

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology  
of Egypt / Egyptology

## Speech Act Analysis of Muhammad Hanif's Novel 'Red Birds'

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Muhammad Akram, <sup>2</sup>Allah Divaya, <sup>3</sup>Muhammad Javed

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor in English, KFUEIT, RYK, Pakistan

<sup>23</sup>M.phil Scholar in English Linguistics, KFUEIT, RYK, Pakistan

**Dr. Muhammad Akram, Allah Divaya, Muhammad Javed, Speech Act Analysis of Muhammad Hanif's Novel 'Red Birds',--Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 18(10), 1611-1621. ISSN 1567-214x.**

**Keywords: Paralinguistic, illocutionary force, cultural context, pragmatic realistic.**

### Abstract:

The core of Pragmatics is the study of meaning in context, to classify what is difficult in context. In fact in any literary work the context of language is felt in the text but it is not applicable all the time; however the cultural context helps for understanding the context which is not seen in the text. Hence the clues of paralinguistic's and extra linguistic which are present in the relating meaning to the context are used to get the intended meaning of the utterance. Sadock (1974) and Green (1975) elucidates clearly and aimed that speech act theory which import that there should be one to one relation between surface form and in addition to illocutionary force for direct speech acts meets through problems. There were a lot of studies regarding speech act theory as one of the major fundamentals for studying the pragmatics from theoretical and experimental perspectives. Literary texts, short stories and drama have encompassed a good pragmatic realistic, but little bit has been paid to modern novels. As the present study was carried out to examine the speech act analysis of the Novel Red Birds written by Muhammad Hanif.

### Introduction:

There are different ways to interpret the meaning of an utterance in terms of what the speaker intends to convey. According to Andrews (2010) man is the crown of creation and is gifted with

divine qualities of speaking, listening, thinking and responding. Such kinds of qualities are not found in the other creatures on the earth. According to Hikmah (2017) language is a God gifted quality which is found among the human being. With the language, people can exchange and share their ideas with others. We have not yet considered the fact that we usually know how the speaker intends us to 'take' (or 'interpret the function of') what is said. In very general terms, we can usually recognize the type of 'action' performed by a speaker with the utterance. Wharton (2009) is of the view that there is a link between the speakers and listeners who take part in the communication.

### **Discourse Analysis**

According to Yule (2020) the word 'discourse' is usually defined as 'language beyond the sentence' and the analysis of discourse is typically concerned with the study of language in text and conversation. Discourse analysis is the further investigation of text carried out to ask and to make sense of what we read, how we can recognize well-constructed texts as opposed to those that are jumbled or incoherent, how we understand speakers who communicate more than they say, and how we successfully take part in that complex activity called conversation, we are undertaking what is known as discourse analysis.

### **Speech Acts**

The term speech act is used to describe actions such as 'requesting', 'commanding', 'questioning' or 'informing'. We can define a speech act as the action performed by a speaker with an utterance. For example, when you say, 'I'll be there at six', you are not just speaking, you seem to be performing the speech act of 'promising' (Yule, 2020).

Speech acts are important factors to interpret the utterances of any speaker. Speech acts are classified into three kinds of acts such as locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. The theory of speech acts is not simply the study of a speaking act, rather it deals with the whole process of successful communication. "Speech is defined as the expression of ideas and thoughts in terms of words expressing before the public" (Humaniora, 2016).

### **Literature Review APreliminaries to Speech Act Theory**

When we wish to teach our children essential life lessons like "Don't play with fire," "Behave nicely," "Stop yelling," and so on, we sometimes utilize phrases that reflect a paradigmatic use of language, such as requests, inquiries, orders, promises, thanks, apologies, and so on. However, the ability to infer what is stated (based on its form and context) is critical for the generation and reception of coherent discourse that leads to effective communication. Such skill necessitates a thorough understanding of the physical and social worlds and assumptions about the knowledge

of the people with whom we engage. The essence of what is known as the Speech Act Theory is the formulation of this information. Speech act theory allows us to delve behind the surface of a conversation and determine the function of what is stated in the text (Cook, 2001). To put it another way, speech act theory tries to explain how speakers use language to perform intended actions and how listeners infer intended meaning from what is said. Even though speech act studies are currently regarded as a sub-discipline of cross-cultural pragmatics, they have their roots in language philosophy:

*It was for too long the assumption of philosophers that the business of a 'statement' can only be to 'describe' some state of affairs, or to 'state some fact', which it must do either truly or falsely. (...) But now in recent years, many things, which would once have been accepted without question as 'statements' by both philosophers and grammarians have been scrutinized with new care. (...) It has come to be commonly held that many utterances which look like statements are either not intended at all, or only intended in part, to record or impart straight forward information about the facts (...). (p.1)(Austin, 1962).*

There was a concept in the 1930s that a sentence had no significance unless it could be confirmed. This was founded on the "Logical Positivism" philosophy, which held that most ethical, aesthetic, and literary discourses, as well as daily statements, were meaningless. In contrast to this rather limited view, which is forced to exclude most utterances within the real world as simply nonsensical when compared to the full range of utterances in the real world, Austin (1962) proposes the second category of utterances that are not subject to the truth/falsity conditions of propositional knowledge, particularly in his *How to Do Things with Words*. Rather, they exist as performatives, or act in and of themselves, as Austin calls them. In contrast to the constative, the performative utterance is unique in that it does not describe a state of circumstances separate from itself, but rather is the reality it depicts. As a result, it's a selfreflective statement. The actions of naming, marrying, bequeathing, and betting are paradigmatic examples of these in Austin. To put it another way, as Levinson (1983) states: *Performatives are, if one likes, just rather special sorts of ceremony. And unlike constative, which are assessed in terms of truth and falsify, performatives can only be assessed as felicitous or infelicitous, according to whether their felicity conditions are met or not.*

Furthermore, according to Van Oort (1997) statements like "I name this ship HMS Hermes" do not describe a state of events in the real world, but rather create one under the utterance. The performative is thus, in the strictest sense, an act and not a representation of something else, at least not in the preferred constative sense of a representation, because the act of naming is concurrently the reference of this assertion. As a consequence, Austin (1962) distinguished two categories of Ac induction: Explicit and Inexplicit. The explicit performative utterances, according to Austin, are neither true nor false, unlike statements. A performative promise, for example, is not the same as and does not include, making a promise. It is an act of a distinct kind, the kind (promising) described by the performative verb, such as "I promise to do the dishes" in an appropriate context is more than just saying or describing something; rather, the promise is done

in making this utterance. The utterance is thus performative because promising is an illocutionary act. According to felicity criteria, however, the sentence can be uttered without the purpose of keeping the promise, in which case it is referred to as "infelicitous." There are also "implicit" or "inexplicit" performatives; for example, if someone says "Go" to command someone to leave the room, this utterance is part of the performance of a command; and the sentence, according to Austin, is neither true nor false; thus, the sentence is performative; however, it is not an explicit performative, because it is not clear that the speaker is persuading the person to leave the room. To put it another way, as stated by Verschueren (1979) quoted in Mey (1993) (p.109): *We are dealing with a performativity 'continuum' running all the way from institutionalized speech act such as 'to baptize' to everyday verbs that occasionally can take on a performative character.*

*1- A locutionary act (or locution) is the specific meaning and context of a speech.*

*2- An illocutionary act (or illocution) is an act performed during, or as a result of, the delivery of an illocution.*

*3- A perlocutionary act (or perlocution) is an act accomplished via the use of words. Austin concentrated on the second act.*

Austin concentrated on the second act. The locution falls under the realm of classical truth-based semantics. Because it deals with the results or effects of an utterance, the perlocution belongs strictly outside of the analysis of language and meaning. Between them, the illocution sits in the midst. This area is now known as pragmatics, or the study of meaning in context. Only the verbs employed to describe illocutions can be utilized as performative verbs, according to Austin Bates (1976), Lyons (1977), Benítez (1978), Brown, Brown, Brown, Gillian, and Yule (1983), (Huitink & Spender, 2004).

Searle and others refined the essential parts of Austin's speech acts into what is now known as Speech Act Theory in 1969 and 1979. In his interpretation, an 'indirect speech act' is meant to be, more specifically, an indirect 'illocutionary' act. He defines indirect speech acts as follows: *In indirect speech acts the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and nonlinguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer (J. R. Searle, 1975).*

*As a result, a description of such an act will necessitate an examination of mutually shared prior information about the dialogue, as well as rationality and linguistic rules. Searle proposes the concepts of 'primary' and 'secondary' illocutionary in relation to indirect speech acts. The indirect illocutionary deed is the most common type of illocutionary conduct. The direct illocutionary act, executed in the literal utterance of the sentence, is the secondary illocutionary act (J. R. Searle, Searle, Vanderveken, & Willis, 1985).*

In the example:

(1) Speaker A: "We should go for the university or else we'll be late."

(2) Speaker B: "I am not ready yet."

The primary illocutionary act is B's rejection of A's suggestion, and the secondary illocutionary act is B's statement that he is not ready to go. J. R. J. L. i. s. Searle (1976) is able to explain how we can grasp two meanings from the same statement while also understanding which one is the correct meaning to respond to by splitting the illocutionary act into two subparts. In his notion of speech act, he attempts to explain how a speaker can say one thing and mean it, while yet meaning something else. This would be impossible, or at the very least improbable, if the hearer had no opportunity of figuring out what the speaker was saying (over and above what she says and mean) Searle's solution is that the listener can figure out what the indirect speech act is supposed to be, and he provides various examples of how this may happen

*Clark (1996) concurs with Searle in that the consistent hypothesis of accomplishment and fulfillment for illocutionary acts can be created based on not many fundamental standards:*

*(a) Each illocutionary power can be isolated into six sorts of parts which are an illocutionary point, a method of accomplishment of that point, preliminary and genuineness conditions and the level of solidarity;*

*(b) The arrangement of illocutionary powers is recursive;*

*(c) The states of achievement of rudimentary illocutionary acts are altogether controlled by the segments of their power and their power and their propositional substance;*

*(d) The states of the fulfillment of rudimentary illocutionary acts are totally dictated by their propositional content and their bearing of fit.*

The relationship between propositional content and reality is achieved via the execution of a speech act, from which the direction of fit between words and objects may be understood, thanks to these rules. (J. R. Searle), GN Leech (1983) and Mey (1993) identified four levels on which such direction may be clearly realized:

1 Words— to — world direction of fit when the illocutionary act is completed, the propositional content of the act matches the general condition of circumstances that exist independently in the universe. For example, asserting, reporting, teaching, concluding, reacting, desiring, and so on communicates a conviction by making words match the words and committing the speaker to the reality of what is stated.

2 Fitting the world to the words (commissives and directives):

3 The reality is changed to suit the propositional content after the illocutionary deed is fulfilled. The global direction of fit applies to all speech actions containing commissure and directing points, such as pledges, vows, pleas, and commands. On the other hand, Commissures convey

an intention by making the world match the words and counting as a commitment for the speaker to participate in a future course of action, such as offering, inviting, vowing, and promising.

1 Fit in two directions (declarative):

If the illocutionary act is fulfilled, the reality is changed by the speaker's action to match the propositional content by the fact that the speaker portrays it as so. Thus, such speech actions as baptizing, declaring war, excommunicating, resigning, sentencing, and so on do not convey any psychological condition by making both the words and the world match the words and the purpose of which to create a change in (institutional) reality. (4) The (expressive) empty direction of fit:

As long as a specific psychological state is represented and a broad variety of psychological states may be expressed, no direction of it exists. As a result, the proposition attributes a quality or action to the speaker or hearer, such as apologizing, thanking, congratulating, welcoming, and so on. "Illocutionary point" was differentiated from "illocutionary deed" and "illocutionary force" by Searle. As a result, he discovered the following five basic illocutionary forces, which are the simplest conceivable forces:

- 1 The primitive assertive illocutionary force, which is named by the per formative verb "assert" and realized in the syntactic type of declarative sentences;
- 2 The primitive commissar illocutionary force, which is named by the per formative verb "commit";
- 3 The primitive directive illocutionary force, which is realized in the type of imperative sentences.
- 4 The force of declaration, which is expressed in per formative u and realized in the syntactic type of declarative sentences
- 5 The syntactic category of exclamatory phrases realizes the basic expressive illocutionary power.

Austin's taxonomy of speech actions isn't perfect since it has flaws like inconsistency and incompleteness.

As a consequence of these flaws, Searle concentrated solely on four of the twelve criteria in the speech act classification process (Illocutionary Point, Direction of Fit, Psychological State, and Content).

As a result, two criteria were established: 2- Context Conditions; 1- Reference to Speaker 'S' or Hearer 'H'. On these grounds, J. R. J. L. i. s. Searle (1976), G Leech and Thomas (1985) divides speech actions into five types as an improvement on Austin's categorization of speech acts:

1 Representative: these speech actions have the values 'true; or 'falls,' i.e., they bind the speaker to the truth of the stated statement, such as stating, reporting, teaching, concluding, and so on.

2 Instructions: the speaker's job is to persuade (direct) the listener to do something (or towards some goal)

3-Commissives: Seale calls it "unexceptionable," implying that the duty imposed in the word by commissives is imposed on the speaker rather than the hearer. As a result, they bind the speaker to future action, such as an offer, a threat, or a promise.

4 - Expressive: these words convey the speaker's inner feelings. They are naturally courteous when greeting, thanking, congratulating, and so on; yet, when criticizing and accusing, they are not.

1-Declarations: they demonstrate the connection between propositional content and actuality, and are "a highly particular category of speech actions," as Searle describes them, such as resigning, dismissing, baptizing, naming, sentencing, and so on. It is undeniable that Searle's categorization resembles Austin's, yet Searle's taxonomy is better than Austin's in one aspect. As a result, Searle coined the term "indirect speech act," which he defines as an indirect "illocutionary" act. He defines indirect speech acts as follows, based on a conception of such illocutionary acts as (roughly) acts of saying something to communicate with an audience: "In indirect speech acts, the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and nonlinguistic." (J. R. Searle, 1975). As a result, a description of such an act will need an examination of mutually shared prior knowledge about the discussion, as well as logic and language norms. Searle proposes the concepts of 'primary and secondary illocutionary actions about indirect speech acts. The indirect illocutionary deed is the most common kind of illocutionary conduct. The direct illocutionary act, which is done in the actual utterance of the phrase, is the secondary illocutionary act. In the example:

(1) Speaker A: "We should go for the university or else we'll be late."

(2) Speaker B: "I am not ready yet."

B's rejection of A's proposal is the main illocutionary act, and B's declaration that she is not ready to go is the secondary illocutionary deed. Searle is able to explain how we may comprehend two meanings from the same speech while also understanding that which is the right meaning to react to by separating the illocutionary act into two subparts. With his theory of indirect speech actions, Searle tries to explain how a speaker may say something and mean it while also implying something else. This would be impossible, or at the very least unlikely, if the listener had no possibility of figuring out what the speaker was saying (over and above what she says and means). Searle's answer is that the listener can figure out what the indirect speech act is supposed to be, and he provides many examples of how this could happen.

## **B: The Pragmatics of Narrative Functionality**

There have been efforts to apply speech act theory to the analysis of literary works since the late 1970s. The analytic usefulness of speech act analysis for literary criticism is suggested by these early efforts. At the same time, these contributions are entirely dedicated to drama, which is understandable given the importance of conversation in this genre. However, as this study demonstrates, analyzing speech acts may provide fresh insights into storytelling.

Perkmann and Walsh (2007) clearly stated that fiction is usually understood to have a secondorder relationship to the real world, i.e., it represents events or imitates discourses that we assimilate through nonfictional modes of narrative understanding, through the use of the mimetic logic of fictional representation. Narratives are constructed, and their meanings are contained within the narrative system. This general quality of narrative, according to some theorists, completely subsumes the concept of functionality: if all narratives derive their meaning from their relationships with other narratives rather than any direct purchase on reality, it no longer makes sense to use this second-order kind of relation to characterize fiction. Because the logic of narrative representation does not benefit the distinction between fiction and nonfiction, theoretical attention is focused on the act of fictive narration rather than the content of fictional narrative. As a result, an important question arises: "How can a fictional narration be a referential act, or even an act of communication?" To gain a clear understanding, a pragmatic approach to the issue of functionality is advocated (Traugott, 1980). The text of the novel was chosen as text examples, in which the overall meaning of the novel is largely determined by the specific speech acts performed by the characters in communication with one another, the order in which these individual speech acts are sequenced in the novel, and the way figural speech acts are contextualized with speech acts on the level of narrative transmission.

### **Red Bird's by Muhammad Hanif**

A brief summary of the novel will be presented in the following sections, followed by a pragmatic analysis of the utterances made by the characters in the novel. In addition, tables show the breakdown of speech acts and their illocutionary forces as a result of the data analysis.

### **APPLICATION OF PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS TO THE DATA (Red Bird's)**

A: The Analysis of "Red Birds" by Muhammad Hanif a US pilot Major Ellie crash lands near the camp of Muslims he was sent drop the bomb upon the people living in the desert. Major Elle finds the injured dog named as Mutt who is other important character of the novel and finally the dog and Major Elle are rescued by the teenage Muslim boy Momo who the money is making schemes are failing due to his family apart. The elder brother of Momo is taken away by the American soldiers from Hanger and never returned and his parents are in the condition of traumatic displacement. A young woman aid worker wanted to research on him for her book on the Teenage



Muslim Mind. The parents of Momo especially Mother dear is not willing to share any personal data with the lady Flower body an American researcher. Momo as passionate young boysets out search for his brother bro Ali. As the hypocrisy of the American's is revealed at the end why they want to collect the data about the young Muslims.

1. Representative: Analysis of the data shows that the representative speech act convey the high frequency between the other types found in the novel of "Red Birds". It is presented in 90 utterances making up 25% out of the total (250). The following is an example of the assertive illocutionary forces which occur in 55 instances with 60% out of the total (250). It is noted when the Momotried his best to rescue the American pilot major Elle who was suffering and dying with hunger in the desert. *"One saved lives. One got a biscuit as a reward. Life was a good. It had a purpose. There was a terror but after that there was a life to sniffed and saved or funerals to hang out at, where you could smell rose water over the freshly dug earth and feel sad"*. The other types of the representative speech act vary in frequency. The next in role come the responding illocutionary force where 19 utterances making up 20% out of the total (93); whereas both responding and wishing illocutionary forces are of less frequency respectively. The former type occurs in 6 utterances with 7% and the latter appears only twice with 2% out of the total (90). Consider the following example: *"Before the second worst day of my life, before the worst day of my life, there were the best days of my life."* It is a concluding illocutionary force expressed by the compilers who decided to remove the golden parts and the jewelry eyes from the statue of the happy prince and give them to the poor people of the kingdom.

2. Directive: In the case of directive speech act, 20 utterances have been realized with 7% out of the total (250). Requesting as well as question illocutionary forces occur in 8 instances at 35% out of the total. *"Goodbye earth. Goodbye war. Goodbye peace. Goodbye frozen margaritas."* Example" *What do you want to do in life?"* On the other hand, ordering illocutionary force have been realized in 5 utterances making up 22% out of the total (23), whereas no instances of responding illocutionary force do occur in the text under analysis.

3. Commissive: Commissive speech act has been realized in 8 instances in the text making up 3% out of the total (250). The only type of commissive speech act that occurs in the text is that of promising with 95% out of the total (7).

4. Expressive: As the data under analysis shows, there are 12 utterances of expressive speech act occurring with 4% out of the total (250). Three illocutionary forces within the expressive speech act vary in their frequencies respectively. Concerning surprise illocutionary force, there are 9 instances with 75% out of the total (12). The following is an example about the Momo's views for hypocrisy of American's. *"First they bomb us from the skies, then they work hard to cure our stress"* Apology illocutionary force also occurs in the text with 6 utterances at 17% out of the total (15), whereas one instance of thanking illocutionary force with 9% out of the total (15) does occur in the text under analysis. In the following example Momo expresses his emotions to show the world about the brutality of the American's and they send their members to rescue the people living in trauma. It is worth stating that through the data analysis to all three texts; there are no instances of declaration speech act that do occur.

#### TABLE ONE

#### BREAKDOWN OF SPEECH ACTS AND THEIR ILLOCUTIONARY FORCE

Text T: 250 Utt.s

SA	Representative					Directive					Commissive				Expressive					
	IF	Assertive	Concluding	Responding	Wishing	Total	Requesting	Ordering	Question	Questions Responding	Total	Offering	Promising	Threatening	Total	Apologizing	Thanking	Congratulating	Greeting	Surprise
Fr.	90	55	19	6		8	/	5	8	19	/	12	9	6	/	/	12	/	/	18
Pc.	25%	60%	20%	7%	7%	35%	0%	22%	3%	90%	0%	4%	75%	17%	0%	0%	17%	5%	0%	9%

SA → Speech Act / IF. → Illocutionary Force / Fr. → Frequency / Pc. → Percentage / Utt.s → Utterance

## Conclusion

To become fruitful communicators, people need to see how unique expression structures can be the vehicles of various informative goals. Among the things which a communicator needs to dominate to effectively plan an expression onto its planned translation are essentially the accompanying: right off the bat, the etymological assets needed to relegate syntactic and semantic design to the expression; furthermore, a high level met authentic gadget dealing with the attribution of mental states; thirdly, an arrangement of social ideas including status, authority, and so forth; at last, a bunch of higher-request portrayals determining how phonetic structures are suitably utilized in explicit settings. It has been presumed that brief tales can be examined even-mindedly also to different texts of show and novel. That the circulation of discourse acts is irregular, there is no critical example that accepts the texts. It has additionally been presumed that the recurrence of the illocutionary powers inside every discourse act is fluctuated starting with the next. In total, account talk is agreeable to discourse act examination paying little heed to the distinctive style among books and novels.

## References

- Andrews, T. (2010). *Animal speak: The spiritual & magical powers of creatures great and small*: Llewellyn Worldwide.
- Austin, J. (1962). *Speech acts*. In: Oxford.
- Bates, E. (1976). *Language and context: The acquisition of pragmatics*: Academic Press.
- Benítez, J. M. J. A. M. (1978). VAN DIJK, TA, *Text and Context. Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse (Book Review)*. 1, 384-388.

- Brown, G., Brown, G. D., Brown, G. R., Gillian, B., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*: Cambridge university press.
- Clark, B. J. J. o. L. (1996). Savas L. Tsohatzidis (ed.), *Foundations of Speech Act Theory: philosophical and linguistic perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994. Pp. viii+ 500. 32(1), 215-220.
- Cook, G. (2001). *The discourse of advertising*: Psychology Press.
- Green, C. (1975). How to get people to do things with words: The whimperative question. In *Speech acts* (pp. 107-141): Brill.
- Hikmah, S. N. (2017). *An Analysis of Language Presupposition in Advertisements of TV Channel in Indonesia*. Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar,
- Huitink, J., & Spender, J. (2004). *Cancellation resistant pcis*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the ESSLLI 2004 workshop on implicature and conversational meaning.
- Humaniora, S. (2016). *The Analysis of Speech Act of President Joko Widodo at APEC Forum*. STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY,
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics* London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Leech, G., & Thomas, J. J. L. U. L. P. i. L. (1985). *Pragmatics: The state of the art*.
- Levinson, S. C. J. C. U. (1983). *Pragmatics* Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics: Volume 1*.
- Mey, J. L. J. S. S. (1993). *Pragmatics as deconstruction*. 3(2), 219-230.
- Perkmann, M., & Walsh, K. J. I. j. o. m. r. (2007). *University–industry relationships and open innovation: Towards a research agenda*. 9(4), 259-280.
- Sadock, J. M. (1974). *Toward a linguistic theory of speech acts*: Academic Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). *A taxonomy of illocutionary acts*.
- Searle, J. R., Searle, J. R. S., Vanderveken, D., & Willis, S. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*: CUP Archive.
- Searle, J. R. J. L. i. s. (1976). *A classification of illocutionary acts*1. 5(1), 1-23. Traugott, E. C. (1980). *Linguistics for students of literature*.
- Van Oort, R. (1997). *Performative-constative revisited: The genetics of Austin's theory of speech acts*.
- Verschueren, J. F. (1979). *What people say they do with words*: University of California, Berkeley.
- Wharton, T. (2009). *Pragmatics and non-verbal communication*: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (2020). *The study of language*: Cambridge university press.