A Pragma-stylistic Study of Hybrid Speech Acts in Selected Dramatic Texts

Riyadh Khalil Ibrahim
Department of English, College of Languages
University of Baghda, Iraq (Corresponding Author)

Khamail Ali Waheeb
Wasit Directorate of Education, Iraq

Abstract
The study is intended to investigate the role of speech act theory (SAT) in understanding dramatic texts through using pragma-stylistic approach. It is also an attempt to examine the stylistic effects of using speech acts (SAs) and their implication in conveying the theme of the play and the intentions of the characters. Therefore, eight extracts are selected from Harold Pinter's Plays : A Night Out and The Birthday party, to be the data of analysis. The analysis reveals that the interaction between stylistics and pragmatics is a vital tool for analyzing dramatic texts in terms of (SAT). SAs are grouped into systematic combination depending on the purpose of the speaker or the playwright. Direct of fit is the most decisive aspect of the combination of some hybrid speech acts. The pragma-stylistics analysis of hybrid (SAs) also reveals the importance of these speech acts in conveying the intended message of the dramatist through the contextual details offered about the characters and events. These details can secure a proper interpretation of the socio-psychological relationships between the characters and the audience of the play.
Keywords: Hybrid speech acts, felicity conditions, pragma-stylistics

Introduction

Stylistics is a branch of linguistics. It is usually defined as the study of style. The concept of style is an old one. It goes back to the very beginning of classical Rhetorics and poetics. It is originally taken from the Latin word (stilus) to mean a short stick made of reed used for writing on boards made of wax(Hough,1969, p.1).

Throughout its history, stylistics witnessed a great deal of development. This development is a result of the development of linguistic theories and the political changes in society which affect the life and the language of people. Today stylistics is a solid discipline interested in analyzing the language of different texts. Obviously contemporary stylistics is influenced by the late twentieth century development of linguistic studies in discourse analysis, pragmatics and sociolinguistics. Consequently, stylistics adopts a range of concepts and models from these fields. These concepts help stylistics to investigate the interpretive impact of linguistic peculiarities used within literature (Fabb, 2002,p.6).

Scholars like Radford(1997), Simpson(2004), Jeffries and Mclntyre (2010) and others maintained that contemporary stylistics is a mature discipline not confined to the analysis of literary texts as it always was. Stylistics involves the analysis of non-literary texts such as scientific, political, legal texts, advertisement, etc.

The latest development of stylistics and its disciplinary nature has led to the emergence of sub-branches; linguistic stylistics, formal stylistics, feminist stylistics, functional stylistics, critical stylistics, pragmatic stylistics and cognitive stylistics (Wales, 2001, p.4). In effect, pragmatic-stylistics is a branch of stylistics which emerged in the 1960s but came to be a focal approach to text analysis during the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s.

The research problem can be stated thus:

1-How can a pragma-stylistic approach to hybrid speech acts be beneficial in providing a mutual understanding among the playwright, the characters and the audience?

2- How far an eclectic model of analysis (pragmatics and stylistics) can be successful in studying dramatic texts?

To the best of the researchers 'knowledge, there exists rare studies that tackle hybrid speech acts in dramatic texts using a pragma-stylistic analysis, thus this can be an attempt to bridge a gap in the literature.

Research Objectives

The present study aims at:

1- Presenting a comprehensive survey of the available literature on the phenomenon of hybrid speech acts.

2- Applying a pragma-stylistic model of analysis on the dramatic texts to detect the type and the realization of hybrid speech acts used.

3-Giving some conclusions derived from the data analysis and suggesting some studies for future research.

Pragma-stylistics

Huang (2012) defines Pragma-stylistics or pragmatic stylistics by stating that it "refers to the application of the findings and methodologies of the theoretical pragmatics to the study of the concept of style in language'(p.19). Stylistics in its analysis to different texts gets use of formal aspects of language, however in analyzing narrative texts and in particular dramatic texts, stylistics makes use of pragmatic theories and strategies to arrive at a comprehensive analysis. Therefore, stylisticians frequently depend on pragmatics theories and discourse analysis in analyzing dramatic texts. Some stylisticians have focused on the dramatic structure of plays as Burton (1980) , others have dealt with plays in terms of politeness and other pragmatic theories like Leech (1992), Short (1989) and Simpson (1989), Culpeper (1998,pp.3-4).

Drama is the literary genre that is mostly like real life situations. It largely consists of dialogues and stage directions. Thus, Stylisticians use those areas of linguistic analysis that best developed by linguists to describe face-to–face interaction and to infer meaning in context. Besides, the language of dramatic dialogues is similar to the everyday language of people. In effect, it is acceptable to employ pragmatics and discourse analysis theories and techniques such as SAT to arrive at a better understanding and interpretation of the text and the message which the playwright wants to convey to his audience.

Language as Action

The theory of SAs is one of the basic components of pragmatics for a long time. The concept (SAT) is first introduced by the British philosopher J.L. Austin (1911-1960) in his own lectures at Harvard University. It is initiated as a reaction to many earlier linguistic theories which disregarded language as action. It is based on the assumption that when people say something they do something. This theory has been modified and developed by the American philosopher Searle (1969) in his influential book entitled "Speech Act" (Verschueren, 1999,p.22).

Austin (1962,p.6) distinguishes between two types of utterances *performatives; acts* that describe constant information, and *constatives*; propositions which can be stated positively or negatively; statements of facts which could be either right or wrong. In contrast to constatives, Austin remarks that performative are used not to describe something but to achieve something for instance, to promise is not to state something about the world rather it is to perform the act of promising.

Austin (1962,pp.14-5) proposes certain circumstances and conditions for the utterances to be felicitous calling them the *felicity conditions*, which demand that there must be an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect. The persons and circumstances for a certain SA must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked. The procedure must be executed by all participants both correctly and completely. Violation of any of these conditions the SA will be infelicitous. Accordingly, the utterance of the sentence:

I now pronounce you husband and wife.

would be rendered felicitous if it is uttered by a priest to a pair of man and woman in the church, as people all gather for celebrating the wedding ceremony. The whole action must be taken seriously by the participants (priest and the couple); otherwise, the SA of pronouncing would go unhappy (infelicitous). If an act fails to conform to the required conventions, it would be

described as *misfire*, and if it is carried out insincerely by the participants, it would be described as an abuse, (Saeed, 1997, p. 207).

Searle (1969, p. 57), on the other hand, tries to develop the felicity conditions of SAs by postulating the necessary and sufficient conditions for the performance of the SA of "*promise*" as a typology. He proposes four kinds of conditions which govern the happy performance of an illocutionary act. These conditions are; *Propositional Content Condition* which specifies restrictions on the content of the speaker's utterance expressed in the sentence.

Preparatory Condition that determines the real world prerequisites to each illocutionary act,

Sincerity Condition that represents the essential beliefs, feelings and intentions of the speaker, being appropriate to the type of illocutionary act in question,

Essential Condition that is the constitutive rule which governs the issuance of a certain illocutionary act. These conditions represent the syntactic and semantic rules required for building up an utterance.

Austin, on the other hand, proposes the theory of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. The three levels of action carried by language in parallel: *first*ly, there is the locutionary act which consists of the actual utterance produced by the speaker; *secondly*, there is the illocutionary act, which is the real intended meaning of the utterance; *finally*, there is the perlocutionary act which is the actual effect of the utterance, such as scaring, persuading, encouraging, etc. It is interesting to notice that the locutionary act is a feature of any kind of language, not only natural ones, and that it does not depend on the existence of any actor. In contrast, an illocutionary act needs the existence of an environment outside language and an actor that possesses intentions, in other words an entity that uses language for acting in the outside environment. Finally, a perlocutionary refers to the consequential effects of uttering something on the audience or listener.

To sum up, SA is a significant theory that attracts the attention to the functional side of language. It plays a prominent role in communication as the production and interpretation of utterances in different circumstances depending on the recognition of the acts.

Speech Act Classification
Several attempts have been made to classify illocutionary acts into a limited number of types. Austin (1962) distinguishes five different groups of performatives:
1. Verdictives, acts that provide findings or judgments, such as estimate, value, assess.
2. Excercitives, this class of verbs shows exercise of powers, rights or influences such as order, dedicate, dismiss,
3. Commissives, acts of commitment or promises of different kinds or the taking on of an obligation or states an intention such as promise, guarantee, plan, swear and bet.
4. Behabitives, SAs involve verbs indicate expressions of attitude and social behavior as congratulate.
5. Expositives involve verbs that refer to discussion and argument going by providing different kinds of clarification, such as: ask, assume, concede, and hypothesize.

Searle (1969) further develops a taxonomy. It is an attempt to systematize Austin's theory of SAs, so that he proposes:

1. Representatives, this class of SAs aims at "committing the speaker (in varying degrees) to something's being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition.
2. *Directives*, the illocutionary point is to direct the hearer towards doing (or not doing) something.
3. *Commissives*, they are SAs in which the speaker is committed to some future course of action.
4. *Declarations,* this class of illocutions brings into existence the state described in the proposition.
5. *Expressives*, they are SAs that express "the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs.

Many specialists regard Searle's classification as the most reliable and comprehensive one, however, the theory runs into problems. There are real examples where difficulties lie in determining a single point to the utterance. Such as in:

 "I hereby reward you with a golden watch" (expressive + commissive)
"I hereby sell you my car for 400 €." (Commissive +directive hybrid)
" I bet that Black Beauty will win!"—"Ok." (Hybrid of conditional commitments of hearer and speaker)
"I hereby invite you to our house tonight" (commissive +directive hybrid). (Eckardt, 2010, p.3)

On his article, Hancher (1979) made a comparison between different taxonomies of SAs; Austin (1969), Ohmann (1972), Fraser (1974) and Searle (1976). He compares all these five taxonomies with Searle's taxonomy as a reference standard. He considers Searle's taxonomy as more comprehensive and more economical than other classifications. For him, these taxonomies represent two kinds of illocutionary acts:

 Illocutionary acts that combine Commissive with Directive illocutionary force, for example, offering, inviting, challenging.

Illocutionary acts that require two participants, for example, giving, selling, contracting.

He refers to the fact that Searle (1976) identifies in his taxonomy five basic kinds of SAs; Representatives, Directives, Commissives, Expressives and Declarations, in addition to an important sub-class of declarative that is representative- declarative SA. This sub-class is a hybrid speech act. Like any representatives, a representative-declarative involves a truth claim but it also carries the force of declaration. Hancher postulates the following examples; if an umpire rules that the ball was in, the ball is counted as in, even if it was out and was seen to be out by others. Hancher (1979,p.5) sustains his hypotheses by arguing that Ohmann's classification contains a special category which no one else made it that is the category of *'conditional*s, it includes the making of contracts which Hancher considers as a prime use of language. Ohmann(1972) considers conditional SA a hybrid speech act that combines influencer (directive) and (commissive).

-*Conjunctive conditionals* are likely to be bargains:
Stay for half an hour, and I'll make you a drink.
Disjunctive conditionals are likely to be threats:
Stop or I'll shoot.   (Ohmann,1972)

Hancher (1979,p.6) refers to the fact that this combination of directive-commissive is not only found in compound sentences, but also in simple sentences as in invitations and offers as in the following examples:

-Would you like a drink?
 -Have a drink.

Offering, bidding, inviting, volunteering and formal challenging are all hybrid SAs that combine directive with commissive illocutionary forces, direct the hearer's behavior and commit the speaker to a certain course of behavior. Accordingly, Hancher contends that speech acts have dual or composite function for which he proposes the notion of "hybrid speech acts". These acts, he adds cannot be completed without other party's cooperation vis-à-vis, hearer's involvement which he labels " cooperative illocutionary act".Hancher has criticized Searle's classification of **illocutionary acts (1976,p.11) for neglecting this issue as Searle classifies "Offers" as** commissives, because offers do not only require the speaker to honour his/her commitment to the hearer, but also call the speaker to persuade the hearer to accept the offer, hence offers represent a hybrid speech act that combine directive and commissive speech acts . Bach and Harnish (1979) likewise avoid an extensive discussion of hybrids, even though they officially use the term for some mixed cases. However, they sort out interactional SA (buy, sell, lend, borrow, bequest, etc.) as *"conventional acts"*. Conventional acts are, as they say, generally uninteresting because they are interactions defined by social convention, not acts of communication.

Methodological Considerations
The pragmatic analysis of SAs is frequently carried out in linguistic studies. This is essentially accomplished by identifying the types of SAs and their felicity or appropriate conditions. The present study follows this pragmatic analysis. Another type of analysis is provided as well, which is the stylistic analysis of texts. It is intended to deduce the stylistic effects which resulted from using SAs in the selected extracts. The two levels of analysis (i.e.: pragma-stylistics)   account for the meaning and interpretation of literary works. Consequently, the pragmatic level of this study involves the following techniques: identifying the type of SAs according to the classification provided by Searle (1969), and Hancher (1979), and analyzing the felicity conditions of their illocutionary acts. Searle's felicity conditions of the successful achievement of the acts are adopted with reference to the hybridity of the conditions of the acts.

The stylistic level of the study accounts for the stylistic aspects of using SAs in drama, their interpretation and effects on the works as a whole. This level of analysis follows Short's model of analyzing SA in dramatic texts. Short (1996,p.198-204) explains in details examples of stylistic analysis of SAs in dramatic texts to arrive at their interpretation. He claims that the meaning of texts can be understood through the use of SAs. He maintains that the contextual

aspects of the text have a crucial role in analyzing the SAs of the literary text. He, thus focuses on:

1. Investigating the extracts to see if there are any typical kinds of SAs used by the different characters.
2. Examining each SA in turn, and deciding whether it is direct or indirect SAs.
3. Deducing from these information about the characters and their relationships and/ or the thematic concern of the text.
4. Explaining the effects of this analysis on the understanding of the whole play and the characters.
5.Examining the perlocutionary effects of the SAs and deciding whether they succeed or fail. If they fail, what the consequences of the failure are?
6.Explaining the effects of this analysis on the understanding of the whole play and the characters.

Data Analysis
        For the purpose of the study, eight texts culled from two plays written by Harold Pinter have been chosen; four texts from the Night out play and another four from the Birthday Party,(Pinter,1960;Osberose,2012). The analysis follows Searle(1969), Hancher (1979), Eckardt (2010), and Short(1996).

A Summary of Night Out Play
        Albert Stokes, a loner in his late twenties lives with his emotionally-suffocating mother. He works in an office. After being falsely accused of groping a female at an office party, he wanders the streets until he meets a girl, who invites him to her flat, where he responds to her overtures by angrily demeaning her. Then he returns home to his mother.

Extract No. 1
MOTHER: <u>Albert, you'll upset me in a minute, you go on like that.</u>
ALBERT: I'm not going on about anything.   (Act One, Scene 1)
The Pragmatic Level
a-Identifying the Type of HSA.
The above utterance has a hybrid SA. According to Hancher (1979), it is a conditional SA, hence it is a commissive -directive act.

-The locutionary act of the underlined utterance is uttering conditional sentences in a nervous way.

-The illocutionary act of the underlined utterance is a conditional threat.

-The perlocutionary act is to oblige the addressee to do the act to get the state of affairs.

b- The Felicity Conditions and their Establishment
1.The preparatory Condition: S believes H is able to do A.
2.The Propositional Content Condition: S believes H does not want A to be done.
3.The Sincerity Condition: S is willing to do A.

4.The Essential Condition: It counts as an attempt to get H to do A.
c- Establishing SA Conditions
 1.Preparatory Condition: The mother wants her son to obey her orders as he always does. She believes that he could do that.
2.Propositional Content Condition: The mother threatens Albert to obey her order and go down the cellar. If he does not do what she says, he will distress her.
3.Sincerity Condition: The mother is willing that Albert obey her.
4.Essential Condition: Albert's mother threatens him in an attempt to get him do what she wants.
The Stylistic Level

It is a conditional SA. The sentence is extended to be ' you upset me if you don't obey the orders and go on talking that way'. The whole utterance is a conditional threatening. It is a direct SA as she directly commands him to stop talking ridiculously about his grandmother; otherwise she will get angry with him. There is a correspondence between the SAs pattern of the commissive-directive act (threatening) and the conditional compound sentence.   On the other hand, one can say the utterance is felicitous in which the mother, as an obsessive character, has the authority over her son and therefore she can order him. The conditions are happily fulfilled. She knows that he will obey her, she is willing to obsess him, she intends sincerely to threaten him as she has used to do when he rejects doing something and the attempt to make him obey her is done. Furthermore, the perlocutionary act of the utterance has succeeded because Albert's response to his mother threatening is that he accepts to stop talking about his grandmother.

Harold Pinter clearly illustrates the dominant character of the mother. He demonstrates the social and power relation between the mother and her son in this play through using a hybrid SA. The playwright tries to show the nature of Albert's character. The implications of the hybrid SA help to understand these stylistic effects.

Extract No. 2
MOTHER: Your father would turn in his grave if he heard you raise your voice to me. You are all I've got.
ALBERT: I'm sorry…. I raised my voice.   (Act One, P.4)

The Pragmatic Level
a-Identifying the Type of SA: According to Eckardt (2010) the utterance has a hybrid SA. It is an expressive-assertive act.
-The locutionary act of the utterance is uttering two declarative sentences in an impressive way.
-The illocutionary act of the utterance is an apologizing act.
-The perlocutionary act is to get the addressee recognize the state of affairs.
b- Felicity Conditions and their Establishment
1.The Preparatory Condition: S assumes H is willing that A be done.
2. The Propositional Content Condition: a. Any proposition P
b. S expresses the proposition of regret in his utterance.
3.The Sincerity Condition: S wishes A to be done.
4.The Essential Condition:
It counts as an attempt to make H recognize his wish for A to be done.

C-Establishing SA Conditions
1.The Preparatory Condition: Albert assumes his mother will be happy if he apologizes to her.
2.The Propositional Content Condition:
Albert wants to show his mother that he feels sorry for upsetting her.
3.The Sincerity Condition: Albert wishes to apologize.
4.The Essential Condition:
The utterance can be accounted as an attempt by Albert to let his mother recognize his regret.

The Stylistic Level
        The utterance is a direct SA. It is a hybrid of expressive-assertive SAs. There is a clear correspondence between the SAs patterns and their grammatical structure. Apologizing is expressed in two declarative sentences in which Albert apologizes first and then expresses his regret. Moreover, one can regard this utterance as felicitous. Albert knows his mother well, so he assumes she wants him to apologize. He wants to reconcile his mother; therefore, he apologizes to her. The perlocutionary act succeeds to achieve its intentions as he expresses his regret.

        The implication of using this hybrid act is to show the psychological state of Albert. His mother tries to oblige him to stay with her and not to go out. She asks him to bring the blub, asks him to have his dinner, asks her stay and play cards. When she finds that he doesn't listen to her, she tries to possess him emotionally.

Extract No. 3
GIDNEY: I'm talking to this man on behalf of the firm! <u>Unless I get a satisfactory explanation I shall   think   seriously   about   recommending   his   dismissal</u>.
(Act Two, P. 24)

The Pragmatic Level
a-Identifying the Type of SAs: According to Hancher(1979) the utterance has a hybrid SA. It is a conditional thereat.
The *locutionary act* of the utterance is a conditional statement.
The *illocutionary act* of the utterance is commissive-directive acts.
The *prelocutionary act* of the utterance is to urge the addressee to do the action.
b-The Felicity Conditions and their Establishment
1.The preparatory Condition: S believes H able to do A.
2.The Propositional Content Condition: S believes H does not want A to be done.
3.The Sincerity Condition: S is willing to do A.
4.The Essential Condition: Accounts as an attempt to urge H to answer, and S is threating H to do A.
C-Establishing SA Conditions
1.The preparatory Condition: The speaker, Gidney, requests Albert, the hearer, to give explanation to the accusation of insulting his mate, Eileen, on the party. He has the authority over Albert. So he threats him to recommend his dismissal.
2.The propositional Content Condition: Gidney threatens Albert to let him speak.
3.The Sincerity Condition: Gidney is willing to do so.

4.The Essential Condition: The speaker directs Albert to answer and commits himself to recommend Albert's dismissal as a consequence.

The Stylistic Level

The utterance is said by Gidney who is one Albert's mates on the firm. He hates Albert and tries to get rid of him because he is jealous of him. Gidney tells Eileen to accuse Albert of touching her in the party leading to his dismissal. The utterance is a conditional SA in which the first part of it is a condition for the second part. Though it is not an explicit performative SA, it is a direct one. This utterance is infelicitous that the hearer does not answer his question and give the hearer an explanation.

The stylistic effect of using this hybrid SA by the playwright is intended to show the social relation between the two characters. The utterance also leads the audience to see the hard events which Albert passes through that night.

Extract No. 4
GIRLE: Quite possibly, <u>I admit that with your continuity girls and secretaries, I don't see why you… had to approach me</u>…. Have you been on the town tonight, then? With a continuity girl?
ALBERT: You 're a bet…. Worried about continuity girls, aren't you? (Act Three, p.32)

A-The Pragmatic Level
a-Identifying the Type of hybrid SA. According to Eckardt(2010) the utterance has a hybrid SA. It is a commissive-assertive act.
-The locutionary act is uttering declarative sentences.
-The illocutionary act of the utterance is the SA of admitting and asserting.
-The perlocutionary act is to get the addressee to recognize the future course of action .
b-The Felicity Conditions and their Establishment.
1.The Preparatory Condition:
a- It is not obvious to both S and H that H knows (does not need to be   reminded of, etc.) A.
b-S believes H is willing to do A.
2.The propositional Content Condition: a-Any proposition P. b-S predicts a future course of action.
3.The Sincerity Condition: a-S wants A to be done. b-S believes A should be done.
4.The Essential Conditions:
 It counts as an undertaking to the effect that S represents an actual   state of affairs.
c-Establishing SA Conditions:
1.Preparatory Condition:
The girl wants Albert to know that she believes there are many girls in his firm. She believes that Albert wants her to assert this fact.
2.Propositional Content Condition:
The girl expresses her opinion that Albert should have girlfriends. She predicts that he accompanies one of his girlfriends in the town tonight.
3.Sincerity Condition: She is willing to assert her opinion by committing herself to the consequences of her admitting.

4.Essential Condition:
It counts as an attempt by the girl to assert her opinion about the relation between Albert and his girlfriends.

The Stylistic Level
The hybrid SA in the above utterance is commissive-assertive SA. It is an indirect SA, the girl's intention is to assert her opinion about Albert and his girlfriends. She indirectly asks Albert " Why he is alone here at night. A man like him, in his age and in his position, must be with his girlfriend enjoying himself in town". He has many girls working with him, so why he approaches her?

The correspondence between the SAs patterns and the grammatical structure is obvious through the use of declarative and interrogative sentences to represent asserting and questioning SA. The utterance is infelicitous because not all the conditions are satisfied. She assumes that Albert is willing to talk about such subject. However, Albert is so bothered by his co-worker girls at that night. The perlocutionary act of the utterance fails. Albert does not assert her opinion or answer her question. Her talk leads him later on to the consequences of frightening her. This hybrid SA indicates the dimensions of the girl's character as well as Albert's character. She is talking too much just like his mother. Albert, on the other hand, has no social relations with girls. He is an awkward person.

A Summary of the Birthday Party
The Birthday Party is about Stanley Webber, an erstwhile piano player in his 30s, who lives in a rundown boarding house, run by Meg and Petey Boles, in an English seaside town, "probably on the south coast, not too far from London". Two sinister strangers, Goldberg and McCann, who arrive supposedly on his birthday and who appear to have come looking for him, turn Stanley's apparently innocuous birthday party organized by Meg into a nightmare.

Extract No. 5
STANLEY (abruptly): How would you like to go away with me?
LULU: Where?
STANLEY: Nowhere. Still, we could go.   (Act One, P.26)

The Pragmatic Level
a-Identifying the Type of SA
According to Hancher(1979) and Eckardt(2010) the utterance has a hybrid SA. It is a commissive- directive act.
-The locutionary act of the above utterance is uttering interrogative sentence to express invitation.
-The ilocutionary act of the above utterance is an inviting act.
-The perlocutionary act of the above utterance is to get the addressee to a future course of action.
b- Felicity Conditions and their Establishment
 1.The preparatory Condition: a- H may accept or refuse A.
 b-S assumes H is willing that A be done.

2.The Propositional Content Condition: a-S expresses the proposition of invitation in his utterance. b- S predicates a future act of S.

3. The Sincerity Condition: a. S wishes A to be done.

4. Essential Condition: a. S intends to make H recognize his wish for A to be done.

C- Establishing the SA Conditions

1.The preparatory Condition: Stanley invites Lulu to go with him. He expects she is willing to do that. She may refuse or accept.

2.The Propositional Content Condition: Stanley expresses invitation to Lulu. He expects her to accept.

3.The Sincerity Condition: Stanley wishes her to accept the invitation.

4. Essential Condition: He intends to make Lulu recognize his wish.

The Stylistic Level

The utterance is a direct SA. The correspondence between the SA patterns and their grammatical structure is salient through using the interrogative sentence for invitation. It is felicitous as he wishes Lulu to come with him. He assumes she likes to. Therefore, the conditions are fulfilled. The perlocutioary act of it fails to achieve its effect when Lulu refuses his invitation.

Stanley is so desperate that morning because he has heard about the two gentlemen. Lulu, his friend, enters and sees his sad appearance. She chats with him and asks him to go out to change his mood. This has led him to think to invite her to go with him anywhere. The utterance counts as an invitation. It is a commissive- directive act. He commits himself to go with her and at the same time directs her to accept or refuse. The stylistic effect of using this utterance says something about the relation between the characters. It also displays the situation and the psychological state of Stanley. He just wants to get out of his conditions.

Extract No. 6
GOLDBERG: But today is different. How are you keeping Mrs. Poles?
MEG: <u>Oh, very well, thank you.</u>   (Act One, P. 30)

The Pragmatic Level
a-Identifying the Type of SA.
According to Hancher (1979) the utterance is an expressive-assertive SA
-The locutionary act of the underlined utterance is declarative
-The illocutionary act of the underlined utterance is thanking.
-The perlocutionary act of the underlined utterance is to get the addressee to recognize the state of affairs.
b-Felicity Conditions and their Establishment
1.The Preparatory Condition: S assumes H is willing that A is to be done.
2.The Propositional Content Condition: a-Any proposition P.
b-S expresses the proposition of thanking.
3.The Sincerity Condition: S wishes A to be done.
4.The Essential Condition: It counts as an attempt to make H recognize the state of affairs.
C-Establishing SA Conditions:

1.The Preparatory Condition: Mrs. Poles believes that it is kind of Mr. Goldberg to praise her. Therefore, she thanks him.
2.The Propositional Content Condition: Meg expresses her gratitude to Mr. Goldberg.
3.The Sincerity Condition: She is willing to thank him.
4.The Essential Condition: She tries to make him recognize her gratitude.

The Stylistic Level

The SA is an expressive SA. The utterance is a direct SA. Further, it is felicitous; Mrs. Poles expresses her gratitude to Mr. Goldberg because he praises her. His words have been very nice. Therefore, she wants to thank him. She does not only express her gratitude. The correspondence between the SAs and the grammatical structure is characterized by the declarative sentences. The perlocutionary effect of this utterance succeeds as Mr. Goldberg recognizes her gratitude.

The playwright uses this SA to display the psychological state of the characters, Mrs. Poles and Mr. Goldberg. From the first time he meets her, he praises her. He uses very nice words to flatter her. This is the way he follows to get the information he wants.

Extract N0. 7
PETEY: Well, if he's no better by lunchtime I'll go and get hold of a doctor.
GOLDBERG (briskly): It's all taken care of, Mr. Boles. Don't worry yourself.

(Act Three, P.73)

The Pragmatic Level
a- Identifying the Type of SA
According to Hancher(1979) the utterance has a hybrid SA. It is a commissive-directive SA.
-The locutionary act of the underlined utterance is uttering declarative sentences.
-The illocutionary act of the underlined utterance is a conditional offer.
-The perlocutionary act of the underlined utterance is an attempt to recognize the state of affairs.
b-Felicity Conditions and their establishment
1.The preparatory Condition: a. S believes A should be done.
b. S is willing to do A.
2.The Propositional Content Conditions: S proposes to do A.
3.The Sincerity Condition: S wants A to be done.
4.The Essential Condition: It counts as an attempt to recognize the proposal.
C-Establishing SA Conditions
1.The preparatory Condition: The speaker is Mr. Boles. He thinks that Stanley should be seen by a doctor. He is willing to fetch a doctor for Stanley.
2.The Propositional Content Condition: Petey proposes to do that if Stanley doesn't get better till lunchtime.
3.The Sincerity Condition: Petey wants Stanley to be taken care of
4.The Essential Condition: He attempts to let a doctor see Stanley.

The Stylistic Level

The utterance contains a hybrid SA. It is a direct act. The correspondence between the SA patterns and their grammatical structure is salient through the use of declarative sentences. Further, the utterance is felicitous that all the conditions are satisfied. Mr. Poles tries to help

Stanley. He offers to bring a doctor for him if he does not get better soon. The perlocutionary act of the utterance fails since the offer has been politely refused.

Goldberg tells Petey that Stanley is so sick; he has got a nervous breakdown because of the birthday party. Petey proposes to fetch a doctor to see Stanley if he doesn't get better before lunchtime. The stylistic effect of using this conditional SA is to show the way Goldberg deals with the events .It also manages to show the psychological state of Petey.

Extract No. 8

GOLDBERG (violently): Up? I thought you weren't going to go up there again?
MCCANN: What do you Why not?
GOLDBERG: You said so.
MCCANN: I never said that.
GOLDBERG: NO?
MCCANN (from the floor, to the room at large): <u>Who said that ? I never said that ! I 'll go up now.</u>

(Act Three, P. 77)

 The Pragmatic Level
a-Identifying the Type of SA
According to Hancher(1979) the utterance has a hybrid SA. It is a commissive- directive act.
-The Locutionary Act of the underlined Act is uttering interrogative and declarative sentences in a challenging tone.
-The Illocutionary Act of the underlined utterance is Challenging SA.
-The Perlocutionary Act of the underlined utterance is to recognize the state of affairs
b-Felicity Conditions and their Establishment
1.Preparatory Condition: a.H has the ability to do A.
b. H would not do A in the usual course of action.
2.The Propositional Content Conditions: S wants H to do A.
3.The Sincerity Condition : H is willing to do A.
4.The Essential Condition: It counts as an attempt to undertake A.
C-Establishing SA Conditions:
1.The Preparatory Condition: Mccann believes that he doesn't say that he wouldn't go up. He tries to make Goldberg believes he doesn't say that. Therefore, he challenges him.
2.The Propositional Content Condition: He wants to prove that he can do it.
3.The Sincerity Condition : Mccann wishes Goldberg to believe that he doesn't say these words. Therefore, he obliged to do it
4.The Essential Condition: It is an attempt to get Goldberg believes that he doesn't say these words.

The Stylistic Level
The utterance is a hybrid SA. It is a commissive-directive act. At the same time, the utterance is direct SA. It is felicitous because Mccann goes up and he says so to prove that he can do it. The perlocutionary act of the utterance succeeds because McCann goes up and brings Stanley. After the birthday night, Goldberg sympathizes Stanley after his bad condition. He gets

McCann to be nervous and says he would go up. McCann denies that and questions Goldberg to prove that.

The utterance is intended to illustrate the psychological state of Goldberg. Firstly, he seems to be a dominant character. He is confidant of himself and his mission. Yet, here his state is changed, he doesn't want McCann to go up and bring Stanley.

Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research
The study finds out that the interaction between stylistics and pragmatics is a vital tool for analyzing dramatic texts in terms of SAT. The application of SAs can support the analysis of dramatic texts and demonstrate the functions of their words and acts. It has been found that hybrid SAs are an essential category of SAs. They are grouped in systematic combinations depending on the purpose of the speaker or the playwright; they may demonstrate the state of action or affairs, then give a request and the like, direction of fit is the most decisive aspect of the combination of some hybrid SAs such as commissive-directive SAs; since the direction of fit for the two categories is to change the world to fit the words.

The stylistic analysis of SAs and hybrid SAs points out that the use of these acts is so important in conveying the intended message of the playwright in that they afford details about the characters and events. The implication of these SAs in dramatic texts provides the analyst with contextual details about the message which the playwright wants to convey to his audience. These details can secure a proper interpretation to these texts. As the case with other types of SAs, the application of hybrid speech acts can illustrate stylistic effects and purposes such as the psychological state of the characters, the dimensions of the character's personality and social and power relations among characters.
A number of future studies can be thus:
1- A similar study can be conducted, but this time on either fictional or narrative texts.
2- A pragmatic study of hybrid speech acts in media interviews deserves an investigation.

About the Authors:
Riyadh Khalil Ibrahim: is a professor of English language and linguistic. He is interested in the fields of pragmatics, stylistics, semantics, and literary theory. He has been teaching English for 25 years to undergraduate and post-graduate students.

Khamail Ali Waheeb: is an MA holder in English language and linguistics. She is currently working at Wasit Directorate of Education in Iraq.

References
Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Bach, K. and Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts.* Cambridge, Mass and London: MIT Press.

Burton, D. (1980*). Dialogue and Discourse: A Socio-linguistic Approach to Modern Drama and Naturally Occurring Conversation*. London: Ruthledge and Kegan Paul.

Culpeper, J. (1998). *Impoliteness in Drama.* In Verdonk, p., M. Short, M. and Jonathan Culpeper (eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama from Text to Context*. London: Rutledge.

Eckardt, R. (2010). *Integrated Speech Acts*. Unpublished Manuscript.available at http://zis.unigoettingen.de/mschwager/esslli09/papers/eckardt_sa. pdf.

Enkvist, N. (1973). *Linguistic Stylistics*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fabb, N. (2002). *Language and the Structure of Literature. The Linguistic Analysis of Form in Verse and Narratives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fraser, B. (1974). "An examination of the performative analysis", Papers in Linguistics,7:1-40.

Hancher, M. (1979). "The classification of cooperative illocutionary acts", Language *in Society 8* (1) :1-14.

Hough, G. (1969). *Style and Stylistics*. London: Rutledge and K. Paul.

Huang, Yan (2012). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jeffries, L & D. McIntyre(2010). *Stylistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leech , G. (1992). " Pragmatic principles in Shaw's you never can tell" in M. Toolan (ed) *Language, Text and Context:Essays in Stylistics*. London: Routhledge.

Ohmann, R. (1972). "Instrumental Style: Notes on the Theory of Speech as Action". In *Current Trends in Stylistics*. Edited by Braj B. Kachru and Herbert F. W. Stahlke. Edmonton, Alberta. Linguistic Research.

Osberose, St. (2012). *Harold Pinter: A Night Out*.

Pinter, H. (1960). *The Birthday Party*. London: Eyre Methuen Ltd.

Radford, R.(1997). *Stylistics.* London: Routledge

Saeed, John (1997). *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1976). *A Classification of illocutionary acts*. Language in Society, 5:1-23

Short, M. (1989). "Discourse Analysis and the Analysis of Drama*"*. In R. Carter and P. Simpson (eds) *Language, Discourse and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Stylistics*. London: Unwin Hyman(139-68)

Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose.* London: Longman.

Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students.* London: Routhledge.

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold

Wales, K. (2001). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. London: Longman.