

UNIVERSITY OF BAHRAIN

College of Arts

**Department of English Language
and Literature**



Pragmatic Communicative Strategies of Persuasion in Shakespeare's *Richard III*

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the
Master Degree in Applied English Language Studies**

Submitted by

Faisal Ashoor Qassim
20052710

Supervised by

Dr. Martin Parker

Associate Professor
University of Bahrain

Kingdom of Bahrain

April, 2015

Declaration



University of Bahrain

College of Arts

Department of English Language and Literature

Master's Program (Applied English Language Studies)

Student Faisal Ashoor Qassim Ashoor ID number 20052710 defended his thesis by which he fulfilled the requirements for the degree of Master in (Applied English Language Studies) and which has the title (Pragmatic Communicative Strategies of Persuasion in Shakespeare's *Richard III*) on Wednesday, the 28th of October, 2015.

The committee recommends awarding him the Master Degree with the grade of -----

(Defense Committee)

Name		Signature
_____	Supervisor	_____
_____	External Examiner	_____
_____	Internal Examiner	_____

Seal of the Academic Department

Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine and analyze the language of Shakespeare's character, Richard III, in his play *Richard III*, from a linguistic and pragmatic point of view. The villain, Richard, uses persuasive language with two women, in order to achieve his evil plans in the play. The manner of speech determines the level of speech's directness and, as a consequence, their level of politeness as well.

The data consisted of two scenes from *Richard III*: Act I Scene II and Act IV Scene IV, the so-called wooing scenes, in which Richard verbally interacts with the characters of Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth. These scenes were analyzed according to the pragmatic theories: The cooperative principle, speech acts and politeness in order to lead to a comprehensive idea of the pragmatic characteristics of each interaction.

The linguistic and pragmatic analysis of the two wooing scenes successfully supported the literary analysis of these two scenes. The literary analysis described Richard as being a manipulator of language who uses lies, honesty and courtesy in his speech with the two ladies. Richard mostly lies to persuade and woo Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth, but he also uses honesty in a number of instances, using both direct and indirect speech acts, and flouting and following mostly the maxim of quality. In addition, Richard is generally polite with Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth, using lots of positive politeness strategies and the politeness maxims of approbation and generosity. Finally, Richard uses Romance as a tool to woo Lady Anne, and succeeds in this attempt. However, he uses reason as a tool to woo Queen Elizabeth, and fails in this attempt.

Dedication

This study is dedicated to my father and mentor, Dr. Ashoor Qassim Ashoor, who always supported me through my hard times, taught me the lessons of life, and encouraged me to be the man I am right now. Without my father, this study would not have been created. This study is also dedicated to my late mother and brother, who are always remembered in my heart. This study is also dedicated to my supervisor, Dr. Martin Parker, who taught me a lot, and who supported and helped to create the topic of my dissertation.

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my sincere thanks to all the people who helped this study to come into existence. I am grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Martin Parker, whose ideas, comments and help aided me in writing this dissertation. My thanks are due to all the professors at UOB, who taught me during both my Bachelor and Master degree.

The one, without whose support, I would not have created this study, is my father, Dr. Ashoor Qassim Ashoor. He has always been my mentor, supporter and protector in my life. He encouraged me to work hard and follow my dreams and goals regardless of hardships and people's judgments. I still remember him saying "*do not let people who do not worth a penny affect you*".

My thanks also go to Dr. A Abdulaziz Bulaila for his guidance and advice.

My special thanks go to William Shakespeare, whose works of art always fascinate me.

Table of Content

Subject	Page Number
Declaration	I
Abstract	II
Dedication	III
Acknowledgement	IV
Table of Content	V-VI
List of Tables	VII
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1 General background	2
1.2 Research questions	3
1.3 Aim of this study	3
1.4 Significance of the study	4
1.5 Definition of terms	5
1.6 Limitations	6
1.7 Methods	6
1.8 Plan of the study	6
Chapter 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 The pragmatic theories	10
2.2.1 The cooperative principle (Grice, 1975)	10
2.2.2 Speech acts (Austin, 1962)	14
2.2.3 Politeness	19
2.3 A literary view of Richard's persuasive language	24
2.4 Persuasive language in Shakespeare's plays	26
2.5 The usage of pragmatic theories in Shakespeare's plays	28
2.6 The usage of pragmatic theories in persuasive language	30
2.6.1 The cooperative principle (Grice, 1975)	31
2.6.2 Speech acts (Austin, 1962)	32
2.6.3 Politeness	33
2.7 Pragmatic persuasive language in Shakespeare's plays	35
2.8 The usage of pragmatics in relation to persuasive language in the two wooing scenes	37
2.9 Conclusion	40

Chapter 3 METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Data collection	42
3.2 Models of analysis	42
3.3 Procedure	43
Chapter 4 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	
4.1 Richard's speech with Lady Anne	45
4.2 Richard's speech with Queen Elizabeth	73
Chapter 5 FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
5.1 Findings	100
5.1.1 Richard's persuasive language with Lady Anne	100
5.1.2 Richard's persuasive language with Queen Elizabeth	103
5.2 Conclusions	106
5.3 Recommendations	108
5.3.1 Recommendations for students and instructors of language and linguistics	108
5.3.2 Recommendations for students and instructors of literature	109
5.3.3 Recommendations for students and instructors of theatre and acting	109
5.3.4 Recommendations for students and instructors of other fields	110
5.3.5 Recommendations for common language speakers	111
5.3.6 Recommendations for further research	111
References	113
Abstract in Arabic	119

List of Tables

Number	Title	Page
1	Grice's Cooperative Principle	11
2	Types of Speech Acts	17
3	Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory	20
4	Leech's Politeness Maxims	23

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 General background

When a person has a certain intention, desire, aim, or goal to fulfil, he/she may use different ways, approaches, or methods to fulfill this objective. However, some objectives are dependent on other people in order to be fulfilled, and this creates more difficulty for the person with the intended goal, particularly when the addressee's consent is the determining factor for the goal to be achieved. The researcher is talking here about when the addresser is requesting or commanding the addressee to fulfil a certain aim, and the addressee either agrees on or rejects the addresser's request or command. If the addressee, who the goal is dependent on, is not willing to cooperate and agree to the intended objective, the intended objective will not be achieved. The key is to persuade the addressee to agree to fulfil the goal and objective.

An addresser can use language and words to persuade the addressee. Everything counts in using language when the function is to persuade; the grammar, vocabulary and even the phonology affect the strength of argument and persuasion. In the study of pragmatics, which is the study of language in use, that is how language is used in different contexts and for different functions, the usage of language to fulfil a goal is examined. The aim of this study is to examine the usage of language to persuade.

Relating to the former, Shakespeare's *Richard III*, written approximately in 1592, tells the story of Richard, Duke of Gloucester, and how he plots to get the throne and become King Richard III. Richard uses his skills in using language to achieve his evil objectives, being devious, wicked and witty. Two significant parts of his plan were examined: Richard decides

to marry Lady Anne, in order to get a noble wife, so he tries to persuade her to marry him, despite the fact that she knows he killed her husband. The other move that appears later on, after getting rid of Lady Anne and becoming king, is when Richard tries to marry his brother's daughter, Young Elizabeth. He tries to accomplish this by speaking to her mother, the former Queen Elizabeth, to get her consent and approval. These two wooing scenes were examined according to the pragmatic strategies Richard uses.

1.2 Research questions

- 1- How does Richard pragmatically use language to persuade Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth?
- 2- How far was Richard successful in wooing the two ladies: Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth?
- 3- How far does the pragmatic analysis of the two wooing scenes meet or deviate from the literary analysis of these scenes?
- 4- What is the general persuasive nature of Richard's character, particularly in the two wooing scenes?

1.3 Aim of this study

The aim of this study is to understand the persuasive nature of Richard's character according to how he uses language pragmatically in order to persuade and woo Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth.

1.4 Significance of the study

The significance of this study is that it contributes to the field of linguistics (pragmatics) by drawing the attention of students of linguistics to the important role of pragmatics in persuasive language. It is very useful for students to understand how pragmatic theories and strategies can be used and exploited by a speaker in order to persuade others. By observing Richard's persuasive language from a pragmatic point of view in the two wooing scenes, students of linguistics can benefit from this study to understand the power and effect of pragmatic theories and strategies in the process of persuasion. Moreover, by making Richard's character a subject to pragmatic investigation in this study; students of English language and linguistics can understand Richard's character and persuasive nature from a pragmatic point of view.

In addition, this study contributes to the field of literature by helping students of literature understand the persuasive nature of Richard's character from a persuasive point of view, observing the function of persuasion in Richard's language in the two wooing scenes. The literary analysis of Richard's character provides an understanding of his language manipulation and persuasive nature from a literary point of view. Conducting a pragmatic analysis of Richard's character in the two wooing scenes provides an understanding of Richard's language manipulation and persuasive nature from a pragmatic perspective. This leads to an effective comparison between the literary view and the pragmatic view of Richard's overall persuasive character, in order for students of English language and literature to see whether these two views match or not. By making a literary character, which has been a subject to literary analysis, a subject to pragmatic investigation, this study combines the study of

literature and pragmatics together, creating a valid description of Richard's persuasive language.

1.5 Definition of terms

- **Pragmatics:** It refers to the study of language within a particular context. It is concerned with how the context affects speech. Moreover, it examines language according to what speakers mean and to what hearers understand. It focuses on the speakers' intended meanings, assumptions and aims behind their utterances, rather than the form of their utterances (Yule, 1996).

- **Persuasion:** It is an act which involves the process of using methods of communication to modify and alter the point of view and behaviour of others regarding certain matters, with the people being persuaded having freedom of choice (Perloff, 2003).

- **The Cooperative Principle:** It is a pragmatic theory that examines speech according to how speakers are cooperative in their communicative efforts and according to how speech participants recognize these efforts. It is a principle which speech participants are expected to observe. This theory contains four categories that are called maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner (Grice, 1975).

- **Speech Acts:** It is pragmatic theory that examines how things and actions are performed by producing utterances (Searle, 1965).

- **Politeness:** It is a pragmatic theory that examines how politeness is achieved through language and speech (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

1.6 Limitations

This study is limited to Richard's speech in the two wooing scenes, which is part of the dramatic script of Shakespeare's *Richard III*, written in Early Modern English. The theories: The cooperative principle, speech acts and politeness are the pragmatic theories that were used to analyze Richard's speech, particularly focusing on the function of persuasion. The application of pragmatics was limited to those theories only, focusing mainly on the character of Richard as the persuader. The speech of the characters of Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth were regarded only as reactions to Richard's persuasive language, and the pragmatic theories were not applied on their speeches.

1.7 Methods

The data, which are the two wooing scenes, were analyzed and dissected carefully. This was done by applying the pragmatic theories: The cooperative principle, speech acts and politeness to the two scenes.

1.8 Plan of the study

The study consists of five chapters:

- **Chapter one:** This introduces the general background of the study, research questions, aim of the study, significance of the study, definition of terms, limitations of the study, the methods and the study's plan.
- **Chapter two:** This is the literature review, which includes nine sections; section one is an introduction. Section two defines and explains the pragmatic theories that were used in this study. Section three discusses the literary view of Richard's language use.

Section four provides an overview of the usage of persuasive language in Shakespeare's plays. Section five includes an examination of the usage of pragmatic theories in Shakespeare's plays. Section six is about the usage of pragmatic theories in relation to persuasive language. In section seven, the researcher discusses persuasive language in Shakespeare's plays in relation to pragmatics. Section eight focuses on the usage of pragmatics in relation to persuasive language in the two wooing scenes. The final section, section nine, is the conclusion.

- **Chapter three:** This is the methodology, which deals with data collection, the models of analysis that the researcher used to conduct this study and the study's procedure.
- **Chapter four:** In this chapter, the researcher analyzes and discusses the two wooing scenes in detail.
- **Chapter five:** This chapter includes the study's findings, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, pragmatic theories are discussed, especially in relation to persuasive language and Shakespeare's works. Pragmatic theories are linguistic strategies that are used in persuasive language, either consciously or unconsciously. In addition, pragmatic theories are projected through many characters in Shakespeare's works. The researcher's aim here is to show how persuasive language works hand in hand with pragmatic theories and how Shakespeare created characters that project the usage of pragmatic theories through their speeches. Moreover, it is vital to observe how pragmatic theories are used in the persuasive language of Shakespearean characters, combining pragmatics, persuasive language and Shakespeare's works together. Others may have used the same methods of research as the researcher is, by applying the same pragmatic theories to Shakespearean characters, either Richard or other characters.

In this chapter, after discussing the pragmatic theories that were used to analyzed Richard's persuasive language, the researcher sheds light on how the study of literature and literary scholars viewed Richard's language. This shows that not only the study of pragmatic linguistics discusses the language of Shakespearean characters, particularly Richard III, but also the study of literature. Moreover, the researcher discusses in this chapter how persuasive language exists in Shakespeare's plays and how pragmatic theories are applied to his plays. Furthermore, it is essential to discuss how pragmatic language and strategies exist in both ancient Shakespearean plays and in real life, but in relation to persuasive language in particular, proving the existence of such language and

strategies in them. Finally, this chapter discusses the usage of pragmatic theories in the persuasive language of Richard in the two wooing scenes in *Richard III*, proving that the aim of this research is possible to achieve.

2.2 The pragmatic theories

2.2.1 The cooperative principle (Grice, 1975)

Regarding Grice's cooperative principle's general notion, Allot (2010) considers the hearer's ability to understand the speaker's intention on the one hand, and whether the speaker can be sure that his intended meanings can be understood on the other hand. During the classical period between the 1940s and the 1960s, Grice was investigating meaning and working on his conversational theory until he came up with his cooperative principle. Grice states in his Cooperative Principle that in order for a person to be cooperative in a conversation that runs in a smooth and successful way, he/she has to follow certain rules or maxims. The following table summarizes Grice's Cooperative Principle:

Table (1)

Grice's Cooperative Principle

The Maxim	Following the Maxim	Flouting the Maxim
The Maxim of Quantity	Make your contribution in the interaction as informative as is needed, and the information you give must be only communicated for the purposes of the interaction, not anything else. You should not make your contribution more informative than is needed in the interaction.	Give either too little information or too much information.
The Maxim of Quality	You should not say what you believe to be false. You should not say something with lacking sufficient evidence.	Do not say what represents what you exactly think and believe. Say something with lacking sufficient evidence.
The Maxim of Relation	Be relevant to what is discussed in the interaction.	Say something that is irrelevant to what is said before.
The maxim of Manner	You should not be obscure in your expression. You should not be ambiguous. You should be brief and avoid using unnecessary and tedious expressions. You should be orderly.	Be obscure, unclear and ambiguous.

Hadi (2012) comments on Grice's cooperative principle by saying that the rules and maxims that are included in it do not define how one should talk, rather, they explain how listeners understand and assume the way speakers talk. Moreover, he believes that these maxims are created by Grice in order to instruct speakers how to communicate successfully. In addition, it can be said that these maxims are what speakers make as presumptions of utterances, which hearers expect and count on, and speakers use to give the hearers what they expect in each utterance in the conversation. In other words, hearers expect speakers to be cooperative in conversations, not careless and/or naive in conversations.

However, the cooperative principle has been negatively criticized as well. Frederking (1996) states that Grice's theory is a vague theory that made researchers' implementations of it not so accurate and real. He comments that although this theory helps in considering how language is used, especially for a researcher, in reality, it is not so helpful in actual and real implementation. The reality of this theory is combined with its vagueness. How Grice categorizes the maxims is misleading and can be even harmful.

Furthermore, the cooperative principle works hand in hand with the level of directness the speaker wants to convey. Davies (2000) suggests that the level of directness of utterances has a lot to do with the cooperative principle. The cooperative principle is about making it easier for the hearer to generate the implicit and intended meaning given in the utterance. Davies goes on by saying that when people produce or hear utterance; they assume that they are generally true, having enough information that is relevant and clearly understandable. If the utterance does not follow this, it would not be assumed to be nonsense, but it would

be considered to have an appropriate meaning that is being inferred indirectly.

Regarding flouting a maxim, Andresen (2013) mentions that in maxim flouting, a maxim is ignored by using a conversational implicature, by adding meaning to the literal meaning of the utterance. In other words, there is an underlined meaning that is being conveyed through the surface meaning. According to Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011), "In the case of flouting (exploitation) of cooperative maxims, the speaker desires the greatest understanding in his/her recipient because it is expected that the interlocutor is able to uncover the hidden meaning behind the utterances" (p. 123).

Considering the above, Grice's cooperative principle is useful to get an idea of the dynamics of verbal interactions. It shows how speakers carry out conversations and how form and function are two separate units that either complement each other or go against each other for certain purposes. However, a point that can be held against Grice's theory is that it is presenting maxims as strict rules that should be observed to make a verbal contribution cooperative; implying the idea that a speaker who doesn't follow these maxims is definitely considered uncooperative in a conversation. In reality, as long as the hearer understands the intended meaning of the speaker's utterance, the speaker is being cooperative, whether the meaning is conveyed explicitly or implicitly, and whether the speaker follows the maxims or not. Nevertheless, Grice believes that maxim flouting is not something wrong, and it is very common to occur in human interactions. He acknowledges conversations in real life rather than just creating a theory about how they work. For example, flouting the maxim of quality in terms of theoretical pragmatics is considered lying. But it is not always so in real life according to real life pragmatics.

Moreover, although Grice presents four maxims, they are actually two if one looks carefully. The maxim of quantity and relation can be thought of one maxim, for a person who gives too much information is also being irrelevant to the topic of conversation. Furthermore, the maxim of quality and manner can be thought of one maxim, for a person who is not being truthful is also being unclear. However, this idea may create some confusion, and Grice may have created four separate maxims to avoid this. A person who flouts the maxim of quantity by giving too little information is not being irrelevant. This thought may cause one to have three maxims. Having four separate maxims may be ideal for pragmatic analysis, and it is easier to carry out to achieve the aims of this study.

2.2.2 Speech acts (Austin, 1962)

Allot (2010) suggests that Austin's main aim behind his speech act theory was to investigate how something can happen socially just by uttering something. Austin defines the concept of speech acts by stating that it is the performance of actions by saying things. Mey (2001) explains the concept of speech acts by stating, "Speech acts are verbal actions happening in the world. Uttering a speech act, I do something with my words: I perform an *activity* that (at least intentionally) brings about a change in the existing state of affairs" (p. 95).

Smith (1991) states that speech act theory, which was introduced by Austin and then developed by Searle (1969), examines the discourse structure of utterances, explaining units of language. The theory of speech acts originally started within the philosophy of language in order to explain how language can be used by human beings. Utterances are examined by Austin on three levels:

- **The locutionary act:** This is the act of saying something, while paying attention to the form of the utterance.
- **The illocutionary force:** This is the function of the utterance and what is being done in uttering the words, regardless of the form. It is the purpose and intention that the speaker has in his mind.
- **The perlocutionary effect:** This is the result of the utterance and the effect on the hearer. It is what the hearer does because of the utterance.

Regarding Austin's analysis of speech acts above, Searle (1965) emphasizes the importance of studying such a theory by stating:

Perhaps I can say why I think it is of interest and importance in the philosophy of language to study speech acts, or, as they are sometimes called, language acts or linguistic acts. I think it is essential to any specimen of linguistic communication that it involves a linguistic act. It is not, as has generally been supposed, the symbol or word or sentence, or even the token of the symbol or word or sentence, which is the unit of linguistic communication, but rather it is the *production* of the token in the performance of the speech act that constitutes the basic unit of linguistic communication (p. 221).

Considering the above, when one observes Austin's speech acts, he/she may consider the fact that it gives a clear idea of how speakers use language and verbal utterances to do things. Austin presents language as a tool to get things done and make society operate smoothly. His three-level analysis of each utterance shows the power of even one simple utterance, even if it consists of one word. This theory observes the units of each utterance that form the utterance's dynamics to get things done,

which fits perfectly in the analysis of Richard's speech, for he is trying to get things done in the play. However, it would be better to observe how language is used for the aim and possibility of getting things done, for not everything is done through uttering things. The circumstances may reject the speaker's aims behind his utterances. Richard's intentions of marriage are dependent on Anne and Elizabeth, and they wouldn't get fulfilled without their consents. The perlocutionary effect would not be the one Richard anticipates in his mind, which means that a failed perlocutionary effect may be considered a gap and weakness in the three-analysis of speech acts, which is a theory specifically created to get things done.

Nevertheless, it can still be regarded as a major theory in the study of pragmatics, which is useful to achieve the aim of this study. Each utterance produced by Richard in the two wooing scenes can be dissected into the three-level analysis of speech acts. This provides an understanding of how Richard is using language for his aims to get fulfilled. Apparently, out of his positive view of Austin's theory, Searle (1969) decided to develop the theory of speech acts and classified them into five macro-classes and types:

Table (2)

Types of Speech Acts

Type of Speech Act	Definition
Declarations	Words and expressions that change the world by just uttering them. Something automatically happens by just uttering certain words and expressions. Like declaring, naming and baptizing.
Representatives	Utterances that say what the speaker believes to be the case, such as claiming, hypothesizing, insisting and predicting.
Commissives	Utterances that commit the speaker to a future action. Once the speaker utters one of these, he is committed to an action in the future, like promising, offering, threatening, refusing, vowing and volunteering.
Directives	Utterances that make the hearer do something, like commanding, requesting, inviting, forbidding and suggesting.
Expressives	Utterances that show how the speaker feels, such as apologizing, praising, congratulating, deploring and regretting.

Furthermore, speech act theory is related to directness. According to Cutting (2002), Searle believes that when a person uses a direct speech act, he/she wants to convey the literal meaning that the words normally express. In other words, when using a direct speech act, there is a direct relationship between the form and function of the utterance. On the other hand, Searle mentions that when a person uses an indirect speech act, he/she wants to convey an underlying, pragmatic meaning that is different from the apparent surface meaning. The function and the form are not directly related and do not equal each other, with having one speech act being performed through another speech act. However, speech acts theory's weakness has been emphasized. Chakrani (2007) criticizes speech act theory by stating, "However, a major criticism leveled against

the theoretical premise of SAT lies in its failure to consider variation in 'cultural context' as a determining factor in assuring successful communication vis a vis performance and reception" (p. 1).

Chakrani's comment is valid in the sense the cultures vary according to how things are done through words. An utterance in a certain culture may have a different function than in another culture, or it may not have a function at all in another culture. A certain utterance may be considered a certain type of speech act in one culture, but may be considered another one in another culture. This is why it is useful to observe the language of Richard through the lens of 16th century England.

After understanding Searle's contribution to Austin's speech acts, one cannot deny that it is useful in the sense that it gives five types of speech acts that are used to get things done by speakers. These five categories have different functions and usages, which present language as a means that contains verbal devices and weapons. These five types are used according to the contexts of interactions and the aims the speaker has in mind. They are used in different situations and psychological states. Declarations are used in rather formal situations to announce the perlocutionary effect of utterances. Representatives are used when one is speaking intellectually from the mind, while expressives are used when one is speaking emotionally for the heart. Commisives are used when one commits himself to a future perlocutionary effect, while directives are used to make the hearer fulfill a perlocutinary effect. This shows how Searle's contribution works hand in hand with Austin's original theory and is useful to classify the speech acts used by Richard in the two wooing scenes.

2.2.3 Politeness

The act of being polite by common language users is not understood as exactly as linguists and scholars do. Geyer (2008) mentions that common language users believe that "politeness" describes how civilians behave in an appropriate manner according to social factors such as being raised well, status and etiquette. On the other hand, politeness has been discussed from a scholarly point of view, especially after the emerge of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory. This theory can be considered the theory that allowed for the scholarly investigation of politeness to take place, particularly in the study of pragmatics, sociolinguistics, social psychology, anthropology and language acquisition. Important journals have been published, investigating linguistic politeness in many fields. Moreover, politeness has been redefined occasionally.

Brown and Levinson (1987) state in their politeness theory that in language use, one should be aware and acknowledge the concept of '**face**', which is the public self-image of people we interact with. Avoiding 'Face Threatening Acts' (FTAs) is one of the ways to be polite. However, FTAs cannot be avoided and, in this case, speakers can redress the threat by using negative politeness and positive politeness as redressive actions.

- **Negative politeness:** It is to respect the hearer's negative face. Having a negative face means that the hearer wants to be independent and free with his/her actions, and not to be imposed on by others.
- **Positive politeness:** This is to respect the hearer's desire to be accepted and liked by others, treated as a member of the group and do as others do.

Furthermore, Brown and Levinson believe that the only way to avoid an FTA is to remain silent. If a speaker does not avoid an FTA, he/she actually says something, and there are different ways to do so, either off-record, or on-record. The following table summarizes Brown and Levinson's politeness theory:

Table (3)

Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory

Politeness Strategy	Characteristics
Off-record FTA	Indirect and Implicit.
On-record FTA (bald)	Direct and Explicit.
On-record FTA with a Redressive Action (With Negative Politeness)	Direct with acknowledging the hearer's negative face.
On-record FTA with a Redressive Action (With Positive Politeness)	Direct with acknowledging the hearer's positive face.

After examining Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, it is clearly noticed that it gives a clear understanding of how the directness of speech works hand in hand with politeness. Their theory provides four understandable strategies and summarizes the whole concept of politeness. It presents two ways or bridges that are used to be polite and redress the face threat upon the hearer, which are negative and positive politeness. This provides the theory strength in the sense that a polite person either creates space between him and the other, or creates closeness between him and the other. Bald-on-record politeness is presented like the risky way of communicating. It is risky because of the lack of the metaphorical bridge that is used to redress face threat. Bald-on-record politeness is as if one jumps from one end to another, with either reaching the other end or falling. Off-record politeness is like one

who stays on the end and refuses to jump, which is the safest politeness strategy.

The researcher chose politeness alongside the theories mentioned earlier because of the fact that they complement each other. Tsuda (1993) mentions how indirectness in conversations and giving conversational implicatures are related, and therefore, how politeness is related to maxim flouting. Maxim flouting and its production of conversational implicatures play important roles in personal interactions. Moreover, the concept of face in human interaction explains how things are said indirectly, especially by using politeness expressions. When it comes to maxim flouting, Tsuda states that Brown and Levinson's politeness theory classifies different types of indirect FTAs according to how a certain maxim is violated. Moreover, when people get their faces threatened, they try not to give much information. Grice's maxims are violated by people who are interested in being cooperative in conversations, with maintaining their faces and independence as much as they can.

In addition, bald-on-record politeness is considered a complete and total observance of Grice's four maxims. Shigemitsu (2004) states that unlike the off-record politeness strategy, Brown and Levinson believe that bald-on-record strategy means that a person follows and observes the four maxims. In other words, a person who uses bald-on-record does so by being sincere (quality), giving enough information (quantity), being relevant (relation) and avoiding ambiguity (manner). Moreover, this politeness strategy is used whenever a person wants to communicate an FTA with maximum efficiency (in order to be as effective as possible), without caring about satisfying the addressee's face.

Furthermore, politeness is related to speech act theory as well. Pinker (2007) relates using indirect speech acts and off-record FTAs. He calls this concept 'Off-record indirect speech acts', which is a combination of indirect speech acts and off-record FTAs, and is a major topic in the study of pragmatics, for this topic has a considerable practical importance, examining and understating linguistic tools such as rhetoric, negotiation and diplomacy. Pinker regards indirect speech as a window into human social relationships, in order to discover the human being's social psychology and his/her way of using indirectness to avoid embarrassment and tension (maintaining face). Lee and Pinker (2010) believe that when it comes to the speech acts of requests for example, people often do not make requests directly. These people can be considered strategic speakers that use indirectness in their strategies of communication. Indirect speech acts and off-record politeness work hand in hand. Lee and Pinker emphasize the scientific and practical importance of off-record indirect speech.

It is not only Brown and Levinson who discussed politeness in depth. Leech (1983) introduces six politeness maxims in his politeness principle, which are supposed to be followed in order to be polite. The following table summarizes this:

Table (4)

Leech's Politeness Maxims

Politeness Maxim	Definition
The Maxim of Tact	- Minimize cost to the other. - Maximize benefit to the other.
The Maxim of Generosity	- Minimize benefit to yourself. - Maximize cost to yourself.
The Maxim of Approbation	- Minimize dispraise of the other. - Maximize praise of the other.
The Maxim of Modesty	- Minimize praise of yourself. - Maximize dispraise of yourself.
The Maxim of Agreement	- Minimize disagreement between you and the other. - Maximize agreement between you and the other.
The Maxim of Sympathy	- Minimize antipathy between you and the other. - Maximize sympathy between you and the other.

After examining the table above, it appears that Leech's politeness maxims discuss politeness in terms of rules rather than strategies. The six politeness maxims are presented like the six rules that should be followed in order to be polite, and if one goes against one of them, he is being impolite. This is the obvious weakness in this theory, for in real life, it may be actually impolite to use one of these maxims. For example, if a speaker follows the maxim of generosity by offering money to a person, the hearer may consider it an offense that touches his pride, for he may think that the speaker is offering an act of charity. Also, a hearer may

regard a speaker following the maxim of sympathy as being offensive, for he may think that the speaker is looking down on him. Moreover, Leech has not considered the cultural aspect of politeness. A male speaker who uses the maxim of approbation and compliments a woman may be considered impolite, for in many cultures, it is wrong to compliment a woman, especially if the speaker does not know personally her.

On the other hand, one may choose to regard Leech's maxims as types of politeness rather than rules of politeness. In this case, Leech provides six types of politeness, and each type has a certain mental or emotional state that is intended to be conveyed through utterances. Each type of politeness is a way to show a certain side of the speaker's polite character or manner. This provides the theory strength in relation to this study, for the aim of this study is to investigate Richard's polite character and manner.

2.3 A literary view of Richard's persuasive language

In the study of literature, the Character of Richard has been discussed in terms of his usage of language to achieve his goals. Olaters (2006) states that the character of Richard in the play shows a man with acting abilities, extreme dramatic skills, direction of actions and manipulation of people. Olaters adds that Richard never kills anyone with his own hands in the play. Instead, he uses language to make others kill for him. The strong point in Olaters's statement is showing how Richard uses language as an important weapon to achieve his goals.

Relating to the former, Varela, Davies, Simmons & Williams (2005) emphasize the fact that Richard's character is used by Shakespeare to show to the audience his verbal skills used to support his high confidence

in his persuasive power. Moreover, Richard killed Lady Anne's husband, she knows about his crimes and had seen his ugly appearance, but these facts did not prevent Richard from wooing and persuading her, showing that persuasion can achieve even the highly unlikely.

Indeed, the two wooing scenes are examples of language manipulation to persuade. Stepkowska (2009) mentions that the two wooing scenes show how women can be treated as mere objects by exploiting conflicted emotions of them, where there is effective persuasion. Words can be powerful and one can exercise power by using double meaning and ambiguities. If one knows how to use language in particular situations, according to the addressees, he/she can get power by persuading others. Stepkowska adds that even though the women in *Richard III* appear to be alert with having intuition, they blindly fall victims to the power of words and become fascinated with the charm these words convey. In both scenes, we have intentions of marriage from a man who wants to conquer two women, and the interactions include word battles between him and them. They look like fights, and the arguments are the blows and strikes that are triggered by intense conflicting emotions.

Regarding the so called "first wooing scene" of Lady Anne, in Act I, Scene II, McGlinn (1999) mentions that Richard "sweet talks" Lady Anne and after being the man who is never gentle with words, he now tries to touch Anne's heart and make her consider him a lover and a husband. Now Richard uses words as weapons, and he is good at it. Finally, Richard offers a ring to Lady Anne and she accepts it, indicating that he touched her heart and got her acceptance. When it comes to the "second wooing scene" in Act IV, Scene IV, Stepkowska (2009) explains that Richard knows how to answer quickly before the verbal opponent gets the chance to think or reflect on what is said, which is a crucial skill.

Richard was able to create some faith in Elizabeth after her hesitation. Finally, the apparent result of this verbal interaction, according to Stepkowska, is that Elizabeth tells Richard that she will deliver his proposal to her daughter. However, whether these words will be actually transformed into actual action is a question of concern and significance. One should consider the possibility that Richard may be the one who is being deceived, not the other way around, and that it is Queen Elizabeth who is mocking him.

It can be understood here that the power of language plays a major role in Shakespeare's character according to the study of literature. Since linguistics and pragmatics dissect language in more depth, this study provides a more analytical observation of Richard's language. Literature describes the language of characters while pragmatic linguistics analyses them.

2.4 Persuasive language in Shakespeare's plays

Rhetoric language, in other words, persuasive language, is one of the interests that Shakespeare's plays pay attention to. This idea is supported by Beier (2014). He examined the art of persuasion Shakespeare projects in his plays, particularly *Othello*, which has been an interest for critics to examine persuasive language. Beier suggests that observing *Othello*, alongside other works, such as *Cymbeline*, *Hamlet*, *King Lear* and *Macbeth*, helps to understand Shakespeare's dramatization of persuasive language. Beier pays particular attention to two characters: Iago in *Othello*, and Iachimo in *Cymbeline*. He emphasizes that the character of Iago provides the best understanding of Shakespeare's persuasive language, and he compares it to Iachimo.

Boden (2004) discussed dialogues in which there is persuasion in Shakespeare's works. Shakespeare adds the element of drama to persuasive dialogues in his works, which creates dramatic tension in them. Boden's aim was to discover how both the persuader and the person being persuaded affect the power of persuasion in Shakespeare's works, and this was achieved by using linguistic methods. Shakespeare's works include lots of persuasive dialogues, with a variety of forms and conditions. Boden examines scenes from historical plays (*Richard III*), tragedies (*Othello*, *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *King Lear*), Roman plays (*Julius Caesar*), comedies (*Much Ado About Nothing*), and romances (*The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest*). Boden compares between the scenes in those plays regarding the persuasive nature of them, and the roles of the persuaders and the people being persuaded. These scenes differ in their features, showing the flexibility in persuasion and the different intentions behind it.

Regarding Boden's study, it is noticed that it compares Richard, Anne and Elizabeth to other characters in Shakespearean plays, focusing on persuasion in Shakespeare's works as a whole. While this is useful to discover how Shakespeare uses persuasion in his plays, the researcher would rather focus on the character of Richard himself, and making him the subject of investigation. Boden compares between different persuasive dialogues in different Shakespearean plays, while the researcher uses detailed analyses of one character in two particular scenes in a play. Regarding the suitable way to examine persuasive language, Beier (2014) and Boden (2004) did not choose to use particular linguistic or pragmatic theories to analyze persuasion. Using particular theories helps to understand the angle and method one is using to analyze persuasion, which is pragmatics in case of this study. Boden focused too

much on Anne and Elizabeth when examining the two wooing scenes. The researcher focuses mostly on the persuader, to get an idea of what kind of persuader Richard is as a whole.

2.5 The usage of pragmatic theories in Shakespeare's plays

Two major theories in the study of pragmatics were used in the analysis of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*. Yousef (2014) applied Austin's (1962) speech act theory and Grice's (1979) cooperative principle to the play, in order to observe the pragmatic strategies in it. His investigation is regarded as proof that pragmatic analysis gives the reader the chance to interpret the play creatively. His study concluded that applying such theories to the play gives a better understanding regarding the meaning of the play, showing the language's social function, and the relationships between the characters and their social status. The reason he mentions is that *Romeo and Juliet* can be considered one of the most suitable Shakespearean plays for pragmatic investigation.

Furthermore, Werring (2011) examined *Romeo and Juliet* in his study as well, particularly the death scene in the play. Werring was trying to make the point that the declaration of death can be considered a powerful act of speech, in other words, a powerful speech act. In addition, the study analyzes another kind of speech act in another Shakespearean play, a wedding vow or a promise in *The Merchant of Venice*, due to the fact that

a vow of marriage is a very important speech act used to change reality according to Austin.

Politeness, as a major theory in pragmatics, has not been neglected in pragmatic studies of Shakespeare's plays. Bouchara (2009) applies Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory to four *comedies* written by Shakespeare: *Much Ado about Nothing*, *Measure for Measure*, *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Twelfth Night*. He compares the application of politeness theory on these *comedies* to another study done by Brown and Gilman (1989), in which they apply Brown and Levinson's politeness theory to four *tragedies*: *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth* and *Othello*. Bouchara's aim is to discover whether different results will be gotten when applying politeness theory to the genre of *comedies* in contrast to the genre of *tragedies*, and whether the genre of a play affects how politeness strategies are used.

Brown and Gilman (1989) conducted a study that is based on their idea that power, distance and ranked extremity that FTAs provide show how politeness can be of different levels in discourse, Shakespeare's Early Modern English discourse in Particular. Using dramatic texts as data, Brown and Gilman chose drama because of its richness of information about how colloquial (informal) language is used in Shakespeare's 16th century time period. Moreover, the psychological inner states of characters in *tragedies* affect how politeness is used, especially when they use "psychological soliloquies". Brown and Gilman's examination of Shakespeare's *tragedies* showed the following results, which might be surprising:

- In *tragedies*, the more power the speaker has over the hearer, the more polite he is.
- In *tragedies*, the more extreme the face threat is, the more polite the speaker is.
- In *tragedies*, the more affection the speaker shows or feels, the more polite he is.

Interestingly, Bouchara's application of politeness theory to *comedies* yielded very similar results to Brown and Gilman's results in their application of politeness theory to *tragedies*. Thus, one can conclude that Bouchara's results show that in *comedies*, the speaker having more power, producing more extreme face threats and showing more affection make him/her more polite.

2.6 The usage of pragmatic theories in persuasive language

It is very useful to observe how pragmatic theories are used in persuasive language, whether in Shakespearean ancient times or modern times. After all, Richard's character is a man and the setting of *Richard III* is real life presented on stage. The aim of this section is to prove that pragmatic strategies are used in persuasive language as a whole, in both modern times and ancient Shakespearean plays. One should not forget that Richard's character is based on the real Richard that existed in 16th century England and that a number of events in *Richard III* actually happened in real life. The different setting of *Richard III* does not affect the usage of pragmatic theories, for language existed since the beginning

of humanity, and pragmatics as well, even if the term *pragmatics* has not been used or identified in the past.

2.6.1 The cooperative principle (Grice, 1975):

In modern real life, one of the contexts in which persuasive language is used is in the language of advertisements. Crisan and Pop (2013) investigate advertising language to observe how the use of pragmatic implicature in the persuasive language of tourism can help to persuade others. They focus on the language of tourism because tourism has developed over the years, and therefore, advertisers in the tourism business have started making more efforts in using language as a tool to persuade people. Moreover, Crisan and Pop state that Grice's maxims can be exploited to create great persuasive power in tourist advertisements, making the customers take the tour being advertised. Furthermore, they clarify that advertisements have the role to seduce, attract, manipulate, persuade, lie and eventually inform, and language is an important tool to persuade and manipulate the addressee.

Crisan and Pop conclude that Grice's maxims are usually flouted in tourism advertisements, either intentionally or not, which leads to the effectiveness of these advertisements. Moreover, using maxim flouting to create implicatures potentially creates reality and imagined worlds. In other words, the advertiser tries to create a new reality in the addressee's mind. Understanding what advertisements implicitly communicate makes all the difference in selling something and trying to persuade, making the analysis of persuasive language in tourism advertisements a perfect subject for serious analysis.

Apparently, persuasive language plays a major role in the language of advertisements. Wenzhong and Jingyi (2013) pragmatically analyzed advertisements as well. They examine the pragmatic functions of vague language in commercial advertising and how Grice's maxims can be exploited in order to be vague as a tool to persuade somebody and sell something. They chose vague language as a subject for analysis because vagueness is used both positively and negatively by advertisers to increase interest, and Grice's maxims and conversational implicature play important roles in this attempt. Wenzhong and Jingyi conclude that, based on Grice's maxims and conversational implicature, using vague language is produced by paying attention to the details of speech, meaning focusing on how language and its explicit and implicit meanings should be observed and manipulated in order to persuade people.

2.6.2 Speech acts (Austin, 1962):

A study was done by Hardin (2010) in which she examines how speech acts are used in persuasive discourse, particularly by intermediate Spanish learners. She explores the types of speech acts used by these Spanish learners, in addition to their choices of how to form these speech acts when they communicate them. Hardin investigates this issue by making Spanish college students give two oral monologues in Spanish, involving two situations: Making a lazy spouse do some work and offering advice for finding a new girlfriend after separating from a woman, both of which require persuasive language the students need to convince the addressee to do something.

The students' monologues regarding the first situation were compared to those of five native speakers in order to compare the use of speech acts. The study's findings show that intermediate Spanish Learners, when it

comes to the first situation of making a lazy spouse do some work, preferred to use speech acts that produce the illocutionary forces of complaints, recommendations, orders and suggestions. Regarding the second situation about offering advice of how to find a girlfriend after separating from one, the same learners produced reactions, advice, consolation, suggestions and insults. According to these findings, Hardin concludes that intermediate Spanish learners prefer to produce those types of illocutionary forces in their speech acts when they are trying to persuade somebody in informal contexts (with a spouse or a good friend).

Persuasion is an element that is considered a major factor in the language used for promoting products. Taillard (2000) discussed persuasive communication in this area and states that when humans interact, their two main aims are to be understood and to be believed, both of which are acts that are produced in persuasive communication. Taillard emphasized that such language and communication offers a rich domain of investigation for the study of the language of persuasion. Taillard's aim was to show how speech acts are related to persuasion by emphasizing that persuasion is performing an act.

2.6.3 Politeness:

Politeness is a pragmatic strategy used in persuasive language. Pastor and Dolores (2005) investigated the phenomenon of persuasion from a pragmatic point of view, particularly in relation to politeness. They performed this by relating persuasion to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. They observed how Politeness and persuasion are used daily in interactions between learners of English as a second/foreign (ESF/EFL), and their friends who are native speakers of English, especially when they

are trying to persuade each other. Pastor and Dolores concluded that persuasion and politeness are interrelated concepts.

Politeness as a strategy of persuasion can even differ from one language to another. Akan language was examined by Agyekum (2004) in relation to politeness and persuasion, viewing persuasion as a mechanism meant to influence a person to either make a change in attitude and mind, or to resist a change. Akan is the native language of the Akan lands in Ghana. The study regards persuasion as a mental persuasion device and observes aspects of persuasive language in routinized traditional events in Akan, looking at persuasion through the concept of politeness in speech communication. Agyekum's aim was to discover how politeness strategies can be used when Akan language speakers want to persuade people, adopting Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. The study observed participants engaging in natural encounters in certain situations, including religious worship, consoling the worried, political propaganda, palace language, and advertisements, all of which require persuasive language. Agyekum's study concludes that positive politeness strategies are considered persuasive strategies, in order to increase the level of intimacy between the addresser and addressee.

Furthermore, Agyekum clarifies that people tend to use certain strategies and forms in order to produce positive politeness, such as honorifics, apologies, indirect utterances, idioms, proverbs and slogans. Furthermore, politeness strategies were investigated in competitive business English letters by Kan (2012). He used Leech's politeness maxims as a theoretical framework to show how politeness is used as strategies in competitive letters. Competitive letters are written in order to specifically persuade

the reader to approve of the writer's idea or do as the writer says, which makes these letters competitive in nature. Competitive letters have many types, including request letters, collection letters, sales letters and so on. The nature of these letters is impolite, because they are trying to make the reader do something, and that is why it is vital to increase their level of politeness and make them sound less threatening, thus making it easier to effectively persuade the reader. Kan clarifies that politeness is an important tool that is used to determine the language and structure being used in speech and writing. Kan concluded that politeness strategies can be used in English competitive business letters to promote business transaction. He recommends that business English writers should use politeness strategies properly, in order to succeed in communication, and therefore, succeed in persuading others.

2.7 Pragmatic persuasive language in Shakespeare's plays

Pragmatic language, particularly when pragmatic theories are involved, can have the element and function of persuasion. This exists in Shakespearean plays. The cooperative principle was used as a method to investigate persuasion in ancient Shakespearean drama. A study was conducted by Behnam (2009), in which he examined Shakespeare's play, *Julius Caesar*. He analyzed two duel-like orations, produced by two characters. Behnam's aim was to show how Antony is able to use Brutus's words against him, in order to captivate, win and persuade the crowd in his oration. Antony is a manipulator of words. One of the ways Behnam used in to achieve his goal was to apply Grice's cooperative principle (1975) to the two orations. Behnam analyzed two persuaders, Antony and

Brutus, focusing on the utterances produced in two scenes and using comparison as well. The researcher uses utterances as proof to discover the kind of persuader Richard is. The main aim is not to discover the persuasive nature of the two wooing scenes, but he wants to discover the persuasive nature of Richard himself.

Combining ancient rhetoric language and modern pragmatics is a method of high effectiveness, especially in examining Shakespeare's dramatic language. Again, *Othello* has been a subject to this linking between the ancient and modern. Keller (2010) focused on the so-called 'temptation scene' in this play by applying pragmatic theories to it, including politeness. He aimed at analyzing the persuasion in Shakespeare's language, following the steps of American scholars of Elizabethan Literature in the 1940s. He concluded that Shakespeare does not suggest that using persuasion and rhetoric language are specifically used to deceive others, for the intention of such language depends on the user and the context he chooses to use such language in. Moreover, using persuasive language can be considered the most dangerous weapon for a villain in *Othello*.

Politeness is related to the cooperative principle and speech acts, because being polite may require flouting a maxim or using an indirect speech act for example. Gilbert (1997) conducted an analysis in which he investigated the rhetoric strategies of persuasion in *Julius Caesar*, alongside *Othello*. He examined a speech performed by the character of Anthony, relying on the cooperative principle and politeness. He viewed Anthony as a dominant speaker, who exploits the maxims and politeness strategies to persuade others. While Gilbert observes a single speech of a persuader, this study aims to observe two dialogues in which a persuader and a person being persuaded are battling with words. This will give a

better idea of persuasion in a situation in which the hearer is able to respond. Such situation can create a difficult task and challenge for a persuader, and it would be interesting to see how he handles the situation by using pragmatic strategies.

The process of examining a persuader's persuasion is by analyzing his strategies, and this is when the cooperative principle and politeness are handy. The cooperative principle and politeness have been combined in the analysis of persuasion in *King Lear* as well. Grice's conversational maxims and Leech's (1983) politeness maxims were applied by Yuan-Guey (2014) in his analysis of *King Lear*, particularly the first act of the play. His study aimed at investigating how Shakespeare uses rhetoric language in the tragic art of the play.

2.8 The usage of pragmatics in relation to persuasive language in the two wooing scenes

One may question the important role of pragmatics in the researcher's study and whether Richard's character is a suitable subject to pragmatic investigation. The study of pragmatics has not been completely neglected in the investigation of Richard's character, especially in the two wooing scenes. If one regards Richard as a language user, the usage of pragmatics automatically exists in his language and character.

One of the wooing scenes has been a subject to pragmatic investigation. Mullini (2012) discussed the power of pragmatic strategies in Act One, Scene Two (The wooing scene of Lady Anne). She states that the study of pragmatics has been applied to some Shakespearean plays, but rarely to *Richard III*. Mullini observed the usage of pronouns (like *thou*) and address terms in the wooing scene of Lady Anne, focusing on both

Richard and Anne. Her main aim was to discover whether Shakespeare used certain strategies that show politeness.

Mullini concludes that there is a difference between the usage of *thou* of Richard and that of Anne. Moreover Anne uses lots of bald-on-record strategies without any redressive action, as a way to verbally attack Richard. Directive speech acts are used by both characters, with Richard using compliments, and Anne using insults and harsh address terms. Richard's usage of compliments is part of him playing the lover's role. According to Mullini, Richard's usage of compliments can be considered "face flattering acts", and his compliments are speech acts combined with positive politeness.

Mullini's strong point is that she observes how speech acts, politeness and the concept of face in the first wooing scene are used, despite the fact that Grice's speech acts are somehow neglected. Further, neglecting the second wooing scene with Queen Elizabeth, which is a subject of comparison to Anne's scene, can be regarded as a negative aspect of her study. Since Grice's maxims are related to politeness and speech acts, the researcher sheds light on it as well. While Shakespearean pronouns like *thou* project different levels of respect, the observation of pronouns is more like a grammatical investigation rather than pragmatic. The best way to apply pragmatics in any discourse is to apply particular pragmatic theories to the selected discourse, which is the method of this study.

Another strong point is that Mullini observes the language of both Anne and Richard (the persuader and the persuadee), which is useful in terms of comparison. Mullini focuses on the speech of those two characters, but the researcher focuses on one character's speech as a means to discover the kind of speaker and persuader he is (Richard), viewing Anne and

Elizabeth's speeches as only reactions to the Persuader's persuasive language. Unlike Mullini's study, this study investigates the wooing scene of Queen Elizabeth, in addition to the wooing scene of Lady Anne. Investigating both scenes provides a useful pragmatic comparison between them. Moreover, Mullini does not mention the clear function of persuasion in Richard's speech with Anne, which is a point that can be held against her. This study focuses on the function of persuasion.

Regarding the persuasive function of Richard's speech in the two wooing scenes, the persuasive nature of these scenes has been actually acknowledged. Boden (2004) chose the two wooing scenes to examine persuasion, as the researcher is doing. These two scenes are two parallel scenes that are similar to each other, in both of which Richard is trying to marry to increase his power by wooing a woman. The apparent difference Boden mentioned between the persuasions in these two scenes is the effect of them, for in the first one with Lady Anne, Richard is Successful, and in the second one with Queen Elizabeth, he is not. Boden concluded that Richard's most important weapon in the persuasive dialogues he engages in is deception, dominating Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth and not giving them enough space to defend themselves. This is shown when one notices passages in which Richard's utterances are longer than Anne and Elizabeth's utterances. Anne and Elizabeth's opposition made the two wooing scenes contain strong persuasive dialogues, having Richard giving verbal counter attacks to Anne and Elizabeth's verbal attacks. The difference between the researcher's study and Boden's study is that the researcher investigates the two wooing scenes through the lens of pragmatics. Boden did not use pragmatic theories to examine the persuasive nature of Richard's character. This study aims to apply

pragmatic theories to Richard's speech in the two wooing scenes as a method to discover his persuasive nature.

2.9 Conclusion

As a conclusion, persuasive language includes the usage of pragmatic strategies to produce effective results. Persuasive language and pragmatic strategies have been observed in relation to modern real-life situations and in fields other than literature. Thus, pragmatic persuasive strategies are applicable to language as a whole, and this is shown when they have been investigated to Shakespearean plays, including *Richard III*.

Furthermore, the study of literature analyzes Richard's character from a literary point of view. It is very useful to observe Richard's persuasive language through the lens of pragmatics, and this observation allows one to discover whether it matches the literary view or not. The study of Pragmatics is designed specifically to investigate language for a particular function, and the function of language being observed in this study is persuasion. This study aims at giving the character of Richard his fair share of pragmatic analysis in relation to persuasive language, using the two wooing scenes as proofs that contain pure usage of persuasive language.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the researcher discusses the method in which he is carrying out this study. This study aims at investigating the usage of certain pragmatic theories in two scenes in Shakespeare's play, *Richard III*.

3.1 Data Collection

The researcher chose two sets of data, which are the two wooing scenes (Act 1, Scene 2 and Act 4, Scene 4). Each set includes a scene that is considered a dramatic script in Early Modern English. These two scenes are selected because of the obvious persuasive nature of them.

3.2 Models of Analysis

The researcher used the following models and theories to analyze the two scenes, which were considered the theoretical framework of this study:

- The cooperative principle (Grice, 1975)
- Speech acts (Austin, 1962)
- Politeness: Brown & Levinson's politeness theory (1987) and Leech's politeness principle (1983)

The theories above form the theoretical framework of this study. They are separate theories, but they complement each other successfully. Gathering all of them together form a useful criterion to examine Richard's persuasive language. Thus, they help to understand how Richard's level of directness projects him as a communicator and persuader, in terms of cooperation, performing acts and politeness.

3.3 Procedure

- 1- Each scene was analyzed and examined separately.
- 2- The researcher reached conclusion of the distinctive features of Richard's speech in each scene.
- 3- A comparison between both scenes was done.
- 4- Relying on the analysis of the two scenes, the researcher reached a conclusion of Richard's overall persuasive language.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter includes a pragmatic analysis and discussion of Richard's speech with Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth in the two wooing scenes. Each Scene was analyzed separately and each analysis includes extracts from the play, which were analyzed in depth according to the pragmatic theories: The cooperative principle, speech acts, and politeness.

4.1 Richard's speech with Lady Anne

In the first wooing scene (act 1, scene 2), after Lady Anne enters with the corpse of her father-in-law, King Henry VI, she starts mourning and lamenting his and her husband's death, cursing the person who killed them both, Richard. What she says shows hatred and disgust towards Richard, saying:

Cursed be the hand that made these fatal holes!

Cursed be the heart that had the heart to do it!

Cursed the blood that let this blood from hence!

When Richard enters, he orders the men to set down Henry's corpse, in order to speak to Lady Anne and start his persuasion and wooing attempts at wooing her. As anticipated, Anne does not welcome Richard's appearance, calling him a devil and throwing curses at him. Richard is focused on his aim of wooing her and stands strong against her curses, remaining collected; he says:

Extract 1:

GLOUCESTER

Sweet saint, for charity, be not so curst.

Richard here uses an on-record FTA with positive politeness as a way to recognize her face and minimize the threat upon her. He uses a directive speech act "*be not so curst*" to calm her down and decrease her anger and frustration, and that's why he says "*for charity*", which is like saying "*for God's sake*", as a redressive action to minimize the threat upon her. "*Be not so curst*" can be seen as going against the politeness maxim of approbation, because he slightly criticizes her by calling her a 'cursing women'. However, he follows the approbation maxim when he flouts the maxim of quality, for he complements and praises her by calling her a "*sweet saint*", and this is a hyperbole in which he exaggerates about how good she is.

Extract 2:

GLOUCESTER

*Lady, you know no rules of charity,
Which renders good for bad, blessings for curses.*

Richard uses the honorific term "*Lady*" as a positive politeness strategy. The utterance in the extract above flouts the maxim of quality, because he is not truthful that Anne "*knows no rules of charity*" and that she replaces good with bad and blessings for curses, for he knows that Anne has the right to curse him and she is right when it comes to believing that he is evil. Again, it can be considered an on-record FTA with positive politeness, saying indirectly to Anne that she should be more charitable and polite, but this is done by using an indirect speech act. "*You know no rules of charity*", in form, is a representative speech act saying that

Richard claims that Anne has no rules of charity, but its function is to order, command, or request Anne to be more charitable and polite, so a person can actually command and be polite at the same time. Furthermore, when Richard says that Ann has no rules of charity, it may be seen as going against the maxim of approbation. Despite this, Richard is showing some intent when he complements and praises Anne, but has not yet told her clearly what he actually wants from her. In the following extract, Richard uses Anne's words against her:

Extract 3:

LADY ANNE

*Villain, thou know'st no law of God nor man:
No beast so fierce but knows some touch of pity.*

GLOUCESTER

But I know none, and therefore am no beast.

LADY ANNE

O wonderful, when devils tell the truth!

Richard plays here with Anne's words by interestingly observing the maxim of quality, for he admits, by using a representative speech act that he knows no pity, and therefore he is not a beast. Anne is surprised how Richard is telling the truth when she says "*O wonderful, when devils tell the truth!*". However, this utterance flouts the maxim of manner, for Richard is being ambiguous regarding whether he is good or bad, unless he believes that beasts can be good. When Richard says "*I know none*", he observes the modesty maxim, for he is maximizing the dispraise upon himself. Richard uses the politeness maxim of agreement by agreeing

that he has no pity, instead of just denying being a beast in a defensive way. The quarrel goes on when Richard says:

Extract 4:

GLOUCESTER

*More wonderful, when angels are so angry.
Vouchsafe, divine perfection of a woman,
Of these supposed-evils, to give me leave,
By circumstance, but to acquit myself.*

In the extract above, Richard flouts the maxim of quality twice, by using two hyperboles when he complements Anne by using a metaphor "*when angels are so angry*" and "*divine perfection of a woman*", both of which are observing the maxim of approbation by maximizing the praise upon Anne. One can notice how Richard excessively uses complements, praises and hyperboles, even if it means exaggerating and lying. All this is to use flatter to successfully woo Anne. Richard uses an on-record FTA with negative politeness when he asks Anne to give him the chance ("*to give me leave*") to defend himself against the accusations of committing those evil crimes. He minimizes the imposition upon Anne, and gives her options by acknowledging her negative face of her wanting to be left alone, so he asks her to grant him some time to defend himself by using a directive speech act with the illocutionary force of a request. Richard continues using utterances that flout the maxim of quality and observe the approbation maxim:

Extract 5:

GLOUCESTER

*Fairer than tongue can name thee, let me have
Some patient leisure to excuse myself.*

The utterance "*Fairer than tongue can name thee*" means "*you are beautiful beyond words*", which is another hyperbole that flouts the maxim of quality, for no woman is beautiful beyond words, and Richard here is exaggerating in order to flatter and flirt with Ann. Richard here is observing the politeness maxim of approbation through praising Anne and her beauty. Moreover, an on-record FTA with negative politeness is used, in which Richard is considering Anne's negative face of her wanting to be left alone. Richard says "*let me have some patient leisure to excuse myself*", which means "*be patient and give me the freedom to defend myself*", and it is a directive speech act with the illocutionary force of a request, following the maxim of tact by minimizing the cost upon her; for he is using negative politeness to politely request her personal time and space. Richard is saying "*I do not want to cost you your time, but have some patience with me and give me the freedom to defend myself*". Anne curses Richard again, and says that the only excuse she will accept from Richard is if he hangs himself:

Extract 6:

LADY ANNE

*Fouler than heart can think thee, thou canst make
No excuse current, but to hang thyself.*

GLOUCESTER

By such despair, I should accuse myself.

LADY ANNE

*And, by despairing, shouldst thou stand excused;
For doing worthy vengeance on thyself,
Which didst unworthy slaughter upon others.*

GLOUCESTER

Say that I slew them not?

In the extract above, Richard is saying that if he commits the act of despair of hanging himself, it would prove that he is guilty of the crimes he has been accused of. His utterance is a representative speech act. Since it is actually true, the act observes the maxim of quality. However, one can say that even though "*by such despair, I should accuse myself*" observes the maxim of quality, it flouts the maxim of manner, for he is not saying clearly whether he is guilty or not. After this, Anne says that if Richard commits suicide, it would suggest that he actually felt some guilt for killing others. Richard says "*Say that I slew them not?*", which is an indirect speech act that conveys this meaning "*Let us say that I did not kill them*". In form, it is an imperative utterance, but in function, it is an interrogative, performing a directive speech act. The verbal debate of whether Richard is guilty or not goes on:

Extract 7:

GLOUCESTER

I did not kill your husband.

LADY ANNE

Why, then he is alive.

GLOUCESTER

Nay, he is dead; and slain by Edward's hand.

Another representative speech act is "*I did not kill your husband*", which is a direct speech act in which Richard uses a declarative utterance to claim that he did not kill Anne's husband. However, this utterance is not true, for Richard is lying and flouting the maxim of quality again, and he knows that he is guilty of killing her husband. He blames his brother Edward for the evil deed, again flouting the maxim of quality by using a direct representative speech act of claiming that it is Edward who killed Anne's husband. In the following extract, Anne conveys that she knows he is lying, that is, flouting the maxim of quality:

Extract 8:

LADY ANNE

*In thy foul throat thou liest: Queen Margaret saw
Thy murderous falchion smoking in his blood;
The which thou once didst bend against her breast,
But that thy brothers beat aside the point.*

GLOUCESTER

*I was provoked by her slanderous tongue,
which laid their guilt upon my guiltless shoulders.*

Anne accuses Richard of lying and says that Queen Margaret saw Richard's sword smothered with her husband's blood, and it is the same sword he was going to use to kill Margaret if Anne's brothers had not stopped him. Richard responds by saying that he was going to kill Margaret because she provoked him by speaking lies about crimes he did not commit. Again, this is an act of flouting the maxim of quality by using a representative speech act of claiming the untrue idea that he is not guilty of killing her husband. In the following extract, Anne responds by saying it was his bloody mind that provoked him, not Margaret's tongue, and then she directly asks him whether he killed her father-in-law "*Didst thou kill this king?*":

Extract 9:

LADY ANNE

Thou wast provoked by thy bloody mind.

Which never dreamt on aught but butcheries:

Didst thou not kill this king?

GLOUCESTER

I grant ye.

Richard's response "*I grant ye*" observes the maxim of quality, for he is admitting the deed of killing Ann's father-in-law, King Henry VI. He now decides to be honest. In addition, he observes the politeness maxim of agreement by maximizing his agreement with Anne that he killed the king. However, Richard tries to soften his guiltiness by justifying his evil deed. He does this by saying that killing her father-in-law sent him to God and heaven:

Extract 10:

GLOUCESTER

The fitter for the King of heaven, that hath him.

LADY ANNE

He is in heaven, where thou shalt never come.

GLOUCESTER

Let him thank me, that help to send him thither;

For he was fitter for that place than earth.

Richard uses an on-record-FTA with positive politeness when he says "*The fitter for the King of heaven that hath him*", for he is trying to say that though he killed him, he actually helped him go to heaven, a way to claim the common goal that Henry is with God in heaven. The aim of being on-record here is to be polite and acknowledge Anne's positive face, because Richard wants to acknowledge her desire that her father-in-law will be in heaven, and he uses a representative speech act to claim that it will please God that Henry is with him right now. When Richard says "*Let him thank me*", one can say that this utterance is not polite at all, for he using a directive speech act to violate the politeness maxim of sympathy, and he is not showing much sympathy here regarding Anne's broken heart caused by her father-in-law's death. In addition, he flouts the maxim of quality by saying "*that help to send him thither*", because he knows he did not kill Henry because he wanted to send him to heaven and he did it for others reasons. He again uses an on-record FTA with positive politeness when he says that he is better to be in heaven than on earth, again to claim the common goal of wanting Henry to be in heaven by flouting the maxim of quality.

Extract 11:

LADY ANNE

And thou unfit for any place but hell.

GLOUCESTER

Yes, one place else, if you will hear me name it.

LADY ANNE

Some dungeon.

GLOUCESTER

Your bed-chamber.

LADY ANNE

I'll rest betide the chamber where thou liest!

GLOUCESTER

So will it, madam till I lie with you.

LADY ANNE

I hope so.

Firstly, Richard observes the politeness maxim of agreement by agreeing with Ann that he belongs in hell by saying "yes", but he adds one more place he thinks he belongs to. He firstly says "*one place else, if you will hear me name it*", in which he is using an on-record FTA with negative politeness ("*if you will hear me name it*"), acknowledging her negative face of wanting to be left alone by politely asking her to hear him name the additional place he belongs to. Moreover, he is following the maxim of tact by minimizing the cost upon her, for he is conveying that he does not want to take her personal time and space, saying "*I know you want to be left alone, but please hear the additional place I belong to*", a negative

politeness strategy. After Anne says that he belongs in a dungeon, communicating straightforwardly that he wants to be with her in her bed-chamber, following the maxim of quality by communicating his real intentions and using an expressive speech act to communicate what he wants. "*Your bed-chamber*" is a bald on-record FTA used to ignore Ann's face, for Richard here baldly expresses his romantic intentions to Anne despite her curses and hatred towards him. Usually, a man does not communicate his romantic intentions to a woman who hates him, for he does not want to be impolite by ignoring her lack of interest towards him, but Richard goes against this. Anne responds by cruelly saying that rest cannot be found in any bedroom where he is. Richard agrees with Ann when saying "*So will it, madam, till I lie with you*", which means "*exactly madam, until I lie with you*". The politeness maxim of agreement is observed here when he says "*So will it*", but when he says "*till I lie with you*", he is again being bald-on-record, ignoring Anne's face and communicating his intention to lie with her, but he also uses the honorific term "*madam*", following the maxim of approbation by praising her by showing respect and using positive politeness to increase the closeness between him and her. Anne's response "*I hope so*" is a sarcastic utterance, for Ann does not assume and anticipate that she will lie with Richard for real, and the underlying meaning is basically saying "*no way*". The persuasion attempt goes on:

Extract 12:

GLOUCESTER

*I know so. But, gentle Lady Anne,
To leave this keen encounter of our wits,
And fall somewhat into a slower method,
Is not the causer of the timeless deaths*

*Of these Plantagenets, Henry and Edward,
As blameful as the executioner?*

LADY ANNE

Thou art the cause, and most accursed effect.

GLOUCESTER

*Your beauty was the cause of that effect;
Your beauty: which did haunt me in my sleep
To undertake the death of all the world,
So I might live one hour in your sweet bosom.*

When Richard says "*I know so*", he is referring to what is said in extract 11, which is the fact that Anne will lie with him. This can be considered a representative speech act in which Richard is stating what he believes, for he is saying "*we will lie together*", without considering Anne's face whatsoever, because Richard is not giving her the option to accept or refuse the offer of lying with him. However, Richard is being polite when he calls Ann "*gentle*", following the maxim of approbation by praising her. When Richard says "*To leave this keen encounter of our wits and fall somewhat into a slower method*", he is saying "*let us stop this fierce argument and move more slowly in our discussion*". This could be seen as speech act with the illocutionary force of a suggestion.

Richard goes on by saying that the person who caused the deaths of Henry and Edward, possibly referring to his brother, King Edward, is as much to blame as him, the person who executed the death. This argument is a representative speech act, with the illocutionary force of hypothesizing, claiming or suggesting. Anne does not agree with Richard's argument and says that he is responsible for both the cause and effect of the death of her husband and father-in-law. Richard's reply to

this is very interesting, for he says that it was her beauty, which did haunt him in his sleep, which made him cause the two deaths, because he would kill the whole world just to spend one hour next to her. This whole statement is flouting the maxim of quality, for Richard knows that he did not kill because he loved Ann and that he actually would not kill the whole world just to be with her. In addition, this statement can be considered a representative speech act in which Richard is claiming that her beauty affected him, and/or an expressive speech act in which Richard is expressing his feelings (although they are not real) towards Anne. "*To undertake the death of all the world*" is also flouting the maxim of quality because it contains a hyperbole in which Richard is exaggerating about what he would do for Ann: killing the whole world. Another hyperbole flouting the maxim of quality is saying that Anne's beauty is haunting him in his sleep, for he is exaggerating about the impact of her looks on him. The maxim of quantity is flouted when Richard repeats "*Your beauty*" twice, for one time is enough. Mentioning Ann's beauty and saying "*your sweet bosom*" are acts of following the politeness maxim of approbation by praising Anne's looks.

Extract 13:

LADY ANNE

*If I thought that, I tell thee, homicide,
These nails should rend that beauty from my cheeks.*

GLOUCESTER

*These eyes could never endure sweet beauty's wreck;
You should not blemish it, if I stood by:
As all the world is cheered by the sun,
So I by that; it is my day, my life.*

LADY ANNE

Black night o'ershade thy day, and death thy life!

GLOUCESTER

Curse not thyself, fair creature thou art both.

In extract 13, after Richard has praised Anne's beauty, she says that if she believes his words, she would scratch that beauty right off her cheeks, expressing that she is unwilling to believe him. Richard continues to praise Anne's beauty, observing the maxim of approbation. He says that he cannot stand seeing her destroy her beauty ("*These eyes could never endure sweet beauty's wreck*"), using an expressive speech act to express how he feels about her hurting herself. Of course, he is flouting the maxim of quality because he actually does not care if Anne hurts herself, and he poisons her later in the play. Richard uses bald-on-record politeness, with the aim of acknowledging her face, when he says "*You should not blemish it, if I stood by*". It is bald-on-record because he uses a representative indirect speech act, and it is indirect because a declarative sentence is used to produce the illocutionary force of an order or request, instead of using an imperative, meaning "*do not touch your face as long as I am standing next to you*". Following the politeness maxim of approbation and flouting the maxim of quality, Richard compares Anne's beauty to the sun, and he produces hyperboles when he metaphorically says that her beauty is both his day and life, a clear untrue exaggeration of a woman's beauty. When Anne says "*Black night o'ershade thy day, and death thy life*", she is saying that that she hopes that night shadows his day and death takes his life. Richard uses Anne's words against her, and he asks her not to curse herself, and he repeats saying that she is both his day and life, flouting the maxim of quantity by repeating what he said earlier. Following the politeness maxim of approbation, Richard says

"fair creature thou art both", using hyperboles and metaphors to flout the maxim of quality. Anne wishes she was Richard's day and life, so that she might get her revenge by depriving him from both:

Extract 14:

LADY ANNE

I would I were, to be revenged on thee.

GLOUCESTER

*It is a quarrel most unnatural,
To be revenged on him that loveth you.*

Richard's whole response is a representative speech act, in which he is stating what he believes, that it is strange that she wants to take revenge on the person who loves her, and the confession of love is also an expressive speech act, in which he expresses his love towards Anne. Of course, Richard does not really love Ann, and that means that he is flouting the maxim of quality.

Extract 15:

LADY ANNE

*It is a quarrel just and reasonable,
To be revenged on him that slew my husband.*

GLOUCESTER

*He that bereft thee, lady, of thy husband,
Did it to help thee to a better husband.*

LADY ANNE

His better doth not breathe upon the earth.

GLOUCESTER

He lives that loves thee better than he could.

LADY ANNE

Name him.

GLOUCESTER

Plantagenet.

LADY ANNE

Why, that was he.

GLOUCESTER

The selfsame name, but one of better nature.

LADY ANNE

Where is he?

GLOUCESTER

Here.

(She spitteth at him)

Why dost thou spit at me?

After Anne says that it is reasonable that she wants to take revenge on the person who killed her husband, Richard states that he killed her husband to help her get a better husband, again flouting the maxim of quality since it is not true. Using the honorific term "*lady*" to express positive politeness, Richard uses an on-record FTA to consider Anne's positive wants and desires, and that happens when he says that there is a better husband awaiting her, using a representative speech act to claim the existence of such a man. He is also making an offer of providing her with a better husband. Anne does not believe that there is a better man than her

late husband, but Richard, flouting the maxim of quality again, says that he lives who loves her more than her husband, trying to use an expressive speech act to express his false feelings of love towards her. Anne asks Richard to name the man he is talking about, surprisingly showing that she is actually considering and thinking about this man. Richard says that the better husband is a Plantagenet who is better than Anne's late Plantagenet husband, and when Anne asks about where he is, Richard says "*here*". Since it is surprising to Anne that the man who killed her husband wants to marry her, she spits at Richard because of his provocative and straightforward utterance. One can say that because Richard really wants to marry Anne, regardless of his intentions, he is observing the maxim of quality when he truly expresses his desire to marry her.

Extract 16:

LADY ANNE

Would it were mortal poison, for thy sake!

GLOUCESTER

Never came poison from so sweet a place.

LADY ANNE

Never hung poison on a fouler toad.

Out of my sight! thou dost infect my eyes.

GLOUCESTER

Thine eyes, sweet lady, have infected mine.

Anne goes on with cursing Richard. She says that she wishes that she spitted poison that would kill him. On the other hand, Richard is not affected and he says that poison could never come out from "*so sweet a place*". "*Never came poison from so sweet a place*" is a representative

speech act, in which Richard is referring to Anne's mouth, and since it is implicating his intended desire of kissing her, it can be an expressive speech act as well. Furthermore, it may be flouting the maxim of quality, for Richard does not really know how Anne's mouth tastes, and in reality, mouths mostly do not taste as sweet as Richard implied, meaning that Richard used a hyperbole to exaggerate. Anne replies by saying that poison never landed on an ugly man like Richard, and she tells him to get out of her sight for he is infecting (poisoning) her eyes. Richard flouts the maxim of quality again, by using a hyperbole, saying that Anne's eyes have infected his. One can notice how Richard continues to follow the maxim of approbation by continuing to praise Anne. He also uses the honorific term "lady" as a positive politeness strategy, to show respect to her.

Extract 17:

LADY ANNE

Would they were basilisks, to strike thee dead!

GLOUCESTER

*I would they were, that I might die at once;
For now they kill me with a living death.
Those eyes of thine from mine have drawn salt tears,
Shamed their aspect with store of childish drops:
These eyes that never shed remorseful tear,
No, when my father York and Edward wept,
To hear the piteous moan that Rutland made
When black-faced Clifford shook his sword at him;
Nor when thy warlike father, like a child,
Told the sad story of my father's death,*

*And twenty times made pause to sob and weep,
That all the standers-by had wet their cheeks
Like trees bedash'd with rain: in that sad time
My manly eyes did scorn an humble tear;
And what these sorrows could not thence exhale,
Thy beauty hath, and made them blind with weeping.
I never sued to friend nor enemy;
My tongue could never learn sweet smoothing word;
But now thy beauty is proposed my fee,
My proud heart sues, and prompts my tongue to speak.*

In the extract above, Anne wished her eyes, which infected Richard's, were basilisks that would kill him. Basilisks are mythical creatures, whose glances killed the people they landed upon. Richard's long response is interesting. He first flouts the maxim of quality in which he wishes himself to be killed by her eyes "*I would they were, that I might die at once - For now they kill me with a living death*". He uses hyperboles in which he exaggerates the beauty of Anne's eyes, and even when he says "*living death*", for there is no such thing. He is also using an expressive speech act in order to express his feelings about her eyes. After this, Richard produces representative speech acts in which he states how he is a man who is unlikely to shed tears but did for Anne. In addition, he produces expressive speech acts in which he expresses how he feels about this. Richard claims that he has never cried before he fell in love with Anne, for he did not cry for his brother, Rutland, and his father. Moreover, he claims that Anne's beauty made him cry, and that before, he was too proud to win over friends or enemies with words.

Richard, making his claim, firstly follows the maxim of quality then switches to flouting it. Firstly, he confesses that he had not cried for his

brother and father. Although one cannot make sure whether this is true or not, it is likely that it is true because of Richard's evil character in the play, and therefore, this is most likely to be an observance of the maxim of quality, especially because it does not make sense that a person would lie about something like this. However, Richard flouts the maxim of quality when he says that he is now crying because of Ann's beauty, an obvious lie, and even a hyperbole is used when he says "*Thy beauty hath, and made them blind with weeping*". Plus, regarding not trying to win over friends or enemies with words, this is flouting the maxim of quality as well, since in the same play, and in the previous scene, Richard manipulated his brother Clarence with his words, in order to make him think that he would support him, only to plan to have him killed later. Despite the untrue nature of Richard's claims here, they are still polite. He follows the politeness maxim of approbation, saying how she made him a sweet talker who is now crying after having a heart of stone. One can say that he is flouting the maxim of quantity as well, because he can make his point without mentioning all these details about his brother, his father and so on, plus, he repeats the word 'beauty' twice in his utterance, in order to emphasize how it affected him.

Extract 18:

(She looks scornfully at him)

GLOUCESTER

Teach not thy lips such scorn, for they were made

For kissing, lady, not for such contempt.

If thy revengeful heart cannot forgive,

Lo, here I lend thee this sharp-pointed sword;

Which if thou please to hide in this true bosom.

And let the soul forth that adareth thee,

*I lay it naked to the deadly stroke,
And humbly beg the death upon my knee.*

(He lays his breast open: she offers at it with his sword)

*Nay, do not pause; for I did kill King Henry,
But 'twas thy beauty that provoked me.
Nay, now dispatch; 'twas I that stabb'd young Edward,
But 'twas thy heavenly face that set me on.*

(Here she lets fall the sword)

Take up the sword again, or take up me.

LADY ANNE

*Arise, dissembler: though I wish thy death,
I will not be the executioner.*

In the extract above, after Anne looks at Richard with disgust, he uses a directive speech act with the illocutionary force of a request or order when he says "*Teach not thy lips such scorn..*", and this is an off-record politeness strategy because Richard does not tell Ann directly that he wants to kiss her, especially when he says "*for they were made for kissing, lady, not for such contempt*". Richard is saying indirectly "*it is better to use those lips to kiss (me), instead of curl them in a scornful way. So kiss me*". He flouts the maxim of quality here because he uses a hyperbole to exaggerate the beauty of Anne's lips, plus lips are not always and only used for kissing. The praise of Anne's lips is following the politeness maxim of approbation.

The rest of what Richard says is interesting; he tells her that if she cannot forgive him, he offers his bare chest so that she can stab his heart with his sword, and in fact, he begs for his death on his knees. Here, uses an on-

record FTA with positive politeness, acknowledging Anne's desire to take her revenge. The politeness maxim of generosity is followed because Richard is minimizing the benefit upon himself, as he is willing to accept his execution by her hands. In addition, the maxim of tact is followed since he is maximizing the benefit to her. A speech act of a declaration is used, in which Richard declares his acceptance to be killed by Anne, while also having a commissive nature in which he commits himself to accept his death. The illocutionary force here is a clear offer, in which Richard is offering Anne the chance to get her revenge. Even when Anne hesitates, Richard continues being on-record with positive politeness by telling her not to hesitate, using directive speech acts like "*do not pause*" and "*now dispatch*". The directive speech act "*Take up the sword again, or take up me*" is bald on-record, for it has the sense of urgency that she either takes up the sword or accepts him as a lover. He follows the maxim of quality when he admits killing her father and husband, but he flouts it when he says "*the soul forth that adoreth thee*", "*'twas thy beauty that provoked me*" and "*'twas thy heavenly face that set me on*", which are excuses following the maxim of approbation, in order to prevent Anne from killing him, showing that he is flouting the maxim of quality again, for he does not really want to be killed by her, but only uses words to manipulate Anne and make her fall for him. By both following and flouting the quality maxim, and following the maxim of approbation by seemingly looking honorable, honest and generous,

Extract 19:

GLOUCESTER

Then bid me kill myself, and I will do it.

LADY ANNE

I have already.

GLOUCESTER

Tush, that was in thy rage:

Speak it again, and, even with the word,

That hand, which, for thy love, did kill thy love,

Shall, for thy love, kill a far truer love;

To both their deaths thou shalt be accessory.

LADY ANNE

I would I knew thy heart.

GLOUCESTER

'Tis figured in my tongue.

LADY ANNE

I fear me both are false.

GLOUCESTER

Then never man was true.

LADY ANNE

Well, well, put up your sword.

Richard follows the maxims of tact and generosity again by offering to kill himself if Lady Anne tells him to do so, but he is also flouting the maxim of quality; he does not really want to kill himself. He first uses a directive speech act "*Then bid me kill myself, and I will do it*" with the illocutionary force of an offer, and having the nature of a commissive speech act in which he is committing himself to killing himself. Furthermore, he uses bald-on-record politeness with the aim of acknowledging her desires and wants. Anne states that she already told

him that he should kill himself, but of course, Richard wants to psychologically manipulate Anne. He says that she said that when she was in rage, so she should tell him again and he will do it immediately for the sake of her love.

Moreover, he says that he killed her late husband, and now is willing to kill a truer lover than her husband. He flouts the maxim of quality by his claims, and he follows the politeness maxim of approbation by praising her. Furthermore, he is flouting the maxim of quantity for he repeats mentioning 'love' in "*That hand, which, for thy love, did kill thy love, - Shall, for thy love, kill a far truer love*". Flouting the maxim of quality, Richard says that Anne will be an accessory to her husband's and his death. He means that she made him kill her husband, and she will make him kill himself as well. The flouting here is to produce an indirect speech act. On the surface "*To both their deaths thou shalt be accessory*" is a representative speech act, stating what he believes, but in reality, it is a commissive speech act in which he is committing himself to killing himself for her. Richard says that he told her what is in his heart, but she says that she feels that both his heart and words are false. "*Then never man was true*" flouts the maxim of quality: a hyperbole is used in order to make a point, because it is impossible that all men are not true. In addition, Richard is saying that if she thinks that he is untrue, it means that all men are untrue, but still the point is not clear, thus he flouts the maxim of manner by being ambiguous.

Extract 20:

GLOUCESTER

Say, then, my peace is made.

LADY ANNE

That shall you know hereafter.

GLOUCESTER

But shall I live in hope?

LADY ANNE

All men, I hope, live so.

GLOUCESTER

Vouchsafe to wear this ring.

LADY ANNE

To take is not to give.

Richard uses bald-on-record FTAs twice, without acknowledging Anne's face, and this happens when he says "*Say, then, my peace is made*" and "*But shall I live in hope?*". The first utterance is a directive speech act of a request, and the second is a speech act of a question. When Richard hands Anne a ring for her to wear, it can be seen as a proposal or a symbolic request of love conveyed by using a directive speech act ("*Vouchsafe to wear this ring*"), and Anne says that she will take the ring but he should not expect anything in return. The word "*vouchsafe*" means to give something to someone as a promise or privilege. Richard again uses a directive speech act when he tells Anne to wear the ring; he is following the maxim of generosity, by maximizing the cost upon himself and being generous (privilege).

Extract 21:

GLOUCESTER

Look, how this ring encompasseth finger.

Even so thy breast encloseth my poor heart;

*Wear both of them, for both of them are thine.
And if thy poor devoted suppliant may
But beg one favour at thy gracious hand,
Thou dost confirm his happiness for ever.*

LADY ANNE

What is it?

GLOUCESTER

*That it would please thee leave these sad designs
To him that hath more cause to be a mourner,
And presently repair to Crosby Place;
Where, after I have solemnly interr'd
At Chertsey monastery this noble king,
And wet his grave with my repentant tears,
I will with all expedient duty see you:
For divers unknown reasons. I beseech you,
Grant me this boon.*

LADY ANNE

*With all my heart; and much it joys me too,
To see you are become so penitent.
Tressel and Berkeley, go along with me.*

Using a directive speech act, Richard requests Anne to look at how the ring encircles her finger, a bald on-record FTA to acknowledge her face and following the maxim of generosity by maximizing the benefit upon her. Moreover, he flouts the maxim of quality here, using a hyperbole in which he exaggerates his love for her. He also follows the maxim of approbation by maximizing praise upon her. Richard continues making requests then complementing them with some praise; he uses a bald-on-

record FTA and a directive speech act when he tells her to wear both the ring and his heart, for both of them belong to her, which can be a commissive speech act in which he promises that his love will only belong to her. The quality maxim is flouted when Richard tells Anne to wear his heart in addition to the ring, since a heart cannot be worn. Then he requests Anne for a favour by using an expressive speech act in which Richard pleads for a favour that will grant him happiness forever, flouting the maxim of quality, as he exaggerates his plea that granting him the favour will make him happy. He follows the maxim of approbation by saying that his happiness is dependent on her and when he describes her hand as being gracious. In addition, he is following the maxim of modesty, calling himself a "*poor devoted suppliant*" and minimizing praise upon himself.

Moreover, an on-record FTA with negative politeness is used, in which Richard is acknowledging Anne's negative face, and personal time and space, as if he is saying "*I know I asked for a number of things, but there is one more favour I want to ask for*". He asks her to let him take care of the burial because he has more cause to mourn than she does. This speech act follows the maxim of generosity. Richard here maximizes the cost upon himself with his offer. Furthermore, he is flouting the maxim of quality when he claims that he mourns the death of her father-in-law, which is a lie. He is also using an on-record FTA in order to acknowledge Anne's positive face, and this happens by offering to assist in the burial, as a way to claim a common goal and convey closeness. This on-record positive politeness strategy is done when Richard says that it would please her to leave the sad burial to him, a way to follow the maxim of generosity, in addition to the maxim of tact by minimizing the cost of the burial upon Anne.

Moreover, he is using tact and generosity by saying that it would also please her that she meets him at Crosby Place, where he will with "*all expedient duty*" see her. Richard flouts the maxim of quality when he says "*And wet his grave with my repentant tears*", for he knows that he is not going to cry or repent. Richard says that after burying the noble king, he will meet her at Crosby Place, where he told her to go to, as if he is deciding for her that she will meet him. When Richard says "*For divers unknown reasons. I beseech you, - Grant me this boon*", he means that for reasons that should remain secret, he pleads her to do this thing (meeting him). This is an on-record FTA with negative politeness, pleading and asking Anne politely to grant him her personal time to meet him.

Richard mentions that there are reasons that should remain secret, and he is actually truthful here, for he is observing the maxim of quality. However, the secret reasons he has in mind are not like the ones Anne has in mind. She is thinking of romantic reasons, but Richard is thinking of evil reasons. When says "*With all my heart, and much it joys me too, - To see you become so penitent*". Anne's utterance here shows that she has fallen into Richard's verbal trap, and that she believes his lies. In fact, saying that she will meet him with all her heart, is a major proof that she has been successfully wooed and persuaded.

Extract 22:

GLOUCESTER

Bid me farewell.

LADY ANNE

'Tis more than you deserve;

But since you teach me how to flatter you,

Imagine I have said farewell already.

Richard uses a directive speech act to make a request, in addition to bald-on-record politeness when he directly asks Anne to say goodbye to him. Anne says that although he does not deserve it, he should imagine that she has said goodbye already, because he taught her how to flatter him. Anne is flirting with Richard, which is further proof that Richard has successfully wooed and persuaded Anne.

4.2 Richard's speech with Queen Elizabeth

In act IV, scene IV, Queen Elizabeth and the Duchess of York throw curses at Richard for committing the crimes that he has committed, especially murdering the two princes. After this, the Duchess of York leaves. Queen Elizabeth intends to leave as well, saying that although she has more reasons to curse Richard, she has no more energy to do it, so she says Amen to what is said earlier. She says:

*Though far more cause, yet much less spirit to curse
Abides in me; I say amen to all.*

Now Richard starts his attempt with Elizabeth to persuade her to grant him her daughter and woo her daughter for him. One should take into account that Richard is not the Duke of Gloucester anymore, for he is now the King of England. He asks her directly not to leave:

Extract 24:

KING RICHARD III

Stay, madam; I must speak a word with you.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*I have no more sons of the royal blood
For thee to murder: for my daughters, Richard,
They shall be praying nuns, not weeping queens;
And therefore level not to hit their lives.*

KING RICHARD III

*You have a daughter call'd Elizabeth,
Virtuous and fair, royal and gracious.*

Richard first uses a directive speech act to order Queen Elizabeth to stay, in a bald-on-record manner, not acknowledging her negative face of wanting to leave. There is a sense of urgency here that Richard wants her to stay immediately, especially when he uses the word "*must*". He is also going against the politeness maxim of tact, for he is maximizing the cost upon her. He directly expresses his desire to speak with her, following the maxim of quality by being forward and truthful, the maxim of quantity by being brief, and the maxim of manner by being clear. However, he still uses a bit of positive politeness when he uses the honorific "*madam*". Richard does not directly convey his desire to marry Young Elizabeth in the beginning, for he mentions that she has a daughter who is virtuous, fair, mild and gracious. He follows the maxim of approbation by complimenting Elizabeth's daughter. He is following the maxim of quality here since he is saying the truth about how Young Elizabeth is, but he is flouting the maxim of manner, for he is being ambiguous regarding what he really wants from her daughter. Complimenting a woman is not enough to convey clearly the desire to marry her.

Extract 25:

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*So she may live unscarr'd of bleeding slaughter,
I will confess she was not Edward's daughter.*

KING RICHARD III

Wrong not her birth, she is of royal blood.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

To save her life, I'll say she is not so.

KING RICHARD III

Her life is only safest in her birth.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

And only in that safety died her brothers.

KING RICHARD III

Lo, at their births good stars were opposite.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

No, to their lives bad friends were contrary.

KING RICHARD III

All unavowed is the doom of destiny.

Elizabeth says that she is willing to say that she cheated on her late husband Edward and that her daughter is not his, just to save her from Richard. Again using a directive speech act, Richard orders her not to wrong her birth, using a bald-on-record FTA to acknowledge her face, telling her that her daughter is of royal blood and that it is her royal birth that keeps her life safe, following the maxim of approbation. He is also following the maxim of quality here, saying honestly that her daughter is

of royal blood. He is also using a representative speech act, as he states his belief that her royal birth protects her. When Elizabeth says that her sons died despite their royal blood, Richard says "*Lo, at their births good stars were opposite*", meaning that they were born under unlucky stars which caused their deaths. Richard knows that they did not die because they were unlucky, and that he was the direct cause of it: he is thus flouting the maxim of quality by using a representative speech act to state how unlucky Elizabeth's sons are. When Elizabeth says that bad friends were the cause of the deaths, not bad luck, Richard says that she cannot escape bad luck when he says "*All unavowed is the doom of destiny*". This is a representative speech act following the maxim of quality, for Richard is claims that destiny cannot be avoided, which is true, if one believes in destiny. The interaction goes on:

Extract 26:

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*True, when avoided grace makes destiny:
My babes were destined to a fairer death,
If grace had bless'd thee with a fairer life.*

KING RICHARD III

You speak as if that I had slain my cousins.

Elizabeth agrees with Richard's idea of destiny, but she says that if destiny was determined by God instead of Richard, her sons would have experienced a better death. Richard uses a representative speech act in which he suggests that Elizabeth is accusing him of her two sons' death, and this indirectly implicates a request or an order saying "*do not accuse me of these crimes*". He is also flouting the maxim of quality, as he knows that he is really guilty of killing Elizabeth's sons.

Extract 27:

KING RICHARD III

*Madam, so thrive I in my enterprise
And dangerous success of bloody wars,
As I intend more good to you and yours,
Than ever you or yours were by me wrong'd!*

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*What good is cover'd with the face of heaven,
To be discover'd, that can do me good?*

KING RICHARD III

The advancement of your children, gentle lady.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

Up to some scaffold, there to lose their heads?

KING RICHARD III

*No, to the dignity and height of honour
The high imperial type of this earth's glory.*

After Elizabeth continues to accuse Richard of the murder of her sons, Richard says that if he reaches victory in this war, Elizabeth and her relatives will live good days after the bad days they have experienced. Here, Richard is using a commissive speech act to promise Elizabeth and her relatives a good life, following the politeness maxim of generosity by maximizing the benefit upon them, and he is doing the same when he promises the advancement of her children. An on-record FTA with positive politeness is used to acknowledge Elizabeth's positive face of wanting to live a good life in the kingdom of Richard.

When Richard calls Elizabeth "*madam*" and "*gentle lady*" and is using honorifics and calling her gentle to follow the maxim of approbation by maximizing the praise upon her and acknowledging her positive face. When Elizabeth says that the advancement he promises will cost her children their heads. Richard goes against the politeness maxim of agreement by saying "*No, to the dignity and height of honour – The high imperial type of this earth's glory*". It is most likely that Richard is flouting the maxim of quality here, for it is unlikely for an evil man like him to keep his promises and mean well for others, especially if they are standing in his way. However, he continues to follow the maxim of generosity and produce on-record FTAs with negative politeness, for Richard is saying here "*I am inviting you to belong to my glorious kingdom of victory*". Moreover, he is following the politeness maxim of generosity.

Extract 28:

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*Flatter my sorrows with report of it;
Tell me what state, what dignity, what honour,
Canst thou demise to any child of mine?*

KING RICHARD III

*Even all I have; yea, and myself and all,
Will I withal endow a child of thine;
So in the Lethe of thy angry soul
Thou drown the sad remembrance of those wrongs
Which thou supposest I have done to thee.*

Richard talks about the dignity and honour he is going to provide for her children, using an on-record FTA with positive politeness to acknowledge Elizabeth's positive face. He replies by saying that he will provide the dignity and honour of all he owns, and that he will provide a child of hers, Young Elizabeth, with everything plus himself, just for her to forget what he has done wrong to her. Of course, he is flouting the maxim of quality, for his true intention is not to compensate for what he has done wrong. He is also flouting the maxim of manner, because he is not saying clearly that he wants to marry Young Elizabeth and how he will provide the glory he claims he will provide. In other words, he is not being brief and orderly. Elizabeth tells Richard to be brief:

Extract 29:

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*Be brief, lest that be process of thy kindness
Last longer telling than thy kindness' date.*

KING RICHARD III

Then know, that from my soul I love thy daughter.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

My daughter's mother thinks it with her soul.

KING RICHARD III

What do you think?

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*That thou dost love my daughter from thy soul:
So from thy soul's love didst thou love her brothers;
And from my heart's love I do thank thee for it.*

Elizabeth asks Richard to be brief and tell her what he wants. In addition to the maxim of manner that he has flouted, he has also flouted the maxim of quantity by giving too much information and saying exactly what he wants. However, he does what Elizabeth tells him to do, and directly says what he wants by saying "*Then know, that from my soul I love thy daughter*". Richard flouts the maxim of quality, for he does not really love her daughter from his soul as he is claiming. Moreover, this is an indirect speech act; he uses an expressive speech act to express his love, but in reality, it is a request to marry Young Elizabeth. Richard is being bald-on-record, and he follows the maxim of approbation by praising her by announcing his love for her. When Elizabeth responds by saying "*My daughter's mother thinks it with her soul*", she is actually being sarcastic she mocks Richard, saying that he loves her daughter to spite his soul, like the way he loved her brothers.

Extract 29:

KING RICHARD III

*Be not so hasty to confound my meaning:
I mean, that with my soul I love thy daughter,
And mean to make her queen of England.*

QUEEN ELIZABETH

Say then, who dost thou mean shall be her king?

KING RICHARD III

Even he that makes her queen who should be else?

QUEEN ELIZABETH

What, thou?

KING RICHARD III

I, even I: what think you of it, madam?

Richard firstly uses a directive speech act to tell Elizabeth not to be so quick to twist the meaning he has in mind. He is following the maxim of manner now by being clearer, by saying that he loves her daughter in a way that he will make her Queen of England, using an expressive speech act by declaring his love, and a commissive speech act by promising to make her Queen of England, following the maxim of generosity.

However, Elizabeth has not yet understood exactly what he means, since she asks about the person who will be her king, and he becomes sarcastic as well, and follows the maxim of quality by saying "*Even he that makes her queen who should be else*". He is following the maxim of quality since he really wants to make Young Elizabeth the queen of England, but he is flouting the maxim of manner since he does not clearly say that is it he who will be her king. Elizabeth then understands that Richard means himself, so she asks him to make sure, then Richard says "*I, even, I: what think you of it?*". Here, he is communicating directly what he wants but with being polite at the same time, following the maxim of quality, manner, relation, and quantity. He uses a bald-on-record strategy without acknowledging her face, forcing her to make a decision about whether to accept him as a son-in-law. However, he still uses the honorific "*madam*" to be positively polite. The speech act he uses here has the illocutionary force of a request.

Extract 30:

QUEEN ELIZABETH

How canst thou woo her?

KING RICHARD III

That would I learn of you,

As one that are best acquainted with her humour.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

And wilt thou learn of me?

KING RICHARD III

Madam, with all my heart.

Elizabeth asks Richard about how he would woo her daughter, and Richard says that he would learn how to do so from her, because as a mother, she knows Young Elizabeth the best, going against the maxim of generosity for he is maximizing the benefit upon himself, not her. He is using positive politeness by conveying common ground and closeness by wanting to learn from Elizabeth. He is following the maxim of approbation by praising her, for he says that she knows her daughter best. In addition, he is following the maxim of modesty, because he is minimizing the praise upon himself, for he is a king who is willing to learn from a woman who is of a lower position and status. The speech act used here is a representative speech act, used to state that Richard will learn from the mother who knows her daughter best, and this has the illocutionary force of a request of being taught how to woo a young girl, using a declarative sentence. When Elizabeth asks Richard about whether he is willing to learn from her how to woo her daughter, he says "*Madam, with all my heart*", starting with the honorific "*madam*" to be positively polite, and "*with all my heart*" to acknowledge Elizabeth's positive face.

Extract 31:

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*Send to her, by the man that slew her brothers,
A pair of bleeding-hearts; thereon engrave
Edward and York; then haply she will weep:
Therefore present to her--as sometime Margaret
Did to thy father, steep'd in Rutland's blood,--
A handkerchief; which, say to her, did drain
The purple sap from her sweet brother's body
And bid her dry her weeping eyes therewith.
If this inducement force her not to love,
Send her a story of thy noble acts;
Tell her thou madest away her uncle Clarence,
Her uncle Rivers; yea, and, for her sake,
Madest quick conveyance with her good aunt Anne.*

KING RICHARD III

*Come, come, you mock me; this is not the way
To win your daughter.*

Elizabeth tells Richard how to woo her daughter, but she is sarcastically mocking him, conveying that a man who killed her brothers will not be able to woo her. She says that he should send her two bleeding hearts, having the names Edward and York on them, and making it clear that they are from the man who killed her brothers. Elizabeth goes on by saying that the two hearts will make her weep, then he should hand her a handkerchief, telling her that a handkerchief sopped up the blood of her brothers and that she should use it to wipe her tears, and if this does not work, he should send her a list of his "noble" deeds, like the crimes he

has committed. This sarcastic suggestion makes Richard say "*Come, come, you mock me; this is not the way to win your daughter*", which is an expressive speech act in which Richard is expressing his dislike of Elizabeth's mocking behaviour, and the illocutionary force is a request or order to change her behaviour, done in a bald-on-record manner.

Extract 32:

KING RICHARD III

Say that I did all this for love of her.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*Nay, then indeed she cannot choose but hate thee,
Having bought love with such a bloody spoil.*

KING RICHARD III

*Look, what is done cannot be now amended:
Men shall deal unadvisedly sometimes,
Which after hours give leisure to repent.
If I did take the kingdom from your sons,
To make amends, Ill give it to your daughter.
If I have kill'd the issue of your womb,
To quicken your increase, I will beget
Mine issue of your blood upon your daughter
A grandam's name is little less in love
Than is the doting title of a mother;
They are as children but one step below,
Even of your mettle, of your very blood;
Of an one pain, save for a night of groans
Endured of her, for whom you bid like sorrow.
Your children were vexation to your youth,*

*But mine shall be a comfort to your age.
The loss you have is but a son being king,
And by that loss your daughter is made queen.
I cannot make you what amends I would,
Therefore accept such kindness as I can.
Dorset your son, that with a fearful soul
Leads discontented steps in foreign soil,
This fair alliance quickly shall call home
To high promotions and great dignity:
The king, that calls your beauteous daughter wife.
Familiarly shall call thy Dorset brother;
Again shall you be mother to a king,
And all the ruins of distressful times
Repair'd with double riches of content.
What! we have many goodly days to see:
The liquid drops of tears that you have shed
Shall come again, transform'd to orient pearl,
Advantaging their loan with interest
Of ten times double gain of happiness.
Go, then my mother, to thy daughter go
Make bold her bashful years with your experience;
Prepare her ears to hear a wooer's tale
Put in her tender heart the aspiring flame
Of golden sovereignty; acquaint the princess
With the sweet silent hours of marriage joys
And when this arm of mine hath chastised
The petty rebel, dull-brain'd Buckingham,
Bound with triumphant garlands will I come
And lead thy daughter to a conqueror's bed;*

*To whom I will retail my conquest won,
And she shall be sole victress, Caesar's Caesar.*

When Richard uses a directive speech act by saying "*Say that I did all this for love for her*", he is flouting the maxim of quality, since he did not commit his crimes because he loves Young Elizabeth, and as far as we know, he does not really love her. In addition, Richard is following the maxim of approbation and generosity here, for he is praising Elizabeth's daughter and being generous by claiming that he committed his crimes just for her, all in order to use an on-record FTA with positive politeness in order to be closer to Elizabeth and her daughter. Elizabeth responds by saying that her daughter will have no choice but to hate him, because he has purchased her love with murder.

Richard handles the situation by producing a long utterance, which one can call a violation of the maxim of quantity for talking too much, and the maxim of manner for not being brief. The whole utterance is done as on-record with positive politeness to acknowledge Elizabeth's positive face by trying to get closer to her and claim a common ground. He says that what has been done cannot be changed, and men later repent when they have time to think, for men can act without thinking. On the surface, this is a representative speech act in which Richard is saying stating what he believes, but in reality, it is an expressive speech act in which he is expressing his regret. Although saying that what has been done cannot be changed is true, following the maxim of quality, Richard flouts it when he expresses his regret, for he does not really feel sorry for the crimes he has committed.

Using commissive speech acts to promise and expressive speech acts to express regret, Richard says that if he took the kingdom from her sons, he

will give it to her daughter to make it up to her, and if he killed her children, he will have others with her daughter. He may be following the maxim of quality by saying that he will have children from her daughter and give her a kingdom by making her a queen, but he is flouting it when he expresses his regret. Moreover, he is following the politeness maxim of generosity by maximizing the benefit upon Young Elizabeth by offering her a kingdom.

One can notice that Richard is using bribes to tempt Elizabeth to approve the marriage. Richard, in a positive on-record polite way, uses a representative speech act in which he is explaining how a grandmother is, that she is hardly less loved than a mother, for grandchildren are just one step removed from her own children, sharing her character and blood. After this, he uses a commissive speech act to promise Elizabeth that after her children caused her trouble in her youth, his children will bring comfort in her old age (*"Your children were vexation you your youth, - But mine shall be a comfort to your age"*). This promise follows the maxim of generosity by maximizing the benefit upon Elizabeth by promising comforting children. However, it is flouting the maxim of quality for Richard does not really intend to give comfort to Elizabeth, and he is just saying that to convince her to approve of him marrying her daughter.

Richard continues to flout the maxim of quality about being sincere about making amends, in order to follow the politeness maxim of generosity by offering a glorious life to Elizabeth's daughter in an on-record manner with positive politeness to get closer to Elizabeth and her daughter: Richard says *"The loss you have is but a son being king – And by that loss your daughter is made queen"*. He says that he cannot take what he did back and says *"Therefore accept such kindness as I can"*, which is by

itself, bald-on-record to acknowledge Elizabeth's face. He offers Elizabeth's son, Dorset, who fled to join France's army against him, to come back safely with dignity. When Richard says "*The king, that calls your beauteous daughter wife. – Familiarly shall call thy Dorset brother*", calling Young Elizabeth "beauteous" is used to follow the maxim of approbation by praising her, and "brother" is used to acknowledge Elizabeth's positive face by claiming closeness to her son. Richard follows the maxim of generosity by stating that he will make her a mother of a king again (if she accepts to be his mother-in-law). He flouts the maxim of quality by using a metaphorical exaggerating hyperbole when he says "*The liquid drops of tears that you have shed - Shall come again, transforme'd to orient pearls*", for tears cannot be turned into pearls.

After doing this, Richard uses directive speech acts by requesting Elizabeth to go to her daughter and tell her what he will give her, is a commissive speech act. An example of this being when he says "*Go, then my mother, to thy daughter go – Make bold her bashful years with your experience – Prepare in her tender heart to hear a wooer's tale*". Here, he is being bald-on-record to acknowledge Elizabeth's face by trying to be closer to her, and this can be seen when he calls her his mother. He also follows the maxim of approbation by praising Elizabeth's experience in life, which will help her daughter learn how to handle him wooing her later on. When he says that he has a "*wooer's tale*" for Young Elizabeth, he is following the maxim of generosity by maximizing the benefit upon her. Following the maxim of generosity, he requests Elizabeth to prepare her daughter for the "*aspiring flame of golden sovereignty*", which means unlimited power and offer to make her the queen of England. This follows the maxim of approbation by calling

Young Elizabeth's heart "*tender*". Furthermore, he becomes more politely generous when he promises "*sweet silent hours of marriage joys*". He says that after he gets victory, she will sleep with a victorious man, and she will be victorious as well, saying that she will be "*Caesar's Caesar*".

Extract 33:

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*What were I best to say? her father's brother
Would be her lord? or shall I say, her uncle?
Or, he that slew her brothers and her uncles?
Under what title shall I woo for thee,
That God, the law, my honour and her love,
Can make seem pleasing to her tender years?*

KING RICHARD III

Infer fair England's peace by this alliance.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

Which she shall purchase with still lasting war.

KING RICHARD III

Say that the king, which may command, entreats.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

That at her hands which the king's King forbids.

KING RICHARD III

Say, she shall be a high and mighty queen.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

To wail the tide, as her mother doth.

KING RICHARD III

Say, I will love her everlastingly.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

But how long shall that title 'ever' last?

KING RICHARD III

Sweetly in force unto her fair life's end.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

But how long fairly shall her sweet lie last?

KING RICHARD III

So long as heaven and nature lengthens it.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

So long as hell and Richard likes of it.

KING RICHARD III

Say, I, her sovereign, am her subject love.

Elizabeth mocks Richard and says "*What were I best to say? her father's brother - Would be her lord? or shall I say, her uncle? - Or, he that slew her brothers and her uncles? - Under what title shall I woo for thee....*".

Richard uses an on-record FTA with positive politeness and says that England's peace relies on her alliance. Of course, this is an exaggerated statement, flouting the maxim of quality, but it follows the maxim of approbation by saying that a young girl can cause peace, and the maxim of modesty by being a king who relies on a young girl.

Then Richard produces a number of directive speech acts using the verb "say". He first says "*Say that the king, which may command, entreats*", and this, in a bald-on-record way, is a command, since he is saying directly that the king (Richard), who has the power to command, requests

her. Richard says "*Say, she shall be a high and mighty queen*", following the maxim of generosity by offering to make her queen, and this follows the maxim of quality since she will really be a queen when she marries Richard. He also says "*Say, I will love her everlastingly*", following the maxim of generosity and approbation, in addition to using a commissive speech act by committing himself to loving her. He flouts the maxim of quality here; Richard is not able to love a person, and the proof is what happened to Lady Anne. When Elizabeth asks him about how long his love for her will last, he says "*Sweetly in force unto her fair life's end*", saying that he will love till the end of her "*fair life*", following the maxim of approbation. Of course this follows the maxim of quality as well. Richard says "*Say, I, her sovereign, am her subject love*", and this is following the maxim of generosity by offering love, and the maxim of modesty by saying that although he is her king, he is her subject love. Also the promising of love means that Richard is also using directive speech acts using "*say*", but in reality they are commissive or expressive speech acts.

Extract 34:

KING RICHARD III

Be eloquent in my behalf to her.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

An honest tale speeds best being plainly told.

KING RICHARD III

Then in plain terms tell her my loving tale.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

Plain and not honest is too harsh a style.

KING RICHARD III

Your reasons are too shallow and too quick.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*O no, my reasons are too deep and dead;
Too deep and dead, poor infants, in their grave.*

KING RICHARD III

Harp not on that string, madam; that is past.

Richard uses bald-on-record politeness and uses a directive speech act by ordering Elizabeth to be a powerful voice speaking on his behalf in order to persuade Young Elizabeth. Richard also uses a directive speech act in order to tell Elizabeth's daughter his "*loving tale*", following the maxim of approbation and flouting the maxim of manner. Since she still calls Richard a Richard a liar, Richard says "*Your reasons are too shallow and too quick*", which means that her answers are too shallow and hasty. He follows the maxim of quality when he calls her answers hasty, but flouts it when calls them shallow. Here, he is going against the maxim of approbation. Using the honorific "*madam*", Richard uses a directive speech act to request Elizabeth not to hold on to the past, in a positive polite way.

Extract 35:

KING RICHARD III

I swear--

QUEEN ELIZABETH

By nothing; for this is no oath:

KING RICHARD III

Now, by the world--

QUEEN ELIZABETH

'Tis full of thy foul wrongs.

KING RICHARD III

My father's death--

QUEEN ELIZABETH

Thy life hath that dishonour'd.

KING RICHARD III

Then, by myself--

QUEEN ELIZABETH

Thyself thyself misusest.

KING RICHARD III

Why then, by God--

QUEEN ELIZABETH

God's wrong is most of all.

KING RICHARD III

The time to come.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

That thou hast wronged in the time o'erpast;

For I myself have many tears to wash

KING RICHARD III

As I intend to prosper and repent,

So thrive I in my dangerous attempt

Of hostile arms! myself myself confound!

Heaven and fortune bar me happy hours!

Day, yield me not thy light; nor, night, thy rest!
Be opposite all planets of good luck
To my proceedings, if, with pure heart's love,
Immaculate devotion, holy thoughts,
I tender not thy beauteous princely daughter!
In her consists my happiness and thine;
Without her, follows to this land and me,
To thee, herself, and many a Christian soul,
Death, desolation, ruin and decay:
It cannot be avoided but by this;
It will not be avoided but by this.
Therefore, good mother,--I must can you so--
Be the attorney of my love to her:
Plead what I will be, not what I have been;
Not my deserts, but what I will deserve:
Urge the necessity and state of times,
And be not peevish-fond in great designs.

Richard swears by the world, by his father's death, by himself, by God and by the future. Looking like a declaration on the surface, Richard is producing a commissive speech act to promise, following the maxim of generosity and approbation that he will repent and prosper, saying that may he destroy himself, may the heaven and destiny deprive him from happy hours, and may he has nothing but terrible luck if he does not love Young Elizabeth ("*thy beauteous princely daughter*") with a pure heart, clean devotion and holy thoughts. One can say that it is an expressive speech act, in which Richard is expressing his regret, repentance and love towards Young Elizabeth. Richard goes on by using a representative speech act being a commissive speech act in reality. Of course, Richard

here is flouting the maxim of quality again, using a hyperbole of saying that if he does not win Young Elizabeth, this land, he, Elizabeth and her daughter will suffer from "*Death, desolation, ruin and decay*".

Richard is giving too much information, flouting the maxim of quantity and manner. Then Richard says "*Therefore, good mother, I must can you so – Plead what I will be, what I have been – Not my deserts, but what I will deserve – Urge the necessity and state of times, - And be not peevish-fond in great designs*", using a directive speech act to request Elizabeth to tell her daughter about how good he will be rather than what he has been, acknowledging Elizabeth and her daughter's positive faces, calling her "*good mother*" to convey closeness and follow the maxim of approbation, and to flout the maxim of quality and even manner, as it is not clear how Richard really will be in the future.

Extract 36:

QUEEN ELIZABETH

Shall I be tempted of the devil thus?

KING RICHARD III

Ay, if the devil tempt thee to do good.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

Shall I forget myself to be myself?

KING RICHARD III

Ay, if yourself's remembrance wrong yourself.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

But thou didst kill my children.

KING RICHARD III

*But in your daughter's womb I bury them:
Where in that nest of spicery they shall breed
Selves of themselves, to your recomforture.*

QUEEN ELIZABETH

Shall I go win my daughter to thy will?

KING RICHARD III

And be a happy mother by the deed.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

*I go. Write to me very shortly.
And you shall understand from me her mind.*

KING RICHARD III

Bear her my true love's kiss; and so, farewell.

Exit QUEEN ELIZABETH

Relenting fool and shallow, changing woman!

Here, Richard is following the politeness maxim of agreement by admitting to be a devil, as well as following the maxim of modesty by lowering his level to that of a devil. In addition, follows the maxim of generosity by offering the benefit of doing to do good to her, using an on-record FTA with positive politeness to acknowledge her positive face by being in peace with each other. He is using a representative speech act to make the request of forgetting the past. One may say that Richard is flouting the maxim of quality here, for he is unlikely to do good, but it is also possible that he will be good.

Elizabeth asks Richard whether she should forget his crimes to be a mother of a king, and he uses the same persuasive tactics by saying that her memories will do her no good, following the maxim of quality, for it is true that her memories will make her suffer. Although Elizabeth says that he killed her children, he says that he will have children from her daughter, saying "*But in your daughter's womb I bury them*", following the maxim of approbation by calling Young Elizabeth's womb "*that nest of spicery*", which means a rich womb. He becomes generous by saying that those children will bring her comfort. Finally, Elizabeth asks him whether she should convince her daughter to marry him, and he produces a directive speech act to command: "*And be a happy mother by the deed*", which is don bald-on-record, to acknowledge her face because it will make her a "*happy mother*".

Before Elizabeth leaves, Richard ends the interaction by saying "*Bear her my true love's kiss; and so' farewell*", to acknowledge her face by saying "*true love's kiss*". He follows the maxim of approbation by sending his kiss, in addition to the maxim of generosity by both the kiss and his love. Of course, he is flouting the maxim of quality, for he does not really love Young Elizabeth. One may think that Richard's persuasive attempt has been successful, but later in the play, Elizabeth promises her daughter to Richard's enemy, the Duke of Richmond, deceiving him and just wasting his time and effort.

When Richard says "*Relenting fool and shallow, changing woman!*" he is saying "*Such a weak-willed fool! And such a shallow wishy-washy woman!*". Richard assumes that he has successfully persuaded Elizabeth with his linguistic persistence, and this is due to her weak will, indecisiveness, and her being a fool. Furthermore, Richard assumes that

because Elizabeth is shallow, he was able to persuade her by tempting her with the great life he said he will provide for her daughter.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Findings

After observing Richard's speech with Anne and Elizabeth in depth, one will notice how the two wooing-scenes are to a certain extent similar to each other, but with some differences in the context and manner of speech that may have affected the results and outcomes of the two verbal persuasive attempts.

5.1.1 Richard's persuasive language with Lady Anne

Regarding the context, when one looks at the interaction between Richard and Lady Anne in act I, scene II, he/she will discover that Richard is talking to her as a romantic lover, meaning that Richard's persuasive persona here is a romantic seducer and wooer. This persona that Richard exhibits in this scene is similar to the personas of Romeo, Casanova, and Don Juan. Richard, the addresser, is not yet a king in the first wooing scene, for he is here a duke, which is of a lower position than of a king. He has power as a duke, but he is not the most important man in the kingdom yet. On the other hand, Anne, the addressee, is a young woman, still in her prime. She is of a noble birth, but she is of a lower position than Richard's, the Duke of Gloucester and the brother of the king.

Richard does observe the maxim of quality when he admits committing his crimes, but he lies and flouts the maxim of quality when it comes to truly loving Anne and having good intentions towards her. In addition, lots of exaggerating hyperboles are used, especially when complimenting Anne's beauty and personality. Richard mostly uses positive politeness

with Anne, to explain that he wants what is good for her and that he wants to be closer to her, using honorifics to show respect towards her. He also becomes bald-on-record, especially when he expresses his desire to marry her, share a bed-chamber with her, and kiss her. He also becomes bald-on-record in some instances to slightly criticize her and say things like that she does not know rules of charity.

In just a few instances, negative politeness is used, just to prevent Anne from leaving and to ask her politely to listen to him. He follows the maxim of approbation on many occasions, for he continuously praises Anne's beauty and fairness excessively. The maxim of generosity is used, especially when he offers a ring to her and his assistance in the burial. In just a few instances, the maxim of modesty is used to be closer to Anne, in order for Anne to forget that he is a duke, and think of him as a lover, as when he calls himself a "*poor devoted suppliant*". The politeness maxim of agreement is also used, for Richard agrees with Anne that he killed her husband and father-in-law.

Richard also uses lots of directive speech acts with Anne, with the illocutionary forces of requesting, commanding or ordering her. He requests when he speaks as a lover, and orders/commands when there is a sense of authority, especially because he is male duke while she is a female of a lower position. When Richard uses representative speech acts, he is mostly trying to debate with Anne and express his points of view, like when he claims that her beauty caused him to commit his crimes. In addition, he uses lots of expressive speech acts, expressing his false love towards her. All this leads to Anne being successfully wooed and persuaded by Richard.

The following points sum up the manner of Richard's verbal persuasive attempt with Lady Anne:

- Richard lies excessively about his love for Anne and having good intentions towards her, flouting the maxim of quality. However, he follows it when he expresses honestly his desire to marry her. He is generally clear about his intents, so he generally follows the maxim of manner.
- Richard is mostly linguistically polite with Anne, for he uses lots of positive politeness strategies. This is shown when he expresses how Ann is admirable and interesting, by exaggerating and intensifying interest towards her, in addition to approving what she says, showing sympathy towards her and taking her wants into consideration. Furthermore, he claims common points of view and opinions, offering, promising and assuming that she will reciprocate his desires and needs. Bald-on-record strategies are used, but mostly to acknowledge her face and eliminate her anxiety, despite the fact that some bald-on-record utterances that ignore her face are used.
- Richard is complimentary and flirtatious, generous, and agreeable with Anne, so he mostly follows the politeness maxims of approbation, generosity and agreement.
- Three kinds of speech acts are excessively used. The first one is the directive speech act with the Illocutionary forces of requests and/or orders. The second one is the expressive speech act that expresses his desires, needs and feelings, also with indirect illocutionary forces of requests that Anne would marry him. The third one is the representative speech act, in which Richard debates Anne and makes arguments, in order to defend himself and

persuade her. Just a few commissive speech acts are used, the most noticeable ones being when he offers to be a good husband and when he offers a ring that is a symbol of a vow and/or a promise.

- Before saying clearly that he wants to marry Anne, Richard is somewhat indirect about his intentions in the beginning of his interaction with her, despite the fact that he can be direct, for he is a male duke who has more social power than her. This gradual and baby-stepping expression of desires leads to Richard successfully wooing Anne.

5.1.2 Richard's persuasive language with Queen Elizabeth

Regarding the context, when it comes to the interaction between Richard and Queen Elizabeth in act IV, scene IV, one should take into account the fact that Elizabeth is older and more mature than Anne. Although she is still a woman, she is of a higher social position than Anne in the first wooing scene, for in this second wooing scene, she is the former Queen of England. One may say that Richard in the play marries Anne, making her the Queen of England and of a high social position, but he has her killed before his interaction with Elizabeth. Richard is supposed to have respect for Elizabeth, for she is older, his late brother's wife and the former queen of England. One should also consider the fact that Richard in this scene is not the Duke of Gloucester any more, and he is the most valuable man in the kingdom, being the King of England, so his social status and position is very high.

When trying to persuade Elizabeth and woo her daughter through her, Richard uses lots of similar verbal tactics that he used with Anne, with slight differences, due mostly to the context. Richard's persuasive persona with Elizabeth is a man asking for the hand of a young girl from her

mother, so the interaction looks be a bit more formal, for the interaction's nature is not romantic; rather it is purely persuasive and argumentative. Richard mostly flouts the maxim of quality, for he lies about being sincere to repent. But he may be observing it as well, for his promise of a glorious life to Young Elizabeth is possible, for she will be a queen if she marries him, but not necessarily a peaceful one.

In the beginning of the interaction between Richard and Elizabeth, Richard firstly becomes bald-on-record as he orders Elizabeth to stay and listen to him. He does the same when he tells her not to mock him. At the same time, he uses positive politeness to express closeness to Elizabeth, by offering to be her son-in-law, and he even uses honorifics like "*mother*". The politeness maxim of approbation is used a lot, in order to praise Elizabeth's daughter. The politeness maxim of generosity is very highly used by Richard, as he keeps offering a kingdom to her daughter and a glorious life to her and her family, as if he is using bribes to persuade her, and all these can be seen as a dowry he keeps presenting, especially because of the context we have here, which is a marriage proposal of marriage. Occasionally, the maxim of modesty is used, especially when he calls Elizabeth his mother, which can be seen as a humble act, and also when he agrees with her that he is a devil, following the politeness maxim of agreement.

Richard uses expressive speech acts excessively, for he keeps expressing his love towards Elizabeth's daughter, in addition to his desire to repent and make amends. Moreover, the commissive speech act is used a lot, for Richard keeps promising a glorious and peaceful life to Elizabeth and her daughter. The argumentative nature of their interaction makes Richard use lots of representative speech acts, explaining how he will grant Young Elizabeth a good life. The illocutionary forces used are requests,

with some commands when there is a sense of Richard's authority as a king, requesting to marry Young Elizabeth, and ordering Queen Elizabeth to persuade her daughter to marry him.

The following points sum up the manner of Richard's verbal persuasive attempt with Queen Elizabeth:

- Richard lies excessively about his love for Young Elizabeth and having good intentions towards her, flouting the maxim of quality. However, he follows it when he expresses honestly his desire to marry her. He is generally clear about his intents, so he generally follows the maxim of manner, and although in the beginning he does not, he starts to do so after Elizabeth asks him to be clear and brief.
- Richard is mostly linguistically polite with Elizabeth; he uses lots of Positive politeness strategies. This is shown when he expresses how both Elizabeth and her daughter are admirable and interesting when he exaggerates and intensifies interest towards them, and when he approves what Elizabeth says, showing sympathy towards her and taking her wants into consideration. Furthermore, he claims common points of view and opinions, with offering, promising and assuming that she will reciprocate his desires and needs. Bald-on-record strategies are used, but mostly to acknowledge her face and eliminate her anxiety, despite the fact that some bald-on-record utterances that ignore her face are used.
- Richard is praising, generous, and agreeable with Queen Elizabeth. He mostly follows the politeness maxims of approbation, generosity and agreement. The amount of the maxims of generosity used in Elizabeth's scene is a lot more than those of

Ann's scene, for Richard keeps repeating again and again that he will provide a glorious life to Young Elizabeth.

- Four kinds of speech acts are excessively used: The first one is the directive speech act with Illocutionary forces of requests and/or orders. The second one is the expressive speech acts that express his desires, needs and feelings, also with the indirect illocutionary forces of requests that Young Elizabeth marries him. The third one is the representative speech act, in which Richard debates Queen Elizabeth and makes arguments, in order to defend himself and persuade her. The fourth speech act is excessively used as well, showing the difference between Richard's interaction with Anne and Elizabeth, which is the commissive speech act, in which Richard keeps promising to be a good husband that will provide a glorious life to Young Elizabeth.

- Similar to Anne's scene, Richard was indirect about his intentions in his interaction with Elizabeth. However, he seems to be less indirect and more direct with Elizabeth, which may be attributed to his position of a king. It may also be attributed to the fact that Elizabeth is older and more experienced, and therefore needs more verbal persistence. This verbal persistence failed anyway.

5.2 Conclusions

To sum up, regarding the type of verbal persuader, Richard is a deceiving man who lies over and over again, flouting mostly Grice's maxim of quality. But he also adds instances of honesty in his persuasive attempts. Moreover, he is generally very linguistically polite, by using Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategies and Leech's approbation and

generosity maxims. Furthermore, he switches between being direct and being indirect, by using both direct and indirect speech acts, but he is more direct with Elizabeth than with Anne.

Richard's verbal weapon with Anne was to flirtatiously praise her and flatter her ego, as if he knew that the best way to persuade a young naive girl is to flirt with her excessively and use romantic words. Richard's usage of romance as a strategy to woo Lady Anne proved to be successful when she agreed to marry him, granting Richard his desire to marry a beautiful lady from a noble birth, which allowed him to get closer to the throne. On the other hand, his verbal weapon with Elizabeth was to offer promises of repentance and to make good arguments. He could not talk to Young Elizabeth directly, and the way to persuade her mature experienced mother was to use good arguments and bribes. However, Richard's usage of reason and generosity with Queen Elizabeth proved to be unsuccessful when mature and wise Elizabeth misleads him into thinking that she will discuss the matter of with her daughter, and promises her daughter to another man, Duke of Richmond. Elizabeth was a shield between Richard and her young daughter.

The linguistic and pragmatic analysis of Richard's persuasive language in the two wooing scenes supports literature's view of Richard's persuasive language with Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth. Literature describes Richard's power and manipulation of words, and how he uses lies, honesty and courtesy to achieve his aims and desires. Pragmatic linguistics successfully complements and supports this description.

The historical *tragedy* of *Richard III* is about a king who is mostly linguistically polite with both Anne and Elizabeth, despite the fact that he has gender, social and political power over them. He shows lots of verbal affection towards Anne, Elizabeth, and Young Elizabeth.

Future linguistic studies might examine whether the same results will be achieved when applying the same linguistic theories to other Shakespearean plays, particularly the *tragedies*, and plays that belong to the *histories* genre. In addition, future studies can be conducted to compare between literature's and linguistics' observations of literary characters, particularly in Shakespearean plays.

5.3 Recommendations

This study discussed the pragmatic features of a Shakespearean character's persuasive language. Thus, it introduces several recommendations and guidelines. There are recommendations for both students and instructors of language and linguistics, of literature, of theatre and acting, and of others fields. In addition, there are recommendations for common language speakers and for further research.

5.3.1 Recommendations for students and instructors of language and linguistics

The researcher recommends that with the guidance of instructors and professors, students of language and linguistics should not only focus on learning pragmatic theories, but also should apply them to actual language and speech to understand fully how they are actually used by speakers. In addition, it is useful to investigate the element of persuasion in actual language and speech, particularly in relation to pragmatic theories. The language which can be a subject for pragmatic investigation can be almost anything, whether it is language in real life in different fields, fictional language or language from literary works. Instructors should encourage students to apply pragmatic theories to all kinds of

discourse they may be interested in, and even be aware of how pragmatics operates in everyday language.

5.3.2 Recommendations for students and instructors of literature

This study suggests that students of literature should benefit from pragmatic theories by applying them to literary works of different genres, with the help of instructors and professors. Instructors should provide useful guidelines for the students to examine how characters of different kinds of literature use pragmatic theories in the speeches, especially where the element of persuasion takes place.

5.3.3 Recommendations for students and instructors of theatre and acting

Students of theatre and acting can use the study of pragmatics for their advantage, under the guidance of teachers, instructors and professors, and even actual actors and directors who can also benefit from this field. They can study pragmatic theories to get a better idea of how dramatic scenes operate, understanding the pragmatic dynamics of them, whether they are performed on stage, television, cinema or radio channels. Instructors of drama and acting can introduce pragmatics to students, showing how this field of study works hand in hand with how characters' languages are produced. In addition, particular attention should be given to scenes that include persuasive language, because of their significant function and usage of pragmatic theories. Such recommendations can be followed and achieved in different languages. Thus, those who are involved in Arabic drama can follow them as well.

5.3.4 Recommendations for students and instructors of other fields

Since language exists everywhere and in every field, students of other fields can examine the usage of pragmatic theories and persuasive language in their fields of study. For example, students of marketing can learn how to use language pragmatically and persuade others to buy a certain product. Moreover, students of law can learn how to do the same to persuade the judge and jury to agree with the facts and information he provides in a court of law. In addition, students of education can learn how to transmit information to the students and make these information stick in their minds. Further, students of political science can learn how to support political arguments in debates.

Moreover, it is also recommended that students of psychology learn how pragmatics operates when a person is in a persuasive mental state. Students of sociology can learn how in social situations in which there is persuasion, pragmatic strategies are used. Students of history are recommended to learn how pragmatic persuasive strategies are used in 16th century England in Early Modern English. Since this research is conducted in the University of Bahrain; it can be very useful to apply pragmatic theories to Arabic language. This will be an interesting observation, because it will allow the students majored in Arabic language to discover how pragmatic theories created by western scholars can be applied to Arabic, and how the element of persuasion operates in it. Moreover, students of Arabic literature can examine the element of persuasion in Arabic literature. The study of pragmatics and persuasive language can reach many fields, for all fields are interrelated. Instructors of each field can introduce pragmatic theories to students and relate those

theories to the students' fields of study, benefiting from the study of pragmatics to teach the guidelines of their fields.

5.3.5 Recommendations for common language speakers

Not only people involved in academic studies can benefit from the study of pragmatics and persuasive language, but also, common speakers of any language can use pragmatic strategies in the persuasive language they use in their daily lives. For example, a buyer can use pragmatic persuasive strategies when bargaining with a seller. Parents can even use pragmatic theories to persuade their children in the process of raising them. A man who wants to marry can use pragmatic theories to persuade a woman to marry him, or to persuade her parents when asking for her hand. The list goes on regarding how pragmatic persuasive strategies can be used in different situations in one's daily life.

5.3.6 Recommendations for further research

Further studies should place the investigation of pragmatic persuasive strategies within other contexts. Thus, the researcher suggests the following:

- Further investigation of pragmatic persuasive strategies should be conducted in relation to other Shakespearean plays, belonging to different genres, such as *histories*, *comedies*, and *tragedies*. This can provide a comparison between Shakespeare's different plays, in addition to the different genres of his works, all of which in relation to pragmatic persuasive strategies.
- Other subjects of investigation can be other characters in Shakespeare's plays. All of these characters can have different natures and personas, which can project different usages of pragmatic persuasive strategies. This can provide a comparison

between different Shakespearean characters regarding the usage of pragmatic persuasive strategies, showing the differences and similarities between them that can show the overall pragmatic and persuasive nature of Shakespeare's characters.

- Another potential area of research can be examining pragmatic persuasive strategies in other literary works other than Shakespeare's, belonging to different genres and periods, and written in different languages. This can provide a comparison between Shakespeare's works and other literary works in relation to pragmatic persuasive strategies, in addition to a comparison between literary works belonging to different languages.
- Pragmatic persuasive strategies in other fields can be examined; especially that many of them contain language in real life. This can introduce the study of pragmatics to academics and students of other fields, and can provide a pragmatic comparison between them as registers, and between language in real life and fictional language.
- Pragmatic investigation of the persuasive language of common language users and speakers can be conducted. Linguistic, psychological and sociological studies can examine how speakers of different languages use pragmatic strategies in their persuasive language in their daily lives. This can accompany examining different social and mental situations, providing a comparison between different situational contexts regarding pragmatic persuasive strategies.

REFERENCES

- Agyekum, K. (2004). Aspects of Akan Persuasive Language. In *RASK International Journal of Language and Communication*. Vol. 21, 63-96. (2004). Aarhus: Aarhus University.
- Allott, N. (2010). *Key Terms in Pragmatics*. London, GBR: Continuum International Publishing.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Behnam, A. (2009). Verbal Power Duel: Verbal Combat Strategies in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar: Brutus Versus Antony. In *KEMANUSIAAN The Asian Journal of Humanities*. (2008). Vol. 16, 35-57. Penang: Malaysia University of Science.
- Beier, B. V. (2014). The Art of Persuasion and Shakespeare's Two Iagos. In *Studies In Philology*, Vol. 111, No.1, 34-64. North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.
- Boden, S. (2004). *Persuasive Dialogues in Shakespeare's Dramatic Work*. Jena: University of Jena. Retrieved October 15, 2014, from <http://www.db-thueringen.de/servlets/DerivateServlet/Derivate-3108/Boden.pdf>.
- Bouchara, A. (2009). *Politeness in Shakespeare: Applying Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory to Shakespeare's Comedies*. Hamburg: Diplomica Verlag.
- Brown, P & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness – Some Universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Brown, R & Gilman, A. (1989). Politeness Theory and Shakespeare's Four Major Tragedies. In *Language in Society*. (1989). Vol. 18, No. 2, 159-212. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chakrani, B. (2007). Cultural Context and Speech Act Theory" A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Bargaining Exchanges in Morocco. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Symposium about Language and Society-Austin*. (2007). Vol. 51, 43-53. Texas: Texas Linguistics Forum.
- Crisan, R & Pop, A (2013). *The Efficiency of Pragmatic Implicature in the Language of Tourism*. In *The International Scientific Conference Literature, Discourse, and Multicultural Dialogue, 1st Edition*. (2013). 156-161. Târgu Mureș: The Alpha Institute for Multicultural Studies, Petru Maior University.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse – A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge – Taylor & Francis Group.
- Davies, P. (2000). Grice's Cooperative Principle: Getting the meaning across'. In *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics*. (2000). 1–26. Leeds: University of Leeds.
- Frederking, R, E. (1996). Grice's Maxims: Do the Right thing. In *Working Notes of the AAAI Spring Symposium on Computational Approaches to Interpreting and Generating Conversational Implicature*. (1996). 21 – 26. Menlo Park: AAAI Press.
- Geyer, N. (2008). *Discourse and Politeness: Ambivalent Face in Japanese*. London, GBR: Continuum International Publishing.
- Gilbert, A. (1997). Techniques of Persuasion in Julius Caesar and Othello. In *Neophilologus*. Vol. 8, No. 2, 309-323. Berlin: Springer.

- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In *Pragmatics (syntax and semantics)*. (1975). Vol. 9, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Hadi, A. (2012). A Critical Appraisal of Grice's Cooperative Principle. In *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*. (2013). Vol.3, No.1, 69-72. Wuhan: Scientific Research Publishing, Inc.
- Hardin, K. J. (2010). Trying to Persuade: Speech Acts in the Persuasive Discourse of Intermediate Spanish Learners. In *A Mosaic of Languages and Cultures*. (2010). 155-179. Dallas: SIL International.
- Kan, F. (2012). Analysis of Politeness Strategy in Competitive Business English Letters. In *International Conference on Education Technology And Management engenering – Lecture Notes in Information Technology*. (2012). Vols. 16-17, 397 – 425. Xuchang: Xuchang University.
- Keller, S. D. (2010). Combining Rhetoric and Pragmatics to Read Othello. In *English Studies*, Vol.91. No. 4, 398-411. New York: Routledge Publishing.
- Khosravizadeh, P & Sadehvandi, N. (2011). Some Instances of Violation and Flouting of the Maxim of Quantity by the Main Characters (Barry & Tim) in Dinner for Schmucks. In *International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics - IPEDR*. (2011). Vol. 26, 122-127. Singapore: IACSIT Press.
- Lee, J & Pinker, S. (2010). Rationales for Indirect Speech: The Theory of the Strategic Speaker. In J, R, Anderson. (2010). *Psychological Review*. Vol. 117, 785-807. Harvard: American Psychological Association.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles in Pragmatics*. Harlow: Longman Group Ltd.

- McGlinn, J. B. (1999). *A Teacher's Guide to the Signet Classic Edition of William Shakespeare's Richard III*. Westminster: Penguin.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics – An Introduction (Second Edition)*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Mullini, R. (2012). "Was Ever a Woman in This Humour Won?": The Power of Pragmatic Strategies in Richard III's wooing of Lady Anne. A case study. In *Historical Perspectives on Forms of English Dialogue*. (2012). 59-79. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Olaters. (2006). *Richard III – Richard and Language*. Retrieved April 5, 2014, from <http://williamshakespeareexperience.blogspot.com/2006/10/richard-iii-richard-and-language.html>.
- Pastor, M. D & Dolores, M. (2005). A Politeness View of Persuasion in ESL/EFL. In *Language and Texts*. (2005). 45-58. Madrid: Spanish Society of Teaching Language and Literature (SDLL).
- Perloff, R. M. (2003). *Dynamics of Persuasion – Communication and Attitudes in the 21st Century*. No. 2. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Pinker, S. (2007). *The Evolutionary Social Psychology of Off-record Indirect Speech Acts*. In *Intercultural Pragmatics*. (2007). Vol. 4, No. 4, 437-461. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1965). What is a Speech Act?. In *Philosophy in America*. (1965). 221-239. London: Allen and Unwin.

- Shigemitsu, Y. (2004). Perspective Difference in 'Bald on Record' between Japanese and English Speakers. In *The Academic Reports, The Faculty of Engineering, Tokyo Institute of Polytechnic*. (2004). Vol. 27, No. 2, 40-52. Tokyo: Tokyo Polytechnic University.
- Smith, P, W, H. (1991). *Speech Act Theory, Discourse Structure and Indirect Speech Acts*. Leeds: University of Leeds.
- Stepkowska, A. (2009). Wooing-scenes in "Richard III": A Parody of Courtliness?. In *Styles of Communication*. (2009). Vol. 1, No. 1. 141-146. Poland: Poznan College of Modern Languages.
- Taillard, M, O. (2000). Persuasive Communication: The Case of Marketing. In *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*. Vol. 12, 145-172. London: The UCL Division of Psychology and Language Sciences.
- Tsuda, S. (1993). Indirectness in Discourse: What Does it Do in Conversations?. In *Intercultural Communication Studies*. Vol. 3, No. 1, 63-74. Kingston: International Association for Intercultural Studies.
- Varela, D. Davies J, Simmons, J. & Williams, R. (2005). The Art of Persuasion. In *Bard & Co*. 202-209. Shah Alam: Marshall Cavendish Limited.
- Werring, R. (2011). *Speech Acts in Shakespeare – A Critique on the Notion of a Play as a Parasitic Form of Communication*. Den Haag: Faculty of Humanities.
- Wenzhong, Z & Jingyi, L. (2013). A Pragmatic Study on the Functions of Vague Language in Commercial Advertising. In *English Language Teaching*. (2013). Vol. 6, No. 6, 103-112. Toronto: Canadian Center of Science and Education.

Yousef, T. I. (2014). A Pragmatic Reading of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet. In *Dirasat: Human & Social Sciences*. Vol. 41, 903-916. Amman: The University of Jordan.

Yuan-Guey, C. (2014). King Lear Revisited: Shakespeare's Language Use and Tragic Art. In *NCUE Journal of Humanities*. Vol. 10, 1-19. Changhua: National Changhua University of Education.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ملخص الدراسة

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل شخصية ريشارد الثالث في مسرحية شكسبير من الناحية اللغوية و التداولية. يستعمل ريشارد الشرير لغة الإقناع مع امرأتين بهدف تحقيق خطته الشريرة في المسرحية. بالإضافة إلى أن أسلوب الخطاب يقرر مستوى الصراحة و بالتالي يؤثر كذلك على مستوى اللباقة. الدراسة تتناول مشهدين من مسرحية ريشارد الثالث: ما يسمى بمشهد التودد و هما المشهد الثاني من الفصل الأول و المشهد الرابع من الفصل الرابع. و في هذين المشهدين، ريشارد يتواصل لفظياً مع الشخصيتين السيدة آن و الملكة إليزابيث. و قد تم تحليل هذين المشهدين من حيث مبدأ التعاون و الأفعال اللغوية و اللباقة من أجل الوصول إلى فكرة شاملة عن الصفات التداولية لكل مشهد.

التحليل اللغوي و التداولي لمشهدي التودد أظهر دعماً للتحليل الأدبي لهذين المشهدين. فالتحليل الأدبي وصف ريشارد أنه مناوئ في استعمال اللغة و أنه يستعمل الكذب و الصدق و المجاملة في خطابه مع السيدتين. غالباً ما يكذب ريشارد لإقناع و إغواء السيدة آن و الملكة إليزابيث، لكنه أيضاً يستعمل الصدق في عدد من المرات، مستعملاً أفعالاً لغوية مباشرة و غير مباشرة معاً، و مخالفة و إتباع في أغلب الأحيان مبدأ النوعية. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، أظهر ريشارد لباقة بصفة عامة مع السيدة آن و الملكة إليزابيث، مستعملاً الكثير من إستراتيجيات اللباقة الإيجابية و مبادئ اللباقة: الإستحسان و الكرم. و أخيراً، يستعمل ريشارد الرومانسية كأداة للتودد إلى السيدة آن و ينجح في هذه المحاولة، كما يستعمل العقل كأداة للتودد إلى الملكة إليزابيث بيد أنه يفشل في هذه المحاولة.

جامعة البحرين

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية و آدابها

كلية الآداب



الإستراتيجيات التداولية و التواصلية في الإقناع في مسرحية

شكسبير ريشارد الثالث

أطروحة مقدمة كجزء من متطلبات الحصول على درجة الماجستير في الدراسات التطبيقية في اللغة
الإنجليزية

إعداد

فيصل عاشور قاسم

20052710

إشراف

الدكتور مارتن باركر

أستاذ مشارك

جامعة البحرين

مملكة البحرين

أبريل، 2015