2014). *Lila.* New York: Picador.

24. Rowling, J. (2002). *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets.* London: Wordsworth Classics.

25. Walters, M. (2004). *Disordered Minds.* London: Wordsworth Classics.

26. Walters, M. (2008). *The Chameleon's Shadow.* London: Wordsworth Classics.

27. Walters, M. (1993). *The Ice House.* London: Wordsworth Classics.

28. Woolf, V. (1993). *Mrs. Dalloway.* London: Everyman's Library.

29. Woolf, V. (2002). *To the Lighthouse.* London: Wordsworth Classics.