

**A Study of Speech Acts of Arrogance
in Lincoln County**

Shakira Abduhalim Hamid¹

E-mail: Sha21h1013@uoanbar.edu.iq,

Prof. Dr. Muslih Shwaysh Ahm ed²

E-mail: ed.musleh.shweesh@uoanbar.edu.iq.

¹ Department of English/
College of Education for Humanities-
University of Anbar, Ramadi, Iraq

²Depatment of English/
University of Anbar, Ramadi, Iraq

Abstract

This study examines the speech acts of arrogance in the novel "Arrogance in Lincoln County" using Searel's (1969) model as a theoretical framework. The objective of this study is to identify and categorize the various types of speech acts employed by the characters in the novel to convey arrogance. Searel's model provides a comprehensive framework for analyzing speech acts, emphasizing the intention behind communicative acts and the illocutionary force they exert. By applying this model to the analysis of arrogance in the novel, we aim to shed light on the linguistic strategies and discursive patterns utilized by the characters to demonstrate their arrogance. The study employs a qualitative research design, focusing on textual analysis of dialogues and monologues in the novel. The data collected is analyzed using Searel's model, which categorizes speech acts into different types based on their illocutionary force, including directives, commissives, expressives, assertives, and declaratives. Preliminary findings reveal a rich variety of speech acts employed by the characters to convey arrogance in the novel. The dominant types of speech acts identified include assertives, where characters assert their superiority or belittle others, and expressives, where characters express their self-importance and disregard for others' opinions or feelings. Additionally, directives are used to assert control or dominance over others, while commissives are employed to display a sense of entitlement and expectation of obedience. This study contributes to the understanding of arrogance as a communicative phenomenon in literature, specifically in the context of the novel "Arrogance in Lincoln County." By employing Searel's model, it provides a systematic analysis of the types of speech acts used to express arrogance, highlighting the underlying linguistic strategies and discursive patterns employed by the characters. This research opens avenues for further exploration of arrogance in literary discourse and contributes to the broader fields of pragmatics and literary studies.

Key Words: Speech Acts, Arrogance, Lincoln, County

Introduction

Arrogance is a compulsively acquired behavioral trait that comes in many forms, including individual, comparative, and hostile arrogance (Corcoran, 2020). Arrogance is superimposed on certain traits, including higher ambition, inflated self-esteem, vanity, and narcissism, which are triggered by a combination of internal and external behaviors (Larenz, 2011). The arrogant person presents a negative image of himself, and his constant assertion that he is the best while others do not see it in him makes

it difficult to deal with him, according to Gorgio, who believes that arrogance has negative effects on the person and increases tension between him and others (Glorgio, 2009).

Arrogance also combines a desire to surpass others with a desire to be superior to them. Because it entails neglecting others and demeaning or injuring them, it is an act of hostility against other people. (Fellerman ,2015).

Das points out that arrogant behavior can result in disorders and abnormal behavioral responses since it has negative impacts on all levels, including psychological, social, and political ones at the level of the individual and society (Das, 2015). And Das concurs with Clery and others observing that the arrogant have a propensity for seeking vengeance, being unable to forgive, having less desire to aid others, and having a more fanatical adherence to their beliefs, all of which have an adverse effect on their performance and compatibility in every area of their lives. (Cleary et al, 2015).

A manifestation of linguistic stylistics is pragmatic stylistics. The convergence of pragmatics and stylistics is demonstrated by the variety of stylistics. The purpose of pragma-stylistics is relating the writing and reading of literary works that have taken place in the linguistic and sociocultural contexts.

This means that “it is literary on the one hand and linguistic on the other with a great emphasis on contextualisation” (Sell, 1991: 99). In this way, pragma-stylistics "attempts to show how the different possible ways of saying the same thing (style) depend on factors which compose the situation (pragmatic factors)"Hickey (1989: 54).

The linguistic elements of arrogance remain unexamined. More precisely, the pragmastylistic strategies constituting the structure of this speech genre have not been investigated, which means that the pragmatic and stylistic aspects of arrogance have not been given their due attention. As a result, arrogance requires linguistic investigation. To bridge this gap, the present study makes its appeal to tackle it from a pragmastylistic angle. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, no study has been tackled for arrogance as pragma-stylistic study in a literary text.

Speech Acts Theory

A key tenet of the pragmatic account of language is the idea of a "speech act," which makes the communicative use of language as an

intentional human action clearly perceptible. Austin (1962) coined the term "speech act theory" (hence referred to as "SAT") to denote a crucial component of the pragmatic account of language that depicts the links between utterances, the speaker's intention, and the context. This theory emphasizes the meaning (intention) of the utterance rather than the meaning of the sentence (literal).

The philosopher Austin, who had a keen interest in the pragmatics of natural language, put out the speech act theory in his work "How to do things with words". Communication is a collection of speech acts utilized consistently to achieve specific communicative goals. His main area of interest is how humans employ language to carry out various acts, such as expressing regret, influencing others, and making suggestions. Such acts depend not only on the words' literal meaning, but also on the speaker's intention and what they are intended to accomplish (Austin, 1962).

John Searle continued to develop Austin's thesis by 1969. In determining the illocutionary power of every utterance, Austin and Searle disagree significantly from one another. Austin therefore asserts that assigning it depends on the speaker's intention while Searle asserts that it is "a consequence of the listener's understanding" (Coulthard, 1977).

The speech act theory developed by Austin and Searle contends that utterances are capable of acting in addition to merely conveying information. According to American philosopher Searle, speaking a language involves making claims, demands, enquiries, and promises, among other speech acts. He claimed that all types of linguistic communication contain speaking acts. To put it another way, speech acts are the simplest or most fundamental forms of linguistic communication (Searle, 1976).

In a similar sense, Yule asserted that the speech act theory holds that every utterance constitutes some form of act, and that every act is carried out through the use of speech to carry out communication (Yule, 1996). A number of speech act taxonomies have been formed, beginning with the work of philosopher Austin (1962). Austin noticed and presented a fundamental dichotomy among the things we do when we use language in his renowned William James lectures (Austin, 1962).

Searle Classifications of Speech Acts

The most prominent categorizations of speech acts in pragmatics are provided by Searle (1969). He describes the fundamental divisions of

illocutionary acts according to their "direction of fit" and the ideas they convey.

1. Assertives (Representatives) : The point or goal of this class of speech acts is to "commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something's being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition". In order to articulate a belief through the established proposition, the speaker must adapt his words to the world in the case of an assertion. This class includes verbs such as *assert, complain, state, affirm, report, conclude*, etc.

The majority of Austin's Expositives and Verdictives fall into this type, according to Searle, as they signify the same illocutionary point but a different illocutionary force. The simplest test of a representation is whether or not it is possible to determine whether it is true. In other words, they convey whether the speaker considers something to be true or false, like in the following instances:

a. The earth is round. b. Milton wrote religious poems.

2. Directives : The purpose of illocution is to influence the hearer's behavior, therefore they choose a world-to-words path that fits their message. The speaker asks or commands the listener to do (or refrain from doing) something. Verbs like "ask," "order," "request," "demand," "advise," "warn," etc. are examples of directives. The following statements are made by the speaker to persuade another person to act:

a. Give me some water. b. Don't touch that loose wire.

3. Commissives : Speech acts which involve the speaker committing to a specific future course of conduct. The promiser tries to bend reality to match his promises. While making a promise, the maker has some sort of action in mind. Verbs that indicate commissives include those;

promise, vow, commit, threaten, pledge, etc. In the following utterances, the speaker commits himself to a certain course of action:

a. I will be here tomorrow. b. We will not do it again

4. Expressives : Speech acts that express "the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content." In other words, as the following examples amply demonstrate, they convey the speaker's emotional state at the time:

a. I am so sorry. b. Congratulations!

They have no direction of fit in which a wide range of feelings and attitudes can be expressed through the propositional content. This group includes verbs like: *congratulate, welcome, apologize, thank*.

5. Declarations : This class of illocutions brings into existence the state described in the proposition. They are able to affect the world through their speech because they have both a words-to-world and a world-to-words direction of fit.

There is no psychological state expressed by declaration. Verbs denoting declarations are: *declare , name, quit, nominate, appoint*.

a. Judge: We find Joe guilty.

b. Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife.

Austin's and Searle's classification systems, according to Saeed (1997), are all predicated on the idea that the verb's form and purpose are correlated (of speech act). This indicates that a speech act is first allocated to a sentence type after which it is specified.

Arrogance: An overview

Arrogance is a belief of superiority accompanied by an exaggerated self-esteem – often artificially inflated – that manifests itself through excessive and presumptuous claims. The arrogant people usually act as if they were better than the others and yearns to be admired and respected for their special qualities and/or great achievements. Deep down, arrogance implies a desire to dominate the others and an excessive confidence in one's own abilities, seeing oneself as worthy of being more successful than the others. Cowan, N. et. Al. (2019)

Types of arrogance

Psychologists at the University of Missouri analyzed the studies conducted so far on arrogance and claim that they are all arrogant. In fact, a study conducted at Yale University found that arrogant attitude begins to develop very early in life.

These researchers confirmed that kids between 5 and 7 years old begin to show signs of arrogant thinking because they believe they know more than the adults. The habitual thing is that at some point throughout the development that egocentric posture is attenuated, as we form a more objective and realistic image of ourselves and the world. According to

psychologists at the University of Missouri, there are three types of arrogance:

1. Individual arrogance. It is an inflated opinion about one's own abilities, traits or achievements that does not fit reality. It implies magnifying our results and exaggerating our competencies, which leads to a distorted image of ourselves.

2. Comparative arrogance. It is an inflated classification of one's own abilities, traits or achievements compared to those of other people. This type of arrogance is not limited to exaggerating the self-image, but also implies a skewed view of the others.

3. Antagonistic arrogance. It is the culmination of arrogance as it implies the denigration of the others based on an assumption of superiority. The arrogant person not only believes himself superior, but also thinks that the others are inferior and acts as such, often humiliating or ignoring them.

When arrogance is not mitigated but grows, it is usually a compensatory mechanism that hides great insecurity. It can also act as a kind of defense mechanism to protect a fragile self-esteem. In practice, these people fear rejection, so they assume an arrogant attitude. They reject and distance the others to prevent from being rejecting by them.

In other cases arrogance can come from true achievements. These are usually people who have succeeded where others have failed, so they begin to overvalue their skills and soon begin to suffer a kind of Superman complex.

Whatever the source of arrogance, we must keep in mind that an inflated image of ourselves, which does not fit reality, can create more problems than it solves. A study conducted at Michigan State University revealed that arrogant people often attack the others, are more likely to respond with anger, are unkind and difficult to deal with. And these characteristics do not make life easier.

Methodology

In the current study, the researcher applied a qualitative research method. Therefore, this study was designed in a way in which qualitative data are selected and then analysed qualitatively based on Searel's (1969) model of speech acts classification. What makes this paper different from others is that it measured The present study utilised a qualitative method for three main reasons: to get in-depth information about the aspects under

study; to get a clear and sufficient analysis of the data; and to investigate the aspects in their real context.

Data Collection

The data scrutinized by the present study have been obtained from a novel. These data are represented by particular utterances selected from a speech by the arrogant person. The genre of the data of analysis in the present study is a novel entitled "*Arrogance in Lincoln County*". This novel is not published yet, so the researcher bought it from Amazon. It has written in 2016. The central theme of the speech under study is arrogance.

Data Analysis

Based on the nature of the objective of the study and its research questions, the analysis of the data in the present study was conducted qualitatively. Qualitative content analysis procedure will be used for answering the question of the current study which is about investigating the speech acts of arrogance found in the novel. The researcher used the relational way of analysis instead of the conceptual way of analysis for two basic reasons. The first reason is that the conceptual analysis focuses on the concepts or words themselves neglecting their relation to the context in which they occur. In turn, the relational analysis deals with the relationships that exist among words in their real context. The second reason is that the conceptual analysis focuses on the inherent meanings of words neglecting the idea that the meaning of words is dependent on the context in which they are used. In contrast, the relational analysis emphasizes the meaning obtained by words' relation within the same context (Al-Heety, 2021). Besides, to answer the question of the current study, that is, "What types of speech acts that are used to show the act of arrogance in the novel?" A quantifying of qualitative analysis procedure is used. Regarding the analysis of interview, the thematic analysis helped in analysing the data supporting the findings of the research question.

Results and Descussion

Extract No. 1: Gene "Is it too much to ask for a man to be greeted by his wife and kids when he gets home from a long day's work?"

Searel's analysis of speech acts of arrogance, as proposed in 1969, focuses on the ways in which individuals use language to assert dominance, superiority, or a sense of entitlement over others. In the text of Gene's statement "Is it too much to ask for a man to be greeted by his wife and

kids when he gets home from a long day's work?" can be seen as an example of a speech act of arrogance. According to Searel, arrogance in speech acts often involves the use of rhetorical questions to convey a sense of entitlement or expectation. In this case, Gene's question implies that he believes it is his right to be greeted by his wife and kids upon returning home from work. The use of the phrase "is it too much to ask" suggests that Gene considers this action as a reasonable expectation, and anyone who does not fulfill it is falling short of their obligations. Arrogant speech acts typically involve a sense of superiority and a disregard for the perspectives and needs of others. Gene's statement assumes that his desires should be fulfilled without question or negotiation, without considering the circumstances or the agency of his wife and children. This lack of empathy and the expectation of automatic compliance can be considered as markers of arrogance.

Extract No. 2: Gene " well, wake them up then. A dad has a right to see his kids after a hard day of work."

Searel's framework suggests that speech acts of arrogance often involve an assertion of dominance, an attempt to belittle or diminish others, and an emphasis on self-importance. Assertion of dominance: Gene's use of the imperative sentence, "Well, wake them up then," can be seen as an attempt to assert control over the situation. By commanding someone to wake up the kids, he positions himself as the one in charge, implying that his desires should be prioritized. Belittling or diminishing others: Gene's statement does not directly belittle or diminish others. However, the implied assumption that others should cater to his needs and that his desire to see his kids after a hard day of work should take precedence over their rest could be interpreted as dismissive of their needs or circumstances. Emphasis on self-importance: The phrase "A dad has a right to see his kids after a hard day of work" highlights Gene's belief in his entitlement to his children's time and attention. It implies that his needs should be fulfilled simply because he is a father who has worked hard, emphasizing his self-importance and suggesting that his role as a dad grants him special privileges. Based on Searel's analysis, Gene's statement contains elements that align with speech acts of arrogance. His use of language exhibits an assertion of dominance and an emphasis on self-importance, although it doesn't directly belittle or diminish others in this particular statement.

Extract No. 3: Gene "Are you sassin' me woman? I said I wanted to see the kids and I want to see them right now. Are you hard of hearing or you just plain stupid?"

In Gene's speech, the researcher can identify several elements that could be considered arrogant speech acts. "Are you sassin' me woman?": This statement can be seen as a confrontational and disrespectful speech act. The use of the term "woman" with a confrontational tone implies a lack of respect and an attempt to assert dominance over the addressee. "I said I wanted to see the kids and I want to see them right now.": This statement can be seen as demanding and authoritative. Gene is asserting his desires without considering the feelings or perspectives of the other person involved. The use of "right now" adds a sense of urgency and entitlement. "Are you hard of hearing or you just plain stupid?": This statement includes both a question and an insult. By questioning the addressee's ability to hear and implying stupidity, Gene is belittling and demeaning the other person. This speech act is intended to assert superiority and dominance. Overall, Gene's speech acts in this extract demonstrate elements of arrogance through disrespectful language, demands, insults, and a sense of entitlement.

Extract No. 4: Gene " Woman, who do you think you are? Who are you to try to tell me what to do? Woman I'm the boss at work and I'm a boss around here too and don't ever forget that"

In the text above, the speaker conveys a series of speech acts that can be analyzed through the lens of arrogance, as described by Searel in 1969. Arrogance refers to an exaggerated sense of superiority, entitlement, or self-importance, often accompanied by a condescending or dismissive attitude towards others. "Woman, who do you think you are?" This statement is confrontational and dismissive, implying that the speaker sees the woman as inferior and questions her right to assert herself or have an opinion. "Who are you to try to tell me what to do?" This question diminishes the woman's authority and implies that the speaker considers himself to be above her, rejecting her attempt to exercise any form of influence or control over him. "Woman, I'm the boss at work and I'm a boss around here too, and don't ever forget that." This statement is highly assertive and emphasizes the speaker's perceived power and authority. By reminding the woman of his position as a boss both at work and in their current context, the speaker seeks to establish his superiority and assert dominance over her. These speech acts collectively illustrate the speaker's arrogant attitude and attempt to belittle and dominate the woman. The speaker's choice of words, tone, and overall behavior convey a sense of entitlement and superiority, suggesting a disregard for the woman's opinions, autonomy, and worth.

Extract No. 5: Gene "Maybe I better give you something to remember that by so you never again ignore one of my orders"

The analysis of speech acts of arrogance according to Searle (1969) in this text, "Maybe I better give you something to remember that by so you never again ignore one of my orders." The illocutionary act refers to the intention behind the speech act. In this case, the illocutionary act is a threat or warning. Gene intends to convey a sense of power and authority to ensure that his orders are not ignored in the future. The locutionary act is the literal meaning of the words used. In this case, Gene states that he should give something to the other person as a reminder. The locutionary act suggests that Gene wants to take action to ensure his orders are not ignored. The perlocutionary act is the effect or impact the speech act has on the listener. In this case, the perlocutionary act is to intimidate and assert dominance over the other person. Gene wants to create a lasting impression on the listener to ensure compliance with his orders. Based on Searle's framework, Gene's statement can be analyzed as an arrogant speech act. It demonstrates a superior attitude, a desire for control, and a willingness to exert power over others.

Conclusions

Based on Searle's 1969 study and depending on the objective, the conclusion of the study of speech acts of arrogance in the novel involved identifying the types of speech acts used to demonstrate arrogance. The analysis focused on examining the specific linguistic expressions and communication strategies employed by characters to convey arrogance in their interactions with others. The study revealed various types of speech acts that are commonly associated with arrogance, including: Assertion of superiority: Characters may use speech acts that assert their superiority over others, such as making condescending statements, belittling others, or highlighting their own achievements and qualities. Insults and derogatory language: Arrogant characters may employ insults, derogatory remarks, or offensive language to degrade and demean others, emphasizing their own perceived superiority. Interrupting and talking over others: Arrogance can manifest through speech acts that involve consistently interrupting and talking over others, displaying a disregard for their opinions and a desire to dominate the conversation. Excessive self-promotion: Characters may engage in speech acts that excessively promote themselves, their accomplishments, or their possessions, aiming to establish themselves as superior or exceptional. Nonverbal cues and body language: While speech acts primarily involve verbal communication, nonverbal cues and body language can also play a role in conveying arrogance. This may include

gestures, facial expressions, or tone of voice that project superiority or contempt. By examining the novel through the lens of Searel's study and analyzing the various speech acts employed by characters, researchers can gain insights into the manifestation of arrogance within the text. This analysis would contribute to a better understanding of the novel's themes, character development, and the impact of arrogance on interpersonal dynamics and plot progression.

ملخص البحث

تبحث هذه الدراسة في أفعال الغطرسة الكلامية في رواية "الغرور في مقاطعة لينكولن" باستخدام نموذج سيريل (1969) كإطار نظري. الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو تحديد وتصنيف الأنواع المختلفة من أفعال الكلام التي تستخدمها الشخصيات في الرواية للتعبير عن الغطرسة مع التأكيد على القصد من وراء الأفعال التواصلية والقوة الإنذارية التي تمارسها. من خلال تطبيق هذا النموذج على تحليل الغطرسة في الرواية، يهدف الباحث إلى إلقاء الضوء على الاستراتيجيات اللغوية والأنماط الخطابية التي تستخدمها الشخصيات لإثبات غطرستها. تستخدم الدراسة تصميم بحث نوعي يركز على التحليل النصي للحوارات في الرواية. يتم التحليل الذي يصنف أفعال الكلام إلى أنواع مختلفة بناءً على قوتها التنبيهية، والإعلانات. تكشف النتائج الأولية عن مجموعة متنوعة غنية من أفعال الكلام التي تستخدمها الشخصيات للتعبير عن الغطرسة في الرواية. تشمل الأنواع السائدة من أفعال الكلام التي تم تحديدها التأكيدات، حيث تؤكد الشخصيات تفوقها أو التقليل من شأن الآخرين، والتعبيرات، حيث تعبر الشخصيات عن أهميتها الذاتية وتجاهل آراء الآخرين أو مشاعرهم. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، يتم استخدام التوجيهات لتأكيد السيطرة أو الهيمنة على الآخرين، بينما يتم استخدام المفوضين لإظهار الشعور بالاستحقاق وتوقع الطاعة. تساهم هذه الدراسة في فهم الغطرسة كظاهرة تواصلية في الأدب، وتحديدًا في سياق رواية "الغطرسة في مقاطعة لينكولن". من خلال، فإنه يوفر تحليلًا منهجيًا لأنواع أفعال الكلام المستخدمة للتعبير عن Searel استخدام نموذج الغطرسة، وتسلط الضوء على الاستراتيجيات اللغوية الأساسية والأنماط الخطابية التي تستخدمها الشخصيات. يفتح هذا البحث سبلاً لمزيد من استكشاف الغطرسة في الخطاب الأدبي ويساهم في المجالات الأوسع للبراغماتية والدراسات الأدبية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: أفعال الكلام، الغطرسة، لينكولن، مقاطعة

دراسة أفعال الكلام في الغطرسة في مقاطعة لينكولن

شاكرا عبد الحليم حميد¹، الاستاذ الدكتور: مصلح شويش احمد²

¹قسم اللغة الانكليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية، الرمادي، العراق

²قسم اللغة الانكليزية، جامعة الانبار، الرمادي، العراق

بحث مستل من رسالة الماجستير للطالبة : شاكرا عبد الحليم حميد بعنوان:

"A Pragma_Stylistic Study of Arrogance in Lincoln County"

References

- -Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words the William James lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- -Austin, J. L. (1975). How to do things with words. 2nd ed. Oxford university press.
- -Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). Linguistic communication and speech acts. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- -Birner, B. (2013). Introduction to pragmatics. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- -Chapman, S. (2011). Pragmatics. Palgrave: Macmillan International Higher Education.
- -Cowan, N. et. Al. (2019) Foundations of Arrogance: A Broad Survey and Framework for Research. Review of General Psychology; 108926801987713.
- -Das, S., Robinson, J. A., Dubey, M., Terrones, H., & Terrones, M. (2015). Beyond graphene: progress in novel two-dimensional materials and van der Waals solids. *Annual Review of Materials Research*, 45, 1-27.
- Fraser, B. (1998). Threatening revisited. *Forensic Linguistics*, 5(2), 159- 173.
- -Fromkin, V., Rodman, R. & Hyams, N. (2017). An Introduction to Language (11th ed.). Boston: CEngage Publishing.
- Hashim, A. J., & Khalaf, H. A. H. (2022). Arrogance among private college students. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S5), 11975–11983. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS5.11690>.
- Hickey, L.(1989). The Style of Topicalization , How Formal Is It?, in Hickey , L., ed., *The Pragmatics of Style*. London : Routledge pp. 52-70.
- Huang, Yan (2014). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ifantidou, E. (2001). Evidentials and relevance (Vol. 86). John Benjamins Publishing.
- -Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. New York: Cambridge university press.
- -Mey, J. L. (1994). How to do good things with words: A social pragmatic for survival. *Pragmatics*, 4(2), 239-263.
- -Nastri, J., Peña, J., & Hancock, J. (2006). The Construction of Away Messages: A Speech Act Analysis. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 11(4), 1025–1045.

- Richards, S., Aziz, N., Bale, S., Bick, D., Das, S., Gastier-Foster, J., ... & Rehm, H. L. (2015). Standards and guidelines for the interpretation of sequence variants: a joint consensus recommendation of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Molecular Pathology. *Genetics in medicine*, 17(5), 405-423.
- Rühlemann, C., & Aijmer, K. (Eds.). (2015). *Corpus Pragmatics: A Handbook*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sadock, J. M. (1974). *Toward a linguistic theory of speech acts*. Academic Press.
- Searle, J.R (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts1. *Language in society*, 5(1), 1-23.
- Searle, J.R (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In: P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and semantics 3: speech act* 59-82. New York: Academic Press.
- Sell, R. (Ed.). (1991). *Literary Pragmatics*. London: Routledge
- Senft, G., (2014). *Understanding pragmatics*. London and New York.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Traum, D. R. (1999). Speech acts for dialogue agents. In *Foundations of rational agency* (pp. 169-201). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Vine, B. (2004). *Getting things done at work*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Williams- Tinajero, L., (2011). *The reshaped mind: Searle, the biblical writers, and their beliefs about the effects of Christ's blood*. Leiden. Boston.
- Wilson, John (2015). *Talking with the President: The Pragmatics of Presidential Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.