

LITERARY DISCOURSE OF SPEECH ACTS

Sherimbetova Nargiza Nietbay qizi
KSU English language and literature department
assistant teacher
shinnara1717@icloud.com
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17302623>

Speech acts represent fundamental units of communication that reveal not only linguistic forms but also deep cultural values. The act of requesting, suggesting, and apologizing manifests diverse pragmatic strategies across languages. This article provides a comparative linguocultural analysis of these acts as realized in Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman*, O'tkir Hoshimov's *Ikki karra ikki besh*, and Shawdirbay Seytov's *Igbal soqpaqlari*. The study interprets the speech acts using the frameworks of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) on illocutionary force, Trosborg's (1995) taxonomy of request strategies, Olshtain and Cohen's (1983) apology models, and Jiang's (2015) taxonomy of suggestions.

The methodology integrates Speech Act Theory (Austin, Searle) with Pragmatic Strategy Models (Trosborg, Olshtain & Cohen, Jiang). Each example is analyzed according to: illocutionary force (the speaker's intended function), degree of directness (direct/indirect realization), and politeness and cultural context (following Grice's Cooperative Principles and Hofstede's collectivist-individualist dimension). The data were extracted from authentic literary dialogues and examined comparatively to uncover linguistic and cultural regularities.

1. The Speech Act of Request

English example from "Death of a Salesman": Biff: Come along, Mom.

This utterance functions as a request. Using Trosborg's framework, it belongs to the conventionally indirect strategy, softened through kinship terms and intonation. Biff's directive is motivated by care rather than authority, reflecting Anglo-American norms of softening imposition even in family settings.

Uzbek example from "Ikki karra ikki besh": -Senga nima, bolam! Mening ishimga aralashib nima qilasan?

The speaker indirectly requests the hearer to refrain from interference. The act is expressed through rhetorical questioning, showing cultural indirectness typical of Uzbek politeness.

Karakalpak example from "Igbal soqpaqlari": - Бүгін үйде қоның, жақсылап түсіндириң, бәлким барар, я басқа биреўди табар...

This example represents an indirect request softened with modal verbs and conditionality. The speaker expresses consideration for the listener's autonomy, emphasizing deference and harmony.

2. The Speech Act of Suggestion

English example from "Death of a Salesman": Biff: How about it, Mom? Better get some rest, heh?

This is a suggestion expressed through an interrogative form. According to Jiang's taxonomy, it belongs to the consultative suggestion type, where the speaker seeks shared decision-making.

Uzbek example from "Ikki karra ikki besh": -Mayli, ayta qoling.

This statement demonstrates a cooperative suggestion, mitigating command like tone by using “mayli”. It reveals Uzbek indirectness and balance between assertiveness and respect.

Karakalpak example from “Iǵbal soqpaqlari”: -Айт соны, -деп тапшырды да бүгин қайтатуғынын айғып, айнаға қостаңлап кетти.

The clause “Айт соны” is a direct suggestion (almost an instruction), yet softened contextually. It demonstrates hierarchical interaction typical of Karakalpak collectivist discourse.

3. The Speech Act of Apology

English example from “Death of a Salesman”: Linda: Stop crying. I’m through with it.

Although no explicit “sorry” is present, the utterance functions as an implicit apology through emotional resignation. It reflects the explanation and acceptance of responsibility strategy.

Uzbek example from “Ikki karra ikki besh”: -Qo’yaver, o’g’lim. Ba’zan shunaqasi ham bo’p turadi.

This represents a parental apology strategy where the speaker comforts instead of explicitly apologizing, showing Uzbek preference for empathetic rather than direct forms.

Karakalpak example from “Iǵbal soqpaqlari”: -Екеуимиз бирден жалынып-жалпайып, сол кәрада жарасып қутылысқан болдық.

The mutual act of pleading implies reciprocal apology. It encodes communal restoration of harmony rather than individual guilt, typical of Karakalpak ethos.

Across the three literary contexts, speech acts reveal contrasts shaped by cultural orientation. English dialogues display individualized empathy and softened directives. Uzbek interactions emphasize deference and emotional balance, while Karakalpak dialogues favor communal negotiation and reciprocal repair strategies. Trosborg’s model shows that indirectness is culturally variable: English uses it to minimize imposition, while Uzbek and Karakalpak use it to maintain solidarity.

The comparative analysis of “Death of a Salesman”, “Ikki karra ikki besh”, and “Iǵbal soqpaqlari” demonstrates that speech acts are influenced by cultural pragmatics. While English speakers rely on linguistic mitigation to preserve autonomy, Uzbek and Karakalpak speakers rely on context and empathy to maintain harmony. Thus, speech acts mirror the national communicative ethos, uniting language structure, social norms, and cultural cognition.

Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:

1. Miller, A. *Death of a Salesman*. New York: Viking Press, 1949. Act II, pp. 98–103.
2. Hoshimov, Ó. *Ikki karra ikki besh*. Toshkent: G’afur G’ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san’at nashriyoti, 1981. Part I, pp. 45–50; Part II, pp. 83–86.
3. Seytov, Sh. *Iǵbal soqpaqlari*. Nukus: Qaraqalpaqstan baspasi, 1978. Chapter IV, pp. 120–126; Chapter V, pp. 132–137.
4. Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
5. Searle, J. R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
6. Trosborg, A. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints, and Apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995.

7. Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. Apology: A Speech Act Set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983. pp. 18–35.
8. Jiang, X. *Suggestions: What Should ESL Students Know?* System. 2006. pp 36-54.