



VOLUME 14, NO. 1, JUNE 2024

ALLEMANIA

Journal homepage:

<https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/allemania/index>



# German Speech Act Analysis In The Romance *Land In Sicht* By Ilona Hartmann (A Pragmatic study)

Melky Ayu Wijayanti<sup>1\*</sup>, Firda Aulia Nur Azizah<sup>2</sup>, Putrasulung Baginda<sup>3</sup>

Universitas Negeri Jakarta<sup>\*</sup>, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

## Article Info

### Paper Type:

### Research Paper

Received: February 03, 2024

Revised: March 10, 2024

Accepted: April 30, 2024

First Available online: June 27, 2024

Publication Date: June 27, 2024

## Abstract

*This research examines speech acts, especially illocutionary acts contained in the romance Land in Sicht by Ilona Hartmann through a pragmatic approach. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the meaning of speech that is bound by context. This illocutionary act is studied based on the type, function, and form by using Searle and Leech's theory. The purpose of this research is to know and understand the types, functions, and forms of illocutionary acts used by speakers to speech partners in the speech that has been delivered. This research focuses on the actions taken by a speaker when delivering an utterance to a speech partner, so that the speech partner needs to understand the meaning of the utterance that has been delivered with the help of the context that surrounds it. This research is designed by using qualitative research method with descriptive analysis. The results prove that there are four types of illocutionary acts found in this romance, namely assertive, directive, commissive, and expressive illocutionary acts. The most common type found is the type of assertive illocutionary acts. Based on the analysis, there are three functions of illocutionary acts found, namely competitive, pleasant, and cooperative functions. The majority of the data is included in the fun function. Then the forms of illocutionary acts found in this romance are direct and indirect illocutionary acts with the majority of the utterances falling into the form of direct illocutionary acts.*

**Keywords:** Pragmatics, Romance, Illocutionary Acts

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The use of language is a very inherent part of human daily life, both written and spoken. One of the functions of language is as a means of communication and is used by people to interact. When communicating, there is a process of conveying information from the speaker (speaker) to

<sup>1\*</sup>Corresponding author: melkyayu@unj.ac.id

the speech partner (listener) and that is where information can be conveyed. The delivery of information alone is not enough to guarantee the conveyance of ideas from speakers to speech partners. The participants involved in the communication process must ensure that the meaning received by the speech partner is the same as the meaning expressed by the speaker. Thus, the meaning of speech or the meaning of writing plays an important role in the communication process. The branches of linguistics that make meaning the object of study are semantics and pragmatics. In this study, the author chose to use studies in the field of pragmatics, because in fact someone will not be able to interpret the meaning implied in the use of language without an understanding of the context. One example is when someone says something, then to understand the context it must be seen from other utterances that exist before and after the utterance is delivered. An example of speech in the study of pragmatics is when the speaker says to the speech partner "*Es regnet*", the speech can have several meanings from different situations. It could be that the speaker only states facts about the weather conditions at that time, asks the speech partner to get an umbrella or even hints at a complaint. This needs to be considered to study speech act units, because when communicating there are actions taken by speakers to speech partners implicitly. An example of speech act is when a speaker says:

(1) "*Komm sofort her.*"

'Come here immediately.'

In this speech, it can be seen that the meaning of the action that the speaker wants to convey to the speech partner is to ask or order the speech partner to take an action that has been said, namely to come here immediately.

(2) "*Ich verspreche, dass ich von nun immer fleißig bin.*"

'I promise that from now on I will always be diligent.'

In the speech, it can be seen that the meaning of the action that the speaker wants to interpret to the speech partner is binding, which means that the speaker will carry out what has been said, namely promising to always be diligent from now on.

From the two examples above, it can be said that speech or utterances that involve a certain action can be identified as a form of speech act. On this occasion, the researcher will analyze speech acts contained in written speech. The written speech or data source that will be analyzed is a German literary work, namely a romance. The researcher uses the romance *Land in Sicht* by Ilona Hartmann which was published on July 21, 2020 by Blumenbar and has 160 pages.

This romance was chosen because there are many series of speech acts in the conversation so that the data to analyze these speech acts will be sufficient. In addition, researchers are very interested in analyzing the speech acts of the characters, because by examining this, readers of German literature can understand the action to do something in the speech conveyed by the author by looking at the existing context.

The problem limitation in this research will be focused on one aspect of speech acts, namely illocutionary acts, in which the types, functions, and forms of illocutionary acts will be explained. The discussion of the types of illocutionary acts will refer to Searle's theory (1999) in his book entitled *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Searle divides illocutionary acts into five types, namely assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative. Then to find out the function contained in the illocutionary act, the researcher will use Leech's theory (1983). There are four illocutionary functions classified by Leech, namely

competitive, pleasant, cooperative, and conflicting. After that, it will be explained about the form of direct and indirect illocutionary acts.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

"Charles Morris, a philosopher in 1938, was the first to introduce the term pragmatics. According to him, pragmatics is a general form of the science of signs or semiotics" (Sulistyono, 2013, p. 1). Morris divides it into three branches of study, namely syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. To find out these three branches more, here are some opinions from experts. Morris (in Finkbeiner, 2015, p. 10) states that "*Morris hat unter Einfluss von Peirce eine Dreiteilung aus zeichentheoretischer Sicht vorgenommen, nach der die Syntax sich mit den formalen Beziehungen zwischen Zeichen beschäftigt, die Semantik mit der Beziehung zwischen Zeichen und Bezeichnetem, und die Pragmatik mit der Beziehung zwischen Zeichen und ihren Interpreten, also den Sprachbenutzern*". Morris, referring to Peirce, analyzes three parts based on the theoretical point of view of signs: syntax which deals with the formal relationship between signs, semantics is the relationship between signs and signifiers, and pragmatics is the relationship between signs and their interpreters, namely language users.

Then Finkbeiner (2015, p. 8) argues that "*Während die Pragmatik die kontextabhängigen Aspekte von Bedeutung untersucht, beschäftigt sich die Semantik mit der kontextunabhängigen - oder wörtlich - Bedeutung*." Based on the above quote, it can be understood that 'Pragmatics studies the meaning that is bound from its contextual aspects, while semantics only studies its literal meaning'. Hermaji (2021, p. 15) expressed the same opinion, he stated that "... the meaning studied in semantics is context-free meaning, while the meaning studied in pragmatics is context-bound meaning (speaker intent) 'speaker meaning' or 'implied meaning'". Then Yule (2014, p. 3) argues about the definition of pragmatics, he says that "Pragmatics is the study of the meaning conveyed by speakers (or writers) and interpreted by listeners (or readers)". Yule then divides it into four studies covered in pragmatics, namely (1) pragmatics is the study of speaker intent, (2) pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning, (3) pragmatics is the study of how to get more said than said, and (4) pragmatics is the study of expression from a distance relationship.

In addition, Levinson (1983, p. 21) argues about one of the definitions of pragmatics, namely "Pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding." The sentence can be interpreted that 'Pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and context which is the basis for an explanation of language understanding'. Language understanding in question is understanding beyond the meaning of words and their grammatical relationships, namely the relationship with the context of their use to understand a language expression or utterance. Based on some of the opinions, it can be concluded that pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies and examines the meaning of speech that is bound by context. The opinions of Morris, Finkbeiner, Hermaji, Yule, and Levinson are important and relevant to this research, because they state the importance of the relationship between the meaning of the speech conveyed and the context that surrounds it in this pragmatic study.

The theory of language use or speech acts was originally proposed by Austin in his lecture The William James Lectures at Harvard University in 1955 and in previous years at Oxford (1952-1954). Austin (1962, p. 5) argues that "The uttering of the sentence is, or is a part of, the doing of an action, which again would not normally be described as saying something". The sentence can

be understood that 'Speaking a sentence is part of doing an action, meaning that in the speech conveyed by the speaker has an intention that will have an impact on the speech partner'. So when someone uses language, he actually does not only produce a series of isolated sentences, but performs an action or makes other people do something behind his speech.

Then this theory was developed by Searle who was one of Austin's students. According to Searle (in Hermaji, 2021, p. 43), "The study of speech acts is built on the assumption that the smallest unit of human communication is not built by sentences or other forms, but is built by language actions or actions." Then Finkbeiner (2015, p. 16) argues that "*Die Grundidee der Sprechakttheorie ist, dass wir mit Äußerungen Handlungen vollziehen.*" The sentence can be translated as 'The basic idea of speech act theory is that we perform actions with speech'. Finkbeiner's opinion is in line with the opinion expressed by Yule (2014, p. 82) who argues that "Actions performed through speech are usually called speech acts." From the opinions of Searle, Finkbeiner, and Yule above, it can be concluded that speech acts are a form of action resulting from a speech that has been delivered.

Finkbeiner (2015, p. 20) says that "*Der illokutionäre Akt ist die Komponente, die beschreibt, als was die Äußerung gelten soll: als Versprechen, als Bitte, als Behauptung usw. In einem engen Sinn wird 'Sprechakt' auch oft gleichbedeutend mit Illokution gebraucht.*" Based on the above quote, it can be understood that 'Illocutionary acts are components that describe what is meant by the utterance delivered: whether as a promise, request, affirmation, and so on. So in a narrow sense, speech acts are often used as synonyms for illocutionary acts'. Austin (1962, p. 99) states that an illocutionary act is "...performance of an act in saying something...". This is in line with the theory of illocutionary acts according to Lyons (in Hermaji, p. 46) who argues that "An illocutionary act is an act performed by saying something such as promising, commanding, requesting, and thanking."

Therefore, it can be concluded that illocutionary acts are actions to do something intended based on what has been said. When a speaker delivers a speech to a speech partner, the speaker is actually performing the action of his speech. There are five types of illocutionary acts that have been classified according to Searle's theory (1999). The five types of illocutionary acts are as follows:

1. Assertive

Assertive is an illocutionary act that binds the speaker to the truth of the proposition expressed. Searle (in Finkbeiner, 2015, p. 28) says that "*Mit einem assertiven Sprechakt legt sich der Sprecher darauf fest, dass die durch die Äußerung ausgedrückte Proposition p wahr ist.*" Based on the quote, it can be understood that with 'Assertive speech acts, the speaker binds himself to the fact that the proposition expressed by the speech is true'. There are several actions that fall into the type of assertive illocutionary acts such as *behaupten* 'state', *mitteilen* 'inform', *berichten* 'report', *informieren* 'inform', *beschreiben* 'describe', and so on.

2. Directive

Directive is an illocutionary act that aims to make speech partners perform an action that has been mentioned by the speaker. Searle (in Busch & Stenschke, 2008, p. 219) states that in directive speech acts "*Der Sprecher gibt zu erkennen, was er will, dass der andere tun soll.*" The sentence can be translated as 'In directive speech acts, the speaker states clearly what he wants others to do'. There are several actions that fall into the type of directive illocutionary acts such as

*befehlen* 'command', *bitten* 'ask', *auffordern* 'invite', *verbieten* 'prohibit', *einladen* 'invite', and so on.

### 3. Commissive

Commissive is an illocutionary act in which the speaker is bound to a future action, so that the speaker is required to carry out everything mentioned in his utterance. Searle (in Finkbeiner, 2015, p. 28) argues that "*Mit einem kommissiven Sprechakt legt sich der Sprecher selbst auf die Ausführung einer zukünftigen Handlung fest. Als Prototyp gilt das Versprechen, weitere Kommissiva sind z.B. Angebot und Schwur.*" From the above quote, it can be understood that 'With commissive speech acts, speakers commit to the implementation of their future actions. Just as a promise is considered a prototype, other examples are an offer and an oath'. There are several actions that fall into the type of commissive illocutionary acts such as *versprechen* 'promise', *drohen* 'threaten', *vereinbaren* 'agree', *garantieren* 'guarantee', and so on.

### 4. Expressive

Expressive is an illocutionary act to express the speaker's psychological attitude towards the situation implied in the illocution. Searle (in Finkbeiner, 2015, p. 28) states that "*Mit einem expressiven Sprechakt bringt der Sprecher eine Einstellung oder ein Gefühl in Bezug auf einen Sachverhalt zum Ausdruck.*" The sentence can be translated as 'With expressive speech acts, the speaker expresses an attitude or feeling about something'. There are several actions that fall into the type of expressive illocutionary acts such as *danken* 'say thank you', *klagen* 'complain', *begrüßen* 'greet', *gratulieren* 'congratulate', *entschuldigen* 'apologize', and so on.

### 5. Declaration

Declaration is an illocutionary act in which the successful implementation of this illocution will result in a match between the content of the proposition and reality. Through this type of illocutionary act of declaration, the speaker will create a new thing (status, state, and so on). Searle (in Finkbeiner, 2015, p. 29) says that "*Mit der Äußerung einer Deklaration schafft der Sprecher neue Sachverhalte.* They function only within best-established social institutions. *Typische Beispiele sind Rücktrittserklärung, Taufe oder Ernennung.*" Based on the quote, it can be understood that 'With declarative speech, speakers create new facts and only function within certain social institutions. Common examples are when declaring resignation, baptism or appointment'. There are several actions that fall into the type of illocutionary acts of declaration such as *taufen* 'baptize', *trauen* 'marry', *verhaften* 'arrest', *verurteilen* 'punish', and so on.

Leech (1983, p. 104) argues that "At the most general level, illocutionary functions can be classified into four types, according to how they relate to the social goal of maintaining polite and respectful behavior". According to Leech (1983), the functions of illocutionary acts are classified into competitive, agreeable, cooperative, and conflicting functions.

The illocutionary goal of the competitive function is to compete with social goals. In this competitive illocutionary function, manners have a negative nature and are basically unmannerly. Therefore, the principle of politeness in this function is needed because it softens the impolite nature contained in its purpose. The purpose of this function is to reduce the disharmony implied in the competition between what the speaker wants to achieve and what politeness demands. The meaning of reducing disharmony here is that manners are still needed even though they are negative, because they aim to soften the impolite nature contained in the speech. The actions included in this function are commanding, requesting, demanding, begging, and so on. The type of illocutionary acts that usually fall into the competitive category are directive illocutionary acts.



The illocutionary purpose of the fun function is in line with social goals. The illocutionary function of pleasing is basically manners and manners in a more positive form, which means adhering to the principles of courtesy, for example when someone has the opportunity to wish a happy birthday, then someone must do it. The purpose of this function is to find opportunities for hospitality. Actions that belong to this function are offering, inviting, greeting, saying thank you, congratulating, and so on. Politeness in this function is positive, because it shows harmony between speakers and speech partners. The types of illocutionary acts that usually fall into the pleasant category are commissive and expressive illocutionary acts.

The illocutionary purpose of the cooperative function is to ignore or pay attention to social goals which means it does not involve manners, because in this cooperative function it is irrelevant if it involves manners. The actions included in this function are stating, reporting, announcing, teaching, and so on. In general, written discourse falls into the category of cooperating. The type of illocutionary acts that usually fall into the category of cooperating are assertive illocutionary acts.

The illocutionary purpose of the conflicting function is contrary to social goals which means that in this function, there is no element of courtesy at all, because basically the purpose of this function is to cause negative effects, namely anger. Some actions that are included in the conflicting function are threatening, accusing, cursing, scolding, and so on. When threatening and cursing someone, it is impossible for the speaker to do it politely, unless the speaker uses irony.

In illocutionary acts, there are two categorized forms, namely direct and indirect forms of illocutionary acts. Direct illocutionary acts are declarative forms used to make a statement. Dölling (in Abbas, 2020, p. 10) argues that "*Der direkte Sprechakt tritt ein, wenn die grammatikalische Form eines Satzes und ihre beabsichtigte Wirkung auf den Adressaten zusammenfallen.*" From the quote, it can be understood that 'Direct speech acts occur when the grammatical form and the intended effect on the speech partner coincide'. So, direct illocutionary acts are a form of delivering speech clearly and easily understood by speech partners. The characteristics of direct illocutionary acts are that the utterance contains performative verbs that can be directly inferred from the action.

In contrast to direct illocutionary acts, in this indirect illocutionary act the speaker conveys an utterance in an indirect way. Therefore, speech partners must be able to understand the meaning in an utterance conveyed by the speaker. Liedtke (2018, p. 36) states that "*Indirekte Sprechakte zeichnen sich dadurch aus, dass die angezeigte Illokution (etwa über performative Verben oder über den Satztyp) nicht mit der von den Sprecher/innen intendierten Illokution übereinstimmt.*" From the quote, it can be understood that 'Indirect speech acts are characterized by the fact that the illocutionary act displayed (e.g. through performative verbs or through sentence types) does not correspond to the action intended by the speaker'.

One of the speakers' intentions of using indirect illocutionary acts is to be polite in their speech, because in this case an order can be conveyed using news sentences or question sentences. This is in line with the opinion of Brown and Levinson (in Liedtke, 2018, p. 36) who argue that "*Der Grund für die Indirektheit des Sprechaktvollzugs ist in der Regel die Höflichkeit des Sprechers/der Sprecherin, denn durch eine direkte Aufforderung würde das negative Face der Adressat/innen verletzt.*" Based on the quote above, it can be understood that 'The reason for indirect speech acts is usually due to the politeness of the speaker, because a direct request will later hurt the speech partner'.

*Roman* belongs to the type of Epic literary works of the large or long form prose variety which is one of the three other types of literary works namely *Lyrik* and *Dramatik*. Esser (2007, p. 79) says that "*Unter einem Roman versteht man im Allgemeinen einen längeren erzählenden Prosatext.*" The sentence can be translated as 'A romance is generally understood as a long narrative prose text'. Esser's opinion is in line with Schneider's opinion (2016, p. 4) which states that "*Ein Roman ist ein schriftlich fixierter, relativ umfangreicher, fiktionaler Prosatext in einer nicht nur Gelehrten verständlichen Sprache.*" Based on the above quote, it can be understood that 'Romance is a fictional prose text that is written, relatively extensive, and the language used cannot only be understood by educated people'. Therefore, it can be concluded that romance is a long fictional prose essay written by telling the series of a person's life and can be easily understood by anyone.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

This research uses qualitative research method with descriptive analysis. Through this research method, the findings are not obtained through statistics or numbers, but the data and data analysis will be explained descriptively which are generally in the form of words and pictures. The data is collected, classified, analyzed, interpreted, and concluded from the types, functions, and forms of illocutionary acts.

The research object used is the illocutionary acts contained in the romance *Land in Sicht* by Ilona Hartmann. The romance was published on July 21, 2020 by Blumenbar and has 160 pages. In this research, the author acts as a research instrument. In other words, this research uses human instrument.

### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the analysis of illocutionary acts that refer to the theory of Searle (1999) and Leech (1983), in the romance *Land in Sicht* by Ilona Hartmann which is the corpus of this research, there are 59 speech acts that contain types, functions, and forms of illocutionary acts. The data analyzed are 20 samples from the total population of 59 data.

Four types of illocutionary acts, three functions of illocutionary acts, and two forms of illocutionary acts were found in the 20 samples. There is one type of illocutionary act and one function of illocutionary act that are not found in this corpus, namely the type of illocutionary act of declaration and the function of illocutionary act of contradiction.

In this romance, there are four types of illocutionary acts found, namely 7 assertive illocutionary acts, 6 directive illocutionary acts, 3 commissive illocutionary acts, and 4 expressive illocutionary acts. Some of the actions performed in the assertive illocutionary acts are *behaupten* 'declare', *mitteilen* 'tell', *informieren* 'inform', and boasting. Then, for the directive illocutionary acts, there are *befehlen* 'command', *bitten* 'ask', *verbieten* 'forbid', and *auffordern* 'invite'. Then, for the commissive illocutionary acts performed by the speakers in their speech are *garantieren* 'guarantee', *versprechen* 'promise', and offer. Furthermore, the actions used by speakers in expressive illocutionary acts are *danken* 'saying thank you', *entschuldigen* 'apologizing', and praising. The type of declaratory illocutionary act is not found in corpus, because there is no illocutionary act that successfully implements the illocution that results in the conformity between

the content of the proposition and reality. Then in the speech, no one uses the actions of *taufen* 'baptize', *trauen* 'marry', *verhaften* 'arrest', *verurteilen* 'punish', fire, resign, and so on.

Based on the types of illocutionary acts that have been obtained, the utterances are then grouped according to Leech's theory (1983) regarding the function of illocutionary acts related to social goals. There are three types of functions of the illocutionary acts found such as competitive, pleasant, and cooperative functions. The competitive function found in the analyzed data amounted to 5 data. The types of illocutionary acts that are generally included in this competitive function are directive illocutionary acts. Furthermore, for the fun function, there are 8 data found. The types of illocutionary acts that are generally included in the fun function are commissive and expressive illocutionary acts. Then, the last function of cooperating was found as much as 7 data. The types of illocutionary acts that usually enter this function are assertive illocutionary acts. The function of conflicting illocutionary acts is not found in this corpus, because there are no acts of threatening, accusing, cussing, scolding, and so on whose illocutionary purposes are contrary to social goals and do not have elements of courtesy in them.

According to the results of the analysis, all forms of illocutionary acts in this romance are found such as direct illocutionary acts and indirect illocutionary acts. The direct illocutionary acts found in this romance amounted to 17 data, while the indirect illocutionary acts amounted to 3 data. The direct illocutionary acts are found more than the indirect illocutionary acts because in this romance the speaker usually conveys a speech clearly, so it has no implied meaning behind the speech.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis above, it can be concluded that there are types, functions, and forms of illocutionary acts in the romance *Land in Sicht* by Ilona Hartmann. The whole data analysis consisting of 20 samples from a total population of 59 data found four types of illocutionary acts, three functions of illocutionary acts, and two forms of illocutionary acts. There is one type of illocutionary action and one function of illocutionary action that is not found in this romance, namely the type of illocutionary action of declaration and the function of contrary illocutionary action.

To be more specific in this romance, there are four types of illocutionary acts found, namely assertive illocutionary acts as much as 7 data, directive illocutionary acts as much as 6 data, commissive illocutionary acts as much as 3 data, and expressive illocutionary acts as much as 4 data. Thus, the dominant type of illocutionary acts found in the research in this *Land in Sicht* romance is the type of assertive illocutionary acts.

The functions of illocutionary acts found in this corpus are three types, namely competitive, fun, and cooperative. Competitive functions amounted to 5 data, fun functions were found in 8 data, and cooperative functions were found in 7 data. From these results, it can be concluded that the majority of illocutionary act functions found are fun functions. All forms of illocutionary acts in this romance were found. The direct illocutionary acts amounted to 17 data, while the indirect illocutionary acts amounted to 3 data. Thus, the results of the analysis of the forms of illocutionary acts are mostly in the form of direct illocutionary acts.

This research has positive implications, namely providing benefits and contributions in adding knowledge about speech acts contained in one of the German-language romances *Land in Sicht* by Ilona Hartmann. This speech act research discusses one aspect of speech acts, namely



illocutionary acts in which it describes the types, functions, and forms of illocutionary acts contained in the romance.

Based on the conclusions and implications that have been made, there are several recommendations related to speech act analysis research, especially the analysis of future illocutionary acts. These recommendations are addressed to future researchers who are interested in conducting further research.

The most important thing in preparing this research is to obtain as much linguistic knowledge as possible from previous researchers, books, journals, and other references and understand them first so as not to experience difficulties when solving the problems that have been formulated.

In addition, the next researcher is suggested to be able to examine illocutionary acts by using a theory that is different from the theory used by the author, namely Searle and Leech's theory. Then, for German language learners, the thing that needs to be considered is to read more often which aims to increase vocabulary.

## REFERENCES

- Abbas, A. M. (2022). Sprechakttheorie: Eine analytische Studie. *Journal of the Iraqi University*, 54(1).
- Bruner, J. (2013). Learning how to do things with words 1. In *Psychology Library editions: Psycholinguistics* (pp. 265-284). Psychology Press.
- Busch, A., & Stenschke, O. (2018). *Germanistische Linguistik: eine Einführung*. Narr Francke Attempto Verlag.
- Esser, R. (2007). *Das große Arbeitsbuch Literaturunterricht: Lyrik, Epik, Dramatik*. Verlag an der Ruhr.
- Finkbeiner, R. (2015). *Einführung in die Pragmatik*. WBG, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Hartmann, I., Herten, S., & Schroeder, K. (2020). *Land in Sicht. Blumenbar, Marke der Aufbau Verlag GmbH*.
- Hermaji, B. (2021). *Theory of pragmatics revised edition*. Yogyakarta: Magnum Pustaka Utama.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge UP.
- Liedtke, F. (Editor). (2018). *Handbuch pragmatik*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.
- Schneider, J. (2016). *Einführung in die Roman-Analyse*(4. Auflage). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Searle, J.L. (1999). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts* (9th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sulistyo, E.T. (2013). *Pragmatics: An initial study*. Surakarta: UNS Press. Yule, G. (2014). *Pragmatics* (2nd Edition). Yogyakarta: Student Library