

A Pragmatic Analysis of Antony's Oration in Julius Caesar

Assist. Instr. Awham Rasheed

ed.awham.rasheed@uoanbar.edu.iq

Prof. Dr. Zidane Kalaf

ed.zidane.kalaf@uoanbar.edu.iq

College Education for Humanities - University of Anbar

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31973/aj.v3i142.3870>

ABSTRACT:

The present study attempts a pragmatic analysis of Antony's famous oration in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar. It aims to identify which speech acts were employed in this oration for the end of achieving a high level of persuasion and, hence, characterizing Antony's peculiar persuasive style. To achieve this objective, the study adopts a pragmatic analysis utilizing the speech act theory whereby all speech acts uttered by Antony were hand-picked and collated to represent the data of the study. In the analysis of the data, Searle's (1969) model for categorizing speech acts was adopted to best reflect the speech acts that helped exhibiting the persuasive intent of the writer. Leech's (1983) politeness principles are adopted to show how polite the characters to each other. The finding of the study shows that the role of speech acts for persuasive goals was vital. It can be concluded that speech acts such as declarations, commissives, directives, etc., were all employed to achieve this rhetorical intention, however, the speech acts of representative were the most significant to portray Antony's peculiar persuasive style.

Keywords: Politeness, Speech Acts, and Persuasive Communication.

1. Introduction

Pragmatics is the study of the speaker meaning (Yule,1996:3). It is the study of language use from the functional perspectives of analysis. It means that communication does not depend on word meaning as sense relations but on the intending meaning of the speaker and interpreted by listeners in a specific context and in specific felicity conditions. It is a matter of collecting information depending on the pragmatic primes.

Speakers use different illocutions to convince and persuade hearers to notarize or to execute something. In this sense, it can be assumed that there is a persuasive communication. This study is an attempt to investigate how speech acts theory and politeness principles could be employed to achieve persuasive communication. Also, it tries to check how the principle of politeness and speech acts might be linked to help people to communicate persuasively. To this end, the present paper suggests critiquing Searle's (1969) speech acts theory and Leech's (1983) politeness principles. In the theory of speech act, Searle (1969) presents three

components of speech acts namely: locution, illocution and perlocution. Locution is simply the act which has taken place. Illocution refers to the real actions which performed by the utterance, where saying equals doing, as in betting, welcoming and warning. Searle, Kiefer and Bierwisch (1980) state that “Perlocutionary acts have to do with those effects which our utterances have on hearers which go beyond the hearer’s understanding. Such as convincing, persuading, annoying...all are cases of prelocutionary acts”. Hence, the persuasive communication is achieved on the level of prelocutionary act. The hearer’s inference for the speaker’s communicative locutionary and illocutionary intent is determined by the linguistic and the speaker’s meaning but it is not delimited because the speaker might use to express his intent nonliterally and obliquely (Bach and Harnish,1979). Hence, “the hearer must rely on much more than the linguistic meaning of the utterance to determine the speaker’s intent”(ibid). So, directness and indirectness of speech acts are of importance in the current study. Dealing with direct speech acts, “only certain kinds of intentions are adequate for the behavior...of speech acts” (Searle,1969) i.e. the speaker means what s/he says and only one meaning of an illocutionary force is available. In contrast, with the indirect speech acts, there are more than one meaning of an illocutionary force. In indirect speech act, the intending meaning is probabilistic. Clark (1979) points out that “The literal meaning of indirect speech acts can be intended to be taken seriously (along with the indirect meaning) or merely pro forma”. If so, how might the speaker be able to convey his intending meaning through the speech acts? The speaker should be careful in using the linguistic meaning to achieve extra or other meanings. That is, to request rather than merely inform i.e. when locution appears in the formo of declarative sentence but intents multi-perlocutionary acts . It is the pragmatic force that the speaker should take in his consideration. Morris (1946:365), cited in (NÖth,1999) defines pragmatics as “that branch of semiotics which studies the origins, the uses, and the effects of signs”. Pragmatics assumes no clear meaning. It is something related to society, cognition and some others (Searle et al, 1980). These components mentioned earlier are the primes of pragmatics which might assume some sort of certainty to the interpretation of the linguistic meaning. The perlocutionary act is a combination of the linguistic and non-linguistic meaning. So, when composing a message, the speaker should take these two meanings in consideration. All in all, the illocutionary act will be the key for the hearer’s interpretation to receive the intended effect of the perlocutionary acts as “interpretation is the process of inferring authorial intentions and of ascribing illocutionary acts”(Vanhoozer,2002). Searle (1975) states that politeness can be the reason behind using indirectness in directives and requests. According to (Reiter, 2000), politeness is borrowed from the Latin word 'politus' that means 'smoothed or accomplished', therefore, the more the structure of an illocution is indirect the more persuasive and polite its perlocutionary act will be. But, the problem is that the data under discussion might not contain the structure of indirect illocution to assume politeness and to ensure persuasive communication.

Therefore, the classifications of speech acts will be accompanied with politeness principles in the analysis.

2. Perspectives of Speech Acts Theory

A speech act is a unit of language that is produced in order to achieve a particular purpose, command, question, reply, request, apology, complaint, etc. (Reiter, 2000). This is what Yule (1996) meant when he defined speech acts as “actions performed via utterances”. Speech acts refer to a theory developed first in philosophy, starting from the philosopher J.L. Austin (1962), whose book is “How to Do Things with Words”. Austin (ibid) succeeds to distinguish between locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Searle completes Austin’s work focusing on the illocutionary force to give more flexible ways about the use of language i.e. to cope with the majority of contexts and discourse structures. Bach (2006) argues that even though words (phrases, sentences) encode information, people do more things with words than convey information and that when people do convey information, they often convey more than their words encode. It should be noted that the phrase (speech acts) should be taken as a generic term for any sort of language use, oral or otherwise. Speech acts, whatever the medium of their performance, fall under the brand category of intentional with which they share certain general features. However, some speech acts are not primary acts of communication and have the function of communicating but of affecting institutional states of affairs, such as: appointing, sentencing, ruling, etc.

Searle (1978) identifies five basic categories of speech acts:

1. Representatives: The speaker is committed to the truth of a proposition: affirm, believe, conclude, deny, report, ...etc. They all state what the speaker believe to be the case or not.
2. Directive: The speaker tries to get the hearer to do something: ask, challenge, command, dare, assist, request, ...etc.
3. Commissive: The speaker is committed to a future course of actions: guarantee, promise, swear, ...etc.
4. Expressives: The speaker expresses an attitude about a state of affairs: apologize, deplore, congratulate, regret, welcome, thank, ...etc.
5. Declaratives: The speaker alters the external state of affairs or condition of an object or situation, solely by making the utterance: I resign, I sentence you to be hanged by the neck until you be dead, I name this ship Titanic.

The force of illocutionary acts can be performed:

- A. directly or indirectly by way of performing other speech acts.
- B. Literally or non-literally depending on how the speaker uses his words.
- D. Explicitly or inexplicitly depending on whether we fully spell out what we mean or not.

3. Pragmatic Issues of Politeness

Significantly, politeness is one aspect of human communication. This aspect is related to the social tradition that people can acquire from socialization. It is possible to say that politeness has a deep connection with culture and history. Politeness is a significant linguistic concept that can be

used to illustrate and recognize another person's face. Politeness is regarded as a stable notion that has a link with culture (Yule,1996). Politeness can be treated as a unique term that deals with the use of polite language focusing on verbal interaction. This concept is associated with culture and status. Thus, it is far away from everyday language (Watts,2003). It seems to have several functions depending on the type of the text and community of practice and is sometimes distinguished through status or pleasant interaction and keeping away conflict (Mills, 2007).

However, languages have different functions: expressive, directive, informative and social or "phatic". It is important to note that the linguistic interaction is necessarily a social interaction (Niazi,2004). Furthermore, it is not restricted to the social rules of behavior. According to Brown and Levinson's theory (1987), politeness is interlinked with social relationships and the public-self image (i.e. face). Hence, expectations and feelings have to be taken into account (Cutting, 2002). Searle (1975) notices that 'politeness is the most prominent motivation for indirectness in requests, and certain forms tend to become the conventionally polite ways of making indirect requests'

Leech (1983) debates that there are six maxims dealing with polite behavior. When discussing politeness, an important component has to be taken into consideration which is the relationship between two participants who may call self and other. In dialogue, 'self' will be designated with the speaker and "other" will distinctively know that these maxims show the rapport between sense and force in human conversation. These maxims are:

1.The Tact Maxim

The tact maxim is considered to be as the most important kind of politeness in English- speaking society by Leech (1983). It concentrates on the hearer and state: "minimize cost to other" and "maximize benefit to other" (Cutting, 2002). Actually, there are two flanks to the tact maxims namely the negative side "minimize the cost to H" and the positive side "maximizing the benefit to H" for example:

3-*This suit case is heavy. Will you help me to carry it, please?* (Schauer,2009).

2.The Generosity Maxim

It differs to a great extent from the tact maxim since it concentrates on the speaker and states: "minimize the benefit to self" and "maximize cost to self" for example:

4- *you relax and let me do the dishes.*

5- *Could I copy down the website address?*

These examples are polite because they imply benefit to hearer and cost to self (Cutting, 2002).

3. The Approbation Maxim

The maxim of approbation is used to "minimize dispraises of other" and "maximize praise of other". According to this maxim, there are two important parts: the first part is to some extent similar to the politeness strategy of keeping away disagreement whereas the second one fits in with

the positive strategy of making other people feel good by showing solidarity, for example:

6- *I heard you singing at the karaoke last night. It was, un... different* (Ibid.)

4. The Modesty Maxim

The modesty maxim however, states to "minimize praise of self" and "maximize dispraise of self" (Ibid). This maxim is more sophisticated than the others because the maxim of quality can sometimes be infringed in absorbing it. Modesty is varied in its usage from one culture to another. For example:

7- A: *They were so kind to us.*

B-*Yes, they were, weren't they?* (Thomas, 1995).

5. The Agreement Maxim

This maxim helps "minimize disagreement between self and other" and "maximize agreement between self and other". This maxim copes with Brown and Levinson's (1997) positive politeness strategy of seeking agreement and avoiding disagreement, for example:

8- *Raymond yes-yes but if you do that, your-your-your tea – towel's soaking and at the end of the night- nothing's getting dried* (Cutting,2002).

6.The Sympathy Maxim

It helps "minimize antipathy between self and other" and "maximize sympathy between self and other" (Cutting,2002). This maxim includes such polite speech acts as congratulate, commiserate, and commiserate and express condolences, Ex.:

9- *I was sorry to hear about your father.*

The speaker does not say I was sorry to hear about your father's death but the speaker often appeases his words.

In fact, Leech (1983) comments that not all the maxims are of equal importance. He declares that the tact maxim is more forceful and significance than the generosity maxim. The approbation is more powerful than the modesty. Leech's (ibid) conception of politeness concentrates on the hearer more than on the speaker. In brief, politeness plays an important role in every conversation because people don't communicate with others aimlessly but they act according to certain rules, bases and strategies.

4. A Brief Description of the Play

Julius Caesar is a play written by Shakespeare. It is one of the tragedies which talks about the murder of the military leader, Caesar. The plot of the play revolves around Caesar, a roman leader who was victorious in many battles. Brutus and his followers were the conspirators who planned to kill Caesar. After the assassination of Caesar, his friend Mark Antony succeeds in stimulating the people through a famous oration to rage them against the conspirators. The play justifies much discussion and argument. The text adopted for this study is Hulme, H.M (ed)1971 Julius Caesar. London: Longman Group Limited.

5. Pragmatics and the Study of Literature

Linguistic analysis of literature is one of the most active areas of literary studies. What increases the interest of the pragmatic analysis of

literature is the fact that the literary work is a phenomenon which cannot be dealt with mere syntactic and semantic issues. Ching, Michael and Ronald (1980) state that ‘‘the time has come for a new place of linguistic investigation of literature’’. Pratt (1977) rejects the distinction of literature between literature and linguistics. She (ibid) believes that there are formal similarities between natural narrations and literary narrations. She (ibid:88) adds that a speech act approach to literature enables people to describe and define literature in the same terms of describing other kinds of discourse. Ohman (1981) adds that ‘‘literary works are discourse with the usual illocutionary rules suspended...’’. Short (1989) points out that drama ‘‘like many texts, has a structure whereby one level of discourse is embedded in another’’.

6. Methodology

It is assumed in this study that the characters interact within the text world as if they were in natural conversation and natural social status of real speakers. Thus, speech acts of the dramatic texts will be looked at as natural and their felicity- conditions are those of natural conversation.

To get a convenient pragmatic analysis of the speech acts and politeness in the oration, there must be an application model of analysis for identification and characterization of these speech acts and politeness principles. Thus, it has been found preferable to adopt Searle’s (1978) and Leech’s (1983) models for speech acts and politeness respectively.

The following methods of analysis will be adopted:

1. Eliciting the speech acts in virtue of their syntactic structure.
2. Deciding on the appropriateness of each act in the light of the set conditions.
3. Pointing out the politeness maxims employed by the speaker.

7. Text Analysis, Results and Discussions

The oration which starts with ‘‘friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears’’: ordering is the term used to inaugurate the oration. The verb ‘‘lend’’ indicates a polite order. He is actually beseeching them to listen. The speech act belongs to directive speech acts holding the view that they postulate the exercise of speaker’s authority over the hearer. As far as his authority and status is concerned in his speech acts (Felicity conditions= preparing condition), Antony is directive, polite and precise; therefore, no other interpretation might be in mind, Antony succeeds in achieving hearers’ attention and achieving his goals. In this way, Antony is performing his locution over the hearers. He determines his illocutionary act to restrict the hearers’ prelocutionary act/s.

I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him.

It carries the speech act of representatives. The utterance carries irony since Antony comes to praise Caesar.

The evil that men do lives after them;

The good is oft interred with their bones;

Here we have a representative speech act which takes the form of aphorism.

So let it be with Caesar.

A speech act of requesting which expresses the speaker's desire for hearing something done for the addressee's benefit act at the cost of the speaker.

The noble Brutus.

Hath told you Caesar was ambitious:

If it were so, it was a grievous fault,

And grievously hath Caesar answered it.

Here we have the speech act of representatives. The speaker represents his state that Caesar has done something wrong and he gets his answer for it.

Here, under the leave of Brutus and the rest-

For Brutus is an honourable man;

So are they all, all honourable men-

Come I to speak in Caesar's Funeral.

Here the speech act of representative carries an irony, when he says Brutus is an honourable man, actually he means the opposite. Leech (1983) says that "ironic force of remark is often signaled by exaggeration or understatement which makes it difficult for him to interpret the mark of it". Irony, in such an oration depends on intonation.

He was my friend, faithful and just to me:

But Brutus says he was ambitious;

And Brutus is an honourable man.

A representative speech act: the speaker S surveys his friendship, gets Brutus says he was ambitious. Sarcastically he repeats the utterance "And Brutus is an honourable man". Antony uses the approbation maxim. He maximizes praise to Caesar.

He hath brought many captives home to Rome

Whose ransoms did the general coffers fill:

An approbation maxim involves in a representative speech act. Antony maximize praise to Caesar.

Did this in Caesar seem ambitious?

The speech act of directive which carries inquiring. The act of inquiring means to show interest in learning new things and that information is needed. In other words, it is a request for information (Farch,2001).

You all did see that on the Lupercal

I thrice presented him a kingly crown,

Which he did thrice refuse: was this ambition?

These are representative speech acts and code utterances with directive speech acts of inquiry.

Yet Brutus says he was ambitious;

And, sure, he is an honourable man.

He means the opposite in this utterance.

I speak not to disprove what Brutus spoke,

But here, I am to speak to this ambition to speak what I do know.

From this line on wards, Antony begins.

You all did love him once, not without cause:

What cause withholds you then, to mourn for him?

A speech act of inquiring which belongs to the directives.

O judgement! thou art fled to brutish beasts,

He says that only the savage animals can judge the difference between one thing and another. Here we have a speech act of representative.

And men have lost their reason. Bear with me;

My heart is in the coffin there with Caesar,

And I must pause till it comes back to me.

Antony stops to watch people's reaction. 'Let me stop till my heart comes to me'.

O masters, if I were disposed to stir

Your hearts and minds to mutiny and rage,

I should do Brutus wrong, and Cassius wrong,

Who, you all know, are honourable men:

Here Antony is putting the idea of revolution in their minds. Although the speech act is that of representative, it carries a directive force, that you should revolt. For the sake of making persuasive communication, Antony minimizes dispraise for both: Brutus and Caesar. In this way he succeeds to stir mutiny and rage in the Romans against Brutus via implicitly and indirectly.

I will not do them wrong; I rather choose

To wrong the dead, to wrong myself and you,

Than I will wrong such honourable men.

A speech act of commissive which takes the act of irony.

But here's a parchment with the seal of Caesar;

I found it in his closet, 'tis his will:

Let but the commons hear this testament--

Which, pardon me, I do not mean to read--

And they would go and kiss dead Caesar's wounds

And dip their napkins in his sacred blood,

A speech act of commissive.

Yea, beg a hair of him for memory,

And, dying, mention it within their wills,

Bequeathing it as a rich legacy

Unto their issue.

A 'Request' expresses the speaker's desire for hearing something done for his benefit and at the cost of the addressee. The required act is at the choice of addressee. Antony considers hearers as self and Caesar as other. The benefit which he tries to achieve is for the sake of Caesar.

Will you be patient? will you stay awhile?

I have o'ershot myself to tell you of it:

I fear I wrong the honourable men

Whose daggers have stabb'd Caesar; I do fear it.

A directive speech which takes it for drawing attention. It is to say something that arouses the addressee to be interested in the matter in question. (Farch, 2001).

Another speech act of representative which is ironic.

4 Plebeian

They were traitors. Honourable men:

Sarcastically, they are not honourable men.

All

The will! the testament!

2 Plebeian

They were villains, murders! They will read the will?

Then make a ring about the corpse of Caesar,

And let me show you him that made the will.

Shall I descend? and will you give me leave?

A sympathy maxim which is represented by speech act of appealing.

The act of appealing refers to the speech act of making an earnest requested usually aiming at arousing a sympathetic response or at making a deeply felt or urgent request to persuade somebody.

‘Shall I descend’ it is a directive speech act of asking for persuasion. Holderoff (1978: 77, cited in Abd AL Aziz, 2003) describes permission as the non-authoritative force performed by the imperative. He suggests that in giving permission, the speaker is not expressing an intention that the addressee done something, or indicating that there is reason to do it, but rather ‘reassuring what might otherwise have been considered a reason not to do it (ibid).

All

Come down

A directive speech act of requesting.

3 Plebeian

You shall have leave

A directive speech act of offering

The speech act of offering expresses the speaker’s willingness to do an action for the benefit of the addressee and of the cost of himself (the speaker) Al. A’ dhem (1998:72).

1 Plebeian

Stand from the hearse; stand from the body!

2 plebeian

Room for Antony, most noble Antony!

Antony

Nay, press not so upon me: stand far off.

A directive speech act of ordering. Antony orders them to stand far off. This solution indicates the act of ordering how the authority over the hearer.

All

Stand back; room, bear back.

A directive speech act of ordering

Antony

If you have tears, prepare to shed them now,

You all do know this mantle. I remember

The first time ever Caesar put it on.

I was on a summer's evening in his tent,
That day he overcome the Nervii.

A representative speech act. Antony uses a visual order. Caesar put the month not to show off.

Look, in this place ran Cassius' dagger through;

A directive speech act of drawing attention.

See what a rent the envious Casca made;

A directive speech act of drawing attention.

Through this, the well-beloved Brutus stabbed,

And, as he plucked his cursed steel away,

Mark how the blood of Caesar followed it,

As rushing out of doors, to be resolved

A series of directive speech act of drawing attention

If Brutus so unkindly knocked, or no;

Judge, O you gods, how dearly Caesar loved him!

A speech act of directive showing disgust. It is an act of expressing a strong dislike for something that one feels is not so right. (Farch,2001).

This was the most unkindest cut of all,

For when the noble Caesar saw him stab,

Ingratitude, more strong than traitors' arms,

Quite vanquished him; then burst his mighty heart,

And in his mantle muffling up his face,

Even as the base of Pompey's statue,

When all the while ran blood, great Caesar fell,

O what a fall was there, my countrymen!

A series of representative speech acts. A superb decoration taken from Antony's imagination. What is fertile.

Then I, and you, and all of us feel down,

Whilst bloody treason flourished over us.

A representative speech act showing that it is a national tragedy because you and I fell with Caesar.

O now you weep, and I perceive you feel

The dint of pity.

A directive speech act (weep)

These are gracious drops.

Kind souls, what weep you, when you but behold

Our Caesar's vesture wounded?

A representative speech act

Look you here! A directive speech act of drawing attention.

Here is himself, marred, as you see, with traitors.

Good friends, sweet friends, let me stir you up

To such a sudden flood of mutiny,

They that have done this deed are honourable,

What private griefs they have, alas, I know not,

That made them do it; they are wise, and honorable,

And will, no doubt, with reasons answer you, for something that one

feels

A directive speech act of showing disgust i.e. the act of expressing a story dislike for something that one feels is not a right (Farch,2001).

I come not, friends, to steal away your hears;
I am no orator, as Brutus is.
But, as you know me all, a plain blunt man
That love my friend; and that they know full well,
That gave me public leave to speak of him;
For I have neither writ, nor words, nor worth,
Action, nor utterance, nor the power of speech,
To stir men's blood, I only speak right on.
I tell you that which you yourselves do not know,
Show you sweet Caesar's wounds, poor, poor dumb mouths,
And bid them speak for me; but were I Brutus,
And Brutus Antony, there were an Antony
Would ruffle up your spirits, and put a tongue
In every wound of Caesar, that should move
The stones of Rome to rise and mutiny.

A series of representative speech act. Now he begins with the word Mutiny and ends with mutiny so that he speeds the idea of mutiny in their hearts:

Antony
Yet hear me, country men, yet hear me speak,
A direct speech act of representing...
Why, friends, you go to do you know not what.
Wherein hatch Caesar thus deserved your loves?
Alas, you know not, I must tell you then;
You have forgot the will I told you of,
A speech act of commissive
Here is the will, and under Caesar's seal:
Roman citizen he gives,
To every several man, seventy-five drachmas.

A representative speech act. He arouses their anger towards the comparators:

Moreover, he hath left you all his walks,
His private arbours and new-planted orchard,
On this side Tiber; he hath left them you,
And to your heirs forever, common pleasures
To walk abroad, and recreate yourselves.
Here was a Caesar! When comes such another?

A directive speech act of inquiry. We will not get another one like him:

Antony

Now let it work! Mischief, thou art afoot,
Take thou what course thou wilt!

A directive speech act of invitation. Antony changes to a hypocrite. He wants destruction. This is his aim, so all his speech is flattery, hypocrisy and irony

And thither will I straight, to visit him:
He comes upon a wish. Fortune is merry,
And in this mood will give us anything.

A speech act of representation. Fortune is smiling. Fortune is a woman

The oration starts with a sympathy maxim. Antony maximize sympathy between himself and the multitude. His speech is friendly. He orders them pitifully. Here, under the leave of Brutus, and the rest. ‘For Brutus is an honorable man...’ Antony keeps the approbation maxim which states maximize price of other ironically

But Brutus says he is ambitious.
And Brutus is an honourable man.
Antony again ironically keeps the approbation maxim

He hath brought many captives home to Rome
Whose ransoms died the general coffers fill
Here Antony observes the tact maxim which states a maximize benefit to other

When that the poor have cried, Caesar hath weeps

....

And Brutus is an honourable man.
Again Antony ironically keeps the approbation maxim.
I speak not to disprove what Brutus spoke,
But leave I am to speak what I do know.

Antony keeps the sympathy maxim. He begins to speak their emotions:

Bear with me,
My heart is in the coffin there with Caesar
Again, he observes sympathy maxim:
O, masters if I were disposed to stir
Your hearts and minds to mutiny and rage,
I should do Brutus wrong, and Cassius wrong,

Leech (1980) states that ‘politeness is manifested not only in the content of conversation, but also in the way conversation is merged and structured by its participants’.

I will not do them wrong; I rather choose
To wrong the dead, to wrong myself and you,
Than I will wrong such honourable men.
(Modesty maxim (minimize point of self)).
But here’s a parchment, with the seal of Caesar; Sympathy maxim.
Have patience, gentle friends; I must not read it. Modesty maxim.
Will you be patient? Will you stay a while?

.
. Whose daggers have stabbed Caesar: I do fear it.

Now Antony after ‘honourable men’, we have daggers it is an irony. Here is a violence of the tact maxim.

You will compel me then to real the will

.

.

Shall I descend? And will you give me leave? Generosity maxim

If you have tears prepare them now.

.

.

A series of observations of sympathy maxim.

For Brutus, as you know, was Caesar’s angel

Brutus is Caesar’s darling

Again we have the observations of sympathy

Then I, and you, and all of us fell down, A generosity maxim

Good friends, sweet friends, let me stir you up

To such a sudden flood of mutiny,

They that have done this deed are honourable, He keeps the sympathy

Approbation maxim but ironic

What private griefs they have, alas, I know not, Agreement maxim

I am no orator, as Brutus is

But, as you know me all, a plain blunt man

For I have neither writ, nor words, nor worth,

Action, nor utterance, nor the power of speech,

To stir men’s blood. I only speak right on.

Modesty maxim

Why, friends, you go to do you know not what

Here is the will, and under Caesar’s seal: Tact maxim.

You will be profitable from Caesar’s will.

Moreover, he hath left you all his walks,

Tact maxim

Belike they had some notice of the people,

How I had moved them.

Perhaps they were told of the people

Generosity maxim.

Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears.

Antony uses the sympathy maxim in addressing the people by maximizing sympathy between self and other. In the following line, he follows the agreement maxim by maximizing the agreement between self and other.

For Brutus is an honourable man,

So are they all; all honourable men.

Sarcastically, Antony says this. Leech (1983) says that:

There are some situations where politeness can take a back seat. This is so, for example, where s and h are engaged in collaborative activity in which exchange of information is equally important to both of them.

He was my friend, faithful, and just to me

An approbation maxim by maximizing price of other when Antony enumerates Caesar's death is the following lines, he is actually following the sympathy maxim, when Antony speaks to the people's emotions he is again following the sympathy maxim.

O, masters if I were disposed to stir

Your hearts and minds to mutiny and rage,

He is following the approbation maxim by maximizing price of other

That I will wrong such honourable men

He is ironically calls them 'honourable men'

He is following offensive maxim

Have patience, gentle friends; I must not read it

A tact maxim maximizes the benefit of other.

You are not wood, you are not stone, but men

A sympathy maxim

Will you be patient? will you stay a while?

Again a sympathetic maxim

You will compel me then to real the will

A sympathy maxim

If you have tears, prepare to shed them now.

In the following lines there is the observations of the agreement maxim. The following lines carry a sympathy maxim.

Mark how the blood of Caesar followed it,

As rushing out of doors, to be resolved

He concludes the speech by a generosity maxim

Then I, and you, and all of us fell down

Which bloody treason flourished over us.

Then Antony changes his mood to a sympathy maxim.

Good friends, sweet friends, let me not stir you up

I am not an orator or Brutus is.

An approbation maxim

For I have neither writ, nor words, nor work

Approbation maxim

Show you sweet Caesar's wounds, poor, poor, dumb mouths,

Sympathy maxim

Moreover, he hath left you all his work,

A maxim of generosity

Conclusions

The current study implements a pragmatic approach to the analysis of the oration. The most prominent conclusions that can be drawn from this study are the followings:

1- Speech act theory can be applied successfully to the analysis of literary texts, especially plays or they offer fertile discourses for speech act and politeness according to the meaning conveyed.

2- The identification of speech acts and politeness principles of any utterance without reference to the situation in which it occurs is inadequate.

Therefore, an accurate analysis of the speech acts and politeness should account for syntax and pragmatics.

3- The speech act of representative occupies the highest frequency scored. Representative illocutions have been utilized variously to serve conveying what the orator wants to deliver.

4. Antony succeeds in achieving most of the persuasive communication through performing illocutions acts unlitrary and implicitly which are clear through irony but not through performing other speech acts i.e. indirectly.

5. Politeness maxims which involve various speech acts are employed to reach successful intended prelocutions. Irony and indirectness are vital elements used in the oration to achieve persuasive communication mostly with employment of politeness maxims.

Bibliography

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

Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, p. xvi.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S., C. (1997). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, H. H. (1979). Responding to Indirect Speech Acts. *Cognitive psychology*, 11(4), p.430-477.

Ching, M.; Michael H. and Ronald L. (1980). *Linguistics on Literature*. London: Routledge and Kegar and Paul, p.4.

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Routledge, p.43-44, 49, 50.

Al. A'dhemi, N. (1998) "Indirect Illocutionary Act of Interrogation Structures in Modern English Texts and ELT Textbooks".(Unpublished M.A. Thesis), University of Baghdad.

Farch, L. (2002) "Illocutionary Forces of Imperative Sentence; in English and Arabic: A Comparative Study: Unpublished MA Thesis. The University of Jordan, p.45,52, 38.

Leech, G. (1980). *Exploration in Semantics and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Br, p.13.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman, p. 40, 82, 131, 143, 179.

Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness (Vol. 17)*. Cambridge University Press, p.137.

Niazi , N. (2004) . *Novel and Interpretation: A pragmatic Approach*. 1st ed. Forum for cultural studies, p.32.

NÖth, W. (1995). *The Handbook of Semiotics*. Indiana University Press, p.52.

Ohman, R. (1981). "Speech Acts and the Space between" in Freeman Donald (ed) *Essays in Modern Stylistic*. London. Methneu.p.367.

Pratt, M. (1977). *Towards a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse*. USA. Indian University Press, p.16, 69.

Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A Contrastive Study of Requests and Apologies*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamin, p.2, p.47.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press, p.17.

Searle, J. (1975). Indirect speech acts. *Syntax and semantics*, ed., by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, 59-82. New York: NY: Academic Press, p.76.

Schauer, G. A. (2009). *Interlanguage pragmatic development*. London: International Group, p.12.

Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F., & Bierwisch, M. (eds.). (1980). *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. ISBN 90-277-1043-0. London: D. Reidel Publishing Company, p. vii, viii.

Short, M. (1989). ‘‘Discourse Analysis and Drama’’ in Carter Simpson (ed). *Language Discourse and Literature*. London: Vawin Hyman, p.149.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to pragmatics*. London: Long man Group Ltd, p.164.

Yule, G.(1996). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press, p.3,60.

Vanhoozer, K. J. (2002). *First Theology: God, Scripture & Hermeneutics*. Intervarsity Press, p. 182.

Watts, R., J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.10.

Abd Al-Aziz, N. (2003, ‘‘The Ability of Iraqi CEFU Learners to Recognize and Produce the Illocutinary Force of Imperative Structures’’. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis) University of Baghdad, p.2, 98.